





CYCLOPÆDIA  
OF  
BIBLICAL,  
THEOLOGICAL, AND ECCLESIASTICAL  
LITERATURE.

PREPARED BY

THE REV. JOHN M'CLINTOCK, D.D.,

AND

JAMES STRONG, S.T.D.

VOL. III.—E, F, G.

PRIVATE LIBRARY  
RICHARD C. HALVERSON

NEW YORK:  
HARPER & BROTHERS, PUBLISHERS,  
FRANKLIN SQUARE.

1882.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year one thousand eight hundred  
and seventy, by

HARPER & BROTHERS,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the Southern District of New York.

## P R E F A C E T O V O L. I I I.

---

IN the Preface to the first volume of this work it was stated that the department of Biblical Literature is exclusively in the charge of Dr. STRONG, who is responsible for all the articles in that field. It may be proper to add that this department embraces not merely Bible names, but also all branches of Biblical Introduction, including such articles, for instance, as *Canon of Scripture, Commentary, Concordance, Criticism, Cross, I., II., Ethnology*, etc.; also, Biblical philology, manuscripts and versions, and many cognate subjects, such as *English Versions, Eschatology, Essenes, Ethiopic Language, Fortification, Geology, Government*, etc. In this department the Dictionaries of Kitto and Smith are freely used, all the important matter of both being incorporated into these pages, with references at the end to the authority cited. The range of this department, however, is greatly extended beyond the scope of these or any similar works heretofore published.

In Dr. McCLINTOCK'S department, all verbal citations are noted by quotation marks. If this is omitted in any case, it is by accident. In this department, also, the names of the writers of special articles are indicated by their initials in the list at the end of the volume, as follows:

- W. J. A.—WILLIAM J. ALLINSON, editor of *Friends' Review*, Burlington, N. J.  
G. F. C.—Professor G. F. COMFORT, Princeton College.  
D. D.—The Rev. DANIEL DE VINNE, New York.  
R. D.—The Rev. ROBERT DAVIDSON, D.D., Huntingdon, L. I.  
F. W. F.—The Rev. F. W. FLOCKEN, missionary of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Tultscha, Bulgaria.  
E. V. G.—The Rev. E. V. GERHART, D.D., professor in Mercersburgh Theological Seminary.  
J. T. G.—The Rev. J. T. GRACEY, missionary in India (Methodist Episcopal Church).  
H. G.—The Rev. HENRY GRAHAM, Lansingburgh, N. Y.  
H. H.—The Rev. H. HARBAUGH, D.D., late president of Theological Seminary, Mercersburgh, Pa.  
R. D. II.—Professor R. D. HITCHCOCK, D.D., Union Theological Seminary, New York.  
C. H.—The Rev. CHARLES HODGE, D.D., Princeton Theological Seminary.  
G. F. II.—Professor GEORGE F. HOLMES, University of Virginia.  
J. F. II.—The Rev. JOHN F. HURST, D.D., Mission Institute, Bremen, Germany.  
S. M. J.—SAMUEL M. JANNEY, Lincoln, Loudoun County, Va.  
O. J.—OLIVER JOHNSON, office of *The Independent*, New York.  
J. B. L.—The Rev. J. B. LOGAN, editor of *Western Cumberland Presbyterian*, Alton, Ill.  
J. W. M.—Professor J. W. MARSHALL, late of Dickinson College.  
B. H. N.—Professor B. H. NADAL, D.D., Drew Theological Seminary.  
E. A. P.—Professor E. A. PARK, D.D., Theological Seminary, Andover.  
J. N. P.—JULES N. PROESCHIEL, Paris, France.  
A. J. S.—Professor ALEXANDER J. SCHEM, New York.  
E. de S.—The Rev. E. DE SCHWEINITZ, editor of *The Moravian*, Bethlehem, Pa.  
L. E. S.—Professor L. E. SMITH, office of *Examiner and Chronicle*, New York.  
A. S.—The Rev. ABEL STEVENS, LL.D., Brooklyn.  
M. L. S.—Professor M. L. STOEVEY, Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg.  
G. L. T.—The Rev. GEORGE L. TAYLOR, New York.  
W. J. R. T.—The Rev. W. J. R. TAYLOR, D.D., Secretary of American Bible Society, New York.  
J. P. W.—The Rev. J. P. WESTERVELT, Paterson, N. J.  
C. P. W.—The Rev. C. P. WING, D.D., Carlisle, Pa.  
J. H. W.—J. H. WORMAN, A.M., librarian of Drew Theological Seminary.  
R. Y.—The Rev. R. YEAKEL, Cleveland, Ohio.

A considerable number of articles for this Cyclopædia are in part prepared, nearly up to the end of the alphabet; but there are numerous subjects that can only be treated advantageously at or near the time of printing. All the articles are revised *de novo* as the work goes through the press, and the latest literature, in new books as well as in the journals of all nations, is consulted in this revision. The succeeding volumes may therefore be expected as rapidly as they can be carried through the press.



# LIST OF WOOD-CUTS IN VOL. III.

Assyrian Eagle.....	Page 3	3 French Feuillant Monk.....	Page 541
Imperial Eagle.....	3	3 Italian Feuillant Monk.....	541
Egyptian Corn.....	4	4 Feuillant Nun.....	541
Early English Window.....	4	4 Fruit of the Fig.....	544
Early English Capital.....	5	5 Fig-tree.....	544
Early English Pediment.....	5	5 Fillets.....	561
Ancient Oriental Ear-rings.....	6	6 Finials.....	561
Ancient Egyptian Ear-rings.....	7	7 Ancient Egyptian refining Gold.....	562
Ancient Assyrian Ear-rings.....	7	7 Ancient Egyptians curing Fish.....	578
Modern Egyptian Ear-rings.....	7	7 Ancient Egyptian spearing Fish.....	579
Ancient <i>Triclinium</i> .....	15	15 Ancient Egyptian Fish-net.....	580
Modern Oriental Dinner-party.....	16	16 Ancient Assyrian Fishing.....	580
Branch of <i>Diospyrus Elurium</i> .....	23	23 <i>Nigella Sativa</i> .....	583
Plan of Echatana.....	25	25 <i>Cyperus Esculentus</i> .....	586
Map of Western Asia.....	55	55 Flamboyant Window.....	588
Hieroglyph for "Egypt".....	75	75 Flax-plant.....	591
Modern Egypt.....	76	76 Ancient Egyptian dressing Flax.....	591
Egypt under the Romans.....	77	77 Common Flax.....	592
Ancient Profiles.....	83	83 Etruscan Flesh-hook.....	595
Sign <i>Tau</i> .....	88	88 Ancient Egyptian Flesh-pot.....	595
<i>Propylon</i> of Temple at Luxor.....	103	103 Ancient Assyrian Floats.....	598
Asiatic Elephant.....	128	128 Modern Assyrian Raft.....	598
Temple at Ellora.....	168	168 Ancient Egyptian Flutes.....	606
Swathing a Mummy.....	174	174 Ancient Roman Flutes.....	606
Painting a Mummy-case.....	174	174 Modern Egyptian Flute.....	606
Mummy's Head in Coffin.....	174	174 Doric and Ionic Fluting.....	607
Mummy of Pen-amen.....	175	175 Silver Coin of Aradus.....	607
Ancient Egyptian Embroidery.....	176	176 <i>Tabanus Alpinus</i> .....	610
Ancient Assyrian Embroidery.....	176	176 Font at Swaton.....	610
Modern Oriental Embroidery.....	177	177 Font at St. Mildred's.....	610
Modern Arab Encampment.....	187	187 Nun of Fontevault.....	610
Ancient Egyptian <i>Testudo</i> .....	196	196 Monk of Fontevault.....	610
Roman <i>Catapult</i> .....	196	196 Oriental Marks in the Forehead.....	618
Roman <i>Balistæ</i> .....	196	196 Ancient Egyptians attacking a Fort.....	627
Assyrian War-engine.....	196	196 Ancient Assyrians attacking a Fort.....	627
Roman Battering-ram worked by hand.....	197	197 Modern Persian Fort.....	628
Roman covered Battering-ram on wheels.....	197	197 Fountain near Beyrout.....	631
Roman <i>Helepolis</i> .....	197	197 Fountain at Nazareth.....	632
Ancient Egyptian Ensigns.....	232	232 Ancient Egyptian Geese-rearing.....	634
Early Coin of Ephesus.....	241	241 Ancient Egyptian Fowling with the Throw-stick.....	634
Plan of Ephesus.....	242	242 Ancient Egyptian catching and pre-serving Geese.....	635
Roman Coin of Ephesus.....	243	243 Syrian Fox.....	636
"Diana of the Ephesians".....	244	244 Egyptian Dog-fox.....	636
Plan of Temple of Diana at Ephesus.....	244	244 Franciscan Friar.....	650
The Jewish Ephod.....	248	248 Conventual Franciscan.....	651
Ancient Egyptian Tunic.....	249	249 Observant Franciscan.....	651
Ancient Egyptian sacred Coat.....	249	249 <i>Bosvelia Serrata</i> .....	651
Specimen of the Ephraim MS.....	249	249 Assyrian Fringed Garments.....	651
Map of Ephraim.....	251	251 Egyptian Fringed Linen.....	651
Ancient Egyptians Writing.....	260	260 Assyrian Tassels and Fringes.....	657
Statue of Erasmus at Rotterdam.....	277	277 Original Form of the <i>Talith</i> .....	678
Tomb of Mordecai and Esther.....	307	307 Modified Form of the <i>Talith</i> .....	678
Ancient Ethiopians.....	327	327 Fritchold at Beverly.....	679
Specimen of Ethiopic MS.....	334	334 <i>Rana Punctata</i> .....	680
Ethnographic Map of the World.....	341	341 Jewish Frontlet.....	682
Oriental Ewer and Basin.....	383	383 Ancient Egyptian Fullers.....	691
Map of the Exode.....	408	408 Egyptian Funeral Rites.....	694
Assyrians Blinding a Prisoner.....	427	427 Mohammedan Bier.....	695
Modern Egyptian Face painted.....	428	428 Ancient Egyptian Funeral.....	695
Ancient Egyptian Boxes for Face-paint.....	428	428 Modern Egyptian Funeral.....	696
Tomb of Ezekiel.....	431	431 Brother of St. Gabriel.....	702
Tomb of Ezra.....	437	437 Map of Gad.....	704
Large Falcon.....	469	469 Coin of Gadara.....	706
Small Falcon.....	470	470 Coin of Galatia.....	710
Common Fallow-deer.....	475	475 Druidical Cairn and Kist-vaens.....	715
<i>Autolope Bubalis</i> .....	476	475 Map of the Dead Sea.....	719
Fan-tracery Vaulting.....	482	482 Ancient Assyrian Galley.....	724
Ancient Egyptian Farming.....	485	482 Egyptians lifting Bags of Sand.....	730
<i>Assarion</i> of Chios.....	486	485 Ancient Egyptians Fencing.....	730
Roman <i>As</i> .....	486	486 Egyptians swinging Women around.....	730
Roman <i>Quadrans</i> .....	486	486 Ancient Roman Beast-fighter.....	731
Ancient Egyptian Poulterers.....	505	486 Figure of a Roman Gladiator.....	731
Ancient Persian Sword.....	506	505 Ancient Leapers.....	732
"Golden Gate" of Jerusalem.....	528	505 Ancient Game of Quoits.....	732
Ancient Egyptian Gate-guard.....	528	528 Ancient Wrestlers.....	732
Ancient Assyrian City-wall.....	528	528 Ancient Boxers.....	732
The Gecko.....	531	528 Ancient hurling the Javelin.....	733
Feet of the Gecko.....	535	531 Ancient Foot-race.....	733
Ancient Egyptian Ferry-boat.....	536	535 Olympic Chariot-race.....	733
Ancient Assyrians crossing a River.....	536	536 Isthmian Crown on a Coin.....	736
Ancient Assyrian Manacles.....	540	536 Assyrian Representation of a Wall hung with Shields.....	735
Ancient Egyptian Handcuffs.....	540	540 Ancient Egyptian Garden.....	739
		541 Ancient Assyrian Gardens.....	740
		541 Oriental Garden-house.....	742
		541 Gargoyle on St. Stephen's, Vienna.....	743
		544 Gargoyle on St. Alkmund's, Derby.....	743
		544 Gargoyle on Horsley Church.....	743
		561 <i>Allium Ascalonicum</i> .....	745
		561 Ancient Egyptians storing Grain.....	745
		562 Ancient Egyptian Gate-guard.....	749
		578 Gateway at Medinet Abu.....	751
		579 Assyrians firing an Enemy's Gate.....	750
		580 Ancient Assyrian Portal.....	751
		580 Sutrâp at the Gate of a Greek City.....	751
		583 Coin of Gaza.....	756
		586 <i>Gazella Arabica</i> .....	758
		588 Canon of St. Geneviève.....	785
		591 Daughter of St. Geneviève.....	785
		591 Map of the Roman World.....	791
		592 Map of Countries known to the Patri-archs.....	792
		595 Section of the Earth's Crust.....	802
		598 Geological Map of Palestine.....	803
		598 Mingrelian Monk.....	812
		606 Ruins of Jerash.....	816
		606 Foundations of Temple on Gerizim.....	820
		606 Garden of Gethsemane.....	820
		607 Map of the Battle at Gibeon.....	841
		607 <i>Percnopteris Neophron</i> .....	857
		608 Canon of St. Gilbert.....	864
		609 Nun of St. Gilbert.....	864
		610 <i>Amuris Glendense</i> .....	869
		610 Circle of Druidical Stones.....	870
		610 Egyptian Sacred Girdles.....	876
		618 Ancient Girdles.....	877
		627 Ancient Egyptian Glass-blowers.....	881
		627 Egyptian Glass Bottles and Jugs.....	881
		628 Glass Bottle from Nimrud.....	881
		631 Bottles and Earthen-ware from Babil.....	881
		632 Glass Vases from Pompeii.....	882
		634 <i>Milvus Ægyptius</i> .....	884
		634 <i>Milvus Æter</i> .....	884
		634 Organs of a Gnat.....	890
		634 Oriental Ox-goad.....	896
		635 Long-eared Syrian Goat.....	898
		636 Common Syrian Goat.....	898
		636 Wild Goat of Sinai.....	899
		650 Coin of Archelaus of Macedonia.....	899
		651 Perso-Macedonian Gem.....	900
		651 Egyptian Goblets and Vases.....	900
		657 Ancient Egyptian Goldsmiths.....	918
		677 Coin of Gortyna.....	929
		677 Map of Goshen.....	931
		677 Pointed Gothic Arches.....	942
		678 Section of Arch at Nevers.....	942
		678 Pillar of Cologne Cathedral.....	943
		679 Window in St. Lambert's, Münster.....	943
		680 Flying-buttress of Cologne Cathedral.....	943
		682 Plan of Cologne Cathedral.....	943
		691 Interior of Cologne Cathedral.....	944
		694 Façade of Rheims Cathedral.....	945
		695 Façade of York Cathedral.....	946
		695 Cathedral of Cologne.....	946
		696 Cathedral of Burgos.....	947
		702 Cathedral of Sienna.....	948
		704 <i>Ricinus Communis</i> .....	952
		706 Oriental Gourd-arbor.....	953
		710 <i>Citrullus Coloquintulus</i> .....	954
		715 Ancient Egyptian Granary.....	964
		719 Palestine Grapes.....	967
		724 Old Man as a Grasshopper.....	968
		730 Ancient Grecian Greaves.....	975
		730 Ancient Assyrian Greaves.....	975
		730 Plan of Treasury of Atreus.....	975
		731 Section of Treasury of Atreus.....	975
		731 Pillar of Treasury of Atreus.....	976
		732 Ionic Order of Erechtheum.....	976
		732 Ionic Order, Monument of Lyciocrates.....	977
		732 Plan of the Parthenon.....	977
		732 Parthenon restored.....	978
		733 Map of Ancient Greece.....	980
		733 Egyptian Woman mourning.....	1008
		733 Oriental Women grinding Meal.....	1012
		735 Assyrian Symbolic Tree.....	1021
		735 <i>Tamarix Orientalis</i> .....	1022
		735 Ancient Egyptian Sentry.....	1024





# CYCLOPÆDIA

OF

## BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL, AND ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE.

### E.

**Eachard, John, D.D.**, an English divine, was born in Suffolk in 1636, and was admitted at Catharine Hall, Cambridge, in 1653. He became fellow of his college in 1658, and was chosen master in 1675. He died July 7, 1697. His *Works* were collected in 3 vols. 12mo (Lond. 1784), containing a *Sketch of his Life*, a *Discussion of Hobbes's State of Nature*, and an *Essay on the Grounds of the Contempt of the Clergy*.—*New Gen. Biog. Dict.* v, 53; *Kippis, Biog. Britannica*, v, 529.

**Eachard, Lawrence.** See **ECHARD**.

**Eadfrith**, bishop of Lindisfarne from 698 to 721. He is sometimes named as the first translator of the Bible into Anglo-Saxon, but this is a mistake. There is, however, a splendid manuscript, written by Eadfrith with his own hand, in the Cottonian Library. It is known as *The Durham Book*.—Wright, *Biog. Brit. Lit., Anglo-Saxon Period*, p. 242.

**Eadmer, or Edmer**, a monk of Canterbury (12th century), was elected bishop of St. Andrew's, in Scotland, 1120, which office he did not accept for the following reason: "The question of lay investiture of ecclesiastical benefices was then in its crisis; there was a controversy between Canterbury and York for jurisdiction over the see of St. Andrew's; that see, again, asserted its independence of either of the English metropolitans; and Eadmer seems to have added to all these perplexities a difficulty as to his monastic allegiance. 'Not for all Scotland,' he said to the Scottish king, 'will I renounce being a monk of Canterbury.' The king, on his side, was equally unyielding; and the issue was the return of Eadmer to his English monastery, unconsecrated indeed, but still claiming to be bishop of St. Andrew's. He was made precentor of Canterbury, and died, it is supposed, in January, 1124" (Chambers, *Encyclopædia*, s. v.). Eadmer is one of the most important of the early English historians. He wrote a history of the affairs of England of his own time, from 1077 to 1122 (*Historia Novorum sive sui sæculi*), in which many original papers are inserted, and many important facts, nowhere else to be found, are preserved. This work has been highly commended, both by old and modern writers, as well for its correctness as for regularity of composition and purity of style. The best edition is that by Selden in 1623. Eadmer wrote the life of Anselm (generally found printed with his works), and the lives of Wilfred, Oswald, Dunstan, and others, given in the *Acta Sanctorum*, and in Warton, *Anglia Sacra* (vol. ii). The *Vita Anselmi* is prefixed to Anselm's works (Benedictine edition; also in Migne's *Patrologia*). The *Historia Novorum* and Eadmer's minor writings are given also in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. clix, 347 sq.—Hook, *Ecol. Biog.* iv, 52; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* (Geneva, 1720) i, 574; Collier, *Ecol. Hist. of Great Britain* (Barham's edit.), ii, 183 sq.; Wright, *Biog. Brit. Lit., Anglo-Norman Period*, p. 82 sq.

III.—A

**Eagle** occurs in Scripture as the translation of the Heb. נֶשֶׁר (ne'sher, so called from tearing its prey with its beak: occurs Exod. xix, 4; Lev. xi, 13; Dent. xiv, 12; xxviii, 49; xxxii, 11; 2 Sam. i, 23; Job ix, 26; xxxix, 27; Psa. ciii, 5; Prov. xxiii, 5; xxx, 17, 19; Isa. xl, 31; Jer. iv, 13; xlvi, 40; xlix, 16, 22; Lam. iv, 19; Ezek. i, 10; x, 14; xvii, 3, 7; Hos. viii, 1; Obad. 4; Mic. i, 16; Hab. i, 8), with which all the designations of the kindred dialects agree, Chald. נֶשֶׁר (nesher', Dan. iv, 33; vii, 4), Sept. and N. T. ἀετός (Matt. xxiv, 28; Luke xvii, 37; Rev. iv, 7; xii, 14). As there are many species of eagles, the *nesher*, when distinguished from others, seems to have denoted the chief species, the golden eagle, χρυσαίετος, as in Lev. xi, 13; Dent. xiv, 12. The word, however, seems to have had a broader acceptation, and, like the Greek ἀετός and Arabic *nesr* (see Bochart, *Hiéroc.* ii, 312 sq.), sometimes comprehends also a species of vulture, especially in those passages where the *nesher* is said to be bald (Mic. i, 16), and to feed on carcases (Job xxix, 27; Prov. xxx, 17; Matt. xxiv, 28), which the true eagle is disinclined to do. See **GIER-EAGLE**; **HAWK**; **OSPREY**; **OSSIFRAGE**; **VULTURE**.

1. The characteristics of the eagle referred to in the Scriptures are, its swiftness of flight (Dent. xxviii, 49; 2 Sam. i, 23; Jer. iv, 13; xlix, 22; Lam. iv, 19, etc.); its mounting high into the air (Job xxxix, 27; Prov. xxiii, 5; xxx, 19; Isa. xl, 31; Jer. xlix, 16); its strength and vigor (in Psa. ciii, 5); its predaceous habits (Job ix, 26; Prov. xxx, 17; compare *Ælian, Anim.* x, 14); its setting its nest in high places (in Jer. xlix, 16; comp. Aristotle, *Anim.* ix, 22; Pliny, x, 4); the care in training its young to fly (in Exod. xix, 4; Dent. xxxii, 11); its powers of vision (in Job xxxix, 29; comp. Homer, *Il.* xvii, 674; *Ælian, Anim.* i, 42; Isidore, *Orig.* xii, 1; Pliny, xii, 88); and its moulting (Psa. ciii, 5). As king of birds, the eagle naturally became an emblem of powerful empires (Ezek. xvii, 3, 7), especially in the symbolical figures of Babylon (Dan. vii, 4), and the cherubim (Ezek. i, 10; x, 14; Rev. iv, 7), like the *griffin* of classical antiquity. See **CREATURE, LIVING**. Eaglets are referred to in Prov. xxx, 17 as first picking out the eyes of their prey.

The following is a close translation of a graphic description of raptorial birds of this class which occurs in the book of Job (xxxix, 26-30):

By thy understanding will [the] hawk tower,  
Spread his wings southward?  
Prelance on thy bidding [the] eagle will soar,  
Or [it is then] that he will make lofty his nest?  
A rock will he inhabit, and [there] roost.  
Upon the peak of a rock, even [the] citadel:  
Thence he has spied food,  
From afar his eyes will look;  
Then his brood will sip blood;  
Ay, wherever [are the] slain, there [is] he!

To the last line in this quotation our Saviour seems to allude in Matt. xxiv, 28. "Whosoever the carcase

is, there will the eagles be gathered together;" that is, wherever the Jewish people, who were morally and judicially dead, might be, there would the Roman armies, whose standard was an eagle, and whose strength and fierceness resembled that of the king of birds, in comparison with his fellows, pursue and devour them. The *âraoi* of Matt. xxiv, 28; Luke xvii, 37, may include the *Vultur fulvus* and *Neophron percnopterus*; though, as some eagles prey upon dead bodies, there is no necessity to restrict the Greek word to the *Vulturidae* (see Lucian, *Navig.* p. 1; comp. Seneca, *Ep.* 95; Martial, vi, 62). The figure of an eagle is now, and has long been, a favorite military ensign. The Persians so employed it, which fact illustrates the passage in Isa. xlvi, 11, where Cyrus is alluded to under the symbol of an "eagle" (אֶרְבֵּי) or "ravenous bird" (compare Xenoph. *Cyrop.* vii, 4). The same bird was similarly employed by the Assyrians and the Romans. Eagles are frequently represented in Assyrian sculptures attending the soldiers in their battles, and some have hence supposed that they were trained birds. Considering, however, the wild and intractable nature of eagles, it is very improbable that this was the case. The representation of these birds was doubtless intended to portray the common feature in Eastern battle-field scenery, of birds of prey awaiting to satisfy their hunger on the bodies of the slain. These passages have been by some commentators referred to the vulture, on the assumed ground that the eagle never feeds on carrion, but confines itself to that prey which it has killed by its own prowess. This, however, is a mistake (see Forskal, *Descript. Anim.* p. 12; compare Michaelis, *Oriental. Bibl.* ix, 37 sq., and new *Oriental. Bibl.* iii, 43 sq.); no such chivalrous feeling exists in either eagle or lion; both will feed ignominiously on a body found dead. Any visitor of the British zoological gardens may see that the habit imputed is at least not invariable. (See also Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 491.) *Aquila bifasciata*, of India, was shot by Col. Sykes at the carcass of a tiger; and *A. rapax*, of South Africa, is "frequently one of the first birds that approaches a dead animal."

Of all known birds, the eagle flies not only the highest, but also with the greatest rapidity (comp. Homer, *Il.* xxii, 308). To this circumstance there are several striking allusions in the sacred volume. Among the evils threatened to the Israelites in case of their disobedience, the prophet names one in the following terms: "The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from far, from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flieth" (Deut. xxviii, 49). The march of Nebuchadnezzar against Jerusalem is predicted in the same terms: "Behold, he shall come up as clouds, and his chariots as a whirlwind; his horses are swifter than eagles" (Jer. iv, 13); as is his invasion of Moab also: "For thus saith the Lord, Behold, he shall fly as an eagle, and shall spread his wings over Moab" (chap. xlviii, 40); i. e. he shall settle down on the devoted country as an eagle over its prey. (See also Lam. iv, 19; Hos. viii, 2; Hab. i, 8.)

The eagle, it is said, lives to a great age, and like other birds of prey, sheds his feathers in the beginning of spring. After this season he appears with fresh strength and vigor, and his old age assumes the appearance of youth. To this David alludes when gratefully reviewing the mercies of Jehovah, "Who satisfieth thy mouth with good things, so that thy youth is renewed like the eagle's" (Psa. ciii, 5); as does the prophet, also, when describing the renovating and quickening influences of the Spirit of God: "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary; and they shall walk and not faint" (Isa. xl, 31). Some Jewish interpreters have illustrated the former passage by a reference to the old fables about the eagle being able to renew his

strength when very old (see Bochart, *Hieroz.* ii, 747). But modern commentators for the most part are inclined to think that these words refer to the eagle after the moulting season, when the bird is more full of activity than before. Others prefer Hengstenberg's explanation on Psa. ciii, 5, "Thy youth is renewed, so that in point of strength thou art like the eagle."

The passage in Mic. i, 16, "Enlarge thy baldness as the eagle," has been understood by Bochart (*Hieroz.* ii, 744) and others to refer to the eagle at the time of its moulting in the spring. Oedman (*Vermischte Samml.* i, 64) erroneously refers the baldness spoken of by the prophet to point to the *Vultur barbatus* (*Gypatus*), the bearded vulture or lammergeyer, which he supposed was bald. It appears to us to be extremely improbable that there is any reference in the passage under consideration to eagles moulting. Allusion is here made to the custom of shaving the head as a token of mourning; but there would be little or no appropriateness in the comparison of a shaved head with an eagle at the time of moulting. But if the *washer* is supposed to denote the griffon vulture (*Vultur fulvus*), the simile is peculiarly appropriate; it may be remarked that the Hebrew verb *kârach* (כָּרַח) signifies "to make bald on the back part of the head;" the notion here conveyed is very applicable to the whole head and neck of this bird, which is destitute of true feathers. The direction of the prophet is to a token of mourning, which was usually assumed by making bald the *crown* of the head; here, however, it was to be enlarged, extended, as the baldness of the eagle. Exactly answering to this idea is Mr. Bruce's description of the head of the "golden eagle;" the crown of his head was bare; so was the front where the bill and skull joined. The meaning of the prophet, therefore, seems to be that the people were not to content themselves with shaving the *crown* of the head merely, as on ordinary occasions, but, under this special visitation of retributive justice, were to extend the baldness over the entire head.

With reference to the texts referred to above, which compare the watchful and sustaining care of his people by the Almighty with that exhibited by the eagle in training its young ones to fly, especially the spirited one in Deut. xxxii, 11, 12—

"As an eagle will rouse his nest;  
Over his fledgelings will hover;  
Will spread his wings, Will take it [i. e. his brood, or each of the young];  
Will bear it upon his pinions:  
[So] Jehovah, he alone would guide him [i. e. Israel];  
And there was not with him a strange god!"—

we may quote a passage from Sir Humphrey Davy, who says, "I once saw a very interesting sight above one of the crags of Ben Nevis, as I was going in the pursuit of black game. Two parent eagles were teaching their offspring, two young birds, the manoeuvres of flight. They began by rising from the top of the mountain, in the eye of the sun. It was about mid-day, and bright for this climate. They at first made small circles, and the young birds imitated them. They paused on their wings, waiting till they had made their first flight, and then took a second and larger gyration, always rising towards the sun, and enlarging their circle of flight so as to make a gradually ascending spiral. The young ones still and slowly followed, apparently flying better as they mounted; and they continued this sublime exercise, always rising, till they became mere points in the air, and the young ones were lost, and afterwards their parents, to our aching sight." The expression in Exod. and Deut., "beareth them on her wings," has been understood by Rabbinical writers and others to mean that the eagle does actually carry her young ones on her wings and shoulders. This is putting on the words a construction which they by no means are intended to convey; at the same time, it is not improbable that

the parent bird assists the first efforts of her young by flying under them, thus sustaining them for a moment, and encouraging them in their early lessons. (Comp. *Elian, Anim.* ii, 49; *Oppian, Cynege.* iii, 115; *Jerome in Jesa.* xlvi; *Naumann, Naturgesch. d. Vögel*, i, 215; on the contrary, *Aristotle, Anim.* ix, 22.)

Finally, the eagle was an Assyrian emblem, and hence probably the reference in *Iab.* i, 8. The eagle-headed deity of the Assyrian sculptures is that of the god *Nisroch* (q. v.); and in the representations of battles trained birds of this order are frequently shown accompanying the Assyrian warriors in their attacks, and in one case bearing off the entrails of the slain. From the Assyrians the use of the eagle



Eagle flying away with the entrails of those slain in Battle.—From the Assyrian Monuments.

as a standard (q. v.) descended to the Persians, and from them probably to the Romans. See *Wemyss, Symbol. Dict.* s. v. The following scientific descriptions are chiefly from *Kitto* and *Smith*, s. v.

2. The eagle, in zoology, forms a family of several genera of birds of prey, mostly distinguished for their size, courage, powers of flight, and arms for attack. The bill is strong, and bent into a plain pointed hook, without the notch in the inner curve which characterizes falcons; the nostrils are covered with a naked coré or skin of a yellow or a blue color; the eyes are lateral, sunken, or placed beneath an overhanging brow; the head and neck covered with abundance of longish, narrow-pointed feathers; the chest broad, and the legs and thighs exceedingly stout and sinewy. Eagles, properly so called, constitute the genus *Aquila*, and have the tarsi feathered down to the toes; they are clothed in general with brownish and rust-colored feathers, and the tail is black, grey, or deep brown. Sea-eagles (genus *Haliaeetus*) have the tarsi or legs half bare and covered with horny scales; not unusually the head, back, and tail more or less white. The larger species of both measure, from head to tip of tail, 3 feet 6 inches or more, and spread their wings above 7 feet 6 inches; but these are proportionably broad to their length, for it is the third quill feather which is the longest, as if the Creator intended to restrain within bounds their rapidity of flight, while by their breadth the power of continuing on the wing is little or not at all impeded. The claws of the fore and hind toe are particularly strong and sharp; in the sea-eagles they form more than half a circle, and in length measure from  $1\frac{1}{2}$  to  $1\frac{3}{4}$  of an inch. These majestic birds have their abode in Europe, on the shores of the Mediterranean, in Syria and Arabia, wherever there are vast woody mountains and lofty cliffs; they occupy each a single district, always by pairs, excepting on the coasts, where the sea-eagle and the osprey (*Pandion haliaeetus*) may be found not remote from the region possessed by the rough-legged eagles—the first because it seeks to subsist on the industry of the second, and does not interfere with the prey of the third. It is in this last genus, most generally represented by the golden eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*) that the most powerful and largest birds are found. That species in its more juvenile plumage, known as the ring-tailed eagle, the imperial eagle, or mogilnick (*A. heliaca*), and the booted eagle (*A. pinnata*), is found in Syria; and at least one species of the sea-eagles (the *Hal. ossifragus*, *albicollis*, or *albicaudus*) frequents the coasts, and is even of stronger wing than the others. These build usually in the cliffs of Phœnicia, while the others are more commonly domiciliated within the mountains. According to their strength and habits, the former subsist on antelopes, hares, hyrax, bustard, stork, tortoises, and serpents; and the latter usually live on

fish; both pursue the catta (*pteroles*), partridge, and lizard. The osprey alone being migratory, retires to Southern Arabia in winter. None, excepting the last mentioned, are so exclusively averse to carrion as is commonly asserted: from choice or necessity they all, but in particular the sea-eagles, occasionally feed upon carcases of horses, etc.; and it is well known in the East that they follow armies for that purpose. Hence the allusions in *Job* and *Matt.* xxiv, 28, though vultures may be included, are perfectly correct. So again are those which refer to the eagle's eyrie, fixed in the most elevated cliffs. The swiftness of this bird, stooping among a flock of wild geese with the rushing sound of a whirlwind, is very remarkable; and all know its towering flight, suspended on its broad wings among the clouds with little motion or effort. Thus the predictions, in which terrible nations coming from afar are assimilated to eagles, have a poetical and absolute truth, since there are species, like the golden, which really inhabit the whole circumference of the earth, and the nations alluded to bore eagles' wings for standards, and for ornaments on their shields, helmets, and shoulders. In the northern half of Asia, and among all the Turkish races, this practice is not entirely abandoned at this day, and eagle ensigns were constantly the companions of the dragons. China, India, Bactria, Persia, Egypt, the successors of Alexandria, the Etruscans, the Romans, the Celts, and the Arabs had eagle signa of carved work, of metal, or the skins of birds stuffed, and set up as if they were living. These, named *ayit*, a "ravenous bird," *Isa.* xlvi, 1, whence *ἀετός*, *aquila*, *eryx*, *simurg*, *humma* or *humai-on*, *karakush* (the birds of victory of different nations and periods of antiquity), were always symbolical of rapid, irresistible conquest. A black eagle was the ensign of *Kalid*, general of *Mohammed*, at the battle of *Ainadin*, and the carved eagle still seen on the walls of the citadel of *Cairo*, set up by *Karakush*, the vizier of *Salah-ed-din*, to commemorate his own name and administration, indicates a species not here enumerated. At least four distinct kinds of eagles have been observed in Palestine, viz. the golden eagle (*Aquila Chrysaetos*), the spotted eagle (*A. nevia*), the common species in the rocky districts (see *Ibis*, i, 23), the imperial eagle (*Aquila Heliaca*), and the very common *Circætos gallicus*, which preys on the numerous reptilia of Palestine (see the vernacular Arabic names of different species of *Vulturidae* and *Falconidae* in *Loche's Catalogue des Oiseaux observ. en Algérie*; and



Imperial Eagle (*Aquila Heliaca*).

in *Ibis*, vols. i, ii, *Tristram's papers on the ornithology of North Africa*). The Heb. *nesher* may stand for any of these different species, though perhaps more partic-

ular reference to the golden and imperial eagles and the griffon vulture may be intended. The *Aq. heliaca*, here figured, is the species most common in Syria, and is distinguished from the others by a spot of white feathers on each shoulder. (See the *Penny Cyclopædia*, s. v. Falconidae; Hebenstreit, *Aquila natara e S.S. historia, e historia naturali et e Monument. vet. illustrata*, Lips. 1747.) See BIRD.

EAGLE, in the Church of England, the desk or lectern from which the lessons are read is often in the form of an eagle with outspread wings. The usage is probably derived from the fact that, in ecclesiastical symbolism, the eagle is the accompanying symbol of the apostle John (see Jamieson, *Sacred and Legendary Art*, i, 137).

É'ânès (Μάρης, Vulg. *Esses*, Syr. *Mani*), a name given (1 Esdr. ix, 21) as that of a third son of Emmer (Immer); apparently in place of Harim, and his first two sons Maaseiah and Elijah of the Heb. list (Ezra x, 21). Fritzsche suggests (*Exec. Handb.* in loc.) that *kai Mários* is a mistranslation of the מָרִים, "and of the sons of," of the Heb. text, the three names following having been omitted by the Greek translator.

Ear (properly אָזן, *o'zen, o'ez*), the organ of hearing. In Scripture the term is frequently employed figuratively. To signify the regard of Jehovah to the prayers of his people, the Psalmist says, "His ears are open to their cry" (Psalm xxxiv, 15). To "uncover the ear" is a Hebraism, and signifies to show or reveal something to a person (1 Sam. xx, 2). The Psalmist, speaking in the person of the Messiah, says, "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; mine ears hast thou opened" (Psa. xl, 6). Ainsworth reads, "Mine ears hast thou digged open." The Sept., which Paul follows (Heb. x, 5), reads the passage thus: "A body hast thou prepared me." "Make the ears of this people heavy," occurs in Isaiah vi, 10, that is, render their minds inattentive and disobedient: with a similar meaning, the prophet Jeremiah speaks of "ears uncircumcised" (vi, 10). Among the Jews, the slave who renounced the privilege of being made free from servitude in the sabbatical year submitted to have his ear bored through with an awl, which was done in the presence of some judge or magistrate, that it might appear a voluntary act. The ceremony took place at his master's door, and was the mark of perpetual servitude (Exod. xxi, 6). See EAR-RING.

EARS, TOUCHING THE, an ancient ceremony in the baptism of catechumens, which consisted in touching their ears and saying *Ephphatha*, "Be opened." This was joined with the imposition of hands and with exorcism, and is supposed to have signified the opening of the understanding to receive instruction on the faith. Ambrose derives the custom from our Saviour's example in saying *Ephphatha*, when he cured the deaf and dumb. The practice never became general.—Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. x, ch. ii, § 13.

EARS OF CORN (אָזן מִן הַתְּבַשְׂתִּים, *melilah*), so called from being cut off, Deut. xxiii, 25; אָזן מִן הַתְּבַשְׂתִּים, *shibbo' leth*, from its growth, Gen. xli, 5 sq.; Ruth ii, 2; Job xxiv, 24; Isa. xvii, 5; אָזן מִן הַתְּבַשְׂתִּים, *karnel'*, prop. a cultivated field, as often; hence produce or ears therefrom, i. e. *grits*, Lev. ii, 14; xxiii, 14; 2 Kings iv, 42; אָזן מִן הַתְּבַשְׂתִּים, *abib'*, green ears, Exod. ix, 31; Lev. ii, 14; ἀράχνη, Matt. xii, 1; Mark ii, 23; iv, 28; Luke vi, 1). The remarkable productiveness of the cereals in Egypt has been proverbial from the days of Joseph (Gen. xli, 47) to the present time. Jowett states, in his *Christian Researches*, that when in Egypt he plucked up at random a few stalks out of the thick grain-fields. "We counted the number of stalks which sprouted from single grains of seed, carefully pulling to pieces each root in order to see that it was one plant. The first had seven stalks, the next three, then eighteen, then fourteen.

Each stalk would bear an ear." Even greater numbers than these are mentioned by Dr. Shaw, and still more by Pliny. It also often happens that one of the stalks will bear two ears, while each of these ears will shoot out into a number of lesser ears, affording a most plentiful increase. See CORN.



Ears of Egyptian Corn: *a*, Wheat (*Triticum Sativum*); *b*, Millet (*Holcus Sorghum*).

Ear, EARING, an old English agricultural term for *ploughing*, occurs in Gen. xlv, 6; Exod. xxxiv, 21; 1 Sam. viii, 12, as a translation of the term אָרַבְתִּי (*charish'*, *ploughing*, as it is elsewhere rendered). (See *Crítica Biblica*, iii, 210.) The same now obsolete word is used by our translators in Deut. xxi, 4; Isa. xxx, 24, to represent the Heb. word אָרַבְתִּי (*abad'*, to till, as it is often elsewhere rendered). See AGRICULTURE; EGYPT. So Shakspeare says "to ear the land that has some hopes to grow" (*Richard II*, iii, 2). It is etymologically connected with the Latin *aro*, to plough. It is directly derived from the Anglo-Saxon *arian*, "to plough," and is radically the same with *harrow*. What we call *arable* land was originally written *earable* land. The root *ar* is one of wide use in all the Indo-European languages (see Müller, *Science of Language*, p. 239). See PLOUGH.

Eardley, SIR CULLING, one of the founders of the Evangelical Alliance, was born in Hatfield in 1805. He was a son of sir Culling Smith, baronet, succeeded to the baronetcy in 1829, and in 1847 assumed by royal license his maternal name of Eardley, his mother having been a daughter of the last lord Eardley. He was educated at Oxford, but did not graduate, having scruples as to subscribing the oaths administered in taking the degree of A.B. He represented Pontefract in one short Parliament previous to the Reform Bill, and in 1846 was an unsuccessful candidate for Edinburgh in opposition to lord Macaulay, sir Culling basing his claim chiefly on his opposition to the Maynooth

grant. Sir Culling greatly distinguished himself for the active part he took in the work of the Evangelical Alliance and other religious associations, and the cause of religious toleration, in particular, found in him an indefatigable and most active champion.—*Ann. Amer. Cyclopaedia* for 1863, p. 358.


**Early**, WILLIAM, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in New Jersey, Oct. 17, 1770; was converted at about nineteen; entered the itinerancy in 1791; was superannuated in 1821, and died in June of the same year, having preached for thirty years. His first two years in the ministry were spent as missionary to New Brunswick, where he endured much hardship in zealously laboring for his Master's cause. His after ministry in Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland was very useful to the Church.—*Min. of Conferences*, i, 380.

**Early English**, a title often given to the first pointed or Gothic style of architecture in England. It is also called the Lancet Style, and also (in the nomenclature of the Ecclesiological Society) the First Pointed Style. "It succeeded the Norman towards the end of the 12th century, and gradually merged into the Decorated at the end of the 13th. It first partook of the heaviness of the Norman, but soon manifested its own beautiful and peculiar characteristics. The arches are usually equilateral and lancet-shaped; the doorways are often divided into two by a single shaft or small pier; the windows are long and narrow, and, when gathered into a group, are frequently surmounted by a large arch, which springs from the extreme moulding of the window on each side. The space between this arch and the tops of the windows is often pierced with circles, or with trefoils or quatrefoils, which constituted the earliest form of tracery. Each window, however, is generally destitute of any tracery in itself" (Chambers, s. v.) The mouldings, says Parker, in general consist of alternate rounds and deeply-cut hollows, with a small admixture of fillets,




Hargrave, cir. A.D. 1260  
(Parker).

producing a strong effect of light and shadow. "Circular windows were more used in England during the prevalence of this style than in either the decorated or perpendicular, and fine specimens remain at York and Lincoln cathedrals, and at Beverley Minster. Groined ceilings are very common in this style; in general they have only cross springers and diagonal ribs, with sometimes longitudinal and diagonal ribs at the apex of the vaults, and good bosses of foliage at the intersections. The pillars usually consist of small shafts arranged round a larger circular pier, but others of different kinds are to be found, and a plain octagonal or circular pillar is common in country churches. The capitals consist of plain mouldings, or are enriched with foliage and sculpture characteristic of the style. The most prevalent base has a very close resemblance to the Attic base of the ancients, though the proportions are different, and the lower torus is worked with a considerably larger projection. The buttresses are often very bold and prominent, and are frequently carried up to the top of the building with but little diminution, and terminate in acutely-pointed peditments,



Chapter House, Southwell, cir.  
A. D. 1220 (Parker).



Westminster Abbey, cir. A.D. 1250 (Parker).

which, when raised above the parapet, produce in some degree the effect of pinnacles. Flying buttresses were first introduced in this style. Pinnacles are but sparingly used, and only towards the end of the style. The roofs appear always to have been high-pitched. The ornaments used in this style are by no means so various as in either of the others; occasionally small roses or other flowers, and bunches of foliage, are carved at intervals in the hollow mouldings, but by far the most common and characteristic is the toothed ornament, which is often introduced in great profusion, and the hollows entirely filled with it. The foliage is very remarkable for boldness of effect, and it is often so much undercut as to be connected with the mouldings only by the stalks and edges of the leaves; there is frequently considerable stiffness in the mode in which it is combined, but the effect is almost always good; the prevailing leaf is a trefoil. Towards the latter part of the style crockets were first introduced. The style may be said to begin in the later half of Richard the First's reign, about which time St. Hugh began his cathedral. During the reign of king John the Early English style had obtained the complete mastery; but the reign of Henry III was the great period of the Early English style, which had now obtained perfection. That king himself and his brother Richard were great builders. The most perfect example of the style is perhaps Salisbury Cathedral. Towards the end of the reign we have examples, such as the presbytery of Lincoln and the chapter-house of Salisbury, of what may be almost called the Decorated style, though the mouldings and many of the details are pure Early English. This kind of work may best be called Transitional."—Parker, *Glossary of Architecture*, s. v. See ARCHITECTURE.

**Earnest**. Ἀρραβών is evidently the Hebrew עֲרָבֹן (*erabon*), a pledge in Greek characters. It is a mercantile term which the Greeks and Romans appear to have adopted from the Phœnicians (kindred in dialect with the Hebrews) as the founders of commerce. With a slight alteration in the letters, but with none whatever in the sense, it becomes the Latin *arrabona*, contr. *arrha*; French *arres*; English *earles* (in the old English expression *Earl's* or *Arl's* money) and *earnest*. These three words occur in the Heb., Sept., and Vulg. in Gen. xxxviii, 17, 18, and in ver. 20, with the exception that the Vulg. there changes it to *pignus*. The use of these words in this passage clearly illustrates their general import, which is that of an earnest or pledge, given and received, to assure the fulfilment of an engagement. Hesychius explains *ἀρραβών* by *πρόδομα*, something given beforehand. The Hebrew word was used generally for *pledge* (Gen. xxxviii, 17), and in its cognate forms for *surety* (Prov. xvii, 18) and

*hostage* (2 Kings xiv, 14). The Greek derivative, however, acquired a more technical sense, as signifying the *deposit* paid by the purchaser on entering into an agreement for the purchase of anything (Suid. *Lex. s. v.*) This idea attaches to all the *particular* applications of the word, as anything given by way of warrant or security for the performance of a promise; part of a debt paid as an assurance of paying the remainder; part of the price of anything paid beforehand to confirm the bargain between buyer and seller; part of a servant's wages paid at the time of hiring, for the purpose of ratifying the engagement on both sides. The idea that the earnest is either to be returned upon the fulfilment of the engagement, or to be considered as part of the stipulation, is also included. A similar legal and technical sense attaches to *earnest*, the payment of which places both the vendor and purchaser in a position to enforce the carrying out of the contract (Blackstone, ii, 30). The payment of earnest-money under the name of *arrabon* is still one of the common occurrences of Arab life. Similar customs of paying down at the time of a contract "something to bind the bargain" have prevailed among all nations. (See Smith's *Dictionary of Class. Antiq. s. v. Arrha.*) See BARGAIN.

The word is used three times in the New Testament, but always in a figurative sense: in the first (2 Cor. i, 22) it is applied to the *gifts* of the Holy Spirit which God bestowed upon the *apostles*, and by which he might be said to have hired them to be the servants of his Son; and which were the earnest, assurance, and commencement of those far superior blessings which he would bestow on them in the life to come as the wages of their *faithful* services: in the two latter (2 Cor. v, 5; Ephes. i, 13, 14) it is applied to the gifts bestowed on *Christians generally* upon whom, after baptism, the apostles laid their hands, and which were to them an *earnest* of obtaining a heavenly habitation and inheritance, upon the supposition of their fidelity. This use of the term finely illustrates the augmented powers and additional capacities promised in a future state. Jerome, in his comment on the second passage, exclaims, "Si arrhabo tantus, quanta erit possessio—If the earnest was so great, how great must be the possession!" (See Kype, Macknight, and Middleton on these passages; Le Moine, *Not. ad Yar. Sacr.* p. 460-480.) In a spiritual sense, it denotes those gifts and graces which the Christian receives as the earnest and assurance of perfect happiness in a future world. (See Clauswitz, *De Arrhabone*, Halle, 1747; Winzer, *Comment. in loc.* Lips. 1836; Schulthess, in Keil and Tschirner's *Analekten*, II, i, 215 sq.) There is a marked distinction between *pledge* and *earnest* in this respect, that the latter is a *part-payment*, and therefore implies the *identity* in kind of the deposit with the future full payment; whereas a pledge may be something of a totally different nature, as in Gen. xxxviii, to be resumed by the depositor when he has completed his contract. Thus the expression "*earnest of the Spirit*" implies, beyond the idea of security, the *identity* in kind, though not in degree, and the *continuity* of the Christian's privileges in this world and in the next. Moreover, a pledge is taken back when the promise which it guaranteed is fulfilled; but whatever is given as earnest, being a part in advance of the whole, is of course retained. See PLEDGE.

**Ear-ring** stands in the Auth. Vers. as the rendering of three Heb. words of considerably different import. See RING.

1.  $\text{אָגִיל}$  (*agil'*, from its *roundness*), properly a *ring*, specially an *ear-ring* (Num. xxxi, 50; Ezek. xvi, 12), nearly all the ancient ear-rings exhibited in the sculptures of Egypt and Persepolis being of a circular shape. These are the *ἐνώτια* spoken of in Judith x, 4.


2.  $\text{נֶזֶם}$  (*ne'zem*, either from its *perforating*, or from its use to *muzzle* in the case of animals), a *ring*, spe-

cially a *nose-ring*, but also an *ear-ring*, which two do not seem, therefore, to have materially differed in form. It most certainly denotes an ear-ring in Gen. xxxv, 4; but in Gen. xxiv, 47; Prov. xi, 22; Isa. iii, 21, it signifies a nose-jewel, and it is doubtful which of the two is intended in Judg. viii, 24, 25; Job xlii, 11. See WOMAN. Hence also we find

3.  $\text{שִׁשְׁבִּיט}$  (*luck'ash*, properly a *whispering* or *incantation*), a *charm* or remedy against enchantment, i. e. a superstitious ornament, often a gem inlaid in a plate or ring of precious metal, on which certain magic formulas were inscribed, and which was worn suspended from the neck or in the ears of Oriental females (Isa. iii, 20). See ENCHANTMENT.


The "collars" or "chains" spoken of in Judg. viii, 26; Isa. iii, 19, may also have been a species of ear-drop. See those terms.

No conclusion can be formed as to the shape of the Hebrew ear-rings except from the signification of the words employed, and from the analogy of similar ornaments in ancient sculpture. The word  $\text{אָגִיל}$ , by which these ornaments are usually described, is unfortunately ambiguous, originally referring to the nose-ring (as its root indicates), and thence transferred to the ear-ring. The full expression for the latter is  $\text{אָגִיל אָזְנוֹתַי}$  (Gen. xxxv, 4), in contradistinction to  $\text{אָגִיל אָזְנוֹתַי}$  (Gen. xxiv, 47). In the majority of cases, however, the kind is not specified, and the only clew to the meaning is the context. The term occurs in this undefined sense in Judg. viii, 24; Job xlii, 11; Prov. xxv, 12; Hos. ii, 13. The material of which the ear-ring was made was generally gold (Exod. xxxii, 2), and its form circular, as we may infer from the name  $\text{אָגִיל}$ , by which it is described (Num. xxxi, 50; Ezek. xvi, 12): such was the shape usual in Egypt (Wilkinson's *Egyptians*, iii, 370). They were worn by women and by youth of both sexes (Exod. i. c.). It has been inferred from the passage quoted, and from Judg. viii, 24, that they were not worn by men: these passages are, however, by no means conclusive. In the former an order is given to the men in such terms that they could not be mentioned, though they might have been implicitly included; in the latter the *amount of the gold* is the peculiarity adverted to, and not the character of the ornament, a peculiarity which is still noticeable among the inhabitants of southern Arabia (Wellsted's *Travels*, i, 321). The mention of the *sons* in Exod. xxxii, 2 (which, however, is omitted in the Sept.), is in favor of their having been worn, and it appears unlikely that the Hebrews presented an exception to the almost universal practice of Asiatics, both in ancient and modern times. That they were not, however, usually worn by men is implied in Judg.




Ancient Oriental Ear-rings.

xiv, 24, where gold ear-rings are mentioned as distinctive of the Ishmaelitish tribes. The men of Egypt also abstained from the use of ear-rings; but how extensively they were worn by men in other nations is shown by the preceding group of heads of different foreigners, collected from the Egyptian monuments. By this also the usual forms of the most ancient ornaments of this description are sufficiently displayed. Those worn by the Egyptian ladies were large, round, single hoops of gold, from one inch and a half to two inches and one third in diameter, and frequently of still greater size, or made of six single rings soldered together. Such probably was the round *agil* of the Hebrews. Among persons of high or royal rank the ornament was sometimes in the shape of an asp, whose body was of gold set with precious stones. Silver ear-rings have also been found at Thebes, either plain hoops like the ear-rings of gold, or simple studs. The




Ancient Egyptian Ear-rings.

ancient Assyrians, both men and women, wore ear-rings of exquisite shape and finish, especially the kings, and those on the later monuments are generally in the form of a cross (Layard, *Nineveh*, ii, 234, 250).



Ancient Assyrian Ear-rings.

Lane thus describes those now worn by Egyptian females: "Of ear-rings (*halak*) there is a great variety. Some of the more usual kinds are here represented. The first is of diamonds set in silver. It consists of a drop suspended within a wreath hanging from a sprig. The back of the silver is gilt, to prevent its being tarnished by perspiration. The specimen here given is that for the right ear; its fellow is similar,



Modern Egyptian Ear-rings (each one half the real size).

but with the sprig reversed. This pair of ear-rings is suited for a lady of wealth; so also is the second, which resembles the former, excepting that it has a large pearl in the place of the diamond drop and wreath, and that the diamonds of the sprig are set in gold. No. 3 is a side view of the same. The next consists of gold, and an emerald pierced through the middle, with a small diamond above the emerald. Emeralds are generally pierced in Egypt, and spoiled by this process as much as by not being cut with facets. The last is of gold, with a small ruby in the centre. The ruby is set in fine filigree-work, which is surrounded by fifteen balls of gold. To the seven lower balls are suspended as many circular *bark*' (*Mod. Eg. ii, 404*). The modern Oriental ear-rings are more usually jewelled drops or pendants than circlets of gold, but sometimes they consist of a small round plate of silver or gold suspended from a small ring inserted into the ear (*Kitto, Pict. Bible*, note on Exod. xxxii, 2). This circular plate (about the size of a halfpenny) is either marked with fanciful figures or set with small stones. It is the same kind of thing which in that country (Mesopotamia) is worn as a nose-jewel, and in it we perhaps find the Hebrew ear-ring, which is denoted by the same word that describes a nose-jewel. Jewels were sometimes attached to the rings: they were called  $\text{רִיבִּיבִּיבִּי}$  (from  $\text{רָבַב}$ , to drop), a word rendered in *Judg.* viii, 26, Sept.  $\text{\rho\acute{o}\mu\mu\sigma\kappa\omicron\iota}$ , Vulg. *monilia*, A.V. "collars;" and in *Isa.* iii, 19,  $\text{\kappa\acute{\alpha}\theta\eta\mu\alpha}$ , *torques*, "chains." The size of the ear-rings still worn in Eastern countries far exceeds what is usual among ourselves (*Harmer's Observations*, iv, p. 311, 314), hence they formed a handsome present (*Job* xlii, 11) or offering to the service of God (*Num.* xxxi, 50). See **JEWEL**.

The ear-ring appears to have been regarded with superstitious reverence as an amulet: thus it is named in the Chaldee and Samaritan versions  $\text{רִיבִּיבִּיבִּי}$ , a holy thing; and in *Isa.* iii, 20 the word  $\text{רִיבִּיבִּיבִּי}$ , prop. *amulets*, is rendered in the A.V., after the Sept. and Vulg., *ear-rings*. On this account they were surrendered along with the idols by Jacob's household (*Gen.* xxxv, 4). Chardin describes ear-rings, with talismanic figures and characters on them, as still existing in the East (*Brown's Antiquities*, ii, 305). See **AMULET**.

**Ears.** See **EAR**.

**Earth**, properly the name of the planet on which we dwell. See **GEOGRAPHY**.

1. There are two Hebrew words thus rendered in the A.V., both of which are rendered by  $\text{\gamma\eta}$  in the Sept., and this  $\text{\gamma\eta}$  is rendered by "earth," "land," "ground," in the New Testament. See also **DUST**.

1.  $\text{אֲדָמָה}$ , *adamah*, is the earth in the sense of soil or ground, particularly as being susceptible of cultivation; hence the expression  $\text{אֲדָמָה אֲרִישׁ}$ , lit. "man of the ground," for an agriculturist (*Gen.* ix, 20). The earth supplied the elementary substance of which man's body was formed, and the terms *adam* and *adamah* are brought into juxtaposition, implying an etymological connection (*Gen.* ii, 7). See **ADAM**. The opinion that man's body was formed of earth prevailed among the Greeks (*Hesiod, Op. et Di.* 61, 70; *Plato, Rep.* p. 269), the Romans (*Virgil, Georg.* ii, 341; *Ovid, Met.* i, 82), the Egyptians (*Diod. Sic.* i, 10), and other ancient nations. It is evidently based on the observation of the material into which the body is resolved after death (*Job* x, 9; *Ecc.* xii, 7). The law prescribed earth as the material out of which altars were to be raised (*Exod.* xx, 24); *Bähr (Symb.* i, 488) sees in this a reference to the name *adam*: others, with more reason, compare the *ara de cespite* of the Romans (*Ovid, Trist.* v, 5, 9; *Horace, Od.* iii, 8, 4, 5), and view it as a precept of simplicity. Naaman's request for two mules' burden of earth

(2 Kings v, 17) was based on the idea that Jehovah, like the heathen deities, was a local god, and could be worshipped acceptably only on his own soil. See GROUND.

2. More generally  $\text{אֶרֶץ}$ , *erets*, which is explained by Von Bohlen (*Introduct. to Gen.* ii, 6) as meaning etymologically the *low* in opposition to the *high*, i. e. the heaven. It is applied in a more or less extended sense: 1, to the whole world (Gen. i, 1); 2, to land as opposed to sea (Gen. i, 10); 3, to a country (Gen. xxi, 32); 4, to a plot of ground (Gen. xxiii, 15); and, 5, to the ground on which a man stands (Gen. xxxiii, 3); also, in a more general view, 6, to "the inhabitants of the earth" (Gen. vi, 11; xi, 1); 7, to *heathen countries*, as distinguished from the land of Israel, especially during the theocracy; i. e. all the rest of the world excepting Israel (2 Kings xviii, 25; 2 Chron. xiii, 9, etc.); particularly the empire of Chaldea and Assyria (Ezra i, 2); 8, in the New Testament especially, "the earth" appears in our translation as applied to the land of Judæa. As in many of these passages it might seem as if the habitable globe were intended, the use of so ambiguous a term as "the earth" should have been avoided, and the original rendered by "the land," as in Lev. xxv, 23; Isa. x, 23, and elsewhere. This is the sense which the original bears in Matt. xxiii, 35; xxvii, 45; Mark xv, 33; Luke iv, 25; xxi, 23; Rom. ix, 28; James v, 17. 9. Finally, in a spiritual sense, the word is employed (in the N. T.) in contrast with heaven, to denote things earthly and carnal (John iii, 31; Colos. iii, 1, 2). See Wemyss, *Symbol. Dict.* s. v.; comp. WORLD.

To demand earth and water was a custom of the ancient Persians, by which they required a people to acknowledge their dominion; Nebuchodonosor, in the Greek of Judith (ii, 7), commands Holofernes to march against the people of the West, who had refused submission, and to declare to them that they were to prepare earth and water. Darius ordered his envoys to demand earth and water of the Scythians; and Megabysus required the same of Amyntas, king of Macedonia, in the name of Darius. Polybius and Plutarch notice this custom among the Persians. Some believe that these symbolical demands denoted dominion of the earth and sea; others, that the earth represented the food received from it, corn and fruits; the water, drink, which is the second part of human nourishment. Ecclus. xv, 16, in much the same sense, says, "The Lord hath set fire and water before thee; stretch forth thy hand unto whether thou wilt; and ch. xxxix, 26, "Fire and water are the most necessary things to life." Fire and water were considered by the ancients as the first principles of the generation, birth, and preservation of man. Proscribed persons were debarred from their use; as, on the contrary, wives in their nuptial ceremonies were obliged to touch them. See ELEMENT.

II. The idea which the ancient Hebrews had of the figure of the earth can only be conjectured from incidental hints occasionally given in Scripture (Isa. xl, 22; Prov. viii, 27; Job xxvi, 10; Psa. xxiv, 2; cxxxvi, 6). From these passages, taken together, says Rosenmüller (*Alterthumsk.* I, i, 133 sq.), we obtain the notion of the earth's disk as circular, rising out of the water, and surrounded with the ocean, the heaven being spread over it as a canopy. Though floating free in the boundless immensity of space, yet, through the Creator's might, it remains firmly fixed, without moving (1 Chron. xvii, 30; Psa. xciii, 1; civ, 5; cxix, 90). It is rather inconclusive, however, to infer the popular notions of the earth's figure from what may have been nothing more than the bold imagery of poets. Some have supposed that so long as the Hebrews were a nomadic race, they conceived of the earth as resembling a round tent, with the expanse as its covering; but that in later times, when domiciled in Palestine, they

spoke of it as a splendid palace resting upon its many pillars (2 Sam. xxii, 8; Psa. lxxxv, 3; civ, 5; Prov. viii, 25-29). The Greek and Roman writers (Hesiod, *Theogn.* 116 sq.; Ovid, *Metam.* i, 5 sq.; comp. Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* i, 10 [Sanchoniathon, ed. Orelli, p. 9 sq.]; Zendavesta, i, 170 sq.) also vary in their representations on this point, describing the earth sometimes as an oblong square, sometimes as a cube, sometimes as a pyramid, sometimes as a *chlamys*, or outspread mantle. (See Eichhorn, *Urgesch.* ed. Gabler, Nürnberg, 1790; Döderlein *Rel.-Unterr.* vii, 59 sq.; Beck, *Weltgesch.* i, 99 sq.; Bauer, *Hebr. Mythol.* i, 63 sq.; De Wette, *Bibl. Dogm.* p. 76 sq.; Baumgarten-Crusius, *Bibl. Theolog.* p. 264 sq.; Colln, *Bibl. Theol.* i, 166; Mignet, in the *Mémoires de l'Acad. des Inscr.* xxxiv, 352 sq.; Anquetil, *Oupnekhat*, i, 409 sq.; Johannsen, *Die kosmog. Ansichten d. Indier u. Hebr.* Altona, 1833; Dornedden, in Eichhorn's *Bibl.* x, 284 sq., 548 sq.; Gessner, in the *Commentt. Soc. Goett.* vol. ii; Corrodi, *Leitr. zum vern. Denken*, xviii, 15 sq.; Link, *Urcelt*, i, 268 sq.; Wagner, *Geschichte d. Urgesch.* p. 496 sq.; Umbreit, in the *Stud. u. Kritiken*, 1839, p. 189 sq.; Ballenstedt, *Die Urvwelt*, 3d ed. Quedlinb. 1819; Von Schrank, *Physik.-theolog. Erklär. der 6 Schöpfungstage*, Augsburg, 1829; Beke, *Researches in Primeval History*, London, 1834; Burton, *View of the Creation*, London, 1836; Tholuck, *Litær. Anzeig.* 1833, No. 67-78; Keil, *apologia Mos. traditionis*, Dorpat, 1839; Benner, *De censura Longini in verba Gen. i, 3*, Giess. 1759; Burmeister, *Gesch. d. Schöpfung*, Lips. 1843; Waterkeyn, *Kosmos Hieros* Grimma, 1846; Goguet, *Urspr. d. Gesetze*, ii, 227.) See COSMOGONY.

**Earthen VESSEL** or **EARTHENWARE**. See POTTERY.

**Earthquake** (אֶרֶץ רָעָה, *ra'ash*, a shaking, σεισμός).

The proximate cause of earthquakes, though by no means accurately defined, seems referable to the action of internal heat or fire. That the earth was once subject to the action of a vast internal power springing probably from the development of subterranean or central heat, the elevations and depressions, and the generally scarred and torn character of its exterior make sufficiently evident. A power similar in kind, but more restricted in degree, is still at work in the bowels of the earth, and occasionally breaks down all barriers and devastates certain parts of the world. There is good reason for holding that earthquakes are closely connected with volcanic agency. Both probably spring from the same cause, and may be regarded as one mighty influence operating to somewhat dissimilar results. Volcanic agency, therefore, is an indication of earthquakes, and traces of the first may be taken as indications of the existence (either present or past, actual or possible) of the latter. (See Hitchcock's *Geology*, p. 234 sq.) The manifestation of these awful phenomena is restricted in its range. Accordingly, geologists have laid down certain volcanic regions or bands within which this manifestation takes place. Over these regions various traces of volcanic agency are found, such as either gaseous vapors, or hot springs, or bituminous substances, and in some instances (occasionally) active volcanoes. Several sources of bitumen are found on the Tigris, in the Persian mountains, near the Kharun, and at Bushire, as well as along the Euphrates. At Hit, especially, on the last-mentioned river, it exists on a very large scale, and, having been much used from the earliest times, seems inexhaustible. Abundant traces of it are also to be seen amid the ruins and over the entire vicinity of Hillah, the ancient Babylon. Syria and Palestine abound in volcanic appearances. Between the river Jordan and Damascus lies a volcanic tract. The entire country about the Dead Sea presents indubitable tokens of volcanic agency. Accordingly, these places come within one of the volcanic regions. The chief of these are, (1) that which extends from the Caspian



Sea to the Azores; (2) from the Aleutian Isles to the Moluccas; (3) that of the Andes; (4) the African; (5) the Icelandic. Syria and Palestine are embraced within the first band, and these countries have not infrequently been subject to earthquakes. (See Stanley, *Palest.* p. 279, 283, 285, 363; Volney, *Trav.* i, 281; Kussenger, *Reisen*, p. 205). See PALESTINE.

That earthquakes were among the extraordinary phenomena of Palestine in ancient times is shown in their being an element in the poetical imagery of the Hebrews, and a source of religious admonition and devout emotion. An earthquake, when great, overturns and changes the surface of the earth, subverting mountains, hills, and rocks, sinking some parts, elevating others, altering the course of rivers, making ponds and lakes on dry lands, and drying up those that already existed; and is therefore a proper symbol of *great revolutions* or changes in the government or political world (Heb. xii, 26). See Wemyss, *Symbolical Dict.* s. v. In Psalm xviii, 7, we read, "Then the earth shook and trembled; the foundations also of the hills moved and were shaken, because he was wroth" (comp. Hab. iii, 6; Nah. i, 5; Isa. v, 25). It was not an unnatural transition that any signal display of the will, sovereignty, or goodness of Providence should be foretold in connection with, and accompanied as by other signs in the heavens above or on the earth below, so by earthquakes and their fearful concomitants (see Joel ii, 28; Matt. xxiv, 7, 29). Earthquakes are not infrequently attended with fissures of the earth's surface; instances of this are recorded in connection with the destruction of Korah and his company (Num. xvi, 32; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* iv, 3, 3), and at the time of our Lord's death (Matt. xxvii, 51); the former may be paralleled by a similar occurrence at Oppido, in Calabria, A. D. 1783, where the earth opened to the extent of 500 and a depth of more than 200 feet, and again by the sinking of the bed of the Tagus at Lisbon, in which the quay was swallowed up (Pfaff, *Schwüpfungsgesch.* p. 115). These depressions are sometimes on a very large scale; the subsidence of the valley of Siddim, at the southern extremity of the Dead Sea, may be attributed to an earthquake. Similar depressions have occurred in many districts, the most remarkable being the submersion and subsequent re-elevation of the temple of Serapis at Puteoli. The frequency of earthquakes about the Dead Sea is testified in the name Bela (Gen. xiv, 2; comp. Jerome ad Isa. xv). See SODOM. The awe which an earthquake never fails to inspire, "conveying the idea of some universal and unlimited danger" (Humboldt's *Kosmos*, i, 212), rendered it a fitting token of the presence of Jehovah (1 Kings xix, 11); hence it is frequently noticed in connection with his appearance (Judg. v, 4; 2 Sam. xxii, 8; Psa. lxxvii, 18; xevii, 4; eiv, 32; Amos viii, 8; Hab. iii, 10). Earthquakes, together with thunder, lightning, and other fearful phenomena of nature, form no small portion of the stock of materials which the interpreters of the German rationalistic school employ with no less liberality than confidence in order to explain after their manner events recorded in the Scriptures which have been commonly referred to the immediate agency of God. Hezel, Paulus, and other miracle-exploders would, but for this resource, find their "occupation gone." But, if there is reason for the statement that truth is sometimes stranger than fiction, it may with equal propriety be observed that their "natural" causes are most unnatural, unlikely, and insufficient. See MIRACLES.

The first visitation of the kind recorded as having happened to Palestine was in the reign of Ahab (about B. C. 905), when Elijah (1 Kings xix, 11, 12) was directed to go forth and stand upon the mountain before Jehovah: "And behold Jehovah passed by, and a great and strong wind rent the mountains, and brake in pieces the rocks before Jehovah; but Jehovah was not in the wind: and after the wind an earthquake; but

Jehovah was not in the earthquake: and after the earthquake a fire; but Jehovah was not in the fire: and after the fire a still small voice." A terrible earthquake took place "in the days of Uzziah, king of Judah" (B. C. 781), which Josephus (*Ant.* ix, 10, 4) says "shook the ground, and a rent was made in the Temple, so that the rays of the sun shone through it, which, falling upon the king's face, struck him with the leprosy," a punishment which the historian ascribes to the wrath of God consequent on Uzziah's usurpation of the priest's office. That this earthquake was of an awful character may be learned from the fact that Zechariah (xiv, 5) thus speaks respecting it: "Ye shall flee as ye fled from before the earthquake in the days of Uzziah, king of Judah:" and it likewise appears from Amos (i, 1) that the event was so striking, and left such deep impressions on men's minds, as to become a sort of epoch from which to date and reckon; the prophet's words are, "two years before the earthquake." See UZZIAH. From Zech. xiv, 4 we are led to infer that a great convulsion took place at this time in the Mount of Olives, the mountain being split so as to leave a valley between its summits. Josephus records something of the sort, but his account is by no means clear, for his words (*τὸ ὄρος ἀπορύγνυται τὸ ἕμισυ τοῦ κατὰ τὴν ὄσσαν*) can hardly mean the *western half of the mountain*, as Whiston seems to think, but the *half of the western mountain*, i. e. of the Mount of Evil Counsel, though it is not clear why this height particularly should be termed the *western mountain*. We cannot but think that the two accounts have the same foundation, and that the Mount of Olives was really affected by the earthquake. Hitzig (*Comm. in Zech.*) suggests that the name *רֶמְסֵס*, "corruption," may have originated at this time, the rolling down of the side of the hill, as described by Josephus, entitling it to be described as the *destroying mountain*, in the sense in which the term occurs in Jer. li, 25. See AZAL.

The only important or clear earthquake mentioned in the New Testament (except the doubtful one of Matt. xxviii, 2) is that which happened at the crucifixion of the Saviour of mankind (Matt. xxvii, 50-1; comp. Luke xxiii, 44-5; Mark xv, 33). The concomitant darkness is most naturally held to have been attendant on the earthquake. Earthquakes are not seldom attended by accompaniments which obscure the light of day during (as in this case from the sixth to the ninth hour, that is, from 12 o'clock at noon to 3 o'clock P. M.) several hours. If this is the fact, then the record is consistent with natural phenomena, and the darkness which sceptics have pleaded against speaks actually in favor of the credibility of the Gospel. Now it is well known to naturalists that such observations are by no means uncommon. It may be enough to give the following instances. A very remarkable volcanic eruption took place on the 19th of January, 1835, in the volcano of Coseguina, situated in the Bay of Fonseca (usually called the coast of Conchagua), in Central America. The eruption was preceded by a rumbling noise, accompanied by a column of smoke which issued from the mountain, increasing until it assumed the form and appearance of a large dense cloud, which, when viewed at the distance of thirty miles, appeared like an immense plume of feathers, rising with considerable velocity, and expanding in every direction. In the course of the two following days several shocks of earthquakes were felt; the morning of the 22d rose fine and clear, but a dense cloud of a pyramidal form was observed in the direction of the volcano. This gradually ascended, and by 11 o'clock A. M. it had spread over the whole firmament, entirely obscuring the light of day, the darkness equaling in intensity that of the most clouded night: this darkness continued with little intermission for three days; during the whole time a fine black pow-

der continued to fall. This darkness extended over half of Central America. The convulsion was such as to change the outline of the coast, turn the course of a river, and form two new islands. Precisely analogous phenomena were exhibited on occasions of earthquakes that took place at Cartago, in Central America, when there prevailed a dense black fog, which lasted for three days (*Recreations in Physical Geography*, p. 382). In the case of the volcanic eruption which overwhelmed Herculaneum and Pompeii (A. D. 79), we learn from the younger Pliny that a dense column of vapor was first seen rising vertically from Vesuvius, and then spreading itself out laterally, so that its upper portion resembled the head, and its lower the trunk of a pine. This black cloud was pierced occasionally by flashes of fire as vivid as lightning, succeeded by darkness more profound than night, and ashes fell even at Misenum. These appearances agree perfectly with those witnessed in more recent eruptions, especially those of Monte Nuovo in 1538, and Vesuvius in 1822. Indeed earthquakes appear to exert a very marked influence on our atmosphere; among other effects, Lyell (*Principles of Geology*, i, 400) enumerates sudden gusts of wind, interrupted by dead calms; evolution of electric matter or of inflammable gas from the soil, with sulphureous and mephitic vapors; a reddening of the sun's disk, and a haziness in the air often continued for months (Joel ii, 30, 31). Other interpreters, however, understand the earthquake in Matt. xxvii, 54 to have been merely some special and supernatural operation of God, in attestation of the marvellous work that was in progress, producing a tremulous motion in the immediate locality, and in connection therewith a sensible consternation in the minds of the immediate actors; hence there is no other historical allusion to it. This view is confirmed by its being in the second case connected with the angel's descent (Matt. xxviii, 2; comp. 1 Sam. xiv, 15). Like the one that occurred at Philippi (Acts xvi, 16), it is perhaps to be regarded as a somewhat exceptional phenomenon, wrought for a specific purpose, and consequently very limited as to its sphere of action. Nor does it appear from any notices of Scripture that the phenomena of earthquakes, in the ordinary and extensive sense of the term, played more than a very occasional and subordinate part in the scenes and transactions of sacred history. Treatises in Latin on the earthquake at our Saviour's passion have been written by Berger (Viteb, 1710), Posner (Jen. 1672), Schmerbauch (Lubben, 1756), Schmid (Jen. 1683). See DARKNESS.

An earthquake devastated Judæa some years (31) before the birth of our Lord, at the time of the battle of Actium, which Josephus (*Ant.* xv, 52) reports was such "as had not happened at any other time, which brought great destruction upon the cattle in that country. About ten thousand men also perished by the fall of houses." Jerome writes of an earthquake which, in the time of his childhood (about A. D. 315), destroyed Rabbath Moab (Jerome on *Isaiah*, xv). The writers of the Middle Ages also speak of earthquakes in Palestine, stating that they were not only formidable, but frequent. In 1834 an earthquake shook Jerusalem, and injured the chapel of the nativity at Bethlehem. In 1837 (Jan. 1) Jerusalem and its vicinity were visited by severe shocks of earthquake, yet the city remains without serious injury from these subterranean causes. This last earthquake totally overthrew the village of Safed, in Galilee (Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 128 sq.). For a full account of these and others, affecting various parts of Syria, see Kitto, *Phys. Hist. of Palest.* vol. ii, ch. iv. Comp. Bulenger, in Graevii *Thesaur.* v, 515 sq.; Forbiger, *Handb. d. alt. Geogr.* i, 636 sq.

**East** is the rendering of the following terms in the English Bible. See GEOGRAPHY.

1.  $\text{מִצְרָח}$ , *mizrach*, properly denotes the *rising*, sc.

of the sun, and strictly corresponds with the Gr. *ἀνατολή*, and the Lat. *oriens*. It is used tropically for the east indefinitely (Psa. ciii, 12; Dan. viii, 9; Amos viii, 12, etc.); also definitely for some place in relation to others, thus, "The land of the east," i. e. the country lying to the east of Syria, the Elymais (Zech. viii, 7); "the east of Jericho" (Josh. iv, 19); "the east gate" (Neh. iii, 29), and adverbially "eastward" (1 Chron. vii, 28; ix, 24, etc.). Sometimes the full expression  $\text{שֶׁלֹּם־רִיבֹן־הַשָּׁמֶשׁ}$ , *sun-rise*, is used (indefinitely, Isa. xli, 25; definitely, Judg. xi, 18). See below.

2.  $\text{קִדְמָה}$ , *ke'dem* (with its modifications), properly means *what is in front of, before* (comp. Psa. cxxxix, 5; Isa. ix, 11 [12]). As the Hebrews, in pointing out the quarters, looked towards the east,  $\text{קִדְמָה}$ , *fore*, came to signify the east,  $\text{אֲחֵרָה}$ , *behind*, the west, and  $\text{יְמִינָה}$ , *the right hand*, the south. In this sense *kedem* is used (a) indefinitely, Gen. xi, 2; xiii, 11, etc.; (b) relatively, Num. xxvii, 11, etc.; (c) definitely, to denote the regions lying to the east of Palestine (Gen. xxix, 1; Num. xxiii, 7; Isa. ix, 11; sometimes in the full form,  $\text{אֶרֶץ־קִדְמָה}$ , "land of the east" (Gen. xxv, 6), the inhabitants of which are denominated  $\text{בְּנֵי־קִדְמָה}$ , "children of the east." See BENE-KEDEM.

Sometimes *kedem* and *mizrach* are used together (e. g. Exod. xxvii, 13; Josh. xix, 12), which is, after all, not so tautological as it appears to be in our translation "on the east side eastward." Bearing in mind this etymological distinction, it is natural that *kedem* should be used when the *four* quarters of the world are described (as in Gen. xiii, 14; xxviii, 14; Job xxiii, 8, 9; Ezek. xlvii, 18 sq.), and *mizrach* when the east is only distinguished from the *west* (Josh. xi, 3; Psa. l, 1; ciii, 12; cxiii, 3; Zech. viii, 7), or from some other one quarter (Dan. viii, 9; xi, 44; Amos viii, 12); exceptions to this usage occur in Psa. cvii, 3, and Isa. xliii, 5, each, however, admitting of explanation. Again, *kedem* is used in a strictly geographical sense to describe a spot or country immediately *before* another in an easterly direction; hence it occurs in such passages as Gen. ii, 8; iii, 24; xi, 2; xiii, 11; xxv, 6; and hence the subsequent application of the term, as a proper name (Gen. xxv, 6, *eastward, into the land of Kedem*), to the lands lying immediately eastward of Palestine, viz. Arabia, Mesopotamia, Babylonia, etc.; on the other hand, *mizrach* is used of the *far* east with a less definite signification (Isa. xli, 2, 25; xliiii, 5; xlvii, 11). In describing *aspect* or *direction*, the terms are used indifferently (comp. *kedem* in Lev. i, 16, and Josh. vii, 2, with *mizrach* in 2 Chron. v, 12, and 1 Chron. v, 10). See WEST, etc.

"The East" is the name given by the ancient Hebrews to a certain region, without any regard to its relation to the eastern part of the heavens, comprehending not only Arabia Deserta and the lands of Moab and Ammon, which really lay to the east of Palestine, but also Armenia, Assyria, Mesopotamia, Babylonia, and Chaldaea, which were situated rather to the north than the east of Judæa. Its geographical boundaries include Syria, the countries beyond the Tigris and Euphrates, and the shores of the Indian Ocean and of the Arabian Gulf. The name given to this entire region by the Hebrews was  $\text{אֶרֶץ־קִדְמָה}$  (*ἀνατολή*), or the land of Kedem or East; by the Babylonians it was called  $\text{אַרְבַּיָּת}$ , or *Arabia*, Arabia. Its miscellaneous population were called by the former "sons of the East," or *Oriental*, and by the latter either *Arabians*, or the "people of the West." The Jews themselves also apply to them the Babylonian name in some of their books written after the Captivity (2 Chron. xxii, 1; Neh. ii, 9). The Arabs anciently denominated themselves, and do to this day, by either of these names. To this region belong the "kings of the East" (Isa. xix, 11; Jer. xxv, 19-25,

Heb.). The following passages may suffice as instances showing the arbitrary application of the term "east" to this region. Balaam says that Balak, king of Moab, had brought him from the mountains of the east (Num. xxiii, 7), i. e. from Pethor on the Euphrates. Isaiah places Syria in the east (ix, 11), "the Syrians from the east" (bishop Lowth). The distinction seems evident in Gen. xxix, 1, "Jacob came unto the land of the children of the East." It occurs again in Judg. vi, 3, "Even the children of the East came against them" (Sept. *οι υιοι ανατολων*; Vulg. *cateri Orientalium nationum*). The preceding facts enable us to account for the prodigious numbers of persons sometimes assembled in war against the Israelites (Judg. vi, 5; vii, 12), "and the children of the East were like grasshoppers for multitude," and for the astonishing carnage recorded (Judg. viii, 10), "there fell a hundred and twenty thousand men that drew the sword." It seems that the inhabitants of this region were distinguished for their proficiency in the arts and sciences (comp. 1 Kings i, 4, 30), and were addicted in the time of Isaiah to superstition (Isa. xxvi). See ARABIA.

The east seems to have been regarded as symbolical of distance (Isa. xlvi, 11), as the land stretched out in these directions without any known limit. In Isa. ii, 6, the house of Jacob is said to be "replenished from the east" (עֲרֹבָה מִמְּזֻרָה), which some explain as referring to witchcraft, or the arts of divination practised in the East. While others, with greater probability, understand it of the men of the East, the diviners and soothsayers who came from the east (comp. Job xv, 2); the correct text may, however, be עֲרֹבָה מִמְּזֻרָה, with sorcery, which gives a better sense (Ges. *Thesaur.* p. 1193). See WITCHCRAFT.

3. *Ἀνατολή*, sun-rise. This word usually occurs in the plural, and without the article. When, therefore, we read, as in Matt. ii, 1, 2, that "μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν came to Jerusalem saying we have seen his star ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ," we are led to suspect some special reason for such a variation. The former phrase is naturally rendered as equivalent to Oriental Magi, and the indefinite expression is to be explained by reference to the use of עֲרֹבָה in the Old Test. The latter phrase offers greater difficulty. If it be taken—"in the east," the questions arise why the singular and not the customary plural should be used? why the article should be added? and why the wise men should have seen the star in the east when the place where the child was lay to the west of their locality (unless, indeed, ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ relates to the star, and not the wise men themselves, to whom it seems to refer). Pressed by the difficulties thus suggested, the majority of recent interpreters take ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ literally = *in its rise*, and trace a correspondence of this with the *τεχθείς* of the preceding clause: they inquired for the child, whom they knew to be born, because they had seen the rising of his star, the signal of his birth. Alford objects to this, that for such a meaning we should expect *ἀντὸν*, if not in ver. 2, certainly in ver. 9; but the construction falls under the case where the article, by indicating something closely associated with the subject, supersedes the use of the demonstrative pronoun. In the Sept. *ἀνατολαί* is used both for *kedem* and *mizrah*. It should be observed that the expression is, with but few exceptions (Dan. viii, 9; Rev. xxi, 13; comp. vii, 2; xvi, 12, from which it would seem to have been John's usage to insert *ἡλιου*), *ἀνατολαί* (Matt. ii, 1; viii, 11; xxiv, 27; Luke xiii, 29), and not *ἀνατολή*. It is hardly possible that Matthew would use the two terms indifferently in succeeding verses (ii, 1, 2), particularly as he adds the article to *ἀνατολή*, which is invariably absent in other cases (comp. Rev. xxi, 13). He seems to imply a definiteness in the locality—that it was the country called עֲרֹבָה, or *ἀνατολή* (comp. the modern *Anatolia*), as distinct from

the quarter or point of the compass (*ἀνατολαί*) in which it lay. In confirmation of this, it may be noticed that in the only passage where the article is prefixed to *kedem* (Gen. x, 30), the term is used for a definite and restricted locality, namely, Southern Arabia.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See STAR IN THE EAST.

The only other terms rendered "east" in the Scriptures are the following: *כַּרְסוּחַ* (*charsuh'*, pottery), applied to a gate of Jerusalem, improperly called "east gate" (Jer. xix, 2), but meaning the potters' gate (q. v.), i. e. one which led to the "potters' field" in the valley of Hinnom (see Strong's *Harmony and Exposition*, Appendix ii, p. 11). See JERUSALEM. מוֹצֵא ( *mosa'*, a going forth, as it is elsewhere usually rendered), applied poetically to sun-rise (Psa. lxxv, 6). For "east-wind," "east-sea," see below.

EAST, TURNING TOWARDS THE. 1. The earliest churches faced eastward; at a later period (4th or 5th century) this was reversed, and the sacramental table was placed at the east, so that worshippers facing it in their devotions were turned towards the east. The Jewish custom was to turn to the west in prayer. Socrates says (*Eccles. Hist.* bk. vi, ch. v) that the church of Antioch had its altar on the west, i. e. towards Jerusalem. 2. Many fanciful reasons are assigned, both by ancient writers and by modern ritualists, for worshipping towards the east. Among them are the following: "(1.) The rising sun was the symbol of Christ, the Sun of Righteousness; and, since people must worship towards some quarter of the heavens, they chose that which led them to Christ by symbolical representation (Tertullian, *Apol.* i, 16). (2.) The east was the place of paradise, our ancient habitation and country, which we lost in the first Adam by the Fall, and whither we hope to be restored again, as to our native abode and rest, in the second Adam, Christ our Saviour (*Apost. Const.* lib. ii, c. 57). (3.) The east was considered the most honorable part of the creation, being the seat of light and brightness. (4.) Christ made his appearance on earth in the east, and thence ascended into heaven, and there will appear again at the last day. The authority of many of the fathers has been adduced by ecclesiastical writers in support of these views. The author of the *Questions to Antiochus*, under the name of Athanasius, gives this account of the practice: 'We do not,' says he, 'worship towards the east, as if we thought God any way shut up in those parts of the world, but because God is in himself the true Light. In turning, therefore, towards the created light, we do not worship it, but the great Creator of it; taking occasion from that most excellent element to adore the God who was before all elements and ages in the world.' A little attention to geography shows that these are nothing but fancies. That part of the heavens, for example, which is east at six o'clock in the morning, is west at six o'clock in the evening, so that we cannot at both these periods pray towards 'that quarter of the heavens where (according to Wheatly) God is supposed to have his peculiar residence of glory,' unless, if we turn to the east at morning prayer, we turn to west at even song. Not only so, but two individuals on opposite sides of the globe, though both suppose that they are praying with their faces to the east, are, so far as it respects each other, or any particular 'quarter of the heavens,' praying in opposite directions, one east and the other west, one looking towards that 'quarter,' the other away from it. So that all such reasons are rendered futile by the geographical fact that, owing to the rotation of the earth on its axis, every degree of longitude becomes during the twenty-four hours both east and west."

3. *Turning East in Baptism*.—In the ancient baptisteries were two apartments: first, a porch or ante-room (*προαύλιος οἶκος*), where the catechumens made their renunciations of Satan and confessions of faith; and the inner room (*ἐσωτερικος οἶκος*), where the cere-

mony of baptism was performed. When the catechumens were brought into the former of these they were placed with their faces to the west, and were then commanded to renounce Satan with some gesture and rite expressing an indignation against him, as by stretching out their hands, or folding them, or striking them together, and sometimes by spitting at him as if he were present. The words generally used by the candidate were, "I renounce Satan, and his works, and his pomps, and his service, and his angels, and his inventions, and all things that belong to him, or that are subject to him." The reason assigned by Cyril (*Catech. Mystag.*) for standing with the face to the west during this adjuration is that the west is the place of darkness; and Satan is darkness, and his kingdom is darkness. That the candidate turned his face to the east, and made his solemn confession of obedience to Christ, generally in these words, "I give myself up to thee, O Christ, to be governed by thy laws." This was called *promissum, pactum, or votum*—a promise, a covenant, a vow. The face was turned to the east because, as Cyril tells his disciples, since they had renounced the devil, the paradise of God, which was planted in the east, and whence our first parents were driven for their transgression into banishment, was now laid open to them.—Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. xi, ch. vii, § 4; Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.

4. It is "a curious instance of the inveteracy of popular custom that in Scotland, where everything that savored of ancient usage was set aside as popish by the reformers, the practice of burying with the feet to the east was maintained in the old churchyards; nor is it uncommon still to set down churches with a scrupulous regard to east and west. In modern cemeteries in England and Scotland no attention appears to be paid to the old punctilio of interring with the feet to the east, the nature of the ground alone being considered in the disposition of graves" (Chambers, *Encyclopædia*, s. v.).—Wheatly, *On Common Prayer*, ch. ii, § 2; Hook, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.; Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* xiii, viii, 15. See CHURCH EDIFICES.

**Eastburn**, JAMES WALLIS, A.M., a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born in London Sept. 26, 1797. In 1803 he came to New York, and in 1816 passed A.B. of Columbia College. In 1818 he became rector of St. George's, Accomac County, Va., where his ministry is still spoken of with great respect. In 1819 he sailed for Santa Cruz, and died on the 2d of December of the same year. He composed the beautiful *Trinity Sunday Hymn*; a lyric, entitled *The Summer Midnight*; a poem, *Yanoojen, a Tale of the Wars of King Philip*; and various anonymous essays.—Sprague, *Ann. v.*, 635.

**East, Christianity in the.** See ARABIA; ASIA; CHINA; INDIA; JAPAN.

**East Gate.** See under EAST.

**East Sea** (with the art. הַיָּם הַמִּזְרָגִי, *ha-yam hak-kadmou'i*, the forward sea; Sept. ἡ ἑσπέρια ἡ πρῶτη) is an epithet used in two passages (Joel ii, 20; Ezek. xlvii, 18) of the DEAD SEA (q. v.), because it lay on the eastern side of the Holy Land. The Mediterranean Sea, because lying in the opposite direction, was on a like account called the West Sea, or the sea on the western border (Num. xxxiv, 6; Josh. xv, 12, etc.). See SEA.

**East Wind** (קָדִימ', *kadim'*, prop. the east [as often rendered], i. e. eastern quarter; hence elliptically for the wind from that direction, Job xxvii, 21; Isa. xxvii, 8; Jer. xviii, 17; Ezek. xxix, 26; the full expression קָדִימ' מִן הַיָּם also occurs, Exod. x, 13, 14, 21; Psa. xlviii, 8; Ezek. xvii, 10). This is in Scripture frequently referred to as a wind of considerable strength, and also of a peculiarly dry, parching, and blighting nature. In Pharaoh's dream the thin ears of corn are represented as being blasted by an east wind, as, in a later age, Jonah's gourd was withered

and himself scorched by "a vehement east wind" (Gen. xli, 6; Jonah iv, 8); and often in the prophets, when a blighting desolation is spoken of, it is associated with the east wind, either as the instrumental cause or as a lively image of the evil (Ezek. xvii, 10; xix, 12; Hos. xiii, 15; Hab. i, 9, etc.). This arose from the fact that in Egypt, Palestine, and the lands of the Bible generally, the east wind, or a wind more or less from an eastern direction, blows over burning deserts, and consequently is destitute of the moisture which is necessary to promote vegetation. In Egypt it is rather a south-east than an east wind, which is commonly found most injurious to health and fruitfulness; but this also is familiarly called an east wind, and it often increases to great violence. Ukert thus sums up the accounts of modern travellers on the subject: "In the spring the south wind oftentimes springs up towards the south-east, increasing to a whirlwind. The heat then seems insupportable, although the thermometer does not always rise very high. As long as the south-east wind continues, doors and windows are closed, but the fine dust penetrates everywhere; everything dries up; wooden vessels warp and crack. The thermometer rises suddenly from 16-20° up to 30-36°, and even 38° of Reaumur. This wind works destruction upon everything. The grass withers, so that it entirely perishes if this wind blows long" (*Geogr.* p. 111). It is stated by another traveller, Wansleb, with special reference to the strong east wind employed on the occasion of the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea, which took place shortly after Easter: "From Easter to Pentecost is the most stormy part of the year, for the wind commonly blows during this time from the Red Sea, from the east" (see in Hengstenberg's *Egypt and the Books of Moses*, p. 9 sq.). There is nothing, therefore, in the scriptural allusions to this wind which is not fully borne out by the reports of modern travellers; alike by sea and by land it is now, as it has ever been, an unwelcome visitant, and carries along with it many disagreeable effects.—Fairbairn, s. v. See WIND.

**Easter** (πάσχα, a Gr. form of the Heb. פֶּסַח, and so Latinized by the Vulgate *pascha*), i. e. *Passover*. *Easter* is a word of Saxon origin, and imports a goddess of the Saxons, or, rather, of the East, *Ester*, in honor of whom sacrifices being annually offered at the Passover time of the year (spring), the name became attached by association of ideas to the Christian festival of the resurrection, which happened at the time of the Passover; hence we say *Easter-day*, *Easter-Sunday*, but very improperly; as we by no means refer the festival then kept to the goddess of the ancient Saxons. So the present German word for Easter, *Ostern*, is referred to the same goddess, *Ester* or *Ostera*.—Calmet, s. v. The occurrence of this word in the A. V. of Acts xii, 4—"Intending after Easter to bring him forth to the people"—is chiefly noticeable as an example of the want of consistency in the translators. See AUTHORIZED VERSION. In the earlier English versions *Easter* had been frequently used as the translation of πάσχα. At the last revision *Passover* was substituted in all passages but this. It would seem from this, and from the use of such words as "robbers of churches" (Acts xix, 37), "town-clerk" (xix, 35), "sergeants" (xvi, 35), "deputy" (xiii, 7, etc.), as if the Acts of the Apostles had fallen into the hands of a translator who acted on the principle of choosing, not the most correct, but the most familiar equivalents (comp. Trench, *On the Authorized Version of the N. T.* p. 21).—Smith, s. v. For all that regards the nature and celebration of the feast referred to in Acts xii, 4, see PASSOVER.

**EASTER, CELEBRATION OF.** In the ancient Church the seventh day of Passion-week (q. v.), the great Sabbath, as it was called, was observed with rigorous precision as a day of fasting. Religious worship was

celebrated by night; and the vigils continued till cock-crowing, the hour at which it is supposed our Lord arose. At this hour the stillness of these midnight vigils was broken by the joyful acclamation, "The Lord is risen! The Lord is risen! The Lord is risen indeed!" The day of Easter was celebrated with every demonstration of joy as a second jubilee. There was a solemn celebration of the Lord's Supper; the baptism of catechumens; appropriate salutations, and demonstrations of joy; the liberation of prisoners, and the manumission of slaves. Charities were dispensed to the needy. Courts of justice were closed. The heathen were forbidden to celebrate public spectacles in order that the devotions of Christians might not be interrupted. The week following was considered as a continuation of the festival. During this time, those who had been baptized at Easter continued arrayed in white, in token of that purity of life to which they were bound by baptism. On the Sunday following they laid aside their garments of white, and were welcomed as members of the Church.—Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. xx, ch. v.

**EASTER CONTROVERSIES.** There was much controversy in the early Church as to the days on which our Lord's resurrection ought to be celebrated. The churches of Asia Minor celebrated the death of the Lord on the day corresponding to the 14th of the month Nisan, on which day, according to the opinion of the whole ancient Church, the crucifixion took place. The Western churches, on the other hand, were of opinion that the crucifixion should be annually commemorated on the particular day of the week on which it occurred, that is, Friday. The resurrection was accordingly commemorated by the former party on the day corresponding to the 16th of Nisan, and by the other party on the Sunday following Good Friday. The two parties also differed with regard to the fasting preceding Easter. The Western churches viewed the death-day of Christ exclusively as a day of mourning, and they did not terminate the time of fasting until the day of resurrection. The churches of Asia Minor, on the other hand, looking upon the death of Christ wholly as the redemption of mankind, terminated fasting at the hour of Christ's death (3 o'clock in the afternoon), and immediately after celebrated the Agape and the Lord's Supper. In addition to these two parties, both of which were within the old catholic Church, there was another, repudiated by the Church as heretical. This third party, an Ebionitic sect, agreed with the churches of Asia Minor in adhering to the commemoration of the day of the month (14th and 16th of Nisan), but differed from them in insisting upon the continuance of the obligatory character of the ancient law, and the consequent duty of Christians to celebrate the Jewish Passover. Both were called *Quartodecimani*, from the *fourteenth* (Latin *quartodecimus*) day of the month on which they commemorated the death of Christ. Eusebius mentions (*Hist. Eccles.* v, 23; *Vita Constant.* iii, 19) Palestine, Pontus, Gallia, Rome, Osroene, Corinth, Phœnicia, Alexandria, as churches following the Western practice. To these the emperor Constantine, in a circular enjoining the observance of a decree of the Nicene Council on the subject, adds all Italy, Africa, Spain, Britain, Greece. Thus the Western practice appears to have largely prevailed. Its adherents traced its origin to the apostles Peter and Paul, while the churches of Asia Minor rested their differing practice upon the authority of the apostle John. Both parties adhered to the name of *Pascha* (*Passover*), by which they understood sometimes the whole week commemorating the Passion, sometimes the specially festive days of this week. In the course of time (it is not known when) the death-day was distinguished as *πίσχα στανρώσιμον*, and the day of resurrection as *πίσχα ἀναστάσιμον*. Irenæus explicitly bears testimony that the bishops of Rome up to Xystus (at the beginning of the 2d century) kept peace

with the adherents of the other practice. The first effort to come to an agreement on the controversy was made by bishop Polycarp, of Smyrna, about the middle of the 2d century, when on a visit to bishop Anicet, of Rome. The two bishops received each other with the kiss of peace, but neither of them was willing to sacrifice the practice of his predecessors. Nevertheless they parted in kindness, and peace continued to reign between the two parties. A few years later, the Ebionitic Quartodecimani caused great trouble at Laodicea (about 170), at Rome (about 180), where a certain Blasius was at their head, and in other places. Books against them were written by Melito of Sardis and Apollinaris of Hierapolis, both of whom were adherents of the practice of Asia Minor; by Clement of Alexandria and Hippolytus (about the middle of the 3d century). Of all these books only fragments are left. That of Hippolytus shows that at this time the Jewish Quartodecimani were regarded by the Church as heretics. The first serious dispute between the parties within the old Catholic Church broke out about 196, when bishop Victor, of Rome, issued a circular to the leading bishops of the Church, requesting them to hold synods in their provinces, and to introduce the Western practice. Some complied with this request; but the synod held by bishop Polycrates, of Ephesus, emphatically refused, and approved the letter of bishop Polycrates, who, in defence of the Asiatic practice, referred Victor to the authority of the apostles Philip and John, to Polycarp, and to seven of his relations, who before him had been bishops of Ephesus. Victor at first intended to excommunicate the Asiatic churches, and therefore issued an encyclical to the Christians of those regions, but whether he really carried out his threat is not certain; the words of Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* v, 24) on the movements of Victor are by some understood as implying a real execution of the excommunication, while the more common opinion is, that, in consequence of the indignant remonstrances against such a usurpation of power by the Western bishops, especially by Irenæus, the threat was never executed.

Thus far the controversy between the Asiatic and the Western churches had only concerned two points, namely, (1) whether the day of the week or the day of the month on which the death of Christ occurred should be commemorated; (2) when the fasting ought to be terminated. Now a third point of dispute arose, as to the time when the 14th day of Nisan really occurred. Many of the Church fathers are of opinion that, according to the original calculation of the Jews up to the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, the 14th of Nisan had always been after the spring equinox, and that it was only in consequence of a miscalculation of the later Jews that the 14th of Nisan occasionally fell before the equinox. They therefore insisted that the 14th of Nisan, which for both parties within the Church determined the time of Easter, should always be after the equinox. As the year of the Jews is a lunar year, and the 14th of Nisan always a full-moon day, the Christians who adopted the above astronomical view, whenever the 14th of Nisan fell before the equinox, would celebrate the death of Christ one month later than the Jewish Passover. As the Christians could now no longer rely on the Jewish calendar, they had to make their own calculations of the time of Easter. These calculations frequently differed, partly from reasons already set forth, and partly because the date of the equinox was fixed by some at the 18th of March, by others at the 19th, by others at the 21st of March. The Council of Arles in 314 endeavored to establish uniformity, but its decrees do not appear to have had great effect. The subject was therefore again discussed and acted upon by the Œcumenical Council of Nice, which decreed that Easter should be celebrated throughout the Church after the equinox, on the Friday following the 14th of Nisan. It was also provided that the Church of Alexandria,

as being distinguished in astronomical science, should annually inform the Church of Rome on what day of the calends or ides Easter should be celebrated, and the Church of Rome should notify all the churches of the world. But even these decrees of the Council of Nice did not put a stop to all differences, and it was reserved to the calculation of Dionysius Exiguus (q. v.) to gradually introduce uniformity of practice into the whole Church. Some countries, like Great Britain, did not abandon their ancient practice until after a long resistance. At the time of Charlemagne uniformity seems to have been established, and no trace is to be found of the Quartodecimani. The revision of the calendar by Pope Gregory XIII, on the whole, retained the Dionysian era, but determined more accurately the Easter full moon, and made careful provision for avoiding any future deviation of the calendar from the astronomical time. By these minute calculations, however, the Christian Easter sometimes, contrary to the decrees of the Nicene Council, coincides with the Jewish Passover. This, for instance, was the case in 1825.—Mosheim, *Church Hist.* i, 68; Neander, *Church Hist.* i, 298; ii, 301, 302; Mosheim, *Comm.* i, 523; Weitzel, *Die christliche Paschafeyer der ersten Jahrhunderte* (1848); Rettberg, in *Zeitschrift für historische Theologie*, 1832, vol. ii; Hefele, in *Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 871; Steitz, in *Herzog, Real-Encyclop.* xi, 140; Steitz, *Die Differenz der Occidentalen u. der Kleinasien* (in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1856). (A. J. S.)

**Easter, John**, a distinguished Methodist Episcopal minister. Dates of his early life are wanting. He joined the itinerancy in 1782, and located in 1792. His ministerial career was "brilliant," and "his success almost unparalleled." In 1787, on Brunswick Circuit, Va., eighteen hundred souls were added to the Church under his ministry. William M'Kendree and Enoch George, afterwards bishops in the Church, were brought to God through his preaching. See *Wakeley's Heroes of Methodism*, p. 219; *Life and Times of Jesse Lee*, p. 356 et al.

**Easter, John**, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Norfolk Co., England, Sept. 21, 1800, and joined the Wesleyan Methodists in 1824. In 1830 he emigrated to America, and settled in Geneva, N. Y. He entered the itinerancy in 1852, and took a supernumerary relation in 1838. His death was caused by a rocket, at Geneva, on July 4, 1842. Mr. Easter was a man of great worth, and a useful and beloved preacher.—*Minutes of Conferences*, iii, 345.

**Eastern Church**, a designation given,

1. Specifically to what is commonly called the Greek Church, in distinction from the Western (or Latin Church). The title claimed by that Church itself is *καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία τῆς ἀνατολικῆς*: *The Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church*. See **GREEK CHURCH**. Bishop Coxé, in the *Churchman's Calendar*, calls it the "Grand Trunk, or main stem of the Catholic Church."

2. The name *Eastern Church*, or, more properly, *Eastern churches*, is given to Eastern Christendom, divided into the churches named in the following list, which gives their statistics to the close of 1867, as far as they can be ascertained:

1. *The Greek Church*.—Russia (in Europe, 51,000,000; in Siberia, 2,600,000; in the provinces of the Caucasus no official account of the ecclesiastical statistics has yet been made; the total population of this part of the empire is 4,257,000, the population connected with the Greek Church may be estimated at about 1,500,000; hence total population of Russia connected with the Greek Church is about), 55,000,000; Turkey (inclusive of the dependencies in Europe and Egypt), about 11,500,000; Austria, 2,921,000; Greece (inclusive of the Ionian Islands), 1,220,000; United States of America (chiefly in the territory purchased in 1867 from Russia), 50,000; Prussia, 1500; China, 200; to-

tal, 69,692,700. The figures referring to Russia, Austria, and Prussia are from an official census; those concerning China are furnished by the Russian missionaries in Peking; those on Turkey and Greece are estimates almost generally adopted. See **GREEK CHURCH**; **RUSSIA**.

2. *The Armenian Church*.—According to Dr. Petermann (in *Herzog's Real-Encyclopädie*), the total number of Armenians scattered in the world is about 2,500,000. Of these, about 100,000 are connected with Rome, and are called United Armenians; 15,000 are Evangelical Armenians, and all others belong to the National (or "Gregorian") Armenian Church. The number of the latter may therefore be set down at about 2,400,000. The great majority of them (about 2,000,000) live in Turkey, about 170,000 in Russia, and 30,000 in Persia. See **ARMENIAN CHURCH**.

3. *The Nestorians*, including the *Christians of St. Thomas* in India, number about 165,000 souls, exclusive of those who have connected themselves with Rome, or have become Protestants. See **NESTORIANS**.

4. *The Jacobites* in Turkey and India are estimated at about 220,000, but the information concerning them is less definite than that about the preceding churches. See **JACOBITES**.

5. *The Copts and Abyssinians*.—The Copts may be roughly estimated at about 200,000, the Abyssinians at about 3,000,000. See **ABYSSINIAN CHURCH**; **COPTS**.

Together, therefore, the population connected with these Eastern communions embraces a population of about 76,500,000. All these bodies lay claim to having bishops of apostolical succession, and consequently all of them are embraced in the union scheme patronized by the High-Church Anglicans. Both the Low-Church and the Broad-Church parties dislike the idea of a union with the Greeks, Copts, Abyssinians, and the other Eastern communions; but the High-Churchmen, of all shades of opinion, are a unit on this subject. An important fact in the history of this movement is the official transmission of a Greek translation of the pastoral letter issued (1867) by the Pan-Anglican Synod to all the patriarchs and bishops of the Greek Church (Schem, in *Methodist Quarterly Review*, 1868, p. 280).


On the Eastern churches, besides the articles on the separate churches in this Cyclopædia, see Stanley, *Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church* (N. Y. 1867, 8vo); Neale, *History of the Holy Eastern Church* (London, 1847-1850, 4 vols. 8vo). A list of the patriarchates, sees, etc., of the Eastern churches is given in the *Churchman's Calendar*, 1868, p. 36 sq.

**Eating** (properly *ἔσθω*, *akal'*, *ἐσθίω*). The ancient Hebrews did not eat indifferently with all persons; they would have esteemed themselves polluted and dishonored by eating with those of another religion or of an odious profession. In Joseph's time they neither ate with the Egyptians nor the Egyptians with them (Gen. xliii, 32), nor in our Saviour's time with the Samaritans (John iv, 9). The Jews were scandalized at his eating with publicans and sinners (Matt. ix, 11). As there were several sorts of meats the use of which was prohibited, they could not conveniently eat with those who partook of them, fearing to contract pollution by touching such food, or if by accident any particles of it should fall on them. See **FOOD**. At their meals some suppose they had each his separate table; and that Joseph, entertaining his brethren in Egypt, seated them separately, each at his particular table, while he himself sat down separately from the Egyptians, who ate with him; but he sent to his brethren portions out of the provisions which were before him (Gen. xliii, 31 sq.). Elkanah, Samuel's father, who had two wives, distributed their portions to them separately (1 Sam. i, 4, 5). In Homer, each guest is supposed to have had his little table apart, and the master of the feast distributed meat to each

(*Olyss.* xiv, 446 sq.). We are assured that this is still practised in China, and that many in India never eat out of the same dish, nor on the same table with another person, believing they cannot do so without sin, and this not only in their own country, but when travelling and in foreign lands. This is also the case with the Brahmins and various castes in India, who will not even use a vessel after a European, though he may only have drank from it water recently drawn out of a well. The same strictness is observed by the more scrupulous among the Mohammedans, and instances have been known of every plate, and dish, and cup that had been used by Christian guests being broken immediately after their departure. The ancient manners which we see in Homer we see likewise in Scripture, with regard to eating, drinking, and entertainments. There was great plenty, but little delicacy; great respect and honor paid to the guests by serving them plentifully. Joseph sent his brother Benjamin a portion five times larger than those of his other brethren. Samuel set a whole quarter of a calf before Saul (1 Sam. ix, 24). The women did not appear at table in entertainments with the men; this would have been an indecency, as it is at this day throughout the East. See BANQUET.

The Hebrews anciently sat at table, but afterwards imitated the Persians and Chaldeans, who reclined on table-beds or divans while eating. (See Gier. *De vet. Ebr. ratione cœnandi*, Lips. 1635). This mode of reclining at meals was common in the East, and also among the Greeks and Romans. Under the Roman emperors the couches were sometimes made semicircular. See ACCUBATION. At the present day, in the East, the custom is to sit or recline upon the floor at meat, and at other times on cushions. Many of the Arabs use no knife, fork, spoon, or plate in eating their victuals (these being used only by foreigners, and that as a special privilege); they dip their hands into the milk which is placed before them in a wooden bowl,

by no means agreeable to a European, to which, however, I would willingly have endeavored to submit, but it was impossible to learn it in the short compass of twenty days' visit. There are set on the table, in the evening, two or three messes of stewed meat, vegetables, and sour milk. To me the privilege of a knife, and spoon, and plate was granted; but the rest all helped themselves immediately from the dish, in which it was no uncommon thing to see more than five Arab fingers at one time. Their bread, which is extremely thin, tearing and folding up like a sheet of paper, is used for the purpose of rolling together a large mouthful, or sopping up the fluid and vegetables. But the practice which was most revolting to me was this: when the master of the house found in the dish any dainty morsel, he took it out with his fingers and applied it to my mouth. This was true Syrian courtesy and hospitality, and had I been sufficiently well-bred, my mouth would have opened to receive it. On my pointing to my plate, however, he had the goodness to deposit the choice morsel there" (*Researches*, p. 210). Niebulr's account is as follows (*Descrip. of Arabia*, p. 52). "The table of the Orientals is arranged according to their mode of living. As they always sit upon the floor, a large cloth is spread out in the middle of the room upon the floor, in order that the bits and crumbs may not be lost, or the carpets soiled. (On journeys, especially in the deserts, the place of this cloth is supplied by a round piece of leather, which the traveller carries with him, *Travels*, ii, 372.) Upon this cloth is placed a small stool, which serves as a support for a large round tray of tinned copper; on this the food is served up in various small dishes of copper, well tinned within and without. Among the better class of Arabs, one finds, instead of napkins, a long cloth, which extends to all who sit at table, and which they lay upon their laps. Where this is wanting, each one takes, instead of a napkin, his own handkerchief, or rather small towel, which he always carries with him to wipe himself



Ancient Triclinium or Dinner-bed.

and lift it to their mouth in their palm. Dr. Russell states, "The Arabs, in eating, do not thrust their whole hand into the dish, but only their thumb and two first fingers, with which they take up the morsel, and that in a moderate quantity at a time." The present mode of eating in Syria and Palestine is thus described by Dr. Jowett: "To witness the daily family habits, in the house in which I lived at Deir el Kamr (not far from Beyrout), forcibly reminded me of Scripture scenes. The absence of the females at our meals has already been noticed. There is another

carries with him to wipe himself with after washing. Knives and forks are not used. The Turks sometimes have spoons of wood or horn. The Arabs are so accustomed to use the hand instead of a spoon, that they can do without a spoon even when eating bread and milk prepared in the usual manner. Other kinds of food, such as we commonly eat with a spoon, I do not remember to have seen. It is, indeed, at first, very unpleasant to a European, just arrived in the East, to eat with people who help themselves to the food out of the common dish with their fingers; but this is easily got over, after one has become acquainted with their mode of life. As the Mohammedans are required, by their religion, very often to wash themselves, it is therefore even on this account probable that

their cooks prepare their food with as much cleanliness as those of Europe. The Mohammedans are even obliged to keep their nails cut so short that no impurity can collect under them; for they believe their prayers would be without any effect if there should be the least impurity upon any part of the body. And since, now, before eating, they always wash themselves carefully, and generally too with soap, it comes at length to seem of less consequence whether they help themselves from the dish with clean fingers or with a fork. Among the sheiks of the desert, who require at

a meal nothing more than *yillav*, i. e. boiled rice, a very large wooden dish is brought on full, and around this one party after another set themselves till the dish is emptied, or they are satisfied. In Merdin, where I once ate with sixteen officers of the Waiwode, a servant placed himself between the guests, and had nothing to do but to take away the empty dishes, and set down the full ones which other servants brought in. As soon as ever the dish was set down, all the sixteen hands were immediately thrust into it, and that to so much purpose, that rarely could any one help himself three times. They eat, in the East, with very great rapidity; and at this meal in Merdin, in the time of about twenty minutes, we sent out more than fourteen empty dishes." See DINE.

"who did eat of my bread, even he hath lifted up his heel against me!" Hence, in part, no doubt, the conviviality that always followed the making of a covenant. Hence, also, the severity of some of the feelings acknowledged by the indignant man of patience, Job, as appears in several passages of his pathetic expostulations. It is well known that Arabs, who have given food to a stranger, have afterwards thought themselves bound to protect him against the vengeance, demanded by consanguinity, for even blood itself. (See Layard's *Nineveh*, 2d series, p. 217.) See HOSPITALITY.

To "eat" is frequently spoken metaphorically in Scripture of the enjoyment or partaking of temporal or spiritual blessings (Jer. xv, 16; Ezek. iii, 1; Rev. x, 9). Wemyss's *Symbol. Diet.* s. v. Comp. DRINK; TASTE.



Modern Oriental Party at Dinner.

The Hebrews, like the modern Orientals, rose early, about the dawn of the day, when they breakfasted. They were accustomed to take a slight repast about noon; and this to husbandmen and mechanics was probably the principal meal (1 Kings xx, 16; Ruth ii, 14; Luke xiv, 12). Wilkinson says, "That dinner was served up at midday among the ancient Egyptians may be inferred from the invitation given by Joseph to his brethren: 'Bring these men home, and slay and make ready, for these men shall dine with me at noon' (Gen. xliii, 16); but it is probable that, like the Romans, they also ate supper in the evening, as is still the custom in the East." Supper appears to have been the principal meal among the Hebrews, as it was among the Greeks and Romans. Among the Romans it anciently took place about three o'clock; but in the East, as at the present day in Persia, about six or seven in the evening, in order to avoid the enfeebling heat of the afternoon (Mark vi, 21; Luke xiv, 16, 24; John xii, 2). In 1 Sam. ix, 13, we read that the people would not eat of the feast until Samuel had arrived and consecrated the sacrifice. But this circumstance affords no evidence of the custom of asking a blessing on food. In the time of Christ, however, it was common before every meal to give thanks (Matt. xiv, 19; xv, 36). See MEAL-TIME.

In closing this subject, we may properly notice the obligations which are considered by Eastern people to be contracted by eating together. Niebuhr says, "When a Bedouin sheik eats bread with strangers, they may trust his fidelity and depend on his protection. A traveller will always do well, therefore, to take an early opportunity of securing the friendship of his guide by a meal." The reader will recollect the complaint of the Psalmist (xli, 9), penetrated with the deep ingratitude of one whom he describes, as having been his own familiar friend, in whom he trusted—

**Eaton, John**, was born at Kant in 1575, and studied at Oxford. In 1625 he was made rector of Wickham Market, Suffolk, where he died in 1641. His writings are Antinomian. They are, *The Discovery of a most dangerous dead Faith* (Lond. 1641, 12mo);—*The Honeycomb of free Justification* (Lond. 1642, 4to). He was imprisoned for this last work by the Long Parliament.—Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*; Hock, *Ecl. Biog.* iv, 526.

**Eaton, Samuel**, a Congregational minister, was a native of England, and took his degrees at Magdalen College, Cambridge. He entered into the ministry of the Est-

ablished Church, but, on account of his Puritanism, came to New England with the Rev. John Davenport in 1637, and was co-pastor with him at New Haven. He returned to England in 1640, and formed a Congregational church at Duckenfield, Cheshire. By the Act of Uniformity he was compelled to cease preaching in 1662, and died June 9, 1665. He published *A Defence of sundry Positions and Scriptures alleged to justify the Congregational Way* (1645; second part, 1646);—*The Mystery of God incarnate, or the Word made Flesh cleared up*, etc. (1650);—*Vindication, or further Confirmation of the Scriptures, produced to prove the Divinity of Jesus Christ, distorted and miserably wrested and abused by Mr. John Knowles*, etc. (1651);—*Treatise of the Oath of Allegiance and Covenant, showing that they oblige not* (replied to 1650);—*The Quakers Confuted*, etc. (1659).—Sprague, *Annals*, i, 98.

**E'bal** (Heb. *Eybal'*, עֵבֶל, *stone*), the name of one or two persons, and also of a hill.

1. (Sept. *Γεμίαν* [Vat. MS. omits], Vulg. *Hebal*.) A various reading for OEBAL (q. v.), the son of Joktan (1 Chron. i, 22; comp. Gen. x, 28).

2. (Γαυβήλ v. r. Ταυβήλ [1 Alex. MS. Γαυβήλ], Vulg. *Ebal*.) The fourth son of Shobal, son of Seir, the Horite of Idumæa (Gen. xxxvi, 23; 1 Chron. i, 40). B.C. ante 1694.

3. (Sept. Γαυβήλ, Josephus *Γίβαλος*, Vulg. *Hebal*.) A mountain on the northern part of the tribe of Ephraim, on the north-eastern side of the valley in which was situated the city of Shechem (now Nablous), in Samaria (q. v.). See Mills, *Three Months at Nablus* (London, 1864).

1. It was here that the Israelites were enjoined to erect an altar, setting up plastered stones, and respond to the imprecations uttered in the valley, according to the divinely prescribed formula, upon those



who should prove faithless to the Sinaitic law (Deut. xi, 29; xxvii, 4, 13), while the responses to the blessings were to be uttered by the other division of the tribal representatives stationed upon the opposite mountain, Gerizim. Both the benediction and the anathema were pronounced by the Levites, who remained with the ark in the centre of the interval (compare Deut. xxvii, 11-26, with Josh. viii, 30-35, with Joseph. *Ant.* iv, 8, 44, and with the comments of the Talmud, *Sota*, 36, quoted in Herxheimer's Pentateuch). But, notwithstanding the ban thus apparently laid on Ebal, it was further appointed to be the site of the first great altar to be erected to Jehovah: an altar of large unhewn stones, plastered with lime, and inscribed with the words of the law (Deut. xxvii, 2-8). On this altar peace-offerings were to be offered, and round it a sacrificial feast was to take place, with other rejoicings (ver. 6, 7). Scholars disagree as to whether there were to be two erections—a kind of cromlech and an altar; or an altar only, with the law inscribed on its stones. The latter was the view of Josephus (*Ant.* iv, 8, 44; v, 1, 19), the former is unhesitatingly adopted by the latest commentator (Keil, *Comment.* on Josh. viii, 32). The terms of Moses's injunction seem to infer that no delay was to take place in carrying out this symbolical transaction. It was to be "on the day" that Jordan was crossed (xxvii, 2), before they "went in unto the land flowing with milk and honey" (ver. 3). Accordingly Joshua appears to have seized the earliest practicable moment, after the pressing affairs of the siege of Jericho, the execution of Achan, and the destruction of Ai had been dispatched, to carry out the command (Josh. viii, 30-35). After this Ebal appears no more in the sacred story. By a corruption of the above-cited texts, the Samaritans transferred the site of the appointed altar to the opposite mountain, which has hence attained the greater notoriety. See GERIZIM.

2. The question now arises, where were Ebal and Gerizim situated? The all but unanimous reply to this is, that they are the mounts which form the sides of the fertile valley in which lies Nablus, the ancient SHECHEM—Ebal on the north and Gerizim on the south.

(1.) It is plain from the passages already quoted that they were situated near together, with a valley between.

(2.) Gerizim was very near Shechem (Judg. ix, 7), and in Josephus's time their names appear to have been attached to the mounts, which were then, as now, Ebal on the north and Gerizim on the south. Since that they have been mentioned by Benjamin of Tudela (Asher, i, 66) and Sir John Maundeville, and among modern travellers by Maundrell (*Mod. Trav.* p. 432).

The main impediment to our entire reception of this view rests in the terms of the first mention of the place by Moses in Deut. xi, 30: A. V. "Are they not on the other side Jordan, by the way where the sun goeth down, in the land of the Canaanites, which dwell in the champaign over against Gilgal, beside the plains of Moreh?" Here the mention of Gilgal, which was in the valley of the Jordan near Jericho, of the valley itself (*Arabah*, mistranslated here only, "champaign"), and of the Canaanites who dwelt there, and also the other terms of the injunction of Moses, as already noticed, seem to imply that Ebal and Gerizim were in the immediate neighborhood of Jericho. This is strengthened by the narrative of Joshua, who appears to have carried out the prescribed ceremonial on the mounts while his camp was at Gilgal (comp. vii, 2; ix, 6), and before he had (at least before any account of his having) made his way so far into the interior of the country as Shechem.

This is the view taken by Eusebius (*Onomasticon*, s. v.  $\text{Ἐβάλ}$ ). He does not quote the passage in Deut., but seems to be led to his opinion rather by the diffi-

culty of the mountains at Shechem being too far apart to admit of the blessings and cursings being heard, and also by his desire to contradict the Samaritans; add to this that he speaks from no personal knowledge, but simply from hearsay ( $\text{Ἀέγεται}$ ), as to the existence of two such hills in the Jordan valley. The notice of Eusebius is merely translated by Jerome, with a shade more of animosity to the Samaritans (*vehementer errant*), and expression of difficulty as to the distance, but without any additional information. Procopius and Epiphanius also followed Eusebius, but their mistakes have been disposed of by Reland (*Palest.* p. 503-4; *Miscell.* p. 129-133).

With regard to the passage in Deut., it will perhaps assume a different aspect on examination. (1.) Moses is represented as speaking from the east side of Jordan, before anything was known of the country on the west, beyond the exaggerated reports of the spies, and when everything there was wrapped in mystery, and localities and distances had not assumed their due proportions. (2.) A closer rendering of the verse is as follows: "Are they not on the other side the Jordan, beyond ( $\text{בְּאַחַד הַצִּדִּים}$ , the word rendered 'the backside of the desert' in Exod. iii, 1) the way of the sunset, in the land of the Canaanite who dwells in the Arabah over against Gilgal, near the terebinths of Moreh?" If this rendering is correct, a great part of the difficulty has disappeared. Gilgal no longer marks the site of Ebal and Gerizim, but of the dwelling of the Canaanites, who were, it is true, the first to encounter the Israelites on the other side of the river, in their native lowlands, but who, we have it actually on record, were both in the time of Abraham (Gen. xii, 6) and of the conquest (Josh. xvii, 18) located about Shechem. The word now rendered "beyond" is not represented at all in the A. V., and it certainly throws the locality much further back; and, lastly, there is the striking landmark of the trees of Moreh, which were standing by Shechem when Abraham first entered the land, and whose name probably survived in Morthia, or Mamorthia, a name of Shechem found on coins of the Roman period (Reland, *Miscell.* p. 137 sq.). See GILGAL.

In accordance with this is the addition in the Samaritan Pentateuch, after the words "the terebinths of Moreh," at the end of Deut. xi, 30, of the words "over against Shechem." This addition is the more credible because there is not, as in the case noticed afterwards, any apparent motive for it. If this interpretation be accepted, the next verse (31) gains a fresh force: "For ye shall pass over Jordan [not only to meet the Canaanites immediately on the other side, but] to go in to possess the land [the whole of the country, even the heart of it, where these mounts are situated (glancing back to ver. 29)], the land which Jehovah your God giveth you; and ye shall possess it, and dwell therein." It may also be asked whether the significance of the whole solemn ceremonial of the blessing and cursing is not missed if we understand it as taking place directly a footing had been obtained on the outskirts of the country, and not as acted in the heart of the conquered land, in its most prominent natural position, and close to its oldest city—Shechem.

This is evidently the view taken by Josephus. His statement (*Ant.* v, 1, 19) is that it took place after the subjugation of the country and the establishment of the tabernacle at Shiloh. He has no misgivings as to the situation of the mountains. They were at Shechem ( $\text{ἐπὶ Σικίμων}$ ), and from thence, after the ceremony, the people returned to Shiloh.

The narrative of Joshua is more puzzling. But even with regard to this something may be said. It will at once be perceived that the book contains no account of the conquest of the centre of the country, of those portions which were afterwards the mountain of Ephraim, Esdraelon, or Galilee. We lose Joshua at

Gilgal, after the conquest of the south, to find him again suddenly at the waters of Merom in the extreme north (x, 43; xi, 7). Of his intermediate proceedings the only record that seems to have escaped is the fragment contained in viii, 30-35. Nor should it be overlooked that some doubt is thrown on this in Josh. viii, 30-35, by its omission in both the Vat. and Alex. MSS. of the Sept.

The distance of Ebal and Gerizim from each other is not such a stumbling-block to us as it was to Eusebius; though it is difficult to understand how he and Jerome should have been ignorant of the distance to which the voice will travel in the clear elastic atmosphere of the East. Stanley has given some instances of this (*Sinai and Pal.* p. 13); others equally remarkable have been observed by those long resident in the neighborhood, who state that a voice can be heard without difficulty across the valley separating the two spots in question (see also Bonar, p. 371).

It is well known that one of the most serious variations between the Hebrew text of the Pentateuch and the Samaritan text is in reference to Ebal and Gerizim. In Deut. xxvii, 4, the Samaritan has Gerizim, while the Hebrew (as in A. V.) has Ebal, as the mount on which the altar to Jehovah and the inscription of the law were to be erected. Upon this basis the Samaritans ground the sanctity of Gerizim and the authenticity of the Temple and holy place, which have existed there. The arguments upon this difficult question will be found in Kennicott (*Dissert.* ii), and in the reply of Verschuir (Levard. 1775; quoted by Gesenius, *De Pent. Sam.* p. 61). Two points may merely be glanced at here which have apparently escaped notice. 1. Both agree that Ebal was the mount on which the cursings were to rest, Gerizim that for blessings. It appears inconsistent that Ebal, the mount of cursing, should be the site of the altar and the record of the law, while Gerizim, the mount of blessing, should remain unoccupied by sanctuary of any kind. 2. Taking into account the known predilection of Orientals for ancient sites on which to fix their sanctuaries, it is more easy to believe (in the absence of any evidence to the contrary) that in building their temple on Gerizim, the Samaritans were making use of a spot already enjoying a reputation for sanctity, than that they built on a place upon which the curse was laid in the records which they received equally with the Jews. Thus the very fact of the occupation of Gerizim by the Samaritans would seem an argument for its original sanctity. On the other hand, all critics of eminence, with the exception of Kennicott, regard this as a corruption of the sacred text; and when it is considered that the invariable reading in Hebrew MSS. and ancient versions, both in this passage and the corresponding one in Josh. viii, 30, is "Ebal," it seems strange that any scholar would for a moment doubt its correctness. Kennicott takes an opposite view, maintaining the integrity of the Samaritan reading, and arguing the point at great length; but his arguments are neither sound nor pertinent (*Dissertations on the Hebrew Text*, ii, 20 sq.). The Samaritans had a strong reason for corrupting the text, seeing that Gerizim was their sanctuary; and they desired to make it not merely the mountain of blessing, but the place of the altar and the inscribed law. See SAMARITANS.

3. Ebal is rarely ascended by travellers, and we are therefore in ignorance as to how far the question may be affected by remains of ancient buildings thereon. That such remains do exist is certain, even from the very meagre accounts published (Bartlett, *Walks about Jerusalem*, App. p. 251 sq.; and Narrative of Rev. J. Mills in *Trans. Pal. Archaeol. Assoc.* 1855), while the mountain is evidently of such extent as to warrant the belief that there is a great deal still to discover.

The report of the old travellers was that Ebal was more barren than Gerizim (see Benjamin of Tadmora, and Maundrell, in *Early Travels in Palestine*, p. 82,

433; Wilson, *Lands of the Bible*, ii, 71); but this opinion probably arose from a belief in the effects of the curse mentioned above. At any rate, it is not borne out by the latest accounts, according to which there is little or no perceptible difference. They are not isolated mountains, but culminating points of a chain. Their declivities facing the vale bear a singular resemblance to each other. They are equally rugged and bare; the limestone strata here and there project, forming bold bluffs and precipices; but the greater portion of the slopes, though steep, are formed into terraces, partly natural and partly artificial. For this reason both mountains appear more barren from below than they are in reality, the rude and naked supporting walls of the terraces alone being thus visible. The soil, though scanty, is rich. In the bottom of the vale are olive groves, and a few straggling trees extend some distance up the sides. The broad summits and upper slopes have no trees, yet they are not entirely bare. The steeper banks are here and there scantily clothed with dwarf shrubbery; while in spring and early summer, rank grass, brambles, and thistles, intermixed with myriads of bright wild flowers—anemones, convolvulus, tulips, and poppies—spring up among the rocks and stones. Ebal is "occupied from bottom to top by beautiful gardens" (Mills; see also Porter, *Leant-book*, p. 332). The slopes of Ebal towards the valley appear to be steeper than those of Gerizim (Wilson, p. 45, 71). It is also the higher mountain of the two. There is some uncertainty about the measurements, but the following are the results of the latest observations (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 178):

Nablûs, above sea,	1672 ft.	
Gerizim do.	2600 "	..... above Nablûs, 928 ft.
Ebal do.	about 2700 "	..... do. 1028 "

According to Wilson (*Lands*, ii, 71; but see Robinson, ii, 277, 280, note), it is sufficiently high to shut out Hermon from the highest point of Gerizim. The structure of Gerizim is nummulitic limestone, with occasional outcrops of igneous rock (Poole, in *Geograph. Journ.* xxvi, 56), and that of Ebal is probably similar. At its base above the valley of Nablûs are numerous caves and sepulchral excavations. This was, doubtless, the necropolis of Shechem (Robinson, iii, 131; Van de Velde, ii, 290). The modern name of Ebal is *Sitti Salamiyah*, from a Mohammedan female saint, whose tomb is standing on the eastern part of the ridge, a little before the highest point is reached (Wilson, p. 71, note). By others, however, it is reported to be called 'Imâd ed-Dîn, "the pillar of the religion" (Stanley, p. 238, note). The tomb of another saint, called Amâd, is also shown (Ritter, p. 641), with whom the latter name may have some connection. On the south-east shoulder is a ruined site bearing the name of 'Askar (Robinson, iii, 132).—Smith, s. v. See SYCHAR.

**Ebbo**, archbishop of Rheims, was the son of a Saxon serf, and was born about 775, or, according to other accounts, about 786. While a boy he became known to the young king Louis, the son of Charlemagne, who sent him to a convent school, and had him educated for the ministry. As he belonged to a serf family, and could not receive orders, Louis set him free, after which he was ordained. After the accession of Louis to the throne, Ebbo's influence rapidly rose, and in 817 the king secured his election as archbishop of Rheims. Soon after, in 822, he placed himself at the head of a mission to the Danes. His plan highly pleased both the king and the Pope. The Danish king Harald allowed him to preach Christianity, but refused to become a Christian himself. Many Danes were baptized; but, owing to some threatening movements against Harald, Ebbo in 823 returned to the emperor, and at the Diet of Compiègne made a full report on his mission. Soon after he undertook a second missionary visit to Denmark, at which he dis-

posed the king favorably towards Christianity. In 826, the king, with his wife, his oldest son, his nephew, and a suite of 400 men, came to the emperor's court at Mayence and was baptized. The mission in Denmark was now placed under Ausgar, and Ebbo returned to his archbishopric. He took an active part in the affairs of the state, and in the war of the sons of Louis against their father, he, with most of the bishops, took side with the sons. He presided at the assembly of bishops which in 833 compelled Louis to do public penance, as such an act, according to the laws of the Church, made him unfit to bear arms. But when, in 834, Louis regained his power, Ebbo was arrested and kept a prisoner in the convent of Fulda. He was brought before the Diet of Diedenhofen in 835, and confessed himself guilty of offences which, in the opinion of the judges, made him unfit for any further administration of his office. He was again confined in the convent of Fulda, where he remained until the death of Louis in 840. He then prevailed upon Lothaire, who made an attempt to possess himself of the whole empire of his father, to reinstate him as archbishop of Rheims (Dec. 6, 840). In May, 841, king Charles, the brother of Lothaire, again expelled him; and as, at the conclusion of peace, Lothaire did not take a special interest in Ebbo, he lost his archbishopric forever. In the last years of his life, king Louis of Germany appointed him, with permission of the Pope, administrator of the diocese of Hildesheim. He died March 20th, 851. Ebbo compiled an *Indiculum Ebbonis de ministris Remensis ecclesie*, an instruction for the clergy of his diocese as to their mode of life, and an *Apologia Archiepiscopi Remensis cum ejusdem ad gentes septentrionales legatione*. They are of small size and no value.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xix, 447; Wetzler u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 349. (A. J. S.)

**E'bed** (Heb. *id.* עֶבֶד, *servant* [q. v.], i. e. of God; comp. *Abda*), the name of two men.

1. (Many MSS., and the Syr. and Arab. Versions, have עֶבֶר, *Eber*; Sept. Ἰωβὴλ; Alexand. MS. Ἀβὲδ; Vulg. *Ebed* and *Obed*.) The father of Gaal (q. v.), who headed the insurgents at Shechem against Abimelech, tyrant judg. of the Israelites (Judg. ix, 26-35). B. C. ante 1321.

2. (Sept. Ωβὶθ v. r. Ωβὴν, Vulgate *Abed*.) Son of Jonathan, and family-head of the lineage of Adin; he returned with 50 males from the captivity (Ezra viii, 6). B. C. 459.

**Ebed-jesu**, surnamed **BAR-BEUCHA** (*Son of the Blessed*), an eminent Nestorian theologian, was born in Mesopotamia about the middle of the 13th century. After having been for five years bishop of Sigara, in Arabia, he was made Nestorian bishop of Soba or Nisibe in 1290. Where Ebed-Jesu pursued his studies is not known, but the works which he has left us show that he was fluent in the Arabic, well acquainted with the Greek, and his dogmatical writings especially display an extensive knowledge with philosophy and dialectics. He seems also to have been familiar with the works of the great Jacobite Bar-Hebraeus. His works, which are more than twenty, are mostly of a theological character; on the interpretation of the O. and N. T., on the Logos, sacraments of the Church, and a treatise on the truth of the Faith (pub. by A. Mai in Syriac and Lat., *Script. Vet.* x, 317:—*Epitome or Collection of the Canons of Councils* (also published by Mai):—*Canones xcv apostolici ab Ecclesie ordinationem*:—*Prima christiana doctrinae Diffusio*) (a Description of the Countries that permitted the preaching of the Apostles):—23 Canons of the Apostles, edited by St. Clement:—5 other Canons of the Apostles, published also by St. Clement:—*The Paradise Eden*, containing 50 poems, divided into two parts, called Henoch and Elias, beginning with the Trinity, and ending with the Resurrection. (Comp. Assemani, *Bibl. Or.* iii, 1, p. 325 sq.) Of literary importance is his catalogue of 200 Syr-

ian writers (ably edited by Assemani, *Bibl. Or.* iii, 1, p. 1-362), at the close of which his own writings are also given.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xv, 594; Herzog, iii, 613; Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* iii, part i. (J. H. W.)

**Ebed-Jesu**, a Chaldean patriarch and Syrian writer, lived about the middle of the 16th century. He received his education at Gozarta, and was afterwards bishop of that place. In 1554 he was elected as the successor of Sulaka, first patriarch of the Nestorians, and confirmed by the Pope in 1562. Ebed-Jesu was a man of great erudition; he was familiar with the writings of all the Greek and Latin fathers, and was also master of the Arabic, Chaldee, and the Syriac. Many of the Nestorians were converted by him, and the numbers of the Chaldees were augmented under his administration. He died a few years after his visit to Rome (1562), in a monastery at the village of Seert in Mesopotamia. We have from him a poem in three parts: *Sur le voyage à Rome, le retour et la mort de Sulaka; Poème à la louange de Pie IV.; a Confession of Faith*, read at the 22d session of the Council of Trent.—Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* i. 538; iii, p. 3, 325; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biographie Générale*, xv, 595. (J. H. W.)

**E'bed-me'lech** (Heb. *E'bed-Me'lek*, עֶבֶד מֶלֶךְ, *servant of the king*, i. q. Arabic *Abd el-Mulek*, Sept. Ἀβὲμῆλεχ, Vulgate *Abdemelech*), an Ethiopian at the court of Zedekiah, king of Judah, who was instrumental in saving the prophet Jeremiah from death by famine (Jer. xxxviii, 7-13), and who, for his humanity in this circumstance, was promised deliverance when the city should fall into the enemy's hands (Jer. xxxix, 15-18). B. C. 589. See JEREMIAH. He is there styled a eunuch (עֲבָדֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ), and he probably had charge of the king's harem (comp. xxxviii, 22, 23), an office which would give him the privilege of free private access to the king; but his name seems to be an official title = *King's slave*, i. e. *minister*. See EUNUCH.

**Ebeh**. See REED.

**Ebel**. See TALMUD.

**Ebel**, JOHANN WILHELM, a Protestant mystic and theosophist, was born in 1784 at Passenheim, in the province of Eastern Prussia. In 1809, while a preacher in the Established Church of Prussia, he attracted the attention of his ecclesiastical superiors on account of his connection with the theosophist Schönher (q. v.). Subsequently he was appointed preacher at Königsberg, where he gathered around him a circle of enthusiastic followers, among them a few noble men and a larger number of noble women. Foremost among the latter were the countess of Kanitz and the countess von der Gröben. In 1837, at the request of the Consistory of that city, a suit was instituted against him and his friend Diestel, which belongs among the most remarkable trials of the kind in modern times. He was in 1842 acquitted from the chief charge of the establishment of a new sect, but deposed from office for violating his official duties by communicating to others theosophic and philosophical views differing from the doctrines of the Church. He died in 1861, at the villa of his friend the countess von der Gröben. Ebel wrote a number of works, chiefly of a mystic nature, among which are the following: *Die Weisheit von Oben* (1822):—*Der Tagesanbruch* (1824):—*Die geistliche Erziehung* (1825):—*Bibelworte u. Winke* (1827):—*Die Philosophie der heil. Urkunde* (1854-56). A full account of Ebel, his doctrines and followers, is given in Dixon, *Spiritual Wives* (London and Philadelphia, 1868), where is also printed for the first time a paper by professor Sachs, which was the chief evidence used against Ebel. See also Diestel, *Das Zengerverhör in d. Prozesse wider d. Prediger Ebel u. Diestel* (Leipzig, 1838), and Ernst count von Kanitz (follower of Ebel), *Aufklärung nach Actenquellen*, etc. (Basel, 1862). (A. J. S.)

**Eben-** (עֵבֶן, *e'ben, stone*), stands as a prefix in several geographical names, which designate monuments set up to commemorate certain events [see **STONE**]; e. g. **EBEN-BOHAN**; **EBEN-EZEL**; **EBEN-EZER**; **EBEN-ZOHELETH**.

**Eben-bohan.** See **BOHAN**.

**Eben-azel.** See **EZEL**.

**Eb'en-e'zer** (Heb. with the art. *E'ben ha-E'zer*, עֵבֶן עֶזֶר, *stone of the help*; Sept. Ἀβενεζερ; Josephus translates λιθὸς ἰσχυρός), the name given to a place marked by a monumental stone which Samuel set up as a memorial of the divine assistance in battle obtained against the Philistines (1 Sam. vii, 12). See **PILLAR**. Twenty years before this, the same spot (mentioned in the history under the same name by anticipation of its subsequent designation) witnessed the discomfiture of the Hebrew hosts, the death of the high-priest's sons, and the capture of the sacred ark by the Philistines (1 Sam. iv, 1; v, 1). Its position is carefully defined (1 Sam. vii, 12) as between Mizpeh—"the watch-tower," one of the conspicuous eminences a few miles N. of Jerusalem—and Shen, "the tooth" or "crag," apparently some isolated landmark. Neither of these points, however, has been identified with certainty—at least not the latter. According to Josephus's record of the transaction (*Ant.* vi, 2, 2), the stone was erected to mark the limit of the victory, a spot which he calls *Corrhæa*, but in the Hebrew **BETH-CAR** (q. v.). Eusebius and Jerome affirm (*Onomast.* s. v. Ἀβενεζερ, *Abenezzer*) that it lay between Jerusalem and Ashkelon, near (πλησίον, *juxta*) Bethshemesh. Now Bethshemesh stands on a low ridge on the south side of the rich valley of Sorar. On the opposite side of this valley, on a rising ground, about three miles north-west of Bethshemesh, are the ruins of an old village called *Beit-fur*. The situation answers in every respect to that assigned to Beth-car; and the name may possibly be an Arab corruption of the latter. It lies in the direct route from Mizpeh to the plain of Philistia, and is just on the borders of the latter province, where a pursuing army would halt (Porter, *Handbook for Syr. and Pal.* p. 283). But, as this is very far from the probable site of Mizpeh (Nehy-Samwil), it is hardly possible to fix the position of Eben-ezer at that of Beth-car. The monumental stone in question may rather have been set up at the point where the enemy began to flee, and we may therefore seek its locality nearer the Israelitish metropolis, possibly at the modern village *Bidlu*, a short distance west of Nehy-Samwil (Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 133, note). See **SIEN**.

**Eben-zoheleth.** See **ZOHELETH**.

**E'ber** (Heb. *id.* עֵבֶר, country *beyond*), the name of five men.

1. (Sept. Ἐβερ and Ἐβερ, Vulg. *Heber*.) Eber (as the name should be Anglicized) was the son of Salah, and father of Peleg, being the third post-diluvian patriarch after Shem (Gen. x, 24; xi, 14; 1 Chron. i, 18, 25). B. C. 2448-1984. He is claimed as the founder of the Hebrew race (Gen. x, 21; Num. xxiv, 24). See **HEBER**. In Luke iii, 35, his name (Ἐβερ) is Anglicized *Heber*.

2. (Sept. אֱבֵר, Vulg. *Heber*.) The youngest of the seven heads of families of the Gadites in Bashan (1 Chron. v, 13; A. V. "Heber"). B. C. 782.

3. (Sept. אֱבֵר, Vulg. *Heber*.) The oldest of the three sons of Elpal the Benjamite, and one of those who rebuilt Ono and Lod, with their suburbs (1 Chron. viii, 12). B. C. 535.

4. (Sept. אֱבֵר, Vulg. *Heber*.) One of the heads of the families of Benjamites resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. viii, 22; A. V. "Heber"). B. C. 535.

5. (Sept. אֱבֵר, Vulg. *Heber*.) The head of the priestly family of Amok, in the time of the return from exile under Zerubbabel (Neh. xii, 20). B. C. 535.

**Eber, PAUL**, a companion of Luther and Melancthon, and an eminent Hebrew scholar and theologian, was born at Kissingen, Nov. 8, 1511. He received his first instruction from his father, and continued his studies at Anspach. The sudden death of his mother caused his father to recall Paul from Anspach, and while on his way home he was thrown from his horse and became lumbpacked. In 1526 he had so far recovered that he could resume his studies at Nuremberg, and in 1532 he entered the university at Wittenberg. Here he was employed as amanuensis to Melancthon, with whom he became so intimate that he consulted him on all important matters, and hence Eber received the name of Philip's Repository (*Repertorium Philippi*). He was also a faithful disciple of Luther. In 1536 he began to lecture on grammar and philosophy, and in 1541 he accompanied Melancthon to the Diet at Worms. In 1544 he was appointed professor of Latin grammar, in 1550 dean of the philosophical faculty, and in 1551 rector of the university. After the death of Förster (1556) he was appointed professor of Hebrew and chaplain to the royal chapel at Wittenberg. These positions he soon changed for others, and in 1559 he was made general superintendent of the electorate, and, as doctor of theology, a member of the theological faculty of the university. From this time to the day of his death, Dec. 16, 1569, he devoted himself entirely to theology and to the faithful discharge of his duties as general superintendent of the electorate. After the death of Melancthon he was regarded as the head of the university. He took large part in the Adiaphoristic and Crypto-Calvinistic controversies, but always showed himself moderate and learned. His principal works are: *Expositio Evangeliorum* (Franf. 1576);—*Calendarium historicum* (1551, 4to);—*Historia populi judæici a reditu ex Babilonico exilio usque ad ultimum exilium Jerosolymæ* (Witeb. 1458; new ed. 1562, and transl. into German, French, and Dutch);—*Unterricht u. Bekenntn. vom h. Sacrament des Leibs u. Bluts unsers Herrn* (Witth. 1562);—*Biblia Latina* (Vitæm. 1565);—*Expositio Evangelicorum Dominicalium* (Franf. 1576);—*Hofer, Novæ Biog. Génér.* xv, 599 sq.; *Hertzog, Real-Encycl.* iii, 618 sq.; *Plank, Gesch. der protest. Theol.* iv, Theil i (Lpz. 1798), 448-525; *Sixt, Paul Eber* (Heidel. 1843, and another book by the same author, Anspach, 1857); *Pressel, Paul Eber nach gleichzeitigen Quellen* (1862); *Bibl. Sacra*, xx, 644 sq.

**Eberhard, JOHANN AUGUST**, a Rationalistic theologian of Germany, was born in 1739 at Halberstadt. He studied theology at Halle, and was in succession preacher at Halberstadt, Berlin, and Charlottenburg. The latter position he obtained by express order of king Friedrich II. In 1778 he was appointed professor of philosophy at Halle, where he opposed the idealism of Kant and Fichte. He died in 1809. Eberhard is a representative of what is called "the vulgar Rationalistic school" (*Vulgär-Rationalismus*). He wrote a considerable number of theological, philosophical, historical, and other works. Among his theological works are: *Næve Apologie des Socrates* (Berlin, 1772, 8d ed. 1788);—*Vorbereitung zur natürl. Theologie* (Halle, 1781);—*Geist des Urchristenthums* (Halle, 1807-1808), and *Sittenlehre der Vernunft* (Berlin, 1781).—*Brockhaus, Conversations-Lex.* s. v. (A. J. S.)

**Eberlin, ANTON**, one of the German reformers, was born in Swabia towards the end of the 15th century. He entered the Franciscan order, and was chosen preacher of the Franciscan convent at Tübingen, from which, in consequence of some difficulties, he was, in 1519, transferred to Ulm. Here he became acquainted with Luther's writings, and having adopted his doctrines, had to leave Ulm in 1521. Repairing to Basle, he became very popular, but was driven away by the bishop of Basle. He found an asylum with Ulrich von Hutten and Francis of Sickingen, and wrote with them several works on ecclesiastical and monas-

tical abuses. In 1522 he came to Wittenberg, where he became personally acquainted with Luther and with Melancthon, under the influence of whose teaching he wrote in the same year his *Vom Missbrauche christlicher Freiheit*, breathing a charitable spirit. In 1524 he went to Erfurt, where he preached for some time, and thence to Wertheim on the Main (1526). He died soon after. His works, to the number of 34, were mostly of local interest; among the others, the most important one, entitled *Wie sich ein Diener Gottes worts im all seyden thun halten soll* (Wittenberg, 1525, 4to), has seen several editions, and can be found in A. H. Franke, *Monita pastoralia*. See Döllinger, *d. Reformation*, etc. i, 205; Strobel, *Liter. Museum*, i, 365; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iii, 620.

**Ebert, Jacob**, an eminent Hebrew scholar, was born at Sprottau in 1549. He was professor of Hebrew and theology at the university then in Frankfort on the Oder, now in Berlin, and at one time its *rector magnificus*. So versed was he in Hebrew that he could write in that language. He died in 1614. His works are, *Historia Juramentorum* (Frankfort on the Oder, 1588, 8vo);—*Institutio intellectus cum elegantia* (ibid. 1597);—*Electa Hebraea 750 a libro Rabbinico Milchar Haphenimim* (1630, 12mo);—*Tetrasticha Hebraea in textus evangelicos*, etc.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xv, 600 sq. (J. H. W.)

**Ebert, Theodor**, son of Jacob Ebert (q. v.), succeeded his father as professor of Hebrew at the university in Frankfort on the Oder. He shared also the honor of being rector with his father. Ebert died in 1630. Among his principal works are, *Vita Christi, tribus de curiis rhythmorum quadratorum hebraicorum* (Frankf. on the Oder, 1615, 4to);—*Animale psalticorum Centuria* (1619, 4to);—*Manueliones aphoristica ad discursum artium. sectiones xvi* (1620, 4to);—*Chronologia precipuorum Lingue Sancte Doctorum, ab O. C. ad suam usque aetatem* (1620, 4to);—*Eulogia jurisconsultorum et politiorum qui linguam hebraicam et reliquis orientales excoluerunt* (1628);—*Poetica Hebraica* (1638, 8vo), in which the Hebrew metres are more extensively exemplified than in any other work.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xv, 610; Etheridge, *Intr. to Heb. Literature*, p. 374.

**Ebi'asaph** (Heb. *Elyasaph'*, עֵיזָאֵפֶן, prob. a contraction for עֵזְרָאֵלֶּךָ, *Abiasaph*; Sept. Ἀβιασαφ and Ἀβισαφ, Vulg. *Abiasaph*), the son of Elkanah and father of Assir, in the genealogy of the Kohathite Levites (1 Chron. vi, 23). B. C. cir. 1660. In ver. 37 he is called the son of Korah, from a comparison of which circumstance with Exod. vi, 24, most interpreters have identified him with the *Abiasaph* (q. v.) of the latter passage; but (unless we there understand not three sons of Korah to be meant, but only three in regular descent), the pedigrees of the two cannot be made to tally without violence. See ASSIR. From 1 Chron. ix, 19, it appears that he had a son named Kore. In 1 Chron. xxvi, 1, his name is abbreviated to אֶסָאֵפֶן.

**Ebionites**, a sect of Judaizing Christians who received the doctrines of the Gospel very partially, and denied the divine nature of Christ. They do not appear to have been at any time numerous, and it is doubtful whether they ever obtained such consistency as to have a definite creed.

1. *The Name*.—The name is derived from the Hebrew עֵיזָאֵפֶן, *poor*. This term was anciently applied in derision to Christians in general (Epiphanius, *adv. Haer.* xxix, 1), and came later to designate Jewish Christians (Origen, *cont. Celsum*, ii, 1). Fürst (*Lexicon*, s. v.) makes the derivation refer to Matt. v, 3, making "Ebionites" equivalent to "oppressed pious exiles" (Isa. xxv, 4). Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* iii, 27) fancifully derives the name from "the poverty and meanness of the Ebionite doctrine concerning Christ." Tertullian (*De Præscrip. Haeret.* c. xxxiii) derives it from a founder, *Ebion*, who maintained the authority

of the Jewish law, and rejected the miraculous conception and divine nature of spirit. The derivation first above given is now generally adopted.

2. *History*.—Dorner (*Person of Christ*, Edinb. transl. i, 189 sq.) traces the Ebionitish tendency as far back as the Epistle to the Hebrews. "From that zeal for the law with which Paul had to contend, the Judaizing spirit was led not at first to impeach the Christology, but rather the Soteriology, or the work of Christ. But the consequence of the legal stand-point soon showed itself. The party which the Epistle to the Hebrews had in view must have over-estimated the law of the O. T. regarding holy times, places, acts, and persons alike, and have been wanting in the Christian knowledge which knows how to secure to the O. T. its abiding significancy, which it has as a divine institute without imperilling the newness and conclusive completeness of Christianity." Epiphanius traces the origin of Ebionitism to the Christians who fled to Pella after the destruction of Jerusalem, A. D. 66 (*adv. Haer.* xxix, 1). According to Hegeppus (*Hist. Eccles.* iv, 22), one Thebutis, at Jerusalem, about the beginning of the second century, "began to corrupt the Church secretly on account of his not being made a bishop." "We find the sect of the Ebionites in Palestine and the surrounding regions, on the island of Cyprus, in Asia Minor, and even in Rome. Though it consisted mostly of Jews, Gentile Christians also sometimes attached themselves to it. It continued into the fourth century, but at the time of Theodoret was entirely extinct. It used a Hebrew Gospel, now lost, which was probably a corruption of the Gospel of Matthew" (Schaff, *Church History*, i, § 68, p. 214).

3. *Doctrines*.—Dr. Schaff sharply distinguishes Ebionism from Gnosticism as follows: "Ebionism is a Judaizing, pseudo-Petrine Christianity, or a Christianizing Judaism; Gnosticism is a paganizing or pseudo-Pauline Christianity, or a pseudo-Christian heathenism. The former is a particularistic contraction of the Christian religion; the latter a vague expansion of it" (*Church History*, i, § 67). According to the same writer, "the characteristic marks of Ebionism in all its forms are, degradation of Christianity to the level of Judaism, the principle of the universal and perpetual validity of the Mosaic law, and enmity to the apostle Paul. But, as there were different sects in Judaism itself, we have also to distinguish at least two branches of Ebionism, related to each other, as Pharisaism and Essenism, or, to use a modern illustration, as the older deistic and the speculative pantheistic rationalism in Germany, or the two schools of Unitarianism in England and America. (1.) The common Ebionites, who were by far the more numerous, embodied the Pharisaic legal spirit, and were the proper successors of the Judaizers opposed in the epistle to the Galatians. Their doctrine may be reduced to the following propositions: (a.) Jesus is, indeed, the promised Messiah, the son of David, and the supreme lawgiver, yet a mere man, like Moses and David, sprung by natural generation from Joseph and Mary. The sense of his Messianic calling first arose in him at his baptism by John, when a higher spirit joined itself to him. Hence Origen compared this sect to the blind man in the Gospel who called to the Lord without seeing him, 'Thou son of David, have mercy on me!' (b.) Circumcision and the observance of the whole ritual law of Moses are necessary to salvation for all men. (c.) Paul is an apostate and heretic, and all his epistles are to be discarded. The sect considered him a native heathen, who came over to Judaism in later life from impure motives. (d.) Christ is soon to come again to introduce the glorious millennial reign of the Messiah, with the earthly Jerusalem for its seat. (2.) The second class of Ebionites, starting with Essenic notions, gave their Judaism a speculative or theosophic stamp, like the errorists of the Epistle to the Colossians. They form the stepping-stone to Gnosticism.

Among these belong the Elkesaites" (Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* i, § 68, 214 sq.). The pseudo-Clementine homilies teach a speculative form of Ebionism, essentially Judaizing in spirit and aim [see CLEMENTINES, ii, p. 383]; and comp. Schaff, *Ch. History*, i, § 63; Dorner, *Person of Christ*, Edinb. transl., p. 203 sq.).

4. Ebionism has reappeared, since the Reformation, in Socinianism (q. v.), and in the other forms of what is called Unitarianism (q. v.). Some Unitarian writers have undertaken to show that Ebionism was the original form of Christian doctrine, and that the Church doctrine as to the person of Christ was a later development; so Priestley, in his *History of the Corruptions of Christianity* (Birmingham, 1782). Bishop Horsley replied to Priestley in his *Charge to the Clergy of St. Albans* (1783), and in other tracts, collected in *Tracts in Controversy with Dr. Priestley* (Dundee, 1812, 3d ed.). Horsley, in this controversy, made use of Bull's learned treatment of the subject in his reply to Zwicker (see Bull, *On the Trinity*, Oxford, 1855, 3 vols.: i, 116; ii, 376; iii, 175 et al. See also Waterland, *Works*, Oxf. 1843, 6 vols.: iii, 554 sq.). A far abler advocate of the Socinian view is Baur, in his *Christenthum d. drei ersten Jahrhunderte; Lehre v. d. Dreieinigkeit Gottes; Dogmengeschichte*, etc. Baur's position is clearly stated, and refuted by professor Fisher (*Am. Presb. and Theolog. Rev.* Oct. 1864, art. i). "Baur agrees with the old Socinians in the statement that the Jewish Christianity of the apostolic age was Ebionite. But, unlike them, he holds that we find within the canon a great departure from, and advance upon, this humanitarian doctrine of Christ's person. He professes to discover in the New Testament the consecutive stages of a progress which, beginning with the Unitarian creed, terminates in the doctrine of Christ's proper divinity. There occurred at the end, or before the end, of the apostolic age, a reaction of the Jewish Christianity, which with Baur is identical with the Judaizing or Ebionite element; and this type of Christianity prevailed through the larger part of the second century." (See Fisher, *l. c.*, for a criticism of this view, and for a brief but luminous sketch of Ebionism. On the other side, see *N. Amer. Rev.* April, 1864, p. 569 sq.).

*Literature.*—See, besides the works already cited, Irenæus, *Har.* i, 26 (Ante-Nicene Library, v, 97); Gieseler, *Ueber die Nazariër und Ebioniten*, in Archiv für A. & N. Kircheng., iv, 279 sq. (Leipzig, 1820); Mosheim, *Commentaries*, i, 220, 400; Neander, *Church Hist.* i, 344, 350; Herzmann, *Die Clementinen* (Hamb. 1844), p. 362 sq.; Schlegel, *Real-Encyclopædie*, iii, 621 sq.; Martensen, *Dogmatics* (Edinburgh, 1866), § 128; Shedd, *History of Doctrines*, i, 106 sq.; Burton, *Eccles. History*, Lect. xi; Burton, *Bampton Lectures* (Oxford, 1829), notes 73-84.

**Ebnerian Manuscript** (CODÆX EBNERIANUS, usually designated as No. 105 of the Gospels, 48 of the Acts, and 24 of the Pauline Epistles), a beautiful cursive Greek MS. of the entire N. T. except Rev., consisting of 425 quarto vellum leaves; assigned to the 12th century; formerly belonging to Jerome Ebner von Eschenbach, of Nuremberg, and now in the Bodleian Library (No. 136). A fac-simile and description are given by Tregelles, in Horne's *Introd.* p. 220. See MANUSCRIPTS, BIBLICAL.

**Ebōda** (Ἐβόδα), a city mentioned only by Ptolemy (xvii, 18) as situated in the sea-board quarter of Arabia Petraea (see Reland, *Palaest.* p. 463), in 65½° and 304°, and marked on the *Peutingier Table* as lying on the Roman road 23 Roman miles S. of Elusa (q. v.). Dr. Robinson (*Researches*, i, 287) discovered the site in the modern *el-Abdeh* (otherwise *Anfeh*, *ib.* p. 560), eight hours from the site of Elusa, at the junction of Wady es-Seram with Wady el-Bircin (*ib.* p. 284). It contains extensive ruins, situated on a rocky ridge from sixty to one hundred feet high; especially the remains of an acropolis, of a capacious castle, and of a

large Greek church, with numerous walls, columns, etc., still standing, and several wells or reservoirs, but no inhabitants (*ib.* p. 285, 286).

**Ebony** (עֵבֶן, *hobni'*, stony, q. d. stone-wood [comp. the Germ. *Steinholz*, "fossil-wood"], only in the plur. עֵבֶן עֵבֶן, *hobnim'* [text עֵבֶן עֵבֶן for עֵבֶן עֵבֶן, *hobenim'*], Sept. [by some confusion or misinterpretation, see Rosenmüller, *Schol.* in loc.] τῶν εἰσαγομένων, Symmachus ἐβένου, Vulg. [dentes] *hebeninos*) occurs only in one passage of Scripture, where the prophet Ezekiel (xxvii, 15), referring to the commerce of Tyre, says, "The men of Dedan were thy merchants; many isles were the merchandise of thine hand; they brought thee for a present horns of ivory and ebony." See **DRY-DAN**. The Hebrew word is translated "ebony" in all the European versions; but, as Bochart states (*Hù roz.* i, 20, part ii), the Chaldee version, followed by R. Scoloro and other Jews, as well as the Greek and Arabic versions, render it by *pearl-fur* (*parones*). Some of the Hebrew critics, however, as Kimchi, also acknowledge that Arabian *ebony* is meant. Of the correctness of this opinion there can now be no doubt. In the first place, we may allude to Dedan being considered one of the ports of Arabia on the Persian Gulf, or at least to the south of the Red Sea; and, secondly, as observed by Bochart, the terms *hobnim* and *ebony* are very similar, the latter word being variously written by ancient authors, as ἐβένη, ἐβένος, ἐβένου, *ebenus* and *hebenus*. The last form is used by Jerome in his Latin, and ἐβένος by Symmachus in his Greek version. The Arabs have *abnis*, which they apply to ebony, and by that name it is known in Northern India at the present day. Forskål mentions *abnis* as one of the kinds of wood imported in his time from India into Arabia. Whether the Arabic name be a corruption of the Greek, or the Greek a modification, as is most likely, of some Eastern name, we require some other evidence besides the occurrence of the word in Arabic works on materia medica to determine, since in these Greek words are sometimes employed as the principal terms for substances with which they are not well acquainted. *Bardus* is, however, given by some as the Arabic name, *abnis* as the Persian. Naturalists have found the latter applied to ebony in north-west India, as did Forskål on the Red Sea.

Ebony wood was highly esteemed by the ancients, and employed by them for a variety of purposes (*Theophr. Hist. Pl.* iv, 5; *Plin. II. N.* vi, 30, § 35; xii, 4, § 8, 9; *Strabo*, xv, 703; *Pausan.* i, 42, 5; viii, 17, 2; *Ovid. Met.* xi, 610; compare *Barhebr. Chron.* p. 181). It is very appropriately placed in juxtaposition with ivory, on account of the beautiful contrast in color. Ivory and ebony are probably, however, also mentioned together because both were obtained from the same countries, Ethiopia and India; and, among the comparatively few articles of ancient commerce, must, from this cause, always have been associated together, while their contrast of color and joint employment in inlaid work would contribute as additional reasons for their being adduced as articles characteristic of a distinct commerce. But it is not in Ezekiel only that ebony and ivory are mentioned together, for Diodorus, as quoted by Bochart, tells us that an ancient king of Egypt imposed on the Ethiopians the payment of a tribute of ebony, gold, and elephants' teeth. So Herodotus (iii, 97), as translated by Bochart, says, "Ἐθιοπίης Περσῶν προτριαννῶν τριβυτὸν ἔχοντων δύοσιν χενεϊκῶσιν αὐρῶν ἀπυρῶν (id est, ignem nondum expertis), et ducentas eburi phalangas, et magnos elephanti dentes viginti." Pliny, referring to this passage, remarks, "But Herodotus assigneth it rather to Ethiopia, and saith that every three years the Ethiopians were wont to pay, by way of tribute, unto the kings of Persia, 100 billets of the timber of that tree (that is, ebene), together with gold and yvorie;" and again, "From Syene (which

confineth and boundeth the lands of our empire and dominion) as farre as to the island Meroë, for the space of 996 miles, there is little ebene found: and that in all those parts betwene there be few other trees to be found but date-trees, which peradventure may be a cause that ebene was counted a rich tribute, and deserved the third place, after gold and ivory" (Holland's *Pliny*, xii, 4). It is sometimes stated that the ancients supposed ebony to come only from India. This arose probably from the passage of Virgil (*Georg.* ii, 117): "Sola India nigrum fert ebum." But the term "India" had often a very wide signification, and included even Ethiopia. Several of the ancients, however, mention both Indian and Ethiopian ebony, as Dioscorides and Pliny; while some mention the Indian, and others the Ethiopian only, as Lucan (*Phars.* x, 304): "Nigris Meroë fecunda colonis, læta comis ebeni."

The only objection to the above conclusion of any weight is, that *hobnim* is in the plural form. To this Bochart and others have replied, that there were two kinds of ebony, as mentioned by Theophrastus, Dioscorides, etc., one Ethiopian, the other Indian. Fuller and others maintain that the plural form is employed because the ebony was in pieces: "Refert ad ebeni palangas, quæ ex India et Æthiopia magno numero afferbantur. Φάλαγγας vocant Herodotus et Arrianus in Periplus. Plinius *palangas*, aut *phalangas*, variante scriptura. id est, fustes teretes, et qui navibus spinnuntur, aut quibus idem onus plures lajulant" (Bochart, *l. c.*). But the names of other valued foreign woods, as Shittim and Almuggim, are also used in the plural form. Besides *abnis*, Arab authors, as stated by Bochart (*l. c.*), mention other words as similar to and substituted for ebony: one of these is called *shiz*, *shizi*; also *susem* and *semsem*, in the plural form *sesamim*, described as "nigrum lignum ad patinas conficiendas." Hence, in the Koran, those who are tormented in Gehenna, it is said, will issue from the fire after a certain period of confinement in it: "They will go forth, I say, like the wood *sesamim*;" that is, black, from being burnt in the fire. That such a wood was known we have the testimony of Dioscorides: "Some sell *sesamine* or acanthine wood for ebony, as they are very similar." Some critics, and even Sprengel, in his late edition of Dioscorides, read *σικάνια* instead of *σητάμια*, for no other reason apparently but because *σικάνια* denotes a tree with which European scholars are acquainted, while *sesamina* is only known to those who consult Oriental writers, or who are acquainted with the products of the East. Bochart rightly reprehends this alteration as being unnecessary, in view of the existence of the words *sesamina*, *sasim*, or *semsem* among the modern Arabs, and cites a notice of Arrian to the same effect (Bochart, *l. c.*). The above word is by Dr. Vincent translated *scamum*; but this is an herbaceous oil-plant.

If we look to the modern history of ebony, we shall find that it is still derived from more than one source. Thus Mr. Holtzappel, in his recent work on Turning, describes three kinds of ebony. (1.) One from the Mauritius, in round sticks like scaffold poles, seldom exceeding fourteen inches in diameter, the blackest and finest in the grain, the hardest and most beautiful. (2.) The East Indian, which is grown in Ceylon and the Peninsula of India, and exported from Madras and Bombay in logs from six to twenty, and sometimes even twenty-eight inches in diameter, and also in planks. This is less wasteful, but of an inferior grain and color to the above. (3.) The African, shipped from the Cape of Good Hope in billets, the general size of which is from three to six feet long, three to six inches broad, and two to four inches thick. This is the least wasteful, as all the refuse is left behind; but it is the most porous, and the worst in point of color. No Abyssinian ebony is at present imported: this, however, is more likely to be owing to the different routes which commerce has taken, although it is

again returning to its ancient channels, than to the want of ebony in the ancient Ethiopia. From the nature of the climate, and the existence of forests in which the elephant abounds, there can be no doubt of its being well suited to the group of plants which have been found to yield the ebony of Mauritius, Ceylon, and India, the genus *Diospyrus* of botanists. Of this several species yield varieties of ebony as their heart-wood, as *D. ebenum* in the Mauritius, and also in Ceylon, where it is called *kaluwara*. It is described by Retz "foliis ovato-lanceolatis, acuminatis, geminis hirtis;" and he quotes as identical *D. glaberrima* (Fr. Rottb. *Nor. Act. Haon.* ii, 540, tab. 5). *D. ebenaster* yields the bastard ebony of Ceylon, and *D. hirsuta* the Calamander wood of the same island, described by Mr. Holtzappel as of a chocolate-brown color, with black stripes and marks, and stated by him to be considered a variety of ebony. *D. melanoxyylon* of Dr. Roxburgh is the ebony-tree of Coromandel, and is figured among Coromandel plants (i, No. 46); it grows to be a large tree in the mountainous parts of Ceylon, and in the Peninsula of India—in Malabar, Coromandel, and Orissa. The black part of the wood of this tree alone forms ebony, and is found only in the centre of large trees, and varies in quantity according to the size and age of the tree. The outside wood is white and soft, and is soon destroyed by time and insects, leaving the black untouched (Roxb. *Fl. Ind.* ii, 530). Besides these, there is in the Peninsula of India a wood called *blackwood* by the English, and *sit-sal* by the natives: it grows to an immense size, is heavy, close-grained, of a greenish-black color, with lighter-colored veins running in various directions. It is yielded by the *Dalbergia latifolia*. To the same genus belongs the *Sissu*, one of the most valued woods of India, and of which the tree has been called *Dalbergia sissu*. The wood is remarkably strong, of a light grayish hue, with darker-colored veins. It is called *sissu* and *shishum* by the natives of India. This is the name which we believe is referred to by Arab authors, and which also appears to have been the original of the *sesamina* of Dioscorides and of the Periplus. The name may be applied to other nearly allied woods, and therefore, perhaps, to that of the above *D. latifolia*. It is a curious confirmation of this that Forskål mentions that in his time *shishum*, with teak and ebony, was among the woods imported from India and Arabia. It is satisfactory to have apparently such competent confirmation of the general accuracy of ancient authors, when we fully understand the subjects and the products of the countries to which they allude (Kitto, s. v.). According to Sir E. Tennent (*Ceylon*, i, 116) the following trees yield ebony: *Diospyros ebenum*, *D. reticulata*, *D. ebenaster*, and *D. hirsuta*. The wood of the first-named tree, which is abundant throughout all the flat country to the west



Branch of *Diospyrus Ebenum*.

of Trincomali, "excels all others in the evenness and intensity of its color. The centre of the trunk is the only portion which furnishes the extremely black part which is the ebony of commerce; but the trees are of such magnitude that reduced logs of two feet in diameter, and varying from ten to twelve feet in length, can readily be procured from the forests at Trincomali" (*Ceylon*, l. c.) It bears a berry that is eaten by the natives when ripe. The leaves are elliptical, having numerous veins. The corolla or colored part is shaped like an antique vase, and bears eight stamens (Kitto, *Pict. Bible*, in loc. Ezek.). There is every reason for believing that the ebony afforded by the *Diospyros ebenum* was imported from India or Ceylon by Phœnician traders, though it is equally probable that the Tyrian merchants were supplied with ebony from trees which grew in Ethiopia (Smith, s. v.). See TYRE. (See Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s. v. Ebenus; *Penny Cyclop.* s. v. Ebony; Geiger, *Pharmaceut. Botanik*, i, 697). See BOTANY.

**Ebraldines**, ORDER OF THE. See FONTÉVRAULD.

**Ebrardus**, an author and theologian of Béthune, in France, who lived during the latter part of the 12th century and the beginning of the 13th. He is known only by his writings. One of the principal of these, his *Græcismus*, a collection of rules of rhetoric, prosody, grammar, and logic, was for many years used as a text-book. His principal theological works are *Liber antihæresis* against the Cathari, which was first published under the title *Contra Waldenses* in Gretser's *Trias scriptorum contra Waldenses* (Inglstadt, 1614, 4to), and reprinted in *Bibl. Patr. Max.* (of Lyons, vol. xxiv), and lastly in Gretser's *Opera Omnia* (vol. xii, part ii).—Herzog, *Real-Encyclopædie*, iii, 625.

**Ebremar** or **Evermer**, the third Latin patriarch of Jerusalem, was born at Cikes, near Terouanne, towards the close of the 11th century. Admitted by Lambert, bishop of Arras, to the priesthood, he joined the first Crusaders, and was of the number appointed by Godfrey de Bouillon canon at the holy sepulchre. In 1103, on the deposition of Daimbert (q. v.), he was elevated to the patriarchate, in which, after much contention on the part of Daimbert, he was solemnly confirmed by the decree of a council. He was a member of the Council of Nablous (1120), and in 1123 signed the treaty between the crusading princes and the Venetians. A letter of this prelate, with the response by Lambert of Arras, is contained in the 5th vol. of the *Miscellanea* of Baluze.—Hoefler, *Nov. Elog. Générale*, xv, 618.

**Ebro'nah** (Heb. *Abrownâh*, עֲבְרֹנָה, *passage*, i. e. of the sea; Sept. *Ἐβρωνά*), the thirtieth station of the Israelites on their way from Egypt to Canaan (Num. xxxiii, 34, 35). Since it lay near Ezion-Gaber on the west, as they left Jotbathah, it was probably in the plain now known as the *Kû'a en-Nûkk*, immediately opposite the pass of the same name at the head of the Eleanitic branch of the Red Sea (see Robinson's Map in *Researches*, vol. i). Rømmel (in the *Holl. Encyclop.* i, 167) compares the *Avra* of Ptolemy (v. 17), in Arabia Petrea (66° 10' and 29° 40'), with the *Havarra* of the *P-nînger Table*; a very improbable supposition. Knobel thinks (*Ezreg. Handb.* in loc.) that the Ezion-Gaber in question cannot be the port of that name at the head of the Eleanitic Gulf; for, as the next station mentioned is Kadesh, this was too far from the north end of the gulf to be reached in one march; but this objection is of little force, as there is no uniformity in the intervals between the stations. Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 213) rightly regards Ebronah as merely the name of a "ferry," by which the people perhaps crossed this arm of the sea (!), or where travellers usually crossed it.

**Ebutius** (*Ἐβούτιος*), a decurion (*δικάροχος*), and a person distinguished for good judgment and prompt action, who was sent with Placidus by Vespasian to

invest Jotapata while garrisoned by Josephus (*Josephus War*, iii, 7, 3). He was slain while defending Vespasian from a furious sally during the siege of Gamala (*ib.* iv, 1, 5).

**Eca'nus** (Vulg. id., the Gr. text being lost), one of the five swift scribes who were selected to attend Esdras (2 Esdr. xiv, 24).

**Ecbat'ana** (1 Esdr. vi, 23) or "ECBAT'ANÈ" (τὰ Ἐκβάτανα, 2 Macc. ix, 3; Judith i, 1 sq.; Tob. v, 9, etc.; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* x, 11, 7; xi, 4, 6; Ἀγβάτανα in Ctesias i; Herod. i, 98; ii, 153), the metropolis of Media (Curt. v, 81), situated 88° and 37° 45', according to Ptolemy (vi, 2, 14), and after the time of Cyrus (Strabo, xi, 522 sq.; Pausan. iv, 24, 1; Xenoph. *Cyr.* viii, 6, 22; *Anab.* iii, 5, 15) two mouths in the year the residence of the Persian (later the Parthian) kings. It is somewhat doubtful whether the name of this place is really contained in the Hebrew Scriptures. Many of the best commentators understand the expression עֲבָתָנָא, in Ezra vi, 2, differently, and translate it *in arcæ*, "in a coffer" (see Buxtorf and others, and so our English Bible *in the margin*). The Sept., however, give ἐν πόλει, "in a city," or (in some MSS.) ἐν Ἀμαθὺ ἐν πόλει, which favors the ordinary interpretation. If a city is meant, there is little doubt of one of the two Ecbatanas being intended; for, except these towns, there was no place in the province of the Medes "which contained a palace" (עֲבָתָנָא), or where records are likely to have been deposited. The name *Achmetha*, too, which at first sight seems somewhat remote from Ecbatana, wants but one letter of *Haqmatana*, which was the native appellation. The earlier and more correct Greek form of the name, too, was *Agbatana* (see Steph. Byz. p. 19; comp. Wesseling ad Herod. iii, 65). Lassen (*Biblioth.* iii, 36) regards the name as Zendish, *Aghwa-Tana*, "land rich in horses." Hyde (*De rel. vet. Pers.* p. 541 sq.) compares it with the Persic *Abadan*, "cultivated place;" Hgen (on Tobit, l. c.) regards it as Shemitic; compare Syr. *Chamtana*, "fortress." For other etymologies, see Simonis *Onom.* V. T. p. 578 sq.; Gesenius, *Thest.* p. 70.

Two cities of the name of Ecbatana seem to have existed in ancient times, one the capital of Northern Media, the Media Atropatênè of Strabo; the other the metropolis of the larger and more important province known as Media Magna (see Sir H. Rawlinson's paper on the Atropatenian Ecbatana, in the 10th volume of the *Journal of the Geographical Society*, art. ii). The site of the former appears to be marked by the very curious ruins at *Takht-i-Sulciman* (lat. 36° 28', long. 47° 9'); while that of the latter is occupied by *Hamadân*, which is one of the most important cities of modern Persia. There is generally some difficulty in determining, when Ecbatana is mentioned, whether the northern or the southern metropolis is intended. Few writers are aware of the existence of the two cities, and they lie sufficiently near to one another for geographical notices in most cases to suit either site. The northern city was the "seven-walled town" described by Herodotus, and declared by him to have been the capital of Cyrus (Herod. i, 98-99, 153; comp. Mos. Choren. ii, 84); and it was thus most probably there that the roll was found which proved to Darius that Cyrus had really made a decree allowing the Jews to rebuild their Temple.


Various descriptions of the northern city have come down to us, but none of them is completely to be depended on. That of the Zendavesta (*Vendidad*, Fargard II) is the oldest and the least exaggerated. "Jemshid," it is said, "erected a *var*, or fortress, sufficiently large, and formed of squared blocks of stone; he assembled in the place a vast population, and stocked the surrounding country with cattle for their use. He caused the water of the great fortress to



flow forth abundantly. And within the var, or fortress, he erected a lofty palace, encompassed with walls, and laid it out in many separate divisions, and there was no place, either in front or rear, to command and overawe the fortress." Herodotus, who ascribes the foundation of the city to his king Deïoces, says: "The Medes were obedient to Deïoces, and built the city now called Agbatana, the walls of which are of great size and strength, rising in circles one within the other. The plan of the place is that each of the walls should out-top the one beyond it by the battlements. The nature of the ground, which is a gentle hill, favors this arrangement in some degree, but it was mainly effected by art. The number of the circles is seven, the royal palace and the treasuries standing within the last. The circuit of the outer wall is nearly the same with that of Athens. Of this outer wall the battlements are white, of the next black, of the third scarlet, of the fourth blue, of the fifth orange: all these are colored with paint. The last two have their battlements coated respectively with silver and gold. All these fortifications Deïoces caused to be raised for himself and his own palace. The people were required to build their dwellings outside the circuit of the walls" (Herod. i, 98, 99). Finally, the book of Judith, probably the work of an Alexandrian Jew, professes to give a number of details, which appear to be drawn chiefly from the imagination of the writer (Jud. i, 2-4).

The peculiar feature of the site of *Tukht-i-Suleiman*, which it is proposed to identify with the northern Ecbatana, is a conical hill rising to the height of about 150 feet above the plain, and covered both on its top and sides with massive ruins of the most antique and primitive character. A perfect enceinte, formed of large blocks of squared stone, may be traced round the entire hill along its brow; within there is an oval inclosure, about 800 yards in its greatest and 400 in its least diameter, strewn with ruins, which cluster round a remarkable lake. This is an irregular basin, about 300 paces in circuit, filled with water exquisitely clear and pleasant to the taste, which is supplied in some unknown way from below, and which stands uniformly at the same level, whatever the quantity taken from it for irrigating the lands which lie at the foot of the hill. This hill itself is not perfectly isolated, though it appears so to those who approach it by the ordinary route. On three sides—the south, the west, and the north—the acclivity is steep, and the height above the plain uniform; but on the east it abuts upon a hilly tract of ground, and here it is but slightly elevated above the adjoining country. It cannot, therefore, have ever answered exactly to the description of Herodotus, as the eastern side could not anyhow admit of seven walls of circumvallation. It is doubted whether even the other sides were thus defended. Although the flanks on these sides are covered with ruins, "no traces remain of any wall but the upper one" (*As. Jour.* x, 52). Still, as the nature of the ground on three sides would allow this style of defence, and as the account in Herodotus is confirmed by the Armenian historian, writing clearly without knowledge of the earlier author, it seems best to suppose that in the peaceful times of the Persian empire it was thought sufficient to preserve the upper enceinte, while the others were allowed to fall into decay, and ultimately were superseded by domestic buildings. With regard to the coloring of the walls, or, rather, of the battlements, which has been considered to mark especially the fabulous character of Herodotus's description, recent discoveries show that such a mode of

ornamentation was actually in use at the period in question in a neighboring country. The temple of the Seven Spheres at Borsippa was adorned almost exactly in the manner which Herodotus assigns to the Median capital (see BABEL, TOWER OF); and it does not seem at all improbable that, with the object of placing the city under the protection of the seven planets, the seven walls may have been colored nearly as described. Herodotus has a little deranged the order of the hues, which should have been either black, orange, scarlet, gold, white, blue, silver—as at the Borsippa temple—or black, white, orange, blue, scarlet, silver, gold—if the order of the days dedicated to the planets were followed. Even the use of silver and gold in external ornamentation—which seems at first sight highly improbable—is found to have prevailed. Silver roofs were met with by the Greeks at the southern Ecbatana (Polybius, x, 27, 10-12); and there is reason to believe that at Borsippa the gold and silver stages of the temple were actually coated with those metals. (See Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, i, 185.)



Plan of Ecbatana.

1. Remains of a Fire-Temple; 2. Ruined Mosque; 3. Ancient buildings with shafts and capitals; 4. Ruins of the Palace of Abakai Khan; 5. Cemetery; 6. Ridge of Rock called "the Dragon;" 7. Hill called "Tawilah," or "the Stable;" 8. Ruins of Kalisiah; 9. Rocky hill of Zindani-Suleiman.

The northern Ecbatana continued to be an important place down to the 13th century after Christ. By the Greeks and Romans it appears to have been known as Gaza, Gazaca, or Canzaca, "the treasure city," on account of the wealth laid up in it, while by the Orientals it was termed *Shiz*. Its decay is referable to the Mogul conquests, cir. A.D. 1200; and its final ruin is supposed to date from about the 15th or 16th century (*As. Soc. Journ.* x, pt. i, 49).

In the 2d book of Maccabees (ix, 3, etc.), the Ecbatana mentioned is undoubtedly the southern city, now represented both in name and site by *Hamadan*. This place, situated on the northern flank of the great mountain called formerly Oroutes, and now Elwend, was perhaps as ancient as the other, and is far better known in history. If not the Median capital of Cyrus, it was, at any rate, regarded from the time of Darius Hystaspis as the chief city of the Persian *satrapy* of Media, and as such it became the summer residence of the Persian kings from Darius downwards. It was occupied by Alexander soon after the battle of Arbela (Arrian, *Exp. Alex.* iii, 19), and at his decease passed under the dominion of the Seleucide. In the wars between his successors it was more than once taken and retaken, each time suffering largely at the hands of its conquerors (Polyb. x, 27). It was afterwards recognised as the metropolis of their empire by the Parthians (Oros. vi, 4). During the Arabian period, from the rise of Bagdad on the one hand and of Ispahan on the other, it sank into comparative insignificance; but still it has never descended below the rank

of a provincial capital, and even in the present depressed condition of Persia it is a city of from 20,000 to 30,000 inhabitants. The Jews, curiously enough, regard it as the residence of Ahasuerus (Xerxes?)—which is in Scripture declared to be Susa (Esth. i, 2; ii, 3, etc.)—and show within its precincts the tombs of Esther and Mordecai (Ker Porter, ii, 105–110). It is not distinguished by any remarkable peculiarities from other Oriental cities of the same size.

The Ecbatana of the book of Tobit is thought by Sir H. Rawlinson to be the northern city (see *As. Soc. Journ.* X, i, 137–141).—Smith, s. v. See ACIMETIA.

**Eccard.** See ECKHARD.

**Ecce Homo**, a name given in art to pictures representing the suffering Saviour as described in John xix, 5: "Then came Jesus forth, wearing the crown of thorns, and the purple robe. And Pilate saith unto them, Behold the man!" It is a comparatively recent subject in art, dating from the 15th century. There are two forms of it, viz. the devotional picture, which offers the single head, or half-figure of Christ, to our contemplation, as the "Man of Sorrows" of the Passion, and the more or less historical picture, which either places him before us attended by Pilate and one or more attendants, or gives the full scene in numerous figures. For an account of them, see Jamieson, *History of our Lord in Art*, ii, 92 sq.

**Echellensis** or **Echollensis**, ABRAHAM, a Maronite scholar, was born at Eckel, Syria, and was educated in Rome, where he afterwards taught the Syriac and Arabic languages. In 1630 he was called to Paris to assist in the preparation of the great Polyglot Bible of Le Jay. For this work Echellensis furnished *Ruth* in Syriac and Arabic, with a Latin translation, and the 3d book of *Maccabees* in Arabic. He undertook also the revision of the Syriac and Arabic texts, and the Latin versions contributed by Gabriel Sionita. He returned again to Rome to fill the chair of Oriental languages offered him in that city, and died there in 1664. Echellensis's writings are numerous; among the most important are, *Lingue Syriacæ sive Chaldaicæ perbrevis Institutio* (Rome, 1628, 4to):—*Synopsis propoſitorum sententiarum Arabum inscriptis speculum mundi repræsentans, ex arabico sermone latini juris facta* (Par. 1641, 4to):—*Sancti Antonii Magni Epistolæ viginti* (Par. 1641, 8vo):—*Conciliū Nicæni Profatio*, etc. (Par. 1645, 8vo):—*Sancti Antonii Magni Regule, sermones, documenta, admonitiones, responsiones, et vita duplex* (Paris, 1646, 8vo):—*Semita Sapientie, sive ad scientias comparandas methodus* (Paris, 1646):—*De Proprietatibus et virtutibus medicis animalium, plantarum et gemmarum, tractatus triplex Habdarrabman* (Paris, 1647, 8vo):—*Chronicon orientale nunc primum latinitate donatum cui accessit supplementum Historiæ orientalis* (Par. 1653, fol.):—*Catalogus librorum Chaldaeorum, tum ecclesiasticorum quam profanorum, auctore Habed-Jesu* (Rome, 1653, 8vo), with notes:—*Concordantia nationum christianarum orientaliū in fidei catholice dogmate* (Mayence, 1655, 8vo). In this book he seeks to harmonize the sentiments of the Orientals with those of the Roman Church. Leo Allatius assisted him in his work. *De Origine nominis Pape . . . adeo de ejus primatu*, etc. (Rome, 1660), and *Eutychiūſ rindicatus sive Responsio ad Selden Origines* (Rome, 1661, 4to), were works written in the controversy against the Protestants.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, v, 621.

**Ecclesia.** See CHURCH.

**Ecclesiæ Domus.** See DOMUS.

**Ecclesiæ Seniores.** See SENIORES.

**Ecclesiastēs**, the fourth of the poetical books in the English arrangement of the O. T., and one of those usually attributed to Solomon. In the Heb. Bible it is the seventh and last of the first part of the *Hagiographā*, עֲבֻדָּה, or fourth division of the Jewish Scriptures. In the Sept. and Vulg. it is placed be-

tween Proverbs and Canticles, as in the A. V. See BIBLE. It is the fourth of the five *Megilloth* (q. v.) or rolls, as they are called by the Jews, being appointed to be read at the Feast of Tabernacles. The form of the book is *poetico-didactic*, without the sublimity of the beautiful parallelism and rhythm which characterize the older poetic effusions of the inspired writings. The absence of vigor and charm is manifest even in the grandest portion of this book (xii, 1–7), where the sacred writer rises above his usual level. (See generally, Bergstr., in Eichhorn's *Bibliothek*, x, 955–84; Paulus, in his *Neues Repertorium*, i, 201–65; Zirkel, *Ueb. der Prediger*, Würzb., 1792; Umbreit, *Coheleth scepticus*, Gött. 1820; Stiebriz, *Vindiciæ Solomonis*, Halle, 1760; Henzi, *Eccles. argumentum*, Dorpat, 1827; Mullert, *Paliogr. Beiträge*, p. 182 sq.; Hartmann, in the *Wien. Zeitschr.* i, 29, 71; Ewald, *Ueb. d. Prediger*, Gött. 1826; Umbreit, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1849; Bruch, *Weisheits-Lehre der Hebräer*, Strasburg, 1851.) See SOLOMON.

I. *Title.*—The Heb. name is עֲבֻדָּה, *Kohe'leth*, and is evidently taken from the designation which the writer himself assumes (ch. i, 2, 2; vii, 27; xii, 8, 9, 10; Sept. ἐκκλησιαστής, Vulg. *ecclesiastes*, Auth. Vers. "preacher"). It is the participle of עָבַד, *kahal'* (cognate with עָבַד, *voice*, Greek καλέω, Eng. *call*), which properly signifies to *call together* a religious assembly (hence עָבַד, עֲבֻדָּה, a *congregation*). The apparent anomaly of the feminine termination הַ indicates that the abstract noun has been transferred from the office to the person holding it (so the Arab. *caliph*, etc.; see Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 1199, 1200), and has thus become capable of use as a masculine proper name, a change of meaning of which we find other instances in *Sophereth* (Neh. vii, 57), *Pochereth* (Ezra ii, 57); and hence, with the single exception of Eccles. vii, 27, the noun, notwithstanding its form, is used throughout in the masculine. Ewald, however (*Poet. Büch.* iv, 189), connects the feminine termination with the noun עָבַד (wisdom), understood, and supposes a poetic license in the use of the word as a kind of symbolic proper name, appealing to Prov. xxx, 1; xxxi, 1, as examples of a like usage. As connected with the root עָבַד, the word has been applied to one who speaks in an assembly, and there is, to say the least, a tolerable agreement in favor of this interpretation. Thus we have the comment of the Midrash, stating that the writer thus designates himself "because his words were spoken in the assembly" (quoted in Preston's *Ecclesiastes*, note on i, 1); the rendering Ἐκκλησιαστής by the Sept.; the adoption of this title by Jerome (*Pref. in Eccl.*), as meaning "qui cæcum, i. e. ecclesiam congregat, quem nos nuncupare possumus Concionatorem"; the use of "Prediger" by Luther, of "Preacher" in the A. V. On the other hand, taking עָבַד in the sense of collecting things, not of summoning persons, and led perhaps by his inability to see in the book itself any greater unity of design than in the chapters of Proverbs, Grotius (*in Eccl.* i, 1) has suggested Συναθροιστής (*compiler*) as a letter equivalent. In this he has been followed by Herder and Jahn, and Mendelssohn has adopted the same rendering (notes on i, 1, and vii, 27, in Preston), seeing in it the statement partly that the writer had compiled the sayings of wise men who had gone before him, partly that he was, by an inductive process, gathering truths from the facts of a wide experience. The title of the book, however, indicates that the author did not write only for a literary public, but that he had in view the whole congregation of the Lord; and that his doctrine was not confined within the narrow bounds of a school, but belonged to the Church in its whole extent (comp. *Psa.* xlix, 2–4). Solomon, who in 1 Kings viii is described as *gathering* (עָבַד) the people to hold communion

with the Most High in the place which he erected for this purpose, is here again represented as *the gatherer* (קִבֵּץ) of the people to the assembly of God. It must, however, be borne in mind that, though Solomon is animated by and represents Wisdom, he does not lose his individuality. Hence he sometimes describes his own experience (comp. i, 16, 17; ii, 9, 12; vii, 23, etc.), and sometimes utters the words of Wisdom, whose organ he is, just as the apostles are sometimes the organs of the Holy Ghost (comp. Acts xv, 28).

Against the common rendering of קִבֵּץ by *preacher* or *Ecclesiastes*, which is supported by Desvœux, Gesenius, Knobel, Herzfeld, Stuart, etc., it has been urged: (1.) The verb קִבֵּץ does not properly include the idea of *preaching*: such, however, would naturally be its derived import, inasmuch as popular assemblies are usually convened for the purpose of being addressed. (2.) It ascribes to Solomon the office of *preacher*, which is nowhere mentioned in the Bible; it is too modern a title, and is inconsistent with his character, if not with the contents of the book: this, however, only applies to the title in its modern sense, and not to the above generic view. (3.) It destroys the connection between the design of the book and the import of this symbolic name: this again depends upon the preconception as to the design of the book; the import, as above explained, is not unsuitable. Moreover, *a. Coheleth* is neither a name of *rank* nor of *office*, but simply describes the act of gathering the people together, and can, therefore, not come within the rule which the advocates of the rendering *preacher* or *Ecclesiastes* are obliged to urge. *b.* The construction of the feminine verb with it in vii, 27, is incompatible with this view. *c.* Abstracts are never formed from the *active participle*; and, *d.* There is not a single instance to be found where a *concrete* is first made an *abstract*, and then again taken in a *personal* sense. These objections are too minute to be of much force, and are overruled by the peculiar use and application of this word, which occurs nowhere else.

The other explanations of Koheleth, viz., *Gatherer* or *Acquirer of wisdom*, and Solomon is called by this name because he gathered much wisdom (Rashi, Rashbam, etc.); *Collector, Compiler*, because he collected in this book divers experience, views, and maxims for the good of mankind (Grotius, Mayer, Mendelssohn, etc.); *Eclectic*, ἐκλεκτικός, a name given to him in this place because of his skill in selecting and purifying from the systems of different philosophers the amassed sentiments in this book (Rosenthal); *Accumulated wisdom*—and this appellation is given to him because wisdom was accumulated in him (Aben-Ezra); *The Reunited, the Gathered Soul*—and it describes his readmission into the Church in consequence of his repentance (Cartwright, Bishop Reynolds, Granger, etc.); *The Penitent*—and describes the contrite state of his heart for his apostasy (Cocceius, Schultens, etc.); *An assembly, an academy*—and the first verse is to be translated “The sayings of the academy of the son of David” (Döderlein, Nachtigal, etc.); *An old man*—and Solomon indicates by the name Koheleth his weakness of mind when, yielding to his wives, he worshipped idols (Simonis *Lex. Heb.* s. v.; Schmilt, etc.); *Exclaiming voice*, analogous to the title assumed by John the Baptist—and the words of the inscription ought to be rendered, “The words of the voice of one exclaiming” (De Dieu); *Sophist*, according to the primitive signification of the word, which implied a combination of philosophy and rhetoric (Desvœux); *Philosopher or Moralist* (Spohn, Gaab, etc.); *The departed spirit of Solomon* introduced as speaking throughout this book in the form of a shadow (Augusti, *Einleit. in d. A. T.* p. 240); Koheleth is the feminine gender, because it refers to חַיָּה, *the intellectual soul*, which is understood (Rashi, Rashbam, Ewald, etc.); it is to show the great

excellency of the preacher, or his charming style which this gender indicates (Lorinus, Zirkel, etc.), because a preacher travails, as it were, like a mother, in the spiritual birth of his children, and has tender and motherly affection for his people, a similar expression being found in Gal. iv, 19 (Pineda, Mayer, etc.); it is to describe the infirmity of Solomon, who appears here as worn out by old age (Mercer, Simonis, etc.); it is used in a neuter sense, because departed spirits have no specific gender (Augusti); the termination קִבֵּץ is not at all feminine, but, as in Arabic, is used as an *acusis*; etc., etc., etc. We believe that the simple enumeration of these views will tend to show their vagueness, fancifulness, and inappropriateness. (See Dindorf, *Quomodo nomen Cohelet Salomoni tribuatur*, Lpz. 1791.)

II. *Author and Date.*—These have usually been regarded as determined by the account that the writer gives of himself in ch. i and ii, that it was written by the only “son of David” (i, 1), who was “king over Israel in Jerusalem” (i, 12). According to this, we have in it what may well be called the Confessions of king Solomon, the utterance of a repentance which some have even ventured to compare with that of the 51st psalm. This authorship is corroborated by the unquestionable allusions made throughout the book to particular circumstances connected with the life of the great monarch (compare chap. i, 16, etc., with 1 Kings iii, 12; chap. ii, 4–10, with 1 Kings v, 27–32; vii, 1–8; ix, 7–19; x, 14–29; ch. vii, 20, with 1 Kings viii, 46; chap. xii, 9, with 1 Kings iv, 32). Additional internal evidence has been found for this belief in the language of vii, 26–28, as harmonizing with the history of 1 Kings xi, 3, and in an interpretation (somewhat forced perhaps) which refers iv, 13–15 to the mourners of the people against Solomon, and the popularity of Jeroboam as the leader of the people, already recognised as their future king (Mendelssohn and Preston in loc.). The belief that Solomon was actually the author was, it need hardly be said, received generally by the Rabbinic commentators, and the whole series of Patristic writers. The apparent exceptions to this in the passages by Talmudic writers, which ascribe it to Hezekiah (*Baba Bathra*, c. i, fol. 15) or Isaiah (*Shvsh. Hakkab.* fol. 66 b. quoted by Michaelis), can hardly be understood as implying more than a share in the work of editing, like that claimed for the “men of Hezekiah” in Prov. xxv, 1. Grotius (*Pref. in Eccles.*) was indeed almost the first writer who called it in question, and started a different hypothesis.

It may seem as if the whole question were settled for all who recognise the inspiration of Scripture by the statement, in a canonical and inspired book, as to its own authorship. The book purports, it is said (Preston, *Proleg. in Eccles.* p. 5), to be written by Solomon, and to doubt the literal accuracy of this statement is to call in question the truth and authority of Scripture. To many it has appeared questionable, however, whether we can admit an *à priori* argument of this character to be decisive. The hypothesis that every such statement in a canonical book must be received as literally true, is, in fact, an assumption that inspired writers were debarred from forms of composition which were open without blame to others. In the literature of every other nation the form of personated authorship, where there is no *animus decipendi*, has been recognised as a legitimate channel for the expression of opinions or the quasi-dramatic representation of character. Hence it has been asked, Why should we venture on the assertion that, if adopted by the writers of the Old Testament, it would have made them guilty of a falsehood, and been inconsistent with their inspiration? The question of authorship does not involve that of canonical authority. A book written by Solomon would not necessarily be inspired and canonical. It is said that there is nothing that need startle us in the thought that an inspired writer might

use a liberty which has been granted without hesitation to the teachers of mankind in every age and country. Accordingly, the advocates of a different authorship for the book in question than that of Solomon feel themselves at liberty to discard these statements of the text as mere literary devices.

They argue that in like manner the book which bears the title of the "Wisdom of Solomon" asserts, both by its title and its language (vii, 1-21), a claim to the same authorship, and, though the absence of a Hebrew original led to its exclusion from the Jewish canon, the authorship of Solomon was taken for granted by all the early Christian writers who quote it or refer to it, till Jerome had asserted the authority of the Hebrew text as the standard of canonicity, and by not a few afterwards. But in reply to this it may justly be said that the traditional character of the two books is so different as to debar any comparison of this kind. See WISDOM, BOOK OF.

The following specific objections have been urged against the Solomonic and for the personated authorship of this book: 1. All the other reputed writings of Solomon have his name in the inscription (comp. Prov. i, 1; Song of Songs, i, 1; Psa. lxxvii), whereas in this book the name of Solomon is studiously avoided, thus showing that it does not claim him as its actual author. Yet he gives other equally decisive intimations of his identity, and the peculiar character of the work sufficiently accounts for this partial concealment. Moreover, in some of his other undoubted writings he employs similar *noms de plume* (Prov. xxx, 1; xxxi, 1). 2. The symbolic and impersonal name *Kohleth* shows that Solomon is simply introduced in an ideal sense as the representative of wisdom. On the other hand, it appears to have an equally tangible application to him historically. 3. This is indicated by the sacred writer himself, who represents Solomon as belonging to the *past*, inasmuch as he makes this great monarch say, "I was (אָנֹכִי מֶלֶךְ) king," but had long ago ceased to be king when this was written. That this is intended by the *præterite* has been acknowledged from time immemorial (comp. *Midrash Rabba*, *Midrash Jalkut* in loc.; Talmud, *Gittin*, 68 b; the Chaldee paraphrase, i, 12; *Midrash*, Maase, Bi-Shloma, Ha-Melech, ed. Jellinek in *Eth Ha-Midrash*, ii, 35; Rashi on i, 12). Yet it does not necessarily require that interpretation, but may naturally be understood as simply referring to past incidents, e. g. "I have been [and still am] king." The passage certainly gives no support to the idea of a fanciful authorship. 4. This is moreover corroborated by various statements in the book, which would otherwise be irreconcilable, e. g. *Kohleth* comparing himself with a long succession of kings who reigned over Israel in Jerusalem (i, 16; ii, 7): the term king in *Jerusalem* (*ibid.*) showing that at the time when this was written there was a royal residence in Samaria; the recommendation to *individuals* not to attempt to resent the oppression of a tyrannical ruler, but to wait for a *general revolt* (viii, 2-9)—a doctrine which a monarch like Solomon is not likely to propound; the description of a royal spendthrift, and of the misery he inflicts upon the land (x, 16-19), which Solomon would not give unless he intended to write a satire upon himself. These historical allusions are too vague to be thus pressed into service. As to the political references, we know (1 Kings xi, 14, 23) that insurrectionary manifestations did exist in Solomon's reign, and were aggravated by his rigid and exacting government (1 Kings xii, 4). It has been asked whether Solomon would have been likely to speak of himself as in i, 12, or to describe with bitterness the misery and wrong of which his own misgovernment had been the cause, as in iii, 16; iv, 1 (*Jahn*, *Einkl.* ii, 840). On the hypothesis that he was the writer, the whole book is an acknowledgment of evils which he had occasioned, while yet there is no

distinct confession and repentance. There are forms of satiety and self-reproach, of which this half sad, half scornful retrospect of a man's own life—this utterance of bitter words by which he is condemned out of his own mouth—is the most natural expression. Any individual judgment on this point cannot, from the nature of the case, be otherwise than subjective, and ought therefore to bias our estimate of other evidence as little as possible. 5. The state of oppression, sufferings, and misery depicted in this book (iv, 1-4; v, 7; viii, 1-4, 10, 11; x, 5-7, 20, etc.) cannot be reconciled with the age of Solomon, and unquestionably shows that the Jews were then groaning under the grinding tyranny of Persia. There are sudden and violent changes, the servant of to-day becoming the ruler of to-morrow (x, 5-7). All this, it is said, agrees with the glimpses into the condition of the Jews under the Persian empire in Ezra and Nehemiah, and with what we know as to the general condition of the provinces under its satraps. But we cannot suppose that these evils, which have been prevalent in all times, were alluded to as specially characteristic of the writer's day. 6. The fact that *Kohleth* is represented as indulging in sensual enjoyments, and acquiring riches and fame in order to ascertain what is good for the children of men (ii, 3-9; iii, 12, 22, etc.), making philosophical experiments to discover the *summum bonum*, is held to be at variance with the conduct of the historical Solomon, and to be an idea of a much later period. In like manner, the admonition not to seek divine things in the profane books of the philosophers (xii, 12) are thought to show that this book was written when the speculation of Greece and Alexandria had found their way into Palestine. In short, the doctrine of a future bar of judgment, whereby *Kohleth* solves the grand problem of this book, when compared with the vague and dim intimations respecting a future state in the pre-exilian portions of the O. T., is regarded as proving that it is a *post-exilian* production. But the untrustworthy character of these arguments is evinced by the parallel case of the book of Job (q. v.). It is also urged that the indications of the religious condition of the people, their formalism and much speaking (v, 1, 2), their readiness to evade the performance of their vows by casuistic excuses (v, 5), represent in like manner the growth of evils, the germs of which appeared soon after the captivity, and which we find in a fully-developed form in the prophecy of Malachi. In addition to this general resemblance, there is the agreement between the use of אֲנֹכִי מֶלֶךְ for the "angel" or priest of God (v, 6, Ewald, *in loc.*), and the recurrence in Malachi of the terms אֲנֹכִי מֶלֶךְ, the "angel" or messenger of the Lord, as a synonyme for the priest (Mal. ii, 7), the true priest being the great agent in accomplishing God's purposes. Significant, though not conclusive in either direction, is the absence of all reference to any contemporaneous prophetic activity or to any Messianic hopes. This might indicate a time before such hopes had become prevalent, or after they were for a time extinguished. It might, on the other hand, be the natural result of the experience through which the son of David had passed, or fitly take its place in the dramatic personation of such a character. The use throughout the book of *Elohim* instead of *Jehovah* as the divine name, though characteristic of the book as dealing with the problems of the universe rather than with the relations between the Lord God of Israel and his people, and therefore striking as an idiosyncrasy, leaves the question as to date nearly where it was. The indications of rising questions as to the end of man's life and the constitution of his nature, of doubts like those which afterwards developed into Sadduceism (iii, 19-21), of a copious literature connected with those questions, confirm, it is urged (Ewald), the hypothesis of the later date. It may be added, too, that the absence of any

reference to such a work as this in the enumeration of Solomon's writings in 1 Kings iv, 32, tends, at least, to the same conclusion. But such considerations drawn *a silentio* are highly inconclusive. 7. The strongest argument, however, against the Solomonic authorship of this book is its vitiated language and style. It is written throughout with peculiarities of phraseology which developed themselves about the time of the Babylonian captivity. So convincing is this fact, that not only have Grotius, J. D. Michaelis, Eichhorn, Döderlein, Spohn, Jahn, J. E. C. Schmidt, Nachtigal, Kaiser, Rosenmüller, Ewald, Knobel, Gesenius, De Wette, Noyes, Hitzig, Heiligstedt, Davidson, Meier, etc., relinquished the Solomonic authorship, but even such unquestionably orthodox writers as Umbreit, Hengstenberg, Gerlach, Vaihinger, Stuart, Keil, Elster, etc., declare most emphatically that the book was written after the Babylonian captivity; and there is hardly a chief rabbi or a literary Jew to be found who would have the courage to maintain that Solomon wrote Koheleth. Dr. Herzfeld, chief rabbi of Brunswick; Dr. Philippson, chief rabbi of Magdeburg; Dr. Geiger, rabbi of Breslau; Dr. Zunz, Professor Luzzatto, Dr. Krochmal, Steinschneider, Jost, Grätz, Fürst, and a host of others, affirm that this book is one of the latest productions in the O.-T. canon. We are moreover reminded that these are men to whom the Hebrew is almost vernacular, and that some of them write better Hebrew, and in a purer style, than that of Koheleth. With most readers, however, a single intimation of the text itself will weigh more than the opinion of these or all other learned men. On the other hand, the Rabbinical scholars, who certainly were not inferior in a knowledge of Hebrew, appear to have found no difficulty in attributing this book to Solomon. Most of those above enumerated are of very questionable sentiments on a point like this, and it must be borne in mind that a very large, if not equal, amount of learning has been arrayed on the opposite side. The last of the above objections, however, deserves a more minute consideration.

Many opponents of the Solomonic authorship of Ecclesiastes have certainly gone much too far in their assertions respecting the impurity of its language. The Grecisms which Zirkle thought that he had found have now generally been given up. The Rabbinisms likewise could not stand the proof. The words, significations, and forms which seem to appertain to a later period of Hebrew literature, and the Chaldaisms, an abundance of which Knobel gathered, require, as Herzfeld has shown (in his *Commentary*, published at Braunschweig, 1838, p. 13 sq.), to be much sifted. According to Herzfeld, there are in Ecclesiastes not more than between eleven and fifteen "young Hebrew" expressions and constructions, and between eight and ten Chaldaisms. Nevertheless, it is certain that the book does not belong to the productions of the first, but rather to the second period of the Hebrew language. This alone would not fully disprove the authorship of Solomon, for it would not necessarily throw the production into the latest period of Hebrew literature. We could suppose that Solomon, in a philosophical work, found the pure Hebrew language to be insufficient, and had, therefore, recourse to the Chaldaizing popular dialect, by which, at a later period, the book-language was entirely displaced. This supposition could not be rejected *a priori*, since almost every one of the Hebrew authors before the exile did the same, although in a less degree. It has been thought, however, that the striking difference between the language of Ecclesiastes and the language of the Proverbs renders that explanation quite inadmissible. This difference would prove little if the two books belonged to two entirely different classes of literature—that is, if Ecclesiastes bore the same relation to the Proverbs as the Song of Solomon does; but since Ecclesiastes and the Proverbs belong essentially to the same class,

the argument taken from the difference of style can only be avoided by attributing it to the effect of greater age in the writer. The occurrence of Chaldee words and forms in any Hebrew document is by no means a certain and invariable indication of lateness of composition. We must be careful to distinguish archaisms, and words and forms peculiar to the poetic style, from Chaldaisms of the later period. Moreover, the Hebrew writings which have been transmitted to us being so few in number, it is of course much more difficult to determine the period to which any of these writings belongs by the peculiar form of language which it presents, than it would have been had there been preserved to us a larger number of documents of different ages to assist us in forming our decision. Still, from the materials within our reach, scanty though they are, we would naturally draw a conclusion as to the age of the book of Ecclesiastes, not altogether certain, indeed, but decidedly unfavorable to an early date; for it needs but a cursory survey of the book to convince us that in language and style it not only differs widely from the other writings of the age of Solomon, but bears a very marked resemblance to the latest books of the Old Testament. (1.) One class of words employed by the writer of Ecclesiastes we find rarely employed in the earlier books of Scripture, frequently in the later, i. e. in those written during or after the Babylonish captivity. Thus *shalut'*, שָׁלוּט, *he ruled* (Eccles. ii, 19; v, 18; vi, 2; viii, 9), is found elsewhere only in Nehemiah and Esther. The derived noun שְׁלוּטָה, *shilton'*, *rule* (ch. iii, 4, 8), is found only in the Chaldee of Daniel; but שְׁלוּטָה, *shallit'*, *ruler*, appears once in the earlier Scriptures (Gen. xlii, 6). Under this head may also be mentioned שְׁמֵרָה, *malkuth'*, *kingdom* (ch. iv, 14), rare in the earlier Scriptures, but found above forty times in Esther and Daniel; and מְדִינָה, *medinah'*, *province* (ch. ii, 8; v, 7), which appears also in Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, and likewise in 1 Kings xx, 14–19, where "princes of the provinces" are mentioned among the officers of king Ahab, but in none of the earlier Scriptures. (2.) A second class includes those words which are never found in any Hebrew writing of earlier date than the Babylonian captivity, but are found in the later books: as זְמַן, *zeman'*, *set time* (ch. iii, 1) = זְמַנִּי, which we meet with in Hebrew only in Neh. ii, 6 and Esth. ix, 27, 31, but in the biblical Chaldee and in the Targums frequently; מִשְׁפָּט, *piithgan'*, *sentence* (chap. vii, 11), which appears in Hebrew only in Esth. i, 20, but in Chaldee frequently. (If this word be, as is commonly supposed, of Persian origin, its appearance only in the later Jewish writings is at once accounted for. See Rödiger's *Additions* to Gesenius's *Thesaurus*.) מַדָּע, *madda'* (ch. x, 20), a derivation of מָדַע, *to know*, found only in 2 Chron. and Daniel, and also in Chaldee; and the particles אִלַּי, *illu'*, *if* (ch. vi, 6), and בְּעֵינַי, *beken'*, *then, so* (ch. viii, 10), found in no earlier Hebrew book than Esther. From this enumeration it appears that the book of Ecclesiastes resembles the book of Esther in some of the most distinctive peculiarities of its language. (3.) A third class embraces those words which are not found even in the Hebrew writings of the latest period, but only in the Chaldee of Daniel and Ezra, or in the Targums, as יִצְרוֹן, *yithron'*, *profit*, which is used nine times in Ecclesiastes, never in any other scriptural writing, but frequently in the Targums, under the slightly modified form *yuthran'*; so also כְּבָר, *kebar'*, *already, long ago*, which recurs eight times in this book; וְתַנְיָן, *takan'* (ch. i, 15; vii, 13; xii, 9), found also in Chaldee (Dan. iv, 33, etc.); רֵעוּת, *reuth'*, *desire*, recurring five times, and also in the Chaldee por-

tions of Ezra;  $\text{יָצַדְתִּי}$  (chap. i, 17, etc.),  $\text{יָצַדְתִּי}$  (ch. i, 13, etc.),  $\text{יָצַדְתִּי}$  (ch. x, 8). (1.) Other peculiarities, such as the frequent use of the participle, the rare appearance of the "eav consecutive," the various uses of the relative particle, concur with the characteristics already noted in affixing to the language and style of this book the stamp of that transition period when the Hebrew language, soon about to give place to the Chaldee, had already lost its ancient purity, and become debased by the absorption of many Chaldee elements. The prevalence of abstract forms again, characteristic of the language of Ecclesiastes, is urged as belonging to a later period than that of Solomon in the development of Hebrew thought and language. The answers given to these objections by the defenders of the received belief are (Preston, *Eccles.* p. 7), (a) that many of what we call Aramaic or Chaldee forms may have belonged to the period of pure Hebrew, though they have not come down to us in any extant writings; and (b) that so far as they are foreign to the Hebrew of the time of Solomon, he may have learned them from his "strange wives," or from the men who came as ambassadors from other countries. (See Davidson, *Horne's Introd.* new ed. ii, 787).

As to the date of Ecclesiastes, these arguments of recent criticism are stronger against the traditional belief than in support of any rival theory, and the advocates of that belief might almost be content to rest their case upon the discordant hypotheses of their opponents. On the assumption that the book belongs, not to the time of Solomon, but to the period subsequent to the captivity, the dates which have been assigned to it occupy a range of more than 500 years. Grotius supposes Zerubbabel to be referred to in xii, 11, as the "One Shepherd" (*Comm. in Eccles.* in loc.), and so far agrees with Keil (*Einführung in das A. T.*), who fixes it in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. Ewald and De Wette conjecture the close of the period of Persian or the commencement of that of Macedonian rule; Bertholdt, the period between Alexander the Great and Antiochus Epiphanes; Hitzig, circ. B.C. 214; Hartmann, the time of the Maccabees, etc. The following table will show the different periods to which it has been assigned:

	B.C.
Nachtigal, between Solomon and Jeremiah . . . . .	975-588
Schmidt, Jahn, etc., between Manasseh and Zedekiah	69-588
Grotius, Kaiser, Eichhorn, etc., shortly after the exile	536-500
Umbreit, the Persian period . . . . .	538-333
Van der Hardt, in the reign of Xerxes II and Darius	464-404
Roemüller, between Nehemiah and Alexander the Great . . . . .	450-333
Hengstenberg, Stuart, Keil . . . . .	433
Ewald, a century before Alexander the Great . . . . .	450
Gerlach, about the year . . . . .	400
De Wette, Knobel, etc., at the end of the Persian and the beginning of the Macedonian period . . . . .	350-300
Bergst, during Alexander's sojourn in Palestine . . . . .	333
Bertholdt, between Alexander and Ant. Epiphanes . . . . .	333-164
Zirkel, the Syrian period . . . . .	312-164
Hitzig, about the year . . . . .	204

Supposing it were proved that Solomon is only introduced as the speaker, the question arises why the author adopted this form. The usual reply is, that Solomon, among the Israelites, had, as it were, the prerogative of wisdom, and hence the author was induced to put into Solomon's mouth that wisdom which he intended to proclaim, without the slightest intention of forging a supposititious volume. This reply contains some truth, but it does not exhaust the matter. The chief object of the author was to communicate wisdom in general; but next to this, as appears from ch. i, 12 sq., he intended to inculcate the vanity of human pursuits. Now, from the mouth of no one could more aptly proceed the proclamation of the nothingness of all earthly things than from the mouth of Solomon, who had possessed them in all their fulness; at whose command were wisdom, riches, and pleasures in abundance, and who had therefore full opportunity to experience the nothingness of all that is earthly.

On the other hand, if we adopt the traditionary view that Solomon was the author, we avoid all these doubtful expedients and pious frauds; and, as no other candidate appears, we shall be safest in coinciding with that ancient opinion. The peculiarities of diction may be explained (as in the book of Job) by supposing that the work was written by Solomon during a season of penitence at the close of his life, and edited in its present form, at a later period, perhaps by Ezra.

III. *Canonicity.*—The earliest catalogues which the Jews have transmitted to us of their sacred writings give this book as forming part of the canon (Mishna, *Yadain*, iii, 5; Talmud, *Baba Bathra*, 14). All the ancient versions, therefore—viz. the Septuagint, which was made before the Christian era; the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, which belong to the second century of Christianity, as well as the catalogue of Melito, bishop of Sardis (fl. A.D. 170)—include Ecclesiastes. Some singular passages in the Talmud indicate, however, that the recognition was not altogether unhesitating, and that it was at least questioned how far the book was one which it was expedient to place among the Scriptures that were read publicly. Thus we find the statements (Mishna, *Shabbath*, c. x, quoted by Mendelssohn in Preston, p. 74; Midrash, fol. 114 a; Preston, p. 13) that "the wise men sought to secrete the book *Koheloth*, because they found in it words tending to heresy," and "words contradictory to each other;" that the reason they did not secrete it was "because its beginning and end were consistent with the law;" that when they examined it more carefully they came to the conclusion, "We have looked closely into the book *Koheloth*, and discovered a meaning in it." The chief interest of such passages is of course connected with the inquiry into the plan and teaching of the book, but they are of some importance also as indicating that it must have commended itself to the teachers of an earlier generation either on account of the external authority by which it was sanctioned, or because they had a clearer insight into its meaning, and were less startled by its apparent difficulties. (See *Bab. Megilla*, 7, a; *Bab. Talm. Sabbath*, 20, a; Midrash, *Vayikra Raba*, xxviii; Mishna, *Edayoth*, v, 3; Jerome, *Comment.* xii, 13.) Traces of this controversy are to be found in a singular discussion between the schools of Shammai and Hillel, turning on the question whether the book *Koheloth* were inspired, and in the comments on that question by R. Ob. de Bartenora and Maimonides (Surenhus, iv, 341).

Within the Christian Church, the divine inspiration of Ecclesiastes, the Proverbs, and the Song of Solomon was denied by Theodorus of Mopsuestia. In recent times, the accusers of Ecclesiastes have been Augusti, De Wette, and Knobel; but their accusations are based on mere misunderstandings. They are especially as follows: (1.) The author is said to incline towards a moral epicurism. All his ethical admonitions and doctrines tend to promote the comforts and enjoyments of life. But let us consider above all what tendency and disposition it is to which the author addresses his admonition, serenely and contentedly to enjoy God's gifts. He addresses this admonition to that speculation which will not rest before it has penetrated the whole depth of the inscrutable councils of God; to that murmuring which bewails the badness of times, and quarrels with God about the sufferings of our terrene existence; to that gloomy piety which wears itself in imaginary good works and external strictness, with a view to wrest salvation from God; to that avarice which gathers, not knowing for whom; making the means of existence our highest aim; building upon an uncertain futurity which is in the hand of God alone. When the author addresses levity he speaks quite otherwise. For instance, in ch. vii, 2, 4. "It is better to go to the house of mourning than to the house of feasting; for that is the end of all men; and the living will lay it to his heart. Sorrow is better than

laughter, for by the sadness of the countenance the heart is made better. The heart of the wise man is in the house of mourning, but the heart of fools is in the house of mirth." The nature of the joy recommended by the author is also misunderstood. Unrestrained merriment and giddy sensuality belong to those vanities which our author enumerates. He says to laughter, Thou art mad, and to joy, What art thou doing? He says, ch. vii, 5, 6, "It is better to hear the rebuke of the wise than for a man to hear the song of fools. For as the crackling of thorns under a pot, so is the laughter of a fool; this also is vanity." That joy which he recommends is joy in God. It is not the opposite, but the fruit of the fear of God. How inseparable these are is shown in passages like ch. v, 6; vii, 18; iii, 12: "I know that there is no good in them, but for a man to rejoice, and to do good in his life;" and in many similar passages, but especially ch. xi, 3, 10, and xii, 1, "Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth," etc. In reference to these passages Ewald says (p. 186), "Finally, in order to remove every doubt, and to speak with perfect clearness, he directs us to the eternal judgment of God, concerning all the doings of man, and inculcates that man, in the midst of momentary enjoyment, should never forget the whole futurity, the account and the consequences of his doings, the Creator and the Judge." Ewald adds (p. 227), in reference to the conclusion, "In order to obviate every possible misunderstanding of this writing, there is, ver. 13, once more briefly indicated that its tendency is not, by the condemnation of murmuring, to recommend an unbridled life, but rather to teach, in harmony with the best old books, the fear of God, in which the whole man consists, or that true singleness of life, satisfying the whole man, and which comprehends everything else that is truly human. It is very necessary to limit the principle of joy which this book recommends again and again in various ways and in the most impressive manner, and to refer this joy to a still higher truth, since it is so liable to be misunderstood. (2.) It is objected that in his views concerning the government of the world the author was strongly inclined to fatalism, according to which everything in this world progresses with an eternally unchangeable step; and that he by this fatalism was (3.) misled into a moral scepticism, having attained on his dogmatical basis the conviction of the inability of man, notwithstanding all his efforts, to reach his aim. However, this so-called fatalism of our author is nothing else but what our Lord teaches (Matt. vi, 25): 'Take no thought,' etc. And as to the moral scepticism, our author certainly inculcates that man with all his endeavors can do nothing; but at the same time he recommends the fear of God as the never-failing means of salvation. Man in himself can do nothing, but in God he can do all. It is quite clear from ch. vii, 16, 18, where both self-righteousness and wisdom, when separated from God, are described as equally destructive, and opposite to them is placed the fear of God, as being their common antithesis, that our author, by pointing to the sovereignty of God, did not mean to undermine morality: 'He that feareth God comes out from them all.' If our author were given to moral scepticism, it would be impossible for him to teach retribution, which he inculcates in numerous passages, and which are not contradicted by others, in which he says that the retribution in individual circumstances is frequently obscure and enigmatical. Where is that advocate for retribution who is not compelled to confess this as well as our author? (4.) This book has given offence also, by ch. iii, 21, and similar passages, concerning immortality. But the assertion that there is expressed here some doubt concerning the immortality of the soul is based on a wrong grammatical perception. The ׀ cannot, according to its punctuation, be the interrogative, but must be the ar-

ticule; and our author elsewhere asserts positively his belief in the doctrine of immortality (ch. xii, 7). How it happens that he did not give to this doctrine a prevailing influence upon his mode of treating his subject has lately been investigated by Heyder, in his essay entitled *Ecclesiaste de Immortalitate Animæ Sententiæ* (Erlangen, 1838)." (See Dr. Nordheimer, on *The Philosophy of Ecclesiastes*, in the *Amer. Bib. Repos.* July, 1838.)—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.; Fairbairn, s. v.

IV. *Plan and Contents.*—The book of Ecclesiastes comes before us as being conspicuously, among the writings of the O. T., the great stumbling-block of commentators. Elsewhere there are different opinions as to the meaning of different passages. Here there is the widest possible divergence as to the plan and purpose of the whole book. The passages already quoted from the Mishna show that some, at least, of the Rabbinical writers were perplexed by its teaching—did not know what to make of it—but gave way to the authority of men more discerning than themselves. The traditional statement, however, that this was among the Scriptures which were not read by any one under the age of thirty (*Crit. Sac. Amama in Eccles.*, but with a "nescio ubi" as to his authority), indicates the continuance of the old difficulty, and the remarks of Jerome (*Prof. in Eccles.*, *Comm. in Eccles.* xii, 13) show that it was not forgotten. Little can be gathered from the series of Patristic interpreters. The book is comparatively seldom quoted by them. No attempt is made to master its plan and to enter into the spirit of its writer. The charge brought by Philastrius of Brescia (circ. A. D. 380) against some heretics who rejected it as teaching a false morality, shows that the obscurity which had been a stumbling-block to Jewish teachers was not removed for Christians. The fact that Theodore of Mopsuestia was accused at the fifth general council of calling in question the authority and inspiration of this book, as well as of the Canticles, indicates that in this respect, as in others, he was the precursor of the spirit of modern criticism. But, with these exceptions, there are no traces that men's minds were drawn to examine the teachings of this book. When, however, we descend to the more recent developments of criticism, we meet with an almost incredible divergence of opinion. Luther, with his broad, clear insight into the workings of a man's heart, sees in it (*Prof. in Eccles.*) a noble "Politica vel Economica," leading men in the midst of all the troubles and disorders of human society to a true endurance and reasonable enjoyment. Grotius (*Prof. in Eccles.*) gives up the attempt to trace in it a plan or order of thought, and finds in it only a collection of many maxims, connected more or less closely with the great problems of human life, analogous to the discussion of the different definitions of happiness at the opening of the Nicomachean Ethics. Some (of whom Warburton may be taken as the type, *Works*, iv, 154) have seen in the language of ii, 18-21, a proof that the belief in the immortality of the soul was no part of the transmitted creed of Israel. Others (Patrick, *Des Vœux*, Davidson, Mendelssohn) contend that the special purpose of the book was to assert that truth against the denial of a sensual scepticism. Others, the later German critics, of whom Ewald may be taken as the highest and best type, reject these views as partial and one-sided; and, while admitting that the book contains the germs of later systems, both Pharisaic and Sadduceean, assert that the object of the writer was to point out the secret of a true blessedness, in the midst of all the distractions and sorrows of the world, as consisting in a tranquil, calm enjoyment of the good that comes from God (*Poet. Büch.* iv, 180).

The variety of these opinions indicates sufficiently that the book is as far removed as possible from the character of a formal treatise. It is simply what it professes to be—the confession of a man of wide experience looking back upon his past life, and looking out

upon the disorders and calamities which surround him. Such a man does not set forth his premises and conclusions with a logical completeness. While it may be true that the absence of a formal arrangement is characteristic of the Hebrew mind in all stages of its development (Lowth, *De Sac. Poet. Heb.* Præl. xxiv), or that it was the special mark of the declining literature of the period that followed the captivity (Ewald, *Poet. Bûch.* iv, 177), it is also true that it belongs generally to all writings that are addressed to the spiritual rather than the intellectual element in man's nature, and that it is found accordingly in many of the greatest works that have influenced the spiritual life of mankind. In proportion as a man has passed out of the region of traditional, easily-systematized knowledge, and has lived under the influence of great thoughts—possessed by them, yet hardly mastering them so as to bring them under a scientific classification—are we likely to find this apparent want of method. The true utterances of such a man are the records of his struggles after truth, of his occasional glimpses of it, of his ultimate discovery. The treatise *De Imitatione Christi*, the *Pensées* of Pascal, Augustine's *Confessions*, widely as they differ in other points, have this feature in common. If the writer consciously reproduces the stages through which he has passed, the form he adopts may either be essentially dramatic, or it may record a statement of the changes which have brought him to his present state, or it may repeat and renew the oscillations from one extreme to another which had marked that earlier experience. The writer of Ecclesiastes has adopted and interwoven both the latter methods, and hence, in part, the obscurity which has made it so pre-eminently the stumbling-block of commentators. He is not a didactic moralist writing a homily on virtue. He is not a prophet delivering a message from the Lord of Hosts to a sinful people. He is a man who has sinned in giving way to selfishness and sensuality, who has paid the penalty of that sin in satiety and weariness of life; in whom the mood of spirit, over-reflective, indisposed to action, of which Shakspeare has given us in Hamlet, Jaques, Richard II, three distinct examples, has become dominant in its darkest form, but who has through all this been under the discipline of a divine education, and has learnt from it the lesson which God meant to teach him. What that lesson was will be seen from an examination of the book itself.

Leaving it an open question whether it is possible to arrange the contents of this book (as Köster and Vaihinger have done) in a carefully balanced series of strophes and antistrophes, it is tolerably clear that the recurring burden of "Vanity of vanities" and the teaching which recommends a life of calm enjoyment, mark, whenever they occur, a kind of halting-place in the succession of thoughts. It is the summing up of one cycle of experience; the sentence passed upon one phase of life. Taking this, accordingly, as our guide, we may look upon the whole book as falling into four divisions, each, to a certain extent, running parallel with the others in its order and results, and closing with that which, in its position no less than its substance, is "the conclusion of the whole matter."

(1.) Ch. i and ii. This portion of the book, more than any other, has the character of a personal confession. The Preacher starts with reproducing the phase of despair and weariness into which his experience had led him (i, 2, 3). To the man who is thus satiated with life, the order and regularity of nature are oppressive (i, 4-7); nor is he led, as in the 90th Psalm, from the things that are transitory to the thought of One whose years are from eternity. In the midst of the ever-recurring changes he finds no progress. That which seems to be new is but the repetition of the old (i, 8-11). Then, having laid bare the depth to which he had fallen, he retraces the path by which he had

travelled thitherward. First he had sought after wisdom as that to which God seemed to call him (i, 13), but the pursuit of it was a sore travail, and there was no satisfaction in its possession. It could not remedy the least real evil, nor make the crooked straight (i, 15). The first experiment in the search after happiness had failed, and he tried another. It was one to which men of great intellectual gifts and high fortunes are continually tempted—to surround himself with all the appliances of sensual enjoyment, and yet in thought to hold himself above it (ii, 1-9), making his very voluptuousness part of the experience which was to enlarge his store of wisdom. This—which one may perhaps call the Goethean idea of life—was what now possessed him. But this also failed to give him peace (ii, 11). Had he not then exhausted all human experience and found it profitless? (ii, 12). If for a moment he found comfort in the thought that wisdom excelleth folly, and that he was wise (ii, 13, 14), it was soon darkened again by the thought of death (ii, 15). The wise man dies as the fool (ii, 16). This is enough to make even him who has wisdom hate all his labor and sink into the outer darkness of despair (ii, 20). Yet this very despair leads to the remedy. The first section closes with that which, in different forms, is the main lesson of the book—to make the best of what is actually around one (ii, 24)—to substitute for the reckless, feverish pursuit of pleasure the calm enjoyment which men may yet find both for the senses and the intellect. This, so far as it goes, is the secret of a true life; this is from the hand of God. On everything else there is written, as before, the sentence that it is vanity and vexation of spirit.

(II.) Ch. iii, 1-vi, 9. The order of thought in this section has a different starting-point. One who looked out upon the infinitely varied phenomena of man's life might yet discern, in the midst of that variety, traces of an order. There are times, and seasons for each of them, in their turn, even as there are for the vicissitudes of the world of nature (iii, 1-8). The heart of man, with its changes, is the mirror of the universe (iii, 11), and is, like that, inscrutable. And from this there comes the same conclusion as from the personal experience. Calmly to accept the changes and chances of life, entering into whatever joy they bring, as one accepts the order of nature, this is the way of peace (iii, 13). The thought of the ever-recurring cycle of nature, which before had been irritating and disturbing, now whispers the same lesson. If we suffer, others have suffered before us (iii, 15). God is seeking out the past and reproducing it. If men repeat injustice and oppression, God also in the appointed season repeats his judgments (iii, 16, 17). It is true that this thought has a dark as well as a bright side, and this cannot be ignored. If men come and pass away, subject to laws and changes like those of the natural world, then, it would seem, man has no pre-eminence above the beast (iii, 19). One end happens to all. All are of the dust and return to dust again (iii, 20). There is no immediate denial of this conclusion. It was to this that the Preacher's experience and reflection had led him. But even on the hypothesis that the personal being of man terminates with his death, he has still the same counsel to give. Admit that all is darkness beyond the grave, and still there is nothing better on this side of it than the temper of a tranquil enjoyment (iii, 22).

The transition from this result to the opening thoughts of ch. iv seems at first somewhat abrupt. But the Preacher is retracing the paths by which he had been actually led to a higher truth than that in which he had then rested, and he will not, for the sake of a formal continuity, smooth over its ruggedness. The new track on which he was entering might have seemed less promising than the old. Instead of the self-centred search after happiness he looks out upon the miseries and disorders of the world, and learns to



sympathize with suffering (iv, 1). At first this does but multiply his perplexities. The world is out of joint. Men are so full of misery that death is better than life (iv, 2). Successful energy exposes men to envy (iv, 4). Indolence leads to poverty (iv, 5). Here, too, he who steers clear of both extremes has the best portion (iv, 6). The man who heaps up riches stands alone without kindred to share or inherit them, and loses all the blessings and advantages of human fellowship (iv, 8-12). Moreover, in this survey of life on a large scale, as in that of a personal experience, there is a cycle which is ever repeated. The old and foolish king yields to the young man, poor and wise, who steps from his prison to a throne (iv, 13, 14). But he too has his successor. There are generations without limit before him, and shall be after him (iii, 15, 16). All human greatness is swallowed up in the great stream of time.

The opening thought of ch. v again presents the appearance of abruptness, but it is because the survey of human life takes a yet wider range. The eye of the Preacher passes from the dwellers in palaces to the worshippers in the Temple, the devout and religious men. Have they found out the secret of life, the path to wisdom and happiness? The answer to that question is that there the blindness and folly of mankind show themselves in their worst forms. Hypocrisy, unseemly prayers, idle dreams, broken vows, God's messenger, the Priest, mocked with excuses—that was what the religion which the Preacher witnessed presented to him (v, 1-6). The command "Fear thou God," meant that a man was to take no part in a religion such as this. But that command also suggested the solution of another problem, of that prevalence of injustice and oppression which had before weighed down the spirit of the inquirer. Above all tyranny of petty governors, above the might of the king himself, there was the power of the Highest (v, 8); and his judgment was manifest even upon earth. Was there, after all, so great an inequality? Was God's purpose, that the earth should be for all, really counteracted? (v, 9). Was the rich man with his cares and fears happier than the laboring man whose sleep was sweet without riches? (v, 10-12). Was there anything permanent in that wealth of his? Did he not leave the world naked as he entered it? And if so, did not all this bring the inquirer round to the same conclusion as before? Moderation, self-control, freedom from all disturbing passions, these are the conditions of the maximum of happiness which is possible for man on earth. Let this be received as from God. Not the outward means only, but the very capacity of enjoyment is his gift (v, 18, 19). Short as life may be, if a man thus enjoys, he makes the most of it. God approves and answers his cheerfulness. Is not this better than the riches or length of days on which men set their hearts? (vi, 1-5). All are equal in death; all are nearly equal in life (vi, 6). To feed the eyes with what is actually before them is better than the ceaseless wanderings of the spirit (vi, 9).

(III.) Chap. vi, 10-viii, 15. So far the lines of thought all seemed to converge to one result. The ethical teaching that grew out of the wise man's experience had in it something akin to the higher forms of Epicureanism. But the seeker could not rest in this, and found himself beset with thoughts at once more troubling and leading to a higher truth. The spirit of man looks before and after, and the uncertainties of the future vex it (vi, 12). A good name is better, as being more permanent, than riches (vii, 1); death is better than life, the house of mourning than the house of feasting (vii, 2). Self-command and the spirit of calm endurance are a better safeguard against vain speculations than any form of enjoyment (vii, 8, 9, 10). This wisdom is not only a defence, as lower things in their measure may be, but it gives life to them that have it (vii, 12). So far there are signs of

a clearer insight into the end of life. Then comes an oscillation which carries him back to the old problems (vii, 15). Wisdom suggests a half-solution of them (vii, 18), suggests also calmness, caution, humility in dealing with them (vii, 22); but this is again followed by a relapse into the bitterness of the sated pleasure-seeker. The search after wisdom, such as it had been in his experience, had led only to the discovery that, though men were wicked, women were more wicked still (vii, 26-29). The repetition of thoughts that had appeared before is perhaps the natural consequence of such an oscillation, and accordingly in ch. viii we find the seeker moving in the same round as before. There are the old reflections on the misery of man (viii, 6), and the confusions in the moral order of the universe (viii, 10, 11), the old conclusion that enjoyment (such enjoyment as is compatible with the fear of God) is the only wisdom (viii, 15).

(IV.) Chap. viii, 16-xii, 8. After the pause implied in his again arriving at the lesson of v, 15, the Preacher retraces the last of his many wanderings. This time the thought with which he starts is a profound conviction of the inability of man to unravel the mysteries by which he is surrounded (viii, 17), of the nothingness of man when death is thought of as ending all things (ix, 3-6), of the wisdom of enjoying life while we may (ix, 7-10), of the evils which affect nations or individual man (ix, 11, 12). The wide experience of the Preacher suggests sharp and pointed sayings as to these evils (x, 1-20), each true and weighty in itself, but not leading him on to any firmer standing-ground or clearer solution of the problems which oppress him. It is here that the traces of plan and method in the book seem most to fail us. Consciously or unconsciously the writer teaches us how clear an insight into the follies and sins of mankind may coexist with doubt and uncertainty as to the great ends of life, and give him no help in his pursuit after truth. In ch. xi, however, the progress is more rapid. The tone of the Preacher becomes more that of direct exhortation, and he speaks in clearer and higher notes. The conclusions of previous trains of thought are not contradicted, but are placed under a new law and brought into a more harmonious whole. The end of man's life is not to seek enjoyment for himself only, but to do good to others, regardless of the uncertainties or disappointments that may attend his efforts (xi, 1-4). His wisdom is to remember that there are things which he cannot know, problems which he cannot solve (xi, 5), and to enjoy, in the brightness of his youth, whatever blessings God bestows on him (xi, 9). But beyond all these there lie the days of darkness, of failing powers and incapacity for enjoyment; and the joy of youth, though it is not to be crushed, is yet to be tempered by the thought that it cannot last forever, and that it too is subject to God's law of retribution (xi, 9, 10). The secret of a true life is that a man should consecrate the vigor of his youth to God (xii, 1). It is well to do this before the night comes, before the slow decay of age benumbs all the faculties of sense (xii, 2, 6), before the spirit returns to God who gave it. The thought of that end rings out once more the knell of the nothingness of all things earthly (xii, 8); but it leads also to "the conclusion of the whole matter," to that to which all trains of thought and all the experiences of life had been leading the seeker after wisdom, that "to fear God and keep his commandments" was the highest good attainable; that the righteous judgment of God would in the end fulfil itself and set right all the seeming disorders of the world (xii, 13, 14). (See two articles on the *plan and structure of the book of Ecclesiastes*, in the *Method. Quart. Rev.* for April and July, 1849, modified by Dr. McClintock from Vaihinger, in the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* for July, 1848; also an article by Gurlitt in the *Stud. u. Krit.* for 1864, ii).

If one were to indulge conjecture, there would per-

haps be some plausibility in the hypothesis that xii, 8 had been the original conclusion, and that the epilogue of xii, 9-14 had been added, either by another writer, or by the same writer on a subsequent revision. The verses (9-12) have the character of a panegyric designed to give weight to the authority of the teacher. The two that now stand as the conclusion may naturally have originated in the desire to furnish a clew to the perplexities of the book, by stating in a broad intelligible form, not easy to be mistaken, the truth which had before been latent.

If the representation which has been given of the plan and meaning of the book be at all a true one, we find in it, no less than in the book of Job, indications of the struggle with the doubts and difficulties which in all ages of the world have presented themselves to thoughtful observers of the condition of mankind. In its sharp sayings and wise counsels it may present some striking affinity to the Proverbs, which also bear the name of the son of David; but the resemblance is more in form than in substance, and in its essential character it agrees with that great inquiry into the mysteries of God's government which the drama of Job brings before us. There are indeed characteristic differences. In the one we find the highest and boldest forms of Hebrew poetry, a sustained unity of design; in the other there are, as we have seen, changes and oscillations, and the style seldom rises above the rhythmic character of proverbial forms of speech. The writer of the book of Job deals with the great mystery presented by the sufferings of the righteous, and writes as one who has known those sufferings in their intensity. In the words of the Preacher, we trace chiefly the weariness or satiety of the pleasure-seeker, and the failure of all schemes of life but one. In spite of these differences, however, the two books illustrate each other. In both, though by very diverse paths, the inquirer is led to take refuge (as all great thinkers have ever done) in the thought that God's kingdom is infinitely great, and that man knows but the smallest fragment of it; that he must refrain from things which are too high for him, and be content with that which is given him to know—the duties of his own life, and the opportunities it presents for his doing the will of God.—Smith, s. v. There is probably a connection in the authorship or editorship of these two books that may to some extent account for this resemblance. See JOB (BOOK OF).

V. *Commentaries*.—The following is a full list of separate exegetical works on Ecclesiastes (the most important are indicated by an asterisk prefixed): Olym-piodorus, *Enarratio* (in the *Bibl. Max.* xviii, 490; Grynaeus, p. 933); Origen, *Scholia* (in *Bibl. Patr.* Gall. p. 14); Dionysius Alex., *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* i, 14; Append. to *Bibl. Patr.* Gall.); Gregory Thaum., *Metaphrasis* (in *Opp.* p. 77); Gregory Nyssen, *Conciones* (in *Opp.* i, 373); Gregory Nazianzen, *Metaphrasis* (in *Opp. Spm.* i, 874); (Eumenius, *Cateua* (in Gr., Verona, 1532); Jerome, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* iii, 383); Salonius, *Explicatio* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* p. 8); Alcuin, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* i, ii, 110); Rupert, *In Eccles.* (in *Opp.* i, 1118); Hugo, *Homilia* (in *Opp.* i, 53); Honorius, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* i); Bonaventura, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* i, 303); Latif, *שׁוֹרֵי* (Constpl. n. d. 12mo); Schirwood, *Note* (Antw. 1523, 4to); Guidaer, *Commentarius* (Paris, 1531, 1540, 4to); Arboreus, *Commentarius* (Paris, 1531, 1537, fol.); Bucer, *Commentarius* (Argent. 1532, 4to); Moring, *Commentarius* (Antw. 1533, 8vo); \*Luther, *Adnotationes* (Wittemb. 1533, 8vo); Borrhous, *Commentarius* (Basil. 1539, 1564, fol.); Titelmann, *Commentarius* (8vo, Par. 1545, 1549, 1577, 1581; Antw. 1552; Lugd. 1555, 1575); Melancthon, *Enarratio* (Wittemb. 1559, 8vo); Zuingle, *Complanatio* (in *Opp.* iii); Brent, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* viii); Cajetanus, *Commentarius* (Lugd. 1552, fol.); Striegel, *Scholia* (Lpz. 1555, 8vo); Sferno, *שׁוֹרֵי* (Ven. 1567, 4to);

Galante, *קְהֵלֵת הַמֶּלֶךְ* (4to, Safet, 1570; Freft. 1681); Sidonius, *Commentaria* (in Germ., Mogunt. 1571, fol.); De Pomis, *Discorso* (Ven. 1572, 8vo); Mercer, *Commentarius* (Genev. 1573, fol.); Taftazak, *פְּרִיֵת יוֹסֵף* (Ven. 1576, 4to); Jaisch, *עַל קְהֵלֵת הַמֶּלֶךְ*, etc. (Constpl. 1576, fol.); Id., *Commentarius* (Antw. 1580, 4to); Jansen, *Paraphrasis* (Leyd. 1578, fol.); Galicho, *עַל בְּנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ* (Ven. 1578, 4to); Corranus, *Paraphrasis* (Lond. 1579, 1581, 8vo; ed. Scultet, Francf. 1618, Heidelberg. 1619, 8vo); Senan, *Commentarius* (Genev. 1580, 8vo; in Engl. by Stockwood, Lond. 1585, 8vo); Manse, *Explicatio* (Flor. 1580, 8vo; Colon. 1580, 12mo); Lavater, *Commentarius* (Tigur. 1584, 8vo); Beza, *Paraphrasis* (Genev. 1588, 1598, 8vo; in Germ., ib. 1599, 8vo); Gifford, *Commentarius* (Lond. 1589, 8vo); Strack, *Predigen* (4to, Cassel, 1590; Freft. 1618; Goth. 1663); Slangendorp, *Commentarius* (Hafn. 1590, 8vo); Greenham, *Brief Sum* (in *Works*, p. 628); Arepol, *הַמֶּלֶךְ* (Constpl. 1591, 4to); Arrivo, *קְהֵלֵת הַמֶּלֶךְ* (Salonica, 1597, 4to); Baruch ben-Baruch, *אֲדָם הַיְהוּדִי הַגָּדוֹל* (Ven. 1599, fol.); Alscheich, *הַמֶּלֶךְ שִׁבְרִים* (Ven. 1601, 4to); Leuchter, *Erklärung* (Frkft. 1603, 1611, 4to); Broughton, *Commentarius* (Lond. 1605, 4to); Lorinus, *Commentarius* (Lugd. 1606, 4to); Bardin, with various titles (in French, Par. 1609, 12mo; 1632, 8vo; in Germ., Guelph. 1662, 8vo); Fay, *Commentarius* (Genev. 1607, 8vo); Osorius, *Commentarius* (Lugd. 1611, 8vo); Amama, *Note* (in the *Crit. Sacri*); Sanchez, *Commentarius* (Barcin. 1619, 4to); \*De Pineda, *Commentarius* (Antw. 1620, fol.); Ferdinand, *Commentarius* (Rom. 1621, fol.); Granger, *Commentarius* (Lond. 1621, 4to); Egard, *Expositio* (Hamb. 1622, 4to); Pemble, *Exposition* (Lond. 1628, 4to); Dieterich, *Predigen* (fol., Ulm, 1632, 1655; Nürnberg. 1665); Drusius, *Annotationes* (Amst. 1635, 4to); Guillebert, *Paraphrasis* (Paris, 1635, 1642, 8vo); à Lapide, *In Eccles.* (Antw. 1638, fol.); Jermin, *Commentary* (Lond. 1638, fol.); Cartwright, *Metaphrasis* (4to, Amst. 1647; 4th edit. ib. 1663); Trapp, *Commentary* (Lond. 1650, 4to); \*Geier, *Commentarius* (4to, Lpz. 1653; 5th edit. 1730); Mercado, *פְּרִיֵת* (Amst. 1653, 4to); Cotton, *Exposition* (London, 1654, 8vo); Gorse, *Explication* (in French, Par. 1655, 3 vols. 12mo); Lusitano, *פְּרִיֵת הַמֶּלֶךְ* (Ven. 1656, 4to); Leigh, *Commentarius* (Lond. 1657, fol.); Varenius, *Gemma Salomonis* (Rost. 1659, 4to); Werenfels, *Uomilie* (Basle, 1666, 4to); \*Reynolds, *Annotations* (Lond. 1669, 8vo; in "Assembly's Annot. Works," iv, 33; also edit. by Washburn, Lond. 1811); De Sacy, *L'Ecclesiaste* (in his *Sainte Bible*, xiv); Anon., *Exposition* (Lond. 1680, 4to); Bossnet, *Libri Salomonis* (Par. 1693, 8vo); Nisbet, *Exposition* (Edinb. 1694, 4to); \*Smith, *Explicatio* (Amst. 2 vols. 4to, 1699, 1704); Leenhof, *Verklaaring* (te Zwolle, 1700, 8vo); Yeard, *Paraphrasis* (Lond. 1701, 8vo); Martianay, *Commentaire* (Par. 1705, 12mo); Seebach, *Erklärung* (Hal. 1705, 8vo); Tietzmann, *Erklärung* (Nürnberg. 1705, 4to); David ben-Ahron, *פְּרִיֵת הַמֶּלֶךְ* (Prague, 1708, 4to); \*Schmidl, *Commentarius* (Strasb. 1709, 4to); Mel, *Predigen* (Frkft. 1711, 4to); Zierold, *Bedeutung*, etc. (Lpz. 1715, 4to); Rambach, *Adnotationes* (Hal. 1720, 8vo); Waechter, *Uebers. m. Anm.* (Memmingen, 1723, 4to); Francke, *Commentarius* (Brandenb. 1724, 4to); Wolle, *Auslegung* (Lpz. 1729, 8vo); Hardouin, *Paraphrase* (Par. 1729, 12mo); Bauer, *Erläuterung* (Lpz. 1732, 4to); Hanssen, *Betrachtungen* (Lub. 1737, 1744, 4to); Lampe, *Adnotationes* (in his *Medit. Evng.* Gronig. 1741, 4to); Michaelis, *Entwickelung* (8vo, Gött. 1751; Brem. 1762); Anon., *Uebers. m. Anm.* (Halle, 1760, 8vo); Peters, *Append. to Crit. Diss.* (Lond. 1760, 8vo); \*Des Vaux, *Essay, Analytical Paraphrase*, etc. (Lond. 1760, 4to; in Germ., Halle, 1764, 4to); Carmeli, *Spiegamento* (Ven. 1765, 8vo); Judetnes, *פְּרִיֵת הַמֶּלֶךְ* (Amst. 1765, 4to); Anon., *Cohleth, a Poem* (Lond. 1768, 4to); \*Mendels

John, *D. Buch Koheleth*, etc. (Berlin, 1770, 8vo; 1789, 4to; tr. with notes by Preston, Camb. 1845, 8vo); De Poix, D'Arras, and De Paris, *L'Ecclesiaste*, etc. (Par. 1771, 12mo); Anon. *Traduct. et Notes* (Par. 1771, 8vo); Moldenhauer, *Übers. u. Erläut.* (Lpz. 1772, 8vo); Grotius, *Annotationes* (Halle, 1777, 4to); Kleuker, *Salomo's Schriften* (Lpz. 1777, 8vo); Zinck, *Commentarius* (Augsb. 1780, 4to); Struensee, *Uebersetzung* (Halberst. 1780, 8vo); Greenway, *Paraphrase* (Lond. 1781, 8vo); Van der Palm, *Ecl. illustratus* (Leyd. 1784, 8vo); Döderlein, *Uebersetzung* (8vo, Jen. 1784, 1792); Levison, *הַכֹּהֵלֶת* (Hamb. 1784, 8vo); Schleusner, *Auctarium* (Götting, 1785, 4to); Spohn, *Übers. m. Ann.* (Lpz. 1785, 8vo); Neunhöfer, *Versuch* (Weissenb. 1787, 8vo); Anon. *Paraphrase*, etc. (London, 1787, 8vo); Friedländer, *Abhandlung* (Berl. 1788, 8vo); Bode, *Erklärende Umschreibung* (Quedlinb. 1788, 8vo); Löwe, *הַכֹּהֵלֶת* (Berl. 1788, 8vo); Gregory II, *Explanatio* (Gr. and Lat., Ven. 1791, fol.); Pacchi, *Parafasi* (Modena, 1791, 8vo); Zirkel, *Übers. u. Erklär.* (Würzb. 1792, 8vo); Boaretti, *Valgarizz.* (Ven. 1792, 8vo); Hodgson, *Translation* (Lond. 1792, 8vo); Schmidt, *Versuch* (Gieß. 1794, 8vo); Loanz, *הַכֹּהֵלֶת* (4to, Amst. 1695; Berl. 1775); Goab, *Beiträge*, etc. (Tübing. 1795, 8vo); Nachtigal, *Koheleth* (Halle, 1798, 8vo); Bergst, *Bearbeitung* (1799, 8vo); Jacobi, *Predigerbuch* (Celle, 1799, 8vo); Fränkel, *הַכֹּהֵלֶת* (Dessau, 1800, 8vo); Middeldorp, *Symbola* (Fr. ad V. 1811, 4to); Kelle, *D. Salomon. Schriften* (Freib. 1815, 8vo); Katzenelnbogen, *הַכֹּהֵלֶת* (Wars. 1815, 4to); \*Umbreit, *Übers. u. Darstell.* (Gotha, 1818, 8vo; also his *Koheleth scepticus de summo bono*, Gott. 1820, 8vo); Wardlaw, *Lectures* (Lond. 1821, 2 vols. 8vo; new ed. Lond. 1838, 2 vols. 12mo); Holden, *Illustration* (Lond. 1822, 8vo); Kaiser, *Übers. u. Erläut.* (Erlang. 1823, 8vo); Henz, *Adumbratio* (Dorpat. 1827, 4to); Anon. *Übers. u. Erläut.* (Stuttg. 1827, 8vo); Rosenmüller, *Scholæ* (pt. ix, Lips. 1830, 8vo); Heinemann, *Commentar* (Berl. 1831, 8vo); Köster, *Stroph. Übers.* (Schlesw. 1831, 8vo); Ewald, *Koheleth* (in his *Poet. Bücher*, iv); \*Knobel, *Commentar* (Lpz. 1836, 8vo); Auerbach, *הַכֹּהֵלֶת*, etc. (Bresl. 1837, 8vo); \*Herzfeld, *Übers. u. Erläut.* (Braunsch. 1838, 8vo); Noyes, *Notes* (Bost. 1846 [3d ed. 1867], 12mo); Barham, *Ecclesiastes* (in his *Bible revised*, i); \*Hitzig, *Erklärung* (in the *Kurzgef. Ereg. Handb.*, Lpz. 1847, 8vo); Hamilton, *Lectures* (Lond. 1851, 12mo); \*Stuart, *Commentary* (N. Y. 1851; Andover, 1862, 12mo); Elster, *Commentar* (Götting. 1855, 8vo); Morgan, *Metrical Paraphrase* (Lond. 1856, 4to); Macdonald, *Explanation* (N. Y. 1856, 8vo); Weiss, *Exposition* (Lond. 1856, 12mo); Plungian, *הַכֹּהֵלֶת* (Wilna, 1857, 8vo); Wangenheim, *Auslegung* (Berlin, 1858, 8vo); \*Vaihinger, *Übersetz. u. Erklär.* (Stuttg. 1858, 8vo; his art. on the subject in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1848, was translated in the *Meth. Quart. Review*, April and July, 1849); Rosenthal, *הַכֹּהֵלֶת*, etc. (Prague, 1858, 8vo); Buchanan, *Commentary* (Glasg. 1859, 8vo); Bridges, *Exposition* (London, 1859, 8vo); \*Hengstenberg, *Auslegung* (Berl. 1859, 8vo; tr. in Clarke's *Library*, Edinb. 1860, 8vo; also Phila. 1860, 8vo); Hahn, *Commentar* (Lpz. 1860, 8vo); Böhl, *De Aravisnis Koheleth* (Erlang. 1860, 8vo); \*Ginsburg, *Koheleth translated with a Commentary* (Lond. 1861, 8vo); Diederich, *Erläuterung* (Neu-Rup. 1865, 8vo); Castelli, *Tradotto e note* (Pisa, 1866, 8vo); Young, *Commentary* (Phila. 1866, 8vo). Others are embraced in the Rabbinical Bibles of Bomberg and Moses Frankfurter (q. v.). For those in general commentaries, see COMMENTARY.

**Ecclesiastic, Ecclesiastical**, of or belonging to the Church (*ecclesia*). In later times the word *ecclesiastic* came to be applied solely to clergymen as a name, and *ecclesiastical* is often confined in use, improperly, to the affairs of the clergy. In the early Church, Christians in general are spoken of by this

title, in opposition to Jews, infidels, and heretics. The word means *men of the Church*, and was applied to Christians as being neither of Jewish synagogues, nor heathen temples, nor heretical conventicles, but members of the Church of Christ; e. g. ἀνδρες ἐκκλησιαστικοί, Eusebius, iv, 7, cited by Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. i, ch. i, § 8.

**Ecclesiastical History** is that branch of historical theology (q. v.) which treats of the development of the kingdom of God among men on the earth by means of the Church.

**I. Idea and Scope of Ecclesiastical History.**—The title *Ecclesiastical History* (*Historia Ecclesiastica*) was used by all the older writers on this branch of science. German writers began the use, in its stead, of the title *Church History* (*Kirchengeschichte*), which has of late been adopted also by most English writers. Its idea and limits depend on the idea which is formed of the Church (*ecclesia*). See CHURCH.

1. If the Church be regarded as a divine institution, existing in all the ages before Christ as well as since, then the field of Church history reaches from the beginnings of the history of the first divine covenant with man down to the present time. It would then be divided into *Biblical Church History* and *Ecclesiastical History*, or simply *Church History*. Biblical Church history, again, could be divided into O. T. and N. T. The entire field of Church history, in its widest sense, would thus be, I. Old-Testament Church history. II. New-Testament Church History, including (1) the life of Christ; (2) the planting of Christianity by the apostles. III. Ecclesiastical history, beginning at the close of the canon, and extending to the present time (see Alexander, *Notes on N.-T. Literature and Ecclesiastical History*, N. Y. 1867, p. 156 sq.; Stanley, *Eastern Church*, Introduction).

2. If (as it generally is for convenience), on the other hand, the term Church be restricted to the Christian Church, then the field of Church history is limited to the development of the kingdom of God among men through and by means of the Christian Church. "Its proper starting-point is the incarnation of the eternal Word, who dwelt among us and revealed his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth; and next to this the miracle of the first Pentecost, when the Church took her place as a Christian institution, filled with the spirit of the glorified Redeemer, and intrusted with the conversion of all nations. Jesus Christ, the God-man and Saviour of the world, is the author of the new creation, the soul and the head of the Church, which is his body and his bride. In his person and work lies all the fulness of the Godhead and of renewed humanity, the whole plan of redemption, and the key of all history from the creation of man in the image of God to the resurrection of the body unto everlasting life" (Schaff, *Church Hist.* vol. i, § 1). Modern writers generally adopt this second view, not only for its practical convenience, but also on the theoretical ground that the sources of the O. and N. T. history are inspired; those of Church history, since the closing of the canon, are human. The former is therefore called *Sacred History*, constituting a department by itself. The relations of Christianity to Judaism and heathenism are generally treated by modern writers in an Introduction or in separate chapters, as the "Preparation for Christianity in the History of the World." The life of Jesus is so treated by some writers; by most others it is relegated to a separate work. Neander makes one work of "The life of Christ" as the ground of the existence of the Christian Church; another work treats of the apostolic Church, or "The Planting and Training of Christianity by the Apostles;" while his great *Church History* continues the development after the apostolic age. Nevertheless, in treating of "Church Discipline and Constitution," he

is compelled to go back to the apostolic age. Dr. Schaff makes "the Church under the Apostles" the first division of his *History of the Christian Church*, and gives the relations of Christianity to Judaism and heathenism in chap. i, as "Preparations for Christianity." Hinds (*History of the Christian Church, 1st Division, Encycl. Metropolitana*) treats in an Introduction of the religion of Jews, Gentiles, and Samaritans, and then makes part i the Ministry of Christ; part ii, the Apostolic Age; part iii, Age of the Apostolic Fathers.

3. As to the relations of Church history to general history, dean Stanley remarks: "To a great extent the two are inseparable; they cannot be torn asunder without infinite loss to both. . . . It is indeed true that, in common parlance, ecclesiastical history is often confined within limits so restricted as to render such a distinction only too easy. . . . Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* is, in great part, however reluctantly or unconsciously, the history of the 'rise and progress of the Christian Church.' . . . Never let us think that we can understand the history of the Church apart from the history of the world, any more than we can separate the interests of the clergy from the interests of the laity, which are the interests of the Church at large. . . . How to adjust the relations of the two spheres to each other is almost as indefinite a task in history as it is in practice and in philosophy. In no age are they precisely the same" (*Eastern Church, Introduction*). A book written from this point of view, however, would be rather a history of Christianity in its relations to the general development of man than a history of the Church. So Milman's *Latin Christianity* is, to great extent, a general history of the times rather than of the Christian Church, while, at the same time, the Church is the prominent feature of it. It is well that such a book should be written, and the work has been well done by dean Milman.

II. *Method of Church History.*—The order and arrangement of the material have varied greatly at different periods. The earliest writers (e. g. Eusebius) wrote generally without scientific method, and their arrangement was arbitrary and fortuitous. In the Church of the Middle Ages history was little studied, and what little was written was put in the form of simple chronicles. The first application of method was really made in the Magdeburg Centuries, projected by Matthias Flacius Illyricus (1559-1574). See CENTURIES. The history is divided into centuries, with a topical arrangement under each century of sixteen heads as rubrics, viz.: 1. General view; 2. Extent of the Church; 3. Its external condition; 4. Doctrines; 5. Heresies; 6. Rites; 7. Polity; 8. Schisms; 9. Councils; 10. Bishops and doctors; 11. Heretics; 12. Martyrs; 13. Miracles; 14. Jews; 15. Other religions; 16. Political changes affecting the condition of the Church. This centennial arrangement (combined with the rubrical subdivision) maintained its ground for two centuries: the last great work which follows it is Mosheim's *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History*. Mosheim divides the material under each century into external and internal history, and these again as follows: External events into prosperous and adverse; internal history into, 1. State of literature and science; 2. Government of the Church; 3. Theology; 4. Rites and ceremonies; 5. Heresies and schisms. The later historians divide the whole history into *periods*, determined by great events, and then arrange the material under each period by topics or rubrics. Each writer, of course, frames his periods according to his own views of the great epochal events of history, but most of them make three great periods—*ancient, mediæval, and modern*, the first beginning with the day of Pentecost; the second with Gregory the Great, A. D. 590 (acc. to others, with Constantine, 306 or 311, or the fall of the West Roman empire, 476, or Charlemagne, 800); the third with the Reformation, 1517.

Perhaps the best modern division is that of Schaff, who proposes nine periods, viz., three *ancient*, three *mediæval*, three *modern*, viz.: I. The Apostolic Church, A. D. 1-100. II. The Church persecuted as a sect, to Constantine, the first Christian emperor, A. D. 100-311. III. The Church in union with the Græco-Roman empire, and amid the storms of the great migration, to pope Gregory I, A. D. 311-590. IV. The Church planted among the Germanic nations, to Hildebrand, A. D. 590-1019. V. The Church under the papal hierarchy and the scholastic theology, to Boniface VIII, A. D. 1049-1294. VI. The decay of mediæval Catholicism, and the preparatory movements of Protestantism, A. D. 1294-1517. VII. The evangelical reformation and the Roman Catholic reaction, A. D. 1517-1600. VIII. The age of polemic orthodoxy and exclusive confession-alism, A. D. 1600-1750. IX. The spread of infidelity and the revival of Christianity in Europe and America, from 1750 to the present time (*Ch. Hist.* i, 14). Dr. J. A. Alexander (*Op. cit.* p. 214 sq.) objects to the minute and fixed rubrical arrangement on various grounds, and proposes to set it aside altogether "as a framework running through the history and determining its whole form, and to substitute a natural arrangement of the topics by combining a general chronological order with a due regard to the mutual relative importance of the topics themselves, so that what is prominent at one time may be wholly in the background at another, instead of giving all an equal prominence at all times, by applying the same scheme or formula to all alike. This natural method, so called to distinguish it from every artificial or conventional arrangement, far from being new, is recommended by the practice and example of the best historians in every language and in every age, affording a presumptive, if not a conclusive, proof both of its theoretical consistency and of its practical efficiency and usefulness, and, at the same time, a convenient means of keeping this and other parts of universal history in mutual connection and agreement with each other." See also Baur, *Epocheu d. kirchlichen Geschichtschreibung* (Tübingen, 1852).

III. *Branches of Church History.*—The number of branches into which the history is divided will of course depend upon the method adopted (see above; but the historian, besides setting forth the progress of Christianity in the world and its vicissitudes, must also treat, more or less fully, of the constitution and government of the Church (ecclesiastical polity); of the history of doctrines; of worship, religious usages, domestic life; of creeds, etc. Some of these are of so great importance as to justify treatment in separate books, and they have, in fact, grown to be independent branches of science: e. g. archaeology, history of doctrines, symbolics, patristics and patrology (the doctrine and literature of the fathers, etc.), history of councils, Church polity, etc.

IV. *Sources of Church History.*—For the history of the Jewish Church and of the Apostolic Church, we find our sources of information in the O. and N. Testaments. For the history since the closing of the Canon, the sources are given by Kurtz as follows: "They are partly primary (original), such as monuments and original documents; partly secondary (derived), among which we reckon traditions, and reported researches of original sources which have since been lost. Monuments, such as ecclesiastical buildings, pictures, and inscriptions, are commonly only of very subordinate use in Church history. But archives, preserved and handed down, are of the very greatest importance. To this class also belong the acts and decrees of ecclesiastical councils; the regesta and official decrees of the popes (decretals, briefs) and of bishops (pastoral letters); the laws and regesta issuing from imperial chancelleries, so far as these refer to ecclesiastical affairs; the rules of monastic orders, liturgies, confessions of faith, letters of personages influential in Church or State; reports of eye-witnesses; sermons and doctrinal

treatises of acknowledged theologians, etc. If the documents in existence are found insufficient, we must have recourse to earlier or later traditions, and to the historical investigations of those who had access to original documents which are now no longer extant" (*Text-book of Church History*, vol. i, § 3). "The private writings of personal actors in the history, the works of the Church fathers for the first six centuries, of the scholastic and mystic divines for the Middle Ages, and of the Reformers and their opponents for the 16th century, are the richest mines for the historian. They give history in its birth and actual movement; but they must be carefully sifted and weighed, especially the controversial writings, where fact is generally more or less adulterated with party spirit, heretical and orthodox" (Schaff, *Church History*, vol. i, § 3).

V. *Literature*.—(1.) *Apostolic Church*. The Acts of the Apostles may be regarded as the first Church history, for they describe the planting of the Church among Jews and Gentiles from Jerusalem to Rome. (In what follows we make free use of Dr. Schaff, vol. i.) (2.) *Greek Church*. Eusebius (q. v.) won by his Church history (εκκλησιαστική ιστορία, up to A.D. 324) the title of the Father of Church history, though he was able to make use of the work of a predecessor, Hege-sippus (about A.D. 150). Eusebius is learned, moderate, and truth-loving, and made use of many sources of information which are now lost. As a work of art his work is inferior to the classic historians. It was continued on the same plan and in a similar spirit by Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret in the fifth, and by the Arians Theodorus and Evagrius in the sixth centuries. Among the later Greek Church historians Nicephorus Callistus (about 1333) deserves mention. A Church history in the modern Greek Church was begun in 1866 by Const. Kontogonis (Εκκλησιαστική ιστορία από της ζείας συστάσεως της εκκλησίας μέχρι των κατ' ημάς χρόνων, vol. i, Athens, 1866). (3.) *The Latin Church before the Reformation* was long content with translations and extracts from Eusebius and his continuators, and but one work of consequence was produced during the Middle Ages. (4.) *The Roman Church after the Reformation*. At the head of Roman writers in Church history stands cardinal Baronius (†1607), whose *Annales Ecclesiastici* (Rome, 1588 sq., 12 vols. fol.) come down to the year 1188. They were continued, though with less ability, by Raynaldus, Bzovius, Spondanus, and very recently, from the year 1572, by Theiner (Rome, 1853 sq., fol.). The *Annales* were designed as a refutation of the Magdeburg Centuries (see CENTURIES), and were refuted in part not only by several Protestant writers, but also by Roman scholars, e. g. by Pagi. The work of Natalis Alexander († 1724), *Historia Ecclesiastica V. et N. T.* (Par. 1699 sq., 8 vols. fol.; Bingii, 1785–91, 20 vols.), is Gallican, learned, and, on the whole, a very valuable work. Fleury (*Histoire Ecclesiastique*, Par. 1691–1720, 20 vols. 4to) commends himself by mildness of spirit, fluency of style, and copiousness of material. Bossuet († 1704) wrote in a very elegant style a history of the world: *Discours sur l'Histoire Universelle depuis le commencement du monde jusqu'à l'empire de Charlemagne* (Paris, 1681). Tillemont († 1698) compiled, almost entirely in the words of the original authorities, his *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles* (Paris, 1693 sq., 4to), which is the most thorough of all the French Church histories. The first comprehensive work in Roman Catholic Germany was commenced by count Stolberg, *Geschichte der Religion Jesu Christi* (Hamburg, 1806–1818, 8vo). The 15 vols., which he completed bring the history down to the year 430. The work is very copious, and written with the enthusiasm of a poet, but is not critical. The continuation, by Kerz (vols. 16–38, 8vo, Mentz, 1824–51, to A.D. 1300) and Brischar (vol. 39 sq., 8vo), are still inferior. The work of Katerkamp (*Kirchengeschichte*) (1819–30 to 1073, 4 parts, 8vo) is by far more thorough.

Rohrbacher's *Histoire Universelle de l'Église* (Par. 1842–48, vol. 29, 8vo; a continuation containing the Church history from 1860–1866, by J. Chantrel, Corbeil, 1867) is written from an ultramontane stand-point, and has not made sufficient use of the recent investigations. The best Roman Catholic manuals of Church history are those of Dollinger (*Gesch. d. christl. Kirche*, vol. i, parts 1 and 2, Landshut, 1833–35; *Lehrbuch d. Kirchengesch.* vol. i, and part 1 of vol. ii, up to the Reformation, Ratisbon, 1836 sq.; 2d edit. 1843; *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. i, part 1, *Heidenthum u. Judenthum*, Ratisbon, 1857; part 2, *Christenthum u. Kirche in der Zeit ihrer Grundlegung*, 1860), Ritter (*Handbuch d. Kirchengesch.* Bonn, 1826–35, 3 vols.; 6th edit., 1856, 2 vols.), and especially Alzog (*Universalggeschichte der christlichen Kirche*, Mainz, 1843, 8vo; 8th edit. 2 vols., 1867–68). Posthumous lectures on Church history by Dr. Möhler (died 1838), the greatest Roman Catholic theologian of Germany in the 19th century, were published thirty years after his death by Dr. Gams (*Kirchengeschichte*, 3 vols. Ratisbon, 1868). (5.) *Protestant Writers*. The first comprehensive Church history from the Protestant stand-point was compiled by Mathias Flacius († 1575), surnamed Illyricus (*Ecclesiastica Historia Novi Testamenti*, usually called *Centurie Magdeburgenses*, Basil, 1559–74, fol.), assisted by ten other theologians. It followed the centurial arrangement, and treated of 13 centuries in as many folio volumes. It remained long the standard work of the Lutheran Church, though it is to a certain extent partial and often uncritical (see CENTURIES). Hottinger († 1667) published a similar work (from the stand-point of the Swiss Reformed Church), *Historia Ecclesiastica N. Testamenti* (Zurich, 1655–67, 9 vols.) extending to the 16th century, but it is inferior to that of Flacius. A thorough refutation of Baronius was furnished by Spanheim (*Summa Historie Ecclesiastica*, Lugd. Bat. 1689, 4to). An attempt to free Church history from the fetters of factionalism was made by J. G. Arnold (in his *Unparteiische Kirch- und Ketzerhistorie*, 1698–1700, 4 vols., to 1688), which, however, was often unjust towards the predominant churches through partiality towards the sects. Objective Church history was greatly advanced by Mosheim († 1755), a moderate and impartial Lutheran. His *Institutiones historice ecclesiasticæ antiquæ et recentioris* (Helmstadt, 1755, 4to) is, in the English translation of Murdock (N. Y., 1841, 3 vols., 3d edit.) and McLaine, a favorite text-book in England and America to the present day. Of the two, Murdock's is far the best. The work of Schröckh, *Christliche Kirchengeschichte* (45 vols., to the end of the 18th century, Leipzig, 1768–1812; the last 2 vols. are by Tzschirner), though leaning towards Rationalism, is very valuable for reference. The principal representative of Rationalism among Church historians is Henke, *Allgemeine Geschichte der christlichen Kirche* (Braunschweig, 1788–1823, 9 vols. 8vo, continued by Vater). The work of Gieseler († 1854), *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte* (Bonn, 1824–1857) gives the history as much as possible in the very words of the sources. It is profoundly learned and impartial, but cold and dry. The best English translation of it is by Prof. H. B. Smith (New York, 1857 sq.). Neander († 1850) is generally considered as the father of modern Church history. His aim was to represent Church history as a continuous proof of the divine power of Christianity, and it is therefore prominently the inner side of ecclesiastical events and their religious significance which he unfolds. His *Allgemeine Geschichte der christlichen Religion und Kirche* (Hamburg, 1825–52, 11 vols. 8vo, extending to the council of Basle) has been translated into English by Ly Torrey (Boston, 1847–51, 5 vols. 8vo). Besides these larger works, Germany has produced a great number of excellent manuals. The most important of these are those of Niedner (1846, new ed. 1866), distinguished for fulness and thought; of Hase (9th edit. 1867, translated by Blumenthal and Wing, New York, 1855,

8vo), distinguished for copiousness combined with conciseness; and Guericke (9th edit. 1867, translated by Shedd, vol. i, 1857), who wrote the best historical work from the old Lutheran stand-point. More a sketch than a manual of Church history is the *Kirchengeschichte* of Schleiermacher, published after his death by Bonnell (Berlin, 1840, 8vo). The manual of Engelhardt, of Erlangen (*Handb. d. Kirchengeschichte*, Erlangen, 1832-34, 4 vols.), is an unpretending but valuable arrangement of the subject, as derived from the sources. The manual of Fricke, left incomplete (*Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, Leipz. 1850, 1 vol.), learned but stiff, is a production of the school of Schleiermacher. In Grfrörer's work on ecclesiastical history (*Allgemeine Kirchengeschichte*, 4 vols. Stuttgart, 1841-46 to 1305, Christianity is treated as the natural product of the time in which it originated. Clerical selfishness, political calculations and intrigues, appear the sole principles of ecclesiastical movements which this author can appreciate or discover. Still, the work is of importance; and those volumes especially which detail the history of the Middle Ages give evidence of original study, and contain much fresh information. The manual of Jacobi, a pupil of Neander (*Lehrb. der Kirchengeschichte*, Berlin, 1850, 1 vol., not completed), breathes the same spirit as that of his teacher. Its tone is elevated; nor is the author content merely to imitate Neander. The prelections of Hagenbach (*Die christl. Kirche der 3 ersten Jahrhunderte*, 2 vols. Leipz. 1853-55; *D. christl. K. vom 7<sup>ten</sup> bis zum 15<sup>ten</sup> Jahrhundert*, Leipz. 1860-61), originally delivered to an educated audience, are somewhat diffuse, but clear and attractive. They breathe throughout a warm Christian spirit, nor is the judgment of the lecturer warped by narrow sectarian prejudices. The works by J. A. Kurtz (*Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, Mitau, 1842, 5th ed. 1863; Engl. transl. in 2 vols., Philadelphia, 1860; *Handbuch der allgem. Kirchengesch.* vol. i in 3 parts, Mitau, 1853-54, vol. ii, pt. i, 1856) belong among the best productions of the Lutheran school. To the same school belong the manuals of W. B. Lindner (*Lehrbuch der christl. Kirchengeschichte*, Leipz. 1847-54) and H. Schmid (*Lehrb. der Kirchengeschichte*, Nördlingen, 1851). The manual of Ebrard (*Handbuch der christl. K.-u. Dogmengesch.* Erlangen, 1865-66, 4 vols.) is written from the stand-point of the United Evangelical Church, as is also the work of Prof. F. A. Hasse (*Kirchengesch.* Leipz. 1864-65, 3 vols.), published after the author's death by A. Köhler. The works published by F. C. Baur, the founder of the Tübingen school on the Church history of the first six centuries (*Das Christenthum u. d. christl. K. der drei ersten Jahrh.* Tüb. 1853, 3d ed. 1863, and *Die christl. K. des 4-6 Jahrh.* Tüb. 1859, 2d ed. 1863), were after his death completed, so as to form a continuous and complete Church history, by the publication of three volumes, treating severally of the Church history of the Middle Ages, of the time from the Reformation to the end of the 18th century, and of the 19th century. The five volumes appeared together, under the title *Geschichte d. christl. Kirche* (Tübingen, 1863-64, 5 vols.). A Church history in biographies was published by F. Böhringer (*Die Kirche Christi und ihre Zeugen*, Zurich, 1842-58).

Among the English works we mention Milner (+ 1797), *History of the Ch. of Christ to the 16th century* (revised edit. by Grantham, Lond. 1847, 4 vols. 8vo). It has been continued by Dr. Stebbing, *The Hist. of the Church of Christ from 1530 to the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1839 sq., 3 vols. 8vo), and a further continuation by Hawes (Edinb. 1834, 8vo); Waddington, *History of the Church from the earliest Ages to the Reformation* (Lond. 2d edit. 3 vols. 8vo), and *Hist. of the Reform. on the Continent* (Lond. 1841, 3 vols. 8vo), is neither accurate nor profound; Foulkes, *Manual of Ecclesiastical Hist.* (1851, to the 12th cent.); Robertson, *Hist. of the Church* (Lond. 2 vols. 1854-56, 8vo) to 1122; Milman, *Hist. of Christianity* (Lond. 1840, 3 vols.

8vo, reprinted in New York), and *Hist. of Latin Christianity* (Lond. 1854 sq. 6 vols. to Nicholas V; 4th ed. in 9 vols. 1867, reprinted in New York), an elaborate and at the same time brilliant work; Hardwick, *Hist. of the Christ. Church*, vol. i Middle Age, vol. ii Reformation (Cambridge, 1853 and 1856, 8vo), an admirable manual, but left unfinished by the sudden death of the author; Hinds, Jeremic, and others, *Church History*, in the *Encyclopædia Metropolitana*, and in a separate edition (Lond. 1850-58, 4 vols. 8vo); Killen, *The Ancient Church* (Belfast and New York, 1859, 8vo), an able work from the Presbyterian stand-point. The best works produced in this field in America are those by Prof. Schaff (*Hist. of the Apostolic Age*, New York, 1853, 8vo, and *Hist. of the Christian Ch.* vol. i to A.D. 311, New York, 1859, vols. ii and iii to Gregory the Great, New York, 1867). They have also appeared in a German edition, *Geschichte der christl. Kirche*, vol. i, Mercurburg, 1851, and Leipzig, 1854; vols. ii and iii, Leipz. 1867). They are distinguished by copiousness of material, philosophical arrangement, and attractive style. A brief work on the history of the Christian Church has been published by Dr. C. M. Butler (Phila. 1868). In Protestant France a luminous sketch of Church history was written by J. Matter (*Hist. Universelle de l'Église Chrétienne*), Strasburg, 1829, 2 vols.; 2d edit. Paris, 1838, 4 vols.).

In addition to the above works, which (unless the contrary is specially mentioned) embrace the whole history of the Christian Church, there is a very copious literature on special periods. The works treating of the primitive Church have been given in the article on the APOSTOLIC AGE. An able work on the history of the first three centuries has been published by Ed. de Pressensé (*Histoire des trois premiers siècles*, Paris, 1858, 2 vols.); also handbooks of modern Church history, by Dr. Nippold (Elberfeld, 1867) and Hagenbach (1865). For the ample literature on the period of the Reformation, see the article REFORMATION. The literature on branches of ecclesiastical history, such as history of heresies, councils, particular religious denominations, popes, saints, countries, monasticism, crusades, etc., and that on prominent men of Church history, is given in the special articles treating of those subjects. *Tables of Church history*, presenting in parallel columns the various departments of history, have been compiled in Germany by Vater (Halle, 6th ed. 1833), Danz (Jena, 1838), Lange (Jena, 1841), Douay (Leipzig, 1841), Uhlemann (to the Reformation, 2d edit. Berlin, 1865); in England, by Riddle (*Ecclesiastical Chronology*, London, 1840); in America, by H. B. Smith (*Hist. of the Ch. of Christ in chronol. Tables*, New York, 1859), which work has considerably improved the plan of all its predecessors, and, in fact, is the most thorough and complete work of the kind extant. Special dictionaries of Church history were compiled by W. D. Fuhrmann (*Handwörterbuch der christl. Religions- u. Kirchengesch.* Halle, 1826-29, 3 vols.) and Neudecker (*Allgem. Lex. der Religions- u. christl. Kirchengesch.* Weimar, 1834-37, 5 vols.). Periodicals specially devoted to ecclesiastical history have been published by Stäudlin, Tschirner, and Vater (*Magazin für Religions- u. Kirchengesch.*, by Stäudlin, 4 vols. Hanover, 1802-5; *Archiv für alte u. neue Kirchengesch.* by Stäudlin u. Tschirner, 1813-1822, 5 vols.; *Kirchenhist. Archiv*, by Stäudlin, Tschirner, u. Vater, 4 vols. Halle, 1823-26); by Ilgen, Niedner, and Kalmis (*Zeitschrift für hist. Theologie*, Leipz. 1832-1868; established by Ilgen; since 1845, by Niedner; since 1867, by Kalmis); by Kist and Royaards (*Archief voor Kerkelijke Geschiedenis*, Leyden, 1829 sq.). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vii, 622; Hagenbach, *Theol. Encyklop.* p. 212 sq.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* vi, 130; *Christian Remembrancer*, xliii, 62; Jortin, *Remarks on Ecclesiastical History*; *Princeton Rev.* xxvi, 300; xxix, 636; Stanlev, *Eastern Church (Introduction on the Study of Church History)*; Dowling, *Introduction*

to the *Critical Study of Ecclesiastical History attempted in an Account of the Progress, and a short Notice of the Sources, of the History of the Church* (Lond. 1838, 8vo).

**Ecclesiastical Polity** denotes the principles and laws of Church government. Personal religion is a matter between the individual man and his Maker. But religion necessarily involves social relations; that is to say, it involves society; and no society of men can exist without government. True, there can be no compulsion in religion; but government is not inconsistent with freedom; nay, it is necessary to all true enjoyment of freedom in any society, religious or other. The "two conditions essential to a good religious government are, first, a good system for the formation and organization of authority; and, second, a good system of security for liberty" (Guizot, *History of Civilization*, N. Y. 12mo, p. 121). So Richard Watson: "The Church of Christ being visible and permanent, bound to observe certain rites and to obey certain rules, the existence of government in it is necessarily supposed."

*Is any form of Church polity divinely ordained?* Perhaps the conclusion on this point most generally adopted at the present day is that, while certain fundamental principles of Church government are laid down in the N. T., no specific form of polity is there enjoined. Comp. Matt. xx, 20-28, with Mark x, 35-45, and Matt. xxiii, 1-11. These passages clearly prohibit all arbitrary rule in the Church, and are utterly inconsistent with hierarchical assumptions; there is "but one Master, and all are brethren." The doctrine of these passages is that the members of the Church are on one level in presence of Christ the Head. We gather some elements of polity from the practice of the apostles as recorded in their acts and writings. This polity is not presented as legislative enactments, but simply as facts, showing how the apostles acted in given cases. In the first account we find the Church composed of the apostles and other disciples, and then of the apostles and "the multitude of them that believed." Hence it appears that the Church was at first composed entirely of members standing on an equality with one another, and that the apostles alone held a higher rank, and exercised a directing influence over the whole body, which arose from the original position in which Christ had placed them (Neander, *Planting and Training*, p. 32). The Gospel is designed to extend to every climate, in every age, under every variety of race, of national life and character, and of civil institutions; accordingly, its settled, fundamental, necessary rules are few and simple; it establishes principles rather than rules; the very regulations which the apostles made were in many instances of local, temporary use only.

The claim of *divine right* on the part of the clergy to govern the Church grew up with the hierarchy. See **EPISCOPACY**. Even after the introduction of episcopacy, in the early Church, the bishops and teachers were chosen by the clergy and people; the bishop managed the ecclesiastical affairs of his diocese in council with the presbyters, and "with a due regard to the suffrages of the whole assembly of the people." "In whatever way the control of ecclesiastical affairs by the laity, or, rather, by the whole community, is exercised, there can be no question that it is in them that by the New Testament and by the first ages of Christendom the supremacy over the Church was vested. They elected their ministers. They chose their own faith, they moulded their own creed, they administered their own discipline, they were the Ecclesia, the Assembly, 'the Church'" (Dean Stanley, *Address on Church and State*, 1868). But the union of Church and State under Constantine consolidated the hierarchical power, and the rights of the laity gradually fell into abeyance. It is an essential doctrine of the hierarchical system that the duty of teaching includes also the power of ruling; and all Church authority

therefore belongs to the clergy, who constitute the *ecclesia docens*. In the Roman Church the government is entirely in the hands of the organized clerical hierarchy, at the head of which stands the pope (see below). At the Reformation, Luther adopted the doctrine of the universal priesthood (1 Pet. ii, 5, 9; Rev. i, 6), and this forms the basis of the Lutheran theory of Church polity, in which the rights of the laity are fairly regarded. "Properly, all Christians have a right to teach—every father his own family; and even to administer the sacraments, as even Tertullian truly observes. There is, therefore, truly a *jus laicorum sacerdotale*, as Grotius, Salmasius, Böhme, and Spener have maintained. Even among the Jews the teachers of the people were not priests, but laymen; and any one who had proper qualifications might teach in the synagogue or in the temple. Among the ancient Israelites the prophets were commonly not from the order of the priesthood, but, for the most part, from other tribes, classes, and orders of the people" (Knapp, *Lectures on Christian Theology*, Woods's translation, Phila., 1853, 8vo, p. 478). Calvin (*Institutes*, book iv) sets out from the idea of the Church as the body of Christ. He finds a certain "mode of government delivered to us by the pure word of God" (iv, 1), and traces this form of government in the early Church until its "subversion by the papal tyranny" (ch. v). In substance Calvin asserted the following principles: 1. That it is unwarrantable and unlawful to introduce into the government and worship of the Church anything which has not the positive sanction of Scripture. 2. That the Church, though it consists properly and primarily only of the elect or of believers, and though, therefore, visibility and organization are not *essential*, as Papists allege they are, to its existence, is under a positive obligation to be organized, if possible, as a visible society, and to be organized in all things, so far as possible—its office-bearers, ordinances, worship, and general administration and arrangements—in accordance with what is prescribed or indicated upon these points in the New Testament. 3. That the fundamental principles, or leading features of what is usually called Presbyterian Church government, are indicated with sufficient clearness in the New Testament, as permanently binding upon the Church. 4. That the Church should be altogether free and independent of civil control, and should conduct its own distinct and independent government by presbyters and synods, while the civil power is called upon to afford it protection and support. 5. That human laws, whether about civil or ecclesiastical things, and whether proceeding from civil or ecclesiastical authorities, do not, *per se*—i. e. irrespective of their being sanctioned by the authority of God—impose an obligation upon the conscience. Calvin professed to find all these principles more or less clearly taught in Scripture (*B. and F. Ev. Rev.* April, 1860, p. 464). On this principle Tulloch remarks (*Leaders of the Reformation*, p. 179 sq.) that Calvin went too far in asserting that Presbyterianism "is the form of the divine kingdom presented in Scripture." "Presbyterianism became the peculiar Church order of a free Protestantism. It rested, beyond doubt, on a true divine order, else it never could have attained this historical success. But it not merely asserted itself to be wise and conformable to Scripture, and therefore divine, but it claimed the direct impress of a divine right for all its details and applications. This gave it strength and influence in a rude and uncritical age, but it planted in it from the first an element of corruption. The great conception which it embodied was impaired at the root by being fixed in a stagnant and inflexible system, which became identified with the conception as not only equally but specially divine" (p. 181). "But were not these 'elements,' some will say, really Biblical? Did not Calvin establish his Church polity and Church discipline upon Scripture? and is not this a warrantable

ble course? Assuredly not, in the spirit in which he did it. The fundamental source of the mistake is here. The Christian Scriptures are a revelation of divine truth, and not a revelation of Church polity. They not only do not lay down the outline of such a polity, but they do not even give the adequate and conclusive hints of one; and for the best of all reasons, that it would have been entirely contrary to the spirit of Christianity to have done so; and because, in point of fact, the conditions of human progress do not admit of the imposition of any unvarying system of government, ecclesiastical or civil. The system adapts itself to the life, everywhere expands with it, or narrows with it, but is nowhere in any particular form the absolute condition of life. A definite outline of Church polity, therefore, or a definite code of social ethics, is nowhere given in the New Testament, and the spirit of it is entirely hostile to the absolute assertion of either the one or the other" (p. 182, 183). Dr. Tulloch, however, goes too far himself in saying that "Presbyterianism 'not merely asserted itself to be wise and conformable to Scripture, and therefore divine, but it claimed the direct impress of a divine right for all its details and applications.' This statement is untrue. There may be differences of opinion among Presbyterians as to the extent to which a divine right should be claimed for the subordinate features of the system, and some, no doubt, have gone to an extreme in the extent of their claims; but no Presbyterians of eminence have ever claimed 'the direct impress of a divine right for all the details and applications' of their system. They have claimed a divine right, or Scripture sanction, only for its fundamental principles, its leading features. It is these only which they allege are indicated in Scripture in such a way as to be binding upon the Church in all ages. And it is just the same ground that is taken by all the more intelligent and judicious among *jure divino* prelatists and Congregationalists" (*Brit. and For. Ev. Review*, April, 1860). Moreover, Calvin did not "unchurch" ecclesiastical bodies which should not choose to adopt the Presbyterian regimen. He introduced his scheme where he had influence to do so; and he employed all the vigor of his talents in pressing upon distant churches the propriety of regulating, in conformity with his sentiments, their ecclesiastical government. But, at the same time, he says, "Wherever the preaching of the Gospel is heard with reverence, and the sacraments are not neglected, there at that time there is a church." Speaking of faithful pastors, he describes them to be "those who by the doctrine of Christ lead men to true piety, who properly administer the sacred mysteries, and who preserve and exercise right discipline."

The Reformers and greatest writers of the Church of England held that no form of Church polity is enjoined in Scripture. Cramer explicitly declared that bishops and priests were of the same order at the commencement of Christianity; and this was the opinion of several of his distinguished contemporaries. "Holding this maxim, their support of episcopacy must have proceeded from views of expediency, or, in some instances, from a conviction which prevailed very generally at this early period, that it belonged to the supreme civil magistrate to regulate the spiritual no less than the political government; an idea involving in it that no one form of ecclesiastical polity is of divine institution. At a later period, during the reign of queen Elizabeth, we find the same conviction, that it was no violation of Christianity to choose different modes of administering the Church. Archbishop Whitgift, who distinguished himself by the zeal with which he supported the English hierarchy, frequently maintains that the form of discipline is not particularly, and by name, set down in Scripture; and he also plainly asserts "that no form of Church government is by the Scriptures prescribed or commanded to the Church of God" (Watson, s. v.). Hooker maintains this prin-

ciple with great vigor in his *Ecclesiastical Polity* (book iii), where the following principles are laid down: 1. The Scripture, though the only standard and law of doctrine, is not a rule for discipline. 2. The practice of the apostles, as they acted according to circumstances, is not an invariable rule for the Church. 3. Many things are left indifferent, and may be done without sin, although not expressly directed in Scripture. 4. The Church, like other societies, may make laws for her own government, provided they interfere not with Scripture. 5. Human authority may interpose where the Scripture is silent. 6. Hence the Church may appoint ceremonies within the limits of the Scriptures. Stillfleet indicates the same view at large in his *Irenicum*: "Those things may be said to be *jure divino* which are not determined one way or other by any positive law of God, but are left wholly as things lawful to the prudence of men, to determine them in a way agreeable to natural right and the general rules of the Word of God." His conclusion is that the reason or ground of Church government, the *ratio regiminis ecclesiastici*, is of divine right, but that the special mode or system of it is left to human discretion. In other words, it is a thing forever and immutably right that the Church should be under a definite form of government. This is undoubtedly *justum*. In no other way can the peace and unity of the Church be secured. But it is by no means equally indubitable what this form of government must be. The necessary end may be secured under diverse forms, as in the case of civil government. "Though the end of all be the same, yet monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy are in themselves lawful means for attaining the same common end. . . . So the same reason of Church government may call for an equality in the persons acting as governors of the Church in one place which may call for superiority and subordination in another" (*Irenicum*, p. 40 sq., Phila. 1840).

In the modern Church the Romanists and High Episcopalians claim divine right for their system of government. The Roman Catholic doctrine is thus stated (*The Catechism of the Council of Trent*, published by command of pope Pius V, Donovan's translation, Baltimore, n. d., 8vo): "Sitting in that chair in which Peter the prince of the apostles sat to the close of life, the Catholic Church recognises in his person the most exalted degree of dignity and the full amplitude of jurisdiction—a dignity and a jurisdiction not based on synodal or other human constitutions, but emanating from no less an authority than God himself. As the successor of St. Peter, and the true and legitimate vicar of Jesus Christ, he therefore presides over the universal Church, the father and governor of all the faithful, of bishops also, and of all other prelates, be their station, rank, or power what they may" (p. 222). And (p. 82), speaking of the power of the keys, "it is a power not given to all, but to bishops and priests only." The following extracts from bishop Forbes's *Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles* (London and New York, 1867-8, 2 vols. 8vo) present a High-Church Episcopalian view of this subject: "Thus one department of the Church is to be called the *Ecclesia docens*. To the hierarchy, as distinguished from the great body of Christians, is committed the duty of handing down and communicating these truths" (Art. xix, p. 268 of vol. i). . . . "It having been shown in the preceding article that the *Ecclesia docens* hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and hath authority in controversies of faith, we come to consider one great channel or organ of that power—the oecumenical council. Given that the Church has this power, by whom or how is it to be exercised? By whom but by the apostolical ministry, who are appointed 'for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ;' by those to whom was committed the power of the keys, who had, among other duties connected with admission to communion,



to test the orthodoxy of applicants; by those whose important office it was to hand on the form of sound words which they had received to their successors" (Art. xxi, p. 288-9 of vol. i). . . . "Our Lord is the immediate founder of the hierarchy, because it was he who ordained the apostles bishops when he said to them, 'As my Father sent me, so send I you; receive the Holy Ghost: go ye into all the world and make disciples of every creature; whatsoever ye shall bind or loose on earth shall be bound or loosed in heaven.' These words denote a power without limit; its measure is the wants of humanity, its field of action the world. At the beginning of the Church there was one general episcopate" (Art. xxxvi, p. 699 of vol. ii). . . . "It is needless to add that the discipline as well as the doctrine of the Church was a purely internal matter, in which the state had no interest nor control. . . . The power of binding and loosing was the charter of all Church discipline, for it relegated the sanction of the visible Church into the unseen world. If salvation depended, *classe non errante*, upon Church membership, and Church membership, under certain laws, was in the hands of the hierarchy, it placed the control of the Church absolutely in their hands" (Art. xxxvii, p. 728-9 of vol. ii). The moderate Episcopalian (including Methodists and Moravians) generally hold that episcopacy is in harmony with Scripture, but is not divinely ordained as essential. For a temperate argument in favor of the conformity of the Episcopal Church organization to the Scriptures and the practice of the early Church, see Browne's *Exposition on the Thirty-nine Articles* (Amer. ed. N. Y. 1865, Art. xxiii, p. 549-576). Archbishop Whately (*The Kingdom of Christ*, 2d ed. N. Y. 1843, 12mo) says (p. 93): "Thus a further confirmation is furnished of the view that has been taken, viz., that it was the plan of the sacred writers to lay down clearly the principles on which Christian churches were to be formed and governed, leaving the mode of application of those principles undetermined and discretionary." And again (p. 213): "They," i. e. reformers compelled to separate, "have an undoubted right, according to the principles I have been endeavoring to establish, to appoint such orders of Christian ministers, and to allot to each such functions as they judge most conducive to the great ends of the society; they may assign to the whole, or to a portion of these, the office of ordaining others as their successors; they may appoint one superintendent of the rest, or several, under the title of patriarch, archbishop, bishop, moderator, or any other that they may prefer; they may make the appointment of them for life or for a limited period, by election or by rotation, with a greater or a less extensive jurisdiction." Mr. Wesley (*Works*, vii, 284, N. Y. 1835) says: "As to my own judgment, I still believe 'the episcopal form of Church government to be scriptural and apostolical.' I mean, well agreeing with the practice and writings of the apostles. But that it is prescribed in Scripture I do not believe." Some Presbyterian writers claim that the Presbyterian polity is the only one divinely ordained. (See especially *The Divine Right of Church Government*, wherein it is proved that the Presbyterian government, by preaching and ruling elders, in sessional, presbyterial, and synodical assemblies, may lay the only lawful claim to a divine right according to the holy Scriptures, by sundry ministers of Christ within the city of London. With an Appendix, containing extracts from some of the best authors who have written on Church government, N. Y. 1844, 12mo.) The same ground is taken by many of the advocates of the Congregational system (see especially Dexter, *On Congregationalism*, Boston, 1865, 8vo, ch. ii).

The special forms of ecclesiastical polity adopted by the various churches will be found stated under the name of each Church in its alphabetical place in this Cyclopædia. We only note, in conclusion, one or two points in which all forms are concerned.

1. *Synodical government* (by councils, synods, assemblies, conferences, etc.) prevails in all the great churches of the world except the Independent (including Congregationalists and Baptists). Synods have "been the most universally received type of Church government in all ages; even the fact that they have undergone so many modifications only serving to bring out more prominently the unanimity with which they have been upheld on all sides, in the midst of so much discordancy respecting almost every other question connected with ecclesiastical polity. The Greek Church, glorying in its agreement with antiquity, will decide nothing of consequence without them still; in the Latin Church it has never ceased to be customary to appeal to them from the pope; the Church of England, which upholds, and the Church of Geneva, which has abjured episcopacy, have made them part and parcel of their respective ideals; in Russia it is the Holy Governing Synod by which its national Church affects to be ruled. More than this, they were ecclesiastical synods that introduced the principle of representative government to mediæval Europe" (Ffoulkes, *Christendom's Divisions*, i, 11).

2. The right of the laity, as an integral part of the Church, to share in its government, is admitted by all churches except the great hierarchical bodies. In the Church of England, Parliament (a lay body) is the central power in the government of the Church. In the Protestant Episcopal Church lay delegates are admitted to the Diocesan and General Conventions. In the Presbyterian Church they find their place in Presbytery, Synod, and Assembly. In the Independent churches the equality of laymen and ministers as to ecclesiastical rights and powers is fundamental. In the Methodist Episcopal Church the supreme judicatory (the General Conference) is as yet (1869) an exclusively clerical body. But that body has itself admitted the rights of the laity to the fullest extent by submitting to a popular vote (held in June, 1869) the fundamental question whether lay delegation shall be practically incorporated into the ecclesiastical system or not. The vote is by a very large majority in favor of lay delegation, and now (July, 1869) only the concurrence in the proposed changes of the Restrictive Rules of three fourths of all the members of the Annual Conferences, present and voting thereon, is required for the admission of lay delegates to the next General Conference in 1872. In the Methodist Episcopal Church South, this change in its polity was, by the General Conference held in 1866, likewise submitted to the Annual Conferences, and, having received the requisite approval, lay delegation has been incorporated into its economy. This subject of controversy in the Methodist Episcopal churches of the United States seems, therefore, now on the eve of settlement. For other points related to ecclesiastical polity, see CHURCH; CHURCH AND STATE; DISCIPLINE; EPISCOPACY; LAITY.

*Literature.* — Hooker, *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (*Works*, vol. i); Potter, *Discourse of Church Government* (*Works*, vol. ii); Stillingfleet, *Irenicum* (Philad. 1842, 8vo); Watson, *Institutes*, pt. iv; Litton, *Church of Christ* (Lond. 1851, 8vo); Barrett, *Ministry and Polity of the Christian Church* (Lond. 1854, 12mo); King, *Primitive Church* (N. Y. 12mo); Stevens, *Church Polity* (N. Y. 1852, 12mo); Coleman, *Primitive Church*, p. 38-50; Wilson, *On Church Government*; Davidson (Congregational), *Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament* (Lond. 1854, 12mo); Morris (Bishop), *On Church Polity* (18mo); Fillmore *Ecclesiastical Polity, its Forms and Philosophy*; Ripley (Congregational), *Church Polity* (Boston, 1867, 18mo); Garratt, *Inquiry into the Scriptural View of the Constitution of a Christian Church* (Lond. 1848); *New Englander*, August, 1860, art. vi (Congregational); Leicester A. Sawyer, *Organic Christianity, or the Church of God, with its Officers and Government, and its Divisions and Variations, both in ancient, mediæval, and modern Times* (Boston, 1854, 12mo; Congregational).

**Ecclesiasticus**, one of the most important of the apocryphal books of the O. T. (see ΑΠΟΚΡΥΦΑ), being of the class ranked in the second canon. See DEUTERO-CANONICAL.

I. *Title*.—The original Hebrew title of this book, according to the authority of the Jewish writings and St. Jerome (*Pref. in Libr. Sol.* ix, 1242), was סֵפֶר הַחִכְמָה, *Proverbs*, or, more fully, סֵפֶר הַחִכְמָה בְּיַד יֵשׁוּעַ בֶּן־סִרְחַי, *the Proverbs of Jesus, son of Sirach*, which was abbreviated, according to a very common practice, into סֵפֶר־חִכְמָה. *Ben-Sirach*; סִרְחַי, *Sirach*, which we find in a few later writers, evidently originated from a desire to imitate the Greek *Σωφάξ*. Hence all the quotations made from this book in the Talmud and Midrashim are under these titles. (Comp. Mishna, *Yadaim*, iii, 15; *Chagigā*, p. 15; *Midrash Rabba*, p. 6, b.; *Tanchuma*, p. 69, a, etc.) The Greek MSS. and fathers, however, as well as the prologue to this book, and the printed editions of the Sept., designate it *Σοφία Ἰησοῦ υἱοῦ Σωφάξ* (v. r. *Σωφάξ*, and even *Σωφάξ*), *The wisdom of Jesus, the son of Sirach*, or, by way of abbreviation, *Σοφία Σωφάξ*, *The wisdom of Sirach*, or simply *Sirach*; also *σοφία ἢ παράδειρος*, or simply *ἢ παράδειρος*, *The book of all virtues*, because of the excellency and diversity of the wisdom it propounds (Jerome, *l. c.*; comp. Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* i, 278). In the Syriac version the book is entitled *The book of Jesus, the son of Simon Asiro* (i. e. the bound); and the same book is called *the wisdom of the Son of Asiro*. In many authors it is simply styled *Wisdom* (Orig. in *Matt.* xiii, § 4; compare Clem. Al. *Pæd.* i, 8, § 69, 72, etc.), and *Jesus Sirach* (August. *ad Simplic.* i, 20). The name *Ecclesiasticus*, by which it has been called in the Latin Church ever since the second half of the fourth century (Rufinus, *Vers.*; Orig. *Hom.* in *Num.* xvii, 3), and which has been retained in many versions of the Reformers (e. g. the Zurich Bible, Coverdale, the Geneva version, the Bishops' Bible, and [together with the other titl.] the Auth. Version) is derived from the *old Latin version*, adopted by Jerome in the Vulgate, and is explained to mean *church reading-book*. Calmet, however, is of opinion (*Preface*) that this name was given to it because of its resemblance to *Ecclesiastes*. But as this explanation of the title is very vague, it is rightly rejected by Luther, and almost all modern critics. The word, like many others of Greek origin, appears to have been adopted in the African dialect (e. g. Tertull. *De pudic.* c. 22, p. 435), and thus it may have been applied naturally in the *Vetus Latina* to a *church reading-book*; and when that translation was adopted by Jerome (*Pref. in Libro Sol. juxta LXX.* x. 404, ed. Migne), the local title became current throughout the West, where the book was most used. The right explanation of the word is given by Rufinus, who remarks that "it does not designate the author of the book, but the character of the writing," as publicly used in the services of the Church (*Comm. in Symb.* § 38). The special application by Rufinus of the general name of the class (*ecclesiastici* as opposed to *canonici*) to the single book may be explained by its wide popularity. Athanasius, for instance, mentions the book (*Ep. Fest.* s. f.) as one of those "framed by the fathers to be read by those who wish to be instructed (*κατηχεῖσθαι*) in the word of godliness."

II. *Design and Method*.—The object of this book is to propound the true nature of wisdom, and to set forth the religious and social duties which she teaches us to follow through all the varied stages and vicissitudes of this life, thus exhibiting the practical end of man's existence by reviewing life in all its different bearings and aspects. Wisdom is represented here, as in Proverbs, as the source of human happiness, and the same views of human life, founded on the belief of a recompense, pervade the instructions of this book also, wherein, however, a more matured reflection is per-

ceptible (De Wette's *Einleitung*). It is, in fact, the composition of a philosopher who had deeply studied the fortunes and manners of mankind, and did not hesitate to avail himself of the philosophy of older moralists: xii, 8-xiii, 23; xv, 11-20; xvi, 26-xvii, 20; xix, 6-17; xxiii, 16-27; xxvi, 1-18; xxx, 1-13; xxxvii, 27; xxxviii, 15, 24-xxxix, 11, etc. (*ib.*). It abounds in grace, wisdom, and spirit, although sometimes more particular in inculcating principles of politeness than those of virtue (Cellerier, *Introd. à la Lecture des Liv. Saints*). It is not infrequently marked by considerable beauty and elegance of expression, occasionally rising to the sublimest heights of human eloquence (*Christian Remembrancer*, vol. ix). It has been observed of it by Addison (see Horne's *Introd.* vol. iv) that "it would be regarded by our modern wits as one of the most shining tracts of morality that are extant if it appeared under the name of a Confucius, or of any celebrated Grecian philosopher."

In addition to the fact that no Palestinian production, whether inspired or uninspired, can be reduced to a logically developed treatise according to Aristotelian rules, there are difficulties in tracing the plan of this book, arising from the peculiar circumstances of the author, as well as from the work itself. Ben-Sirach brings to the execution of his plan the varied experience of a studious and practical life, and in his great anxiety not to omit any useful lesson which he has gathered, he passes on, after the manner of an *Eastern* logic, from the nature of heavenly wisdom to her godly teachings, from temptation in her varied forms to filial duties; he discloses before the eyes of his readers the inward workings of the heart and mind, he depicts all passions and aspirations, all the virtues and vices, all the duties towards God and man, in proverbs and apothegms, in sayings which have been the property of the nation for ages, and in maxims and parables of his own creation, with a rapidity and suddenness of transition which even an Eastern mind finds it at times difficult to follow. Add to this that the original Hebrew is lost, that the Greek translation is very obscure, that it has been mutilated for dogmatic purposes, and that some sections are transposed beyond the hope of readjustment, and the difficulty of displaying satisfactorily the method or plan of this book will at once be apparent, and the differences of opinion respecting it will be no matter of surprise. The book (see Fritzsche's *proleg.* in his *Commentar*) is divisible into seven parts or sections: 1. Comprising chaps. 1-xvi, 21, describes the nature of wisdom, gives encouragements to submit to it, as well as directions for conducting ourselves in harmony with its teachings; 2. xvi, 22-xxiii, 17, shows God in the creation, the position man occupies with regard to his Maker, gives directions how he is to conduct himself under different circumstances, and how to avoid sin; 3. xxiv, 1-xxx, 24; xxxiii, 12-xxxvi, 16<sup>a</sup>; xxx, 25-27, describes wisdom and the law, and the writer's position as to the former, gives proverbs, maxims, and admonitions about the conduct of men in a social point of view; 4. xxx, 28-xxxiii, 11; xxxvi, 16<sup>b</sup>-22, describes the wise and just conduct of men, the Lord and his people; 5. xxxvi, 23-xxxix, 11, instructions and admonitions about social matters; 6. xxxix, 12-xlii, 14, God's creation, and the position man occupies with regard to it; 7. xlii, 11-1, 26, the praise of the Lord, how he had glorified himself in the works of nature, and in the celebrated ancestors of the Jewish people. Thereupon follows an epilogue, ch. l. 27-29, in which the author gives his name, and declares those happy who will ponder over the contents of this book, and act according to it; as well as an appendix, ch. li, 1-30, praising the Lord for deliverance from danger, describing how the writer has successfully followed the paths of wisdom from his very youth, and calling upon the uneducated to get the precious treasures of wisdom.

III. *Its Unity*.—The peculiar difficulties connected

both with the plan of the book and the present deranged condition of its text will have prepared the reader for the assertions made by some that there is no unity at all in the composition of this book, and that it is, in fact, a compilation of divers national sayings, from various sources, belonging to different ages (see Davidson, in Horne's *Introd.* ii, 1013 sq.). Encouragement is sought for these assertions from the statement in the spurious prologue of this book, *ὁ μόνον τὰ ἐτέρων τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ συνετῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀπαφθέγματα συνέγαγεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ἴδια τινα ἀπεφθέγγετο*, as well as from the remark of St. Jerome: "Quorum priorem [*πανάτορον* Jesu filii Sirach librum] Hebraicum reperi, non *Ecclesiasticum* ut apud Latinos, sed *Parabolus* prænatum, cui juncti erant *Ecclesiasticus* et *Canticum Canticorum*, ut similitudinem Salomonis non solum librorum numero, sed etiam materiarum genere cœquaret" (*Pref. in Libr. Solom.*), which seems to imply that the book of Ben-Sira was intended to answer to all the three reputed works of Solomon. So also Luther. Eichhorn can see in it three different books: the first book consists of chaps. i-xxiii, comprising desultory remarks upon life and morals, and is divisible into two sections, viz. (a) i-ix, and (b) x-xxiii; the second book comprises xxiv-xlii, 14, begins with a vivid description of wisdom, whereupon follow remarks and maxims without any order; and the third book, comprising xlii, 15-1, 24, is the only portion of Sirach carefully worked out, and contains praise of God and the noble ancestors of the Hebrews (*Einführung in d. Ap.* p. 50, etc.). Ewald, again, assures us that Ben-Sira made two older works on Proverbs the basis of his book, so that his merit chiefly consists in arranging those works and supplementing them. The first of these two books originated in the fourth century before Christ, extends from ch. i to xvi, 21, and contains the most simple proverbs, written with great calmness. The second book originated in the third century before Christ, extends from xvi, 22, to xxxvi, 22, and displays the excitement of passions as well as some penetrating observations, and has been greatly misplaced in its parts, which Ewald rearranges. The third book, which is the genuine work of Ben-Sira, extends from xxxvi, 23, to li, 50, with the exception of the song of praise contained in xxxix, 12-35, which belongs to the author of the second work (*Geschichte d. V. Isr.* iv, 300, etc.; *Jahrh.* iii, 131, etc.). These must suffice as specimens of the opinions entertained by some respecting the unity of this book. Against this, however, is to be urged—1. That the difference in form and contents of some of the constituent parts by no means precludes the unity of the whole, seeing that the writer brought to the illustration of his design the experience of a long life, spent both in study and travelling. 2. That this is evidently the work of the author's life, and was written by him at different periods. 3. That the same design and spirit pervade the whole, as shown in the foregoing section; and, 4. That the abruptness of some portions of it is to be traced to the Eastern style of composition, and more especially to the present deranged state of the Greek translation.

IV. *Author and Date.*—This is the only apocryphal book the author of which is known. The writer tells us himself that his name is *Jesús* (Ἰησοῦς, יֵשׁוּעַ, יְהוֹשֻׁעַ, i. e. *Jeshua*), the son of *Sirach*, and that he is of *Jerusalem* (1, 27). Here, therefore, we have the production of a Palestinian Jew. The conjectures which have been made to fill up this short notice are either unwarranted (e. g. that he was a physician, from xxxviii, 1-15) or absolutely improbable. There is no evidence to show that he was of priestly descent; and the similarity of names is scarcely a plausible excuse for confounding him with the Hellenizing high-priest Jason (2 Macc. iv, 7-11; Georg. Sync. *Chronogr.* p. 276). In the Talmud, the name of Ben-Sira (בְּנֵי סִרָּה) for which סִרָּה is a late error, Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth.* p. 311)

occurs in several places as the author of proverbial sayings which in part are parallel to sentences in Ecclesiasticus, but nothing is said as to his date or person, and the tradition which ascribes the authorship of the book to Eliezer (B.C. 260) is without any adequate foundation (Jost, *ib.*; yet see note 1). The Palestinian origin of the author is, however, substantiated by internal evidence, e. g. xxiv, 10 sq. For the various speculations advanced about the personal character, acquirements, and position of the author, we must refer to the article *JESUS, SON OF SIRACH*. That the book should have been ascribed by the Latin Church to Solomon, notwithstanding this plain declaration of the book itself, the discreditable terms in which Solomon is spoken of, the reference to Solomon's successors, to prophets and other great men who lived before and after the Babylonish captivity, the mention of the twelve minor prophets (xlix, 10), the citation from the prophet Malachi (comp. xlviii, 10, with Mal. iv, 6), and the description of the high-priest Simon (chap. I), only shows what the fathers can do.

The age of the book has been, and still is, a subject of great controversy. The life-like description of the high-priest Simon, contained in chap. I, seems to indicate that the writer had seen this high functionary officiate in the Temple; but there were two high priests of the same name, viz. Simon, son of Onias, surnamed *the Just*, or *the Pious*, who lived B.C. cir. 370-300, and Simon II, son of Onias, who lived in the reign of Ptolemy Philopator, B.C. 217-195 (3 Macc. i, 2). See *Simon*. Some interpreters, therefore, are of opinion that Simon I is described by Ben-Sira, whilst others think that Simon II is intended. The lives and acts of these two pontiffs, however, as well as the esteem in which they were respectively held by the people, as recorded in their national literature, must show to which of these two high-priests the description of Ben-Sira is applicable. 1. The eucumiums show beyond doubt that one of Israel's *most renowned* high-priests is described, whereas Simon II was so little distinguished that Josephus cannot relate a single good thing about him. 2. Ben-Sira characterizes him as *the deliverer of his people from destruction*; whereas in the time of Simon II no deliverance of either the people or the Temple was necessary. 3. In the time of Simon II, Hellenism, the great enemy of Judaism, which was represented by the sons of Tobias, had made great progress; and if Ben-Sira had written about this time, we should have had some censures from this pious poet of these thoughtless and godless innovations, whereas there is no allusion to these throughout the whole of this book. This appears the more strange when it is borne in mind that Simon II himself sided with these faithless sons of Tobias, as Josephus distinctly declares (*Ant.* xii, 4, 11). 4. It is utterly impossible that such a man as Simon II should be described in such extraordinary terms in the catalogue of national benefactors, and that Simon I, the personification of goodness, nobility, and grandeur, whom the nation crowned with the title *the Just, the Pious*, should be passed over with silence. 5. No Jew, on reading so sublime a description of the high-priest, would ever think, with his national traditions before him, of applying it to any one else but *the Simon*, unless he were *distinctly told* that it was intended for another Simon. These considerations, therefore, show that Ben-Sira's life-like description refers to Simon I. Now as Simon I died B.C. cir. 300, Ben-Sira must have written his work not earlier than 290-280, as chap. I implies that this high-priest was dead. (See also *infra*, sec. vi.)

V. *The original Language of the Book.*—The translator of this work into Greek most distinctly declares in his preface that it was written in Hebrew, and St. Jerome assures us that he had seen the Hebrew original (*vide supra*, sec. iii). That by the term *Ἑβραϊστί* is meant *Hebrew*, and not *Aramaean*, is evident from

the numerous quotations made from this book both in the Talmud and the Mishramim. Compare

<i>Ben-Sira.</i>	<i>Talmud and Mishramim.</i>
Chap. iii, 20.....	Chagiga, 13; Bereshith Rab. 10.
" vi, 10.....	" vi, 10; Yebamoth, 63, b; Erub. 65, a.
" vii, 34.....	Derek Erets, 19, c. 4.
" ix, 8.....	Sanhed. 100, b; Yebamoth, 63.
" ix, 12 (Syriac)	Aboth, i, 5.
" xi, 1.....	Jer. Berach. 29, a; Nazir, 18, a; Beresh. Rab. 78, b.
" xi, 27.....	Sanhed. 100.
" xiii, 15.....	Baba Kama, 92, b.
" xiii, 25.....	Bereshith Rabba, 82.
" xiii, 51.....	Bereshith Rabba, 64, b.
" xiv, 11.....	Erubin, 54, a.
" xiv, 17.....	Erubin, 71.
" xv, 8.....	Pesachim, 66; Erubin, 55, a.
" xviii, 23.....	Taanitha Vayikra, 41, b.
" xxv, 3, 4.....	Pesachim, 113.
" xxv, 13.....	Sabbath, 11, a.
" xxvi, 1.....	Sanhed. 100; Yebamoth, 63, b.
" xxvi, 20.....	Nida, 70.
" xxvii, 9.....	Baba Kama, 92, b.
" xxviii, 14.....	Vayikra Rab. 153, a.
" xxx, 21.....	Sanhed. 100, b.
" xxx, 25.....	Yebamoth, 63, b.
" xxxviii, 1.....	Sanhed. 44; Taanith, 9, a; Shemoth. R. 106, b.
" xxxviii, 4 S.....	Beresh. Rab. 8, a; Yalkut Job, 148.
" xxxviii, 16-23.....	Moed Katon, 27.
" xl, 28.....	Betza, 32, b; Yalkut Job, 149.
" xlii, 9, 10.....	Sanhedrin, 100, b.

By some writers, however, it is thought that the *Sentences of Ben-Sirach*, cited in the Talmud (*Sanhed. Gem.* xi, 42; *Bereshith Rabba*, viii, f. 10; *Baba Kama*, f. 92, c. 2), and published in Latin by Paul Fagius (1542), and in Hebrew, Chaldee, and Latin by Drusius (1597), though so similar to those in Ecclesiastics, are, upon the whole, a different work (Eichhorn's and Bertholdt's *Introductions*).

Almost all of these quotations are in *Hebrew*, though the works in which they are found are in *Aramaean*, thus showing beyond doubt that the book of Ben-Sira was written in genuine Hebrew. Besides, some of the blunders in the Greek can only be accounted for from the fact that the original was Hebrew. Thus, for example, in xxiv, 25 we read, "He maketh knowledge to come forth as light, as Gihon in the days of vintage," where the parallelism Γήσων = גִּיחֹן (Gen. ii, 13), whereby the Nile was designated in later times, which the Sept. also understands by גִּיחֹן (Jer. ii, 28), shows that *ὡς φῶς* in the first hemistich originated from the translator's mistaking the Hebrew כְּנֵרִים, like a stream, for כְּנֵרִים, like light. Comp. also xlix, 9, which is most unintelligible in the Greek through the translator's mistaking the Hebrew בְּזָרִים בְּזָרִים. Bishop Lowth, indeed, went so far as to assert that the translator "seems to have numbered the words, and exactly to have preserved their order, so that, were it literally and accurately to be retranslated, I have very little doubt that, for the most part, the original diction would be recovered." The learned prelate has actually retranslated chap. xxiv into Hebrew (*Hebrew Poet. Lect.* xxiv, Oxford ed. 1821, p. 254). This retranslation is also printed by Fritzsche, who has added some corrections of his own, and who also gives a translation of chap. i.

VI. *The Greek and other Translations of this Book.*—The Greek translation incorporated in the Sept. was made by the grandson of the author (ὁ πάτριος μου Ἰησοῦς), who tells us that he came from Palestine into Egypt in his thirty-eighth year, "in the reign of Euergetes" (ἐν τῷ ὀγδόῳ καὶ τρακοστῷ ἔτει ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἐυεργέτου βασιλεύοντος). But there were two kings who have borne this name—Euergetes I, son and successor of Ptolemy II, Philadelphus, B.C. 247-222, and Euergetes II, i. e. Ptolemy VII, known by the nickname Physcon, the brother of Ptolemy VI, B.C. 145-116, and the question is, which of these two is meant? Now, if Ben-Sira wrote B.C. cir. 290-280, when an old man, and if we take ὁ πάτριος μου to mean *great-*

*grandfather*, a sense which it frequently has, and that the translator was born after the death of his illustrious ancestor, his arrival in Egypt in his thirty-eighth year would be B.C. cir. 230, i. e. in the reign of Euergetes I. On the other hand, the manner in which the translator speaks of the Alexandrine version of the Old Testament, and the familiarity which he shows with its language (e. g. xlv, 16, Ἐνώχ μετετέθη), Gen. v, 24; comp. Linde, ap. Eichhorn, p. 41, 42), is scarcely consistent with a date so early as the middle of the third century. Winer (*De utr. Sirac. etate*, Erlang. 1832) maintains that Simon the Just is the person referred to, but that it is not necessary to conclude that the author was his contemporary. He thinks that, although the grammatical construction rather requires *ἔτει τῷ ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἐυεργέτου* to refer to the age of the monarch's reign, Euergetes the Second was the king in whose reign the translation was made, and that the canon could not have been yet closed under the reign of the first Euergetes, as implied in the preface—"the law, the prophets, and the other books." As there appears to be no special reason for the translator's reference to *his own* age, the date has been taken to allude to that of the reigning Ptolemy by many critics since Eichhorn, e. g. by Bruch, Palfrey, Davidson, Ewald, Fritzsche, etc. The "thirty-eighth year of his reign," although not applicable to the first Euergetes, may refer to the second, if his regency be included. According to this, which De Wette conceives the most probable hypothesis, the translator would have lived B.C. 130, and the author B.C. 180. But if, with most interpreters, the chronological datum in question refers to the translator's own age, then the grandson of the author was already past middle-age when he came to Egypt: and if his visit took place early in the reign of Ptolemy Physcon, it is quite possible that the book itself was written while the name and person of the last of "the men of the great synagogue" was still familiar to his countrymen. Even if the date of the book be brought somewhat lower than the times of Simon the Just, the importance of the position which that functionary occupied in the history of the Jews would be a sufficient explanation of the distinctness of his portraiture; and the political and social troubles to which the book alludes (ii, 6, 12; xxxvi, sq.) seem to point to the disorders which marked the transference of Jewish allegiance from Egypt to Syria rather than to the period of prosperous tranquillity which was enjoyed during the supremacy of the earlier Ptolemies. On the whole, therefore, we may conclude that the book was probably written B.C. cir. 200, and translated B.C. cir. 140.

The present state of this translation, however, is very deplorable; the text as well as the MSS. are greatly disfigured by numerous interpolations, omissions, and transpositions. The *Old Latin* version, which Jerome adopted in the Vulgate without correcting it, was made from this Greek translation, and, besides being barbarous in style, is also greatly mutilated, and in many instances cannot be harmonized with its original. Even in the first two chapters the following words occur which are found in no other part of the Vulgate: *defunctio* (i, 13), *religiositas* (i, 17, 18, 26), *compartior* (i, 24), *inhonoratio* (i, 38), *obductio* (ii, 2; v, 1, 10), *receptibilis* (ii, 5). The Syriac alone is made direct from the Hebrew, and contains a quotation made by Jose ben-Jochanan about 150 B.C. (comp. *Aboth*, i, 5 with Ben-Sira ix, 12), which the secondary versions have not, because it was dropped from the Greek. Notwithstanding the ill treatment and the changes which this version has been subjected to, it is still one of the best auxiliaries for the restoration of the old text. The Arabic seems to have been made from the Syriac: whilst the old English version of Coverdale, as usual, follows the Zurich Bible and the Vulgate, the Bishops' Bible again copies Coverdale; the Geneva version, as is often the case, departs from the other

English version for the better. The present A. V. chiefly follows the Complutensian edition of the Greek and the Latin Vulgate. The arrangement, however, of chaps. xxx, 25-xxxvi, 17 in the Vatican and Complutensian editions is very different. The English version here follows the latter, which is supported by the Latin and Syriac versions against the authority of the Uncial MSS. The extent of the variation may be seen in the following table:

Compl., Lat., Syr., A. V.	Vat. MSS. "A, B, C."
xxx, 25	xxxiii, 13, λαμπρά καρδία, κ. τ. λ.
xxxii, xxxii	xxxiv, xxxv.
xxxiii, 16, 17, ἡγρόπνησα	xxxvi, 1-16.
xxxiii, 10 sq. ὡς καλαμώνες	xxxv, 25 sq.
xxxiv, xxxv	xxxii, xxxii.
xxxvi, 1-11, φολίς Ἰακώβ	xxxiii, 1-13.
xxxvi, 12 sq. καὶ κατεκλήρονόμησα.	xxxvi, 17 sq.

The most important interpolations are: i, 5, 7; 18b, 21; iii, 25; iv, 23b; vii, 26b; x, 21; xii, 6c; xiii, 25b; xvi, 15, 16, 22c; xvii, 5, 9, 16, 17a, 18, 21, 23c, 26b; xviii, 2b, 3, 27c, 33c; xix, 5b, 6a, 13b, 14a, 18, 19, 21, 25c; xx, 3, 14b, 17b, 32; xxii, 9, 10, 23c; xxiii, 3e, 4e, 5b, 28; xxiv, 18, 21; xxv, 12, 26c; xxvi, 19-27; 1, 29b. All these passages, which occur in the A. V. and the Compl. texts, are wanting in the best MSS. The edition of the Syro-Hexaplaric MS. at Milan, which is at present reported to be in preparation (since 1858), will probably contribute much to the establishment of a sounder text.

The name of the Greek translator is unknown. He is commonly supposed to have borne the same name as his grandfather, but this tradition rests only on conjecture or misunderstanding (Jerome, *Synops. S. Script.* printed as a Prologue in the Compl. ed. and in the A. V.).

VII. *Canonicity.*—Though this book has been quoted in the Jewish Church as early as B.C. 150 and 100, by Jose ben-Jochanan (*Aboth*, i, 5) and Simon ben-She-tach (*Nazir*, v, 3), and references to it are dispersed through the Talmud and Midrashim (*rile sup. sec. v*), yet these latter declare most distinctly that it is not canonical. Thus *Yadain*, c. ii, says *the book of Ben-Sira, and all the books written from its time and afterwards, are not canonical.* We also learn from this remark that Ben-Sira is the *oldest* of all apocryphal books, thus confirming the date assigned to it in section iv. Again, the declaration made by R. Akiba, that he who studies uncanonical books will have no portion in the world to come (*Mishna, Sanhed. x, 1*), is explained by the *Jer. Talmud* to mean the books of *Ben-Sira* and *Ben-Laiah* (comp. the Midrash on *Coheloth* xii, 12). It was never included by the Jews among their Scriptures; for though it is quoted in the Talmud, and at times like the Kethubim, yet the study of it was forbidden, and it was classed among "*the outer books*" (ספריים התיירים), that is, probably, those which were not admitted into the Canon (Dukes, *Rabb. Blumenlese*, p. 24 sq.).

Allusions to this book have been supposed to be not unfrequently discernible in the New Testament (compare, especially, *Eccles.* xxxiii, 13; *Rom.* ix, 21; xi, 19; *Luke* xii, 19, 20; v, 11; *James* i, 19, etc.; xxiv, 17, 18; *Matt.* xi, 28, 29; *John* iv, 13, 14; v, 35, etc.). The earliest clear coincidence with the contents of the book occurs in the epistle of Barnabas (c. xix=*Eccles.* iv, 31; compare *Const. Apost.* vii, 11), but in this case the parallelism consists in the thought and not in the words, and there is no mark of quotation. There is no sign of the use of the book in Justin Martyr, which is the more remarkable, as it offers several thoughts congenial to his style. The first distinct quotations occur in Clement of Alexandria; but from the end of the second century the book was much used and cited with respect, and in the same terms as the canonical Scriptures; and its authorship was often assigned to Solomon, from the similarity which it pre-

sented to his writings (*August. De Cura pro Mort.* 18). Clement speaks of it continually as *Scripture* (*Prod.* i, 8, § 62; ii, 2, § 34; 5, § 46; 8, § 69, etc.), as the work of Solomon (*Strom.* ii, 5, § 24), and as the voice of the great Master (παύλαγωγός, *Prod.* ii, 10, § 98). Origen cites passages with the same formula as the canonical books (γράφεται, in *Johann.* xxxii, § 14; in *Matt.* xvi, § 8), as *Scripture* (*Comm. in Matt.* § 44; in *Ep. ad Rom.* ix, § 17, etc.), and as the utterance of "*the divine word*" (c. *Cels.* vii, 50). The other writers of the Alexandrine school follow the same practice. Dionysius calls its words "*divine oracles*" (*Frag. de Nat.* iii, p. 1258, ed. Migne), and Peter Martyr quotes it as the work of "*the Preacher*" (*Frag.* i, § 5, p. 515, ed. Migne). The passage quoted from Tertullian (*De exhort. cast.* 2, "Sicut scriptum est: *Ecce posui ante te bonum et malum; gustasti enim de arbore agnitionis.*" etc.; compare *Eccles.* xv, 17, *Vulg.*) is not absolutely conclusive; but Cyriac constantly brings forward passages from the book as *Scripture* (*De bono pat.* 17; *De mortalitate*, 9, § 13), and as the work of Solomon (*Ep.* lxxv, 2). The testimony of Augustine sums up briefly the result which follows from these isolated authorities. He quotes the book constantly himself as the work of a prophet (*Serm.* xxxix, 1), the word of God (*Serm.* lxxxvii, 11), "*Scripture*" (*Lib. de Nat.* 33), and that even in controversy (c. *Jul. Pelag.* v, 36); but he expressly notices that it was not in the Hebrew Canon (*De Cura pro Mort.* 18), "though the Church, especially of the West, had received it into authority" (*De Civit.* xvii, 20; compare *Speculum*, iii, 1127, ed. Paris). Jerome, in like manner (*Præf. in Sap. Sir.* § 7), contrasts the book with "*the canonical Scriptures*" as "*doubtful,*" while they are "*sure;*" and in another place (*Prolog. Galeat.*) he says that it "*is not in the Canon,*" and again (*Prolog. in Libr. Sol.*) that it should be read "*for the instruction of the people (plebis), not to support the authority of ecclesiastical doctrines.*" The book is cited by Hippolytus (*Opp.* p. 192) and by Eusebius (*Opp.* iv, 21, etc.), but is not quoted by Irenæus; and it is not contained in the Canon of Melito, Origen, Cyril, Laodicea, Hilary, or Rufinus. See CANON.

But while the book is destitute of the highest canonical authority, it is a most important monument of the religious state of the Jews at the period of its composition. As an expression of Palestinian theology it stands alone; for there is no sufficient reason for assuming Alexandrine interpolations, or direct Alexandrine influence (Gröner, *Philo*, ii, 18 sq.). The translator may, perhaps, have given an Alexandrine coloring to the doctrine, but its great outlines are unchanged (comp. Dähne, *Relig. Philos.* ii, 129 sq.). The conception of God as Creator, Preserver, and Governor is strictly conformable to the old Mosaic type; but, at the same time, his mercy is extended to all mankind (xviii, 11-13). Little stress is laid upon the spirit-world, either good (xlviii, 21; xlv, 2; xxxix, 28?) or evil (xxi, 27?), and the doctrine of a resurrection fades away (xiv, 16; xvii, 27, 28; xlv, 14, 15. Yet comp. xlviii, 11). In addition to the general hope of restoration (xxxvi, 1, etc.), one trait only of a Messianic faith is preserved, in which the writer contemplates the future work of Elias (xlviii, 10). The ethical precepts are addressed to the middle class (Eichhorn, *Eint.* p. 44 sq.). The praise of agriculture (vii, 15) and medicine (xxxviii, 1 sq.), and the constant exhortations to cheerfulness, seem to speak of a time when men's thoughts were turned inwards with feelings of despondency and perhaps (Dukes, *u. s. p.* 27 sq.) of fatalism. At least the book marks the growth of that anxious legalism which was conspicuous in the sayings of the later doctors. Life is already imprisoned in rules; religion is degenerating into ritualism; knowledge has taken refuge in schools (compare Ewald, *Gesch. d. Volkes Isr.* iv, 298 sq.).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

VIII. *Commentaries, etc.*—Special exegetical works which have appeared on the whole of this book are the

following, of which the chief are designated by an asterisk prefixed: Rabanus Maurus, *In Ecclesiasticum* (in his *Opp.*); Anon. *Beschreib. u. Uebers.* (in Lorschach's *Archiv*, ii, 11 sq.); Alexander, *De libro Eccclus.* (in his *Hist. Eccles.* iii, 690); Bengel, *Muthmassliche Quelle*, etc. (in Eichhorn's *Bibliothek*, vii, 852-64); De Sacy, *L'Ecclesiastique* (in his *Sainte Bible*, xvi); Bossuet, *Liber Eccclus.* (in his *Œuvres*, xxii, 1 sq.); Couz, *Bemerkungen* (in Henke's *Mus.* ii, 177-243); \*Came-rarius, *Sententiæ J. S.* (Lips. 1570, 8vo); *Sapientia J. S.* (Lips. 1570, 8vo); Striegel, in his *Libri Sapientie* (Lpz. 1575, 12mo), p. 277 sq.; Drusius, *Eccclus. interpretatus* (Franeker, 1596, 4to); Höschel, *Sap. Sirachi* (Augsb. 1604, 4to); also in the *Crit. Sacri*, v; \*à Lapide, *Commentarius* (Antwerp, 1634, 1687, fol.); Stif-fer, *Homiliæ* (Lips. 1676, 4to); Calmet, *Commentaire* (Paris, 1707, fol.); in Latin, ed. Manse, Wirecb. 1792; viii, 351 sq.); \*Arnald, *Crit. Commentary* (Lond. 1748, fol., and often since); Koken, *Dus. B. Sirach* (Hildesheim, 1756, 12mo); Telens, *Disquisitiones* (Hafn. 1779, 8vo); Bauer, *Erläut. m. Anmerk.* (Bamberg, 1781, 1793, 8vo); Onymus, *Weisheit J. S.* (Würtzburg, 1788, 8vo); Sonntag, *De Jes. Siracide* (Riga, 1792, 4to); \*Linde, *Sententiæ Jes. Sir.* (Danz. 1795, 4to); also *Glaubens u. Sittenlehre Jes. Sir.* (Lpz. 1782, 1795, 8vo); Zange, *Denksprüche Jes. Sir.* (Amst. 1797, 8vo); Fed-dersen, *Jes. Sir. übers.* (Amst. 1797, 1827, 8vo); Ben-Seeb, *שִׁיר הַיֵּשׁוּעַ*, etc. (8vo, Breslau, 1798; Vienna, 1807, 1818, 1828); \*Bretschneider, *Lib. Jesu Sirac* (Ratisbon, 1806, 8vo); Gaab, *Diss. exegetica* (Tubing, 1809, 4to); Luther, *Das Buch J. S.* (Lpz. 1815, 1816, 12mo); Anon. *Jes. S. bearbeit.* (Lpz. 1826, 8vo); Howard, *Eccclus. tr. from the Vulg.* (Lond. 1827, 8vo); Anon. *Sirach, ein Spiegel* (Kreuznach, 1829, 8vo); Van Gilse, *Commentatio* (Grön. 1832, 4to); Grimm, *Commentar* (Lpz. 1837, 8vo); Gutmann, *Weisheits-Spruch J. S.* (Altona, 1841, 8vo); Dulk, *שִׁיר הַיֵּשׁוּעַ* (Warsaw, 1843, 8vo); Stern, *Weisheitsprüche J. S.* (Wien, 1844, 8vo); Hill, *Translation* (in the *Monthly Religious Mag.* Bost. 1852-53); \*Fritzsche, *Weish. J. S. erklärt u. übers.* (as part of the *Kurtz. Exeg. Handb. z. d. Apokr.* Lpz. 1860, 8vo); Cassel, *Uebers.* (Berl. 1866, 8vo). See also Rä-biger, *Ethica Apoc. V. T.* (Vratslav, 1838); Bruch, *Weisheits-Lehre der Hebräer* (Strasb. 1851); Geiger, in the *Zeitschr. d. Morgenl. Gesellsch.* 1858, p. 536 sq.; Horowitz, *Das Buch Sirach* (Bresl. 1865). Compare APOCRYPHA.

**Ecclesiology**, "a word of recent use, is the name which has been given in the British Islands to the study of Church architecture and decoration. Besides discriminating the various styles of ecclesiastical architecture, ecclesiology takes account of the ground-plan and dimensions of a church; of its orientation, or the deviation of its line from the true east; of its apse, or circular or polygonal east end; of its altar or communion-table, whether fixed or movable, stone or wood; of its reredos, dossel, or altar-screen; of its piscina, or basin and drain for pouring away the water in which the chalice was rinsed, or the priest washed his hands; of the sedilia, or seats for the priest, deacon, and sub-deacon, during the celebration of the Eucharist; of the ambry, or locker, for the preservation of the communion vessels and elements; of the 'Easter sepulchre,' or recess for the reception of the host from Good Friday till Easter day; of the altar-candlesticks; of the altar-steps; of the altar-rails; of the credence table, or shelf on which to place the communion elements before they were put upon the altar; of the 'misereres,' or elbowed stalls; of seats within and without the chancel walls; of the height of the chancel as compared with the nave; of the chancel arch; of the rood-screen, rood-staircase, rood-door, and rood-loft; of the piers or columns; of the triforium or blind-story; of the clerestory; of the windows; of the parvise-turret, or outside turret leading to the parvise; of the roof or groining; of the eagle-desks and lecturns;

of the pulpit; of the hour-glass stand, by which the preacher was warned not to weary the patience of the flock; of the reading pew; of the benches, pews, and galleries; of the aisles; of the shrine, fetour, or reliquary; of the benatura, or holy-water stoup; of the corbels, with special reference to the head-dress figured on them; of the pavement; of the belfry; of the baptismal font, with its accessories, the baptistery, the steps, the kneeling-stone, the chrismatory, the cover, and the desk; of the tower, with its lantern, parapet, pinnacles, louvres, windows, buttresses, and bells; of the porch and doors, with their niches and seats; of the parvise, or priest's chamber, above the porch; of the mouldings; of the pinnacle crosses; of the gurgoyles, or rain-spouts; of the church-yard or village cross; of the church-yard yew; of the lych-gate, or corpse-gate, where the corpse was met by the priest; of the crypt; of the confessional; of the hagioscope, or opening in the chancel arch through which the elevation of the host might be seen; of the lychoscope, or low window in the side wall of the chancel, the use of which is uncertain; of the chest for alms; of the table of the ten commandments; of the church plate; of the faldstool, or litany stool, of the embroidered work; of the images of saints; of the church well; of the sepulchral monuments and brasses, with their inscriptions; of the chapels or sacristies; of the vestry; of the dedication crosses. Ecclesiology has a literature of its own, including a monthly journal, called *The Ecclesiologist*. There are societies for promoting its study, one of which, 'The Ecclesiological, late Cambridge Camden Society,' has published *A Handbook of English Ecclesiology* (Lond. 1847).—Chambers, *Encyclopaedia*, s. v.

**Ecdippa**. See ACHIZIB.

**Echard, Jacques**, a learned Dominican, was born at Rouen September 22, 1644, and died at Paris March 15, 1724. He published *S. Thomæ Summa suo auctori vindicata, sive de V. P. Vincentii Bellouacensis scriptis dissertatio, in qui quid de speculo morali sententiarum aperitur* (1708, 8vo). He has contributed to illustrate his order by the "Library of Dominican Writers" (*Scriptores ordinis Prædicatorum recens. notisque illustrati, inchoavit J. Quetif, absolvit J. Echard* [Par. 1719-21, 2 vols. fol.]), which is held in high esteem by all bibliographers.—Hoefcr, *Nov. Biogr. Génér.* xv, 623.

**Echard, Lawrence**, A.M., archdeacon of Stowe, was born in Suffolk about 1671, and was educated at Christ's College, Cambridge. He was presented to the livings of Welton and Elkinton, Lincolnshire, and was made archdeacon of Stowe and prebendary of Lincoln in 1712. He died in 1730. In his *History of England*, written on High-Church principles, he relates facts with perspicuity; and the work is rendered entertaining by short characters of the most eminent literary men in the different periods of history. At present his writings are little valued. His chief works are, (1) *A general Ecclesiastical History, from the Nativity of our Saviour to the first Establishment of Christianity by human Laws under Constantine* (Lond. 1722, 2 vols. 8vo, 6th edit.);—(2) *The Roman History, from the building of the City to the removal of the imperial Seat by Constantine the Great* (Lond. 1707, 4 vols. 8vo);—(3) *The History of England to the end of the Revolution* (Lond. 1707-18, 3 vols. fol.).—Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 540; Kippis, *Biographia Britannica*, v, 552.

**Eck** or **Eckius**, JOHANNES (Johann Mayr von Eck), one of the most capable and violent of Luther's opponents, was born in Suabia, Nov. 13, 1486, the son of a peasant. He was educated at Heidelberg and Tübingen, and in 1516 was made professor and vice-chancellor at Ingolstadt. His intense ambition for literary fame stimulated him to unwearied activity and industry. In 1512 he was made vice-chancellor of the University of Ingolstadt. In 1514 he published *Centuriæ vi de Prædestinatione*; and lectured and wrote

on all sorts of subjects from 1514 to 1518. Ranke describes him as follows: "Eck was one of the most eminent scholars of his time; a reputation which he had spared no pains to acquire. He had visited the most celebrated professors in various universities: the Thomist Sïstern at Cologne, the Scotists Sumenhard and Scriptoris at Tübingen; he had attended the law lectures of Zasius in Freiburg, those on Greek of Reuchlin, on Latin of Bebel, on cosmography of Reusch. In his twentieth year he began to write and to lecture at Ingolstadt upon Occam and Biel's canon law, on Aristotle's dialectics and physics, the most difficult doctrines of dogmatic theology, and the subtleties of nominalistic morality; he then proceeded to the study of the mystics, whose most curious works had just fallen into his hands: he set himself, as he says, to establish the connection between their doctrines and the Orphicoplatonic philosophy, the sources of which are to be sought in Egypt and Arabia, and to discuss the whole in five parts (*Eckii Epistola de ratione studiorum suorum*, in Strobel, *Miscellanea*, iii, 97). He was one of those learned men who held that the great questions which had occupied men's minds were essentially settled; who worked exclusively with the analytical faculty and the memory; who were always on the watch to appropriate to themselves a new subject with which to excite attention, to get advancement, and to secure a life of ease and enjoyment. His strongest taste was for disputation, in which he had made a brilliant figure in all the universities we have mentioned, as well as in Heidelberg, Mainz, and Basle: at Freiburg he had early presided over a class (the Bursa zum Pfauen) where the chief business was practice in disputation; he then took long journeys—for example, to Vienna and Bologna—expressly to dispute there. It is most amusing to see in his letters the satisfaction with which he speaks of his Italian journey: how he was encouraged to undertake it by a papal nuncio; how, before his departure, he was visited by the young markgrave of Brandenburg; the very honorable reception he experienced on his way, in Italy as well as in Germany, from both spiritual and temporal lords, who invited him to their tables; how, when certain young men had ventured to contradict him at one of these dinners, he had confuted them with the utmost case, and left them filled with astonishment and admiration; and lastly, how, in spite of manifold opposition, he had at last brought the most learned of the learned in Bologna to subscribe to his maxims" (Kiederer, *Nachrichten*, iii, 47).

With such antecedents, Eck was prepared to take up arms against Luther (as, indeed, he was ready to take up arms against any man). They had been good friends, and Luther sent him his *Theses*. See LUTHER. Against these, in 1518, Eck wrote animadversions under the title *Obelisci* (given in Löscher, *Vollst. Ref. Act.* ii, 333 sq.), which were freely circulated, though the writer declared they were not meant to be published. Eck was at that time inquisitor for Bavaria, and what he said and wrote had great weight in fixing upon a man the reputation of heresy. Carlstadt (q. v.), at Luther's request, replied in 406 theses, in which he assailed both the learning and the orthodoxy of Eck, and very satirically. The controversy ended in a public *Disputation*, to which Carlstadt challenged Eck. According to a letter of Luther, written to Eck Nov. 15, 1518, Luther seems to have cherished the hope of a friendly settlement of the difficulty; but Eck was only puffed up by this tenderness of Luther, and in February, 1519, he printed an outline for the expected disputation, in which he endeavored again to impeach the University of Wittenberg, but more especially Carlstadt and Luther, particularly the latter, as holding heretical doctrines on penitence and on the papal power. Malice only could have inspired Eck here, as Luther had at that very time promised to Miltitz to discontinue the dispute. Luther was, of course, relieved

from his promise, and he so declared to the elector Frederick on the 13th of March. He wrote at once a reply to Eck, so unanswerable in all its points, and so full of severity, that Eck could no longer remain in doubt as to the fate which awaited him at Leipzig. Eck's aim was undoubtedly not so much to gain the mastery over Carlstadt as over Luther. He published (February, 1519) 13 theses, which he professed himself willing to defend against Luther. They referred chiefly to the doctrine of penitence and absolution, and the thirteenth especially sought to provoke an answer from Luther which should make him liable to the Inquisition for heresy. It read: "*Romanam Ecclesiam non fuisse superiorem aliis Ecclesiis ante tempora Sybestrî, negamus. Sed eum, qui sedem beatissimi Petri habuit et fidem, successorem Petri et Vicarium Christi generalem semper agnovimus.*" Eck here really gained his object. Luther accepted the challenge, and answered it by the following: "*Romanam Ecclesiam esse omnibus aliis superiorem, probatur ex frigidissimis Rom. Pontificum decretis, intra quadringentos annos natis. CONTRA quæ sunt historie approbate mille et centum annorum, textus scripture divine et decretum Niceni Concilii omnium sacratissimi.*" Eck, eager to bring Luther into a still more inextricable position as heretic, advanced, March 14, 1519, the following: "*Excusatio adversus criminationes Fr. M. Lutheri, ordinis Eremitarum,*" with the accusation that Luther was a coward, and that he only endeavored to advance Carlstadt in order that he might himself safely retreat. To this Luther replied in another "*Excusatio Fr. Martini Lutheri adversus criminationes Dr. Jo. Eckii,*" and with the assertion ("*Ich fürchte mich weder vor dem Pabste und des Pabstes Namen noch vor Pabstchen und Puppen*") (I am neither afraid of the pope or the pope's name, nor of popelings or puppets"). But Eck succeeded at least in frightening some true friends of Luther, and it was no easy task to quiet Spalatinus, who had grown very doubtful as to the final result of the dispute. But Luther was already decided not to spare the Roman see. The Roman Church he calls (De Wette, *Luther's Briefe*, i, 260) "Babylon;" the power of the Roman pontiff he counts among *worldly* powers (*ib.* i, 264). Meanwhile many causes delayed disputation. At last the personal interference of duke George, who asked of the bishop "not to defend the lazy priests, but to oblige them to meet the battle manfully, unless the pope should interfere," removed all obstacles.

The session opened at Leipsic June 27, 1519, and from that date to July 3 Eck and Carlstadt were the disputants. Eck admitted that the Scriptures were the ultimate rule of doctrine, and maintained a synergistic doctrine as to grace and free-will. Carlstadt supported the doctrine of the impotency of the will, and that good works are from grace alone. The controversy led to no result. "On Monday, the 4th of July, at seven in the morning, Luther arose; the antagonist whom Eck most ardently desired to meet, and whose rising fame he hoped to crush by a brilliant victory. He stood in the prime of manhood, and in the fulness of his strength: he was in his thirty-sixth year; his voice was melodious and clear; he was perfectly versed in the Bible, and its aptest sentences presented themselves unbidden to his mind; above all, he inspired an irresistible conviction that he sought the truth. The battle immediately commenced on the question of the authority of the papacy, which, at once intelligible and important, riveted universal attention. It was immediately obvious that Luther could not maintain his assertion that the pope's primacy dated only from the last four centuries: he soon found himself forced from this position by ancient documents; and the rather, that no criticism had as yet shaken the authenticity of the false decretals. But his attack on the doctrine that the primacy of the pope (whom he still persisted in regarding as the œcumenical bishop) was founded on Scripture and by divine right, was far

more formidable. Christ's words, 'Thou art Peter; feed my sheep,' which have always been cited in this controversy, were brought forward. In the exposition by Nicolas Lyranus also, of which Luther made the most use, there occurs this explanation, differing from that of the curia, of the passage in Matthew, chap. xvi: '*Quia tu es Petrus, i. e. confessor vera petra qui est Christus factus; et super hanc petram, quam confessus es, i. e. super Christum, edificabo ecclesiam meam.*' Luther labored to support the already well-known explanation of them, at variance with that of the curia, by other passages which record similar commissions given to the apostles. Eck quoted passages from the fathers in support of his opinions, to which Luther opposed others from the same source. As soon as they got into these more recondite regions, Luther's superiority became incontestable. One of his main arguments was that the Greeks had never acknowledged the pope, and yet had not been pronounced heretics; the Greek Church had stood, was standing, and would stand without the pope; it belonged to Christ as much as the Roman. Eck did not hesitate at once to declare that the Christian and the Roman Church were one; that the churches of Greece and Asia had fallen away, not only from the pope, but from the Christian faith—they were unquestionably heretics: in the whole circuit of the Turkish empire, for instance, there was not one soul that could be saved, with the exception of the few who adhered to the pope of Rome. 'How?' said Luther; 'would you pronounce damnation on the whole Greek Church, which has produced the most eminent fathers, and so many thousand saints, of whom not one had even heard of a Roman primate? Would Gregory of Nazianzen, would the great Basil, not be saved? or would the pope and his satellites drive them out of heaven?' These expressions prove how greatly the omnipotence and exclusive validity of the forms of the Latin Church, and the identity with Christianity which she claimed, were shaken by the fact that, beyond her pale, the ancient Greek Church, which she had herself acknowledged, stood in all the venerable authority of her great teachers. It was now Eck's turn to be hard pressed: he repeated that there had been many heretics in the Greek Church, and that he alluded to them, not to the fathers—a miserable evasion, which did not in the least touch the assertion of his adversary. Eck felt this, and hastened back to the domain of the Latin Church. He particularly insisted that Luther's opinion—that the primacy of Rome was of human institution, and not of divine right—was an error of the poor brethren of Lyons, of Wickliffe and Huss; but had been condemned by the popes, and especially by the general councils wherein dwelt the spirit of God, and recently at that of Constance. This new fact was as indisputable as the former. Eck was not satisfied with Luther's declaration that he had nothing to do with the Bohemians, nay, that he condemned their schism; and that he would not be answered out of the collectanea of inquisitors, but out of the Scriptures. The question had now arrived at its most critical and important moment. Did Luther acknowledge the direct influence of the divine Spirit over the Latin Church, and the binding force of the decrees of her councils, or did he not? Did he inwardly adhere to her, or did he not? We must recollect that we are here not far from the frontier of Bohemia; in a land which, in consequence of the anathema pronounced in Constance, had experienced all the horrors of a long and desolating war, and had placed its glory in the resistance it had offered to the Hussites: at a university founded in opposition to the spirit and doctrine of John Huss: in the face of princes, lords, and commoners, whose fathers had fallen in this struggle; it was said that delegates from the Bohemians, who had anticipated the turn which this conflict must take, were also present. Luther saw the danger of his position. Should he really reject the prevailing

notion of the exclusive power of the Roman Church to secure salvation? oppose a council by which John Huss had been condemned to the flames, and perhaps draw down a like fate upon himself? Or should he deny that higher and more comprehensive idea of a Christian church which he had conceived, and in which his whole soul lived and moved? Luther did not waver for a moment. He had the boldness to affirm that, among the articles on which the Council of Constance grounded its condemnation of John Huss, some were fundamentally Christian and evangelical. The assertion was received with universal astonishment. Duke George, who was present, put his hands to his sides, and, shaking his head, uttered aloud his wrothed curse, 'A plague upon it!' Eck now gathered fresh courage. It was hardly possible, he said, that Luther could censure a council, since his grace the elector had expressly forbidden any attack upon councils. Luther reminded him that the Council of Constance had not condemned all the articles of Huss as heretical, and specified some which were likewise to be found in St. Augustine. Eck replied that all were rejected; the sense in which these particular articles were understood was to be deemed heretical; for a council could not err. Luther answered that no council could create a new article of faith; how, then, could it be maintained that no council whatever was subject to error? 'Reverend father,' replied Eck, 'if you believe that a council regularly convoked can err, you are to me as a heathen and a publican' (*Disputatio Excellentissimorum Theologorum Johannis Eccii et D. Martini Lutheri Augustiniani quæ Lipsiæ capta fuit iudie Julii aō 1519. Opera Lutheri, Jena, i, 231*). Such were the results of this disputation. It was continued for a time, and opinions more or less conflicting on purgatory, indulgences, and penance were uttered. Eck renewed the interrupted contest with Carlstadt: the reports were sent, after the solemn conclusion, to both universities; but all these measures could lead to nothing further. The main result of the meeting was, that Luther no longer acknowledged the authority of the Roman Church in matters of faith. At first he had only attacked the instructions given to the preachers of indulgences, and the rules of the later schoolmen, but had expressly retained the decretals of the popes; then he had rejected these, but with appeal to the decision of a council; he now emancipated himself from this last remaining human authority also; he recognised none but that of the Scriptures" (Ranke, *History of Reformation*, Austin's transi., bk. ii, ch. iii).

After the disputation, in which Eck's pride of intellect had been grievously wounded, he wrote (July 23) a letter to the elector of Saxony exhorting him to discourage the pernicious doctrines of his professor, and to cause his books to be burned. Frederick replied with some delay and great moderation, and Carlstadt with bitterness. A bitter controversy followed, in which Melancthon took part, and Eck got the worst of it. In February, 1520, Eck also completed a treatise on the primacy, in which he promises triumphantly and clearly to confute Luther's assertion that "it is not of divine right." "Observe, reader," says he, "and thou shalt see that I keep my word." Nor is his work by any means devoid of learning and talent. After obtaining a condemnation of Luther from the universities of Louvain and Cologne, Eck went to Rome (1520) to present his book (*De Primatu*) to the pope, and to stir up feeling against Luther. His exhortations animated the enemies of Luther, and they at length prevailed upon the pope to summon a congregation on the subject, which passed sentence of condemnation upon Luther. Leo X indiscreetly appointed Eck as his nuncio for the promulgation of his bull in Germany. Elated by vanity, Eck set out with puerile exultation to inflict, as he thought, a fatal blow on his devoted adversary. In September he caused the bull to be fixed up in public places in Meis-



sen, Merseburg, and Brandenburg. "Everywhere he contended with force and energy, and on more than one occasion with success. Germany was his usual arena, where the bruit of controversy was almost invariably sustained by him. But in Switzerland his voice was likewise heard; and there, indeed, the papal interests were never upheld by any advocate of talent or distinction except himself and Faber. He was confronted in a long series of combats, during a space of twenty years, with all the chieftains of the Reformation; and, though he was defending what we are wont to consider the feebler cause, he never defended it feebly, or was overthrown with shame." He died February, 1543. His works against Luther embrace five volumes (*Opera contra Lutherum*, Augsburg, 1530-35). Besides this, and the work *De Primatu* already mentioned, Eck published *Exchirium Controversiarum* (last edit. Cologne, 1600); *Apologia contra Bucerum* (Ingolstadt, 1543), and others.—Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* iv, 532; Ranke, *Hist. of Reformation*; D'Aubigne, *Hist. of Reformation*, vol. i; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* bk. iv, c. xvii, sec. i, ch. ii, § 9, and ch. iii, § 13; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* iii, 626 sq.

**Eckart or Eckhardt** (called *Master Eckart*), a Dominican monk, one of the most profound thinkers of the Middle Ages. Of the time or place of his birth we have no record. He is first mentioned as a teacher at the College of St. James, at Paris. Having gone to Rome, where he received the degree of D.D., he was appointed provincial of Saxony, the appointment being confirmed by a chapter of his order held at Toulouse in 1294. In 1307 he was appointed vicar-general of Bohemia, with power to reform the Dominican convents. We afterwards find him again in Strasburg, preaching in the nunneries, and making acquaintances among the "Brethren of the Free Spirit." Having preached in Cologne, where archbishop Heinrich had already, in 1322, condemned the Beghards, Eckart, who inclined to them, brought upon himself the displeasure of the Church. Cited before the Inquisition in January, 1327, Eckart disclaimed heretical doctrines, and professed his willingness to recant any such that could be found in his teachings. A total recantation, however, being demanded of him, he refused, and in consequence was condemned as a heretic. He appealed to the pope, who, out of 28 points acknowledged by Eckart, condemned 17 as heretical and the remainder as suspicious. Notwithstanding this condemnation, Henry Suso's autobiography, published in 1360, calls him "the holy Master Eckart," and praises his "sweet doctrine." Copies of his sermons were made and preserved in numerous monasteries. Eckart has been claimed both by speculative philosophers and orthodox theologians; both by Protestants and Romanists. He is perhaps properly to be considered as the father of the modern mystical pantheism. He upheld the doctrines of the Brethren of the Free Spirit, but yet was free from their practical aberrations, as also from their opposition to the rites of the Church and to moral law. His writings have latterly been collected by Pfeiffer (*Deutsche Mystiker des 14<sup>ten</sup> Jahrh.* 1857, 2d vol.); they consist of 110 sermons, 18 treatises, 70 theses, and the *Liber positionum*. Before this, some of his sermons and short treatises, appended to Tauler's collection, Basle, 1521, were the only ones of his writings which were generally accessible.

See Schmid, in *Theol. Stud. u. Kritik.* (1839); *Mémoires de l'Acad. des Sciences mor. et polit.* (Schmid's *Etud. sur le mysticisme allem. au XIV<sup>me</sup> siècle*, Paris, 1847); Martensen, *Meister Eckart* (Hamburg, 1842); Schmid, in Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie*, iii, 638. All the writers here cited charge Eckart with pantheistic views. But Preger, in *Zeitschrift f. d. hist. Theol.* 1864, p. 163 sq., and 1866, p. 453 sq., publishes a new tract of Eckart's, not found in Pfeiffer's collection, and vindicates Eckart from the charge of pantheism. So also does Bach, in *Meister Eckhart, d. Vater d. deutschen*

*Speculation* (Wien, 1864), noticed in *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theologie*, 1867, p. 363.

**Eckermann, JACOB CHRISTOPH RUDOLPH**, was born September 6, 1754, at Wedendorf, in Mecklenburg-Schwerin. In 1782 he was appointed professor of theology at the University of Kiel, and Danish Church councillor. He died May 6, 1836. He is the author of *Erklärung aller dunklen Stellen des N. T.* (Kiel, 1806-1808, 3 vols. 8vo).—*Joel metrisch übersetzt mit einer neuen Erklärung* (Lüb. and Leipz. 1786, 8vo).—*Compend. theol. theor. bibl. histor.* (Altona, 1792, 8vo); a German edition of the same work, *Handb. für das systemat. Studium der Glaubenslehre*, in which he declares that the doctrines of Jesus are only a popular guide to a real adoration of the deity, and that whatever else the New Test. may contain is to be considered true only from an historical point of view (Altona, 1801-2, 4 vols. 8vo).—*Erinnerung an den unvergängl. u. unschätz. grossen Werth der Reformat. Iuthers* (Altona, 1817, 8vo), besides a number of other works, which have been collected in 6 vols. 8vo, under the title of *Theologische Beiträge* (Altona, 1790-99), and in two additional vols., *Vermischte Schriften* (ibid. 1799, 1800).—Wiener, *Theologische Literatur*; Kitto, *Cyclopaedia*, i, 725; Grässe, *Allgem. Literaturgeschichte*, vii, 872.

**Eclectics**, (1.) a sect of ancient philosophers, who professed to *select* (ἐκλέγειν) from all systems of philosophy what they deemed to be true. The *Eclectics* were chiefly *Neo-Platonists* (q. v.), and the philosophers chiefly *selected from* were Pythagoras, Plato, and Aristotle. "This union of the Aristotelian and Platonic philosophies was attempted first by Potamo of Alexandria, whose principles were taken up and maintained by Ammonius Saccas. It may be doubted, however, if the title of eclectics can be properly given to Potamo or Ammonius, the former of whom was in fact merely a Neo-Platonist, and the latter rather jumbled together the different systems of Greek philosophy (with the exception of that of Epicurus) than selected the consistent parts of all of them. The most eminent of the followers of Ammonius were Plotinus, Porphyry, Jamblichus, Proclus, and the ancient Eclecticism became at last little more than an attempt to reconcile Platonism with Christianity" (*Penny Cyclop.* ix, 265). See AMMONIUS.

Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* i, 228) said: "By philosophy I mean neither the Stoic, nor the Platonic, nor the Epicurean, nor the Aristotelian, but whatever things have been properly said by each of these sects, inculcating justice and devout knowledge—*this whole selection I call philosophy.*" "The sense in which this term is used by Clemens" (of Alexandria), says Mr. Maurice (*Mor. and Metaphys. Phil.* ii, 53), "is obvious enough. He did not care for Plato, Aristotle, Pythagoras, as such; far less did he care for the opinions and conflicts of the schools which bore their names; he found in each hints of precious truths of which he desired to avail himself; he would gather the flowers without asking in what garden they grew, the prickles he would leave for those who had a fancy for them. *Eclectic*ism, in this sense, seemed only like another name for catholic wisdom. A man, conscious that everything in nature and art was given for his learning, had a right to suck honey wherever it was to be found; he would find sweetness in it if it was hanging wild on trees and shrubs; he could admire the elaborate architecture of the cells in which it was stored. The Author of all good to man had scattered the gifts, had imparted the skill; to receive them thankfully was an act of homage to him. But once lose the feeling of *devotion and gratitude*, which belonged so remarkably to Clemens—once let it be fancied that the philosopher was not a mere receiver of treasures which had been provided for him, but an ingenious chemist and compounder of various naturally unsociable ingredients, and the eclectic doctrine would lead to more self-con-

ceit, would be more unreal and heartless than any one of the sectarian elements out of which it was fashioned. It would want the belief and conviction which dwell, with whatever unsuitable companions, even in the narrowest theory. Many of the most vital characteristics of the original dogmas would be effaced under pretence of taking off their rough edges and fitting them into each other. In general the superficialities and formality of each creed would be preserved in the new system; its original and essential characteristics sacrificed" (Fleming, *Vocabulary of Philosophy*, s. v.).

(2.) "Modern eclecticism is conceived by some to have originated with Bacon and Descartes, but Hegel may be more properly considered its founder. In his *Philosophy of History* and other works he endeavors, among other things, to point out the true and false tendencies of philosophic speculation in the various ages of the world; but it is to the lucid and brilliant eloquence of Victor Cousin (q. v.) that modern eclecticism owes its popularity. This system, if it can be so called, may best be defined as an effort to expound, in a critical and sympathetic spirit, the previous systems of philosophy. Its aim is to apprehend the speculative thinking of past ages in its historical development, and it is the opinion of some that such a method is the only one possible in our day in the region of metaphysics" (Chambers, *Encyclopaedia*, s. v.).—Murdoch's Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* bk. i, c. ii, pt. ii, ch. i; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* i, 658; Mosheim, *Commentaries*, ch. i, § 30. See AMMONIUS; PLATONISM.

**Eclipse.** An eclipse of the sun is caused by the intervention of the moon when new, or in conjunction with the sun, intercepting his light from the earth, either totally or partially. An eclipse of the moon is caused by the intervention of the earth, intercepting the sun's light from the moon when full, or in opposition to the sun, either totally or partially. An eclipse of either luminary can only take place when they are within their proper limits, or distances, from the nodes or intersections of both orbits. A total eclipse of the moon may occasion a privation of her light for an hour and a half, during her total immersion in the shadow; whereas a total eclipse of the sun can never last in any particular place above four minutes, when the moon is nearest to the earth, and her shadow thickest. See **SUN**; **MOON**.

No historical notice of an eclipse occurs in the Bible, but there are passages in the prophets which contain manifest allusion to this phenomenon. (Comp. *Lucan*, i, 540 sq.; *Virgil, Georg.* i, 466; *Curt.* iv, 3; *Evang. Nicod.* c. 11.) They describe it in the following terms: "The sun goes down at noon," "the earth is darkened in the clear day" (*Amos* viii, 9), "the day shall be dark" (*Mic.* iii, 6), "the light shall not be clear nor dark" (*Zech.* xiv, 6), "the sun shall be dark" (*Joel* ii, 10, 31; iii, 15). Some of these notices have been thought to refer to eclipses that occurred about the time of the respective compositions; thus the date of *Amos* nearly coincides with a total eclipse which occurred Feb. 9, B.C. 781, and was visible at Jerusalem shortly after noon (*Hitzig, Comm.* in Prop.); that of *Micah* with the eclipse of June 5, B.C. 716, referred to by *Dionys. Hal.* ii, 56, to which same period the latter part of the book of *Zechariah* has been assigned by some. A passing notice in *Jer.* xv, 9 nearly coincides in date with the eclipse of Sept. 30, B.C. 610, so well known from *Herodotus's* account (i, 74, 103). The Hebrews seem not to have philosophized much on eclipses, which they considered as sensible marks of God's anger (see *Joel* ii, 10, 31; iii, 15; *Job* ix, 7). *Ezekiel* (xxxii, 7) and *Job* (xxxvi, 32) speak more particularly, that God covers the sun with clouds when he deprives the earth of its light by eclipses. These passages, however, are highly figurative, and the language they present may simply be borrowed from the lurid look of the heavenly orbs as seen through a hazy atmosphere. Yet, when we read that "the sun shall

be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood," we can hardly avoid discerning an acquaintance with the appearance of those luminaries while under eclipse. The interruption of the sun's light causes him to appear black; and the moon, during a total eclipse, exhibits a copper color, or what Scripture intends by a blood color. See **ASTRONOMY**. The awe which is naturally inspired by an eclipse in the minds of those who are unacquainted with the cause of it rendered it a token of impending judgment in the prophetic books. See **EARTHQUAKE**.

The plague of darkness in Egypt has been ascribed by various neologistic commentators to non-miraculous agency, but no sufficient account of its intense degree, long duration, and limited area, as proceeding from any physical cause, has been given. See **PLAGUES OF EGYPT**.

*Josephus* mentions (*Ant.* xvii, 6, 4 s. f.) an eclipse of the moon as occurring on the night when Herod deprived Matthias of the priesthood, and burnt alive the seditious Matthias and his accomplices. This is of great importance in the chronology of Herod's reign, as it immediately preceded his own death. It has been calculated as happening March 13, B.C. 4. See **HEROD (THE GREAT)**.

The darkness ἐπι πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν of *Matt.* xxvii, 45, attending the crucifixion has been similarly attributed to an eclipse. See **CRUCIFIXION (OF CHRIST)**. *Phlegon* of Tralles, indeed, mentions an eclipse of intense darkness, and, beginning at noon, combined, he says, in Bithynia, with an earthquake, which, in the uncertain state of our chronology (see *Clinton's Fasti Romani*, *Olymp.* 202), more or less nearly synchronizes with the event. Nor was the account without reception in the early Church. See the testimonies to that effect collected by *Whiston (Testimony of Phlegon vindicated, London, 1732)*. *Origen*, however, ad loc. (*Latin commentary on Matthew*), denies the possibility of such a cause, arguing that by the fixed Paschal reckoning the moon must have been about full, and denying that *Luke* xxiii, 45, by the words ἰσκιώθη ὁ ἥλιος, means to allege that fact as the cause. The genuineness of this commentary has been impeached, nor is its tenor consistent with *Origen ad. Cel.* p. 80; but the argument, unless on such an assumption as that mentioned below, seems decisive, and has ever since been adhered to. He limits πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν to Judæa. *Dean Alford* (ad loc.), though without stating his reason, prefers the wider interpretation of all the earth's surface on which it would naturally have been day. That *Phlegon's* darkness, perceived so intense in Tralles and Bithynia, was felt in Judæa, is highly probable; and the evangelist's testimony to similar phenomena of a coincident darkness and earthquake, taken in connection with the near agreement of time, gives a probability to the supposition that the former speaks of the same circumstances as the latter. *Wieseler (Chron. Synop.* p. 388), however, and *De Wette (Comment.* on *Matt.*) consider the year of *Phlegon's* eclipse an impossible one for the crucifixion, and reject that explanation of the darkness. The argument from the duration (three hours) is also of great force, for an eclipse seldom lasts in great intensity more than six minutes. The darkness in this instance, moreover, cannot with reason be attributed to an eclipse, as the moon was at the full at the time of the Passover (q. v.). On the other hand, *Seyffarth (Chronolog. Sacr.* p. 58, 9) maintains that the Jewish calendar, owing to their following the sun, had become so far out that the moon might possibly have been at new, and thus, admitting the year as a possible epoch, revives the argument for the eclipse as the cause. He, however, views this rather as a natural basis than as a full account of the darkness, which in its degree at Jerusalem was still preternatural (*ib.* p. 138). The pamphlet of *Whiston* above quoted, and two by *Dr. Sykes, Dissertation on the Eclipse mentioned by Phlegon, and Defence of the*

same (London, 1733 and 1734), may be consulted as regards the statement of Philegon. Treatises on the phenomenon in question have been written in Latin by Baier (Regiom. 1718), Engeström (London, 1730), Fleischer (Viteb. 1692), Frick (Lips. 1692), Lauth (Argent. 1743), Pasch (Viteb. 1683), Posner (Jena, 1661), Schmid (Jena, 1683), Sommel (London, 1774), Töpfer (Jen. 1678), Wiedeberg (Helmst. 1687), Zeibich (Viteb. 1741), and in German by Grausbeck (Tübing. 1835). See DARKNESS.

**Economy**, "a term which properly means the arrangement of a household (*oikonomia*), but is also frequently employed by ecclesiastical writers for the practical measures adopted in order to give effect to a divine dispensation. The Jewish economy included all the details of spiritual and secular government, but the Christian economy, belonging to a 'kingdom not of this world,' has no direct reference to political arrangements" (Eden). See DISPENSATION.

**Ecthesis**, a proclamation or formula of faith, in the form of an edict, written by Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, published A.D. 639 by the emperor Heraclius, to put an end to the troubles occasioned by the Eutychian heresy. It prohibited all controversies on the question, Whether in Christ there were one or two operations? though in the same edict the doctrine of one will was plainly inculcated. A considerable number of the Eastern bishops declared their assent to this law, which was also submissively received by Pyrrhus, the new patriarch of Constantinople. In the West the case was quite different. The Roman pontiff, John IV, assembled a council at Rome, A.D. 629, in which the ecthesis was rejected, and the Monothelites were condemned (Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.* N. Y. ed. i, 453). A copy of it is given in Harduin, *Concilia*, iii, 791. See also Gieseler, *Church History*, i, § 126; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, iii, 154 sq. See EUTYCHIANS.

**Ecuador** (the Spanish term for *Equator*), a republic in South America. In lat. it extends from 1° 40' N. to 5° 50' S., while in W. long. it stretches from 69° to 81° 20'. It measures, therefore, from north to south fully 500 miles, and from east to west nearly 850, presenting an area of about 300,000 square miles. It is bounded by the United States of Colombia, Brazil, Peru, and the Pacific. The population in 1857 (according to Vilavencio) was 1,108,042, composed as follows: Whites (Creoles), 100,000; descendants of whites and Indians, 501,200; civilized Indians, 462,400; negroes, 7840; descendants of negroes and whites or negroes and Indians, 36,000; uncivilized Indians, 200,000. Ecuador, until the beginning of the present century, belonged to the Spanish viceroyalty of New Granada. After the establishment of the independence of the Spanish colonies, Ecuador formed part, until 1830, of the federal republic of Colombia. Since 1830 it has been an independent republic. The chief cities are Quito, the capital, and Guayaquil, the emporium of foreign trade. The government appears to have been constituted on the model of the United States of North America, having a president and vice-president, with a Senate and a House of Representatives. All the inhabitants belong to the Roman Catholic Church, which contains the following dioceses: 1. The archbishopric of Quito, established as an episcopal see in 1545, erected into an archbishopric in 1861; 2. the bishopric of Guayaquil, established in 1838; 3. the bishopric of Nueva Cuenca. The public exercise of no other religion is allowed by the Constitution of the state. There were, in 1855, 277 parochial and 106 viceparochial churches, 534 secular priests, 262 monks in 36 and 202 nuns in 11 convents. The University of Quito, established in 1586 by the Jesuits, has 4 colleges and several seminaries. There were 11 high schools, called colleges or seminaries, and 200 primary schools, of which 30 were for girls. Nearly all the

scholars were the children of the whites and mulattoes; the Indian population grows up almost without education. — *Allgemeine Real-Encycl.* iv, 1018; Vilavencio, *Geographia de la Republica del Ecuador* (N. Y. 1858). (A. J. S.)

**Ed**, i. e. "witness" (for Heb. *id.* עֵד), supplied (apparently on the authority of a few MSS. and also of the Syr. and the Arab. versions) in the A. V. as the name of the altar erected by the three tribes east of Jordan in commemoration of their adhesion to the others (Josh. xxii, 34). The commonly received Heb. text is literally as follows: "And the sons of Reuben and the sons of Gad called the altar [עֵד לְרֵעֵינוּ וְלְרֵעֵיכֶם], Sept. ἐπιπρόμαρον καὶ ἕπαν, Vulg. vocaverunt]; for a witness is this [עֵד הָיָה עֵד, Sept. ὅτι μαρτύριον ἐστίν, Vulg. testimonium]," etc., or as it may be rendered (עֵד הָיָה being sometimes used absolutely thus), "gave a name to the altar, [saying]," etc. The gloss is unnecessary (see Maurer, *Comment.* in loc.), for the latter clause furnishes both the name and the explanation (Keil, *Comment.* in loc.), i. e. "they named the altar (as follows), that 'This is a witness,'" etc. See OREB.

**E'dar** (Heb. *E'der*, עֵדָר, flock, as often rendered), the name of a tower (עֵדָרָה), beyond (עֵדָרָה) which Jacob first halted between Bethlehem and Hebron (Gen. xxxv, 21, Sept. Γαδὴ, Vat. omits, Vulg. *Eder*). In Mic. iv, 8 (Sept., Vulg., and A. V. translate ποιμνιον, *grex*, "flock") it is put for the neighboring village Bethlehem itself, and hence tropically for the royal line of David as sprung thence. It perhaps derived its name from the fact of having been erected to guard [see ΜΙΘΡΟΛ-] flocks, or else from some individual of the name of Eder (q. v.). Jerome (who calls it *turris Ader*) says it lay 1000 paces from Bethlehem (*Onomast.* s. v. Bethlehem), and intimates that it contained a prophetic anticipation (comp. *Targum* of Pseudo-Jon. in loc.) of the birth of the Messiah in the same spot (Luke ii, 7, 8). (See Albert, *De turri Eder*, Lips. 1689.) See BETHLEHEM.

**Edayoth.** See TALMUD.

**Eddy**, JOHN REYNOLDS, a Methodist Episcopal minister, son of Rev. Augustus Eddy, was born in Xenia, Ohio, Oct. 10, 1829, obtained a liberal English education, and made some proficiency in the classics. He commenced the study of law, but determined to devote himself to the ministry, and was admitted on trial in the North-west Indiana Conference in 1856. After filling various appointments acceptably, he accepted in 1862 the chaplaincy of the 72d Indiana Regiment. He immediately joined his regiment at Murfreesborough, Tenn., and commenced his labors among the soldiers. Sunday, June 21, he preached from Prov. xvi, 32; Wednesday, June 24, during a fight between colonel Wilder's cavalry brigade and a rebel force he was instantly killed by a shell.—*Min. of Conferences*, 1863.

**Edelmann**, JOHANN CHRISTIAN, an infidel German writer, was born at Weissenfels in 1698, and studied theology at Jena. From his youth he evinced an unsteadiness of mind, which afterwards led him, after oscillating between the different Christian denominations, to forsake them all and become an opponent of all orthodoxy. He rejected the Christian doctrine, and considered reason as a part of the essence of God, in no way different from him. For some years he abstained from all animal food, in order, as he expressed it, not to eat a part of divinity. He had previously taken part in the translation of the Bible, published at Berleburg (q. v.). His principal works are his *Unschulhige Wahrheiten*, in which he attempts to prove that no religion is of any importance:—*Moses mit aufgedecktem Angesicht* (1740, 8vo):—*Christ und Belial* (1741, 8vo):—*die Göttlichkeit d. Vernunft* (1742, 8vo). He finally went to Berlin, where Friedrich II tolerated

his presence on the plea that he had to put up with many other fools. Edelmant died in Berlin Feb. 15, 1767. A selection of his works appeared at Berne in 1847 (*Auswahl aus E.'s Schriften*).

"What Edelmant wished was nothing new; after the manner of all adherents of Illuminism, he wished to reduce all positive religions to natural religion. The positive heathenish religions stand, to him, on a level with Judaism and Christianity. He is more just towards heathenism than towards Judaism, and more just towards Judaism than towards Christianity. Everything positive in religion is, as such, superstition. Christ was a mere man, whose chief merit consists in the struggle against superstition. What he taught, and what he was anxious for, no one, however, may attempt to learn from the New Testament writings, inasmuch as these were forged as late as the time of Constantine. All which the Church teaches of his divinity, of his merits, of the gracious influence of the Holy Spirit, is absurd. There is no rule of truth but reason, and it manifests its truths directly by a peculiar sense. Whatever this sense says is true. It is this sense which perceives the world. The reality of everything which exists is God. In the proper sense there can, therefore, not exist any atheist, because every one who admits the reality of the world admits also the reality of God. God is not a person, least of all are there three persons in God. If God be the substance in all the phenomena, then it follows of itself that God cannot be thought of without the world, and hence that the world has no more had an origin than it will have an end. One may call the world the body of God, the shadow of God, the son of God. The spirit of God is in all that exists. It is ridiculous to ascribe inspiration to special persons only; every one ought to be a Christ, a prophet, an inspired man. The human spirit, being a breath of God, does not perish; our spirit, separated from its body by death, enters into a connection with some other body. Thus Edelmant taught a kind of metempsychosis. What he taught had been thoroughly and ingeniously said in France and England; but from a German theologian, and that with such eloquent coarseness, with such a mastery in expatiating in blasphemy, such things were unheard of. But as yet the faith of the Church was a power in Germany!" (*Kahnis, German Protestantism*, bk. i, chap. ii, § 2). An autobiography of Edelmant was published by Klose (Berlin, 1849). See Pratzke, *Histor. Nachrichten* (Hamb. 1755, 8vo); Elster, *Erinnerungen an Edelmant* (Clausthal, 1839); Hurst, *History of Rationalism*, ch. v.

É'den (Heb. *id.*), the name of three places and of one or two men.

1. "The garden of EDEN" (עֵדֶן, *de'right*, and so Sept. *τοῦτοῦ*, Vulg. *voluptas*) is the most ancient and venerable name in geography, the name of the first district of the earth's surface of which human beings could have any knowledge.

1. *The Name.*—The word is found in the Arabic as well as in the Hebrew language. It is explained by Firuzabadi, in his celebrated Arabic lexicon (*Kamūs*), as signifying *delight, tenderness, loveliness* (see Morren, in *Edinb. Biblical Cabinet*, xi, 2, 48, 49). Major Wilford and professor Wilson find its elements in the Sanscrit. The Greek ἡδονή is next to identical with it in both sound and sense. It occurs in three places (Isa. xxxvii, 12; Ezek. xxvii, 23; Amos i, 5) as the name of some eminently pleasant districts, but not the Eden of this article. Of them we have no certain knowledge, except that the latter instance points to the neighborhood of Damascus. In these cases it is pointed, in the Hebrew text, with both syllables short (עֵדֶן); but when it is applied to the primitive seat of man, the first syllable is long. The passages in which it occurs in the latter sense are, in addition to Gen. ii, iii, iv, 16, the few following, of which we transcribe the

chief, because they cast light upon the primeval term: "He will make her wilderness like Eden, and her desert like the garden of Jehovah." "Thou hast been in Eden, the garden of God." "All the trees of Eden, that were in the garden of God, envied him." "This land which was desolate is become like the garden of Eden" (Isa. li, 3; Ezek. xxviii, 13; xxxi, 9, 16, 18; xxxvi, 35; Joel ii, 3). All this evidence goes to show that *Eden* was a tract of country, and that in the most eligible part of it was the *Paradise*, the garden of all delights, in which the Creator was pleased to place his new and pre-eminent creature, with the inferior beings for his sustenance and solace. See GARDEN.

The old translators appear to have halted between a mystical and literal interpretation. The word עֵדֶן is rendered by the Sept. as a proper name in three passages only, Gen. ii, 8, 10; iv, 16, where it is represented by Ἐδέη. In all others, with the exception of Isa. li, 3, it is translated *τοῦτοῦ*. In the Vulgate it never occurs as a proper name, but is rendered "*voluptas*," "*locus voluptatis*," or "*deliciae*." The *Targum* of Onkelos gives it uniformly עֵדֶן, and in the Peshito Syriac it is the same, with a slight variation in two passages. See PARADISE.

11. *Biblical Description.*—The following is a simple translation of the Mosaic account of the situation of the Adamic Paradise (Gen. ii, 8–17). See GENESIS.

Now Jehovah God had planted a garden in Eden eastward, and he placed there the man whom he formed; for Jehovah God had caused to spring from the ground every tree pleasant for sight or good for food; also the tree of life in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Now a river issued from Eden to water the garden, and thence it was parted, and became four head-[streams]; the name of the first is Pi-hon; this [is the one] that surrounds all the land of the Chavilah, where [is] the [metal] gold (the gold too of that land [is] good); there [also is] the [substance called] *bedolach*, and a stone [called] the *shoham*; and the name of the second river [is] Gihon; this [is the one] that surrounds all the land of Cush; and the name of the third river [is] Chiddékél; this [is the one] that flows east of Ashshur; and the name of the fourth river, that [is] Perath.

Thus Jehovah God took the man, and settled him in the garden of Eden, to till it, and to keep it. Then Jehovah God enjoined upon the man, saying, "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat except of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil—thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day of thy eating of it, thou shalt surely die."

The garden of Paradise is here said to be to the east, i. e. in the eastern part of the tract of Eden (see Gesenius, *Heb. Lex.* s. v.). The river which flowed through Eden watered the garden, and thence branched off into four distinct streams. The first problem to be solved, then, is this: To find a river which, at some stage of its course, is divided into four streams, two of which are the Tigris and Euphrates. The identity of these rivers with the Hiddekel and Perath has never been disputed, and no hypothesis which omits them is worthy of consideration. Setting aside minor differences of detail, the theories which have been framed with regard to the explanation of the above description of the terrestrial paradise naturally divide themselves into two classes. The first class includes all those which place the main river of the garden of Eden below the junction of the Euphrates and Tigris, and interpret the names Pison and Gihon of certain portions of these rivers; the second, those which seek for it in the high table-land of Armenia, the fruitful parent of many noble streams. These theories have been supported by most learned men of all nations, of all ages, and representing every shade of theological belief; but there is scarcely one which is not based in some degree upon a forced interpretation of the words of the narrative. Those who contend that the united stream of the Euphrates and Tigris is the "river" which "goeth forth from Eden to water the garden," have committed a fatal error in neglecting the true meaning of עֵדֶן, which is only used of the course of a river from its source *downwards* (comp. Ezek. xlvii, 1). Following the guidance which this word supplies, the de-

scription in ver. 10 must be explained in this manner: the river takes its rise in Eden, flows into the garden, and from thence is divided into four branches, the separation taking place either in the garden or after leaving it. If this be the case, the Tigris and Euphrates before junction cannot, in this position of the garden, be two of the four branches in question. But, though they have avoided this error, the theorists of the second class have generally been driven into another but little less destructive. Looking for the true site of Eden in the highlands of Armenia, near the sources of the Tigris and Euphrates, and applying the names Pison and Gihon to some one or other of the rivers which spring from the same region, they have been compelled to modify the meaning of נָהָר, the "river," and to give to אֲרָצוֹת a sense which is scarcely supported by a single passage. In no instance is אֲרָצוֹת (lit. "head") applied to the *source* of a river. On several occasions (comp. Judg. vii, 16; Job i, 17, etc.) it is used of the detachments into which the main body of an army is divided, and analogy therefore leads to the conclusion that אֲרָצוֹת denotes the "branches" of the parent stream. There are other difficulties in the details of the several theories which may be obstacles to their entire reception, but it is manifest that no theory which fails to satisfy the above-mentioned conditions can be allowed to take its place among things that are probable. What, then, is the river which goes forth from Eden to water the garden? is a question which has often been asked, and still waits for a fully satisfactory answer. That the ocean stream which surrounded the earth was the source from which the four rivers flowed was the opinion of Josephus (*Ant.* i, 1, 3) and Johannes Damascenus (*De Orthod. Fid.* ii, 9). It was the *Shat el-Arab*, according to those who place the garden of Eden below the junction of the Tigris and Euphrates, and their conjecture would deserve consideration were it not that this stream cannot, with any degree of propriety, be said to rise in Eden. By those who refer the position of Eden to the highlands of Armenia, the "river" from which the four streams diverge is conceived to mean "a collection of springs," or a well-watered district. It is scarcely necessary to say that this signification of נָהָר (*mahar'*) is without a parallel; and even if it could, under certain circumstances, be made to adopt it, such a signification is, in the present instance, precluded by the fact that, whatever meaning we may assign to the word in ver. 10, it must be essentially the same as that which it has in the following verses, in which it is sufficiently definite. Siekler (Augusti, *Theol. Monatschrift*, i, 1), supposing the whole narrative to be a myth, solves the difficulty by attributing to its author a large measure of ignorance. The "river" was the Caspian Sea, which in his apprehension was an immense stream from the east. Bertheau, applying the geographical knowledge of the ancients as a test of that of the Hebrews, arrived at the same conclusion, on the ground that all the people south of the Armenian and Persian highlands place the dwelling of the gods in the extreme north, and the regions of the Caspian were the northern limit of the horizon of the Israelites (Knobel, *Genesis*). But he allows the four rivers of Eden to have been real rivers, and not, as Siekler imagined, oceans which bounded the earth east and west of the Nile. The modern Lake Van, or perhaps the ancient stream of which this is now the representative, appears to be the only body of water in this vicinity answering to the Mosaic description. Nor will it do to suppose that in former ages great changes had taken place, which have so disguised the rivers in question that their course, connection, and identity are not now traceable; for two of the rivers, at least, remain to this day essentially the same as in all historic times, and the whole narrative of Moses is evidently adapted

to the geography as it existed in his own day, being constantly couched in the *present tense*, and in terms of well-known reference as landmarks. See RIVER.

Some, ever ready to use the knife, have unhesitatingly pronounced the whole narrative to be a spurious interpolation of a later age (Granville Penn, *Min. and Mos. Geol.* p. 184). But, even admitting this, the words are not mere unmeaning jargon, and demand explanation. Ewald (*Gesch.* i, 331, *note*) affirms, and we have only his word for it, that the tradition originated in the far East, and that in the course of its wanderings the original names of two of the rivers at least were changed to others with which the Hebrews were better acquainted. Hartmann regards it as a product of the Babylonian or Persian period. Luther, rejecting the forced interpretations on which the theories of his time were based, gave it as his opinion that the garden remained under the guardianship of angels till the time of the Deluge, and that its site was known to the descendants of Adam; but that by the flood all traces of it were obliterated. But, as before remarked, the narrative is so worded as to convey the idea that the countries and rivers spoken of were still existing in the time of the historian. It has been suggested that the description of the garden of Eden is part of an inspired antediluvian document (Morren, Rosenmüller's *Geogr.* i, 92). The conjecture is beyond criticism; it is equally incapable of proof or disproof, and has not much probability to recommend it. The effects of the flood in changing the face of countries, and altering the relations of land and water, are too little known at present to allow any inferences to be drawn from them. (See below.)

Conjectures with regard to the dimensions of the garden have differed as widely as those which assign its locality. Ephraem Syrus maintained that it surrounded the whole earth, while Johannes Tostatus restricted it to a circumference of thirty-six or forty miles, and others have made it extend over Syria, Arabia, and Mesopotamia. But of speculations like these there is no end.

III. *Identifications of the Site.*—It would be difficult, in the whole history of opinion, to find any subject which has so invited, and at the same time so completely baffled conjecture, as the garden of Eden. The three continents of the Old World have been subjected to the most rigorous search; from China to the Canary Isles, from the Mountains of the Moon to the coasts of the Baltic, no locality which in the slightest degree corresponded to the description of the first abode of the human race has been left unexamined. The great rivers of Europe, Asia, and Africa have in turn done service as the Pison and Gihon of Scripture, and there remains nothing but the New World wherein the next adventurous theorist may bewilder himself in the mazes of this most difficult question. Upon the question of the exact geographical position of Eden dissertations innumerable have been written. Many authors have given descriptive lists of them, with arguments for and against each. The most convenient presentation of their respective outlines has been reduced to a tabulated form, with ample illustrations, by the Rev. N. Morren (annexed to his translation of the younger Rosenmüller's *Biblical Geography of Central Asia*, p. 91-98, Edinb. 1836). He reduces them to nine principal theories, as follows (numbered as in the following table; comp. Kalsch, *Genes's*, p. 100 sq.)

i. The opinion which fixes Eden in *Armenia* we have placed first, because it is that which has obtained most general support, and seems nearest the truth. (See No. vi.) For if we may suppose that, while Cain moved to the East (Gen. iv, 16), the posterity of Seth remained in the neighborhood of the primeval seat of mankind, and that Noah's ark rested not very far from the place of his former abode, then Mount Ararat in Armenia becomes a connecting point between the antediluvian and post-diluvian worlds (Gen. viii, 4), and

Names.	I.	II.	III.	IV.	V.	VI.	VII.	VIII.	IX.
EDEN.	Armenia.	Korneh, in Babylonia.	Country near the Caspian Sea.	Bactria.	Syria.	Country between the Ganges and Nile.	Babian.	India.	Cashmere.
PISHON.	The Phasis.	Western mouth of the Shat el-Arab.	The Araxes.	The Sihon, or Jaxartes.	The Chyrosorhous.	The Ganges.	The Nilah, or Lesser Sind.	The Irabatti.	The Phasia.
GIHON.	The Araxes.	Eastern mouth of the Shat el-Arab.	The Oxus, or Jihun.	The Oxus, or Jihun.	The Orontes.	The Nile.	The Hirmend.	The Ganges.	The Oxus.
HIDDEKEL.	The Tigris.	The Tigris.	The Tigris.	The Tigris.	The Tigris.	The Tigris.	River of Bah-luc.	The Indus.	The Tigris.
PHRAT.	The Euphrates.	The Euphrates.	The Euphrates.	The Euphrates.	The Euphrates.	The Euphrates.	River of Cud-nuz.	The Euphrates.	The Euphrates.
HAVILAH.	Colchis.	Arabia Felix.	Jhwala, on the west of the Caspian.	Chworasmia.	Jhwala, in Arabia.	India.	Cabul.	Ava.	Colchis.
CUSH.	Land of the Cossæi.	Jnsistan, or Susiana.	Jhowrasmia, on the east of the Caspian.	Hindu-cush.	Jassiotis.	Nubia and Abyssinia.	Cusha.	The extreme South.	Bactria.
ASSUR.	Assyria.	Assyria.	Assyria.	Assyria.	Assyria.	Assyria.	Jazarah.	Assyria.	Assyria?

the names of the Phrat, Hiddekel, etc., would readily be given to rivers, which, after the great deluge, seemed to flow in channels somewhat corresponding to the Paradisiacal streams. The opinion in question was first systematically propounded by Reland, and is held by Calmet, and by his American editor, Prof. Robinson, who, however, understands by Cush, Chusistan. Prof. Stuart takes the Pishon for the Kur, and Cush for Cushi-Capech, i. e. the northern part of the region between the Caspian Lake and the Persian Gulf (*Heb. Christ* on Gen. ii, 10-14). The Cossæi, whom Reland finds in Cush, lived near Media, in the tract now called Dilem, south-west of the Caspian Sea. Link takes the Gihon for the Cur or Cyrus, and Cush for the Caucasus. Verbrugge coincides with Reland, except that he takes the Gihon to be the Gyndes, which flowed between Armenia and Matiana.

ii. This opinion was most elaborately defended by Huet, bi-shop of Avranches; but it is also maintained by Calvin, Bochart, Wells, Steph. Morinus, Vorst, etc. Hales was of this sentiment in the first edition of his *Chronology*, but in the second he follows the opinion of Reland. The Shat el-Arab is the name of the united streams of the Euphrates and Tigris. Ainsworth says, "It is probable that the united rivers emptied themselves into the gulf at this period (in ancient times) by several distinct mouths, of which the first or greatest was at Teredon, the Ostium Tigris Occidentale of Ptolemy, and the mouth of the Euphrates, according to Nearehus; the second was the Pasitigris of Pliny, probably the Shat el-Arab, and the Ostium Tigris Orientale of the Alexandrian geographer." Cush they compare with the Cutlia of 2 Kings, xvii, 24; and Havilah with the Chaulataioi of Eratosthenes in Strabo, xvi, 767. Grotius thinks the Pishon is the Pasitigris, and the Gihon the Nahr Malikah, or the Chaboras. Hottinger agrees with Grotius as to the Pishon, but takes the Gihon for the Nahr Sura. Hopkinson makes the Pishon and Gihon to be the two canals of the Euphrates, the Nahr Malikah, and the Nahr Sares or Sura.

iii. The celebrated Göttingen professor, J. D. Michaelis, originated this hypothesis, though he is doubtful as to some of the points. Gatterer, in the main, agrees with him, only he understands the Hiddekel to be the Indus, and takes the Pishon for the Phasis. Cush is found by Michaelis in the name of the city Cath or Caths, the ancient capital of Chowrasmia, on the Oxus or Jihun, near the site of Balkh. He refers to Quint. Curtius as speaking of the Cusæi or Cusitani being in Bactria upon the Oxus. Wahl sees Cush in the Khousti of Moses of Chorene, meaning the large province between the Caspian and Persian Seas, as far as the Indus and Oxus. The land of Havilah Michaelis connects with the tribe of Chwaliski or Chwalisses, from whom the Russians call the Caspian Sea the Chwalinskole More.

iv. This theory has been proposed by the eminent Orientalist Von Hammer. The Sihon, he says, rises near the town of Cha, and compasses the land of Ilah, famous for the gold and precious stones of Turkistan.

v. That Paradise was in Syria was the opinion of


the voluminous Le Clerc, in his valuable Commentary. Havilah is the tract mentioned in 1 Sam. xv, 7. Cush is Cassiotis or Mount Casius, near Seleucia in Syria. This opinion is shared by Lakemacher, who, however, takes the Pishon to be the Jordan. Heidegger thinks the Jordan was the great river of Paradise, an idea adopted by the paradoxical Hardouin, in his *Ereursus to Pliny's Nat. Hist.* lib. vi. Others, who place Eden in Arabia Felix, transform the Pishon into the Persian Gulf, and the Gihon into the Red Sea.

vi. This is perhaps the most ancient opinion of any, being found in Josephus (*Ant. i, 1, 3*), and in several of the fathers, e. g. Theophilus Autol, ii, 24; Epiphanius (*Epp. ii, 60*); Philostorgius in Nicephorus, *Hist. Eccl.* ix, 19, though the latter takes the Pishon for the Indian river Hyphasis. The editor of Calmet observes that "the inhabitants of the kingdom of Goiam call the Nile the Gihon." Cush is naturally taken for Ethiopia. This view is embraced by the celebrated Gesenius, with the exception that he maintains the Pishon to be the Indus; in this he is followed in the main by Prof. Bush, who likewise observes: "This view of the subject, it is admitted, represents the ancient Eden as a very widely extended territory, reaching from the Indus on the east to the Nile and the Mediterranean on the west, and including the intermediate countries. If the view above given of the topography of Eden be correct, it will be seen that it embraced the fairest portion of Asia, besides a part of Africa, comprising the countries at present known as Cabul, Persia, Armenia, Kurdistan, Syria, Arabia, Abyssinia, and Egypt. The garden, however, which is said to have been 'eastward in Eden,' was probably situated somewhere in the neighborhood of the Euphrates, perhaps not far from the site of Babylon, a region nearer its eastern than its western limits; but the exact position it is apparently vain to attempt to determine." Among the most thorough scholars, the contest seems now to lie mainly between this view and that in No. i.

vii. Captain Wilford, well known for his profound acquaintance with Hindû antiquities, advanced the present view, as being founded upon the Indian Puranas (*Asiatic Researches*, vi, 455, Lond. edit.). It was partly adopted by a late ingenious but fanciful writer, Mr. C. Taylor, editor of *Calmet's Dictionary*, who, however, makes the Pishon the Nilab; the Gihon, the western branch of the Oxus; the Hiddekel, the eastern; and the Phrat, the Hirmend.

viii. This and the following are given as specimens of the views of the modern German school of neology, which regards the whole narrative as a *myth*, similar to the Greek tradition of the Hesperides, the Islands of the Blessed, etc. Philip Buttmann is the author of the hypothesis under the present number. The Pishon he compares with the Besynga, which is mentioned by Ptolemy as the most considerable river of India east of the Ganges. Ava was early known as a region of gold; and an anonymous geographer, in Hudson's collection, vol. iii, speaks of the Eviltae or Evilæi as being near the Senes or Chinese.

ix. Another neological theory—the author, A. T.



U.S. LONG. EAST OF GREENWICH

30 35 40 45 50 55 60 65 70

30 35 40 45 50 55 60 65 70

30 35 40 45 50 55 60 65 70

25 30 35 40 45 50 55 60 65 70

Hartmann, who looks upon the description as a product of the Babylonish or Persian period. The idea of Eden being the far-famed vale of Cashmere had been anticipated by Herler in his work on the History of Mankind. Appropriate accounts of Cashmere may be found in the travels of Burnes and Jacquemont.

Many of the Orientals think that Paradise was in the island of Serendib or Ceylon; while the Greeks place it at Beth-Eden, on Lebanon.

These, indeed, are but a few of the opinions that have been propounded; yet, though many more might be added, it is to be observed that most of them have much in common, and differ only in some of the details. To enumerate the vagaries of German and other writers on this subject would be endless. (See Kitto's *Scripture Laws*, p. 1-8.) The fact is that not one of them answers to all the conditions of the problem. It has been remarked that this difficulty might have been expected, and is obviously probable, from the geological changes that may have taken place, and especially in connection with the Deluge. This remark would not be applicable, to the extent that is necessary for the argument, except upon the supposition before mentioned, that the earlier parts of the book of Genesis consist of primeval documents, even antediluvian, and that this is one of them. There is reason to think, however, that *since the Deluge* the face of the country cannot have undergone any change approaching to what the hypothesis of a post-diluvian composition would require. But we think it highly probable that the principal of the immediate causes of the Deluge, the "breaking up of the fountains of the great deep," was a subsidence of a large part or parts of the land between the inhabited tract (which we venture to place in E. long. from Greenwich, 30° to 50°, and N. lat. 25° to 40°) and the sea which lay to the south, or an elevation of the bed of that sea. See DELUGE.

As nearly as we can gather from the Scriptural description, Eden was a tract of country, the finest imaginable, lying probably between the 35th and the 40th degree of N. latitude, of such moderate elevation, and so adjusted, with respect to mountain ranges, and watersheds, and forests, as to preserve the most agreeable and salubrious conditions of temperature and all atmospheric changes. Its surface must therefore have been constantly diversified by hill and plain. In the finest part of this land of Eden, the Creator had formed an enclosure, probably by rocks, and forests, and rivers, and had filled it with every product of nature conducive to use and happiness. Due moisture, of both the ground and the air, was preserved by the streamlets from the nearest hills, and the rivulets from the more distant; and such streamlets and rivulets, collected according to the levels of the surrounding country ("it proceeded from Eden") flowed off afterwards in four larger streams, each of which thus became the source of a great river.

Here, then, in the south of Armenia, after the explanation we have given, it may seem the most suitable to look for the object of our exploration, the *site* of Paradise.

That the Hiddekel (this name is said to be still in use among the tribes who live upon its banks—Col. Chesney, *Exp. to Tigris and Euphrates*, i, 13) is the Tigris, and the Phrath the Euphrates, has never been denied, except by those who assume that the whole narrative is a myth which originated elsewhere, and was adapted by the Hebrews to their own geographical notions. As the former is the name of the great river by which Daniel sat (Dan. x, 4), and the latter is the term uniformly applied to the Euphrates in the Old Testament, there seems no reason to suppose that the appellations in Gen. ii, 14 are to be understood in any other than the ordinary sense. One circumstance in the description is worthy of observation. Of the four rivers, one, the Euphrates, is mentioned by name only,

as if that were sufficient to identify it. The other three are defined according to their geographical positions, and it is fair to conclude that they were therefore rivers with which the Hebrews were less intimately acquainted. If this be the case, it is scarcely possible to imagine that the Gihon, or, as some say, the Pison, is the Nile, for that must have been even more familiar to the Israelites than the Euphrates, and have stood as little in need of a definition.

But the stringent difficulty is to find any two rivers that will reasonably answer to the predicates of the Pishon and the Gihon, and any countries which can be collocated as Havilah and Cush. The latter name, indeed, was given by the Hebrews and other Orientals to several extensive countries, and those very distant both from Armenia and from each other. As for Havilah, we have the name again in the account of the dispersion of the descendants of Noah (chap. x, 29); but whether that was the same as this Havilah, and in what part of Asia it was, we despair of ascertaining. Reland and others, the best writers upon this question, have felt themselves compelled to give to these names a comprehension which destroys all preciseness. So, likewise, the meaning of the two names of natural products can be little more than matter of conjecture—the *bedolach* and the stone *shoham*. The former word occurs only here and in Num. xi, 7. The Septuagint, our oldest and best authority with regard to terms of natural history, renders it, in our passage, by *anthrax*, meaning probably the ruby, or possibly the topaz; and in Numbers by *crystallos*, which the Greeks applied not merely to rock-crystal, but to any finely transparent mineral. Any of the several kinds of odoriferous gum, which many ancient and modern authorities have maintained, is not likely, for it could not be in value comparable to gold. The pearl is possible, but not quite probable, for it is an animal product, and the connection seems rather to confine us to minerals; and pearls, though translucent, are not transparent as good crystal is. Would not the diamond be an admissible conjecture? The *shoham* occurs in ten other places, chiefly in the book of Exodus, and in all those instances our version says onyx; but the Septuagint varies, taking onyx, sardius, sardonius, beryl, prase-stone, sapphire, and smaragdus, which is a green-tinctured rock-crystal. The preponderance seems to be in favor of onyx, one of the many varieties of banded agate; but the idea of *value* leads us to think that the emerald is the most probable. There are two remarkable inventories of precious stones in Exod. xxxix, 10-13, and Ezek. xxviii, 13, which may be profitably studied, comparing the Septuagint with the Hebrew. See HAVILAH. For attempted identifications of the Pison and Gihon, see those names respectively.

IV. For the *Literature* of the subject, see PARADISE.

2. (גֶּזֶן, Sept. Ἐδέμ, but omits in Isa. xxxvii, 12, and Ezek. xxvii, 23; Vulg. *Eden*), one of the marts which supplied the luxury of Tyre with richly embroidered stuffs. It is associated with Haran, Sheba, and Asshur; and in Amos i, 5, Beth-Eden, or "the house of Eden," is rendered in the Sept. by *Charran* (Χαῖρᾶν). In 2 Kings xix, 12, and Isa. xxxvii, 12, "the sons of Eden" are mentioned with Gozan, Haran, and Rezep, as victims of the Assyrian greed of conquest. Telassar appears to have been the head-quarters of the tribe; and Knobel's (*Comm. on Isaiah*) etymology of this name would point to the highlands of Assyria as their whereabouts. But this has no sound foundation, although the view which it supports receives confirmation from the version of Jonathan, who gives חֶדְרֵי (*Chudb*) as the equivalent of Eden. Bochart proved (*Phaleg*, pt. i, p. 274) that this term was applied by the Talmudic writers to the mountainous district of Assyria, which bordered on Media, and was known as *Adiabene*. But if Gozan be Gausanitis in Meso-



potamia, and Haran be Carrhæ, it seems more natural to look for Eden somewhere in the same locality. Keil (*Comm. on Kings*, ii, 97) thinks it may be *Ma'don*, which Assemani (*Bibl. Or.* ii, 224) places in Mesopotamia, in the modern province of Diarbekr. Bochart, considering the Eden of Genesis and Isaiah as identical, argues that Gozan, Haran, Rezep, and Eden are mentioned in order of geographical position, from north to south; and, identifying Gozan with Gausanitis, Haran with Carrhæ, a little below Gausanitis on the Chabor, and Rezep with Receph, he gives to Eden a still more southerly situation at the confluence of the Euphrates and Tigris, or even lower. According to him, it may be *Addan* or *Addana*, which geographers place on the Euphrates. Michaelis (*Suppl.* No. 1826) is in favor of the modern *Aden*, a port of Arabia (called by Ptolemy Ἀραβίαις ἐμπορίων), as the Eden of Ezekiel. —Smith, s. v. See VEDAN.

3. (יֶדֶן, Amos i, 5, "house of Eden"). See BETH-EDEN.

4. (Sept. Ἰωάν v. r. Ἰωαῶμ.) Son of Joab, and one of the Gershonite Levites who assisted in the reformation of public worship under Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxix, 12). B.C. 726. He is probably the same with the Levite appointed in the same connection one of the superintendents of the distribution of the free-will offerings (2 Chron. xxxi, 15, Sept. Ὅδομ v. r. ῥῶδων).

**Edenius**, **JORDAN NICOLAS**, a Swedish theologian, was born in 1624, and became professor of theology at Upsal in 1659. He died in 1666, leaving, among other works, *Dissertationes theologice de Christiana religionis veritate* (Abo, 1664): — *Epitome historice ecclesiasticæ*, published by bishop Gezelius at Abo in 1681. —Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xv, 647.

**E'der** (Heb. יֶדֶר, a flock, as often), the name of a place and also of a man. See EDAR; ADER.

1. (Sept. Ἐδραῖν, Vat. MS. omits; Vulg. *Eder*.) A city in the extreme south of Judah, on the Idumean border, mentioned between Kabzeel and Jagur (Josh. xv, 21); therefore, doubtless, one of those afterwards assigned to Simeon. Schwarz suggests (*Palest.* p. 99) that it may be the same with ARAD (q. v.), by a transposition of letters; but this is doubtful. Possibly it was situated on the eminence north of the fountain marked as "water" on Van de Velde's *Map*, in wady el-Ernez, S. W. of the Dead Sea.

2. (Sept. Ἐδῶν, Vulg. *Eder*.) The second named of the three "sons" (i. e. descendants) of Mushi appointed to the Levitical offices in the time of David (1 Chron. xxiii, 23; xxiv, 30). B.C. 1013.

**E'dès** (rather *Ebis*, Ἰεῖαῖς, Vulg. *Esmi*), one of the "sons of Ethma," who had married foreign wives after the captivity (1 Esdr. ix, 35); evidently the *Jadai* (q. v.) of the Heb. list (Ezra x, 43).

**Edessa** (modern name *Urshû* or *Orfu*; Armenian name *Edessia*; Arab. *Er-Rohî*; Syrian, *Urhoi*), an ancient city of Mesopotamia, 78 miles S.W. from Diarbekir. An old legend attributes its origin to Nimrod, or to Khabiba, a female contemporary of Abraham. The Targums (followed by Jerome and Ephrem Syrus) make it the *Erech* of Gen. x, 10. Another tradition (Jewish and Arabic) makes it *Ur of the Chaldees* (Gen. xi, 28). "With the conquest of Persia by the Greeks the history of Edessa first becomes clear. Seleucus, in particular, is said to have done much for the aggrandizement of the city. Christianity was introduced into Edessa at an early period. In the reign of Trajan the place was made tributary to Rome, and in A.D. 216 became a Roman military colony, under the name of *Colonia Marcia Edessenorum*. During this period its importance in the history of the Christian Church continued to increase. More than 300 monasteries are said to have been included within its walls. With the extension of the religion of Islam,

Edessa fell into the hands of the Arabian caliphs. Christianity declined, and wars at home and abroad during the caliphate destroyed likewise its temporal splendor and prosperity, till, in 1040, it fell into the possession of the Seljuk Turks. The Byzantine emperors succeeded in recovering Edessa, but the viceroy contrived to make himself independent. He was, however, hard pressed by the Turks, and this rendered it easy for the crusader Baldwin, the brother of Godfrey of Bouillon, to gain possession of the city (A.D. 1097), and make it the capital of a Latin principality, and the bulwark of the kingdom of Jerusalem. Under the Frankish princes, Edessa held out valiantly against the Mussulmans, till at length Zengi, ruler of Mosul, succeeded in taking the town and citadel in the year 1144, when all the Christian churches were converted into mosques. After many vicissitudes, in the course of which Edessa fell successively into the hands of the sultans of Egypt, the Byzantines, the Mongols, Turkomans, and Persians, the city was finally conquered by the Turks, and has ever since formed a portion of the Turkish dominions. The population is variously estimated at from 25,000 to 50,000, of whom 2000 are Armenian Christians. The Jacobites, in the last century, had 150 houses and a church. The rest are Turks, Arabians, Kurds, and Jews. Edessa is regarded by the Easterns as a sacred city, because they believe it to have been the residence of Abraham" (Chambers, *Encyclopædia*, s. v.). It is still the seat of a Greek archbishop and an Armenian bishop. A dialect of the Aramaic is still spoken at Edessa (comp. Etheridge on the *Aramaic Dialects*, p. 10).

The report of the introduction of Christianity by king Abgar (q. v.), a contemporary of Christ, is probably an unfounded legend; but it is certain that Christianity became firmly rooted in Edessa at a very early period. The twenty-sixth Osrhoënian king (152-187) was, if not a Christian himself, a patron of Christianity, and the Gnostic Bardesanes is said to have been highly esteemed by him. Edessa was an early episcopal see, and in the 4th century became the chief seat of Syrian ecclesiastical learning. The emperor Julian threatened to distribute the large treasure of the churches of Edessa among his soldiers, but his death saved the churches from the execution of this threat. In 363, Ephrem (q. v.), the Syrian, came from Nisibis to Edessa, and by his preaching, teaching, and prolific writings, greatly distinguished himself in the defence of the orthodox doctrines of the Church. After the death of Ephrem, the Arians took possession of all the churches of Edessa, but after five years the ascendancy of the orthodox school was restored. Different from the Edessene school established by Ephrem was the Persian school at Edessa, which was intended to be a seminary for the Christian subjects of the Persian king. It attained its highest prosperity in the time of Ephrem, became subsequently a stronghold of Nestorianism, and was on that account dissolved in 489. — Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* iii, 645; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 391; *Chronicon Edessenum*, in Assemani, *Biblioth. Oriental.* i, 387-428; Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Documents relative to Edessa*, etc. (Lond. 1866); Etheridge, *The Syrian Churches* (Lond. 1846), p. 35 sq. See NESTORIANS.

**Edgar, John, D.D.**, a Presbyterian minister of Ireland, was born in County Down, Ireland, in 1797, and entered the ministry in 1820. His life from the outset of his ministry in 1820 was one of ceaseless toil. "His energy of character was immense, and his name became a tower of strength to all the Christian enterprises with which he was identified. Upon the union of Presbyterians in 1840 he was made one of the professors of Divinity for the Assembly, and the influence he wielded over its students was very great, and he put forth strenuous and successful efforts for the erection and equipment of its theological college in Belfast. He fired the hearts of his students with his own

zeal in the work of the evangelization of their country, and spent much of his vacation in personal labors for it. His spirit in church extension was remarkable. His last great effort was in undertaking to raise about \$100,000 for erecting additional manse among the churches. By far the greater part of this had been secured before his death." At least fifty of the houses of worship belonging to the Presbyterian Church in Ireland owe their existence to his persevering efforts. He died in Dublin August 26, 1866. See Killen, *Memoirs of John Edgar* (Belfast and London, 1867); *American Annual Cyclopaedia* for 1866, p. 277.

**Edgar, John Todd, D.D.**, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Sussex County, Delaware, April 13, 1792. With the proverbial love for knowledge of the Scotch-Irish, his parents gave him the best education that could be obtained in Kentucky, to which state they removed soon after his birth. He graduated at Princeton in 1816, and was licensed by the New Brunswick Presbytery. In 1817 he was ordained pastor of the church at Flemingsburg, Ky. He was thence called to Maysville, where he labored unremittingly. In 1829 he was induced to accept a call from the church at Frankfort, Ky, where his eloquence soon gathered around him the leading men of the state. Henry Clay said of him, "If you want to hear eloquence, listen to John T. Edgar." In 1833 he became pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Nashville, Tenn., and continued to discharge the duties of that office with great fidelity and success up to the year 1859, when an assistant was appointed to aid him. He was distinguished for power in the pulpit, and for a degree of liberality of feeling and public spirit which caused him to be regarded as belonging rather to the whole community than to his particular church. Mr. Edgar wrote little, though at one time he was editor of the *American Presbyterian*, published at Nashville. He died suddenly of apoplexy Nov. 13, 1860.

**Edge**, with reference to the sword, is the rendering of  $\text{פֶּה}$ , *peh*, *mouth* (like  $\sigma\tau\omicron\mu\alpha$ , Luke xxi, 24; Heb. xi, 34), or fem.  $\text{פֶּיחַ}$ , *peyah'* (Judg. iii, 16); also  $\text{פָּנִים}$ , *panim'*, *face* (Eccles. x, 10); poet.  $\text{צֶרֶף}$ , *tsur*, a *rock*, hence *sharpness* (Psa. lxxxix, 43); elsewhere, in the sense of *brink* or *margin*; it corresponds to  $\text{שֶׁפָּרַח}$ , *saphah'*, *lip*; and to  $\text{קֵצֶה}$ , *katsah'*,  $\text{קֵצֶה}$ , *kasteh'*, or  $\text{קֵצֶה}$ , *katsveh'*, *extremity* (Exod. xxviii, 7; xxxix, 4; xiii, 20; xxvi, 5; xxxvi, 12; Num. xxxiii, 6, 37; Josh. xiii, 27; Psa. xxxix, 4). To "set on edge" is an inaccurate rendering (Jer. xxxi, 29, 30; Ezek. xviii, 2) of  $\text{קָהַח}$ , *kahah'*, to be *blunt* (as in Eccles. x, 10). See **SWORN**.

**Ed(d)ias** ( $\text{Ἰεῦδιαι}$ , Alex. MS.  $\text{Ἰεῦδιαι}$ , Vulg. *Geddi-as*), the second named of the "sons of Phul," who took foreign wives after the captivity (1 Esdr. ix, 26); evidently the JEZIAH (q. v.) of the Heb. list (Ezra x, 25).

**Edict**, the technical name of a paper read in Presbyterian churches in Scotland, "as a species of guard on the purity of the Christian ministry. It is a public invitation to all who can say anything against the minister elect to come forward for the purpose. The form of the document authorized by the United Presbyterian Church is as follows: 'Whereas the presbytery of \_\_\_\_\_ of the United Presbyterian Church have received a call from this congregation, addressed to A. B., preacher (or minister) of the Gospel, to be their minister, and the said call has been sustained as a regular Gospel call, and been accepted of by the said A. B., and he has undergone trials for ordination; and whereas the said presbytery having judged the said A. B. qualified for the ministry of the Gospel and the pastoral charge of this congregation, have resolved to proceed to his ordination on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, unless something occur which may reasonably impede it, notice is hereby given to all concerned that if they, or

any of them, have anything to object why the said A. B. should not be ordained pastor of this congregation, they may repair to the presbytery, which is to meet at \_\_\_\_\_ on the said \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_; with certification, that if no valid objection be then made, the presbytery will proceed without further delay. By order of the presbytery.'"—Eadie, *Eccles. Cyclopaedia*, s. v.

**Edict of Nantes.** See NANTES; FRANCE, REFORMED CHURCH OF.

**Edicts, Imperial.** See PERSECUTIONS.

**Edification**, "the process by which believers are built up, that is, progressively advanced in knowledge and holiness. (1.) The 'sacred writers perpetually employ this figure as their favorite illustration of the condition of Christians, as forming collectively the temple, succeeding that literal one on Mount Zion; the temple in which the Lord dwells by his holy Spirit; and as being, individually, 'living stones, builded up into an habitation for the Lord.'" 'The words 'edify' and 'edification' have so completely lost their literal signification in our tongue, that it would be reckoned even an impropriety to use them in speaking of the building of a literal edifice, and thus the reader loses the force and significance of the language of the sacred writers.' The word 'edify,' especially when applied to individual Christians, has often the sense of *instruct*; though in the 'Preface to the 'Order of Confirmation' in the English Prayer-book, 'To the end . . . . to the more edifying,' the word is probably used in the sense already explained, not in the especial sense of 'instruct' (Eden).

(2.) "To perceive the full force and propriety of the term as used by the apostles, it is quite necessary to keep in mind the similitudes by which they generally describe a Christian church. All those spiritual gifts, which were bestowed on the Christians were for the building and edifying of the members of the Church. The apostolical power in Church censures was for edification, not for destruction (2 Cor. x, 8); to build, and not to pull down; that is, to preserve the unity of the Church entire, and its communion pure. And we may observe that this edification is primarily applied to the Church; that the Church may receive edifying; that ye may excel to the edifying of the Church; for the edifying of the body of Christ (1 Cor. xiv, 5, 12; Ephes. iv, 12). And it is very observable wherein the apostle places the edification of the body of Christ, viz. in unity and love: till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ (Ephes. iv, 12, 13). Till we are united by one faith unto one body, and perfect man. And speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ; from whom the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love (Ephes. iv, 15, 16). This is an admirable description of the unity of the Church, in which all the parts are closely united and compacted together, as stones and timber are to make one house; and thus they grow into one body, and increase in mutual love and charity, which is the very building and edification of the Church, which is edified and built up in love, as the apostle adds, that knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth (1 Cor. viii, 1). This builds up the Church of Christ; and that not such a common charity as we have for all mankind, but such a love and sympathy as is peculiar to the members of the same body, and which none but members can have for each other" (Hook, *Ch. Dict.* s. v.).

(3.) "Many professors, and even teachers of religion, not greatly liking such union and its obvious consequences, yet finding much said in the New Testament of the attainments and comforts of the first Christians have studied to devise means of enjoying these com

forts separately. Instead of the objects that chiefly drew the attention of the first believers, they have endeavored to fix the attention of Christians on a multitude of rules respecting the particular conduct of each in his devout exercises, his attendance on ordinances, and the frame of his heart therein. But this is a scheme of religion of mere human device. Nothing can be plainer from the whole tenor of the Acts of the Apostles, and their epistles to the churches, than that it is the will of Christ his disciples should unite together, holding fellowship in the institutions of the Gospel; and also that, as he in his infinite wisdom and grace has made abundant provision for their comfort, establishment, and edification, so these blessings can only be effectually enjoyed in proportion as they obey his will in this respect" (Buck, *Theol. Dictionary*, s. v.).

**Edifice.** See ARCHITECTURE; HOUSE; TEMPLE; CHURCH.

**Eðilthryda** or **Etheldrida**, St., daughter of the Anglo-Saxon queen Anne. She made a vow of chastity in her youth, but was afterwards compelled to marry earl Tondbert, who, at her request, respected her vow. After his death she desired to retire to the island of Ely, but was eventually obliged to marry Egfrid, son of the king of Northumbria. This marriage was dissolved, and in 671 she retired to the convent of Coldingham, and afterwards to the island of Ely, where she erected a convent, of which Wilfrid named her abbess. Here she led a life of asceticism until her death in 679.—Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* iii, 618; Butler, *Lives of Saints*, June 23.

**Edinburgh**, the capital of Scotland, and seat of a bishop of the Scotch Episcopal Church. The diocese of Edinburgh had in 1867 24 churches, 2 missions, 33 clergymen, and 20 schools. The population of the city was, in 1861, 168,098. Edinburgh is also the seat of a Roman Catholic vicar apostolic, whose district had in 1860 about 60 parishes and 70,000 Roman Catholics. See *Churchman's Calendar for 1868*; Neher, *Kirchl. Geogr.* i, 103. (A. J. S.)

**Editions, PRINTED, OF THE ORIGINAL TEXTS OF THE BIBLE.** See SCRIPTURES, HOLY; CRITICISM, BIBLICAL.

**Edmund I** of England, king and martyr, succeeded in 855, when but fifteen years of age, to his father Offa, king of the East Angles. Edmund reigned in meekness, and his whole life was a preparation for martyrdom. About 870 the heathen Danes invaded the kingdom, and, after violating the nuns, killing the priests, and laying waste the country, made him a prisoner. Unwilling to offend God by submitting to the terms of his captors, he was tortured, and finally beheaded (870). In 1122 his anniversary was placed among the English holidays, and the kings of England took him for patron. See his *Life* by Abbo, and another by John Lydgate.—Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* iii, 618.

**Edmund, St.**, EDMUND RICH, archbishop of Canterbury in the thirteenth century, studied at Paris, where he became doctor of theology. Returning to England, he preached for the Crusades with such success as to command the approval of the Pope. He was consecrated archbishop of Canterbury April 2, 1234. It fell to his lot as prelate to resist the will of the Pope, and also that of the king of England, and he did resist manfully. He died at the monastery of Soissy, in France, Nov. 16, 1242. The English people, who admired and loved him, demanded his canonization; the papal court at first refused, but finally yielded, and he was canonized by pope Innocent IV in 1249. His *Speculum Ecclesie* is published in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*.—Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xv, 660; Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury* (1865, vol. iii); Wright, *Biographia Literaria* (Anglo-Norman period).

**Ed'na** (עֲדָנָה, i. e. עֲדָנָה, *pleasure*; Vulg. *Anna*), the wife of Ragnel and mother of Sara, the bride of Tobias (Tob. vii, 2, 8, 14, 16; x, 12; xi, 1).

**E'dom** (Heb. *Edom'*, עֲדוֹם or עֲדוֹמִים, so called from his red hair, Gen. xxv, 25, or from the red potage for which he bartered his birthright, ver. 30; Sept. *Ἐδῶμ*), the later name of Isaac's son, elder twin-brother of Jacob; more frequently called **ESAU** (q. v.). See also **OBEDE-EDOM**.

**EDOM** (Sept. *Ἰδομαία*) stands also collectively for the *Edomites*, the posterity of Edom or Esau; and likewise for their country. See **EDOMITE**.

**E'domite** (Heb. *Adomi'*, עֲדוֹמִי, Sept. *Ἰδομαίος*, fem. plur. *Ἰδομαίαι*, 1 Kings xi, 1, Sept. *Ἰδομαία*; but usually *עֲדוֹם*, *Edom*, put collectively for the Edomites). The name Edom (fully written *עֲדוֹם*, *red*; see Gesenius, *Heb. Thesaur.* i, 26) was originally the secondary name of Esau (Gen. xxv, 30, comp. ver. 25; xxxvi, 8), but is used ethnographically in the O. T., his descendants ("children of Edom," *בְּנֵי עֲדוֹם*) being the race who had settled in the south of Palestine, and who at a later period came into conflict with the kindred nation of the Israelites (Deut. xxiii, 7; Num. xx, 14). Comparatively seldom are the appellations *children of Esau* (Deut. ii, 4, 8; 1 Macc. v, 3), *house of Esau* (Obad. 18), *mount Esau* (Obad. 8, 9, 19, 21), or simply *Esau* (Jer. xlix, 8, 10; Obad. 6), used in Scripture for the Edomites or Idumæa; the people and country are often called merely *Edom* (Num. xxiv, 18; Josh. xv, 1; 2 Sam. viii, 14; 1 Kings xi, 14; and especially by the prophets), hence, more fully, *land of Edom* (Gen. xxxvi, 16, 21; Num. xxxiii, 37), or *field of Edom* (Gen. xxxii, 3; Judg. v, 4). The territory of the Edomites was mountainous (Obad. 8, 9, 19, 21), situated at the southern (Josh. xi, 17; xii, 7), i. e. south-eastern border of Palestine (Num. xxxiv, 5), or more particularly of the tribe of Judah (Josh. xv, 1, 21), in the neighborhood of the Moabites (Judg. xi, 18; Isa. xi, 14; 2 Kings iii, 8), and was properly called the land or mountain of *Seir* (עֵיִר, Gen. xxvi, 20; xxxii, 4; Josh. xxiv, 2; Ezek. xxxv, 3, 7, 15; comp. Deut. ii, 4, 29). See **SEIR**. Lofty and intersected by chasms in the rocks, it formed a natural fastness (Jer. xlix, 16 sq.; Obad. 3 sq.), yet it was by no means unfruitful (Gen. xxvii, 30). It contained, among other cities, the famous rock-hewn Sela (2 Kings xiv, 7), and extended from the Ælantic Gulf to the Red Sea (1 Kings ix, 26; 2 Chron. viii, 17). Hence it admits of no doubt that the cleft and craggy region traversed by fruitful valleys, now called *el-Shira*, which stretches from the southern extremity of the Dead Sea to the eastern arm of the Red Sea, and is separated on the west by the long sandy plain el-Ghór from the desert et-Tib (Sectzen, xviii, p. 90, 434; Burekhardt, *Trav.* ii, 683), and bounded on the north by the wady el-Ahsa, which separates it from the land of Moab, near Kerak, in the district of Jebel, is the ancient land of Edom, as Saadias has long ago perceived, for he renders Seir in Gen. xxxvi, 8 by the same Arabic name SHERA (comp. Raumer in Berghaus's *Annal. d. Erd. u. Völkerkunde*, i, 562 sq.). See SELA; TEMAN; UZ; BOZRAH. According to the division in Greek authors, the territory of Edom, *Idumæa* (Ἰδομαία, a name evidently derived from the Heb.), was reckoned as a part of Arabia Petraea (see Anthon's *Class. Dict.* s. v.). The early inhabitants of Mount Seir, who were called *Horites*, were destroyed by the Edomites (Deut. ii, 12, 22), or rather supplanted and absorbed by them. See **HORITE**. Already, in the time of Moses, the Edomites showed a hostile feeling towards the Israelites by forbidding them to pass through their territories, and thus subjecting them to the hardship of journeying around it (Num. xx, 15-21; xxi, 4; comp. Judg. xi, 17 sq.; see Hengstenberg, *Pent.* ii, 283); an act which Saul successfully

avenged (1 Sam. xiv, 47), while David subjugated them (2 Sam. viii, 14; comp. 1 Kings xi, 15 sq.; Psa. lx, 2, 10), and his successor Solomon fitted out a merchant fleet in the Edomitish harbors (1 Kings ix, 26), although under his reign a partially successful revolt took place (1 Kings xi, 14 sq.). In the division of the Hebrew commonwealth the Edomites continued under the sway of Judah (probably by means of viceroys, 2 Kings iii, 9, 12, 26; but compare 1 Kings xxii, 48; 2 Kings viii, 20), so that their ports were at the disposal of Jewish commerce to the time of Joram (1 Kings xxii, 49), under whose reign (B.C. 885) they threw off their allegiance (2 Kings viii, 20), and maintained their independence by force of arms against several succeeding princes of the weak kingdom of Judah (2 Kings viii, 21). Amaziah (2 Kings xv, 7; 2 Chron. xxv, 11), in B.C. cir. 836, and also Uzziah (2 Kings xv, 22; 2 Chron. xxv, 11), in B.C. cir. 802, again reduced the Edomites to subjection; but under Ahaz (B.C. cir. 738) they invaded Judæa (2 Chron. xxviii, 17), while, at the same time, the harbor of Elath was wrested from the Jewish dominions by the Syrians (2 Kings xvi, 6). From this time forward, the Edomites, favored by the increasingly formidable attitude of Assyria, and later of Chaldaea, remained in merely nominal connection with the kingdom of Judah, enjoying real independence, until they too at last were forced to succumb to the Chaldaean power (Jer. xxvii, 3, 6). The early prophets, nearly contemporary with these events, had already announced Judah's future triumph over these rebellious subjects and persistent enemies (Isa. xi, 14; Joel iii, 19; Amos i, 11); but, after they had made common cause with the foes of Israel at the capture of Jerusalem (Ezek. xxxv, 15; xxxvi, 5; Obad. 10, 13 sq.), the denunciations of the prophets became still more decisive (Jer. xlix, 8, 20; Lam. iv, 21 sq.; Ezek. xxv, 12 sq.—compare 35; Obad. pass.; Psa. cxxxvii, 7; comp. Isa. xxxiv, 5 sq.; lxiii, 1 sq.). The Edomites, it is true, likewise felt the ravages of the Chaldaean march (Mal. i, 3 sq.), but they were left in their own land (in opposition to the view of Eichhorn, *Hebr. Proph.* ii, 618, 624; Bertholdt, *Einleit.* iv, 1440, 1626, who maintain that the Idumæans were politically annihilated by Nebuchadnezzar; see Gesenius, *Comm.* on Isa. i, 906: nor are the predictions of the utter desolation of Edom, e. g. Jer. xlix, 17 sq., to be pressed to their extreme fulfilment; see Heinrich, *De Idumæa ejusque vastatione*, Lips. 1782), and they even rent away a portion of southern Palestine (comp. Ezek. xxxv, 10), including the town of Hebron (1 Macc. v, 65). During the Syrian rule they continued to evince their old ill will against the Jews (1 Macc. v, 3, 65; 2 Macc. x, 15; xii, 32 sq.), until they were wholly subdued by John Hyrcanus (B.C. cir. 129), and, by a compulsory circumcision, were merged in the Jewish state (Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 9; xv, 7, 9; comp. *War.* iv, 5, 5; yet they were invidiously termed *half-Jews*, *Ant.* xiv, 15, 2). From that time Idumæa continued under a Jewish prefect (σπαρταγός, Joseph. *Ant.* xiv, 1, 3). One of these, Antipater, managed so to ingratiate himself with the Jewish court, and, during the disputes concerning the Macabæan succession, yielded the procuratorship of all Judæa, with which the friendship of the emperor had invested him, with such efficiency (B.C. 47), that he eventually secured the supreme power instead of Hyrcanus II (Joseph. *Ant.* xiv, 8, 5). His son Herod became the acknowledged king of the Jews, and founded an Idumæan dynasty in Palestine. Idumæa formed a province of his dominions, and was under the administration of a special governor (ἀρχων, Joseph. *Ant.* xv, 7, 9). Concerning the farther history of this people, we can here only remark, that the Idumæans in the last Jewish contest acted the same ruinous part with the Jews themselves (Joseph. *War.* iv, 4, 1 and 5; vii, 8, 1). The name of Edom or Edomite is to this day hateful to the Jews (Otho, *Lex. Rab.* p. 196; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* p. 693). From the time of

the overthrow of the Jewish nation, the name of Idumæa no longer occurs, but passes away in the wider denomination Arabia (comp. Steph. Byz. p. 334, 341; Strabo xvi, 760, 749); since already for a long period the southern part of the ancient land of the Edomites was reckoned, together with its metropolis Petra, to Arabia, and entitled separately from (the Jewish province) Idumæa (Joseph. *Ant.* xiv, 1, 3; xvii, 3, 2; *War.* i, 13, 8); so that Idumæa, while on the north it included in addition a Jewish district (comp. the term Idumæan for Jew, especially among the Roman poets, Celsii *Hierob.* ii, 469 sq.), at the same time was contracted in its southern boundary (comp. Ptol. v, 16, 10; v, 17; Strabo, xvi, 760; Jerome in *Obad.* 1); but this does not affect Biblical geography, and it would be difficult to reduce the point to full historical and topographical clearness (see Reland, *Palæst.* p. 69 sq.). See ARABIA; PETRA.

The form of government among the Edomitish people was, like that of surrounding nations, tribal (comp. Gen. xxxvi, 15 sq.), yet they originally (or at least earlier than the Israelites) had kings (Gen. xxxvi, 32 sq.; Num. xx, 14; see Tuch on Gen. xxxvi, 9 sq.; Bertheau, *Israel. Gesch.* p. 207), who appear to have been freely chosen from among the clan-chieftains (princes, Gen. xxxvi, 40; Ezek. xxxii, 29; comp. Isa. xxxiv, 12, and Gesenius, in loc.; Hengstenberg, *Pent.* ii, 299 sq.), until (in the time of Solomon) a hereditary dynasty had established itself (1 Kings xi, 14 sq.). While the country remained under Israelitish sway, the native royal government was nearly superseded (1 Kings xxii, 48); although under Jehoshaphat mention is made (2 Kings iii, 9, 26) of a king (viceroy) of the Edomites (in alliance with him), and from this time they seem to have had an uninterrupted line of kings (Amos ii, 1; Jer. xxvii, 3; Ezek. xxxii, 29). The principal mode of livelihood and employment of the Edomites were commerce by land by means of caravans (Heeren, *Ideen*, i, 1, p. 107; Lengerke, *Ken.* i, 298; compare Ezek. xxviii, 16, where, however, the true reading is *Aram*; see Hävernick in loc.), probably to Elath and Ezion-geber, on the Red Sea; the raising of cattle, agriculture, and the cultivation of vines (Num. xx, 17; Ezek. xxv, 13); according to Jerome (*Onom.* s. v. Fenon), also mining (see C. G. Flade, *De re metall. Mōtanit., Edomit., et Phœnic.*, Lips. n. d.). Respecting their religion the Old Test. is entirely silent, except that it was some form of polytheism (2 Chron. xxv, 20); Josephus (*Ant.* xv, 7, 9) mentions one of their gods by the name of Coze (Κοζῆ, ἡ Πύξῆ), the *destroyer or ender*; see Hitzig, *Philist.* p. 265; and comp. Epiphani. *Her.* 55; Lengerke, *Ken.* i, 298). From the earliest times the wisdom of the Edomites, namely, of the Temanite branch, was celebrated (Obad. 8; Jer. xlix, 7). See Uz. (On the subject generally, see Van Iperen, *Hist. crit. Edomæor. et Amalck.* Leonard. 1768; Hoffmann, in the *Hull. Encyclop.* II, xv, 146). —Winer, i, 292. See IDUMÆA.

Ed'rei (Heb. *Edr'ei*, עֲדְרַי, *mighty*; Sept. Ἐδραεῖν and Ἐδραῖν), the name of two cities.

1. One of the metropolitan towns (Ashtaroth being the other) of the kingdom of Bashan, beyond the Jordan (Josh. xii, 4, 5; xiii, 12; Dent. xiii, 10). It was here that Og, the gigantic king of Bashan, was defeated by the Israelites, and lost his kingdom (Num. xxi, 33-35; Dent. i, 4; iii, 1-8). Edrei afterwards belonged to eastern Manasseh (Josh. xiii, 31; Num. xxxii, 33). It is probable that Edrei did not remain long in possession of the Israelites. May it not be that they abandoned it in consequence of its position within the borders of a wild region infested by numerous robber bands? The Lejah is the ancient Argob, and appears to have been the stronghold of the Geshurites; and they perhaps subsequently occupied Edrei (Josh. xii, 4, 5). It was the seat of a bishop in the early ages of Christianity (Reland, *Palæst.* p. 517), and a bishop of

*Adraa* sat in the Council of Seleucia (A.D. 381) and of Chalcedon (A.D. 451). In A.D. 1142 the Crusaders under Baldwin III made a sudden attack upon *Adraa*, or *Adratum*, then popularly called also *Civitas Bernardi de Stampis*, but they encountered such obstacles in the difficult nature of the ground, the scarcity of water, and the valor of the inhabitants, that they were compelled to retreat (Will. Tyr. p. 895, 896, 1031). Abulfeda calls it *Adsvaat* (*Tab. Syr.* 79).

There are two ancient towns in Bashan which now claim the honor of being the representatives of Edrei. The one is called *Edhra*, and is situated on the south-west angle of the rocky district of Lejah, the Argob of the Hebrews, and the Trachonitis of the Greeks. The ruins of *Edhra* are among the most extensive in Hauran. The site is a strange one. It is a rocky promontory projecting from the Lejah [see TRACHONITIS], having an elevation of some thirty feet above the plain, which spreads out beyond it smooth as a sea, and of unrivalled fertility. The ruins are nearly three miles in circuit, and have a strange, wild look, rising up in black shattered masses from the midst of black rocks. A number of the ancient houses still remain, though half buried beneath heaps of more modern ruins. Their walls, roofs, and doors are all of stone; they are low, massive, and simple in plan; and they bear the marks of the most remote antiquity. Some of them are doubtless as old as the time of the Rephaim, and they are thus specimens of primeval architecture such as no other country could produce. At a later period *Edhra* was adorned with many public edifices, now mostly in ruins. A large church still stands at the northern end of the town. A Greek inscription over the door informs us that it was originally a heathen temple, was converted into a church, and dedicated to St. George in A.D. 516. There are the walls of another church of St. Elias; and in the centre of the town a cloistered quadrangle, which appears to have been at first attached to a forum, and afterwards to a cathedral. On the public buildings and private houses are many Greek inscriptions. Some were copied by Burckhardt, and some by Rev. J. L. Porter. At the time of the visit of the latter in 1854 the population amounted to about fifty families, of which some eight or ten were Christian, and the rest Mohammedan. A full account of the history and antiquities of Edrei is given in Porter's *Five Years in Damascus*, ii, 220 sq., and *Handbook for Syria and Palestine*, p. 532 sq.; also in his *Giant Cities of Bashan*, p. 94 sq. See also Burckhardt's *Travels in Syria*, p. 57 sq.; Buckingham's *Travels among the Arab Tribes*, p. 274.

The other place with which Edrei has been identified is called *Dera*, and stands in a shallow wady in the open plain of Hauran, about fourteen miles south of *Edhra*. The following reasons have been assigned in favor of the other site. 1. The name *Edrei*, which signifies "strength," and the fact that it was the capital of an ancient and warlike nation, naturally lead to the belief that it was a very strong city. Ancient cities were always, when possible, built on the tops of hills, or in rocky fastnesses, so as to be easily defended. *Edhra* stands on a ridge of jagged rocks, and is so encompassed with cliffs and defiles as to be almost inaccessible. *Dera*, on the contrary, is in the open plain, and has no traces of old fortifications (G. Robinson, *Travels in Palestine*, ii, 168). It is difficult to believe that the warlike Rephaim would have erected a royal city in such a position. 2. *Dera* has neither well nor fountain to attract ancient colonists to an undefended site. Its supply of water was brought by an aqueduct from a great distance (Ritter, *Palest. und Syr.* ii, 834). 3. The ruins of *Edhra* are more ancient, more important, and much more extensive than those of *Dera*. The dwellings of *Edhra* possess all the characteristics of remote antiquity—massive walls, stone roofs, stone doors. The monuments now existing seem to show that it must have been an important

town from the time the Romans took possession of Bashan; and that it, and not *Dera*, was the episcopal city of *Adraa*, which ranked next to Bostra (Reiland, *Pal.* p. 219, 223, 548). None of the buildings in the latter seem older than the Roman period (Dr. Smith, in Robinson's *Bib. Res.* iii, App. p. 155, 1st ed.). On the other hand, the identification of *Dera* and Edrei can be traced back to Eusebius and Jerome, who say that Edrei was then called *Adara* (*Ἀδάρᾶ*), and was a noted city of Arabia, twenty-four miles from Bostra (*Onomast.* s. v. *Ἐσδραῖ*, Esdrai). In another place they give the distance at twenty-five miles from Bostra and six from Ashtaroth (*ib.* s. v. *Ἀστραθῶς*, Astaroth, where the place in question is called *Ἀδρᾶα*, *Adra*). *Adara* is laid down in the Peutinger Tables as here indicated (Reiland, *Palest.* p. 547; comp. Ptolemy, v, 17; 7). There can be no doubt that the city thus referred to is the modern *Dera*; and the statement of Eusebius is too explicit to be set aside on the supposition that he has confounded the two sites in dispute. Moreover, it is improbable that the boundaries of Manasseh East extended so far as the locality of *Edhra*. Most modern geographers have therefore concluded that *Dera* marks the real site of Edrei (Reiland, *Palest.* p. 547; Ritter, *Palest. und Syr.* ii, 834; Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 241; Buckingham, *Arab Tribes*, p. 168; Schwarz, however, declares for the other position, *Palest.* p. 222).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

2. A fortified town of northern Palestine, allotted to the tribe of Naphtali, and situated near Kedesh and Hazor (Josh. xix, 37). About two miles south of Kedesh is a conical rocky hill called *Tell Khurabeh*, the "Tell of the ruin," with some remains of ancient buildings on the summit and a rock-hewn tomb in its side. It is evidently an old site, and it may be that of the long-lost Edrei. The strength of the position, and its nearness to Kedesh, give probability to the supposition. Dr. Robinson (*Bib. Res.* iii, 365) suggests the identity of Tell Khurabeh with Hazor (q. v.). For the objections to this theory, see Porter's *Handbook for Syria and Palestine*, p. 442.—Smith, s. v.

**EDUCATION, HEBREW.** Although nothing is more carefully inculcated in the Law than the duty of parents to teach their children its precepts and principles (Exod. xii, 26; xiii, 8, 14; Dent. iv. 5, 9, 10; vi, 2, 7, 20; xi, 19, 21; Acts xxii, 3; 2 Tim. iii, 15; Susanna, 3; Josephus, *Ap.* ii, 16, 17, 25), yet there is little trace among the Hebrews in earlier times of education in any other subjects. The wisdom, therefore, and instruction, of which so much is said in the book of Proverbs, is to be understood chiefly of moral and religious discipline, imparted, according to the direction of the Law, by the teaching and under the example of parents (Prov. i, 2, 8; ii, 2, 10; iv, 1, 7, 20; viii, 1; ix, 1, 10; xii, 1; xvi, 22; xvii, 24; xxxi). Implicit exceptions to this statement may perhaps be found in the instances of Moses himself, who was brought up in all Egyptian learning (Acts vii, 22); of the writer of the book of Job, who was evidently well versed in natural history and in the astronomy of the day (Job xxxviii, 31; xxxix, xl, xli); of Daniel and his companions in captivity (Dan. i, 4, 17; and, above all, in the intellectual gifts and acquirements of Solomon, which were even more renowned than his political greatness (1 Kings iv, 29, 34; x, 1-9; 2 Chron. ix, 1-8), and the memory of which has, with much exaggeration, been widely preserved in Oriental tradition. The statement made above may, however, in all probability, be taken as representing the chief aim of ordinary Hebrew education, both at the time when the Law was best observed, and also when, after periods of national decline from the Mosaic standard, attempts were made by monarchs, as Jehoshaphat or Josiah, or by prophets, as Elijah or Isaiah, to enforce, or at least to inculcate reform in the moral condition of the people on the basis of that standard (2 Kings xvii, 13; xxii, 8-20; 2 Chron. xvii, 7, 9; 1 Kings xix, 14; Isa. i sq.).

In later times the prophecies, and comments on them as well as on the earlier Scriptures, together with other subjects, were studied (Prol. to *Eccles.*, and *Eccles.* xxxviii, 24, 26; xxxix, 1-11). St. Jerome adds that Jewish children were taught to say by heart the genealogies (Jerome on *Titus*, iii, 9; Calmet, *Dict.* s. v. *Généalogie*). Parents were required to teach their children some trade, and he who failed to do so was said to be virtually teaching his child to steal (Mishna, *Kid-dush*, ii, 2, vol. iii, p. 413; Surenhus; Lightfoot, *Chron. Temp.* on Acts xviii, vol. ii, p. 79).

The sect of the Essenes, though themselves abhorring marriage, were anxious to undertake, and careful in carrying out the education of children, but confined its subject matter chiefly to morals and the divine law (Josephus, *War*, ii, 8, 12; Philo, *Quod omnis probus liber*, ii, 458; ed. Mangey; § 12, Tauchn.).

Previous to the captivity, the chief depositaries of learning were the schools or colleges, from which, in most cases (see Amos vii, 14), proceeded that succession of public teachers who, at various times, endeavored to reform the moral and religious conduct of both rulers and people. (See Werkmeister, *De prima scholarum ap. Hebr. origine*, Jesnit. 1735; Hegewisch, *Ob bei den Alten öffentl. Erziehung war*, Altona, 1811.) In these schools the Law was probably the chief subject of instruction; the study of languages was little followed by any Jews till after the Captivity, but from that time the number of Jews residing in foreign countries must have made the knowledge of foreign languages more common than before (see Acts xxi, 37). From the time of the outbreak of the last war with the Romans, parents were forbidden to instruct their children in Greek literature (Mishna, *Sotah*, c. ix, 15, vol. iii, p. 307, 308, Surenhus). Nor had it ever been generally pursued by the Jews (Origen, *con'tra Celsum*, ii, 34).

Besides the prophetic schools, instruction was given by the priests in the Temple and elsewhere, but their subjects were doubtless exclusively concerned with religion and worship (Lev. x, 11; Ezek. xlv, 23, 24; 1 Chron. xxv, 7, 8; Mal. ii, 7). Those sovereigns who exhibited any anxiety for the maintenance of the religious element in the Jewish polity were conspicuous in enforcing the religious education of the people (2 Chron. xvii, 7, 8, 9; xix, 5, 8, 11; 2 Kings xxiii, 2).

From the time of the settlement in Canaan there must have been among the Jews persons skilled in writing and in accounts. Perhaps the neighborhood of the tribe of Zebulun to the commercial district of Phœnicia may have been the occasion of their reputation in this respect. The "writers" of that tribe are represented (Judg. v, 14) by the same word, *סופרים*, *sopher*, used in that passage of the levying of an army, or, perhaps, of a military officer (Gesenius, s. v.) as is applied to Ezra in reference to the Law (Ezra vii, 6); to Seraiah, David's scribe or secretary (2 Sam. viii, 17); to Shebna, scribe to Hezekiah (2 Kings xviii, 37); Shemaiah (1 Chron. xxiv, 6); Baruch, scribe to Jeremiah (Jer. xxxvi, 32), and others filling like offices at various times. The municipal officers of the kingdom, especially in the time of Solomon, must have required a staff of well-educated persons in their various departments under the recorder, *מזכיר*, *mazkir*, or historiographer, whose business was to compile memorials of the reign (2 Sam. viii, 16; xx, 24; 2 Kings xviii, 18; 2 Chron. xxxiv, 8). Learning, in the sense above mentioned, was at all times highly esteemed, and educated persons were treated with great respect, and, according to Rabbinical tradition, were called "sons of the noble," and allowed to take precedence of others at table (Lightfoot, *Chr. Temp.* Acts xvii, vol. ii, 79, fol.; *Ilor. Hebr.* Luke xiv, 8-24; ii, 540). The same authority deprecates the degeneracy of later times in this respect (Mishna, *Sotah*, ix, 15, vol. iii, 308, Surenhus).

To the schools of the prophets succeeded, after the Captivity, the synagogues, which were either them-

selves used as schools, or had places near them for that purpose. In most places there was at least one, and in Jerusalem, according to some, 394, according to others, 460 (Calmet, *Dict.* s. v. *Ecoles*). It was from these schools, and the doctrines of the various teachers presiding over them, of whom Gamaliel, Sammai, and Hillel were among the most famous, that many of those traditions and refinements proceeded by which the Law was in our Lord's time encumbered and obscured, and which may be considered as represented, though in a highly exaggerated degree, by the Talmud. After the destruction of Jerusalem, colleges, inheriting and probably enlarging the traditions of their predecessors, were maintained for a long time at Japhne in Galilee, at Lydda, at Tiberias, the most famous of all, and at Sepphoris. These schools, in process of time, were dispersed into other countries, and by degrees destroyed. According to the principles laid down in the Mishna, boys at five years of age were to begin the Scriptures, at ten the Mishna, at thirteen they became subject to the whole Law (see Luke ii, 46), at fifteen they entered the Gemara (Mishna, *Pirk. Ab.* iv, 20; v, 21, vol. iv, p. 460, 482, 486, Surenhus.). Teachers were treated with great respect, and both pupils and teachers were exhorted to respect each other. Physical science formed part of the course of instruction (*ib.* iii, 18). Unmarried men and women were not allowed to be teachers of boys (Mishna, *Kid-dush*, iv, 13, vol. iii, p. 383). In the schools the Rabbins sat on raised seats, and the scholars, according to their age, sat on benches below or on the ground (Lightfoot on Luke ii, 46; Philo, *ut sup.* 12, ii, 458, Mangey).

Of female education we have little account in Scripture, but it is clear that the prophetic schools included within their scope the instruction of females, who were occasionally invested with authority similar to that of the prophets themselves (Judg. iv, 4; 2 Kings xxii, 14). Needlework formed a large, but by no means the only subject of instruction imparted to females, whose position in society and in the household must by no means be considered as represented in modern Oriental—including Mohammedan—usage (see Prov. xxi, 16, 26; Hist. of Sus. 3; Luke viii, 2, 3; x, 33; Acts xiii, 50; 2 Tim. i, 5).

Among modern Mohammedans, education, even of boys, is of a most elementary kind, and of females still more limited. In one respect it may be considered as the likeness or the caricature of the Jewish system, viz. that besides the most common rules of arithmetic, the Koran is made the staple, if not the only subject of instruction. In Oriental schools, both Jewish and Mohammedan, the lessons are written by each scholar with chalk on tablets, which are cleaned for a fresh lesson. All recite their lessons together aloud; faults are usually punished by stripes on the feet. Female children are, among Mohammedans, seldom taught to read or write. A few chapters of the Koran are learned by heart, and in some schools they are taught embroidery and needlework. In Persia there are many public schools and colleges, but the children of the wealthier parents are mostly taught at home. The Koran forms the staple of instruction, being regarded as the model not only of doctrine, but of style, and the text-book of all science. In the colleges, however, mathematics are taught to some extent (Norberg, *Opusc.* ii, 144 sq.; Shaw, *Travels*, p. 194; Rauwolff, *Travels*, vii, 60; Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 326; *Travels in Arabia*, i, 275; Porter, *Damascus*, ii, 95; Lane, *Mod. Egypt.* i, 89, 93; *English in Eg.* ii, 28, 31; Wellsted, *Arabia*, ii, 6, 395; Chardin, *Voyages*, iv, 224, Langles; Olearius, *Travels*, p. 214, 215; Pietro della Valle, *Viaggi*, ii, 188).—Smith, s. v. On the subject generally, see Jahn, *Bibl. Arch.* § 106, 166; Ursini, *Antiquit. Hebr. scholastic. acad.* (Hafn. 1702; also in Ugolini *Thesaur.* xxi); Dnmor, *De scholis et academiis vet. Hebr.* (Wirceb. 1782; uncritical); Purnmann, *De re scholastica Judæor.* (Fref. 1779); Seiferheld, in Beye'schlag's *Sylloge var. opusc.* i,

582 sq.; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* ii, 917 sq.; Hartmann, *Verbind. des A. T. mit den Neuen*, p. 377 sq.; Gfrörer, *Gesch. d. Urchristenth.* i, 109 sq.; Beer, *Skizzen einer Gesch. der Erziehung u. des Unterr. bei den Israeliten* (Prague, 1832; a superficial work). See SCHOOL.

EDUCATION FOR THE MINISTRY. See MINISTRY; THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION.

**Edumia**, a place thus described by Eusebius and Jerome (in the *Onomasticon*, s. v. Ἐδουμία, Edomia): "of the tribe of Benjamin; and there is still a village *Eduma*, Ἐδουμία, in Acrabatie, about twelve miles east of Neapolis." From this language, Leclerc (*not. in loc.*) infers that *Adummim* is meant; but this lay farther south. Van de Velde finds the locality in the modern village *Dammeh*, S.E. of Nablous (*Narrat.* ii, 308); a coincidence first pointed out by Robinson (*Researches*, iii, 103), as lying in the prescribed position, although not within the tribe of Benjamin (apparently a conjecture of Euseb.). It is situated on the tableland overlooking the Jordan valley, and contains a fountain and ancient sepulchres in the outskirts (Robinson, *Later Researches*, p. 292, 293).

**E'duth** (עֲדוּת, *eduth'*, *precept*), as it is often rendered; Sept. and Vulg. translate accordingly) stands (besides being translated elsewhere in its ordinary acception) as a part (in connection with "Shushan" either sing. or plur.) of the inscription of certain poetical compositions, indicating that the contents were of a *revealed* or sacred character (title of *Psa.* lx, lxxx). See SHOSHANNIM.

**Edward III**, CONFESSOR, king of the Anglo-Saxons, was born in Oxfordshire in 1004, and died Jan. 5, 1066. He was canonized by Pope Alexander III, and styled "Confessor" in the bull of canonization. The only ground for this was the fact that when, in 1044, he married Editha, daughter of earl Godwin, he informed her that he would make her his queen, but that she should not share his bed. He kept this unnatural vow, and for it, in spite of a licentious life, he was sainted by the Pope.

**Edward VI**, king of England, son of Henry VIII by his wife Jane Seymour, was born at Hampton Court, October 12, 1537. He is mentioned here rather for the great events of his reign than for his personal qualities, though these were excellent. He was crowned in 1547, and his uncle, Edward Seymour, afterwards earl of Somerset, became Protector of the kingdom. "He was attached to the principles of the Reformation, and during his rule great strides were made towards the establishment of Protestantism in England. The images were removed from the churches; refractory Roman Catholic bishops were imprisoned; the laity were allowed the cup at the ceremony of the Lord's Supper; all ecclesiastical processes were ordered to run in the king's name; Henry's famous six articles (known as the Bloody Statute) were repealed; a new service-book, compiled by Crammer and Ridley, assisted by eleven other divines, was drawn up, and ordered to be used, and is known as the *First Prayer-book of Edward VI* (see COMMON PRAYER-BOOK); and the celibacy of the clergy ceased to be obligatory" (Chambers, *Encyclopedia*, s. v.). The young king was in full sympathy with the Reformation; but his plans, and those of his counsellors, were arrested by his death, July 6, 1553.

**Edwards, Bela Bates**, D.D., was born in Southampton, Mass., July 4, 1802, and graduated at Amherst College in 1824, and at Andover Theological Seminary in 1830. He served as a tutor in Amherst College during the years 1827-28, and as assistant secretary of the American Education Society during the years 1828-33. In 1837 he was ordained as a minister of the Gospel, and was also appointed professor of Hebrew in Andover Theological Seminary; and in 1848 he was elected associate professor of sa-

cred literature, as successor of Professor Moses Stuart, in the same institution. From 1828 to 1842 he edited the *American Quarterly Register*. He established in 1833 the *American Quarterly Observer*. After publishing two volumes of it, he united it with the *Biblical Repository*, and was sole editor of the combined periodicals from January, 1835, to January, 1838. From 1844 to 1852 he was the senior editor of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*. For twenty-three years he was employed in superintending periodical literature, and, with the assistance of several associates, has left thirty-one octavo volumes as the monuments of his enterprise and industry in this department of labor. He also edited several duodecimo volumes, among which are the *Eclectic Reader*, the *Biography of Self-taught Men*, the *Memoir of Henry Martyn*, to which he prefixed an Introductory Essay. He published many articles in the religious newspapers, various pamphlets, and important parts of several volumes, such as the *German Selections*, by professors Edwards and Park; *Classical Studies*, by professors Edwards, Sears, and Felton. He injured his constitution by his unremitting toils, and was compelled to make the tour of Europe for his health, and to spend two winters in the South. He died at Athens, Ga., April 20, 1852, in the fiftieth year of his age. He was distinguished not only for his poetic sentiment, large erudition, soundness of judgment, skill as an instructor, and eloquence as a preacher, but also for his delicacy of taste, his tender sensibilities, and, above all, his deep, earnest, and uniform piety. Some of his discourses and essays, with a memoir of his life by E. A. Park, were published in Boston in 1853 in two duodecimo volumes. (E. A. P.)

**Edwards, John**, D.D., one of the strongest Calvinistic divines the Church of England has produced. He was born at Hertford Feb. 26, 1639, and was educated at Merchant-Taylor's School, London. In 1653 he entered St. John's College, Cambridge, where he became scholar and fellow. He was minister of Trinity Church, Cambridge, from 1664 to about 1676, when he was made rector of St. Peter's, Colchester. He returned to Cambridge in 1679, and there wrote industriously on controversial theology. He died April 16, 1716. "It may be questioned whether, since the days of Calvin himself, there has existed a more decided Calvinist than Dr. Edwards. He has been termed the Paul, the Augustine, the Bradwardine, the Calvin of his age. Such was his abhorrence of Arminianism that he contended, with the old Puritans, that there is a close connection between it and popery." His principal writings are, *Theologia reformativa*, or the *Body and Substance of the Christian Religion, comprised in distinct Discourses or Treatises upon the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments* (Lond. 1713-26, 3 vols. fol.);—*A complete History or Survey of all the Dispensations or Methods of Religion* (Lond. 1699, 2 vols. 8vo);—*The Arminian Doctrines condemned by the Scriptures* (Lond. 1711, 8vo);—*Authority of the O. and N. T.* (Lond. 1693, 3 vols. 8vo);—*Exercitations, critical, theological, etc., on important places in the O. and N. T.* (Lond. 1702, 8vo);—*Socialism unmasked* (Lond. 1697, 8vo);—*The Doctrine of Faith and Justification* (Lond. 1708, 8vo);—Jones, *Christ. Biography*, s. v.; Kippis, *Biographia Britannica*, vol. v.

**Edwards, Jonathan**, was born at East Windsor, Conn., on the 5th of October, 1703. His great-grandfather on the paternal side was the Rev. Richard Edwards, a clergyman in London in the time of queen Elizabeth. His great-grandfather, William Edwards, was born in England, came to America about the year 1640, and was an honorable trader in Hartford, Conn. His grandfather, Richard Edwards, was born at Hartford, and spent his life there as a respectable and wealthy merchant. His father, Rev. Timothy Edwards, was born in Hartford May 14, 1669. He entered Harvard College in 1687, and received the

two degrees of Bachelor and Master of Arts on the same day, July 4, 1691, one in the morning and the other in the afternoon, 'an uncommon mark of respect paid to his extraordinary proficiency in learning.' He was ordained pastor of the church at East Windsor in May, 1694. In 1711 he was appointed, by the Legislature of Connecticut, chaplain of the troops sent on an important expedition to Canada. He was distinguished for his scholarship, devoutness, and general weight of character. He generally preached extempore, and until he had passed his seventieth year he did not often write the heads of his discourses. He lived to enjoy the fame of his son, and died January 27, 1758. On the maternal side, the great-grandfather of President Edwards was Anthony Stoddard, Esq., who emigrated from the west of England to Boston, and was a member of the General Court from 1665 to 1684. The grandfather of Edwards was the Rev. Solomon Stoddard, of Northampton, Mass., one of the most erudite and powerful clergymen of New England. Edwards's mother was Esther, the second child of the Northampton pastor, a lady of excellent education and rare strength of character.

The history of President Edwards cannot be fully understood without considering that both on the paternal and maternal side he was allied with families belonging to the ecclesiastical aristocracy of New England. He was an only son, and had ten sisters, some of whom became the wives of eminent men. He was trained by his father and his four eldest sisters (all of whom were proficient in learning) for Yale College, which he entered in 1716, just before he was thirteen years of age. During the next year his favorite study was Locke on the Human Understanding. "Taking that book into his hand upon some occasion not long before his death, he said to some of his select friends who were then with him, that he was beyond expression entertained and pleased with it when he read it in his youth at college; that he was as much engaged, and had more satisfaction and pleasure in studying it, than the most greedy miser in gathering up handfuls of silver and gold from some new-discovered treasure." When about twelve years of age he wrote a paper which indicates that he had been thoroughly interested in the question of Materialism. At about the same age he composed some remarkable papers on questions in natural philosophy. Having distinguished himself at college as an acute thinker, and also as an impassioned writer, he took his Bachelor's degree in 1720, and delivered the "salutatory, which was also the valedictory oration."

When he was a boy, probably about the age of seven or eight years, he began to develop his religious character. He writes: "I was then very much affected for many months, and concerned about the things of religion and my soul's salvation, and was abundant in religious duties. I used to pray five times a day in secret, and to spend much time in religious conversation with other boys, and used to meet with them to pray together. I experienced I know not what kind of delight in religion. I, with some of my schoolmates, joined together and built a booth in a swamp, in a very retired spot, for a place of prayer; and, besides, I had particular secret places of my own in the woods where I used to retire by myself, and was from time to time much affected. My affections seemed to be lively and easily moved, and I seemed to be in my element when engaged in religious duties." Reflecting on these fervid emotions, Edwards afterward regarded them as no signs of genuine piety. He was keen in his analysis of character, and was wont to encourage, not only in others, but also in himself, the habit of severe self-examination, and of jealous watchfulness against the influence of self-love. Although from his earliest childhood he had been dutiful, docile, and exemplary in his outward demeanor, yet he writes concerning his boyhood and youth: "I

was at times very uneasy, especially towards the latter part of my time at college, when it pleased God to seize me with a pleurisy, in which he brought me nigh to the grave, and shook me over the pit of hell. And yet it was not long after my recovery before I fell again into my old ways of sin. But God would not suffer me to go on with any quietness. I had great and violent inward struggles, till, after many conflicts with wicked inclinations, repeated resolutions, and bonds that I laid myself under by a kind of vows to God, I was brought wholly to break off all former wicked ways, and all ways of known outward sin, and to apply myself to seek salvation, and practice many religious duties, but without that kind of affection and delight which I had formerly experienced." With his characteristic fidelity in scrutinizing his motives, he looked with distrust on his seeking the Lord after this "miserable manner, which," he says, "has made me sometimes since to question whether it ever issued in that which was saving, being ready to doubt whether such miserable seeking ever succeeded." At length, however, but precisely at what period he does not state, he began to entertain an abiding confidence in his having been regenerated by the Holy Ghost. In the poetic and fervid style which often characterizes his writings, he says: "I began to have a new kind of apprehensions and ideas of Christ, and the work of redemption, and the glorious way of salvation by him. This I know not how to express otherwise than by a calm, sweet abstraction of soul from all the concerns of this world, and sometimes a kind of vision, or fixed ideas and imaginations of being alone in the mountains or some solitary wilderness, far from all mankind, sweetly conversing with Christ, and rapt and swallowed up in God." On one occasion "I walked abroad alone in a solitary place in my father's pasture for contemplation. As I was walking there, and looking upon the sky and clouds, there came into my mind so sweet a sense of the glorious *majesty* and *grace* of God as I know not how to express. I seemed to see them both in a sweet conjunction, majesty and meekness joined together; it was a sweet, and gentle, and holy majesty, and also a majestic meekness, an awful sweetness, a high, and great, and holy gentleness. After this my sense of divine things gradually increased, and became more and more lively, and had more of that inward sweetness. The appearance of every thing was altered; there seemed to be, as it were, a calm, sweet cast or appearance of divine glory in almost every thing. God's excellency, his wisdom, his purity, and love, seemed to appear in every thing—in the sun, moon, and stars; in the clouds and blue sky; in the grass, flowers, trees; in the water and all nature—which used greatly to fix my mind. I often used to sit and view the moon for a long time, and in the day spent much of my time in viewing the clouds and sky, to behold the sweet glory of God in these things, in the mean time singing forth with a low voice my contemplations of the Creator and Redeemer, and scarce any thing in all the works of nature was so sweet to me as thunder and lightning; formerly nothing had been so terrible to me. Before, I used to be uncommonly terrified with thunder, and to be struck with terror when I saw a thunder-storm rising; but now, on the contrary, it rejoiced me. I felt God, if I may so speak, at the first appearance of a thunder-storm, and used to take the opportunity at such times to fix myself in order to view the clouds, and see the lightnings play, and hear the majestic and awful voice of God's thunder, which oftentimes was exceedingly entertaining, leading me to sweet contemplations of my great and glorious God. While thus engaged it always seemed natural for me to sing or chant forth my meditations, or to speak my thoughts in soliloquies with a singing voice."

The sharpness of his intellect, the activity of his imagination, the liveliness of his sensibilities, and the



depth of his piety, were regarded as signs of his being called of God to the ministry of the Gospel. Having been a resident scholar nearly two years at Yale College after his graduation, and having pursued his theological studies during that period, he was "approbated" as a preacher in June or July, 1722, several months before he was nineteen years of age. From August, 1722, until April, 1723, he preached to a small Presbyterian church in New York city. His eloquence fascinated his hearers, but he felt compelled to decline their urgent invitations to become their pastor. In his solitary walks along the silent banks of the Hudson he learned more and more of "the bottonless depths of secret corruption and deceit" belonging to his heart, and of the beauty and amiableness of true holiness. "Holiness, as I then wrote down some of my contemplations on it, appeared to me to be of a sweet, pleasant, charming, serene, calm nature, which brought an inexpressible purity, brightness, peacefulness, and ravisment to the soul. In other words, that it made the soul like a field or garden of God, with all manner of pleasant flowers, enjoying a sweet calm, and the gentle, vivifying beams of the sun. The soul of a true Christian, as I then wrote my meditations, appeared like such a little white flower as we see in the spring of the year, low and humble on the ground, opening its bosom to receive the pleasant beams of the sun's glory; rejoicing, as it were, in a calm rapture; diffusing around a sweet fragraney; standing peacefully and lovingly in the midst of other flowers round about, all in like manner opening their bosoms to drink in the light of the sun." It was during his residence in New York that he wrote the first thirty-four of his well-known "Resolutions" for the government of his life.

In September, 1723, he was called to a tutorship in Yale College. Having passed the preceding winter and spring in severe study at the college, he entered on his tutorship in June, 1724, and left it in September, 1726. After having declined various invitations to take the oversight of churches, he was ordained February 15, 1727, as pastor of the church in Northampton, a colleague with his celebrated grandfather, Solomon Stoddard. He rose at once into eminence as a preacher, especially as a preacher of the divine law, of the divine sovereignty, of man's entire sinfulness by nature, of justification by faith, and of eternal punishment. He often spoke *extempore*; he seldom made a gesture; his voice was not commanding; his power was that of deep thought and strong feeling. Dr. Trumbull says that when Mr. Edwards was preaching at Enfield, Conn., "there was such a breathing of distress and weeping that the preacher was obliged to speak to the people and desire silence that he might be heard." A gentleman remarked to President Dwight that when, in his youth, he heard Mr. Edwards describe the day of judgment, he fully supposed that immediately at the close of the sermon "the Judge would descend, and the final separation take place." During the delivery of one of his most overwhelming discourses in the pulpit of a minister unused to such power, this minister is said to have forgotten himself so far as to pull the preacher by the coat, and try to stay the torrent of such appalling eloquence by the question, "Mr. Edwards! Mr. Edwards! is not God a merciful Being?"

In February, 1729, in consequence of the death of Mr. Stoddard, the entire charge of the congregation at Northampton was devolved on Mr. Edwards. In 1734 and 1735 occurred a remarkable "awakening" of religious feeling in his parish; another occurred in 1740, at which period he became a bosom friend of George Whitefield. During both these developments of religious activity he preached with a force which overawed his hearers. While his parochial labors were multifarious and earnest, he studied the phenomena of the revival with the keenness of a philosopher, and they prompted him to write some of his most acute

disquisitions. Indeed, nearly all the works which he published during his ministry at Northampton indicate the degree in which he labored for the promotion or the regulation of those religious "awakenings" for which his ministry was distinguished. Some of these works are merely sermons, others are larger treatises. They bear the following titles: *God glorified in Man's Dependence* (1731):—*A divine and supernatural Light imparted to the Soul by the Spirit of God* (1734); a sermon noted for its spiritual philosophy):—*Curse ye Meroz* (1735):—*A faithful Narrative of the surprising Work of God in the Conversion of many hundred Souls in Northampton*, etc. (London, 1736):—*Five Discourses prefixed to the American Edition of this Narrative* (1738):—*Sinners in the Havils of an angry God* (1741); one of his most terrific sermons):—*Sorrows of the bereaved spread before Jesus* (1741):—*Distinguishing Marks of a Work of the true Spirit* (1741):—*Thoughts on the Revival in New England*, etc. (1742):—*The Watchman's Duty and Account* (1743):—*The true Excellency of a Gospel Minister* (1744):—*A Treatise concerning religious Affections* (1745); one of his most spiritual and analytical works):—*An humble Attempt to promote explicit Agreement and visible Union among God's People in extraordinary Prayer* (1746):—*True Saints, when absent from the Body, present with the Lord* (1747):—*God's awful Judgments in breaking the strong Rods of the Community* (1748):—*Life and Diary of the Rev. David Brainerd* (1749); a volume which exerted a decisive influence on Henry Martyn, and has affected the missionary spirit of the English as well as American churches):—*Christ the Example of Gospel Ministers* (1749):—*Qualifications for full Communion in the visible Church* (1749); a treatise of historical as well as theological importance):—*Farewell Sermon to the People of Northampton* (1750); called "the best farewell sermon ever written").

The last two publications suggest the most sorrowful event of President Edwards's life. He was dismissed from his Northampton pastorate on the 22d of June, 1750. As early as 1744 he had offended many, and among them some of the most influential families in his congregation, by certain stringent measures which he adopted in regard to alleged immoralities prevalent at Northampton. The whole parish was shaken by his resolute and uncompromising reproofs, and was predisposed to resist any subsequent innovation which he might make. His grandfather, Mr. Stoddard, had favored the principle that unconverted persons who are not immoral have a right to partake of the Lord's Supper. The authoritative influence of Mr. Stoddard had induced not only the Northampton Church, but also many other churches, to adopt that principle. Mr. Edwards, after prolonged deliberation, opposed it. The entire community was aroused by his boldness in controverting the teachings of a man like Solomon Stoddard, "whose word was law." After a prolonged and earnest controversy, he was ejected from the office which he had adorned for more than twenty-three years. He never saw occasion to change the opinions which were so obnoxious to his people; and two years after his dismissal he published a work entitled *Misrepresentation corrected and Truth vindicated in a Reply to Mr. Solomon Williams's Book on Qualifications for Communion*; to which is added a *Letter from Mr. Edwards to his late Flock at Northampton* (1752). After his death, and after a disastrous controversy through the land, his principles prevailed among the evangelical churches.

At the present day, when the dismissal of pastors is so frequent, we cannot easily imagine the mortification and injury which Edwards suffered in consequence of his difficulties with his parish. He was in his forty-seventh year, and had accumulated no property for the support of his large and expensive family. He was compelled to receive pecuniary aid from his friends in remote parts of this country and in Great

Britain. His wife was a descendant from the earls of Kingston, and was a lady of rare accomplishments. The description which he wrote of her in her girlhood was pronounced by Dr. Chalmers to be one of the most beautiful compositions in the language. He was married to her on the 27th of July, 1727, and at the time of his dismission, his eldest son, afterwards judge Timothy Edwards, was about twelve years of age; his second son, afterwards Dr. Jonathan Edwards, was about five years of age; and his youngest son, afterwards judge Pierpont Edwards, was an infant of two or three months; his third daughter, afterwards the mother of Aaron Burr, was in her eighteenth year; and his fourth daughter, afterwards the mother of president Timothy Dwight, was in her sixteenth year. He had a family of three sons and seven daughters—another daughter, Jerusha, having died three years before his dismission. She was betrothed to David Brainerd, who had been a cherished inmate of her father's family.

In July, 1751, about a year after his dismission, Edwards was installed pastor of the small Congregational church in Stockbridge, Mass., and missionary of the Housatonic tribe of Indians at that place. He preached extemporaneously to the Indians through an interpreter. In this uncultivated wilderness he was sadly afflicted with the fever and ague, and other disorders incident to the new settlements. He published a characteristic sermon in 1752, entitled *True Grace distinguished from the Experience of Devils*. In 1754 he published the most celebrated of his works—his *Essay on the Freedom of the Will*. Of this essay there are conflicting interpretations. One school of interpreters contend that he believed in a *literal* inability of the soul to act otherwise than it does act; another school contend that he did not believe in an inability which is *natural and literal*, but only in one which is *moral, figurative*, “an inability improperly so called.” One school contend that he believed liberty to consist in the mere power of doing what the soul has previously willed, of outwardly executing what the soul has antecedently chosen; another school contend that he believed liberty to consist in the power of electing either of two or more objects—such a power that men are not “at all hindered by any fatal necessity from doing, and even willing and choosing as they please, with full freedom; yea, with the highest kind of liberty that ever was thought of, or that ever could possibly enter into the heart of any man to conceive” (Letter to a Scotch theologian). One school regard Edwards as agreeing with those Calvinists who suppose that “man, in his state of innocence, had freedom and power to do that which is good and well-pleasing to God, but yet mutably so that he might fall from it,” and that “man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation;” another school regard Edwards as denying this proposition in its *literal*, and affirming it only in its *figurative* sense, and believing that since the Fall man has all the freedom or liberty which he ever had, or can be imagined to have. One class of critics suppose him to believe that motives are the efficient or the necessitating causes of volitions; another class suppose him to believe that the volition is the *result* of motive as an *occasion*, rather than the necessary *effect* of motive as a *cause*. The latter class interpret his whole theory of the will in the light of the following remark of Edwards to the Scotch divine: “On the contrary, I have largely declared that the connection between antecedent things and consequent ones, which takes place with regard to the acts of men's wills, which is called moral necessity, is called by the name of *necessity* improperly, and that all such terms as *must, cannot, impossible, unable, irresistible, unavoidable, invincible, etc.*, when applied here, are not applied in their proper signification, and are either used nonsensically and with perfect insignificance, or

in a sense quite diverse from their original and proper meaning, and their use in common speech, and that such a necessity as attends the acts of men's wills is more properly called certainty than necessity, it being no other than the certain connection between the subject and predicate of the proposition which affirms their existence.” It is asserted by many that Edwards makes no distinction between the will and the sensibilities; it is thought by some that he does make a distinction; the acts of the will being acts of moral *choice*, the processes of the sensibilities being what he elsewhere terms “*natural or animal feelings or affections.*”

During his virtual banishment to the Stockbridge wilderness he wrote another of his more noted works, entitled *The great Christian Doctrine of Original Sin defended, etc.* The work was finished May 26, 1757, but was not published until 1758, several months after his death. Perhaps the distinctive peculiarity of this treatise is his defence of the doctrine that there was a constituted *oneness* or *identity* of Adam and his posterity; “that they constituted, “as it were, *one* complex person, or *one* moral whole;” that as a tree, when a century old, is *one* plant with the little sprout from which it grew—as the body of a man, when forty years old, is *one* with the infant body from which it grew—as the body and soul are *one* with each other, so there is a divine “constitution” according to which Adam and his posterity are “*looked upon as one*, and dealt with accordingly;” that in his descendants “the *first existing* of a corrupt disposition is not to be looked upon as sin belonging to them, *distinct* from their participation in Adam's first sin;” that “the *guilt* a man has upon his soul at his first existence is *one* and simple, viz. the guilt of the original apostasy, the guilt of the sin by which the species first rebelled against God. This, and the guilt arising from the first corruption or depraved disposition of the heart, are not to be looked upon as *two* things distinctly imputed and charged upon men in the sight of God,” but are one and the same thing, according to an arbitrary constitution, like that which causes the continued identity of a river which is constantly flowing, or of an animal body which is constantly fluctuating. “When I call this an *arbitrary constitution*, I mean that it is a constitution which depends on nothing but the *divine will*, which divine will depends on nothing but the *divine wisdom.*” During his retirement at Stockbridge, Edwards wrote his *Dissertation concerning the End for which God created the World*, and also his *Dissertation concerning the Nature of true Virtue*. On the former of these treatises he had expended much, and on the latter a life-long study. One class of his interpreters suppose that he wrote the first of these treatises with the design, and that the treatise has been followed with the result, of modifying the popular aspect of Calvinism, and of thereby removing some of the popular objections to the system as formerly held. They suppose that he designed to make the sovereignty of God appear the more amiable by showing that it is intent on the highest interests of his creatures; that the glory of God and the well-being of the universe are one and the same thing, and therefore, when God is said to govern the universe for his own glory, he is also said to govern it for its own well-being. In the second of the two last-named treatises, a treatise which, like the first, and like many of his other essays, was designed to reconcile reason with faith—a treatise the rudiments of which were written in his boyhood, and are found scattered through many of his published works—he reduces all moral goodness to “the love of being in general,” and this love he considers an act of the will as distinct from “animal or natural feeling.” Those Calvinistic divines who believe that all the virtues, such as faith, justice, etc., are in their nature active, and are mere forms of benevolence, and that all sin is equally active, and is the elective preference of

an inferior above a superior good, appeal to Edwards's *Dissertation on Virtue* as having given a marked impulse to what has been called by various names, such as the new, or the New England, or the Hopkinsian divinity. The two last-named dissertations were not published until 1788, thirty years after his death. In 1764 eighteen of Edwards's sermons were published in a volume, to which was prefixed his memoir by Dr. Samuel Hopkins. In 1777 his celebrated *History of Redemption*, in 1788 a new volume of his sermons, in 1789 another new volume of his sermons, in 1793 his *Miscellaneous Observations on important Theological Subjects*, in 1796 his *Remarks on important Theological Controversies*, were all published at Edinburgh, Scotland. His published works were collected and printed in eight volumes at Worcester, Mass., under the editorship of Dr. Samuel Austin, in 1809, and have been republished repeatedly in England and America. A larger edition of his writings, in ten volumes, including a new memoir, and much new material, especially his *Notes on the Bible*, was published at New York in 1829, under the editorial care of Rev. Dr. Sereno Edwards Dwight. Parts of this edition have been republished in England. In 1852, his work entitled *Charity and its Fruits* was published for the first time, and more recently a volume of his writings has been printed in England, which has never been reprinted in America.

One of most interesting aspects in which president Edwards may be viewed is that of his influence over Whitefield, Brainerd, and two of his theological pupils, Bellamy and Hopkins. Another is that of his influence over European scholars and divines. Several of his treatises were published in Great Britain before they were published in America, and the estimate formed of him by Dr. Erskine, Dr. Chalmers, Robert Hall, Dugald Stewart, Sir Henry Moncrief, Sir James Mackintosh, Dr. Priestley, Dr. George Hill, Isaac Taylor, and others, is higher than that expressed by men of the same relative position in this country. It is a remarkable fact that, while living in a kind of exile as a missionary among the Indians at Stockbridge, he was invited to the presidency of the college at Princeton, New Jersey. He was elected to the office on the 26th of September, 1757. In his first response to the trustees he expressed his great surprise at their appointment, and, among other reasons for declining it, he said, with his characteristic simplicity, "I have a constitution in many respects peculiarly unhappy, attended with flaccid solids, vapid, sisy, and scarce fluids, and a low tide of spirits, often occasioning a kind of childish weakness and contemptibleness of speech, presence, and demeanor, with a disagreeable dulness and stiffness much unfitting me for conversation, but more especially for the government of a college." He was dismissed from his Stockbridge pastorate January 4, 1758, after having labored in it six years and a half. He spent a part of January and all of February at Princeton, performing some duties at the college, but was not inaugurated until the 16th of February, 1758. He was inoculated for the small-pox on the 23d of the same month; and after the ordinary effects of the inoculation had nearly subsided, a secondary fever supervened, and he died on the 22d of March, 1758. He had then resided at Princeton about nine weeks, and had been the inaugurated president of the college just five weeks. His age was 54 years, 5 months, and 17 days. His father died in his 89th year, only two months before him; his son-in-law, president Burr, died in his 42d year, only six months before him; his daughter, Mrs. President Burr, died in her 27th year, only sixteen days after him; his wife died in her 49th year, only six months and ten days after him. The three last named are interred in the same burial-ground at Princeton. (E. A. P.)

Edwards, Jonathan, D.D., the second son and ninth child of the President whose history has been sketched in the preceding article, was born at North-

ampton, Mass., May 26th, 1745. Although each was the president of a college, yet, as the father was not a doctor of divinity, he is familiarly termed the President, and the son is distinguished from him as the Doctor. In his early childhood young Edwards was afflicted with an ocular disease, and therefore did not learn to read at so early an age as his powers and instincts would have inclined him. In consequence also of his father's ecclesiastical troubles at Northampton, he was deprived of some important facilities for his education. "When I was but six years of age," he writes in 1788, "my father removed with his family to Stockbridge, which at that time was inhabited by Indians almost solely, as there were in the town but twelve families of whites, or Anglo-Americans, and perhaps one hundred and fifty families of Indians. The Indians being the nearest neighbors, I constantly associated with them; their boys were my daily schoolmates and playfellows. Out of my father's house I seldom heard any language spoken but the Indian. By these means I acquired the knowledge of that language, and a great facility in speaking it. It became more familiar to me than my mother-tongue. I knew the names of some things in Indian that I did not know in English. Even all my thoughts ran in Indian; and, though the true pronunciation of the language is extremely difficult to all but themselves, they acknowledged that I had acquired it perfectly, which, as they said, had never been done before by any Anglo-American. On account of my skill in their language in general, I received from them many compliments applauding my superior wisdom. This skill in their language I have in a good measure retained to this day."

Although the pastor at Stockbridge was nominally the teacher of the Housatonucks, yet, in fact, he often gave instruction to families of the Mohawks, Oneidas, and Tuscaroras, who had gone to his parish for the sake of its educational advantages. He was a patron and also an intimate companion of Gideon Hawley, a man highly revered as a preacher to the Indian tribes. The elder Edwards desired that his son Jonathan should be trained for a missionary among the aborigines, and he therefore sent the boy, not then eleven years old, to a settlement of the Oneida Indians on the banks of the Susquehanna. The faithful friend, Gideon Hawley, travelled with the boy, and took the charge of him, but, in consequence of the French and Indian war, was obliged to return with him, after a residence of about six months among the Oneidas. Young Edwards endeared himself to the Oneida tribe, and on one occasion, when they expected an attack from the French, the Indians took the boy upon their shoulders, and bore him many miles through the wilderness to a place of safety. At that early age he exhibited the traits which afterwards distinguished him—courage, fortitude, and perseverance. While travelling through the wilderness in the depths of winter he was sometimes compelled to sleep on the ground in the open air, and he endured the hardness as a good soldier. He spent the two years 1756, 1757, under the parental roof in Stockbridge, but in January, 1758, his father removed to Princeton, and in October, 1758, both his father and mother were removed from the world, and thus, in his fourteenth year, he was left an orphan. He had no pecuniary means for pursuing his education; but, having received promises of aid from the friends of his parents, he entered the Grammar School at Princeton in February, 1760, was admitted to Princeton College in September, 1761, and was graduated there in September, 1765. During the presidency and under the preaching of Dr. Finley, he became, as he thought, a true servant of Christ, and in September, 1763, he became a member of the Church. After having studied theology with Dr. Joseph Bellamy, he was appointed as a preacher in October, 1766, by the Litchfield County Association. In 1767 he was ap-

pointed to the office of tutor at Nassau Hall, and was continued in the office two years. He was also offered, but he declined to accept, the professorship of languages and logic in the same institution. He had distinguished himself as a linguist and as a logician at Nassau Hall, and at a later day he received the doctorate of divinity from that college. Thus in his earlier years he was honored by his Alma Mater as a man of uncommon promise, and in his maturer years as a man of uncommon attainments. His contemporaries speak of him as indefatigably diligent while at college, and as ever afterwards an eager aspirant for knowledge in its various branches.

He was also an instructive and sometimes an eloquent preacher. Accordingly, he was invited to the pastorate of an important church in New Haven, Conn., and was ordained there Jan. 5, 1769. It is stated in his memoir, that the ordaining council were so intensely interested in his preparatory examination that they continued it for their own pleasure and profit several hours after the time which had been previously appointed for the public exercises of the ordination. Several members of his church were advocates of the "half-way covenant;" he, like his father, was decidedly hostile to it. This divergence of views occasioned much trouble to him in his pastorate. The extravagances which had been connected with the "great awakening" in 1740-2 were followed by a disastrous reaction among the New England churches, and the ministry of Dr. Edwards was made in some degree uncomfortable by it. His pastorate was also disturbed by the demoralizing influences of the Revolutionary war. That war introduced a flood of errors among the people. Dangerous heresies were adopted by some members of his parish. The result of all these untoward events was that he was dismissed from his office May 19, 1795, after having labored in it more than twenty-six years. *The Connecticut Evangelical Magazine* stated that the principal cause "of his dismissal was the departure of some of his parishioners from their former faith, but the ostensible cause assigned by the society was their inability to support a minister."

He had already acquired a great reputation as a philosopher and as a philanthropist. He was well known and much beloved by divines in Great Britain, with some of whom he maintained an active correspondence. Such a man could not long remain without some official relations. In January, 1796, he was installed pastor of the church in Colebrook, Conn. Here, in the bosom of an intelligent, affectionate, and confiding parish, he persevered in his rigorous system of study, and prepared himself for works which he did not live to execute. Having enjoyed his busy retreat a little more than three years, he was surprised by being called in May, 1799, to the presidency of Union College, Schenectady, N. Y. After a prolonged examination of his duty, he applied to an ecclesiastical council for their advice, and in accordance with their counsel he accepted the new office. He entered on its duties in the summer of 1799, and was welcomed with unusual demonstrations of joy. Rev. Dr. Andrew Yates, who was associated with Dr. Edwards in the government of the college, says of him: "His discipline was mild and affectionately parental, and his requirements reasonable. Such a character for government in president Edwards was unexpected to some who professed to know his disposition, and had formed their opinions of him in this respect. It was therefore the more noticed. There was an apparent austerity and reserve in his manner, which no doubt arose from the retirement of study and from habits of close thought, and would leave such an impression after a slight acquaintance; but in his domestic intercourse, and with his intimate friends, while conscientiously strict and prompt in his duties, and while he acted with decision, he was mild and affectionate. The

same spirit characterized his government of the college. It was probably conducted with greater mildness and affection than would have been exercised had not the prevailing expectations of some intimated the danger of his erring on the side of severity. His pupils, like a well-regulated family under faithful discipline, were respectfully attached to him."

On August 1, 1801, after an illness of about a fortnight, he died, at the age of fifty-six years, two months, and six days. "The blood of Christ is my only ground of hope" were among his last words. A highly eulogistic sermon was preached at his funeral in the Reformed Dutch Church at Schenectady by his friend, Rev. Robert Smith, of Savannah. Dr. Edwards had been greatly affected by the loss of his first wife, who, in June, 1782, was drowned. He had also been bereaved of one child; but three of his children survived him.

The influence of Dr. Edwards in the pulpit, although not equal to that of his father, was yet greater than might have been expected from his analytic habits. His eye was piercing, his whole manner was impressive, his thoughts were clear and weighty, and his general character was itself a sermon. He was known to be honest, and a hearty lover of the truth as it is in Jesus. Although not a talker, in the superficial meaning of that phrase, yet he was powerful in conversation with men of letters, and was a prince among disputants; therefore his influence over his theological pupils was perhaps as important as his power in moulding the character of his parishioners. He instructed many young men for the Christian ministry, and his influence is yet apparent in the writings of some of them. One of these pupils was his nephew, president Dwight, of Yale College, who was wont to speak of him with filial reverence; another was Dr. Griffin, president of Williams College, who bore frequent testimony to the power of his teacher. A large part of Dr. Edwards's influence arose from his interpretations of his father's writings. He often said that he had spent his life on those writings, although, in fact, he had a more various learning than belonged to his father. He studied the published and the unpublished works of the elder president with peculiar care. He was an early and confidential friend of Dr. Bellamy, one of the most intimate associates of the elder president, and he learned from Bellamy the exact shadings of the father's system. He was also a lifelong friend of Dr. Samuel Hopkins, another of president Edwards's bosom companions, and he obtained from Hopkins many nice discriminations in regard to the president's theories as expounded in his conversations. He was thus well fitted to be an editor of his father's works, and he did prepare for the press the *History of the Work of Redemption*, two volumes of sermons, and two volumes of *Miscellaneous Observations on important Theological Subjects*. He was also well fitted to write a commentary on his father's doctrinal system, as that system was originally published by the President, or afterwards modified by Hopkins, Bellamy, Smalley, and others. In this aspect there is great value belonging to Dr. Edwards's treatise entitled *Improvements in Theology made by President Edwards and those who have followed his Course of Thought*. In 1797, while he was at Colebrook, he published *A Dissertation concerning Liberty and Necessity; in reply to the Rev. Dr. Samuel West*. This volume may be regarded as perhaps the fairest exponent of the elder president's theory of the will. It led Dr. Emmons to say that, of the two, the father had more reason than the son, yet the son was a better reasoner than the father. It is accordingly in his published works that the influence of Dr. Edwards has been most conspicuous. He printed numerous articles in the *New York Theological Magazine*; various sermons, one in 1783, at the ordination of Rev. Timothy Dwight, at Greenfield, Conn.; one in 1791, on the Injustice and Impolicy of

the Slave-trade; one in 1791, on Human Depravity; one in 1792, at the ordination of Rev. Dan Bradley, at Hamden; one in 1792, at the ordination of Rev. William Brown, at Glastenbury; one in 1792, the Concio ad Clerum, preached in the chapel of Yale College on the marriage of a deceased wife's sister; one in 1793, on the death of Roger Sherman; an election sermon in 1794; in 1797, a sermon on the Future State of Existence and the Immortality of the Soul; in 1799, a Farewell Sermon to the people of Colebrook. The most celebrated of his discourses are the three *On the Necessity of the Atonement and its Consistency with Free Grace in Forgiveness*. They were "preached before his excellency the governor and a large number of both houses of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, during their sessions at New Haven, in October, 1785, and published by request." They have been frequently republished, and they form the basis of that theory of the atonement which is sometimes called the "Edwardean theory," and is now commonly adopted by what is termed the "New England school of divines." These discourses have great historical as well as theological importance, and they serve to illustrate the fact that some of the most profound treatises in the science of divinity have been originally preached in sermons. One ultimate design of his volume on the Atonement was to refute the argument which some were deriving from that doctrine in favor of universal salvation. Intimately connected with this volume was another larger work, originally published in 1789, but frequently republished, and entitled, *The Salvation of all Men strictly examined, and the endless Punishment of those who die impenitent argued and defended against the Reasonings of Dr. Chaucy in his book entitled "The Salvation of all Men."* This work alone would have established the fame of Dr. Edwards as a divine of singular acuteness, deep penetration, accuracy and precision of thought and style. At the present day it is more suggestive of the true and the decisive modes of reasoning on this subject than is perhaps any other volume. The preceding works illustrate the metaphysical acumen and the profound judgment of Dr. Edwards; he published one essay which indicates his tact as a philologist, and which elicited the enthusiastic praises of Humboldt. This is his *Observations on the Language of the Muhhekanew Indians, in which the Extent of that Language in North America is shown, its Genus grammatically traced, and some of its Peculiarities, and some Instances of Analogy between that and the Hebrew are pointed out*. These observations were "communicated to the Connecticut Society of Arts and Sciences, and published at the request of the society." One of the most accomplished of American linguists, Hon. John Pickering, who edited one edition of this paper, says of it: "The work has been for some time well known in Europe, where it has undoubtedly contributed to the diffusion of more just ideas than once prevailed respecting the structure of the Indian languages, and has served to correct some of the errors into which learned men had been led by placing too implicit confidence in the accounts of hasty travellers and blundering interpreters. In the *Mithridates*, that immortal monument of philological research, professor Vater refers to it for the information he has given upon the Mohegan language, and he has published large extracts from it. To a perfect familiarity with the Muhhekanew dialect, Dr. Edwards united a stock of grammatical and other learning which well qualified him for the task of reducing an unwritten language to the rules of grammar." Nearly all of Dr. Edwards's published writings were collected and reprinted in two octavo volumes, each of above 500 pages, in 1842. They were edited, and a memoir was prefixed to them, by his grandson, Rev. Tryon Edwards, D.D.

Although the two Edwardses were in various particulars dissimilar, yet in many respects there was a

striking resemblance between them. Dr. Samuel Miller, of Princeton, says "the son greatly resembled his venerable father in metaphysical acuteness, in ardent piety, and in the purest exemplariness of Christian deportment." The son, like the father, was a tutor in the college where he had been a student; was first ordained over a prominent church in the town where his maternal grandfather had been the pastor; was dismissed on account of his doctrinal opinions; was afterwards the minister of a retired parish; was then president of a college, and died soon after his inauguration. His memoir states that both the father and the son preached on the first Sabbath of the January preceding their death from the text, "This year thou shalt die." (E. A. P.)

**Edwards, Justin, D.D.**, an eminent Congregational minister, was born at Westhampton, Mass., April 25, 1787. He graduated at Williams College 1810; entered the Theological Seminary in Andover March, 1811, and was installed pastor of the South Church in the same place December 2, 1812. In 1825 he was one of the sixteen who founded the "American Society for the Promotion of Temperance." He was installed pastor of the Salem-Street Church, Boston, January 1, 1828, but resigned August 20, 1829, and entered the service of the American Temperance Society as secretary. His zeal, wisdom, and activity contributed, perhaps more than any other agency, to diffuse the principles of the Temperance reform in the United States. He was elected Professor of Theology in the Seminary in New York in February, 1836, and President of the Seminary at Andover, 1837. He accepted the latter appointment. In 1842 he was chosen secretary of the newly-formed American and Foreign Sabbath Union, and in this service he spent several laborious and eminently useful years. He died July 24, 1853. He published *An Address before the Rhetorical Society in the Theological Seminary at Andover* (1824):—*An Address at the laying of the corner-stone of the new meeting-house in Andover* (1826):—*A Letter to the friends of Temperance in Mass.* (1836):—*Permanent Temperance Documents*, a series of papers (1830-36):—*Permanent Documents*, a series of papers on *The Sabbath*; and numerous tracts for the American Tract Society, and a compendious *Commentary* (N. T. and part of O. T.; Amer. Tract Society). His life was full of varied but always consecrated labor, and few men have contributed more largely to promote Christian ethics in America by laying their foundation wisely in true religion. See Halleck, *Life of Justin Edwards* (Amer. Tract Society); and Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 572.

**Edwards, Morgan**, a Baptist minister, was born in Treveithin parish, Wales, May 9, 1722. He commenced preaching in 1738, supplied for seven years a small congregation in Boston, Lincolnshire, and thence removed to Cork, Ireland, where he was pastor for nine years. After spending one year more at Rye, in Sussex, he emigrated to America, and in May, 1761, became pastor of the Baptist Church in Philadelphia. In 1772 he removed to Newark, Del., and preached to several vacant churches until the commencement of the Revolution. After the war he delivered lectures on divinity in Philadelphia and other parts of Pennsylvania, as well as in New Jersey, Delaware, and New England. He died January 28, 1795. Besides various manuscripts, he left behind him forty-two volumes of sermons. He published a number of occasional sermons, addresses, pamphlets, etc.—Sprague, *Ann.* vi, 82.

**Edwards, Thomas**, an English divine, was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he passed A.B. in 1605, and A.M. in 1609. He did not become a Nonconformist, but yet was always a Puritan in theology. "I never," says he, "had a canonical coat, declined subscription for many years before the Parliament, though I practised the old conformity; much less did I bow to the altar and at the name of Jesus,"

etc. He was lecturer at Hertford, and afterwards in London. When the Long Parliament declared against Charles I he sided with them, but when the Independents came into power he opposed them with great virulence both by writing and acting. He published *Reasons against the Independent Government of particular Congregations* (1641, 4to):—*Antapologia, or a full answer to the apologetical Narration of Mr. Goodwyn. Mr. Nye, Mr. Symson, Mr. Burroughs, Mr. Bridge, Members of the Assembly of Divines, wherein are handled many of the Controversies of these Times* (1644, 4to): the chief design of this work we learn from himself, in the preface to it: "This *Antapologia*," says he, "I here recommend to you for a true glass to behold the faces of Presbytery and Independency in, with the beauty, order, and strength of the one, and the deformity, disorder, and weakness of the other":—*Gangrana, or a Catalogue and discovery of many of the Errors, Heresies, Blasphemies, and pernicious Practices of the Secretaries of this Time* (1645, 4to):—*Gangrana*, part ii (1646, 4to):—*Gangrana*, part iii:—*The casting down of the last and strongest hold of Satan, or a Treatise against Toleration* (part i, 1647):—*Of the particular Visibility of the Church:—A Treatise of the Civil Power in Ecclesiasticals, and of Suspension from the Lord's Supper*. The time and place of his death are unknown. He professed himself "a plain, open-hearted man, who hated tricks, reserves, and designs; zealous for the Assembly of Divines, the Directory, the use of the Lord's Prayer, singing of psalms, etc., and so earnest for what he took to be the truth that he was usually called in Cambridge young Luther."—*Kippis, Biog. Brit.* vol. v.

**Edwards, Thomas, D.D.**, a learned Arminian divine, born at Coventry, England, in 1729; entered Clare Hall, Cambridge (of which he became fellow), in 1747; master of the Free School, and rector of St. John the Baptist, Coventry, in 1758; vicar of Nuneaton, Warwickshire, in 1770; and died in 1785. His principal writings are, (1.) *The Doctrine of irresistible Grace proved to have no Foundation in the Writings of the New Testament* (Camb. 1759, 8vo):—(2.) *Prolegomena in libros veteris Testamenti poeticos* (Cantab. 1762, 8vo).

**Edwards, Timothy**, a Congregational minister, was born May 14, 1669, at Hartford, Conn. He graduated at Harvard College July 4, 1691, and was ordained May, 1694, as pastor in East Windsor, which relation he sustained until his death, Jan. 27, 1758. Mr. Edwards was father of the distinguished Jonathan Edwards. He published but one sermon (*Election Sermon*, 1732).—*Sprague, Annals*, i, 230.

**Edwy**, surnamed the Fair, eldest son of king Edmund, succeeded his uncle Eldred as king of England in 955, while his brother Edgar became viceroy of Mercia. Edwy had married Alfriga, the daughter of a noble matron, and was affectionately attached to his young wife. The monks, at the head of whom were Dunstan and archbishop Odo, had, during the reign of Eldred, exerted a great influence at the court; but the young king rejected their councils, and this appears to have made them jealous of Alfriga, believing her to be the cause of this change; and when, on the occasion of his coronation, the king left his court for a time, Dunstan, who had watched for an opportunity to revenge himself on the queen, rushed to her chamber, tore the king from her arms, and brought him back to his courtiers. In revenge for this indignity, Edwy not only banished Dunstan (956), but extended his hatred to the monks generally. Odo declared the marriage unlawful, carried the queen a prisoner to Ireland, and ordered her face to be branded with a red-hot iron. Her wounds soon healing, she recovered her former beauty, and returned to Gloucester. Here she was discovered by Odo's emissaries, and was treated with such cruelty as to cause her

death. When Edwy attempted to resist this violence of the monks, Odo formed a conspiracy against him with Edgar, supported by the Mercians and Northumbrians, and he was deprived of the larger part of his kingdom—all England north of the Thames. He survived the partition of his kingdom only a few months, and died before the end of the year 959. While the monks represent king Edwy as licentious and a mal-administrator, Huntingdon, who was no party in the quarrel, gives him a handsome character, reports that the country flourished under his administration, and that Odo and Dunstan became his enemies because he was unwilling to submit to the severity of monastic rulers.—*Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xv, 692; Mackintosh, *History of England*, i, 55 sq.; Wright, *Biographia Brit. Lit.* (A. S. P.) 430 sq.; Collier, *Eccles. History*, i, 430 sq.; *Edinb. Rev.* xxv and xlii.

**Edzardi, Esra**, a great Hebrew scholar, was born at Hamburg June 28, 1629. He pursued his studies at Leipzig, Wittenberg, and Tübingen, and, in order to become still more proficient, visited many of the larger cities, as Zwickau, where he studied under Daum; Basle, where he enjoyed the instruction of Buxtorf (q. v.); Strasburg, Giessen, Greifswald, and also Rostock, where he was made a licentiate. On his return to Hamburg he gave instruction in Hebrew, and became famous not only for his learning in the Oriental tongues, his thorough acquaintance with Talmudic literature and Hebrew antiquities, but also for his zeal in the conversion of Jews and Romanists. He died January 1, 1708. Most of the works of Edzardi remain in MS. form. The only book mentioned by Grässe is *Consensus Antiquit. Judaicæ c. explicat. christianorum super Jerem. xxvii*, 5, 6, *Hebr. Rab. (Hamb. 1670, fol.)*.—*Hoefer, Nouv. Biograph. Générale*, xv, 693; Grässe, *Allgem. Literär-geschichte*, vi, 886. (J. H. W.)

**Edzardi, Esra Heinrich**, a theologian and historian, son of Sebastian Edzardi, was born at Hamburg Jan. 28, 1703. Although his life was very short (he died Feb. 4, 1733), he left a number of works, of which the principal are, *Schwedische Kirchengeschichte* (Altona, 1720, 8vo):—*Ordnung der zehn Gebote in Lutheri Catechismo* (Hamburg, 1721, 8vo):—*Disputatio de Cycno ante mortem non canente* (Wittenb. 1722, 4to):—*Wahre Lehre von der Gnadenwahl* (1721, 4to).—*Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xv, 694. (J. H. W.)

**Edzardi, Georg Elieser**, son of Esra Edzardi, known, like his father, as a great Hebrew scholar, was born at Hamburg January 22, 1661. He studied at the universities of Giessen, Frankfurt on the Oder, and Heidelberg, and resided for some time at Worms, where he held many disputations with the Rabbis. After a journey through Germany, he was appointed professor of Greek and history at the gymnasium in Hamburg. In 1717 he was appointed professor of Hebrew, and in this department became the worthy successor of his father, and, like him, was zealous in the conversion of the Jews. He died July 23, 1727. Besides treatises on the Talmud, we have from him *Excerpta Gemaræ Babylonicæ*.—*Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xv, 693; Grässe, *Literär-geschichte*, vi, 886. (J. H. W.)

**Edzardi, Johann Esra**, a German historian, brother of the distinguished Hebraist Georg Elieser, was born at Hamburg June 23, 1662. He studied at his own native place, at Giessen, and at the leading universities of Germany and Switzerland. He was for a time an instructor at Rostock, and on his return to Hamburg was called to London to preside as pastor over the evangelical Church of the Holy Trinity. He died Nov. 15, 1713. Besides a *Funeral Oration to Queen Mary*, he left in MS. a *History of the Church of England*.—*Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xv, 693. (J. H. W.)

**Edzardi, Sebastian**, youngest son of Esra, was born at Hamburg August 1, 1673. When only eighteen years old he went to Holland and England, and soon after entered the University of Wittenberg,

where he received his M.A. degree in 1695. He then entered upon the study of theology, but in 1696 was appointed professor of logic and metaphysics at the Hamburg Gymnasium. He was a man of vast learning, but his zeal for the Lutherans and his hatred of the Reformed, whom he believed insincere in their professions, engaged him in long and violent controversies. The king of Prussia, Friedrich I (in 1705), ordered five of Edzardi's dissertations written against the Reformed to be burned at Berlin by the hand of the sheriff (Walch, *Ketzer-Historie*, i, 512 sq.; iii, 1087 sq.). But this punishment was of no avail with Edzardi. He even went so far as to impeach the character of the University of Halle, which he called *Hölle* (Tartarus). After the death of his father he aided his brother Georg Elisier in his efforts for the conversion of the Jews. He died June 10, 1736. A complete catalogue of his numerous polemical writings may be found in Thiessen, *Versuch e. Gelehrt. Gesch. von Hamburg*, Th. i, 139-154, and in Moller's *Cimbria Litterata*, i, 147-151. His leading dissertations against a union with the Reformed were, *Dissertat. de unione cum Reformatis hodiernis judicanda* (Hamb. 1703, 4to);—*Diatr. de caus. unionis a Calvinianis quesite* (Hamb. 1704, 4to);—*Pelagianismus Calvinianorum commonstratus* (Hamb. [Viteb.] 1705, 4to);—*Manichæismus Calvinianorum commonstratus, una cum consecratio: nullum esse eocl. c. Calvin. unioni locum* (Hamb. 1705, 4to).—Hoefler, *Nov. Biogr. Génér.* xv, 694; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch.* i, 672; Asehbach, *Allgem. Kirchen-Lexikon*, ii, 495; Schröckh, *Kirchengeschichte s. d. Reform.* viii, 231, 232; Grässe, *Allgem. Literaturgeschichte*, vi, 886. (J. H. W.)

**Effectual Calling.** See CALL.

**Effectual PRAYER** is the rendering of an expression which occurs James v, 16; "The *effectual fervent* (ἐνεργουμένη) prayer of a righteous man availeth much." The verb ἐνεργῶ (the root of the English *energy*), thus translated, signifies to *work in*, produce, effect (intransitively, Matt. xiv, 2; Mark vi, 15; or transitively, 1 Cor. xii, 6; Gal. iii, 5; Ephes. i, 11; Phil. ii, 13; or in the "middle voice," Rom. vii, 5; 2 Cor. i, 6; iv, 12; Gal. v, 6; Ephes. iii, 20; Col. i, 29; 1 Thess. ii, 13; 2 Thess. ii, 7). The participle here, if regarded as used in a neuter sense, adjectively, would signify *operative, effective*, and such is the interpretation of most commentators (see Wolli's *Cure*, in loc., for the views and discussions of the older writers); but this produces a tautology with the context (πολλὸν ἰσχύει, "availeth much"), which all efforts have failed to remove (such as that of Meyer, who renders adverbially, "The prayer of a righteous man avails much, *in that it works* [indem es wirkt]," i. e. in its efficiency (so Alford, in loc.). It is better (with Vatablus, Hammond, Whitley, Macknight, Doddridge, and Clarke, to regard it as *passive*, in its literal sense, *inwrought*, implying both earnest unction and divine influence, not full inspiration (although the example of Elijah adduced in the following verse would almost warrant that), but such an afflatus as accompanies the supplications of the believing suppliant. See PRAYER.

**Efficacious Grace.** See GRACE; JANSENISM.

**Effrontes**, an obscure Transylvanian sect of the sixteenth century, who not only denied the Holy Ghost, but, among other fooleries, cut their foreheads and anointed them with oil as a mode of initiation. Hence their name "*effrons*"—out of the brow (Eadie, *Ecol. Cyclop.* s. v.).

**Effusion of the Holy Spirit.** See PENTECOST.

**Egbert or Ecbert**, archbishop of York, was a brother of Eadbert, king of Northumberland, and a pupil, and later a friend, of Beda. As teacher at the cathedral school of York, he became celebrated for extensive knowledge and for his Christian character. Among those who were educated at this school were Alcuin and Aelbert. He became bishop of York in

731, and soon after, in 735, York was made an archbishopric, with metropolitan power over all bishoprics north of the river Humber. Even as bishop and archbishop he continued to give instruction at the cathedral school. He founded a library at York which gained great reputation, but was destroyed by fire in the reign of Stephen. He died in 767, leaving a *Dialogus de Ecclesiastica Institutione* (Dublin, 1664; Lond. 1693; also in Galland's *Bibl. Patr.* xiii, 266), and a collection of canonical prescriptions, *De jure sacerdotali*, of which only a few fragments are extant (Mansi, xii, fol. 411-431). The treatise *De Remedii peccatorum* (Mansi, xii, 489) is probably an extract from the work just named by some other writers. Some penitential books have also been ascribed to Egbert, but falsely.—Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 15; Collier, *Ecol. Hist. of England*, vol. i; Wright, *Biog. Brit. Lit. Anglo-Saxon Period*, p. 297; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* iii, 658; Hoefler, *Biographie Générale*, xv, 700.

**Egbert, Saint**, was born in the 7th century. He was a monk in the convent of Rathmelsing, and in 644, when seized with the plague, he made a vow that, in case of recovery, he would leave his country and preach the Gospel among the pagans. He accordingly set out as a missionary for Germany, but was by a tempest compelled to return. He then took up his abode among the monks of the island of Hy, from where he sent as missionaries to Friesland, first, the learned monk Wictbert, and, when this one returned after two years of fruitless labor, twelve Anglo-Saxons. Egbert had a prominent share in kindling that remarkable missionary zeal which distinguished the Anglo-Saxons in the 8th century. He introduced, in 716, into the monastery of Hy the Roman manner of celebrating Easter, and the Roman tonsure. He died in 729.—Beda, *Hist. Ecol. Angl.* iii, 27; v, 10, 11, 23; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* iii, 658. (A. J. S.)

**Egede, Hans**, an eminent Danish missionary, called the "apostle of Greenland," was born at Harstad, Norway (which at that time belonged to Denmark), Jan. 31, 1686, and became pastor at Drontheim in 1707. Here he conceived the project of a mission to Greenland, having derived from a history of Norway the impression that formerly there had been Christians in Greenland, where now there were only heathens. "Egede, after receiving some suggestions to this effect from a friend in Bergen, became so enthusiastic on the subject that he wrote to the bishops of Bergen and Drontheim in 1710, proposing an expedition to convert the Greenlanders; and on its striking him that such a recommendation would come with an ill grace from one who did not offer to undertake it himself, he made the offer, supposing, however, as he himself tells us, that as it was war-time, and the expedition would require some money, the proposal would not be accepted. He received in reply a strange letter from the bishop of Drontheim, Krog, in which the prelate suggested that 'Greenland was undoubtedly a part of America, and could not be very far from Cuba and Hispaniola, where there was found such abundance of gold;' concluding that it was very likely that those who went to Greenland would bring home 'incredible riches.' Egede had made this offer; very oddly, without acquainting his wife; and as soon as she became aware of it, by the receipt of the bishop's letters, she, with her mother and his mother, assailed Egede with such strong remonstrances, that, he says in his own account, he was quite conquered, and repulsed his folly with a promise to remain in the land which 'God had placed him in' (*Eng. Cyclop.*). Soon after, his wife, however, gave her consent. In 1717 he threw up his benefice at Vaagen, and went with his family to Bergen, endeavoring to find a company to trade with Greenland. The merchants did not receive this project favorably, and Egede determined to lay his plans before the king at Copenhagen. "Fred-

erick IV of Denmark, who had already, in 1714, founded a college for the propagation of the Gospel, sent Egede back to Bergen with his approbation: a company was formed, to which Egede put down his name for the first subscription of 300 dollars, and finally, on May 3, 1721, a ship called 'Haabet,' or 'The Hope,' set sail for Greenland, with forty-six souls on board, including Egede and his family. On the 3d of July, after a dangerous voyage, they set foot on shore at Baalrevier, on the western coast, and were, on the whole, hospitably received by the natives. The very appearance of the Greenlanders at once put a negative on the supposition that they were descended from the Northmen, and their language, which it was now the missionary's business to learn, was found to be entirely of a different kind, being, in fact, nearly related to that spoken by the Esquimaux of Labrador. The climate and the soil were both harsher and ruder than the Norwegians had expected, and the only circumstance that was in their favor was the character of the inhabitants, which, though at first excessively phlegmatic, so as to give the idea that their feelings had been frozen, was neither cruel, nor, as was found by further experience, unadapted to receive religious impressions. For some years the mission had a hard battle for life. The settlers, unable to obtain sufficient food by fishing and the chase, were entirely dependent on the supply of provisions sent them by annual store-ships from Denmark, and when this supply was delayed, were reduced to short rations and the dread of starvation. On one occasion even Egede's courage gave way, and he had made up his mind to abandon the mission and return to Europe unless the provisions arrived within fourteen days. His wife alone opposed the resolution, and refused to pack up, persisting in predicting that the store-ship would arrive in time; and, ere the time had elapsed, the ships, which had missed the coast, found their way, and brought tidings that, rather than give up the attempt to Christianize Greenland, the king had ordered a lottery in favor of it, and, on the lottery's failing, had imposed a special tax on Denmark and Norway under the name of the Greenland Assessment. In 1727 the Bergen company for trading with Greenland was dissolved, from the losses it had sustained, and the Danish government then resolved on founding a colony in Greenland, and sent in 1728 a ship of war, with a body of soldiers under the command of a Major Paars. The soldiers grew mutinous when they saw to what a country they had been sent, and Egede found his life in more danger from his countrymen than it had ever been from the natives. The death of king Frederick IV, in 1731, occasioned a change of affairs. The new king, Christian IV, determined to break up the colony and recall all his subjects from Greenland, with the exception of such as chose to remain of their own free-will, to whom he gave directions that provisions were to be allowed for one year, but that they were to be led to expect no further supply. Egede had then been ten years in Greenland, and his labors were beginning to bear fruit. His eldest son Paul, who was a boy of twelve when they landed, had been of much assistance in learning the language and in other ways; his wife and the younger children had aided greatly in producing a favorable effect on the natives, who had seen no Europeans before except the crews of the Dutch trading-vessels. The angekokks, or conjurers, who might almost be called the priests of the native religion, had been awed, some into respect and others into silence, by the mildness and active benevolence of the foreign angekok; the natives had seen with wonder the interest he took in their welfare, and, if they refused to believe the new doctrines themselves, had not forbidden them to their children, of whom Egede had a hundred and fifty baptized. The elder Greenlanders, when Egede told them of the efficacy of prayer, asked him to pray that there should be no winter; and when he

spoke of the torment of fire, said they should prefer it to frost. Egede, confirmed by his wife, resolved to remain, and this resolution greatly increased his influence over the Greenlanders, who knew that it could only proceed from zeal in their behalf. The king of Denmark, unable to resist his constancy, sent another year's provision beyond what he had promised, and finally, in 1733, announced that he had changed his mind, and determined to devote a yearly sum to the Greenland mission. A dreadful trial was approaching. The Greenland children, of whom some had occasionally been sent to Denmark, almost all died of the small-pox. Two of them were returning home from Copenhagen in the vessel which came in 1733; one of them died on the voyage, the other brought the disorder to Greenland, and the mortality was dreadful. From September, 1733, to June, 1734, the contagion raged to a degree that threatened to depopulate Greenland. When the trading-agents afterwards went over the country, they found every dwelling-house empty for thirty leagues to the north of the Danish colony, and the same devastation was said to have extended still farther south: the number of the dead was computed at 3000. That winter in Greenland offered a combination of horrors which could seldom be equalled, but they were met with admirable constancy by Egede and his indefatigable wife. The same ship that brought the small-pox had brought the assistance of some Moravian missionaries. In the year 1734 his son Paul Egede returned from Copenhagen, whither he had been sent to study, and the elder Egede, finding his health begin to fail, applied for leave to return home. The permission reached him in 1735, but his return was delayed from the illness of his wife, who longed to see her native land again, but was denied that gratification, dying finally in Greenland on the 21st of December, 1735, at the age of 62. Egede carried her coffin with him to Denmark, and she was buried in Copenhagen, where she was followed to the grave by the whole of the clergy of the city. A seminary for the Greenland mission was established there in 1740, and Egede was appointed superintendent, with the title of bishop. In the same year he preferred a memorial for an expedition to be sent out to discover the lost 'eastern colony' of the old Norwegians, and offered to accompany it in person, but the proposal was not adopted. In 1747 Egede retired from his office at Copenhagen, and spent most of the remainder of his life at the house of his daughter Christine, who was married to a clergyman of the island of Falster. While he was at Copenhagen he had married a second wife, who accompanied him to Falster, but before his last illness he expressed his wish that he should be buried by the side of his first wife at Copenhagen, and said that if they would not promise to carry this wish into effect, he would go to Copenhagen to die there. He died at Falster on the 5th of November, 1758" (*Eng. Cyclop.*). He wrote two books on the history of his life's labors. The first was, *Relation angaaende den Grønlandske Missions Begyndelse og forsøttelse* (Copenh. 1738; German, Hamb. 1748). It is rich in materials, but dry in style. Its chief recommendation is its sincerity. The reader is disposed to give entire confidence to the missionary, who not only tells him that on one occasion he labored earnestly in his vocation, but that on another he occupied himself for days in the study of alchemy; who not only speaks of the ardor of his faith at times, but tells us that at others he was seized with a hatred of his task and of religion altogether. *Den gamle Grønlands nye Perlestrat* (Copenh. 1741-4) was translated into French (1763), and into English in 1745, under the title of *A Description of Greenland*. The translation was reprinted in 1818. It comprises his observations on the geography and natural history of Greenland, and the manners of its inhabitants. See *Engl'sh Cyclopaedia*, s. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encycl.* iii, 639; Voelfer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xv, 702; Brauer, *Leitrag zur*



*Gesch. der Heidenbekehrung* (part iii, 1839); Rudelbach, *Christl. Biogr.* (part vi).

**Egede, Paul**, son of Hans, was born at Waagen, Norway; went to Greenland in 1720, in his twelfth year; afterwards studied at Copenhagen; returned to Greenland in 1734; finally left it in 1740, and was, in reward for his labors, appointed chaplain of the hospital of the Holy Ghost, member of the College of Missions, director of the Hospital of Orphans, and finally (1776) bishop of Greenland. Having retired to the house of his son-in-law, pastor Saabye, he did not cease to urge the Danish government to send new expeditions to that colony, and had the joy of seeing his wishes finally complied with. He died June 3, 1789. He wrote and published a Greenland grammar (*Grammatica Grœnlandico-Lat.-Dan.*, Copenh. 1760) and dictionary (*Dictionarium Grœnlandicum-Dano-Latinum*, Copenh. 1751), which have since been improved by Fabricius; translated the New Testament into the language, and was the author of a work, *Ejterretninger om Grønland* (*Information on Greenland*, Copenh. 1789), which is one of the most interesting in Danish literature. It gives a history of the mission from 1720 to 1788 in a more interesting style than his father was master of.—*Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Génér.* xv, 705.

**Egel.** See HEIFER.

**Egg** (אֵי, *beytsah'*, so called from its whiteness, *óóv*) occurs, in the plur., of eggs deserted (Isa. x, 14), of the eggs of a bird (Deut. xxii, 6), of the ostrich (Job xxxix, 14), or the cockatrice (Isa. lix, 5). See FOWL; OSTRICH; COCKATRICE. It is apparently in this last sense that an egg is contrasted with a scorpion in Luke xi, 12, as a desirable article of food. The body of the scorpion is said to be very like an egg; the head can scarcely be distinguished, as it appears to be joined and continued to the breast. Bochart adduces authorities to prove that scorpions in Judea were about the size of an egg (Job xxxix, 14; Isa. x, 14; lix, 5). The passage in Deut. xxii, 6, humanely prohibits the taking away of a brooding bird from a nest, and is similar in its nature to the provision respecting other animals and their young (Lev. xxii, 28).

Eggs are usually considered a great delicacy in the East, and are served up with fish and honey at their entertainments. Among the ancient Egyptians poultry seems to have been bred in abundance, and the most remarkable thing connected with it is the manner in which the eggs were hatched by artificial means, and which, from the monuments, we have reason to infer, was known and practised there at a very early period. At the present time there are as many as four hundred and fifty of these establishments, which, being heavily taxed, produce a large revenue to the government. The proprietors of these egg-ovens make the round of the villages in their vicinity, and collect eggs from the peasants, which are given in charge to the rearers, who, without any previous examination, place all they receive on mats strewn with bran, in a room eleven feet square, with a flat roof, and about four feet high, over which is a chamber of the same size, but with a vaulted roof, about nine feet high; a small aperture in the centre of the vaulted roof admitting light during the warm weather, and another of larger diameter immediately below, communicating with the oven, through whose ceiling it is pierced. By this the man descends to observe the eggs; but in the cold season both openings are closed, and a lamp is kept burning instead, another entrance at the front part of the oven being then used for the same purpose, and shut immediately on his quitting it. In the upper room, the fire is disposed along the length of two troughs, based with earthen slabs, reaching from one side to the other against the front and back walls. In the oven the eggs are placed in a line corresponding to and immediately below the fire, where they remain half a day. They are then removed to a warmer

place, and replaced by others, and so on, till all have taken their share of the warmest positions, to which each set returns, again and again, in regular succession, till the expiration of six days. They are then held up one by one towards a strong light, and if the egg appears clear, and of a uniform color, it is evident it has not succeeded; but if it shows an opaque substance within, or the appearance of different shades, the chicken is already formed; and these last are all returned to the oven for four days more, their positions being changed as before. At the expiration of the fourth day they are removed to another oven, over which, however, there are no fires, where they remain for five days in one heap, the aperture in the roof being closed with tow to exclude air; after which they are placed separately about one, two, or three inches apart, over the whole surface of the mats, which are sprinkled with a little bran. They are now continually turned and shifted from one part of the mats to another for six or seven days, all air being carefully excluded, and are constantly examined by one of the rearers, who applies each singly to his upper eyelid. Those which are cold prove the chickens to be dead; but warmth greater than that of the human skin is the favorable sign that the eggs have succeeded. The average temperature maintained is from 100° to 105°. The manager, having been accustomed to his art from his youth, knows from experience the exact temperature required for the success of the operation, without having any instrument like our thermometer to guide him. Each *ma'amal*, or set of ovens, receives about one hundred and fifty thousand eggs during the annual period of its being brought into use, which is only during about two or three months in the spring. Of this number, generally one quarter, or a third, fail to be productive; so that when the peasants bring their eggs to be hatched, the proprietor of the *ma'amal* returns one chicken for every two eggs. The fowls produced in this way are inferior both in size and flavor to those of Europe (Wilkinson's *Anc. Egyptians*, ii, 170, Am. ed.; Lane's *Mod. Egyptians*, ii, 5).

The word חֵלֶבֶת, *challamuth'*, in Job vi, 6, which our translators have rendered "the white of an egg," is so rendered by the Hebrew interpreters, and the Targum, or rather, "the slime of the yolk of an egg." The Syriac interpretation gives "a tasteless herb," which is there proverbially used for something unsavory or insipid. See PURSLAIN.

**Egidio Antonini**, surnamed of Viterbo, Latin patriarch of Constantinople, was born at Viterbo in the second half of the 15th century. He was received into the order of the hermits of St. Augustine at the early age of ten years; was professor of philosophy and theology in several towns of Italy, and became one of the most eloquent preachers of his epoch. Having become general of his order in 1507, he was appointed patriarch of Constantinople, and bishop of Viterbo, Nepi, Castro, and Sutri. In 1512 he opened, by order of pope Julius II, the Council of Lateran, and on this occasion severely censured the corruption prevailing in the Church, and, in particular, among the clergy. In 1517 pope Leo X sent him to Germany, and appointed him cardinal; in the following year he was sent as papal legate to Spain. Egidio was well versed in the Oriental languages, and a good Latin poet. He wrote a commentary to the first three chapters of Genesis and to several psalms, Latin dialogues, epistles, and poems, and a treatise *De ecclesie incremento*. Some of these works are given in Martene et Durand, *Amplissima Collectio veterum monumentorum*, tom. iii.—*Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Génér.* xv, 718. (A. J. S.)

**Egidius.** See ÆGIDIUS.

**Egidius.** See GIL JUAN.

**Eginhard** or **Einhard** (sometimes also called Agenhard or Ainhard), the biographer of Charle-

magne, was born about 770. The place of his birth is entirely unknown. At an early age he repaired to the court of Charlemagne, and became a pupil of Alcuin. Eginhard gained the favor of the emperor to a high degree, and an intimate friendship sprang up between him and the emperor's children, especially the emperor's oldest son and successor, Louis le Débonnaire. The emperor appointed him his private secretary, and superintendent of public buildings at Aix-la-Chapelle. Eginhard accompanied the emperor in all his marches and journeys, never separating from him excepting on one occasion (806), when he was dispatched by Charlemagne, on a mission to pope Leo, in order to obtain the signature of the pope for the document which divided the empire among the sons of Charlemagne. The emperor departed in his case, as in that of Alcuin, Angilbert, and some other friends, from his habit not to cumulate ecclesiastical benefices in one hand, and gave to him the abbeys of St. Bavo and Blandenberg in Ghent, St. Lerontius in Maestricht, Fritzlär in Germany, St. Wandregisil in France, and others. On the death of Charlemagne, he was appointed preceptor of Lothaire, son of Louis le Débonnaire. The latter presented him with a large tract of land in the Odenwald, the centre of which was Michelstadt. Here Eginhard spent the last years of his life in retirement. He was in 826 ordained presbyter, and in 827 assumed as abbot the direction of a monastery at Seligenstadt, which he had erected upon his estates. As his wife Emma was still alive at this time, he appears to have agreed with her to consider her only as a sister. The report that his wife was a daughter of Charlemagne is probably untrue. The year of his death is unknown. He was still alive in 848. He probably had no children, and the claim of the counts of Erbach, who trace their descent from him, and in whose castle the coffins of Eginhard and his wife are still shown, is probably unfounded. The reputation of Eginhard rests chiefly upon his life of Charlemagne (*Vita et Conversatio Gloriosissimi Imperatoris Karoli Regis Magni*, completed about 820), which is generally regarded as the most important historical work of a biographical nature that has come down to us from the Middle Ages. It frequently served as a model for other biographies, and was extensively used as a school-book. The best edition is that of Pertz (1829), in vol. ii. of the *Monumenta Germanicæ historica*; another edition, with valuable notes and documents, was published by Ideler, *Leben u. Wandel Karl's des Grossen* (Gotha, 1839, 2 vols.). Another work, the *Annales Regum Francorum, Pipini, Caroli Magni, Ludovici Imperatoris*, embraces the period from 741 to 829 (published in Pertz, *Monumenta*, vol. i). The first part (741-788) is based on the Annals of Lorsch; the second part is original. He also wrote an account of the transfer of the relics of St. Marcellin and St. Peter from Rome to his monastery in Seligenstadt (*Historia translationis St. Marcellini et Petri*, in *Acta Sanctorum*, June 2). His *Epistolæ*, 62 in number, are also of considerable value in a historical point of view. They are published in Weinkens, *Eginhardus vindicatus* (Franç. 1714). Another work, *Libellus de adoranda cruce*, is lost. The French consider the edition of Eginhard's works by M. Tenlot, with a translation and life of Eginhard (Paris, 1840-43, 2 vols.), to be the best and most complete.—Cave, *Hist. Lit.*, anno 814; Moshelm, *Ch. Hist.* cent. viii. chap. ii, note 43; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* iii, 725; Dahl, *Ueber Eginhard und Emma* (Darmstadt, 1817). (A. J. S.)

**Eg'lah** (Heb. *Eglah*, עֵגְלָה, a heifer, as often; Sept. Αἴγλα and Ἀγλα), one of David's wives during his reign in Hebron, and the mother of his son Ithream (2 Sam. iii. 5; 1 Chron. iii. 3). B.C. 1045. In both lists the same order is preserved, Eglah being the sixth and last, and in both is she distinguished by the special title of David's "wife." According to the an-

cient Hebrew tradition preserved by Jerome (*Quæst. Hebr.* on 2 Sam. iii. 5; vi, 23), she was MICHAL (q. v.), the wife of his youth, and she died in giving birth to Ithream. A name of this signification is common among the Arabs at the present day.—Smith, s. v. See also EGLATH.

**Eg'taim** (Heb. *Eglā' yim*, עֵגְלַיִם, two ponds; Sept. Ἀγαλείμ, Vulg. *Gallim*), a place named in Isa. xv, 8, apparently as one of the most remote points on the boundary of Moab. It is probably the same as the EN-EGLAIM (q. v.) of Ezek. xlvii, 10. Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v. Ἀγαλλεῖμ, *Agallcim*) say that it still existed in their day as a village (Ἀγαλλεῖμ), eight miles south of Areopolis, i. e. Ar-Moab. Exactly in that position, however, stands Kerak, the ancient Kir-Moab. A town named *Agalla* (Ἀγάλλα) is mentioned by Josephus with Zoar and other places as in the country of the Arabians (*Ant.* xiv, 1, 4). Some have also confounded it with GALLIM (q. v.). De Saulcy conceives Eglaim to be the same with a place which he names *Wady Ajerrah*, not far north of the ruins of Rabbah, but on slender grounds (*Dead Sea*, i, 262, 270). See also EGLATH; EGLON 3.

**Eglath** or **Eglah** (q. v.), in the phrase עֵגְלַת הַשְּׁלִישִׁיָּה, *eglah' shelishiyah*, Isa. xv, 5; Jer. xlviii, 34, which literally signifies a heifer of the third year; Sept. ἑταῖα τρίτης (unt v. r. ἑταῖα Σαδισία in Jer.); Vulg. vitula tertians; A. V. "a heifer three years old;" and so the Targum, and most modern interpreters (Hitzig, Umbreit, etc.). Others (as Knobel, Winer, etc.) understand the term to be the proper name of a place on the border of Moab, mentioned in connection with Zoar, Luhith, and Horonaim (q. v. respectively), and so compare it with the *Agalla* of Josephus (*Ant.* xiv, 1, 4) and the *Necla* (or *Jecla*, Νέκλα or Ἰέκλα) of Ptolemy (v, 17, 5), which lay in this region (Lightfoot, *Hor.* Hebr. p. 931), and with the modern region *Ajlan* north of Jabbok (Abulfeda, *Syr.* 13, 93; Robinson, *Research.* iii, App. p. 162), as the last name has in Arab. the same signification as the Heb. See EGLAIM.

**Eglinus**, RAPHAEL, also called Iconius, a minister of the Reformed Church, was born at Rüssicon, in the Swiss canton of Zurich, Dec. 28, 1559. After studying theology at Zurich, Geneva, and Basel, he for some time taught school at Sonders, in the Veltlin (now part of Lombardy); but, with the Protestants generally, he had to leave this place in 1586. After working for some time as teacher and "diaconus" in Winterscheid, and as "pædagogus" at the college of the alumni at Zurich, he was, in 1592, appointed professor of the New Testament in the latter city. Becoming absorbed in the study of theosophy and alchemy, he spent his whole property in experiments, and in 1601 had to flee on account of debts which he had contracted. Through the intercession of his friends he obtained, however, permission to return, and an honorable dismissal. He went to Cassel, where landgrave Moritz, himself a great friend of alchemy, appointed him teacher at the court school, and later, June 13, 1606, professor of theology at Marburg. From the theological faculty of this university he received, in 1607, the title of D.D. Subsequently Moritz also appointed him court preacher at Marburg. He died May 20, 1622. Eglinus was one of the first Reformed theologians in Hesse where landgrave Moritz and his successors endeavored to supplant Lutheranism by the Reformed Church. He wrote in defence of his creed a number of small essays, the most important of which relate to the doctrine of predestination. He is one of those writers in whom the German reformed theology became more scholastic in its character, and was merged in the stricter Calvinistic tendency. In 1618 Eglinus wrote an apology of the Rosicrucians, of which association he had become an active member. He also wrote several books on alchemy and on the

Apocalypse. A complete list of his works is given by Strieder, *Grundlage zu einer Hess. Gelehrten-Gesch.*—Heppé, in Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, xix, 456; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines* (edited by Smith), ii, 175. (A. H. S.)

**Eg'lon** (Heb. *Eglon'*, עִגְלוֹן, place of heifers, q. d. *vituliné*), the name of a man, and also of two places.

1. (Sept. *'Eglómu*, Josephus *'Eglón*, Vulgate *Eglon*.) An early king of the Moabites (Judg. iii, 12 sq.), who, aided by the Ammonites and the Amalekites, crossed the Jordan and took "the city of palm-trees," or Jericho (Josephus). B.C. 1527. Here he built himself a palace (Josephus, *Ant.* v, 4, 1 sq.), and continued for eighteen years to oppress the children of Israel, who paid him tribute (Josephus). Whether he resided at Jericho permanently, or only during the summer months (Judg. iii, 20; Josephus), he seems to have formed a familiar intimacy (*συνήθης*, Josephus, not Judg.) with Ehud, a young Israelite (*νεανίας*, Josephus) who lived in Jericho (Josephus, not Judg.), and who, by means of repeated presents, became a favorite courtier of the monarch. Eglon subdued the Israelites beyond the Jordan, and the southern tribes on this side the river, and made Jericho the seat, or one of the seats, of his government. This subjection to a power always present must have been more galling to the Israelites than any they had previously suffered. At length (B.C. 1509) they were delivered, through the instrumentality of Ehud, who slew the Moabite king (Judg. iii, 12-33).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See **EHUD**.

2. (Sept. *'Eglómu* v. r. *Αἰλάμ*, but in Josh. x, 'Ὀδολάμ; Vulgate *Eglon*, *Aglon*.) A city in the maritime plain of Judah, near Lachish (Josh. xv, 39), formerly one of the royal cities of the Canaanites (xii, 12). Its Amoritic king Debir (q. v.) formed a confederacy with the neighboring princes to assist Adoni-zedek, king of Jerusalem, in attacking Gibeon, because that city had made peace with Joshua and the Israelites (Josh. x, 3, 4). Joshua met the confederated kings near Gibeon and routed them (Josh. x, 11). Eglon was soon after visited by Joshua and destroyed (x, 34, 35). Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v. *'Eglómu*, *Eglon*) erroneously identify it with *Odollam* or *ADULLAM* (q. v.), and say it was still "a large village," ten R. miles (Jerome, twelve) east of Eleutheropolis, being misled by the unaccountable reading of the Sept. as above. On the road from Eleutheropolis to Gaza, nine miles from the former and twelve from the latter, are the ruins of *Ajlan*, which mark the site of the ancient Eglon (Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 392). The site is now completely desolate. The ruins are mere shapeless heaps of rubbish, strewn over a low, white mound (Porter, *Handb. for Syria*, p. 262). The absence of more imposing remains is easily accounted for. The private houses, like those of Damascus, were built of sun-dried bricks; and the temples and fortifications of the soft calcareous stone of the district, which soon crumbles away. A large mound of rubbish, strewn with stones and pieces of pottery, is all we can now expect to mark the site of an ancient city in this plain (Van de Velde, *Narrative*, ii, 188; Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 356).

3. Another important place of this name (עִגְלוֹן), according to Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 235), is mentioned in Talmudical authorities as situated within the bounds of Gad. He identifies it with the present village *Ajlan*, one mile east of Kulat er-Rubud, or Wady Rejil, which runs parallel with Jebel Ajlun on the south (see Robinson's *Map*, and comp. *Researches*, ii, 121). The village is built on both sides of the narrow rivulet Jenne, and contains nothing remarkable except a few ancient mosques (Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 266).


**Egoism.** See **SELFISHNESS**.

**Egypt** (or, more strictly, *Ægypt*, since the word

is but Anglicized from the Gr. and Lat. Αἴγυπτος, *Ægyptus*), a region important from the earliest times, and more closely identified with Bible incidents than any other, except the Holy Land itself. For a vindication of the harmony between Scripture history and the latest results of Egyptological research (Brugsch, *Aus dem Orient*, Berl. 1864), see Volck in the *Dorpater Zeitschrift*, 1867, ii, art. 2.


I. **Names.**—The common name of Egypt in the Heb. Bible is *Mizraim*, מִצְרַיִם, *Misra'yim* (or, more fully, "the land of Mizraim"). In form *Mizraim* is a dual, and accordingly it is generally joined with a plural verb. When, therefore, in Gen. x, 6, *Mizraim* is mentioned as a son of Ham, some conclude that nothing more is meant than that Egypt was colonized by descendants of Ham. See **MIZRAIM**. The dual number doubtless indicates the natural division of the country into an upper and a lower region, the plain of the Delta and the narrow valley above, as it has been commonly divided at all times. The singular *Mazor*, מִצֹר, *Matsor'*, also occurs (2 Kings xix, 24; Isa. xxxvii, 25; perhaps as a proper name in Isa. xix, 6; Mic. vii, 12; A. V. always as an appellative, "besieged city," etc.), and some suppose that it indicates Lower Egypt, the dual only properly meaning the whole country; but there is no sure ground for this assertion. See **Mazor**. The mention of *Mizraim* and *Pathros* together (Isa. xi, 11; Jer. xlv, 1, 15), even if we adopt the explanation which supposes *Mizraim* to be in these places by a late usage put for *Mazor*, by no means proves that, since *Pathros* is a part of Egypt, *Mizraim*, or rather *Mazor*, is here a part also. The mention of a part of a country by the same term as the whole is very usual in Hebrew phraseology. This designation, at all events, is sometimes used for Egypt indiscriminately, and was by the later Arabs extended to the entire country. Josephus (*Ant.* i, 6, 2) says that all those who inhabit the country call it *Mestre* (Μέστρη), and the Egyptians *Mestreaus* (Μέστραυοί). The natives of Modern Egypt invariably designate it by the name *Misr*, evidently cognate with its ancient Heb. appellation (Hackett's *Illustra. of Scripture*, p. 120).

Egypt is also called in the Bible מִצְרַיִם, "the land of Ham" (Psa. cv, 23, 27; comp. lxxviii, 51), referring to the son of Noah. See **HAM**. Occasionally (Psa. lxxxvii, 4; lxxxix, 10; Isa. li, 9) it is poetically styled *Ra'hab*, רַחַב, i. e. "the proud" or "insolent." See **RAHAB**. The common ancient Egyptian

name of the country is written in hieroglyphics 

**KEM**, which was probably pronounced *Chem*; the demotic form is **KEMI** (Brugsch, *Geographische Inschriften*, i, 73, No. 362); and the Coptic forms are *Chamē* or *Chemī* (Memphitic), *Kemē* or *Kēmē* (Sahidic), and *Kēni* (Bashmuric). This name signifies, alike in the ancient language and in Coptic, "black," and may be supposed to have been given to the land on account of the blackness of its alluvial soil (comp. Plutarch, *De Is. et Osir.* c. 33). It would seem, however, to be rather a representative of the original Heb. name *Ham* (i. e. *Cham*), which likewise in the Shemitic languages denotes *sun-burnt*, as a characteristic of African tribes. The other hieroglyphic names of Egypt appear to be of a poetical character.

The Greek and European name (ἡ Αἴγυπτος, *Ægyptus*), Egypt, is of uncertain origin and signification (Champollion, *L'Égypte*, i, 77). It appears, however, to have some etymological connection with the modern name *Copt*, and is perhaps nothing more than "land of the Copts" (the prefix *ai-* being perhaps for *aia*=*γαία* or *γη*). In Homer the Nile is sometimes (*Odys.* iv, 351, 355; xiv, 257, 258) called Egypt (Αἴγυπτος).



Modern Egypt.

II. *Extent and Population.*—Egypt occupies the north-eastern angle of Africa, between N. lat.  $31^{\circ} 37'$  and  $24^{\circ} 1'$ , and E. long.  $27^{\circ} 13'$  and  $34^{\circ} 12'$ . On the E. it is bounded by Palestine, Idumæa, Arabia Petrea, and the Arabian Gulf. On the W., the moving sands of the wide Libyan desert obliterate the traces of all political or physical limits. Inhabited Egypt, how-

ever, is restricted to the valley of the Nile, which, having a breadth of from two to three miles, is enclosed on both sides by a range of hills: the chain on the eastern side disappears at Mokattam, that on the west extends to the sea. Its limits appear to have always been very nearly the same. In Ezekiel (xxix, 10; xxx, 6), according to the obviously correct rendering



Egypt under the Romans.

(see MIGDOL), the whole country is spoken of as extending from Migdol to Syene, which indicates the same limits to the east and the south as at present. Egypt seems, however, to have always been held, except by the modern geographers, to include no more than the tract irrigated by the Nile lying within the limits we have specified. The deserts were at all times wholly different from the valley, and their tribes more or less independent of the rulers of Egypt. Syene, now Aswan, is also assigned by Greek and Arabian writers as the southern limit of Egypt. Here the Nile issues from the granite rocks of the cataracts, and enters Egypt proper. The length of the country, therefore, in a direct line, is 456 geographical miles. The breadth of the valley between Aswan and the Delta is very unequal; in some places the inundations of the river extend to the foot of the mountains; in other parts there remains a strip of a mile or two in breadth, which the water never covers, and which is therefore always dry and barren. Originally the name *Egypt* designated only this valley and the Delta; but

at a later period it came to include also the region between this and the Red Sea from Berenice to Suez, a strong and mountainous tract, with only a few spots fit for tillage, but better adapted to pasturage. It included also, at this time, the adjacent desert on the west, as far as to the oases, those fertile and inhabited islands in the ocean of sand. The name *Delta*, also, was extended so as to cover the districts between Pelusium and the border of Palestine, and Arabia Petraea; and on the west it included the adjacent tract as far as to the great deserts of Libya and Barca, a region of sand of three days' journey east and west, and as many north and south.

Egypt, in the extensive sense, contains 115,200 square geographical miles, yet it has only a superficies of about 9582 square geographical miles of soil, which the Nile either does or can water and fertilize. This computation includes the river and lakes as well as sandy tracts which can be inundated, and the whole space either cultivated or fit for cultivation is no more than about 5626 square miles. Anciently 2735 square

miles more may have been cultivated, and now it would be possible at once to reclaim about 1295 square miles. These computations are those of Colonel Jacotin and M. Estève, given in the Memoir of the former in the great French work (*Description de l'Égypte*, 2d ed. xviii, pt. ii, p. 101 sq.). They must be very nearly true of the actual state of the country at the present time. Mr. Lane calculated the extent of the cultivated land in A.D. 1375-6 to be 5590 square geographical miles, from a list of the cultivated lands of towns and villages appended to De Sacy's *Abd-Allatif*. He thinks this list may be underrated. M. Mengin made the cultivated land much less in 1821, but since then much waste territory has been reclaimed (Mrs. Poole, *Englishwoman in Egypt*, i, 85). The chief differences in the character of the surface in the times before the Christian era were that the long valley through which flowed the canal between the Nile and the Red Sea was then cultivated, and that the Gulf of Suez perhaps extended further north than at present.

As to the number of its inhabitants, nothing very definite is known. Its fertility would doubtless give birth to and support a teeming population. In very remote times as many as 8,000,000 souls are said to have lived on its soil. In the days of Diodorus Siculus they were estimated at 3,000,000. Volney made the number 2,300,000. A late government estimate is 3,200,000, which seems to have been somewhat below the fact (Bowring's *Report on Egypt and Candia*, p. 4). According to the census taken in 1867, the inhabitants are 4,911,619. Among them are half a million of Copts, descendants of the ancient occupants of the country; 400,000 Bedouins; 250,000 Europeans and Syrians; and 500,000 Turks. In Alexandria, at the close of the last century, scarcely 40,000 inhabitants were counted, whereas at present that city contains 300,000, about half of whom are Arabs and half Europeans. The nationality of the latter has been ascertained to be as follows (the figures represent thousands): Greeks, 25; Italians, 18; French, 16; Anglo-Maltese, 13; Syrians and natives of the Levant, 12; Germans and Swiss, 10; various, 6. Cairo, the capital, contains upwards of 400,000 inhabitants; within its walls are 140 schools, more than 400 mosques, 1166 cafés, 65 public baths, and 11 bazars. The other towns of importance, from their population, are, in Lower Egypt, Damietta, 45,000; Rosetta, 20,000; and in Upper Egypt, Syout, on the left bank of the Nile, numbering 20,000 souls.

III. *Geographical Divisions*.—Under the Pharaohs Egypt was divided into Upper and Lower, "the two regions" TA-TI? called respectively "the Southern Region" TA-RES, and "the Northern Region" TAME-III. There were different crowns for the two regions, that of Upper Egypt being white, and that of Lower Egypt red, the two together composing the *pschent*. The sovereign had a special title as ruler of each region: of Upper Egypt he was SUTEN, "king," and of Lower Egypt SHEBT, "bee," the two combined forming the common title SUTEN-SHEBT. The initial sign of the former name is a bent reed, which illustrates what seems to have been a proverbial expression in Palestine as to the danger of trusting to the Pharaohs and Egypt (1 Kings xviii, 21; Isa. xxxvi, 6; Ezek. xxix, 6); the latter name may throw light upon the comparison of the king of Egypt to a fly, and the king of Assyria to a bee (Isa. vii, 18). It must be remarked that Upper Egypt is always mentioned before Lower Egypt, and that the crown of the former in the *pschent* rises above that of the latter. In subsequent times the same division continued. Manetho speaks of it (ap. Josephus, *c. Apion*, i, 14), and under the Ptolemies it still prevailed. In the time of the Greeks and Romans, Upper Egypt was divided into the Heptanomis and the Thebais, making altogether three provinces, but the division of the whole country into two was even then the most usual. The Thebais

extended from the first cataract at Philæ to Hermopolis, the Heptanomis from Hermopolis to the point where the Delta begins to form itself. About A.D. 400 Egypt was divided into four provinces, Augustamnica Prima and Secunda, and Ægyptus Prima and Secunda. The Heptanomis was called Arcadia, from the emperor Arcadius, and Upper Egypt was divided into Upper and Lower Thebais.

From a remote period Egypt was subdivided into *nomes* (HESPU, sing. HESP), each one of which had its special objects of worship. The monuments show that this division was as old as the earlier part of the twelfth dynasty, which began cir. B.C. 1900. They are said to have been first 36 in number (*Diod. Sic.* i, 54; Strabo, xvii, 1). Ptolemy enumerates 44, and Pliny 46; afterwards they were further increased. There is no distinct reference to them in the Bible. In the Sept. version, indeed, הַמְּלָכּוּת (Isa. xix, 2) is rendered by *rómos*, but we have no warrant for translating it otherwise than "kingdom." It is probable that at that time there were two, if not three kingdoms in the country. Two provinces or districts of Egypt are mentioned in the Bible, Pathros (q. v.) and Caphor (q. v.); the former appears to have been part of Upper Egypt; the latter was evidently so, and must be represented by the Coptite nome, although no doubt of greater extent. The division into nomes was more or less maintained till the invasion of the Saracens. Egypt is now composed of 24 departments, which, according to the French system of geographical arrangement, are subdivided into *arrondissements* and *cantons* (Bowring's *Report*).

IV. *Surface, Climate, etc.*—The general appearance of the country cannot have greatly changed since the days of Mosès. The Delta was always a vast level plain, although of old more perfectly watered than now by the branches of the Nile and numerous canals, while the narrow valley of Upper Egypt must have suffered still less alteration. Anciently, however, the rushes must have been abundant; whereas now they have almost disappeared, except in the lakes. The whole country is remarkable for its extreme fertility, which especially strikes the beholder when the rich green of the fields is contrasted with the utterly-bare yellow mountains or the sand-strewn rocky desert on either side. Thus the plain of Jordan, before the cities were destroyed, was, we read, "well watered everywhere" . . . "[even] like a garden of the Lord, like the land of Egypt" (Gen. xiii, 10). The aspect of Egypt is remarkably uniform. The Delta is a richly-cultivated plain, varied only by the mounds of ancient cities and occasional groves of palms. Other trees are seldom met with. The valley in Upper Egypt is also richly cultivated. It is, however, very narrow, and shut in by low hills, rarely higher than 300 feet, which have the appearance of cliffs from the river, and are not often steep. They, in fact, form the border of the desert on either side, and the valley seems to have been, as it were, cut out of a table-land of rock. The valley is rarely more than twelve miles across. The bright green of the fields, the reddish-brown or dull green color of the great river, the tints of the bare yellow rocks, and the deep blue of the sky, always form a pleasant view, and often one of great beauty. The soil consists of the mud of the river, resting upon desert sands; hence this country owes its existence, fertility, and beauty to the Nile, whose annual overflow is indispensable for the purposes of agriculture. The country around Syene and the cataracts is highly picturesque; the other parts of Egypt, and especially the Delta, are exceedingly uniform and monotonous. The prospect, however, is extremely different, according to the season of the year. From the middle of the spring season, when the harvest is over, one sees nothing but a gray and dusty soil, so full of cracks and chasms that he can hardly pass along. At the time

of the autumnal equinox, the whole country presents nothing but an immeasurable surface of reddish or yellowish water, out of which rise date-trees, villages, and narrow dams, which serve as a means of communication. After the waters have retreated, which usually remain only a short time at this height, you see, till the end of autumn, only a black and slimy mud. But in winter nature puts on all her splendor. In this season, the freshness and power of the new vegetation, the variety and abundance of vegetable productions, exceed everything that is known in the most celebrated parts of the European continent; and Egypt is then, from one end of the country to the other, nothing but a beautiful garden, a verdant meadow, a field sown with flowers, or a waving ocean of grain in the ear.

The climate is very equable, and, to those who can bear great heat, also healthy; indeed, in the opinion of some, the climate of Egypt is one of the finest in the world. There are, however, unwholesome tracts of salt marsh which are to be avoided. Rain seldom falls except on the coast of the Mediterranean. At Thebes a storm will occur, perhaps, not oftener than once in four years. Cultivation nowhere depends upon rain or showers. This absence of rain is mentioned in Deut. (xi, 10, 11) as rendering artificial irrigation necessary, unlike the case of Palestine, and in Zech. (xiv, 18) as peculiar to the country. The atmosphere is clear and shining; a shade is not easily found. Though rain falls even in the winter months very rarely, it is not altogether wanting, as was once believed. Thunder and lightning are still more unfrequent, and are so completely divested of their terrific qualities that the Egyptians never associate with them the idea of destructive force. Showers of hail descending from the hills of Syria are sometimes known to reach the confines of Egypt. The formation of ice is very uncommon. Dew is produced in great abundance. The wind blows from the north from May to September, when it veers round to the east, assumes a southerly direction, and fluctuates till the close of April. The southerly vernal winds, traversing the arid sands of Africa, are most changeable as well as most unhealthy. They form the simoom or samiel, and have proved fatal to caravans and even to armies (*View of Ancient and Modern Egypt*, Edin. Cab. Library).

Egypt has been visited at all ages by severe pestilences, but it cannot be determined that any of those of ancient times were of the character of the modern plague. The plague with which the Egyptians are threatened in Zech. (l. c.) is described by a word, *מַדְבָּרָה*, which is not specially applicable to a pestilence of their country (see ver. 12). See BORCH. Cutaneous disorders, which have always been very prevalent in Egypt, are distinctly mentioned as peculiar to the country (Deut. vii, 15; xxviii, 27, 35, 60, and perhaps Exod. xv, 20, though here the reference may be to the plague of boils), and as punishments to the Israelites in case of disobedience, whereas if they obeyed they were to be preserved from them. The Egyptian calumny that made the Israelites a body of lepers and unclean (Joseph. c. *Apion.*) is thus refuted, and the traditional tale as to the Exodus given by Manetho shown to be altogether wrong in its main facts, which depend upon the truth of this assertion. Famines are frequent, and one in the Middle Ages, in the time of the Fatimite caliphate El-Mustansir-billah, seems to have been even more severe than that of Joseph. Mosquitoes, locusts, frogs, together with the small-pox and leprosy, are the great evils of the country. Ophthalmia is also very prevalent. See DISEASE.

V. *The Nile*.—Egypt is the land of the Nile, the country through which that river flows from the island of Philæ, situated just above the Cataracts of Syene, in lat. 24° 1' 36", to Damietta, in 31° 35' N., where

its principal stream pours itself into the Mediterranean Sea. In lat. 30° 15' the Nile divides into two principal streams, which, in conjunction with a third that springs somewhat higher up, forms the Delta, so called from its resemblance to the Greek letter Δ. At Khar-tum, 160 miles north of Sennâr, the Nile forks into two rivers, called Bahr el-Abiad and Bahr el-Azrak, or the white and blue river, the former flowing from the west, the latter from the east. The blue river is the smaller of these, but it possesses the same fertilizing qualities as the Nile, and is of the same color. The sources of this river were discovered by Bruce; those of the white river were, until quite recently, undiscovered. They are now known to flow from lakes situated among the mountains south of the equator (Beke, *Sources of the Nile*, Lond. 1860). Most ancient writers mention seven mouths of the Nile, beginning from the east: 1, Pelusiac or Bulastic; 2, Saitic or Tanitic; 3, Mendesian; 4, Bucolic or Phatmetic (now of Damietta); 5, Sebennitic; 6, Bolbitine (now of Rosetta); 7, Canopic or Heracleotic.

The Nile is called in the Bible *Shichor*, שִׁיחֹר, or "the black (river);" also *Yeor*, יְאוֹר, "the river." As to the phrases נַחַל מִצְרַיִם, "the river of Egypt," and נַחַל מִצְרַיִם, "the brook of Egypt," it seems unlikely that the Nile should be so specified; and נַחַל or נָהָר here more probably denotes a mountain stream, usually dry, on the borders of Egypt and Palestine, near the modern El-Arish (Num. xxxiv, 5; Josh. xiii, 3, etc.). See EGYPT, RIVER OF. Some have thought that נַחַל is the origin of the word Nile; others have been anxious to find it in the Sanscrit *Nīla*, which means dark blue. The Indus is called Nil-ab, or "the blue river;" the Sutlej also is known as "the blue river." It is to be observed that the Low Nile was painted blue by the ancient Egyptians. The river is turbid and reddish throughout the year, and turns green about the time when the signs of rising commence, but not long after becomes red and very turbid. The Coptic word is *iom*, "sea," which corresponds to the Arab name for it, *bahr*, properly sea; thus Nahum iii, 3, "Populous No (Thebes), whose rampart was the sea." In Egyptian the Nile bore the sacred appellation HAPI, or HAPI-MU, "the abyss," or "the abyss of waters." As Egypt was divided into two regions, we find two Niles, HAPI-RES, "the Southern Nile," and HAPI-MEHIT, "the Northern Nile," the former name being given to the river in Upper Egypt and in Nubia. The common appellation is ATUR, or AUR, "the river," which may be compared with the Heb. *Yeôr*.

The inundation, HAPI-UR, "great Nile," or "high Nile," fertilizes and sustains the country, and makes the river its chief blessing, a very low inundation or failure of rising being the cause of famine. The Nile was on this account anciently worshipped, and the plague in which its waters were turned into blood, while injurious to the river itself and its fish (Exod. vii, 21; Psa. cv, 29), was a reproof to the superstition of the Egyptians. The rise begins in Egypt about the summer solstice, and the inundation commences about two months later. The greatest height is attained about or somewhat after the autumnal equinox. The inundation lasts about three months. During this time, and especially when near the highest, the river rapidly pours along its red turbid waters, and spreads through openings in its banks over the whole valley and plain. The prophet Amos, speaking of the ruin of Israel, metaphorically says that "the land . . . shall be drowned, as [hy] the flood [river] of Egypt" (viii, 8; ix, 5). Owing to the yearly deposit of alluvial matter, both the bed of the Nile and the land of Egypt are gradually raised. The river proceeds in its current uniformly and quietly at the rate of two and a half or three miles an hour, always deep enough for

navigation. Its water is usually blue, but it becomes of a deep brick-red during the period of its overflow. It is salubrious for drinking, meriting the encomiums which it has so abundantly received. On the river the land is wholly dependent. If the Nile does not rise a sufficient height, sterility and dearth, if not famine, ensue. An elevation of sixteen fathoms is essential to secure the prosperity of the country. Such, however, is the regularity of nature, and such the faithfulness of God, that for thousands of years, with but few and partial exceptions, these inundations have in essential particulars been the same. The waters of the stream are conveyed over the surface of the country by canals when natural channels fail. During the overflow the land is literally inundated, and has the appearance of a sea dotted with islands. Wherever the waters reach abundance springs forth. The cultivator has scarcely more to do than to scatter the seed. No wonder that a river whose waters are so grateful, salubrious, and beneficial should in days of ignorance have been regarded as an object of worship, and that it is still revered and beloved. See NILE.

VI. *Geology*.—The fertile plain of the Delta and the valley of Upper Egypt are bounded by rocky deserts covered or strewn with sand. On either side of the plain they are low, but they overlook the valley, above which they rise so steeply as from the river to present the aspect of cliffs. The formation is limestone as far as a little above Thebes, where sandstone begins. The First Cataract, the southern limit of Egypt, is caused by granite and other primitive rocks, which rise through the sandstone and obstruct the river's bed. In Upper Egypt the mountains near the Nile rarely exceed 300 feet in height, but far in the eastern desert they often attain a much greater elevation. The highest is Jebel Gharib, which rises about 6000 feet above the sea. Limestone, sandstone, and granite were obtained from quarries near the river; basalt, breccia, and porphyry from others in the eastern desert between the Thebais and the Red Sea. A geological change has, it is thought, in the course of centuries raised the country near the head of the Gulf of Suez, and depressed that on the northern side of the isthmus. The Delta is of a triangular form, its eastern and western limits being nearly marked by the courses of the ancient Pelusiac and Canopic branches of the Nile: Upper Egypt is a narrow winding valley, varying in breadth, but seldom more than twelve miles across, and generally broadest on the western side. Anciently there was a fertile valley on the course of the Canal of the Red Sea, the Land of Goshen (q. v.), now called Wady Tumeilat: this is covered with the sands of the desert. To the south, on the opposite side, is the oasis now called the Feyum, the old Arsinoite Nome, connected with the valley by a neck of cultivated land.

VII. *Agriculture, etc.*—The ancient prosperity of Egypt is attested by the Bible, as well as by the numerous monuments of the country. As early as the age of the Great Pyramid it must have been densely populated and well able to support its inhabitants, for it cannot be supposed that there was then much external traffic. In such a climate the wants of man are few, and nature is liberal in necessary food. Even the Israelites in their hard bondage did "eat freely" the fish, and the vegetables, and fruits of the country, and ever afterwards they longed to return to the idle plenty of a land where even now starvation is unknown. The contrast of the present state of Egypt with its former prosperity is more to be ascribed to political than to physical causes. It is true that the branches of the Nile have failed, the canals and the artificial lakes and ponds for fish are dried up: that the reeds and other water-plants which were of value in commerce, and a shelter for wild-fowl, have in most parts perished; that the Land of Goshen, once, at least for pasture, "the best of the land" (Gen. xlvii, 6, 11), is now sand-strewn and unwatered, so as scarcely to be

distinguished from the desert around, and that the predictions of the prophets have thus received a literal fulfilment (see especially Isa. xix, 5-10), yet this has not been by any irresistible aggression of nature, but because Egypt, smitten and accursed, has lost all strength and energy. The population is not large enough for the cultivation of the land now fit for culture, and long oppression has taken from it the power and the will to advance.

Egypt is naturally an agricultural country. As far back as the days of Abraham, we find that when the produce failed in Palestine, Egypt was the natural resource. In the time of Joseph it was evidently the granary—at least during famines—of the nations around (Gen. xii, 10; comp. Exod. xvi, 3; Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 9, 2). The inundation, as taking the place of rain, has always rendered the system of agriculture peculiar; and the artificial irrigation during the time of low Nile is necessarily on the same principle. We read of the Land of Promise that it is "not as the land of Egypt, from whence ye came out, where thou sowest thy seed, and waterdest [it] with thy foot, as a garden of herbs; but the land whither thou goest in to possess it, [is] a land of hills and valleys, [and] drinketh water of the rain of heaven" (Deut. xi, 10, 11). Watering with the foot may refer to some mode of irrigation by a machine, but we are inclined to think that it is an idiomatic expression implying a laborious work. The monuments do not afford a representation of the supposed machine. That now called the sháduf, which is a pole having a weight at one end and a bucket at the other, so hung that the laborer is aided by the weight in raising the full bucket, is depicted, and seems to have been the common means of artificial irrigation (q. v.). There are detailed pictures of breaking up the earth, or ploughing, sowing, harvest, threshing, and storing the wheat in granaries. See AGRICULTURE. The threshing was simply treading out by oxen or cows, unmuzzled (comp. Deut. xxv, 4). The processes of agriculture began as soon as the water of the inundation had sunk into the soil, about a month after the autumnal equinox (Exod. ix, 31, 32). Vines were extensively cultivated, and there were several different kinds of wine, one of which, the Mareotic, was famous among the Romans. Of other fruit-trees, the date-palm was the most common and valuable. The gardens resembled the fields, being watered in the same manner by irrigation. See GARDEN; VINEYARD. On the tenure of land much light is thrown by the history of Joseph. Before the famine each city and large village—for "city" must be held to have a wider signification than our "city"—had its field (Gen. xli, 48); but Joseph gained for Pharaoh all the land, except that of the priests, in exchange for food, and required for the right thus obtained a fifth of the produce, which became a law (slvii, 20-26). The evidence of the monuments, though not very explicit, seems to show that this law was ever afterwards in force under the Pharaohs. There does not seem to have been any hereditary aristocracy, except perhaps at an earlier time, and it is not impossible that these lands may have been held during tenure of office or for life. The temples had lands which of course were inalienable. Diodorus Siculus states that all the lands belonged to the crown except those of the priests and the soldiers (i, 73). It is probable that the latter, when not employed on active service, received no pay, but were supported by the crown lands, and occupied them for the time as their own. See LAND.

The great lakes in the north of Egypt were anciently of high importance, especially for their fisheries and the growth of the papyrus. Lake Menzelen, the most eastern of the existing lakes, has still large fisheries, which support the people who live on its islands and shore, the rude successors of the independent Egyptians of the Bucolia. Lake Moeris, anciently so



celebrated, was an artificial lake between Beni-Suweif and Medinet el-Feynum. It was of use to irrigate the neighboring country, and its fisheries yielded a great revenue. See ANGLING. It is now entirely dried up. The canals are now far less numerous than of old, and many of them are choked and comparatively useless. The Bahr Yûsuf, or "river of Joseph"—not the patriarch, but the famous sultan Yusuf Salâh-ed-deen, who repaired it—is a long series of canals, near the desert on the west side of the river, extending northward from Farshut for about 350 miles to a little below Memphis. This was probably a work of very ancient times. There can be no doubt of the high antiquity of the canal of the Red Sea, upon which the Land of Goshen mainly depended for its fertility. It does not follow, however, that it originally connected the Nile and the Red Sea.

VIII. *Botany*.—The cultivable land of Egypt consists almost wholly of fields, in which are very few trees. There are no forests and few groves, except of date-palms, and in Lower Egypt a few of orange and lemon trees. There are also sycamores, mulberry-trees, and acacias, either planted on the sides of roads or standing singly in the fields. The Theban palm grows in the Thebais, generally in clumps. All these, except, perhaps, the mulberry-tree, were anciently common in the country. The two kinds of palm are represented on the monuments, and sycamore and acacia-wood are the materials of various objects made by the ancient inhabitants. The chief fruits are the date, grape, fig, sycamore-fig, pomegranate, banana, many kinds of melons, and the olive; and there are many others less common or important. These were also of old produced in the country. Anciently gardens seem to have received great attention, to have been elaborately planned, and well filled with trees and shrubs. Now horticulture is neglected, although the modern inhabitants are as fond of flowers as were their predecessors. The vegetables are of many kinds and excellent, and form the chief food of the common people. Anciently cattle seem to have been more numerous, and their meat, therefore, more usually eaten, but never as much so as in colder climates. The Israelites in the desert, though they looked back to the time when they "sat by the flesh-pots" (Exod. xvi, 3), seem as much to have regretted the vegetables and fruits, as the flesh and fish of Egypt. "Who shall give us flesh to eat? We remember the fish which we did eat in Egypt freely, the cucumbers, and the melons, and the leeks, and the onions, and the garlic" (Num. xi, 4, 5). The chief vegetables now are beans, peas, lentils, of which an excellent thick pottage is made (Gen. xxv, 14), leeks, onions, garlic, radishes, carrots, cabbages, gourds, cucumbers, the tomato, and the egg-fruit. There are many besides these. The most important field-produce in ancient times was wheat; after it must be placed barley, millet, flax, and, among the vegetables, lentils, peas, and beans. At the present day the same is the case; but maize, rice, oats, clover, the sugar-cane, roses, the tobacco-plant, hemp, and cotton, must be added, some of which are not indigenous. In the account of the plague of hail four kinds of field-produce are mentioned—flax, barley, wheat, and  $\text{לֶחֶם}$  (Exod. ix, 31, 32), which is variously rendered in the A. V. "rye" (l. c.), "spelt" (Isa. xxviii, 25), and "fitches" (Isa. xxviii, 27). It is doubted whether the last be a cereal or a leguminous product: we incline to the former opinion. See RYE.

It is clear from the evidence of the monuments and of ancient writers that, of old, reeds were far more common in Egypt than now. The byblus or papyrus is almost or quite unknown. Anciently it was a common and most important plant: boats were made of its stalks, and of their thin leaves the famous paper was manufactured. It appears to be mentioned under two names in the Bible, neither of which, however, can

be proved to be a peculiar designation for it. (1.) The mother of Moses made  $\text{אֲרֹן עֲבֹתַי}$ , "an ark" or "skiff" "of papyrus," in which to put her child (Exod. ii, 3), and Isaiah tells of messengers sent apparently from farthest Ethiopia in  $\text{אֲבִיבֵי-פָפִירוס}$ , "vessels of papyrus" (xviii, 2), in both which cases  $\text{פָּפִירוס}$  must mean papyrus, although it would seem in other places to signify "reeds" generically. (2.) Isaiah prophesies, "The papyrus-reeds ( $\text{רִבְרִיבֵי}$ ) in the river ( $\text{נַחַל}$ ), on the edge of the river, and everything growing [lit. sown] in the river shall be dried up, driven away [by the wind], and [shall] not be" (xix, 7). Gesenius readers  $\text{רִבְרִיבֵי}$  a naked or bare place, here grassy places on the banks of the Nile. Apart from the fact that little grass grows on the banks of the Nile, in Egypt, and that little only during the cooler part of the year, instead of those sloping meadows that must have been in the European scholar's mind, this word must mean some product of the river which with the other water-plants should be dried up, and blown away, and utterly disappear. Like the fisheries and the flax mentioned with it, it ought to hold an important place in the commerce of ancient Egypt. It can therefore scarcely be reasonably held to intend anything but the papyrus. See PAPER REED.

The marine and fluvial product  $\text{לֹטוֹס}$ , from which the Red Sea was called  $\text{יַם-סוּפִיר}$ , will be noticed under RED SEA. The lotus was anciently the favorite flower, and at feasts it took the place of the rose among the Greek and Arabs: it is now very rare.

IX. *Zoology*.—Anciently Egypt was far more a pastoral country than at present. The neat cattle are still excellent, but lean kine are more common among them than they seem to have been in the days of Joseph's Pharaoh (Gen. xli, 19). Sheep and goats have always been numerous. Anciently swine were kept, but not in great numbers; now there are none, or scarcely any, except a few in the houses of Copts and Franks. The Egyptian oxen were celebrated in the ancient world (Aristot. *Hist. Anim.* viii, 28).—Horses abounded (1 Kings x, 28); hence the use of war-chariots in fight (Isa. xxxi, 1; Diod. Sic. i, 45), and the celebrity of Egyptian charioteers (Jer. xlvi, 4; Ezek. xvii, 15). Under the Pharaohs the horses of the country were in repute among the neighboring nations, who purchased them as well as chariots out of Egypt. Thus it is commanded respecting a king of Israel: "He shall not multiply horses to himself, nor cause the people to return to Egypt, to the end that he should multiply horses: forasmuch as the Lord hath said unto you, Ye shall henceforth return no more that way" (Deut. xvii, 16), which shows that the trade in horses was with Egypt, and would necessitate a close alliance. "Solomon had horses brought out of Egypt, and linen yarn: the king's merchants received the linen yarn at a price. And a chariot came up and went out of Egypt for six hundred [shekels] of silver, and a horse for a hundred and fifty; and so for all the kings of the Hittites and for the kings of Syria did they bring [them] out by their hand" (1 Kings x, 28, 29). The number of horses kept by this king for chariots and cavalry was large (iv, 26; x, 26; 2 Chron. i, 14; ix, 25). Some of these horses came as yearly tribute from his vassals (1 Kings x, 25). In later times the prophets reproved the people for trusting in the help of Egypt, and relying on the aid of her horses and chariots and horsemen, that is, probably, men in chariots, as we shall show in speaking of the Egyptian armies. The kings of the Hittites, mentioned in the passage quoted above, and in the account of the close of the siege of Samaria by Benhadad, where we read, "The Lord had made the host of the Syrians to hear a noise of chariots, and a noise of horses, [even] the noise of a great host: and they said one to another, Lo, the king of Israel hath hired against us the kings

of the Hittites and the kings of the Egyptians to come upon us" (2 Kings vii, 6)—these kings ruled the Hittites of the valley of the Orontes, who were called by the Egyptians SHETA or KHETA. The Pharaohs of the 18th, 19th, and 20th dynasties waged fierce wars with these Hittites, who were then ruled by a great king and many chiefs, and whose principal arm was a force of chariots, resembling those of the Egyptian army.—Asses were anciently numerous: the breed at the present time is excellent.—Buffaloes are common, and not wild.—Dogs were formerly more prized than now; for, being held by most of the Moslems to be extremely unclean, they are only used to watch the houses in the villages.—Cats are as numerous, but less favored.—The camel has nowhere been found mentioned in the inscriptions of Egypt, or represented on the monuments. In the Bible Abraham is spoken of as having camels when in Egypt, apparently as a gift from Pharaoh (Gen. xii, 16), and before the Exodus the camels of Pharaoh or his subjects were to be smitten by the murrain (Exod. ix, 3; comp. 6). Both these Pharaohs may have been shepherds. The Ishmaelites or Midianites who took Joseph into Egypt carried their merchandise on camels (Gen. xxxvii, 25, 28, 36), and the land traffic of the Arabs must always have been by caravans of camels; but it is probable that camels were not kept in Egypt, but only on the frontier. On the black obelisk from Nimrud, now in the British Museum, which is of Shalmanubar, king of Assyria, contemporary with Jehu and Hazael, camels are represented among objects sent as tribute by Egypt. They are of the two-humped sort, which, though perhaps then common in Assyria, has never, so far as is known, been kept in Egypt.—The deserts have always abounded in wild animals, especially of the canine and antelope kinds. The wolf, fox, jackal, hyena, wild cat, weasel, ichneumon, jerboa, and hare are also met with.—Anciently the hippopotamus was found in the Egyptian Nile, and hunted. This is a fact of importance for those who suppose it to be the behemoth (q. v.) of the book of Job, especially as that book shows evidence of a knowledge of Egypt. Now this animal is rarely seen even in Lower Nubia.—The elephant may have been, in the remotest historical period, an inhabitant of Egypt, and, as a land animal, have been driven further south than his brother pachyderm, for the name of the island of Elephantine, just below the First Cataract, in hieroglyphics, AB . . . "Elephant-land," seems to show that he was anciently found there.—Bats abound in the temples and tombs, filling the dark and desecrated chambers and passages with the unearthly whirr of their wings. Such desolation is represented by Isaiah when he says that a man shall cast his idols "to the moles and to the bats" (ii, 20). See each animal in its place.

The birds of Egypt are not remarkable for beauty of plumage: in so open a country this is natural. The *Rapaces* are numerous, but the most common are scavengers, as vultures and the kite. Eagles and falcons also are plentiful. Quails migrate to Egypt in great numbers. The *Grallatores* and *Anseres* abound on the islands and sand-banks of the river, and in the sides of the mountains which approach or touch the stream.

Among the reptiles, the crocodile (q. v.) must be especially mentioned. In the Bible it is usually called תַּנִּינִי, תַּנִּינִי, "dragon," a generic word of almost as wide a signification as "reptile," and is used as a symbol of the king of Egypt. Thus, in Ezekiel, "Behold, I am against thee, Pharaoh, king of Egypt, the great dragon that lieth in the midst of his rivers, which hath said, My river [is] mine own, and I have made [it] for myself. But I will put hooks in thy jaws, and I will cause the fish of thy rivers to stick unto thy scales, and I will bring thee up out of the midst of thy rivers, and all the fish of thy rivers shall stick unto thy scales. And I will leave thee [thrown]

into the wilderness, thee and all the fish of thy rivers. . . . I have given thee for meat to the beasts of the field and to the fowls of the heaven" (xxix, 3, 4, 5). Here there seems to be a retrospect of the Exodus (which is thus described in Isa. li, 9, 10, and 15), and with a more close resemblance in Psa. lxxiv, 13, 14, "Thou didst divide the sea by thy strength: thou brakest the heads of the dragons (תַּנִּינִי) in the waters. Thou brakest the heads of leviathan (לֵוִיָּתָן) in pieces, [and] gavest him [to be] meat to the dwellers in the wilderness" (תַּנִּינִי, i. e. to the wild beasts; comp. Isa. xiii, 21). The last passage is important as indicating that whereas תַּנִּינִי is the Hebrew generic name of reptiles, and therefore used for the greatest of them, the crocodile, לֵוִיָּתָן is the special name of that animal. The description of leviathan in Job (xli) fully bears out this opinion, and it is doubtful if any passage can be adduced in which a wider signification of the latter word is required. In Job (xxvi, 12) also there is an apparent allusion to the Exodus in words similar to those in Isaiah (li, 9, 10, and 15?), but without mention of the dragon. In this case the division of the sea and the smiting of Rahab, רִהַב, the proud or insolent, are mentioned in connection with the wonders of creation (ver. 7-11, 13): so, too, in Isaiah (ver. 13, 15). The crossing of the Red Sea could be thus spoken of as a signal exercise of the divine power.—Frogs are very numerous in Egypt, and their loud and constant croaking in the autumn in "the streams," נְהַרֹת, "the rivers," יַאֲרֵרִים, and "the ponds" or "marshes," מַנְתְּשִׁים (Exod. viii, 1, A. V. 5), makes it not difficult to picture the Plague of Frogs.—Serpents and snakes are also common, including the deadly cerastes and the cobra di capello; but the more venomous have their home in the desert (comp. Deut. viii, 15).

The Nile and lakes have an abundance of fishes; and although the fisheries of Egypt have very greatly fallen away, their produce is still a common article of food.

Among the insects the locusts must be mentioned, which sometimes come upon the cultivated land in a cloud, and, as in the plague, eat every herb and fruit, and leaf where they alight; but they never, as then, overspread the whole land (Exod. x, 3-6, 12-19). They disappear as suddenly as they come, and are carried away by the wind (ver. 19). As to the lice and flies, they are now plagues of Egypt, but it is not certain that the words פְּתִימִים and קָרִיב designate them (Exod. viii, 16-31). The dangerous scorpion is frequently met with. Beetles of various kinds are found, including the sacred scarabæus. Bees and silkworms are kept, but the honey is not very good, and the silk is inferior to that of Syria.

X. *Ancient Inhabitants.*—The old inhabitants of Egypt appear from their monuments and the testimony of ancient writers to have occupied in race a place between the Nigritians and the Caucasians. The constant immigrations of Arab settlers have greatly diminished the Nigritian characteristics in the generality of the modern Egyptians. The most recent inquiries have shown that the extreme limit at Philæ was only of a political nature, for the natives of the country below it were of the same race as those who lived above that spot—a tribe which passed down into the fertile valley of the Nile from its original abode in the south. These Ethiopians and the Egyptians were not negroes, but a branch of the great Caucasian family. Their frame was slender, but of great strength. Their faces appear to have been oval in shape, and narrower in the men than in the women. The forehead was well-shaped, but small and retiring; the eyes were almond-shaped and mostly black; the hair was long, crisp, and generally black; the skin of the men



Ancient Profiles (from the Monuments): 1. Egypto-Ethiopian (the Tirlake of Scripture); 2, 4. Ethiopian; 3. Egyptian.

was dark brown, chiefly from exposure; that of the women was olive-colored or even lighter. The women were very fruitful (Strabo, xv, p. 695; Heeren, *Ideen*, xi, 2, 10). The ancient dress was far more scanty than the modern, and in this matter, as in manners and character, the influence of the Arab race is also very apparent. The ancient Egyptians, in character were very religious and contemplative, but given to base superstition, patriotic, respectful to women, hospitable, generally frugal, but at times luxurious, very sensual, lying, thieving, treacherous, and cringing, and intensely prejudiced, through pride of race, against strangers, although kind to them. This is very much the character of the modern inhabitants, except that Mohammedanism has taken away the respect for women. The ancient Egyptians are indeed the only early Eastern nation that we know to have resembled the modern Westerns in this particular; but we find the same virtue markedly to characterize the Nigritians of our day. That the Egyptians in general treated the Israelites with kindness while they were in their country, even during the oppression, seems almost certain from the privilege of admission into the congregation in the third generation, granted to them in the Law, with the Edomites, while the Ammonites and Moabites were absolutely excluded, the reference in three out of the four cases being to the stay in Egypt, and the entrance into Palestine (Deut. xxiii, 3-8). This supposition is important in its bearing on the history of the oppression.

XI. *Language*.—The ancient Egyptian language, from the earliest period at which it is known to us, is an agglutinate monosyllabic form of speech. It is expressed by the signs which we call hieroglyphics. The character of the language is compound: it consists of elements resembling those of the Nigritian languages and the Chinese language on the one hand, and those of the Shemitic languages on the other. All those who have studied the African languages make a distinct family of several of those languages, spoken in the north-east quarter of the continent, in which family they include the ancient Egyptian; while every Shemitic scholar easily recognises in Egyptian, Shemitic pronouns and other elements, and a predominantly Shemitic grammar. As in person, character, and religion, so in language we find two distinct elements, mixed but not fused, and here the Nigritian element seems unquestionably the earlier. Bunsen asserts that this language is "ante-historical Shemitism:" we think it enough to say that no Shemitic scholar has accepted his theory. For a full discussion of the question, see Poole, *The Genesis of the Earth and of Man*,

chap. vi. As early as the age of the 26th dynasty, a vulgar dialect was expressed in the demotic or enchorial writing. This dialect forms the link connecting the old language with the Coptic or Christian Egyptian, the latest phase. The Coptic does not very greatly differ from the monumental language, distinguished in the time of the demotic as the sacred dialect, except in the presence of many Greek words. See COPTIC LANGUAGE.

The language of the ancient Egyptians was entirely unknown until the discoveries made by Dr. Young from the celebrated Rosetta stone, now preserved in the British Museum. This stone is a slab of black marble, which was found by the French in August, 1799, among the ruins of Fort St. Julien, on the western bank, and near the mouth of the Rosetta branch of the Nile. It contains a decree in three different kinds of writing, referring to the coronation of Ptolemy V (Epiphanes), and is supposed to have been sculptured B.C. cir. 195. As part of the inscription is in Greek, it was easily deciphered, and was found to state that the decree was ordered to be written in sacred, enchorial, and Greek characters. Thence, by carefully comparing the three inscriptions, a key was obtained to the interpretation of the mysterious hieroglyphics. The language which they express closely resembles that which was afterwards called Coptic when the people had become Christians. It is monosyllabic in its roots, and abounds in vowels. There were at least two dialects of it, spoken respectively in Upper and Lower Egypt. See ROSETTA STONE.

"The wisdom of Egypt" was a phrase which, at an early period, passed into a proverb, so high was the opinion entertained by antiquity of the knowledge and skill of the ancient Egyptians (1 Kings iv, 30; Herod. ii, 160; Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 25; Acts vii, 22). Nor, as the sequel of this article will show, were there wanting substantial reasons for the current estimate. If, however, antiquity did not on this point exceed the bounds of moderation, very certain is it that men of later ages are chargeable with the utmost extravagance in the terms which they employed when speaking on the subject. It was long thought that the hieroglyphical inscriptions on the monumental remains of Egypt contained treasures of wisdom no less boundless than hidden; and, indeed, hieroglyphics were, in the opinion of some, invented by the priests of the land, if not expressly to conceal their knowledge from the profane vulgar, yet as a safe receptacle and convenient storehouse for their mysterious but invaluable doctrines. Great, consequently, was the expectation of the public when it was announced that a key had been discovered which opened the portal to these long-concealed treasures. The result has not been altogether correspondent, especially with regard to the presumed secrets of ancient lore. Men of profound learning, great acuteness of mind, and distinguished reputation have engaged and persevered in the inquiry: it is impossible to study without advantage the writings of such persons as Zoega, Akerblad, Young, Champollion, Spohn, Seyffarth, Kosegarten, Rühle; and equally ungrateful would it be to affirm that no progress has been made in the undertaking; but, after all, the novel conclusions and positions which have been drawn and set forth are only in a few cases (comparatively) definite and unimpeachable (Heeren, *Ideen*, ii, 2, 4; Quatremère, *Recherches sur la langue et la littérature de l'Égypte*). See HIEROGLYPHICS. The results in point of history and archaeology, as detailed by Lepsius, Brugsch, and other late Egyptologists, are far more important than in a purely scientific view. See below.

XII. *Religion*.—The basis of the religion was Nigritian fetishism, the lowest kind of nature-worship, differing in different parts of the country, and hence obviously indigenous. Upon this were engrafted, first, cosmic worship, mixed up with traces of primeval revelation, as in Babylonia; and then a system of per-

sonifications of moral and intellectual abstractions. The incongruous character of the religion necessitates this supposition, and the ease with which it admitted extraneous additions in the historical period confirms it. There were, according to Herodotus, three orders of gods—the eight great gods, who were the most ancient, the twelve lesser, and the Osirian group. They were represented in human forms, sometimes having the heads of animals sacred to them, or bearing on their heads cosmic or other objects of worship. The fetichism included, besides the worship of animals, that of trees, rivers, and hills. Each of these creatures or objects was appropriated to a divinity. There was no prominent hero-worship, although deceased kings and other individuals often received divine honors—in one case, that of Osirtasen II, of the 12th dynasty, the old Sesostris, of a very special character. The great doctrines of the immortality of the soul, man's responsibility, and future rewards and punishments, were taught. Among the rites, circumcision is the most remarkable: it is as old as the time of the 4th dynasty.

Wilkinson gives us the following classification of the Egyptian deities (*Materia Hieroglyphica*, p. 58, modified by himself in Rawlinson's *Herod.* ii, 241 sq.):

## I. FIRST ORDER.

1. Amen, or Amun-ra, "the king of all the gods."
2. Mant, or Mat (Sanchon. *mot*), the material principle, sometimes as Buto (=Latona).
3. Noutm, Nu, Nef, or Kneph=Mercury.
4. Sate=Juno.
5. Pthah, or Ptah, the creative power [a function assigned by others to Kneph]=Vulcan.
6. Neith, self-born and of masculine character=Minerva.
7. Khem, the generative principle (*phallus*).
8. Pshst=Diana.

## II. SECOND ORDER.

1. Re, Ra, or Phrah, the Sun, father of many deities, often combined with those of the others.
2. Seb, the Earth=Saturn, father of the inferior gods.
3. Netpé, wife of Seb, the Sky, mother of gods=Rhea.
4. Khous, son of Amun and Mant, the Moon=Hercules.
5. Anouké [Fire]=Vesta.
6. Atmu [? or Mat], Darkness, or Twilight.
7. Mui, or Sim, son of Re, Light [=Phœbus].
8. Taphne (Daphne), or Tafnet, a lion-headed goddess.
9. Thoth, the Intellect=Hermes and the Moon.
10. Sana-k-re, or Sebak.
11. Eilithyia=Lucina.
12. Mandu, or Munt=Mars.

## III. THIRD ORDER.

1. Osiris, } son and daughter of Seb and Netpé.
2. Isis, }
3. Akeris, the elder Iforus, son of Netpé.
4. Seth, or Typhon, the destructive principle [Death].
5. Nephthys (Nebet), "lady of the house"=Vesta.
6. Iforus the younger, god of Victory=Apollo.
7. Harpocrates, son of Osiris and Isis, emblem of Youth.
8. Anubis, son of Osiris.

## IV. MISCELLANEOUS.

1. Thmei, or Ma (*théus*), goddess of Truth and Justice, headless.
2. Athor (eit-Ilor)=Venus, another daughter of Ra.
3. Nophr-Atmu, perhaps a variation of Atmu above.
4. Hor-Ilat, a winged globe, as *ἀγλαόβαλλων*.
5. Hakté (Hecate), a lion-headed goddess.
6. Selk, a scorpion-headed goddess.
7. Toré, a god connected with Ptah.
8. Amunta, perhaps a female Amun.
9. The, "the heavens."
10. Hapi, or the god of the Nile.
11. Ranno, an asp-headed goddess, as *ἀσπασθοδαίμων*.
12. Hermes Trismegistus, a form of Thoth.
13. Asclepius, Moth, or Imoph, "son of Ptah."
14. Soph, the goddess of Speech.

Together with about 50 more, some of them local divinities, and personifications of cities, besides deified animals, etc.

*Nun, Nu, or Kneph*, was one of the most important of the gods, corresponding to the "soul" of the universe, to whom was ascribed the creation of gods, men, and the natural world. He is represented as a man with the head of a ram and curved horns. The chief god of Thebes was *Amen*, or *Amen-Ra*, or *Amen-Ra Khem*, also worshipped in the great oasis, and sometimes portrayed under the form of Kneph. He was the Jupiter Ammon of the classics. The goddess *Mut*, or "the mother," is the companion of Amen, and is

represented as a female wearing the crowns of Upper and Lower Egypt, and the vulture head-dress of a queen. *Khem* was the god by whom the productive-ness of nature was symbolized. His name reminds us of the patriarch Ham. The Greeks identified him with Pan, and called Chemmis, a city in the Thebais, where he was worshipped, Panopolis. He is accompanied by a tree or a flower on the sculptures, which may have been, as supposed by Mr. Poole, the *asherah* or sacred grove spoken of in the Bible. *Ptah* was the god of Memphis, and worshipped there under the form of a pigmy or child; but, as his temples have been destroyed, little is known of his worship. The goddess *Neit* or *Neith* is often associated with Ptah. She was the patron deity of Sais, in the Delta; and the Greeks say that Cecrops, leading a colony from thence to Athens, introduced her worship into Greece, where she was called Athene. This name may be derived from the Egyptian, if we suppose the latter to have been sometimes called Thenei, with the article prefixed like the name of Thebes. She is represented as a female with the crown of Lower Egypt on her head. *Ra*, or the sun, was worshipped at Heliopolis. His common figure is that of a man with a hawk's head, on which is placed the solar disk and the royal asp. *Thoth* was the god of science and letters, and was worshipped at Hermopolis Magna. His usual form is that of a man with the head of an ibis surmounted by a crescent. *Bast* was called Bubastis by the Greeks, who identified her with Artemis. She is represented as a lion or cat-headed female, with the globe of the sun on her head. There is a similar goddess called Pasht. *Athor* was the daughter of Ra, and corresponded to the Aphrodite of the Greeks; the town of Tentyra or Denderah was under her protection. *Shu* represented solar or physical light, and *Ma-t* or Thma (Themis) moral light, truth, or justice. *Sebak* was a son of Ra. He has a crocodile's head. *Osiris* is the most remarkable personage in the Egyptian Pantheon. His form is that of a mummied figure holding the crook and flail, and wearing the crown of Upper Egypt, generally with an ostrich feather on each side. He was regarded as the personification of moral good. He is related to have been on earth instructing mankind in useful arts; to have been slain by his adversary Typhon (Set or Seth), by whom he was cut in pieces; to have been bewailed by his wife and sister Isis; to have been embalmed; to have risen again, and to have become the judge of the dead, among whom the righteous were called by his name, and received his form—a wonderful fore-feeling of the Gospel narrative, and most likely symbolizing the strife between good and evil. *Isis* was the sister and spouse of Osiris, worshipped at Abydos and the island of Philæ. *Ilorus* was their son. *Apep*, Apophis of the Greeks, an enormous serpent, was the only representative of moral evil. The worship of animals is said to have been introduced by the second king of the second dynasty, when the bull Apis, at Memphis, and Mnevis, at Heliopolis, and the Mendesian goat, were called gods. The cat was sacred to Pasht, the ibis to Thoth, the crocodile to Sebak, the scarabæus to Ptah and a solar god Atmu. In their worship of the gods, sacrifices of animals, fruit, and vegetables were used, as well as libations of wine and incense. No decided instance of a human sacrifice has been found. After death a man was brought before Osiris: his heart weighed against the feather of truth. He was questioned by forty-two assessors as to whether he had committed forty-two sins about which they inquired. If guiltless, he took the form of Osiris, apparently after long series of transformations and many ordeals, and entered into bliss, dwelling among the gods in perpetual day on the banks of the celestial Nile. If guilty he was often changed into the form of some base animal, and consigned to a fiery place of punishment and perpetual night. From this abstract it may be seen that the Egyptian religion is to be re-

ferred to various sources. There is a trace of some primeval revelation in it; also a strong Sabæan element. (See a full discussion of the subject, with figures of the leading deities, in Kitto's *Pictorial Bible*, note on Deut. iv, 16). A more favorable view of the ancient Egyptian theology is taken by Wilkinson in his *Ancient Egyptians* (see his summary in the abridged ed. ii, 327 sq.); and it is probably true, as was the case with the polytheism of the Greeks and Romans likewise, that the more learned and philosophical classes were able to spiritualize to some extent a religion which could have been to the populace nothing but a gross idolatry.

The Israelites in Egypt appear, during the oppression, to have adopted to some extent the Egyptian idolatry (Josh. xxiv, 14; Ezek. xx, 7, 8). The golden calf, or rather steer,  $\text{𐀀𐀃𐀆}$ , was probably taken from the bull Apis, certainly from one of the sacred bulls. Remphan and Chiuu were foreign divinities adopted into the Egyptian Pantheon, and called in the hieroglyphics RENU (probably pronounced *Remphu*) and KEN. It can hardly be doubted that they were worshipped by the shepherds; but there is no satisfactory evidence that there was any separate foreign system of idolatry. See REMPHAN. Ashtoreth was worshipped at Memphis, as is shown by a tablet of Amenoph II, B.C. cir. 1415, at the quarries of Tura, opposite that city (Vyse's *Pyramids*, iii, "Tourah tablet 2"), in which she is represented as an Egyptian goddess. The temple of "the Foreign Venus," in "the Tyrian camp" in Memphis (Herod. ii, 112), must have been sacred to her. Doubtless this worship was introduced by the Phœnician shepherds.

As there are prominent traces of primeval revelation in the ancient Egyptian religion, we cannot be surprised at finding certain resemblances to the Mosaic law, apart from the probability that whatever was unobjectionable in common belief and usages would be retained. The points in which the Egyptian religion shows strong traces of truth are, however, doctrines of the very kind that the Law does not expressly teach. The Egyptian religion, in its reference to man, was a system of responsibility mainly depending on future rewards and punishments. The Law, in its reference to man, was a system of responsibility mainly depending on temporal rewards and punishments. All we learn, but this is of the utmost importance, is that every Israelite who came out of Egypt must have been fully acquainted with the universally recognised doctrines of the immortality of the soul, man's responsibility, and future rewards and punishments, truths which the law does not, and of course could not, contradict. The idea that the Mosaic law was an Egyptian invention is one of the worst examples of modern reckless criticism.

**XIII. Laws.**—We have no complete account of the laws of the ancient Egyptians either in their own records or in works of ancient writers. The passages in the Bible which throw light upon the laws in force during the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt most probably do not relate to purely native law, nor to law administered to natives, for during that whole period they may perhaps have been under shepherd rulers, and in any case it cannot be doubted that they would not be subject to absolutely the same system as the Egyptians. The paintings and sculptures of the monuments indicate a very high degree of personal safety, showing us that the people of all ranks commonly went unarmed, and without military protection. We must therefore infer that the laws relating to the maintenance of order were sufficient and strictly enforced. The punishments seem to have been lighter than those of the Mosaic law, and very different in their relation to crime and in their nature. Capital punishment appears to have been almost restricted, in practice, to murder. Crimes of violence were more

severely treated than offences against religion and morals. Popular feeling seems to have taken the duties of the judge upon itself in the case of impiety alone. That in early times the Egyptian populace acted with reference to any offence against its religion as it did under the Greeks and Romans, is evident from the answer of Moses when Pharaoh proposed that the Hebrews should sacrifice in the land. "It is not meet so to do; for we shall sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians to the Lord our God: lo, shall we sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians before their eyes, and will they not stone us?" (Exod. viii, 26.)

**XIV. Government.**—The rule was monarchical, but not of an absolute character. The sovereign was not superior to the laws, and the priests had the power to check the undue exercise of his authority. The kings under whom the Israelites lived seem to have been absolute, but even Joseph's Pharaoh did not venture to touch the independence of the priests. Nomes and districts were governed by officers whom the Greeks called nomarchs and toparchs. There seems to have been no hereditary aristocracy, except perhaps at the earliest period, for indications of something of the kind occur in the inscriptions of the 4th and 12th dynasties.

**XV. Foreign Policy.**—This must be regarded in its relation to the admission of foreigners into Egypt and to the treatment of tributary and allied nations. In the former aspect it was characterized by an exclusiveness which sprang from a national hatred of the yellow and white races, and was maintained by the wisdom of preserving the institutions of the country from the influence of the pirates of the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean, and the robbers of the deserts. Hence the jealous exclusion of the Greeks from the northern ports until Naueratis was opened to them, and hence, too, the restriction of Semitic settlers in earlier times to the land of Goshen, scarcely regarded as part of Egypt. It may be remarked as a proof of the strictness of this policy that during the whole of the sojourn of the Israelites they appear to have been kept in Goshen. The key to the policy towards foreign nations, after making allowance for the hatred of the yellow and white races balanced by the regard for the red and black, is found in the position of the great Oriental rivals of Egypt. The supremacy or influence of the Pharaohs over the nations lying between the Nile and the Euphrates depended as much on wisdom in policy as prowess in arms. The kings of the 4th, 6th, and 15th dynasties appear to have uninterruptedly held the peninsula of Sinai, where tablets record their conquest of Asiatic nomads. But with the 18th dynasty commences the period of Egyptian supremacy. Very soon after the accession of this powerful line most of the countries between the Egyptian border and the Tigris were reduced to the condition of tributaries. The empire seems to have lasted for nearly three centuries, from about B.C. 1500 to about 1200. The chief opponents of the Egyptians were the Hittites of the valley of the Orontes, with whom the Pharaohs waged long and fierce wars. After this time the influence of Egypt declined; and until the reign of Shishak (B.C. cir. 990-967), it appears to have been confined to the western borders of Palestine. No doubt the rising greatness of Assyria caused the decline. Thenceforward to the days of Pharaoh Necho there was a constant struggle for the tracts lying between Egypt, and Assyria, and Babylonia, until the disastrous battle at Carchemish finally destroyed the supremacy of the Pharaohs. It is probable that during the period of the empire an Assyrian or Babylonian king generally supported the opponents of the rulers of Egypt. Great aid from a powerful ally can indeed alone explain the strong resistance offered by the Hittites. The general policy of the Egyptians towards their eastern tributaries seems to have been marked by great moderation. The Pharaohs intermarried with them, and neither forced upon them

Egyptian garrisons, except in some important positions, nor attempted those deportations that are so marked a feature of Asiatic policy. In the case of those nations which never attacked them they do not appear to have even exacted tribute. So long as their general supremacy was uncontested they would not be unwise enough to make favorable or neutral powers their enemies. Of their relation to the Israelites we have for the earlier part of this period no direct information. The explicit account of the later part is fully consistent with what we have said of the general policy of the Pharaohs. Shishak and Zerah, if the latter were, as we believe, a king of Egypt or a commander of Egyptian forces, are the only exceptions in a series of friendly kings, and they were almost certainly of Assyrian or Babylonian extraction. One Pharaoh gave his daughter in marriage to Solomon, another appears to have been the ally of Jehoram, king of Israel (2 Kings vii, 6), So made a treaty with Hosea, Tirhakah aided Hezekiah, Pharaoh Necho fought Josiah against his will, and did not treat Judah with the severity of the Oriental kings, and his second successor, Pharaoh Hophra, maintained the alliance, notwithstanding this break, as firmly as before, and, although foiled in his endeavor to save Jerusalem from the Chaldeans, received the fugitives of Judah, who, like the fugitives of Israel at the capture of Samaria, took refuge in Egypt. It is probable that during the earlier period the same friendly relations existed. The Hebrew records of that time afford no distinct indication of hostility with Egypt, nor have the Egyptian lists of conquered regions and towns of the same age been found to contain any Israelitish name, whereas in Shishak's list the kingdom of Judah and some of its towns occur. The route of the earlier Pharaohs to the east seems always to have been along the Palestinian coast, then mainly held by the Philistines and Phœnicians, both of whom they subdued, and across Syria northward of the territories occupied by the Hebrews. With respect to the African nations a different policy appears to have been pursued. The Rebu (Lebu) or Lubim, to the west of Egypt, on the north coast, were reduced to subjection, and probably employed, like the Shayretana or Cherethim, as mercenaries. Ethiopia was made a purely Egyptian province, ruled by a viceroy, "the prince of Kesh (Cush)," and the assimilation was so complete that Ethiopian sovereigns seem to have been received by the Egyptians as native rulers. Further south the negroes were subject to predatory attacks like the slave-hunts of modern times, conducted not so much from motives of hostility as to obtain a supply of slaves. In the Bible we find African peoples, Lubim, Phut, Sukkiim, Cush, as mercenaries or supporters of Egypt, but not a single name that can be positively placed to the eastward of that country.

XVI. *Army.*—There are some notices of the Egyptian army in the O. T. They show, like the monuments, that its most important branch was the chariot-force. The Pharaoh of the Exodus led 600 chosen chariots, besides his whole chariot-force, in pursuit of the Israelites. The warriors fighting in chariots are probably the "horsemen" mentioned in the relation of this event and elsewhere, for in Egyptian they are called the "horse" or "cavalry." We have no subsequent indication in the Bible of the constitution of an Egyptian army until the time of the 22d dynasty, when we find that Shishak's invading force was partly composed of foreigners; whether mercenaries or allies cannot as yet be positively determined, although the monuments make it most probable that they were of the former character. The army of Necho, defeated at Carchemish, seems to have been similarly composed, although it probably contained Greek mercenaries, who soon afterwards became the most important foreign element in the Egyptian forces.

XVII. *Customs, Science, and Art.*—The sculptures

and paintings of the tombs give us a very full insight into the domestic life of the ancient Egyptians, as may be seen in Sir G. Wilkinson's work. What most strikes us in their manners is the high position occupied by women, and the entire absence of the harem system of seclusion. The wife is called "the lady of the house." Marriage appears to have been universal, at least with the richer class; and if polygamy were tolerated it was rarely practised. Of marriage ceremonies no distinct account has been discovered, but there is evidence that something of the kind was usual in the case of a queen (De Rougé, *Essai sur une Stele Egyptienne*, p. 53, 54). Concubinage was allowed, the concubines taking the place of inferior wives. There were no castes, although great classes were very distinct, especially the priests, soldiers, artisans, and herdsmen, with laborers. A man of the upper classes might, however, both hold a command in the army and be a priest; and therefore the caste-system cannot have strictly applied in the case of the subordinates. The general manner of life does not much illustrate that of the Israelites from its great essential difference. The Egyptians from the days of Abraham were a settled people, occupying a land which they had held for centuries without question, except through the aggression of foreign invaders. The occupations of the higher class were the superintendence of their fields and gardens, their diversions, the pursuit of game in the deserts or on the river, and fishing. The tending of cattle was left to the most despised of the lower class. The Israelites, on the contrary, were from the very first a pastoral people: in time of war they lived within walls; when there was peace they "dwelt in their tents" (2 Kings xiii, 5).

The Egyptian feasts, and the dances, music, and feasts which accompanied them for the diversion of the guests, as well as the common games, were probably introduced among the Hebrews in the most luxurious days of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah. The account of the noontide dinner of Joseph (Gen. xliii, 16, 31-34) agrees with the representations of the monuments, although it evidently describes a far simpler repast than would be usual with an Egyptian minister. The attention to precedence, which seems to have surprised Joseph's brethren (ver. 33), is perfectly characteristic of Egyptian customs.

The Egyptians were in the habit of eating much bread at table, and fancy rolls or seed-cakes were in abundance at every feast. Those who could afford it ate wheaten bread, the poor alone being content with a coarser kind, made of *dura* flour or millet. They ate with their fingers, though they occasionally used spoons. The table was sometimes covered with a cloth; and in great entertainments among the rich, each guest was furnished with a napkin. They sat on a carpet or mat upon the ground, or else on stools or chairs round the table, and did not recline at meat like the Greeks and Romans. They were particularly fond of music and dancing. The most austere and scrupulous priest could not give a feast without a good band of musicians and dancers, as well as plenty of wine, costly perfumes and ointments, and a profusion of lotus and other flowers. Tumblers, jugglers, and various persons skilled in feats of agility, were hired for the occasion, and the guests played at games of chance, at *mora*, and the game of *latrunculi*, resembling draughts. The latter was the favorite game of all ranks, and Rameses III is more than once represented playing it in the palace at Thebes. The number of pieces for playing the game is not exactly known. They were of different colors on the opposite sides of the board, and were not flat as with us, but about an inch and a half or two inches high, and were moved like chessmen, with the thumb and finger.

The religious festivals were numerous, and some of them were, in the days of Herodotus, kept with great merry-making and license. His description of that

of the goddess Bubastis, kept at the city of Bubastis, in the eastern part of the Delta, would well apply to some of the great Mohammedan festivals now held in the country (ii, 59, 60). The feast which the Israelites celebrated when Aaron had made the golden calf seems to have been very much of the same character: first offerings were presented, and then the people ate, and danced, and sang (Exod. xxxii, 5, 6, 17, 18, 19), and even, it seems, stripped themselves (ver. 25), as appears to have been not unusual at the popular ancient Egyptian festivals.

The funeral ceremonies were far more important than any events of the Egyptian life, as the tomb was regarded as the only true home. The body of the deceased was embalmed in the form of Osiris, the judge of the dead, and conducted to the burial-place with great pomp and much display of lamentation. The mourning lasted seventy-two days or less. Both Jacob and Joseph were embalmed, and the mourning for the former lasted seventy days.

The Egyptians, for the most part, were accustomed to shave their heads; indeed, except among the soldiers, the practice was probably almost universal. They generally wore skull-caps. Otherwise they wore their own hair, or wigs falling to the shoulders in numerous curls, or done up in the form of a bag. They also shaved their faces; kings, however, and other great personages had beards about three inches long and one inch broad, which were plaited. The crown of Upper Egypt was a short cap, with a tall point behind, which was worn over the other. The king often had the figure of an asp, the emblem of royalty, tied just above his forehead. The common royal dress was a kilt which reached to the ankles; over it was worn a shirt, coming down to the knees, with wide sleeves as far as the elbows: both these were generally of fine white linen. Sandals were worn on the feet, and on the person, armbands, bracelets, and necklaces. The upper and middle classes usually went barefoot; in other respects their dress was much the same as that of the king's, but of course inferior in costliness. The priests sometimes wore a leopard's skin tied over the shoulders, or like a shirt, with the fore legs for the sleeves. The queen had a particular head-dress, which was in the form of a vulture with expanded wings. The beak projected over the forehead, the wings fell on either side, and the tail hung down behind. She sometimes wore the uræus or asp. The royal princes were distinguished by a side-lock of hair elaborately plaited. The women wore their hair curled or plaited, reaching about half way from the shoulders to the waist.

The Egyptians were a very literary people, and time has preserved to us, besides the inscriptions on their tombs and temples, many papyri of a religious or historical character, and one tale. They bear no resemblance to the books of the O. T., except such as arises from their sometimes enforcing moral truths in a manner not wholly different from that of the book of Proverbs. The moral and religious system is, however, essentially different in its principles and their application. Some have imagined a great similarity between the O. T. and Egyptian literature, and have given a show of reason to their idea by dressing up Egyptian documents in a garb of Hebrew phraseology, in which, however, they have gone so awkwardly that no one who had not prejudged the question could for a moment be deceived. We find frequent reference in the Bible to the magicians of Egypt. The Pharaoh of Joseph laid his dream before the magicians, who could not interpret it (Gen. xli, 8); the Pharaoh of the Exodus used them as opponents of Moses and Aaron, when, after what appears to have been a seeming success, they failed as before (Exod. vii, 11, 12, 22; viii, 18, 19; ix, 11; 2 Tim. iii, 8, 9). The monuments do not recognise any such art, and we must conclude that magic was secretly practised, not because it was

thought to be unlawful, but in order to give it importance. See MAGIC; JAMBRES; JANNES.

In science, Egyptian influence may be distinctly traced in the Pentateuch. Moses was "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians" (Acts vii, 22), and probably derived from them the astronomical knowledge which was necessary for the calendar. His acquaintance with chemistry is shown in the manner of the destruction of the golden calf. The Egyptians excelled in geometry and mechanics: the earlier books of the Bible, however, throw no light upon the degree in which Moses may have made use of this part of his knowledge. In medicine and surgery, the high proficiency of the Egyptians was probably of but little use to the Hebrews after the Exodus: anatomy, practised by the former from the earliest ages, was repugnant to the feelings of Shemites, and the simples of Egypt and of Palestine would be as different as the ordinary diseases of the country. In the arts of architecture, sculpture, and painting, the former of which was the chief, there seems to have been but a very slight and material influence. This was natural, for with the Egyptians architecture was a religious art, embodying in its principles their highest religious convictions, and mainly devoted to the service of religion. Durable construction, massive and grand form, and rich, though sober color, characterize their temples and tombs, the abodes of gods, and "homes" of men. To adopt such an architecture would have been to adopt the religion of Egypt, and the pastoral Israelites had no need of buildings. When they came into the Promised Land they found cities ready for their occupation, and it was not until the days of Solomon that a temple took the place of the tent, which was the sanctuary of the pastoral people. Details of ornament were of course borrowed from Egypt; but, separated from the vast system in which they were found, they lost their significance, and became harmless until modern ecologists made them prominent in support of a theory which no mind capable of broad views can for a moment tolerate.

It is hardly needful to observe that the ancient Egyptians had attained to high degrees of civilization and mental culture. This is evidenced by many facts. For instance, the variation of the compass may even now be ascertained by observing the lateral direction of the pyramids, on account of their being placed so accurately north and south. This argues considerable acquaintance with astronomy. Again, we know that they were familiar with the duodecimal as well as the decimal scale of notation, and must therefore have made some progress in the study of mathematics. There is proof that the art of painting upon plaster and panel was practised by them more than 2000 years before Christ; and the sculptures furnish representations of inkstands that contained two colors, black and red; the latter being introduced at the beginning of a subject, and for the division of certain sentences, showing this custom to be as old as that of holding the pen behind the ear, which is often portrayed in the paintings of the tombs. Alabaster was a material much used for vases, and as ointment was generally kept in an alabaster box, the Greeks and Romans applied the name *alabastron* to all vases made for that purpose; and one of them found at Thebes, and now in the museum at Alnwick Castle, contains some ointment perfectly preserved, though from the queen's name in the hieroglyphics it must be more than 3000 years old. In architecture they were very successful, as the magnificent temples yet remaining bear evident witness, though in ruins. The Doric order is supposed to have been derived from columns found at Beni-Hassan, and the arch is at least as old as the 16th century B.C. In medical science, we know from the evidence furnished by mummies found at Thebes that the art of stopping teeth with gold, and probably cement, was known to the ancient Egyptians, and Cuvier found incontestible

proof that the fractured bone of an ibis had been set by them while the bird was alive.

Sacred music was much used in Egypt, and the harp, lyre, flute, tambourine, cymbals, etc., were admitted in divers religious services, of which music constituted an important element. Sacred dancing was also common in religious ceremonies, as it seems to have been among the Jews (Psa. cxlix, 3). Moses found the children of Israel dancing before the golden calf (Exod. xxxii, 19), in imitation probably of rites they had often witnessed in Egypt.

The industrial arts held an important place in the occupations of the Egyptians. The workers in fine flax and the weavers of white linen are mentioned in a manner that shows they were among the chief contributors to the riches of the country (Isa. xix, 9). The fine linen of Egypt found its way to Palestine (Prov. vii, 16). That its celebrity was not without cause is proved by a piece found near Memphis, and by the paintings (comp. Gen. xli, 42; 2 Chron. i, 16, etc.). The looms of Egypt were also famed for their fine cotton and woollen fabrics, and many of these were worked with patterns in brilliant colors, sometimes being wrought with the needle, sometimes woven in the piece. Some of the stripes were of gold thread, alternating with red ones as a border. Specimens of their embroidery are to be seen in the Louvre, and the many dresses painted on the monuments of the 18th dynasty show that the most varied patterns were used by the Egyptians more than 3000 years ago, as they were subsequently by the Babylonians, who became noted for their needle-work. Sir G. Wilkinson states that the secret of dyeing cloths of various colors by means of mordants was known to the Egyptians, as proved by the manner in which Pliny has described the process, though he does not seem to have understood it. They were equally fond of variety of patterns on the walls and ceilings of their houses and tombs, and some of the oldest ceilings show that the chevron, the checker, the scroll, and the guilloche, though ascribed to the Greeks, were adopted in Egypt more than 2000 years before our era.

A gradual progress may be observed in their choice of fancy ornament. Beginning with simple imitations of real objects, as the lotus and other flowers, they adopted, by degrees, conventional representations of them, or purely imaginary devices; and it is remarkable that the oldest Greek and Etruscan vases have a similarly close imitation of the lotus and other real objects. The same patterns common on Greek vases had long before been introduced on those in Egypt; whole ceilings are covered with them; and the vases themselves had often the same elegant forms we admire in the *exile* and others afterwards made in Greece. They were of gold and silver, engraved and embossed; those made of porcelain were rich in color, and some of the former were inlaid or studded with precious stones, or enamelled in brilliant colors. Their knowledge of glass-blowing is shown by a glass bead inscribed with the name of a queen of the 18th dynasty, which proves it to be as old as 3200 years ago. Among their most beautiful achievements in this art were their richly-colored bottles with waving lines and their small inlaid mosaics. In these last, the fineness of the work is so great that it must have required a strong magnifying power to put the parts together, especially the more minute details, such as feathers, the hair, etc. "They were composed," says Sir G. Wilkinson, "of the finest threads or rods of glass (attenuated by drawing them when heated to a great length), which, having been selected according to their color, were placed upright side by side, as in an ordinary mosaic, in sufficient number to form a portion of the intended picture. Others were then added until the whole had been composed; and when they had all been cemented together by a proper heat, the work was completed. Slices were then sawn off


transversely, as in our Tunbridge ware, and each section presented the same picture on its upper and under side."

The more wealthy Egyptians had their large town-houses and spacious villas, in which the flower-garden and pleasure-grounds were not the least prominent features. Avenues of trees shaded the walks, and a great abundance of violets, roses, and other flowers was always to be had, even in winter, owing to the nature of their climate and the skill of their gardeners. A part also was assigned to vines and fruit-trees; the former were trained on trellis-work, the latter were standards. It is a curious fact that they were in the habit of employing monkeys, trained for the purpose, to climb the upper branches of the sycamore-trees, and to gather the figs from them. The houses generally consisted of a ground floor and one upper story; few were higher. They were often placed round an open court, in the centre of which was a fountain or small garden. Large houses had sometimes a porch with a flight of steps before the street door, over which latter was painted the name of the owner. The wealthy landed proprietors were *grands* of the priestly and military classes (Mr. Birch and M. Ampère may be said to have proved the non-existence of castes, in the *Indian sense*, in Egypt); but those who tended cattle were looked down upon by the rest of the community. This contempt is often shown in the paintings, by their being drawn unshaven, and squalid, and dressed in the same covering of mats that were thrown over the beasts they tended. None would intermarry with swineherds. It was the custom for the men to milk, as it is still among some Arab tribes, who think it disgraceful for a woman to milk any animal.

Potters were very numerous, and the wheel, the baking of cups, and the other processes of their art were prominent on the monuments. It is singular, as affording illustration of Scripture language, that the same idea of fashioning the clay was also applied to man's formation; and the gods Ptah and Num, the creative agencies, are represented sitting at the potter's wheel turning the clay for the human creation. Pottery appears to have furnished employment to the Hebrews during the bondage (Psa. lxxxi, 6; lxxviii, 13; comp. Exod. i, 14).

The Egyptians were familiar with the use of iron from a very remote period, and their skill in the manufacture of bronze was celebrated. They were acquainted also with the use of the forceps, the blow-pipe, the bellows, the syringe, and the siphon. Gold mines were wrought in Upper Egypt (Diod. Sic. iii, 12).

Leather was sometimes used for writing purposes, but more frequently paper made from the papyrus, which grew in the marsh-lands of the Delta. The mode of making it was by cutting the pith into thin slices lengthwise, which being laid on a table were covered with similar layers at right angles, and the two sets, being glued together and kept under pressure a proper time, formed a sheet. The dried flower-heads of the papyrus have been found in the tombs.

As illustrating Scripture, it may be mentioned that the gods are sometimes represented in the tombs holding the *Tau* or sign of life () which was adopt-

ed by some of the early Christians in lieu of the cross, and is mentioned by Ezek. ix, 4, 6, as the "mark (Tau) set upon the foreheads of the men" who were to be preserved alive. Christian inscriptions at the great oasis are headed by this symbol; it has been found on Christian monuments at Rome.

Egyptian edicts seem to have been issued in the form of a *firmán* or written order; and from the word used by Pharaoh in granting power to Joseph ("According to thy word shall all my people be ruled;" Hebrew *kiss*, Gen. xli, 40, alluding evidently to the



custom of kissing a *firmân*), we may infer that the people who received that order adopted the usual Eastern mode of acknowledging their obedience to the sovereign. Besides the custom of kissing the signature attached to these documents, the people were doubtless expected to "bow the knee" (Gen. xli, 43) in the presence of the monarch and chiefs of the nation, or even to prostrate themselves before them. The sculptures represent them thus bowing with the hand stretched out towards the knee.

The account of brick-making in Exod. v, 7-19 is illustrated in a remarkable degree by a painting in a tomb at Thebes, in which the hardness of the work, the tale of bricks, the straw, and the native taskmasters set over foreign workmen, are vividly portrayed. The making of bricks was a monopoly of the crown, which accounts for the Jews and other captives being employed in such numbers to make bricks for the Pharaohs. SEE BRICK.

Certain injunctions of the Mosaic law appear to be framed with particular reference to Egyptian practices, e. g. the fact of false witness being forbidden by a distinct and separate commandment, becomes the more significant when we bear in mind the number of witnesses required by the Egyptian law for the execution of the most trifling contract. As many as sixteen names are appended to one for the sale of a part of certain properties, amounting only to 400 pieces of brass. It appears that bulls only, and not heifers, were killed by the Egyptians in sacrifice. Compare with this the law of the Israelites (Num. xix, 2), commanding them to "bring a red heifer, without spot, wherein was no blemish." It was on this account that Moses proposed to go "three days' journey into the desert," lest the Egyptians should be enraged at seeing the Israelites sacrifice a heifer (Exod. viii, 26); and by this very opposite choice of a victim they were made unequivocally to denounce and separate themselves from the rites of Egypt. The Egyptian common name for Heliopolis was AN, from which was derived the Hebrew On or Aon, pointed in Ezek. xxx, 17, Aven, and translated by Bethshemesh (Jer. xliiii, 13). So also the Pi-beseth of the same place in Ezekiel is from the Egyptian article *Pi*, prefixed to *Bast*, the name of the goddess there worshipped, and is equivalent to Bubastis, a city named after her, supposed to correspond to the Grecian Artemis. The Tahpanhes of Scripture (Jer. xliiii, 8; Ezek. xxx, 18) was perhaps a place called Daphnæ, sixteen miles from Pelusium.

XVIII. *Comparison with the Manners of the modern Inhabitants.*—The mode of life of the Egyptians has in all ages necessarily been more or less influenced by their locality: those who dwelt on high lands on the east, as well as those who dwelt on the marshy flat country in the Delta, have become shepherds, as their land does not admit of cultivation. The people who live along the Nile become fishermen and sailors. The cultivated part of the natives who live on the plains and over the surface of the country diligently and most successfully practise all the arts of life, and in former ages have left ever-during memorials of their proficiency and skill.

On this natural diversity of pursuits, as well as on a diversity of blood—for besides the master and ruling race of Ethiopians there were anciently others who were of nomade origin—was early founded the institution of so-called castes, which Egypt had, although less marked than India, and which pervaded the entire life of the nation. These, according to Herodotus (xi, 164), were seven in number (comp. Diod. Sic. i, 73). The priestly caste was the most honored and influential. It had in every large city a temple dedicated to the deity of the place, together with a high-priest, who stood next to the king and restricted his power. The priesthood possessed the finest portions of the country. They were the judges, physicians,

astrologers, architects—in a word, they united in themselves all the highest culture and most distinguished offices of the land, while with them alone lay tradition, literature, and the sacred writings. This class exerted the most decided and extensive influence on the culture not only of their own country, but of the world; for during the brightest periods of Grecian history the love of knowledge carried into Egypt men who have done much to form the character of after ages, such as Solon, Pythagoras, Archytas, Thales, Herodotus, Plato, and others (comp. Gen. xli, 8; Exod. vii, 11; viii, 11; xiii, 7; Josephus, *Ant.* ii, 9, 2).

The peculiarities of the ancient Egyptians of the lower castes seem to have survived best, and to be represented, at least in some particulars, by the Fellahs of the present day. These Fellahs discharge all the duties of tilling the country and gathering its rich abundance. They are a quiet, contented, and submissive race, always living, through an unjust government, on the edge of starvation, yet always happy, with no thought for the morrow, no care for, no interest in, political changes. "Of the Fellahs it may be said, as was said by Amrou of the ancient Egyptians, 'they are bees always toiling, always toiling for others, not themselves.' The love of the Fellah for his country and his Nile is an all-absorbing love. Remove him, and he perishes. He cannot live a year away from his village; his grave must be where his cradle was. But he is of all men most submissive: he will rather die than revolt; resignation is his primary virtue; impatience under any yoke is unknown to him; his life, his faith, his law is submission. 'Allah Kerim!' is his hourly consolation, his perpetual benediction. He was made for peace, not for war; and, though his patriotism is intense, there is no mingling in it of the love of glory or the passion for conquest. His nationality is in his local affections, and they are most intense. Upon this race, the race of bright eyes and beautiful forms, it is impossible to look without deep interest: of all the gay, the gayest; of all the beings made for happiness, the most excitable. If days of peace and prosperity could be theirs, what songs, what music, what joys!" (Bowring's *Report*, p. 7).

The ruling class consists of Arabs intermingled with Turks, who have been in succession the conquerors of the land, and may be regarded as representing the priestly and military castes.

The only other tribe we have room to notice is that of the Copts, equally with the preceding indigenous. They are Christians by hereditary transmission, and have suffered centuries of cruel persecutions and humiliations, though now they seem to be rising in importance, and promise to fill an important page in the future history of Egypt. In character they are amiable, pacific, and intelligent, having, of course, the faults and vices of dissimulation, falsehood, and meanness, which slavery never fails to engender. In office they are the scribes, the arithmeticians, the measurers, the clerks—in a word, the learned men of the country. The language which they use in their religious services is the ancient Egyptian, or Coptic, which, however, is translated into Arabic for the benefit of the laity (Bowring's *Report*). See below, EGYPT, CHRISTIAN; and COPTS.

XIX. *Technical Chronology.*—That the Egyptians used various periods of time, and made astronomical observations from a remote age, is equally attested by ancient writers and by their monuments. It is, however, very difficult to connect periods mentioned by the former with the indications of the same kind offered by the latter; and what we may term the recorded observations of the monuments cannot be used for the determination of chronology without a previous knowledge of Egyptian astronomy that we have not wholly attained. The testimony of ancient writers must, however, be carefully sifted, and we must not

take their statements as a positive basis without the strongest evidence of correctness. Without that testimony, however, we could not at present prosecute the inquiry. The Egyptians do not appear to have had any common era. Every document that bears the date of a year gives the year of the reigning sovereign, counted from that current year in which he came to the throne, which was called his first year. There is, therefore, no general means of testing deductions from the chronological indications of the monuments.

There appear to have been at least three years in use with the Egyptians before the Roman domination, the Vague Year, the Tropical Year, and the Sothic Year; but it is not probable that more than two of these were employed at the same time. The Vague Year contained 365 days without any additional fraction, and therefore passed through all the seasons in about 1500 years. It was used both for civil and for religious purposes. Probably the Israelites adopted this year during the sojourn in Egypt, and that instituted at the Exodus appears to have been the current Vague Year fixed by the adoption of a method of intercalation. See YEAR. The Vague Year was divided into twelve months, each of thirty days, with five *epagomenæ*, or additional days, after the twelfth. The months were assigned to three seasons, each comprising four months, called respectively the 1st, 2d, 3d, and 4th of those seasons. The names by which the Egyptian months are commonly known, Thoth, Paophi, etc., are taken from the divinities to which they were sacred. The seasons are called, according to our rendering, those of Vegetation, Manifestation, and the Waters, or the Inundation: the exact meaning of their names has, however, been much disputed. They evidently refer to the phenomena of a tropical year, and such a year we must therefore conclude the Egyptians had, at least in a remote period of their history. If, as we believe, the third season represents the period of the inundation, its beginning must be dated about one month before the autumnal equinox, which would place the beginning of the year at the winter solstice, an especially fit time in Egypt for the commencement of a tropical year. The Sothic Year was a supposed sidereal year of 365 $\frac{1}{4}$  days, commencing with the so-called heliacal rising of Sothis. The Vague Year, having no intercalation, constantly retreated through the Sothic Year, until a period of 1461 years of the former kind, and 1460 of the latter had elapsed, from one coincidence of commencements to another.

The Egyptians are known to have used two great cycles, the Sothic Cycle and the Tropical Cycle. The former was a cycle of the coincidence of the Sothic and Vague years, and therefore consisted of 1460 years of the former kind. This cycle is mentioned by ancient writers, and two of its commencements recorded, the one, called the Era of Menophres, July 20, B.C. 1322, and the other on the same day, A.D. 139. Menophres is supposed to be the name of an Egyptian king, and this is most probable. The nearest name is Mem-ptah, or Menephtah, which is part of that of Sethi Menptah, a title that seems to have been in one form or another common to several of the first kings of the 19th dynasty. Chronological indications seem to be conclusive in favor of Sethos I. The Tropical Cycle was a cycle of the coincidence of the Tropical and Vague years. We do not know the exact length of the former year with the Egyptians, nor, indeed, that it was used in the monumental age; but from the mention of a period of 500 years, the third of the cycle, and the time during which the Vague Year would retrograde through one season, we cannot doubt that there was such a cycle, not to speak of its analogy with the Sothic Cycle. It has been supposed by M. Biot to have had a duration of 1505 years; but the length of 1500 Vague Years is preferable, since it contains a number of complete lunations, besides that the Egyptians could scarcely have been more exact,

and that the period of 500 years is a subdivision of 1500. Ancient writers do not fix any commencements of this cycle. If the characteristics of the Tropical Year are what we suppose, the cycle would have begun B.C. 2005 and 507: two hieroglyphic inscriptions are thought to record the former of these epochs (Poole, *Hore Egyptiacæ*, p. 12 sq., pl. i, Nos. 5, 6). The return of the Phœnix has undoubtedly a chronological meaning. It has been supposed to refer to the period last mentioned, but Poole is of opinion that the Phœnix Cycle was of exactly the same character, and therefore length, as the Sothic, its commencement being marked by the so-called heliacal rising of a star of the constellation BENNU HESAR, "the Phœnix of Osiris," which is placed in the astronomical ceiling of the Rameseum of El-Kurneh six months distant from Sothis. The monuments make mention of Panegyric Months, which can only, it is supposed, be periods of thirty years each, and divisions of a year of the same kind. Poole has computed the following as dates of commencements of these Panegyric Years, in accordance with which he has adjusted his chronology: 1st, B.C. 2717, 1st dynasty, æra of Menes (not on monuments); 2d, B.C. 2352, 4th dynasty, Sûphis I and II; 3d, B.C. 1986 (12th dynasty, Osirtasen III? not on monuments); the last-mentioned date being also, according to him, the beginning of a Phœnix Cycle, which he thinks comprised four of these Panegyric Years. The other important dates of the system of panegyrics which occur on the monuments are, in his scheme: B.C. 1442, 18th dynasty, queen Amen-nem; and B.C. 1412, 18th dynasty, Thothmes III.

Certain phenomena recorded on the monuments have been calculated by M. Biot, who has obtained the following dates: Rising of Sothis in reign of Thothmes III, 18th dynasty, B.C. 1445; supposed vernal equinox, Thothmes III, B.C. cir. 1441; rising of Sothis, Rameses II, 19th dynasty, B.C. 1301; star-risings, Rameses VI and IX (? Menephtah I and II), 20th dynasty, B.C. cir. 1241. Some causes of uncertainty affect the exactness of these dates, and that of Rameses II is irreconcilable with the two of Thothmes III, unless we hold the calendar in which the inscription supposed to record it occurs to be a Sothic one, in which case no date could be obtained.

Egyptian technical chronology gives us no direct evidence in favor of the high antiquity which some assign to the foundation of the first kingdom. The earliest record which all Egyptologists are agreed to regard as affording a date is of the fifteenth century B.C., and no one has alleged any such record to be of an earlier time than the twenty-fourth century B.C. The Egyptians themselves seem to have placed the beginning of the 1st dynasty in the twenty-eighth century B.C., but for determining this epoch there is no direct monumental evidence, and a comparison with Scripture does not favor quite so early a date. See CHRONOLOGY.

XX. *Historical Chronology.*—The materials for this are the monuments and the remains of the historical work of Manetho. Since the interpretation of hieroglyphics has been discovered the evidence of the monuments has been brought to bear on this subject, but as yet it has not been sufficiently full and explicit to enable us to set aside other aid. We have still to look elsewhere for a general framework, the details of which the monuments may fill up. The remains of Manetho are now generally held to supply this want. A comparison with the monuments has shown that he drew his information from original sources, the general authenticity of which is vindicated by minute points of agreement. The information Manetho gives us, in the present form of his work, is, however, by no means explicit, and it is only by a theoretical arrangement of the materials that they take a definite form. The remains of Manetho's historical work consist of a list of the Egyptian dynasties and two considerable frag-

ments, one relating to the Shepherds, the other to a tale of the Exodus. The list is only known to us in the epitome given by Africanus, preserved by Syncellus, and that given by Eusebius. These present such great differences that it is not reasonable to hope that we can restore a correct text. The series of dynasties is given as if they were successive, in which case the commencement of the first would be placed full 5000 years B.C., and the reign of the king who built the Great Pyramid, 4000. The monuments do not warrant so extreme an antiquity, and the great majority of Egyptologists have therefore held that the dynasties were partly contemporary. A passage in the fragment of Manetho respecting the Shepherds, where he speaks of the kings of the Thebais and of the rest of Egypt rising against these foreign rulers, makes it almost certain that he admitted at least three contemporary lines at that period (Josephus, *Apion*, i, 14). The naming of dynasties anterior to the time of a single kingdom, and then of later ones, which we know generally held sway over all Egypt—in other words, the first seventeen, distinct from the 18th and following dynasties—lends support to this opinion. The former are named in groups: first a group of Thinites, then one of Memphites, broken by a dynasty of Elephantinites, next a Heracleopolite line, etc., the dynasties of a particular city being grouped together; whereas the latter generally present but one or two together of the same name, and the dynasties of different cities recur. The earlier portion seems therefore to represent parallel lines, the later a succession. The evidence of the monuments leads to the same conclusion. Kings who unquestionably belong to different dynasties are shown by them to be contemporary (see, for example, in Rawlinson's *Herod.* ii, 289). In the present state of Egyptology this evidence has led to various results as to the number of contemporary dynasties, and the consequent duration of the whole history. One great difficulty is that the character of the inscriptions makes it impossible to ascertain, without the explicit mention of two sovereigns, that any one king was not a sole ruler. For example, it has lately been discovered that the 12th dynasty was for the greatest part of its rule a double line; yet its numerous monuments in general give no hint of more than one king, although there was almost always a recognised colleague. Therefore, *à fortiori*, no notice would be taken, if possible, on any monument of a ruler of another house than that of the king in whose territory it was made. We can therefore scarcely expect very full evidence on this subject. Mr. Lane, as long ago as 1830, proposed an arrangement of the first seventeen dynasties based upon their numbers and names. The subjoined table, after Poole, contains the dynasties thus arranged, with the approximate dates B.C. which he assigns to their commencements.

I. Thinites 2717 Mænes.	III. Memphites. 2650				
II. 2470	IV. 2440	V. Elephantinites. 2440			
	VI. 2200		IX. Hermonthites. 2200	XI. Diospolites. 2200	
	VII. 1890			XII. 2080	XIV. Xoites. 2080
	VIII. 1800			XIII. 1920	XV. and XVI. 2080
			X. 1750		XVII. 1680
				XVIII. 1525	

The monuments will not justify any great extension of the period assigned in the table to the first seventeen dynasties. The last date, that of the commencement of the 18th dynasty, cannot be changed more than a few years. Some Egyptologists, indeed, place it much earlier (Bunsen, B.C. 1625; Böckh, 1655; Lepsius, 1684; Brugsch, 1706), but they do so in opposition to positive monumental evidence. The date of the beginning of the 1st dynasty, which Poole is disposed to place a little before B.C. 2700, is more doubtful, but a concurrence of ethnological evidence points

to the twenty-fifth century. The interval between the two dates cannot therefore be greatly more or less than nine hundred years, a period quite in accordance with the lengths of the dynasties according to the better text, if the arrangement here given be correct. Some have supposed a much greater antiquity for the commencement of Egyptian history (Bunsen, B.C. 3623; Lepsius, 3892; Brugsch, 4455; Böckh, 5702). Their system is founded upon a passage in the chronological work of Syncellus, which assigns a duration of 3555 years to the thirty dynasties (*Chron.* p. 51 r). It is by no means certain that this number is given on the authority of Manetho, but apart from this, the whole statement is unmistakably not from the true Manetho, but from some one of the fabricators of chronology, among whom pseudo-Manetho held a prominent place (*Encyc. Brit.* 8th edit., "Egypt," p. 452; *Quarterly Review*, No. 210, p. 395-7). If this number be discarded as doubtful or spurious, there is nothing definite to support the extended system so confidently put forth by those who adopt it.

The importance of this ancient list of Egyptian kings—it being, in fact, the only completely connected line extant—requires a fuller exhibit than we find in the dictionaries of Smith and Kitto, from which a large part of the other investigations of this article is derived. The dates given by us are essentially those assigned by Wilkinson in Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, vol. ii, chap. viii. The identifications are in part made by Kenrick (*Egypt under the Pharaohs*, vol. ii). The names of Manetho exhibit many striking coincidences with the elements afforded by the latest researches and discoveries, especially Mariette's "Apis list" on the tablet of Sakkarah, Dümichen's "Sethos list" on that of Abydos, and the "Turin papyrus," as these are given in detail by Unger (*Chronologie des Manetho*, Berlin, 1867), although we have not been able to adopt all the conclusions of this author, whose work is the most elaborate on the subject. The fact that the names in all these lists are in continuous order does not prove an unbroken succession of reigns, for such is the case in Manetho's list, although he expressly states that the several dynasties were of different localities. That the dynasties of the monumental lists likewise are not all consecutive is further proved by at least two conclusive circumstances: 1. The sum of the years of those 74 reigns, to which an explicit length is assigned in the Turin roll, is 1060; now if to this we add a corresponding number for the other 160 reigns whose duration is not specified in the same document, and also for the 10 subsequent names in the parallel lists down to Sethi I (B.C. 1322), we obtain a total of 3484 years for the first eighteen dynasties, or a date for Menes of B.C. 4806; but this would be 2144 years before the Flood, even according to the longest computation of the Biblical text. See AGES OF THE WORLD.

2. Several dynasties are wholly and designedly omitted in one of these monumental lists, which are given at length in the others (e. g. the 7th, 8th, 9th, 13th, 14th, and 15th), and at least one of them (the 11th) is absent in all of them, not to speak of numerous gaps and discrepancies: they must therefore, if at all trustworthy, be intended as contemporaneous lines in different sections of the empire, precisely as were those of Manetho, who frequently dispatches an entire dynasty without any details whatever, as being of local importance only. See MANETHO.



TABLE OF THE EGYPTIAN REIGNS.—(Continued.)

Dynasty.	Order.	MANETHO.	Years.	Various Readings, and other Authors.	ON THE ANCIENT MONUMENTS.				Designation by most Writers.	Accession, B.C.	
					Turin Papyrus.	Tablet of Abydos.	Tablet of Sakkarah.	Other Inscriptions.			
X.		19 kings	185							1750	
XI.		16 kings	43	Murtaios 22  Ousimaris 19 Sethinios 8 Semphroukrates 18 Chouthar 7 Meïres 12 Chomæmphtha 11  Soikounos 60	VI, 1, Ra-s'hetep-hati 2, . . . . ke 3, . . . . .	46 59, Ra-shepher-ke 29 60, Ra-nub-keu	39, Ra-s'hetep-hati 40, Ra-shepher-ke 41, Ra-nub-ke	Ra . . . . Ra-shepher-ke Ra-neb-nem Ra-nub-sheper Vesur-en-ra  Necht-en-ra Ra-skenen Amen-em-hat Ra-ke Vesur-tesen Ra-nub-ke Amen-em-hat Vesur-tesen Ra-keu Vesur-tesen Ra-mat Amar-em-hat Ra-shepura Amen-em-hat Ra-sebek-nophru Ra-she-m-shu-toti Sebek-hotp	Amunemhet I. Osirtasen I. Amunemhet II.   Osirtasen II. Osirtasen III. Amunemhet III. Amunemhet IV.		1718
XII.		17. Amnenemes 1. Sesonchosis 2. Amnenemes  3. Sesostris 4. Lachares 5. Amères  6. Amenemes  7. Skemiôphris 60 kings	16 46 38  48 8 8  8  4 453	Gezonçosis, etc. Amnanemes  Sistoschermes Lamaris, etc. Mares    60	VI, 1, Ra-s'hetep-hati 2, . . . . ke 3, . . . . .  4, . . . . . 5, . . . . . 6, . . . . .  7, Sheruma  8, Ra-sebek-nophru 4, 1, Ra-shu-toti	46 59, Ra-shepher-ke 29 60, Ra-nub-keu  19 61, Ra-ke-shepher 30 62, Ra-sha-keu 40 63, Ra-n-maab  9 64, Ra-shepura  46, Ra-sebek-ke	39, Ra-s'hetep-hati 40, Ra-shepher-ke 41, Ra-nub-ke  42, Ra-ke-shepher 43, Ra-sha-ke 54, Ra-n-maat  45, Ra-shepura  46, Ra-sebek-ke	Ra . . . . Ra-shepher-ke Ra-neb-nem Ra-nub-sheper Vesur-en-ra  Necht-en-ra Ra-skenen Amen-em-hat Ra-ke Vesur-tesen Ra-nub-ke Amen-em-hat Vesur-tesen Ra-keu Vesur-tesen Ra-mat Amar-em-hat Ra-shepura Amen-em-hat Ra-sebek-nophru Ra-she-m-shu-toti Sebek-hotp	Amunemhet I. Osirtasen I. Amunemhet II.   Osirtasen II. Osirtasen III. Amunemhet III. Amunemhet IV.		1906
XIII.		60 kings	453		VII, a, 1, Ra-shu-toti  2, Ra-ka-shem 3, Ra-amen-em-hati 4, Ra-setep-hati 5, Aup-na 6, Ra-s'anch-hati 7, Ra-s'men-ke 8, Ra-setp-hati 9, Ra-s'nezem-ke 10, 11, Ra-nezem-hati 12, Ra-sebek-hotp 13, Ra-nepher-ke 14, Ra-vutu-hati 15, Ra-sezephau-hotp 16, Ra-she-m-shu Sebek-hotp 17, Ra-vesur-shu 18, Ra-s'mench-ke Mer-men-phiu 19, . . . . ke 20, . . . . vesiu Seth 21, Ra-she-m Sebek-hotp b, 1, Ra-she Nepher-hotp 2, P-se-t-hathor 3, Ra-shu-nepher Sebek-hotp 4, 5, 6, Ra-she-hotp 7, Ra-hati Aa-hati 8, 1, Ra-meri-nepher c, 1, Ra-meri-nepher A 2, Ra-meri-hotp 3, Ra-s'anch-en-s'vutu 4, Ra-mer-shem Au-ran 5, Ra-s'vut-keu Hora 6, Ra-sem-zam 7, . . . . . 8, . . . . . 9, . . . . . 10, . . . . . 11, . . . . . 12, . . . . . 13, . . . . . 14, . . . . . 15, . . . . . 16, Ra-mer-shepher 17, Ra-meri-keu 18, Ra-she-m-vut-shau 19, . . . . . 20, . . . . . 21, . . . . . 22, . . . . . 23, . . . mesu 24, Ma-n-ra Abe 25, Ra-uben Nrau 26, Ra . . . ke 27, Ra . . . ma 28, . . . . . 29, . . . . . 30, Ra-nehusi 31, Ra-she-shru 32, Ra-neb-em-vutu 33, 1, Ra-sech-hat 2, Ra-mer-zepha 3, Ra-s'vut-ke 4, Ra-zephau-ra-nib 5, Ra-uben 6, . . . . . 7, . . . . . 8, Ra-neb-zepha 9, Ra-uben 10, Ra-s'vutu-het 11, Ra-heri-het 12, Ra-neb-acerm 13, . . . . . 14, . . . . . 15, Ra-be 16, Se-shepher-en-ra 17, Ra-tat-sheru 18, Ra-s'anch-ke	46 59, Ra-shepher-ke 29 60, Ra-nub-keu  19 61, Ra-ke-shepher 30 62, Ra-sha-keu 40 63, Ra-n-maab  9 64, Ra-shepura  46, Ra-sebek-ke	39, Ra-s'hetep-hati 40, Ra-shepher-ke 41, Ra-nub-ke  42, Ra-ke-shepher 43, Ra-sha-ke 54, Ra-n-maat  45, Ra-shepura  46, Ra-sebek-ke	Ra . . . . Ra-shepher-ke Ra-neb-nem Ra-nub-sheper Vesur-en-ra  Necht-en-ra Ra-skenen Amen-em-hat Ra-ke Vesur-tesen Ra-nub-ke Amen-em-hat Vesur-tesen Ra-keu Vesur-tesen Ra-mat Amar-em-hat Ra-shepura Amen-em-hat Ra-sebek-nophru Ra-she-m-shu-toti Sebek-hotp	Amunemhet I. Osirtasen I. Amunemhet II.   Osirtasen II. Osirtasen III. Amunemhet III. Amunemhet IV.		1860
XIV.		76 kings	184	484	VIII, a, 1, Ra-sech-hat 2, Ra-mer-zepha 3, Ra-s'vut-ke 4, Ra-zephau-ra-nib 5, Ra-uben 6, . . . . . 7, . . . . . 8, Ra-neb-zepha 9, Ra-uben 10, Ra-s'vutu-het 11, Ra-heri-het 12, Ra-neb-acerm 13, . . . . . 14, . . . . . 15, Ra-be 16, Se-shepher-en-ra 17, Ra-tat-sheru 18, Ra-s'anch-ke	46 59, Ra-shepher-ke 29 60, Ra-nub-keu  19 61, Ra-ke-shepher 30 62, Ra-sha-keu 40 63, Ra-n-maab  9 64, Ra-shepura  46, Ra-sebek-ke	39, Ra-s'hetep-hati 40, Ra-shepher-ke 41, Ra-nub-ke  42, Ra-ke-shepher 43, Ra-sha-ke 54, Ra-n-maat  45, Ra-shepura  46, Ra-sebek-ke	Ra . . . . Ra-shepher-ke Ra-neb-nem Ra-nub-sheper Vesur-en-ra  Necht-en-ra Ra-skenen Amen-em-hat Ra-ke Vesur-tesen Ra-nub-ke Amen-em-hat Vesur-tesen Ra-keu Vesur-tesen Ra-mat Amar-em-hat Ra-shepura Amen-em-hat Ra-sebek-nophru Ra-she-m-shu-toti Sebek-hotp	Amunemhet I. Osirtasen I. Amunemhet II.   Osirtasen II. Osirtasen III. Amunemhet III. Amunemhet IV.		1900

TABLE OF THE EGYPTIAN REIGNS.—(Continued.)

Dynasty.	Order.	MANETHO.	Years.	Various Readings, and other Authors.	ON THE ANCIENT MONUMENTS.				Designation by most Writers.	Accession. B. C.			
					Turin Papyrus.	Tablet of Abydos.	Tablet of Sakkarah.	Other Inscriptions.					
					19, Ra-nepher-bau 20, Ra-schem 21, Ra-ke-der b, 1, Ra-nepher-het 2, Ra-a . . . abe 3, Ra-shau 4, Ra-anut-ke 5, Ra-s'men 6, Ra . . . 7, . . . . . 8, . . . . . 9, Ra-schem . . . 10, Ra-schem . . . 11, Ra-schem . . . 12, Ra-sesen . . . 13, Ra-neb-aten-vutu 14, Ra-neb-aten-vutu 15, Ra-s'men-ke 16, Ra-s'vesur-ke 17, Ra-hau-shed-hen't 18, . . . . . 19, . . . . . 20, . . . . . 21, Ra-vesur . . . 22, Ra-vesur . . . 23, . . . . . 24, . . . . . c, 1, . . . . . 2, . . . . . Nerau 3, . . . . . hebal d, 1, . . . . . 2, . . . . . 3, . . . . . 4, . . . . . 5, . . . . . 6, . . . . . 7, . . . . . 8, . . . . . 9, . . . . . 10, . . . . . 11, . . . . . 12, . . . . . mhit 13, . . . . . n-neb 14, . . . . . 15, Ra . . . . . 16, Ra . . . . . 17, . . . . . 18, . . . . . 19, Ra-s'nepher-ke 20, Ra-men-ch-heru 21, Hu . . . . . 22, . . . . . e, 1, . . . . . ke 2, . . . . . ke 3, . . . . . ke Iiapu 4, . . . . . ke Ha-na-ha 5, . . . . . ke Bebnuu 6, . . . . . ke ? . . . . . en-na Anmu ? . . . . . n . . . . . ateph 30 ? . . . . . Ap . . . . . 40 ? . . . . . Ap . . . . . 60								
XV.	1. Saïtes		19	Silites									
	2. Buon		44	Balon	49								
	3. Apachnan		61	Apachnas	36								
	4. Aphôbia		61	6, Aphôphis	14				! Pianki ! Ab-				
	5. Staan		50	Sethos, etc.									
	6. Archies		49	Asseth, etc.	30				! Aan				
XVI.	32 kings		518								! 2061		
XVII.	86 kings		151								! 1680		
XVIII.	1. Amôsis		18	Tethmôsis	25	65, Aah-mes	47, Aah-mes	Aah-mes	Ames I		1520		
	[One misplaced.]					66, Amen-hotp	48, Amen-hotp	Amen-hotp	Amenoph I.		1498		
	2. Amenôphthis		90	Amenphis	21	67, Taut-mes	49, Taut-mes	Taut-mes	Thothmes I.		1478		
	3. Chebros		13	Chebron	22	68, Taut-mes	50, Taut-mes	Taut-mes	Thothmes II.		1470		
	4. Amensia		29	Amesses	12	69, Taut-mes	51, Taut-mes	Taut-mes	Thothmes III.		1463		
	5. Misaphris		13	6, Miphres									
	6. Mispfragmouthôsis		26	5, Mephragmou-thôsis		70, Amen-hotp	52, Amen-hotp	Amen-hotp	Amenoph II.		1416		
	7. Thouthmôsis		9	Thmôsis	10	71, Taut-mes	53, Taut-mes	Taut-mes	Thothmes IV.		1410		
	8. Amenôphis		31	Mennon		72, Amen-hotp	54, Amen-hotp	Amen-hotp	Amenoph III.		1403		
	9. Horus		37			! regent							
	10. Acherrhes		12	Achenhereses	16	73, Har-erm-heb	55, Har-erm-heb	Har-erm-heb	Horus.		1367		
	11. Rathos		12	Athêris	31								
	12. Chebros		12	Chenchêres	16								
	13. Acherrhes II		12	Akenchêres, etc.	30				! Resitot Ra-shephru-neb, or Amen-anch-tut-hak				
	14. Armais		5	Arma'sis	4				Amen-mer				
	15. Rhammêses		7	Rhamesses Rhamesses Ma-moun	68 66	74, Ra-messu	56, Ra-messu	Ra-mes-su	Rameses I.		1324		
XIX.	1. Sethos		51		55	75, Seti	57, Seti	Ra-maa-men Seti	Sethi I.		1322		
	2. Rhampakes		66	Rhampses	61	76, Ra-messu		Ra-messu-mer-amen	Rameses II.		1307		
IXVIII.	16.] Amenôphath		19	Amenôphis	8			Ra-messu-mer-amen Mern-ptah-hotp-her	Menepthah I.		! 1247		
	3. Armenôphthes		20	Amenôphis	40			Seti Mern-ptah	Sethi II, Menepthah II.		! 1240		
	4. Rhameses		60	Sethos		77, Ra-messu		Ra-messu hak	Rameses III.		! 1200		
	5. Ammenemnes		5	Ammenêmes	27								
	6. Thonôris		7										
XX.	12 kings		135		178				Amen-amen Nets-hor Ra-vesur Ra-messu Ra-saur Ra-messu Uncertain. Ra-nepher Ra-messu Mer-amen Ra-messu Ra-messu Ra-shepher Ra-sha Ra-messu Mer-amen Ra-messu Shu-muab Ra-messu	Rameses IV. Rameses V. Rameses VI. Rameses VII. Rameses VIII. Rameses IX. Rameses X.		1192	
									The rest uncertain.				

TABLE OF THE EGYPTIAN REIGNS.—(Continued.)

Dynasty.	Order.	MANETHO.	Years.	Various Readings, and other Authors.	On the Monuments.	Designation by most Writers.	Accession, B.C.		
XXI.	1.	Smendes	26	Smendis	! Nes-ben-tet		1085		
	2.	Psoousenes	41						
	3.	Nephelethres	4	Nephelethres					
	4.	Amenophthia	9	Amenophthia	! Amun-se Pehor				
	5.	Osöchor	6						
XXII.	6.	Psinachea	9		! Pisanh ! P'sham				
	7.	Psoousenes	14	Sonsenosia	Ra-het Sheshonk	Sheshonk I.	989		
	1.	Seosochis	21	Seosochosia	Ra-heru Osorkan	Osorkon I.	968		
	2.	Osorthon	15	Osorchon	! Ra-het Tekerot ! Ra-vesur Osorkan ! Ra-shen Sheshonk Ra-het Tekerot	Osorkon II. Sheshonk II. Tiklat I II. Tiklat I II.	! 957 ! 943 ! 920 ! 905		
	3 others	25			! Ra-vesur Sheshonk	! Osorkon III.	! 890		
XXIII.	6.	Takelöthls	13	3,		Sheshonk III. ! Tiklat III.	! 862 ! 833		
	3 others	42			Ra-vesur Pimai Ra-aa-shepher Sheshonk	! Fishak. Sheshonk IV.	! 818 ! 796		
	1.	Petoubastis	40	Petoubatos	25	Pet-Basht.	! 818		
	2.	Osorcho	8	Osorthon	9	Ra-aa-shepher Sheshonk	! Osorkon IV.	! 783	
	3.	Psammos	10		Ra-vesur P'si-mut		! 775		
XXIV.	4.	Zet	31		34		! 765		
	XXV.	1.	Boeöhöria	6		44	! Bek-en-rupht	! 734	
		2.	Sabakon	8		15	Ra-nepher-she Shebake	! 728	
		3.	Tarkos	14	Tarakoä	18	Ra-tet-ku Shebatke	! 716	
		1.	Ammeria	18		20	Ra-nepher-teru-shu Taharka	Tehrak.	690
2.		Stephinales	12						
XXVI.	2.	Nechepsoä	7	2,					
	3.	Nechao	8	3,					
	4.	Psammetichos	54	4, Nachao	46	Ra-ah-het Psemitik	Psametik I.	664	
	5.	Nechao II	6	Nechepsoä	Ra-nem-het Nekau	Neku.	610		
	6.	Psammonthis II	6	Psammetichos	17	Ra-nepher-het Psemitik	Psametik II.	594	
XXVII.	7.	Omaphris	19		25	Ra-has-het Ru-ah-het	Vapnhat.	588	
	8.	Amösis	44		42	Ra-knum-het Aab-mes	Ames II.	569	
	1.	Kambuses	4	Psammecherites	3	Ra-anch-ka'n Psemitik	Psametik III.	525	
	2.	Dareios (7 months.)	36		6	Ra ment Kambth	Cambyses.	525	
	3.	Dareios (son of) Hystaspes	21						
XXVIII.	4.	Artaxerxes	41	4, Artabanos		Ra-amen-nari Ntariush	Darius I.	521	
	XXIX.	5.	[Sogdianus, 1]	19	The Long-handed Xerxes II	40	Khsersha	Xerxes I.	485
		1.	Amurtäos	6	Amurtös		Artakhsersha	Artaxerxes I.	465
		2.	Nepherites	6					
		3.	Achöris	10					
4.		Psamonthia	1		2 mos.	Amen-ret-kam Ra-ba'n-netru Naiph-au-ret	Darius II. Nephaerot. Hakor.	423 414 409	
XXX.	1.	Nektanebes	18		13	Ra-usa't-khnum Itakar	Hakor.	358	
	2.	Nektaneboä	18						
	3.	Nektaneboä	18						
	1.	Oichos	6						
	2.	Arses	3						
XXXI.	3.	Dareios	4						
	1.	Nektanebes	18						
	2.	Nektaneboä	18						
	1.	Oichos	6						
	2.	Arses	3						
3.	Dareios	4							

Conquest of Egypt by Alexander the Great.

XXI. History.—1. *Traditional Period.*—We have first to notice the indications in the Bible which relate to the earliest period. In Gen. x we find the colonization of Egypt traced up to the immediate children of Noah, for it is there stated that Mizraim was the second son of Ham, who was himself the second son of Noah. That Egypt was colonized by the descendants of Noah in a very remote age is further shown by the mention of the migration of the Philistines from Caphtor, which had taken place before the arrival of Abraham in Palestine (Gen. x, 14; compare Deut. ii, 23; Amos ix, 27). Before this migration could occur the Caphtorim and other Mizraites must have occupied Egypt for some time. Immediately after these genealogical statements, the sacred narrative (Gen. xii) informs us that the patriarch Abraham, pressed by famine, went down (B.C. 2087) into Egypt, where it appears he found a monarch, a court, princes, and servants, and where he found also those supplies of food which the well-known fertility of the country had led him to seek there; for it is expressly stated that the favor which his wife had won in the reigning Pharaoh's eyes procured him sheep and oxen, as well as heasses, and men-servants, and maid-servants, and sheasses, and camels. A remarkable passage points to a knowledge of the date at which an ancient city of Egypt was founded: "Hebron was built seven years before Zoan in Egypt" (Num. xiii, 22). We find that Hebron was originally called Kirjath-arba, and was a city of the Anakim (Josh. xiv, 15), and it is mentioned under that appellation in the history of Abraham (Gen. xxiii, 2); it had therefore been founded by the giant-race before the days of that patriarch. In Gen. xxi, 9, mention is made in the case of Ishmael, the son of Hagar the Egyptian, whose mother took him a wife out of the land of Egypt (B.C. cir. 2055), of a mixed

race between the Egyptians and the Chaldeans, a race which in after times became a great nation. From this mixture of races it has been supposed the Arabs (عرب, "mixed people") had their name (Sharpe's *Early Hist. of Egypt*, i, 11).

The evidence of the Egyptians as to the primeval history of their race and country is extremely indefinite. They seem to have separated mankind into two great stocks, and each of these again into two branches, for they appear to have represented themselves and the negroes, the red and black races, as the children of the god Horus, and the Semites and Europeans, the yellow and white races, as the children of the goddess Pesht (comp. Brugsch, *Geogr. Inschr.* ii, 90, 91). They seem, therefore, to have held a double origin of the species. The absence of any important traditional period is very remarkable in the fragments of Egyptian history. These commence with the divine dynasties, and pass abruptly to the human dynasties. The latest portion of the first may indeed be traditional, not mythical, and the earliest part of the second may be traditional and not historical, though this last conjecture we are hardly disposed to admit. In any case, however, there is a very short and extremely obscure time of tradition, and at no great distance from the earliest date at which it can be held to end we come upon the clear light of history in the days of the pyramids. The indications are of a sudden change of seat, and the settlement in Egypt of a civilized race, which, either wishing to be believed autochthonous, or having lost all ties that could keep up the traditions of its first dwelling-place, filled up the commencement of its history with materials drawn from mythology. There is no trace of the tradition of the Deluge which is found in almost every other country of the world. The

priests are indeed reported to have told Solon, when he spoke of one deluge, that many had occurred (Plat. *Tim.* 23), but the reference is more likely to have been to great floods of the Nile than to any extraordinary catastrophes. See DELUGE.

2. *Uncertain Period.*—The history of the dynasties preceding the 18th is not told by any continuous series of monuments. Except the bare lists indicated in the above table, there are scarcely any records of the age left to the present day, and thence in a great measure arises the difficulty of determining the chronology. From the time of Menes, the first king, until the Shepherd invasion, Egypt seems to have enjoyed perfect tranquillity. During this age the Memphite line was the most powerful, and by it, under the 4th dynasty, were the most famous pyramids raised. The Shepherds were foreigners who came from the east, and, in some manner unknown to Manetho, gained the rule of Egypt. Those whose kings composed the 15th dynasty were the first and most important. They appear to have been Phœnicians, and it is probable that their migration into Egypt, and thence at last into Palestine, was part of the great movement to which the coming of the Phœnicians from the Erythræan Sea, and the Philistines from Capthor, belong. It is not impossible that the war of the four kings—Chedorlaomer and his allies—was directed against the power of the kings of the 15th dynasty. Most probably the Pharaoh of Abraham was of this line, which lived at Memphis, and at the great fort or camp of Avaris on the eastern frontier. The period of Egyptian history to which the Shepherd invasion should be assigned is a point of dispute. It is generally placed after the 12th dynasty, for it is argued that this powerful line could not have reigned at the same time as one or more Shepherd dynasties. Poole is of the opinion that this objection is not valid, and that the Shepherd invasion was anterior to the 12th dynasty. It is not certain that the foreigners were at the outset hostile to the Egyptians, for they may have come in by marriage, and it is by no means unlikely that they may have long been in a position of secondary importance. The rule of the 12th dynasty, which was of Thebans, lasting about 160 years, was a period of prosperity to Egypt, but after its close those calamities appear to have occurred which made the Shepherds hated by the Egyptians. During the interval to the 18th dynasty there seems to have been no native line of any importance but that of the Thebans, and more than one Shepherd dynasty exercised a severe rule over the Egyptians. The paucity of the monuments proves the troubled nature of this period. See *HYKOSOS*.

Of these first seventeen dynasties, Menes, the first mortal king of Egypt, according to Manetho, Herodotus, Eratosthenes, and Diodorus, and preceded, according to the first, by gods, heroes, and Manes (?), *ἄνθρωποι*, is accepted on all hands as a historical personage. His hieroglyphic name reads MENIM or MENA, and is the first on the list of the Ramesium of el-Kurruh. It is also met with in the hieratic of the Turin Papyrus of Kings. Strong reasons are given by Mr. Stuart Poole for fixing the date of his accession at B.C. 2717 (*Horæ Ægyptiacæ*, p. 94-98); but even this date must be somewhat lowered; or, as it would precede that of the Flood (B.C. 2515), on the other hand, Unger (*ut sup.*) raises it to June 27, B.C. 5613. As one step in Poole's argument involves a very ingenious elucidation of a well-known statement of Herodotus, we cannot forbear to mention it. Herodotus says that, in the interval from the first king to Sethon, the priest of Hephestus, the priests told him that "the sun had four times moved from his wonted course, twice rising where he now sets, and twice setting where he now rises." Upon this Mr. Poole remarks: "It is evident that the priests told Herodotus that great periods had elapsed since the time of Menes, the first king, and

that, in the interval from his reign to that of Sethon, the solar risings of stars—that is to say, their manifestations—had twice fallen on those days of the Vague Year on which their settings fell in their time, and *vice versa*; and that the historian, by a natural mistake, supposed they spoke of the sun itself." Menes appears to have been a Thinite king, of the city of This, near Abydos, in Upper Egypt. Herodotus ascribes the building of the city of Memphis to him, while Manetho says that he made a foreign expedition and acquired renown, and that eventually he was killed by a hippopotamus. Menes, after a long reign, was succeeded by his son Athothis, who was the second king of the first dynasty. Manetho says that he built the palace at Memphis, that he was a physician, and left anatomical books; all of these statements implying that even at this early period the Egyptians were in a high state of civilization. About the time of Athothis, the 3d dynasty is supposed, according to the scheme which seems most reasonable, to have commenced, and Memphis to have become independent, giving its name to five dynasties of kings—3d, 4th, 6th, 7th, and 8th. The 1st Thinite dynasty probably lasted about two centuries and a half. Of the 2d very little has reached us; under one of the kings it was determined that women could hold the sovereign power; in the time of another it was fabled, says Manetho, that the Nile flowed mixed with honey for the space of eleven days. The duration of this dynasty was probably between 300 and 400 years, and it seems to have come to a close at the time of the Shepherd invasion. The 3d (Memphite) dynasty, after having lasted about 200 years, was succeeded by the 4th, one of the most famous of the lines which ruled in Egypt; while the 5th dynasty of Elephantine kings arose at the same time. This was emphatically the period of the pyramids, the earliest of which was probably the northern pyramid of Abû-Sir, supposed to have been the tomb of Soris or Shurai, the head of the 4th dynasty. He was succeeded by two kings of the name of Suphis, the first of whom, the Cheops of Herodotus, the Shuphu of the monuments, was probably the builder of the great pyramid. On these wondrous monuments we find traces at that remote period of the advanced state of civilization of later ages. The cursive character scrawled on the stones by the masons proves that writing had been long in common use. Many of the blocks brought from Syene are built together in the pyramids of Ghizeh in a manner unrivalled at any period. The same manners and customs are portrayed on them as on the later monuments. The same boats are used, the same costume of the priests, the same trades, such as glass-blowing and cabinet-making. At the beginning of the 4th dynasty, moreover, the peninsula of Sinai was in the possession of the Egyptians, and its copper mines were worked by them. The duration of this dynasty probably exceeded two centuries, and it was followed by the 6th. The 5th dynasty of Elephantines, as just remarked, began the same time as the 4th. The names of several of its kings occur in the Necropolis of Memphis. The most important of them is Saphres, the Shuphra of the monuments, the Chephren of Herodotus, and Chephren of Diodorus. This dynasty lasted nearly 600 years. Of the 6th dynasty, which lasted about 150 years, the two most famous sovereigns are Phiois or Pepi and queen Nitocris. The former is said to have ruled for a hundred years. With the latter the dynasty closed; for at this period Lower Egypt was invaded by the Shepherds, who entered the country from the north-east, about 700 years after Menes, and eventually drove the Memphites from the throne. Of the 7th and 8th dynasties nothing is known with certainty; they probably followed the 15th. To the former of them, one version of Manetho assigns a duration of 70 days, and 150 years to the latter. The 9th dynasty of Heracleopolites, or,



more properly, of Hermonthites, as Sir G. Wilkinson has suggested (Rawlinson's *Herod.* ii, 293), arose while the 6th was in power. Little is known of either the 9th or 10th dynasties, which together may have lasted nearly 600 years, ending at the time of the great Shepherd war of expulsion, which resulted in the overthrow of all the royal lines except the Diospolite or Theban. With the 11th dynasty commenced the Diospolite kingdom, which subsequently attained to greater power than any other. Amenemhet I was the last and most famous king of this dynasty, and during part of his reign he was co-regent of Osirtasen or Sesertesen I, head of the 12th. An epoch is marked in Egyptian history by the commencement of this dynasty, since the Shepherd rule, which lasted for 500 years, is coeval with it. The three Osirtasens flourished in this dynasty, the second of whom is probably the Sesostris of Manetho. It began about Abraham's time, or somewhat later. In ancient sculptures in Nubia we find kings of the 18th dynasty worshipping Osirtasen III as a god, and this is the only case of the kind. The third Osirtasen was succeeded by Amenemhet III, supposed to be the Mæris of Herodotus, who built the labyrinth. After the reigns of two other sovereigns, this dynasty came to a close, having lasted about 160 years. The 13th dynasty, which lasted some 400 years, probably began before the close of the 12th. The kings of this dynasty were of little power, and probably tributary to the Shepherds. The Diospolites, indeed, did not recover their prosperity till the beginning of the 13th dynasty. The 14th, or Xoite dynasty, seems to have risen with the 12th. It was named from Xoïs, a town of Lower Egypt, in the northern part of the Delta. It may have lasted for nearly 500 years, and probably terminated during the great Shepherd war. The 15th, 16th, and 17th dynasties are those of the Shepherds. Who these foreigners were who are said to have subdued Egypt without a battle is a question of great uncertainty. Their name is called Hyksôs by Manetho, which is variously interpreted to mean shepherd kings, or foreign shepherds. They have been pronounced to have been Assyrians, Scythians, Ethiopians, Phœnicians, and Arabs. The kings of the 15th dynasty were the greatest of the foreign rulers. The kings of the 16th and 17th dynasties are very obscure. Mr. Poole says there are strong reasons for supposing that the kings of the 16th were of a different race from those of the 15th, and that they may have been Assyrians. Having held possession of Egypt 511, or, according to the longest date, 625 years, the Shepherds were driven out by Ames, or Amosis, the first king of the 18th dynasty; and the whole country was then united under one king, who rightly claimed the title of lord of the two regions, or of Upper and Lower Egypt.

3. *Period of the Hebrew Sojourn.*—In Gen. xxxix begins the interesting story of Joseph's being carried down to Egypt, with all its important consequences for the great-grandchildren of Abraham. The productiveness of the country is the allurements, famine the impulse. Attendant circumstances show that Egypt was then famous also for its commercial pursuits; and the entire narrative gives the idea of a complex system of society (about B.C. 1890), and a well-constituted yet arbitrary form of government. As in Eastern courts at later periods of history, elevation to high offices was marked and sudden. The slave Joseph is taken from prison and from impending death, and raised to the dignity of prime vizier, and is intrusted with making provision for an approaching dearth of food, which he had himself foretold, during which he effects in favor of the ruling sovereign one of the greatest revolutions of property which history has recorded. The high consideration in which the priestly order was held is apparent. Joseph himself marries a daughter of the priest of On. Out of respect towards, as well as by the direct influence of Joseph, the He-

brews were well treated. The scriptural record, however, distinctly states (xlvii, 34) that before the descent of Israel and his sons "every shepherd" was "an abomination unto the Egyptians." The Hebrews, whose "trade had been about cattle," must have been odious in the eyes of the Egyptians, yet they are expressly permitted to dwell "in the best of the land" (xlvii, 6), which is identified with the land of Goshen, the place which the Israelites had prayed might be assigned to them, and which they obviously desired on account of the adaptation of its soil to their way of life as herdsmen. Having settled his father and family satisfactorily in the land, Joseph proceeded to supply the urgent wants of a hungry nation, and at the same time converted the tenure of all property from freehold into tenancy-at-will, with a rent-charge of one fifth of the produce, leaving the priests' lands, however, in their own hands; and thus he gave another evidence of the greatness of their power.

The richness of Goshen was favorable, and the Israelites "grew and multiplied exceedingly," so that the land was filled with them. But Joseph was now dead; time had passed on, and there rose up a new king (probably one of a new dynasty) "which knew (Exod. i, 8) not Joseph," having no personal knowledge, and, it may be, no definite information of his services; who, becoming jealous of the increase of the Hebrews, set about persecuting them with the avowed intention of diminishing their numbers and crippling their power. Severe task-masters are therefore set over them; heavy tasks are imposed; the Hebrews are compelled to build "treasure cities, Pithom and Raameses." It is found, however, that they only increase the more. In consequence, their burdens are doubled and their lives made bitter with hard bondage (Exod. i, 14), "in mortar and in brick, and in all manner of service in the field." See BRICK. Their first-born males, moreover, are doomed to destruction the moment they come into being. The deepest heart-burnings ensue; hatred arises between the oppressor and the oppressed; the Israelites seek revenge in private and by stealth (Exod. ii, 12). At last a higher power interferes, and the afflicted race is permitted to quit Egypt (B.C. 1658). At this time Egypt appears to have been a well-peopled and well-cultivated country, with numerous cities, under a despotic monarch, surrounded by officers of his court and a life-guard. There was a ceremonial at audience, a distinction of ranks, a state-prison, and a prime minister. Great buildings were carried on. There was set apart from the rest of the people an order of priests who probably filled offices in the civil government; the priest of Midian and the priest of On seem to have ruled over the cities so named. There was in the general class of priests an order—wise men, sorcerers, and magicians—who had charge of a certain secret knowledge; there were physicians or embalmers of the dead; the royal army contained chosen captains, and horsemen, and chariots. The attention which the people at large paid to agriculture, and the fixed notions of property which they in consequence had, made them hold the shepherd or nomade tribes in abhorrence, as freebooters only less dangerous than hunting-tribes. See PHARAOH.

According to the scheme of Biblical chronology, which we have adopted as the most probable, the whole sojourn in Egypt would belong to the period before the 18th dynasty. The Israelites would have come in and gone forth during that obscure age, for the history of which we have little or no monumental evidence. This would explain the absence of any positive mention of them on the Egyptian monuments. Some assert that they were an unimportant Arab tribe, and therefore would not be mentioned, and that the calamities attending their departure could not be commemorated. These two propositions are contradictory, and the difficulties are unsolved. If, as Lepsius sup-

poses, the Israelites came in under the 18th dynasty, and went out under the 19th, or if, as Bunsen holds, they came in under the 12th, and (after a sojourn of 1431 years!) went out under the 19th, the oppression in both cases falling in a period of which we have abundant contemporary monuments, sometimes the records of every year, it is impossible that the monuments should be wholly silent if the Biblical narrative is true. Let us examine the details of that narrative. At the time to which we should assign Joseph's rule, Egypt was under Shepherds, and Egyptian kings of no great strength. Since the Pharaoh of Joseph must have been a powerful ruler and held Lower Egypt, there can be no question that he was, if the dates be correct, a Shepherd of the 15th dynasty. How does the Biblical evidence affect this inference? Nothing is more striking throughout the ancient Egyptian inscriptions and writings than the bitter dislike of most foreigners, especially Easterns. They are constantly spoken of in the same terms as the inhabitants of the infernal regions, not alone when at war with the Pharaohs, but in time of peace and in the case of friendly nations. It is a feeling paralleled in our days by that of the Chinese alone. The accounts of the Greek writers, and the whole history of the later period, abundantly confirm this estimate of the prejudice of the Egyptians against foreigners. It seems to us perfectly incredible that Joseph should be the minister of an Egyptian king. In lesser particulars the evidence is not less strong. The Pharaoh of Joseph is a despot, whose will is law, who kills and pardons at his pleasure; who not only raises a foreign slave to the head of his administration, but through his means makes all the Egyptians, except the priests, serfs of the crown. The Egyptian kings, on the contrary, were restrained by the laws, shared the public dislike of foreigners, and would have avoided the very policy Joseph followed, which would have weakened the attachment of their fellow-countrymen by the loosening of local ties and complete reducing to bondage of the population, although it would have greatly strengthened the power of an alien sovereign. Pharaoh's conduct towards Joseph's family points to the same conclusion. He gladly invites the strangers, and gives them leave to dwell, not among the Egyptians, but in Goshen, where his own cattle seem to have been (Gen. xlv, 34; xlvii, 6). His acts indicate a fellow-feeling, and a desire to strengthen himself against the national party. See JOSEPH.

The "new king," "which knew not Joseph," is generally thought by those who hold with us as to the previous history, to have been an Egyptian, and head of the 18th dynasty. It seems at first sight extremely probable that the king who crushed, if he did not expel the Shepherds, would be the first oppressor of the nation which they protected. Plausible as this theory appears, a close examination of the Biblical narrative seems to us to overthrow it. We read of the new king that—"he said unto his people, Behold, the people of the children of Israel [are] more and mightier than we: come on, let us deal wisely with them, lest they multiply, and it come to pass that, when there falleth out any war, they join also unto our enemies, and fight against us, and [so] get them up out of the land" (Exod. i, 9, 10). The Israelites are therefore more and stronger than the people of the oppressor; the oppressor fears war in Egypt, and that the Israelites would join his enemies; he is not able at once to adopt open violence, and he therefore uses a subtle system to reduce them by making them perform forced labor, and soon after takes the stronger measure of killing their male children. These conditions point to a divided country and a weak kingdom, and cannot, we think, apply to the time of the 18th and 19th dynasties. The whole narrative of subsequent events to the Exodus is consistent with this conclusion, to which the use of universal terms does not offer any real objection.

When all Egypt is spoken of, it is not necessary either in Hebrew or in Egyptian that we should suppose the entire country to be strictly intended. If we conclude, therefore, that the Exodus most probably occurred before the 18th dynasty, we have to ascertain, if possible, whether the Pharaohs of the oppression appear to have been Egyptians or Shepherds. The change of policy is in favor of their having been Egyptians, but is by no means conclusive, for there is no reason that all the foreigners should have had the same feeling towards the Israelites, and we have already seen that the Egyptian Pharaohs and their subjects seem in general to have been friendly to them throughout their history, and that the Egyptians were privileged by the law, apparently on this account. It may be questioned whether the friendship of the two nations, even if merely a matter of policy, would have been as enduring as we know it to have been, had the Egyptians looked back on their conduct towards the Israelites as productive of great national calamities, or had the Israelites looked back upon the persecution as the work of the Egyptians. If the chronology be correct, we can only decide in favor of the Shepherds. During the time to which the events are assigned there were no important lines but the Theban, and one or more of Shepherds. Lower Egypt, and especially its eastern part, must have been in the hands of the latter. The land of Goshen was in the eastern part of Lower Egypt: it was wholly under the control of the oppressors, whose capital or royal residence, at least in the case of the Pharaoh of the Exodus, lay very near to it. Manetho, according to the transcript of Africanus, speaks of three Shepherd dynasties, the 15th, 16th, and 17th, the last of which, according to the present text, was of Shepherds and Thebans, but this is probably incorrect, and the dynasty should rather be considered as of Shepherds alone. It is difficult to choose between these three: a passage in Isaiah, however, which has been strangely overlooked, seems to afford an indication which narrows the choice. "My people went down aforetime into Egypt to sojourn there, and the Assyrian oppressed them without cause" (iii, 4). This indicates that the oppressor was an Assyrian, and therefore not of the 15th dynasty, which, according to Manetho, in the epitomes, was of Phœnicians, and opposed to the Assyrians (Josephus, *Apion*, i, 14). Among the names of kings of this period in the royal Turin papyrus (ed. Wilkinson) are two which appear to be Assyrian, so that we may reasonably suppose that some of the foreign rulers were of that race. Their exact date, however, is undecided. It cannot be objected to the explanation we have offered that the title Pharaoh is applied to the kings connected with the Israelites, and that they must therefore have been natives, for it is almost certain that at least some of the Shepherd kings were Egyptianized, like Joseph, who received an Egyptian name, and Moses, who was supposed by the daughters of Jethro to be an Egyptian (Exod. ii, 19). It has been urged by the opponents of the chronological schemes that place the Exodus before the later part of the fourteenth century B.C., that the conquests of the Pharaohs of the 18th, 19th, and 20th dynasties would have involved collisions with the Israelites had they been in those times already established in Palestine, whereas neither the Bible nor the monuments of Egypt indicate any such event. It has been overlooked by the advocates of the Rabbinical date of the Exodus that the absence of any positive Palestinian names, except that of the Philistines, in the lists of peoples and places subject to these Pharaohs, and in the records of their wars, entirely destroys their argument; for while it shows that they did not conquer Palestine, it makes it impossible for us to decide on Egyptian evidence whether the Hebrews were then in that country or not. Shishak's list, on the contrary, presents several well-known names of towns in Palestine, be-

sides that of the kingdom of Judah. The policy of the Pharaohs, as previously explained, is the key to their conduct towards the Israelites. At the same time, the character of the portions of the Bible relating to this period prevents our being sure that the Egyptians may not have passed through the country, and even put the Israelites to tribute. It is illustrative of the whole question under consideration that, in the most flourishing days of the sole kingdom of Israel, a Pharaoh should have marched unopposed into Palestine and captured the Canaanitish city Gezer, at no great distance from Jerusalem, and that this should be merely incidentally mentioned at a later time instead of being noticed in the regular course of the narrative (1 Kings ix, 15, 16). See EXODE.

4. *Definite Period.*—With the 18th dynasty, about B.C. 1520, a new and clearer epoch of Egyptian history begins, both as regards the numerous materials for reconstructing it, and also its great importance. In fact, the history of the 18th, 19th, and 20th dynasties is that of the Egyptian empire. Amosis, or Ahmes, the head of the first of these, overthrew the power of the Shepherds, and probably expelled them. No great monuments remain of the first king, but from various inscriptions we are warranted in supposing that he was a powerful king. During his reign we first find mention of the horse, and, as it is often called by the Semitic name *sais*, it seems probable that it was introduced from Asia, and possibly by the Shepherd kings. If so, they may have been indebted to the strength of their cavalry for their easy conquest of Egypt. It is certain that, while other animals are frequently depicted on the monuments, neither in the tombs near the pyramids, nor at Beni-Hassan, is there any appearance of the horse, and yet, subsequently, Egypt became the great dépôt for these animals, inasmuch that in the time of Solomon they were regularly imported for him, and for "all the kings of the Hittites, and for the Kings of Syria;" and when Israel was invaded by Sennacherib, it was on Egypt that they were said to put their trust for chariots and for horsemen. Amenoph I, the next king (B.C. cir. 1498), was sufficiently powerful to make conquests in Ethiopia and in Asia. In his time we find that the Egyptians had adopted the five intercalary days, as well as the twelve hours of day and night. True arches, not "arches of approaching stones," also are found at Thebes, bearing his name on the bricks, and were in common use in his time. See ARCU. Some of the more ancient chambers in the temple of Amen-ra, or El-Karnak, at Thebes, were built by him. In the reign of his successor, Thothmes I (B.C. cir. 1478), the arms of Egypt were carried into Mesopotamia, or the land of "Naharayn:" by some Naharayn is identified with the Nairi, a people south-west of Armenia. Libya also was subject to his sway. A monument of his reign is still remaining in one of the two obelisks of red granite which he set up at El-Karnak, or Thebes. The name of Thothmes II (B.C. cir. 1470) is found as far south as Napata, or Gebel Berkel, in Ethiopia. With him and his successor was associated a queen, Amense or Amen-nunt, who seems to have received more honor than either. She is thought to have been a Semiramis, that name, like Sesostris, probably designating more than one individual. Queen Amen-nemt and Thothmes II and III are the earliest sovereigns of whom great monuments remain in the temple of El-Karnak, the chief sanctuary of Thebes. Thothmes III (B.C. cir. 1463) was one of the most remarkable of the Pharaohs. He carried his arms as far as Nineveh, and reduced perhaps Babylon also to his sway, receiving a large tribute from Asiatic nations over whom he had triumphed. This was a common mode of acknowledging the supremacy of a conqueror, and by no means implied that the territory was surrendered to him; on the contrary, he may only have defeated the *army* of the nation, and that beyond

its own frontier. The *Punt*, a people of Arabia, the *Shupha*, supposed to be of Cyprus, and the *Ruten*, a people of the Euphrates or Tigris, thus confessed the power of Thothmes; and the monuments at Thebes are rich in delineations of the elephants and bears, camelopards and asses, the ebony, ivory, gold, and silver which they brought for tribute. Very beautiful specimens of ancient Egyptian painting belong to the time of this king; indeed his reign, with that of Thothmes II preceding it, and those of Amenoph II (B.C. cir. 1416), Thothmes IV (whose name is borne by the sphinx at the pyramids), and Amenoph III following it, may be considered as comprising the best period of Egyptian art; all the earlier time showing a gradual improvement, and all the later a gradual declension. In the reign of Thothmes IV (B.C. cir. 1410), according to Manetho, the Shepherds took their final departure. The conquests of Amenoph III (B.C. cir. 1403) were also very extensive; traces of his power are found in various parts of Ethiopia; he states on scarabæi, struck apparently to commemorate his marriage, that his northern boundary was in Mesopotamia, his southern in Kara (Choloë?). From his features, he seems to have been partly of Ethiopian origin. His long reign of nearly forty years was marked by the construction of magnificent temples. Of these, the greatest were two at Thebes; one on the west bank, of which little remains but the two great colossi that stood on each side of the approach to it, and one of which is known as the vocal Memnon. He likewise built, on the opposite bank, the great temple, now called that of El-Uksor, which Rameses II afterwards much enlarged. The tomb of this king yet remains at Thebes. For a period of about thirty years after the reign of Amenoph III, Egypt was disturbed by the rule of stranger kings, who abandoned the national religion, and introduced a pure sun-worship. It is not known from whence they came, but they were regarded by the Egyptians as usurpers, and the monuments of them are defaced or ruined by those who overthrew them. Sir G. Wilkinson supposes that Amenoph III may have belonged to their race; but, if so, we must date the commencement of their rule from the end of his reign, as then began that change of the state religion which was the great peculiarity of the foreign domination. How or when the sun-worshippers were destroyed or expelled from Egypt does not appear. Thobes, or Harem-heb, who succeeded them (B.C. cir. 1367), was probably the prince by whom they were overthrown. He was a son of Amenoph III, and continued the line of Diospolite sovereigns. The records of his reign are not important; but the sculptures at Silsili commemorate a successful expedition against the negroes. Horus was indirectly succeeded by Rameses I, with whom substantially commences the 19th dynasty, about B.C. 1324. His tomb at Thebes marks the new dynasty, by being in a different locality from that of Amenoph III, and being the first in the valley thenceforward set apart as the cemetery of the Theban kings. After a short and unimportant reign, he was succeeded by his son Sethi I, or Sethos (B.C. 1322). He is known by the magnificent hypostyle hall in the great temple of El-Karnak, which he built, and on the outside of the north wall of which are sculptured the achievements of his arms. His tomb, cruelly defaced by travellers, is the most beautiful in the Valley of the Kings, and shows that his reign must have been a long one, as the sepulchre of an Egyptian king was commenced about the time of his accession, and thus indicated the length of his reign. He conquered the *Kheta*, or Hittites, and took their stronghold Ketesh, variously held to be at or near Emesa, or near the Orontes, or Kadesh, or even Ashtaroth. His son Rameses II, who was probably for some time associated with him in the throne, became the most illustrious of the ancient kings of Egypt (B.C. cir. 1307). If he did not exceed all others in foreign conquests, he

far outshone them in the grandeur and beauty of the temples with which he adorned Egypt and Nubia. His chief campaign, as recorded on his numerous monuments, was against the *Khetu* or Hittites, and a great confederacy they had formed. He defeated their army, captured Ketesh, and forced them to conclude a treaty with him, though this last object does not seem to have been immediately attained. It is he who is generally intended by the Sesostris of classic writers. He built the temple which is erroneously called the Memnonium, but properly the Rameseum of El-Kurneh, on the western bank of the Nile, one of the most beautiful of Egyptian monuments, and a great part of that of El-Uksor, on the opposite bank, as well as additions to that of El-Karnak. Throughout Egypt and Nubia are similar memorials of the power of Rameses II, one of the most remarkable of which is the great rock-temple of Abu-Simbel, not far north of the second cataract. The temple of Ptah, at Memphis, was also adorned by this Pharaoh, and its site is chiefly marked by a very beautiful colossal statue of him, fallen on its face and partly mutilated through modern vandalism. He was succeeded by his son Menepthah, who is supposed by the advocates of the Rabbinical date of the Exodus to have been the Pharaoh in whose time the Israelites went out. The monuments tell us little of him or of his successor, which latter was followed by his son Rameses III, perhaps the head of the 20th dynasty (B.C. cir. 1200). With this sovereign the glories of the Theban line revived, and a series of great victories by land and sea raised Egypt to the place which it had held under Rameses II. He built the temple of Medinet-Habû, on the western bank at Thebes, the walls of which are covered with scenes representing his exploits. The most remarkable of the sculptures commemorating them represents a naval victory in the Mediterranean, gained by the Egyptian fleet over that of the *Tokkari*, probably the Carians, and *Shairetana* (Khairretana), or Cretans. Other *Shairetana*, whom Mr. Poole takes to correspond to the Cherethim of Scripture, served in the Egyptian forces. This king also subdued the *Pelesatu*, or Philistines, and the *Rebu* (Lebu), or Lubim, to the west of Egypt. Several kings bearing the name of Rameses succeeded Rameses II, but their tombs alone remain. Under them the power of Egypt evidently declined, and towards the close of the dynasty the country seems to have fallen into anarchy, the high-priests of Amen having usurped regal power at Thebes, and a Lower Egyptian dynasty, the 21st, arisen at Tanis. Of these, however, but few records remain.

With the succeeding dynasty occurs the first definite point of connection between the monumental and the scriptural history of Egypt. The ill feelings which the peculiar circumstances connected with the exode from Egypt had occasioned served to keep the Israelites and the Egyptians strangers, if not enemies, one to another during the lapse of centuries, till the days of David and Solomon, when (1 Kings iii, vii, ix, xi) friendly relations again spring up between the two countries. Solomon marries the daughter of Pharaoh, who burns the city of Gezer, and who, in consequence, must have been master of Lower Egypt (B.C. cir. 1010). "And Solomon had horses brought out of Egypt, and linen yarn;" six hundred shekels was the price of a chariot, and one hundred and fifty the price of a horse. Probably the Egyptian princess who became Solomon's wife was a daughter of a king of the Tanite dynasty. It was during the reign of a king of this age that "Hadad, being yet a little child," fled from the slaughter of the Edomites by David, and took refuge, together with "certain Edomites of his father's servants," at the court of Pharaoh, who "gave him to wife the sister of his own wife, the sister of Tahpenes the queen" (1 Kings xi, 17-19), B.C. cir. 1040-1000. The 22d dynasty was of Imbastite kings; the name of one of them has been found among the

sculptured remains of the temples of Bubastis; they were probably not of unmixed Egyptian origin, and may have been partly of Assyrian or Babylonian race. The first king was Sheshonk I (B.C. cir. 990), the contemporary of Solomon, and in his reign it was that "Jeroboam arose and fled into Egypt unto Shishak, king of Egypt, and was in Egypt until the death of Solomon" (1 Kings xi, 40), B.C. 973. In the 5th year of Rehoboam, B.C. 969, Sheshonk invaded Judea with an army of which it is said "the people were without number that came with him out of Egypt, the Lubims, the Sukkiims, and the Ethiopians;" and that, having taken the "fenced cities" of Judah, he "came up against Jerusalem, and took away the treasures of the house of the Lord, and the treasures of the king's house," and "the shields of gold which Solomon had made" (2 Chron. xii). "The record of this campaign," says Sir G. Wilkinson, "which still remains on the outside of the south wall of the great temple of Karnak, bears an additional interest from the name of *Yuda-Melehi* (kingdom of Judah), first discovered by Champollion in the long list of captured districts and towns put up by Sheshonk to commemorate his success." Perhaps it was by Jeroboam's advice that he thus attacked Judah. It is doubtful, however, whether Jeroboam did not suffer by the invasion as well as Rehoboam. See SHESHAK. The next king, Osorkon I, is supposed by some to have been the Zerah whom Asa defeated (2 Chron. xiv, 9); and in that view, as the army that Zerah led can only have been that of Egypt, his overthrow will explain the decline of the house of Sheshonk. According to others, Zerah was a king of Asiatic Ethiopia. See ZERAH. Of the other kings of this dynasty we know scarcely more than the names. It was followed by the 23d dynasty of Tanite kings, so called from Tanis, the Zoan of Scripture. They appear to have been of the same race as their predecessors. Bocchoris the Wise, a Saïte, celebrated as a lawgiver, was the only king of the 24th dynasty (B.C. cir. 734). He is said to have been burned alive by Sabaco the Ethiopian, the first king of the 25th or Ethiopian dynasty. Egypt therefore makes no figure in Asiatic history during the 23d and 24th dynasties; under the 25th it regained, in part at least, its ancient importance. This was a foreign line, the warlike sovereigns of which strove to the utmost to repel the onward stride of Assyria. It is not certain which of the Sabacos—Shebake, or his successor Shebateke—corresponded to the So or Seva of the Bible, who made a treaty with Hoshea, which, as it involved a refusal of his tribute to Sennacherib, caused the taking of Samaria, and the captivity of the ten tribes. See SO. The last king of this dynasty was Tirhakah, or Tehrak (B.C. 690), who, probably while yet ruling over Ethiopia or Upper Egypt only, advanced against Sennacherib to support Hezekiah, king of Judah, B.C. 713. It does not appear whether he met the Assyrian army, but it seems certain that its miraculous destruction occurred before any engagement had been fought between the rival forces. Perhaps Tirhakah availed himself of this opportunity to restore the supremacy of Egypt west of the Euphrates. See TIRHAKAH. With him the 25th dynasty closed. It was succeeded by the 26th, of Saïte or native kings. The first sovereign of importance was Psammetichus, or Psametik I (B.C. 664), who, according to Herodotus, had previously been one of a dodecarchy which had ruled Egypt. Rawlinson finds in Assyrian history traces of a dodecarchy before Psammetichus. This portion of the history is obscure. Psammetichus carried on a war in Palestine, and is said to have taken Ashdod, or Azotus, i. e., according to Wilkinson, *Shedid*, "the strong," after a siege of twenty-nine years (Herod. ii, 157; see Rawlinson in loc. ii, 204). It was probably held by an Assyrian garrison, for a Tartan, or general of the Assyrian king, had captured it apparently when garrisoned by Egyptians and Ethiopians in the

preceding century (Isa. xx). Psammetichus was succeeded by his son Neku, the Pharaoh-Necho of Scripture, B.C. 610. In his first year he advanced to Palestine, marching along the sea-coast on his way to Carchemish on the Euphrates, and was met by Josiah, king of Judah, whom he slew at Megiddo, B.C. 609. The remonstrance of the Egyptian king on this occasion is very illustrative of the policy of the Pharaohs in the East (2 Chron. xxxv, 21), no less than in his lenient conduct after the defeat and death of the king of Judah. Neku was probably successful in his enterprise, and on his return deposed Jehoahaz, the son of Josiah, and set up Jehoiakim in his stead. He apparently wished by this expedition to strike a blow at the falling power of the Assyrians, whose capital was shortly after taken by the combined forces of the Babylonians and Medes. The army, however, which was stationed on the Euphrates by Neku met with a signal disaster three years afterwards, being routed by Nebuchadnezzar at Carchemish (Jer. xli, 2). The king of Babylon seems to have followed up his success, as we are told (2 Kings xxiv, 7) that "the king of Egypt came not again any more out of his land, for the king of Babylon had taken from the river of Egypt unto the river Euphrates all that pertained to the king of Egypt." Neku either commenced a canal to connect the Nile and the Red Sea, or else attempted to clear one previously cut by Iameses II; in either case the work was not completed. See Necho. The second successor of Neku was the next sovereign of note, Rnaphrah, or Vaphrah, called Pharaoh-Hophra in the Bible, and by Herodotus Apries. He took Gaza and Sidon, and defeated the king of Tyre in a sea-fight. He also worsted the Cyrians. Having thus restored the power of Egypt, he succored Zedekiah, king of Judah, and when Jerusalem was besieged, obliged the Chaldeans to retire (Jer. xxxvii, 5, 7, 11). He was so elated by these successes that he thought "not even a god could overthrow him." In Ezek. xxix, 3, he is thought to be called "the great dragon (i. e. crocodile?) that lieth in the midst of his rivers, which hath said, My river is mine own, and I have made it for myself." At last, however, Amosis, or Ahmes II, who had been crowned in a military revolt, took him prisoner and strangled him (B.C. 569), so that the words of Jeremiah were fulfilled: "I will give Pharaoh-Hophra, king of Egypt, into the hand of his enemies, and into the hand of them that seek his life" (Jer. xli, 30). There seems little doubt that at the time of this rebellion, and probably in conjunction with the advance of Amosis, Egypt was invaded and desolated by Nebuchadnezzar. See HOPHRA. The remarkable prophecies, however, in Ezek. xxix-xxxii may refer for the most part to the invasion of Cambyses, and also to the revolt of Inarus under Artaxerxes. Amosis, the successor of Apries, reigned nearly fifty years, and, taking advantage of the weakness and fall of Babylon, he somewhat restored the weight of Egypt in the East. But the new power of Persia was to prove even more terrible to his house than Babylon had been to the house of Psammetichus. He was succeeded by his son Psammenitus, held to be the Psammetik III of the monuments, B.C. 525. Shortly after his accession this king was attacked by Cambyses, who took Pelusium, or "Sin, the strength of Egypt," and Memphis, and subsequently put Psammenitus to death.—With Cambyses (B.C. 525) began the 27th dynasty of Persians, and Egypt became a Persian province, governed by a satrap. The conduct of Darius Hystaspis (B.C. 521) to the Egyptians was favorable, and he caused the temples to be adorned with additional sculptures. The large temple in the Great Oasis was principally built by him, and in it is found his name, with the same honorary titles as the ancient kings. Before the death of Darius, however, the Egyptians rebelled, but were again subdued by Xerxes (B.C. 485), who made his brother Achæmenes governor

of the country. Under Artaxerxes Longimanus they again revolted, as above referred to, and in the 10th year of Darius Nohus contrived to throw off the Persian yoke, when Amyrtaeus the Saitte became the sole king of the 28th dynasty (B.C. 414). After having ruled six years, he was succeeded by the first king of the 29th or Mendesian dynasty. Of the four kings comprising it little is known, and the dates are uncertain. It was followed by the last, or 30th dynasty of Sebennyte kings. The first of these was Nectanebo, or Nekt-har-heb (B.C. 387), who successfully defended his country against the Persians, had leisure to adorn the temples, and was probably the last Pharaoh who erected an obelisk. His son Teos, or Tachos, was the victim of a revolt, from which he took refuge in the Persian court, where he died, while his nephew Nectanebo II, or Nekt-neb, ascended the throne as the last native king of Egypt (B.C. 361). For some time he successfully opposed the Persians, but eventually succumbed to Artaxerxes Ochus, about B.C. 343, when Egypt once more became a Persian province. "From that time till our own day," says Mr. Poole, "a period of twenty-two centuries, no native ruler has sat on the throne of Egypt, in striking fulfilment of the prophecy, 'There shall be no more a prince of the land of Egypt' (Ezek. xxx, 13)."

Egypt was governed by a Persian satrap till Persia itself was conquered by Alexander the Great, B.C. 332. When Alexander's army occupied Memphis, the numerous Greeks who had settled in Lower Egypt found themselves the ruling class. Egypt became at once a Greek kingdom, and Alexander showed his wisdom in the regulations by which he guarded the prejudices and religion of the Egyptians, who were henceforth to be treated as inferiors, and forbidden to carry arms. He founded Alexandria as the Greek capital. On his death, his lieutenant Ptolemy made himself king of Egypt, being the first of a race of monarchs who governed for 300 years, and made it the second chief kingdom in the world, till it sunk under its own luxuries and vices and the rising power of Rome. The Ptolemies founded a large public library and a museum of learned men. See ALEXANDRIA.

After the time of the exile the Egyptian Ptolemies were for a long while (from B.C. 301 to about 180) masters of Palestine, and during this period Egypt became as of old a place of refuge to the Jews, to whom many favors and privileges were conceded. This shelter seems not to have been for ages withdrawn (Matt. ii, 13). Yet it cannot be said that the Jews were held in esteem by the Egyptians (Philo, *c. Aïon*, ii, p. 521). Indeed, it was from an Egyptian, Manetho (B.C. 300), that the most defamatory misrepresentations of Jewish history were given to the world; and, in the days of Augustus, Chærenon took special pains to make the Jewish people appear despicable (Josephus, *Aïon*, i, 32; comp. Creuzer, *Com. Herod.* i, 270). See PTOLEMY.

In the reign of Ptolemy Philometor, Onias, whose father, the third high-priest of that name, had been murdered, fled into Egypt, and rose into high favor with the king and Cleopatra his queen. The high-priesthood of the Temple of Jerusalem, which belonged of right to his family, having passed from it to the family of the Maccabees, by the nomination of Jonathan to this office (B.C. 153), Onias used his influence with the court to procure the establishment of a temple and ritual in Egypt which should detach the Jews who lived there from their connection with the Temple at Jerusalem. The king complied with the request. To reconcile the Egyptian Jews to a second temple, Onias alleged Isa. xix, 18, 19. He chose for the purpose a ruined temple of Bubastis, at Leontopolis, in the Heliopolitan nome, one hundred and fifty stadia from Memphis, which place he converted into a sort of miniature Jerusalem (Josephus, *War*, i, 1), erecting an altar in imitation of that in the Temple, and

constituting himself high-priest. The king granted a tract of land around the temple for the maintenance of the worship, and it remained in existence till destroyed by Vespasian (Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 3; xx, 9; *War.* vii, 11). The district in which this temple stood appears to have been, after Alexandria, the chief seat of the Jews in Egypt, and which, from the name of its founder, was called *Ὀρίων χώρα* (Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 8; *Helen's Pilgrim.* p. 328). See ONIAS, CITY OF.

Under these Alexandrian kings the native Egyptians still continued building their grand and massive temples, nearly in the style of those built by the kings of Thebes and Saïs. The temples in the island of Philæ, in the Great Oasis, at Latopolis, at Ombos, at Dendera, and at Thebes, prove that the Ptolemies had not wholly crushed the zeal and energy of the Egyptians. An Egyptian phalanx had been formed, armed and disciplined like the Greeks. These soldiers rebelled unsuccessfully against Epiphanes, and then Thebes rebelled against Soter II, but was so crushed that it never again held rank among cities. But while the Alexandrians were keeping down the Egyptians, they were themselves sinking under the Romans. Epiphanes asked for Roman help; his two sons appealed to the senate to settle their quarrels and guard the kingdom from Syrian invasion. Alexander II was placed on the throne by the Romans, and Anletes went to Rome to ask for help against his subjects. Lastly, the beautiful Cleopatra, the disgrace of her country and the firebrand of the republic, maintained her power by surrendering her person, first to Julius Cæsar, and then to Mark Antony. On the defeat of Mark Antony by Augustus, B.C. 30, Egypt became a province of Rome, and was governed by the emperors with jealous suspicion. It was still a Greek state, and Alexandria was the chief seat of Greek learning and science. Its library, which had been burned by Cæsar's soldiers, had been replaced by that from Pergamus. The Egyptians yet continued building temples and covering them with hieroglyphics as of old; but on the spread of Christianity the old superstitions lost their sway, the animals were no longer worshipped, and we find few hieroglyphical inscriptions after the reign of Commodus. On the division of the Roman empire, A.D. 337, Egypt fell to the lot of Constantinople. See Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geogr.* s. v. *Ægyptus*.

Ever since its first occupancy by the Romans Egypt has ceased to be an independent state, and its history is incorporated with that of its different conquerors and possessors. In A.D. 618 it fell under the power of the Persians, but in 640 it was transferred to the Saracens by the victorious Amru, general of the caliph Omar, under whose successors it continued till about 1171, when the Turcomans expelled the caliphs; these again were in their turn expelled in 1250 by the Mamelukes. The latter raised to the throne one of their own chiefs with the title of sultan, and this new dynasty reigned over Egypt till 1517, when the Mamelukes were totally defeated, and the last of their sultans put to death by the Turkish sultan Selim. This prince established the government of Egypt in twenty-four beys, whose authority he subjected to a council of regency, supported by an immense standing army. The conqueror did not, however, entirely suppress the Mameluke government, who continued to be "the power behind the throne" until their massacre in 1811, which made the pacha virtually independent of the Sublime Porte. Great and rapid changes have taken place in this interesting country within the last fifty years. The campaign of the French army in 1800, undertaken with a view to subdue Egypt, and so secure to the French an important share of the East India trade, though it resulted unsuccessfully, was attended with important consequences to the interests of science and learning. Mohammed Ali, the late viceroi, though a perfect despot, did much to elevate

his dominions to a rank with civilized nations in arts, commerce, and industry. The works of internal improvement which he undertook, the extensive manufactories he established, and the encouragement he gave to literary institutions, have done much to change the political, if not the moral aspect of Egypt. His successors have carried out his enlightened views by establishing railroads and opening out canals, which, while they increase the commerce of the country, greatly facilitate communication with India by what is called the overland route—by the Mediterranean, Egypt, and the Red Sea, to Bombay. See M'Culloch's *Gazetteer*, s. v.

For the history of Christianity in Egypt, see EGYPT, CHRISTIAN.

XXII. *Monumental Localities.*—Of the towns on the northern coast the most western is Alexandria or El-Iskenderiyeh, founded B.C. 332 by Alexander the Great, who gave it the form of a Macedonian chlamys or mantle. Proceeding eastward, the first place of importance is Er-Rashid, or Rosetta, on the west bank of the branch of the Nile named after this town. In ascending the Rosetta branch the first spot of interest is the site of the ancient Saïs, on the eastern bank, marked by lofty mounds and the remains of massive walls of crude brick. It was one of the oldest cities of Egypt, and gave its name to the kings of the 26th dynasty. The goddess Neith, supposed to be the origin of Athene, was the local divinity, and in her honor an annual festival was held at Saïs, to which pilgrims resorted from all parts of Egypt. On the eastern side of the other branch of the Nile, to which it gives its name, stands the town Dimyât, or Damietta, a strong place in the time of the Crusades, and then regarded as the key of Egypt. It has now about 28,000 inhabitants. To the eastward of Damietta is the site of Pelusium, the Sin of Scripture, and the ancient key of Egypt, towards Palestine. No important remains have been found here. Between this site and the Damietta branch are the mounds of Tanis, or Zoan, the famous Avaris of the Shepherds, with considerable remains of the great temple, of which the most remarkable are several fallen obelisks, some of them broken. This temple was as ancient as the time of the 12th dynasty, and was beautified by Rameses II. Tanis was on the eastern bank of the Tanitic branch of the Nile, now called the canal of El-Moïz. A little south of the modern point of the Delta, on the eastern bank of the river, is the site of the ancient Heliopolis, or On, marked by a solitary obelisk, and the ruins of a massive brick wall. The obelisk bears the name of Osirtasen I, the head of the 12th dynasty. At a short distance south of Heliopolis stands the modern capital, Cairo, or El-Kâhîreh. The ancient city of Memphis, founded by Menes, stood on the western bank of the Nile, about ten miles above Cairo. The kings and people who dwelt there chose the nearest part of the desert as their burial-place, and built tombs on its rocky edge or excavated them in its sides. The kings raised pyramids, round which their subjects were buried in smaller sepulchres. The site of Memphis is marked by mounds in the cultivated tract. A few blocks of stone and a fine colossus of Rameses II are all that remains of the great temple of Ptah, the local deity. See MEMPHIS.


There is not space here for a detailed account of the pyramids; suffice it to say that the present perpendicular height of the great pyramid is 450 ft. 9 in., and its present base 746 ft. It is about 30 ft. lower than it was originally, much of the exterior having been worn off by age and man's violence. Like all the other pyramids, it faces the cardinal points. The surface presents a series of great steps, though when first built it was eased, and smooth, and polished. The platform on the summit is about 32 ft. square. The pyramid is almost entirely solid, containing only a few chambers, so small as not to be worthy of consideration in calcu-

lating its contents. It was built by Khufa (Cheops), or Shufu (Suphis). The second pyramid stands at a short distance south-west of the great pyramid, and is not of much smaller dimensions. It is chiefly remarkable for a great part of its casing having been preserved. It was built by Khafra or Shafra (Chephren), a king of the same period. The third pyramid is much smaller than either of the other two, though it is constructed in a more costly manner. It was built by Mycerinus or Mencheres, the fourth ruler of the 4th dynasty. Near the three pyramids are six smaller ones; three of them are near the east side of the great pyramid, and three on the south side of the third pyramid. They are supposed to be the tombs of near relatives of the kings who founded the great pyramid. To the east of the second pyramid is the great sphinx, 188 feet in length, hewn out of a natural eminence in the solid rock, some defects of which are supplied by a partial stone casing, the legs being likewise added. See PYRAMIDS.

In the tract between the pyramids of Sakkárah and Abú-Sir are the remains of the Serapeum, and the burial-place of the bulls Apis, both discovered by M. Mariette. They are inclosed by a great wall, having been connected, for the Serapeum was the temple of Apis. The tomb is a great subterranean gallery, whence smaller passages branch off, and contains many sarcophagi in which the bulls were entombed. Serapis was a form of Osiris, his name being Osir-hapi, or Osiris Apis. In ascending the river we arrive at the ancient Abnás, supposed by some to be the Hanes of Isaiah, and about sixty miles above Cairo, at Beni-Suweif, the port of the province of the Feyum. In this province are supposed to be the remains of the famous Labyrinth of Mæris, probably Amen-em-ha III, and not far off, also, may be traced the site of the Lake Mæris, near the ancient Arsinoë, or Crocodilopolis, now represented by Medinet el-Feyúm. The next objects of peculiar interest are the grottoes of Beni-Hassan, which are monuments of the 12th dynasty, dating about B.C. 2000. Here are found two columns of an order which is believed to be the prototype of the Doric. On the walls of the tombs are depicted scenes of hunting, fishing, agriculture, etc. There is also an interesting representation of the arrival of certain foreigners, supposed to be Joseph's brethren—at least illustrative of their arrival. In the town of Asyút, higher up the river, is seen the representative of the ancient Lycopolis. It was an important place 3500 years ago, and has thus outlived Thebes and Memphis, Tanis and Pelusium.

Further on, a few miles south-west of Girga, on the border of the Libyan desert, is the site of the sacred city of Abydos, a reputed burial-place of Osiris, near which, also, must have been situated the very ancient city of This, which gave its name to the 1st and 2d dynasties. About forty miles from Abydos, though nearly in the same latitude, is the village of Denderah, famous for the remains of the temple of Athor, the Egyptian Venus, who presided over the town of Teutyra, the capital of the Teutyrite nome. This temple dates from the time of the earlier Cæsars, and the names of the last Cleopatra, and Cæsarion her son, are found in it. See DENDERAH.

About twenty miles still higher up the Nile than Denderah, and on the western bank, are the ruins of Thebes, the No-Amón of the Bible. In the hieroglyphic inscriptions the name of this place is written AP-T, or with the article prefixed T-AP, and AMEN-HA, the abode of Amen. The Copts write the former name *Tape*, which becomes in the Memphitic dialect *Thaba*, and thus explains the origin of the Greek *Θήβαι*. The time of its foundation is unknown, but remains have been found which are ascribed to the close of the 11th dynasty, and it probably dates from the commencement of that first Diospolite line of kings. Under the 18th and two following dynasties it attained its highest prosperity, and to this period its greatest monuments belong. The following is a description of this celebrated locality by Mr. Poole: "The monuments of Thebes, exclusive of its sepulchral grottoes, occupy a space on both sides of the river, of which the extreme length from north to south is about two miles, and the extreme breadth from east to west about four. The city was on the eastern bank, where is the great temple, or, rather, collection of temples, called after El-Karnak, a modern village near by. The temple of El-Karnak is about half a mile from the river, in a cultivated tract. More than a mile to the south-west is the temple of El-Uksur, on the bank of the Nile. On the western bank was the suburb bearing the name Memmonia. The desert near the northernmost of the temples on this side almost reaches the river, but soon recedes, leaving a fertile plain generally more than a mile in breadth. Along the edge of the desert, besides the small temple just mentioned as the northernmost, are the Rameseum of El-Kurneh, and that of Medinet-Habú less than a mile farther to the south-west, and between them, but within the cultivated land, the remains of the Amenophium, with its two gigantic seated colossi. Behind these



Restoration of the Propylon, or Gate of the Temple of El-Uksur, or Luxor.

edifices rises the mountain, which here attains a height of about 1200 feet. It gradually recedes in a south-westerly direction, and is separated from the cultivated tract by a strip of desert in which are numerous tombs, partly excavated in two isolated hills, and two small temples. A tortuous valley, which commences not far from the northernmost of the temples on this bank, leads to those valleys in which are excavated the wonderful tombs of the kings, near the highest part of the mountain, which towers above them in bold and picturesque forms" (*Encyclop. Britannica*, art. Egypt, p. 506). At the entrance to the temple of El-Uksur stood two very fine obelisks of red granite, one of which is now in the centre of the Place de la Concorde, at Paris. There is also a portal with wings 200 feet in width, covered with sculptures of the highest interest, illustrating the time of Rameses II. Within is a magnificent avenue of 14 columns, having capitals of the bell-shaped flowers of the papyrus. They are 60 feet high, and elegantly sculptured. These are of the time of Amenoph III.—On a south portal of the great temple of El-Karnak is a list of countries subdued by Sheshonk I, or Shishak, the head of the 22d dynasty. Among the names is that of the kingdom of Judah, as before mentioned. The great hypostyle hall in this temple is the most magnificent work of this class in Egypt. Its length is 170 feet, its width 529; it is supported by 134 columns, the loftiest of which are nearly 70 feet in height and about 12 in diameter, and the rest more than 40 feet in height and about 9 in diameter. The great columns, 12 in number, form an avenue through the midst of the court from the entrance, and the others are arranged in rows very near together on each side. There is a transverse avenue made by two rows of the smaller columns being placed further apart than the rest. This great hall is therefore crowded with columns, and the effect is surpassingly grand. The forest of pillars seems interminable in whatever direction one looks, producing a result unequalled in any other Egyptian temple. This great hall was the work of Sethi I, the head of the 19th dynasty, who came to the throne B.C. cir. 1340, and it was sculptured partly in his reign and partly in that of his son and successor Rameses II.—The Rameseum remains to be briefly noticed. This temple on the edge of the desert is perhaps the most beautiful ruin in Egypt, as Karnak is the grandest. It also records the glories of Rameses II, of whom there is in one of its courts a colossal statue hewn out of a single block of red granite, supposed to weigh nearly 500 tons, and transported thither from the quarries of Syene. This temple is also noted for containing the celebrated astronomical ceiling, one of the most precious records of ancient Egyptian science. Not the least interesting among the monuments of Thebes are the tombs of the kings. The sepulchres are 20 or 21 in number. Nineteen are sculptured, and are the mausolea of kings, of a queen with her consort, and of a prince, all of the 18th, 19th, and 20th dynasties. The paintings and sculptures are almost wholly of a religious character, referring chiefly to a future state. Standing on the resting-places of kings and warriors who figured in the history of Egypt while the world was yet young, and long before the age of others whom we are accustomed to consider heroes of antiquity, it seems as though death itself were immortalized; and proudly indeed may those ancient Pharaohs, who labored so earnestly to preserve their memory on earth, look down upon the paltry efforts of later aspirants, and their slender claims to be regarded as either ancient or immortal. See THEBES.

About twenty miles further south of the site of Thebes is the village of Edfu, representing the town called by the Greeks Apollinopolis Magna, where is still found in a comparatively perfect state a temple of the Ptolemaic period. See TEMPLE. Above Edfu, at Jebel es-Silsileh, the mountains on either side, which have for some time confined the valley to a

narrow space, reach the river, and contract its course; and higher still, about thirty miles, is the town of Assuan, which represents the ancient Syene, and stands among the palm-trees on the eastern bank, opposite to the island of Elephantine. The bed of the river above this place is obstructed by numerous rocks and islands of granite, which form the rapids called the first cataract. During the inundation boats are enabled by a strong northerly wind to pass this cataract without aid, and, in fact, at other times the principal rapid has only a fall of five or six feet, and that not perpendicular. The roaring of the troubled stream, and the red granite islands and rocks which stud its surface, give the approach a wild picturesqueness till we reach the open stream, less than two miles further, and the beautiful island of Philæ suddenly rises before our eyes, completely realizing one's highest idea of a sacred place of ancient Egypt. It is very small, only a quarter of a mile long and 500 feet broad, and contains monuments of the time of the Ptolemies. In the desert west of the Nile are situate the great and little *wahs* (oases), and the valley of the Natron lakes, containing four Coptic monasteries, the remains of the famous anchorite settlement of Nitria, recently noted for the discovery of various Syrian MSS. In the eastern desert the chief town of importance is Es-Suveis, or Suez, the ancient Arsinoë, which gives its name to the western gulf of the Red Sea.

XXIII. *Prophecies*.—It would not be within the province of this article to enter upon a general consideration of the prophecies relating to Egypt; we must, however, draw the reader's attention to their remarkable fulfilment. The visitor to the country needs not to be reminded of them; everywhere he is struck by the precision with which they have come to pass. We have already spoken of the physical changes which have verified to the letter the words of Isaiah. In like manner we recognise, for instance, in the singular disappearance of the city of Memphis and its temples in a country where several primeval towns yet stand, and scarce any ancient site is unmarked by temples, the fulfilment of the words of Jeremiah: "Noph shall be waste and desolate without an inhabitant" (xvi, 19), and those of Ezekiel, "Thus saith the Lord God, I will also destroy the idols, and I will cause [their] images to cease out of Noph" (xxx, 13).

The principal passages relating to Egypt are as follows: Isa. xix; Jer. xliii, 8-13; xlv, 30; xlv, 1; Ezek. xxix-xxxii, inclusive. In the course of what has been said, several allusions have been made to portions of these prophecies; and it may here be observed that the main reference in them seems to be to the period extending from the times of Nebuchadnezzar to those of the Persians, though it is not easy to elucidate them to any great extent from the history furnished by the monuments. Nebuchadnezzar appears to have invaded Egypt during the reign of Apries, and Sir G. Wilkinson thinks that the story of Amasis's rebellion was invented or used to conceal the fact that Pharaoh-Hophra was deposed by the Babylonians. It is not improbable that Amasis came to the throne by their intervention. The forty years' desolation of Egypt (Ezek. xxix, 10) is a point of great difficulty, owing chiefly to the statements of Herodotus (ii, 161, 177) as to the unexampled prosperity of the reigns of Apries and Amasis (B.C. 588-25), during which the period in question must have fallen. That the Greek historian was misled by the accounts of the Egyptian priests, who wished to conceal the extent of the national humiliation by Nebuchadnezzar and Cambyses, is made evident by Browne (*Ordo Saculorum*, p. 191 sq.), who thus arranges the events: "Soon after B.C. 572, Nebuchadnezzar invades Egypt, conquers Apries, and puts him to death, and carries off the spoil of Egypt, together with its chief men, to some other part of his dominions: Amasis is appointed his viceroy. Cyrus,



about B. C. 532, 'turns the captivity of Egypt,' as he had before done that of the Jews. On his death Amasis revolts, and Cambyses invades and fully subjugates all Egypt, B. C. 525." See EZEKIEL.

XXIV. *Literature.*—For a very full classified list of works on Egypt, see Jolowicz's *Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca* (Lpz. 1858, 8vo), with the *Supplement* thereto (ib. 1861). The following are the most useful, excepting such as relate to the modern history. On Egypt generally: *Description de l'Égypte* (2d ed. Par. 1821-9); *Encyclopædia Britannica* (8th edit. art. Egypt). Description, Productions, and Topography: Abd-Allatif, *Relation de l'Égypte* (ed. Silvestre de Saey, Par. 1810); D'Anville, *Mémoires sur l'Égypte* (Par. 1766); Belzoni, *Narrative of Operations* (London, 1820); Brugsch, *Geographische Inschriften d. alt-ägyptischen Denkmäler* (Lpz. 1857); Id. *Reiseberichte aus Ägypten* (ib. 1855); Champollion le Jeune, *L'Égypte sous les Pharaons* (Par. 1814); Id. *Lettres écrites pendant son Voyage en Égypte* (2d edit. Par. 1833); Ehrenberg and Hemprich, *Naturgeschichtliche Reisen—Reisen in Ägypten*, etc. (Lpz. 1828); *Symbolæ Physicæ* (ib. 1829-1845); Forskäl, *Descriptiones animalium*, etc. (Hafn. 1775-6); Id. *Flora Aegyptiaco-arabica* (ib. 1775); Harris, *Hieroglyphical Standards* (London, 1852); Linant de Bellefonds, *Mémoire sur le lac de Mœris* (Paris, 1843); Quatremère, *Mémoires Géographiques et Historiques* (Paris, 1811); Russegger, *Reisen* (Lpz. 1811-8); Vyse and Perring, *Pyramids of Gizeh* (Lond. 1839-42); Perring, *58 Large Views, etc., of the Pyramids of Gizeh* (Lond. 1841); Wilkinson, *Modern Egypt and Thebes* (Lond. 1843); Id. *Hand-book for Egypt* (2d edit. Lond. 1858); Id. *Survey of Thebes* (plan); Id. on the *Eastern Desert* (in the *Jour. Geogr. Soc.* ii, 1832, p. 28 sq.); Hartmann, *Naturgesch. der Niländer* (Lpz. 1865); Kremer, *Ägypten* (modern, Lpz. 1863); Parthey, *Erk. des alten Ägyptens* (ib. 1859); Petherick, *Ägypt*, etc. (Lond. 1861). Monuments and Inscriptions: Champollion le Jeune, *Monuments* (Paris, 1829-47); Id. *Notices descriptives* (ib. 1844); Gliddon, *Lectures* (N. Y. 1843); Lepsius, *Denkmäler* (Lpz. 1849 sq.); Letronne, *Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines d'Égypte* (Par. 1842); Rosellini, *Monumenti* (Pisa, 1832-44); Dümichen, *Altägypt. Inschriften* (in three series, Lpz. 1865-8); Brugsch, *Recueil de Monuments Égyptiens* (Par. 1862-63); Leemans, *Monuments Égyptiens* (ib. 1866); Rhind, *Thebes*, etc. (Lond. 1862). Language: Brugsch, *Grammaire Dénotique* (Berl. 1855); Id. *Hierog.-Dénot. Wörterb.* (Berl. 1867); Id. *Zwei bilingue Papyri* (ib. 1865); Birch, *Dictionary of Hieroglyphics* (in *Bunsen*, vol. v); Champollion le Jeune, *Grammaire Égyptienne* (Paris, 1836-41); *Dictionnaire Égyptien* (ib. 1841); *Encyclop. Brit.* (8th edit. art. Hieroglyphics); Parthey, *Vocabularium Coptico-Latinum*, etc. (Berl. 1844); Peyron, *Grammatica Linguae Coptice* (Turin, 1841); Id. *Lexicon* (ib. 1835); Schwartze, *Dis. Alte Aegypten* (Lpz. 1843). Ancient Chronology, History, and Manners: Bunsen, *Egypt's Place* (London, 1850-59); Cory, *Ancient Fragments* (2d edit. Lond. 1832); Herodotus (ed. Rawlinson, vols. i-iii, Lond. and N. Y. 1861); Hengstenberg, *Egypt and the Books of Moses* (Lond. 1843); Ideler, *Handbuch der Chronologie* (Lpz. 1825); Lepsius, *Chronologie der Aegypter* (vol. i, Lpz. 1849); Id. *Königsbuch der alten Aegypter* (ib. 1858); Poole, *Horæ Aegyptiacæ* (Lond. 1851); Wilkinson, *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians* (ib. 1837, 1841); Id. *Popular Account of the Ancient Egyptians* (Lond. and N. Y. 1855); Kenrick, *Egypt under the Pharaohs* (Lond. and N. Y. 1852); Osburn, *Monumental History* (Lond. 1854); Sharpe, *Hist. of Egypt* (Lond. 1846); Brugsch, *Histoire de l'Égypte* (Paris, 1859 sq.); Hincks, *Years of the Egyptians* (Lond. 1865); Lauth, *Der Dynast. Manetho's* (Leipzig, 1865); Unger, *Chronologie des Memten* (Berlin, 1867). Ancient Religion: Herodotus; Diodorus of Sicily; Plutarch; Porphyry; Iamblichus, etc.; Jablonski, *Pantheon aegypt.* (Frankf. 1750-52, 3 vols.); Schmidt, *De sacerdot. et sacrificiis Aegyptiorum* (Tüb. 1786); Hirt, *U. d. Bildung d. ägyptischen Gottheiten* (1821); Cham-

pollion, *Pantheon ägyptien* (Paris, 1832); Haymann, *Darstellung d. A.-u. M.* (Bonn, 1837); Röth, *Die äg. u. Zoroastrische Glaubenslehre* (Maih. 1846); Beauregard, *Les divinités Égyptiennes* (Paris, 1866); Sharpe, *Egyptian Mythology* (Lond. 1863); Lepsius, *D. Tottenbuch* (Lpz. 1867); Rougé, *Rituel des Égyptiens* (Paris, 1866); Birch, *The Funeral Ritual* (in Bunsen, vol. v); Pleyte, *La Religion des Pré-Israélites* (Par. 1862). Modern Inhabitants: Lane, *Modern Egyptians* (3d ed. 1860); Id. *Thousand and One Nights* (2d edit., by Poole, Lond. 1859); Mrs. Poole, *Englishwoman in Egypt* (Lond. and N. Y. 1844). The periodicals of Great Britain, France, and Germany contain many valuable papers on Egyptian history and antiquities, by Dr. Hincks, Mr. Birch, M. de Rougé, and others. There is a monthly *Zeitschrift*, devoted exclusively to Egyptological science and information, edited by Lepsius, with the aid of M. Brugsch, published at Berlin.

EGYPT, BROOK OR RIVER OF. This is frequently mentioned as the southern limit of the Land of Promise (Gen. xv, 18; 2 Chron. vii, 8; Num. xxiv, 5; Josh. xv, 4). See BROOK. Calmet is of opinion that this was the Nile, remarking that Joshua (xiii, 3) describes it by the name of Sihor, which is the true name of the Nile (Jer. ii, 18), "the muddy river;" and that Amos (vi, 14) calls it the river of the wilderness, because the eastern arm of the Nile adjoined Arabia, or the wilderness, in Hebrew *Arabah*, and watered the district by the Egyptians called Arabian. In answer to this, it is said that this stream was the limit of Judæa toward Egypt, and that the Sept. (Isa. xxvii, 12), "unto the river of Egypt," render "to *Rhinocorura*," an interpretation which is adopted by Cellarius, Bochart, Wells, and others, although that is the name of a town certainly not adjacent to the Nile. See NILE. Besides, it is extremely dubious whether the power of the Hebrew nation extended at any time to the Nile, and, if it did, it was over a mere sandy desert. But, as this desert is unquestionably the natural boundary of the Syrian dominions, no reason can be given why the political boundary should exceed it. Most geographers, therefore, understand by "the River of Egypt" the modern *Wady el-Arish*, which drains the middle of the Sinaitic desert; a few, however, take it to be the *brook Desor*, between Gaza and Rhinocorura. (See Josh. xv, 47.) See EGYPT.

EGYPT, CHRISTIAN.—1. *Church History.* The first seeds of Christianity were undoubtedly scattered in Egypt at the time of the apostles. According to some ancient historians, Peter founded the Church of Alexandria and several other Egyptian churches. Mark the Evangelist is said by an old tradition, preserved by Eusebius (*Eccles. Hist.* ii, 16), to have been "the first that was sent to Egypt, and first established churches at the city of Alexandria." See ALEXANDRIA. The testimony of Eusebius, that the first Christians of Egypt followed a rigidly ascetic school, is very doubtful, because Philo, to whom he refers, does not speak of Christians, but of a Jewish sect, the Therapeutæ, and expressly mentions that they lived, not in Alexandria, but on Lake Mœris. From Lower Egypt Christianity soon spread to Cyrene, Pentapolis, Libya, Central and Upper Egypt. There were at least twenty bishoprics in Egypt about the middle of the third century, for that number of bishops were assembled at a council in 235. Five councils of Egyptian bishops were held before 311; a great many in the fourth and following centuries. As Egypt had been in the times before Christ the seat of philosophy and mysticism, so it now became one of the chief seats of Christian literature. The Alexandrian school was the oldest of the higher class of institutions for Christian education. Jerome and others hold Mark the Evangelist to have been its founder, but the succession of catechists is differently stated. See ALEXANDRIAN SCHOOL. Among the scientific men whom it gave to

the Church were *Clement, Athanasius, Origen, Cyril*. Gnosticism found numerous adherents. Basilides, Valentinus, Hieracon, Ptolemæus, Carpocrates, were Egyptians. The Ophites and Doketism sprang up there; Sabellianism and Arianism were also products of Egypt. The influence of Egypt in the history of Monachism is equally marked; Pachomius, Anthony, and many other celebrated hermits, greatly contributed to the spreading of Monachism in the Christian Church. Monachism (q. v.), in fact, cannot be fully understood without a due appreciation of the Egyptian element. In the history of the constitution of the Christian Church Egypt has also had a considerable influence. In no other country of the East were hierarchical tendencies so early developed, for the patriarch of Alexandria soon sought to obtain privileges which no other of the superior bishops enjoyed. The Monophysites, who subsequently received the name of Copts, became in Egypt the predominant Church, and gradually wrested nearly all the churches from the orthodox Christians, who, as early as the end of the sixth century, were reduced to a very insignificant number. The patriarchal seat at Alexandria was occupied almost exclusively by Monophysite (Jacobite) patriarchs, with the exception of Cosmas (elected about 726) and Eutyclus (elected in 934). The orthodox (Greek) Christians received from their opponents the nickname Melchites (q. v.). In 615 Egypt was invaded by Chosroes, king of Persia, when few bishoprics were spared. The dominion of the Persians lasted only a few years, when the whole country, with the capital city of Alexandria, passed into the power of the Mohammedans in 635 (according to others in 640). Under them Christianity suffered incalculable injuries, and gradually declined so as to become a despised and oppressed sect. See *Copts*. Better prospects for Christianity did not open till the beginning of the 19th century, when Egypt, under the reign of the enlightened Mehemet Ali, was brought under the influence of European civilization. Since then the educated Egyptians have learned to appreciate the superiority of European nations, especially of England and France; many young men of talent have been sent to European schools; the native Christian population begins to rise from its degradation and despised condition; the large cities, especially Alexandria and Cairo, are filling up with an intelligent and influential population of foreign-born Christians; Christian schools, and other religious and charitable institutions, are multiplying; and the signs of the times seem to indicate that the prospects of Christianity are at present very bright.

An attempt to establish a Protestant mission in Egypt was made by the Moravians in 1769. A missionary, Hoeker, who previously had sought to open communication with the Abyssinian Church, but had been compelled to return to Europe in 1761, was in 1768 commissioned, together with a young man named Danke, a carpenter by trade, to return to Egypt, and await any opening that might present itself to penetrate into Abyssinia. "On March 5, 1769, they reached Cairo, Hoeker earning a livelihood by practising as a physician and Danke by working at his trade. The latter soon learned to converse tolerably in Arabic, and when an assistant arrived for Hoeker in the person of John Antes, a watchmaker, he set out on his first journey to the Copts, landing at Gizeh, in Upper Egypt. The state of the country at this time was exceedingly disturbed, the Mameluke beys having revolted against the Turkish government, and many of them being also at war with one another. Hoeker had been summoned to attend members of the household of Ali Bey (for a time the first chief in Egypt), and Danke's connection with the 'English physician,' as Hoeker was called, brought him into favor with the officers and soldiers at Gizeh, who treated him with the greatest kindness. He met a number of Copts in

this city, with whom he formed a very intimate friendship. At first several of them invited him to visit their native city, Behnesse, the population of which was exclusively Coptic, but afterwards they endeavored to deter him by describing the danger to which he would expose himself. Danke, however, refused to listen to them, and, after bidding the Copts at Gizeh farewell, he set out Sept. 13th. Danke made in all three visits to the Copts at Behnesse. His labors were by many eagerly accepted, by others they were viewed with suspicion or openly opposed. His testimony for Jesus was not without encouraging effect, and many of the priests even became his firm supporters, and begged him to remain amongst them. On his third visit he caught a severe cold, upon which followed an attack of malignant fever. Notwithstanding the most careful nursing on the part of the other brethren, the disease increased upon him, and on Oct. 6th, 1772, he died, aged only 38 years. By permission of the Greek patriarch, his body was interred in a vault of St. George's church, in the Old City of Cairo. In May, 1775, George Winiger arrived as Danke's successor. He proceeded to Behnesse, and labored faithfully in preaching the Gospel and instructing the people privately. Michael Baschara (the magistrate referred to above) remained faithful to his profession, and was an active and influential assistant. In 1780, three other brethren were sent from Herrnhut to reinforce the mission, but it had become evident before their arrival that in the present state of the country it would be impossible to continue the work amongst the Copts, and that an effort to penetrate into Alysinnia would be useless. The brethren remained at their post until the Synod of 1782 resolved to discontinue the mission. Hoeker, who had labored for its establishment ever since the year 1762, died at Cairo in August, 1781" (*Moravian* [newspaper], May 7, 1868).

In 1826, the "Church Missionary Society" of London sent out some German missionaries to labor among the Copts. After spending some time in studying the Arabic language, and distributing the Bible and religious tracts, the missionaries fixed the location of the mission at Cairo, where they had two schools, attended by Greek, Coptic, Armenian, Roman Catholic, and even pure Mohammedan children. In 1833 a boarding-school was commenced, designed for training teachers and catechists. In 1834 a chapel was constructed by subscriptions obtained on the spot. In 1835 the mission was interrupted by a terrible visitation of the plague. In 1840 it was reported by the missionaries that in the different quarters of the town no less than six religious meetings had been established by the native Copts for the purpose of reading the Scriptures; that the patriarch had sanctioned both these meetings and a plan for the establishment of an institution in Egypt for the education of the Coptic clergy. In 1841, a pupil of the missionary school of Cairo was appointed by the patriarch Abuna, or head of the Abyssinian Church. Bishop Gobat, who visited Egypt in 1849, expressed in a letter dated Jan. 9, 1850, the opinion that the plan on which this mission had been established, to seek the friendship of the higher clergy of the Eastern churches, and to induce them to reform their churches, had failed. The mission was subsequently abandoned.

A mission established by the American Missionary Association has also been again abandoned. The most successful of any of the Protestant missions has been that undertaken by the United Presbyterian Church. It organized a number of congregations and schools, and, through the liberality of the Maharajah Dhuleep Singh, who married a pupil of the mission school, it obtained a press, through which a large amount of useful reading has been scattered throughout the land. The growth of the Church was sufficiently encouraging to organize the churches into the Presbytery of Egypt, in connection with the General As-

sembly of the Church in the United States. A flourishing theological school has been established at Osioot, for which the Rev. Mr. Hogg, in 1866, raised in Great Britain about \$2500. In 1867 the patriarch of the Coptic Church manifested the fiercest hostility to the mission; and obtaining, it is believed, at least the tacit consent and authority of the civil government, he instituted proceedings that at one time threatened the mission churches with great disaster. Finally, however, the Egyptian government, chiefly in consequence of the remonstrances of the English and American consuls, stopped the persecution. The last annual report on this mission, made to the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church in May, 1868, states that in nearly all the churches gratifying accessions have been made to the membership during the past year, and that during the persecution only four shrunk back, all of whom subsequently returned. The Presbytery have taken the proper steps for each native church to have a native pastor duly called, ordained, and installed. The churches of Ghous and Cairo already have called native pastors, and taken steps for providing the necessary salaries. The Presbytery of Egypt, in 1867, also adopted strong resolutions against the slave-trade, which is still carried on in Egypt with the connivance of the government.

2. *Statistics.*—The large majority of the inhabitants are Mohammedans. The theological school connected with the mosque of Cairo is one of the most frequented schools of the Islam. All the elementary schools and higher institutions for the Mohammedan population are of a strictly religious character. Mehemet Ali established several schools after the European model, in which young Egyptians were to be educated, partly by European teachers, for civil and military offices. Such schools were the medical school at Abu-Zabel, the cadet school at Gizeh, the marine school at Alexandria, the school of engineers at Chanka, the medical college of Casr-el-Ayin, the artillery school of Turrah, and the musical institute in the Citadel of Cairo. A special college for young Egyptians was also established in Paris. Several of these schools were, however, suppressed under the reign of Abbas Pasha. The most numerous body of Christians are the Copts, who have a patriarch, four metropolitans, and seven other bishops, and a population estimated from 150,000 to 250,000 souls. See COPTS. The number of United Copts, who recognise the authority of the Pope, is about 10,000. They have a vicar apostolic at Cairo. For the Latin Roman Catholics there is another vicar apostolic at Alexandria, who is at the same time delegate for the United Orientals of other rites than the Coptic. According to letters of Roman Catholic missionaries, Alexandria had, in 1853, 7020 Latins, 600 United Copts, 240 Maronites, 350 Melchites (United Greeks), 50 Syrians, 60 Armenians—together 8320. The Roman Catholic population of Cairo at the same time consisted of 4148 Latins, 200 Melchites, 800 Copts, 300 Maronites, 300 Armenians, 200 Syrians, 100 Chaldees. Since then the Roman Catholic population of these two cities has undoubtedly largely increased in consequence of the rapid growth of the total population of the two cities; but no later trustworthy statistics are known. There are Franciscan monasteries at Alexandria, Danielta, Cairo, and two in Upper Egypt. The orthodox Greek Church has in Egypt a population of about 8000 souls. They are under the patriarch of Alexandria, who resides at Alexandria or Cairo, and whose official title is "The most Blessed and Holy Patriarch of the great City of Alexandria, and of all Egypt, Pentapolis, Libya, and Ethiopia, Pope, and Œcumenical Judge." Four metropolitan sees belong to the Greek patriarchate of Alexandria, viz.: 1, Libya; 2, Memphis; 3, Pelusium; 4, Metelis; but the last three appear to have been vacant for some time.

The mission of the American United Presbyte-

rian Church reported at the General Assembly for 1868 the following statistics: missionaries, 12, including one medical missionary; congregations, 5; organized out-stations, 9; communicants, 125. The mission occupies five central stations: Alexandria, Cairo, Osioot (the metropolis of Upper Egypt), Fayoum, and Ghous. The theological school at Osioot had in 1867 13 theological students. Schools for boys and girls are organized in connection with each of the five churches and at each of the out-stations. The distribution of the Bible is prosecuted by the agents of the British and Foreign Bible Society, by the American missionaries, by the Crischona mission, and by others. There were, in 1866, three dépôts in Cairo for the sale of the Bible, and the yearly sale of the Scriptures averaged from 7000 to 10,000 copies. The Crischona, or Pilgrim mission, at Basel, Switzerland, intended to establish a so-called "Apostles' Street," or series of twelve stations, from Alexandria far into the heart of Abyssinia. Of these, the following stations were, in 1866, in active operation in Egypt: St. Matthew's in Alexandria; St. Mark's in Cairo; St. Peter's at Assouan, at the falls of the Nile; St. Thomas at Khartoum, at the junction of the White and Blue Niles; and St. Paul's at Matammah, on the borders of Abyssinia. The deaconesses of Kaiserswerth have a hospital in Alexandria, and the first German Protestant church of Egypt was opened in 1866.—*Princeton Review*, 1850, p. 260; 1856, p. 715; Newcomb, *Cyclop. of Missions*, s. v.; Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, vol. ii; *Journal of Sac. Lit.* viii, ix; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vi, 707; *Christian Year-book* for 1867, p. 289; the Annual Reports of the U. P. Foreign Mission Board, in July number of *Evangel. Repository* (1860-1868). (A. J. S.)

**Egypt'ian** (properly מִצְרַיִם, *Mitsrai'*, Αἰγύπτιος; but often in the plur. as a rendering in the A. V. of מִצְרַיִם, *Egypti*), a native of the land of Egypt (q. v.); found in the sing. masc. (Gen. xxxix, 1, etc.; Acts xxi, 38, etc.), fem. מִצְרַיִתָּה (Gen. xvi, 1), plur. masc. מִצְרַיִם (Gen. xii, 12, 14; Acts vii, 22, etc.), fem. מִצְרַיִתָּה (Exod. i, 19). The Egyptian insurrectionist of Acts xxi, 38, seems to have been a mountebank (*γόνε*, Josephus, *Jar*, ii, 13, 5), or pretended prophet (*Ant.* xx, 7, 6). See PAUL. That country was proverbial for such characters.

**EGYPTIAN PLAGUES.** See PLAGUES OF EGYPT.

**EGYPTIAN VERSIONS OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.** After the death of Alexander the Great the Greeks multiplied in Egypt, and obtained important places of trust near the throne of the Ptolemies. The Greek language accordingly began to diffuse itself from the court among the people, so that the proper language of the country was either forced to adapt itself to the Greek both in construction and in the adoption of new words, or was entirely suspended. In this way originated the Coptic, compounded of the old Egyptian and the Greek. (See Tattam, *Egyptian Grammar of the Coptic, Sahidic, and Bashmuric Versions*, 2d edit. Lond. 1863.) See COPTIC LANGUAGE. There is a version in the dialect of Lower Egypt usually called the *Coptic*, or, better, the *Memphitic* version; and there is another in the dialect of Upper Egypt, termed the *Sahidic*, and sometimes the *Thebaic*. See Davidson, *Bibl. Criticism*, ii, 206 sq.; Scrivener, *Introd. to N. T.*, p. 270 sq.; Westcott, *N.-T. Canon*, p. 322 sq.

1. The *Memphitic* version of the Bible.—The O. T. in this version was made from the Septuagint and not from the original Hebrew. It would appear from Münter (*Specim. vers. Dan. Copt.* Rome, 1786) that the original was the Hesychnan recension of the Sept. then current in the country. There is little doubt that all the O.-T. books were translated, though many of them have not yet been discovered. Although this version (not the Thebaic) seems to be that exclusively used

in the public services of the Copts, it was not known in Europe till Dr. Marshall, of Lincoln College, contributed some readings from it to bishop Fell's New Testament (Oxford, 1675). The Pentateuch has been published by Wilkins (London, 1751, 4to), by Fallet (Paris, 1854 sq.), and by De Lagarde (Leipzig, 1867, 8vo); the Psalms at Rome (1744 and 1749) by the Propaganda Society. In 1837 Ideler published the Psalter more correctly; and in 1844 the best critical edition, by Schwartz, appeared. The twelve minor prophets were published by Tattam (Oxon. 1836, 8vo), and the major prophets by the same (1852). Bardelli published Daniel (Pisa, 1849). A few pieces of other books were printed at different times by Mingarelli, Quatrenière, and Münter. The N. T., made from the original Greek, was published by Wilkins, with a Latin translation (Oxford, 1716). In 1846 a new and more correct edition was begun by Schwartz, and continued, but in a different manner, after his death, by Bötticher (1852, etc.). In 1848-52, the "Society for promoting Christian Knowledge" published the N. T. in Memphitic and Arabic (Lond. 2 vols. fol.). The text was revised by Lieder. The readings of this version, as may be inferred from the place where it was made, coincide with the Alexandrine family, and deserve the attention of the critic. Unfortunately, the version has not yet been adequately edited. It belongs perhaps to the 3d century. See Davidson, in Horne's *Introd.* ii, 66.

2. The *Thebaic*.—This version was also made from the Greek, both in the O. and N. T., and probably in the 2d century. Only some fragments of the O.-T. part have been printed by Münter, Mingarelli, and Zoega. In the N. T. it agrees generally, though not uniformly, with the Alexandrine family. Not a few readings, however, are peculiar; and some harmonize with the Latin versions. Fragments of it have been published by Mingarelli, Giorgi, Münter, and Ford.

3. The *Bashmuric*, or *Ammonian*.—Only some fragments of such a version in the O. and N. T. have been published, and very little is known concerning it. Scholars are not agreed as to the nature of the dialect in which it is written, some thinking that it does not deserve the name of a dialect, while others regard the Bashmuric as a kind of intermediate dialect between those spoken in Upper and Lower Egypt. Hug and De Wette are inclined to believe that it is merely the version of Upper Egypt transferred to the idiom of the particular place where the Bashmuric was spoken. The origin of this version belongs to the 3d or 4th century. See Tregelles, in Horne's *Introduet.* iv, 287-299.—Kitto, s. v. See VERSIONS (OF THE BIBLE).

E'hi (Heb. *Echî'*, עֲחִי, prob. a modified form of the name אֲחִי; Sept. Ἀγχίς; Vulg. *Echî*), one of the "sons" of Benjamin (Gen. xlvj, 21), apparently the grandson called אֲחִירָם (q. v.) in Num. xxvi, 38 (from which the name is perhaps contracted). In the parallel passage (1 Chron. viii, 6) he seems to be called EHUD (q. v.).

E'hud (Heb. *Ehud'*, עֲהוּד, *union*), the name of two or three Benjamites, and apparently hereditary in that tribe, like Gera (q. v.).

1. (Sept. Ἐδὺ v. r. Ἀώδ; Vulg. *Ahod*.) A descendant of Benjamin, progenitor of one of the clans of Geba that removed to Manahath (1 Chron. xiii, 10). The name is there written עֲהוּד, *Ehud'*, either for עֲחִי, as above, or altogether erroneously for עֲחִי, *Echî'*, i. e. EHI (q. v.), the grandson of Benjamin, which appears in the parallel list of Gen. xlvj, 21, and as a son of Belah according to the Sept. version of that passage. He seems to be the same as ANI-RAM, אֲחִירָם, in the list in Num. xxvi, 38, and, if so, *Ahiram* is probably the right name, as the family were called *Ahiraimites*. In 1 Chron. viii, 1, the same person seems to be called עֲחִי, אֲחִירָם, and perhaps also עֲחִי, אֲחִירָם, in

ver. 4 (Sept. Ἀχιά, and in Cod. Vatic. Ἀχράν), עֲחִי, אֲחִירָם (Ἀχιά), *Ahiash*, ver. 7, and עֲחִי (Ἀόρ), *Aher*, 1 Chron. vii, 12. See SHAHARAIM. These fluctuations in the orthography seem to indicate that the original copies were partly effaced by time or injury. See BÉCHER; CHRONICLES.

2. (Sept. Ἀμῖν v. r. Ἀώδ; Vulg. *Aod*.) The third named of the seven sons of Bilhan, the son of Jediael, and grandson of the patriarch Jacob (1 Chron. vii, 10). B. C. post 1856.

3. (Sept. Ἀώδ; Vulg. *Aod*; Josephus Ἡοδῆς.) The son of Gera (there were three others of this name, Gen. xlvj, 21; 2 Sam. xvi, 5; 1 Chron. viii, 3), of the tribe of Benjamin (Judg. iii, 16, marg. "son of Jemini," but vid. Gesenius, *Lex.* sub v. עֲחִי), the second judge of the Israelites, or, rather, of that part of Israel which he delivered from the dominion of the Moabites by the assassination of their king Eglon. These were the tribes beyond the Jordan, and the southern tribes on this side the river. In the Bible he is not called a judge, but a *deliverer* (l. c.); so Othniel (Judg. iii, 9), and all the judges (Neh. ix, 27). As a Benjamite he was specially chosen to destroy Eglon, who had established himself in Jericho, which was included in the boundaries of that tribe. See EGLON. In Josephus he appears as a young man (*νεανίας*). He was very strong, and left-handed. So A. V.; but the more literal rendering is, as in the margin, "shut of his right hand." The words are differently rendered: 1. left-handed, and unable to use his right; 2. using his left hand as readily as his right. For 1. Targum, Josephus, Syr. (*impotens*), Arab. (*aribum*), and Jewish writers generally; Cajet., Buxtorf, Parkh., Gesen. (*impeditus*): derivation of עֲחִי from עֲחִי, the latter only in Psa. lxix, 16, where it = to shut. For 2. Sept. (ἀμφοτέρωθεν), Vulg. (*quâ utraque manu pro dextrâ utebatur*), Corn. a Lap., Bonfrer., Patrick (comp. πεποιθῆτος, Hom. *Il.* xxi, 163; Hipp. *Aph.* 7, 43); Judg. xx, 16, sole recurrence of the phrase, applied to 700 Benjamites, the picked men of the army, who were not likely to be chosen for a physical defect. As regards Psa. lxix, 16, it is urged that עֲחִי may = *corono* = *aperio*; hence עֲחִי = *apertus* = *expeditus*, q. d. *expedita dextra*; or if "*clausus*," *clausus dextra* = *cinctus dextra* = *πεποιθῆτος*, *ambidexter* (vid. Poli *Sym.*). The feat of drawing the dagger from the right thigh (Judg. iii, 21) is consistent with either opinion. See AMBIDEXTER.

Ehud obtained access to Eglon as the bearer of tribute from the subjugated tribes, and being left-handed, or, rather, ambidextrous, he was enabled to use with a sure and fatal aim a dagger concealed under a part of his dress, where it was unsuspected, because it would there have been useless to a person employing his right hand. The circumstances attending this tragical event are somewhat differently given in Judges and in Josephus (see Winkler, *Unters. schererer Schriftst.* i, 45 sq.; Redlob, in the *Studien u. Krit.* ix, 912 sq.; Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* ii, 375 sq.). That Ehud had the entrance of the palace is implied in Judges (iii, 19), but more distinctly stated in Josephus. In Judges the Israelites send a present by Ehud (iii, 15); in Josephus Ehud wins his favor by repeated presents of his own. Josephus represents this intimacy as having been of long continuance; but in Judges we find no mention of intimacy, and only one occasion of a present being made, viz., that which immediately preceded the death of Eglon. In Judges we have two scenes, the offering of the present and the death scene, which are separated by the temporary withdrawal of Ehud (ver. 18, 19); in Josephus there is but one scene. The present is offered, the attendants are dismissed, and the king enters into friendly conversation (*συλάειν*) with Ehud. In Judges the place seems to change from the reception-room into the "summer-parlor," where Ehud found him upon his return (comp. ver. 18, 20). In Josephus the entire ac-

tion takes place in the summer-parlor (*δωμάριον*). In Judges the king exposes himself to the dagger by rising apparently in respect for the divine message which Ehud professed to communicate (Patrick, ad loc.); in Josephus it is a *dream* which Ehud pretends to reveal, and the king, in delighted anticipation, springs up from his throne. The obesity of Eglon, and the consequent impossibility of recovering the dagger, are not mentioned by Josephus (vid. Judg. iii, 17, *ful. dōrōtōc*, Sept.; but "crassus," Vulg., and so Gesenius, *Lex.*). The "quarries that were by Gilgal," to which Ehud retired in the interval between the two interviews (iii, 19), are rendered in the margin better, as in Deut. vii, 25, "graven images" (Patrick, ad loc.; comp. Gesen. *Heb. Lex.* s. v. עֲבֹתֵי־בָרָז). See EGLON.

After this desperate achievement Ehud repaired to Seirah (improp. Seirath; see Gesen. *Lex.* s. v.), in the mountains of Ephraim (iii, 26, 27), or Mount Ephraim (Josh. xix, 50). To this wild central region, commanding, as it did, the plains east and west, he summoned the Israelites by sound of horn (a national custom according to Josephus; A.V. "a trumpet"). Descending from the hills they fell upon the Moabites, dismayed and demoralized by the death of their king (Josephus, not Judges). The greater number were killed at once, but 10,000 men made for the Jordan with the view of crossing into their own country. The Israelites, however, had already seized the *fords*, and not one of the unhappy fugitives escaped. As a reward for his conduct Ehud was appointed judge (Josephus, not Judges). The Israelites continued to enjoy for eighty years (B.C. 1509-1430) the independence obtained through this deed of Ehud (Judg. iii, 15-30).—Smith, s. v.; Kitto, s. v. See JUDGES.

**Ekdach.** See CARUNCLE.

**Eichhorn, Johann Gottfried**, a celebrated German Orientalist and theologian, was born Oct. 16, 1752, at Dörenzimmern, in the principality of Hohenzollern-Hechingen. He received his education at the gymnasium of Heilbronn and at the University of Göttingen, under Michaelis and Heyne. He became professor of Oriental literature at Jena in 1775, and was named court-councillor by the duke of Saxe-Weimar in 1783. In 1788 he succeeded Michaelis as professor of philosophy at the University of Göttingen, and in 1811 he was made professor of theology there, which post he retained until his death, June 25, 1827. Eichhorn was a thoroughly industrious student and a very voluminous writer. His first proof of Oriental knowledge was given in his *Geschichte des Ostindischen Handels vor Mohammed* (Gotha, 1775, 8vo). This was followed by *Monumenta antiquissima historie Arabum, post Ab. Schultens, arabice edidit, latine vertit, et annotationibus auct. J. G. Eichhorn* (Gotha, 1775, 8vo):—*De rei nummarie apud Arabos uetus* (Jena, 1776, 4to). At Jena he devoted himself to Biblical literature, and established, as a sort of organ, a magazine entitled *Repertorium für biblische und morgenländische Literatur*, which lasted from 1777 to 1786 (Leipzig), and was followed by the *Allgemeine Bibliothek d. biblischen Literatur* (Leipz. 1787-1803, 10 vols, 8vo). His professorship at Göttingen opened to him a wider field (1788) after the death of J. D. Michaelis. He lectured not only on Oriental literature, and on the exegesis of the O. and N. T., but also in the field of general history, in which he soon appeared as an author. In 1790-93 appeared his *Urgeschichte* (Primitive History), edited by Gabler from the *Repertorium* (Nuremb. 8vo). His more important works, in addition, are *Commentarius in Apocalypsin Joannis* (Götting, 1791, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Einkleitung ins A. T.: Einkleitung ins N. T.* (also published under the general title of *Kritische Schriften*, Leips. 1804-1814, 8vo, 7 vols.). He also published a number of historical writings, besides many essays, reviews, etc.; and all this time his lectures were kept up in the university. The zealous and continued indus-

try of Eichhorn is one of the marvels of modern literature.

As an interpreter of the Bible, Eichhorn, following Michaelis, transcended him in the boldness of his criticism and in his far-reaching Rationalism. The results of his criticism were that the Bible, *as we have it*, has only a moral and literary superiority over other books. The primeval history attributed to Moses was made up of ancient *sagas*, and gathered up, partly, by Moses into the Pentateuch. His system of interpretation multiplies paradoxes, and tends to uproot the Christian revelation, as such, entirely. In his view the Apocalypse is a prophetic drama, and he comments on it as he would on a play of Aristophanes or Terence. But his vast labors in Biblical literature retain great part of their reputation, while his method of interpretation is fast passing into oblivion, even in Germany.—*Saintes, History of Rationalism*, chap. xi; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iii, 710.

**Eichhorn, Karl Friedrich**, son of Johann Gottfried Eichhorn (q. v.), was born at Jena in 1781. After completing his studies at the University of Göttingen, he became *privatdozent* of law at the University of Jena. In 1805 he was appointed professor at the University of Frankfort on the Oder, and in 1811 was transferred, with the university, to Berlin, where he edited, with Savigny, Göschen, and, later, with Rudorff, the *Zeitschrift für geschichtliche Rechtswissenschaft*. From 1817 to 1828 he was professor of Church law, and other branches, at Göttingen; from 1831 to 1833 professor at the University of Berlin. In 1833 he was appointed a member of the supreme state court, and subsequently filled some other high offices in the civil administration. He was regarded as the head of the historical school of German jurists. He died at Berlin July 4, 1854. Besides a number of law books, which still occupy a high rank in that literature, he wrote a work on Church law (*Grundsätze des Kirchenrechts der kathol. u. evangel. Religionsparteien*, Götting, 1831-1833).—Herzog, *Real-Encycl.* xi, 470. (A. J. S.)

**Einhard.** See EGINHARD.

**Einsiedeln** (*Maria-Einsiedeln, Deipare Virginis Erenus, Notre Dame des Ermites*), a Benedictine monastery in Switzerland, founded in the 9th century by Meinrad of Solcure, who was murdered by robbers A.D. 861. In 934, Eberhard, provost of the cathedral of Strasburg, built a monastery and church here, which the emperor Otto, in 946, endowed with the free right of election. The convent was to be consecrated September 14, 948, by the bishop of Constanz, but the latter claimed to have heard the preceding night the song of angels, and to have seen Christ himself, attended by angels, saying mass and consecrating the chapel; and when, the next morning, he prepared to perform the act of consecration, he was admonished by a voice saying, "Hold on, brother, God himself has dedicated the chapel." The story was believed, and on the sole strength of it the annual pilgrimage to Einsiedeln on September 14, to commemorate the "Angelic Consecration" (*Engel-Welt*), became, and still is, one of the most famous pilgrimages in the Church of Rome. The popes granted full absolution to all who went in pilgrimage to the church. The congregation consisted mostly of scions of noble families, and the convent steadily increased in power and riches. A new church was built in the beginning of the last century on the model of the Lateran Church, and contains Meinrad's cell and the image of the Virgin. In the time of the Reformation most of the monks left the convent, but it was subsequently reorganized by Ludwig Blarer, a Benedictine monk of St. Gall. In 1710 260,000 arc said to have visited Einsiedeln, and in 1851 the number was over 200,000. The vendors of blessed images, medals, etc., do a thriving business there, and at a large profit. There are at Einsiedeln confessionals for the people of different

nations and languages, each bearing an inscription by which it is recognised. In 1867 the convent had 75 priests, and 6 clerical and 17 lay brothers. The "Stiftsschule" ("Gymnasium" and Lyceum) numbered about 200 pupils. Until 1852 the convent had a second "gymnasium" in Bellizona, in the canton of Tessin, but in that year it was suppressed by the Liberal government of the canton. See Placidus, *Documenta archivii Einsiedlensis* (3 vols. folio); *Annales Heremi Deipurae matris* (Frib. Brigg. 1612, fol.); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* iii, 742; Landolt, *Ursprung u. erste Gestaltung des Klosters Einsiedeln* (Einsied. 1845); Brandes, *Der heil. Meinrad u. die Wallfahrt von Einsiedeln* (Einsiedeln, 1861).

**Eisenmenger**, JOHANN ANDREAS, a German Orientalist, was born at Mannheim in 1654, and studied at the University of Heidelberg, in which, after a journey to England and Holland, he became in 1700 professor of Oriental languages. He died in 1704. His principal work is entitled *Entdecktes Judenthum* (Frankf. 1700). The Jews opposed its publication by all means in their power, and even obtained an imperial edict against it. At the time of his death nearly the whole edition of the work still lay under arrest. The Jews shortly before offered him 12,000 florins for the surrender of all the copies, but he asked 30,000. Friedrich I of Prussia appealed, in behalf of the heirs of Eisenmenger, to the emperors Leopold and Joseph for permission to publish the book, and, when this led to no result, had the book reprinted and published at his own expense (Königsberg, 1711). Subsequently the Frankfurt edition was also permitted to see the light. Eisenmenger also compiled a *Lexicon Orientale harmonicum*, which has never been printed, and he published, conjointly with Leusden (q. v.), in 1694, an edition (without points) of the Heb. Bible.—Herzog, *Re.-Encyk.* iii, 744; Hofer, *Biog. Gén.* xv, 776; Wetzler u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* xii, 311; Jost, *Gesch. der Juden.* vol. viii. (J. H. W.)

**E'ker** (Heb. *il.* עֵקֶר, a plant rooted up and transplanted, e. g. metaph. a resident foreigner, Lev. xxv, 47), the youngest of the three sons of Ram, the grandson of Hezron (1 Chron. ii, 27; Sept. Ἀκόρ, Vulg. Achar). B. C. post 1856.

**Ekkehard**, the name of several learned monks of St. Gall. The first of the name, about the middle of the 10th century, was the director of the convent school, and subsequently dean of the convent. He laid the foundation of the literary celebrity of St. Gall, wrote several ecclesiastical hymns, and is honorably mentioned in the history of German literature. Another *Ekkehard*, a nephew of the former, was also a director of the convent school, and subsequently a chaplain of emperor Otto II. He also composed ecclesiastical hymns, and is supposed to have been familiar with stenography. He died April 23, 990. A third *Ekkehard*, born about 980, was a pupil of Notker Labeo, and became distinguished for his knowledge of Latin, Greek, German, mathematics, astronomy, and music. Arlbo, archbishop of Mentz, appointed him superior of the cathedral school of that city. He continued the Annals of St. Gall, which a monk by the name of Ratpertus had begun and carried to the year 883. This work, *Casus Monasterii Sancti Galli* (printed in *Monumenta Germania histor. Scriptor.* ii, 74-163) is of great importance for the Church history of the 10th century. Ekkehard also compiled a collection of ecclesiastical hymns, under the title *Liber Benedictionum*. He wrote a poem, *De ornatu dictionis*, and translated a life of St. Gall, in German verses by Ratpertus, into Latin. He died in 1036. A fourth *Ekkehard*, who lived at the beginning of the 12th century, wrote a *Vita Sancti Notkeri*.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* iii, 745. (A. J. S.)

**Ek'rebel** (Ἐκροβίλη; Pesh. *Ecerabat*; Vulg. omits), a place named in Jud. vii, 18 only, as "near to Chusi, which is on the brook Mochmur," apparently somewhere in the hill country to the south-east of the Plain

of Esdraelon and of Dothain. The Syriac reading of the word points to the place *Acrabbein*, mentioned by Eusebius in the *Onomasticon* as the capital of a district called *Acrabattine*, and still standing as *Akrabih*, about six miles south-east of Nablús (Shechem), in the Wady Makfariyeh, on the road to the Jordan valley (Van de Velde, ii, 304, and Map). Though frequently mentioned by Josephus (II'ar, ii, 20, 4; iii, 3, 5, etc.), neither the place nor the district are named in the Bible, and they must not be confounded with those of the same name in the south of Judah.—Smith, s. v. See AKRABEIN; ARABATTINE; MAALEH-ACRABEIN.

**Ek'ron** (Heb. *Ekrôn'*, עֶקְרוֹן, *eradication*; comp. Zeph. ii, 4, which apparently contains a play upon the word; Sept. [usually] and Josephus ἡ Ἀκκαρόν, Vulg. *Accaron*), one of the five towns belonging to the lords of the Philistines, and the most northerly of the five (Josh. xiii, 3). Like the other Philistine cities, its situation was in the maritime plain. In the general distribution of territory (unconquered as well as conquered) Ekron was assigned to Judah, as being upon its border (Josh. xiii, 3), between Bethshemesh and Jabneel (Josh. xv, 11, 45), but apparently was afterwards given to Dan, although conquered by Judah (Josh. xv, 11, 45; xix, 43; Judg. i, 18; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* v, 1, 22; v, 2, 4). But it mattered little to which tribe it nominally belonged, for before the monarchy it was again in full possession of the Philistines (1 Sam. v, 10). In Scripture Ekron is chiefly remarkable from the ark having been sent home from thence, upon a new cart drawn by two milk kine (1 Sam. v, 10; vi, 1-8). Ekron was the last place to which the ark was carried before its return to Israel, and the mortality there in consequence seems to have been greater than at either Ashdod or Gath. (The Sept. in both MSS., and Josephus [*Ant.* vi, 1, 1], substitute Ascalon for Ekron throughout this passage [1 Sam. v, 10-12]. In support of this it should be remarked that, according to the Hebrew text, the golden trespass-offerings were given for Ashkelon, though it is omitted from the detailed narrative of the journeyings of the ark. There are other important differences between the Sept. and Hebrew texts of this transaction. See especially v, 6.) From Ekron to Bethshemesh (q. v.) was a straight highway (Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 309). After David's victory over Goliath, the Philistines were pursued as far as this place (1 Sam. xvii, 52). Henceforward Ekron appears to have remained uninterruptedly in the hands of the Philistines (1 Sam. xvii, 52; 2 Kings i, 2, 16; Jer. xxv, 20). Except the casual mention of a noted sanctuary of Baalzebub (q. v.) existing there (2 Kings i, 2, 3, 6, 16), there is nothing to distinguish Ekron from any other town of this district. In later days it is merely named with the other cities of the Philistines in the denunciations of the prophets against that people (Jer. xxv, 20; Amos i, 8; Zeph. ii, 4; Zech. ix, 5). The name occurs in the cuneiform inscriptions (q. v.) of the Assyrian monuments. In the Apocrypha it appears as *Accaron* (Ἀκκαρόν, 1 Macc. x, 89, only), bestowed with its borders (τὰ ὅρια αὐτῆς) by Alexander Balas on Jonathan Maccabæus as a reward for his services. Eusebius and Jerome describe it (*Onomast.* s. v. Ἀκκαρόν, *Accaron*) as a large village of the Jews, between Azotus and Jammia towards the east, or eastward of a line drawn between these two places. The same name *Accaron* occurs incidentally in the histories of the Crusades (*Gesta Dei per Francos*, p. 404). The site of Ekron has lately been recognised by Dr. Robinson (*Bib. Researches*, iii, 24) in that of *'Akir*, in a situation corresponding to all that we know of Ekron. The radical letters of the Arabic name are the same as those of the Hebrew, and both the Christians and Moslems of the neighborhood regard the site as that of the ancient Ekron. It is a considerable Moslem village, about five miles south-west of Ram-

leh, and three due east of Yebna, on the northern side of the important valley Wady Surar. It is built of unburnt bricks, and, as there are no apparent ruins, the ancient town was probably of the same materials. It is alleged, however, that cisterns and the stones of hand-mills are often found at Akir and in the adjacent fields. The plain south is rich, but immediately round the village it has a dreary, forsaken appearance (hence perhaps the name = "wastiness"), only relieved by a few scattered stunted trees (Porter, *Handb.* p. 275; and see Van de Velde, ii, 169).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

**Ek'ronite** (Heb. *Ekroni'*, עֶקְרוֹנִי, Josh. xiii, 3, Sept. Ἀκκαρωνίτης, Vulg. *Accaronite*; plur. עֶקְרוֹנִי, 1 Sam. v, 10, Ἀκκαρωνίται, *Accaronite*), a native of the Philistine town EKRON (q. v.).

**EL-** (עֵל, *mighty*, hence *God*, either Jehovah or a false deity; sometimes a *hero* or *magistrate* [see **GOD**]) occurs as a prefix (and also as a suffix) to several Heb. names, e. g. EL-BETH-EL; EL-EL-OHI-ISRA-EL, all of which see in their place. Compare ELI.

**E'la** (חָלָא, Vulg. *Jolaman*), one of the heads of clans (or places) whose "sons" had taken foreign wives after the Babylonian exile (1 Esdr. ix, 27); evidently the ELAM (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra x, 26). See also ELAM.

**El'adah** (Heb. *Eladah'*, עֵלְאָדָה, whom *God* has put on, i. e. fills with himself; Sept. Ἐλαῶα v. r. Ἐλαεῶα, Vulg. *Elada*), one of the sons (rather than grandson or later descendant, as the text seems to state) of Ephraim (1 Chron. vii, 20), perhaps the same as ELEAD (q. v.) of ver. 21, since several of the names [see **TAHATHI**] in the list appear to be repeated (compare Num. xxvi, 36, where the only corresponding name is ERAN). See BERIAH.

**E'lah** (Heb. *Elah'*, עֵלָה, *terebinth* or oak [q. v.]), the name of a place, and also of five men.

1. THE VALLEY OF ELAH (עֵלָה הַבְּקָעָה, *vale of the terebinth* or oak; Sept. ἡ κοιλία Ἰλά, but translates ἡ κοιλία τῆς ἐρυός in 1 Sam. xvii, 2, 19; Vulg. likewise *vallis terebinthi*), a valley in (not "by," as the A. V. has it) which the Israelites were encamped against the Philistines when David killed Goliath (1 Sam. xvii, 2, 19; xxi, 9). It lay somewhere near Shocoh of Judah, and Azekah, and was nearer Ekron than any other Philistine town (1 Sam. xvii). Shocoh has been with great probability identified with Shuweikeh, near Beit Netif, some 14 miles S.W. of Jerusalem, on the road to Beit Jibrin and Gaza, among the more western of the hills of Judah, not far from where they begin to descend into the great Philistine plain. The village stands on the south slopes of the *wady es-Sumt*, or *vally of the acacia*, which runs off in a N.W. direction across the plain to the sea just above Ashdod. Above Shuweikeh it branches into two other wadys, large, though inferior in size to itself, and the junction of the three forms a considerable open space of not less than a mile wide cultivated in fields of grain. In the centre is a wide torrent bed thickly strewn with round pebbles, and bordered by the acacia bushes from which the valley derives its present name. There seems to be no reason to doubt that this is the Valley of the Terebinth. It has changed its name, and is now called after another kind of tree (the *sumt*, or acacia), but the terebinth (*butm*) appears to be plentiful in the neighborhood, and one of the largest specimens in Palestine still stands in the immediate neighborhood of the spot, in wady Sur, the southernmost of the branch wadys. Four miles E. of Shuweikeh, along wady Musur, the other branch, is the klan and ruined site Akbeh, which Van de Velde proposes to identify with Azekah. These identifications are confirmed by that of Ephesdammin (q. v.), the site of the Philistine camp. Ekron is 17 miles, and Bethlehem 12 miles distant from Shocoh. (For the valley, see Robinson, *Researches*, ii,

350; Van de Velde, *Narrative*, ii, 191; Porter, *Handbook*, p. 249, 250, 280; Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 77.)

There is a point in the topographical indications of 1 Sam. xvii which it is very desirable should be carefully examined on the spot. The Philistines were between Shocoh and Azekah, at Ephesdammin, or Pasdammin, on the mountain on the S. side of the wady, while the Israelites were in the "valley" (עֵלָה) of the terebinth, or, rather, on the mountain on the N. side, and "the ravine" or "the glen" (עֵלָה) was between the two armies (ver. 2, 3). Again (ver. 52), the Israelites pursued the Philistines "till you come to 'the ravine'" (the same word). There is evidently a marked difference between the "valley" and the "ravine," and a little attention on the spot might do much towards elucidating this, and settling the identification of the place. In the above location, the distance between the armies was about a mile, and the vale beneath is flat and rich. The ridges rise on each side to the height of about 500 feet, and have a uniform slope, so that the armies ranged along them could see the combat in the vale. The Philistines, when defeated, fled down the valley towards Gath and Ekron.

The traditional "Valley of the Terebinth" is the *wady Beit-Hannua*, which lies about 4 miles to the N.W. of Jerusalem, and is crossed by the road to Nebi Samwil. The scene of David's conflict is pointed out a little N. of the "Tombs of the Judges," and close to the traces of the old paved road. In this valley olive-trees and carob-trees now prevail, and terebinth-trees are few; but the brook is still indicated whence the youthful champion selected the "smooth stones" wherewith he smote the Philistine. The brook is dry in summer, but in winter it becomes a mighty torrent, which inundates the vale (Kitto, *Pictorial Palestine*, p. 121). But this spot is in the tribe of Benjamin, and otherwise does not correspond with the narrative of the text (see Thenius, *Sächs. exeg. Stud.* ii, 151).—Smith, s. v.

2. (Sept. Ἰλάς, but Ἰλάς in Chron.; Vulg. *Ela*.) One of the Edomitish "dukes" or chieftains in Mount Seir (Gen. xxxvi, 41; 1 Chron. i, 52), B.C. post 1963. By Knobel (*Comment. zu Gen.* in loc.) he is connected with Elath (q. v.) on the Red Sea.

3. (Sept. Ἀδὰ v. r. Ἀνά.) The middle one of the three sons of Caleb the son of Jephunneh (1 Chron. iv, 15), B.C. 1618. In that passage his sons are called Kenaz or Uknaz, but the words may be taken as if Kenaz was, with Elah, a son of Caleb. It is a singular coincidence that the names of both Elah and Kenaz also appear among the Edomitish "dukes."

4. (Properly ELA, Heb. *Ela'*, עֵלָה; Sept. Ἰλά.) The father of Shimei ben-Ela, Solomon's commissariat officer in Benjamin (1 Kings iv, 18), B.C. 1013.

5. (Sept. Ἰλά, Josephus Ἰλαρος, Vulg. *Ela*.) The son and successor of Baasha, king of Israel (1 Kings xvi, 8-10); his reign lasted for little more than a year (comp. ver. 8 with 10), B.C. 928-7. He was killed while drunk by Zimri, in the house of his steward Arza, who was probably a confederate in the plot. This occurred, according to Josephus (*Ant.* viii, 12, 4), while his army and officers were absent at the siege of Gibbethon. He was the last king of Baasha's line, and by this catastrophe the predictions of the prophet Jehu were accomplished (1 Kings xvi, 6, 7, 11-14).

6. (Sept. Ἰλά.) The father of Hoshea, last king of Israel (2 Kings xv, 30; xvii, 1), B.C. 729, or ante.

7. (Sept. Ἰλά v. r. Ἰλάω, Vulg. *Ela*.) The son of Uzzi, and one of the Benjamite heads of families who were taken into captivity (1 Chron. ix, 8), or rather, perhaps, returned from it. B.C. 536.

**Elah.** See OAK; TEREBINTH.

**Elais** (Ἐλαίς), a Phœnician city mentioned by Dionysius (*Perieg.* 910) and other ancient authors as

lying between Joppa and Gaza, but apparently merely an appellative (see Reland, *Palaest.* p. 747) for some place noted for olives (*ἔλαια*), which abound in that entire region.

**E'lam** (Heb. *Eylam'*, עֵלָם, corresponding to the Pehlvi *Airjama* [see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 1016]), the name of a man and of the region settled by his posterity, also of several Hebrews, especially about the time of the Babylonian captivity.

1. (Sept. *Ἐλάμ*; Josephus *Ἐλαμος*, *Ant.* i, 6, 4; Vulg. *Elam*.) Originally, like Aram, the name of a man—the son of Shem (Gen. x, 22; 1 Chron. i, 17), B.C. post 2514. Commonly, however, it is used as the appellation of a country (Gen. xiv, 1, 9; Isa. xi, 11; xxi, 2; Jer. xxv, 25; xlix, 34–39; Ezek. xxxii, 24; Dan. viii, 2). In Gen. xiv, 1, it is introduced along with the kingdom of Shinar in Babylon, and in Isa. xxi, 2, and Jer. xxv, 25, it is connected with Media. In Ezra iv, 9, the Elamites are described among the nations of the Persian empire; and in Dan. viii, 2, Susa is said to lie on the river Ulai (Euleus or Choaspes), in the province of Elam. This river was the modern Karun (Layard, *Nineveh and Bab.* p. 146), and the capital of Elam was Shushan (q. v.), one of the most powerful and magnificent cities of the primeval world. The name Elam occurs in the cuneiform inscriptions (q. v.) found on the bulls in Sennacherib's palace at Nineveh. The country was also called *Nu-vaki*, as we learn from the monuments of Khorsabad and Besutun (Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 452).

The Elam of Scripture appears to be the province lying south of Assyria and east of Persia Proper, to which Herodotus gives the name of *Cissia* (iii, 91; v, 49, etc.), and which is in part termed *Susis* or *Susiana* by the geographers (Strab. xv, 3, § 12; Ptolem. vi, 3, etc.). It includes a portion of the mountainous country separating between the Mesopotamian plain and the high table-land of *Iran*, together with a fertile and valuable low tract at the foot of the range, between it and the Tigris. The passage of Daniel (viii, 2) which places Shushan (Susa) in "the province of Elam," may be regarded as decisive of this identification, which is further confirmed by the frequent mention of Elymeans in this district (Strab. xi, 13, § 6; xvi, 1, § 17; Ptolem. vi, 3; Plin. *H. N.* vi, 26, etc.), as well as by the combinations in which Elam is found in Scripture (see Gen. xiv, 1; Isa. xxi, 2; Ezek. xxxii, 24). It appears from Gen. x, 22, that this country was originally peopled by descendants of Shem, closely allied to the Arameans (Syrians) and the Assyrians; and from Gen. xiv, 1–12, it is evident that by the time of Abraham a very important power had been built up in the same region. Not only is "Chedor-laomer, king of Elam," at the head of a settled government, and able to make war at a distance of two thousand miles from his own country, but he manifestly exercises a supremacy over a number of other kings, among whom we even find Amraphel, king of Shinar, or Babylonia. It is plain, then, that at this early time the predominant power in Lower Mesopotamia was Elam, which for a while held the place possessed earlier by Babylon (Gen. x, 10), and later by either Babylon or Assyria. Discoveries made in the country itself confirm this view. They exhibit to us Susa, the Elamitic capital, as one of the most ancient cities of the East, and show that its monarchs maintained, throughout almost the whole period of Babylonian and Assyrian greatness, a quasi-independent position. Traces are even thought to have been found of Chedor-laomer himself, whom some are inclined to identify with an early Babylonian monarch, who is called the "Ravager of the West," and whose name reads as Kudur-mapula. The Elamitic empire established at this time was, however, but of short duration. Babylon and Assyria proved, on the whole, stronger powers, and Elam during the period of their

greatness can only be regarded as the foremost of their feudatories. Like the other subject nations she retained her own monarchs, and from time to time, for a longer or a shorter space, asserted and maintained her independence. But generally she was content to acknowledge one or other of the two leading powers as her suzerain. Towards the close of the Assyrian period she is found allied with Babylon, and engaged in hostilities with Assyria; but she seems to have declined in strength after the Assyrian empire was destroyed, and the Median and Macedonian arose upon its ruins. Elam is clearly a "province" of Babylonia in Belshazzar's time (Dan. viii, 2), and we may presume that it had been subject to Babylon at least from the reign of Nebuchadnezzar. The desolation which Jeremiah (xlix, 30–34) and Ezekiel (xxxii, 24, 25) foresaw was probably this conquest, which destroyed the last semblance of Elamitic independence. It is uncertain at what time the Persians added Elam to their empire. Possibly it only fell under their dominion together with Babylon; but there is some reason to think that it may have revolted and joined the Persians before the city was besieged. The prophet Isaiah in two places (xxi, 2; xxii, 6) seems to speak of Elam as taking part in the destruction of Babylon; and, unless we are to regard him with our translators as using the word loosely for Persia, we must suppose that, on the advance of Cyrus and his investment of the Chaldean capital, Elam made common cause with the assailants. She now became merged in the Persian empire, forming a distinct satrapy (Herod. iii, 91), and furnishing to the crown an annual tribute of 300 talents. Susa, her capital, was made the ordinary residence of the court, and the metropolis of the whole empire. This mark of favor did not, however, prevent revolts. Not only was the Magian revolution organized and carried out at Susa, but there seem to have been at least two Elamitic revolts in the early part of the reign of Darius Hystaspis (*Behistun Inscr.* col. i, par. 16, and col. ii, par. 3). After these futile efforts, Elam acquiesced in her subjection, and, as a Persian province, followed the fortunes of the empire. These historic facts illustrate the prophecy of Jeremiah (xlix, 35–39), "And upon Elam will I bring the four winds from the four quarters of heaven, and I will scatter them towards all these winds." The situation of the country exposed it to the invasions of Assyrians, Medes, and Babylonians; and it suffered from each in succession before it was finally embodied in the Persian empire. Then another part of the prophecy was also singularly fulfilled: "I will set my throne in Elam, and I will destroy from thence the king and princes." The present state of the Persian empire, in which Elam is included, may be a fulfilment of the concluding words of the passage: "But it shall come to pass in the latter days that I will bring again the captivity of Elam" (Vaux, *Nineveh and Persepolis*, p. 85 sq.). See PERSIA.

Herodotus gives the name *Cissia* to the province of which Susa was the capital (iii, 91); Strabo distinguishes between *Susiana* and the country of the Elymeans. The latter he extends northwards among the Zagros mountains (xi, 361; xv, 503; xvi, 507). Pliny says *Susiana* is separated from Elymais by the River Euleus, and that the latter province extends from that river to the confines of Persia (*Hist. Nat.* vi, 27). Ptolemy locates Elymais on the coast of the Persian Gulf, and regards it as part only of *Susiana* (*Geogr.* vi, 3). According to Josephus, the Elymeans were the progenitors of the Persians (*Ant.* i, 6, 4); and Strabo refers to some of their scattered tribes as far north as the Caspian Sea. From these various notices, and from the incidental allusions in Scripture, we may conclude that there was a little province on the east of the Lower Tigris called Elymais; but that the Elymeans, as a people, were anciently spread over and ruled a much wider district, to which their name was



often attached. They were a warlike people, trained to arms, and especially skilled in the use of the bow (Isa. xxi, 2; Jer. xlix, 35); they roamed abroad like the Bedawin, and like them, too, were addicted to plunder (Strabo, xi, 361). Josephus mentions a town called Elymais, which contained a famous temple dedicated to Diana, and rich in gifts and votive offerings (*Ant.* xxii, 9, 1); Appian says it was dedicated to Venus (Bochart, *Opp.* i, 70 sq.). Antiochus Epiphanes attempted to plunder it, but was repulsed (1 Macc. vi). It is a remarkable fact that little images of the goddess, whose Assyrian name was Anaitis, were discovered by Loftus in the mounds of Susa (*Chalvea*, p. 379). The Elamites who were in Jerusalem at the feast of Pentecost were probably descendants of the captive tribes who had settled in Elam (Acts ii, 9).

It has been repeatedly observed above that Elam is called Cissia by Herodotus, and Susiana by the Greek and Roman geographers. The latter is a term formed artificially from the capital city, but the former is a genuine territorial title, and probably marks an important fact in the history of the country. The Elamites, a Shemitic people, who were the primitive inhabitants (Gen. x, 22), appear to have been invaded and conquered at a very early time by a Hamitic or Cushite race from Babylon, which was the ruling element in the territory from a date anterior to Chedor-laomer. These Cushites were called by the Greeks *Cissians* (*Κίσσιοι*) or *Cosseans* (*Κοσσαιῶν*), and formed the dominant race, while the Elamites or Elymæans were in a depressed condition. In Scripture the country is called by its primitive title without reference to subsequent changes; in the Greek writers it takes its name from the conquerors. The Greek traditions of Memnon and his *Ethiopiens* are based upon this Cushite conquest, and rightly connect the Cissians or Cosseans of Susiana with the Cushite inhabitants of the upper valley of the Nile.

The fullest account of Elam, its physical geography, ruins, and history, is given in Loftus's *Chalvea and Susiana* (Lond. 1856; N. Y. 1857). The southern part of the country is flat, and towards the shore of the gulf marshy and desolate. In the north the mountain ranges of Backhtiari and Luristan rise gradually from the plain in a series of calcareous terraces, intersected by ravines of singular wildness and grandeur. Among these mountains are the sources of the Ulai (Loftus, p. 308, 347 sq.). The chief towns of Elymais are now Shuster ("little Shush") and Dizful; but the greater part of the country is overrun by nomad Arabs.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See ELAMITE.

2. (Sept. *Ἐλωνηλωάμ* v. r. *Ἰωλάμ*, also *Ἐλάμ* and *Αἰλάμ*; Vulg. *Elam*.) A Korhite Levite, fifth son of Mesheleiah, one of the Bene-Asaph, and superintendent of the fifth division of Temple wardens in the time of king David (1 Chron. xxvi, 3), B.C. 1014.

3. (Sept. *Ἀηλάμ* v. r. *Αἰλαμ*, Vulg. *Elam*.) A chief man of the tribe of Benjamin, one of the sons of Shashak, resident at Jerusalem at the captivity or on the return (1 Chron. viii, 24), B.C. 536 or ante.

4. (Sept. *Αἰλάμ*, *Ἠλάμ*, Vulg. *Elam*.) "Children of Elam," *Bene-Elam*, to the number of 1254, returned with Zerubbabel from Babylon (Ezra ii, 7; Neh. vii, 12; 1 Esdr. v, 12), and a further detachment of 71 men with Ezra in the second caravan (Ezra viii, 7; 1 Esdr. viii, 33). It was one of this family, Shechani-ah, son of Jehiel, who encouraged Ezra in his efforts against the indiscriminate marriages of the people (Ezra x, 2, text *בְּבָנָיו*, i. e. *בְּבָנָיו*, Olam), and six of the Bene-Elam accordingly put away their foreign wives (Ezra x, 26). The lists of Ezra ii and Neh. vii contain apparently an irregular mixture of the names of places and of persons. In the former, ver. 21-34, with one or two exceptions, are names of places; 3-19, on the other hand, are not known as names of places,

and are probably of persons. No such place as Elam is mentioned as in Palestine, either in the Bible or in the *Onomasticon* of Eusebius, nor has since been discovered as existing in the country, although Schwarz endeavors (*Palest.* p. 143) to give the word a local reference to the grave of a Samaritan priest Eli, at a village named by him as *Charim ben-Elim*, on the bay, 8 miles N.N.E. of Jaffa. See HARIM. Most interpreters have therefore concluded that it was a person. B.C. ante 536. It is possible, however, that this and the following name have been borrowed from No. 1, perhaps as designating Jews who resided in that region of the Babylonian dominions during the captivity.

5. In the same lists is a second Elam, whose sons, to the same number as in the former case, returned with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 31; Neh. vii, 34), and which, for the sake of distinction, is called "the other Elam" (*הַלְאָמִים הַשֵּׁנִי*; Sept. *Ἠλαράμ*, *Ἠλαμαάμ*, Vulg. *Elam alter*). The coincidence of the numbers is curious, and also suspicious, as arguing an accidental repetition of the foregoing name. B.C. ante 536.

6. (Sept. *Αἰλάμ*, Vulg. *Elam*.) One of the sacerdotal or Levitical singers who accompanied Nehemiah at the dedication of the new wall of Jerusalem (Neh. xii, 42). B.C. 446.

7. (Sept. *Ἠλάμ*, Vulg. *Elam*.) One of the chiefs of the people who signed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x, 14), B.C. 410.

**E'lamite** (Chald. *Elemay'*, *אֵלַמַּי*, in the plural *אֵלַמַּיִם*; Gr. *Ἐλαμίται*, Strabo, Ptolemy; or *Ἐλαμίται*, Acts ii, 9; Vulg. *Elamite*). This word is found in the O. T. only in Ezra iv, 9, and is omitted in that place by the Sept. translators, who probably regarded it as a gloss upon "Susanchites," which had occurred only a little before. The Elamites were the original inhabitants of the country called Elam; they were descendants of Shem, and drew their name from an actual man, Elam (Gen. x, 22). It has been observed in the preceding article that the Elamites yielded before a Cossean or Cushite invasion. See ELAM. They appear to have been driven in part to the mountains, where Strabo places them (xi, 13, § 6; xvi, 1, § 17), in part to the coast, where they are located by Ptolemy (vi, 3). Little is known of their manners and customs, or of their ethnic character. (See Müller, in the *Journal Asiatique*, 1839, vii, 299; Wahl, *Asien*, p. 603; Mannert, *Geogr.* V, ii, 158; comp. Plutarch, *17. Pomp.* 36; Justin. xxxvi, 1; Tacit. *Annal.* vi, 44). Strabo says they were skilful archers (xv, 3, § 10; comp. Xenoph. *Cyrop.* ii, 1, 16; Livy, xxxv, 48; Appian, *Syr.* 32), and with this agree the notices both of Isaiah and Jeremiah, the latter of whom speaks of "the bow of Elam" (xlix, 35), while the former says that "Elam bare the quiver" (xxii, 6). Isaiah also adds in this place that they fought both on horseback and from chariots. They appear to have retained their nationality with peculiar tenacity, for it is plain from the mention of them on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii, 9) that they still at that time kept their own language, and the distinct notice of them by Ptolemy more than a century later seems to show that they were not even then merged in the Cosseans. (See Hassel, *Erdbeschr.* v. *Asien*, ii, 769 sq.; Assemani, *Bibl. Or.* III, ii, 419, 744; comp. Herod. i, 102; Arrian, *Ind.* 42; Pliny, vi, 31; Strabo, xv, 728.) In Judith i, 6, the name is given in the Greek form as ELYMÆANS, and in 1 Macc. vi, 1, mention is made of a city ELYMAIS (q. v.).—Smith, s. v.

**El'asah** [some *Ela'sah*] (Heb. *Elasah'*, *אֵלְאָשָׁה*, whom *God made*; Vulg. *Elasa*), the name of four men (variously Anglicized in the A. V.). See also ELEASA.

1. (Sept. *Ἐλεασά*.) The son of Helez, and father of Sisamai; one of the descendants of Judah, of the family of Hezron (1 Chron. ii, 39, A. V. "Elesah"). B.C. post 1046.

2. (Sept. Ἐλεασά v. r. Ἐλασά, A. V. "Elcasah.") A son of Rapha or Repharah, and father of Azel; descendant of king Saul through Jonathan and Meribbaal or Mephibosheth (1 Chron. viii, 37; ix, 43). B. C. considerably ante 588.

3. (Sept. Ἐλασάφ v. r. Ἐλασάφ, A. V. "Elasah.") The son of Shaphan; one of the two men who were sent on a mission by king Zedekiah to Nebuchadnezzar at Babylon after the first deportation from Jerusalem, and who at the same time took charge of the letter of Jeremiah the prophet to the captives in Babylon (Jer. xxix, 3). B. C. 594.

4. (Sept. Ἐλασά, A. V. "Elasah.") One of the Bene-Pashur, a priest, who renounced the Gentile wife whom he had married after the return from Babylon (Ezra x, 22). B. C. 458.

**Elath** (Heb. *Eylath'*, עֵילָת, *grove*, perhaps of TEREBINTH-trees; occurs in this form Deut. ii, 8; 2 Kings xiv, 22; xvi, 6; also in the plur. form עֵילָתִים, "EYLATH" [q. v.], 1 Kings ix, 26; 2 Chron. viii, 17; xxvi, 2; "Elath," 2 Kings xvi, 6; in the Sept. Ἐλάθ and Ἐλάθ; in Joseph. [*Ant.* viii, 6, 4] Ἐλάθ; in Jerome, *Ailath* [who says that in his day it was called *Ailath*, to which its appellation in Arabic writers corresponds]; by the Greeks and Romans, *Elana* or *Elana*, Ἐλάνα [Ptol. v, 17, [Ἰλανα [Strabo, xvi, 768; comp. Pliny, v, 12; vi, 32]; in Arabic authors *Ailah*], a city of Idumæa, having a port on the eastern arm or gulf of the Red Sea, which thence received the name of Sinus Elaniticus (Gulf of Akabah). According to Eusebius (*Onomast.* s. v. Ἐλάθ), it was ten miles east from Petra. It must have been situated at the extremity of the valley of El-Ghór, which runs at the bottom of two parallel ranges of hills, north and south, through Arabia Petraea, from the Dead Sea to the northern parts of the Elanitic Gulf; but on which side of the valley it lay has been matter of dispute (see McCulloch's *Geog. Dict.* s. v. Akabah). In the geography of Arabia it forms the extreme northern limit of the province of the Hijoz (El-Makrizi, *Khitat*; and *Marásid*, s. v.; comp. ARABIA), and is connected with some points of the history of the country. According to several native writers the district of Ailah was in very ancient times peopled by the Sameyda', said to be a tribe of the Amalekites (the first Amalek). The town itself, however, is stated to have received its name from Eylah, daughter of Midian (El-Makrizi's *Khitat*, s. v.; Caussin's *Essai sur l'Histoire des Arabes*, i, 23). The Amalekites, if we may credit the writings of Arabic historians, passed in the earliest times from the neighborhood of the Persian Gulf through the peninsula (spreading over the greater part of it), and thence finally passed into Arabia Petraea. Future researches may trace in these fragments of primeval tradition the origin of the Phœnicians. Herodotus seems to strengthen such a supposition when he says that the latter people came from the Erythrean Sea. Were the Phœnicians a mixed Cushite settlement from the Persian Gulf, who carried with them the known maritime characteristics of the peoples of that stock, developed in the great commerce of Tyre, and in that of the Persian Gulf, and, as a link between their extreme eastern and western settlements, in the fleets that sailed from Ezion-geber and Elath, and from the southern ports of the Yemen? See ARABIA; CAPHTOR; MIZRAIM. It should be observed, however, that Tyrian sailors manned the fleets of Solomon and of Jehoshaphat (see *Jour. Sac. Lit.* Oct. 1851, p. 153, n.).—Smith, s. v.

The first time that Elath is mentioned in Scripture is in Deut. ii, 8, in speaking of the journey of the Israelites towards the Promised Land: "When we passed by from our brethren the children of Esau, which dwelt in Seir, through the way of the plain from Elath, and from Ezion-geber." These two places are mentioned together again in 1 Kings ix, 26 (comp. 2 Chron. viii,

17), in such a manner as to show that Elath was more ancient than Ezion-geber, and was of so much repute as to be used for indicating the locality of other places; the passage also fixes the spot where Elath itself was to be found: "and king Solomon made a navy of ships in Ezion-geber, which is beside Elath, on the shore (Num. xxxiii, 35) of the Red Sea, in the land of Edom." See EZION-GEBER. The use which David made of the vicinity of Elath shows that the country was at that time in his possession. Accordingly, in 2 Sam. viii, 14, we learn that he had previously made himself master of Idumæa, and garrisoned its strong-holds with his own troops. Under Joram, however (2 Kings viii, 20), the Idumæans revolted from Judah, and elected a king over themselves. Joram thereupon assembled his forces, "and all the chariots with him," and, falling on the Idumæans by night, succeeded in defeating and scattering their army. The Hebrews, nevertheless, could not prevail, but "Edom revolted from under the hand of Judah unto this day;" thus exemplifying the striking language employed (Gen. xxvii, 40) by Isaac: "By thy sword shalt thou live, and shalt serve thy brother; and it shall come to pass, when thou shalt have the dominion, that thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck." From 2 Kings xiv, 22, however, it appears that Uzziah recovered Elath, and, having so repaired and adorned the city as to be said to have built, that is, rebuilt it, he made it a part of his dominions. This connection was not of long continuance; for in chap. xvi, ver. 6 of the same book, we find the Syrian king Rezin interposing, who captured Elath, drove out the Jews, and annexed the place to his Syrian kingdom, and "the Syrians came to Elath, and dwelt there unto this day." At a later period it fell under the power of the Romans, and was for a time guarded by the tenth legion, forming part of *Palestina Tertia* (Jerome, *Onomast.* s. v. *Ailah*; Strabo, xxi, 4, 4; Reland, *Palest.* p. 556). It subsequently became the residence of a Christian bishop. Bishops of Elath were at the Council of Chalcedon (A. D. 451) and at that of Constantinople (A. D. 536). At the Council of Chalcedon, Beryllus thus wrote his designation as "Bishop of Ela of Third Palestine" (Ἐλάθ τῆς Παλαιστίνης τρίτης). In the days of its prosperity it was much distinguished for commerce, which continued to flourish under the auspices of Christianity (Cellarii *Notit.* ii. 686 sq.). In the 6th century it is spoken of by Procopius as being inhabited by Jews subject to the Roman dominion (*De Bell. Pers.* i, 19). In A. D. 630 the Christian communities of Arabia Petraea found it expedient to submit to Mohammed, when John, the Christian governor of Ailah, became bound to pay an annual tribute of 300 gold pieces (Abulfeda, *Ann.* i, 171). Henceforward, till the present century, Ailah lay in the darkness of Islamism. It is merely mentioned by the supposed Ibn-Haukal (Engl. translation of D'Arvieux, *Append.* p. 353), perhaps in the 11th century; and, after the middle of the 12th, Edrisi describes it as a small town frequented by the Arabs, who were now its masters, and forming an important point in the route between Cairo and Medina. In A. D. 1116, king Baldwin of Jerusalem took possession of it. Again it was wrested from the hands of the Christians by Saladin I, A. D. 1167, and never again fully recovered by them, although the reckless Rainald of Chatillon, in A. D. 1182, seized, and for a time held, the town. In Abulfeda's day, and before A. D. 1500, it was already deserted. He says, "In our day it is a fortress, to which a governor is sent from Egypt. It had a small castle in the sea, but this is now abandoned, and the governor removed to the fortress on the shore." Such as Ailah was in the days of Abulfeda, is *Akahab* now. Mounds of rubbish alone mark the site of the town, while a fortress, occupied by a governor and a small garrison under the pasha of Egypt, serves to keep the neighboring tribes of the desert in awe, and to minister to the wants and protection of the annual Egyptian Haj,

or pilgrim caravan. Under the Roman rule it lost its former importance with the transference of its trade to other ports, such as Berenice, Myos Hormos, and Arsinoë; but in Mohammedan times it again became a place of some note. It is now quite insignificant. It lies on the route of the Egyptian pilgrim-caravan, and the mountain-road or 'Akabah named after it was improved or reconstructed by Ahmad Ibn-Tulun, who ruled Egypt from A. D. cir. 840 to 848. This place has always been an important station upon the route of the Egyptian Haj. Such is the importance of this caravan of pilgrims from Cairo to Mecca, both in a religious and political point of view, that the rulers of Egypt from the earliest period have given it convoy and protection. For this purpose a line of fortresses similar to that of Akabah has been established at intervals along the route, with wells of water and supplies of provisions (Robinson's *Biblical Researches*, i, 250). The first Frank who visited this place in modern times was Ruppell, in 1822 (*Reise*, p. 248 sq.). Laborde (*Journey through Arabia Petraea*, London, 1836) was well received by the garrison and inhabitants of the castle of Akabah, of which he has given a view (i, 116). The fortress, he states, is built on a regular plan, and is in a pretty good condition, though within several good habitations have been suffered to fall to decay. It has only two guns fit for service (Bartlett, *Forty Days in the Desert*, p. 99 sq.). The ancient name of the place is indicative of groves in the vicinity, and Strabo speaks of its palm-woods (xvi, 776), which appear still to subsist (Niebuhr, *Beschr.* p. 400; Schubert, ii, 379).—Kitto, s. v.

**El-Beth'el** (Heb. *El Beyth-El*, **בֵּית אֱלֹהִים**, *God of Bethel*; Sept. simply *Baθ̄n̄n̄*, Vulg. *Domus Dei*), the name given by Jacob to the altar erected by him as a sanctuary (Gen. xxxv, 7), on the spot where he had formerly experienced the vision of the mystic ladder (chap. xxxi, 13; xxviii, 18). See **BETHEL**.

**Elcesaites.** See **ELKESAITES**.

**El'cia** (Ἐλκία), one of the forefathers of Judith, and therefore belonging to the tribe of Simeon (Jud. viii, 1); what Hebrew name the word represents is doubtful. Hilkiash is probably Chelkias, two steps back in the genealogy. The Syriac version has *Elkana*. In the Vulgate the names are hopelessly altered.—Smith, s. v.

**El'daäh** [some *Eld'ah*] (Heb. *Eldah'ah*, **אֵלְדָּאָה**, whom *God called*; Sept. Ἐλδαγιά, Ἐλδαά; Josephus Ἐλδαῖ, *Ant.* i, 15, 1), the last-named of the five sons of Midian, Abraham's son by Keturah (Gen. xxv, 4; 1 Chron. i, 33). B. C. post 2063.

**El'dad** (Heb. *Eldad*, **אֵלְדָּד**, whom *God has loved*; comp. *Theophilus*; Sept. Ἐλδαδ), one of the seventy elders who had been appointed under Moses to assist in the administration of justice among the people. B. C. 1658. He is mentioned along with Medad, another elder, as having on a particular occasion received the gift of prophecy, which came upon them in the camp, while Moses and the rest of the elders were assembled around the door of the tabernacle. The spirit of prophecy was upon them all; and the simple peculiarity in the case of Eldad and Medad was that they did not lose their share in the gift, though they abode in the camp, but they prophesied there. It appeared, however, an irregularity to Joshua, the son of Nun, and seems to have suggested the idea that they were using the gift with a view to their own aggrandizement. He therefore entreated Moses to forbid them. But Moses, with characteristic magnanimity, replied, "Enviest thou for my sake? Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put his spirit upon them!" (Num. xi, 24-29).—Fairbairn, s. v. The great fact of the passage is the more general distribution of the spirit of prophecy, which had hitherto been concentrated in Moses; and

the implied sanction of a tendency to separate the exercise of this gift from the service of the tabernacle, and to make it more generally available for the enlightenment and instruction of the Israelites, a tendency which afterwards led to the establishment of "schools of the prophets." The circumstance is in strict accordance with the Jewish tradition that all prophetic inspiration emanated originally from Moses, and was transmitted from him by a legitimate succession down to the time of the captivity. The *mode* of prophecy in the case of Eldad and Medad was probably the extempore production of hymns, chanted forth to the people (Hammond); comp. the case of Saul, 1 Sam. x, 11. From Num. xi, 25, it appears that the gift was not merely intermittent, but a continuous energy, though only occasionally developed in action.—Smith, s. v. See **PROPHECY**.

**Elder** (properly **זֶנֶן**, *zaken'*; *πρεσβύτερος*, a term which is plainly the origin of our word "priest;" *Saxon prooster* and *preste*, then *priest*, High and Low Dutch *priester*, French *prestre* and *prêtre*, Ital. *prete*, Span. *presbytero*), literally, one of the older men; and because, in ancient times, older persons would naturally be selected to hold public offices, out of regard to their presumed superiority in knowledge and experience, the term came to be used as the designation for the office itself, borne by an individual of whatever age. (See Gesenius, *Heb. Lex.* s. v.) Such is the origin of the words *γερονσία* (a council of elders), *senatus*, *alderman*, etc.

1. *In the O. T.*—The term elder was one of extensive use, as an official title, among the Hebrews and the surrounding nations. It applied to various offices; Eliezer, for instance, is described as the "old man of the house," i. e. the *major-domo* (Gen. xxiv, 2); the officers of Pharaoh's household (Gen. i, 7), and, at a later period, David's head servants (2 Sam. xii, 17) were so termed; while in Ezek. xxvii, 9 the "old men of Gebal" are the *master-workmen*. But the term "elder" appears to be also expressive of respect and reverence in general, as *signore*, *seigneur*, *senior*, etc. The word occurs in this sense in Gen. i, 7, "Joseph went up to bury his father, and with him went up all the servants of Pharaoh, the elders of his house, and all the elders of the land of Egypt" (Sept. *πρεσβύτεροι*, Vulg. *senes*). These elders of Egypt were probably the various state officers. As betokening a political office, it applied not only to the Hebrews and Egyptians, but also to the Moabites and Midianites (Num. xxii, 7). The elders of Israel, of whom such frequent mention is made, may have been, in early times, the lineal descendants of the patriarchs (Exod. xii, 21). To the elders Moses was directed to open his commission (Exod. iii, 16). They accompanied Moses in his first interview with Pharaoh, as the representatives of the Hebrew nation (ver. 18); through them Moses issued his communications and commands to the whole people (Exod. xix, 7; Deut. xxxi, 9); they were his immediate attendants in all great transactions in the wilderness (Exod. xvii, 5); seventy of their number were selected to attend Moses, Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, at the giving of the law (Exod. xxiv, 1), on which occasion they are called the *nobles* (**נְדָבִים**, lit. *deep-rooted*, i. e. of high-born stock; Sept. *ἐπιλεκτοι*) of the children of Israel, who did eat and drink before God, in ratification of the covenant, as representatives of the nation (ver. 11). In Num. xi, 16, 17, we meet with the appointment of seventy elders to bear the burden of the people along with Moses; these were selected by Moses out of the whole number of the elders, and are described as being already officers over the children of Israel. It is the opinion of Michaelis that this council chosen to assist Moses should not be confounded with the Sanhedrim, which, he thinks, was not instituted till after the return from the Babylonish captivity. See **SANHEDRIM**. He ob

serves that these seventy elders were not chosen to be *judges* of the people, who had already more than 60,000 judges. He also argues that the election of seventy additional *judges* would have done but little towards suppressing the rebellion which led Moses to adopt this proceeding; but that it seems more likely to have been his intention to form a supreme senate to take a share in the government, consisting of the most respectable persons, either for family or merit, which would materially support his power and influence among the people in general; would unite large and powerful families, and give an air of aristocracy to his government, which had hitherto been deemed too monarchical. He further infers that this council was not permanent, not being once alluded to from the death of Moses till the Babylonish captivity; that Moses did not fill up the vacancies occasioned by deaths, and that it ceased altogether in the wilderness. Wherever a patriarchal system is in force, the office of the *elder* will be found as the keystone of the social and political fabric; it is so at the present day among the Arabs, where the sheik (=the *old man*) is the highest authority in the tribe. That the title originally had reference to age is obvious; and age was naturally a concomitant of the office at all periods (Josh. xxiv, 31; 1 Kings xii, 6), even when the term had acquired its secondary sense. At what period the transition occurred, in other words, *when* the word *elder* acquired an official signification, it is impossible to say. The earliest notice of the *elders* acting in concert as a political body is at the time of the Exodus. We need not assume that the order was then called into existence, but rather that Moses availed himself of an institution already existing and recognised by his countrymen, and that, in short, "the elders of Israel" (Exod. iii, 16; iv, 29) had been the *senate* (Sept. *γεροντία*) of the people ever since they had become a people. The position which the elders held in the Mosaic constitution, and more particularly in relation to the people, is described under CONGREGATION; they were the representatives of the people, so much so that *elders* and *people* are occasionally used as equivalent terms (comp. Josh. xxiv, 1 with 2, 19, 21; 1 Sam. viii, 4 with 7, 10, 19). Their authority was undefined, and extended to all matters concerning the public weal; nor did the people question the validity of their acts, even when they disapproved of them (Josh. ix, 18). When the tribes became settled the elders were distinguished by different titles, according as they were acting as national representatives ("elders of Israel," 1 Sam. iv, 3; 1 Kings viii, 1, 3; "of the land," 1 Kings xx, 7; "of Judah," 2 Kings xxiii, 1; Ezek. viii, 1), as district governors over the several tribes (Deut. xxxi, 28; 2 Sam. xix, 11), or as local magistrates in the provincial towns, appointed in conformity with Deut. xvi, 18, whose duty it was to sit in the gate and administer justice (Deut. xix, 12; xxi, 3 sq.; xxii, 15; Ruth iv, 9, 11; 1 Kings xxi, 8; Judg. x, 6); their number and influence may be inferred from 1 Sam. xxx, 26 sq. They retained their position under all the political changes which the Jews underwent: under the judges (Judg. ii, 7; viii, 14; xi, 5; 1 Sam. iv, 3; viii, 4); in the time of Samuel (1 Sam. xvi, 4); under Saul (1 Sam. xxx, 26), David (1 Chron. xxi, 16), and the later kings (2 Sam. xvii, 4; 1 Kings xii, 6; xx, 8; xxi, 11); during the captivity (Jer. xxix, 1; Ezek. viii, 1; xiv, 1; xx, 1); subsequently to the return (Ezra v, 5; vi, 7, 14; x, 8, 14); under the Maccabees, when they were described sometimes as the senate (*γεροντία*; 1 Macc. xii, 6; 2 Macc. i, 10; iv, 41; xi, 27; Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 3, 3), sometimes by their ordinary title (1 Macc. vii, 33; xi, 23; xii, 35); and, lastly, at the commencement of the Christian era, when they are noticed as a distinct body from the Sanhedrim, but connected with it as one of the classes whence its members were selected, and always acting in conjunction with it and the other dominant classes.

See COUNCIL. Thus they are associated sometimes with the chief priests (Matt. xxi, 23), sometimes with the chief priests and the scribes (Matt. xvi, 21), or the council (Matt. xxvi, 59), and always taking an active part in the management of public affairs. Luke describes the whole order by the collective term *πρεσβυτήριον*, i. e. eldership (Luke xxii, 66; Acts xxii, 5). Like the scribes, they obtained their seat in the Sanhedrim by election, or nomination from the executive authority.—Smith, s. v.; Kitto, s. v. See AGE.

II. *In the New Testament and in the Apostolical Church.*—In the article BISHOP (i, 818 sq.), the origin and functions of the eldership in the N. T. and in the early Church are treated at some length, especially with regard to the question of the original identity of *bishops* and *presbyters* (or elders). Referring our readers to that discussion, we add here the following points.

1. *Origin of the Office.*—No specific account of the origin of the eldership in the Christian Church is given in the N. T. "The demand for it arose, no doubt, very early; as, notwithstanding the wider diffusion of gifts not restricted to office, provision was to be made plainly for the regular and fixed instruction and conduct of the rapidly multiplying churches. The historical pattern for it was presented in the Jewish synagogue, namely, in the college or bench of elders (*πρεσβύτεροι*, Luke vii, 3; *ἀρχισυνάγωγοι*, Mark v, 22; Acts xiii, 15), who conducted the functions of public worship, prayer, reading, and exposition of the Scriptures. We meet Christian presbyters for the first time (Acts xi, 30) at Jerusalem, on the occasion of the collection sent from the Christians of Antioch for the relief of their brethren in Judaea. From thence the institution passed over not only to all the Jewish-Christian churches, but to those also which were planted among the Gentiles. From the example of the household of Stephanas at Corinth (1 Cor. xvi, 15) we see that the first converts (*the ἀπαρχαί*) ordinarily were chosen to this office, a fact expressly confirmed also by Clemens Romanus" (1 Cor. c. xlii). Schaff, in *Meth. Quart. Rev.* Oct. 1851; *Apostolic Church*, § 182. "The creation of the office of elder is nowhere recorded in the N. T., as in the case of deacons and apostles, because the latter offices were created to meet new and special emergencies, while the former was transmitted from the earliest times. In other words, the office of elder was the only permanent essential office of the Church under either dispensation" (*Princeton Review*, xix, 61). The Jewish eldership, according to this view, was tacitly transferred from the Old Dispensation to the New, without express or formal institution, except in Gentile churches, where no such office had a previous existence (comp. Acts xi, 30; xiv, 23).

2. *Functions of the Elders.*—The "elders" of the N. T. Church were plainly the "pastors" (Eph. iv, 11), "bishops, or overseers" (Acts xx, 28, etc.); "leaders" and rulers" (Heb. xiii, 7; 1 Thess. v, 12, etc.) of the flock. But they were not only leaders and rulers, but also the "regular teachers" of the congregation, to whom pertained officially the exposition of the Scriptures, the preaching of the Gospel, and the administration of the sacraments. That this function was closely connected with the other is apparent, even from the conjunction of "pastors and teachers," Eph. iv, 11, where the terms, as we have already seen, denote the same persons. The same association of ruling and teaching occurs Heb. xiii, 7: "Remember them which have the rule over you (*ηγούμενοι*), who have spoken unto you the word of God (*οἰκτιρεῖς ἐλάλησαν ὑμῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ*), whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation" (comp. ver. 17). Especially decisive, however, are the instructions of the pastoral epistles, where Paul, among the requirements for the presbyterate, in addition to a blameless character and a talent for business and government, expressly mentions also *ability to teach* (1 Tim. iii, 2): "A bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober,

of good behavior, given to hospitality, *apt to teach* (ἑὺδασκῶν), etc.; so also Tit. i, 9, where it is required of a bishop that he shall "hold fast the faithful word as he hath been taught (ἀπτεχόμενον τοῦ κατὰ τὴν εὐαγγέλιον πιστοῦ λόγου), that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers" (Schaff, *l. c.*). It is not improbable (indeed, several passages in the New Test. seem clearly to favor the notion) that many persons were ordained elders in the apostolical age who were not, and could not be, separated from their temporal occupations. "At first, those who held office in the Church continued, in all probability, to exercise their former trades for a livelihood. The churches would scarcely be able (as they were mostly poor) to provide stipends at first for their pastors" (Neander). Nevertheless, men specially called and fitted for the work, and devoted to it, were *entitled* by the Christian law, as set forth by the apostles, to be supported by the people; but there was no distinction of rank, honor, or authority between those elders who had stipends and those who had none, unless, indeed, the latter, who, following Paul's example, "worked with their own hands" that they might not be chargeable to the churches, were held in greater honor for the time. The principle that full ministerial title may stand apart from stipend is fully recognised in modern times in the system of *local preachers* (q. v.) in the Methodist Episcopal Church (see Steward, *On Church Government*, Lond. 1853, p. 128).

"After the pattern of the synagogues, as well as of the political administration of cities, which from of old was vested in the hands of a senate or college of *decuriones*, every church had a number of presbyters. We meet them every where in the plural and as a corporation: at Jerusalem, Acts xi, 30; xv, 4, 6, 23; xxi, 18; at Ephesus, xx, 17, 28; at Philippi, Phil. i, 1; at the ordination of Timothy. 1 Tim. iv, 14, where mention is made of the laying on of the hands of the *presbytery*; and in the churches to which James wrote, James v. 14: 'Is any sick among you? let him call for the *presbyters* of the congregation, and let them pray over him,' etc. This is implied also by the notice (Acts xiv, 23) that Paul and Barnabas ordained elders for every church, several of them of course; and still more clearly by the direction given to Titus (Tit. i, 5) to ordain elders, that is, a presbytery of such officers, in every city of Crete. Some learned men, indeed, have imagined that the arrangement in the larger cities included several congregations, while, however, each of these had but one elder or bishop; that the principle of congregational polity thus from the beginning was neither democratic nor aristocratic, but monarchical. But this view is contradicted by the passages just quoted, in which the presbyters appear as a college, as well as by the associative tendency which entered into the very life of Christians from the beginning. The *household congregations* (ἐκκλησία κατ' οἶκον), which are often mentioned and greeted (Rom. xvi, 4, 5, 14, 15; 1 Cor. xvi, 19; Col. iv, 15; Philem. 2), indicate merely the fact that where the Christians had become very numerous they were accustomed to meet for edification at different places, and by no means exclude the idea of their organized union as a whole, or of their being governed by a common body of presbyters. Hence, accordingly, the apostolical epistles also are never addressed to a separate part, an *ecclesiola* in *ecclesia*, a conventicle, but always to the whole body of Christians at Rome, at Corinth, at Ephesus, at Philippi, at Thessalonica, etc., treating them in such case as a moral unity (comp. 1 Thess. i, 1; 2 Thess. i, 1; 1 Cor. i, 2; v. 1 sq.; 2 Cor. i, 1, 23; ii, 1 sq.; Col. iv, 16; Phil. i, 1, etc.). Whether a full parity reigned among these collegiate presbyters, or whether one, say the eldest, constantly presided over the rest, or whether, finally, one followed another in such presidency as *primus inter pares* by some certain rotation, cannot be decisively determined from the N. T. The

analogy of the Jewish synagogue leads here to no entirely sure result, since it is questionable whether a particular presidency belonged to its eldership as early as the time of Christ. Some sort of presidency, indeed, would seem to be almost indispensable for any well-ordered government and the regular transaction of business, and is thus beforehand probable in the case of these primitive Christian presbyteries, only the particular form of it we have no means to determine" (Schaff, *l. c.*).

III. *In the early Church (post-apostolic).*—Very soon after the apostolic age the episcopacy arose, first in the congregational form, afterwards in the diocesan episcopacy. See EPISCOPACY. Until the full development of the latter, elders or presbyters were the highest order of ministers. No trace of ruling elders, in the modern sense, is to be found in the early Church. There was a class of *seniores ecclesie* in the African Church, whom some writers have supposed to correspond to the ruling elder; but Bingham clearly shows the contrary. The name occurs in the writings of Augustine and Optatus. In the Diocletian persecution, when Mensurinus was compelled to leave his church, he committed the ornaments and utensils to such of the elders as he could trust, *fidelibus senioribus commendabit* (Optatus, lib. 1, p. 41). In the works of Optatus there is a tract called "the Purgation of Felix and Cæcilian," where is mention of these *seniores*. Augustine inscribes one of his epistles, *Clero, senioribus, et universæ plebi*: "To the clergy, the elders, and all the people" (Epist. 137). According to Bingham, some of these *seniores* were the civil *optimates* (magistrates, aldermen); the Council of Carthage (A. D. 403) speaks of *magistratus vel seniores locorum*. Others were called *seniores ecclesiastici*, and had care of the utensils, treasures, etc., of the church, and correspond to modern churchwardens or trustees (Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. ii, ch. xix, § 19; Hitchcock, in *Amer. Presb. Review*, April, 1868).

IV. *In the modern Church.*—1. In the Roman Catholic Church, the Church of England, and the Protestant Episcopal Church, the word "priest" is generally used instead of "presbyter" or "elder" to designate the second order of ministers (the three orders being bishops, priests, and deacons). See PRESBYTER; PRIEST.

2. In the Methodist Episcopal Church but two orders of ministers are recognised, viz. elders and deacons, the bishop being chosen as *primus inter pares*, or superintendent. See EPISCOPACY. For the election, ordination, duties, etc., of elders, see the *Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, pt. ii, ch. ii, § 15, and pt. iv, ch. vi, § 2. The *presiding elder* is appointed by the bishop, once in four years, to superintend a district. For the nature and functions of this office, see PRESIDING ELDER.

3. Among Congregationalists, the only Church officers now known are elders (or ministers) and deacons. Ruling elders were recognised in the Cambridge platform (q. v.), and their duties particularly pointed out; but neither the office itself nor the reasons by which it was supported were long approved. Ruling elders never were universal in Congregationalism, and the office was soon everywhere rejected (Upham, *Ratio Discipline*, 1844, § 38, 39; Dexter, *On Congregationalism*).

4. Among Presbyterian churches (i. e. all which adopt the Presbyterial form of government, whether designated by that name or not) there are generally two classes of elders, teaching and ruling elders. The teaching elders constitute the body of pastors; the ruling elders are laymen, who are set apart as assistants to the minister in the oversight and ruling of the flock. Together with the minister, they constitute "the Session," the lowest judicatory in the Church. See PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH. They cannot administer the sacraments, but aid at the Lord's Supper by distributing the elements to the communicants.

1. In Scotland, ruling elders constitute, with the ministers, the "Kirk Session." The *Form of Government* annexed to the *Confession of Faith* asserts that "as there were in the Jewish Church elders of the people, joined with the priests and Levites in the government of the Church, so Christ, who hath instituted government and governors ecclesiastical in the Church, besides the ministers of the Word, with gifts for government, and with commission to execute the same when called thereunto, who are to join with the minister in the government of the Church, which officers reformed churches commonly call *elders*." "These elders are chosen from among the members, and are usually persons of tried character. After their acceptance of office, the minister, in the presence of the congregation, sets them apart to their office by prayer, and sometimes by imposition of hands, and concludes the ceremony of *ordination* with exhorting both elders and people to discharge their respective duties. They have no right to teach or to dispense the sacraments. They generally discharge the office, which originally belonged to the deacons, of attending to the interests of the poor; but their peculiar function is expressed by the name "ruling elders;" for in every question of jurisdiction they are the spiritual court of which the minister is officially moderator, and in the presbytery—of which the pastors within the bounds are officially members—the elders sit as the representatives of the several sessions or consistories' (Hill's *Theology*, *Instit.*, pt. ii, sec. ii, p. 171). In the Established Church of Scotland elders are nominated by the Session, but in unestablished bodies they are freely chosen by the people" (Eadie, *Ecl. Cyclop.* s. v.). The *United Presbyterian Church* has the following rules on the subject: "1. The right of electing elders is vested solely in the members of the congregation who are in full communion. 2. No fixed number of elders is required, but two, along with the minister, are required to constitute a Session. 3. When the Session judge it expedient that an addition should be made to their number, the first step is to call a meeting of the congregation for the purpose of electing the required number. . . . 6. At the meeting for election a discourse is generally delivered suitable to the occasion. Full opportunity is first of all given to the members to propose candidates. The names are then read over, and, after prayer, the votes are taken, and the individuals having the greatest number of votes are declared to be duly elected. 7. After the election the call of the congregation is intimated to the elders elect, and on their acceptance the Session examines into their qualifications, and, if satisfied, orders an edict to be read in the church. 8. At the time mentioned in the edict, which must be read on two Sabbath days, the Session meets, the elders elect being present. After the Session is constituted, if no objections are brought forward, the day of ordination is fixed. If objections are made, the Session proceeds to inquire into and decide on them. 9. On the day of ordination, the moderator calls on the elders elect to stand forward, and puts to them the questions of the formula. Satisfactory answers being given, the minister proceeds to ordain or set them apart by prayer to the office of ruling elder. Immediately afterwards the right hand of fellowship is given to the persons thus ordained by the minister and by the other elders present, and the whole is followed by suitable exhortations" (Eadie, s. v.).

2. The *Form of Government* of the Presbyterian Church in the United States (bk. i, ch. v) contains the following: "Ruling elders are properly the representatives of the people, chosen by them for the purpose of exercising government and discipline, in conjunction with pastors or ministers. This office has been understood, by a great part of the Protestant reformed churches, to be designated in the holy Scriptures by the title of governments, and of those who rule well, but do not labor in the word and doctrine" (1 Cor. xii,

28). Chap. xiii gives the rules for the election and ordination of ruling elders. Each congregation elects "according to the mode most approved and in use in that congregation;" and the whole procedure is very similar to that of the U. P. Church recited above. The ordination is "by prayer" and the "right hand of fellowship," not by imposition of hands. The office is perpetual. The elders, with the pastor, constitute the *Session*; one elder from each church is a member of *Presbytery* and *Synod*; and one for every twenty-four ministers in each presbytery is sent to the *General Assembly*.

In the Reformed Church the elders are chosen for two years only, by the congregation or by the Consistory (*Constitution of the Ref. Dutch Church*, ch. i, art. iii). They are entitled to membership in Classis and Synod as delegates (*Constitution*, ch. ii, art. iii). There is a form given in the book for their ordination, without imposition of hands. So also in the new liturgy prepared for the German Reformed Church.

3. *Ruling Elders*.—The distinction between teaching and ruling elders originated with Calvin, and has diffused itself very widely among the churches which adopt the Presbyterian form of government; and the authority of the N. T. is claimed for it (see above, 2) in the Presbyterian "Form of Government" (bk. i, ch. v); in the Reformed Church *Form of Ordination* (Constit. p. 118); in the Lutheran Church *Formula of Government* (ch. iii, § 6). The Congregationalists of New England admitted this distinction for a while (see above), but soon abandoned it.

Calvin (*Institutes*, bk. iv, chap. iii, § 8) seeks a scriptural basis for lay eldership as follows: "Governors (1 Cor. xii, 2) I apprehend to have been persons of advanced years, selected from the people to unite with the bishops in giving admonition, and exercising discipline. No other interpretation can be given of 'He that ruleth, let him do it with diligence' (Rom. xii, 8). . . . Now that this was not the regulation of a single age experience itself demonstrates." This passage, however, occurs first in the 3d edition of the *Institutes*, 1543; it is not found in the editions of 1536 or 1539. The office of lay elders had existed before among the *Unitas Fratrum*, who were supposed to have borrowed it from the Waldenses; but these lay elders were only trustees or churchwardens. Calvin himself organized a lay eldership in Geneva, to be elected yearly, and seems afterwards to have sought a scriptural warrant for it. In so doing he formed a novel theory, viz. that of a *two-fold* eldership. "This cardinal assumption of a *dual presbyterate* was controverted by Blondel, himself a Presbyterian, in 1648, and again in 1696 by Vtringa, who, as Rothe says in his *Anfänge*, 'routed from the field this phantom of apostolic lay elders.' Even the Westminster Assembly, when, in 1643, it debated the question of Church government, as it did for nearly four weeks, was careful not to commit itself to Calvin's theory of lay presbyters, refused to call them ruling elders, and in its final report in 1644 spoke of them as 'other Church governors,' 'which reformed churches commonly call *elders*.' Calvin's theory has also been controverted by James P. Wilson in his *Primitive Government of Christian Churches* (1833), and by Thomas Smyth in his *Name, Nature, and Functions of Ruling Elders* (1845). The drift of critical opinion is now decidedly in this direction. It is beginning to be conceded, even among Presbyterians of the staunchest sort, that Calvin was mistaken in his interpretation of 1 Tim. v, 17; that two orders of presbyters are not there brought to view, but only one order, the difference referred to being simply that of service, and not of rank. And if this famous passage fails to justify the *dual presbyterate*, much less may we rely upon the *ὁ προϊστάμενος, ἐν σπουδῇ*, 'he that ruleth with diligence,' of Rom. xii, 8, or the *κυβερνήσεις*, 'governments,' of 1 Cor. xii, 28. In short, the *jure divino* theory of the lay eldership is

steadily losing ground. A better support is sought for it in the New-Testament recognition throughout of the right and propriety of lay participation in Church government; in the general right of the Church, as set forth by Hooker in his *Ecclesiastical Polity*, to govern itself by whatsoever forus it pleases, provided the great end of government be answered; and in the proved fitness and efficiency of our present Presbyterian polity, as compared either with prelacy on the one side, or Congregationalism on the other" (Hitcheck, in *Am. Presb. Rev.* 1868, p. 255). Dr. Thornwell (*Southern Presb. Review*, 1859; *Spirit of the XIXth Century*, Dec. 1843; reprinted in *Southern Presb. Rev.* July, 1867) sets forth a peculiar theory of the divine right of the ruling eldership, viz. that the ruling elder is the presbyter of the N. T., whose *only* function was to rule, while the *preachers* were generally selected from the class of elders. This view is also maintained by Breckinridge (*Knowledge of God, subjectively considered*, p. 629); and is refuted by Dr. Smyth, *Princeton Review*, vol. xxxiii (see also *Princeton Review*, xv, 313 sq.). Principal Campbell (*Theory of Ruling Elderships*, Edinb. and Lond. 1866) aims to show that "elder" in the N. T. always means pastor, and never means the modern "ruling elder" (see *Brit. and For. Evan. Review*, Jan. 1868, p. 222). He shows that the Westminster Assembly, after a long discussion, refused to sanction Calvin's view; but he seeks to find lay elders, under another name, in Rom. xii, 8; 1 Cor. xii, 28, etc., and also in early Church History. For a criticism of his view, and a luminous statement of the whole subject of lay eldership, with a conclusive proof that there is no trace of it in the N. T., see Dr. Hitcheck's article in the *Amer. Presb. Review*, April, 1868, p. 253 sq. See also an able critical and historical discussion of the subject in Dexter, *Congregationalism* (Boston, 1865), p. 120 sq. The scriptural right of lay elders is maintained in *The Divine Right of Church Government, with Dr. Owen's Argument in favor of Ruling Elders* (New York, 1844, 12mo); in Miller, *On Ruling Elders* (Presb. Board, 18mo). See also King, *Eldership in the Christian Church* (N. Y. 1851); Muhlenberg, *On the Office of Ruling Elders*; M'Kerrow, *Office of Ruling Elders* (London, 1846); Engles, *Duties of Ruling Elders* (Presb. Board); Smyth, *Name, Nature, and Functions of Ruling Elders* (N. Y. 1845, 12mo); Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. ii, ch. xx, § 19; Gieseler, *Church History*, vol. i, § 29; Neander, *Planting and Training*, bk. i, ch. ii; Davidson, *Ecc. Polity of N. T.*; Watson, *Theol. Institutes*, pt. iv, ch. i; Schaff, *Apostolic Church*, § 132, 133; Rothe, *Anfänge d. christlichen Kirche*, § 28, 29; Bilson, *Perpetual Government of Christ's Church*; Owen, *Works* (Edinb. 1851), xv, 504.

**El'eād** (Heb. *Elad*, עֵלֶאָד, whom *God has applauded*; Sept. 'Ελεάδ, Vulg. *Elad*), a descendant of Ephraim (1 Chron. vii, 21), but whether through Shuthelah (q. v.), or a son of the patriarch (the second Shuthelah being taken as a repetition of the first, and Elzer and Elead as his brothers), is not determined (see Bertheau, *Comment. zu Chronik*, p. 82). B. C. post 1856. Perhaps he is the same with ELADAI (q. v.) in the preceding verse, who appears to have survived, if identical with ERAN (Num. xxvi, 36).

**El'eā'leh** (Heb. *Elaleh*, עֵלֶאָלֵה, whither *God has ascended*, once *Elale'*, עֵלֶאָלֵה, Num. xxxii, 37; Sept. 'Ελεαλί), a place on the east of Jordan, in the pastoral country, taken possession of and rebuilt by the tribe of Reuben (Num. xxxii, 3, 37). We lose sight of it till the time of Isaiah and Jeremiah, by both of whom it is mentioned as a Moabitic town, and, as before, in close connection with Heshbon (Isa. xv, 4; xvi, 9; Jer. xlviii, 34). It apparently lay close to the border of Reuben and Gad (Josh. xiii, 26). On the decline of Jewish power, Elealeh, with the whole Mishor, fell into the hands of the Moabites, and is thus included in

the woes pronounced by Isaiah on Moab (xvi, 9): "I will water thee with my tears, O Heshbon and Elealeh; for the alarm is fallen upon thy summer fruits, and thy harvest." Elealeh was still a large village in the time of Eusebius and Jerome, one mile from Heshbon (*Onomast.* s. v. 'Ελεάλε, Eleale). The extensive ruins of the place are still to be seen, bearing very nearly their ancient name, *El-'Al'*, though with a modern signification, "the high," a little more than a mile north of Heshbon (Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 278). It stands on the summit of a rounded hill commanding a very extended view of the plain, and the whole of the southern Belka (Burekhardt, *Syria*, p. 265; Seetzen, 1854, p. 407). The whole surrounding plain is now desolate. The statements of all travellers who have visited it show how fully the prophetic curses had been executed (Irby and Mangles, 1st ed. p. 471; Ritter, *Pal. und Syr.* ii, 1172; G. Robinson's *Palest. und Syr.* ii, 180 sq.).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

**Ele'āsa** ('Ελεασά, Alex. MS. 'Αλασά; Vulg. *La'isa*), a place at which Judas Maccabæus encamped before the fatal battle with Bæchides, in which he lost his life (1 Macc. ix, 5). It was apparently not far from Azotus (comp. ver. 15). Josephus (*Ant.* xii, 11, 1) has *Bethætho* (Βηθεθώ), by which he elsewhere renders Bezeth. But this may be but a corrupt reading of Berzetha or Bethzetha, which is found in some MSS. for Berea in 1 Macc. ix, 4. Elsewhere (*War*, i, 1, 6), however, Josephus states that Judas lost his life in a battle with the generals of Antiochus Eupator at *Adasa* (q. v.), which is probably the correct reading here, since Adasa was where Judas had encamped on a former memorable occasion (1 Macc. vii, 40). It is singular that Bezeth should be mentioned in this connection also (see verse 19).—Smith, s. v.

**Ele'āsah** [many *Eleā'sah*], the name (in the A. V.) of two men (1 Chron. ii, 39; viii, 37; ix, 4), identical (in the Heb.) with that of two others (*Jer.* xxix, 3; *Ezra* x, 22), more properly Anglicized ELASAI (q. v.).

**Eleatic School**, the designation given to an early and brilliant sect of Greek philosophers. The name was bestowed in consequence of the residence or birth of the chiefs of the school at Elea or Velia, a town on the western coast of Italy, founded in 544 by the Phocæans, who abandoned their Ionian home rather than submit to the arms of Cyrus. The general characteristic of this type of speculation is the maintenance of a broad and irreconcilable distinction between the apparent and the intellectual universe—between transitory phenomena and eternal truth. It is thus contrasted with the earlier Ionic School, which assumed material principles as the origin of the world, and with the Pythagorean School, which assigned a mathematical basis for the creation. But it exhibited several points of contact with these more ancient doctrines, and hence both Empedocles and Democritus are sometimes enumerated among the Eleatics. In its wider acceptance, the Eleatic philosophy includes the pantheistic idealism of Xenophanes and Parmenides, and the sceptical materialism of Leucippus and Epicurus, embracing both extremes of metaphysical thought. It may thus be distributed into two main divisions:

I. The Eleatic School proper, which asserted a divine unity to be the origin and essence of all things, regarded multiplicity as only the manifestation of the incessant activity of this divine unity, considered all change as merely phenomenal, and all temporal facts as only the transitory and deceitful shows of things, believing that the only true existence was the one indelicate divine Essence, which underlay, determined, animated, and enclosed the whole sensible and intelligible order of the universe.

II. The Atomistic or Epicurean School, which confined attention to the earthly and material side of the problem, not denying the immaterial and spiritual, but

renouncing it as unattainable. Its position may be appreciated by comparing it with the modern schemes of Moleschott, Herbert Spencer, and Comte. It took note only of the temporal and perishable side of the universe, and established a foundation for its reasonings by supposing the eternity and indestructibility of the elementary constituents of matter.

*Esse immortali primordia corpore debent,  
Dissolvi quo quæ ne supremo tempore possint,  
Materies ut suppediet rebus reparandis.*

Thus the two branches of the school, or the two schools, starting from the same point, but pursuing divergent courses, arrived at exactly opposite conclusions. The Eleatics disregarded the sensible, the Epicureans the divine element; the former contemplated the imperishable, the latter the perishable aspects of the universe. But neither denied what they renounced. In the present article, the Eleatic School proper will alone be considered; for a notice of the other branch, reference is made to the title EPICUREAN PHILOSOPHY.

*History of the Eleatic Philosophy.*—The shadowy and impalpable character of the Eleatic doctrine renders it peculiarly difficult of determination, because it admits of many modifications, and of a great variety of expositions and limitations. Another difficulty arises from the fact that the sources of our knowledge are confined to a few metrical fragments of Xenophanes and Parmenides, to the statements of their adversaries, Plato and Aristotle, to Diogenes Laërtius, who is by no means a reliable witness, and to a few other relics of antiquity. There is, consequently, more uncertainty in regard to the tenets of this school, and to the interpretation given to them by their advocates, than in regard to any other of the Greek sects except the Pythagorean. After all the diligence of Fülleborn, Brandis, Karsten, Cousin, and other inquirers, there is much doubt whether we are ascribing to the Eleatic leaders positions which they deliberately held, or are imposing our own conjectural interpretations upon their doctrines. The general complexion of the school is, however, readily recognized.

The Eleatic School is rather united by a common principle than by agreement in the application of the principle (v. Aristotle, *Metaphysica*, i, v). Each distinguished philosopher of the sect creates his own scheme, and differs in procedure and in doctrine from the rest: hence it is impracticable to give any general exposition which will be true for its whole development, and it therefore becomes necessary to consider the peculiar modifications which it assumed in the hands of its successive teachers. The principal exponents of the Eleatic philosophy were Xenophanes, Parmenides, Zeno, and Melipus: the first of these was its founder. The period during which they flourished may be considered to extend over the century preceding the Peloponnesian War. But the chronological data are confused and uncertain.

*Xenophanes.*—Xenophanes of Colophon, in Asia Minor, an exile from his native land, migrated to Sicily, and may have resided in Elea, whose foundation he celebrated in verse. The dates are uncertain; but Cousin, in an elaborate essay, fixes his birth in the 40th Olympiad (B.C. 620-616), and he lived nearly a century. His philosophy was presented in a metrical form in his poem *On Nature*, of which fragments remain, though they are too broken and obscure to give any clear revelation of his tenets. His leading doctrines, as far as they can now be ascertained, appear to have constituted an indistinct, confused, and undeveloped idealism, remarkable at the period of their introduction, but requiring expansion and rectification before they could be arranged in any harmonious system. They are rather germs of thought than precise principles. They needed the acute logical intellect of Parmenides to give them consistency, as the Socratic speculations received definite form from Plato.

Parmenides probably deviated as far from the simple reveries of Xenophanes as Plato did from the practical maxims of Socrates. Xenophanes apparently adopted from Pythagoras, either directly or indirectly, the conviction that there must be an ultimate term of being, which was not the sensible universe, but the divine intelligence. But Pythagoras distinguished between God and nature; while Xenophanes, by exaggerating, confused this distinction, and resolved everything into a single divine essence. He denied all beginning, and therefore denied that anything could become what it had not always been. The doctrine *ex nihilo nihil fit* had with him a broader and deeper significance than it received from Epicurus, and his Roman expositor, Lucretius. If nothing commences and nothing becomes, then all things are eternal, and all things are one. The unity of the Godhead is thus asserted against polytheism; the individuality of the Deity against the dualism of conflicting forces. This antagonism to the current creed and prevalent speculations is developed in his attacks on Homer, Hesiod, and the whole Hellenic mythology, and by his earnest repudiation of all anthropomorphism. The substantial reality of the sensible world is necessarily rejected: God and the universe are identified, and a close approximation is made to Spinozism, though not without essential differences. The only reality is the divine intelligence, *σὺμπαντὰ τε εἶναι νοῖν καὶ φύσιν* (Diogenes Laërt. ix, xix). Everything cognizable by the human senses represents merely the accidents and shows of things. The sensible world is in an unceasing flux, but the divine essence is unchanging, unchangeable, unmoving, incapable of being moved, impassive, eternal, infinite, though possessing spherical dimensions, uncompounded, one (*αἰῶνον-ἄπειρον-πάν-ὄν-ἐν-μέτρον-ἀκίνητον-ἀνώγειον-ἀνάληγον-ἄνοσον-οὔτε ἑτεροούμενον εἶδει, οὔτε μινόμενον ἄλλῳ*, Aristot. *De Xenoph.* i: "unum esse omnia, neque id esse mutabile, et id esse Deum, neque natum unquam, et sempiternum, conglobata figura," Cicero, *Acad. Pr.* ii, xxxvii.). All change is but apparent—the restless play of colors on the surface of the immutable Existence—the incessant agitation of the waves on the bosom of the boundless and unalterable deep. There is no denial of the actuality of sensible facts and changes; there is a denial of their reality; they are shadows of the eternal, the mists and vapors that disguise and conceal the infinite One.

Unquestionably there are contradictions involved in this scheme, but the acceptance of antinomies is one of the most striking characteristics of the doctrines of Xenophanes. Naturally and necessarily he is brought to declare all things incomprehensible. Certain knowledge is thus impossible; all truth evaporates into opinion; scepticism is introduced—the scepticism which disregards the sensible as a delusion—the scepticism which excludes the eternal and the divine as unintelligible, or the scepticism which regards truth as unattainable. Thus the fundamental positions of the Eleatics prognosticate the age of the Sophists, and the theories of the Epicureans the Pyrrhonists and the Neo-Platonists.

It is not easy to discover the exact mode in which Xenophanes interpreted the order of the sensible creation. The remarkable feature in his cosmogony is that he anticipated geology, and made it the basis of some of his deductions. He thus contributed to science the commencement of that marvellous investigation, as Pythagoras contributed the theory of the geometrical harmonies of the universe, and divined the Copernican system. It may appear a remarkable incongruity that, after identifying God and the universe, and asserting the infinity, immutability, and eternity of the divine existence, Xenophanes and Parmenides should both have held the periodicity of the destruction of the world—the former by water, the latter by fire. This conclusion may have been suggested



to the earlier philosopher by the fossil remains which he recognised as aqueous deposits; but it also results from the dogma that all things are in a perpetual flux except the one eternal existence. The phenomena change recurrently, the One remains unchanged.

The Eleatic philosophy, in its first enunciation, was a crude idealism, extravagant in expression, if moderate in design. It was an anxious attempt to unite the operation of the omnipotence, omnipresence, and unity of the divine Intelligence with the recognition of his continual support and government of the creation. It was a protest alike against the vain abstractions, the materialistic tendencies, and the polytheistic creed of the Hellenic world; but in the endeavor to avoid popular and philosophical errors, it fell into the opposite extreme, and became in tendency, though not in purpose, distinctly pantheistic. It is impossible to explain the connection between the Creator and the creation—the distinction and the union of the intelligible and the sensible universe. To these heights the mind of man cannot soar. There is a truth of things sensible and a truth of things spiritual. Neither can be safely disregarded or misapprehended. The world of matter, with all its changes—the world of mind, with all its intuitions and reasonings, are as essentially real as the divine Being on whom they depend. But what the degree and mode of the dependence—when the dependence is interrupted and the laws imposed upon creation come into action—what is the hidden spring of natural forces, who shall define? If Xenophanes ran into errors as hazardous as those which he resisted, he is entitled to indulgent censure when it is considered that he was the first, or among the first, to introduce into Greek speculation worthy, if inadequate, conceptions of the grandeur and glory, and ineffable sovereignty of the divine Intelligence.

*Parmenides.*—The most illustrious name produced by the Eleatic School is that of Parmenides, the disciple, probably, of the founder of the sect. He was, by all accounts, a native of Elea (about 536 B.C.), and may have furnished, by his birthplace, the chief cause for the designation habitually bestowed upon this type of philosophy. He is frequently represented as the founder of dialectics, though this distinction is given by Aristotle to his pupil Zeno. He is, however, entitled to the credit of having given a more logical development to the views of his supposed teacher. So far as any authoritative exposition of his doctrines is concerned, we are in nearly as unfortunate a position as in the case of his predecessor. Insufficient fragments of his philosophical poem are preserved, but the rest of our knowledge must be obtained from the polemics of his adversaries, and from the statements of late compilers. He is commended by Aristotle for his perspicacity, and certainly gave greater coherence to the system espoused by him. In doing so he may have improved its form at the expense of its elevation. The divinity of the universal Existence disappears; for his point of departure is not the all-embracing Intelligence, but the abstract conception of being. In the main he agrees with Xenophanes, though he presents his tenets in a different order and connection. He states precisely the antagonism between the judgments of the senses and the conclusions of the reason, but he leaves it undeveloped. This has been regarded as his most important addition to the Eleatic metaphysics, though the principle is latent and presupposed in the whole speculations of the earlier philosopher. The fundamental position of his scheme is the contradiction of entity and nonentity. What is cannot be non-existent; what is non-existent is not. But everything that is, exists. Hence the universality and unity of existence must be admitted; and as nothing can spring from nothing, or proceed from non-existence to existence, all existence is eternal and unchangeable. There is nothing but being; therefore there is a *plenum* without any *vacuum*, and all being is

thought. Being is limited, but limited only by itself, and embodied in a perfect sphere. It is independent of time, space, and motion, all of which are denied to have any absolute existence. It is a state of everlasting repose. All changes and motions are apparent only; they are mere semblances. On this system being is indestructible—a dogma which has returned upon us unexpectedly in the philosophy of Herbert Spencer, and those with whom he coincides. There is no loss or cessation of existence, only variation of species, or change of apparent condition. Everything is determined by an indwelling necessity—a law which is involved in the existence by which it is revealed.

There is a singular accordance in the procedure of Parmenides and that of Des Cartes. The highest speculations of man roll, like the world on which he dwells, in one self-repeating orbit around the centre of attraction, deviating by slight deflections from the precisely-described track, but never departing so far as to destroy the uniformity of the course. Contrasted but connected schemes of thought succeed each other in each revolution like the seasons, and all "lead up the golden year."

In the physical application of his principles Parmenides recurred, like Xenophanes, to the procedure of the Ionic and Pythagorean schools, admitting antagonistic elements and forces, whose collisions and conjunctions produced the phenomena of the universe.

In all these speculations, one main cause of bewilderment and exaggeration is the oscitaney and impalpability of abstract terms. We are at the mercy of the *abracadabra* with which the enchantments are attempted. The perplexity and hallucination resulting from loose and elastic phrases was of course most perilous and least suspected before logical science arose, and before metaphysicians distinguished between rigorous thought and current expression.

Such defects exposed the doctrines of Parmenides to the attacks of acute contemporaries, and led to the recognition of the necessity of precision in statement, and to the consequent examination of the strict import of terms and of the validity of arguments. Hence they furnished to his disciple the occasion of inaugurating logic.

*Zeno.*—The relation of Zeno to Parmenides is the most certain fact connected with the filiation of the Eleatic School. He was pupil, friend, companion, and apologist. He was the only prominent member of the sect who was unquestionably a native of Elea. He defended and explained the dogmas of his preceptor; but the mode of his exposition led to notable changes in the career of philosophy, and prepared the way for the Socratic irony, the Platonic dialectics, the *Organon* of Aristotle, and other developments scarcely less important. He became the inventor of regular dialectic procedure, but his claims in this respect are limited by the remarkable declaration of the Stagyrrite in regard to his own labors, that his predecessors had only furnished examples of the forms of reasoning, while he had created the art (*Sophist. Elench.* sub fin.).

Increase of logical precision may give greater consistency and intelligibility to a philosophical system, but it renders its errors and dangers more prominent. This was the case with Zeno's presentation of the views of Parmenides. In urging the unreliability of the senses, and of inferences from observation, he arrayed experience against reason, and denied the validity of the former. He acknowledged, at the same time, the impossibility of recognising in things sensible the unity which was alone real existence, and thus invited scepticism and provoked the age of the Sophists.

*Melissus.*—There is no reason for believing that Melissus of Samos was directly or consciously connected with the Eleatic family, but he is habitually included in their number in consequence of substantial identity of doctrine. He confined his attention almost exclusively to the negative aspects of the system, endeavoring

oring to demonstrate the unreality of the phenomenal world, and the inconsistency of ascribing time, motion, change, divisibility or limitation to the solitary Existence. In representing being as infinite, he recoiled from the position of Parmenides and Zeno, and in some degree also from Xenophanes. He differed from them also in asserting that we can have no knowledge of the gods; and, according to Aristotle, inclined to materialism in his conception of the universal One. The Eleatic idealism was thus verging towards the form of doctrine propounded by Epicurus. It had completed its course, and had swung round nearly to the opposite extreme from the point where it started.

Whatever extravagances may be justly charged upon this celebrated school, its services to speculation and to the cause of truth should be neither denied nor underrated. It was surely a splendid and meritorious office, in the dawn of systematic philosophy, to awaken the minds of men to the recognition of the vain and evanescent character of all temporal things; to protest against the delusions of Polytheism; to direct attention to a supreme and omnipresent Intelligence, perfect in all attributes; to unveil the everlasting truth which was latent, but active, beneath all material and transitory forms; and to bring the reason of man into direct communion with the sovereign Power of the universe, in which he and all things else "lived, and moved, and had their being." In discharging this high function, the Eleatics promoted physical speculation, laid the foundations of logic, and perhaps of rhetoric, and introduced the argumentative dialogue which was employed with such consummate genius by Plato.

There is a most profound significance in the observation made by Aristotle in regard to Parmenides, that, "looking up to the whole heavens, he declared the one only Being to be God." This seems to have been the distinctive purport of the Eleatic School, though it was soon obscured, and ultimately discarded; but it propagated itself by a secret growth, and allied itself with other forms of speculation.

*Literature.*—Plato, *Sophista*, *Parmenides*; Aristotle, *De Xenophane, Zenone et Gorgia*; *Metaphysica*, lib. i, cap. v; Diogenes Laërtius; Bayle, *Dict. Hist. et Crit.* s. v. *Xenophane*; Roschmann, *Diss. Hist. Philosoph.* de *Xenophane* (Altona, 1729); Fülleborn, *Liber de Xenophane, Zenone, Gorgia, Aristotelis vulgo tributus, partim illustratus commentario* (Hal. 1789); *Fragments of Xenophanes and Parmenides* (Zullichau, 1795); Van der Kemp, *Parmenides* (Edmæ, 1781); Gundling, *Observations on the Philosophy of Parmenides*; Brandis, *Comm. Eleaticarum pars i* (Altona, 1813); F. Cousin, *Nouveaux Essais Philosophiques* (Paris, 1828); Rosenberg, *De Eleaticis philo. primordiis* (Berl. 1829); Karsten, *Philosophorum Græc. veterum Reliquiæ* (Bruxelles, 1830); Mullach, *Aristotelis de Melisso lib. Disputationes* (Berol. 1846); Lewes, *Hist. of Philosophy* (Lond. 1867, i, 67 sq.); Ueberweg, *Gesch. d. Philosophie*, i, 47; and the various historians of Greek philosophy. (G. F. H.)

**Eleáz'zar** (Heb. *Elazar'*, אֵלְעָזָר, whom *God has helped*; Sept. and N. T. *Ἐλεάζαρ*; from the Græcized form *Ἐλεάζαρος* [found in Maccabees and Josephus], came by contraction the later name *Λάζαρος*, *Lazarus*), a common name among the Hebrews, being borne by at least six persons mentioned in Scripture, besides several in the Apocrypha and Josephus. See also **ELIEZER**.

1. The third son of Aaron, by Elishela, daughter of Aminadab, who was descended from Judah, through Pharez (Exod. vi, 23; xxviii, 1; for his descent, see Gen. xxxviii, 29; xlv, 12; Ruth i, 18, 20). He married a daughter of Putiel, who bore him Phinehas (Exod. vi, 25). After the death of Nadab and Abihu without children (Lev. x, 1; Num. iii, 4), Eleazar was appointed chief over the principal Levites, to have the oversight of those who had charge of the sanctuary

(Num. iii, 32). With his brother Ithamar he ministered as a priest during their father's lifetime, and immediately before the death of their father he was invested on Mount Hor with the sacred garments, as the successor of Aaron in the office of high-priest (Num. xx, 28). B. C. 1619. One of his first duties was, in conjunction with Moses, to superintend the census of the people (Num. xxvi, 3). He also assisted at the inauguration of Joshua, and at the division of spoil taken from the Midianites (Num. xxvii, 22; xxxi, 21). After the conquest of Canaan by Joshua, he took part in the distribution of the land (Josh. xiv, 1). The time of his death is not mentioned in Scripture; Josephus says it took place about the same time as Joshua's, 25 years after the death of Moses. He is said to have been buried in "the hill of Phinehas" his son (Josh. xxiv, 33), where Josephus says his tomb existed (*Ant.* v, 1, 29), or possibly a town called Gibeah-Phinehas (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 260, b). The high-priesthood is said to have remained in the family of Eleazar until the time of Eli, a descendant of Ithmar, into whose family, for some reason unknown, it passed until it was restored to the family of Eleazar in the person of Zadok (1 Sam. ii, 27; 1 Chron. vi, 8; xxiv, 3; 1 Kings ii, 27; Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 1, 3).—Smith, s. v. See **HIGH-PRIEST**.

2. An inhabitant of Kirjath-jearim, on the "hill" (קִרְיַתְעֵזֶר), who was set apart by his fellow-townsmen to attend upon the ark, while it remained under the roof of his father Abinadab, after it had been returned to the Hebrews by the Philistines (1 Sam. vii, 1, 2). B. C. 1124. His service in this capacity was doubtless somewhat irregular, but justifiable under the circumstances; for there is no evidence that he belonged to the priestly order, although it is probable that he was of a Levitical family (who were not allowed to touch the ark, but had only the general charge of it, Num. iii, 31; iv, 15). He seems to have continued to exercise this sole care of the sacred deposit for the twenty years that intervened till the judgeship of Samuel (1 Sam. vii, 1), although the ark remained in the same place much longer (1 Chron. xiii, 7).

3. A Levite, son of Mahli, and grandson of Merari. B. C. cir. 1618. He is mentioned as having had only daughters, who were married by their "brethren" (i. e. their cousins) (1 Chron. xxiii, 21, 22; xxiv, 28).

4. The son of Dodo the Ahoite (אֲחֹיטָיִם), i. e. possibly a descendant of Ahoah, of the tribe of Benjamin (1 Chron. viii, 4); one of the three most eminent of David's thirty-seven distinguished heroes (1 Chron. xi, 12), who "fought till his hand was weary" in maintaining with David and the other two a daring stand against the Philistines after "the men of Israel had gone away." He was also one of the same three when they broke through the Philistine host to gratify David's longing for a drink of water from the well of his native Bethlehem (2 Sam. xxiii, 9, 10, 13). B. C. cir. 1046. See **DAVID**.

5. Son of Phinehas, and associated with the priests and Levites in taking charge of the sacred vessels restored to Jerusalem after the Exile (Ezra viii, 33). B. C. 459. He is probably the same with one of those who encompassed the walls of Jerusalem on their completion (Neh. xii, 42). B. C. 416. It does not appear from these passages, however, that he was necessarily a priest or even a Levite.

6. One of the descendants (or citizens) of Parosh, an Israelite (i. e. layman) who renounced the Egyptian wife whom he had married on returning from Babylon (Ezra x, 25). B. C. 410. Possibly he is the same with No. 5.

7. The first-named of the "principal men and learned" sent for by Ezra to accompany him to Jerusalem (1 Esd. viii, 43); evidently the **ELIEZER** (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra viii, 16).

8. According to Josephus, the Jewish high-priest,

brother and successor of Simon the Just, and son of Onias I, whose correspondence with Ptolemy Philadelphus resulted in the Septuagint (q. v.) translation being made (*Ant.* xii, 2, 5 sq.; 4, 4). See HICUPRIEST.

9. Surnamed AVARAN (1 Macc. ii, 5, Ἀβαράν, or Ἀβάρ, and so Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 6, 1; 9, 4. In 1 Macc. vi, 43, the common reading ὁ Σαβαράν arises either from the insertion of C by mistake after O, or from a false division of Ἐλεύζαρος Ἀβαράν), the fourth son of Mattathias, who fell by a noble act of self-devotion in an engagement with Antiochus Eupator, being crushed to death by the fall of an elephant which he stabbed under the belly in the belief that it bore the king, B.C. 164 (1 Macc. vi, 43 sq.; Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 19, 4; *War.* i, 1, 5; Ambrose, *De offic. min.* 46). In a former battle with Nicanor, Eleazar was appointed by Judas to read "the holy book" before the attack, and the watchword in the fight—"the help of God"—was his own name (2 Macc. viii, 23).

The surname "Avaran" is probably connected with Arab. *hawar*, "to pierce an animal behind" (Michaelis, s. v.). This derivation seems far better than that of Rödiger (Ersch u. Gruber, s. v.) from Arab. *khawaran*, "an elephant-hide." In either case the title is derived from his exploit.

10. A distinguished scribe (Ἐλεάζαρος . . . τῶν πρωτεόντων γραμματίων, 2 Macc. vi, 18) of great age, who suffered martyrdom during the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes (2 Macc. vi, 18-31). B.C. cir. 167. His death was marked by singular constancy and heroism, and seems to have produced considerable effect. Later traditions embellished the narrative by representing Eleazar as a priest (*De Macc.* 5), or even high-priest (Grimm, *ad Macc.* l. c.). He was also distinguished by the nobler title of "the proto-martyr of the old covenant," "the foundation of martyrdom" (Chrysost. *Hom. 3 in Macc.* init. Comp. Ambrose, *De Jacob.* ii, 10). For the general credibility of the history comp. Grimm, *Excurs. über 2 Macc.* vi, 18-viii, in *Exeg. Handb.*; also Ewald, *Gesch.* iv, 341, 532. See MACCABEES.

The name Eleazar in 3 Macc. vi appears to have been borrowed from this Antiochian martyr, as belonging to one weighed down by age and suffering, and yet "helped by God."—Smith, s. v.

11. The father of John, ambassador from Judas Maccabæus to Rome (1 Macc. viii, 18). B.C. 161.

12. Son of Eliud and father of Matthan, which last was the grandfather of Joseph, Christ's reputed father (Matt. i, 15). B.C. cir. 150.

13. A priest mentioned by Josephus as having charge of the Temple treasures, who sought to divert Crassus from pillaging the sanctuary by the largess of a beam of gold (*Ant.* xiv, 7, 1).

14. A son of Boëthus, whom Archelaus put into the high-priesthood in place of his brother Joazar, but soon displaced by Jesus the son of Sie (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 13, 1).

15. Son of Ananus (or Ananias), made high-priest in the room of Ishmael (son of Phabi) by Gratus, who deposed him after one year in favor of Simon son of Camithus (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 2, 2). While a youth, his boldness led him, as prefect of the Temple, to advise the Jews to refuse all foreign presents (Josephus, *War.* ii, 17, 2). He had been seized by the Sicarii as a hostage for ten prisoners of their own number (*Ant.* xx, 9, 3). He was one of the generals chosen by the Jews for Idumæa during the revolt under Cestius (*War.* ii, 20, 4).

16. Son of Dineus, a robber who for many years infested the mountains of Samaria, whose troop was at length broken up by Cumanus (Josephus, *Ant.* xx, 6, 1). He was himself captured by stratagem and sent to Rome by Felix (*ib.* 8, 5). He seems to be the same with the notorious rebel commander of Massada, at whose instigation the desperate garrison committed

suicide (*War.* vii, 8-9; comp. *Ant.* xx, 1, 1; *War.* ii, 13, 2).

17. A companion of Simon of Gerasa; sent by the latter to endeavor to persuade the garrison of Herodium to capitulate, but indignantly put to death by them (Josephus, *War.* iv, 9, 5).

18. A young Jew of great valor in the siege of Machærus by Bassus; captured by Rufus, but released by the Romans on condition of the surrender of the fortress (Josephus, *War.* vii, 6, 4).

19. A Jewish conjuror whom Josephus speaks of having seen exorcise demons in the presence of Vespasian and his officers by means of a magical ring (*Ant.* viii, 2, 5).

20. A son of Sameas, and born in Saab in Galilee, who performed a heroic act of valor and self-devotion during the final siege of Jerusalem (Josephus, *War.* iii, 7, 21).

21. Son of Simon, and ringleader of the Zealots in the final convulsions of the Jewish nation (Josephus, *War.* iv, 4, 1). He first appears as possessor of a large amount of plunder from the Romans under Cestius, which gave him control of public affairs (*ib.* ii, 20, 3). During the siege by Titus he held the Temple against the other factions (*ib.* v, 1, 2), being supplied by the sacred stores of provisions (*ib.* 3); but at length he formed a coalition with one of these opponents, John of Gischala, who occupied the remainder of the eastern part of the city (*ib.* v, 6, 1), having lost his vantage by a stratagem of the latter (*ib.* 3, 1). See the full account under JERUSALEM.

**Eleazar** (in Armenian *Eghlazar*), an Armenian patriarch, was born at Anthab, in Syria. In 1650, David, the patriarch of Constantinople, was ejected from his seat, and Eleazar elected in his place. He held this position only for two years, for in 1652 Philip, the patriarch of Etchmiadzin, and supreme head of the Church, arrived at Constantinople, expelled Eleazar, and consecrated John of Meghin, who, in turn, was soon ejected by the intrigues of Eleazar. The see then remained vacant for some time. Eleazar went to Jerusalem, in compliance with an invitation of the patriarch of that city, Azduadzadur, who wished his assistance in a quarrel with the Greeks, and promised to make him his successor. While residing in the convent of St. James, Eleazar discovered a treasure of 100,000 pieces of gold and 100,000 pieces of silver. After many troubles with Turkish officials and several imprisonments, he succeeded in obtaining possession of the convent. He built a church, called after the residence of the chief patriarch of the Armenians, Etchmiadzin, and caused himself to be elected independent patriarch of Jerusalem. He was expelled in 1664, and again, after having regained possession of the dignity, in 1668, when he was succeeded by a personal enemy, Martyr. The people, dissatisfied with this change, replaced Azduadzadur, after whose death Eleazar took forcible possession of the patriarchal see. He maintained himself in this position until 1680, when, after the death of James IV, the patriarch of Etchmiadzin, he assumed the title of patriarch of all the Armenians. A subsequent election confirmed him in this position, and in 1682 he took up his residence in Etchmiadzin. His chief aim as head of the Armenian Church was to put an end to internal dissensions. He died at Etchmiadzin in 1691.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xv, 791. (A. J. S.)

**Eleazu'rus** (a strange rendering for Ἐλιάσζος, Alex. MS. Ἐλιάσζος, Vulg. *Ellisib*), one of the Levitical musicians who married a Gentile wife after the return from Babylon (1 Esdr. ix, 24); evidently the ELLASHIB (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra x, 24).

**Elect**, a term sometimes applied in the ancient Church (1) to the whole body of baptized Christians, who were called ἅγιοι, ἐκλεκτοί, *saints, elect*; (2) to the highest class of catechumens *elected* to baptism;

(3) at other times to the newly baptized, as especially admitted to the full privileges of their profession, and sometimes called the elect.

Ascetics, who at one time were considered the most eminent of Christian professors, were called the *elect* of the *elect*.—Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. x, ch. ii, § 5. See CATECHUMENS.

**Electa** or **ELECTA** (Ἐλεκτή, Auth. Vers. "elect" lady). According to Grotius, Wetstein, and some other critics, this word is used as a proper name in the address of John's second epistle, Ὁ Ἡμεσιβύτερος Ἐλεκτῆς κυρία—"The Presbyter to the Lady Electa." This meaning is advocated by bishop Middleton, in his treatise on the *Doctrine of the Greek Article* (2d edit. Cambridge, 1828, p. 626-629). He adduces in support of it several epistolary inscriptions from Basil, in which the name precedes, and the rank or condition in life is subjoined, such as Ἐκσταθίου ἱατροῦ—Λευγίου σοφιστῆς—Βοσπορίου ἐπισκόπου—Μαγνημιανῶν κόμητι; none of these, however, are purely honorary titles. To meet the objection that the sister of the person addressed is also called Electa in verse 13, he suggests that the words τῆς Ἐλεκτῆς are a gloss, explanatory of σοῦ. But this is mere conjecture, unsupported by a single manuscript; and such a gloss, if occasioned (as bishop Middleton supposes) by the return to the singular number, would more naturally have been inserted after σε, in which position, however unnecessary, it would at least produce no ambiguity. Some writers, both ancient and modern, have adopted a mystical interpretation, though contrary to the *usus loquendi*, and to all apostolic usage, and suppose with Jerome that the term Ἐλεκτή referred to the Church in general, or with Cassiodorus, to some particular congregation. The last-named writer (born A. D. 470, died 562), in his *Complexiones in Epistolas*, etc. (London, 1722, p. 136), says, "Johannes—electe dominæ scribit ecclesiæ, filiisque ejus, quas sacro fonte generat." Clemens Alexandrinus, in a fragment of his *Adumbrationes*, attempts to combine the literal and the mystical meanings—"Scripta vero est ad quandam Babyloniam Electam nomine, significat autem electionem ecclesiæ sanctæ" (*Opera*, ed. Klotz, iv, p. 66). The Auth. Version translates the words in question "the elect lady," an interpretation approved by Castalio, Beza, Mill, Wolf, Le Clerc, and Macknight. Most modern critics, however—Schleuser and Breitschneider, in their lexicons; Bourger (1763), Vater (1824), Göschen, and Tischendorf (1841), in their editions of the N. Testament; Neander (*Planting of the Church*, ii, 71), De Wette (*Lehrbuch*, p. 339), and Lücke (*Commentary on the Epistles of St. John*, p. 314-320, Eng. transl.)—agree with the Syriac and Arabic versions in making Κυρία a proper name, and render the words "to the elect Cyria." (See Gruteri *Inscript.* p. 1127.) Lardner has given a copious account of critical opinions in his *History of the Apostles and Evangelists*, c. xx (*Works*, vi, 284-288).—Kitto, s. v. See also Heumann, *De Cyria* (Gotting, 1726); Rittmeier, *De Ἐλεκτῆ Κυρίᾳ* (Helmst. 1706); Knauer, *Ueber Ἐλεκτῆ Κυρία* (in the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* vi, 452 seq.); *Amer. Presb. Rev.*, Jan. 1867. See JOHN (THIRD EPISTLE OF).

**Election of Clergy.** How far the people had a right in the election of ministers in the early Church is a question that has been much disputed.

1. The account in Acts i, 15 of the choice of an apostle in place of Judas is cited as proof that even the apostles would not elect without the voice of the Church at Jerusalem. So in the choice of the deacons (Acts vi), the people "chose Stephen and set him before the apostles." On the other hand, the apostles themselves appointed elders, and St. Paul empowered Titus and Timothy to do the same (Acts xiv, 23; 2 Tim. ii, 1; Tit. i, 5); though some interpret the word *χειροτονῆν*, in these passages, as implying ordination only, and not excluding a previous election by the

people. Compare also Acts xv, 1; 1 Cor. v, 2; 2 Cor. viii, 19.

2. Clemens Romanus († 100) (*Epist. ad Corinth.* i, § 44) asserts that the apostles appointed bishops and deacons with the concurrence of the whole Church. It is clear, from Clement's statement, that in his time the Church had a share in the appointment of its ministers. Cyprian († 258) testifies to the share of the people in the election of bishops and elders, calling it matter of divine authority that "sacerdos plebe presente sub omnium oculis deligatur, et dignus atque idoneus publico judicio ac testimonio comprobetur" (*Epist.* 68). Bingham cites Lampridius (*Vit. Alex. Severi*, c. 45) as stating that the emperor (A. D. 222-235) gave the people a negative vote in the appointment of procurator, on the express ground that "what the Christians did in the election of their priests and ministers, should certainly be allowed the people in the appointment of governors of provinces."

3. Even after the establishment of the hierarchy, it seems to have been usual for the clergy or presbytery, or the sitting bishop or presbyter, to nominate a person to fill the vacant office, and then for the suffrages of the people—not merely testimonial, but really elective suffrages—to be taken. Bingham sums up the facts (*Orig. Eccles.* bk. iv, chap. ii) in substance as follows: 1. No bishop could be obtruded upon an orthodox people against their consent (in case a majority were heretics or schismatics, the case was otherwise provided for): when they agreed upon a deserving bishop, they were usually gratified in their choice. The emperor Valentinian III held it to be a crime in Hilary of Arles that "he ordained bishops against the consent and will of the people." 2. In many cases the voices of the people prevailed against the nominations of the bishops. 3. The modes of voting illustrate the power of the people in the elections; if they were unanimous for or against a man, they cried out "worthily" or "unworthily" (*ἄξιος, ἀνάξιος; dignus, indignus*). If they were divided, they expressed their dissent in accusations, or even in tumults. There are instances in which persons were brought by force to the bishop to be ordained, or were elected to the office by acclamation. It was decided by the fourth Council of Carthage, that as the bishop might not elect clerks without the advice of his clergy, so likewise he should secure the consent, co-operation, and testimony of the people. The popular elections, however, became scenes of great disorder and abuse. A remarkable passage from Chrysostom (*De Sacerd.*) has been frequently quoted, and applies more or less to such elections, not only in Constantinople, but also in Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and other large cities. He says: "Go and witness the proceedings at our public festivals, in which, more especially, according to established rule, the election of ecclesiastical officers take place. You will find there complaints raised against the minister as numerous and as various in their character as the multitude of those who are the subject of Church government. For all those in whom the right of election is vested split into factions. It is evident that there is no good understanding, either among themselves, or with the appointed president, or with the presbytery. One supports one man, and one another; and the reason of this is, that they all neglect to look at that point which they ought to consider, namely, the intellectual and moral qualifications of the person to be elected. There are other points by which their choice is determined. One, for instance, says, 'It is necessary to elect a person who is of a good family.' Another would choose a wealthy person, because he would not require to be supported out of the revenues of the Church. A third votes for a person who has come over from some opposite party. A fourth uses his influence in favor of a relative or friend; while another lends his influence to one who has won upon him by fair speeches and plausible pretensions." In order to

set aside these abuses, some bishops claimed an exclusive right of appointing to spiritual offices. In this way they gave offence to the people. In the Latin and African churches an attempt was made to secure greater simplicity in elections by introducing *inter-ventors* or "visitors." This did not, however, long continue. Another plan was to vest the election in members of the lay aristocracy. But the determining who these should be was left to caprice or accident; and the result was, that the right of election was taken out of the hands of the people, and vested partly in the hands of the ruling powers, and partly with the clergy, who exercised their right, either by the bishops, their suffragans and vicars, or by collegiate meetings, and this very often without paying any regard to the Church or diocese immediately concerned. Sometimes the extraordinary mode of a bishop's designating his successor was adopted; or some one unconnected with the diocese, to whom a doubtful case had been referred for decision, was allowed to nominate. But in these cases the consent of the people was presupposed. Patronage has prevailed since the fifth century; but the complete development of this system was a work of the 8th and 9th centuries.—Bingham, *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*, bk. iv, chap. ii; Farrar, *Ecclesiastical Dict.* s. v.; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, bk. iii, chap. xv; Coleman, *Christian Antiquities*, chap. v. See PATRONAGE.

**Election of Grace.** On the history of the doctrine of Election, see ARMINIANISM; PREDESTINATION. We present here, I. A statement of the doctrine from the Augustinian or Calvinistic point of view, by the Rev. C. Hodge, D.D., of Princeton; II. A statement of the doctrine from the Methodist point of view; III. Some other conceptions of the doctrine.

I. *Election from the Calvinistic Point of View.*—The Scriptures speak, 1st, of the election of individuals to office, or to positions of honor and privilege. Thus Abraham was chosen to be the father of the faithful, and the depository of the promise of redemption. Thus Jacob was chosen, in preference to Esau, to be the progenitor of the chosen people. In like manner, Saul was chosen by God to be king over Israel, and subsequently David, and after him Solomon, were selected for the same high dignity. Thus also the prophets, and, under the new dispensation, the apostles, were chosen by God for the work assigned them. 2d. The Bible speaks of the election of nations to special privileges. The Hebrews were chosen from all the nations of the earth to be God's peculiar people. To them were committed the oracles of God. They were his inheritance. They received from him their laws and their religion, and were under his special guidance and protection. In Deut. vii, 6, it is said, "Thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God: the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth;" xxxii, 9, "The Lord's portion is his people; Jacob is the lot of his inheritance;" Rom. ix, 4, "Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving to the law, and the service of God, and the promises." 3d. Besides this election of individuals and of nations to external advantages, the Scriptures speak of an election to salvation: 2 Thess. ii, 13, "We are bound to give thanks always to God for you, brethren, beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth."

Of this election to eternal life all Augustinians teach, first, that its objects are not nations, nor communities, nor classes of persons, but individuals. 1. Because neither the nations nor communities, as such, are saved. God did not choose all the nation of the Jews to salvation. Neither does he choose the nations of Christendom to eternal life; nor any organized Church,

whether Papal or Protestant. The heirs of salvation are individual men.

2. Because those chosen to salvation are chosen to "sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth. They are chosen "to be holy and without blame before him in love" (Eph. i, 4). They are elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. i, 2). But nations and communities are not sanctified, or obedient, or unblameable before God in love.

3. We accordingly find that the elect are always addressed as individuals. Paul, when writing to a number of persons residing in Thessalonica, says, "God hath chosen you to salvation." Writing to the Ephesians, he says, "God hath chosen us," "having predestinated us." Our Lord (John xiii, 18) says, "I speak not of you all; I know whom I have chosen;" and again (John vi, 37), "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out." John xvii, 2, "Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." Ver. 9, "I pray not for the world, but for those which thou hast given me." The Scriptures, therefore, clearly teach that the elect are certain individuals chosen out of the world to be the heirs of salvation.

*Secondly.* Augustinians hold that the ground of this election is the good pleasure of God. That is, that the reason why one person and not another is chosen to eternal life is to be found, not in what he is or does, distinguishing him favorably from his fellow-men, but simply because so it seems good in the sight of God. All being equally guilty and unworthy, God, for the manifestation of his glory, and for the attainment of the highest ends, chooses some, and not others, to be vessels of mercy prepared beforehand unto glory.

That such is the doctrine of the Scriptures on this subject is argued, 1. Because the Bible expressly says that election is of grace and not of works. It is not of works means that it is not what a man does that determines whether he is to be one of the elect or not. The apostle, in Rom. ix, 11, teaches that the choice of Jacob instead of Esau was made and announced before their birth, "that the purpose of God, according to election, might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth." It matters not whether the election here spoken of be to eternal life or to temporal advantages. The apostle refers to this incident in proof of God's sovereignty, and therefore he infers from it, "It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy" (ver. 16). In like manner, in ch. xi of the same epistle, he refers to the declaration made in the Old Test. to Elias: "I have reserved unto myself seven thousand men who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal;" and adds, "Even so, then, at this present time there is a remnant according to the election of grace. And if by grace, then it is no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace" (ver. 4-6). The mass of the Jews were cast off. A remnant was saved. That remnant consisted of those whom God chose. His choice was a sovereign one. It was of grace, and not of works. It was determined by the good pleasure of God, and not by what the objects of that choice had done. Paul himself belonged to that remnant. He was an illustrious example of the sovereignty of God in election. He had done nothing to secure the favor of God. He was chosen to eternal life not because he repented and believed. He was converted not because he had faithfully used the means of securing a knowledge of Christ. On the contrary, he was converted in the midst of his wicked career of persecution. He was brought to faith and repentance because, as our Lord says, "He was a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel" (Acts ix,

15). Paul's experience, as well as the teaching of the Holy Spirit, impressed upon his mind a deep conviction of the sovereignty of God in the salvation of men. He knew he had been chosen not for, but notwithstanding, his previous character and conduct. And he knew that, had he not been thus chosen, he would have perished forever. It is not surprising, therefore, that he valued this doctrine, or that he so often refers to himself as a monument of the grace of God in the election and salvation of sinners. In his epistle to the Galatians, after referring to the fact that he had "beyond measure persecuted the Church of God," he adds, "It pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me" (Gal. i, 15). See also Acts xxii, 14; 1 Cor. xv, 9; 1 Tim. i, 15, 16: "Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief. Howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first Jesus Christ might show forth all suffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe in him to life everlasting." Nothing could have pained the apostle more than that any one should attribute his conversion in any form or in any measure to himself. His constant and grateful acknowledgment was, "By the grace of God I am what I am." The negative statement that election is "not of works," is often, as in the passages above cited, connected with the positive assertion that it is of grace, or due to the sovereign pleasure of God.

2. It is not, however, merely in isolated passages that this doctrine is taught; it is elaborately proved and vindicated. Thus, in 1 Cor. i, 17-31, the opponents of Paul in Corinth had urged against him that he was neither a philosopher nor a rhetorician; he came neither with "the wisdom of men" nor with "enticing words." Paul's answer to this objection is twofold. First, he shows that philosophy, or the wisdom of men, had never led to the saving knowledge of God (i, 18-21); secondly, that when the true method of salvation was revealed, it was rejected by the wise. "Look at your calling, brethren," he says; see whom it is that God hath chosen. It is not the wise, the noble, or the great; but God hath chosen the foolish, the weak, and the base. This was done with the design that no flesh should glory in his presence; no man was to be allowed to refer his conversion to himself. It is of God ye are in Christ Jesus, that he that glorieth may glory in the Lord (i, 26-31).

Thus, also, in Eph. i, 3-6, the apostle reminds his readers that God had blessed them with every spiritual blessing (v. 3). This he had done because he had chosen them in Christ before the foundation of the world, to be holy and without blame before him in love (v. 4). He had thus chosen them to holiness, because he had, according to the good pleasure of his will, predestined them to the high dignity of sonship (v. 5). He had thus predestined them to be his sons, in order to glorify his grace or unmerited love (v. 6). In these few verses the whole Augustinian doctrine on this subject is stated with the utmost clearness and precision.

In the 8th chapter of the epistle to the Romans, the design of the apostle is to show the security of believers. Those who are in Christ shall never be condemned; because they are justified; because they have the principle of spiritual life through the indwelling of the Holy Ghost; because they are the children of God; because the Spirit makes intercession for them; because those whom God foreknows, he predestinates; whom he predestinates, he calls; whom he calls, he justifies; whom he justifies, he glorifies. This is a chain which cannot be broken. Those in whom he fixes his choice, he predestines, as said in the Ephesians, to be his sons and daughters; and those whom he thus predestinates, he effectually calls or regenerates; and those whom he regenerates, he will certainly save. All this the apostle confirms by a reference to

the infinite and immutable love of God. "If God se loved us," he argues, "that he spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us, how shall he not with him freely give us all things? Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justified. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea, rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us."

It was a natural objection to the apostle's doctrine that God had rejected the Jews and called the Gentiles; that it involved a violation of his promise to the patriarch Abraham. To this objection he gives, in the ninth chapter of his epistle to the Romans, a twofold answer. The one is, that the promise of salvation pertained not to the natural, but to the spiritual children of Abraham; not to the *Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα*, but to the *Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ πνεῦμα*. The other is, that God acts as a sovereign in the dispensation both of temporal and of spiritual blessings. This he illustrates in the choice of Isaac instead of Ishmael, and of Jacob instead of Esau. Besides, he expressly claims this prerogative, saying to Moses, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion."

To the objection that it is unjust thus to dispense or withhold mercy at his own good pleasure, Paul's answer is, that any attribute which the Scriptures ascribe to God, and any prerogative which he actually exercises, we must admit rightfully to belong to him. If God, in his Word, claims this prerogative of having mercy on whom he will have mercy, and if he actually exercises it in his providence, and in the dispensation of his grace, it is vain for us to deny or to protest. The judge of all the earth must do right.

Besides, as the inspired writer continues his argument, if the potter has the right of the same mass of clay to make one vessel to honor and another to dishonor, has not the infinite God the same right over his fallen creatures? Can any one complain if, to manifest his mercy, he saves some of the guilty children of men, and to manifest his justice he allows others to bear the just recompense of their sins? This is only doing what every good and wise human sovereign is expected and required to do.

It cannot fail to be noticed that the character of the apostle's doctrine is determined by the objections to it. Had he taught that God chooses as vessels of mercy those who he foresees will believe, and leaves to perish those who he foresees will reject the Gospel, there had been no pretext for the charge of injustice. It was because he taught that God gave repentance and faith to some and not to others that his opponents charged him with teaching what was inconsistent with impartial justice on the part of God.

3. That God is sovereign in the election of the heirs of salvation is plain, because men are chosen to holiness: faith and repentance are gifts of God, and fruits of his Spirit. If it is election to salvation which secures repentance and faith, repentance and faith cannot be the ground of election. The passages of Scripture already quoted distinctly assert that election precedes and secures the exercise of faith. In Eph. i, 4, it is said, We were chosen, before the foundation of the world, to be holy. In chap. ii, 8, of the same epistle, it is said, "Faith is the gift of God;" and in v. 10, that we were foreordained unto good works. In Colossians, faith is said to be "of the operation of God" (ii, 12). In Eph. i, 19, it is referred to "the mighty power of God," which wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead. In 1 Pet. i, 2, it is said, we are elected "unto obedience and the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." Vocation, that is, regeneration, the fruits of which are faith and holy living, follows election, as taught in Rom. viii, 30, "whom he did predestinate, them he also called." In a preceding verse of that chapter, it is said, we are predestinated

"to be conformed to the image of his Son." But conformity to the image of Christ includes all that is good in us. Christ was exalted "to give repentance and forgiveness of sin" (Acts v, 31). "If God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth" (2 Tim. ii, 25). "Hearken, my beloved brethren, hath not God chosen the poor of this world to be rich in faith" (James ii, 5). "It is of him ye are in Christ Jesus" (1 Cor. i, 30). It is, however, unnecessary to multiply quotations. The Bible is full of the doctrine that regeneration is the gift of God; that all holy exercises are due to the working of his Spirit. All Christians recognise this truth in their prayers. They pray earnestly for the conversion of those dear to them. This takes for granted that God can and does change the heart; that all that pertains to salvation, the means as well as the end, are his gifts. If he gives us repentance—if the fact be due to him that we, and not others, turn from our sins to the living God, then surely he does not choose us and not others because of such repentance.

4. Salvation is by grace. Grace is not mere benevolence, nor is it love in the form in which God loves the holy angels. It is love to the unholy, the guilty, to enemies. It is mysterious love. It is compared to the instinctive love of a mother for her child, which is independent of its attractions. This is the most wonderful, and, perhaps, the most glorious of all the known attributes of God. We are distinctly told that the special object of the redemption of man was the revelation of this divine perfection; it was for the manifestation "of the glory of the riches of his grace" (Eph. i, 6). He hath quickened us, raised us up, made us sit in heavenly places, "that in the ages to come he might show the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness to us through Christ Jesus" (Eph. ii, 5-7). Such being the design of redemption, it must, in all its stages, be a work of grace. It was a matter of grace that redemption was provided for man and not for angels; it was a matter of grace that God gave his Son for our salvation. To make the mission of Christ a matter of justice, something to which our fallen race had a righteous claim, would alter the whole character of the Bible. The incarnation, sufferings, and death of the Son of God are everywhere set forth as manifestations of the unmerited and infinite love of God. But if a matter of grace that salvation was provided for the children of men, it was a matter of grace that the knowledge of the plan of salvation was communicated to some and not to others—to the Jews and not to the Gentiles. It is of grace that any sinner is justified, that he is sanctified and saved. From first to last salvation is of grace. To introduce the element of works or merit into any part of the plan vitiates its character. It is expressly taught that regeneration or conversion, the fact that one man is converted and not another, is a matter of grace. This is what the apostle specially insists upon in the first chapter to the Corinthians, already referred to. He calls upon his readers to look at their calling, to see who among them were called. It was not the wise or the great, but the foolish and the insignificant, whom God chose, for the very purpose that no flesh should glory in his presence. It was necessary that the subjects of salvation should feel and acknowledge that they were saved by grace; that it was not for any merit of their own, not for anything favorably distinguishing them from others, but simply that God, and the riches and sovereignty of his grace, should be magnified in them. Such is the form of apostolic Christianity, and such is the form in which it reveals itself in the heart of the believer. His theory may be one thing, but his inward and, it may be added, his delightful consciousness is that he owes his salvation to the grace of God alone.

5. The doctrines of the Bible are so related that one of necessity implies others. If the Scriptures teach that men, since the Fall, are born in a state of sin and

condemnation, and are spiritually dead until renewed by the Holy Ghost; if this death in sin involves entire helplessness, or inability to any spiritually good; if regeneration, or effectual calling, is effected, not by the moral influence of the truth, or by those divine influences common to all who hear the Gospel, but "by the mighty power of God," then of necessity the calling and consequently the election of those who are saved is a matter of sovereignty. If Christ, when on earth, raised some from the dead and not others, it was not anything in the state of one dead body as distinguished from others which determined which should rise and which should remain in their graves. As this connection between doctrines exists, all the evidence which the Bible contains of one of the truths just mentioned is so much evidence in favor of the others.

6. The system of doctrine with which these views are connected is frequently designated as Pauline. But this is a misnomer. Although clearly taught by the apostle Paul, these views are far from being peculiar to his writings. They not only pervade the Scriptures, but were inculcated with greater solemnity, clearness, and frequency by our blessed Lord himself than by any other of the messengers of God. He constantly addressed men as in a hopeless and helpless state of sin and misery, from which nothing but the almighty power of God could deliver them. Of the mass of mankind thus lying under the just displeasure of God, he speaks of those whom the Father had given him, who should certainly come to him, and whom he would without fail bring into his heavenly kingdom. He constantly refers to the good pleasure of God as the only assignable reason why one is saved and not another. "Many widows were in Israel in the days of Elias . . . but unto none of them was Elias sent save unto Sarepta, a city of Sidon, unto a woman, and she was a widow. And many lepers were in Israel in the time of Eliseus the prophet, and none of them was cleansed saving Naaman the Syrian" (Luke iv, 25-27). "At that time Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight" (Matt. xi, 25, 26). "To you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God, but to others in parables; that seeing they might not see, and hearing they might not understand" (Luke viii, 10). "All that the Father hath given me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out. . . . And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but raise it up again at the last day" (John vi, 37, 39). "No man can come to me except the Father draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day" (v. 44). "No man can come to me except it were given unto him of my Father" (v. 65). "Ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world" (John xv, 19). "Ye believe not because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you. My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand. I and my Father are one" (John x, 26-28). "Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he might give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him" (John xvii, 2). "Thine they were, and thou gavest them me" (v. 6). "I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me; for they are thine" (v. 9). "Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me" (v. 11). "Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am." Our Lord thus teaches that those who are saved are certain persons chosen out of the world and given

to him by the Father; that those thus given to him certainly come to him; that this certainty is secured by the drawing of the Father; and that those thus given to him are certainly saved.

7. There is an intimate relation between truth and Christian experience. The one accords with the other. What the Bible teaches of the sinfulness of man, the believer feels to be true concerning himself. What it teaches of the helplessness and dependence of the sinner, his own experience teaches him to be true; what is said of the nature and effects of faith answers to what he finds in his own heart. If, therefore, the Bible teaches that it is of God, and not of himself, that the believer is in Christ Jesus; that he, and not others, repent and believe; that he has been made to hear the divine voice, while others remain deaf—this will find a response in the bosom of the experienced Christian. We consequently find all these truths impressed upon the common consciousness of the Church, as it finds expression in its liturgies, its prayers, praises, and confessions. "Not unto us, not unto us, O Lord, but unto thy name be the glory," is the spontaneous language of the believer's heart. It is not in experimental religion, in the theology of the heart, that the children of God differ, but in the form in which the understanding undertakes to reduce these facts of Scripture experience to logical consistency.

8. As there is this correspondence between the truths of the Bible and religious experience, there is a like analogy between the providence of God and the dispensations of his grace. He is not more sovereign in the one than in the other. It is of him that we were born in a Christian land and not heathendom; among Protestants instead of in Spain or Italy; of Christian parents and in the bosom of the Church instead of being the children of the irreligious and immoral. It is the "Lord that maketh poor and maketh rich; he bringeth low and lifteth up" (1 Sam. ii, 7). "God putteth down one and setteth up another" (Psa. lxxv, 7). "It is he giveth power to get wealth" (Deut. viii, 18). "He giveth wisdom to the wise, and knowledge to them who know understanding" (Dan. ii, 12). "The Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he wills" (iv, 17). The Bible is full of this doctrine. God governs all his creatures and all their actions. "He governs all things after the counsel of his own will" (Eph. i, 11). This is a truth of even natural religion; at least it is recognised by all Christians. They pray for favorable seasons, for protection from disease and accident, and from the malice of their enemies. When the pestilence sweeps over the land, and one is taken and another left, we all say, "It is the Lord, let him do what seemeth right in his sight." All that Augustinians teach concerning election is, that God acts in the dispensation of grace as he does in his providential government of the world. If sovereignty be consistent with justice and goodness in the one case, it must be in the other.

The difficulty which is usually felt on this subject arises from looking at only one aspect of the case. It is true that God gives health, wisdom, riches, power, the knowledge of the truth, saving grace, and life everlasting, according to his good pleasure. He exercises the prerogative of having mercy upon whom he will have mercy. It is true that what in fact occurs God intended to permit. Although he can, as all Christians admit, control the acts of free agents, he permitted the fall of man. He permits the present amount of sin and misery in the world. If so be that multitudes perish in their sins, it is undeniable that God intended, for wise reasons, to permit them to perish. While all this is true, it is no less true that he never interferes with the free agency of his rational creatures. If a man of the world determines to make the acquisition of wealth the end of his life, he is perfectly free in forming that determination. If he determines by diligence and honesty to accomplish his

object, or if he chooses to resort to deceit and fraud, he is in both cases free and responsible. On the other hand, if a man determines to make the salvation of his soul and the service of Christ the great end of his being, he also is perfectly free in the choice he makes. If God makes him willing, he does not act unwillingly. Paul was never more free in his life than when he made a complete surrender of himself to Christ, saying, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" No man, we may well believe, ever sought Christ with the diligence and constancy, under the guidance of the Gospel, which the men of the world exhibit who failed of being saved. All who perish under the knowledge of the truth perish because they deliberately prefer the world to God.

The importance of the doctrine in question arises from the fact that, in the present state of human nature, if God by his almighty power did not convert some from the error of their way, no man would be saved. If he left all to themselves, and to those influences of the Spirit common to all who hear the Gospel, all would continue in their sins. Had not Christ by his omnipotence healed some lepers, none would have been healed; had he not opened some sightless eyes, all the blind would have continued in darkness.

The practical effect of the doctrine that we are entirely helpless in our sin and guilt, lying at the mercy of God, is to lead us to cast ourselves at his feet, saying, God be merciful to us sinners! As the deaf, and blind, and leprous, under a sense of helplessness and misery, crowded to Christ for healing, so souls burdened with the leprosy of sin are constrained to look to him for help, and those who come to him he will in no wise cast out. (C. H.)

11. *The Doctrine of Election from the Methodist Point of View.*—1. John Wesley sums up his view of election as follows: "I believe it commonly means one of these two things: (1.) A divine appointment of some particular men to do some particular work in the world. And this election I believe to be not only personal, but absolute and unconditional. Thus Cyrus was elected to rebuild the Temple, and St. Paul, with the twelve, to preach the Gospel. But I do not find this to have any necessary connection with eternal happiness. Nay, it is plain it has not; for one who is elected in this sense may yet be lost eternally. 'Have I not chosen (elected) you twelve,' saith our Lord, 'yet one of you hath a devil?' Judas, you see, was elected as well as the rest; yet is his lot with the devil and his angels. (2.) I believe election means, secondly, a divine appointment of some men to eternal happiness. But I believe this election to be conditional, as well as the reprobation opposite thereto. I believe the eternal decree concerning both is expressed in these words: 'He that believeth shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned.' And this decree, without doubt, God will not change, and man cannot resist. According to this, all true believers are in Scripture termed elect; as all who continue in unbelief are so long properly reprobates, that is, unapproved of God, and without discernment touching the things of the Spirit. Now God, to whom all things are present at once, who sees all eternity at one view, calleth the things that are not as though they were, the things that are not as yet as though they were now subsisting. Thus he calls Abraham 'the father of many nations' before even Isaac was born. And thus Christ is called 'the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,' though he was not slain, in fact, till some thousands of years after. In like manner God calleth true believers 'elect from the foundation of the world,' although they were not actually elect or believers till many ages after, in their several generations. Then only it was that they were actually elected when they were made 'the sons of God by faith.' Then were they in fact chosen and taken out of the world; 'elect,' saith St. Paul, 'through belief of the truth;'



or, as St. Peter expresses it, 'elect according to the foreknowledge of God, through sanctification of the Spirit.' This election I as firmly believe as I believe the Scripture to be of God. But unconditional election I cannot believe; not only because I cannot find it in Scripture, but also (to waive all other considerations) because it necessarily implies unconditional reprobation. Find out any election which does not imply reprobation, and I will gladly agree to it. But reprobation I can never agree to while I believe the Scriptures to be of God, as being utterly irreconcilable to the whole scope of the Old and New Testaments" (*Works*, N. Y. edition, vi, 28, 29).

2. The following summary statement is from the Rev. Dr. Whedon: "All God's choices are elections. Some of these elections are unconditional, viz. those which relate to material objects, the absolute disposing of which violates no free agency. But there is also a class of conditional elections or predeterminations by God, which are so far contingent as that they are conditioned upon the actual performance of certain free acts by the finite agent as foreseen. Those free acts, required by God as conditions to this election, are by divine grace placed in the power of every responsible agent, so that the primary reason why any are not elected is that they do not exercise their power of meeting those conditions. And since every responsible agent has the power to make his own calling and election sure, and every elect person has full power to reject the conditions, so it is not true that the number of the elect can be neither increased nor diminished. Every man has gracious powers to be elected according to the eternal purpose of God. All men may be saved. Every individual, by grace divine, may place himself in the number of those who are chosen from before the foundation of the world. The reprobates are those who, abusing the conferred grace of God, resisting the Holy Spirit, reject the conditions of salvation, and so fail to present the necessary tests to their election. The elect are chosen *unto* good works, to holy faith, to persevering love, to a full manifestation of the power of the Gospel during their probationary life, and upon their full performance of this their work and mission, they attain, through grace divine, to a rich, unmerited salvation" (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, April, 1862, p. 268).

3. The following statement and argument is chiefly abridged from Watson, *Theological Institutes*, pt. ii, ch. xxvi. Three kinds of election are mentioned in Scripture, viz.:

i. *The election of individuals to perform some particular service*, which has no necessary connection with their salvation. Cyrus was God's chosen servant to promote the rebuilding of his Temple. The apostles of our Lord were elected to their office: "Have I not chosen you twelve?" This was an act of sovereign choice for which Christ gave no reason. He made no apologies to those disciples who were not chosen, and he never allowed any one who had the call to refer to anything meritorious in himself as the cause. It is the Lord of his Church. Great mischief has been done by confounding this election to office, which in its nature must be unconditional, with personal election to salvation, dependent upon faith and perseverance. St. Paul had an unconditional election to the same office from which Judas fell. He was a "chosen" vessel to be the apostle of the Gentiles.

ii. The second kind of election is that of *communities or bodies of people to eminent religious privileges* to accomplish, through their means, the merciful purposes of God in benefiting other nations. This was once applicable to the Jews, as it is now to the Christians. "You only have I chosen of all the families of the earth." "The Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth." This fact may in part account for the frequent and familiar use of

the terms *elect*, *chosen*, and *peculiar* in the New Testament, when the apostles are writing to the churches. This, however, does not explain fully the reason for the use of these terms. The abrogation of the *church-state* of the Jews, and the admission of Gentiles to an equality with Jews as the people of God, will account for the adoption of this phraseology. The reason of their peculiar existence as a nation ceased with the coming of Christ, for he was a light to lighten the Gentiles, as well as the glory of his people Israel. There was a new election of a new people of God, to be composed of Jews, not by virtue of their natural descent, but by faith in Christ; and of Gentiles of all nations, also believers, and placed on an equal ground with the believing Jews (see Rom. xi). It is easy, therefore, to see what is the import of the 'calling' and 'election' of the Christian Church, as spoken of in the New Testament. It was not the calling and the electing of one nation in particular to succeed the Jews, but it was the calling and the electing of believers in all nations, wherever the Gospel should be preached, to be in reality what the Jews typically, and therefore in an inferior degree, had been—the visible Church of God, 'his people,' under Christ 'the head,' with an authenticated revelation; with an appointed ministry, never to be lost; with authorized worship; with holy days and festivals; with instituted forms of initiation; and with special protection and favor.

Now what were the effects of this election? (1.) Plainly the ancient election of the Jews to be God's peculiar people did not secure the salvation of every Jew individually, nor did it exclude the non-elect Gentiles from adequate means of salvation; nay, the election of the Jews was intended for the benefit of the Gentiles—to restrain idolatry and diffuse spiritual truth. (2.) As to the election of the Christian Church, it does not infallibly secure the salvation of every member of the Church, nor does it conclude anything against the saving mercy of God being still exercised as to those who are out of the Church; nay, the very election of Christians (who are the "salt" of the earth) is intended to bring those who are still in "the world" to Christ.

This collective election is often confounded by Calvinists with personal election. This is especially done in the interpretation of Paul's argument in Romans ix–xi. But a just exegesis of these chapters shows that they can be interpreted only of collective election, not of personal election (see the full examination of this in Watson, *Institutes*, ii, 312–325). The apostle does, indeed, treat of unconditional election in this discourse, but it is of unconditional *collective* election.

iii. The third kind is *personal election of individuals to be the children of God*. Our Lord says, "I have chosen you out of the world." St. Peter says, "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." Then election must take place in time, and must be subsequent to the administration of the means of salvation. The "calling" goes before the "election," and the "sprinkling of the blood of Christ" before that "sanctification" through which they become "the elect" of God. In a word, "the elect" are the body of true believers; and personal election into the family of God is through personal faith. All who truly believe are elected; and all to whom the Gospel is sent have, through the grace that accompanies it, the power to believe placed within their reach; and all such might, therefore, attain to the grace of personal election. The doctrine of personal election is therefore brought down to its true meaning. *Actual* election cannot be eternal; for from eternity the elect were not actually chosen out of the world, and from eternity they could not be "sanctified unto obedience." The phrases "eternal

election' and "eternal decree of election" can therefore mean only "an eternal purpose" to elect, a purpose formed in eternity to choose and sanctify *in time* "by the Spirit and the blood of Jesus." But when Calvinists graft on this the doctrine that God hath from eternity chosen in Christ unto salvation a set number of men (*certain quorundam hominum multitudinem*) unto holiness and eternal life, without cause or condition except his arbitrary will, they assert a doctrine not to be found in the Word of God. It has two parts: (1) the choosing of a determinate number of men, which cannot be increased or diminished; (2) this choice is unconditional. Let us consider these two points.

a. As to the choosing of a *determinate number of men*, it is allowed by Calvinists that they have no express scriptural evidence for this tenet. And, (1.) As to God's *eternal* purpose to elect, we know nothing except from revelation, and that declares (a) that he willeth *all* men to be saved; (b) that Christ died for *all* men, in order to the salvation of all; and (c) the decree of God is, "He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned;" and if God be unchangeable, this must have been his decree from all eternity; (d) if the fault of men's destruction lies in *themselves*, then the number of the elect is capable of *increase and diminution*. (2.) This doctrine *necessarily* carries with it that of the *unconditional reprobation* of all mankind, except the elect, which cannot be reconciled with the moral attributes of God, i. e. with his love, wisdom, grace, compassion, justice, or sincerity; nor with the scriptural doctrine that *God is no respecter of persons*; nor with the scriptural doctrine of the *eternal salvation of infants*; nor, finally, with the proper end of *punitive justice*, which is, to deter men from sin, and to add strength to the law of God.

b. As to the second branch of this doctrine, viz. that personal election is *unconditional*. (1.) According to this doctrine, the Church of God is constituted on the sole principle of the divine purpose, not upon the basis of faith and obedience, which manifestly contradicts the Word of God, according to which Christ's Church is composed not merely of men, as Peter, James, and John, but of Peter, James, and John believing and obeying; while all who "believe not," and obey not, are of "the world," not of "the chosen." (2.) This doctrine of *election without respect to faith* contradicts the history of the commencement and first constitution of the Church of Christ. The first disciples became such by believing; and before baptism men were required to believe, so that their actual election had respect to faith. (3.) There is no such doctrine in Scripture as the election of individuals *unto* faith, and it is inconsistent with several passages which speak expressly of personal election, e. g. John xv, 19; 1 Pet. i, 2; 2 Thess. ii, 13, 14. (4.) There is another class of texts in which the term election occurs, referring to believers, not personally, but as a body forming the Church of Christ, which texts, containing the *word* election, are ingeniously applied to the support of the doctrine of unconditional personal election, when in fact they do not contain it. Such is Eph. i, 4, 5, 6. Now in regard to this text, it might be shown (a) that if personal election *were* contained in it, the choice spoken of is not of men merely, but of *believing* men; but (b) it does not contain the doctrine of personal election, but that of the eternal purpose of God to constitute his visible Church no longer upon the ground of descent from Abraham, but on that of *faith in Christ*. (5.) Finally, the Calvinistic doctrine has no stronger passage to lean upon. We conclude by asking, if this doctrine be true, (a) Why are we commanded "to make our election sure?" (b) Where does Scripture tell us of *elect unbelievers*? (c) and how can the Spirit of truth convince such of sin and danger, when they are, *in fact*, in no danger?

The fundamental objection made by Calvinists to

the Arminian doctrine is that it "subverts grace!" How? Because "it is not an act of grace for the Most High to do justice!" Does this mean that God cannot be at once gracious and just? Grace, in this discussion, is not opposed to God's justice, but to man's desert. If, indeed, human merit alone had entered into the question, the race would have ended with Adam; and it was only in virtue of the covenant of grace that descendants were born to him. Under that covenant God is bound, not, indeed, by any desert of man (for that would preclude grace), but by his own faithfulness, to offer salvation in Christ to all who fell in Adam. This is the doctrine of Arminians; this, too, is the doctrine of Scripture. The Gospel system is called by St. Paul the "grace of God, given to us in Christ Jesus." And he tells us that "the grace of God, which bringeth salvation to all men (*ἡ σωτηρία πάντων ἀνθρώπων*) hath appeared" (Tit. ii, 11); that "the living God is the Saviour of all men, especially those that believe" (1 Tim. iv, 10); that he "will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. ii, 4). According to the Gospel scheme, "As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." This *θέλημα Θεοῦ* is his determinate counsel—a decree "of his good pleasure." "Not, however, that it would have been consistent for God to desert the human race, and leave it to perish; the divine goodness forbids such a supposition. The simple meaning is that no external necessity compelled him to it, and that it was his free grace, without desert or worthiness on the part of man" (Knapp, *Theol.* § 88). Were God bound, *by any merit in man*, to restore freedom of will and moral power to man, there would be no grace in the act. But God may be bound by the perfections of his own character, and, in accordance with the scheme of human salvation which he in his infinite goodness has devised and announced, to do many things for man, which, so far as the recipient is concerned, are pure acts of grace. The Augustinian doctrine holds, in effect, that God displays his mercy in saving a portion of mankind by irresistible grace, and in "destroying the rest by the simple rule of his own sovereignty." The Methodist doctrine is that God, of his boundless philanthropy (*φιλανθρωπία*, Tit. iii, 4), provides means for the salvation of the whole human race, gives grace to enable each man to appropriate that salvation to himself, and destroys none but those who wilfully refuse that grace. The former, in its fatalistic elements, is as much the doctrine of Mohammed as of Christ; the latter is the very "grace of the Gospel." See GRACE.

III. *Other Views on Election.*—It is undeniable that the Augustinian doctrine has been held by many of the greatest and subtlest intellects from Augustine's time until now. It has a sort of fascination, especially for masculine and vigorous natures. Is not the explanation probably to be found in the fact that such natures find "a deep peace in the belief that their own greatest efforts are not really efforts at all, but the natural fruits of a divine necessity; that they can neither fail nor succeed so long as they obey implicitly, but only transmit the energies and register the decrees of a diviner might and wisdom? No doubt there is a great fascination in a mode of thought which almost obliterates the human instrument in the grandeur of the inevitable purpose. Calvinism is a personal and Christian way of merging the individual in the grandeur of a universal destiny" (*Spectator*, July 2, 1864). Perhaps the greatest danger in the tendencies of modern thought is that of the subversion of the moral freedom of man by the general acceptance of the doctrine that physical law is just as valid in the moral world as in the material. That the Calvinistic doctrine *tears in this direction* cannot be denied. And this tendency is doubtless one of the grounds, if not the chief ground, of the modern reaction against Augustinianism among spiritual thinkers (as distinguished

from materialists) on the one hand, and of the various schemes of modified Augustinianism which have been proposed within the theological sphere as substitutes for extreme Calvinism, as Baxterianism, the so-called moderate Calvinism (q. v.) and the New-England Theology (q. v.).

1. Dr. Nevin (*Mercersburgh Review*, April, 1857, *not* writing from the Arminian point of view) compares the New-Testament idea of election with the Calvinistic as follows: "Are the references to the idea of election in the New Testament such, as a general thing, that they may be fairly construed in the known and established sense of the Calvinistic dogma; or are they so circumstanced and conditioned as to require plainly a different interpretation? On this point there is no room for any serious doubt. The New-Testament doctrine of election, as it meets us, for instance, in the epistles of St. Peter, and rules continually the thinking and writing of St. Paul, is something essentially different from the doctrine of election which is presented to our view in Calvin's Institutes. The proof of this is found sufficiently in one single consideration. The Calvinistic election involves, beyond the possibility of failure, the full salvation at last of all those who are its subjects; there is no room to conceive of their coming short of this result in any single instance, made certain as it is in the form of a specific purpose and predetermination in the divine mind from all eternity. Election and glorification, the beginning and the end of redemption, are so indissolubly bound together that they may be considered different sides only of one and the same fact. The 'elect' in Calvin's sense have no power really to fall from grace, or come short of everlasting life. But, plainly, the 'elect' of whom the New Testament speaks, the 'chosen and called of God' in the sense of St. Peter and St. Paul, are not supposed to possess any such advantage; on the contrary, it is assumed in all sorts of ways that their condition carries with it, in the present world, no prerogative of certain ultimate salvation whatever. They may forget that they were purged from their old sins, lose the benefit of their illumination, make shipwreck of their faith, and draw back to everlasting perdition. They have it in their power to throw away the opportunities of grace, just as much as it lies in the power of men continually to waste in like manner the opportunities of mere nature. Their salvation is, after all, hypothetical, and suspended upon conditions in themselves which are really liable to fail in every case, and which with many do eventually fail in fact. Hence occasion is supposed to exist, in the sphere of this election itself, for all sorts of exhortation and warning to those who are the subjects of it, having the object of engaging them to 'make their calling and election sure.' The tenor of all is, 'Walk worthy of your vocation. Only such as endure unto the end shall be saved. So run that ye may obtain.' Plainly, we repeat, the two conceptions are not the same. The difference here brought into view is such as to show unanswerably that the Calvinistic dogma is one thing, and the common New-Testament idea of election altogether another. The Calvinistic election terminates on the absolute salvation of its subjects; that forms the precise end and scope of it, in such sort that there is no room to conceive of its failing to reach this issue in any single case. The N.-T. election, as it enters into the thinking of St. Peter and St. Paul, terminates manifestly on a state or condition short of absolute salvation. Whatever the distinction may involve, for those who are its subjects, in the way of saving grace, it does not reach out at once to the full issue of eternal life. The fact it serves to establish and make certain for them is of quite another character and kind; it sets them in the way of salvation, but it does not make their salvation sure."

2. Martensen (*Christian Dogmatics*, Edinb. 1866), a modern Lutheran divine, remarks that Calvin "con-

found predestination with the election of grace. The separation which is only temporal he made eternal, because he laid its foundations in the eternal counsel of God. God, according to him, made from eternity a twofold election, because he hath foreappointed certain persons to faith and to blessedness, and certain others to unbelief and everlasting damnation. This awful election he further maintained to be purely unconditional, and thus he mistook the true relations between the divine and the human. . . . From Calvin's point of view man has no *history*—at least so far as history includes the idea of a temporal and free life in which what is as yet undecided will be decided; all is decided beforehand—existence, life, destiny. . . . The true basis of the doctrine of election is given in the Lutheran doctrine of universal grace and conditional decrees" (§ 206-210).

3. Browne, bishop of Ely, in his *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles* (N. Y. 1865, 8vo), gives a pretty full history of the doctrine of election, and maintains, in substance, the theory of "ecclesiastical election," viz. that, as the "Jews of old were God's chosen people, so now is the Christian Church; that any baptized member of the Church is one of God's elect, and that this election is from God's irrelative and unsearchable decree. Here, therefore, election is to baptismal privileges, not to final glory; and the elect are identical with the baptized; and the 'election' constitutes the Church" (p. 402). His conclusion, from an examination of the passages of Scripture bearing on the question, is, "that the revelation which God has given us concerns his will and purpose to gather together in Christ a Church chosen out of the world, and that to this Church, and to every individual member of it, he gives the means of salvation. That salvation, if attained, will be wholly due to the favor of God, which first chooses the elect soul to the blessings of the baptismal covenant, and afterwards endues it with power to live the life of faith. If, on the other hand, the proffered salvation be forfeited, it will be in consequence of the faults and wickedness of him that rejects it. Much is said in Scripture of God's will that all shall be saved, and of Christ's death as sufficient for all men; and we hear of none shut out from salvation but for their own faults and demerits. More than this cannot with certainty be inferred from Scripture, for it appears most probable that what we learn there concerns only predestination to grace, there being no revelation concerning predestination to glory" (p. 442). See also, for views somewhat similar, Faber, *Primitive Doctrine of Election* (New York, 1840, 8vo); Fry, *Essay on Election* (Lond. 1864). For the further literature, see ARMINIANISM; PREDESTINATION.

**Election of Pope.** See CARDINALS; CONCLAVE; POPE.

**El-elo'he-'Is-ra'el** (Hebrew *El Elohey' Yisra'el*, מְלֹכֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל; Sept. ὁ θεός Ἰσραὴλ; Vulg. *Fortissimus Deus Israel*), the name bestowed by Jacob on the altar which he erected facing the city of Shechem, in the piece of cultivated land upon which he had pitched his tent, and which he afterwards purchased from the Bene-Hamor (Gen. xxxiii, 20). This compound term designates God as the being who can do whatever seems good to him, and who, in the recent experience of Jacob, had peculiarly manifested his power in overcoming the deep-rooted enmity of Esau, and thereby averting the most alarming evil which Jacob had ever been called to encounter. See JACOB.

**Elements** (στοιχεῖα). The etymon both of the English and Greek word conveys their primary meaning; thus, elements, from "elementa," the *alimenta* from which things are made, and στοιχεῖα, from στοιχεῖω, "to go up by steps"—the *first principles* whence the subsequent parts of things (στοιχεῖοσι) proceed in order. It seems to have been believed, from a very early period,

that all bodies consist of certain first, specific ingredients (*στοιχεῖα*), into which they are all resolvable, although different opinions prevailed respecting the number and nature of these primary constituents of things. Hesyechius explains *στοιχεῖα* by *πῦρ, ὕδωρ, γῆ, καὶ ἀήρ, ἀφ' ὧν τὰ σώματα*—fire, water, earth, and air, of which bodies are formed. This, which is the simplest, may be called the primary sense of the word. A secondary use of the word relates to the organized parts of which anything is framed, as the letters of the alphabet (Hesyechius gives also *γράμματα*), these being the elements of words; also the elements, rudiments, or first principles of any art or science.

The word occurs in its *primary* sense, Wis. vii, 17, *σύστασιν κόσμον καὶ ἐβέργειαν στοιχείων*, "the constitution of the world and the operation of the elements;" also xix, 18. It is used in the *same sense*, 2 Pet. iii, 10, *στοιχεῖα ἧ καυσούμενα λυθήσονται*, and ver. 12, *τίκται*, "the elements burning will be dissolved and melted." The Jews, in Peter's time, spoke of *four elements* (Josephus, *Ant.* iii, 7, 7).

The word occurs in a *secondary* sense in Gal. iv, 3-9, *τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*, "the elements or rudiments of the world," which the apostle calls *ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα*, "weak and poor elements." He introduces the word to preserve the unity of his comparison of the law to a *pedagogue* (iii, 24), and of persons under it to children under tutors; and by the elements or rudiments of the world he evidently means that state of religious knowledge which had subsisted in the world, among Jews and Gentiles, before Christ; the weakness of which, among the Jews, may be seen in Heb. vii, 18, 19: x, 1; and among the Gentiles, in the epistle to the Romans, *passim*. "The elements of the world" occurs again, Col. ii, 8-20, in the same sense, as appears from the various allusions both to the terms used in Grecian philosophy, and the dogmas of the Judaizers in the subsequent verses; the phrase being possibly suggested to the apostle by his previous use of it to the Galatians. The word *στοιχεῖα*, in Heb. v, 12, is restricted, by the addition *πῶν λογίων τοῦ Θεοῦ*, to the rudiments of Christianity (see Rosenmüller and Benson on the passages).—Kitto, s. v.

II. *In the Sacraments*.—The materials used in the sacraments are called the *elements*. Water is the element of baptism, bread and wine are the elements of the Eucharist. "This use of the word 'elements' (*στοιχεῖα*) sprung from the philosophy of the school divines, and evidently had reference to the change supposed to take place after consecration. The Church of England has discarded the term in her services, and has introduced instead the word 'creatures' ('These thy creatures of bread and wine') in the communion service, though the word 'elements' is found in one of the rubrics of that office" (Eden). "In all the Jewish sacrifices of which the people were partakers, the viands or materials of the feast were first made God's by a pious oblation, and then afterwards eaten by the communicants, not as man's, but as God's provisions, who, by thus entreating them at his own table, declared himself reconciled, and again in covenant with them. And therefore our blessed Saviour, when he instituted the new sacrament of his own body and blood, first gave thanks and blessed the elements—that is, offered them up to God as Lord of the creatures, as the most ancient fathers expound that passage; who for that reason, whenever they celebrated the holy Eucharist, always offered the bread and wine for the communion to God upon the altar by this or some short ejaculation: 'Lord, we offer thee thine own out of what thou hast bountifully given us'" (Bishop Patrick, cited by Hook, *Church Dictionary*, s. v.).

**Elem-Recho'kim.** See JONATH-ELEM-RECHOKIM.

**E'leph** (Heb. with the art. *ha-E'leph*, עֵלֶף, Vulg. *Eleph*), one of the second group of towns allotted to

Benjamin, and named between Zelah and Jerusalem (Josh. xviii, 28). It is possibly the ruined site marked as *Katamon* on Van de Velde's "Map of the environs of Jerusalem," about one mile S.W. of Jerusalem. The Sept. unites the preceding name with this, under the compound form Σηλαλέφ (Vat. MS. Σελεκάρι), and accordingly assigns only *thirteen* (ἐκατρεῖς) cities to this group. Eusebius and Jerome (in their *Onomasticon*, s. v.) mention Sela (Σελά, φολῆς Βενιαμίν) as distinct from Eleph. The Peshito strangely renders the name as *Gebira*. From the occasional use of עֵלֶף in the *bucolic* sense of "ox," it has been conjectured that "Eleph and its villages" was a pastoral district. The extremely frequent *numerical* sense, however, of עֵלֶף, a *thousand*, points rather to the *populousness* of these towns, which lay in the neighborhood of Jebus or Jerusalem. Schultens (*Prov. Solom.* ii, 17) refers to the Arabic *alaph*, "union," in illustration of both the *numerical* and the *domestic* sense of the Heb. root. (See further Meier, *Heb. W.* v. b. p. 379.) Simon (in his *Onomasticon*, p. 141) refers to the name of the Cilician town *Μεφίαντρος* in illustration, and to Deut. i, 11; Psa. xci, 7, etc., for an indefinite use of עֵלֶף, to designate a *great multitude*. Fürst, in his *Hebräisches Wörterb.* (i, 91, 98), finds in Zech. ix, 7 another mention of our town Eleph, under the form עֵלֶף or עֵלֶף, *Alluph*; which, like *Sebusi*, he makes a frontier city belonging to Benjamin and Judah. He quotes from Jephth (or Jefet ben-Ali), a Jewish commentator who lived at Jerusalem in the 10th century, a statement that the words of Josh. xviii, 28, עֵלֶף עֵלֶף, are, in fact, the designation of but a single city—or still less, apparently, than even that, for he further quotes Jefet as saying that in his time a *ward* of Jerusalem bore that aggregate name, in which was the sepulchre of Zechariah. We reject this view as not only doing violence to the distinct enumeration of the group of cities given in Josh. xviii, 28, but as disturbing the sense of the passage in Zech. ix, 7 (see Hengstenberg, *Christology*, iii, 392-394). The phrase עֵלֶף עֵלֶף (tribe-prince in Judah), used by the prophet in this passage, is by him repeated twice (see Zech. xii, 5, 6). In the Pentateuch and 1 Chron. the same noun, עֵלֶף, in the plural, designates the chieftains or "dukes" of Edom. For some valuable remarks on the phrase, as indicating the *genuineness* of the passages in Zechariah, see also Hengstenberg, iv, 67, note.—Kitto, s. v.


**Elephant** (ἐλέφας) does not occur in the text of the canonical Scriptures of the A. V., except in the adj. *ἐλεφάντινος*, "of ivory," Rev. xviii, 12. But the animal is believed to be referred to in the Heb. עֵלֶף עֵלֶף, *elephant's tooth*, i. e. "ivory," 1 Kings x, 22; 2 Chron. ix, 21. See **IVORY**. Some have also regarded it as identical with the ΒΕΒΕΜΟΘΙ (q. v.), as in the margin of Job xl, 15. Elephants, however, are repeatedly mentioned in the 1st and 2d books of Maccabees as being used in warfare. The way in which they were used in battle, and the method of exciting them to fight, is described in 1 Macc. vi. The essential syllable of the Greek (and modern) name seems to be derived from that which all the nations of the south and west of Asia have for many ages generally used, namely, *fil, fecl, pheel, phil*, פִּיל; for we find it in the Chaldee (פִּילָא, *phila'*, Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* col. 1722), Syriac, Persian, Arabic, and Turkish, extending to the east far beyond the Ganges, where, nevertheless, in the indigenous tongues, *avei, waranam, and hattii* are existing names. See Cassel, *De variis eleph. denominationibus*, in the *Synbol. lit. Brem.* i, i, 136 sq.; *Zeitschr. f. Kunde des Morgenl.* IV, i, 12 sq.

It is well known that these animals were anciently employed in battles, originally in India (Aristotle,

*Anim.* ix, 1; Pliny, vi, 22; Ælian, *Anim.* xiii, 8, 22; comp. Ritter, *Erdk.* v, 903 sq.), where they are commonly stronger and more sagacious than in Africa (Diod. Sic. ii, 16; Pliny, vi, 22; Philostr. *Apoll.* ii, 12; Curtius, viii, 9, 17; Ælian, *Anim.* xvi, 15; yet see Herod. iv, 191; comp. Burmeister, in the *Hall. Encycl.* xxxiii, 265 sq.); next in Persia (although only indirectly before the times of Alexander, Arrian, *Alex.* iii, 11, 6); later also in Asia Minor and even in the West (Flor. i, 18; Livy, xxxi, 36; xxxvii, 40; xxxviii, 39; Iri-tius, *Bell. Afr.* xviii, 86; Pliny, viii, 5; Veget. *Mil.* iii, 24; comp. Pausanias, i, 12, 4); and the Maccabees had to contend with such trained elephants in the Syrian armies of the Selencidæ (comp. Plutarch, *Demetr.* xxviii sq.; Appian, *Syr.* 46; Polybius, xi, 32) in immense numbers (comp. Livy, xxxvii, 39; Pliny, vi, 22; Polybius, v, 53). Military elephants were accustomed to carry on their backs a wooden tower (Pliny, viii, 7; Philostr. *Apoll.* ii, 6; Juvenal, xii, 110; Livy, xxxvii, 40), in which were a number of soldiers (four in the Syrian army of Antiochus the Great, according to Livy, l. c.; according to Philostr. *Apoll.* ii, 12, about ten to fifteen; in India only three, Ælian, *Anim.* xiii, 19; comp. Pliny, l. c.; certainly not thirty-two, as is stated in 1 Macc. vi, 37; in modern India only four or five persons are placed in the elephant-tower, Munro, *Hist. of War in East India*, p. 91 [comp. Schlegel, *Ind. Bibl.* i, ii, 176; Bochart, i, 262; and see Wernsdorf, *De fide Macc.* p. 119 sq.], although an elephant can easily travel with 4000 pounds on his back); and their courage was artificially stimulated by wine (Ælian, *Anim.* xiii, 8; on the fondness of these animals for spirituous drinks, see Thevenot, *Voyage*, iii, 89). This illustrates 3 Macc. v, 2; also 1 Macc. vi, 34. Each equipped elephant was surrounded in battle by more than a hundred soldiers, to protect him on the side (1 Macc. vi, 35 sq.), and thus were these animals conveniently distributed along the whole line (1 Macc. vi, 35; comp. Livy, xxxvii, 40; Curtius, viii, 12, 7). Occasionally, however, the elephant, becoming frightened, did his master more harm than the enemy (Curtius, iii, 13, 15; viii, 14, 16; ix, 2, 20). The driver of a single armed elephant was called Ἰνδός, i. e. an Indian (1 Macc. vi, 37), while the commander of a battalion of such was styled ἑλεφαντάρχης, an elephantarch (2 Macc. xiv, 12; 3 Macc. v, 4). See generally Bochart, *Hieroz.* i, 233 sq.; Schlegel, *Indische Bibliothek*, I, ii, 129 sq.; Armandi, *Histoire militaire des éléphants* (Par. 1844); Oken, *Lehrb. der Naturgesch.* III, ii, 783 sq.; Tavernier, *Voyage*, ii, 72 sq.; Phil. a. S. Trinitate, *Reisebesch.* p. 386 sq.; fig. in Schreber's *Säugethiere*, vi, pl. 317.

The elephant's tusks, growing from the upper jaw (Aristotle, *Anim.* ii, 4; Ælian, *Anim.* xi, 37), which the ancients sometimes mistook for horns (Ælian, *Anim.* iv, 31; vii, 2; xi, 37; Pausan. v, 12, 1; Pliny, viii, 4; xviii, 1; Philostr. *Apoll.* ii, 13; perhaps the קַרְנֵי הַפֶּלֶאֱשֵׁת of Ezek. xxvii, 15; comp. Ludolf, *Hist. Ethiop.* i, 10, 29; but see Hävernick, in loc.) or ivory (קַרְנֵי הַפֶּלֶאֱשֵׁת, or simply קַרְנֵי הַפֶּלֶאֱשֵׁת), comp. Pott, in the *Zeitschr. f. Morgenl.* IV, i, 13 sq.), much earlier known in Asia Minor and Europe than the animal itself, were used by the Hebrews from the time of Solomon for ornamenting (overlying, Pliny, xvi, 84) furniture (especially the divan, Amos vi, 4; Philo, *Opp.* ii, 478;—1 Kings x, 18; Apulej. *Metam.* ii, p. 37, ed. Bip.) and chambers (1 Kings xx, 39; Amos iii, 15; Psa. xlv, 9; comp. Homer, *Odys.* iv, 73; Diod. Sic. iii, 47; Pausan. i, 12, 4; Petron. 135; Horace, *Od.* ii, 18, 1; Lucan, x, 119; Herodian, iv, 2, 3; Ælian, *Var. Hist.* xii, 39; Avien, 1200), also weapons (Curtius, viii, 5, 1). Likewise vessels and images of the gods (Pausan. v, 12, 1; ii, 17, 4; Virgil, *Georg.* i, 480; Pliny, xxxvi, 4; comp. Hermann, *Ad Lucian. conscrib. hist.* p. 303) were constructed of it (Rev. xviii, 12); while the Tyrians, who disposed of ivory as an article of commerce (Ezek.

xxvii, 15), carried luxury so far as to make the rowers' benches of their ships of boxwood inlaid with ivory. For the estimation in which ivory was anciently held, and its various uses among the Greeks and Romans, see Heyne, *Antiquar. Aufs.* ii, 149 sq. (also in the *Nov. commentat. Soc. Goetting.* I, ii, 96 sq.); Schlegel, *ut sup.* p. 137 sq.; Kype, *Observ.* ii, 461 sq.; Müller, *Archäol.* p. 418 sq.; Böttiger, *Archäol. Andeut.* i, 108 sq. Solomon brought it by sea from Ophir (1 Kings x, 22; comp. ver. 11).—Winer, i, 315.



Asiatic Elephant.

The animals of this genus consist at present of two very distinct species, one a native of Southern Asia, once spread considerably to the westward of the Upper Indus, and the other occupying southern and middle Africa to the edge of the great Sahara. In a fossil state, however, there are six more species clearly distinguished. The elephant is the largest of all terrestrial animals, sometimes attaining above eleven feet of vertical height at the shoulders, and weighing from five to seven thousand pounds; he is of a black or slaty-ash color, and almost destitute of hair. The head, which is proportionately large, is provided with two broad pendulous ears, particularly in those of the African species, which are occasionally six feet in length. This species has also two molar teeth on each side of the jaw, both above and below, and only three toe-nails on each of the hind feet, whereas the Asiatic species is provided with only one tooth on each side above and below, and, though both have tusks or defences, the last mentioned has them confined solely to the males: they are never of more than 70 pounds in weight, often much less, and in some breeds even totally wanting; while in the African both sexes are armed with tusks, and in the males they have been known seven feet in length, and weighing above 150 pounds each. The forehead of the African is low, that of the Asiatic high; in both the eyes are comparatively small, with a malevolent expression, and on the temples are pores which exude a viscous humor; the tail is long, hanging nearly to the heels, and distichous at the end. But the most remarkable organ of the elephant, that which equally enables the animal to reach the ground and to grasp branches of trees at a considerable height, is the proboscis or trunk—a cylindrical elastic instrument, in ordinary condition reaching nearly down to the ground, but contractile to two thirds of its usual length, and extensible to one third beyond it; provided with nearly 4000 muscles crossing each other in such a manner that the proboscis is flexible in every direction, and so abundantly supplied with nerves as to render the organ one of the most delicate in nature. Within is the double canal of the nostrils, and at the terminal opening a finger-like process, with which the animal can take up very minute objects and grasp others, even to a writing

pen, and mark paper with it. By means of the proboscis the elephant has a power of suction capable of raising nearly 200 pounds' weight; and with this instrument he gathers food from trees and from the earth, draws up drink to squirt it down his throat, draws corks, unties small knots, and performs numberless other minute operations; and, if necessary, tears down branches of trees more than five inches in diameter with no less dexterity than strength. The gait of an elephant is an enormous stride, performed with his high and ponderous legs, and sufficiently rapid to require brisk galloping on horseback to outstrip him. Elephants are peaceable towards all inoffensive animals; sociable among themselves, and ready to help each other; gregarious in grassy plains, but more inclined to frequent densely-wooded mountain glens; at times not unwilling to visit the more arid wastes, and fond of rivers and pools, where they wallow in mud and water among reeds and under the shade of trees. They are most assuredly more sagacious than observers, who, from a few visits to menageries, compare them with dogs, are able to appreciate, for on this question we must take into account, on the one hand, the physical advantages of the proboscis added to the individual experience gained by an animal slow in growth, and of a longevity exceeding a century, but still placed in contact with man after a birth free in every sense, where his powers expand without human education; while, on the other hand, dogs are the offspring of an immense number of generations, all fashioned to the will of a master, and consequently with innate dispositions to acquire a certain education. In Griffith's *Curier* are found several anecdotes illustrating the sagacity of these animals, to which we shall add only a single one, related by the late Captain Hobson, R.N., as observed by himself at Travancore, where several of these animals were employed in stacking teak-timber balk. They had scarcely any human aid or direction, but each beam being successively noosed and slung, they dragged it to the stack, raised one end up, contrived to shove it forward, nicely watching when, being poised by its own weight, the lower end would rise, and then, placing their foreheads against the butt end, they pushed it even on the stack; the sling they unfastened and carried back to have it fitted again. In a wild state no other animal has the sagacity to break off a leafy branch, hold it as a fan, and use it as a brush to drive away flies.

The Asiatic species, carrying the head higher, has more dignity of appearance, and is believed to have more sagacity and courage than the African, which, however, is not inferior in weight or bulk, and has never been in the hands of such experienced managers as the Indian mohants are, who have acquired such deep knowledge of the character of these beasts that they make them submit to almost incredible operations; such, for example, as suffering patiently the extraction of a decayed part of a tooth, a kind of chisel and mallet being the instruments used for the purpose. Elephants walk under water as long as the end of the proboscis can remain above the surface, but when in greater depth they float with the head and back only about a foot beneath it. In this manner they swim across the broadest streams, and guide themselves by the sense of smelling till they reach footing to look about them and land. They are steady, assiduous workmen in many laborious tasks, often using discretion when they require some dexterity and attention in the performance. Good will is all man can trust to in directing them, for correction cannot be enforced beyond their patience; but flattery, good treatment, kind words, promises, and rewards, even to the wear of finery, have the desired effect. In history they appear most conspicuous as formidable elements of battle. From the remotest ages they were trained for war by the nations of India, and by their aid they no doubt acquired and long held possession of several regions of

High Asia westward of the Indus. They are noticed in the ancient Mahabarata. According to Sauti, the relative force of elephants in an *akshauhini*, or great army corps, was one to each chariot of war, three horsemen, and five foot soldiers, or, rather, archers mounted on the animal's back within a defensible *howdah*—in the West denominated a castle. Thus one armed elephant, one chariot, and three horsemen, formed a *patti* or squad of at most eleven men, and, if there were other bodies of infantry in the army, they are unnoticed. This enumeration is sufficient to show that in India, which furnished the elephants and the model of arming them, there were only four or five archers, with or without the mohant or driver, and that, consequently, when the successors of Alexander introduced them in their wars in Syria, Greece, and even Italy, they could not be encumbered more than perhaps momentarily with one or two additional persons before a charge; for the weight carried by a war-elephant is less than that of one used for burden, which seldom equals £200 pounds. In order to ascend his back when equally required, the animal will hold out one of his hind legs horizontally, allowing a person to step upon it until he has grasped the crupper and crept up. In the West, where they were considered for a time of great importance, no doubt the squad or escort was more considerable than in the East, and may have amounted to thirty-two foot-soldiers, the number given, by some mistake, as if actually mounted, in 1 Macc. vi, 37. Although red colors are offensive to many animals, it may be observed that the use of mulberry-juice or grapes must have been intended as an excitement to their taste, for they are all fond of fruit. Wine, so as to cause an approach to intoxication, would render them ungovernable, and more dangerous than when in a state of fear. They do not require stimulants to urge them on in a modern battle, with all its flashes of fire, smoke, and explosion; and red colors usually employed for their trappings produce more of a satisfactory feeling than rage. Judicious and long-continued training is the only good remedy against sudden surprises caused by objects not yet examined by their acutely-judging senses, or connected with former scenes of danger, which are alone apt to make them turn. It is likely that the disciplined steadiness of well-armed ranks frightened them by their novelty more than the shouts of Macedonian thousands, which must have been feeble in the ears of elephants accustomed to the roar of hundreds of thousands of Indians. It is probable that the Carthaginians made the experiment of training African elephants in imitation of Ptolemy Philadelphus: they are noticed in their army only in the first Punic war; and, from what appears of the mode of managing them, there is reason to believe, as already noticed, that they were never so thoroughly subdued as the Indian elephants (see *Penny Cyclopaedia*, s. v.).—Kitto, s. v.

**Eleusinian Mysteries**, the sacred rites with which the annual festival of Ceres was celebrated at Eleusis, a town in Attica, situated to the north-west of Athens, and opposite the island of Salamis. They were the most ancient and most venerated mysteries of Greece, and were probably at first a national and harvest festival instituted to thank Demeter for the gift of fruit, to remember the barbaric times preceding the introduction of agriculture, and to rejoice at the progress made since. Both the founder of the mysteries and the time of their foundation are unknown. It is probable that the first foundation of them was laid by Thracians, who from Bœotia spread over Western Attica; and that they were farther developed by the Athenians themselves, especially at the time of the Pisistratide. The place in which they were celebrated was the temple of Demeter at Eleusis, a spacious, almost quadratic structure, which had been erected by the architect Iktinos, and was surrounded with a double vestibule (*peribolos*). At the time when Her-

acles came to Athens to be initiated into the mysteries it was not yet permitted to admit any foreign Greek. In order not to violate the traditional laws, and at the same time not to offend the great hero, who was not less feared than venerated, the lesser mysteries were transferred to Agræ, a suburb of Athens, and with them Heracles had to be content. From this time the lesser mysteries served as a preparation for the greater. The initiation into the mysteries was preceded by some devotional exercises, sacred rites, and symbolic actions, the object of which was to divert the candidates for initiation for a time from the world, its pleasures and occupations, and to bring about in them a change of mind, and a longing for the disclosures to be made to them. Between initiation into the lesser and initiation into the greater one year had to elapse. The lesser were celebrated from the 19th to the 21st of the month Anthesterion (beginning of April); the greater one, the Eleusinian mysteries, were celebrated from the 16th to the 25th of Boedromion (beginning of October). "On the first day (called *agurnos*, the assembling), the neophytes, already initiated at the preparatory festival, met, and were instructed in their sacred duties. On the second day (called *Ialadê*, *mystæ*, *To the sea, ye initiated!*), they purified themselves by washing in the sea. On the third day, sacrifices, comprising, among other things, the mullet-fish, and cakes made of barley from the Rharian plain, were offered with special rites. The fourth day was devoted to the procession of the sacred basket of Ceres (the *Kalathion*). This basket—containing pomegranates, salt, poppy seeds, etc., and followed by bands of women carrying smaller baskets similarly filled—was drawn in a consecrated cart through the streets, amid shouts of 'Hail, Ceres!' from the onlookers. The fifth day was known as the 'day of the torches,' and was thought to symbolize the wanderings of Ceres in quest of her daughter. On it the *mystæ*, led by the 'daduchus,' the *torch-bearer*, walked two by two to the temple of the goddess, and seem to have spent the night there. The sixth day, called *Iacchus*, in honor of the son of Ceres, was the great day of the feast. On that day the statue of *Iacchus* was borne in pomp along the sacred way from the Ceramieus at Athens to Eleusis, where the votaries spent the night, and were initiated in the last mysteries. Till this stage of the proceedings they had been only *mystæ*; but on the night of the sixth day they were admitted into the innermost sanctuary of the temple, and, from being allowed to behold the sacred things, became entitled to be called 'epoptæ,' or 'ephorî,' i. e. *spectators*, or *contemplators*. They were once more purified, and repeated their original oath of secrecy with an imposing and awful ceremonial, somewhat resembling, it is believed, the forms of modern free-masonry. On the seventh day the votaries returned to Athens with mirth and music, halting for a while on the bridge over the Cephissus, and exercising their wit and satire against the spectators. The eighth day was called *Epidauria*, and was believed to have been added to the original number of the days for the convenience of those who had been unable to attend the grand ceremonial of the sixth day. It was named in honor of Æsculapius, who arrived on one occasion from his native city of Epidaurus too late for the solemn rites, and the Athenians, unwilling to disappoint so distinguished a benefactor of mankind, added a supplementary day. On the ninth day took place the ceremony of the 'Plemochœ,' in which two earthen vessels filled with wine were turned one towards the east and the other towards the west. The attendant priests, uttering some mystic words, then upset both vessels, and the wine so spilt was offered as a libation. Slaves, prostitutes, and persons who had forfeited their citizenship were excluded from the rites. During the period of the festival, none of those taking part in it could be arrested for any offence. Lyeurgus, with a view to

destroying distinctions of class, forbade any woman to ride to the Eleusinia in a chariot, under a penalty of 6000 drachmæ. The mysteries were celebrated with the most scrupulous secrecy. No initiated person might reveal what he had seen under pain of death, and no uninitiated person could take part in the ceremonies under the same penalty. The priests were chosen from the sacred family of the *Eumolpidæ*, whose ancestor, *Eumolpus*, had been the special favorite of Ceres. The chief-priest was called the 'Hierophant,' or 'Mystagogue;' next in rank to him was the *Daduchus*, or *Torch-bearer*; after whom came the 'Hieroceryx,' or *Sacred Herald*, and the priest at the altar. Besides these leading ministers, there was a multitude of inferior priests and servants" (Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v.). It was undoubtedly one chief aim of these mysteries to spread among the educated classes of the people more elevated religious ideas than were held by the mass of the people, especially with regard to the immortality of the soul, the punishment of the wicked, and the rewards of the good. The initiated were supposed to be especially protected by the gods, and to be sure of the joys of the future life. See Ouzwaroff, *Essai sur les Mystères d'Eleusis* (3d edit. Paris, 1816; Preller, *Demeter und Persephone* (Hamb. 1837); Mommsen, *Heortologie. Antiquar. Untersuchungen über die städtischen Feste der Athener* (Leipzig. 1864). (A. J. S.)

**Eleutheropolis** (Ἐλευθερόπολις, *free city*), a place not named in Scripture, but which was an episcopal city of such importance in the time of Eusebius and Jerome that they assumed it as the point whence to estimate the distances and positions of other cities in southern Palestine (*Onomast.* s. v. *Estherne*, *Sephela*, *Jermus*, etc.; see Reland, *Palæst.* p. 410, 411). It appears from these and many other notices that Eleutheropolis was the capital of a large province during the fourth and fifth centuries of our era. It was also an episcopal city of *Palestina Prima* (St. Paul, *Geogr. Sac.* p. 306; *Notitiæ Ecclesiasticæ*, p. 6). Its site remained unknown for many centuries, though defined by several ancient writers with much minuteness. Eusebius states that the plain of Shepheleh extends from Eleutheropolis westward and southward (*Onomast.* s. v. *Sephela*), and hence it must have stood at the south-western base of the mountains of Judah. He also states that Bethshemesh was ten miles distant from it, on the road to Nicopolis; and *Jedna*, six miles on the road to Hebron; and *Sochoh*, nine miles on the road to Jerusalem. All these places are now known, and the lines of road being traced and the distances measured, we find that the site indicated is *Beit Jibrin* (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* ii, 348, 359, 398, 404-420, 612-646). In the *Acta Sanctorum Martyrum*, published by Assemani in Syriae, Greek, and Latin, Peter Abtelama the martyr is said to have been born at *Anea*, which lay, according to the Syriae version, in the district of *Beth Gubrin*, while both the Greek and Latin read in the district of *Eleutheropolis* (*ib.* p. 66). This establishes the identity of *Beth Gubrin* and *Eleutheropolis*. Josephus mentions a town in this neighborhood called *Betaris*, which some copies read *Βήταβρις*, and it appears to be the same place (*War.* iv, 8, 1). Under its ancient name *Betogabra* (Βετογάβρα, i. e. *house of Gabra* or *Gabriel?*), it is enumerated by Ptolemy among the cities of Palestine (v, 16), and it is also laid down as *Betogabri* in the Peutinger tables (Reland, *Palæst.* p. 421). The name *Eleutheropolis* first appears on coins of this city inscribed to Julia Donna, the wife of Septimius Severus, in A. D. 202-3 (Eckhel, iii, 488). The emperor had been in Syria about that time, and had conferred important privileges on various cities, among which was *Betogabris*, which appears to have been then called *Eleutheropolis*, as being made a free city. Epiphanius, the well-known writer, was born in a village three miles from the city in the beginning of the 4th century, and is often called an *Eleutheropolitan* (Reland, p. 751, 752). In the year A. D. 796, little

more than a century and a half after the Saracenic conquest, Eleutheropolis was razed to the ground, and left completely desolate. The Greek language now gave place to the Arabic, and this city lost its proud name and its prouder rank together (Reland, p. 987). Like so many other cities, the old Aramaic name, which had probably never been lost to the peasantry, was revived among writers, and we thus find *Beigebirin*, or some form like it, constantly in use after the 8th century (Reland, *Palæst.* p. 222, 227; *Gesta Dei per Francos*, p. 1044). In the 12th century the Crusaders found it in ruins, and called by the Arabs *Bethgebrim* (doubtless a Frank corruption of *Beit Jibrin*). They built a strong fortress on the old foundations to guard against the incursions of the Moslems, the remains of which, and the chapel connected with it, still exist. After the battle of Hattin it fell into the hands of Saladin, but was retaken by Richard of England. It was finally captured by Bilars (see *Will. Tyr.* xiv, 22; *Jac. de Vit.* in *Gesta Dei*, p. 1070, 1071; Bohaeddin, *It. Salud.* p. 229). It has since crumbled to ruin under the blight of Mohammedan rule.

The modern village of Beit Jibrin is about twenty-five miles from Jerusalem, on the road to Gaza. It contains between two and three hundred inhabitants, and is situated in a little nook or glen in the side of a long green valley, which is shut in by low ridges of limestone partially covered with dark cope. The ancient ruins are scattered around it, and are of considerable extent. The principal one is a large irregular inclosure, formerly surrounded by a massive wall, still in part standing, and containing the remains of the Crusaders' castle. A great part of this outer wall is completely ruinous; but the north side, which skirts the bank of the valley, is still several feet high. The inclosure is about 600 feet in diameter. The fortress is about 200 feet square, and is of a much later date than the outer wall. In the castle, along the south side, are portions of the walls and the groined roof and clustered columns of a fine old chapel—the same, doubtless, which was built by the Crusaders. An Arabic inscription over the castle-gate bears the date A.H. 958=A.D. 1551—probably the time when it was last repaired. A short distance eastward are other massive ruins and a deep well; while about a mile up the valley are the picturesque remains of the church of St. Anne (Porter, *Handbook for Syr. and Pal.* p. 256 sq.). Several curious traditions have found a "local habitation" at Beit Jibrin. One places here the miraculous fountain which sprang from the jaw-bone Samson wielded with such success against the Philistines (Anton, *Mant. Itin.* p. 30, 32).

The valley, on the side of which the ruins of Eleutheropolis lie, runs up among the hills for two miles or more south-by-east. On each side of it are low ridges of soft limestone, which rises here and there in white bare crowns over the dark shrubs. In these ridges are some of the most remarkable caverns and excavations in Palestine, rivalling in extent and interest the catacombs of Rome and Malta. They are altogether different in character from the rock-tombs of Jerusalem and the grottos of Petra. They were examined and described by Dr. Robinson, and they have since been more fully explored by Mr. Porter. They are found together in clusters, and form subterranean villages. Some are rectangular, 100 feet and more in length, with smooth walls and lofty arched roofs. Others are bell-shaped—from 40 to 70 feet in diameter, by nearly 60 feet in height—all connected together by arched doorways and winding subterranean passages. A few are entirely dark, but most of them are lighted by a circular aperture at the top. They occur at short intervals along both sides of the whole valley, and may also be seen at several other neighboring villages. The origin and object of these singular excavations are easily ascertained. During the Babylonian captivity the Edomites overran and

occupied the whole of southern Palestine, which is hence called by Josephus Idumæa. Jerome calls the Idumæans Horites, and says they inhabited the whole country extending from Eleutheropolis to Petra and Elah, and that they dwell in caves—preferring them both on account of their security and their coolness during the heat of summer (*Comm. in Obad.* i). The original inhabitants of Edom were Horites, that is, *Troglochytes*, "dwellers in caves." The descendants of Esau adopted the habits of their predecessors, and when they took possession of southern Palestine excavated rock dwellings wherever practicable (see Robinson's *Biblical Researches*, 2d ed. ii, 23, 57 sq.; Van de Velde, *Narrative*, ii, 147 sq.; Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 358 sq.)—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

**Eleu'therus** (Ἐλευθέριος, *free*; see Simonis, *Onom.* p. 58), a river of Syria mentioned in 1 Macc. xi, 7; xii, 30. In early ages it was a noted border stream (Pliny, v, 17; ix, 12; Ptolemy, v, 15, 4). According to Strabo, it separated Syria from Phœnicia (xvi, 753), and formed the northern limit of Cœle-Syria. Josephus informs us that Antony gave Cleopatra "the cities that were within the river Eleutherus, as far as Egypt, except Tyre and Sidon" (*Ant.* xv, 4, 1; *War.* i, 18, 5). A careful examination of the passages in Num. xxxiv, 8-10, and Ezek. xlvi, 15-17, and a comparison of them with the features of the country, lead Mr. Porter to the conclusion that this river also formed in part the northern border of the "Promised Land" (*Five Years in Damascus*, ii, 354 sq.). Pliny says that at a certain season of the year it swarmed with tortoise (ix, 10). Of the identity of the Eleutherus with the modern *Nahr el-Kebir*, "Great River," there cannot be a doubt. Its highest source is at the north-eastern base of Lebanon: it sweeps round the northern end of the range, through the opening called in Scripture "the entrance of Hamath" (Num. xxxiv, 8), and, after receiving several small tributaries from the heights of Lebanon, it falls into the Mediterranean about eighteen miles north of Tripolis. It still forms the boundary between the provinces of Akkâr and el-Husn. During summer and autumn it is but a small stream, easily forded, but in winter it swells into a large and rapid river (Maundrell, p. 33; Burckhardt, p. 270; Paulus, *Samml.* i, 35, 203).—Smith, s. v.

**Eleuthêrus** or **Eleutherius**, a native of Nicopolis, elected bishop of Rome after the death of Soter, May 3, 177. He is previously (168) mentioned as a deacon of bishop Anicetus of Rome. He opposed with much zeal the errors of the Valentinians during his tenure of office. Two events are reported to have rendered his pontificate memorable: the glorious death of the martyrs of Lyons and Vienne (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* v, 4), and an embassy from Lucius, king of Great Britain, to demand a missionary to teach the Britons the Christian religion (Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* iii, 25; Collier, *Eccl. Hist.* i, 35). The churches of Lyons and Vienne sent to him the acts of those of their members who had just suffered martyrdom. Their messenger was the presbyter Irenæus, subsequently celebrated as one of the pillars of the Church in Gaul. As the letter of these churches to Eleutherus warns against the Montanists, some have inferred, though without being supported by any other proof, that Eleutherus was an adherent of the Montanist sect. The legend about the embassy of king Lucius, and the subsequent mission of two Roman missionaries to England, is doubted by many historians. Eleutherus died A.D. 192. He is commemorated in the Church of Rome as a saint on the 26th of May. See Mosheim, *Comment.* i, 273; Neander, *Planting and Training*, ii, 518; Smith, *Religion of Ancient Britain*, p. 121, 122; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* iii, 753. (A. J. S.)

**Elha'nan** (Heb. *Elchanan'*, עֶלְחָנָן, whom God has graciously bestowed [compare *Hananeel*, *Hananavah*, *Johanan*, Phœn. *Hannibal*; also *Baal-hanan*, etc.];



Sept. Ἐλεανάν; Vulg. *Adeodatus*, but *Chanan*, *Elhanan*, in Chron.), a distinguished warrior in the time of king David, who performed a memorable exploit against the Philistines, though in what that exploit exactly consisted, and who the hero himself was, it is not easy to determine. B. C. cir. 1020.

1. 1 Sam. xxi, 19, says that he was the "son of Jaare Oregim the Bethlehemite," and that he "slew Goliath the Gittite, the staff of whose spear was like a weaver's beam." Here, in the A. V., the words "the brother of" are inserted, to bring the passage into agreement with,

2. 1 Chron. xx, 5, which states that "Elhanan, son of Jair (or Jaor), slew Lahmi, the brother of Goliath the Gittite, the staff of whose spear," etc.

Of these two statements the latter is probably the more correct, the differences between them being much smaller in the original than in English (see Kennicott, *Dissertation*, p. 78). See LAHMI.

(a.) The word *Oregim* (q. v.) exists twice in the verse in Samuel, first as a proper name, and again at the end—"weavers." The former has probably been taken in by an early transcriber from the latter, i. e. from the next line of the MS. To the end of the verse it certainly belongs, since it is found in the parallel passage of Chronicles, and also forms part of what seems to have been a proverbial description of Goliath (comp. 1 Sam. xvii, 7).

(b.) The statement in Samuel is in contradiction to the narrative of 1 Sam. xvii, according to which Goliath the Gittite was killed by David. True, Ewald (*Gesch.* iii, 91 sq.)—from the fact that David's antagonist is, with only three exceptions (one of them in the doubtful verses, xvii, 12-32), called "the Philistine," and for other linguistic reasons—has suggested that Elhanan was the real victor of Goliath, and that after David became king the name of Goliath was attached to the nameless champion whom he killed in his youth. But against this is the fact that Goliath is named thrice in 1 Sam. xvii and xxi—thrice only though it be; and also that Elhanan's exploit, from its position both in Samuel and in Chronicles, and from other indications, took place late in David's reign, and when he had been so long king, and so long renowned, that all the brilliant feats of his youth must have been brought to light, and well known to his people. It is recorded as the last but one in the series of encounters of what seems to have been the closing struggle with the Philistines. It was so late that David had acquired among his warriors the fond title of "the light of Israel" (2 Sam. xxi, 17), and that his nephew Jonathan was old enough to perform a feat rivaling that of his illustrious uncle years before. It was certainly after David was made king, for he goes down to the fight, not with his "young men," as when he was leading his band during Saul's life, but with his "servants," literally his "slaves," a term almost strictly reserved for the subjects of a king. The vow of his guard, on one of these occasions, that it would be his last appearance in the field, shows that it must have been after the great Ammonitish war, in which David himself had led the host to the storming of Rabbah (2 Sam. xii, 29). It may have been between this last event and the battle with Absalom beyond Jordan, though there are other obvious reasons why David staid within the walls of Mahanaim on that occasion. See DAVID.

Jerome, in his *Quest. Hebr.* on both passages—he does not state whether from ancient tradition or not—translates Elhanan into *ἰ' d'o-datus*, and adds *filius sultis Polymitarius Bethlehemites*—"the son of a wood, a weaver, a Bethlehemite." Adeodatus, he says, is David, which he argues not only by considerations drawn from the meaning of each of the above words, but also from the statement in the concluding verse of the record that all these giants "fell by the hand of David and by the hand of his servants," and as Elhanan slew Goliath, Elhanan must be David.

3. Elhanan is elsewhere called the son of Dodo of Bethlehem, one of "the thirty" of David's guard, and named first on the list (2 Sam. xxiii, 24; 1 Chron. xi, 26). See Kennicott's *Dissertation*, p. 179. Perhaps his father had both names.—Smith, s. v. See JAIR.

**Elevation of the Host.** See HOST and MASS.

**Elfege.** See ALPHAGE.

**Elfric.** See ELFRIC.

**E'li** (Heb. *Elí'*, עֲלִי, i. q. עֲלִי, *ascend*; Sept. Ἠλί [so N. T. see HELI], Josephus Ἠλεῖ, Vulg. *Heli*), the high-priest of the Jews when the ark was in Shiloh (1 Sam. i, 3, 9). He was descended from Aaron through Ithamar, the youngest of his two surviving sons (Lev. x, 1, 2, 12), as appears from the fact that Abiathar, who was certainly a lineal descendant of Eli (1 Kings ii, 27), had a son Ahimelech, who is expressly stated to have been "one of the sons of Ithamar" (1 Chron. xxiv, 3; comp. 2 Sam. viii, 17). With this accords the circumstance that the names of Eli and his successors in the high-priesthood up to and including Abiathar are not found in the genealogy of Eleazar (1 Chron. vi, 4-15; comp. Ezra vii, 1-5). As the history makes no mention of any high-priest of the line of Ithamar before Eli, he is generally supposed to have been the first of that line who held the office (Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 1, 3). From him, his sons having died before him, it appears to have passed to his grandson Abitub (1 Sam. xiv, 3; comp. however Josephus, *Ant.* v, 11, 2), and it certainly remained in his family till Abiathar, the grandson of Abitub, was "thrust out from being priest unto the Lord" by Solomon for his share in Adonijah's rebellion (1 Kings ii, 26, 27; i. 7), and the high-priesthood passed back again to the family of Eleazar in the person of Zadok (1 Kings ii, 35). How the office ever came into the younger branch of the house of Aaron we are not informed; perhaps it was through the incapacity or minority of the then sole representative of the elder line, for it is very evident that it was no unauthorized usurpation on the part of Eli (1 Sam. ii, 27, 28, 30). See ITHAMAR. Eli also acted as regent or civil judge of Israel after the death of Samson, being the immediate predecessor of his pupil Samuel (1 Sam. vii, 6, 15-17), the last of the judges. This function, indeed, seems to have been intended, by the theocratic constitution, to devolve upon the high-priest, by virtue of his office, in the absence of any person specially appointed by the divine King to deliver and govern Israel. He is said to have judged Israel 40 years (1 Sam. iv, 18); the Septuagint makes it 20. It has been suggested, in explanation of the discrepancy, that he was *sole* judge for 20 years, after having been co-judge with Samson for 20 years (*Judge*, xvi, 31). But the probability is that the number 40 is correct, but that it comprehends only the period of his administration as *judge*; for not only does the whole tenor of the narrative imply that this immediately succeeded the judgeship of Samson (as indeed Josephus evidently understood it; a fact apparent not only from his history, but also from the summing up of his numbers as computed by himself, *Ant.* v, 9; x, 3; title to book v), but this view is evidently taken by Paul in his assignment of the period of 450 years to the judges (*Acts* xiii, 20), a number that immediately results from simply adding together the items as given in the O.-T. history, including Samson and Eli as continuous to the others. See JUDGES. As Eli died at the age of ninety-eight (1 Sam. iv, 15), the forty years (B. C. 1165-1125) must have commenced when he was fifty-eight years old. (See *Lightfoot's Works*, i, 53, 907, fol. Lond. 1684; Selden, *De Success. in Pontif. Hebr.* lib. i, cap. 4). See HIGH-PRIEST.

Eli seems to have been a religious man, and the only fault recorded of him was an excessive easiness of temper, most unbefitting the high responsibilities of his official character. His sons Hophni and Phinehas, whom he invested with authority, misconducted

themselves so outrageously as to excite deep disgust among the people, and render the services of the tabernacle odious in their eyes (1 Sam. ii, 27-36; 1 Kings ii, 27). Of this misconduct Eli was aware, but contented himself with mild and ineffectual remonstrances (1 Sam. ii, 22-25), where his station required severe and vigorous action (1 Sam. iii, 13). For this neglect the judgment of God was at length denounced upon his house, through the young Samuel (q. v.), who, under peculiar circumstances, had been attached from childhood to his person (1 Sam. ii, 29; iii, 18). Some years passed without any apparent fulfilment of this denunciation, but it came at length in one terrible crash, by which the old man's heart was broken. The Philistines had gained the upper hand over Israel, and the ark of God was taken to the field, in the confidence of victory and safety from its presence. But in the battle which followed the ark itself was taken by the Philistines, and the two sons of Eli, who were in attendance upon it, were slain. The high-priest, then blind with age, sat by the wayside at Shiloh, awaiting tidings from the war, "for his heart trembled for the ark of God." A man of Benjamin, with his clothes rent, and with earth upon his head, brought the fatal news: and Eli heard that Israel was defeated—that his sons were slain—that the ark of God was taken—at which last word he fell heavily from his seat, and died (1 Sam. iv). According to Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 142), an erroneous tradition locates his grave in an elegant building at the village Charim ben-Elim, eight miles N.N.E. of Jaffa, on the shore. The ultimate doom upon Eli's house was accomplished when Solomon removed Abiathar (the last high-priest of this line) from his office, and restored the line of Eleazar, in the person of Zadok (1 Kings ii, 27). See ABIATHAR. Another part of the same sentence (1 Sam. ii, 31-33) appears to have been taking effect in the reign of David, when we read that "there were more chief men found of the sons of Eleazar than of the sons of Ithamar"—sixteen of the former, and only eight of the latter (1 Chron. xxiv, 4).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

E'li (*יְלִי*, for Heb. *יְלִי* [Psa. xxii, 2], *eli', my God*, as it is immediately rendered), an exclamation used by our Saviour on the cross, in appeal to his heavenly Father (Matt. xxvii, 46). See AGONY. In the parallel passage (Mark xv, 34) it is written *Ἐλωι, ELOI* (q. v.).

Eli- (*יְלִי*, an old form of the "construct state" of *יְלִי*, the *Mighty*, i. e. Almighty, the union vowel *i* being used as in *Abi-*, *Ahi-*, etc.) often occurs as the first element of proper names (comp. *Elihu*, *Elijah*, and many others here following), as referring to the highest notion of the Deity among the Shemitic races. As such epithet it is sometimes interchangeable with *Baal-* (q. v.) (see 2 Sam. v, 16; 1 Chron. xiv, 7), or even *Jeho-* (q. v.) (see 2 Kings xxiii, 34). This constructive form is also sometimes interchanged with the abbreviation of the simple *יְלִי* into *יְלִי* (1 Chron. iii, 6; xiv, 5; comp. Exod. vi, 22; Num. iii, 30), or it even exchanges places with the other element of the name, e. g. *Elium* (2 Sam. xi, 3) becomes *Amniel* (1 Chron. iii, 5). As in the words beginning with *Abi-*, *Ahi-*, etc., this element often melts into the other member, not strictly in a genitive sense, but as a sort of liturgical invocation or eulogium of the Deity, as is found to be the case with similar names used as religious formulae, especially among the ancient Phœnicians (see ELIHANAN).

E'liab [usually *Eli'ab*] (Heb. *Eliab'*, *יְלִי־אֵב*, to whom *God is father*; Sept. *Ἐλιὰβ*, Vulg. *Eliab*), the name of seven men.

1. A Reubenite, son of Pallu or Phallu, whose family was one of the principal in the tribe, and father or progenitor of Dathan and Abiram, the leaders in the revolt against Moses (Num. xxvi, 8, 9; xvi, 1, 12;

Deut. xi, 6). B.C. post. 1856. Eliab had another son named Nemuel; and the record of Num. xxvi is interrupted expressly to admit a statement regarding his sons.

2. A son of Helon, and phylarch of the tribe of Zebulun at the time of the census in the wilderness of Sinai (Num. i, 9; ii, 7; vii, 24, 29; x, 16). B.C. 1657.

3. An ancestor of Samuel (q. v.) the prophet, being a Kohathite Levite, son of Nahath and father of Jeroham (1 Chron. vi, 27 [12]). B.C. cir. 1250. In the other statements of the genealogy this name appears to be given as ELIHU (1 Sam. i, 1) and ELIEL (1 Chron. vi, 34 [19]).

4. The eldest son of Jesse and brother of David (1 Sam. xvi, 6; xvii, 13; 1 Chron. ii, 13). It was he that made the contemptuous inquiry, by which he sought to screen his own cowardice, when David proposed to fight Goliath, "With whom hast thou left those few sheep in the wilderness?" (1 Sam. xvii, 28.) B.C. 1063. His daughter Abihail married her second cousin Rehoboam, and bore him three children (2 Chron. xi, 18); although, taking into account the length of the reigns of David and Solomon, it is difficult not to suspect that the word "daughter" is here used in the less strict sense of granddaughter or descendant. In 1 Chron. xxvii, 18, we find mention of "ELIHU, of the brethren of David," as "ruler" (*יְרֵיב*) or "prince" (*יְרֵיב*) of the tribe of Judah. According to the ancient Hebrew tradition preserved by Jerome (*Quæst. Heb.* ad loc.), this Elihu was identical with Eliab. "Brethren" is, however, often used in the sense of kinsman, e. g. 1 Chron. xii, 2.—Smith, s. v.

5. The third of the Gadite heroes who joined David in his stronghold in the wilderness (1 Chron. xii, 9). B.C. 1061.

6. A Levite in the time of David, who was both a "porter" (*שְׁוֹרֵי*, *shōrē*, i. e. a door-keeper) and a musician of the "psaltery" (1 Chron. xv, 18, 20; xvi, 5). B.C. 1013.

7. Son of Nathanael, one of the forefathers of Judith, and therefore belonging to the tribe of Simeon (Judith viii, 1).

Eli'ada (Heb. *Elyada'*, *יְלִי־אָדָא*, whom *God has known*), the name of three men.

1. (Sept., in Kings, *Ἐλιὰδ*, and repeated, *Βααλ-μαϊθ*; in Chron. *Ἐλιαδᾶ*, v. r. *Ἐλιᾶδα*; Vulg. *Elioda*, *Elidada*.) One of David's sons; according to the list, the youngest but one of the family born to him after his establishment in Jerusalem (2 Sam. v, 16; 1 Chron. iii, 8). B.C. post 1033. From the latter passage it appears that he was the son of a wife and not of a concubine. In 1 Chron. xiv, 7, the name appears in the form of *יְלִי־בְעִלְיָדָא*, BEELIADA (q. d. whom the *Master has known*; see Simonis, *Onomast.* p. 460; *בְּעִלְיָדָא* being the Syriac form of *בְּעִלְיָדָא*, *Lord*). This curious reading of the Masoretic text is not, however, indisputable; De Rossi's *Cod.* 186 (*primū manu*) reads *יְלִי־אָדָא*, the Sept. *Ἐλιαδῆ*, and the Peshito *Elidada*. On the strength of these authorities, De Rossi (after Dathius, *Lit. Hist. V. T.* p. 654) pronounces in favor of assimilating this passage to the other two, and refers to the improbability of David's using the names *יְלִי* and *בְּעִלְיָדָא* promiscuously (see De Rossi's *Var. Lect. V. T. Hebraicæ*, iv). We must not, however, in the interest of careful criticism, too hastily succumb to arguments of this kind. As to MSS., the four or five which Kennicott adduces all support the text of 1 Chron. xiv, 7; the authority of the Sept. is neutralized by *Codd. Alex.* and *Friël. August.*, the former of which has *Βαλλιαδᾶ*, and the latter *Βαλεγᾶδῆ*, evidently corroborating the Masoretic text, as does the Vulg. *Baal-iadr*. As to the difficulty of David's using a name which contained *בְּעִלְיָדָא* for one of its elements, it is at

least very doubtful whether that word, which literally means *master, proprietor, husband*, and is often used in the earlier Scriptures inoffensively (see Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 224), in David's time had acquired the bad sense which *Baal*-worship in Israel afterwards imparted to it. It is much to the present point that in this very chapter (ver. 11) David does not object to employ the word בַּזְזִים in the name *Baal-perazim*, in commemoration of a victory vouchsafed to him by the Lord (see 2 Sam. v, 20, where the naming of the place is ascribed to David himself). It is possible that this appellation of his son might itself have had reference to that signal victory. The name appears to be omitted by Josephus in his list of David's family (*Ant.* vii, 3, 3), unless he be there called *Elien* (Ἐλιών).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

2. (Sept. Ἐλιαδά, v. r. Ἐλιαδαί; Vulg. *Eliada*.) Apparently an Aramite of Zobah, the father of Rezon, which latter was captain of a marauding band that annoyed Solomon (1 Kings xi, 23, where the name is Anglicized "Eliadah"). B. C. ante 975.

3. (Sept. Ἐλιαδά, Vulg. *Eliada*.) A mighty man of war (יְהוֹרָם בֶּן-יִשָּׁכָר), a Benjamite, who led 200,000 (?) archers of his tribe to the army of Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xvii, 17). B. C. 945. See JEIOSHAPHAT.

**Eli'adah** (1 Kings xi, 23), a less correct mode of Anglicizing the name *Eliad* (q. v.).

**Eli'adas** (Ἐλιαδάς, Vulg. *Eliadas*), one of "the sons of Zanoth" who divorced his Gentile wife after the restoration from Babylon (1 Esdr. ix, 28); evidently the ἘΛΙΟΕΝΑΙ (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra x, 27).

**Eli'adun** (Ἠλιαδοῦν v. r. Ἡλιαδοῦν, Vulg. omits), a name given as that of the father of Joda, whose sons and brethren assisted in rebuilding the Temple after the return from Babylon (1 Esdr. v, 58); apparently a corruption for the HENADAD (q. v.) of the Hebrew narrative (Ezra iii, 19).

**Eli'ah** (1 Chron. viii, 27; Ezra x, 26), a less correct mode of Anglicizing the name of ELIJAH (q. v.), but referring to others than the prophet.

**Eli'ahba** (Heb. *Elyachba'*, אֵלִיָּאָבָה, but in Chron. *Elyachba'*, אֵלִיָּאָבָה, whom *God will hide*; Sept. Ἐλιαβά, Vulg. *Eliabai*), a Shaalbonite; one of David's thirty chief warriors (2 Sam. xxiii, 32; 1 Chron. xi, 33). B. C. 1046.

**Eli'akim** (Heb. *Elyakim'*, אֵלִיָּאֲכִים, whom *God will raise up*; Sept. Ἐλιακίμ and Ἐλιακίμ; N. T. Ἐλιακίμ; Josephus, Ἐλιακίμος, *Ant.* x, 1, 2; Vulg. *Eliacim*), the name of five men.

1. The son of Melea and father of Jonan, in the genealogy (q. v.) of Christ (Luke iii, 30); probably the grandson of Nathan, of the private line of David's descent (Strong's *Harm. and Expos.* p. 16). B. C. considerably post 1013.

2. Son of Hilkiah, and prefect of the palace under king Hezekiah, who sent him to receive the message of the invading Assyrians, and report it to Isaiah (2 Kings xviii, 18; xix, 2; Isa. xxxvi, 3, 11, 22; xxxvii, 2). B. C. 713. He succeeded Shebna in this office after the latter had been ejected from it (Grotius thinks by reason of his leprosy) as a punishment for his pride (Isa. xxii, 15-20). Eliakim was a good man, as appears by the title emphatically applied to him by God, "my servant Eliakim" (Isa. xxii, 20), and as was evinced by his conduct on the occasion of Sennacherib's invasion (2 Kings xviii, 37; xix, 1-5), and also in the discharge of the duties of his high station, in which he acted as a "father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and to the house of Judah" (Isa. xxii, 21). It was as a special mark of the divine approbation of his character and conduct, of which, however, no further details have been preserved to us, that he was raised to the post of authority and dignity which

he held at the time of the Assyrian invasion. What this office was has been a subject of some perplexity to commentators. The ancients, including the Sept. and Jerome, understood it of the priestly office, as appears by the rendering of אֲרֹן (Isa. xxxi, 15; A. V. "treasurer") by *παστοφόριον*, the "priest's chamber," by the former, and of אֲרֹן הַבַּיִת ("over the house," as Isa. xxxvi, 3) by "*propositus templi*," by the latter. Hence Nicephorus, as well as the author of the Alexandrian Chronicle, includes in the list of high-priests Somnas or Sobnas (i. e. Shebna), and Eliakim, identifying the latter with Shallum and Meshullam. But it is certain from the description of the office in Isa. xxii, and especially from the expression in ver. 22, "The key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder," that it was the king's house, and not the house of God, of which Eliakim was prefect, as Ahishar had been in the reign of Solomon (1 Kings iv, 6), and Azrikam in that of Ahaz (2 Chron. xxxvii, 7). With this agrees both all that is said, and all that is not said, of Eliakim's functions. The office seems to have been the highest under the king, as was the case in Egypt, when Pharaoh said to Joseph, "Thou shalt be over my house (אֲרֹן הַבַּיִת) . . . only in the throne will I be greater than thou" (Gen. xli, 40; comp. xxxix, 4). In 2 Chron. xxxviii, 7, the office is called "governor (אֲרֹן) of the house." It is clear that the "scribe" was inferior to him, for Shebna, when degraded from the prefecture of the house, acted as scribe under Eliakim (2 Kings xviii, 37). The whole description of it too by Isaiah implies a place of great eminence and power. This description is transferred in a mystical or spiritual sense to Christ the son of David in Rev. iii, 7, thus making Eliakim in some sense typical of Christ. The true meaning of אֲרֹן, *soken'*, is very doubtful. "Friend," i. e. of the king; and "steward of the provisions," are the two most probable significations. See TREASURER. Eliakim's career was a most honorable and splendid one. Most commentators agree that Isa. xxii, 25 does not apply to him, but to Shebna.—Smith, s. v.

3. The original name of Jehoikim (q. v.), king of Judah (2 Kings xxiii, 34; 2 Chron. xxxvi, 4).

4. Son of Abiud and father of Azor, of the posterity of Zerubbabel (Matt. i, 13). He is probably identical with the SHECHANIAM (q. v.) of 1 Chron. iii, 21 (Strong's *Harmony and Expos. of the Gospels*, p. 11). See GENEALOGY (OF CHRIST).

5. A priest in the days of Nehemiah, who assisted at the dedication of the new wall of Jerusalem (Neh. xii, 41). B. C. 446.

**Eli'ali** (Ἐλιαλί v. r. Ἐλιαλεί, Vulg. *Dielus*), one of "the sons of Maani" who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (1 Esdr. ix, 34); apparently a corruption for the BISSUI (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra x, 38).

**E'liam** [usually *El'am*] (Heb. *Eliam'*, אֵלִיָּאָם, *God is [his] people*, i. e. *friend*; Sept. Ἐλιαός, Vulg. *Eliam*), the father of Bathsheba, the wife of Uriah and afterwards of David (2 Sam. xi, 3). In the list of 1 Chron. iii, 5, the names of both father and daughter are altered, the former to the equivalent AMMIEL (q. v.), and the latter to Bathshua, both the latter names being also those of non-Israelite persons, while Uriah was a Hitite (comp. Gen. xxxviii, 12; 1 Chron. ii, 3; also 2 Sam. xvii, 27). The same name Eliam also occurs as that of a Gilonite, the son of Abithophel, and one of David's "thirty" warriors (2 Sam. xxiii, 34). It is omitted in the list of 1 Chron. xi, but is now probably discernible as "AMUJAM the Pelonite" (ver. 36) (see Kennicott, *Dissertation*, p. 207). The ancient Jewish tradition preserved by Jerome (*Qu. Hebr.* on 2 Sam. xi, 3, and 1 Chron. iii, 5) is that the two Eliams are the same person. An argument has been founded

on this to account for the hostility of Abithophel to king David, as having dishonored his house and caused the death of his son-in-law (Blunt, *Coincidences*, pt. ii, x). But he would perhaps have rather been proud of this alliance with royalty. B.C. 1046.—Smith, s. v.

**Eliāōnias** [many *Eliōnias*'] (*Ἐλιωνίας*, Vulg. *Morbilianus*, including the preceding name), a son of Zarahias of Pahath-Moab, leader of two hundred exiles from Babylon (1 Esdr. viii, 31); evidently the *ELIHOENAI* (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra viii, 4).

**Eli'as** (*Ἠλιᾶς*, in Maccabees, elsewhere and in N. T. *Ἠλιᾶς*, Vulg. *Elias*, but in Cod. Amiat. *Heliōs*), the Græcized form in which the name of *ELIJAH* (q. v.) is given in the A. V. of the Apocrypha and N. T. (Ecclus. xlviii, 1, 4, 12; 1 Macc. ii, 58; Matt. xi, 14; xvi, 14; xvii, 3, 4, 10, 11, 12; xxvii, 47, 49; Mark vi, 15; viii, 28; ix, 4, 5, 11, 12, 13; xv, 35, 36; Luke i, 17; iv, 25, 26; ix, 8, 19, 30, 33, 54; John i, 21, 25; Rom. xi, 2; James v, 17). In Rom. xi, 2, the reference is not to the prophet, but to the portion of Scripture designated by his name, the words being *ἐν Ἠλιᾷ*, "in Elias," not as in A. V. "of Elias."—Smith, s. v.

**Elias Levita** (properly *ELIJAH the Levite, son of Asher*), one of the greatest Jewish scholars of modern times, was born in the latter half of the fifteenth century. Both the year and the place of his birth have been the subject of literary controversy. The former point seems to have been settled by the learned Rossi (see below), who showed that Elias was born in 1471 or 1472, not, as Hirt maintains, in 1469, or, as Nagel undertook to prove, in 1477. The second point is still a point of dispute, both Italians and Germans being desirous to claim this great writer for their country. The chief argument of the former is that Elias, in one of his works, speaks of Italy as "my country" and Venice as "my city;" the chief arguments of the Germans are that Elias, on the titles-pages of several of his books, calls himself *Ashkenazi* (*אַשכּנזי*), or "the German," and that, according to the express testimony of his friend and pupil, Sebastian Münster (q. v.), he was born at Neustadt, on the Aich, not far from Nuremberg. The margrave of Neustadt expelled Elias, together with several other Jews, from that town. He then went to Italy, lived in several places as teacher of the Hebrew language, especially (from 1504) at Padua, where he lectured on the Hebrew grammar of Moses Kimchi, and wrote a commentary on it. When Padua, in 1509, was captured and plundered, Elias lost all his property and went to Venice, which city, in 1512, he again left for Rome. There he met with a very friendly reception from cardinal Egidio of Viterbo, who even received him and his family into his own house. For many years Elias instructed the cardinal in the Hebrew language, who, in turn, made him better acquainted with the classical languages. Through Egidio, Elias entered into intimate relations with a number of other cardinals and bishops, who so warmly recommended him that he received an honorable call from king François I of France, which he, however, declined. When Rome, in 1527, was plundered by the troops of Karl V, Elias again lost his whole property. He again went to Venice, where he remained until 1540, when he accepted a call from Paul Fagius to assist him in the establishment of a new Hebrew printing-office, and in the publication of several Hebrew books, at Isny, in Suabia. He remained in Isny until 1547, when he returned to Venice, where he died in 1549. Elias rejected many of the Jewish traditions, and always spoke favorably of the Christians; but he expressly denied that he had secretly become a Christian, and averred that, "thanks to God, he was still a Jew." He was universally esteemed both for his character and his extraordinary scholarship; only some fanatical Jews hated him, as they suspected his fidelity to Judaism. His celebrated works on Hebrew

grammar procured him the surname of "the Grammarian" (*הַמְּדַבֵּר*). His first work was a commentary on the *מְחֻלָּקִים* (*Mahalak*), or grammar of the rabbi Moses Kimchi, first published by a certain Benjamin who had stolen the MS. (at Pesaro, 1508; frequently reprinted, with a Latin translation by Sebastian Münster, Basel, 1527, 1531; and another by L'Empereur, Leyd. 1631). This is a different work from his scholia on Kimchi's *פֶּתַח דְּבַרָּי* (*Pethach Debaray*), or brief grammatical introduction, the text of which had appeared at Naples in 1492, and Levita's scholia on it at Pesara in 1507, and later editions. At Rome he composed a grammar entitled *חֹב בַּחֹר* (*hab-Bachur*, Rome, 1518), and a work on "Composition" (*חֵבֶרֶת פְּתִיחָה*, Rome, 1519), in which he treats of the irregular words of the Bible. Both works were translated by Münster (the former first at Basel in 1518, and the latter in 1536). He also wrote a more extensive grammatical treatise in four parts, entitled *פְּתִיחַת אֲשֵׁרֵי*, "*Elijah's Sections*" (Soncino, 1520, and later elsewhere; trans. by Münster, Basel, 1527, and later). After his return to Venice he wrote a book on the accents (*טַבְּ טַבְּ טַבְּ*) *Tub Taam* (Ven. 1538, and other eds.; likewise translated by Münster, Basel, 1539), and, the most celebrated of all his works, a critical book on the Biblical text and its authors (*מַסֹּרֶת הַמִּסֹּרֶת*, *Masoreth ham-Masoreth* (Venice, 1538, 1546; Basel, 1539 [with a Latin summary of the work by Münster; Sulzläch, 1769 and 1771]). This work, remarkable alike for literary merit, although it anticipated the judgments of the highest modern criticism on the questions of which it treats, and although it was, in fact, the father of the great Buxtorf and Cappel controversy, which raged round the Hebrew Scriptures for more than a hundred years after Levita's death, had, until recently, never been actually translated either into Latin or any modern language. Nagel translated into Latin the three introductions (Aldorf, 1757-1771); and there is a so-called German translation of Levita's book, published at Halle in 1772, and commonly known as Semler's. But Semler was not really, as indeed he did not profess to be, the translator of Levita. The translation, such as it was, was executed by a young Jewish convert to Christianity of the name of Meyer, and all that Semler did was to supervise and annotate the German rendering. After all, the work was full of errors, and many valuable passages of the original are altogether omitted. A complete and very carefully executed translation into English, together with a critical edition of the original, was in 1867 published by Dr. Ginsburg (*The Masoreth ha-Masoreth of Elias Levita, in Hebrew, with an English Translation and Explanatory Notes*, London, 1867). Among the works compiled by him at Isny is a Chaldaic-Rabbinical Dictionary (*מִתְּחֵלָה*, *Methurgeman*, Isny, 1541; Ven. 1560). Elias also prepared a German translation of the Psalms (Ven. 1545), and was, according to Sabbai, the author of a Hebrew-German novel, *Baba*. A full list of these and other works of Elias, with their editions, translations, etc., also bibliographical treatises on them and their author, may be found in Fürst's *Bibliotheca Judaica*, ii, 239 sq. A valuable biography of Elias is found in Dr. Ginsburg's edition of *Masoreth ham-Masoreth*, cited above; see also Herzog, *Real-Encycl.* iii, 758; Hofer, *Nour. Biog. Gén.* xv, 810; Rossi, *Dizionario storico degli Autori Ebrei* (German transl. [*Hist. Handwörterbuch der jüd. Schriftsteller*] by Dr. Hammerger, Leipz. 1839); Hirt, *Oriental. und Exeget. Bibliothek*, pt. vii, Jena, 1755; Wolfii *Bibliotheca Hebraea*, Hamburg, 1715, i, 153. (A. J. S.)

**Eli'asaph** (Heb. *Elyasaph*, *אֵלְיָאֶשָׁף*, whom *God has added*; Sept. *Ἐλισάφ*), the name of two Israelites at the time of the Exode.

1. Son of Reuel or Deuel, and phylarch of the tribe of Dan (Num. i, 14; ii, 14; vii, 42, 47; x, 20). B.C. 1657.

2. Son of Lael, and chief of the family of the Gershonite Levites (Num. iii, 24). B.C. 1657.

**Eli'ashib** (Heb. *Elyashib'*, עֲלִישִׁיב, whom *God will restore*; Sept. Ἐλιασιβίων, Ἐλιασίβι, Ἐλιασιβ, Ἐλιασιβίβ, etc.; Josephus Ἐλιασίβος; Vulg. *Elyasub, Eliasib*), a common name of Israelites, especially at the later period of the O.-T. history.

1. A priest in the time of king David; head of the eleventh "course" in the order of the "governors" (עֲלִישִׁיב) of the sanctuary (1 Chron. xxiv, 12). B.C. 1013.

2. A Levitical singer who repudiated his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezra x, 24). B.C. 458.

3. An Israelite of the lineage of Zattu, who did the same (Ezra x, 27). B.C. 458.

4. An Israelite of the lineage of Bani, who did the same (Ezra x, 36). B.C. 458.

5. The high-priest of the Jews in the time of Nehemiah (Neh. xii, 28). B.C. 446. With the assistance of his fellow-priests, he rebuilt the eastern city wall adjoining the Temple (Neh. iii, 1). His own extensive mansion was doubtless situated in the same vicinity, probably on the ridge Ophel (Neh. iii, 20, 21). See JERUSALEM. Eliashib was in some way allied (עֲרִיב = near) to Tobiah the Ammonite, for whom he had prepared an ante-room in the Temple, a desecration which excited the pious indignation of Nehemiah (Neh. xiii, 4, 7). One of the grandsons of Eliashib had also married the daughter of Sanballat the Hironite (xiii, 28). There seems no reason to doubt that the same Eliashib is referred to in Ezra x, 6, as the father of Johanan, who occupied an apartment in the Temple (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* xi, 5, 4). He is evidently the same with the son of Joiakim and father of Joiada (Josephus, "Judas," *Ant.* xi, 7, 1), in the succession of high-priests (Neh. xii, 10, 22). See HIGH-PRIEST.

6. A son of Elioenai, and member of the latest family of the lineage of Zerubbabel, mentioned in the Old Test. (1 Chron. iii, 24). B.C. 406.

**Eli'asib** (Ἐλιασίβος), the Grecized form (1 Esdr. ix, 1) of the name of the high-priest ELIASHIB (q. v.).

**Eli'asis** (Ἐλιασίς v. r. Ἐλιάσις), a name given (1 Esdr. ix, 34) as that of one of the "sons of Maani" who divorced their Gentile wives after the captivity, and corresponding in position to MATTHENAI (q. v.) of the Heb. list (Ezra x, 33); but probably a merely erroneous repetition of EXASIBOS (q. v) preceding in the same verse.

**Eli'athah** (Heb. *Eliá' thah*, עֲלִיָּאֲתָה, 1 Chron. xxxv, 4, or *Eliya' thah*, עֲלִיָּיָה, ver. 27, to whom *God will come*; Sept. Ἐλιαθά v. r. Ἐλιάθ, Vulg. *Eliathah*), the eighth named of the fourteen sons of the Levite Heman, and a musician in the Temple in the time of king David (1 Chron. xxv, 4), who, with twelve of his sons and brethren, had the twentieth division of the Temple-service (xxv, 27). B.C. 1013. In Jerome's *Quest. Hebr.* on ver. 27, the name is given as *Eliaba*, and explained accordingly; but not so in the Vulgate.

**Eliberis**. See ELYVIRA.

**Eli'dad** (Hebrew *Eliáda'*, עֲלִידָד, whom *God has loved*; Sept. Ἐλάδ, Vulg. *Eldad*), the son of Chislon, and phylarch of the tribe of Benjamin, one of the commissioners appointed to portion out the promised land among the tribes (Num. xxxi, 7, 21). B.C. 1619.

**E'liel** (Heb. *Eliél'*, עֲלִיֵּל, to whom *God is might*), the name of some nine Israelites.

1. (Sept. Ἐλιήλ.) A valiant phylarch of the tribe of Manasseh east (1 Chron. v, 24). B.C. post 1612.

2. (Sept. Ἐλιήλ.) Son of Toah and father of Jerohan, ancestors of Heman the singer and Levite (1 Chron. vi, 34); probably identical with the ELIAB of 1

Chron. vi, 34, and the ELIHU of 1 Sam. i, 1. B.C. cir 1250. See SAMUEL.

3. (Sept. Ἐλιήλ.) One of the descendants of Shim' hi, and head of a Benjamite family in Jerusalem (1 Chron. viii, 20). B.C. between 1612 and 588.

4. (Sept. Ἐλιήλ.) One of the descendants of Shashak, and likewise head of a Benjamite family at Jerusalem (1 Chron. viii, 22). B.C. eod.

5. (Sept. Ἐλιήλ v. r. Ἐλιάβ.) The seventh of the Gadite heroes who joined David in his stronghold in the wilderness (1 Chron. xii, 11), possibly the same with No. 6 or 7. B.C. 1061.

6. (Sept. Ἐλιήλ v. r. Ἰελιήλ.) A Mahanite (q. v), and one of David's distinguished warriors (1 Chron. xi, 46). B.C. 1046.

7. (Sept. Ἰαλιήλ v. r. Δαλιήλ.) Another of David's distinguished warriors (1 Chron. xi, 47). B.C. eod.

8. (Sept. Ἐλιήλ.) Chief of the 80 Hebronite Levites assembled by David to assist in bringing the ark to Jerusalem (1 Chron. xv, 9, 11). B.C. 1043.

9. (Sept. Ἐλιήλ.) One of the Levites appointed by Hezekiah to have charge of the offerings for the Temple services (2 Chron. xxxi, 13). B.C. 726.

**Elié'nai** (Heb. *Eliénay'*, עֲלִינָי, perh. contracted for ELIOENAI [q. v.]; Sept. *Eliouyai* v. r. Ἐλιουναί, Vulg. *Elioenai*), one of the Bene-Shimhi Benjamite heads of families resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. viii, 20). B.C. between 1618 and 588.

**Elié'zer** (Heb. *id.* עֲלִיזֵר, *God is his help*, a modification of the name *Elezar* [see LAZARUS]; Sept. Ἐλιέζερ and Ἐλιέζερ, N. T. Ἐλιέζερ), the name of eleven men.

1. "ELIEZER OF DAMASCUS," mentioned in Gen. xv, 2, 3, apparently as a house-born domestic [see SLAVE] and steward of Abraham, and hence likely, in the absence of direct issue, to become the patriarch's heir. B.C. 2088. The Sept. interprets the terms thus: "But the son of Masek, my house-born maid, is this Heliezer of Damascus." It appeared even thus early that the passage of Scripture in which the name of Eliezer occurs is one of some difficulty. Abraham, being promised a son, says, "I go childless, and the steward of my house is this Eliezer of Damascus (עֲלִיזֵר עַבְדִּי מֵדַמָּשְׁקַי, *he of Damascus, Eliezer*) . . . Behold, to me thou hast given no seed: and, lo, one born in mine house is mine heir" (Gen. xv, 2, 3). The common notion is that Eliezer was Abraham's house-born slave, adopted as his heir, and meanwhile his chief and confidential servant, and the same who was afterwards sent into Mesopotamia to seek a wife for Isaac (q. v.). This last point we may dismiss with the remark that there is not the least evidence that "the elder servant of his house" (Gen. xxiv, 2), whom Abraham charged with this mission, was the same as Eliezer. The obvious meaning is that Eliezer was born in Damascus, and how is this compatible with the notion of his being Abraham's house-born slave, seeing that Abraham's household never was at Damascus? It is true that there is a tradition, quoted by Josephus from Nicolaus of Damascus (*Ant.* i, 7, 4), that Abraham "reigned in Damascus;" but the tradition was probably founded on this very passage, and has no claim on our belief. The Mohammedans call him *Dameshak*, or *Damascennis*, and believe him to have been a black slave given to Abraham by Nimrod, at the time when he saw him, by virtue of the name of God, walking out of the midst of the flames (Ur), into which he had been cast by his orders. See ABRABAM. The expression, "the steward of mine house," in ver. 2, עֲבֵד בְּיַדְּךָ מֵבֵיתִי (note the alliteration between the obscure term *meshek* and *Dammesek*), literally translated, is "the son of possession of my house," i. e. one who shall possess my house, my property, after my death, and is therefore exactly the same as the phrase in the next verse, "the son of my house

(עֲבָדֵי הַבַּיִת, paraphrased by "one born in mine house") is mine heir." This removes every objection to Eliezer's being of Damascus, and enables us to dispense with the tradition; for it is no longer necessary to suppose that Eliezer was a house-born slave, or a servant at all, and leaves it more probable that he was some near relative whom Abraham regarded as his heir-at-law. It is by no means certain that "this Eliezer" was present in Abraham's camp at all; and we, of course, cannot know in what degree he stood related to Abraham, or under what circumstances he was born at, or belonged to Damascus. It is possible that he lived there at the very time when Abraham thus spoke of him, and that he is hence called "Eliezer of Damascus." This view removes another difficulty, which arises from the fact that, while Abraham speaks of Eliezer as his heir, his nephew Lot was in his neighborhood, and had until lately been the companion of his wanderings. If Eliezer was Abraham's servant, it might well occasion surprise that he should speak of him and not of Lot as his heir; but this surprise ceases when we regard Eliezer as also a relative, and if so, a nearer relative than Lot, although not, like Lot, the companion of his journeys. Some have supposed that Lot and Eliezer were, in fact, the same person; and this would be an excellent explanation if the Scriptures afforded sufficient grounds for it. (See Gesenius, *Theo. Heb.* s. v. עֲבָדֵי הַבַּיִת; Rosenmüller, on Gen. xv; Knobel, *Comment.* in loc.)—Kitto, s. v.

2. A son of Becher, and grandson of Benjamin (1 Chron. vii, 8). B.C. post 1856.

3. (Josephus *Ἐλεάζαρος*, *Ant.* ii, 13, 1.) The second of the two sons of Moses and Zipporah, born during the exile in Midian, to whom his father gave this name, "because, said he, the God of my fathers was my help, that delivered me from the sword of Pharaoh" (Exod. xviii, 4; 1 Chron. xxiii, 15, 17). B.C. cir. 1600. He remained with his mother and brother Gershom, in the care of Jethro his grandfather, when Moses returned to Egypt (Exod. iv, 18), she having been sent back to her father by Moses (Exod. xviii, 2), though she set off to accompany him, and went part of the way with him. Jethro brought back Zipporah and her two sons to Moses in the wilderness, after he heard of the departure of the Israelites from Egypt (xviii). Eliezer had one son, Rehabiah, from whom sprang a numerous posterity (1 Chron. xxiii, 17; xxvi, 25, 26). Shelomith, in the reigns of Saul and David (ver. 28), who had the care of all the treasures of things dedicated to God, was descended from Eliezer in the 6th generation, if the genealogy in 1 Chron. xxvi, 25, is complete.—Smith, s. v.

4. One of the priests who blew with trumpets before the ark when it was brought to Jerusalem (1 Chron. xv, 24). B.C. 1043.

5. Son of Zichri, and chief of the Reubenites under David (1 Chron. xxvii, 16). B.C. ante 1013.

6. A prophet (son of Dodavah of Mareshah), who foretold to Jehoshaphat (q. v.) that the merchant fleet which he fitted out in partnership with Abaziah should be wrecked, and thus prevented from sailing to Tarsish (2 Chron. xx, 37). B.C. 895.

7. Son of Jorim, and father of Joseph, of the private lineage of David prior to Salathiel (Luke iii, 29). B.C. ante 588.

8. One of the chiefs of the Jews during the exile, sent by Ezra, with others from Ahava, to Casiphia, to induce some Levites and Nethinim to join the party returning to Jerusalem (Ezra viii, 16). B.C. 459.

9. One of the priests (of the kindred of Joshua) who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezra x, 18). B.C. 458.

10. A Levite who did the same (Ezra x, 23). B.C. 458.

11. An Israelite of the lineage of Harim, who did the same (Ezra x, 31). B.C. 458.

**Eliezer ben-Elias Aschenazi** (i. e. *son of Elijah, the German*), a distinguished Rabbi, was born about the opening of the 16th century, and practiced medicine at Cremona. Obligated to leave that town, he went to Constantinople, and was intrusted with the care of the synagogue at Naxos, in the Archipelago. Finally he went to Poland, and was made chief Rabbi of the synagogue at Posen. His coreligionists regard him as one of the most learned men of the 16th century. He died at Cracow in 1586. He published *הַשְּׁמֵרָה הַשְּׁמֵרָה* (Cremona, 1576, and often), a commentary on Esther:—*עֲבָדֵי הַבַּיִת* (*Work of Jehovah*), in which he describes the historical events of the Pentateuch (Venice, 1583; Cracow, 1584, and later), and one or two less important works.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biogr. Génér.* xv, 827. (J. H. W.)

**Eliezer ben-Hyrkanos**, surnamed the Great, was born about the middle of the 1st century. He was of a good family, but his early education was very much neglected, and at the age of 28, urged by an awakened impulse after knowledge, he left his father's house and became a disciple of Johanan ben-Zachai. Eliezer soon repaired his deficiencies, and became one of the distinguished Rabbins of his age. Profound in the *Cabala* (q. v.), he made many practical acquisitions in magical science, and became the thaumaturgist of the school. During the controversies between Gamaliel (q. v.) and the rival doctors at Jamnia, he founded a school at Lydda, where his teaching appears to have assumed so mystical a character as to involve him in difficulties with the rabbinical authorities. The Karaites regarded Eliezer as one of the defenders of their doctrines. He died about 73 A.D., at Cæsarea, in Palestine. His principal work is *Virke R. Eliezeris* (edit. Princ. Hebraice, Venet. 1544, 4to), translated into Latin with notes by Vorstius (Leyd. 1614, 4to), ed. by Abr. Aaron Broda, with a Heb. commentary (Wilna, 1838, 4to), and often republished. See *Boraiha der R. Eliezer*, by Leop. Zunz (Berlin, 1832), a critical account of the work and its author. He is regarded also as the author of *Ortocheilaim* (*The Way of Life*), which has been often reprinted.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biogr. Génér.* xv, 825-6; Etheridge, *Introd. to Heb. Literature*, p. 60 sq.; Grässe, *Allgem. Literärgesch.* i, 1108 sq. (J. H. W.)

**Eliezer ben-Judah** (sometimes called ELEAZAR GARMIZA, but apparently without good reason), of Worms, the son of Kalonymos of Mentz, was one of the most distinguished Rabbins of the 13th century. He was a pupil of Judah the Saint, and died in 1238. He wrote thirty works, of which only a few have been printed. The principal ones are: *Yoreh Chataim* *יְוֵרֵה חַטָּאִים*, "he will instruct sinners" a liturgical and ascetic formulary (Venice, 1589, 8vo, and often):—*Yeyn ha-Rekach* *יַיִן הַרַקָּח*, "wine of spicery"), a cabalistic commentary on Canticles and Ruth (Lublin, 1608, 4to):—*Sypher Rokeach* *סֵפֶר רֹקַעַח*, "spiced book"), on the fear of God and repentance (Fano, 1505, fol., and often since):—*שְׁפָרַיִם*, etc., a commentary on the cabalistic book *Jezirah* (Mantua, 1562, 4to, and since):—*שְׁפָרַיִם*, etc., a cabalistic exposition of the Pentateuch (extracts in Azulai's *מִקְרָאֵי תַּלְמוּד*, Leghorn, 1800):—*רֵזִיזֵי רֵזִיזֵי*, on angelology (in part, Amst. 1701, 4to). Several of his works in MS. are at the *Bibliothèque de l'Oratoire* at Paris.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biogr. Génér.* xv, 826-7; Grässe, *Allgem. Literärgesch.* iii, 521; Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, i, 228. (J. H. W.)

**Eliezer ben-Nathan**, sometimes also surnamed Metz, from his native place, was a contemporary of Rashi, and eminent in the cabalistic science. His renown is greatly due to a work on Talmudical law which he composed in 1152, under the title *אֲבֵן חֵץ* (*stone of help*), printed at Prague in 1610. The Rabbis Jachia and Wolf ascribe to him also the author-

ship of *Tsophnath Paaneach*, but Rossi asserts that Eliezer of Spain was the real author of that work. It appears to be only another title of the preceding work. He wrote also **רֵיבִּיבִּי פִּיטְיָה** (Constantinople, 1520, and later) and **פְּאָרִי הַשְּׂפֵל** (Cremona, 1554, and later); both relating to the Jewish ritual.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xv, 826; Grässe, *Allgem. Literaturgesch.* iii, 502.

**Eligius, Eloï, or Eloysius** (Str.), bishop of Noyon, one of the most eminent names in the ecclesiastical history of France, was born at Cadillac, near Limoges, in or shortly before the year 588. He learned the trade of a goldsmith, and became the most skilful artist of the day, especially in ornaments for churches and tombs. He gained the confidence of Clotaire II, and stood high at his court. While working at his art, he always had an open Bible before him. He devoted his gains to works of piety, especially to the redemption of slaves from captivity, sometimes emancipating a hundred at one time. As a layman, he instructed the common people constantly. Dagobert, the son and successor of Clotaire, made him his treasurer, and employed him for important missions, in which he was always successful. Thus he brought about a treaty of peace between Dagobert and Judicahill, duke of Brittany. Eligius availed himself of his influence with the weak and licentious Dagobert to obtain large donations, which he used for the establishment of churches, monasteries, and hospitals. In 640, two years after the death of Dagobert, the major-domo Herchenoald, who was regent during the minority of Clodvig II, in order to get rid of the influence of Eligius, appointed him bishop of Noyon. In this office he was in labors abundant for eighteen years, preaching, taking missionary tours, and founding churches and monasteries. Eligius seems to have been a thoroughly converted man, and his life is indeed a light in a dark place. Eligius, together with his friend Autoenus (St. Ouen), archbishop of Rheims, had a predominant influence upon the churches of Gaul; and although most of the bishops disliked the rigor and severity of Eligius, they yielded to his zeal and authority. Thus, in 644, at a synod of Chalons sur Saone, very strict rules were given for the appointment of bishops and abbots; and the metropolitan Theodosius of Arles, who had violated many Church laws, was suspended from his office. When bishop Martin of Rome, in the Monothelitic controversy, was imprisoned and exiled by the emperor, the majority of the Gallic bishops, at a council held in Orleans, under the leadership of Eligius and Autoenus, declared for the pope and against the Monothelites, who were cruelly persecuted. After the death of Clodvig II and Herchenoald, Eligius was recalled by the queen dowager Bathilde to the court, where he remained until shortly before his death. He died at Noyon Nov. 30, 658 (or 659), and the people soon after began to venerate him as a saint. His life (*Vita S. Eligii*), written by his disciple Autoenus (St. Ouen), will be found in D'Achery, *Spicilegium*, ii, 76-123, and in Migne, *Patrol. Latín.* lxxxix, 474. The extracts from sermons of Eligius which are included in this biography are almost verbally taken from the sermons of Caesarius of Arles. In its present form this work is undoubtedly of a later origin. Sixteen homilies are given to him in *Bib. Max. Patr.* xii, 300; also in Migne, *Patrol. Latín.* lxxxvii, 595; but their genuineness is questioned. A letter from Eligius to bishop Desiderius of Cahors is given in Canisii *Antiquit. Lectión.* ed. Basnage, tom. i, and in Migne, lxxxvii, 657. See Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iii, 760; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xv, 904; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* iii, 41, 42; Neander, *Light in Dark Places*; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* bk. ii, ch. vii, pt. ii, ch. ii, n. 24.

**Elihoë'nai** (Heb. *Elychoë'nay'*, **אֵלִיחֹהַי**, toward Jehovah are my eyes), the name of two men. See also ELIOENAI and ELIENAI.

1. (Sept. *Ἐλιωνάϊ* v. r. *Ἐλιωνάϊ*, Vulg. *Elioenai*.) The seventh and youngest son of Meshelemiah (q. v.) the Levite, of the time of David (1 Chron. xxvi, 3, where the name is improperly Anglicized "Elioenai"). B. C. 1043-13.

2. (Sept. *Ἐλιαυά* v. r. *Ἐλιανά*, Vulg. *Elioenai*.) Son of Zeriahah of the "sons of Pahath-Moab," who returned with 200 males from the exile (Ezra viii, 4). B. C. 459.

**Eliho'reph** (Heb. *Eliho'reph*, **אֵלִיחֹרֵפֶת**, God is his recompense; Sept. *Ἐλιχόρεφ* v. r. *Ἐλάφ* and *Ἐναρόφ*), son of Shisha, and appointed, with his brother Abiah, royal scribe (**סֹפֵר**) by Solomon (1 Kings iv, 3). B. C. 1012.

**Eli'hu** (Heb. *Elihu*, **אֵלִיחִי** [but abbreviated **אֵלִיחִי** in Job xxxii, 4; xxxv, 1; 1 Chron. xxvi, 7; xxvii, 18], whose God is *Ie*, i. e. Jehovah), the name of five men.

1. (Sept. *Ἐλιούε*.) One of Job's friends, described as "the son of Barachel, a Buzite, of the kindred of Ram" (Job xxxii, 2). This is usually understood to imply that he was descended from Buz, the son of Abraham's brother Nahor, from whose family the city called Buz (Jer. xxv, 23) also took its name. The Chaldee paraphrase asserts that Elihu was a relation of Abraham. Elihu's name does not appear among those of the friends who came in the first instance to condole with Job, nor is his presence indicated till the debate between the afflicted man and his three friends had been brought to a conclusion. Then, finding there was no answer to Job's last speech, he comes forward with considerable modesty, which he loses as he proceeds, to remark on the debate, and to deliver his own opinion on the points at issue (Job xxxii, xxxvii). B. C. cir. 2200. It appears, from the manner in which Elihu introduces himself (Job xxxii, 3-7), that he was much the youngest of the party; and it is evident that he had been present from the commencement of the discussion, to which he had paid very close attention. This would suggest that the debate between Job and his friends was carried on in the presence of a deeply-interested auditory, among which was this Elihu, who could not forbear from interfering when the controversy appeared to have reached an unsatisfactory conclusion (see Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* in loc.). He expresses his desire to moderate between the disputants; and his words alone touch upon, although they do not thoroughly handle, that idea of the disciplinary nature of suffering, which is the key to Job's perplexity and doubt; but, as in the whole book, the greater stress is laid on God's unsearchable wisdom, and the implicit faith which he demands (see Velthuisen, *De Elia carmine*, Rotterdam, 1789-90). He does not enlarge on any supposable wickedness in Job as having brought his present distresses upon him, but controverts his replies, his inferences, and his arguments. He observes on the mysterious dispensations of Providence, which he insists, however they may appear to mortals, are full of wisdom and mercy; that the righteous have their share of prosperity in this life no less than the wicked; that God is supreme, and that it becomes us to acknowledge and submit to that supremacy, since "the Creator wisely rules the world he made;" and he draws instances of benignity from the constant wonders of creation, of the seasons, etc. His language is copious, glowing, and sublime; and it deserves notice that Elihu does not appear to have offended God by his sentiments; nor is any sacrifice of atonement commanded for him as for the other speakers in the poem. It is almost pardonable that the character of Elihu has been thought figurative of a personage interposed between God and man—a mediator—one speaking "without terrors," and not disposed to overcharge mankind. This sentiment may have had its influence on the ac-

ceptability and preservation of the book of Job (see Hodges's *Elihu*, Oxford, 1750). See JOB (Book of).

2. (Sept. 'Ελιού.) Son of Tohu, and grandfather of Elkanah, Samuel's father (1 Sam. i, 1). In the statements of the genealogy of Samuel in 1 Chron. vi the name ELIEL (q. v.) occurs in the same position—son of Toah, and father of Jeroham (vi, 34 [Heb. 19]); and also ELIAB (vi, 27 [Heb. 12]), father of Jeroham, and grandson of Zophai. The general opinion is that Elihu is the original name, and the two latter forms but copyists' variations of it.—Smith, s. v.

3. (Sept. 'Ελιούδ v. r. 'Ελιούδ.) One of the chiliarchs of Manasseh who joined David at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 20), after he had left the Philistine army on the eve of the battle of Gilboa, and who assisted him against the marauding band (777?) of the Amalekites (comp. 1 Sam. xxx). B. C. 1053.

4. (Sept. 'Ελιού.) One of the eminently able-bodied members of the family of Obed-edom (apparently a grandson by Shemaiah), who were appointed porters of the Temple under David (1 Chron. xxvi, 7). B. C. 1043. Terms are applied to all these doorkeepers which appear to indicate that they were not only "strong men," as in A. V., but also fighting men. (See ver. 6, 7, 8, 12, in which occur the words מַרְבָּזִים = army, and מַרְבָּזִים = warriors or heroes.)

5. (Sept. 'Ελιού.) A chief of the tribe of Judah, said to be "of the brethren of David" (1 Chron. xxvii, 18), and hence supposed by some to have been his oldest brother ELIAB (1 Sam. xvi, 6). B. C. 1013 or ante.

ELI'jah (Heb. *Eliyāh*, עֲלִיָּהוּ, whose God is Jehovah, 2 Kings i, 3, 4, 8, 12; 1 Chron. viii, 27; Ezra x, 21, 26; Mal. iv, 5; elsewhere in the prolonged form *Eliyāhu*, עֲלִיָּהוּ; Sept. 'Ηλιού v. r. 'Ηλιας; N. T. 'Ηλιας; Josephus, *Heliac*, *Ant.* viii, 13, 4; Vulg. *Elias*), the name of several men in the O. T., but the later ones apparently all namesakes of the famous prophet.

1. "ELIJAH THE TISHBITE," the "Elias" of the N. T., a character whose rare, sudden, and brief appearances, undaunted courage and fiery zeal—the brilliancy of whose triumphs—the pathos of whose despondency—the glory of whose departure, and the calm beauty of whose reappearance on the Mount of Transfiguration—throw such a halo of brightness around him as is equalled by none of his compeers in the sacred story.

1. *Origin.*—This wonder-working prophet is introduced to our notice like another Melchizedek (Gen. x, 4, 18; Heb. vii, 3), without any mention of his father or mother, or of the beginning of his days—as if he had dropped out of that cloudy chariot which, after his work was done on earth, conveyed him back to heaven. "Elijah the Tishbite, of the inhabitants of Gilead," is literally all that is given us to know of his parentage and locality (1 Kings xvii, 1). The Hebrew text is עֲלִיָּהוּ תִישְׁבִיטִי מִגִּלְעָד. The third word may be pointed (1), as in the present Masoretic text, to mean "from the inhabitants of Gilead," or (2) "from Tishbi of Gilead," which, with a slight change in form, is what the Sept. has (ὁ ἐκ Θάσσεβων). The latter is followed by Ewald (*Isr. Gesch.* iii, 486, note). Lightfoot assumes, but without giving his authority, that Elijah was from Jabesh-Gilead. By Josephus he is said to have come from Thesbon—ἐκ πόλεως Θασβώνης τῆς Γαλααδίτιδος χώρας (*Ant.* viii, 13, 2). Perhaps this may have been read as Heshbon, a city of the priests, and given rise to the statement of Epiphanius that he was "of the tribe of Aaron," and grandson of Zadok. (See also the *Chron. Pasch.* in Fabricius, *Cod. Pseudep.* I. T. p. 1070, etc.; and Quaresmius, *Ethioid.* ii, 605.) According to Jewish tradition—grounded on a certain similarity between the fiery zeal of the two—Elijah was identical with Phinehas, the son of Eleazar the priest. He was also the angel of Jehovah who appeared in fire to Gideon

(Lightfoot on John i, 21; Eisenmenger, i, 686). Arab tradition places his birthplace at Gilhad (Jalūd), a few miles north of es-Salt (Irby, p. 98), and his tomb near Damascus (Mislin, i, 490). The common assumption—perhaps originating with Hiller (*Onom.* p. 947) or Reland (*Pal.* p. 1035)—is that he was born in the town of Thisbe (q. v.), mentioned in Tob. i, 2. But, not to insist on the fact that this Thisbe was not in Gilead, but in Naphtali, it is nearly certain that the name has no real existence in that passage, but arises from a mistaken translation of the same Hebrew word which is rendered "inhabitants" in 1 Kings xvii, 1. See TISHBITE.

2. *Personal Appearance.*—The mention of Gilead, however, is the key-note to much that is most characteristic in the story of the prophet. Gilead was the country on the further side of the Jordan—a country of chase and pasture, of tent-villages and mountain-castles, inhabited by a people not settled and civilized like those who formed the communities of Ephraim and Judah, but of wandering, irregular habits, exposed to the attacks of the nomad tribes of the desert, and gradually conforming more and more to the habits of those tribes; making war with the Hagarites, and taking the countless thousands of their cattle, and then dwelling in their stead (1 Chron. v, 10, 19-22). See GILEAD. With Elijah this is seen at every turn. Of his appearance as he "stood before" Ahab—with the suddenness of motion to this day characteristic of the Bedouins from his native hills—we can perhaps realize something from the touches, few, but strong, of the narrative. Of his height little is to be inferred—that little is in favor of its being beyond the ordinary size. His chief characteristic was his hair, long and thick, and hanging down his back, and which, if not betokening the immense strength of Samson, yet accompanied powers of endurance no less remarkable. See HAIR. His ordinary clothing consisted of a girdle of skin round his loins, which he tightened when about to move quickly (1 Kings xviii, 46). But in addition to this he occasionally wore the "mantle" (q. v.), or cape, of sheep-skin, which has supplied us with one of our most familiar figures of speech. In this mantle, in moments of emotion, he would hide his face (1 Kings xix, 13), or when excited would roll it up as into a kind of staff. On one occasion we find him bending himself down upon the ground with his face between his knees. Such, so far as the scanty notices of the record will allow us to conceive it, was the general appearance of the great prophet—an appearance which there is no reason to think was other than uncommon even at that time. The solitary life in which these external peculiarities had been assumed had also nurtured that fierceness of zeal and that directness of address which so distinguished him. It was in the wild loneliness of the hills and ravines of Gilead that the knowledge of Jehovah, the living God of Israel, had been impressed on his mind, which was to form the subject of his mission to the idolatrous court and country of Israel.

3. *History.*—The northern kingdom had at this time forsaken almost entirely the faith in Jehovah. The worship of the calves had been a departure from him, it was a violation of his command against material resemblances; but still it would appear that even in the presence of the calves Jehovah was acknowledged, and they were at any rate a national institution, not directly imported from the idolatries of any of the surrounding countries. See CALF. They were announced by Jeroboam as the preservers of the nation during the great crisis of its existence: "Behold thy gods, O Israel, that brought thee up out of the land of Egypt" (1 Kings xii, 28). But the case was quite different when Ahab, not content with the calf-worship—"as if it had been a light thing to walk in the sins of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat"—married the daughter of the king of Sidon, and introduced on the



most extensive scale (Josephus, *Ant.* ix, 6, 6) the foreign religion of his wife's family, the worship of the Phœnician Baal. What this worship consisted of we are ignorant—doubtless it was of a gay, splendid, and festal character, and therefore very opposite to the grave, severe service of the Mosaic ritual. Attached to it and to the worship of Asherah (A. V. "Ashtaroth," and "the groves") were licentious and impure rites, which in earlier times had brought the heaviest judgments on the nation (Numb. xxv; Judg. ii, 13, 14; iii, 7, 8). But the most obnoxious and evil characteristic of the Baal religion was that it was the worship of power, of mere strength, as opposed to that of a God of righteousness and goodness—a foreign religion, imported from nations the hatred of whom was inculcated in every page of the law, as opposed to the religion of that God who had delivered the nation from the bondage of Egypt, had "driven out the heathen with his hand, and planted them in," and through whom their forefathers had "trodden down their enemies, and destroyed those that rose up against them." It is as a witness against these two evils that Elijah comes forward. (B. C. cir. 907.)

(1.) What we may call the first act in his life embraces between three and four years—three years and six months for the duration of the drought, according to the statements of the New Testament (Luke iv, 25; James v, 17), and three or four months more for the journey to Horeb and the return to Gilead (1 Kings xvii, 1-xix, 21). His introduction is of the most startling description: he suddenly appears before Ahab, as with the unrestrained freedom of Eastern manners he would have no difficulty in doing, and proclaims the vengeance of Jehovah for the apostasy of the king. This he does in the remarkable formula evidently characteristic of himself, and adopted after his departure by his follower Elisha—a formula which includes everything at issue between himself and the king—the name of Jehovah—his being the God of Israel—the Living God—Elijah being his messenger, and then—the special lesson of the event—that the god of power and of nature should be beaten at his own weapons. "As Jehovah, God of Israel, liveth, before whom I stand," whose constant servant I am, "there shall not be dew nor rain these years, but according to my word." Before, however, he spoke thus, it would seem that he had been warning this most wicked king as to the fatal consequences which must result both to himself and his people from the iniquitous course he was then pursuing, and this may account for the apparent abruptness with which he opens his commission. What immediate action followed on this we are not told; but it is plain that Elijah had to fly before some threatened vengeance, either of the king, or more probably of the queen (comp. xix, 2). Perhaps it was at this juncture that Jezebel "cut off the prophets of Jehovah" (1 Kings xviii, 4). We can imagine Ahab and Jezebel being greatly incensed against Elijah for having ferreted and prayed that such calamities might befall them. For some time they might attribute the drought under which the nation suffered to natural causes, and not to the interposition of the prophet; and, therefore, however they might despise him as a vain enthusiast, they would not proceed immediately to punish him. When, however, they saw the denunciation of Elijah taking effect far more extensively than had been anticipated, they would naturally seek to wreak their vengeance upon him as the cause of their sufferings. But we do not find him taking one step for his own preservation till the God whom he served interposed. He was directed to the brook Cherith, either one of the torrents which cleave the high table-lands of his native hills, or on the west of Jordan, more in the neighborhood of Samaria, perhaps the present wady Kelt. See CHERITH. There, in the hollow of the torrent-bed, he remained, supported in the miraculous manner with

which we are all familiar, till the failing of the brook obliged him to forsake it. How long he remained in the Cherith is uncertain. The Hebrew expression is simply "at the end of days;" nor does Josephus afford us any more information. A vast deal of ingenuity has been devoted to explaining away Elijah's "ravens." The Hebrew word, *orebim'*, has been interpreted as "Arabians," as "merchants," as inhabitants of some neighboring town of *Orbo* or *Orbi*. By others Elijah has been held to have plundered a raven's nest, and this twice a day regularly for several months! See RAVEN.

His next refuge, under the divine guidance (1 Kings xvii, 9), was at Zarephath, a Phœnician town lying between Tyre and Sidon, certainly the last place at which the enemy of Baal would be looked for. The widow woman in whose house he lived is thought, however, to have been an Israelite, and no Baal-worshipper, by some who take her adjuration by "Jehovah thy God" as an indication. But the obvious circumstances of the case, and her mention by our Saviour (Luke iv, 26), imply her heathen character. Here Elijah performed the miracles of prolonging the oil and the meal, and restored the son of the widow to life after his sudden death. The traditional scene of his meeting with the widow was in a wood to the south of the town (Mislin, i, 532, who, however, does not give his authority). In the time of Jerome the spot was marked by a tower (Jerome, *Ep. Paula*). At a later period a church dedicated to the prophet was erected over the house of the widow, in which his chamber and her kneading-trough were shown (Anton. Martyr and Phocas, in *Ireland*, p. 985). This church was called τὸ Χριστιῶν (*Acta Sanctorum*). The Jewish tradition, quoted by Jerome, was that the resuscitated boy was the servant who afterwards accompanied Elijah, and finally became the prophet Jonah (Jerome, *Pref. to Jonah*; and see the citations from the Talmuds in Eisenmenger, ii, 725).

The drought continued, and at last the full horrors of famine, caused by the failure of the crops, descended on Samaria. During this time the prophet was called upon passively to suffer God's will; now he must once again resume the more active duties of life; he must make one great public effort more to reclaim his country from apostasy and ruin. According to the word of the Lord, he returned to Israel; Ahab was yet alive, and unreformed; Jezebel, his impious consort, was still mad upon her idols; in a word, the prophets of Baal were prophesying lies, the priests were bearing rule by their means, and the people loved to have it so. The king and his chief domestic officer had divided between them the mournful duty of ascertaining that neither round the springs, which are so frequent a feature of central Palestine, nor in the nooks and crannies of the most shaded torrent-beds, was there any of the herbage left, which in those countries is so certain an indication of the presence of moisture. No one short of the two chief persons of the realm could be trusted with this quest for life or death—"Ahab went one way by himself, and Obadiah went another way by himself." It is the moment for the reappearance of the prophet. Wishing not to tempt God by going unnecessarily into danger, he first presented himself to good Obadiah (1 Kings xviii, 7). There, suddenly planted in his path, is the man whom he and his master have been seeking for more than three years. Before the sudden apparition of that wild figure, and that stern, unbroken countenance, Obadiah could not but fall on his face. Elijah requested him to announce to Ahab that he had returned. Obadiah, apparently stung by the unkindness of this request, replied, "What have I sinned, that thou shouldst thus expose me to Ahab's rage, who will certainly slay me for not apprehending thee, for whom he has so long and so anxiously sought in all lands and in confederate countries, that they

should not harbor a traitor whom he looks upon as the author of the famine," etc. Moreover, he would delicately intimate to Elijah how he had actually jeopardized his own life in securing that of one hundred of the Lord's prophets, and whom he had fed at his own expense. Satisfied with Elijah's reply to this touching appeal, wherein he removed all his fears about the Spirit's carrying him away (as 2 Kings ii, 11-16; Ezek. iii, 4; Acts viii, 39), he resolves to be the prophet's messenger to Ahab. Intending to be revenged on him, or to inquire when rain might be expected, Ahab now came forth to meet Elijah. He at once charged him with troubling Israel, i. e. with being the main cause of all the calamities which he and the nation had suffered. But Elijah flung back the charge upon himself, assigning the real cause to be his own sin of idolatry. Regarding, however, his magisterial position, while he reproved his sin, he requests him to exercise his authority in summoning an assembly to Mount Carmel, that the controversy between them might be decided by a direct miracle from heaven (comp. Matt. xvi, 1). Whatever were his secret motives, Ahab accepted this proposal. As fire was the element over which Baal was supposed to preside, the prophet proposes (wishing to give them every advantage), that, two bullocks being slain, and laid each upon a distinct altar, the one for Baal, the other for Jehovah, whichever should be consumed by fire must proclaim whose the people of Israel were, and whom it was their duty to serve. The people consent to this proposal, because, it may be, they were not altogether ignorant how God had formerly answered by fire (Gen. iv, 4; Lev. ix, 24; Judg. vi, 21; xiii, 20; 1 Chron. xxi, 26; 2 Chron. vii, 1). Elijah will have summoned not only all the elders of Israel, but also the four hundred priests of Baal belonging to Jezebel's court, and the four hundred and fifty who were dispersed over the kingdom. The former, however, did not attend, being, perhaps, glad to shelter themselves under the plea that Jezebel would not allow them to do so. Why Mount Carmel, which we do not hear of until now, was chosen in preference to the nearer Ebal or Gerizim, is not evident. Possibly Elijah thought it wise to remove the place of the meeting to a distance from Samaria. Possibly in the existence of the altar of Jehovah (xviii, 30)—in ruins, and therefore of earlier erection—we have an indication of an ancient sanctity attaching to the spot. On the question of the particular part of the ridge of Carmel which formed the site of the meeting, there cannot be much doubt. See CARMEL.

There are few more sublime stories in history than this. On the one hand the solitary servant of Jehovah, accompanied by his one attendant, with his wild shaggy hair, his scanty garb, and sheepskin cloak, but with calm dignity of demeanor, and the minutest regularity of procedure; on the other hand, the prophets of Baal and Ashtaroth, doubtless in all the splendor of their vestments (2 Kings x, 22), with the wild din of their "vain repetitions" and the maddened fury of their disappointed hopes, and the silent people surrounding all—these things form a picture which brightens into fresh distinctness every time we consider it. Having reconstructed an altar which had once belonged to God, with twelve stones—as if to declare that the twelve tribes of Israel should again be united in the service of Jehovah—and having laid thereon his bullock, and filled the trench by which it was surrounded with large quantities of water, lest any suspicion of deceit might occur to any mind, the prophet gives place to the Baalites—allows them to make trial first. In vain did these deceived and deceiving men call, from morning till evening, upon Baal—in vain did they now mingle their own blood with that of the sacrifice: no answer was given—no fire descended. Elijah having rebuked their folly and wickedness with the sharpest irony, and it being at last evident to all

that their efforts to obtain the wished-for fire were vain, now, at the time of the evening sacrifice, offered up his prayer. The Baalites' prayer was long, that of the prophet is short—charging God with the care of his covenant, of his truth, and of his glory—when, "behold, the fire came down, licked up the water, and consumed not only the bullock, but the very stones of the altar also." The effect of this on the mind of the people was what the prophet desired: acknowledging the awful presence of the Godhead, they exclaim, as with one voice, "The Lord, he is God; the Lord, he is God!" Seizing the opportunity while the people's hearts were warm with the fresh conviction of this miracle, he bade them take those juggling priests and kill them at Kishon, that their blood might help to fill that river which their idolatry had provoked God to empty by drought. All this Elijah might lawfully do at God's direction, and under the sanction of his law (Deut. xiii, 5; xviii, 20). Ahab having now publicly vindicated God's violated law by giving his royal sanction to the execution of Baal's priests, Elijah informed him that he may go up to his tent on Carmel to take refreshment, for God will send the desired rain. In the mean time he prayed earnestly (James v, 17, 18) for this blessing: God hears and answers: a little cloud arises out of the Mediterranean Sea, in sight of which the prophet now was, diffuses itself gradually over the entire face of the heavens, and now empties its refreshing waters upon the whole land of Israel! Here was another proof of the divine mission of the prophet, from which, we should imagine, the whole nation must have profited; but subsequent events would seem to prove that the impression produced by these dealings of God was of a very partial and temporary character. Impressed with the hope that the report of God's miraculous actings at Carmel might not only reach the ear, but also penetrate and soften the hard heart of Jezebel, and anxious that the reformation of his country should spread in and about Jezreel also, Elijah, strengthened, as we are told, from on high, now accompanies Ahab thither on foot. The ride across the plain to Jezreel was a distance of at least 16 miles; the prophet, with true Arab endurance, running before the chariot, but also, with true Arab instinct, stopping short of the city, and going no further than the "entrance of Jezreel."

So far the triumph had been complete; but the spirit of Jezebel was not to be so easily overcome, and her first act is a vow of vengeance against the author of this destruction. "God do so to me, and more also," so ran her exclamation, "if I make not thy life as the life of one of them by to-morrow about this time." It was no duty of Elijah to expose himself to unnecessary dangers, and, as at his first introduction, so now, he takes refuge in flight. The danger was great, and the refuge must be distant. The first stage on the journey was Beersheba—"Beersheba which belongeth to Judah," says the narrative, with a touch betraying its Israelitish origin. Here, at the ancient haunt of those fathers of his nation whose memory was so dear to him, and on the very confines of cultivated country, Elijah halted. His servant—according to Jewish tradition, the boy of Zarephath—he left in the town, while he himself set out alone into the wilderness—the waste uninhabited region which surrounds the south of Palestine. The labors, anxieties, and excitement of the last few days had proved too much even for that iron frame and that stern resolution. His spirit is quite broken, and he wanders forth over the dreary sweeps of those rocky hills wishing for death—"It is enough! Lord, let me die, for I am not better than my fathers." The man whose prayer had raised the dead, had shut and opened heaven, he who had been so wonderfully preserved by God at Cherith and Zarephath, and who dared to tax Ahab to his face with being Israel's troubler, is now terrified and disconsolate, thus affording a practical evidence of what the apostle James

says of him, that he was a man of like passions with us. His now altered state of mind would seem to have arisen out of an exaggerated expectation of what God designed to effect through the miracles exhibited to, and the judgments poured upon this guilty nation. He seems to have thought that, as complete success did not crown the last great effort he had made to reform Israel, there could not be the slightest use in laboring for this end any longer. It is almost impossible not to conclude from the terms of the story that he was entirely without provisions for this or any journey. But God, who had brought his servant into this difficulty, provided him with the means of escaping from it. He now, alone in the wilderness and at Mount Horeb, will at once touch his heart and correct his petulance by the ministrations of his angel, and by a fearful exhibition of his divine power. The prophet, in a fit of despair, laid himself down beneath a lone "juniper-tree" (Hebrew יְבֵרֵת, *one Rothen-tree*). See JUNIPER. The indented rock opposite the gate of the Greek convent Deir Mar-Elyas, between Jerusalem and Bethlehen, which is now shown to travellers as the spot on which the prophet rested on this occasion, appears at an earlier date not to have been so restricted, but was believed to be the place on which he was "accustomed to sleep" (Sandys, lib. iii, p. 176; Maundrell, *Ear. Trav.* p. 456), and the site of the convent as that where he was born (Gaysforde, 1506, in Bonar, p. 117). Neither the older nor the later story can be believed; but it is possible that they may have originated in some more trustworthy tradition of his having rested here on his southward journey, in all probability taken along this very route. (See a curious statement by Quaresmius of the extent to which the rock had been defaced in his own time "by the piety or impiety" of the Christian pilgrims, *Elucidatio*, ii, 605; comp. Doubdan, *Voyage*, etc. p. 144.) In this position the prophet was wakened from his despondent dream beneath the solitary bush of the wilderness, was fed with the bread and the water which to this day are all a Bedouin's requirements, and went forward, "in the strength of that food," a journey of forty days, "to the mount of God, even to Horeb." Here, in "the cave" (יְבֵרֵת), one of the numerous caverns in those awful mountains—perhaps some traditional sanctuary of that hallowed region, at any rate well known—he remained for certainly one night (יָמָא). In the morning came the "word of Jehovah"—the question, "What dost thou here, Elijah? Driven by what hard necessity dost thou seek this spot, on which the glory of Jehovah has in former times been so signally shown?" In answer to this invitation the prophet opens his griefs. He has been very zealous for Jehovah; but force has been vain; one cannot stand against a multitude; none follow him, and he is left alone, flying for his life from the sword which has slain his brethren. The reply comes in that ambiguous and indirect form in which it seems necessary that the deepest communications with the human mind should be couched to be effectual. He is directed to leave the cavern and stand on the mountain in the open air, face to face with Jehovah. Then, as before with Moses (Exod. xxxiv, 6), "the Lord passed by;" passed in all the terror of his most appalling manifestations. The fierce wind tore the solid mountains and shivered the granite cliffs of Sinai; the earthquake crash reverberated through the defiles of those naked valleys; the fire burnt in the incessant blaze of Eastern lightning. Like these, in their degree, had been Elijah's own modes of procedure, but the conviction is now forced upon him that in none of these is Jehovah to be known. Then, penetrating the dead silence which followed these manifestations, came the fourth mysterious symbol—"the still small voice." What sound this was—whether articulate voice or not, we cannot determine; but low and still as it was, it spoke in

louder accents to the wounded heart of Elijah than the roar and blaze which had preceded it. To him, no less unmistakably than to Moses centuries before, it was proclaimed that Jehovah was "merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth." Elijah knew the call, and at once stepping forward and hiding his face in his mantle, stood waiting for the divine communication. It is in the same words as before, and so is his answer; but with what different force must the question have fallen on his ears, and the answer left his lips! "Before his entrance to the cave he was comparatively a novice; when he left it he was an initiated man. He had thought that the earthquake, the fire, the wind, must be the great witnesses of the Lord. But He was not in them; not they, but the still small voice had that awe in it which forced the prophet to cover his face with his mantle. What a conclusion of all the past history! What an interpretation of its meaning!" (Maurice, *Prophets and Kings*, p. 136). Not in the persecutions of Ahab and Jezebel, nor in the slaughter of the prophets of Baal, but in the 7000 unknown worshippers who had not bowed the knee to Baal, was the assurance that Elijah was not alone as he had seemed to be.

Three commands were laid on him—three changes were to be made. Instead of Ben-hadad, Hazael was to be king of Syria; instead of Ahab, Jehu the son of Nimsbi was to be king of Israel; and Elisha the son of Shaphat was to be his own successor. These persons shall revenge God's quarrels: one shall begin, another shall prosecute, and the third shall perfect the vengeance on Israel. Of these three commands, the first two were reserved for Elisha to accomplish; the last only was executed by Elijah himself. It would almost seem as if his late trials had awakened in him a yearning for that affection and companionship which had hitherto been denied him. His first search was for Elisha. Apparently he soon found him; we must conclude at his native place, Abel-meholah, probably somewhere about the centre of the Jordan valley. See ABEL-MEHOLOAH. Elisha was ploughing at the time, and Elijah "passed over to him"—possibly crossed the river—and, without uttering a word, cast his mantle, the well-known sheepskin cloak, upon him, as if, by that familiar action (which was also a symbol of official investiture), claiming him for his son. A moment of hesitation—but the call was quickly accepted; and then commenced that long period of service and intercourse which continued till Elijah's removal, and which after that time procured for Elisha one of his best titles to esteem and reverence—"Elisha the son of Shaphat, who poured water on the hands of Elijah." See ELISHA.

(2.) For about six years from this calling of Elisha we find no notice in the sacred history of Elijah, till God sent him once again to pronounce sore judgments upon Ahab and Jezebel for the murder of unoffending Naboth (1 Kings xxi, 17, etc.). How he and his associate in the prophetic office employed themselves during this time we are not told. We may conceive, however, that they were much engaged in prayer for their country, and in imparting knowledge in the schools of the prophets, which were at Jericho and Beth-el. Ahab and Jezebel now probably believed that their threats had been effectual, and that they had seen the last of their tormentor. At any rate, this may be inferred from the events of chap. xxi. See AHAH. Foiled in his wish to acquire the ancestral plot of ground of Naboth by the refusal of that sturdy peasant to alienate the inheritance of his fathers, Ahab and Jezebel proceed to possess themselves of it by main force, and by a degree of monstrous injustice which shows clearly enough how far the elders of Jezreel had forgotten the laws of Jehovah, how perfect was their submission to the will of their mistress. At her orders Naboth is falsely accused of blaspheming

God and the king, is with his sons (2 Kings ix, 26; comp. Josh. vii, 24) stoned and killed, and his vineyard then—as having belonged to a criminal—becomes at once the property of the king. See NABOTH.

Ahab loses no time in entering on his new acquisition. Apparently the very next day after the execution he proceeds in his chariot to take possession of the coveted vineyard. Behind him—probably in the back part of the chariot—ride his two pages Jehu and Bidkar (2 Kings ix, 26). But the triumph was a short one. Elijah had received an intimation from Jehovah of what was taking place, and rapidly as the accusation and death of Naboth had been hurried over, he was there to meet his ancient enemy, and as an enemy he does meet him—as David went out to meet Goliath—on the very scene of his crime; suddenly, when least expected and least wished for, he confronts the miserable king. Then follows the curse, in terms fearful to any Oriental—peculiarly terrible to a Jew, and most of all significant to a successor of the apostate princes of the northern kingdom—"I will take away thy posterity; I will cut off from thee even thy very dogs; I will make thy house like that of Jeroboam and Baasha; thy blood shall be shed in the same spot where the blood of thy victims was shed last night; thy wife and thy children shall be torn in this very garden by the wild dogs of the city, or as common carrion devoured by the birds of the sky"—the large vultures which in Eastern climes are always wheeling aloft under the clear blue sky, and doubtless suggested the expression to the prophet. How tremendous was this scene we may gather from the fact that after the lapse of at least twenty years Jehu was able to recall the very words of the prophet's burden, to which he and his companion had listened as they stood behind their master in the chariot. The whole of Elijah's denunciation may possibly be recovered by putting together the words recalled by Jehu, 2 Kings ix, 26, 36, 7, and those given in 1 Kings xxi, 19-25. Fearing that these predictions would prove true, as those about the rain and fire had done, Ahab now assumed the manner of a penitent; and, though subsequent acts proved the insincerity of his repentance, yet God rewarded his temporary abasement by a temporary arrest of judgment. We see, however, in after parts of this sacred history, how the judgments denounced against him, his abandoned consort, and children took effect to the very letter. See JEZEBEL.

(3.) A space of three or four years now elapses (comp. 1 Kings xxii, 1; xxii, 51; 2 Kings i, 17) before we again catch a glimpse of Elijah. The denunciations uttered in the vineyard of Naboth have been partly fulfilled. Ahab is dead, and his son and successor, Ahaziah, has met with a serious accident, after a troubled reign of less than two years (2 Kings i, 1, 2; 1 Kings xxii, 51). Fearing a fatal result, as if to prove himself a worthy son of an idolatrous parentage, he sends to an oracle or shrine of Baal at the Philistine town of Ekron to ascertain the issue of his illness. But the oracle is nearer at hand than the distant Ekron. An intimation is conveyed to the prophet, probably at that time inhabiting one of the recesses of Carmel, and, as on the former occasions, he suddenly appears on the path of the messengers, without preface or inquiry utters his message of death, and as rapidly disappears. The tone of his words is as national on this as on any former occasion, and, as before, they are authenticated by the name of Jehovah—"Thus saith Jehovah, Is it because there is no God in Israel that ye go to inquire of Baalzebub, god of Ekron?" The messengers returned to the king too soon to have accomplished their mission. They were possibly strangers; at any rate they were ignorant of the name of the man who had thus interrupted their journey. But his appearance had fixed itself in their minds, and their description at once told Ahaziah, who must have seen the prophet about his father's court or have heard

him described in the harem, who it was that had thus reversed the favorable oracle which he was hoping for from Ekron. The "hairy man" (עֵלִיָּא הַשֵּׂרֵפִי, *a man, a lord of hair*), with a belt of rough skin round his loins, who came and went in this secret manner, and uttered his fierce words in the name of the God of Israel, could be no other than the old enemy of his father and mother, Elijah the Tishbite. But, ill as he was, this check only roused the wrath of Ahaziah, and, with the spirit of his mother, he at once seized the opportunity of possessing himself of the person of the man who had been for so long the evil genius of his house. A captain was dispatched, with a party of fifty, to take Elijah prisoner. He was sitting on the top of "the mount" (הַרְרָם), i. e. probably of Carmel. The officer approached and addressed the prophet by the title which, as before noticed, is most frequently applied to him and Elisha—"O man of God, the king hath spoken: come down." "And Elijah answered and said, If I be a man of God, then let fire come down from heaven, and consume thee and thy fifty! And there came down fire from heaven, and consumed him and his fifty." A second party was sent, only to meet the same fate. The altered tone of the leader of a third party, and the assurance of God that his servant need not fear, brought Elijah down. But the king gained nothing. The message was delivered to his face in the same words as it had been to the messengers, and Elijah, so we must conclude, was allowed to go harmless. This was his last interview with the house of Ahab. It was also his last recorded appearance in person against the Baal-worshippers. It was this occasion to which the fiery sons of Zebedee alluded (Luke ix, 51-56) in a proposal that brought out from the lips of the Saviour the contrast with his own benign mission (Trench, *Miracles*, ch. iv).

(4.) It must have been shortly after the death of Ahaziah that Elijah made a communication with the southern kingdom. It is the only one of which any record remains, and its mention is the first and last time that the name of the prophet appears in the Books of Chronicles. Mainly devoted, as these books are, to the affairs of Judah, this is not surprising. The alliance between his enemy Ahab and Jehoshaphat cannot have been unknown to the prophet, and it must have made him regard the proceedings of the kings of Judah with more than ordinary interest. When, therefore, Jehoram, the son of Jehoshaphat, who had married the daughter of Ahab, began "to walk in the ways of the kings of Israel, as did the house of Ahab, and to do that which was evil in the sight of Jehovah," Elijah sent him a letter (עֵלִיָּא שָׁלַח, *a writing*, different from the ordinary word for an epistle, פָּתָר, *a book*), denouncing his evil doings, and predicting his death (2 Chron. xxi, 12-15). This letter has been considered as a great difficulty, on the ground that Elijah's removal must have taken place before the death of Jehoshaphat (from the terms of the mention of Elisha in 2 Kings iii, 11), and therefore before the accession of Joram to the throne of Judah. But, admitting that Elijah had been translated before the expedition of Jehoshaphat against Moab, it does not follow that Joram was not at that time, and before his father's death, king of Judah, Jehoshaphat occupying himself during the last eight or ten years of his life in going about the kingdom (2 Chron. xix, 4-11), and in conducting some important wars, amongst others that in question against Moab, while Joram was concerned with the more central affairs of the government (2 Kings iii, 7, etc.). That Joram began to reign during the lifetime of his father Jehoshaphat is stated in 2 Kings viii, 16. According to one record (2 Kings i, 17), which immediately precedes the account of Elijah's last acts on earth, Joram was actually on the throne of Judah at the time of Elijah's interview with Ahaziah; and though this is modified by the statements of other

places (2 Kings iii, 1; viii, 16), yet it is not invalidated, and the conclusion is almost inevitable that Joram ascended the throne as viceroy or associate some years before the death of his father. See JORAM; JEHOIAPHAT; JUDAH. The ancient Jewish commentators get over the apparent difficulty by saying that the letter was written and sent after Elijah's translation. Others believed that it was the production of Elisha, for whose name that of Elijah had been substituted by copyists. The first of these requires no answer. To the second, the severity of its tone, as above noticed, is a sufficient reply. Josephus (*Ant. ix, 5, 2*) says that the letter was sent while Elijah was still on earth. (See Lightfoot, *Chronicle*, etc., "Jehoram.") Other theories will be found in Fabricius, *Cod. Pseudepigr.* p. 1075, and Otho, *Lex. Rubb.* p. 167). In its contents the letter bears a strong resemblance to the speeches of Elijah, while in the details of style it is very peculiar, and quite different from the narrative in which it is imbedded (Bertheau, *Chronik*, ad loc.).

(5.) The prophet's warfare being now accomplished on earth, God, whom he had so long and so faithfully served, will translate him in a special manner to heaven. Conscious of this, he determines to spend his last moments in imparting divine instruction to, and pronouncing his last benediction upon, the students in the colleges of Bethel and Jericho; accordingly, he made a circuit in this region (2 Kings ii, 1, etc.). It was at Gilgal (q. v.)—probably not the ancient place of Joshua and Samuel, but another of the same name still surviving on the western edge of the hills of Ephraim—that the prophet received the divine intimation that his departure was at hand. He was at the time with Elisha, who seems now to have become his constant companion. Perhaps his old love of solitude returned upon him, perhaps he wished to spare his friend the pain of a too sudden parting, or perhaps he desired to test the affection of the latter; in either case he endeavors to persuade Elisha to remain behind while he goes on an errand of Jehovah. "Tarry here, I pray thee, for Jehovah hath sent me to Bethel." But Elisha will not so easily give up his master—"As Jehovah liveth, and as thy soul liveth, I will not leave thee." They went together to Bethel. The event which was about to happen had apparently been communicated to the sons of the prophets at Bethel, and they inquire if Elisha knew of his impending loss. His answer shows how fully he was aware of it. "Yea," says he, with emphasis, "indeed I do know it (עֵינַי רָאִתִּיךָ מֵהַיּוֹם הַזֶּה וְעַד הַיּוֹם הַבֹּאֵי) : hold ye your peace." But, though impending, it was not to happen that day. Again Elijah attempts to escape to Jericho, and again Elisha protests that he will not be separated from him. Again, also, the sons of the prophets at Jericho make the same unnecessary inquiries, and again he replies as emphatically as before. Elijah makes a final effort to avoid what they both so much dread. "Tarry here, I pray thee, for Jehovah hath sent me to the Jordan." But Elisha is not to be conquered, and the two set off across the undulating plain of burning sand to the distant river—Elijah in his mantle or cape of sheep-skin, Elisha in ordinary clothes (עֲרֵבָה, ver. 12). Fifty men of the sons of the prophets ascend the abrupt heights behind the town—the same to which a late tradition would attach the scene of our Lord's temptation—and which command the plain below, to watch with the clearness of Eastern vision what happens in the distance. Talking as they go, the two reach the river, and stand on the shelving bank beside its swift brown current. But they are not to stop even here. It is as if the aged Gileadite cannot rest till he again sets foot on his own side of the river. He rolls up (עָרַב) his mantle as into a staff, and with his old energy strikes the waters as Moses had done before him—strikes

them as if they were an enemy (רִיבֵי); and they are divided hither and thither, and they two go over on dry ground. What follows is best told in the simple words of the narrative. "And it came to pass when they were gone over, that Elijah said to Elisha, 'Ask what I shall do for thee before I be taken away from thee.' And Elisha said, 'I pray thee let a double portion of thy spirit be upon me.' And he said, 'Thou hast asked a hard thing: if thou see me taken from thee, it shall be so unto thee; but if not, it shall not be so.' And it came to pass as they still went on and talked, that, behold, a chariot of fire and horses of fire, and parted them both asunder, and Elijah went up by the whirlwind into the skies." (It was not in the chariot of fire that he went up into the skies. The fire served to part the master from the disciple, to show that the severance had arrived, but Elijah was taken up by the fierce wind of the tempest, רִיבֵי). Well might Elisha cry with bitterness (עָרַב), "My father, my father." He had gone who, to the discerning eye and loving heart of his disciple, had been "the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof" for so many years; and Elisha was at last left alone to carry on a task to which he must often have looked forward, but to which in this moment of grief he may well have felt unequal. He saw him no more; but his mantle had fallen, and this he took up—at once a personal relic and a symbol of the double portion of the spirit of Elijah with which he was to be clothed. Little could he have realized, had it been then presented to him, that he whose greatest claim to notice was that he had "poured water on the hands of Elijah" should hereafter possess an influence which had been denied to his master—should, instead of the terror of kings and people, be their benefactor, adviser, and friend, and that over his death-bed a king of Israel should be found to lament with the same words that had just burst from him on the departure of his stern and silent master, "My father, my father, the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof!" (2 Kings xiii, 14).

4. *Traditionary Views and Character.*—Elijah and Moses are the only men whose history does not terminate with their departure out of this world. Elijah appeared with Moses on Mount Hermon at the time of our Lord's transfiguration, and conversed with him respecting the great work of redemption which he was about to accomplish (Matt. xvii, 1-3). The author of the book of Ecclesiasticus (ch. xlvi) justly describes him as a prophet "who stood up as a fire, and whose word burned as a lamp." But, with the exception of the eulogiums contained in that catalogue of worthies, and 1 Mace. ii, 58, and the passing allusion in Luke ix, 54, none of the later references allude to his works of destruction or of portent. They all set forth a different side of his character from that brought out in the historical narrative. They speak of his being a man of like passions with ourselves (Luke v, 17); of his kindness to the widow of Sarepta (James iv, 25); of his "restoring all things" (Matt. xvii, 11); "turning the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just" (Mal. iv, 5, 6; Luke i, 17). In the sternness and power of his reproofs, however, he was a striking type of John the Baptist, and the latter is therefore prophesied of under his name: "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord" (Mal. iv, 5, 6). Our Saviour also declares that Elijah had already come in spirit, in the person of John the Baptist. Many of the Jews in our Lord's time believed him to be Elijah, or that the soul of Elijah had passed into his body (Luke ix, 8). See JOHN THE BAPTIST. How deep was the impression which he made on the mind of the nation may be judged from the fixed belief which many centuries after prevailed that Elijah would again appear for the relief and restoration of his country. The prophecy of Mal-

acbi was possibly at once a cause and an illustration of the strength of this belief. Each remarkable person, as he arrives on the scene, be his habits and characteristics what they may—the stern John, equally with his gentle Successor—is proclaimed to be Elijah (Matt. xvi, 14; Mark vi, 15; John i, 21). His appearance in glory on the Mount of Transfiguration does not seem to have startled the disciples. They were “sore afraid,” but not apparently surprised. On the contrary, Peter immediately proposes to erect a tent for the prophet whose arrival they had so long been expecting. Even the cry of our Lord from the cross, containing as it did but a slight resemblance to the name of Elijah, immediately suggested him to the bystanders. “He calleth for Elijah.” “Let be, let us see if Elijah will come to save him.”

In the Talmud (see the passages cited by Hamburger, *Real-Encycl.* s. v. Eliabu) he is recorded as having often appeared to the wise and good rabbis—at prayer in the wilderness, or on their journeys—generally in the form of an Arabian merchant (Eisenmenger, i, 11; ii, 402-7). At the circumcision of a child a seat was always placed for him, that, as the zealous champion and messenger of the “covenant” of circumcision (1 Kings xix, 14; Mal. iii, 1), he might watch over the due performance of the rite. During certain prayers the door of the house was set open that Elijah might enter and announce the Messiah (Eisenmenger, i, 685). His coming will be three days before that of the Messiah, and on each of the three he will proclaim, in a voice which shall be heard all over the earth, peace, happiness, salvation, respectively (Eisenmenger, ii, 696). So firm was the conviction of his speedy arrival, that when goods were found and no owner appeared to claim them, the common saying was, “Put them by till Elijah comes” (Lightfoot, *Exercit.* Matt. xvii, 10; John i, 21). The same customs and expressions are even still in use among the stricter Jews of this and other countries (see *Revue des deux Mondes*, xxiv, 131, etc.).

Elijah has been canonized in both the Greek and Latin churches. Among the Greeks *Mar Elytis* is the patron of elevated spots, and many a conspicuous summit in Greece is called by his name (Clark, *Peloponnesus*, p. 190). The service for his day—Ἡλιαὺς μεγαλόνομος—will be found in the *Menaion* on July 20, a date recognised by the Latin Church also. (See the *Acta Sanctorum*, July 20). By Cornelius à Lapide it is maintained that his ascent happened on that day, in the 19th year of Jehoshaphat (Keil, *On Kings*, p. 331). The convent bearing his name, Deir Mar Elyās, between Jerusalem and Bethlehem, is well known to travellers in the Holy Land. It purports to be situated on the spot of his birth, as already observed. Other convents bearing his name once existed in Palestine: in Jebel Ajlūn, the ancient Gilead (Ritter, *Syrien*, p. 1023, 1066, etc.); at Ezra, in the Hauran (Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 59), and the more famous establishment on Carmel.

It is as connected with the great Order of the barefooted Carmelites that Elijah is celebrated in the Latin Church. According to the statements of the Breviary (*Off. B. Mariæ Virginis de Monte Carmelo*, Julii 16), the connection arose from the dedication to the Virgin of a chapel on the spot from which Elijah saw the cloud (an accepted type of the Virgin Mary) rise out of the sea. But other legends trace the origin of the order to the great prophet himself, as the head of a society of anchorites inhabiting Carmel; and even as himself dedicating the chapel in which he worshipped to the Virgin! (St. John of Jerusalem, as quoted by Mislin, *Liens Saints*, ii, 49; and the bulls of various popes enumerated by Quaresimus, vol. ii.) These things are matters of controversy in the Roman Church, Baronius and others having proved that the order was founded in 1181, a date which is repudiated by the Carmelites (see extracts in Fabricius, *Codex Pseudepigraph.* p. 1077).

In the Mohammedan traditions *Ilyās* is said to have drank of the Fountain of Life, “by virtue of which he still lives, and will live to the day of judgment.” He is by some confounded with St. George, and with the mysterious *el-Khidr*, one of the most remarkable of the Moslem saints (see Lane’s *Arabian Nights*, Introd. note 2; also *Selections from the Kur’an*, p. 221, 222). The Persian *Sofis* are said to trace themselves back to Elijah (Fabricius, p. 1077); and he is even held to have been the teacher of Zoroaster (D’Herbelot, *Bib. Or.* s. v.).

Among other traditions, it must not be omitted that the words “Eye hath not seen,” etc., 1 Cor. ii, 9, which are without doubt quoted by the apostle from Isaiah lxiv, 4, were, according to an ancient belief, from “the Apocalypse, or mysteries of Elijah,” τὰ ἅλια ἀπόκρυφα. The first mention of this appears to be Origen (*Hom. on Matt.* xxvii, 9), and it is noticed with disapproval by Jerome, *ad Pammachium* (see Fabricius, p. 1072).

By Epiphanius, the words “Awake, thou that sleepest,” etc., Eph. v, 14, are inaccurately alleged to be quoted “from Elijah,” i. e. the portion of the O. T. containing his history—παρά τῷ Ἡλιαί (comp. Rom. xi, 2).—Smith, s. v.; Kitto, s. v.

5. *Literature*.—On the general subject, Anon, *Lectures on Elijah* (Lond. 1865); Kitto, *Daily Bible Illustrations*. Solomon and Kings, 45-47th week. Ephraem Syrus, *In Eliam* (Opp. iii, 240); Basil, *In Eliam* (Opp. p. 61); Ambrose, *De Elia* (Opp. i, 555); Chrysostom, *In Helium* (Opp. *Spuria*, vi, 708); Alexander, *De Elia* (*Hist. Eccl.* iii, 335); Zouch, *Life of Elijah* (Works, ii, 219); Robinson, *Elijah* (*Script. Char.* ii); Krummacker, *Elijah the Tishbite* (from the Germ., Lond. 1840; N. Y. 1847); Anderson, *Discourses on Elijah* (Lond. 1835); Evans, *Elijah* (*Script. Evng.* i); Williams, *Elijah* (*Char. of O. T.* p. 222); Frischmuth, *De Elia* (*Critici Sacri*, ii); Camartus, *Elius Thesites* (Par. 1631); Simpson, *Lectures on Elijah* (Lond. 1836); Berr, *Notice sur Elie* (Nancy, 1839); Niemeyer, *Ch. vakt.* v, 350; Schreiber, *Allgem. Religionslehre*, i, 194; Knobel, *Prophet.* ii, 73; Rüdiger, in the *Hall. Encycl.* i, 33, p. 320; Menken, *Gesch. des Elias* (in his *Schiffte*, ii, 17 sq.); Hall, *Contemplations*, bk. xviii, xix; Stanley, *Jewish Church*, ii, 321 sq. On the “ravens,” Schülen, *De Elia corvorum abunco* (Wittenb. 1717); id. ib. (Altorf, 1718); Mayer, *Elias corvorum convictor* (Viteb. 1685); Van Hardt, *Corbeaux d’Elie* (Helmst. 1709); Heumann, *Dissert. syllog.* i, 896; Beykert, *De יֵלְיָאֵם Eliam alemb.* (Argent. 1774); Berg, in the *Duisb. Wochenbl.* 1768, No. 52; 1769, No. 1; Gumpach, *Alttestam. Stud.* p. 200 sq.; Deyling, *Obs. Sacra*, pt. i, No. 25. On his “mantle,” Brockmann, *Comment. philol.* (Gryph. 1750). On Elijah’s “coming,” Hartung, *De El. adventu* (Jen. 1659); *Jour. Sac. Lit.* July, 1852, p. 420 sq. On his proceedings at Carmel, Klausung, *De sacrificio Elie* (Lips. 1726); *Jour. Sac. Lit.* Jan. 1867. On his vision at Horeb, Verschuur, *De apparitione Elie* (*Dissert. phil.* p. 85 sq.). On his stay at Cherith, at Zarephath, *Jour. Sac. Literature*, 1860, p. 1; *Unters. einiger Verstorbenen* (Lips. 1793). On his ascension, Hergott, *De curru Elie* (Wittenb. 1676); Müller, *Elia ascensio* (Lpz. 17—); Pfaff, *De rapta Elie* (Tub. 1739). On his letter to Joram, Pfaff, *De litteris El. ad Jor.* (Tub. 1755); Berg, in the *Duisb. Wochenbl.* 1774, No. 5, 6.

2. (Sept. Ἡλία v. r. Ἐπία.) One of the “sons of Jeroham,” and heads of Benjaminite families resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. viii, 27, where the name is inaccurately Anglicized “Eliah”). B. C. post 1612.

3. (Sept. Ἰαζα.) One of the “sons of Eliam” (q. v.), who divorced his Gentile wife on returning from the exile (Ezra x, 21, where the name is likewise wrongly Anglicized “Eliah”). B. C. 458.

Elī’ka [some *El’ika*] (Heb. *Elika’*, עֲלִיקָא, *God is his rejecter*; Sept. Ἐλικὰ v. r. Ἐρακὰ, Vulg. *Elīca*), a Harodite (q. v.), one of David’s thirty-seven distin-

guished warriors (2 Sam. xxiii, 25). B.C. 1046. His name is omitted in the parallel list of 1 Chron. xi, 27 (see Kennicott's conjecture, *Dissertation*, p. 182). See SHAMMOTH.

**Elimim.** See TALMUD.

**E'lim** (Heb. *Eylim'*, עֵלִים, *trees* [so called from their strength; see OAK]; perh. here *palm-trees*; Sept. *Alēip*), a place mentioned in Exod. xv, 27; Num. xxxiii, 9, as the second station where the Israelites encamped after crossing the Red Sea. (See Huldreich or Ulrich, *De fontibus in Elim repertis*, Brem. 1728). See also BEER-ELIM. It is distinguished as having had "twelve wells (rather "fountains," מְיֻנִּים) of water, and threescore and ten palm-trees." Laborde (*Geographical Commentary on Exod.* xv, 27) supposed *wady Useit* to be Elim, the second of four wadys lying between 29° 7' and 29° 20', which descend from the range of et-Tih (here nearly parallel with the shore) towards the sea. The route of the Israelites, however, cannot well be mistaken at this part. It evidently lay along the desert plain on the eastern shore of the Red Sea. Elim must consequently have been in this plain, and not more than about fifty miles from the place of passage. With these data, and in a country where fountains are of such rare occurrence, it is not difficult to identify Elim. Near the south-eastern end of this plain, and not far from the base of Jebel Hummam, the outpost of the great Sinai mountain-group, a charming vale, called *wady Ghurundel*, intersects the line of route. It is the first of the four wadys noticed above, and is, in fact, the most noted valley of that region, and the only one in the vicinity containing water (Robinson, *Researches*, i, 100, 105). In the dry season it contains no stream, but in the rainy season it becomes the channel of a broad and powerful mountain current, being bounded by high ridges, and extending far into the interior. It has no soil, but drifting sand, which has left but one of the "wells" remaining, the others anciently existing being doubtless tilled up. This principal fountain springs out at the foot of a sandstone rock, forming a pool of sparkling water, and sending out a tiny but perennial stream. This, in fact, is one of the chief watering-places in the peninsula of Sinai (Bartlett, *Forty Days in the Desert*, p. 33 sq.). There are no palm-trees at present here, but the place is fringed with trees and shrubbery, stunted palms, with their hairy trunks and dishevelled branches; tamarisks, their feathery leaves dripping with what the Arabs call manna; and the acacia, with its gray foliage and white blossoms (Stanley, *Palestine*, p. 68). These supply the only verdure, which, however, in contrast with the naked desert, is quite refreshing (Olin's *Travels*, i, 362). Well might such a wady, in the midst of a bare and treeless waste, be called emphatically *Elim*, "the trees." Lepsius takes another view, that Ghurundel is Mara, by others identified with Howara (2½ hours N.W. from Ghurundel, and reached by the Israelites, therefore, before it), and that Elim is to be found in the last of the four above named, *wady Shubeikeh* (*Travels*, Berlin, 1845, p. 27 sq.). See EXODE.

**Elim'elech** (Heb. *Elim'elek*, עֵלִים־עֶלֶךְ, *God is his king*; Sept. *Ἐλιμ᾽ελεκ*; Josephus, *Ἐλιμ᾽ελεχος*, *Ant.* v, 9, 1), a man of the tribe of Judah, and of the family of the Hezronites and kinsman of Boaz, who dwelt in Bethlehem-Ephrathah in the days of the judges. B.C. cir. 1368. In consequence of a great dearth in the land he went with his wife Naomi, and his two sons, Mahlon and Chilion, to dwell in Moab, where he and his sons died without posterity (Ruth i, 2, 3; ii, 1, 3; iv, 3, 9). See RUTH.

**Eliō'nai** (Heb. *Elyō'nay'*, עֵלְיוֹנָי, a contracted form of the name *Elihoenai*), the name of several men.

1. (Sept. *Ἐλιωνάϊ* v. r. *Ἐλιζενάϊ*, Vulg. *Elioenai*.)

Fourth son of Becher, son of Benjamin (1 Chron. vii, 8). B.C. post 1856.

2. (Sept. *Ἐλιωνάϊ* v. r. *Ἐλιωνάϊ*, Vulg. *Elioenai*.) A chief of the posterity of Simeon (1 Chron. iv, 36). B.C. post 1618.

3. (1 Chron. xxvi, 3.) See ELIHOENAI.

4. (Sept. *Ἐλιωνάϊ* v. r. *Ἐλιωνάϊ*, Vulg. *Elioenai*.) A priest of the sons of Pashur, who had married a foreign wife after the return from Babylon, but who, at Ezra's instigation, put her away with the children born of her, and offered a ram for a trespass offering (Ezra x, 22). B.C. 458. He is perhaps the same mentioned in Neh. xii, 41, as one of the priests who accompanied Nehemiah with trumpets at the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem. B.C. 446.

5. (Sept. *Ἐλιωνάϊ* v. r. *Ἐλιωνάϊ*, Vulg. *Elioenai*.) An Israelite of the sons of Zattu, who likewise divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezra x, 27). B.C. 458.

6. (Sept. *Ἐλιωνάϊ*, v. r. *Ἐλιωνάϊ* and *Ἐλιζενάϊ*, Vulg. *Elioenai*.) Eldest son of Meariah, son of Shemaiah, of the descendants of Zerubbabel; his family are the latest mentioned in the Old Test. (1 Chron. iii, 23, 24). B.C. ante 280. He appears to be the same with ESLI, of the maternal ancestry of Christ (Luke iii, 25). (See Strong's *Harmony and Expos. of the Gosp.* p. 16.) According to the present Heb. text he is in the seventh generation from Zerubbabel, or about contemporary with Alexander the Great; but lord Hervey thinks that Shemaiah is identical with Shimei (ver. 19), Zerubbabel's brother (*Geneal. of our Lord*, p. 107-109, and ch. vii).

**Eliōnæ'us** (Ἐλιωνάϊος, doubtless a Græcized form of *Elioenai*), a high-priest of the Jews, who succeeded Matthias, son of Ananus (A.D. 42), and was the next year succeeded by Simon Cantheras (Josephus, *Ant.* xix, 8, 1). See HIGH-PRIEST.

**Eliō'nas**, the name of two men in the Apocrypha.

1. (*Ἐλιωνάϊ* v. r. *Ἐλιωνάϊ*, Vulg. omits.) One of the sons of "Phaisur," who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (1 Esdras ix, 22); evidently the ELIOENAI (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra x, 22).

2. (*Ἐλιωνάϊ*, Vulg. *Nonæus*.) One of the sons of "Annas," who did the same (1 Esd. ix, 32); doubtless the ELIEZER (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra x, 31).

**Eliot, Andrew, D.D.**, a Congregational minister, was born in Boston Dec. 25, 1719 (O. S.), and graduated at Harvard College in 1737. In 1742 he was ordained pastor (as colleague with Mr. Webb) of the New North Church in Boston, in which service he remained until his death. In 1757 he was made D.D. by the University of Edinburgh. In 1773 he was elected president of Harvard College, but declined to leave his pastoral work. He died Sept. 13, 1778. Besides occasional sermons, he published a volume of *Discourses* (1774).—Sprague, *Annals*, i, 417.

**Eliot, John**, styled "the apostle of the Indians," was born in the county of Essex, England, in 1604, and studied at the University of Cambridge. Emigrating to New England in 1631, he joined the Church in Boston. He was settled over the Church in Roxbury Nov. 5, 1632. Here he studied the Indian language, with the view of converting the natives to Christianity. "The first Indian Church, established by the labors of Protestants in America, was formed at Natick in 1660, after the manner of the Congregational churches in New England. Those who wished to be organized into a Christian body were strictly examined as to their faith and experience by a number of the neighboring ministers, and Mr. Eliot afterwards administered to them baptism and the Lord's Supper. Other Indian churches were planted in various parts of Massachusetts, and he frequently visited them; but his pastoral care was more particularly over that which he first established. He made every exertion to promote the welfare of the Indian tribes; he stimulated many servants of Jesus to engage in the missionary

work; and, although he mourned over the stupidity of many who preferred darkness to light, yet he lived to see twenty-four of the copper-colored aborigines fellow-preachers of the precious Gospel of Christ. In 1661 he published the New Testament in the Indian language, and in a few years the whole Bible, and several other books best adapted for the instruction of the natives. When he reached the age of fourscore years he offered to give up his salary, and desired to be liberated from the labors of his office as a teacher of the Church at Roxbury. It was with joy that he received Mr. Walter as his colleague in 1688. When he was bending under his infirmities, and could no longer visit the Indians, he persuaded a number of families to send their negro servants to him once a week, that he might instruct them in the truths of God. He died May 20, 1690, saying that all his labors were poor and small, and exhorting those who surrounded his bed to pray. His last words were, "Welcome joy" (Allen). In 1649 Mr. Eliot published *The glorious Progress of the Gospel among the Indians*; in 1653, *Tears of Repentance*; in 1655, *A further Manifestation of the Progress of the Gospel among the Indians*; and in 1670, *A brief Narrative of the Progress of the Gospel*. Baxter says, in one of his letters, "There was no man on earth whom I honored above him." A handsome memorial to the "Apostle of the Indians, and the pastor for fifty-eight years of the first Church in Roxbury," has been erected in the Forest Hills Cemetery, Roxbury.—*Life and Death of John Eliot*, by Cotton Mather (1691); Mather's *Magnalia*, iii, 270; Francis, *Life of John Eliot* (Edinb. 1828); Sprague, *Annals*, i, 18; Allen, *American Biography*.

**Elipandus**, archbishop of Toledo in the 8th century. He shared the opinions of Felix, bishop of Urgel, with regard to the person of Christ, viz. that, with respect to his human nature, he was only the *adoptive* Son of God, thus giving rise to the sect of *Adoptianists*. Elipandus disseminated his views in Spain, France, and Germany. Adosinda, queen of Galicia, induced bishop Etherius of Osma and the priest Beatus to write against him. They published against him two books, the originals of which are said to be still extant in Toledo. Elipandus replied by several letters, but he was condemned at the council which Paulinus, patriarch of Aquileja, convened at Ciudad de Friuli in 791. In the following year the doctrines of Elipandus and Felix were again condemned at a synod which Charlemagne held at Ratisbon. Pope Adrian confirmed the sentence, to which Felix submitted; but Elipandus, and several other bishops of Spain, persisted in their views, and wrote against Felix. This letter was refuted, and condemned by Adrian in a council held in Italy, and in the Council of Frankfort in 794. Charlemagne himself wrote a letter (still extant) to Elipandus urging him to submit; but the letter seems to have had little effect, for shortly before his death (in 799) Elipandus wrote a reply maintaining his views.—Hoefler, *Nour. Biog. Génér.* xv, 832; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* iii, 156-158; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* bk. iii, c. viii, pt. ii, ch. v, § 3. See **ADOPTIANISM**.

**El'iphal** (Heb. *Eliphal'*, עִלְפָּחַל, *God is his judge*; Sept. Ἐλιφαὶλ v. r. Ἐλφάρ, Vulg. *Eliphal*), son of Ur (q. v.), and one of David's famous guard (1 Chron. xi, 35). B. C. 1046. In the parallel passage (2 Sam. xxiii, 34) he seems to be called "ELIPHELET, the son of Ahasbai (q. v.), the son of the Maachathite;" but the names are here greatly confused. See **DAVID**.

**Eliph'alat** (Ἐλιφαλάτ, Vulg. *Eliphalach*), one of the sons of "Asom," who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (1 Esd. ix, 33); evidently the **ELIPHELET** (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra x, 33).

**Eliph'alet**, a less correct mode of Anglicizing (2 Sam. v, 16; 1 Chron. xiv, 7) the name **ELIPHELET** (q. v.). It also occurs in the Apocrypha (Ἐλιφαλέτ) as the name of one of the sons of Adonican, who returned

from the exile (1 Esdr. viii, 39); the **ELIPHELET** of the Heb. text (Ezra viii, 13).

**El'iphaz** (Hebrew *Eliphaz'*, עִלְפָּז, *God is his strength*; Sept. Ἐλιφάζ, but in Gen. Ἐλιφάξ, Vulg. *Eliphaz*), the name of two men.

1. The leading one of the "three friends" who came to condescend with Job in his affliction (Job iv, 1), and who took part in that remarkable discussion which occupies the book of Job. B. C. cir. 2200. He is called "the Temanite;" hence it is naturally inferred that he was of the region substantially known as Teman (q. v.), in Idumea; and as Eliphaz, the son of Esau, had a son called Teman, from whom the place took its name, many have concluded that this Eliphaz was a descendant of the other Eliphaz. Some, indeed, even go so far as to suppose that the Eliphaz of Job was no other than the son of Esau. This view is of course confined to those who refer the age of Job to the time of these patriarchs. But it is doubtful whether even this gives a date sufficiently early. See **JOB**.

Eliphaz is the first of the friends to take up the debate, in reply to Job's passionate complaints. He appears to have been the oldest of the speakers, from which circumstance, or from natural disposition, his language is more mild and sedate than that of the others (see Eichler, *De visione El'iphazi* [iv, 12-31], l. p. 1781). He begins his orations with delicacy, and conducts his part of the controversy with considerable address (chap. iv, v, xv, xxii). On him falls the main burden of the argument, that God's retribution in this world is perfect and certain, and that consequently suffering must be a proof of previous sin. His words are distinguished from those of Bildad and Zophar by greater calmness and elaboration, and, in the first instance, by greater gentleness towards Job, although he ventures afterwards, apparently from conjecture, to impute to him special sins. The great truth brought out by him is the unapproachable majesty and purity of God (iv, 12-21; v, 12-16). But still, with the other two friends, he is condemned for having, in defence of God's providence, spoken of him "the thing that was not right," i. e. by refusing to recognise the facts of human life, and by contenting himself with an imperfect retribution as worthy to set forth the righteousness of God. On sacrifice and the intercession of Job all three are pardoned.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See **JOB**, **BOOK OF**.

2. The son of Esau by one of his first wives, Adah, and father of several Edomitish tribes (Gen. xxxv, 4, 10, 11, 16; 1 Chron. i, 35, 36). B. C. post 1963.

**Eliph'eleh** (Heb. in the prolonged form *Eliphel'e'lu*, עִלְפָּהֶלֶּה, *God will distinguish him*; Sept. Ἐλιφαλά and Ἐλιφαλόυ v. r. Ἐλιφενά and Ἐλιφαιλαίας; Vulg. *Eliphahel*), a Merarite Levite; one of the gatekeepers (עֲרֵבֵי הַיָּד, A. V. porters") appointed by David to play on the harp "on the Sheminith," on the occasion of bringing up the ark to the city of David (1 Chron. xv, 18, 21). B. C. 1043.

**Eliph'elet** (Hebrew *Eliph'elet*, עִלְפָּהֶלֶּט, in pause *Eliph'al'et*, עִלְפָּהֶלֶּט, *God is his deliverance*), the name of several men.

1. (Sept. Ἐλιφאלάρ v. r. Ἀλιφαλέξ and Ἀλιφαλέτ, Vulg. *Eliphelath*.) One of David's distinguished warriors, styled "the son of Ahasbai, the son of the Maachathite" (2 Sam. xxiii, 34); but, by some error and abbreviation, **ELIPHAL** (q. v.), the son of Ur, [and] Hopher, the Mecherathite," in the parallel passage (1 Chron. xi, 35, 36).

2. (Sept. Ἐλιφאלέρ v. r. Ἐλιφαλέξ, Vulg. *Eliphaleth*.) The third of the nine sons of David, born at Jerusalem, exclusive of those by Bathsheba (1 Chron. ii, 6; xiv, 5, in which latter passage the name is written *Elphat*). B. C. post 1044.

3. (Sept. Ἐλιφאלέρ v. r. Ἐλιφαλά, Vulg. *Eliphelath*.) The ninth of the same (1 Chron. iii, 8; xiv, 7; 2 Sam.



v. 16, in which two latter passages the name is Anglicized "Eliphalet"). It is believed that there were not two sons of this name, but that, like Nogah, one is merely a transcriber's repetition. The two are certainly omitted in Samuel, but, on the other hand, they are inserted in two separate lists in Chronicles, and in both cases the number of sons is summed up at the close of the list. Josephus mentions but one *Eliphale* ('Ελιφαλ), as the last of David's eleven sons, and states that the last two were born of concubines (*Ant.* vii. 3, 3). See DAVID.

4. (Sept. 'Ελιφαλέρ, Vulg. *Eliphalet*.) The third of the three sons of Eshek, of the posterity of Benjamin, and a descendant of king Saul through Jonathan (1 Chron. viii. 39). B.C. ante 536.

5. (Sept. 'Ελιφαλάζ v. r. 'Ελιφαλάτ, Vulg. *Eliphalet*.) One of the sons of Adonikam, who returned from Babylon with his two brothers and 60 males (Ezra viii. 13). B.C. 459.

6. (Sept. 'Ελιφαλέτ, Vulg. *Elipheleth*.) An Israelite of the lineage of Hashum, who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezra x. 33). B.C. 458.

**Elis'abeth** (Ελισάβετ), wife of Zacharias or Zachariah, and mother of John the Baptist (Luke i. 5). She was a descendant of Aaron, or of the race of the priests; and of her and her husband this exalted character is given by the evangelist: "They were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless" (Luke i. 7, 13). They had remained childless till the decline of life, when an angel foretold to her husband Zachariah the birth of John, and Zachariah returning home, Elisabeth conceived. During five months she concealed the favor God had granted her; but the angel Gabriel discovered to the Virgin Mary this miraculous conception, as an assurance of the birth of the Messiah by herself. See ANNUNCIATION. Mary visited Elisabeth, and when she saluted her, Elisabeth felt the quickening of her unborn babe. When her child was circumcised she named him John, according to previous instructions from her husband (Luke i. 39-63). B.C. 7. See ZACHARIAS.

The name in this precise shape does not occur in the Old Testament, where the names of few females are given. But it is a Hebrew name, the same in fact as ELISHEBA (q. v.). It is perhaps etymologically connected with *Elissa* or *Elisa*, the Phœnician name of queen Dido (Virgil, *Æu.* iv. 335), whence the modern *Eliza*, *Elizabeth*.

**Elisæ'us** (Ελισαΐος or 'Ελισσαΐος), the Græcized form of the name of ELISHA (q. v.) in the N. T. (Luke iv. 27) and Apocrypha ('Ελισαΐ, Ecclus. xlviii. 12), as well as Josephus (*Ant.* viii. 13, 7 etc.).

**Elis'ha** (Heb. *Elisha'*, עִישָׁא, for עִישָׁאֵל, *God is his salvation*; Sept. 'Ελισαΐ or 'Ελισσαΐ, Josephus and N. T. 'Ελισσαΐος, Vulg. *Elisæus*, A. V. in N. T. and Apoc. ("Elisæus"), the son of Shaphat of Abel-meholah (1 Kings xix. 16-19), who became the attendant and disciple of Elijah (Josephus, *Ant.* viii. 13, 7), and his successor as prophet in the kingdom of Israel. See ELIJAH.

1. *History*.—The earliest mention of Elisha's name is in the command to Elijah in the cave at Horeb (1 Kings xix. 16, 17). But our first introduction to the future prophet is in the fields of his native place (B.C. cir. 900). Abel-meholah—the "meadow of the dance"—was probably in the valley of the Jordan, and, as its name would seem to indicate, in a moist or watered situation. See ABEL. Elijah, on his way from Sinai to Damascus by the Jordan valley, lights on his successor engaged in the labors of the field, twelve yoke before him, i. e. probably eleven other ploughs preceding him along the same line (see Thomson, *Land and Book*, i. 208). To cross to him, to throw over his shoulders the rough mantle—a token at once of investiture with the prophet's office, and of adoption as a son—was to Eli-

jah but the work of an instant, and the prophet strode on as if what he had done were nothing—"Go back again, for what have I done unto thee?" So sudden and weighty a call, involving the relinquishment of a position so substantial, and family ties so dear, might well have caused hesitation. But the parley was only momentary. To use a figure which we may almost believe to have been suggested by this very occurrence, Elisha was not a man who, having put his hand to the plough, was likely to look back; he delayed merely to give the farewell kiss to his father and mother, and preside at a parting feast with his people, and then followed the great prophet on his northward road to become to him what in the earlier times of his nation Joshua had been to Moses. Of the nature of this connection we know hardly anything. "Elisha the son of Shaphat, who poured water on the hands of Elijah," is all that is told us. The characters of the two men were thoroughly dissimilar, but how far the lion-like daring and courage of the one had infused itself into the other, we can judge from the few occasions on which it blazed forth, while every line of the narrative of Elijah's last hours on earth bears evidence how deep was the personal affection which the stern, rough, reserved master had engendered in his gentle and pliant disciple.

Seven or eight years must have passed between the call of Elisha and the removal of his master, and during the whole of that time we hear nothing of him. But when that period had elapsed he reappears, to become the most prominent figure in the history of his country during the rest of his long life.

Being anxious, after his remarkable appointment on receiving the robe as a symbol of inheriting the prophetic spirit of his ascended master, to enter at once upon the duties of his sacred office, Elisha determined to visit the schools of the prophets which were on the other side of the Jordan. Accordingly, returning to that river, and wishing that sensible evidence should be afforded, both to himself and others, of the spirit and power of his departed master resting upon him, he struck its waters with Elijah's mantle, when they parted asunder and opened a way for him to pass over on dry land. Witnessing this miraculous transaction, the fifty sons of the prophets, who had seen from the opposite side Elijah's ascension, and who were awaiting Elisha's return, now, with becoming reverence, acknowledged him their spiritual head. These young prophets are not more full of reverence for Elisha than of zeal for Elijah; they saw the latter carried up in the air—they knew that this was not the first time of his miraculous removal. Imagining it therefore possible that the Spirit of God had cast him on some remote mountain or valley, they ask permission to go and seek him. Elisha, though fully aware that he was received up into glory, but yet fearful lest it should be conceived that he, from any unworthy motives, was not anxious to have him brought back, yielded to their request. The unavailing search confirmed Elisha's fame. (B.C. cir. 892.)

There are several considerations from which the incompleteness of the records of Elisha's life may be inferred: (a.) The absence of marks by which to determine the dates of the various occurrences. The "king of Israel" is continually mentioned, but we are left to infer what king is intended (2 Kings v. 5, 6, 7, &c.; vi. 8, 9, 21, 26; vii. 2; viii. 3, 5, 6, etc.). This is the case even in the story of the important events of Naaman's cure, and the capture of the Syrian host at Dothan. The only exceptions are iii. 12 (comp. 6), and the narrative of the visit of Jehoash (xiii. 14, etc.), but this latter story is itself a proof of the disarrangement of these records, occurring as it does after the mention of the death of Jehoash (ver. 13), and being followed by an account of occurrences in the reign of Jehoahaz his father (ver. 22, 23). (b.) The absence of chronological sequence in the narratives. The story of the Shunam-

mite embraces a lengthened period, from before the birth of the child till he was some years old. Gehazi's familiar communication with the king, and therefore the story which precedes it (viii, 1, 2), must have occurred before he was struck with leprosy, though placed long after the relation of that event (v, 27). (c). The different stories are not connected by the form of words usually employed in the consecutive narrative of these books. (See Keil, *Comment. on Kings*, p. 318, where other indications will be found.) The call of Elisha seems to have taken place about four years before the death of Ahab. He died in the reign of Joash, the grandson of Jehu, B.C. cir. 855. Hence his public career embraces a period of not less than 65 years, for certainly 55 of which he held the office of "prophet in Israel" (2 Kings v, 8).

(1.) After the departure of his master, Elisha returned to dwell (עָשָׂה) at Jericho (2 Kings ii, 18). The town had lately been rebuilt (1 Kings xvi, 34), and was the residence of a body of the "sons of the prophets" (2 Kings ii, 5, 15). Among the most prominent features of that place are still the two perennial springs which, rising at the base of the steep hills of Quarantania behind the town, send their streams across the plain towards the Jordan, scattering, even at the hottest season, the richest and most grateful vegetation over what would otherwise be a bare tract of sandy soil. At the time in question, part, at least, of this charm was wanting. One of the springs was noxious—had some properties which rendered it unfit for drinking, and also prejudicial to the land (ii, 19, עָשָׂה, *bad*, A. V. "naught"). At the request of the men of Jericho, Elisha remedied this evil. He took salt in a new vessel, and cast it into the water at its source in the name of Jehovah. From the time of Josephus (*War*, iv, 8, 3) to the present (Saewulf, *Mod. Trav.* p. 17), the tradition of the cure has been attached to the large spring N.W. of the present town, and which now bears, probably in reference to some later event, the name of *Ain es-Sultân* (Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 383 sq.). See JERICHO.

(2.) We next meet with Elisha at Bethel, in the heart of the country, on his way from Jericho to Mount Carmel (2 Kings ii, 23). His last visit had been made in company with Elijah on their road down to the Jordan (ii, 2). Sons of the prophets resided there, but still it was the seat of the calf-worship, and therefore a prophet of Jehovah might expect to meet with insult, especially if not so well known and so formidable as Elijah. The road to the town winds up the defile of the wady Suweint, under the hill which still bears what in all probability are the ruins of Ai, and which, even now retaining some trees, was at that date shaded by a forest, thick, and the haunt of savage animals (comp. Amos v, 19). See BETHEL. Here the boys of the town were clustered, waiting, as they still wait at the entrance of the villages of Palestine, for the chance passer-by. In the scanty locks of Elisha, how were they to recognise the successor of the prophet, with whose shaggy hair streaming over his shoulders they were all familiar? So, with the license of the Eastern children, they scoff at the new-comer as he walks by—"Go up (עָשָׂה, hardly *ascend*, as if alluding to Elijah, but *pass on out of the way*), bald-head (עָשָׂה, devoid of hair on the *back* of the head, as opposed to עָשָׂה, bald on the *forehead*)!" For once Elisha assumed the sternness of his master. He turned upon them and cursed them in the name of Jehovah. There was in their expressions an admixture of rudeness, infidelity, and impiety. But the inhabitants of Bethel were to know, from bitter experience, that to dishonor God's prophets was to dishonor himself, for Elisha was at the moment inspired to pronounce the judgment which at once took effect. God, who never wants for instruments to accomplish his purposes, caused two

she-bears to emerge from the neighboring wood and punish the young delinquents. It is not said that they were actually killed (the expression is עָשָׂה, *to rend*, which is peculiarly applicable to the claws of the bear). This fate may indeed have befallen some of the party, but it is by no means probable in regard to the greater number.

Ehrenberg says that the bear is seen only on one part of the summit of Lebanon, called Mackmel, the other peak, Jebel Sanin, being, strangely enough, free from these animals. The Syrian bear is more of a frugivorous habit than the brown bear (*Ursus arctos*), but when pressed with hunger it is known to attack men and animals; it is very fond of a kind of chick-pea (*Cicer arietinus*), fields of which are often laid waste by its devastations. Most recent writers are silent respecting any species of bear in Syria, such as Shaw, Volney, Hasselquist, Burckhardt, and Schulz. Seetzen, however, notices a report of the existence of a bear in the province of Hasbeiya, on Mount Hermon. Klacder supposed this bear must be the *Ursus arctos*, for which opinion, however, he seems to have had no authority; and a recent writer, Dr. Thomson (*Land and Book*, ii, 373), says that the Syrian bear is still found on the higher mountains of this country, and that the inhabitants of Hermon stand in great fear of him. Hemprich and Ehrenberg (*Symbolæ Phys.* pt. i) inform us that during the summer months these bears keep to the snowy parts of Lebanon, but descend in winter to the villages and gardens; it is probable, also, that at this period in former days they extended their visits to other parts of Palestine; for, though this species was in ancient times far more numerous than it is now, yet the snowy summits of Lebanon were probably always the summer home of these animals. It is not improbable, therefore, that the attack upon the forty-two children who mocked Elisha took place some time in the winter, when these animals inhabited the low lands of Palestine. See BEAR.

(3.) Elisha extricates Jehoram, king of Israel, and the kings of Judah and Edom, from their difficulty in the campaign against Moab, arising from want of water (iii, 4-27). The revolt of Moab occurred very shortly after the death of Ahab (iii, 5; comp. i, 1), and the campaign followed immediately—"the same day" (iii, 6; A. V. "time"). The prophet was with the army; according to Josephus (*Ant.* ix, 3, 1) he "happened to be in a tent outside the camp of Israel." Joram he refuses to hear, except out of respect for Jehoshaphat, the servant of the true God; but a minstrel is brought, and at the sound of music the hand of Jehovah comes upon him, and he predicts a fall of rain, and advises a mode of procedure in connection therewith which results in the complete discomfiture of Moab. This incident probably took place at the S.E. end of the Dead Sea. See JEHORAM.

(4.) The widow of one of the sons of the prophets—according to Josephus, of Obadiah, the steward of Ahab—is in debt, and her two sons are about to be taken from her and sold as slaves by her creditors, as by an extension of the law (Exod. xxi, 7, and Lev. xxv, 29), and by virtue of another (Exod. xxii, 3), they had the power to do; and against this hard-hearted act she implores the prophet's assistance. God will not, *without a cause*, depart from the general laws of his administration: Elisha therefore inquires how far she herself had the power to avert the threatened calamity. She replies that the only thing of which she was possessed was one pot of oil. This Elisha causes (in his absence, iv, 5) to multiply (after the example of Elijah at Zarephath), until the widow has filled with it all the vessels which she could borrow, and thus procured the means of payment (2 Kings iv, 1-7). No place or date of the miracle is mentioned.

(5.) The next occurrence is at Shunem and Mount Carmel (iv, 8-37). The account consists of two parts.

[a.] Elisha, probably on his way between Carmel and the Jordan valley, calls accidentally at Shunem, now Solan, a village on the southern slopes of Jebel ed-Duhly, the little Hermon of modern travellers. Here he is hospitably entertained by a woman of substance, apparently at first ignorant of the character of her guest. Wishing that he should take up, more than occasionally, his abode under her roof, she proposed to her husband to construct for him a chamber which he might have for his own accommodation. The husband at once consented, and, the apartment being fitted up in a way that showed their proper conception of his feeling, the prophet becomes its occupant. Grateful for such disinterested kindness, Elisha delicately inquired of her if he could prefer her interest before the king or the captain of his host; for he must have had considerable influence at court, from the part he had taken in the late war. But the good woman declined the prophet's offer by declaring that she would rather "dwell among her own people," and in the condition of life to which she had been accustomed. Still, to crown her domestic happiness, she lacked one thing—she had no child; and now, by reason of the age of her husband, she could not expect such a blessing. In answer, however, to the prayer of the prophet, and as a recompense for her care of him, she was saved from that childless condition which was esteemed so great a calamity by every Jewish wife, and permitted to "embrace a son" (2 Kings, iv, 8-17).

[b.] After an interval of several years, the boy is old enough to accompany his father to the corn-field, where the harvest is proceeding. The fierce rays of the morning sun are too powerful for him, and (affected apparently by a *sun-stroke*) he is carried home to his mother only to die at noon. She says nothing of their loss to her husband, but depositing her child on the bed of the man of God, at once starts in quest of him to Mount Carmel. The distance is fifteen or sixteen miles—at least four hours' ride; but she is mounted on the best ass (אֲתוֹן, *the she-ass*, such being noted for excellence), and she does not slacken rein. Elisha is on one of the heights of Carmel commanding the road to Shunem, and from his position opposite to her (אֲתוֹן) he recognises in the distance the figure of the regular attendant at the services which he holds here at "new moon and sabbath" (comp. ver. 23). He sends Gehazi down to meet her, and inquire the reason of her unexpected visit. But her distress is for the ear of the master, and not of the servant, and she presses on till she comes up to the place where Elisha himself is stationed (אֲתוֹן, *the mount*, ver. 27, i. e. Carmel, ver. 25); then throwing herself down in her emotion, she clasps him by the feet. Misinterpreting this action, or perhaps with an ascetic feeling of the unholiness of a woman, Gehazi attempts to thrust her away. But the prophet is too profound a student of human nature to allow this—"Let her alone, for her soul is vexed within her, and Jehovah hath hid it from me, and hath not told me." "And she said"—with the enigmatical form of Oriental speech—"did I desire a son of my lord? Did I not say, do not deceive me?" No explanation is needed to tell Elisha the exact state of the case. The heat of the season will allow of no delay in taking the necessary steps, and Gehazi is at once dispatched to run back to Shunem with the utmost speed. He takes the prophet's walking-staff in his hand which he is to lay on the face of the child. The mother and Elisha follow in haste. Before they reach the village the sun of that long, anxious summer afternoon must have set. Gehazi meets them on the road, but he has no reassuring report to give; the placing of the staff on the face of the dead boy had called forth no sign of life. Then Elisha enters the house, goes up to his own chamber, "and he shut the door on them twain, and prayed unto Jehovah." It was what Elijah had done on a similar occasion, and

in this and his subsequent proceedings Elisha was probably following a method which he had heard of from his master. The child is restored to life, the mother is called in, and again falls at the feet of the prophet, though with what different emotions—"and she took up her son and went out" (2 Kings iv, 18-37). There is nothing in the narrative to fix its date with reference to other events. We here first encounter Gehazi, the "servant" (עַבְדִּי, *lad*) of the man of God. It must of course have occurred before the events of viii, 1-6, and therefore before the cure of Naaman, when Gehazi became a leper.

(6.) The scene now changes to Gilgal, apparently at a time when Elisha was residing there (iv, 38-41). The sons of the prophets are sitting round him. It is a time of famine, possibly the same seven years' scarcity which is mentioned in viii, 1, 2, and during which the Shunammite woman of the preceding story migrated to the Philistine country. The food of the party must consist of any herbs that can be found. The great caldron is put on at the command of Elisha, and one of the company brings his blanket (לַבְּשֵׁי, *not "lap"* as in A. V.) full of such wild vegetables as he has collected, and empties it into the pottage. But no sooner have they begun their meal than the taste betrays the presence of some noxious herb [see GORRD], and they cry out, "There is death in the pot, oh man of God!" In this case the cure was effected by meal which Elisha cast into the stew in the caldron (1 Kings iv, 38-41).

(7.) The next miracle in all probability belongs to the same time, and also to the same place as the preceding. A man from Baal-shalisha (q. v.) brings the man of God a present of the first-fruits, which under the law (Num. xviii, 8, 12; Deut. xviii, 3, 4) were the perquisite of the ministers of the sanctuary—20 loaves of the new barley, and some delicacy, the exact nature of which is disputed, but which seems most likely to have been roasted ears of corn not fully ripe (אֶבֶן, perhaps elliptically for אֶבֶן אֶבֶן; comp. Lev. xxiii, 4), brought with care in a sack or bag (אֶבֶן אֶבֶן, Sept. *πίρα*). This moderate provision is by the word of Jehovah rendered more than sufficient for a hundred men (2 Kings iv, 42-44). This is one of the instances in which Elisha is the first to anticipate in some measure the miracles of Christ.

(8.) The simple records of these domestic incidents amongst the sons of the prophets are now interrupted by an occurrence of a more important character (2 Kings v, 1-27). The chief captain of the army of Syria, to whom his country was indebted for some signal success (the tradition of the Jews is that it was Naaman who killed Ahab, *Midrash Tehillim*, p. 29 b, on Psa. lxxviii), was afflicted with leprosy, and that in its most malignant form, the white variety (ver. 27). In Israel this would have disqualified him from all employment and all intercourse (2 Kings xv, 5; 2 Chron. xxvi, 20, 21). But in Syria no such practice appears to have prevailed; Naaman was still a "great man with his master," "a man of countenance." One of the members of his establishment is an Israelitish girl, kidnapped by the marauders (אֲרָבִים) of Syria in one of their forays over the border, and she brings into that Syrian household the fame of the name and skill of Elisha. "The prophet in Samaria," who had raised the dead, would, if brought into the presence of (אֲרָבִים) the patient, have no difficulty in curing even this dreadful leprosy. The news is communicated by Naaman himself (אֲרָבִים, *not "one told"*) to the king. Benhadad had yet to learn the position and character of Elisha. He writes to the king of Israel a letter very characteristic of a military prince, and curiously recalling words uttered by another military man in reference to the cure of his sick servant many centuries later—"I say to this one, go, and he goeth, and to my servant, do

this, and he doeth it." "And now"—so ran Benhadad's letter after the usual complimentary introduction had probably opened the communication—"and now, when this letter is come unto thee, behold, I have sent Naaman, my slave, to thee, that thou mayest recover him of his leprosy." With this letter, and with a present, in which the rich fabrics (כִּי־בָבֶלֶת, i. q. a dress of ceremony) for which Damascus has always been in modern times so famous form a conspicuous feature, and with a full retinue of attendants (13, 15, 23), Naaman proceeds to Samaria. The king of Israel—his name is not given, but it was probably Joram—is dismayed at the communication. He has but one idea, doubtless the result of too frequent experience—"Consider how this man seeketh a quarrel against me!" The occurrence soon reaches the ears of the prophet, and with a certain dignity he "sends" to the king—"Let him come to me, and he shall know that there is a prophet in Israel." To the house of Elisha Naaman goes with his whole cavalcade, the "horses and chariot" of the Syrian general fixing themselves particularly in the mind of the chronicler. Elisha still keeps in the background, and while Naaman stands at the doorway, contents himself with sending out a messenger with the simple direction to bathe seven times in the Jordan. The independent behavior of the prophet, and the simplicity of the prescription—not only devoid of any ceremonial, but absolutely insulting to the native of a city which boasted, as it still boasts, of the finest water-supply of any city of the East, all combined to enrage Naaman. His slaves, however, knew how to deal with the quick but not ungenerous temper of their master, and the result is that he goes down to the Jordan and dips himself seven times, "and his flesh came again like the flesh of a little child, and he was clean." His first business after his cure is to thank his benefactor. He returns with his whole train (מִלְּבַיִת, i. e. "host" or "camp"), and this time he will not be denied the presence of Elisha, but, making his way in, and standing before him, he gratefully acknowledges the power of the God of Israel, and entreats him to accept the present which he had brought from Damascus. But Elisha is firm, and refuses the offer, though repeated with the strongest adjuration. Naaman, having adopted Jehovah as his God, begs to be allowed to take away some of the earth of his favored country, of which to make an altar. He then consults Elisha on a difficulty which he foresees. How is he, a servant of Jehovah, to act when he accompanies the king to the temple of the Syrian god Rimmon? He must bow before the god; will Jehovah pardon this disloyalty? Elisha's answer is "Go in peace," and with this farewell the caravan moves off. But Gehazi, the attendant of Elisha, cannot allow such treasures thus to escape him. "As Jehovah liveth"—an expression, in the lips of this vulgar Israelite, exactly equivalent to the oft-repeated *W'allah*—"by God"—of the modern Arabs, "I will run after this Syrian and take somewhat of him." So he frames a story by which the generous Naaman is made to send back with him to Elisha's house a considerable present in money and clothes. He then went in and stood before his master as if nothing had happened. But the prophet was not to be so deceived. His heart had gone after his servant through the whole transaction, even to its minutest details, and he visits Gehazi with the tremendous punishment of the leprosy, from which he has just relieved Naaman. The date of the transaction must have been at least seven years after the raising of the Shunammite's son. This is evident from a comparison of viii, 4 with 1, 2, 3. Gehazi's familiar conversation with the king must have taken place before he was a leper. See NAAMAN.

(9.) We now return to the sons of the prophets, but this time the scene appears to be changed, and is probably at Jericho, and during the residence of Elisha there. Whether from the increase of the scholars con-

sequent on the estimation in which the master was held, or from some other cause, their habitation had become too small—"The place in which we sit before thee is too narrow for us." They will therefore move to the close neighborhood of the Jordan, and cutting down beams—each man one, as with curious minuteness the text relates—make there a new dwelling-place. Why Jordan was selected is not apparent. Possibly for its distance from the distractions of Jericho—possibly the spot was once sanctified by the crossing of Israel with the ark, or of Elijah, only a few years before. Urged by his disciples, the man of God consents to accompany them. When they reach the Jordan, descending to the level of the stream, they commence felling the trees (כִּי־יִצְטָקוּ) of the dense belt of wood in immediate contact with the water. See JORDAN. As one of them was cutting at a tree overhanging the stream, the iron of his axe (a borrowed tool) flew off and sank into the water. His cry soon brought the man of God to his aid. The stream of the Jordan is deep up to the very bank, especially when the water is so low as to leave the wood dry, and is, moreover, so turbid that search would be useless. But the place at which the lost axe entered the water is shown to Elisha; he lops off (כִּי־יִצְטָקוּ) a stick and casts it into the stream, and the iron appears on the surface, and is recovered by its possessor (2 Kings vi, 1-7).

(10.) Elisha is now residing at Dothan, half way on the road between Samaria and Jezreel. The incursions of the Syrian marauding bands (comp. ver. 2) still continue, but apparently with greater boldness, and pushed even into places which the king of Israel is accustomed to frequent (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* ix, 4, 3). But their manœuvres are not hid from the man of God, and by his warnings he saves the king "not once nor twice." So baffled were the Syrians by these repeated failures as to make their king suspect treachery in his own camp. But the true explanation is given by one of his own people—possibly one of those who had witnessed the cure wrought on Naaman, and could conceive no power too great to ascribe to so gifted a person: "Elisha, the prophet in Israel, telleth the king of Israel the words that thou speakest in thy bed-chamber." So powerful a magician must be seized without delay, and a strong party with chariots is dispatched to effect his capture. They march by night, and before morning take up their station round the base of the eminence on which the ruins of Dothan still stand. Elisha's servant—not Gehazi, but apparently a new-comer, unacquainted with the powers of his master—was the first to discover the danger. But Elisha remains unmoved by his fears; and at his request the eyes of the youth are opened to behold the spiritual guards which are protecting them, horses and chariots of fire filling the whole of the mountain. But this is not enough. Elisha again prays to Jehovah, and the whole of the Syrian warriors are struck blind. He then descends, and offers to lead them to the person and the place which they seek. He conducts them to Samaria. There, at the prayer of the prophet, their sight is restored, and they find themselves, not in a retired country village, but in the midst of the capital of Israel, and in the presence of the king and his troops. His enemies thus completely in his grasp, the king of Israel is eager to destroy them. "Shall I slay? shall I slay, my father?" But the end of Elisha has been answered when he has shown the Syrians how futile are all their attempts against his superior power. "Thou shalt not slay. Thou mayest slay those whom thou hast taken captive in lawful fight, but not these [literally, "Are these what thou hast captured with thy sword and bow, that thou art for smiting them?"]: feed them, and send them away to their master." After such a repulse it is not surprising that the marauding forays of the Syrian troops ceased (2 Kings vi, 8-23). See BENHADAD.

(11.) But the king of Syria could not rest under such dishonor. He abandons his marauding system, and gathers a regular army, with which he lays siege to Samaria. The awful extremities to which the inhabitants of the place were driven need not here be recalled. Roused by an encounter with an incident more ghastly than all, and which remained without parallel in Jewish records till the unspeakable horrors of the last days of Jerusalem (Josephus, *War*, v, 10, 3; 13, 7, etc.), the king vents his wrath on the prophet, probably as having, by his share in the last transaction (so Josephus, *Ant.* ix, 4, 4), or in some other way not recorded, provoked the invasion; possibly actuated by the spite with which a weak bad man in difficulty often regards one better and stronger than himself. The king's name is not stated in the Bible, but there can be no doubt that Josephus is correct in giving it as Joram; and in keeping with this is his employment of the same oath which his mother Jezebel used on an occasion not dissimilar (1 Kings xix, 2), "God do so to me and more also, if the head of Elisha, the son of Shaphat, shall stand on him this day." No sooner is the word out of the king's mouth than his emissary starts to execute the sentence. Elisha is in his house, and round him are seated the elders of Samaria, doubtless receiving some word of comfort or guidance in their sore calamity. He receives a miraculous intimation of the danger. Ere the messenger could reach the house, he said to his companions, "See how this son of a murderer (alluding to Ahab in the case of Naboth) hath sent to take away my head! Shut the door, and keep him from entering: even now I hear the sound of his master's feet behind him (hastening to stay the result of his rash exclamation!" interprets Josephus, *Ant.* ix, 4, 4). As he says the words the messenger arrives at the door, followed immediately, as the prophet had predicted, by the king and by one of his officers, the lord on whose hand he leaned. What follows is very graphic. The king's hereditary love of Baal burst forth, and he cries, "This evil is from Jehovah," the ancient enemy of my house: "why should I wait for Jehovah any longer?" To this Elisha answers: "Hear the word of Jehovah"—he who has sent famine can also send plenty—"to-morrow at this time shall a measure of fine flour be sold for a shekel, and two measures of barley for a shekel, in the gate of this very city." "This is folly," says the officer; "even if Jehovah were to make windows in heaven and pour down the provisions, it could not be." "It can, it shall," replies Elisha; "and you, ye shall see it all, but shall not live even to taste it" (2 Kings vi, 24-vii, 2). The next night God caused the Syrians to hear the noise of chariots and horses; and conceiving that Jehoram had hired against them the kings of the Hittites and the king of Egypt, they fled from before the walls of Samaria—leaving their tents filled with gold and provisions—in the utmost panic and confusion. In this way did God, according to the word of Elisha, miraculously deliver the inhabitants of Samaria from a deadly enemy without, and from sore famine within, its walls: another prediction moreover was accomplished; for the distrustful lord was trampled to death by the famished people in rushing through the gate of the city to the forsaken tents of the Syrians (2 Kings vii). See SAMARIA.

(12.) We now go back several years to an incident connected with the lady of Shunem, at a period antecedent to the cure of Naaman and the transfer of his leprosy to Gehazi (v, 1, 27). Elisha had been made aware of a famine which Jehovah was about to bring upon the land for seven years; and he had warned his friend the Shunammite of it that she might provide for her safety. Accordingly she had left Shunem with her family, and had taken refuge in the land of the Philistines, that is, in the rich corn-growing plain on the sea-coast of Judah, where, secure from want, she remained during the dearth. At the end of the seven

years she returned to her native place, to find that during her absence her house with the field-land attached to it—the corn-fields of the former story—had been appropriated by some other person. In Eastern countries kings are (or were) accessible to the complaints of the meanest of their subjects to a degree inconceivable to the inhabitants of the Western world. To the king, therefore, the Shunammite had recourse, as the widow of Tekoah on a former occasion to king David (2 Sam. xiv, 4). Thus occurred one of those rare coincidences which it is impossible not to ascribe to something more than mere chance. At the very moment of the entrance of the woman and her son—clamoring, as Oriental suppliants alone clamor (פזז), for her home and her land—the king was listening to a recital by Gehazi of "all the great things which Elisha had done," the crowning feat of all being that which he was then actually relating—the restoration to life of the boy of Shunem. The woman was instantly recognised by Gehazi. "My lord, O king, this is the woman and this is her son whom Elisha restored to life." From her own mouth the king hears the repetition of the wonderful tale, and, whether from regard to Elisha, or struck by the extraordinary coincidence, orders her land to be restored, with the value of all its produce during her absence (2 Kings viii, 1-6).

(13.) Hitherto we have met with the prophet only in his own country. We now find him at Damascus. (The traditional spot of his residence on this occasion is shown in the synagogue at *Jobar* [? *Hobah*], a village about two miles E. of Damascus. The same village, if not the same building, also contains the cave in which Elijah was fed by ravens and the tomb of Gehazi [Stanley, *Palest.* p. 412; Quaresmius, ii, 881—"vama et mendacia Hebræorum"].) He is there to carry out the command given to Elijah on Horeb to "anoint Hazael to be king over Syria." At the time of his arrival Benhadad was prostrate with his last illness. This marks the time of the visit as after the siege of Samaria, which was conducted by Benhadad in person (comp. vi, 24). The memory of the cure of Naaman, and of the subsequent disinterestedness of the prophet, were no doubt still fresh in Damascus; and no sooner does he enter the city than the intelligence is carried to the king—"The man of God is come hither." The king's first desire is naturally to ascertain his own fate; and Hazael, who appears to have succeeded Naaman, is commissioned to be the bearer of a present to the prophet, and to ask the question on the part of his master, "Shall I recover of this disease?" The present is one of royal dimensions—a caravan (of 40 camels, according to Josephus, *Ant.* ix, 4, 6) laden with the riches and luxuries which that wealthy city alone could furnish. The terms of Hazael's address show the respect in which the prophet was held even in this foreign and hostile country. They are identical with those in which Naaman was addressed by his slaves, and in which the king of Israel in a moment of the deepest gratitude and reverence had addressed Elisha himself. "Thy son Benhadad hath sent me to thee, saying, 'Shall I recover of this disease?'" The reply, probably originally ambiguous, is doubly uncertain in the present doubtful state of the Hebrew text, but the general conclusion was unmistakable: "Jehovah hath showed me that he shall surely die." But this was not all that had been revealed to the prophet. If Benhadad died, who would be king in his stead but the man who now stood before him? The prospect was one which drew forth the tears of the man of God. This man was no rash and imprudent leader, who could be baffled and deceived as Benhadad had so often been. Behind that "steadfast," impenetrable countenance was a steady courage and a persistent resolution, in which Elisha could not but foresee the greatest danger to his country. Here was a man who, give him but the power, would "op-

press" and "cut Israel short," would "thresh Gilead with threshing instruments of iron," and "make them like the dust by threshing" as no former king of Syria had done, and that at a time when the prophet would be no longer alive to warn and to advise. At Hazael's request Elisha confesses the reason of his tears. But the prospect is one which has no sorrow for Hazael. How such a career presented itself to him may be inferred from his answer. His only doubt is the possibility of such good fortune for one so mean. "But what is thy slave, dog that he is (דָּבָרִים אֲדָבָרִים, *thy servant*, THE *dog*, i. e. insignificant object), that he should do this great thing?" To this Elisha replies, "Jehovah hath showed me that thou wilt be king over Syria." Returning to the king, Hazael tells him only half the dark saying of the man of God—"He told me that thou shouldst surely recover." But that was the last day of Benhadad's life. What were the circumstances attending his death, whether in the bath as has recently been suggested (Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* iii, 523 note), is not clear, except that he seems to have been smothered. The general inference, in accordance with the account of Josephus, is that Hazael himself was the murderer, but the statement in the text does not necessarily bear that interpretation (הִרְבֵּה הַבְּשָׂמִים, may well be rendered "one took the [not a] hair-cloth," i. e. perhaps divan-mattress); and, indeed, from the mention of Hazael's name at the end of the passage, the conclusion is rather the reverse (2 Kings viii, 7-15). See HAZAEL.

(14.) Two of the injunctions laid on Elijah had now been carried out, but the third still remained. Hazael had begun his attacks on Israel by an attempt to recover the stronghold of Ramoth-Gilead (viii, 28), or Ramah, among the mountains on the east of Jordan. But the fortress was held by the kings of Israel and Judah in alliance, and, though the Syrians had wounded the king of Israel, they had not succeeded in capturing the place (viii, 28; ix, 15). One of the captains of the Israelitish army in the garrison was Jehu, the son of Jehoshaphat, the son of Nimshii. At this time his name was mentioned to Elijah on Horeb he must have been but a youth; now he is one of the boldest and best known of all the warriors of Israel. He had seen the great prophet once, when with his companion Bidkar he attended Ahab to take possession of the field of Naboth, and the scene of that day, and the words of the curse then pronounced, no subsequent adventure had been able to efface (ix, 25, 36). The time had now come for the fulfilment of that curse by his being anointed king over Israel. Elisha's personal share in the transaction was confined to giving directions to one of the sons of the prophets, and the detailed narrative may be found in 2 Kings ix (see Maurice, *Prophets and Kings*, serm. ix). See JEHU.

(15.) Beyond this we have no record of Elisha's having taken any part in the revolution of Jehu, or the events which followed it. He does not again appear till we find him on his death-bed in his own house (xiii, 14-19). Joash, the grandson of Jehu, is now king, and he has come to weep over the approaching departure of the great and good prophet. His words are the same as those of Elisha when Elijah was taken away—"My father! my father! the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof!" But it is not a time for weeping. One thought fills the mind of both king and prophet. Syria is the fierce enemy who is gradually destroying the country, and against Syria one final effort must be made before the aid of Elisha becomes unobtainable. What was the exact significance of the ceremonial employed, our ignorance of Jewish customs does not permit us to know, but it was evidently symbolic. The window is opened towards the hated country, the bow is pointed in the same direction, and the prophet laying his hands on the string as if to convey force to the shot, "the arrow of Jehovah's deliverance,

the arrow of deliverance from Syria," is discharged. This done, the king takes up the bundle of arrows, and, at the command of Elisha, beats them on the ground. But he does it with no energy, and the successes of Israel, which might have been so prolonged as completely to destroy the foe, are limited to three victories. See JEHOASH.

(16.) The power of the prophet, however, does not terminate with his death. Even in the tomb (Josephus embellishes the account by stating that he had a magnificent funeral, *Ant.* ix, 8, 6) he restores the dead to life. Moab had recovered from the tremendous reverse inflicted on her by the three kings at the opening of Elisha's career (2 Kings iii), and her marauding bands had again begun the work of depredation which Syria so long pursued (2 Kings v, 2; vi, 23). The text perhaps infers that the spring—that is, when the early crops were ripening—was the usual period for these attacks; but, be this as it may, on the present occasion they invaded the land "at the coming in of the year." A funeral was going on in the cemetery which contained the sepulchre of Elisha. Seeing the Moabitish spoilers in the distance, the friends of the dead man hastened to conceal his corpse in the nearest hiding-place. They chose—whether by design or by accident is not said—the tomb of the prophet, and, as the body was pushed (אֶרְבֶּבֶת) into the cell which formed the receptacle for the corpse in Jewish tombs, it came in contact with his bones. The mere touch of those hallowed remains was enough to effect that which in his lifetime had cost Elisha both prayers and exertions—the man "revived and stood up on his feet." Other miracles of the prophet foreshadow, as we have remarked, the acts of power and goodness of our Saviour, but this may rather be said to recal the marvels of a later period—of the early ages of the Christian Church. It is in the story of Gervasius and Protasius (Augustine's *Confessions*, ix, § 16), and not in any occurrence in the life of our Lord or of the apostles, that we must look for a parallel to the last-recorded miracle of Elisha (2 Kings xiii, 20-22).

2. *Characteristics and Traditional Views.*—In almost every respect Elisha presents the most complete contrast to Elijah. The copious collection of his sayings and doings which are preserved in the 3d to the 9th chapter of the 2d book of Kings, though in many respects deficient in that remarkable vividness which we have noted in the records of Elijah, is yet full of testimonies to this contrast. Elijah was a true Bedouin child of the desert. The clefts of the Cherith, the wild shrubs of the desert, the cave at Horeb, the top of Carmel, were his haunts and his resting-places. If he enters a city, it is only to deliver his message and be gone. Elisha, on the other hand, is a civilized man, an inhabitant of cities. He passed from the translation of his master to dwell at Jericho (2 Kings ii, 18); from thence he "returned" to Samaria (ver. 25). At Samaria (v, 3; vi, 32; comp. ver. 24) and at Dothan (vi, 14) he seems regularly to have resided in a house (v, 9, 24; vi, 32; xiii, 17) with "doors" and "windows," in familiar intercourse with the sons of the prophets, with the elders (vi, 32), with the lady of Shunem, the general of Damascus, the king of Israel. Over the king and the "captain of the host" he seems to have possessed some special influence, capable of being turned to material advantage if desired (2 Kings iv, 13). The touches of the narrative are very slight, but we can rather that his dress was the ordinary garment of an Israelite, the *beged*, probably similar in form to the long *abbejeh* of the modern Syrians (2 Kings ii, 12), that his hair was worn short (if not naturally deficient) behind, in contrast with the long locks of Elijah (ii, 23), and that he used a walking-staff (iv, 29) of the kind ordinarily carried by grave or aged citizens (Zech. viii, 4). What use he made of the rough mantle of Elijah, which came into his possession at their

parting, does not anywhere appear, but there is no hint of his ever having worn it. Elijah was emphatically a destroyer. His mission was to slay and to demolish whatever opposed or interfered with the rights of Jehovah, the Lord of Hosts. The nation had adopted a god of power and force, and they were shown that he was feebleness itself compared with the God whom they had forsaken. But after Elijah the destroyer comes Elisha the healer. "There shall not be dew nor rain these years" is the earliest proclamation of the one. "There shall not be from thence any death or barren land" is the first miracle of the other. What may have been the disposition of Elijah when not engaged in the actual service of his mission we have unhappily no means of knowing. Like most men of strong, stern character, he probably had affections not less strong. But it is impossible to conceive that he was accustomed to the practice of that beneficence which is so strikingly characteristic of Elisha, and which comes out at almost every step of his career. Still more impossible is it to conceive him exercising the tolerance towards the person and the religion of foreigners for which Elisha is remarkable—in communication, for example, with Naaman or Hazaël; in the one case calming with a word of peace the scruples of the new proselyte, anxious to reconcile the due homage to Kimmion with his allegiance to Jehovah; in the other case contemplating with tears, but still with tears only, the evil which the future king of Syria was to bring upon his country. That Baal-worship was prevalent in Israel even after the efforts of Elijah, and that Samaria was its chief seat, we have the evidence of the narrative of Jehu to assure us (2 Kings x, 18-27), but his mission is not so directly to rebuke and punish it. In the eulogium of Elisha contained in the catalogue of worthies of Ecclesiastes, xlviii, 12-14—the only later mention of him save the passing allusion of Luke iv, 27—his special character is more strongly brought out than in the earlier narrative: "Whilst he lived he was not moved by the presence of any prince, neither could any bring him into subjection. No word could overcome him, and after his death his body prophesied. He did wonders in his life, and at his death were his works marvelous."

This thaumaturgic view of Elisha is indeed the true key to his Biblical history, for he evidently appears in these records chiefly as a worker of prodigies, a predictor of future events, a revealer of secrets, and things happening out of sight or at a distance. The working of wonders seems to be a natural accompaniment of false religions, and we may be sure that the Baal-worship of Samaria and Jezreel was not free from such arts. The story of 1 Kings xxii shows that even before Elisha's time the prophets had come to be looked upon as diviners, and were consulted, not on questions of truth and justice, nor even as depositaries of the purposes and will of the Deity, but as able to foretell how an adventure or a project was likely to turn out, whether it might be embarked in without personal danger or loss. But if this degradation is inherent in false worship, it is no less a principle in true religion to adjust itself to a state of things already existing, and out of the forms of the alien or the false to produce the power of the true. Thus Elisha appears to have met the habits of his fellow-countrymen. He wrought, without reward and without ceremonial, the cures and restorations for which the soothsayers of Baalzebub at Ekron were consulted in vain: he warned his sovereign of dangers from the Syrians which the whole four hundred of his prophets had not succeeded in predicting to Ahab, and thus in one sense we may say that no less signally than Elijah he vanquished the false gods on their own field.

The frequency and unparalleled nature of his miracles also furnish perhaps the best explanation of Elisha's behest of "a double portion of his own spirit"

upon Elisha (2 Kings-ii, 9). The ordinary meaning put upon this phrase (see, for example, J. H. Newman, *Subj. of the Day*, p. 191) is that Elisha possessed double the power of Elijah. This, though sanctioned by the renderings of the Vulgate and Luther, and adopted by a long series of commentators from Ephraem Syrus to Krummacker, would appear not to be the real force of the words. The expression is *שְׁנַיִם פִּי*, literally "a mouth of two"—a double mouthful—the same phrase employed in Deut. xxi, 17 to denote the amount of a father's goods which were the right and token of a first-born son. Thus the gift of the "double portion" of Elijah's spirit was but the legitimate conclusion of the act of adoption which began with the casting of the mantle at Abel-meholah years before. It was this which Elisha sought—not a gift of the spirit of prophecy twice as large as Elijah himself possessed. This carries improbability on the very face of it; for with what propriety could a man be asked to leave as an inheritance to another double of what he himself possessed? Nor did Elisha get any such superlative endowment; his position as a prophet was altogether of a dependent and secondary nature as compared with Elijah's; and the attempts that have been made to invert the relation of the one to the other, proceed upon arbitrary and superficial considerations. Not less arbitrary is the view of Ewald, that the request of Elisha must be understood as indicating a wish for two thirds only of Elijah's spirit (*Gesch.* iii, 507)—a view that requires no refutation. The proper explanation is, that Elisha here regarded Elijah as the head of a great spiritual household, which included himself as the first-born and all who had since been added to the fraternity under the name of "the sons of the prophets;" and what he now sought was, that he might be constituted Elijah's heir in the spiritual vineyard, by getting the first-born's double portion, and therewith authority to continue the work. For a curious calculation by Peter Damianus that Elijah performed twelve miracles and Elisha twenty-four, see the *Acta Sanctorum*, July 20.

Elisha is canonized in the Greek Church; his day is the 14th of June. Under that date, his life, and a collection of the few traditions concerning him—few indeed when compared with those of Elijah—may be found in the *Acta Sanctorum*. In the time of Jerome a "mausoleum" containing his remains was shown at Samaria (Reland, *Palæst.* p. 986). Under Julian the bones of Elisha were taken from their receptacle and burnt. But, notwithstanding this, his relics are heard of subsequently, and the church of St. Apollinaris at Ravenna still boasts of possessing his head. The Carmelites have a special service in honor of Elisha.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.; Fairbairn, s. v.

3. *Literature.*—On the subject generally, Kitto, *Daily Bible Illustrations*, "Solomon and Kings," 47th to 49th week; Niemeyer, *Charakt.* v, 364 sq.; Blunt, *History of Elisha* (new ed. Lond, 1862); Krummacker, *Elisha* (from the German, Lond, 1838); Anon. *Short Meditations on Elisha* (Lond, 1848); Cassel, *Der Prophet Elisa* (Berlin, 1860); Stanley, *Jewish Church*, ii, 353 sq. On the fate of the Bethelie youths, Michaelis, *De Elisæo vindicato* (Pref. a. O. 1734). On the miracle of the axe-helve, Freise, *Ferrum natans* (Jen. 1689). On the Shunammite's, Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 177 sq.

**Elisha** (in Armenian *Eghische*), one of the most celebrated Armenian historians, was born at the beginning of the 5th century. He was a pupil of the patriarch St. Sahag (Isaac) and of St. Mesrob, by whom he was sent to the schools of Athens, Alexandria, and Constantinople. Subsequently he became almoner and secretary of prince Vartan, who, in the religious war of the Armenians against the Persians, was chief commander of the Armenian army. He died in 480. Probably he is the same person with bishop Elisha of Amathunik, who in 449 was present at the Syn-

od of Artishat, at which the bishops of Armenia replied to the summons of the Persian ruler Yesdegerd II to adopt the faith of Zoroaster. This reply, to which was added a brief apology of the Christian religion, led to the religious war which is described by Elisha. So great was the reputation of this work that its author received the surname of the Armenian Xenophon. It begins with the accession to the throne of Yesdegerd in 439, describes in full the schemes of persecution devised by the Persian king against the Armenians, the resistance of the Armenian bishops and princes, the "holy alliance" concluded by the latter, and its operation and fate until the unfortunate battle at the river Techmut, in the province of Artas, in 451, in consequence of which the leaders of the holy alliance and most of the bishops were captured and taken to Persia. The first edition of this work was printed at Constantinople in 1764 (new ed. 1833); other editions appeared at Nakhidchevan (1764), Calcutta (1816), and Venice (1823 and 1838). The last Venice edition, which is the best, contains also commentaries to the books of Joshua and Judges, a recommendation of monastic life, an exposition of the Lord's Prayer, several homilies, and a work on the ecclesiastical canons. An English translation of the work was published by Fr. Neumann (*The History of Vartan and of the Battle of the Armenians, containing an Account of the religious Wars between the Persians and Armenians*, by Elisens, bishop of the Amaduniens, etc., Lond. 1830). It has also been translated into French by abbé G. K. Garabed (*Soulercement national de l'Arménie chrétienne*, Par. 1844, 8vo), and into Italian by G. Cappelletti (Ven. 1841). Elisha is also the author of a history of Armenia, which, however, appears to be lost.—Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 540; Hofer, *Nov. Biog. Génér.* xv, 884; Neumann, *Versuch einer Gesch. der armen. Litter.* p. 69, 70. (A. J. S.)

**Eli'shah** (Heb. *Elishah*, עִלְיָשָׁה, deriv. unknown; Sept. *Ἐλισά* and *Ἐλισαί*; Josephus, *Ἐλισάς*, Vulg. *Elisha*), the oldest of the four sons of Javan (Gen. x, 4; 1 Chron. i, 7). B.C. cir. 2450. He seems to have given name to a region on the Mediterranean, "the isles (עִלְיָשָׁה, *shores*) of Elishah," which are described as exporting fabrics of purple and scarlet to the markets of Tyre (Ezek. xxvii, 7). If the descendants of Javan peopled Greece, we may expect to find Elishah in some province of that country. The circumstance of the purple suits the Peloponnesus, for the fish affording the purple dye was caught at the mouth of the Eurotas, and the purple of Laconia was very celebrated. See PURPLE. The name seems kindred to *Elis* (Bochart, *Phaleg*, iii, 4), which, in a wider sense, was applied to the whole Peloponnesus; and some identify *Elishah* with *Hellas* (Michaelis, *Spicileg.* i, 79).—Kitto, s. v. Josephus, however, identified the race of Elishah with the *Æolians* (*Ant.* i, 6, 1). His view is adopted by Knobel (*Völkertafel*, p. 81 sq.). It appears correct to treat it as the designation of a race rather than of a locality; and if Javan represents the Ionians, then Elishah the *Æolians*, whose name presents considerable similarity (*Ἰολοίς* having possibly been *Ἰελίς*), and whose predilection for maritime situations quite accords with the expression in Ezekiel. In early times the *Æolians* were settled in various parts of Greece, Thessaly, Bœotia, Ætolia, Locris, Elis, and Messenia: from Greece they emigrated to Asia Minor, and in Ezekiel's age occupied the maritime district in the N.W. of that country, named after them *Æolis*, together with the islands Lesbos and Tenedos. The purple shell-fish was found on this coast, especially at Abydos (Virgil, *Georg.* i, 207), Phocæa (Ovid, *Metam.* vi, 9), Sigæum and Lectum (Athenæus, iii, 88). Not much, however, can be deduced from this as to the position of the "isles of Elishah," as that shell-fish was found in many parts of the Mediterranean, especially on the coast of Laconia (Pausan. iii, 21, § 6).—

Smith, s. v. Schulthess (*Paradies*, p. 264), without the slightest probability, argues in favor of a position on the western coast of Africa, on the ground of the resemblance to *Elisha* as the Phœnician name of Carthage. See ETYMOLOGY.

**Elish'ama** (Heb. *Elishama*, עִלְיָשָׁמָא, whom *God has heard*), the name of several men.

1. (Sept. *Ἐλισαμά* v. r. in Chron. *Ἐλισαμαί*.) Son of Ammihud, and "prince" or "captain" (both *נָשִׂיא*, i. e. phylarch) of the tribe of Ephraim at the Exode (Num. i, 10; ii, 18; vii, 48, 53; x, 22). B.C. 1658. From the genealogy in 1 Chron. vii, 26, we find that he was the grandfather of Joshua.

2. (Sept. *Ἐλισαμά* v. r. *Ἐλισά*.) The second of the nine sons of David born at Jerusalem, exclusive of those by Bathsheba (1 Chron. iii, 6); called in the parallel passages (2 Sam. v, 15; 1 Chron. xiv, 5) by apparently the more correct name ELISHUA (q. v.).

3. (Sept. *Ἐλισαμά*.) The seventh of the same series of sons (2 Sam. v, 16; 1 Chron. iii, 8; xiv, 7), being one of the thirteen, or, according to the record of Samuel, the eleven, sons born to David of his wives after his establishment in Jerusalem. B.C. post 1044. The list in Josephus (*Ant.* vii, 3, 3) has no similar name. See DAVID.

4. (Sept. *Ἐλισαμά*.) One of the two priests sent by Jehoshaphat with the Levites to teach the Law through the cities of Judah (2 Chron. xvii, 8). B.C. 912.

5. (Sept. *Ἐλισαμά*.) Son of Jekamiah, a descendant of Judah (1 Chron. ii, 41). In the Jewish traditions preserved by Jerome (*Qu. Hebr.* on 1 Chron. ii, 41) he appears to be identified with

6. (Sept. *Ἐλισαμά* v. r. in Jer. *Ἐλισά* and *Ἐλεασά*.) A member of the royal line of Judah; father of Nethaniah, and grandfather of Ishmael who slew Gedaliah, provisional governor of Jerusalem after its capture by the Babylonians (2 Kings xxv, 25; Jer. xli, 1). B.C. considerably ante 588.

7. (Sept. *Ἐλισαμά*.) A royal scribe in whose chamber the roll of Jeremiah was read to him and other assembled magnates, and afterwards deposited for a time (Jer. xxxvi, 12, 20, 21). B.C. 605.

**Elish'aphat** (Heb. *Elishaphat*, עִלְיָשָׁפָת, whom *God has judged*; Sept. *Ἐλισαφάτ* v. r. *Ἐλισαφάν*), son of Ziechri, and one of the "captains of hundreds" whom Jehoiaada associated with himself in the league to overthrow the usurpation of Athaliah (2 Chron. xxiii, 1). B.C. 877.

**Elish'eba** (Heb. *Elish'eba*, עִלְיָשָׁבָה, *God is her oath*, or she *swears by God*, i. e. worshipper of God, comp. Isa. xix, 8; Sept. *Ἐλισάβητ*, Vulg. *Elisabeth*; as in Luke i, 7), the daughter of Amminadab, phylarch of the tribe of Judah, and sister of Nahshon, the captain of the Hebrew host (Num. ii, 3); she became the wife of Aaron (q. v.), and hence the mother of the priestly family (Exod. vi, 23). B.C. 1658.

**Elishu'a** (Heb. *id.* עִלְיָשֻׁעַ, *God is his salvation*; Sept. *Ἐλισουή* v. r. *Ἐλισάβ* and *Ἐλισά*, Vulg. *Elishu*), one of the sons of David, born at Jerusalem (2 Sam. v, 15; 1 Chron. xiv, 5); called ELISHAMA (q. v.) in the parallel passage (1 Chron. iii, 6). B.C. post 1044.

**Elis'imus** (*Ἐλισάμοσ*; Vulg. *Liasmus*), an Israelite of the "sons of Zamoth," who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (1 Esdr. ix, 28); evidently the ELASHIB (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra x, 27).

**Eli'u** (Ἠλιού, i. e. *Elihu*), one of the forefathers of Judith (Jud. viii, 1), and therefore of the tribe of Simeon. See JUDITH.

**Eli'ud** (*Ἐλισάδ*, prob. for Heb. *עִלְיָד*, *God is his praise*, but not found in O. T.), son of Achim, and father of Eleazar, being the fifth in ascent in Christ's paternal genealogy (Matt. i, 14, 15). B.C. cir. 200. See GENEALOGY OF CHRIST.



**Elizabeth**, queen of England, ascended the throne on the death of her sister, the bloody Mary, Nov. 17, 1558, and died March 24 (April 3, New Style), 1603. She was the daughter and only living child of Anne Boleyn and Henry VIII. She was born Sept. 7, 1533, and was therefore "full five-and-twenty years old when she came to the crown." Before she was three years of age her mother was beheaded by her father, who, according to his own declaration, "never spared man in his anger, nor woman in his lust." On the 8th of June of the same year, 1536, the Parliament declared the divorces of Catharine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn legal, and bastardized the issue of both marriages. The same decision had been previously pronounced by archbishop Cranmer in the Star-Chamber, and confirmed by the Convocation. The Parliament also empowered Henry to settle the succession by testamentary disposition. In January, 1544, Elizabeth was restored to the line of royal inheritance.

During the lifetime of her father her education was carefully encouraged, especially by queen Catharine Parr; and it was continued after his death. She was instructed in Latin and Greek by William Grindal and Roger Ascham. The latter commends her masculine power of application, quick apprehension, and retentive memory. "She spoke French and Italian with fluency, was elegant in her penmanship, and was skilful in music, though she did not delight in it." She seems also to have had some acquaintance with German. Her position was at all times exceedingly dubious, and rarely free from peril.

On the accession of her brother Edward VI she encountered other risks than those she had been previously exposed to. In her infancy her hand had been designed for the duke of Orleans, third son of Francis I; it was offered to the earl of Arran, and declined by him; it was then proposed for Philip of Spain. Under Edward VI, admiral Seymour, the brother of the lord protector, hesitated between seeking the hand of Mary, Elizabeth, or the lady Jane Grey. He finally accepted that of the queen dowager, but did not discontinue his amorous attentions, and renewed his addresses to the princess Elizabeth on his wife's death. Her fair fame was impeached by her encouragement of his devotions; and this furnished one of the charges against him which resulted in his execution.

New dangers encompassed her on the death of her brother. Dudley, earl of Northumberland, father of the earl of Leicester, the subsequent favorite, had persuaded the boy-king, in his last illness, to set aside both his sisters on the ground of their illegitimacy, and to bequeath the crown to the lady Jane Grey (great-niece of Henry VIII), who had recently been married to his fourth son, lord Guilford Dudley. Ridley, bishop of London, preached vehemently in favor of lady Jane, and against any supposed title of Mary and Elizabeth, both of whom were regarded as Roman Catholic, and favorable to the restoration of the old religion. Northumberland offered lands and money to Elizabeth to induce her to renounce her claims, but she adroitly evaded his proposals.

The legitimacy of Mary was declared by Parliament, which thus stigmatized anew the birth of Elizabeth. She conformed to the rites of the Roman Catholic Church with some reluctance, but was viewed with suspicion. In 1554 she was implicated, in connection with her dissolute suitor, Courtenay, earl of Devonshire, in Wyatt's conspiracy, and was confined to the Tower for two months. Her death was demanded; but Philip II, now the husband of Mary, interposed, and she was put under surveillance at Woodstock. Philip proposed to bestow her upon Emanuel Philibert, duke of Savoy, who afterwards married, according to the provisions of the treaty of Cateau-Cambresis, Margaret of France.

These points may appear trivial in a rapid notice of the life and reign of Elizabeth, but they affected both

the development of her character and the policy of her government. The death of queen Mary exposed her to untried difficulties, requiring discernment, resolution, and singular good fortune. Her accession to the throne was unchallenged in Parliament, and was heard with demonstrations of joy by the populace of London. She herself, however, in her retirement at Hatfield, recognised the gravity of the occasion. She had been declared illegitimate and incapable of the crown by her father, by her brother, by the Star-Chamber, by the Convocation, and twice by act of Parliament. For the last twenty years the religion of England had been determined by royal edicts and parliamentary enactments. The majority of the people were Roman Catholic in consequence of the measures of the late reign. Elizabeth, in the presence of her dying sister, had "prayed God that the earth might open and swallow her alive if she were not a true Roman Catholic." But, if Roman Catholicism remained the national creed, her tenure of the crown would be wholly precarious, as the illegitimacy of her birth would be inevitably and irrefragably maintained. The superior title of Mary, queen of Scots, would prevail, perhaps, with the aid of French arms, while the Brandon or Suffolk line might seek Spanish support. Roman Catholic her government could not be; but, if she renounced Rome, she united the religious with the political enthusiasm of France, under the instigation of the Guises, against her reign, and alienated or provoked Philip II, then aspiring to universal dominion, and having in his own person some claims to the English throne, which he afterwards advanced. He had hastened to tender his widowed heart and hand to the new queen immediately on the death of her sister. Could she venture to reject it at once, while his party was still strong, and in possession of all places of influence in England—while her own throne was still uncertain? She temporized, she coquetted, she entertained his proposals till she could reject them. She did not fully renounce the old and lately restored religion. She retained the crucifix and lights in her private chapel, and throughout her life addressed prayers to the Virgin. But she gradually abolished the most distinctive practices of the Papal Church, and established by act of Parliament her ecclesiastical supremacy. Her own Protestantism was always political rather than religious; the creed was less important to her than the political submission of the people. Her first measures were very cautious, and were adroitly introduced by her great minister, Sir William Cecil, who guided her councils till his death, forty years after. So insecure was her hold upon the sceptre, that in the year of her coronation her title was denied by pope Paul IV, and also by John Knox, who had written a diatribe against *the intolerable regimen of women*, and who at this time addressed a letter to the queen to persuade her to surrender her crown.

Nearly all omens were adverse. The state was divided into factions—all opposed to her. Foreign states were hostile or indifferent in interest and in sentiment. Her title was most questionable, if not utterly invalid. She had no support but her own brave heart, the patriotic antipathy of her people to foreign rule, the civil wars and discords prevailing or in prospect in the kingdoms around her, and the sagacity of the advisers whom she might choose. She had to knit together her own people into a nation, to win popular support by suppressing all factions at home, to avert foreign dangers by creating a party for herself, and provoking occupation for her enemies in the realms by which she was menaced. The character and conduct of Elizabeth present a most interesting, but most difficult moral and historical study. No hasty and sweeping censures, whether of praise or blame, can exhibit the complicated intertexture of threads of various material and hue in that strange fabric. All was not virtue, all was not vice. The virtues were obscured, soiled,

or dwarfed by supposed state necessities; the vices were darkened or deepened by ceaseless provocations and harassing perplexities. Never, perhaps, was an illustrious character composed of a more undistinguishable admixture of fine gold, and dross, and clay, and never was there one better calculated to invite and reward curious examination.

In the earlier years of her reign she could trust only to those political friends whose fortunes were indissolubly connected with her own, and to her relatives, principally by her mother's line—the descendants of Mary Boleyn. As her throne became more assured, she attracted to her court the young men of ancient gentry, of adventurous spirit, of chivalrous bearing, of great but restricted ambition, and of high physical and intellectual advantages. Gentle birth, great talents, and good looks were the passports to the favor of the court. She thus created supporters and officers for her crown. The old nobility she did not and could not trust. They were powers in the land which despised, envied, and menaced her own. She accumulated favors on Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester, from compassion for the fate of his father and brother, from regard for his courtly manners, perhaps for a tenderer feeling, which she deemed it unregal and unsafe to gratify. Leicester, like his father, was ever scheming for a crown. Essex she petted, indulged, spoiled, as a bright, petulant, promising youth, who was one of her nearest male relatives, and the chief hope of her lonely old age.

Her crown was at first held merely by the acquiescence of the nation; it was not confirmed by any parliamentary sanction till the fourteenth year of her reign. Civil and religious disorder desolated Scotland, France, and the Netherlands: she prevented such commotions in her own realm. She promptly suppressed the commencements of revolt; she arrested the numerous conspiracies against her life and throne before they had time to explode; and she left her people united, if not a harmonious nation—prosperous, intelligent, powerful, independent, and free.

Menaced by the claims of Mary, and by their prospective advocacy by France or Spain, she placed herself at the head of the Protestant movement, and aided, openly or secretly, the Protestant lords in Scotland, the Huguenots in France, William of Orange, and the Gueux in the Netherlands. She assisted all; she gave no decisive aid to any.

In the midst of perils and successes at home and abroad, she made head against the incessant revolts of Ireland, which has been a thorn in the side of Britain from the fabulous days of king Arthur to the current year of queen Victoria. Throughout her reign she was harassed by its state of chronic though intermittent rebellion, but in the year preceding her death she received its submission through lord Mountjoy.

The important results achieved in the long reign of Elizabeth were mainly due to the impulses communicated by herself and the policy pursued by her ministers. All portentous stars were in conjunction in her horoscope. Internal and external hazards environed her. Industry was disorganized, agriculture disordered, trade inactive, enterprise stagnant, fortunes were shattered, ranks confused, beggars and vagabonds multiplied by the confiscation and private appropriation of Church lands, by the inclosure of commons, and the extension of pasturage. These social evils were aggravated by the growth of colossal fortunes alongside of increasing destitution among the masses, as commerce rapidly advanced under her rule. They were augmented also by the progressive depreciation of the precious metals, which grievously affected the public revenue, and the condition of families with fixed and moderate means.

All these circumstances must be considered in order to appreciate justly the otherwise suspicious and unintelligible policy of Elizabeth. They explain the

meaning, if they do not evince the propriety of her ecclesiastical measures; they illustrate the spirit of her internal government; they interpret her severity to the beautiful and unfortunate queen who sought as a kinswoman an asylum and protection in her realm. They enable us to see how she fostered the high empire and the transcendent genius of the Elizabethan Age; and how, in the midst of all the clouds and mists which obscured her career, she remained a right royal woman, created the national spirit of England, established the English Church, maintained the Protestant cause, and spread such blessings over the land that to this day the popular imagination still fondly looks back to "the merry days of good queen Bess."

Her religious policy was hostile alike to Roman Catholics and Puritans; yet Howard of Effingham, who commanded the navies of England against the Spanish Armada, belonged to the Roman communion; and nearly all her chief ministers were supporters of the Puritan doctrine. There seems to be substantial truth in the declaration of lord Bacon, who had ample opportunities of forming a correct judgment, who was Puritan by family and political connections, but tolerant by disposition. He says, with an affirmation of "certain knowledge," "Most certain it is that it was the firm resolution of this princess not to offer any violence to consciences; but then, on the other side, not to suffer the state of her kingdom to be ruined under pretence of conscience and religion." Her aim was to maintain her ascendancy in Church and State, in order to prevent internal divisions which would invite external aggressions. It was impossible, in the turmoil and religious acrimony of the period, to draw precisely the line of discrimination between religious belief and political intrigue. There is reason to believe that the persecutions which darkened her reign did not contemplate capital penalties till her crown and life had both been endangered by papal excommunications, by Papist plots, and by Spanish or domestic schemes of assassination.

These principles also controlled in large measure her harsh, unsympathizing treatment of her beautiful and accomplished cousin, Mary of Scotland, whose graces have been employed, like the charms of Aspasia and Phryne in an Athenian court, to secure acquittal when the evidence compels a condemnation. If Mary was innocent of the murder of her husband; if she was not involved in the Northern rebellion; if she did not beguile the duke of Norfolk; if she did not connive at Babington's conspiracy and other similar transactions; if she did not instigate Hamilton of Bothwellhaugh to murder her royal jailor; if she practised no collusion with Philip of Spain—all these things might have been readily credited by the English queen and her council, and such belief would remove the atrocity, if not the formal illegality, of their procedure. But if all, or most of these suspicions were well founded; if they have been confirmed by the most dispassionate historians, and by the most recent and diligent investigations, the action of Elizabeth may still be illegal, but it ceases to be iniquitous. It should be remembered, too, that Elizabeth did not consent to the trial of Mary till after repeated and urgent demands from the lords and commons of England in Parliament assembled; that her signature of the death-warrant is by no means certain; that it was issued and carried into effect without her consent, and contrary to her orders; and that the execution caused her bitter agony and horror. This plea is, indeed, counterbalanced by the suspicion that she sought the removal of her royal captive by secret murder. Such a design is, of course, infamous, though in accordance with the spirit and practices of the age.

To these habits of indirect procedure may be referred much of that matrimonial coquetting which furnished occasion for the malignant censures of hostile contemporaries. There was much female vanity in the fre-

quent and not always coy reception of tender addresses. The Tudor blood displayed its licentious warmth in Margaret and Mary, the sisters of Henry VIII, and in their female descendants, as well as in "bluff king Harry." But there was much also of policy in Elizabeth's demeanor. It introduced a courtly language which has often been misconstrued. It cannot have been entirely unworthy, degrading, or vicious, when it inspired the compliments of Sidney, and Raleigh, and Spenser, and Shakspeare, and Bacon. There is a fashion in language and manners as well as in dress, and the fashion must be regarded if we would interpret their significance.

The supposition of a warmer attachment to Essex than the natural attachment of an aged relative for the hopeful representative of an almost extinct line has neither foundation nor probability. Just as little truth is there in the fancy that her life was overcast and her death hastened by the execution of Essex. The misguided earl had been guilty of the grossest breach of trust and treachery at the head of the government and armies of Ireland; he had repeated his treason, and menaced her existence and crown, in the midst of her capital. He had a solemn trial, and was inevitably condemned. He confessed the enormity of his guilt, and the queen shortly after assured the ambassador of Henry IV that she felt no scruples in regard to his punishment.

Whatever may be thought on these points, which will always be disputed, the spirit, the conduct, and the measures of Elizabeth encouraged and produced the most splendid outburst of national prowess and of varied abilities that any age has ever witnessed. Strong men surrounded her from the first—men of marked capacity as statesmen, of eminent qualities as precursors of the approaching splendor—Sir William Cecil, Sir Nicholas Bacon, Sir Francis Walsingham, Sir Ralph Sadler, the earl of Sussex, and lord Sackville. But she had been a quarter of a century on the throne, more than half her reign was passed, and she was verging to old age before the great names which immortalized her times commenced those achievements which have immortalized themselves. It was under the inspiration of her rule, and of the results attained by her rule, that the brilliant generation grew up which has left to all future admiration the names of Sidney, and Spenser, and Shakspeare, and Bacon—of Raleigh, and Vere, and Essex, and Grenville—of Hooker and Gilbert—the generation which confirmed the independence of England and of Europe, which invented new arts, extended and applied the principles of law and government, secured the Protestant ascendancy, founded colonies, extended commerce, glorified letters, discovered new sciences, and established the political eminence, the industrial wealth, and the intellectual empire of England.

The first twenty years of Elizabeth's reign were occupied in consolidating her throne, by averting foreign aggression through the encouragement given by her to the insurgents in each neighboring state, by suppressing disorder and divisions at home, and by promoting Protestant interests at home and abroad. The next twenty years, which terminated with the peace of Vervins, was a period of secret or open contention with Philip of Spain. The execution of Mary, queen of Scots, 1587, and the defeat of the Spanish Armada, 1588, marked the culmination of this perilous struggle. It was closed by the death of the great minister, lord Burleigh. The last five years of her reign were free from serious apprehensions of foreign dangers, but they were distracted by the disturbances in Ireland, by the treacherous intrigues of the court, and by the ambitious designs of the reckless and ungrateful Essex. Her whole life was one long succession of hazards, and after all her glories she died lonely, unloved, and without friends.

Few sovereigns have ever impressed themselves

more strongly than Elizabeth upon the imaginations and hearts of their people; few ever bestowed greater or more permanent benefits upon them; yet few have met with blinder admiration or more undistinguishing vituperation. The presumptions are all adverse to this great queen. Contemporary slanders, designed for political objects, have crystallized themselves into commonly accepted facts. But with each addition to our knowledge of the period, the perception of her heroism, and even of her virtues, becomes clearer, and the exaggeration or false coloring of her frailties diminishes. It was an age of great crimes and of multitudinous vices, and Elizabeth did not escape the contamination; but a minute study of the fearful difficulties of her position from infancy to old age will produce profound commiseration rather than bitter censure.

It is only in the diaries and journals of Parliament; in the state papers of the time; in the records of the religious and political intrigues of the period; in the reports of Venetian, French, and Spanish ambassadors; in contemporaneous memoirs, and in the numerous miscellaneous letters and papers of the age, that the true characteristics of Elizabeth and her reign can be discovered. Perhaps a definite conclusion cannot be reached until the voluminous calendars and other records, now in process of publication under the auspices of the Master of the Rolls, have been given to the world. Certainly the portrait offered by the latest historian of her reign, Mr. Froude, cannot be accepted with any confidence, for it is as strangely distorted and miscolored as his picture of Henry VIII. The commendation of her earliest eulogist, lord Bacon, who knew her well, is still appropriate: "To say the truth, the only commender of this lady's virtues is time, which, for as many ages as it hath run, hath not yet showed us one of the female sex equal to her in the administration of a kingdom."

The literature of this subject is so extensive that it is scarcely necessary to enumerate particular works. Any or all of the historians of England may be consulted; but further researches may be aided by examining Camden, *Annals of Queen Elizabeth*; Strype's *Annals of the Reformation in England*; Harrison's *Description of England in Hall's Chronicle*; Sir Robert Naunton, *Fragmenta Regalia*; Symonds d'Ewes's *Diary*; Rushworth's *Collections*; *Harleian Miscellany*; *Felicities of Queen Elizabeth*, in the works of Lord Bacon; Egerton, Sidney, and Burleigh *Papers*; Miss Strickland's *Life of Queen Elizabeth*; Miss Aiken's *Memoirs of Queen Elizabeth*; Wright's *Elizabeth*; Mignet, *Hist. Mary, Queen of Scots*; Caird, *Mary Stuart*; Froude's *Hist. England*, and the *Calendars of State Papers* for the period published by the British government. A very able essay on queen Elizabeth and queen Mary appeared in the *Edinburgh Review* for October, 1866. (G. F. H.)

**Elizabeth, Albertine**, countess of the Palatinate, was born at Heidelberg Dec. 26, 1618. She was the eldest daughter of the unfortunate Friedrich V, king of Bohemia, and of Elizabeth Stuart, daughter of James I. The misfortunes of her family led to her becoming abbess of the institution of Herford, in Westphalia, where she died Feb. 11, 1680. She was no less distinguished for her high attainments in literature and science than for her sincere and active piety. All true Christians in need of help were sure to receive it from her. She was the intimate friend of Fox, Keith, Barclay, Malebranche, Leibnitz, Des Cartes, Gichtel, etc. Penn, in a passage of his "*No Cross, no Crown*," pays a fitting tribute to her piety and virtue.—*Herzog, Real-Encyclop.* iii, 769. See Guhrauer, *Pfalzgräfin Elizabeth* (Raumer's *Historisches Taschenbuch*, 1851); Goebel, *Gesch. d. christlichen Lebens in d. rhein.-westphäl. evang. Kirche* (Coblenz, 1852).

**Elizabeth, Saint**, of Thuringia, was a daughter of king Andrew II, of Hungary, and was born at

Pressburg in 1207. When only four years old she was destined by her father to become the wife of Ludwig, oldest son of landgrave Hermann of Thuringia. She was immediately sent to the court of the landgrave, at the Wartburg, for her education, and on her arrival was betrothed to Ludwig. She early showed a remarkable inclination for ascetic exercises. Several efforts were on that account made to have her sent back to her father, but Ludwig, who in 1215 succeeded his father as landgrave, refused to dismiss her, and in 1221 married her. As landgravine she continued her ascetic manners, and refused all the comforts of life. At the same time, she was indefatigable in all works of charity. She spun and sowed garments for the poor, and, at the time of a famine, fed as many as 900 people daily. Her confessor, Konrad von Marburg, not only encouraged her asceticism, but made her vow absolute obedience, and that, in the case of her husband's death, she would not marry again. Ludwig died in 1227, at Otranto, while taking part in the crusade of emperor Friedrich II. In consequence of the opposition of her mother-in-law Sophia, and most of the members of the family, as well as the courtiers generally, Elizabeth was deprived of the regency during the minority of her oldest son, and her brother-in-law, Heinrich Raspe, assumed the administration of the landgravate. Soon Elizabeth, with her son Hermann, and her two daughters, was expelled from the Wartburg, and for a time had to beg in the streets of Eisenach for the necessaries of life. At length she found a refuge at one of the castles of her maternal uncle, the bishop of Bamberg. Repeated offers of a second marriage (even, it is said, from the emperor Friedrich), which were made to her she refused. When the knights who had accompanied her husband returned from the crusade, they compelled Heinrich Raspe to restore to Elizabeth the Wartburg, and the revenue to which she could lay claim as the widow of the landgrave. Subsequently Heinrich gave her the town of Marburg, with a number of adjoining villages, and an annual income of 500 marks in silver. Elizabeth took up her residence at Marburg in 1229, and again devoted her whole time to asceticism and benevolence. Her confessor Konrad not only continued to be very severe, but several times was even guilty of acts of great cruelty with regard to her. Nevertheless, she declined an invitation from her father to return to him. Exhausted by her ascetic life, she died in a hospital which had been erected by her, Nov. 19, 1231. The fame of her ascetic life had already pervaded all Europe, and, as was usual in such cases, the people soon ascribed to her relics a number of miracles, about the details of which there is, however, the greatest discrepancy among the contemporaneous writers, showing how little they rested on careful investigation. No longer than four years after her death, in 1235, she was canonized by pope Gregory IX. In 1236 her relics were transferred with great solemnity to a new church (St. Elizabeth's) which landgrave Konrad erected at Marburg. The emperor Friedrich II placed a golden crown on the head of the saint, and an immense crowd of people, estimated at 200,000, came to see the relics while exhibited to public view. After the Reformation, landgrave Philip, in order not to countenance the veneration of relics, had them removed from the church; subsequently the Teutonic knights obtained permission to send them to various Roman Catholic churches and convents. Her head is preserved in the church of St. Elizabeth at Breslau.—See Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iii, 767; Wetzer and Welte, *Kirch.-Lex.* iii, 511; Hofer, *Nov. Biog. Générale*, xv, 875; Justi, *Elisabeth die Heilige* (Zurich, 1797, 2d ed. Marb., 1835); Schermbach, *Elisabeth die Heilige* (Erfurt, 1828); Montalembert, *Ve de St. Elisabeth* (Par. 1835); Simon, *Lubrig IV und s. Gemahlin, die heil. Elisabeth* (Frankf. 1854); Kahnis, *Die heil. Elis. in Zeitschrift für histor. Theol.* 1868. See KONRAD VON MARBURG. (A. J. S.)

**Elizabethines.** (1.) Associations of women whose object it was to imitate the ascetic life and the benevolent zeal of Elizabeth (q. v.) of Thuringia. They did not retire from the world, and only met for prayer and some ascetic exercises. (2.) A branch of nuns of the third order of St. Francis, so called after Elizabeth of Hungary, who, after the death of her husband, is said to have joined of the third order of St. Francis. Modern writers on monastic orders generally doubt or deny the report that Elizabeth ever was a member of the third order of Franciscans, but the name Elizabethines is still in use to designate Franciscan nuns of the third order. In France they have also been designated by the name of *Sœurs* or *Filles de la Miséricorde* (Sisters of Charity). The real foundress of the monastic community is said to have been Angelina di Corbaro, daughter of the count of Corbaro and Tisigniano. She was born in 1377, married the count de Civitelle, with whom she lived as a sister, and immediately after the death of her husband (1393) joined the third order of Franciscans. She founded the first monastery of Franciscan Tertiarians in 1395 at Foligno. In 1428 the monasteries of this order were organized into a congregation, which was authorized to elect at the triennial conventions ("Chapters General") a general. In 1459 the congregation was placed under the general of the Franciscan Observants. In the middle of the 16th century the Elizabethines had 135 monasteries and 3872 nuns. In 1843 the number of members was estimated at 1000.—Helyot, *Dict. des Ordres Relig.* (ed. Migne), ii, 144; Fehr, *Geschichte der Mönchsorden*, i, 275. (A. J. S.)

**Eliz'aphan** (Heb. *Elitsaphan'*, עֵלִישָׁפָן, whom *God has protected*; Sept. Ἐλισάφαν), the name of two men.

1. Second son of Uzziel, and chief of the Kohathite Levites at the Exode (Num. iii. 30; Exod. vi. 22). B.C. 1657. He, with his elder brother, was directed by Moses to carry away the corpses of their sacrilegious cousins Nadab and Abihu (Lev. x, 4). In these two last-cited passages the name is written contracted into ELZAPHAN. His family was known and represented in the days of king David (1 Chron. xv, 8), and took part in the revival of Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxix, 13).

2. Son of Parnoch, and phylarch (שׂרֵי־צִבְרוֹן, "prince") of the tribe of Zebulun at the Exode, being one of the men appointed to assist Moses in apportioning the land of Canaan.

**Eliz'zur** (Heb. *Elitsur'*, אֵלִישׁוּר, *God is his rock*; Sept. Ἐλισούρ), son of Shedeur, and phylarch (שׂרֵי־צִבְרוֹן, "prince") of the tribe of Reuben at the Exode (Num. i, 5; ii, 10; vii, 30, 35; x, 18). B.C. 1657.

**Elka'nah** [some *El'kanah*] (Hebrew, *Elkanah'*, אֵלְכָנָה, whom *God has gotten*; Sept. Ἐλκανά, but Ἐλκανά in Exod., and Ἠλκανά v. r. Ἐλκανά in 1 Chron. xii, 6; xv, 23; Josephus, Ἐλκάνης and Ἐλκάν; Vulg. *Elcana*), the name of several men, all apparently Levites.

1. Second son of Korah, the son of Izhar, the son of Kohath, the son of Levi, according to Exod. vi, 24, where his brothers are represented as being Assir and Abiasaph. But in 1 Chron. vi, 22, 23 (Hebr. 7, 8) Assir, Elkanah, and Eliasaph are mentioned in the same order, not as the three sons of Korah, but as son, grandson, and great-grandson respectively; and this seems to be correct. If so, the passage in Exodus must be understood as merely giving the families of the Korhites existing at the time the passage was penned, which must in this case have been long subsequent to Moses. In Num. xxvi, 58, "the family of the Korhites" (A. V. "Korathites") is mentioned as one family. As regards the fact of Korah's descendants continuing, it may be noticed that we are expressly told in Num. xxvi, 11, that when Korah

and his company died, "the children of Korah died not."—Smith, s. v. See KORAH. On the above view, this Elkanah becomes the son of Assir (q. v.), grandson of Korah, and father of Ebiasaph (q. v.). B. C. cir. 1700. See SAMUEL. A writer in the *Journal of Sacred Lit.* (April, 1852, p. 200), however, proposes to reject both Assir and this first Elkanah from the list in Chronicles.

2. Son of Shaul or Joel, being father of Amasai, and sixth in descent from Ebiasaph, son of the foregoing (1 Chron. vi, 25, 36). B. C. cir. 1445.

3. Son of Ahimoth or Mahuth, being father of Zuph or Zophai, and great grandson of the one immediately preceding (1 Chron. vi, 26, 35). B. C. cir. 1340. (See Hervey, *Genealogies*, p. 210, 214, note.)

4. Another Kohathite Levite, in the line of Heman the singer. B. C. cir. 1190. He was the fifth in descent from the foregoing, being son of Jeroham, and father of Samuel, the illustrious judge and prophet (1 Chron. vi, 27, 28, 33, 34). Josephus (*Ant.* v, 10, 2) calls him a man "of middle condition among his fellow-citizens" (τῶν ἐν μέσῳ πολιτῶν). All that is known of him is contained in the above notices and in 1 Sam. i, 1, 4, 8, 19, 21, 23, and ii, 2, 20, where we learn that he was of a Bethlehemite stock (an "Ephrahtite;" the Levites not being confined to their cities), but lived at Ramathaim-Zophim in Mount Ephraim, otherwise called Ramah; that he had two wives, Hannah and Peninnah, but had no children by the former, till the birth of Samuel in answer to Hannah's prayer. We learn also that he lived in the time of Eli the high-priest, and of his sons Hophni and Phinehas; that he was a pious man, who went up yearly from Ramathaim-Zophim to Shiloh, in the tribe of Ephraim, to worship and sacrifice at the tabernacle there; but it does not appear that he performed any sacred functions as a Levite; a circumstance quite in accordance with the account which ascribes to David the establishment of the priestly and Levitical courses for the Temple service. He seems to have been a man of some wealth from the nature of his yearly sacrifice, which enabled him to give portions out of it to all his family, and from the costly offering of three bullocks when Samuel was brought to the house of the Lord at Shiloh. After the birth of Samuel, Elkanah and Hannah continued to live at Ramah (where Samuel afterwards had his house, 1 Sam. vii, 7), and had three sons and two daughters.—Smith, s. v. See SAMUEL.

5. Another man of the family of the Korhites who joined David while he was at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 6). B. C. 1054. From the terms of ver. 2, some have thought it doubtful whether this can be the well-known Levitical family of Korhites; but the distinction there seems merely to refer to residents within the tribe of Benjamin, which included the Levitical cities. Perhaps he was the same who was one of the two door-keepers for the ark when it was brought to Jerusalem (1 Chron. xv, 23). B. C. 1043.

6. An officer in the household of Ahaz, king of Judah, and slain by Zichri the Ephraimite, when Pekah invaded Judah; apparently the second in command under the prefect of the palace (2 Chron. xxxviii, 7). B. C. 739. Josephus says that he was the general of the troops of Judah, and that he was merely carried into captivity by "Amaziah," the Israelitish general (*Ant.* ix, 12, 1). See AHAZ.

7. Father of one Asa, and head of a Levitical family resident in the "villages of the Netophathites" (1 Chron. ix, 16). B. C. long ante 536.

**Elkesaites**, a sect of Jewish Christians, which sprang up in the 2d century. The origin of the name is uncertain. Delitzsch (in Rudelbach u. Guericke, *Zeitschrift*, 1841) derives it from a hamlet, Elkesi, in Galilee. The Church fathers derived it from the name of a pretended founder, Elxai, which name, according to Epiphanius, denotes "a hidden power" (עֲלֵי כֹחַ).

Elxai is probably not the name of a person, but the name of a book which was the chief authority for this sect. Gieseler thinks that the name signifies the Holy Ghost, which in *Hom. Clem.* xvii, 16, is called *ἀόρατος ἄσρατος*, "the incorporeal power." At all events, the sect held as highest doctrinal authority a book which is brought into connection with Elxai. This book, which appears to have been the chief authority of all the Gnostic sects of Jewish Christians, was known to Origen (*Euseb. Hist. Eccl.* vi, 38), and the Syrian Alciabiades of Apamea brought it with him to Rome. Epiphanius shows its influence among all sects of Jewish Christians. As Origen reports, this book was believed to have fallen from heaven; according to an account in the *Philosophoumena*, it was revealed by an angel, who was the Son of God. Elxai is said to have received it from the Seri, in Parthia, in the third year of Trajan (A. D. 101), and its contents were communicated to no one except upon an oath of secrecy. Ritschl puts the origin of the book in the last third of the second century, while Uhlhorn thinks that it must have originated soon after the beginning of the second century, as it served as the basis of the doctrinal system of the Clementine Homilies, which were nearly completed about A. D. 150.

The best account of the standard book of the Elkesaites is to be found in the *Philosophoumena*, and its main points are confirmed by the statements of Origen. Epiphanius, as usual, is somewhat confused in his exposition of the sect, and his report seems in many points to refer to a modified, and not the original system. According to the *Philosophoumena*, there was in the Elkesaite system a pagan element of naturalism, mixed with Jewish and Christian elements. The pagan element shows itself in particular in the ablutions. A remission of sins is proclaimed upon the ground of a new baptism, consisting without doubt in oft-repeated ablutions, which were also used against sickness, and were made in the name of the Father and the Son. In connection with these ablutions appear seven witnesses—the five elements, and oil and salt (also bread), the latter two denoting baptism and the Lord's Supper. The same pagan element appears in the use made by the Elkesaites of astronomy and magic; even baptismal days were fixed in accordance with the position of the stars. The Jewish element appears in the obligatory character of the law, and in circumcision. They rejected, however, sacrifices, and also several parts of the Old and New Testaments (of the latter, the Pauline epistles). Their views of Christ seem not to have been settled. On the one hand, their Christ is described as an angel; on the other, they taught a repeated, continuous incarnation of Christ, although his birth of a virgin seems to have been retained. The Lord's Supper was celebrated with bread and salt; the eating of meat was forbidden; marriage was highly esteemed; renunciation of the faith in time of persecution was allowed. A prayer, which is preserved by Epiphanius (xix, 4), is entirely unintelligible.

The Elkesaite doctrine probably arose among the Jewish Christians, who, in the neighborhood of the Dead Sea, coalesced with the Essenes, and were to some extent influenced by Oriental paganism. Under bishop Callistus of Rome, a certain Alciabiades of Apamea went to that city as an Elkesaite teacher, and in 274 Origen met a missionary of the sect at Cesarea. These efforts appear, however, to have met with but little success. The Clementine Homilies contain a further development of Elkesaite doctrines, with a stronger predominance of the Christian element. At the time of the emperor Constantius, Epiphanius found Elkesaites to the east of the Dead Sea, in Nabathæa, Ituræa, and Moabitis. He calls them Σαρψαῖτοι, which name he explains as ἡλιακοί, and therefore seems to have derived from שֶׁפֶטֶן, "sun." From the cir-

cumstance that in Epiphanius Elxai appears among nearly all parties of Jewish Christians, Uhlhorn infers that the Elkesaites were not so much a separate sect as a school among all sects of Jewish Christians. Ritschl regards them as antipodes of the Montanists, and, as their chief peculiarity, the setting forth of a new theory of remission of sins by a new baptism. Hefele, in *Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex.* art. *Ebioniten*, iii, 359, takes the Elkesaites for the highest of four classes of Jewish Essenes, from whom, or, rather, from a member of whom (the Elxai of Epiphanius), a party of Ebionites received about the middle of the second century a gnosis or theosophic secret system, which was fully developed in the Clementine Homilies. See Uhlhorn, in Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iii, 771 (which article is the basis of our account); Ritschl, *Ueber d. Sekte. der Elkesaiten*, in *Zeitschrift für histor. Theologie*, 1853; Hefele, in *Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex.* [art. *Ebioniten*], iii, 358; and [art. *Clement I*] ii, 590; Schaff, *Hist. of the Christ. Church*, § 69; Lipsius, *Zur Quellen-Kritik des Epiphanius* (Vien. 1865); Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* bk. i, c. ii, pt. ii, ch. v, 3, 5-7. (A. J. S.)

**El'kōsh** (עֶלְקוֹשׁ, i. e. *God is its bow*, see Fürst, *Hebr. Handw.* s. v.), the birthplace of the prophet Nahum, hence called "the ElkosHITE" (Nah. i, 1). Two widely differing Jewish traditions assign as widely different localities to this place. In the time of Jerome it was believed to exist in a small village of Galilee. The ruins of some old buildings were pointed out by his guide as the remains of the ancient ElkosH (Jerome, on *Nah.* i, 1). Cyril of Alexandria (*Comm. on Nahum*) says that the village of ElkosH was somewhere or other in the country of the Jews. Pseudo-Epiphanius (*De Vitis prophetarum*, in his *Opp.* ii, 247) places ElkosH on the east of the Jordan, at Bethabara (εἰς Βηθαβάρην, *Chron. Pasch.* p. 150, Cod. B, has εἰς Βηθαβαρίην), where he says the prophet died in peace. According to Schwartz (*Palestine*, p. 188), the grave of Nahum is shown at *Kefr Tanchum*, a village 2½ English miles north of Tiberias. A village of the name *El-Kawzah* is found about 2½ hours S.W. of Tiberias, which seems to correspond with Jerome's notice. Another village of that name, also an ancient site, lies on a high hill rather more than 2 hours S. of Nablous (Van de Velde, *Memoir.* p. 309). But mediæval tradition, perhaps for the convenience of the Babylonian Jews, attached the fame of the prophet's burial place to *El-Kush*, or *Alkosh*, a village on the east bank of the Tigris, near the monastery of Rabban Hormuzd, and about two miles north of Mosul. It is situated on a stony declivity, has a few gardens, and contains about 30 papal Nestorian families (Perkins, in the *Biblioth. Sacra*, July, 1852, p. 643). Benjamin of Tudela (p. 53, ed. Asher) speaks of the synagogues of Nahum, Obadiah, and Jonah at Asshur, the modern Mosul. R. Petachia (p. 35, ed. Benisch) was shown the prophet's grave, at a distance of four parasangs from that of Barnah, the son of Neriah, which was itself distant a mile from the tomb of Ezekiel. It is mentioned in a letter of Masius, quoted by Assemani (*Bibl. Orient.* i, 525). Jews from the surrounding districts make a pilgrimage to it at certain seasons. The synagogue which is built over the tomb is described by Colonel Shiel, who visited it in his journey through Kurdistan (*Journ. Geog. Soc.* viii, 93). Rich evidently believed in the correctness of the tradition, considering the pilgrimage of the Jews as almost sufficient test (*Kurdistan*, i, 101). Layard, however, speaks less confidently (*Ninereh*, i, 197). Gesenius doubts the genuineness of either locality (*Thes. Heb.* p. 1211 b). The tradition which assigns ElkosH to Galilee is more in accordance with the internal evidence afforded by the prophecy, which gives no sign of having been written in Assyria (Knobel, *Prophet.* ii, 208; Hitzig, *Kl. Proph.* p. 212; Edwards, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Aug. 1848, p. 557 sq.).—Smith, s. v. See NAHUM.

**El'koshite** (Heb. *Elkoshi'*, עֶלְקוֹשִׁי, the regular patrial form; Sept. Ἐλκείσιος, Vulg. *Elcesæus*), an epithet (Nah. i, 1) of the prophet Nahum (q. v.), apparently as an inhabitant of ELKOSH (q. v.).

**El'lasar** (Heb. *Ellasar'*, עֶלְלָסָר: Fürst suggests [*Heb. Handw.* s. v.] that it may be compounded of עֶלְלָסָר = עֶלְלָסָר and עֶלְלָסָר = עֶלְלָסָר; Sept. Ἐλλασάρ), a territory in Asia, whose king, Arioch, was one of the four who invaded Canaan in the time of Abraham (Gen. xiv, 1, 9). The association of this king with those of Elam and Shinar indicates the vicinity of Babylonia and Elymais as the region in which the kingdom should be sought; but nothing further is known of it, unless it be the same as THELASAR mentioned in 2 Kings xix, 12, the TELLASAR of Isa. xxxvii, 12. Symmachus and the Vulg. understand *Pontus*. The Jerusalem Targum renders the name by *Tellasar*. The Assyro-Babylonish name of the king Arioch (q. v.) would seem to point to some province of Persia or Assyria (compare Dan. ii, 14). Col. Rawlinson thinks (see *Jour. Sac. Lit.* Oct. 1851, p. 152 note) that Ellasar is the Hebrew representative of the old Chaldean town called in the native dialect *Larsa* or *Larancha*, and known to the Greeks as *Larissa* (Ἀρρῖσα) or *Larachon* (Λαράχων). This suits the connection with Elam and Shinar (Gen. xiv, 1), and the identification is orthographically defensible. Larsa was a town of Lower Babylonia or Chaldea, situated nearly half way between Ur (now Mugheir) and Erech (Warka), on the left bank of the Euphrates. It is now *Senkerch*. The inscriptions show it to have been one of the primitive capitals, of earlier date, probably, than Babylon itself; and we may gather from the narrative in Gen. xiv, that in the time of Abraham it was the metropolis of a kingdom distinct from that of Shinar, but owing allegiance to the superior monarchy of Elam. That we hear no more of it after this time is owing to its absorption into Babylon, which took place soon afterwards.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See ABRAHAM.

**Eller**, ELIAS, chief of a fanatical sect known under the name of the Ellerians, or "Communion of Ronsdorf." He was born in 1690 (according to others, in the beginning of the 18th century). He was the son of a poor peasant in the village of Ronsdorf, in the duchy of Berg, where at that time not only Pietism, but Millenarianism and "Philadelphia" mysticism had numerous adherents. He early went to Elberfeld to find employment in a manufactory, and while there he won the confidence of a rich widow, Bolckhaus, to so high a degree that she married him. Eller at this time had already gained a great influence among the Separatists in Elberfeld, as he was thoroughly acquainted with the writings of all the leading Mystics. Having become rich by his marriage, he soon (1726) organized, together with a Reformed pastor, Schleiermacher, a society of Apocalyptic Millenarians who regularly met in his house, and on meeting and separating greeted each other with a "seraphic" kiss. Among the regular attendants at these meetings was Anna von Buchel, the beautiful daughter of a baker in Elberfeld, who soon astonished the whole society by her ecstasies and visions, and by the wonderful prophecies which she proclaimed while in this condition. She claimed to hold frequent conversations with the Lord, and announced the beginning of the millennium to take place in 1730. The new doctrine found many adherents, and numbered upwards of 50 families; but the relations of Anna with Eller became at the same time so intimate that Eller's wife openly accused the two of illicit intercourse, and declared the prophecies of Anna to be a deliberate fraud. Eller declared his wife to be insane, and had her locked up, while Anna claimed to have received a revelation that Eller's wife was possessed by an evil spirit, and would soon be carried off by Satan. The whole society, even the sons of Eller's wife from

her first marriage, believed this announcement, and the unfortunate woman was consequently subjected to the utmost indignities and tribulations for about six months, when death put an end to her sufferings. Almost immediately after her burial Eller married Anna von Buchel. His society was now deemed sufficiently strong to appear in public. Eller maintained, in union with the prophecies of Professor Horch in Marburg, that in accordance with Rev. iii, 1, 7, the Church of Sardis would cease in 1729, and the Church of Philadelphia begin in 1730. The revelations and visions of his wife increased rapidly. What she announced as a new revelation was laid down in a writing, which was subsequently communicated to the initiated under the name of the "Hirtentasche" ("The Shepherd's Bag"). The chief points of the new doctrines were, The Bible is the Word of God, but a new revelation has become necessary, and this is laid down in the *Hirtentasche*. Not only the ancient saints, but the Saviour himself, will reappear upon earth. The person of the Father dwelt in Abraham, the person of the Son in Isaac, the person of the Holy Ghost in Sarah, but the fullness of the Deity in Eller. Moses, Elias, David, and Solomon were prototypes both of Christ and of Eller. The children of Anna were not the natural children of Eller, but begotten by God himself. The faithful, whose number had largely increased, were divided into three classes. To the first class belonged those who expressed belief, but were not yet made acquainted with all doctrines and secrets; to the second those who, being initiated, were called in the congregations "Persons of Rank" ("Standespersonen"); to the third, the most trustworthy among the initiated, who had reached the temple, and were called "gifts" (Geschenke). The society believed that from Anna the Saviour would be born a second time, and there was therefore some dissatisfaction when her first child was a daughter. Her second child, born 1733, was a son, Benjamin, and he was believed by the sect to be the Saviour, manifested a second time in the flesh, but he died when only a year old. Eller, in the mean while, had sent out missionaries throughout Germany, Switzerland, and Scandinavia, but the investigations which in 1735 were made in Elberfeld concerning the meetings held by him induced him to depart in 1737, with his family, for Ronsdorf, his native place. Many of his adherents followed him immediately, and fifty new houses arose in Ronsdorf in a short time. The missionaries sent out by Eller collected large amounts of money for the new church to be built in Ronsdorf, and in 1741 Schleiermacher was called as pastor. Eller himself was elected burgomaster, and soon established a theocratic despotism. His wife Anna died in 1744, in a mysterious manner, and Eller proclaimed that all the supernatural gifts which had been possessed by Anna had been transferred to him. But now Schleiermacher began to lose his faith and even to oppose Eller, who, however, to neutralize the sermons of Schleiermacher, caused one of his most fanatical adherents, Pastor Wülfing, of Solingen, to be called as second pastor. In 1749 Eller married the widow of a rich merchant at Ronsdorf, Bosselmann, who had died under suspicious circumstances; and in the same year he procured the removal of Schleiermacher from his position of first pastor, and the election of Pastor Rudenhaus, of Rattingen, who, since 1738, had been a fanatical adherent of the sect, as his successor. Schleiermacher was, even after his departure from Ronsdorf, persecuted by Eller, who lodged with the government a formal charge of sorcery against him; and so great was still Eller's influence, that Schleiermacher deemed it best to flee to Holland. Eller died on May 16, 1750, and soon after him died also Wülfing. After the death of these two men the sect seems to have soon become extinct. Schleiermacher's innocence was, chiefly owing to the efforts of his friend J. W. Knevel, fully established by the

declarations of the theological faculties of Marburg and Herborn, and the Synod of Berg. This fanaticism singularly resembles that of the Buchanites (q. v.). See Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* xx, 606; Knevel, *Gründel d. Verwüstung an heil. Stätte od. d. Geheimnisse der Bosheit d. Ronsdorfer Sekte* (Frankf. 1750); Wülfing, *Ronsdorffischer Catechismus* (Düsseldorf, 1756); Joh. Bolckhaus (step-son of Eller), *Ronsdorf's gerechte Sache* (Düsseldorf, 1757); *Das jubelrende Ronsdorf* (compiled by Wülfing, but edited by Bolckhaus, Mühlheim, 1761); Wülfing, *Ronsdorf's silberne Trompete* (Mühlheim, 1761); Engels, *Versuch einer Gesch. d. relig. Schwärmerei im ehemal. Herzogthum Berg* (Schwelm, 1826); Hase, *Ch. Hist.* § 421. The *Hirtentasche* may be found in the *Histoire des Sectes Religieuses*. (A. J. S.)

**Ellerians.** See ELLER.

**Elliott, Arthur W.**, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Maryland in 1784; emigrated to Butler Co., Ohio, in 1805, and was converted in 1806. In 1818 he entered the itinerancy, and rapidly rose to eminence and usefulness. He filled many important charges in his Conference until his health failed. He was supernumerary eight years, and superannuated seventeen during his ministry. In 1854 he removed to Paris, Ill., where he died in January, 1858. Mr. Elliott had a "wonderful power over the multitude, and thousands of souls will call him blessed in eternity."—*Minutes of Conferences*, 1858, p. 296.

**Elliott, Charles.** See p. 1042 of this vol.

**Elliott, John, D.D.**, a Congregational minister, was born at Killingworth, Conn., Aug. 24, 1768, graduated at Yale College 1786, entered the ministry 1791, and was installed pastor in East Guilford Nov. 2, 1791, in which place he remained until the close of his life, Dec. 17, 1824. Dr. Elliott was made fellow of Yale College 1812, and one of the prudential committee 1816. He published *An Oration on the Death of Thomas Lewis* (1804), and a few sermons.—Sprague, *Annals*, ii, §21.

**Elliott, Stephen, D.D.**, Protestant Episcopal bishop of the diocese of Georgia, was born in Beaufort, S. C., Aug. 31, 1806. At sixteen he entered the sophomore class at Harvard University, but returned during the junior year to South Carolina College, Columbia, where he graduated A.B. in 1825. In 1827 he engaged in the practice of law. "In 1832, under the pressure of a newly-awakened devotion to the cause of Christ, he abandoned his profession, and became a candidate for holy orders. He was ordained by bishop Bowen in 1835, served as deacon one month in the church at Wilton, and was then elected professor of sacred literature and the evidences of Christianity in the South Carolina College. Five years later he was chosen first bishop of Georgia. He was consecrated in February, 1841, removed to Savannah, and became rector of St. John's Church. In 1844 he became provisional bishop of Florida. In 1845 he removed to Montpellier, to direct in person the work of female education. Here he spent about seven years of his life, and, like many other bishops, expended his whole fortune in the noble effort. In 1853 he removed to Savannah, and took charge of Christ Church in that city as rector. This office he continued to hold, with the exception of one brief interval, till his death. His numerous home duties did not hinder his visitation of his diocese at least once each year, often much more frequently. But two hours before his decease he had returned, in cheerfulness and apparent health, from one of those long episcopal journeys. Instantly, not to him 'suddenly,' in the midst of his labors, and at the height of his power," he died at his home in Savannah Dec. 24, 1866.—*Amer. Quart. Church Review*, April, 1867, 224 April, 1868.

**Ellis, Reuben**, an early Methodist Episcopal minister. The dates of his early life are wanting. He was a native of North Carolina, entered the itinerancy in 1777, and died in Baltimore February, 1796. "He

was a man of very sure and solid parts, weighty and powerful in preaching, and full of simplicity and godly sincerity."—*Minutes of Conferences*, i, 67; Stevens, *History of Methodist Episcopal Church*, p. 39 et al.

**Ellis, Robert Fulton**, a Baptist minister, was born at Topsham, Me., Oct. 16, 1809; studied at Bowdoin College, and at Newton Theological Institution, where he graduated in 1838. He was pastor of the Second Baptist Church in Springfield, Mass., from 1838 to 1845. He then spent two and a half years in the State of Missouri, preaching, establishing Sunday-schools, and furnishing them with libraries. In 1847 he became pastor of the First Baptist Church of Alton, Ill., but, becoming associate editor of the *Western Watchman*, published at St. Louis, Mo., he again took an itinerant agency in that state, and, while thus employed, he died, July 24, 1854.—Sprague, *Annals*, vi, 827.

**Ellys, ANTHONY**, bishop of St. David's, was born in 1693. He was educated at Clare Hall, Cambridge, where he took his master's degree in 1716. In 1724 he was presented to the vicarage of St. Olave, Jewry, and to the rectory of St. Martin's, Ironmonger's Lane. In 1728 he obtained a prebend of Gloucester, and in 1728 was created D.D. at Cambridge. He was next promoted to the bishopric of St. David's, and died at Gloucester in 1761. His writings are as follows: 1. *A Plea for the Sacramental Text*:—2. *Remarks on Hume's Essay concerning Miracles*, and sermons preached on public occasions (4to):—3. *Tracts on the Liberty, Spiritual and Temporal, of Protestants in England* (1767, 4to):—4. *Tracts on the Liberty, Spiritual and Temporal, of Subjects in England*: the two last-mentioned are collections of tracts, and form one great and elaborate work, which was the principal object of the bishop's life. They were published posthumously.—Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, vol. iv; Kippis, *Biographia Britannica*, v, 581.

**Elm** stands in the Auth. Vers. as the translation of עֵלֶם, *elah*, in Hos. iv, 13; elsewhere rendered "oak" (q. v.).

**Elmo'dam** (Ἐλμοδάμ; perhaps for עֵלֶם דָּם, *Al-*

*modad*), son of Er and father of Cosam; one of the ancestors of Christ, in the private line of David, and great-grandfather of Maaseiah, the great-grandfather of Salathiel (Luke iii, 28). B.C. cir. 700. He is not mentioned in the Old Test.


**Elna'am** [many *El'naam*] (Heb. *Elna'am*, עֵלְנָאָם [in pause עֵלְנָאָם], *God is his delight*; Sept. 'Ελναίμ v. r. 'Ελλαίμ, Vulgate *Elnaem*) father of Jeribai and Joshaviah, two of David's distinguished warriors (1 Chron. xi, 46). B.C. 1044. In the Sept. the second warrior is said to be the son of the first, and Elnaam is given as himself a member of the guard.

**Elna'than** [some *El'nathan*] (Heb. *Elnathan'*, עֵלְנָתָן, whom *God has given*; compare *John, Theodore, Diodati*), the name of four leading men.

1. An inhabitant of Jerusalem, father of Nehushta, the mother of king Jehoiachin (2 Kings xxiv, 8, Sept. 'Ελνασζάν v. r. 'Ελλασζάν). B.C. ante 598. He was perhaps the same with the son of Achbor, sent by Jehoiakim to bring the prophet Urijah out of Egypt (Jer. xxvi, 22, Sept. 'Ελκαζάν), and in whose presence the roll of Jeremiah was read, for the preservation of which he interceded with the king (Jer. xxxvi, 12, 25, Sept. *Naζάν* v. r. 'Ιωναζάν). B.C. 605.

2, 3, 4. (Sept. 'Ελναζάν, *Naζάν*, and 'Ελναζάν respectively). Three of the Israelites, of established prudence and integrity, sent by Ezra to invite the priests and Levites to accompany him to Jerusalem (Ezra viii, 16). B.C. 459.

**Ellōra**, a decayed town in the dominions of the Nizam, not far from the city of Dowlatabad, in lat. 20° 2' N., and long. 75° 13' E. (This article is taken from Chambers's *Encyclopædia*.) It is celebrated for its wonderful rock-cut temples. Their number has not been precisely ascertained, but Erskine reckoned 19 large ones, partly of Hindu and partly of Buddhist origin. Some are cave-temples proper—i. e. chambers cut out in the interior of the rock—but others are vast buildings hewn out of the solid granite of the hills, having an exterior as well as an interior architecture, and being, in fact, magnificent monoliths. In executing the latter, the process was first to sink a great



Temple called Kailasa, at Ellora. From Fergusson's *Handbook of Architecture*.



quadrangular trench or pit, leaving the central mass standing, and then to hew and excavate this mass into a temple. The most beautiful of these objects is the Hindu temple Kailasa. At its entrance the traveler passes into an antechamber 138 feet wide by 88 deep, adorned by numerous rows of pillars. Thence he proceeds along a colonnade over a bridge into a great rectangular court, which is 247 feet in length and 150 broad, in the centre of which stands the temple itself, a vast mass of rock richly hewn and carved. It is supported by four rows of pilasters, with colossal elephants beneath, and seems suspended in the air. The interior is about 103 feet long, 56 broad, and 17 high, but the entire exterior forms a pyramid 100 feet high, and is overlaid with sculpture. In the great court are numerous ponds, obelisks, colonnades, sphinxes, and on the walls thousands of mythological figures of all kinds, from ten to twelve feet in height. Of the other temples, those of Indra and Dumarbeyna are little inferior to that of Kailasa. Regarding their antiquity and religious significance, authorities are not agreed; but at all events they must be subsequent to the epic poems *Ramayana* or *Mahabharata*, because they contain representations taken from these poems, and also to the cave-temples at Elephanta, because they exhibit a richer and more advanced style of architecture.

**Elohim** is the Heb. plural (*Elohim'*, עֲלֹהִים), of which the sing. form, עֶלֶה, *Elo'ah*, is also employed to designate in general any deity, but likewise the true God. The word is derived, according to Gesenius (*Thes. Heb.* p. 94), from an obsolete root, עָלָה, *alah*, to *revere*; but is better referred by Fürst (*Heb. Handb.* p. 90) to the kindred עָזַח [see *EL-*], the name of God as *mighty* (from the extensive root עָזַח עָזַח עָזַח, to *be firm*); and has its equivalent in the Arabic *Allah*, i. e. God. The plur. *Elohim* is sometimes used in its ordinary sense of *gods*, whether true or false (e. g. of the Egyptians, Exod. xii, 12; xxxv, 2, 4; Deut. xx, 18; xxxii, 17; including Jehovah, Psa. lxxxvi, 8; Exod. xviii, 11; xxii, 19; or distinctively of actual deity, Isa. xlv, 6; xlv, 5, 14, 21; xlv, 9; 1 Chron. xiii, 9); once of *kings* (Psa. lxxxii, 1, 6); but Gesenius thinks not of *angels* (Psa. viii, 6; xci, 7; cxxxviii, 1), nor *judges* (Exod. xxi, 6; xxii, 7, 8). But it is especially spoken of one true God, i. e. Jehovah, and in this sense it is always *construed as a sing.*, especially when it has the article prefixed (אֱלֹהִים הַיְהוָה). See Sack, *Commentatt. theol. hist.* (Bonn, 1821), i; Reinhard, *De notione Dei*, etc. (Vitemb. 1792); Edzard, *Utrum "Elohim" a Canaanivis orig. ducet* (ib. 1696); Michaelis, *Num Deus dicatur עֲלֹהִים inito federe* (ib. 1723); Sennert, *Esercitt. philol.* (ib. 1678). Comp. *God*.

**Elohist**, the name technically given in theology and sacred criticism to the assumed authors of those parts of the Pentateuch (q. v.) in which the Deity is styled *ELOHIM* rather than *YHWH* (q. v.).

**Elo'ī** (עֲלֹהִים) for Aramæan עֲלֹהִים, *my God*), an exclamation quoted thus by our Saviour (Mark xv, 34) on the cross from Psa. xxii, 2 (where the Sept. has ὁ θεός μου), for the Heb. עֲלֹהִים, which is more literally Græcized ἰησὺς, *ELI*, by Matthew (xxvi, 46).

**E'lon**, a name occurring in two forms in the Heb. (but both having the primitive sense of *oak* [q. v.]), as that of a place, and also of three men.

1. (Heb. *Eylon'*, עֵילֹן; Sept. Ἐλών.) A city of Dan, mentioned between Jethlah and Timnath (Josh. xix, 43); probably the same elsewhere (1 Kings iv, 9) more fully called *ELON-BETH-HANAN* (q. v.).

2. (Heb. *Eylon'*, עֵילֹן; Sept. Ἐλών) A Hittite, father of Bashmath (Gen. xxvi, 34) or Adah (Gen. xxxvi, 3), the first wife of Esau (q. v.). B. C. ante 1963.

3. (Heb. *Elon'*, עֵילֹן; Sept. Ἐλών and Ἐλλών v. r. Ἀρόών.) The second of the three sons of Zebulon (Gen. xli, 14), and father of the family of the Elonites (Num. xxvi, 26). B. C. 1856.

4. (Heb. *Eylon'*, עֵילֹן; Sept. Ἐλών, Josephus Ἠλών, Vulg. *Ahiolon*.) A native of the tribe of Zebulon (perhaps a descendant of the preceding), and the 11th of the Hebrew judges for ten years (Judg. xii, 11, 12), B. C. 1243-34; which are simply noted as a period of tranquillity (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* v, 7, 14). See *JUDGES*.

**E'lon**. See *OAK*.

**E'lon-beth-ha'nan** [some *E'lon-beth-hanan*] (Heb. *Eylon' beyth-Chanan'*, עֵילֹן בֵּית חָנָן, *oak of Beth-hanan*, i. e. of the house of Hanan; Sept. Ἐλών [v. r. Αἰάδωμ] εὐς Βηθανάν, Vulg. *Elon et in Beth-hanan*), one of the Danite cities in the commissary-district of Ben-Dekar, the third of Solomon's purveyors (1 Kings iv, 9). It is simply called *ELON* in Josh. xix, 43, being probably a site marked from early times by a particular tree [see *OAK*] of traditional fame. For "Beth-hanan" some Hebrew MSS. have "Ben-hanan," and some "and Beth-hanan;" the latter is followed by the Vulgate. To judge from the order of the list in Joshua, its situation must have been on the border of Dan, between Ajalon and Ekron. Thenius suggests (*Execg. Handb.* in loc.) that Beth-hanan can be no other than the village *Bêt-Hunun*, in the rich plain near Gaza (Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 371); but this is entirely out of the region in question. Possibly it may be the modern *Bêt-Susin*, a "small village, looking old and miserable," on a ridge near an ancient well, about half way between the sites of Nicopolis and Zorah (Robinson, *Later Researches*, p. 152).

**E'lonite** (Heb. with the art. and collectively, *ha-Eloni'*, הַעֲלֹנִים; Sept. ὁ Ἀλλωνί), the patronymic designation (Num. xxvi, 26) of the descendants of *ELON* (q. v.), the son of Zebulon.

**Eloquence of the Pulpit**. See *HOMELETICS*.

**E'loth** (Heb. *Eylloth'*, עֵילֹת, *trees*; Sept. Ἀλάθ v. r. in Chron. Ἀλάρα), another (plur.) form (1 Kings ix, 26; 2 Chron. viii, 17; xxvi, 2) of the name of the city *ELATH* (q. v.).

**Elpa'al** [many *El'paal*] (Heb. *Elpa'al*, עֵלְפָאֵל, in pause עֵלְפָאֵל, *God* is his *wages*; Sept. Ἀλφαᾶλ and Ἐλφαᾶλ), the second named of the two sons of Shalah-ram (a descendant of Benjamin residing in the region of Moab) by his wife Ihusim, and progenitor of a numerous posterity (1 Chron. viii, 11, 12, 14). B. C. cir. 1618. The Bene-Elpaal appear to have lived in the neighborhood of Lydda (Lod), and on the outposts of the Benjaminite hills as far as Ajalon (viii, 12-18), near the Danite frontier.

**Elpa'let** [many *El'palet*] (Heb. *Elpe'let*, עֵלְפָאֵל, in pause עֵלְפָאֵל; Sept. Ἐλφαᾶλετ v. r. Ἐλφαᾶλ, Vulg. *Elphalelet*), a contracted form (1 Chron. iv, 5) of the name *ELIPHALET* (q. v.).

**Elpa'ran** [many *El'paran*] (Hebrew *Eyl Paran'*, עֵילְפָאֵרָן, *oak of Paran*; Sept. ἡ περιβύτουρος [v. r. περιμυμζουός] τῆς Φαράν, Vulg. *campestris Pharan*), a spot (bounding on the south the territory of the Rephaim smitten by Chedorlaomer) on the edge of the wilderness bordering the territory of the Horites or Idumæa, probably marked by a noted tree (Gen. xiv, 6). See *OAK*; *PARAN*. An ingenious writer in the *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* (Oct. 1851, p. 153 note) argues, from the rendering of the Sept., for the identity of *El-paran* with *Elath*, but inconclusively.

**Elphegus**. See *ALPHAGE*.

**Elphinston**, WILLIAM, was born at Glasgow in 1481, studied in the university of that city, and obtain-

ed the rectory of Kirkmichael. He subsequently was professor of civil and canon law at Paris and Orleans for nine years, and on his return (1471) was appointed rector of the University of Glasgow. He afterwards became successively member of Parliament and of the Privy Council, ambassador of James III to France, and bishop of Ross, from whence he was transferred to Aberdeen in 1484. As bishop of Aberdeen he was twice sent on a diplomatic mission to England. In 1488 he was for several months lord chancellor of the kingdom, and subsequently, on returning from an embassy to Germany, he was appointed to the office of lord privy seal. He secured the foundation of the University at Aberdeen, for which pope Alexander VI gave a bull dated Feb. 10, 1494. King's College was in consequence erected in 1506, and Elplinton contributed 10,000 pounds Scots towards it, and the building of a bridge over the Dee. He died October 25th, 1514, while negotiations were pending with the court of Rome for his elevation to the primacy of St. Andrew's. He wrote a book of canons, the lives of some Scottish saints, and a history of Scotland, which is preserved among Fairfax's MSS. in the Bodleian Library. —Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, vol. iv; Oudin, *De Script. Eccles.* iii, 2670.

**Elpis** (Ἐλπίς, *hope*), one of the wives of Herod the Great, who had by her and another wife Phædra two daughters, Roxana and Salome (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 1, 3; *War.* i, 28, 4).

**Elrington**, THE RIGHT REV. THOMAS, lord bishop of Leighlin and Ferns, obtained a scholarship in the University of Dublin in 1778, and in 1781 was elected fellow. In 1794 he was appointed Donellan lecturer at his alma mater; in 1795, professor of mathematics, and in 1806, rector of Ardree, in the county of Tyrone. In 1811 he was raised to the highest literary rank in Ireland by appointment as provost of Trinity College. This position he held with high credit to himself until 1820, when he was consecrated bishop of Limerick. In 1822 he was transferred to the see of Leighlin and Ferns. He died in 1835. Besides editing several of the classics, he published his lectures delivered while Donellan lecturer: "The proof of Christianity derived from the miracles recorded in the New Testament," under the title, *Sermons preached in the Chapel of Trinity College*, etc. (Dublin, 1796, 8vo):—*Reflections on the Appointment of Dr. Milner as the Political Agent of the Roman Catholic Clergy in Ireland* (1809, 8vo):—*The Clergy of the Church of England truly ordained* (1809, 8vo), and a number of other polemical writings.—*Annual Biography and Obituary*, xx (1836); Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, p. 1034-5.

**Elsner**, JACOB, D.D., was born at Saalfeld, Prussia, in March, 1692. He studied at the University of Königsberg, and in 1715 became "conrector" of the Reformed school in that city. Two years later he visited Utrecht and Leyden. In 1720 he was appointed professor of theology and philology at Bingen; in 1722, rector and first professor of the Joachimsthal Gymnasium at Berlin. Subsequently he became pastor at one of the Berlin churches. From 1742 to 1744 he was director of the class of belles-lettres at the Royal Society. He died Oct. 8, 1750. His principal works are: *Observationes sacre in novi fœderis libros* (Traj. 1720-1728, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Comm. sacro-philologicis in evang. Matthæi* (Zwolle, 1767-69, 2 vols. 4to):—*Commentarius in evang. Marci* (Traj. 1733, 4to).—Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*; Doering, *die gelehrten Theolog. Deutschlands*, i, 366; Hoefcr, *Nouv. Biogr. Génér.* xv, 919.

**El'tekoh** [some *Elte'keh*] (Heb. *Eltekeh'*, אֱלֵתֶכֶה, *God is its fear*, i. e. object of awe; but *Elteke'*, אֱלֵתֶכֶה in Josh. xxi, 23; Sept. Ἐλτεκό v. r. Ἀλτακά and ἡ Ἐκωζαίρ, Vulg. *Elthece* and *Elthecho*), a city in the tribe of Dan, apparently near the border, and mentioned between Ekron and Gibbethon (Josh. xix, 44).

With its "suburbs" it was assigned as a city of refuge and Levitical city to the Kohathites (Josh. xxi, 23); but it is omitted in the parallel list (1 Chron. vi). The site is possibly now represented by *El-Mansurah* ("the victorious"), "a miserable little village" near a copious spring, in the plain between Ramleh and Akir (Robinson, *Researches*, iii, 21). Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 141) confounds Eltekeh with Eltekon, and locates both at a village which he calls "*Althini*, not far from Beilin (Baalath)."

**El'telkon** [some *Elte'kon*] (Heb. *Eltekon'*, אֱלֵתֶקֹן, *God is its foundation*; Sept. Ἐλτεκοῖν v. r. Ἐλτεκῖν and Ἐίκοιν, Vulg. *Eltecon*), a city of Judah, in the mountain-district, mentioned last in order after Maarath and Beth-Anoth (Josh. xv, 59), being in the group north of Hebron (Keil, *Comment.* in loc.). See JUDAH. It is perhaps identical in site with the present *Zeit-Sabur el-Atikah*, a little S.E. of Jerusalem. See ELTEKEH. It is perhaps the *Atagu* mentioned in the Assyrian inscriptions. See HEZEKIAH.

**Elto'lad** [many *El'tolad*] (Heb. *Eltolad'*, אֱלֵתוֹלָד, perhaps meaning *God is its race* or posterity; but, according to Fürst [*Hebr. Handw.* s. v.], whose *God is Mylita*, the Phœnician deity [comp. MOLADAH]; Sept. Ἐλτοωλά and Ἐλτοωλά, v. r. Ἐρβωωλά and Ἐρβουλά; Vulg. *Eltholad*), a city in the south of Judah, mentioned between Azem and Chesil (Josh. xv, 29), but afterwards assigned to Simeon, and mentioned between Azem and Bethul (Josh. xix, 4). It remained in possession of the latter tribe in the time of David (1 Chron. iv, 29, where it is called simply TOLAD). It is possibly the ruined site *Tell-Melaha*, observed by Van de Velde (*Memoir*, p. 113) along the N. branch of wady Sheriah, which empties into the Mediterranean a little S. of Gaza.

**El'lul** (Heb. *Elul'*, אֱלּוּל, Neh. vi, 15; Sept. Ἐλούλ, also in 1 Macc. xiv, 27; the Macedonian Ἰορπιαῖος) is the name of that month which was the sixth of the ecclesiastical, and the twelfth of the civil year of the Jews, and which began with the new moon of our August or September, and consisted of 29 days. Several unsatisfactory attempts have been made to find a Syro-Arabian etymology for the word, as it occurs in a similar form in both these languages (see Gesenius, *Thes. Hebr.* p. 1036). The most recent derivation, that of Benfey, deduces it, through many commutations and mutilations, from an original Zend form *haurvatât* (*Monatsnamen*, p. 126). According to the Talmud, the following are the days devoted to religious services. See CALENDAR.

1. The new moon. The propitiatory prayers are commenced in the evening service after the new moon.
7. The festival of the dedication of the walls of Jerusalem by Nehemiah.
17. A fast because of the death of the spies who brought up the evil report of the Land of Promise (Num. xiv, 36, 37).
21. The festival of wood offering (*Xylophoria*). According to others, this occurred during the previous month.
22. A fast in memory of the punishment of the wicked and incorrigible Israelites.
29. This is the last day of the month, on which the Jews reckoned up the beasts that had been born, the tenths of which belonged to God. They chose to do it on this day because the first day of the month Tisri was a festival, and therefore they could not tithe a flock on that day.

**Elûsa** (Ἐλουσα, apparently for the Aramæan אֱלּוּסָא; see Jerome, *Comment. in Esa.* xv, 4), an ancient city of Idumæa, frequently mentioned by writers of the fourth to the sixth centuries (see the citations in Rehd, *Palest.* p. 755-7) as an episcopal city of the Third Palestine (*Concil. Gem.* iii, 448); the *Elÿssa* of the Pentinger Table, 71 Roman miles S. of Jerusalem (Ritter, *Erdk.* xiv, 120); recognised by Dr. Robinson (*Bib. Res.* i, 296 sq.) as the present ruins *el-Khulaseh*, 5 hours S. S. W. of Hebron on the way to Egypt, and consisting of walls, a fine well, and inclosures sufficient to have contained a population of 15,000 or 20,000

persons (see also Stewart, *Tent and Khan*, p. 205). See also CHELLUS.

**Elu'zai** (Heb. *Eluzay'*, אֱלֻזַי, *God is my praises*, i. e. object of praise; Sept. Ἐλουζαῖ v. r. Ἀζαῖ, Vulg. *Eluzai*), one of the Benjamite warriors who joined David at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 5). B. C. 1054.

**Elvira**, COUNCIL OF (*Concilium Eliberitanum* or *Illyberitanum*), held in the town of Elvira (or Illiberis, Iliberi, or Liberini), in the Spanish province of Batica. The town, which no longer exists, was situated not far from the modern Granada. That it was not Illiberis, in Gallia Narbonensis, is shown by the fact that all the signers were Spanish bishops. The council was most probably held at the beginning of the fourth century, but the year (303, 305, 309) is uncertain. Some of the early Protestant writers (as the authors of the *Magdeburg Centuries*) inferred, from the resolutions concerning pictures and the lighting of candles, that the synod took place as late as the year 700; but this opinion has now been abandoned. The Synod of Elvira is the most ancient among those of which all the canons (eighty-one) are extant. It was attended by nineteen bishops, among them Hosius of Cordova, and twenty-six priests. Some of the canons show that the Church of Spain was at that time strongly under the influence of Novatian and Montanist principles. The most important of the resolutions were, 1, depriving of communion, i. e. of absolution, even in death, those who, after baptism, have voluntarily sacrificed to idols; 3, relaxing the penalty in canon 1 in favor of those who have not gone beyond offering a present to the idol. It allows of admitting such to communion at the point of death, if they have undergone a course of penance; canons 6 and 7 forbid communion even at the point of death to those who have caused the death of another maliciously, and to adulterers who have relapsed after entering upon the course of penance; 12 and 13 forbid communion even in death to mothers who prostitute their own daughters, and to women who, after consecrating themselves in virginity to God, forsake that state; 33 prohibits the clergy from the use of marriages; 34 prohibits the lighting of candles during daytime in cemeteries, "for the spirits of the saints must not be disturbed;" 36 declares that pictures ought not to be in a church, lest the object of veneration and worship be depicted upon walls; 63 and 64 forbid communion even in death to adulteresses who have wilfully destroyed their children, or who abide in a state of adultery up to the time of their last illness; 65 forbids communion even in death to one who has falsely accused of a crime a bishop, priest, or deacon. The canons may be found in Mansi, ii, 2 sq., and in Routh, *Reliquie*, vol. iv. Special treatises on the canons were written by the bishop Ferdinand de Mendoza (*De Confirmando concil. Illyberitano*, in Mansi, l. c.), and bishop Aubespine of Orleans (Mansi, l. c.). The canons, together with some explanatory remarks, may also be found in the *Tübinger Theolog. Quartalschrift*, 1821, p. 1-44.—Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iii, 775; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 543; Gams, *Kirchengesch. von Spanien*; Hefele, *Concilien-geschichte*, i, 122 sq. (A. J. S.)

**Elxai, Elxaites.** See ELKESAITES.

**Ely**, EZRA STILES, D.D., a Presbyterian (O. S.) minister, was born in Lebanon, Conn., June 13, 1786. At twelve years of age he made a profession of religion. He graduated at Yale College in 1803. His theological studies were pursued under his father, the Rev. Z. Ely. In 1806 he was ordained, and installed as pastor of the church in Colchester, Conn., which he left some time after to become chaplain to the New York City Hospital. In 1811 the Old Pine Street Church, Philadelphia, became vacant. Its pulpit had been filled by the most eloquent ministers of the day, and it was necessary to choose a man of commanding

intellect and power. The choice fell most wisely upon Dr. Ely. He entered upon his field of labor with earnestness and zeal. He was the principal founder of the Jefferson Medical College. He was stated clerk and moderator of the General Assembly in 1825 and 1828, and was constantly engaged in works of charity and schemes of benevolence. In 1834 he conceived the plan of establishing a college and theological seminary in Missouri. He entered into this with great zeal, and for a while with success, but the crisis of 1837 made it a failure. In this enterprise he lost his large fortune, and returned to Philadelphia a poor man—his intellect and oratorical powers unimpaired—but failed to receive that degree of attention he commanded when in affluence. In 1844 he became pastor of the church in Northern Liberties, Philadelphia, where he labored until prostrated by paralysis in 1851. He lingered ten years, his intellect being so impaired as to preclude activity of any kind. He died June 18, 1861. He published *Memoirs of the Rev. Z. Ely* (his father):—*Collateral Bible*, or *Key to the Holy Scriptures* (in connection with Bedell and M'Corckle):—*Ely's Journal*:—*Sermons on Faith*:—*Visits of Mercy*. He was also editor of *The Philadelphian*.—Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac*, 1862.

**Ely**, so called from a Saxon word, *elig*, an eel, or *helig*, a willow, a cathedral town in that part of the fen country of Cambridgeshire called the *Isle of Ely*. Pop. about 6000.

*Ely Cathedral*.—About the year 673, Etheldreda, daughter of the king of East Anglia, and wife of Oswy, king of Northumberland, founded a monastery here, and took on herself the government of it. A new church was begun in 1081, which was converted into a cathedral, and the abbey erected into a see in 1109. The possessions of the abbey were divided between the bishop and the community. Among the celebrated names connected with Ely are abbot Thurstan, who defended the isle against William the Conqueror for seven years, and bishop Andrews. The bishops of Ely, like the bishops of Durham, formerly enjoyed a palatine jurisdiction, and appointed their own chief justice, etc., but this privilege was taken from them by the 6th and 7th William IV. The bishop of Ely is visitor to St. Peter's, St. John's, and Jesus colleges, Cambridge, of which last he also appoints the master. There is a grammar-school attached to the cathedral, founded by Henry VIII. The diocese of Ely belongs to the province of Canterbury, and embraces Cambridgeshire, Bedfordshire, Huntingdonshire, and the archdeaconry of Sudbury, in Suffolk. The income of the bishop is £5500. Present (1868) incumbent is Edward Harold Browne. The diocese has 26 deaneries and 172,263 church sittings. The total population within the territory of the diocese was, in 1861, 480,716.—Chambers, *Encyclop.* s. v.; *Churchman's Calendar* for 1868.

**Elymæ'an** (Ἐλυμαῖος), the Græcized form (Judith i, 6) of the designation usually Anglicized ELAMITE (q. v.).

**Elyma'is** (Ἐλυμαίς), a general designation (To-bit ii, 10) of that province of the Persian empire (see Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s. v.) termed ELAM (q. v.) in the Bible. In 1 Macc. vi, 1, however, the word is used (incorrectly) in a more specific or local sense of some Persian city, as we are there informed that Antiochus Epiphanes, understanding there were very great treasures in the temple at Elymais, determined to plunder it; but the citizens resisted him successfully. 2 Macc. ix, 2 calls this city *Persepolis*, probably because it formerly had been the capital of Persia; for Persepolis and Elymais were very different cities; the former situated on the Araxes, the latter on the Eulæus. The temple which Antiochus designed to pillage was that of the goddess Nannoæ, according to 2 Macc. i, 13; Apian says (*Syr.* p. 66) a temple of Venus (i. e.

probably the goddess Anubis; Polybius (xxxi, 11), Diodorus, Josephus (*Ant.* xii, 9, 1), and Jerome say a temple of Diana. See ANTHOCHUS (EMPHANES).

**Elymas** (Ελύμας), an appellation commonly derived from the Arabic *Aliman* ("a wise man," see Pfeiffer, *Dubia vcr.* p. 941; like the Turkish title *Ulema*, see Lakemacher, *De Elyma Mago*, in his *Observatt.* ii, 162), which Luke interprets by ὁ μάγος, the *Magian* or "sorcerer;" it is applied to a Jew named BAR-JESUS, who had attached himself to the prosconsul of Cyprus, Sergius Paulus, when Paul visited the island (*Acts* xiii, 6 sq.). A.D. 44. On his attempting to dissuade the prosconsul from embracing the Christian faith, he was struck with miraculous blindness by the apostle (see Neander's *History of first Planting of the Christian Church*, i, 125). A very different but less probable derivation of the word is given by Lightfoot in his *Hebrew and Talmudical Exerccitions on the Acts* (*Works*, viii, 461), and in his *Sermon on Elymas the Sorcerer* (*Works*, vii, 104). Chrysostom observes, in reference to the blindness inflicted by the apostle on Bar-Jesus, that the limiting clause, "for a season," shows that it was not intended so much for the punishment of the sorcerer as for the conversion of the deputy (Chrysost. in *Acta Apost. Homil.* xxxviii; *Opera*, ix, 241). On the practice generally then prevailing, in the decay of faith, of consulting Oriental impostors of this kind, see Conybeare and Howson, *Life of St. Paul*, i, 177-180, 2d ed.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See MAGIC.

**El'zabad** [some *Elza'bad*] (Heb. *Elzabad'*, עֶלְזָבָד, whom *God has bestowed*, i. q. *Theodore*; Sept. ΕΛΕΖΑΒΑΪΔ and ΕΛΕΖΑΒΑΪ, v. r. Ελεζέβ and ΕΛΕΖΑΒΑΪ), the name of two men.

1. The ninth of the eleven Gadite heroes who joined David in his fastness in the wilderness of Judah (*1 Chron.* xii, 12) B.C. 1061.

2. One of the able-bodied sons of Shemaiah, the son of Obed-edom the Levite; he served as a porter to the "house of Jehovah" under David (*1 Chron.* xxvi, 7). B.C. 1014.

**El'zaphan** [some *Elza'phan*] (Heb. *Eltsaphan'*, עֶלְזָפָן), a contracted form (*Exod.* vi, 22; *Lev.* x, 4) of the name ELIZAPHAN (q. v.).

**Emanation** (Latin *emanatio*, a flowing forth), a religious theory concerning the relation of the universe to the Deity, which lies at the basis of some of the Oriental religions, and from them found its way into several philosophical systems. Emanation denotes a development, descending by degrees, of all things from the Supreme Being, the universe constituting in general, as well as in particular, a chain of revelations, the individual rings of which lose the divine character the more the farther they are remote from the primary source, the Deity. A system of emanation is different from a system of evolution, because in the latter the revelation of the Deity in the universe has for the Deity itself the signification of a process of self-cognition which grows in a progressive ratio. Emanation was the basis of the religions of India, in the northern provinces of which country it developed from the original religion of nature even before the compilation of the Vedas. The cause of all things was found in a universal world-soul. See ANIMA MUNDI. The world-soul was identified with Brahma, and, viewed as the eternal spiritual unit, the mysterious source of all life. The ancient gods were explained as the first rays of Brahma, whom he had constituted the guardians of the world. The creation was an emanation from brahma, which became the more gross, dense, materialized, the farther it removed from the primitive source. Those who give themselves up to the corporeal world sink deeper and deeper, and only rise again upward when purified by the fire of hell; but those who renounce all sensuality, and direct all their thoughts to the one

divine substance, are gradually absorbed by it. The religion of the Parsees is also based upon emanation. From the *Zervane akhercuc* (the uncreated one), Ormuzd and Ahriman proceed as the highest revelation. From Ormuzd and Ahriman all other substances emanate, from the ministering angels down to the beings of the material world. But the Persians did not teach, like the Indians, a self-destruction of personality for the purpose of obtaining a reunion with the original unit; in the Parsee system the good is perfected and completed by overcoming the bad, and the series of the imperfect emanations is closed by a reunion of Ahriman with Ormuzd. In the Western countries, Plato is the first in whose writings we find, though not yet distinctly, traces of the doctrine of emanation. More developed, it appears in the writings of Philo. It is a prominent feature of the Neoplatonic school, and through Valentinus (q. v.) it was introduced into the Gnostic schools. Finally, it is to be found in the philosophy of the Arabs, which was more or less an Aristotelism mixed with Neoplatonic views.—Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 548; Möller, *Gesch. der Kosmologie in der griech. Kirche bis auf Origenes* (Halle, 1860); Neander, *Ch. Hist.* vol. i. (A. J. S.)

**Emancipation.** 1. In the Roman Church, *Emancipatio canonicarum* is the raising of some member of a convent to an ecclesiastical dignity, by virtue of which he is no longer subject to his former superior. The *Emancipatio canonica* is the release of a young canon from the obligation of visiting the foundation school when about to receive a prebend. 2. The term is also used to denote the act whereby a government or Legislature delivers from a state of slavery, or sets at political liberty, any classes of persons who have previously been declared ineligible for certain offices or privileges, on account of their religious peculiarities, e. g. emancipation of Jews in Christian countries (see JEWS); Roman Catholic emancipation in 1829 in England (see TESTS). 3. The freeing of slaves from bondage (see SLAVERY).

**Embalm** (עֲבָרָה, *chanal'*, to *spice*; hence spoken of the ripening of fruit, on account of its aromatic juice, improperly rendered "putteth forth" in *Cant.* ii, 13), the process of preserving a corpse by means of aromatics (*Gen.* 1, 2, 3, 26; Sept. ἐνταφιάζω). This art was practised among the Egyptians from the earliest times, and arrived at great perfection in that country, where, however, it has now become lost, the practice apparently having gradually fallen into disuse in consequence of the change of customs affected by the introduction of Christianity in that part of the Roman empire. It is in connection with that country that the above instances occur, and later examples (*2 Chron.* xvi, 14; *John* ix, 59, 40) seem to have been in imitation of the Egyptian custom. The modern method of embalming is in essential points similar.

1. *Egyptian*.—1. The feeling which led the Egyptians to embalm the dead probably sprang from their belief in the future reunion of the soul with the body. Such a reunion is distinctly spoken of in the Book of the Dead (Lepsius, *Totentbuch*, chap. 89 and *passim*), and Herodotus expressly mentions the Egyptian belief in the transmigration of souls (ii, 123). This latter idea may have led to the embalming of lower animals also, especially those deemed sacred, as the ox, the ibis, and the cat, mummies of which are frequent. The actual process is said to have been derived from "their first merely burying in the sand, impregnated with natron and other salts, which dried and preserved the body" (Rawlinson, *Herod.* ii, 122). Drugs and bitumen were of later introduction, the latter not being generally employed before the 18th dynasty. When the practice ceased entirely is uncertain.

2. Herodotus (ii, 86-89) describes three modes, varying in completeness and expense, and practised by persons regularly trained to the profession, who were in-

tified into the mysteries of the art by their ancestors. The most costly mode, which is estimated by Diodorus Siculus (i, 91) at a talent of silver (over \$1000), was said by the Egyptian priests to belong to him whose name in such a matter it was not lawful to mention, viz. Osiris. The embalmers first removed part of the brain through the nostrils by means of a crooked iron, and destroyed the rest by injecting caustic drugs. An incision was then made along the flank with a sharp Ethiopian stone, and the whole of the intestines removed. The cavity was rinsed out with palm-wine, and afterwards scoured with pounded perfumes. It was then filled with pure myrrh pounded, cassia, and other aromatics, except frankincense. This done, the body was sewn up and steeped in natron for seventy days. When the seventy days were accomplished, the embalmers washed the corpse and swathed it in bandages of linen, cut in strips and smeared with gum. They then gave it up to the relatives of the deceased, who provided for it a woollen case, made in the shape of a man, in which the dead was placed, and deposited in an erect position against the wall of the sepulchral chamber. Diodorus Siculus gives some particulars of the process which are omitted by Herodotus. When the body was laid out on the ground for the purpose of embalming, one of the operators, called the scribe (*γραμμάρειός*), marked out the part of the left flank where the incision was to be made. The dissector (*παρῶσις*) then, with a sharp Ethiopian stone (black flint, or Ethiopian agate, Rawlinson, *Herod.* ii, 121), hastily cut through as much flesh as the law enjoined, and fled, pursued by curses and volleys of stones from the spectators. When all the embalmers (*ταριεῦραι*) were assembled, one of them extracted the intestines, with the exception of the heart and kidneys; another cleansed them one by one, and rinsed them in palm-wine and perfumes. The body was then washed with oil of cedar, and other things worthy of notice, for more than thirty days (according to some MSS. forty), and afterwards sprinkled with myrrh, cinnamon, and other substances, which possess the property not only of preserving the body for a long period, but also of communicating to it an agreeable smell. This process was so effectual that the features of the dead could be recognised. It is remarkable that Diodorus omits all mention of the steeping in natron. Porphyry (*De Abst.* iv, 10) supplies an omission of Herodotus, who neglects to mention what was done with the intestines after they were removed from the body. In the case of a person of respectable rank they were placed in a separate vessel and thrown into the river. This account is confirmed by Plutarch (*Sept. Sap. Conv.* c. 16).

The second mode of embalming cost about 20 mina. In this case no incision was made in the body, nor were the intestines removed, but cedar-oil was injected into the stomach by the rectum. The oil was prevented from escaping, and the body was then steeped in natron for the appointed number of days. On the last day the oil was withdrawn, and carried off with it the stomach and intestines in a state of solution, while the flesh was consumed by the natron, and nothing was left but the skin and bones. The body in this state was returned to the relatives of the deceased.


The third mode, which was adopted by the poorer classes, and cost but little, consisted in rinsing out the intestines with *symæa*, an infusion of senna and cassia (Pettigrew, *Hist. of Mummies*, p. 69), and steeping the body for the usual number of days in natron.

Although the three modes of embalming are so precisely described by Herodotus, it has been found impossible to classify the mummies which have been discovered and examined under one or other of these three heads. Pettigrew, from his own observations, confirms the truth of Herodotus's statement that the brain was removed through the nostrils. But in many instances, in which the body was carefully preserved

and elaborately ornamented, the brain had not been removed at all, while in some mummies the cavity was found to be filled with resinous and bituminous matter. M. Rouyer, in his *Notice sur les Embaume-ments des Anciens Egyptiens (Description de l'Egypte, p. 471)*, endeavored to class the mummies which he examined under two principal divisions, which were again subdivided into others. These were, I. Mummies with the ventral incision, preserved, 1, by balsamic matter, and, 2, by natron. The first of these are filled with a mixture of resin and aromatics, and are of an olive color—the skin dry, flexible, and adhering to the bones. Others are filled with bitumen or asphaltum, and are black, the skin hard and shining. Those prepared with natron are also filled with resinous substances and bitumen. II. Mummies without the ventral incision. This class is again subdivided, according as the bodies were, 1, salted and filled with *pisasphaltum*, a compound of asphaltum and common pitch; or, 2, salted only. The former are supposed to have been immersed in the pitch when in a liquid state. The medicaments employed in embalming were various. From a chemical analysis of the substances found in mummies, M. Rouelle detected three modes of embalming: 1, with *asphaltum*, or Jew's pitch, called also *funeral gum*, or *gum of mummies*; 2, with a mixture of asphaltum and cedria, the liquor distilled from the cedar; 3, with this mixture, together with some resinous and aromatic ingredients. The powdered aromatics mentioned by Herodotus were not mixed with the bituminous matter, but sprinkled into the cavities of the body. Pettigrew supposes that after the spicing "the body must have been subjected to a very considerable degree of heat; for the resinous and aromatic substances have penetrated even into the innermost structure of the bones, an effect which could not have been produced without the aid of a high temperature, and which was absolutely necessary for the entire preservation of the body" (p. 62). M. Rouyer is of the same opinion (p. 471). The surface of the body was in one example covered with "a coating of the dust of woods and barks, nowhere less than one inch in thickness," which "had the smell of cinnamon or cassia" (Pettigrew, p. 62, 63). At this same stage plates of gold were sometimes applied to portions of the body, or even its whole surface. Before enwrapping, the body was always placed at full length, with no variety save in the position of the arms.


The principal embalming material in the more costly mummies appears to have been asphalt, either alone or mixed with a vegetable liquor, or so mixed with the addition of resinous and aromatic ingredients. Pettigrew supposes resinous matters were used as a kind of varnish for the body, and that pounded aromatics were sprinkled in the cavities within. The natron, in a solution of which the mummies were placed in every method, appears to have been a fixed alkali. It might be obtained from the Natron Lakes and like places in the Libyan desert. Wax has also been discovered (Pettigrew's *History*, p. 75 sq.).

3. The embalming having been completed, the body was wrapped in bandages. There has been much difficulty as to the material; but it seems certain that linen was invariably used. Though always long, they vary in this respect; and we know no authenticated instance of their exceeding 700 yards, though much greater measures are mentioned. The width is also very various, but it is generally not more than seven or eight inches. The quantity of cloth used is best ascertained from the weight. The texture varies, in the cases of single mummies, the coarser material being always nearer to the body. The bandages are found to have been saturated with asphalt, resin, gum, or natron; but the asphalt has only been traced in those nearest the body: probably the saturation is due to the preparation of the mummies, and does not indicate any special preparation of the clothes. The beau-




Swathing a Mummy. (From the Egyptian Monuments.)

ty of the bandaging has been the subject of great admiration. The strips were very closely bound, and all directions were adopted that could carry out this object. Pettigrew is of opinion that they were certainly applied wet. Various amulets and personal ornaments are found upon mummies and in their wrappings; the former were thought to be of use to the soul in its wanderings, and they were placed with the body from the belief in the relation between the two after death. With these matters, and the other particulars of Egyptian mummies, we have little to do, as our object is to show how far the Jewish burial-usages may have been derived from Egypt. The body in the cases of most of the richer mummies, when bandaged, has been covered with what has been termed by the French a *cartonage*, formed of layers of cloth, plastered with lime on the inside. The shape is that of a



The Mummy's Head, as seen at an open panel of the Coffin. (From the Monuments.)

II. *Hebrew-Egyptian*.—The records of the embalming of Jacob and Joseph are very brief. In the former case we read, "And Joseph commanded his servants the physicians to embalm his father: and the physicians embalmed Israel. And forty days were fulfilled for him; for so are fulfilled the days of embalming: and the Egyptians mourned for him threescore and ten days" (Gen. 1, 2, 3). Of Joseph we are only told that "they embalmed him, and he was put in a coffin in Egypt" (ver. 26). It should be remarked, that in Joseph's case the embalming must have been thorough, as Moses at the Exodus carried his body into Canaan. The motive of embalming in these instances was evidently that the strong desire of these patriarchs to be buried in the Land of Promise might be complied with, although, had this not been so, respect would probably have led to the same result. That the physicians were employed by Joseph to embalm his father may mean no more than the usual embalmers, who must have had medical and surgical knowledge, but it is not unlikely that the kings and high officers were embalmed by household physicians. The periods of forty days for embalming, and seventy for mourning, are not easily reconciled with the statement of Herodotus, who specifies seventy days as the time that the body remained in natron. Hengstenberg (*Egypt and the Books of Moses*, p. 69) attempts to reconcile this discrepancy by supposing that the seventy days of Herodotus include the whole time of embalming, and not that of steeping in natron only. But the differences in detail which characterize the descriptions of Herodotus and Diodorus, and the impossibility of reconciling these descriptions in all points with the results of scientific observation, lead to the natural conclusion that, if these descriptions are correct in themselves, they do not include every method of embalming which was practised, and that, consequently, any discrepancies between them and the Bible narrative cannot fairly be attributed to a want of accuracy in the latter. Perhaps the periods varied in different ages, or the forty days may not include the time of steeping in natron. Diodorus Siculus, who, having visited Egypt, is scarcely likely to have been in error in a matter necessarily well known, speaks of the anointing of the body at first with oil of cedar and other things for above thirty or forty days (ἑφ' ἡμέρας πλείους τῶν τριάκοντα; some MSS. τεσσαράκοντα). This period would correspond very well with the forty days mentioned in Genesis, which are literally "the days of spicing," and indicate that the latter denoted the most essential period of embalming. Or, if the same period as the seventy days of Herodotus be meant by Diodorus, then there would appear to have been a change. It may be worth noticing, that Herodotus, when first mentioning the steeping in natron, speaks of seventy days as the extreme time to which it might be lawfully prolonged (ἡμέρας ἐβδομήκοντα· πλείνας ἢ τούτων οὐκ ἔστι ταριχεύ-



Painting the *Cartonage* or Mummy-case. (From the Monuments.)

body of which the arms and legs are not distinguishable. In this shape every dead person who had, if we may believe Diodorus, been judged by a particular court to be worthy of the honor of burial, was considered to have the form of Osiris, and was called by his name. It seems more probable, however, that the tribunal spoken of was that of Amenti, "the hidden," the Egyptian Hades, and that the practice of embalming was universal. The *cartonage* of the more costly mummies is generally beautifully painted with subjects connected with Amenti. Mummies of this class are inclosed in one or even two wooden cases, either of sycamore, or, rarely, of cedar. The mummies of royal and very wealthy persons were placed in an outer stone case, within which there was a wooden case, and, probably, sometimes two such cases. See MUMMY. It would seem that the features of the face, as well as the other parts of the body, were covered over with the bandage, and that it was only through this, and latterly through the coffin, which commonly took the form of the features, that these could be recognised.

iv), that (according to Pettigrew, p. 61) "appearing to be precisely the time necessary for the operation of the alkali on the animal fibre." This would seem to render it possible that the seventy days in the time of Herodotus was the period of mourning, as it was not to be exceeded in what appears to have been the longest operation of embalming. The division of the seventy days mentioned in Genesis into forty and thirty may be suggested if we compare the thirty days' mourning for Moses and for Aaron, in which case the seventy days in this instance might mean until the end of seventy days. It is also to be remarked that Diodorus speaks of the time of mourning for a king being seventy-two days, apparently ending with the day of burial (i, 72). Joseph's coffin was perhaps a stone case, as his mummy was to be long kept ready for removal. See COFFIN.

III. *Jewish*.—It is not until long after the Exodus that we find any record of Jewish embalming, and then we have, in the O. T., but one distinct mention of the practice. This is in the case of king Asa, whose burial is thus related: "And they buried him in his own sepulchre, which he had digged for himself in the city of David, and laid him in the bed [or rather "coffin," not "bier"] which he had filled [or "which was filled"] with perfumes and spices compounded by the apothecaries' art; and they made for him an exceeding great burning" (2 Chron. xvi, 14). The burning is mentioned of other kings of Judah. From this passage it seems that Asa had prepared a bed, probably a sarcophagus, filled with spices, and that spices were also burnt at his burial. In the accounts of our Saviour's burial the same or similar customs appear to be indicated, but fuller particulars are given. We read that Nicodemus "brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pound [weight]." The body they wound "in linen clothes with the sweet spices, as the manner of the Jews is to prepare for burial" (John xix, 39, 40). Mark specifies that fine clothes were used (xv, 46), and mentions that the women who came to the sepulchre on the morning of the resurrection "had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him" (xvi, 1). Luke relates that the women went to see the sepulchre. "And they returned, and prepared sweet spices and ointments" (xxiii, 56). Immediately afterwards he speaks of their "bringing the sweet spices which they had prepared" (xxiv, 1) on the second day after. Our Lord himself referred to the use of ointment in burial-ceremonies (*πρός τὸ ἐνταφιάζειν*) "for the preparation for burial," when he commended the piety of the woman who had anointed his head with "very precious ointment" (Matt. xxvi, 6-13), and spoke in like manner in the similar case of Mary, the sister of Lazarus (John xii, 3-8). The customs at this time would seem to have been to anoint the body and wrap it in fine linen, with spices and ointments in the folds, and afterwards to pour more ointment upon it, and perhaps also to burn spices. In the case of our Saviour, the hurried burial and the following of the Sabbath may have caused an unusual delay. Ordinarily everything was probably completed at once.

Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus speak of the use of myrrh in Egyptian embalming, but we do not find any mention of aloes. The wrapping in fine linen is rather contrary to the Egyptian practice than like it, when we remember that the coarser mummy-bandages are those which immediately enfold the body, and would best correspond to the clothes used by the Jews.

The Jewish custom has therefore little in common with the Egyptian. It was, however, probably intended as a kind of embalming, although it is evident from what is mentioned in the case of Lazarus, who was regularly swathed (John xi, 44), that its effect was not preservation (ver. 39). The use of aromatics may naturally have been a harmless relic of the Egyptian cus-

tom, which, however, was very different in all else that relates to the disposal of the corpse. See BURIAL.



Mummy of Pen-amen, priest of Amun-Ra. (From the British Museum.)

Among the later Jews a sort of embalming by means of honey occurs (Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 7, 4; see Strabo, xvi, 746; compare Pliny, xxii, 50). Wax is said to have been employed for a similar purpose by the ancient Persians (Herodotus, i, 140; comp. Cicero, *Tusc. Quæst.* i, 45; Xenophon, *Hellen.* v, 3, 19).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

IV. *Literature*.—See Pettigrew, *History of Egyptian Mummies* (Lond. 1840, 4to); Wilkinson, *Ancient Egyptians*, 2d series, ii, 451 sq.; Rosellini, *Monumenti dell'Egitto*, II, iii, 334 sq., and pl. 121; Jablonski, *Opusc.* ed. Water, i, 472; Caylus, *Abhand. zur Gesch. u. Kunst.* i, 334 sq.; Heyne, in the *Comment. Soc. Gott.* 1780, iii, 89 sq.; Winckler, *Animadverss.* i, 105 sq.; Creuzer, *Comment. in Herod.* i, 14 sq., 361 sq.; Sethus, *De alimenter. facultatibus* (Par. 1658), x, p. 74; Ritter, in the *Hall. Encyclop.* vii, 374 sq.; Brande's *Encyclopædia*, and the *Penny Cyclopædia*, s. v. Mummy.

#### Embalming the Dead in the Christian Church.

It was the custom of the early Church to bestow the honor of embalming upon the bodies of martyrs at least. According to an intimation of Tertullian (*Apol.* cap. 42), the usage appears to have been even generally adopted by Christians in burying their dead. One of the chief ingredients used was myrrh; in imitation of the Jewish custom, which was followed by Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus, who "brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pound weight, and took the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen clothes with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury" (John xix, 39). There was supposed to be some mystic meaning in the presents made by the wise men to our Saviour at his birth when they offered to him gifts, gold, frankincense, and myrrh: gold as to a king, frankincense as to a God, and myrrh as to a man that must die and be buried. In addition to the Jewish custom and the mode of our Saviour's burial, another reason which rendered the use of myrrh important was that the ancient Christians were often compelled to bury their dead in the places in which they assembled for divine worship, and the embalming would tend to preserve them from corruption, and render the burial-places less offensive.—Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. xxiii, ch. ii, § 5.

**Ember Weeks.** The weeks in which the ember days fall. These are certain days set apart in the Roman and Anglican churches for imploring God's blessing upon the ordinations which are appointed to be held in the church on the Sundays next following these weeks. The ember days are the Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday after the first Sunday in Lent; after Whit-Sunday; after the 14th of September; and after the 13th of December. These days were settled by the Council of Placentia, A. D. 1095. The name is derived by some from a German word signifying "abstinence;" by others it is supposed to signify "ashes;" the most probable derivation, however, is from a Saxon word (*ymbren* or *embren*) signifying "a circuit or course," because these fast-days return at certain periods (Eden, s. v.). The ember weeks in the Roman Church are called the *quatuor tempora*, the fast so called being observed at the beginnings of the four seasons. In the French Church it is called the fast of *quatre-temps*. It is observed at the same dates, nearly, as in the English Church. It was first distinctly fixed in the Church year by Gregory VII.—Thomas-sin, *Traité des Jeûnes*, pt. i, chap. xxi; Bingham, *Orig.*

*Ecc.* bk. xxi, ch. ii; Eden, *Churchman's Dictionary*, s. v.; Palmer, *Orig. Liturg.* i, 305; Procter, *On Common Prayer*, p. 261.

**Emblem**, "a device or figure employed to represent some moral notion. There are various opinions as to the lawfulness and expediency of emblems in religious matters, some considering it to be both allowable and useful thus to represent spiritual ideas to the bodily eye; others, again, holding it to be both presumptuous and dangerous, if not superstitious, to use any emblems of sacred things not warranted and enjoined by Scripture. This, at least, is certain, that it is quite as likely to lead to idolatry (answering to that of the Hindoos, Egyptians, etc.) as pictures or images giving a simple resemblance. The golden calf was meant for an emblem, but it was the occasion of gross idolatry" (Eden).

Emblems are to be distinguished from symbols. Symbols are generally intended to represent revealed doctrines; emblems are "arbitrary representations of an idea of human invention" (Walcott). Thus a sword is the emblem of St. Paul. A lion, as indicating solitude, was chosen as the emblem of Jerome as a recluse. See IDOLATRY; IMAGE.

**Embroider** (רָמַד, *ramak'*, to variegate, Exod. xxxv, 35; xxxviii, 23; elsewhere "needle-work," etc.; שָׁבַט, *shabats'*, to interweave, Exod. xxviii, 39; "set," Exod. xxxviii, 20). See BROIDEREED. If these passages are correctly rendered, the Israelites must have known the art of embroidery. In several passages, also, an equivalent expression is used—*needle-work*—and used so as to imply that not plain sewing, but ornamental work, was evidently meant (Exod. xxvi, 36; Judg. v, 30; Psalm xlv, 14, etc.). The Hebrew women were undoubtedly indebted to their residence in Egypt for that perfectness of finish in embroidery which was displayed in the service of the tabernacle, and in the preparation of the sacerdotal robes directed to be worn by the high-priest (Exod. xxviii, 29). The colored figures in the cloth of the Hebrews are thought by most authors to have been partly the product of the weaver in colors, whose art appears the superior, and partly that of the embroiderer in colors. The notices



Ancient Egyptian Princess in embroidered dress. (From the Monuments.)

of Egyptian history, confirmed by the monumental remains, give reason for believing that at a comparatively early period they had made wonderful attain-

ments in this line. For example, a corslet is mentioned by Herodotus as having been presented by Amasis, king of Egypt, to the Lacedæmonians, which was of linen, each thread composed of 360 finer threads, and ornamented with numerous figures of animals, worked in gold and cotton (Herod. iii, 47). This was many centuries indeed after the Exodus; but its testimony reaches back to a much earlier time, as such a beautiful and elaborate piece of workmanship could not have been produced without ages of study and application to the art. Wilkinson says, "Many of the Egyptian stuffs presented various patterns worked in colors by the loom, independent of those produced by the dyeing or printing process, and so richly composed that they vied with cloths embroidered by the needle. The art of embroidery," he adds, "was commonly practised in Egypt" (iii, 128)—referring in proof, however, simply to passages in Scripture, and taking them in the sense put upon them in the authorized version, sanctioned by Gesenius and the rabbins. The Egyptian sails, says the same author, were some of them embroidered with fanciful devices, representing the phoenix, flowers, and other emblems. This, however, was confined to the pleasure-boats of the nobles and king. That this was done even in the early ages is evident from the paintings at Thebes, which show sails ornamented with various colors, of the time of Rameses III. The devices are various; the most common is the phoenix (Ezek. xxvii, 7). The Egyptian ladies of rank wore splendid dresses of needle-work (Psalm xlv, 13, 14). (See Wilkinson's *Ancient Egyptians*, abridgm. ii, 81; Gesenius, *Heb. Thesaur.*, s. v., ut sup.)

The art of embroidery became hereditary in certain families of the Israelites, but finally fell into desuetude (1 Chron. iv, 21).

In later times, the Babylonians were the most noted of all the Asiatic nations for the weaving of cloth of different colors, with gold threads introduced into the woof. These Assyrian dresses are mentioned as an



Ancient Assyrian embroidered Robe. (From the Monuments.)

article of commerce by Ezekiel (xxvii, 24), and occur even as early as the time of Joshua (vii, 21). They formed, perhaps, the "dyed attire and broided work" so often mentioned in Scripture as the garments of princes and the costly gifts of kings. The ornaments upon them may either have been dyed, worked in the loom, or embroidered with the needle (Judg. v, 30). (See Layard's *Ninveh*, 1st series, ii, 313.) See WOMAN; WEAVING. (See further in Adam's *Roman Antiquities*, p. 372; Miss Lambert's *Hand-book of Needle-work*, London and New York, 1846.) See NEEDLE-work.





Modern Oriental Embroidery-frame.

**Embury, Philip**, the first Methodist minister in America, was born in Ballygaran, Ireland, Sept. 21, 1728 or 1729. His parents were Germans of the Palatinate, and he was educated at a school near Ballygaran. In 1752 he was converted, and in 1758 he was entered upon the roll of the Irish Conference as a preacher. In 1760 he emigrated to America, but it is not known whether he preached or not during the first few years of his life in New York. In 1766, stimulated by the advice of Barbara Heck, a pious Methodist, he organized a class, and commenced preaching, first in his own house, then in a hired room, and soon after (1767) in the "Rigging Loft," famous as the birth-place of Methodism in New York. A chapel became necessary, and in 1768 the pioneer Methodist church was erected on the site of the present John-street Church. New York at this time had a population of twenty thousand. Embury continued to serve the Church in this chapel gratuitously until the arrival of the first missionaries sent out by John Wesley in 1769, when he surrendered the charge, and, with a party of fellow-Methodists, emigrated to Washington County. He there continued his labors as a "local preacher, and formed a society, chiefly of his own countrymen, at Ashgrove, the first Methodist organization within the bounds of the present Troy Conference, now numbering twenty-five thousand communicants, and more than two hundred travelling preachers. Embury died suddenly in August, 1775, in consequence of an accident in mowing. He was buried on a neighbor's farm, but in 1832 his remains were taken up and deposited in Ashgrove church-yard, with funeral ceremonies, and an address by John N. Maffitt. In 1866, the centenary year of American Methodism, his remains were transferred, by order of the Troy Conference, to the Woodland Cemetery, Cambridge, Washington County, N. Y., with impressive services, conducted by bishop James and the Rev. S. D. Brown. See a good sketch of his life by Saxe, *Ladies' Repository*, May, 1859; also Bangs, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, vol. i; Stevens, *Memorials of Methodism*, vol. ii; Wakeley, *Heroes of Methodism*; Stevens, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, vol. i; Wakeley, *Lost Chapters*.

**Emek.** See BETH-EMEK; KEZIZ.

**Emerald** (ἤμαρ, *no'phek*, of uncertain signif.; Sept. ἄνθραξ, N. T. and Apoc. *σμάραγδος*), a precious stone, named first in the second row on the breast-plate of the high-priest (Exod. xxviii, 18; xxxix, 11), imported to Tyre from Syria (Ezek. xxvii, 16), used as a seal or signet (Ecclus. xxxii, 6), as an ornament of clothing and bedding (Ezek. xxviii, 13; Judg. x, 21), and spoken of as one of the foundations of Jerusalem (Rev. xxi, 19; Tob. xiii, 16). The rainbow round the throne

is compared to emerald in Rev. iv, 3 (ὄμοιος ὄρασει σμαραγδίνῳ). The Sept., Josephus, and Jerus. Targum understand by it the *carbuncle*. This name (in Greek denoting a *live coal*) the ancients gave to several glowing red stones resembling live coals (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xxxii, 25; comp. Theophrast. *De Lapid.* 18), particularly rubies and garnets. See **CARBUNCLE**. The most valued of the carbuncles seems, however, to have been the Oriental garnet, a transparent red stone, with a violet shade, and strong vitreous lustre. It was engraved upon (Theophrast. 31), and was probably not so hard as the ruby, which, indeed, is the most beautiful and costly of the precious stones of a red color, but is so hard that it cannot easily be subjected to the graving-tool. The Hebrew *nophek*, in the breast-plate of the high-priest, was certainly an engraved stone; and there is no evidence that the ancients could engrave the ruby, although this has in modern times been accomplished (Rosenmüller, *Biblical Mineralogy*, p. 32, 33; Braunius, *De Vest. Sacerdot.* p. 523; Bellermann, *Ueber die Urin u. Thuninnim*, p. 43). See **BERYL**.

The *smaragdus* of the New Test. was the generic name of twelve varieties of gems, some of which were probably true emeralds, while others seem to have been rather stones of the prasius or jasper kind, and still others no more than colored crystals and spars from copper mines. The statues, etc., of emerald mentioned by several ancient authors appear to have been nothing more than rock crystals, or even colored glass (Hill on Theophrast. *de Lapid.* 41; Moore's *Anc. Mineral.* p. 150). See **GEM**.

The modern emerald is a species of *beryl*, of a beautiful green color, which occurs in primitive crystals, and is much valued for ornamental jewelry. The finest are obtained from Peru. The mines from which the ancients obtained emeralds are said to have existed in Egypt, near Mount Zabarah. (See the *Penney Cyclopaedia*, s. v. **BERYL**.)

**Em'erods.** See **HEMORRHOIDS**.

**Emerson, John S.**, a Congregational minister and missionary, was born at Chester, N. H., in 1802; graduated at Dartmouth College in 1826, and studied theology at Andover. He had studied with special reference to the missionary work, and went, under the auspices of the American Board, to the Sandwich Islands, and was appointed to Waialua, Oahu, where he spent nearly the whole of his missionary life, laboring with zeal and success. For four years he was professor in the Lahainaluna seminary, and while there he prepared (with other writers) an *English-Hawaiian Dictionary*. He died at Waialua March 28, 1867.—*American Annual Cyclopaedia*, vii, 559.

**Emerson, Ralph, D. D.**, a Congregational divine and scholar, was born at Hollis, N. H., August 18, 1787, and was educated at Yale College, where he graduated in 1811 with the highest honors of his class. After studying theology at Andover until 1814, he was tutor at Yale for a short time, and in 1816 became pastor at Norfolk, Conn. In 1827 he was chosen professor of Church history and pastoral theology at Andover, which office he held until 1854. He lived for five years at Newburyport, and then removed to Rockford, Illinois, where some of his children resided, and where he died, May 20, 1863. As a teacher, he maintained a high character during his long service at Andover.—*Congregational Quarterly*, July, 1863.

**Emery, Jacques André**, an eminent French Roman Catholic divine, was born at Gex, August 27, 1732, and studied in the Jesuits' College at Mâcon, and also at St. Sulpice, Paris. He was ordained in 1756; became professor of theology at Orleans 1759; and afterwards he held the chair of philosophy at Lyons; in 1776, superior of the seminary at Angers; 1784, head of the abbey of Boisgroland, and also head of the congregation of St. Sulpice. In 1789 he founded a seminary of his congregation at Baltimore, Maryland.

During the French Revolution he was imprisoned both at St. Pelagie and at the Conciergerie. In 1802 he resumed his place among the clergy of Paris, and devoted himself to the restoration of the scattered and broken congregation of St. Sulpice. He died April 18, 1811. Among his numerous writings are *L'Esprit de Leibnitz* (Lyons, 1772, 2 vols. 12mo; Paris, 1804, 2 vols. 8vo);—*Esprit de St. Thérèse* (3d edit. Avignon, 1825, 2 vols. 12mo).—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xv, 943; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, xii, 315.

**Ē'mim** (Heb. *Eymim*', עִמִּים, *terrors*; Sept. Ὀυμαῖοι and Ὀυμείν; Auth. Vers. "Emims"), a numerous and warlike tribe of the ancient Canaanites, of gigantic stature, defeated by Chedorlaomer and his allies in the plain of Kiriathaim; they occupied, in the time of Abraham, the country east of the Jordan, afterwards possessed by the Moabites (Gen. xiv, 5; Deut. ii, 10, 11). See CANAAN. An ingenious writer in the *Journal of Sac. Lit.* (April, 1852, p. 55 sq.; Jan. 1853, p. 296) argues, but upon rather slender grounds, that their original title was *Shittim*, and identifies them with the *Chetta* so often referred to in the Egyptian inscriptions. It would appear, from a comparison of Gen. xiv, 5-7 with Deut. ii, 10-12, 20-23, that the whole country east of Jordan was, in primitive times, held by a race of giants, all probably of the same stock, comprehending the Rephaim on the north, next the Zuzim, after them the Emin, and then the Horim on the south; and that afterwards the kingdom of Bashan embraced the territories of the first; the country of the Ammonites, the second; that of the Moabites, the third; while Edom took in the mountains of the Horim. The whole of them were attacked and pillaged by the Eastern kings who destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah. See REPHAIM. The Emin were related to the Anakim, and were generally called by the same name; but their conquerors, the Moabites, termed them Emin—that is, "Terrible men" (Deut. ii, 11)—most probably on account of their fierce aspect. See ANAKIM.

**Eminence**, a title of the Romish cardinals, first given to them by Urban VIII. to endow them with a rank equal to that of the spiritual princes of Europe, and of the grand masters of the knights of St. John and of Malta. See CARDINALS.

**Emlyn**, ΤΙΜΟΛΑΣ, an English Nonconformist theologian, was born May 27, 1663, at Stamford, in Lincolnshire; made chaplain 1683 by the countess of Donegal. In 1691 he became assistant to Mr. Boyce in the congregation of Nonconformists in Wood Street, Dublin. Having imbibed and preached Arian doctrines, he was deprived of his functions, and fined and imprisoned for two years. Restored to liberty, he continued to preach and to write in favor of Arianism until his death, July 30, 1743. His *Works* were collected and published in London, 1746 (3 vols. 8vo). Waterland notices Emlyn's writings frequently (see the Index to his works, 6 vols. 8vo). See also DORNER, *Person of Christ* (Edinb. transl.), div. ii, vol. iii, 357.

**Emman'uél** (Ἐμμανουήλ), a Græcized form (Matt. i, 23) of the name IMMANUEL (q. v.).

**Em'maus** (Ἐμμαούε, prob. from עִמְמַו, *hot baths*, see Gen. xxxvi, 24), the name of three places in Palestine.

1. A village (κώμη) 60 stadia (A. V. "furlongs") or 7½ miles from Jerusalem, noted for our Lord's interview with two disciples on the day of his resurrection (Luke xxiv, 13). The same place is mentioned by Josephus (*War*, vii, 6, 6), and placed at the same distance from Jerusalem, in stating that Vespasian left 800 soldiers in Judea, to whom he gave the village of *Ammis* (Ἐμμαούε). The direction, however, is not given in either passage. Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v. Ἐμμαούε, Emmaus) hold that it is identical with *Nicopolis* [see No. 2, below]; and they were followed by all geographers down to the commencement

of the 14th century (Reland, *Palest.* p. 758). Then, for some reason, it began to be supposed that the site of Emmaus was at the little village of *Kubeibeh*, about 3 miles W. of Neby Samwil, the eminence N.W. of Jerusalem (Maundeville, in *Early Travels in Palestine*, p. 175; Ludolph, de Suchem, *Itiner.*; Quaresmius, ii, 719; Robinson, *Bib. Res.* iii, 66, note). Mr. Williams regards *Kariet el-Enab* as the true location (*Journal of Philology*, iv, 26), and Thomson inclines to the same position (*Land and Book*, ii, 308); but this view has little to recommend it, and the locality is otherwise appropriated. See KILJATIS-JEARIM. Schwarz thinks it different from Nicopolis, and that it is mentioned in the Talmud as *Barur Chayil* (בְּרֻר חַיִּיל, i. e. *chosen of the army*) or *Gibbor Chayil* (גִּבּוֹר חַיִּיל, i. e. *heroes of the army*, as being occupied by Roman veterans), a name that he finds in "some ruins which the Arabs call *Barbariā*, S. of Saris, 7½ Eng. miles from Jerusalem" (*Palest.* p. 117, 118); but no such name appears on Van de Velde's *Map* (which lays down Saris at 7 miles N. of W. from Jerusalem). In this uncertainty, the monkish identification with el-Kubeibeh ("the little dome") may for the present be acquiesced in. This corresponds sufficiently in distance from Jerusalem (Raumer, *Paläst.* p. 169), being 7500 paces (Cotovicus, p. 315), or 2½ hours to the N.W. (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 309); and containing the ruins of a convent and church (Tobler, *Topograph. von Jerus.* ii, 540), although Dr. Robinson describes it (*Bib. Res.* ii, 394) as "a village built up by the government of Gaza on a stony, barren hill, without anything to mark it particularly as an ancient site." On the evangelical incident at this place there are treatises in Latin by Harenberg (in his *Olia Gandersh.* p. 41-60); Waleh (Jen. 1754). Zschokke (*Das neueste. Emmaus beleuchtet*, Schaffh, 1865) argues at length in favor of the modern traditional site; and the chief building on the spot, known as the "castrum Arnoldi," has lately been bought by some zealous Catholics as a "holy place" (*Bibliotheca Saera*, July, 1866, p. 517).

2. EMMAUS (Ἐμμαούε, 1 Macc. iii, 40, etc.; Ἀμμαούε, Josephus, *War*, ii, 20, 4) or NICOPOLIS, a town in the plain of Philistia, at the foot of the mountains of Judah (Jerome, in *Dan.* viii), 22 Roman miles from Jerusalem, and 10 from Lydda (*Itin. Hieros.* ed. Hessel, p. 600; Reland, *Palest.* p. 309). The name does not occur in the O. T.; but the town rose to importance during the later history of the Jews, and was a place of note in the wars of the Asmonæans. It was fortified by Bacehides, the general of Antiochus Epiphanes, when he was engaged in the war with Jonathan Maccabæus (Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 1, 3; 1 Macc. ix, 50). It was in the plain beside this city that Judas Maccabæus so signally defeated the Syrians with a mere handful of men, as related in 1 Macc. iii, 57; iv, 3; ix, 50. Under the Romans, Emmaus became the capital of a topharchy (Josephus, *War*, iii, 3, 5; Pliny, v, 14). It was burned by the Roman general Varus about A.D. 4. In the 3d century (about A.D. 220) it was rebuilt through the exertions of Julius Africanus, the well-known Christian writer, and then received the name *Nicopolis*. Eusebius and Jerome frequently refer to it in defining the positions of neighboring towns and villages (*Chron. Pas.* ad A.C. 223; Reland, p. 759). Early writers mention a fountain at Emmaus, famous far and wide for its healing virtues (Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* v, 21); the cause of this Theophanes ascribes to the fact that our Lord on one occasion washed his feet in it (*Chron.* p. 41). The Crusaders still called it Nicopolis, but confounded it with a small fortress farther south, on the Jerusalem road, now called Iatrôn (Will. Tyr. *Hist.* vii, 24). A small, miserable village called *Ammis* still occupies the site of the ancient city. It stands on the western declivity of a low, rocky hill commanding the plain, and contains the ruins of an old church a little south of the village, also two copi-

ous fountains, one of which is doubtless the ancient medicinal spring (Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 363; *Later Res.* p. 146, 147; Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 290).

Dr. Robinson has recently revived the old theory that the Emmaus of Luke is identical with Nicopolis, and has supported it with his wonted learning, but not with his wonted conclusiveness (*Bib. Res.* iii, 65, 66; *Later Res.* p. 148). He endeavors to cast doubts on the accuracy of the reading *Ἐμμαύρα* in Luke xxiv, 13, because several uncial MSS. and a few unimportant cursive MSS. insert *ἱκατόν*, thus making the distance 160 stadia, which would nearly correspond to the distance of Nicopolis. But the best MSS. have not this word, and the best critics regard it as an interpolation. There is a strong probability that some copyist who was acquainted with the city, but not the village of Emmaus, tried thus to reconcile Scripture with his ideas of geography. The opinions of Eusebius, Jerome, and their followers, on a point such as this, are not of very great authority. When the *name* of any noted place agreed with one in the Bible they were not always careful to see whether the *position* corresponded in like manner. Emmaus-Nicopolis being a noted city in their day, they were led somewhat rashly to confound it with the Emmaus of the Gospel. The circumstances of the narrative are plainly opposed to the identity. The two disciples, having journeyed from Jerusalem to Emmaus in part of a day (Luke xxiv, 28, 29), left the latter again after the evening meal, and reached Jerusalem before it was very late (*ver.* 33, 42, 43). Now, if we take into account the distance, and the nature of the road, leading up a steep and difficult mountain, we must admit that such a journey could not be accomplished in less than from six to seven hours, so that they could not have arrived in Jerusalem till long past midnight. This fact seems conclusive against the identity of Nicopolis and the Emmaus of Luke (Reland, *Palæst.* p. 427 sq.; Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 309).—Smith, s. v.

3. The name Emmaus, or Ammaus (*Ἀμμαούς*), was also borne by a village of Galilee close to Tiberias; probably the ancient *ἩΜΜΑΥΗ* (q. v.), i. e. hot springs—of which name Emmaus was but a corruption. The hot springs still remained in the time of Josephus, and are mentioned by him as giving name to the place (*War.* iv, 1, 3; *Ant.* xviii, 2, 3).

**Em'mer** (*Ἐμμέρ*), given (1 Esdr. ix, 21) as the name of one of the priests whose "sons" had married foreign wives after the exile, in place of the *EMMER* (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra x, 20).

**Emmeran** or **Emmeram**, a bishop of Poitiers in the 7th century. He left his see for the purpose of missionary labors in Hungary, but is said to have stopped in Bavaria three years, at the request of duke Theodo, to purify the Christianity of that duchy, where it was sadly mixed with paganism. After this he continued his journey to Rome, and was waylaid and murdered by a son of the duke (Sept. 22, 652), because the daughter of the latter, Uta, claimed to have been dishonored by Emmeran. After his death, a clergyman, Wulfaich by name, maintained the innocence of Emmeran, saying that the latter, shortly before his death, had told him that, in order to help Uta, he had allowed her to name him as seducer, though the real culprit was Sieghart, the son of a judge. This statement of Wulfaich is said to have induced Theodo to bury him with great honors, and to exile his son to Hungary. Emmeran was soon venerated as a saint, and became one of the patron saints of the city and diocese of Ratibon. He is commemorated in the Church of Rome on the 22d of September. On pictures he is represented as a bishop with a ladder. The accounts of Emmeran are very confused and conflicting; the best one is given by Canisius, *Lectiones Antiquæ*, iii, 1. See Neander, *Ch. Hist.* iii, 39; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iii, 779; Wetzler u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 558.

**Emmons**, NATHANAEL, D.D., one of the founders of a new school in Calvinistic theology, was born April 20 (O. S.), 1745, at East Haddam, Conn., a town which was also the birthplace of the missionary brothers David and John Brainard, of President Edward Dorr Griffin and his brother George D. Griffin, Esq., of the jurist Jeremiah Gates Brainard and the poet James Brainard Taylor. He was the sixth son, and the twelfth and youngest child of his parents. He entered Yale College in 1763, and was graduated with honor in 1767. Among his classmates were Gov. John Treadwell, the poet John Trumbull, Professor Samuel Wales, and Dr. Joseph Lyman, who, as long as they lived, exhibited a high degree of reverence for Dr. Emmons. He studied theology first with Rev. Nathan Strong, of Coventry, Conn., and afterwards with Rev. Dr. John Smalley, of Berlin, Conn., a divine who had been a pupil of Dr. Joseph Bellamy, and who exerted more influence than perhaps any other man in shaping the theological opinions of young Emmons.—In 1769 Emmons was approbated as a preacher, and not on the 20th of April, 1773, was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church in Franklin, Mass. He remained sole pastor of this church fifty-four years, and an active member of it sixty-seven years and five months. Among the members of the council which ordained him were his two special friends, Rev. Dr. Hopkins, of Newport, R. L., and Rev. Dr. Hart, of Preston, Conn., a son-in-law of Dr. Bellamy. During his active pastorate at Franklin he was favored with three revivals of religion, one in 1784, one in 1794, and one in 1808-9. In the first of these revivals about seventy persons, in the second about thirty, and in the third about forty were thought to have consecrated themselves to Christ. One of his aphorisms was, "The seed which a faithful laborer sows is apt to come up when he retires from the field;" and as soon as Dr. Emmons was relieved of his sole pastorate at Franklin, he was gladdened by a fourth revival, in which thirty-six persons were added to his church, and after nine or ten years he rejoiced in a fifth ingathering of the fruits which he had planted. He lived to see nearly four hundred of his parishioners profess their faith in Christ. One of them, Rev. Dr. Blake, has recorded: "Hardly a case of defection from the truth has ever occurred among those who were turned unto God under Dr. Emmons's ministry." His examinations of candidates for church-membership were very rigid.—A large part of his influence on the churches has been exerted through his theological pupils. Between eighty-six and a hundred young men were guided by him in their studies preparatory to the Christian ministry. Of these pupils several became useful as professors in our colleges and theological seminaries; many, as sound and strong preachers. Forty-six of them are noticed in the biographical dictionaries of eminent men. His impress upon them was decided and permanent. They were often called Emmonites.—Although he was an adept in metaphysical abstractions, yet he aimed to be a practical man, not only in his influence on his pupils, but also in the general affairs of the Church and the State. He was the first president, and a father, if not the father of the Massachusetts Missionary Society, which was the parent of many philanthropic institutions. He was also one of the original editors of the *Massachusetts Missionary Magazine*, which was the germ of the present *Missionary Herald*. He was among the foremost in starting various trains of influence which have now become parts of our history. When the masonic fraternity was most popular, he was a zealous anti-mason. When anti-slavery was most generally denounced, he was an active abolitionist. It was often his lot to be an advocate of the weaker party. He was a decided Federalist in politics, and produced a great excitement by some of his political writings. He seldom visited his parishioners, still he was remarkable for his knowledge of their

secular as well as religious affairs. He was a man of authority in his parish, faithful, often stern, yet beloved.—It is as an author, however, that he has exerted his greatest influence on the churches. He published during his life more than seven thousand copies of nearly two hundred sermons, besides four elaborate dissertations and more than a hundred essays for the magazines of his day. He must have preached nearly or quite six thousand times, and at his death a part only of his discourses were collected and published in six octavo volumes; to these a seventh volume was afterwards added. At a still subsequent period a new and enlarged edition of his sermons was published in six volumes. The first edition of his works was introduced with a memoir by his son-in-law, Rev. Jacob Ide, D.D., of Medway, Mass.; the second edition with a memoir by E. A. Park, of Andover, Mass.—He began to study in 1762; he ceased to preach in 1827; during these sixty-five years he was an earnest, patient, and singularly methodical applicant to books. During ten of the years which followed his resignation of his active pastorate he continued to be an assiduous reader, although he relaxed his habits of intense energetic study. It may be safely affirmed, then, that he devoted seventy-five years to the perusal of books, the meditation on their contents, and the writing on themes suggested by them. He was accustomed to spend ten, twelve, or fourteen hours daily in his room with his book or pen in hand. He had a place for everything, and kept everything in its place. He was temperate in his diet, regular in all his habits, and, although he took no physical exercise, he enjoyed uninterrupted health during his long and laborious life. He was distinguished for his punctuality, precision, definiteness, and sharpness of mind, keen analysis, self-consistency, wit, frankness, honesty, profound reverence for the truth. He was tenacious of old usages, and went so far as to continue to wear the antique dress, even the three-cornered hat, as long as he appeared in public. He was an original thinker, and formed his theological system with rare independence of mind. He coincided in opinion with Dr. Samuel Hopkins, of Newport, more nearly than with any preceding divine. A sketch of his theological system will be given in the subsequent notice of Dr. Hopkins. It may be here remarked, however, that he considered himself not a *high*, nor a *low*, but a *consistent* Calvinist; and, so far as his speculations were novel, they were mainly designed to make the Genexan scheme consistent with itself. On one Sabbath, for instance, he would use so bold language in advocating the doctrine of decrees as might induce some to call him a Fatalist; and on a following Sabbath he would use so bold language in advocating the doctrine of free-will as might induce some to call him a Pelagian; and on a third Sabbath he would employ his ingenuity in reconciling his statements on the agency of God with his statements on the free agency of man. This ingenuity in harmonizing such views as are often pronounced irreconcilable, was a main source of the interest excited in him.—Dr. Emmons died on the 23d of September, 1840, at the age of ninety-five years and five months. He retained his faculties to a surprising degree until his death, and few men have ever left the world with a more unflinching and solid faith in Christ.—In 1775 he was married to his first wife, who, with her two children, died in 1778. In 1779 he was married to his second wife, by whom he had five children, two of whom survived him. She was the step-daughter of Rev. Dr. Samuel Hopkins, of Hadley, Mass., and thus he became the brother-in-law of Rev. Dr. Spring, of Newburyport, Mass., Rev. Dr. Austin, president of Burlington College, Rev. Leonard Worcester, and Rev. Mr. Riddell, four strong Hopkinsian divines. In 1831, when he was eighty-six years of age, he was married to his third wife, the widow of his former friend, Rev. Mr. Mills, of Sutton, Mass. (E. A. P.)

**Em'mor** ('Εμμόρ v. r. 'Εμμόρ), a Græcized form (Acts vii, 16) of the name of ΗΑΜΟΡ (q. v.), the father of Shechem (Gen. xxxiv, 2).

**Emperor** (Lat. *imperator, general*), a title common (in its Lat. form) to all governors who had paramount jurisdiction within a given province (Smith, *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s. v. Imperium), but technically assumed as a prænomen first by Julius Cæsar (Sueton. *Jul.* 76), as affecting supreme power, and historically attributed to his successors, the heads of the so-styled ROMAN EMPIRE (q. v.). They were also designated as CÆSAR (q. v.). We are here chiefly concerned with them as they came in contact with the Christian religion in the character of persecutors or patrons. See PERSECUTION. (See Baldwin, *Edicta vet. principum Roman. de Christianis*, Hal. 1727 [also in Heineccii *Jurispr. Rom. i.*, 374 sq.]; Crause, *De Romanorum imperatoribus hæreticis*, Ziz. 1674; Hebenstreit, *De primis Christianis imperatoribus*, Jen. 1702; Heineccius, *De ministris Cæsarum Christianis*, Hal. 1712; also Hirt, *De imperatorum ante Constant. erga Christianos favore*, Jen. 1758; Koepke, *De statu Christianorum sub imp. Berol.* 1828).

The following is a complete list of the Roman emperors, with their respective dates of accession. See each name of ecclesiastical interest in its alphabetical place.

B.C.	A.D.	A.D.
31. Augustus.	363. Jovian.	842. Michael III.
A. D.	<i>Western Empire.</i>	867. Basil I.
14. Tiberius.	364. Valentinian I.	886. Leo VI.
37. Caligula.	367. Gratian.	911. Constantine VII.
41. Claudius I.	375. Valentinian II.	919. Alexander.
54. Nero.	392. Theodosius I.	944. Constantine VIII.
68. Galba.	395. Honorius.	944. Stephanus.
69. Otho.	423. Theodosius II.	959. Romanus II.
69. Vitellius.	425. Valentinian III.	963. Nicephorus II.
76. Vespasian.	455. Petronius.	969. John I.
76. Titus.	455. Avitus.	969. Basil II.
81. Domitian.	457. Majorian.	976. Constantine IX.
96. Nerva.	461. Libius.	1028. Romanus III.
98. Trajan.	467. Anthemius.	1024. Michael IV.
117. Hadrian.	472. Olybrius.	1041. Michael V.
138. Antoninus.	473. Glycerius.	1042. Zoe and Theodora.
161. M. Aurelius.	474. Julius.	1042. Constantine X.
161. Lucius Verus.	475. Romulus.	1054. Theodora.
180. Commodus.	<i>Eastern Empire.</i>	1056. Michael VI.
193. Pertinax.	364. Valens.	1057. Isaac I.
193. Julian.	378. Theodosius I.	1059. Constantine XI.
193. Niger.	385. Arcadius.	1067. Romanus IV.
193. Severus.	408. Theodosius II.	1071. Michael VII.
211. Caracalla.	408. Marcian.	1078. Nicephorus III.
211. Geta.	457. Leo I.	1081. Alexis I.
217. Macrinus.	474. Leo II.	1118. John II.
218. Elagabalus.	474. Zeno.	1143. Manuel I.
222. Alexander.	491. Anastasius.	1181. Alexis II.
235. Maximin I.	518. Justin I.	1183. Andronicus I.
237. Gordian.	527. Justinian I.	1185. Isaac II.
237. Maximus.	565. Justin II.	1195. Alexis III.
237. Balbinus.	578. Tiberius II.	1203. Alexis IV.
238. Gordian, jun.	582. Mauricius.	1204. Alexis V.
244. Philipp.	602. Phocas.	<i>Latin Emperors of Constantinople.</i>
249. Decius.	610. Heraclius I.	1204. Baldwin I.
251. Gallus.	641. Constantine or Heraclius II.	1206. Henry.
252. Volusian.	641. Heraclonas.	1217. Peter.
253. Emilian.	641. Constans II.	1221. Robert.
253. Marian.	668. Constantine IV.	1228. Baldwin II.
253. Valerian.	685. Justinian II.	<i>Greek Emperors of Nicæa.</i>
256. Gallienus.	695. Leontius.	1206. Theodoros I.
260. Claudius II.	698. Absimarns.	1222. John III.
270. Quintillus.	704. Justinian III.	1255. Theodoros II.
270. Aurelian.	711. Philippicus.	1259. John IV.
275. Tacitus.	713. Anastasius II.	1260. Michael VIII.
276. Florianus.	716. Theodosius III.	<i>Greek Emperors of Constantinople.</i>
277. Probus.	717. Leo III.	1261. Michael VIII.
282. Carus.	741. Constantine V [Artavasdes].	
283. Carinus.	775. Leo IV.	
283. Numerianus.	780. Constantine VI.	
284. Diocletian.	797. Irene.	
286. Maximian.	802. Nicephorus.	
292. Constantius.	811. Stauracius.	
292. Galerius.	811. Michael I.	
305. Valerius.	813. Leo V.	
305. Maximin II.	820. Michael II.	
306. Constantine.	829. Theophilus.	
307. Licinius.		
307. Constantine, jun.		
337. Constantius.		
337. Constans.		
361. Julian, apostate.		

A.D. 1283. Andronicus II.	A.D. 1322. Andronicus III.	A.D. 1384. Manuel II. 1425. John VII.
1294. Michael IX.	1341. John V. 1347. John VI.	1445. Constantine XIII.

**Emory, John, D.D.**, a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Queen Anne County, Maryland, April 11, 1789. After completing his academical education at Washington College, he studied law, and was admitted to the bar at nineteen years of age. His great ability was soon manifest; he came rapidly into practice, and had every prospect of early success. But he had passed through a decided religious experience before his admission to the bar, and soon after decided, in opposition to the will of his father, to enter the ministry. In 1810 he was received on trial in the Philadelphia Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. He soon established a reputation for pre-eminence in all the qualities of a true Christian minister. From 1813 to 1824 he filled the most important pastoral stations in the Methodist Connection in America, his appointments being as follows: 1811, Cambridge Circuit; 1812, Talbot Circuit; 1813-14, Philadelphia; 1815, Wilmington; 1816-17, Union Church, Philadelphia; 1818-19, Washington; 1820-21, Annapolis; 1822, Hagerstown; 1823, Baltimore. In 1816 he was elected to the General Conference, and he was a member of every subsequent General Conference until his death, except that of 1824. In 1820 he was sent as a delegate from the American to the British Conference, and discharged the delicate duties of his mission to the entire satisfaction of the churches. From 1824 to 1832 he was book-agent and editor for the Methodist Episcopal Church at New York. In this post his rare combination of intellectual power and culture with business habits was pre-eminently displayed. To none of the eminent men who have held this office is the Methodist Book Concern more indebted for its present greatness than to Dr. Emory. In the language of Bishop Waugh, "The two great objects which Dr. Emory aimed to accomplish were, first, the extinguishment of the debts due from the concern, and, second, the actual sale of the stock on hand, and especially that part of it which was daily depreciating, because of the injuries which were constantly being sustained by it, in the scattered and exposed state in which most of it was found. The ability, skill, diligence, and perseverance which he displayed in the measures devised by him for the accomplishment of these objects have seldom been equaled, and perhaps never surpassed by the most practiced business man. His success was complete. Before the meeting of the General Conference he had canceled all the obligations of the institution which had been so opportunely intrusted to his supervision. He had greatly enlarged the annual dividends to an increased number of conferences. He had purchased several lots of ground for a more enlarged and eligible location of the establishment, and had erected a large four story brick building as a part of the improvements intended to be put on them, for the whole of which he had paid. It was his high honor, and also his enviable satisfaction, to report to the General Conference, for the first time, that its Book Concern was no longer in debt." He originated the "Publishing Fund" and "The Methodist Quarterly Review," and abolished entirely the sale of books on commission.

In 1832 he was elected a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and entered upon his duties at once, not only by attending the annual Conferences, but also by general attention to the interests of the Church. He was especially active with regard to education, and had a large share in the organization of Dickinson College. In addition to this, he drew up the outline of a plan for an education society in the Methodist Episcopal Church, which he designed to aid ministers and others in educating their sons. Soon after his election

to the episcopacy Dr. Emory devised a course of study for candidates for deacons' and elders' orders, in which, with his usual discretion, he did not hazard everything by attempting too much. The Troy Conference of 1835 was the last which he attended. On the 16th of December in that year he was thrown from his carriage, about two miles from his own house (Reisterstown, Md.), at seven o'clock A.M., and at half past seven in the evening he died.

Bishop Emory was a man of great talent and large cultivation. As a scholar, he was accurate and profound; as a preacher, he was clear and convincing; as an administrative officer, he hardly had a superior in any church. As a controversial writer, he was distinguished for logical directness and for fairness to his adversaries. In 1817 he published two pamphlets in reply to bishop White's *Objections against Personal Assurance by the Holy Spirit*; and in 1818, another, entitled *The Divinity of Christ vindicated against the Cavils of Mr. John Wright*. The period from 1818 to 1830 was one of great excitement in the Methodist Episcopal Church on various points of Church polity, and in all the controversy Dr. Emory bore a distinguished part. A large party wished to have the office of presiding elder made elective; he fell into the ranks of that party, and, at the General Conference of 1820, he opposed vigorously a theory which gave the bishops a right to veto the acts of the General Conference. In the later conferences as to lay representation he was the principal writer, publishing, in 1824, *The Defence of our Fathers*, in reply to A. McCaine, a very vigorous and powerfully written work. After his death there appeared from his pen *The Episcopal Controversy Reviewed* (New York, 1838, 8vo), edited by his son, Robert Emory, from an unpublished manuscript; it is a luminous sketch, in reply to bishop Onderdonk's *Episcopacy tested by Scripture*. Most of the original articles in the first two volumes of the *Methodist Quarterly Review* were written by him.—*Life of Bishop Emory*, by his eldest son (N. Y. 1840, 8vo); M'Clintock, in *Methodist Quarterly Review*, 1842, p. 62 sq.; Sprague, *Annals*, vii, 486; Stevens, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, vol. iv.

**Emory, Robert, D.D.**, son of the preceding, an eminent Methodist minister and scholar, was born in Philadelphia, July 29, 1814. His early education was superintended by his father. In 1827 he entered Columbia College, New York, where he graduated in 1831 with the highest honors and medals of his class. He then entered upon the study of law, first in the law school of Yale College, and afterwards in the office of the Hon. Reverdy Johnson, of Baltimore. In 1834 he was elected professor of ancient languages at Dickinson College, Carlisle, and entered upon his duties there with great zeal. In 1839 he was admitted on trial in the Baltimore Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church; in 1841 he was appointed to the Baltimore city station; and in 1842 he was appointed acting president of Dickinson College, during the absence of the president (Dr. Durbin). In 1844 he was appointed presiding elder of the Carlisle District; and in 1845 he was made president of Dickinson College. In the same year the degree of D.D. was conferred upon him by Columbia College. In 1847 he attended the session of the Evangelical Alliance held at London, and few of the delegates made a greater impression upon the body. His health showed signs of failure during this year, and he spent the winter following in the West Indies. But he continued to decline, and on his return homeward he died in Baltimore, May 18, 1848. Dr. Emory was one of those rare men in whom the human faculties, both moral and intellectual, seem to approach perfection, and to reach almost complete harmony of action. His classical scholarship was thorough and accurate; his mind was at once logical and comprehensive, and his general culture was wide and generous. His religious experience was, in many re-

pects, similar to that of President Edwards, and ripened into similar fullness and serenity. As a preacher he was luminous, earnest, and successful. As a college officer he was seldom rivaled. "His power of government was unsurpassed; he seemed born to command. In him prudence and independence met to form that rare combination so essential to one who rules. This remark finds its illustration and proof in his government of the college, to whose interests he devoted so much of his brief earthly life. While he shrunk from no responsibility of his position, he was still careful to maintain that position by devising the best means to meet responsibility. Though many felt the weight of the sceptre in his hand, yet the conviction that it was wielded by a strong man, and in the fear of the Lord, conciliated esteem. As president of the college, as in every other position, he rose rapidly, both before the public and in the college; and the last year in which his name appeared in connection with that office was the most prosperous in the history of the institution. The students honored him even to reverence, and regarded him as standing on a moral and intellectual eminence toward which the indolent and unworthy must not even look, and to which the noblest and best among them ought eagerly to aspire." In 1841 he published *A Life of the Rev. John Emory, D.D.* (N. Y. 8vo); in 1843, an elaborate *History of the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church* (N. Y. 12mo). He left unfinished an *Analysis of Butler's Analogy*, which was completed by the Rev. G. R. Crooks, D.D. (N. Y. Harpers, 1856, 8vo), and which is the best analysis of the *Analogy* that has ever appeared.—*Minutes of Conferences*, 1849; Sprague, *Annals*, vii, 828.

**Emotion** (*emoreo*, to move out) "is often used as synonymous with feeling. Strictly taken, it means 'a state of feeling which, while it does not spring directly from an affection of body, manifests its existence and character by some sensible effect upon the body.' An *emotion* differs from a *sensation* by its not originating in a state of body; and from a *cognition*, by its being pleasurable or painful. Emotions, like other states of feeling, imply knowledge. Something beautiful or deformed, sublime or ridiculous, is known and contemplated; and on the contemplation springs up the appropriate feeling, followed by the characteristic expression of countenance, or attitude, or manner. In themselves considered, emotions can scarcely be called springs of action. 'The feelings of beauty, grandeur, and whatever else is comprehended under the name of taste, do not lead to action, but terminate in delightful contemplation, which constitutes the essential distinction between them and the moral sentiments, to which, in some points of view, they may doubtless be likened' (Mackintosh, *Dissert.* p. 238). Emotions tend rather, while they last, to fix attention on the objects or occurrences which have excited them. In many instances, however, *emotions* are succeeded by desires to obtain possession of the objects which awaken them, or to remove ourselves from the presence of such objects. When an *emotion* is thus succeeded by some degree of desire, it forms, according to Lord Kames, a *passion*, and becomes, according to its nature, a powerful and permanent spring of action. Emotions, then, are awakened through the medium of the intellect, and are varied and modified by the conception we form of the objects to which they refer. Emotions manifest their existence and character by sensible effects upon the body. Emotions, in themselves and by themselves, lead to quiescence and contemplation rather than activity; but they combine with springs of action, and give to them a character and a coloring. What is said to be done from surprise or shame has its proper spring—the surprise or shame being concomitant" (Dr. Chalmers, *Sketches of Mental and Moral Philosophy*, p. 88).—Fleming, *Vocabulary of Philosophy*, s. v.

**Empedocles**, an ancient philosopher of Agrigen-

tum, "distinguished himself by his knowledge of natural history and medicine, and his talents for philosophical poetry. It is generally believed that he perished, in the crater of *Ætna*. Some suppose him to have been a disciple of Pythagoras or Archytas (Diog. Laert. viii, 54 sq.); others, of Parmenides. He cannot have been an immediate scholar of the first, inasmuch as Aristotle (*Met.* i, 3) represents him as contemporary with, but younger than Anaxagoras, and because he appears to have been the master of Gorgias. His philosophy, which he described in a didactic poem, of which only fragments have come down to us, combined the elements of various systems, most nearly approaching that of Pythagoras and Heraclitus, but differing from the latter, principally, 1. Inasmuch as Empedocles more expressly recognises four elements, earth, water, air, and fire: these elements (compare his system, in this respect, with that of Anaxagoras) he affirmed not to be *simple* in their nature, and assigned the most important place to fire. 2. Besides the principle of concord (*φιλία*), opposed to that of discord (*νῆκος*) (the one being the source of union and good, the other of their opposites), he admitted into his system *necessity* also, to explain existing phenomena. To the first of these principles he attributed the original composition of the elements. The material world (*σφαῖρος, πῦμα*) he believed, as a whole, to be divine, but in the *sublunary* portion of it he detected a considerable admixture of evil and imperfection. He taught that at some future day all things must again sink into chaos. He advanced a subtle and scarcely intelligible theory of the active and passive affections of things (comp. Plato, *Menon*. ed. Steph. p. 76. C. D.; Arist. *De Gener. et Corr.* i, 8; *Fragm. ap. Sturz.* v, 117), and drew a distinction between the world as presented to our senses (*κόσμος αἰσθητός*), and that which he presumed to be the type of it, the intellectual world (*κόσμος νοητός*). He looked for the principle of life in fire, admitting, at the same time, the existence of a Divine Being pervading the universe. From this superior intelligence he believed the *dæmones* to emanate, to whose nature the human soul is allied. Man is a fallen *dæmon*. There will be a return to unity, a transmigration of souls, and a change of forms. The soul he defined to consist in a combination of the four elements (because cognition depends upon the similarity of the subject and object), and its seat he pronounced to be principally the blood" (Tennemann, *Manual Hist. Phil.* § 106). Lewes differs from all other historians respecting the place occupied by Empedocles, making his system to include elements from the Pythagorean, Eleatic, Heraclitic, and Anaxagorean systems (*History of Philosophy*, Lond. 1867, 2 vols. 8vo, i, 89 sq.). See Sturz, *Empedocles Agrigentinus, De Vita et Philosophiæ ejus exposit.* *Carminum Reliquias ex Antiquis Scripturis collectas, recensitas, illustravit Fr. Guil. Sturz* (Lips. 1865, 8vo); J. G. Neumann *Prog. de Empedocle Philosopho* (Viteb. 1750, fol.); Lomnatzsch, *Die Weisheit des Emped.* (Berlin, 1830); Stein, *Emped. Agrigent. fragment.* (Bonn, 1852); Winnefeld, *Die Philosophie des Emped.* (Rastadt, 1862); Steinhart, in Ersch und Gruber, *Allgem. Encyclop.* s. v. Empedocles.

**Empiricism, Empirism, Empiric.** Empiricism, in its primary meaning, signifies the method or habit of judging from observation or trial; and an empiric is one who forms his conclusions in this manner. Empiricism may thus be employed to denote either inductive reasoning, in which observation and experiment furnish the data for the conclusions drawn by the reason, or that unscientific mode of procedure which accepts the phenomena as they are observed, without analysis or accurate determination. In the former case the term is used in a good sense, and is equivalent to experimental science; in the latter it is used in a bad sense, and this is its ordinary employment.

The relation of experience to science, and to art

or practice, is precisely exhibited by Aristotle in the opening chapter of his *Metaphysics*; but the peculiar terseness of the Aristotelian phraseology renders expansion and restatement of his positions necessary, in order to adapt them to modern views.

Art, or systematic action, is founded upon observation, but upon observation reduced to theory, or to consonance with theory. That is to say, observation furnishes the facts, but they must be co-ordinated and interpreted in order to constitute valid knowledge (science), or a reliable rule of action (art). If the observations be indistinct or perplexed, or if they be not sufficiently numerous to establish a general conclusion, or if a general conclusion be drawn prematurely, the induction is deceptive, and obnoxious to the censures passed by Lord Bacon upon the simple enumeration of examples (*Nov. Org.* i, aph. lxxix, cv; *Instaur. S. l. Int.* tom. ix, p. 146; *Dist. Op.* p. 167, ed. Montagu). The true nature of the induction required is briefly stated by Campanella: "Inductio est argumentatio a partibus sufficienter enumeratis ad sum totum universale." What is a sufficient exposition of the particulars may be learned from the *Second Book of the Novum Organon*, or more satisfactorily from Whewell's *Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences*, Comte's *Political Philosophy*, and Mill's *Logic*.

When the observations are sufficiently multiplied and varied, and when they have been analyzed and sifted so as to eliminate all illusions, and everything which does not bear distinctly upon the point under consideration, then they justify a definite conclusion. This is the "*multiplicatio et vividitas instantiarum*" so strenuously urged by Lord Bacon. But, even in this case, the general experience authorizes a universal conclusion only by assuming a law latent under each of the concordant instances by which all are governed. In establishing or accepting the conclusion there is need for the introduction of a purely rational element—if none other, at least the principle that nature acts uniformly, and that what is true of all observed instances is true of all similar phenomena. Thus theory is needed to permit and to complete induction, or inference from observation.

This accumulation, collation, and appreciation of instances is disregarded by undisciplined and impatient minds. A few recurrences loosely noted, or a single undigested observation, is made the foundation for a universal conclusion, without reference to any rational principle. The designation derived from experience and inquiry is still retained, but, in consequence of want of validity in the process, and of method, reliability, and rationality in the corresponding practice, it receives an unfavorable import, and empiricism commonly denotes that mode of reasoning which is based upon hasty and inadequate observation, and which neglects scientific principle and scientific precision.

This exposition of the derivation and deflection of the meaning is illustrated and confirmed by the history of the term. In the middle of the 3d century before Christ a revolution in medical practice was inaugurated by Philinus of Cos and Serapion of Alexandria. They revolted against the maxims of the Dogmatists, and repudiated the course pursued by the Methodists of treating all cases of disease according to fixed theoretical rules. They observed the symptoms of disorders, and the specific effects of remedial agents; they considered the idiosyncrasies of their patients as affected by climates and localities; and they employed the therapeutics which had been found effectual in analogous instances. They recognised three kinds of experience: chance, experiment, and imitation, but relied principally upon the last, which is a sort of blind observation. They thus introduced into medical practice the whole train of inductive reasoning, and were in consequence designated Empirics. The school flourished for nearly five centuries, and its duration attests its merit and success. It had started, however, with

sundry hazardous hypotheses, such as the doctrine of Homeopathy, and in its best period had trusted mainly to disguised analogies, which were usually obscure, and too often delusive. The Empirics rejected formal science; they contemned theoretical views and rational deductions, and thus drifted into close approximation to the Sceptics. Their original doctrine was an extravagance in the manner of its assertion, but it was a wholesome reaction against a more perilous excess. With the succession of generations, however, their cardinal principle of depending exclusively on observation was pushed so far as to engender the wildest fantasies. Hence no confidence could be placed in their treatment of diseases. It was thus that the term Empiricism received the opprobrious signification which is habitually attached to it. The meaning of a word is perpetuated in the last perversion which it has received from popular use.

The name originating in this way in the schools of medicine was readily transferred to the corresponding procedure in other departments of knowledge. Empiricism is opposed to science in the same way that a paralogism is opposed to a syllogism: it is the abuse, or the imperfect use of a procedure which is valid when correctly pursued. It is confused observation developed into unreliable induction. But the distortion of the process, and the consequent degradation of the word denoting the process, evince the partial agreement between empiricism and scientific reasoning. It becomes, therefore, expedient to point out more explicitly the relation which observation and experience bear to theory, or philosophical reasoning.

Science is the systematic co-ordination of observed facts, and the exhibition of their dependence upon general principles. Observation collects particulars, which should be compared and tested, so as to eliminate all discrepancies and all accidental agreements, and to disentangle from the complex phenomena the single point of positive and habitual concordance. When this is adequately achieved, the regular association of the facts under consideration is established. This, however, provides only what Bacon designates *axiomata media*—those inductions which ascertain the character and direct connections of the phenomena. A further generalization is required; these intermediate axioms must be traced to precise laws. Such is the nature and procedure of strict inductive science, with which empiricism is more immediately contrasted, though it arose originally out of the antagonism to dogmatic deduction. The empiric disregards these careful comparisons and gradual approximations, and leaps at once from loosely-observed data, from casual coincidences, or from a few disconnected instances to a general conclusion. He has no principle to restrain him, no recognised law for his guidance. From the absence of all certainty, and the consequent liability to error, empiricism has come to denote rash and ignorant generalization leading to hazardous and unreasoning applications.

Another important point demands attention. Certain phenomena are so complex and so inapprehensible by the processes of rigid observation, comparison, and experiment, that they scarcely admit of rigorously scientific treatment. Moreover, from the want of opportunity for applying the methods of science, and from the multiplicity of concurrent, interacting, and irregularly varying influences involved in the production of the result, scientific induction and philosophical deduction fail to include or to exclude everything which should be embraced or rejected. The subject either does not yet admit of scientific treatment, but must be governed by the suggestions of unanalyzed experience, or there is a large discordance between the scientific conclusions and the observed facts. In these cases the indications of experience cannot be disregarded, and the procedure, to be adopted, must be in greater or less measure empirical. History, politics,

social organization, agriculture, and many of the applications of physical science to human requirements demand, in a greater or less degree, this subordination of scientific results to observed facts. But the insufficiency of the procedure should be recognised; for empiricism, even in its most favorable form, is tentative and problematical, because it is the renunciation of the guidance of the reason, and the acceptance of imperfect or imperfectly-digested observation for the prescriptions of ascertained and immutable law. Empiricism is available only in *consimili casu*; and, as this exact similitude can never be assured, but is always precarious, it is necessarily attended with insecurity. If the conditions or concomitants vary so as to modify the result, it is a blind leader of the blind. The only protection in changed circumstances, or under novel conditions, is a knowledge of the general principles which govern the facts, and this knowledge is obtained only from science, inductive or deductive. Theory and experience have distinct but associated functions: theory is the abstract rationale of the phenomena; experience is their indiscriminating representation: theory degenerates into rash inexperience when not checked by careful observation; experience runs into wild and pernicious fantasies when not illuminated by speculative discernment. The two must be combined and conciliated in order to afford any absolute confidence in the rectitude of our conclusions, and the procedure founded thereon. If they be separated, and to the extent to which they are separated, experience is valid only in matters of mere routine; theory or science is always required under novel combinations. Theory, unregulated by experience, is arbitrary and capricious as experience unenlightened by reason, and misleads hopelessly, because it never awakens any suspicion of the possibility of error. But theory, which systematizes the conclusions drawn from an adequate range and degree of observation, furnishes guidance under all changes of circumstance; while empiricism only misleads and betrays in every case when it is necessary to deviate in any respect from a procedure already adopted and approved.

Empiricism is thus at all times an irrational procedure, though it may furnish a practical rule within a very limited sphere. Theory may beguile, in consequence of its imperfect constitution or rash application, but is always requisite to insure the recognition of established law, and obedience to the immutable prescriptions of reason in the individual or in the order of creation. An empirical procedure may often be indispensable, but, when most necessary, it is provisional only. A theoretical procedure may be demanded before adequate experience has been acquired, but this must be confirmed or reformed by the observation of facts. It is only when theory is sustained by facts, and facts are explained by theory, that knowledge becomes entirely trustworthy. Many departments of practical knowledge are not yet, and may never be, capable of thorough scientific organization. In these we must continue to be guided by empirical conclusions; but they are received, not because they are sufficient, but because nothing better is attainable. Empiricism is, therefore, always inadequate, and usually deceptive. (G. F. II.)

**Ems Congress**, a meeting of plenipotentiaries of the archbishops of Mentz, Cologne, Treves, and Salzburg, held in the watering-place of Ems, in August, 1786, for the purpose of defining the rights belonging to bishops and archbishops, and of opposing the exorbitant demands of the papal nuncio. The agreement which was arrived at, and which consists of 23 articles, is called the Ems Punctuation. The archbishops of Germany, as well as the emperors, had long been dissatisfied with the endeavors made by the popes, under the pretext of securing the execution of the decrees of the Council of Trent, to steadily enlarge the rights of papal nuncios and legates in Germany at

the expense of the bishops. A serious conflict was brought on by the elector Karl Theodor of Bavaria, who, in order to supersede as much as possible the episcopal jurisdiction of other princes of the empire, such as the archbishops of Salzburg and Cologne, over his subjects, induced the Pope to appoint a papal nuncio at the court of Munich. The archbishop of Salzburg in 1785 requested the archbishop of Mentz, as primate of the German Catholic Church, to avert the new danger threatening the authority of the archbishops. The primate remonstrated in Rome, and his example was soon followed by the bishops of Eichstätt and Freising. But Pope Pius VI declared that the new nuncio in Munich, Zoglio, would be clothed with the same authority which had heretofore been exercised by the nuncio in Cologne. The archbishops of Mentz and Salzburg appealed to the emperor Joseph II for aid against this encroachment of the Pope upon their rights. The emperor replied, Oct. 12, 1785, that the Pope would at once be notified that the emperor would never allow an infringement upon the diocesan rights of the German bishops. Nevertheless, the new nuncio Zoglio made his appearance in Munich in March, 1786; informed all archbishops and bishops whose dioceses embraced part of Bavaria of his arrival; exercised all the prerogatives which the Pope claimed for his nuncios; and even appointed a sub-nuncio at Disseldorf. The archbishop of Cologne remonstrated against these proceedings to the emperor, and the latter ordered the elector Karl Theodor to forbid the nuncio the further exercise of functions which did not belong to him. At the same time, the archbishops of Cologne, Treves, Mentz, and Salzburg forbade their subjects to receive any orders from the nuncios of Munich and Cologne. In order to organize a combined resistance to the papal encroachments, the archbishop of Mentz invited the archbishops of Cologne, Treves, and Salzburg to send deputies to a congress to be held at Ems. The invitation was accepted, and accordingly the Ems congress met in August, 1786. It was composed of the assistant bishop Heimes, of Mentz, the official Beck, of Treves, the official Von Tautphæus, of Cologne, and the consistorial councillor Bönike, of Salzburg. These deputies, on the 25th of August, agreed upon the Ems Punctuation, the most important points of which are the following: 1. All those papal prerogatives and reservations which were unknown in the first centuries, but derived from the pseudo-Isidorian decretals, must now be abandoned. 2. The bishops, having received from Christ the power to bind and to loose, the persons living within their dioceses must not pass over their immediate ecclesiastical superiors in order to have recourse to Rome. No exemptions must any more be allowed except such as have been confirmed by the emperors. The members of monastic orders are forbidden to receive any orders from their generals, or any superiors living outside of Germany. 3. As the bishops have the power to grant dispensations, the so-called *facultates quinquennales* shall no longer be asked from the papal court; and the bulls, briefs, and rescripts of the popes, as well as all the declarations, rescripts, and orders of the Roman congregations, shall not be received in Germany without their express recognition by the bishops. 4. The nuncios shall have no ecclesiastical jurisdiction, but shall be merely ambassadors of the Pope.

The Punctuation, signed by the four archbishops, was sent to the emperor Joseph, who assured the archbishops of his assistance, but also declared, perhaps influenced by the nuncio Caprara at Vienna, that the execution would depend upon an agreement between the archbishop on the one hand, and the exempt, the suffragan bishops, and the government on the other. The papal party, in the mean while, endeavored to excite the jealousy of the bishops against the four archbishops, charging the latter with an intention of extending their rights at the expense of those of the



bishops. The archbishop of Mentz was in particular charged with a desire to establish a primate authority over all archbishops and bishops of Germany. Among the bishops who came forward to attack the Punctuation, those of Spire, Hildesheim, and Würzburg were prominent. Soon particular interests caused disagreement among the signers of the Punctuation. The archbishop of Mentz approached the Pope with a request to have baron von Dalberg appointed his coadjutor; the archbishop of Treves (1787) appealed to Rome for a renewal of the *facultates quinquennales*; and finally, in 1789, all the four archbishops declared that they desired a settlement of the controversy, and that they recognised the right of the Pope to send nuncios and to grant dispensations. The literature on the Congress and the Punctuation of Ems is very copious. The results of the congress were at once published in the work *Resultate des Ems Congresses* (Francf. 1787) [also in *Die neuesten Grundrissen der deutsch-kath. Kirchen-Verfassung*, Stuttgart, 1821]. The official reply of Rome is entitled *Responsio ad Metropolitanum Mogunt. Trevir. Colon. et Salisb. super Nuntiaturis* (Romæ, 1789). See also Neudecker, in Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iii, 784; Münch, *Gesch. des Ems Congresses*; Pacca (papal nuncio at Cologne), *Histor. Denkwürdigkeiten* (Augsburg, 1832); Stigloher, *Die Errichtung der päbstl. Nuntiatur in München und der Ems Congress* (Ratisbon, 1866). (A. J. S.)

**Emser**, HIERONYMUS, a Roman Catholic divine, and one of the most violent of Luther's opponents in the Reformation, was born at Ulm March 26, 1477. After having begun his studies at Tübingen, he went to continue them at Basle, where he applied himself to jurisprudence, theology, and Hebrew. He accompanied cardinal Raymond de Gurk, who had appointed him his chaplain and secretary, through Germany and Italy in 1500-1502. Some time after he became lecturer at Erfurt, which he quitted (1504) to reside at the University of Leipzig, where he taught canonical law. About the same time, George, duke of Saxony, took him as his private secretary. The duke, who had a desire to procure the canonization of bishop Benno, of Meissen, employed Emser to visit a number of convents, especially in Bohemia, to collect information concerning Benno; and in 1510 sent him to Rome. On his return from Rome he received from the duke two prebends, at Dresden and Meissen. About this time he also appears to have been consecrated a priest. His recovery from a severe sickness he ascribed to the intercession of bishop Benno, and was thereby induced to write a eulogy of him (*Divi Bennonis Vita*, Lips. 1512). With Luther, whose reformatory zeal had already begun to attract attention, Emser remained on good terms until the time of the Leipzig disputation (1519). Luther called him *Emser noster* (our Emser), and was kindly received by Emser when he had to preach before duke George at Dresden. The literary controversy between Emser and Luther commenced soon after the Leipzig disputation with a letter from Emser to Dr. Zack, provost at Leitmeritz, in which the opinion was expressed that Luther had nothing in common with the Bohemian Hussites, and an intimation was given that Luther was ready to abandon his reformatory views. As Emser, who was descended from a noble family, used in this letter his esutcheon, the forepart of a he-goat, Luther addressed his very bitter reply to the "Wild-goat Emser" (*ad Egocerotem Emseranum*, Wittenberg, 1519), and in his subsequent writings generally called him "the he-goat of Leipzig," or "He-goat Emser." In his reply, Emser called Luther's theology "novel and cynic," and represented Luther's reformatory labors as merely the result of the jealousy of the Augustinian monks against the Dominicans. Emser also attacked Carlstadt, Zwingle, Pickheimer, and other reformers; was soon joined by Eck, and thus helped to kindle a violent controversy all through Germany. In 1520 Lu-

ther burned Emser's writings along with the papal bull and the decretals. As Emser's works were almost wholly personal invectives, the interest in them soon ceased, and in the history of the Reformation they are of little significance. As duke George forbade Luther's translation of the Bible, Emser, in 1527, published another German translation made from the Vulgate. Emser branded Luther's version as a horrible corruption; but at present even the Roman Catholic writers of Germany acknowledge that Emser's version is of no value, and, in a literary point of view, greatly inferior to that of Luther. Emser died Nov. 8, 1527, where and how is not known. The titles of the numerous works of Emser may be found in Waldan, *Nachrichten von Emser's Leben und Schriften* (Auspach, 1783). See Neudecker, in Herzog, *Real-Encycl.* iii, 782; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xvi, 17. (A. J. S.)

**En-** (Heb. *Eyn-*, עַן, constr. of עַיִן, a fountain), a prefix to many names of places in Heb. (e. g. En-gedi, En-gamini, En-dor, En-haddah, En-hazor, En-harod, En-mishpah, En-eglaim, En-shemesh, En-rogel, Entannim [Neh. ii, 13], En-tappuah); all so called from a living spring in the vicinity; and corresponding to the Arabic prefix *Ain-* (Robinson, *Researches*, iii, 225), in which language, as also in the Syriac and Ethiopic, it has the same signification; in two instances (Josh. xxi, 16; Num. xxxiv, 11) it stands alone as the name of a place (q. d. "the spring"); also in the dual, ENAM (q. v.), and plural ANIM (q. v.), the latter likewise in the Aramaic form *Enon* (q. v.). See AIN.

**Enaim.** See ENAM.

**E'nam** (Heb. with the art. *ha-Eynam'*, הַעֵינַם, doubtless a contraction for עַיִן עַיִן, the two springs; Sept. Ἐνάϊμ v. r. Ἐναεῖμ and Μααρί, Vulg. *Enaim*), a city in the lowlands of Judah, mentioned between Tappuah and Jarmuth (Josh. xv, 34). From its mention with towns (Jarmuth and Eshtaol for instance) which are known to have been near Timnath, this is very probably the place in the "entrance" of which (perhaps at a fork of the road) Tamar sat to intercept her father-in-law on his way to Timnath (Gen. xxxviii, 14), (עַיִן עַיִן הַרְהוּ, *pe'thuck Eynay'im*, i. e. *doorway of Enaim*, or the *double spring*; Sept. αὐτὰς Αἰνὰν, Vulg. *brivium itineris*, A. V. "an open place;" comp. *Reland, Palest.*, p. 761). Eusebins and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v. Ἐνάϊμ, Enaim) state that it was "still a village *Bethenim* (Βεθενίμ) near the terebinth;" meaning probably "Abraham's oak," 22 miles S. of Jerusalem (*ib.* s. v. Ἀρκώ, Archoch), near Hebron (Robinson, *Res.* ii, 443). Schwarz in like manner identifies Enam with "the village *Beth-Ani*, distant 2½ English miles from Saafir" (*Palest.* p. 102); meaning apparently *Beit-Anur*, which is laid down on Van de Velde's *Map* at that distance S.W. of Bir es-Zafaraneh, in the region N.E. of Hebron. But this site is appropriated to Beth-anoth (q. v.), with which the similarity of names has doubtless caused these authors to confuse Enam. The place in question lay in the group of cities situated N.W. of Hebron, on the border of the tribe of Dan (Keil, *Comment. on Josh.* in loc.). It is perhaps the present *Deir el-Batm*, with a well adjoining, laid down by Van de Velde (*Map*) a little beyond *Deir Dubban*, N. of Eleutheropolis.

**E'nan** (Heb. *Eynan'*, עֵינָן, born at a fountain, q. d. *fontanus*; Sept. Αἰνὰν), the father of Ahira, which latter was phylarch of the tribe of Naphtali at the Exode (Num. i, 15; ii, 29; vii, 78, 83; x, 27). B.C. ante 1657. See also HAZAR-ENAN.

**Enas'ibus** (Ἐνάσιβος, Vulgate *Eliasib*), given (1 Esdr. ix, 34) as the name of one of "the sons of Moani" who had married a Gentile wife after the exile, in place of the ELIASIB (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra x, 36).

**Encænïa** (ἐγκαῖνια). (1.) When heathen temples

were converted to Christian use, they were purified by a solemn dedication, called *Encenia*, and by the sign of the cross; they also received new and appropriate names (Middle, *Antiq.* vi, 2). (2.) At a later period *encenia* denoted festivals kept in memory of the dedication of churches. In the church of Jerusalem, built by Constantine to the honor of our Saviour, it was customary to observe an anniversary festival which lasted eight days, during which divine service was performed. The practice was soon adopted by other churches. In England the first Saxon bishops allowed the people liberty on the annual feasts of the dedication of their churches, to build themselves booths round the church, and to entertain themselves with eating and drinking. In German such a feast is called *Kirchweih*, church-consecration, whence the English name *Church-wake*. The ceremonies and solemnities instituted at Oxford in honor of founders and benefactors of colleges are called *encenia*.—Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. xx, ch. viii, § 1. See DEDICATION.

**Encamp** (עָנַף, *chanah*), to decline, e. g. of the day, Judg. xix, 9, i. e. evening; hence to "pitch" a tent, Gen. xxvi, 17, especially to "camp" down at night, as often rendered), among the Hebrews, primarily denoted the resting of an army or company of travelers at night (Exod. xiii, 20; Num. i, 50; comp. Exod. xvi, 13; Gen. xxxii, 21), and hence the derivative *עָנַף*; *machaneh*, camp, once *עָנַף*; *machanoh*, 2 Kings vi, 8) is applied to the army or caravan when on its march (Exod. xiv, 19; Josh. x, 5; xi, 4; Gen. xxxii, 7, 8). See MAHAXAIM. Sometimes the verb refers to the casual arrangement of a siege (Psa. xxix, 3) or campaign (1 Sam. iv, 1), and occasionally it is extended to the signification of a permanent abode (Isa. xxix, 1). Among nomadic tribes war never attained the dignity of a science, and their encampments were consequently devoid of all the appliances of more systematic warfare. See WAR.

1. The description of the camp of the Israelites, on their march from Egypt (Num. ii, iii), supplies the greatest amount of information on the subject: whatever else may be gleaned is from scattered hints. The tabernacle, corresponding to the chieftain's tent of an ordinary encampment, was placed in the centre; and around and facing it (Num. ii, 1), arranged in four grand divisions, corresponding to the four points of the compass (but not necessarily in the strict quadrangular form usually represented, since modern Arab caravans are ranged at night in a nearly circular manner), lay the host of Israel, according to their standards (Num. i, 52; ii, 2). On the east the post of honor was assigned to the tribe of Judah, and round its standard rallied the tribes of Issachar and Zebulun, descendants of the sons of Leah. On the south lay Reuben and Simeon, the representatives of Leah, and the children of Gad, the son of her handmaid. Rachel's descendants were encamped on the western side of the tabernacle, the chief place being assigned to the tribe of Ephraim. To this position of Ephraim, Manasseh, and Benjamin, allusions are made in Judg. v, 14, and Psa. lxxx, 2. On the north were the tribes of Dan and Naphthali, the children of Bilhah, and the tribe of Asher, Gad's younger brother. All these were encamped around their standards, each according to the ensign of the house of his fathers. In the centre, round the tabernacle, and with no standard but the cloudy or fiery pillar which rested over it, were the tents of the priests and Levites. The former, with Moses and Aaron at their head, were encamped on the eastern side. On the south were the Kohathites, who had charge of the ark, the table of shew bread, the altars and vessels of the sanctuary. The Gershonites were on the west, and when on the march carried the tabernacle and its lighter furniture; while the Merarites, who were encamped on the north, had charge of its heavier appurtenances. The order of encampment

was preserved on the march (Num. ii, 17), the signal for which was given by a blast of the two silver trumpets (Num. x, 5). The details of this account supply Prof. Blunt with some striking illustrations of the undesigned coincidences of the books of Moses (*Undes. Coincid.* p. 75-86).

In this description of the order of the encampment no mention is made of sentinels, who, it is reasonable to suppose, were placed at the gates (Exod. xxxii, 26, 27) in the four quarters of the camp. This was evidently the case in the camp of the Levites (comp. 1 Chron. ix, 18, 24; 2 Chron. xxxi, 2).

The sanitary regulations of the camp of the Israelites were enacted for the twofold purpose of preserving the health of the vast multitude, and the purity of the camp as the dwelling-place of God (Num. v, 3; Deut. xxiii, 14). With this object the dead were buried without the camp (Lev. x, 4, 5); lepers were excluded till their leprosy departed from them (Lev. xiii, 46; xiv, 3; Num. xii, 14, 15), as were all who were visited with loathsome diseases (Lev. xiv, 3). All who were defiled by contact with the dead, whether these were slain in battle or not, were kept without the camp for seven days (Num. xxxi, 19). Captives taken in war were compelled to remain for a while outside (Num. xxxi, 19; Josh. vi, 23). The ashes from the sacrifices were poured out without the camp at an appointed place, whither all uncleanness was removed (Deut. xxiii, 10, 12), and where the entrails, skins, horns, etc., and all that was not offered in sacrifice, were burnt (Lev. iv, 11, 12; vi, 11; viii, 17).

The execution of criminals took place without the camp (Lev. xxiv, 14; Num. xv, 35, 36; Josh. vii, 24), as did the burning of the young bullock for the sin-offering (Lev. iv, 12). These circumstances combined explain Heb. xiii, 12, and John xix, 17, 20.

2. The encampment of the Israelites in the desert left its traces in their subsequent history. The temple, so late as the time of Hezekiah, was still "the camp of Jehovah" (2 Chron. xxxi, 2; comp. Psalm lxxviii, 28); and the multitudes who flocked to David were "a great camp, like the camp of God" (1 Chron. xii, 22).

High ground appears to have been uniformly selected for the position of a camp, whether it were on a hill or mountain side, or in an inaccessible pass (Judg. vii, 18). So, in Judg. x, 17, the Ammonites encamped in Gilead, while Israel pitched in Mizpeh. The very names are significant. The camps of Saul and the Philistines were alternately in Gilead, the "height" of Benjamin, and the pass of Michmash (1 Sam. xiii, 2, 3, 16, 23). When Goliath defied the host of Israel, the contending armies were encamped on hills on either side of the valley of Elah (1 Sam. xvii, 3); and in the fatal battle of Gilboa Saul's position on the mountain was stormed by the Philistines who had pitched in Shunem (1 Sam. xxxiii, 4), on the other side of the valley of Jezreel. The carelessness of the Midianites in encamping in the plain exposed them to the night surprise by Gideon, and resulted in their consequent discomfiture (Judg. vi, 33; vii, 8, 12). But another important consideration in fixing upon a position for a camp was the proximity of water; hence it is found that in most instances camps were pitched near a spring or well (Judg. vii, 3; 1 Macc. ix, 33). The Israelites at Mount Gilboa pitched by the fountain in Jezreel (1 Sam. xxxi, 1), while the Philistines encamped at Aphek, the name of which indicates the existence of a stream of water in the neighborhood, which rendered it a favorite place of encampment (1 Sam. iv, 1; 1 Kings xx, 26; 2 Kings xiii, 17). In his pursuit of the Amalekites David halted his men by the brook Besor, and there left a detachment with the camp furniture (1 Sam. xxx, 9). One of Joshua's decisive engagements with the nations of Canaan was fought at the waters of Merom, where he surprised the confederate camp (Josh. xi, 5, 7; comp. Judg. v, 19, 21). Gide-

on, before attacking the Midianites, encamped beside the well of Harod (Judg. vii, 1), and it was to draw water from the well at Bethlehem that David's three mighty men cut their way through the host of the Philistines (2 Sam. xxiii, 16).

The camp was surrounded by the *magalah'* (1 Sam. xvii, 20), or *magal'* (1 Sam. xxvi, 5, 7), which some, and Thenius among them, explain as an earthwork thrown up round the encampment, others as the barrier formed by the baggage-wagons. The etymology of the word points merely to the circular shape of the inclosure formed by the tents of the soldiers pitched around their chief, whose spear marked his resting-place (1 Sam. xxvi, 5, 7; see Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 20 sq.), and it might with propriety be used in either of the above senses, according as the camp was fixed or temporary. We know that, in the case of a siege, the attacking army, if possible, surrounded the place attacked (1 Macc. xii, 43), and drew about it a line of circumvallation (*dayek'*, 2 Kings xxv, 1), which was marked by a breastwork of earth (*mesillah'*, Isa. lxii, 10; *solelah'*, Ezek. xxi, 27 [22]; comp. Job xix, 12), for the double purpose of preventing the escape of the besieged and of protecting the besiegers from their sallies. But there was not so much need of a formal intrenchment, as but few instances occur in which engagements were fought in the camps themselves, and these only when the attack was made at night. Gideon's expedition against the Midianites took place in the early morning (Judg. vii, 19), the time selected by Saul for his attack upon Nahash (1 Sam. xi, 11), and by David for surprising the Amalekites (1 Sam. xxx, 17; comp. Judg. ix, 33). To guard against these night attacks, sentinels (*shomerim'*) were posted (Judg. vii, 20; 1 Macc. xii, 27) round the camp, and the neglect of this precaution by Zebah and Zalmunna probably led to their capture by Gideon and the ultimate defeat of their army (Judg. vii, 19).

The valley which separated the hostile camps was generally selected as the fighting ground (*sadeh'*, "the battle-field," 1 Sam. iv, 2; xiv, 15; 2 Sam. xviii, 6), upon which the contest was decided, and hence the valleys of Palestine have played so conspicuous a part in its history (Josh. viii, 13; Judg. vi, 33; 2 Sam. v,

22; viii, 13, etc.). When the fighting men went forth to the place of marshaling (*maarakah'*, 1 Sam. xvii, 20), a detachment was left to protect the camp and baggage (1 Sam. xvii, 22; xxx, 21). The beasts of burden were probably tethered to the tent pegs (2 Kings vii, 10; Zech. xiv, 15).

The *machaneh'*, or movable encampment, is distinguished from the *matstsab'*, or *netsib'* (2 Sam. xxiii, 14; 1 Chron. xi, 16), which appears to have been a standing camp, like those which Jehoshaphat established throughout Judah (2 Chron. xvii, 2), or an advanced post in an enemy's country (1 Sam. xiii, 17; 2 Sam. viii, 6), from which skirmishing parties made their predatory excursions and ravaged the crops. It was in resisting one of these expeditions that Shamah won himself a name among David's heroes (2 Sam. xxiii, 12). *Machaneh* is still farther distinguished from *mibtsu'*, "a fortress" or "walled town" (Num. xiii, 19).

Camps left behind them a memorial in the name of the place where they were situated, as among ourselves (comp. *Chester*, etc., from the Lat. *castra*). Mahaneh-Dan (Judg. xiii, 25) was so called from the encampment of the Danites mentioned in Judg. xviii, 12. The more important camps at Gilgal (Josh. v, 10; ix, 6) and Shiloh (Josh. xviii, 9; Judg. xxi, 12, 19) left no such impress; the military traditions of these places were eclipsed by the greater splendor of the religious associations which surrounded them. (See Ker Porter, *Travels in Persia*, ii, 147 sq., 300 sq.; Rhodes, *Tent-Life and Encampment of Armies in ancient and modern Times*, Lond. 1858.)—Smith, s. v.

Among the Ancient Egyptians, "the field encampment was either a square or a parallelogram, with a principal entrance in one of the faces, and near the centre was the general's tent and those of the principal officers. The general's tent was sometimes surrounded by a double rampart or fosse inclosing two distinct areas, the outer one containing three tents, probably of the next in command, or of the officers on the staff; and the guards slept or watched in the open air. Other tents were pitched outside these inclosures; and near the external circuit a space was set apart for feeding horses and beasts of burden, and another for ranging the chariots and baggage. It was near the general's tent, and within the same area, that the al-



Modern Arab Encampment in the Desert.

tars of the gods, or whatever related to religious matters, the standards, and the military chest, were kept; and the sacred emblems were deposited beneath a canopy within an inclosure similar to that of the general's tent" (Wilkinson, i, 409, abridgm.).

**Enchantment** stands in the Auth. Vers. as the representative of several Heb. words: usually some form of נָחַשׁ, *nachash*' (2 Kings xvii, 17; xxi, 6; 2 Chron. xxxiii, 6; Lev. xix, 26; Deut. xviii, 10; Num. xxiii, 23; xxiv, 1), literally to *whisper* a spell, hence to *practice divination* in general; נִחַשׁ, *nichash*' (Eccles. x, 11), of cognate form and signification, especially *incantation*; לָטַח, *lut*, literally to *muffle up*, hence to use *magic arts* (Exod. vii, 11, 22; viii, 7, 18); אָנַח, *anan*', literally to *cover with a cloud*, hence to *practice sorcery* (Jer. xxvii, 9); and חָבַר, *chabar*', to *bind*, i. e. with a spell, to *charm* (Isa. xlvii, 9, 12). The following are the specific forms which the black art assumed among the Hebrews. See also AMULET; DIVINATION.

1. לִטְמִים, *lutim*', or לְחַטְמִים, *lechatumim*', Exod. vii, 11, 22; viii, 7; Sept. *pharmacia* (Grotius compares the word with the Greek *λρατ*); secret arts, from לָטַח, to *cover*; though others incorrectly connect it with נִחַשׁ, a *flame*, or the glittering blade of a sword, as though it implied a sort of dazzling cheironomy which deceives spectators. Several versions render the word by "whisperings," *insurrations*, but it seems to be a more general word, and hence is used of the various means (some of them no doubt of a quasi-scientific character) by which the Egyptian *chartumim* imposed on the credulity of Pharaoh. See MAGICIAN.

2. קְשָׁפִים, *kesaphim*'; Sept. *pharmacia*, *φάρμακα* (2 Kings ix, 22; Mic. v, 12; Nah. iii, 4); Vulg. *veneficia*, *maleficia*; "malefice artes," "prastigie," "muttered spells." Hence it is sometimes rendered by *ἐπαοιδαι*, *incantations*, as in Isa. xlvii, 9, 12. The belief in the power of certain formulæ was universal in the ancient world. Thus there were *carmina* to evoke the tutelary gods out of a city (Macrob. *Saturnal* iii, 9), others to devote hostile armies (*Id.*), others to raise the dead (Maimon. *De Idol.* i, 15; Senec. *Ed. p.* 547), or bind the gods (*ἑσμοὶ θεῶν*) and men (*Æsch. Fur.* 331), and even influence the heavenly bodies (Ovid, *Met.* vii, 207 sq.; xii, 263; "Te quoque Luna traho," Virg. *Ecl.* viii; *Æn.* iv, 489; Hor. *Epod.* v, 45). They were a recognised part of ancient medicine, even among the Jews, who regarded certain sentences of the law as efficacious in healing. The Greeks used them as one of the five chief resources of pharmacy (Pind. *Pyth.* iii, 8, 9; Soph. *Aj.* 582), especially in obstetrics (Plat. *Theat.* p. 145) and mental diseases (Galen, *De Similit. tuenda*, i, 8). Homer mentions them as used to check the flow of blood (*Od.* xix, 456), and Cato even gives a charm to cure a disjoined limb (*De Re Rust.* 160; comp. Plin. *II. N.* xxviii, 2). The belief in charms is still all but universal in uncivilized nations; see Lane's *Modern Egypt*, i, 300, 306, etc.; ii, 177, etc.; Beckman's *Voyage to Bornoe*, ch. ii; Meroller's *Congo* (in Pinkerton's *Voyages*, xvi, p. 221, 273); Hue's *China*, i, 223; ii, 326; Taylor's *New Zealand*, and Livingstone's *Africa*, passim, etc.; and hundreds of such remedies still exist, and are considered efficacious among the uneducated. See INCANTATION.

3. נִחַשְׁתִּים, *nichashtim*' (Ecc. x, 11), Sept. *φθνησιμῶς*, is especially used of the charming of serpents, Jer. viii, 17 (comp. Psa. lviii, 5; Eccles. xii, 13; Ecc. x, 11; Lukan. ix, 89)—a parallel to "cantando rumpitur anguis," and "Viperæas rumpo verbis et carmine fauces," Ov. *Metam.* l. c.). Maimonides (*De Idol.* xi, 2) expressly defines an enchanter as one "who uses strange and meaningless words, by which he imposes on the folly of the credulous. They say, for instance, that if one utter the words before a serpent or scorpion it will do

no harm" (Carpzov, *Annot. in Godwynum*, iv, 11). An account of the Marsi, who excelled in this art, is given by Augustine (*ad Gen.* ix, 28), and of the Psylli by Arnobius (*ad Nat.* ii, 32); and they are alluded to by a host of other authorities (Pliny, vii, 2; xxviii, 6; *Ælian*, *II. A.* i, 57; Virg. *Æn.* vii, 750; Sil. Ital. viii, 495. They were called 'Οφιοὐόκτρα). The secret is still understood in the East (Lane, ii, 106). See CHARM.

4. The word נִחַשְׁתִּים, *nichashtim*', is used of the enchantments sought by Balaam (Num. xxiv, 1). It properly alludes to ophiomancy, but in this place has a general meaning of endeavoring to gain omens (Sept. *ἐξ συνάφην τοῖς οὐνοῖς*). See SOOTHISAYER.

5. חֶבֶר, *che'ber*, is used for magic (Isa. xlvii, 9, 12). It means generally the process of acquiring power over some distant object or person; but this word seems also to have been sometimes used expressly of serpent charmers, for R. Sol. Jarchi, on Deut. xvii, 11, defines the חֶבֶר הַחֶבֶר to be one "who congregates serpents and scorpions into one place." See MAGIC.

Any resort to these methods of imposture was strictly forbidden in Scripture (Lev. xix, 26; Isa. xlvii, 9, etc.), but to eradicate the tendency is almost impossible (2 Kings xvii, 17; 2 Chron. xxxiii, 6), and we find it still flourishing at the Christian era (Acts xiii, 6, 8; viii, 9, 11, *γοητεία*; Gal. v, 20; Rev. ix, 21). See WITCHCRAFT.

The chief "sacramenta dæmoniacæ" were a rod, a magic circle, dragon's eggs, certain herbs, or "insane roots," like the henbane, etc. The fancy of poets, both ancient and modern, has been exerted in giving lists of them (Ovid and Hor. *l. c.*; Shakspeare's *Macbeth*, Act iv, 1; Kirke White's *Gondoline*; Southey's *Course of Kehama*, cant. iv, etc.).—Smith, s. v. See SOCRERY.

**Encinas.** See ENZINAS.

**Encolpium.** See RELIQUARY.

**Eneratites** (Ἐγκρατίες, *Ἐγκρατῖαι*, *Continentes*), a name given by several Church fathers (Irenæus, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Jerome, Augustine, Theodoret) to a particular Gnostic sect, but which, in the opinion of most of the modern Church historians (Neander, Hase), either designates collectively several Gnostic sects, or, in general, the tendency of Gnostic asceticism in the ancient Church. The Eneratites condemned marriage, forbade the eating of flesh or drinking of wine, and used even at the celebration of the Lord's Supper water instead of wine, on which account they were called *ἰδρωπογαστράται*, *aquarii*. They were, in general, representatives of the Gnostic asceticism based upon the principle of Dualism, in opposition to the asceticism of the Ebionites, Montanists, and others which kept within the limits of the Church. The Church fathers who regarded the Eneratites as one sect of Gnostics, called Tatian (q. v.) its founder; but it is certain that there were Eneratites before Tatian, and that subsequently there were Eneratites who in some points differed from Tatian. Prominent men among the Eneratites were, besides Tatian, Saturninus, Marcion, Julianus, Cassianus, and Severus, who is called the founder of a particular sect, the Severians, and made himself known as a violent opponent of the apostle Paul and of the Pauline epistles. In the 12th century the name of the Eneratites was used, together with the names of several other ancient heresies, to designate and condemn the Bogomiles. See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iv, 29; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* (N. Y. 3 vols.) i, 149, 282; Mosheim, *Comment.* i, 482; Hase, *Ch. Hist.* p. 64, 83; Lea, *Sacerdotal Celibacy*, p. 42; Lardner, *Works* (10 vols. 8vo), ii, 148 sq.; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* i, 245; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* iv, 67; Wetzler u. Welte, *Kirch.-Lex.* iii, 575. See TATIAN.

**Encyclica, Encyclical Letters** (from the Gr. ἐγκύκλιος, letters which have to go the rounds of a certain number of men—*literæ encyclicæ, literæ circulares*), in the ancient Church, letters sent by bishops to

all the churches of a particular circuit. At present the name is exclusively used for letters addressed by the Pope to all the bishops of the Roman Catholic world. In the encyclicals the Pope lays down his views of the general wants of the Church, or of some prevailing demands and sentiments; he warns against dangerous movements within the Church, as well as against dangers threatening the Church from abroad. He urges the bishops to be watchful, and points to the proper antidotes for existing evils. Among modern encyclicals, none attracted greater attention than that issued by Pope Pius IX, in Dec., 1864, against modern civilization.—Wetzer and Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vi, 540. See LITERÆ ENCYCLICÆ. (A. J. S.)

**Encyclopædia of Theology**, a branch of theological science of comparatively recent origin. Its aims are to furnish (1) a sketch of the different branches of theology in their organic connection and relations with each other; showing the fitness of the various branches to theological science as a whole, and the relative importance of these branches; and (2) a plan of theological study, showing the order in which the topics should be taken up, and indicating the best methods of study and necessary books and helps of all kinds. This second branch, including the practical application of encyclopædia, is generally called Methodology, and the whole science taken together is called by the double name *Encyclopædia and Methodology*. Of these, Encyclopædia is the objective side, the outline of the science itself; Methodology is the subjective side, having reference to the work of the student of the science.

I. *History of the Science*.—In form, this branch of science is modern. When theology as a science was in its infancy, theological encyclopædia as science was impossible. But at an early period helps for students were prepared. Such were the treatise by Chrysostom, *De Sacerdote*, the *De officiis ministrorum* of Ambrosius, *De doctrina christiana* of Augustine, and a work of the same kind as the latter, *De disciplina scholarum*, attributed to Boethius († 525), but probably written after his time. Cassiodorus († 562) wrote *De Institutione Divinarum Litterarum*, an introduction to the profitable study of Scripture, for the use of monks. In the 7th century Isidor of Seville wrote a larger work, a kind of general encyclopædia, wherein he also treats of theology, *Originum sive Etymologiarum libr. xx*, but it is more in the shape of pastoral theology, as is the *De institutione clericorum* of Rabanus Maurus in the 9th century. The latter contains, however (vol. iii), a sketch of the different branches of information necessary to a minister. The *Didascalion (eruditio didascalica)* of Hugo of St. Victor († 1141) comes nearer to the character of a theological encyclopædia—its 1st, 2d, and 3d books treating on the preparatory studies, and the others, 4th to 6th, on the exposition of Scripture and the study of the fathers (Liebner, *Hugo v. St. Victor*, p. 96). In the 13th century, Vincent of Beauvais († 1264), in his *Speculum doctrinale*, gave a scientific exposition of several subjects, including theology. After these we find the writings of Nicolas of Clémanges (*De studio theologico*, d'Acbery, i, 473), and Jean Charlier Gerson (*De reformatione theologice, and Epistole duæ ad studentes Collegii Navarre Parisiensis, quid et qualiter studere debeat novus theologice auditor*).

But the real origin of theological encyclopædia is to be found in the time when the Reformation, in the 16th century, breaking through the bonds of scholastic divinity, brought in a new era for science, particularly for theology. Erasmus first led the way in the new direction by his *Ratio s. methodus compendio perveniendi ad veram theologiam* (1519-1522), giving to theological studies a solid philosophical foundation, promoting the study of the Scriptures, and requiring from the theologian a knowledge of natural sciences. In the *Lutheran Church* we first find Melancthon giving a short guide to theological studies in his *Brevi*

*ratio discende Theologiæ* (Opp., Bas. 1541, iii, 287). This was followed by a work of his pupil, Theobald Thamer, *Adhortatio ad theologie studium in academia Marburgensi*, 1543. After these we find the *Oratio de studio theol. recte inchoando*, 1577, and *Regulæ studiorum seu de ratione discendi in præcipuis artibus recte instituenda* (Lips. 1565), both by David Chytrius; the *Consilium de theologiæ studio recte constituendo* (Nuremberg, 1565), by Hieronymus Weller, the pupil and friend of Luther; the systematic *Methodus studii theologiæ publicis prælectionibus in academia Jenensi a. 1617 exposita* (1620, 1622, 1654), by John Gerhard; as also the works of Jacob Andrea, *De Stud. Sacr. Litt.* (Lips. 1567); Nicholas Selnecker (*Notatio de Stud. Theologiæ* (Lips. 1579); and Abr. Calov (*Isagoge ad Theologiam*). First in the list of encyclopedic works of the *Reformed Church* stands Bullinger's *Ratio studii theologiæ*, and the latter part of Conrad Gessner's *Pandectarum universalium liber ultimus*. But more important than either of those is the work of Andreas Gerhard of Ypern (Hyperius), professor at Marburg († 1564), *Theologiæ, seu de ratione studii theologiæ* (Basel, 1572, 1582), in which we find a first attempt to arrange the matter of the *Encyclopædia*, dividing it into different departments, exegetical, dogmatical, historical, and practical, though the exact limits of each were not yet well defined. The writers on dogmatics often prefixed an encyclopedic essay to their works, as did J. H. Alsted in his *Methodus sacrosanctæ Theologiæ* (Hanov. 1623), which contains two prefatory books on the study of theology. From the school of Saumur came Steph. Gausson's *Disertationes de studii theologiæ ratione*, etc. (1678, 6th ed., by Rambach, Hal. 1726). Calixtus († 1656) wrote a copious *Apparatus Theologicus* (Helmst., edited by his son, 1661); and Spener († 1705) gave acute advice and discriminations in several of his writings.

The term encyclopædia, in its present meaning, we find for the first time in the title of a work by the Reformed theologian S. Mursinna, *Præmiæ lineæ Encyclopædiæ Theologiæ* (Hal. Magd. 1764; 2d ed. 1794). But this, like all the works heretofore mentioned, has now only a historical interest. Herder's *Brief v. d. Studium d. Theologiæ* (1785, 4 vols.) is, on the other hand, even now of value in this field. A new era in the history of theological encyclopædia was inaugurated by Schleiermacher in his *Darstellung d. theologischen Studiums z. Behufe eintretender Vorlesungen* (Berlin, 1811); but the full effect of the book was not felt until its 2d edition appeared in 1830, although Bertholdt (*Theol. Wissenschaftskunde*, Erlangen, 1821, 2 vols.), Francke (*Theol. Encyclopædie*, 1819), and Danz (*Encyclopædie und Methodologie*, Wein. 1832) had been stimulated and guided by Schleiermacher's remarkable sketch. The powerful grasp of the whole science, and the luminous statement of the relations of all the parts, given by Schleiermacher, give his *Darstellung* the foremost place in this branch of science. (There is an English translation by Farrar, not very well done, under the title *Brief Outline of the Study of Theology*, Edinb. 1850, 12mo.) Its practical fault lies in the divisions made of the whole science (see below). It was followed by Hagenbach's *Encyclopædie u. Methodologie d. Theol. Wissenschaften* (Leips. 1833, 8vo), a work of great practical value, which has maintained its position as the most useful manual on the subject (7th edition, Leips. 1864, 8vo). The *Encyclopædie d. theol. Wissenschaften* of K. Rosenkranz (Halle, 1845) is thoroughly speculative and Hegelian. Harless's *Encyclopædie u. Methodologie* (Nürnberg. 1837) is a Lutheran work, and is really valuable for its historical sketch of the development of theology and for its copious literature. The *Anleitung z. Studium d. christl. Theologie* of Lobegott Lange (Jena, 1841) advocates Biblical rationalism. Pelt's *Theologische Encyclopædie* (Hamb. 1843, 8vo) follows Schleiermacher's method closely, but is a thorough and scholarly work, careful in state-

ment, broad in range, and accurate in literature. Holland has produced a valuable compendium in Clarisse, *Encyclopædie Theologica Epitome* (2d edit. Lugd. Bat. 1835, 8vo), which has a copious literature, especially full in reference to English books, a matter in which the German writers on the subject are all signally deficient.

Among Roman Catholic books in this field are to be mentioned Possevinus, *Bibliotheca selecta de ratione studiorum* (Colon. 1607); Ellies du Pin, *Méthode pour étudier la théologie* (1716), translated into several languages. In the 18th century, Denina (1758), Gerbert (1764), Braun (1777), Brandmeier (1783), and especially Oberthür, labored in this field. The influence of the later Protestant writers is manifest in such works as Drey, *Kurze Einl. in das Stud. d. Theologie* (Tübing. 1819); Klee, *Encyclopædie* (Mainz, 1832); Staudenmaier, *Encyclopædie der theol. Wissenschaften als System d. gesamten Theol. g'e* (Mentz, 1834-1840); Gengler, *D. Ideale d. Wissenschaft. o. d. Encyclopædie d. Theologie* (Bamb. 1834); Buchner, *Enc. u. Method.* (Sulzb. 1837); A. von Sieger, *De natura fidei et methodo theologia ad ecclesie catholicae Theologos* (Monast. 1839).

No book properly to be called *Encyclopædia of Theology* has appeared in English, and no book is more needed, as the English theological literature is almost wholly neglected by the Germans. (We are glad to see, as this article goes to press, 1868, an *Encyclopædia and Methodology* announced as in preparation by Dr. H. B. Smith.) But there are many excellent remarks in English books of pastoral theology on the best methods of study, and some special treatises which deserve notice. Among them are Dodwell, *Advice on Theological Studies* (Lond. 1691); Bennet, *Directions for Studying* (Lond. 1727, 3d edit. 8vo); Cotton Mather, *Manuductio in Ministerium* (Boston, 1726, 12mo; re-published, with additions, as Mather's *Student and Preacher*, by Ryland (Lond. 1781); Mason, *Student and Pastor* (Lond. 1755); Marsh, *Course of Lectures on Divinity* (Cambridge, 1809, 8vo), which gives good practical hints, and also attempts an encyclopædic outline; Doddridge, *Lectures* (Works, Lond. 1830, 255 sq.); Bickersteth, *Christian Student* (Lond. 4th edit. 1844), contains much information and good advice, but is destitute of scientific form or spirit. There are many compends, such as Preston's *Theological Manual* (1850), Smith's *Compendium* (1836), etc., which are superficial sketches of theology, designed to aid students in cramming rather than in thorough work. Many good hints are given in books of pastoral theology, for which see PRACTICAL THEOLOGY. There is a good list of books in Lowndes's *British Librarian*, p. 813 sq.

11. *Method of Theological Encyclopædia and Methodology*.—1. Some writers hold that encyclopædia should be treated entirely apart from methodology: so Kienlen, *Encyclopædie* (Strasb. 1842), confines the former to the exposition of the relation of the several branches of theology to the science as a whole; making methodology a separate work, aiming, not to set forth the science at all, but to show how it should be studied. This view is correct, if encyclopædia be taken in its broadest sense, as not merely an introductory science, taking the beginner by the hand at the portals of theology, and showing him the way to enter, and the plan of the edifice, but also as forming the *conclusion* of the course of study, in which all the branches are exhibited in their natural relations to the central trunk. But in view of practical use, most of the recent writers blend methodology with encyclopædia in one connected whole.

2. We give here the methods of the chief writers on the subject. (1.) Schleiermacher (§ 31) divides theology as science into three branches, Philosophical, Historical, and Practical. *Philosophical* theology includes, 1. Apologetics; 2. Polemics. *Historical* theology includes, 1. Exegetics, or the knowledge of primitive

Christianity; 2. Church history, or the knowledge of the earthly career of Christianity; 3. the knowledge of the present condition of Christianity (*a*) as to doctrine (Dogmatic theology), (*b*) as to social condition and extension (Ecclesiastical statistics). *Practical* theology includes, 1. Church service (Liturgy, Worship, Homilies, Pastoral care); 2. Church government. (2.) Hagenbach adopts the old and useful division of theology into four parts, Exegetical, Historical, Systematic, and Practical. *Exegetical* theology includes a knowledge of the sacred books, as the primary source of Christian doctrine, and the record of the original facts of Christianity. This knowledge presumes a knowledge of the languages of the sacred books, and requires also an apparatus (1) of criticism; (2) of history, viz. archeology, geography, etc.; (3) of interpretation (Hermeneutics). *Historical* theology includes Bible-history of Old and New Test., Biblical theology, Church history, Doctrine history, Patristics, Symbolics, Archeology, Statistics. *Systematic* theology includes Dogmatics, Apologetics, Polemics, and Ethics. *Practical* theology embraces Catechetics, Worship, Homilies, Pastoral care, Church government.—Pelt gives a very complete outline (founded on Schleiermacher's) in his *Encyclopædie* (1843, 8vo), which he modifies somewhat in his article *Theologie*, in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*, xv, 748 (compare also his article in *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1849, p. 27).—Godet (*Bulletin Théologique*, Paris, 1863, art. i) divides theology into, 1. Speculative, or the knowledge of salvation; 2. Practical, or the art of saving men. Under the first he classes Exegetical, Systematic, and Historical theology; under the second, Ecclesiastical economy, Missions, Apologetics (compare a criticism on this outline by Pronier in the same journal, May, 1863, p. 76 sq.). Thomas (*Bullet. Théol.* Sept. 1865) proposes to arrange as follows: 1. Apologetics (historical and philosophical); 2. Historical theology (Biblical sciences, Church history, Statistics); 3. Systematic theology (Dogmatics, Polemics, Speculative theology); 4. Practical theology (the individual, the family, the nation, civilization, the Church, (*a*) as to its base, (*b*) as to its organization, (*c*) as to its active working.—Dr. W. F. Warren, of the Boston Theological Seminary, gives a philosophical but luminous outline in *Jahrbücher f. Deutsche Theologie*, 1867, p. 318, as follows: 1. The Church, in its origin in time (History of the sacred writings; Biblical doctrines; Mosaic, Jewish, and New Test.; Biblical Church history; auxiliary sciences: philology, archeology, geography, chronology, etc.). 2. The Church in its development in time (Literature, History of doctrines, System of Christian doctrines, Church history, Church economy, auxiliary sciences, with Polemics as a concluding discipline). 3. The Church in its consummation (the scientific exposition of what the Word of God tells us concerning the future development and final consummation of the Church). In a note to Dr. Warren's article (p. 321), Dr. Wagenmann gives another outline, to which we refer the reader.

*Literature*.—Besides the authors already cited, see Tholuck's *Lectures on Encyclopædia*, translated in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vol. i; *Biblical Repository*, edited by Dr. Robinson, i, 613; iv, 127; Zyro, in *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1837, p. 689 sq.; Shedd, *Essays*, Essay i, on *Method and Influence of Theological Studies*; Vincent, *Du Protestantisme en France*, i, 314 sq. (Paris, 1860, 12mo); Credner, *Preface to Kito's Cyclopædia*.

**ENCYCLOPEDIA**, FRENCH, and the ENCYCLOPÉDISTES. The *Dictionnaire Encyclopédique* was a publication of the 18th century, which exerted a great influence not merely on general science and literature, but also on theology and religion. Its full title is *Encyclopédie ou Dictionnaire raisonné des Sciences, des Arts, et des Métiers, par une société de gens de Lettres; mis en ordre et publié par DIDEROT; et quant à la partie Mathématique par D'ALEMBERT* (Par. and Amst. 1751-80, 25 vols. fol.). This great work was projected by Diderot

(q. v.), and carried through, in the midst of difficulties, chiefly by his indomitable industry and perseverance. The name of D'Alembert (q. v.) added lustre to the publication; and these two called to their aid all the sceptical and free-thinking talent of France. A great aim of the Encyclopedists was to establish what they called philosophy instead of religion; and the higher intellect of France seemed to become thoroughly imbued with their views, social, moral, and political. The *Encyclopædia* was a product of the same causes which generated the Revolution, but the publication itself doubtless greatly hastened the catastrophe. It was only one stage in the development of that one-sided realism which commenced with Locke; expanded into the deism of England; and, crossing over to France, found a powerful advocate in Condillac. The progress of this development was very rapid. Among the Encyclopedists a single lifetime produced startling changes. Diderot, the editor and leading philosophical spirit of the *Encyclopædia*, "was at first only a doubter, next he became a deist, lastly an atheist. In the first stage he only translated English works, and even condemned some of the English deists. His views seem gradually to have altered, probably under the influence of Voltaire's writings and of the infidel books smuggled into France, and he thenceforth assumed a tone bolder and marked by positive disbelief. Diderot's atheism is a still farther development of his unbelief. It is expressed in few of his writings, and presents no subject of interest to us, save that it seeks to invalidate the arguments for the being of God drawn from final causes" (Farrar, *Critical History of Free Thought*, p. 179). D'Alembert, the scientific editor of the *Encyclopædia*, was the author of the celebrated *Discours Préliminaire des Éditeurs*, which was issued in separate form, and became a text-book of infidelity not only in France, but also in England. D'Alembert's reputation in the department of science was very great over the entire continent of Europe, and he gave to the *Encyclopædia* its high scientific character and value. (See ALEMBERT, D.) There has been much discussion as to whether the *Encyclopædia* proper really was issued in the interests of atheism. Many of the articles are entirely Christian in their tone and spirit. Others are as decidedly atheistic, while the *Discours Préliminaire* can hardly be called doubtful as to its character and aims. The true view seems to be that the Encyclopedists endeavored clandestinely to accomplish what more honest infidels had long attempted openly. They endeavored to undermine both religion and the state, while seeming to be in favor of them. Voltaire doubtless stands at the head of the coterie which furnished the articles for the *Encyclopædia*, although he wrote little for it himself. More than any other man he was the educator of the Encyclopedists. His principles are too well known to need statement. Helvetius derived his philosophy from Locke. "He was the moralist of the sensational philosophy, one who applied the philosophy of Condillac to morals. His philosophy is expressed in two works: the one on the spirit, the other on man; the former a theoretical view of human nature, the latter a practical view of education and society. His primary position is, that man owes all his superiority over animals to the superior organization of his body. Pleasure is the only good, and self-interest the true ground of morals, and the frame-work of individual and political right" (Farrar, *History of Free Thought*, p. 180). Next come the authors of the *Système de la Nature*, a work issued by the encyclopedists. It has been attributed to baron d'Holbach, his tutor Lagrange, Diderot, Grimm, Helvetius, and Robinet. It was doubtless a joint work, and expressed the views of all these men, or was a compromise creed to which they could all subscribe, for they held widely different opinions in other respects. The great object of the *System of Nature* was to banish God from the universe. It is de-

voted to the boldest materialism. "There is, in fact, nothing but matter and motion, says this book. Both are inseparably connected. If matter is at rest, it is only because hindered in motion, for in its essence it is not a dead mass" (Schwegler, *History of Philosophy*). The first part of this work undertakes to disprove the existence of mind; the second part is directed against religion. This *System of Nature* was the boldest achievement of infidelity, a work which even Voltaire pronounced "illogical in its deductions, absurd in its physics, and abominable in its morality." To those already named we may add Rousseau, whose *Political Essays* became the text-book of the French Revolution. He did for the state what the others had done for the Church. Such, then, were the views of those who projected and carried forward the *Encyclopædia*. If in the *Encyclopædia* itself we find those views covered up, or at least offset by thoroughly Christian ones, we are justified in believing that they were concealed and balanced by contrary opinions only to make the *Encyclopædia* acceptable to the unthinking masses of the French nation. The fact, as some hold, that the French nation was ripening for a revolution both in Church and State, and would have rushed into such a catastrophe at all hazards, proves nothing respecting the motives of the encyclopedists; and the terrible quickening which their great popular work gave to infidelity is perhaps the best test by which to judge the purposes of its authors.

Let us now look at the *Encyclopædia* itself, and its spirit can perhaps be best read from the *Discours Préliminaire*. D'Alembert was its author, although he probably secured both the approval and assistance of Diderot in its form and contents. The object of this *Discours* is to set forth the philosophy underlying the *Encyclopædia*, and this is nothing more than the sensualism of Locke. D'Alembert declares that "all our abstract knowledge may be reduced to what we receive through our senses." Showing that this may be the case, he thence argues that it is so. Sensations are the only things about which he cannot raise a doubt. With regard to ethics, the following is his underlying principle. Our ideas of good and evil "arise from the oppression which, by nature, the stronger practices upon the weaker, and the latter bears the more reluctantly the more violent it is, because he feels that there is no reason why he should submit to it; the evils which befall us through the vices of our fellow-men lead to the indirect knowledge of antagonistic virtues." These are the grounds upon which his philosophy is based. And yet this *Discours* made infidelity more popular to the unthinking masses than the writings of Locke, Condillac, Helvetius, De la Mettrie, or Holbach had done.

Such is the sensualistic materialism contained in the *Discours Préliminaire*, containing the ethical principle that we feel a sense of oppression only because we can see no reason why we should submit to it. And yet, by the side of this, in the same *Discours*, we find the following statement: "Nothing, therefore, is more necessary than a revealed religion, which instructs us concerning so many things. Designed for the completion of our natural knowledge, it shows us a portion of what was concealed from us; but confines itself to that which is most needful, while all the rest remains forever hidden. A few points of faith, and a small number of practical precepts, is all to which the revealed religion refers; yet, thanks to the light which it communicates to the world, since then the people are more firm and decided concerning a great number of interesting questions than the philosophers of any school ever were." In this way infidelity and religion were woven into the same system, religion being always held subordinate, a something to accomplish an end which science and philosophy could not quite reach. This being once admitted, it was not difficult to persuade the French people that, when philosophy

could accomplish all that is necessary, religion might be set aside.

In the body of the *Encyclopedia* itself, many of the articles upon religious subjects are apparently in full sympathy with catholicity, and even orthodoxy. For instance, the article "Trinité" defends the orthodox dogma from attacks of Socinians, Jews, and infidels of all kinds. In the article "Dieu" the arguments for the existence of God are ably summed up, and objections are refuted. Quotations are made from Christian authorities, and the writer of the article seems to have been in full sympathy with the Christian view of the subject. The existence of angels and devils is recognised. The article "Christianisme" pronounces Christianity the only true revealed religion, and the Old and New Testaments are recognised as divine. It declares that the severest criticism has not been able to invalidate their authenticity. Reason and philosophy must accord to them the honor of setting forth facts beyond their reach. The hand of God is seen in the style of the sacred writings. Articles on Protestantism condemn severely every innovation in doctrine, every departure from the established creeds of the various denominations. The errors of the Romish Church are pointed out and severely castigated. It is not necessary to suppose these articles written in a spirit of hypocrisy. Their authors doubtless held the views expressed. The fact that they did not invalidate the opinion that the *Encyclopedia* was secretly issued in the interests of atheism. Its authors could well afford to give Christian men a voice within its pages, when there was so much to counteract all they might say. It was not that Christianity had no advocates in the *Encyclopedia*, but that it was allowed only a feeble defence, and was often defended on principles which directly tended to its overthrow. Its very defenders, in many cases, were its worst enemies, and only erected fortifications on the side of religion to show how easily they could be carried by infidelity. The defence is made chiefly to rest on endemionism. Christianity should be upheld because it brings us more good than any other system of religion. Whatever system is most advantageous for man in his worldly relations is the system to which he should adhere. Whenever men can be made to believe that Christianity fails to do this, then it must be set aside. For example, in the article "Christianisme," Christ is placed side by side with the other lawgivers, his only superiority being that, while they kept the useful in view, he aimed at the true as well as the useful. "Though he set forth, as its first object, the happiness of another life, he also meant it to make us happy in this world." In other places morality is preferred to faith, "because he who does good and makes himself useful to the world is in a better condition through morality without faith than through faith without morality." Theism is better than atheism, because it is more advantageous for nations to admit the existence of God than to reject it.

The work began to appear in 1751, and was concluded in 1765, in 17 vols. fol., besides 11 vols. of plates. A supplement, in 5 vols., appeared at Amsterdam, 1776-1777, and a *Table analytique et raisonnée des matières*, in 2 vols., at Paris, in 1780. The publication was stopped two or three times by the government, and the last volumes were distributed privately, though the king himself was one of the purchasers. Diderot himself said of the *Encyclopedia* that he had had "neither time nor means of being particular in the choice of his contributors, among whom some were excellent, but most of the rest were very inferior; moreover the contributors, being badly paid, worked carelessly; in short, it was a patch-work composed of very ill-sorted materials, some masterpieces by the side of school-boys' performances; and there was also considerable neglect in the arrangement of the articles, and especially in the references." In

spite of all its defects, the *Encyclopedia* was the pride of France, and is in many respects a very able production. See La Porte, *Esprit de l'Encyclopédie* (Paris, 1768); Voltaire, *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie* (Paris, 1770); Van Mildert, *Boyle Lecture*, i, 378; Kurtz, *Church History*, ii, 236; Farrar, *Hist. of Free Thought*, p. 166-178; Tenenmann, *Manual Hist. Philosophy*, p. 378; Schwegler, *Hist. Philosophy*, translated by Scelye, p. 206; Chambers, *Encyclopedia*; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* iv, 1; Morell, *Hist. Phil.* p. 111. (H.G.)

**End of the World.** See ESCHATOLOGY.

**En'-dor** (Heb. *Eyn-Dor'*, עֵינֹדוֹר, *fountain of Dor*, i. e. of the age, 1 Sam. xxviii, 7, Sept. 'Ενδὼρ v. r. 'Αενδῶρ; but defectively דֹר עֵינֹ in Josh. xvii, 11, Sept. Δόρ v. r. 'Ενδῶρ; and עֵינֹדוֹר in Psa. lxxxiii, 10 [11], Sept. 'Αενδῶρ; Josephus 'Ενδῶροι, *Ant.* vi, 14, 2), a place which, with its "daughter-towns" (בָּתֵּי עֵינֹדוֹר), was in the territory of Issachar, and yet possessed by Manasseh (Josh. xvii, 11). This was the case with five other places which lay partly in Asher, partly in Issachar, and seem to have formed a kind of district of their own, called "the three, or the triple *Nejheh*" (q. v.). The Israelites were unable to expel the Canaanites from it until a late period. Endor was long held in memory by the Jewish people as connected with the great victory of Deborah and Barak over Sisera and Jabin. Taanach, Megiddo, and the torrent Kishon all witnessed the discomfiture of the huge host, but it was emphatically to Endor that the tradition of the death of the two chiefs attached itself (Psa. lxxxiii, 9, 10). Possibly it was some recollection of this, some fame of sanctity or good omen in Endor, which drew the unhappy Saul thither (see Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 161) on the eve of his last engagement with an enemy no less hateful and no less destructive than the Midianites (1 Sam. xxviii, 7). Endor is not again mentioned in the Scriptures; but it was known to Eusebius and Jerome, who describe it (by the same name, 'Αενδῶρ and 'Ενδῶρ, *Endor* and *Endor*) as a large village in the plain of Jezreel or Esdraelon, 4 miles S. of Tabor (*Onomast.* s. v. 'Ανδῶρ, *Endor*), near Nain and Scythopolis (*ib.* s. v. 'Ηνδῶρ, *Endor*). It was recognised during the Crusades (Brocardus, c. vi, p. 176; Marin. Sanut, p. 248), but was then partially lost sight of till the 17th century (Doubdan, p. 580; Nau, p. 632; Maundrell, Apr. 19). On the bleak northern slope of Jebel Duhy (the "Little Hermon" of travellers) the name still lingers, attached to a considerable but now deserted village (Burekhardt, *Trav.* p. 342; Robinson, *Res.* iii, 218; Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 149). The rock of the mountain, on the slope of which *Endôr* stands, is hollowed into caves, one of which, containing a little fountain, the entrance narrow, between rugged rocks, and partly covered with a fig-tree, may well have been the scene of the incantation of the witch (Van de Velde, *Narrative*, ii, 383). The distance from the slopes of Gilboa to Endor is 7 or 8 miles, over difficult ground (Porter, *Hamab.* ii, 358).

**E'neas.** See ÆNEAS.

**En-eg'-la'im** [many *En-egla'im*] (Heb. *Eyn Egla'im*, עֵינֵי עֵגְלָיִם, *fountain of two calves*, unless for עֵינֵי שְׁנֵי עֵגְלָיִם, *fountain of two pools*; Sept. 'Εναγαιεῖμ v. r. Εναγαλλεῖμ), a place named only by Ezekiel (xlvii, 10), apparently as on the Dead Sea, but whether near to or far from Engedi, on the west or east side of the sea, it is impossible to ascertain from the text: "The fishers shall stand upon it from En-gedi even to En-eghlim: they shall be a place to spread forth nets." In his comment on the passage, Jerome places it at the northern end of the Dead Sea, at the influx of the Jordan. M. de Saunley thinks it identical with *Ain-Ajloh*, situated towards the northern point of the Dead Sea, between Jericho and the Jordan (*Narrative*, i,



163). See BETH-HOGLAH. En-eglaim is probably another name for the EGLAIM (q. v.) of Isa. xv, 8.

**Enemes'sar** (Ἐνεμῆσαρος and Ἐνεμῆσαρ) is the name under which SHALMANESER (q. v.) appears in the book of Tobit (i, 2, 13, 15, 16). The change of the name is a corruption, the first syllable *Shal* being dropped (compare the Bupalnssor of Abydenus, which represents Nabopolassar), and the order of the liquids *m* and *n* being reversed. The author of Tobit makes Enemesar lead the children of Israel into captivity (i, 2), following the apparent narrative of the book of Kings (2 Kings xvii, 3-6; xviii, 9-11). He regards Sennacherib not only as his successor, but as his son (i, 15), for which he has probably no authority beyond his own speculations upon the text of Scripture.—Smith, s. v. See TOBIT.

**Ené'níus** (Ἐννῆός v. r. Ἐννῆος, Vulg. *Emmanius*), one of the leaders of the people who returned from captivity with Zorobabel (1 Esdr. v, 8); corresponding to the NAHAMANI (q. v.) of Nehemiah (vii, 7).

**Energici**, a sect in Germany in the 16th century, so called because they held that the Eucharist was the energy of Jesus Christ—not his body, nor a representation thereof.—Buck, *Theol. Dictionary*, s. v.

**Energumens** (ἠνεργούμενοι), persons possessed, and, in the narrower and more usual sense, persons possessed by an evil spirit. In the early Church such persons constituted a distinct class, bearing some relation to the catechumens and the faithful, but differing from them in this, that they were under the special care of exorcists, while they took part in some of the religious exercises of both classes. Catechumens who became disordered in mind during their term of probation were not baptized until thoroughly recovered, except in cases of sickness. Should any among the baptized become thus afflicted, they were excluded from the Christian assembly during the worst stages of their disease, being compelled to remain in the area of the church. From this circumstance they were called *χαιμαζόμενοι*, exposed to the weather. When partially recovered they were permitted to join in public worship, but were not permitted to partake of the Lord's Supper till they were properly restored, except in the immediate prospect of death.—Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. iii, ch. iv, § 6, 8.

**Enfantin**, BARTHÉLEMY PROSPER, more commonly called father Enfantin, one of the founders of Saint Simonism (q. v.), was born at Paris Feb. 8, 1796. He received his education at a lyceum, and subsequently (1813) at the Polytechnic School. After the fall of Napoleon he engaged in commercial and industrial pursuits. Towards the close of the year 1825 Enfantin became intimately acquainted with Olinde Rodrigues, and through him with Saint Simon, who converted him to his theories of an industrial and religious reformation. He accepted from his dying master the mission to spread and develop his doctrines. The work was begun with the establishment of a journal called *Le Producteur* (1825-26, 5 vols.), which closed its career with the celebrated epitaph, *The golden age, which a blind tradition has formerly placed in the past, is still before us*. The Liberal party at first saw in this periodical the application of its own ideas to the material order, and supported it; but the support was withdrawn when Benjamin Constant denounced it as theocratic. In 1828 Enfantin had about a dozen collaborators, among whom were Blanqui, Duveyrier, Buchez (in 1848 president of the Constituent Assembly), and Pereire. The revolution of 1830 filled Enfantin with enthusiastic hopes. He signed, on the 30th of July, a proclamation, in which he demanded community of goods, abolition of inheritance, and the emancipation of woman. He organized "centres of action" at Toulouse, Montpellier, Lyons, Metz, and Dijon; provided for regular preaching at Paris, and frequently ad-

ressed the learned, the artists, and the industrials. In 1830 he secured the support of the *Globe* newspaper. Soon he was made by acclamation (the sacred word was *acclamé*) one of the supreme fathers, with Bazard. The two chiefs disagreed, however, on one important point: Bazard wished to pay prominent attention to political agitation, while Enfantin occupied himself only with ethics, art, religion, and social reform. He desired first of all to regulate individual relations, to emancipate woman and the pauper, and to sanctify the flesh by labor and pleasure. He expected to obtain control of society by dispossessing the Church, not the state. In November, 1831, he issued a manifesto to the forty thousand adherents of the new doctrine in France, that Bazard and Rodriguez had separated from him, and that the new dogma had become incarnate in him alone, as the living law and the messiah. But his attempt to establish communistic colonies failed, and the researches made for finding a female messiah, to share with him the leadership of the communion, made the whole movement ridiculous. The *Globe*, which was gratuitously distributed, had to be discontinued. In 1832 the government suppressed the association. Enfantin, followed by about forty of his disciples, among whom were Michael Chevalier (subsequently a member of the senate), Duveyrier, and Gustave d'Eichthal, retired to an estate which he possessed on the coast of Menilmontant, and there organized a model community. There the new brethren, divided into groups of laborers, wore a peculiar garb, and passed the day in work, religious conferences, and symbolical ceremonies. The "father" (Enfantin) had this name conspicuously inscribed upon his breast, superintended, preached, encouraged; he wrote articles for *Les Feuilles Populaires*, and the *Livre Nouveau*; composed mystical hymns, and developed some mystical pantheism. It cost him great efforts to refute the attacks of Carnot, J. Reynaut, and others. He was then summoned before the assizes of the Seine, being charged with having held forbidden meetings, and outraged public morality, and was condemned to a year of imprisonment (August 28, 1832). The Saint Simonians now dispersed. Enfantin, who after a few months was set at liberty, left with about a dozen of his disciples for Egypt. Most of them, turning Mohammedans, received appointments from the pasha of Egypt; but Enfantin refused to profess Mohammedanism, and after remaining in Egypt for two years, returned to France. He was for a time postmaster, and in 1841, through the influence of his friends, some of whom had obtained high offices, was appointed member of a scientific commission sent to Algeria. In 1845 he received the chief direction of the Lyons railroad. In November, 1848, Enfantin, conjointly with Duveyrier, established a daily paper, *Le Crédit*, which was continued until 1850. Subsequently Enfantin became connected with the administration of the railroad from Lyons to the Mediterranean. He died May 31, 1864. Shortly before his death he appointed Arles Dufour head of the sect. Enfantin developed the socialistic views of his master and his own in the works *Economie politique et St. Simonienne* (Par. 1831) and *Morale* (Par. 1832). The latter work was at once condemned by the *Cour d'assises*. Another work of the same class, *Le Livre nouveau* (completed in 1832), has never been printed. His philosophical and theological views were set forth at length in the *Correspondance philosophique et religieuse* (Par. 1847), of which the *Correspondance politique* (Paris, 1849) is a supplement, and in a pamphlet against the Jesuit orator, father Felix (*Réponse au Père Felix*, Paris, 1856). His last work was *La Vie Eternelle présente, future* (Paris, 1861; also republished in the *Bibliothèque utile*, Paris, 1864). In 1865 a collective edition of his socialistic works was published.—Vapereau, *Dictionnaire des Contemporains*, s. v.; Hofer, *Nouv. Biogr. Génér.* xvi, 37. (A. J. S.)

**Enfield**, WILLIAM, LL.D., an English Dissenter

and voluminous writer, was born at Sudbury March 29, 1741, and was educated at Davenport under Dr. Ashworth. On leaving the seminary he became pastor to a congregation at Liverpool. He afterwards became resident tutor and lecturer on belles-lettres at Warrington Academy. In 1785 he became minister of the Unitarian Church at Norwich, where he died Nov. 3, 1797. Among his numerous publications were (1) *A History of Philosophy*, drawn up from Brucker (Lond. 1819, 2 vols. 8vo);—(2) *The Preachers' Directory* (London, 1771, 4to);—(3) *Sermons for Families* (Lond. 1778, 2 vols. 12mo);—(4) *The English Preacher* (Lond. 9 vols. 12mo). He was a frequent contributor to periodicals, and shared with Dr. Aikin in the preparation of the *General Biographical Dictionary*.

Engad'di (ἐν αἰγάλοις v. r. Ἐργαδί in ἐν Γάδι, or ἐν Γάδαις, Vulg. in *Cades*), Ecclus. xxiv, 14. See ENGEDI.

En-gan'nim (Heb. *Eyn Gannim'*, עַיִן גַּנִּים, fountain of gardens), the name of several places in Palestine, for, besides those mentioned below, there was said, according to Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v. Ἰγαννί, Engannim), then to be a third village called Engannim (Ἰγαννά, *Eganna*) near Gerasa, beyond the Jordan.

1. (Sept. Ἡργοनीμ v. r. unrecognisable; Vulg. *Engannim*.) A town in the plains of Judah, mentioned between Zanoah and Tappuah (Josh. xv, 34). Eusebius and Jerome state (*Onomast.* s. v. Ἰγαννί, Engannim) that it was still extant in their day near Bethel; but there must have been some mistake in this, as the place in question lay in the group N.W. of Jerusalem (Keil, *Comment. on Josh.* in loc.), possibly at the site of the present agricultural village *Rana*, north of Eleutheropolis (Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 354). Schwarz, however, thinks (*Palest.* p. 162) that "En-gannim is certainly identical with the village *Jenin*, 3 Eng. miles S.E. of Ashkelon;" but this is not in the quarter indicated by the associated names, and is, moreover, with greater probability appropriated to another ancient locality. See ZENAX.

2. A city on the border of Issachar (Josh. xix, 21; Sept. Ἰεὼν καὶ Τορμάν, Alex. Ἰν Γαννίμ; Vulg. *En-Gannim*); allotted with its "suburbs" to the Gershonite Levites (xxi, 29; Sept. Πηγὴ γαρμάντων; Vulg. *En-Gannim*); probably the same (see *Reiland, Palest.* p. 812) as the *Ginsea* (Γινσαία) or *Gennim* (Γεννίμ) of Josephus, on the borders of the great plain toward Samaria (*Ant.* xx, 6, 1; *War*, iii, 3, 4; comp. ii, 12, 3), which Biddulph (in *Purchas*, ii, 135) identifies with the present *Jenin*, a town 15 miles south of Mount Tabor, and which he and others describe as still a place of gardens and abundant water (Wilson, *Lands of Bible*, ii, 84; Van de Velde, *Narrative*, ii, 359; Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 167). In the lists of Levitical cities in 1 Chron. vi, ANEM is substituted for Engannim, apparently by contraction. The position of *Jenin* is in striking agreement with the requirements of BETHEG-GAN (A.V. "the garden-house;" Sept. Βαθγάν) in the direction of which Abaziah fled from Jehu (2 Kings ix, 27). The rough road of the ascent was probably too much for his chariot, and, keeping the more level ground, he made for Megiddo, where he died (Stanley, *Palest.* p. 342). The place is several times noticed by Arabian writers in connection with the march of Saladin, and has been visited by many modern travellers (Robinson, *Researches*, iii, 156). The only remains of *Ginsea* are a few foundations of walls close to the mosque of the present town (De Sauley, *Narrative*, i, 78, 79). The town is high enough to overlook the broad plain, and low enough to have its houses encircled by its verdure. The hills rise steeply behind, dotted with bushes, and here and there clothed with the sombre foliage of the olive. Rich gardens, hedged with prickly pear, extend along their base, and a few palm-trees give variety to the scene.

The "fountain," from which the town took the first part of its Scripture name (*En*), is in the hills a few hundred yards distant; and its abundant waters flow over and fertilize the "gardens" (*Gannim*) from which the second and chief part of the name is derived. The leading road from Jezreel and the north to Samaria and Jerusalem passes *Jenin*. It contains about 2000 inhabitants, and is the capital of a large district (Porter, *Handbook*, p. 351; Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 189).

En-ge'di [many *En'-gedi*, some *En-ge'di*] (Heb. *Eyn Gedi'*, עַיִן גֵּדִי, fountain of the kid; Sept. in Josh. Ἡργαδί v. r. Ἀγκαδῖς, in Sam. Ἐργαδί, in Chron. and Cant. Ἐργαδέει v. r. Ἰργαδί and ἐν Γαδί, in Ezek. Ἐργαδέει v. r. Ἰργαδέει, Apocr. ENGADDI; Josephus Ἐργαδί; Ptolemy Ἐργαίαι, v, 16, 8; Stephanus Byz. Ἐργαδά, p. 333; Eusebius Ἡργαδί, *Onomast.* s. v.; Pliny, *Engudd*, *Hist. Nat.* v, 17), a town in the wilderness of Judah (Josh. xv, 62), on the western shore of the Dead Sea (Ezek. xlvii, 10), which gave its name to a part of the desert whither David withdrew for fear of Saul (Josh. xv, 62; 1 Sam. xxiv, 1-4). Its more ancient name was HAZEZON-TAMAR (q. v.), and by that name it is mentioned before the destruction of Sodem, as being inhabited by the Amorites, and near the cities of the plain (Gen. xiv, 7); a title ("the pruning of the palm") doubtless derived from the palm-groves that surrounded it (Ecclus. xxiv, 14). It was immediately after an assault upon the "Amorites, that dwelt in Hazezon-tamar," that the five Mesopotamian kings were attacked by the rulers of the plain of Sodom (Gen. xiv, 7; comp. 2 Chron. xx, 2). Saul was told that David was in the "wilderness of En-gedi;" and he took "300 men, and went to seek David and his men upon the rocks of the wild goats" (1 Sam. xxiv, 1-4). These animals still frequent the cliffs above and around the fountain: the Arabs call them *Beden*. At a later period En-gedi was the gathering-place of the Moabites and Ammonites who went up against Jerusalem, and fell in the valley of Berachah (2 Chron. xx, 2). It is remarkable that this is the usual route taken in the present day by such predatory bands from Moab as make incursions into Southern Palestine. They pass round the southern end of the Dead Sea, then up the road along its western shore to the pass at *Ain-Jidy* (the ascent by the cliff *Ziz*," 2 Chron. xx, 16), and thence toward Hebron, Tekoa, or Jerusalem, as the prospects of plunder seem most inviting. The vineyards of En-gedi were celebrated by Solomon (Cant. i, 14); its balsam by Josephus (*Ant.* ix, 1, 2). Stephanus of Byzantium places it near Sodom; Jerome at the south end of the Dead Sea (*Comm. in Ezek.* xlvii); but Josephus more correctly upon the Lake Asphaltites, at the distance of 300 stadia from Jerusalem (*Ant.* ix, 1, 2; comp. xvi, 13, 4; *War*, iii, 3, 5). In the time of Eusebius and Jerome, En-gedi was still a large village on the shore of the Dead Sea, but it must have been abandoned very soon afterwards, for there is no subsequent reference to it in history, nor are there any traces of recent habitation (Porter's *Handbook*, p. 242). There is a curious reference to it in Mandeville (*Early Trav.* p. 179), who says that the district between Jericho and the Dead Sea is "the land of Dengadda" (Fr. *d'Engadda*), and that the balm-trees were "still called vines of Gady." En-gedi has always, until recently, been sought at the north end of the Dead Sea (Reiland, *Palest.* p. 449); but in 1805 Seetzen recognised the ancient name in the *Ain-Jidy* of the Arabs, and lays it down in his map at a point of the western shore nearly equidistant from both extremities of the lake. This spot was visited by Dr. Robinson, and he confirms the identification (*Researches*, ii, 209-216). The site lies among the mountains, a considerable way down the descent to the shore. Here is a rich plain, half a mile square, sloping very gently from the base

of the mountains to the water, and shut in on the north by a lofty promontory. About a mile up the western acclivity, and at an elevation of some 400 feet above the plain, is the fountain of Ain-Jidy, bursting forth at once in a fine stream upon a sort of narrow terrace or shelf of the mountain, having an abrupt margin towards the lake. The water is sweet, but warm, and strongly impregnated with lime. The stream rushes down the steep descent of the mountain below, and its course is hidden by a luxuriant thicket of trees and shrubs belonging to a more southern clime. Near this fountain are the remains of several buildings, apparently ancient, although the main site of the town seems to have been farther below. The whole of the descent below seems to have been once terraced for tillage and gardens, and near the foot are the ruins of a town, exhibiting nothing of particular interest, and built mostly of unhewn stones. This we may conclude was the town which took its name from the fountain. On reaching the plain, the brook crosses it in nearly a straight line to the sea. During a great part of the year it is absorbed in the thirsty soil. Its banks are now cultivated by a few families of Arabs, who generally pitch their tents near this spot. The soil is exceedingly fertile, and in such a climate it might be made to produce the rarest fruits of tropical climes; but vineyards no longer clothe the mountain-side, and neither palm-tree nor balsam is seen on the plain.

THE WILDERNESS OF EN-GEDI is doubtless the immediately neighboring part of the wild region west of the Dead Sea, which must be traversed to reach its shores. It was here that David and his men lived among the "rocks of the wild goats," and where the former cut off the skirts of Saul's robe in a cave (1 Sam. xxi, 1-4). "On all sides," says Dr. Robinson, "the country is full of caverns, which might then serve as lurking-places for David and his men, as they do for outlaws at the present day." He adds that, as he came in sight of the ravine of the Ghôr, a mountain-goat started up and bounded along the face of the rocks on the opposite side (*Researches*, ii, 203). M. de Sauley imagines that he has identified the particular cave in question with one in that vicinity now called *Bir el-Makukieh* (*Narrative*, i, 162).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

**Engelbert**, abbot of Admont, of the Benedictine order in Styria, was born of noble parents about 1250. He became abbot of Admont about 1297, and died 1331, leaving a great number of works, of which the principal are: *De ortu, progressu et fine imperii Romani*, published by Gaspard Brusch (Basle, 1553, 8vo; Mentz, 1603, 8vo);—*Tractatus super passionem secundum Mattheum; de statu defunctorum; de Providentia; de causa longevitatis hominum ante diluivium*;—*Speculum virtutum*. Several of his works were published by the learned Benedictine monk Pez, partly in the *Thesaurus Anecdotorum Novissimus* (Augsb. 1721), partly in the *Bibliotheca ascetica antiquo-nova* (Ratisbon, 1723-25). A biography of Engelbert, and a complete list of all his works, are given by Pez, both in an introductory essay in the 1st volume of the *Thesaurus* and in the preface to the 3d volume of the *Bibliotheca*.—Hoefler, *Nov. Biog. Génér.* xvi, 48; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 589. (A. J. S.)

**Engelbert, SAINT**, archbishop of Cologne, was a son of count Engelbert I of Berg-Geldern, and was born in 1185. When he was twenty-two years old the diocese of Münster was offered to him, but he declined it on the ground of youth and inexperience. In 1215 he was elected archbishop of Cologne. With great energy he reorganized the electorate, which, under the administration of his predecessors, had become quite disordered. He extinguished its debt, recovered those portions of its territory which had been lost, and acquired new ones. When the emperor Friedrich II

was called to Italy, Engelbert was appointed head of the regency to which was intrusted the administration of the empire. As archbishop, Engelbert made the utmost endeavors to reform the corrupt habits of the clergy, and to repel the interference of the nobility in ecclesiastical affairs. The rigor with which he carried through his principles made him many enemies, and on Nov. 7, 1225, he was surprised and assassinated at Gevelsberg by his nephew, count Friedrich von Isenburg. The murderer was captured and broken on the wheel; the bishops of Münster and Osnabrück, who were charged with complicity, were excommunicated; and Engelbert, on account of his zeal for enlarging the power of the Church, was enrolled in the number of saints. A life of Engelbert, by Cæsar of Heisterbach (q. v.), was, in 1630, edited by Gelenius, with many learned remarks and additions (*Index libertatis ecclesie et martyri St. Engelbertus*, Colonia, 1630); see also Ficker, *Engelbert der Heilige*, Cologne, 1853; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 590. See also COLOGNE. (A. J. S.)


**Engelbrecht, JOHANN**, a visionary religionist, was born in Brunswick 1599. He was sickly from his youth, and suffered dreadfully from melancholy, caused by physical pain as well as by mental disturbance. He believed himself (after 1623) the subject of revelations and visions, and went from house to house preaching and narrating his supernaturally acquired knowledge of heaven and hell. Some preachers, like Paul Egard, in Holstein, gave very favorable testimonials of his character and his preaching; but the larger number took offence at his pretended revelations, and persecuted him. In Hamburg, where he spent several years, he was imprisoned. During the last years of his life he lived in great retirement in his native city. He died in 1644. Though unlettered, he wrote several books, especially a *View of Heaven* (Brunswick, 1625); and they were collected in 1640, and again in 1697, into editions of his *Werte und Offenbarungen* (Brunsw. and Amsterd.). Some of his writings have been translated into French and English.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* iv, 32.

**Engelhardt, JOHANN GEORG VEIT**, a German theologian, was born at Neustadt on the Aich, Nov. 12, 1791. After studying for three years at the University of Erlangen, and being for several years a tutor in two noble families, he was, in 1817, appointed deacon at a church in Erlangen and professor at the gymnasium. In 1820 he became lecturer at the University of Erlangen, and obtained the degree of doctor of divinity; the next year he was advanced to an extraordinary, and in 1822 to an ordinary professorship at the university. The latter position he retained until his death, Sept. 13, 1855. For several years he held the office of university preacher, and five times he was elected rector of the university. From 1845 to 1848 he was deputy of the university in the Bavarian diet. The king of Bavaria conferred upon him the title of ecclesiastical councillor and the order of St. Michael, and the city of Erlangen the right of honorary citizenship. In the history of theological literature, Engelhardt has secured a lasting place by his manuals of Church history and history of doctrines (*Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, 4 vols., Erlangen, 1833-34; *Dogmengeschichte*, 2 vols., Neustadt, 1839). He gave special attention to the study of the history of mystic theology. His intention to write a comprehensive history of this theology he did not find time to carry out, but he wrote a number of separate articles on the subject. Among the most important of this class of his works are those on Dionysius Areopagita (*Dissertatio de Dionysio plotiniano*, Erlangen, 1820; *De origine scriptorum Areopagiticorum*, Erlang. 1823; *Die angebl. Schriften des Areopagiten Dionysius, übersetzt u. mit Abhandlungen begleitet*, Erlang. 1823, 2 vols.); on Plotinus (*Plotin's Enneaden, übersetzt u. mit*

*Anmerkungen*, part i, Erlangen, 1820, incomplete); on Richard of St. Victor and Ruysbroek (*Rich. von St. Victor u. Joh. Ruysbroek*, Erlang. 1838). Several other works on kindred topics are preserved in MS. in the library of the Erlangen University. Next to mystic theology, the study of the Church fathers was one of his favorite occupations, to which we owe a work on patristics (*Leitfaden zu Vorlesungen über Patristik*, Erlang. 1823). He also left in MS. a complete translation of Irenæus. A biographical sketch of Engelhardt is given in the funeral sermon by his colleague, professor Thomasius (Erlang. 1855). See Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* xix, 479. (A. J. S.)

**Engine** (*μηχανή*, *machine*, 1 Macc. v, 30, etc.; 2 Macc. xii, 15, etc.), a term exclusively applied in Scripture to military affairs. Such instruments were certainly known much earlier than the Greek writers appear to admit, since figures of them occur in Egyptian monuments, where two kinds of the *testudo*, or penthouse, used as shelters for the besiegers, are represented, and a colossal lance, worked by men who, under the cover of a *testudo*, drive the point between the stones of a city wall. See FORT.

were of much inferior strength. Darts varied similarly from small beams to large arrows, and the range they had exceeded a quarter of a mile, or about 450 yards. All these engines were constructed upon the principle of the sling, the bow, or the spring, the last




Roman Balista.



Ancient Egyptian Testudo.


1. The Hebrew  $\text{כִּישְׁשָׁבוֹן}$ , *chishshabon'* (2 Chron. xxvi, 15), lit. *invention* (as in Eccles. vii, 29), is its counterpart in etymological meaning, each referring to the *ingenuity* (engine, from *ingenium*) displayed in the contrivance. The engines to which the term is applied in 2 Chron. were designed to propel various missiles from the walls of a besieged town; one, like the *balista*, was for stones, consisting probably of a strong spring and a tube to give the right direction to the stone; another, like the *catapulta*, for arrows, an enormous stationary bow. The invention of these is assigned to Uzziah's time—a statement which is supported both by the absence of such contrivances in the representations of Egyptian and Assyrian warfare, and by the traditional belief that the *balista* was invented in Syria (Pliny, vii, 56). Of the *balista* and cata-

ping an elastic bar, bent back by a screw or a cable of sinews, with a trigger to set it free, and contrived either to impel darts by its stroke, or to throw stones from a kind of spoon formed towards the summit of the spring. (See Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s. v. *Tormentum*.) See WAR.



Roman Catapulta.

*pulta* it may be proper to add that they were of various powers. For battering walls there were some that threw stones of fifty, others of one hundred, and some of three hundred weight; in the field of battle they



Ancient Assyrian War-engine.


2. Another military engine with which the Hebrews were acquainted was the battering-ram, described in Ezek. xxvi, 9 as  $\text{מִכְּבֹּלֹה}$ , *mechi' kobollo'*, lit. a *beating of that which is in its front*, hence a ram for striking walls; and still more precisely in Ezek. iv, 2, xxi, 22 as  $\text{כָּר}$ , *kar*, a *ram*. The use of this instrument was well known both to the Egyptians (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* i, 353) and the Assyrians. The references in Ezekiel are to the one used by the latter people, consisting of a high and stoutly-built framework on four wheels, covered in at the sides in order to protect the men moving it, and armed with one or two pointed

weapons. Their appearance was very different from that of the Roman *aries* with which the Jews afterwards became acquainted (Joseph. *War*, iii, 7, 19). No notice is taken of the *testudo* or the *vineæ* (comp. Ezek. xxvi, 9, *Vulg.*), but it is not improbable that the Hebrews were acquainted with them (comp. Wilkinson, i, 361). The marginal rendering "engines of shot" (Jer. vi, 6; xxxii, 24; Ezek. xxvi, 8) is incorrect. An engine for battering the wall is mentioned in the reign of king David (2 Sam. xx, 15); but the instrument itself for throwing it down may have been that above noticed, and not the battering-ram. The ram was, however, a simple machine, and capable of demolish-




Roman Battering-ram worked by hand.

ing the strongest walls, provided access to the foot was practicable, for the mass of cast metal which formed the head could be fixed to a beam lengthened sufficiently to require between one and two hundred men to lift and impel it; and when it was still heavier and hung in the lower floor of a movable tower, or *helepolis*, it became a most formidable engine of war—one used in all great sieges from the time of Demetrius, about B.C. 306, till long after the invention of gunpowder. Towers of this kind were largely used at the destruction of Jerusalem (q. v.) by the Romans.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See BATTERING-RAM.



Roman covered Battering-ram mounted on Wheels.



Roman *Helepolis* or movable Tower and Battering-ram combined.

**England, Church of.** The proper designation of this church since the Act of Union in 1801 is "The United Church of England and Ireland." The Reformed Church of England dates from the 16th century; but it is convenient to treat in this article of the rise of Christianity in England, and of its growth under the protection of the State. (The free churches of England are given under their several titles in this work.)

**I. HISTORY.**—(I.) *Early Period* (to the mission of Augustine, A.D. 596). 1. *To the Saxon Invasion*, A.D. 449. It is generally believed that Christianity was introduced into Britain before the end of the 2d century. Tertullian († about 220) speaks of places in Britain not reached by the Romans, but yet subject to Christ (*Britannorum inaccessa Romanis loca, Christo vero subdita*). Eusebins, indeed, declares that some of the apostles preached in Britain (*Decm. Evang.* iii, 7); Stillingfleet (*Origines Britannicæ*, c. i), Cave (*Lives of the Apostles*), and others, insist that St. Paul was the founder of British Christianity. Clemens Romanus (A.D. 101) says that Paul went to the limits of the West (το ἄκρον τῆς ἕσπερος, *1 Epist. ad Cor.*); and Theodoret († 457) says that Paul brought salvation to the isles of the ocean (ταῖς ἐν τῷ πελάγει ὑακριναις ἡσίαις, in *Psalm cævi*). But none of these hints amount to proof. Other traditions use the names of St. James, of Simon Zelotes, and of Joseph of Arimathea; asserting that the latter came over A.D. 35, or about the twenty-first year of Tiberius, and died in England. Of all this there is no proof (Fuller, *Ch. Hist. of Britain*, i, 13; Stillingfleet, *Orig.* c. iv; Short, *Ch. History of England*, i, § 2). Another legend is that an English king, Lucius, sent messengers to Eleutherius († 192), bishop of Rome, asking for Christian instruction; that the messengers were converted and ordained, one a bishop and the other a teacher; and that on their return king Lucius and his chief men were baptized, and a regular Church order established (Collier, *Ecl. History*, vol. i, ch. i; Smith, *Religion of Ancient Britain*, ch. v). But it is very doubtful whether there ever was a king Lucius, and the whole story is now generally discredited.

The Gospel having been introduced into Britain, a Christian Church subsisted there, though not always in an equal degree of vigor, till the persecution of Diocletian. It then acquired new strength from the fortitude of its martyrs. Though the names of only three have been recorded (St. Alban, Aaron, and Julius), yet all historians agree that numbers suffered in Britain with the greatest constancy and courage (compare Gildas, § 8; Bede, i, 6, 7). The first martyr is said to have been St. Alban, who lived in the town of Verulam, which had a Roman colony; he had been converted from paganism by a teacher to whom he had afforded protection from the general persecution. Though Constantian, the Roman governor of Britain, had an inclination to favor the Christians, yet it was not in his power to dispense with the edicts of the emperors, and he complied so far with them as to demolish the churches. Though he died a pagan, yet he granted to the Christians the free exercise of their religion, and protected them from injury or insult. This emperor died at York, and was succeeded by his son Constantine, A.D. 306 (Carwithe, *Hist. of Christian Church*, chap. xvi). The best illustration of the early organization of Christianity in Britain is the fact that three British bishops attended the council at Arles, A.D. 314, the canons of which have among their signers *Eborius* episcopus, de civitate Eboracensi, provincia Britannia; *Restitutus* episcopus, de civitate Londinensi, provincia suprascripta; *Adelfius* episcopus, de civitate colonia Londinensium (perhaps Colonia Lindi, i. e. *Lincoln*); compare Jac. Usserii *Brit. eccles. antiq.* (Lond. 1687); Bingham, *Orig. Ecl.* iii, 557 sq. British bishops also attended the councils of Sardica (A.D. 347) and of Ariminum (A.D. 359).

Little is accurately known of the real state of Christianity in this period. Pelagianism took root in Britain (the native country of Pelagius), and the British bishops called in Germanus and Lupus from Gaul, who refuted Pelagius at the conference of Verulam (A.D. 446). They also founded a cathedral at Llandaff, making Dubricius bishop, with extensive jurisdiction. The monastery of Banchor (Bangor), near Chester, was founded at about the same time.

2. *From the Saxon Invasion, 449, to the Invasion of Augustine, 596.*—Hengist and Horsa, retained by Vortigern, A.D. 449, to aid him with 5000 men in expelling the Scots and Picts from Britain, remained in the island as conquerors. The greater part of Britain was again plunged into barbarism, and Christianity kept its ground only in Wales and Cornwall. (Its history in Ireland and Scotland is given in separate articles.) The patron saint of Wales, St. David (6th century), is said to have been consecrated a bishop at Jerusalem; he held a synod against Pelagianism at Brey, and became archbishop of Caerleon (see DAVID, St.). In Cornwall the British rites and usages were preserved until near the end of the 7th century. Iona, where Columba (q. v.) established his foundations about 565, was a centre of light not only for Scotland, but also for north Britain (see IONA).

(II.) *Middle Age: Era of Submission to the Papacy (6th to 16th century).* Up to the 6th century British Christianity had been independent of Rome. But at that time Gregory the Great determined to seek the conversion of the English Saxons to Christianity. Ethelbert, king of Kent, had married a Christian wife, Bertha, daughter of Charibert, king of the Franks. She induced her husband to favor Christianity, and thus prepared the way for the mission of Augustine (sent by Gregory), who, with a number of monks, landed in 596. They converted Ethelbert, who was not only king of Kent, but Bretwalda, or chief of the Saxon monarchs. His example was soon followed by the kings of Essex and East Anglia, and gradually by the other chieftains of England. It is said that 10,000 English were baptized within the year of Augustine's arrival. In 597 Augustine went over to Arles, in France, where he was consecrated by bishop Virgilius, and on his return he became the first bishop of Canterbury. His see was immediately endowed by king Ethelbert, who likewise established the dioceses of Rochester and London. Another portion of the Anglo-Saxons were converted by Aidan and other Scottish missionaries. But the ecclesiastical system set up by the Roman missionaries was entirely of the Roman type, which differed from that of the Irish and of the old British Church in various points, e. g. the reckoning of Easter, the clerical tonsure, chrisms, etc. More important were the questions of the marriage of the clergy and of the papal jurisdiction. Wherever the Roman influence prevailed, the Roman view, of course, was adopted. But Scottish and Irish missionaries were also at work in the kingdom, and up to the 7th century the converts of the latter were probably in the majority. In 661, king Oswy of Northumberland held a conference at Whithy, where Colman (q. v.) of Lindisfarne maintained the old British and Irish views, and Wilfrid (q. v.) took the Roman side. The king was persuaded by Wilfrid (or perhaps by his queen, who was a Romanist), and went over to the Roman party. Colman and all his clergy then went to Ireland. In 688 the pope sent over Theodore to be primate of England, and under his administration (688–689) the Roman and British Christians (what remained of them) were fused into one body. See THEODORE. But for many ages we hear little of any exercise of jurisdiction by the popes in England: the English bishops and kings did not permit appeals to Rome. When Wilfrid, bishop of York, appealed, A.D. 680, against an English synod which had deposed him from his diocese, and obtained a decree in his favor

from the pope, that decree was disregarded in England, even Theodore himself refusing to obey it. From this period England was in formal connection with the see of Rome up to the time of the Reformation. A few great names shine amid the general gloom, e. g. Bede († 735), Alcuin († 804), king Alfred († 900). The Anglo-Saxon Church, from the time of Alfred, grew more and more Romanish. "At length, from the time of Gregory VII (A.D. 1073), the papal jurisdiction was pushed into England, as it was into other countries; legates made frequent visits, held councils, exacted subsidies. Appeals, dispensations, mandates, reserves, annates, bulls, and all the other inconveniences of papal usurpation, followed each other in rapid succession; and for four centuries no country in Europe suffered more, and with greater reluctance, than England. But the popes and the kings of England had, after much disputation, made their agreement, and the Church was their prey" (Palmer, *Ch. History*, ch. xxii).

The Norman Conquest took place A.D. 1066. From this period, for several centuries, the history of England is full of struggles between the ecclesiastical and royal power for supremacy. William the Conqueror refused to acknowledge the pope as his feudal superior, and declared his right to retain in his own hand the investiture of bishops and abbots which the early Saxon kings had possessed. He prohibited the publishing of papal bulls and letters of advice till they had been submitted to and approved of by him; and, further, he deprived the clergy of the right of excommunicating any of his nobles except with his express permission. On the other hand, "he confirmed by charter a law of Edward the Confessor, granting to the clergy title of cattle and profits, in addition to the ancient title of produce," and committed a still greater error in establishing ecclesiastical courts, to which alone clerical persons were thenceforth to be amenable. The "spiritual courts" became an enormous power in supporting the Roman domination. In 1076 celibacy was first made imperative on the English clergy. "Under Henry Beauclerc a synod met at Westminster, 1102, which passed various reforming measures, the nature of which attests the existing depravity and degradation of the Church. This synod prohibited simony, and the pope ruled that lay investiture was simony, and on this question a rupture between the pope and the king soon occurred. After a struggle to maintain the rights of investiture, which he had received with the crown, Henry felt himself compelled to relinquish them to the pope, and only got permission from the pope for bishops to do homage to him, if they chose, without being on that account removed from their sees. None of the proposed measures of reform accomplished any result. The morals of the clergy were thoroughly relaxed; murder by a person in holy orders was quite a usual occurrence; against such offenders there was no resort to common law, and ecclesiastical courts rarely interfered with them. A case of this kind gave rise to the protracted struggle between Thomas à Becket, archbishop of Canterbury, on the side of the pope, and Henry II. for himself and people" (Eadie, *Cyclopaedia*, s. v.). The "Constitutions of Clarendon" (see CLARENDON) were intended to secure the rights of the civil against the ecclesiastical power; but the resistance of Becket (q. v.), his murder, and the repentant fears of the king, caused their speedy revocation in all the points to which the pope objected. "It was not, however, till the reign of John, when England was laid under an interdict, and the king resigned his crown to the pope, that the papal encroachments rose to their height; and the weak reign of Henry III, which followed, did nothing to abate them. Edward I gave a check to the power of the clergy, subjected them to taxation, and passed the statute of mortmain (1279), which prohibited the transfer of land without the king's consent. There is little to be said as to innovations in doctrine

during these three centuries; but it may be noted that about the middle of this period, viz. 1213, the Council of St. John Lateran declared transubstantiation, or the bodily presence of Christ in the consecrated elements, to be a tenet of the Church" (Chambers, s. v.). In 1350 the important statute of *Provisors* was passed. It was provoked by the fact that most of the valuable English benefices were reserved to the pope or to alien clergy, and it provided that the pope should confer no English benefice on any one without consent of the king. The statute of *Premunire* (1389; enlarged 1393) forbade any interference of the Church with the statute of *Provisors*, and also all appeals from English civil courts to the pope. The statute of *Mortmain* (in Magna Charta), and the various amendments and additions to it, all aimed to prevent the accumulation of property in the Church. See *MORTMAIN*.

In the reign of Henry II certain German Church reformers found their way to England—probably Waldensian Christians; and, though they were bitterly persecuted, all the good seed did not perish. In 1327 John Wycliffe was born. As rector of Lutterworth he preached until his death against the supremacy of the pope, the abuses of the hierarchy, and the Romish doctrine of the sacraments. In 1377 he was arrested for heresy, but no harm came to him. His translation of the Scriptures, and other writings, made a great impression upon the more educated classes, but his labors had little effect upon the mass of the people. After his death more fruit appeared; and by 1400 his followers were numerous enough to form a party and to get the designation of *Lollards* (q. v.), and for a century persecution for Lollardism was common in England. "Henry IV thought it necessary to fortify his usurped position by assisting the bishops against the Lollards, and from this time to the Reformation there was an uninterrupted succession of confessors and martyrs. Sir John Oldcastle, lord Cobham, was the most illustrious of these sufferers. Fox gives a detailed account of nearly twenty individuals burned for heresy between the death of lord Cobham and 1509, when Henry VIII ascended the throne. To some extent, the blood of these martyrs was the seed of the Reformed Church; but we must not overlook the 'hidden seed,' which was growing secretly from the time that Wycliffe gave to his countrymen a translation of the Scriptures in their own tongue. The progress of learning, and especially the study of Greek, led to a better understanding of the sacred books, whilst the invention of printing (1442) caused a wider circulation of them" (Chambers, s. v.). See *WYCLIFFE*; *LOLLARDS*.

(III.) *From the Reformation to the present Time.*—The Church of Rome, however, was to all outward appearance fairly established in England at the time of the accession of Henry VIII in 1509 [see *HENRY VIII*], and his minister, cardinal Wolsey, maintained the splendor of the Church to a degree unexampled in England. Nevertheless, the great edifice was already undermined. In view of the facts cited in the last paragraph, it is absurd to say, as Roman writers do, that the source of the English Reformation is to be found in the vices of Henry VIII. However, it was not till the reign of that monarch that the Reformation in England in reality commenced. When Luther declared war against the pope, Henry wrote his treatise on the seven sacraments against Luther's book, *Of the Captivity of Babylon*, and was repaid by the pontiff with the title of "Defender of the Faith" (1521). The king had married his brother's widow, Catharine of Aragon, and was weary of her. Wolsey at first favored a divorce, "to revenge himself on Charles V for having disappointed him of the papacy; but after the king began to look with favor on Anne Boleyn, one of a house from whom Wolsey had everything to fear, he adopted a covert policy of opposition to the divorce he had suggested. When at last he was pressed on every side, with no open way before him, and his own

ruin imminent, his course became tortuous, and was marked by a constant endeavor to protract the proceedings, and delay any sentence being pronounced on this question by the pope. The issue was, in consequence of the advice of Cranmer, an appeal to the universities, and to the learned men of Christendom, for their opinion on this point, which was given in favor, for the most part, of Henry. The disgrace of Wolsey followed thereon. See *WOLSEY*. Henry's quarrel with the pope daily became more palpable. Convocation was summoned in 1531, and charged with breaking the statutes of *provisors* and *premunire*. They humbly offered to pay a fine. The first step towards a schism was made by this Convocation, but it was under the pressure of the court. They proclaimed the king of England 'only and supreme lord, and, as far as the law of Christ permits, even the supreme head of the Church of England.' In 1533, on the elevation of Cranmer to the see of Canterbury, he pronounced sentence of divorce between Henry VIII and Catharine; and the marriage of Anne Boleyn to Henry was publicly notified. The pope declared this illegal, and threatened, unless these doings were undone, that he would pronounce excommunication on Henry. To prevent any such proceedings affecting the stability of his throne and his succession, in the following year Henry caused Parliament to abolish all papal authority in England, and to stop all payments to the Roman exchequer. After this came, under Thomas Cromwell, acting as vice-regent, a blow upon popish power in England from which it never recovered—namely, first a visitation, and then, as a consequence, the suppression of the monasteries, because 'they had long and notoriously been guilty of vicious and abominable living.' Among the bishops there were two parties; one whose sympathies were with the pope, the other with reform; to the former belonged Bonner and Gardiner, to the latter Cranmer and Latimer. But it was necessary to have some authoritative declaration of what the Church of England held since it had rejected the pope; and hence, in 1536, the king, as head of the Church, issued a proclamation on this subject, and in 1539 Parliament passed an act for establishing the Creed, under the rather characteristic title, 'An act for abolishing diversity of opinions.' By this the doctrine of transubstantiation was taught, and the penalty of death by burning was attached to the denial of it. All who stood out for 'the necessity of the communion in both kinds, or for the marriage of priests, or against the observance of vows of chastity, or the propriety of private masses, or the fitness of auricular confession; all priests who shall marry after having advisedly made vows of chastity, shall suffer the pains of death as felons; and all those who maintain the same errors under any other manner may be imprisoned during the king's pleasure' (Mackintosh). Henry felt compelled to go on and increase the distance which separated him from Rome. There was in the Church a powerful party (Cranmer, Latimer, and many others of less note) that were of progressive tendencies, and to this party Thomas Cromwell, during his continuance in power, lent all his influence. His favor shown to the Protestant cause was one ground of his fall. About this time, too, several editions of the English Bible were printed and circulated with the permission of Henry. They were based upon Coverdale's translation. To Cranmer and Cromwell the permission to circulate them is due, and the command to place them in the cathedrals for public use, and for ministers to instruct their people in them. But the tide of political power now turned in favor of the Romanist party, and these permissions were withdrawn: the Bible became again for a time a prohibited book, and many who had received enlightened views of truth suffered bitter persecution. "In 1540 Cranmer persuaded Henry to appoint a commission, of which he was made a member, to draw up a formal

confession. This appeared under the title, *The Erudition of a Christian Man*. It indicates some progress, since it only recommends prayers for the dead as 'good and charitable; and because it is not known what condition departed souls are in, we ought only to recommend them to the mercy of God.' It affirms justification by faith, though it modifies this declaration so far as to add, 'Yet man, prevented by grace, is by his free consent and obedience a worker toward the attaining of his own justification.' It forbids the worship of images, though it allows their use to excite devotional feeling. It altered some minor matters also in the service. Such was the character of the Church of England's first confession. The Reformers were gaining strength, and under Edward VI and the Protector Somerset their triumph was undoubted. Thirty commissioners were sent through the country to abolish superstitious practices. Crammer drew up twelve homilies, which were appointed to be read in the churches where the ministers could not preach. This was one of the provisions made for the diffusion of sound religious knowledge. This step, and the sermons themselves, elicited the unqualified approbation of the Continental Reformers. Crammer wrote also a catechism, which was generally circulated. Such theologians as Bucer and Peter Martyr were invited to come and lecture in the English universities; and the most strenuous exertions were made to provide preaching; 'one sermon every quarter of the year at least' in every church being imperative. But such was the state of the Romish clergy that even this much they could hardly accomplish. In 1547 Parliament repealed the various persecuting acts of Henry VIII and earlier reigns, levelled against the new opinions, as they are often called. As Convocation was inclined in favor of the Romish party, Parliament assumed to itself the task of reforming the Church. It passed that year acts 'concerning the sacrament,' ordaining 'the communion to be received in both kinds,' forbidding the priest to communicate alone, and requiring him to prepare the people for worthily communicating by an exhortation on the day *preceding* its celebration. In 1548 there was a commission appointed for the revision of the offices of public worship. One of its first fruits was a new communion service. Confession was no longer made imperative. At the same time a new liturgy was compiled. At the end of it occurs the petition—'From the tyranny of the bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities, good Lord, deliver us.' See COMMON PRAYER. In 1551 a farther series of emendations was made in the Prayer-book: in it very few alterations have since been introduced. The same year the Articles, then forty-two in number, were published. See ARTICLES, THIRTY-NINE. The commission appointed in 1552 to prepare a canon law, in consequence of the death of Edward, was discontinued before its work was done. Under his reign the progress of reformation had been rapid, but it was to be sorely tried. Mary ascended the throne (1553) and re-established Romanism. Bonner and Gardiner were restored; the Book of Common Prayer and Catechism were declared heretical; the kingdom was reconciled to the see of Rome; a persecution of the chief reformers commenced—Rogers was burned at Smithfield, Hooper at Gloucester, Saunders at Coventry, Taylor at Hadley. The prisons were filled with 'heretics;' many fled beyond sea; some purchased safety by an outward conformity. Crammer, Latimer, and Ridley perished in the flames at Oxford. Cardinal Pole was made primate. One benefit was conferred on the Church by Mary—she surrendered all the Church lands, as well as the first-fruits and tithes, which had been seized by Henry. At last the death of Mary (1558), with which that of the cardinal was all but simultaneous, delivered the Church from its oppressors. Under Elizabeth (1558-1603) Protestantism was again in the ascendant; and by the various measures

which were taken, the Reformation in England was completed. The Convocation of 1562, besides drawing up the Thirty-nine Articles, published two volumes of homilies by Crammer, Ridley, and Latimer, and caused Nowell, dean of St. Paul's, to draw up a catechism for general use. See NOWELL.

"About this time the more extreme reforming party began to appear (see PURITANS), and to exert their influence specially in all the questions which arose about the various ceremonies of the Church. Elizabeth's extreme jealousy of her supreme authority often obstructed the plans for reform which the more zealous clergy contrived—a jealousy which brought her into collision with the primate himself, as on the subject of 'the prophesyings.' The works of the great Continental divines, as Calvin and Bullinger, were studied in England; and the great standard work of Richard Hooker on *Ecclesiastical Polity*—which may be styled the apology of the Church of England—was published 1594-97.

"When James ascended the throne, both the Puritans and the Church party calculated on having his support. The Puritans hastened to present to him the famous Millenary Petition, which embodied a statement of those things in the Church which they desired to see amended. This elicited from the universities a counter-petition, and James held a conference with both parties at Hampton Court (q. v.), January, 1604. It resulted in no-good to the Puritans, for king James now thought Episcopacy was most conformable to monarchy, and the reply to their arguments he pithily put in the form 'No bishop, no king.' One advantage which ensued from this conference was the revision of the translation of the Bible, instituted at the suggestion of the leader of the Puritans, and the result was the present authorized version. During the reign of James the famous Synod of Dort met, and four English divines were sent thither by James. See DORT, SYNOD OF. Henceforward the Calvinistic party in the Church of England began to decline, and king James himself turned against it. James first issued the *Book of Sports* in 1618, and offended very many, because he thereby legally sanctioned certain amusements on the Sabbath day. Under Charles it was republished in 1663, the declaration affirming that it was done 'out of a pious care for the service of God . . . . and the ease, comfort, and recreation of our well-deserving people.' It was received with manifest disgust, and many of the clergy refused to obey the ordinance requiring its publication in the churches. In 1644 the House of Commons caused it to be burnt by the hangman. See SPORTS, BOOK OF." Under Charles, the High-Church party, with Laud at their head, rose to the highest power. The court of High Commission and the Star Chamber never had more constant employment, and their hateful tyranny most thoroughly roused the people. The severity of Laud occasioned the greatest discontent; and the Puritan party, as they could not maintain themselves in the Church, began to found special lectureships; but, on Laud's advice, the king issued instructions to the bishops to suppress all such. Forbearance at last came to an end. Then came the great rebellion and civil war, which led to the putting down of Episcopacy, and the establishment of Presbyterianism on the basis of the *Westminster Confession*, though afterwards Independence took the lead. Laud was condemned the day after the House of Commons established Presbyterianism, and executed January 10, 1645.

"With the restoration of Charles II occurred the restoration of Episcopacy in England. The Sunday after his return heard the liturgy read in almost every parish church. The Puritans, who are henceforward known as Presbyterians (q. v.), having greatly contributed to the restoration, were treated at first by Charles with kindness, and several of their number were offered high ecclesiastical preferments. In 1661



the famous Savoy Conference (q. v.) met, with Baxter as leader of the Presbyterian party, and Sheldon as that of the bishops, to try, if possible, to unite both sides. As might have been expected, the plan failed. In 1662 the Act of Uniformity was passed; and, rather than take the test it prescribed, 2000 Puritan clergy left the Church of England. Then, in quick succession, followed those persecuting acts, the Corporation, Conventicle, and Five-miles Acts. Still further grievances were inflicted by the Test Act of 1672. Next arose another school of divines—'Christian philosophers rather than divines.' Their lives were moral, but they eviscerated the Gospel of all that was characteristic of it. When a plan for 'comprehension' was revived in 1668, the House of Commons prohibited such a measure being introduced. When James, duke of York, professed Roman Catholicism, Charles at once proclaimed complete toleration. This was in 1672; but the Commons the year following compelled him to withdraw his indulgence. Popery they were determined to resist. When James came into power he proclaimed similar indulgences, and forbade preaching against Romanist errors: nay, in defiance of the enactment of 1651, he re-created the court of High Commission. These measures the clergy resisted. In consequence of his resistance, the bishop of London was suspended for a time. The University of Cambridge came into collision with the king, and also Magdalen College, Oxford. Rather than do what might advantage Rome, the Nonconformists did not avail themselves of the royal indulgence. But James renewed his declaration, and commanded that it should be published in the churches. Eighteen out of twenty-five bishops refused to do so, and nearly all the clergy. The bishops were commanded to cite the recusants, but they refused. Seven of them—Sanicroft, Lloyd, Ken, Turner, Lake, White, and Irelawney—even drew up a remonstrance, and, as a consequence, were sent to the Tower. Their committal to it had rather the appearance of a triumphal entry, from the enthusiasm displayed by the people on their behalf. They were tried at Westminster Hall, and the news of their acquittal was received with rapturous delight on all hands, for all felt that they were committed to a struggle against an insidious attempt to restore Popery. The royal career of James was now ending, and his further schemes were not developed, for that very year the Prince of Orange landed (5th of November, 1688). One of William's earliest acts was the passing of a toleration bill in 1689; but an act of comprehension was rejected in the Commons. In September of that year a commission was appointed to revise the liturgy and canons, and reform ecclesiastical abuses; but all their proposals were rejected by Convocation. Three of the seven bishops mentioned above refused the oath of allegiance to William and Mary. They headed the party known as the Nonjurors, which ceased to exist as an independent Episcopal Church in 1780; but many of them became attached to the Scottish Episcopalians" (Chambers, s. v.). See NONJURORS.

During the period just described a school of divines was formed who, in seeking to avoid Puritanism on the one hand, and Romanism on the other, became Latitudinarians. "They became Christian philosophers rather than divines; and, except an occasional dissertation on the Trinity or a Whitsunday sermon, in which the work of the Holy Spirit was carefully guarded against fanatical abuses, they scarcely interfered with matters of Christian doctrine. Still they were men of blameless lives, and in a slothful age remarkable for pastoral diligence. Amongst the leaders were Whitecoate, Cudworth, Wilkins, and Worthington; some of these were known to be men of eminent piety, but it was more apparent in their lives (and, since their deaths, by their private diaries) than in their preaching. They were equally afraid of superstition on the one hand, and enthusiasm on the

other. They loved the constitution of the Church, and were well satisfied with the liturgy; but they did not think all other forms unlawful. They wished to see a spirit of greater moderation. They continued on good terms with Nonconformists, and allowed great freedoms, not only in philosophical speculations, but in religion; and the boldness of their inquiries into the reasonableness, rather than the scriptural warrant of the truths of religion, led them to be regarded as Socinians. They were all zealous against Popery; and the Papists cried them down, in return, as Athelists, Deists, or, at best, Socinians, and men of no principles at all. In the society of these men, Tillotson, Patrick, Lloyd, and Stillingfleet were trained—the greatest divines of the next generation, but still with the faults of the school in which they had been educated. They received, and long bore, the title of the Latitudinarian divines; and, in the sense in which we have explained it, the charge was just. They attempted a divorce between evangelical doctrine and Christian practice. The former they at first neglected, and at length lost out of sight; the latter they displayed with admirable clearness, and, if any other principles than those of the Gospel could possibly have enforced it, they would not have so completely failed. But the founders of the school made no deep impression in the days of Charles II, and their still more gifted pupils saw religion in the Church of England almost expiring in spite of all their efforts" (Marsden, *Churches and Sects*, i, 286). "In 1698 the Church of England gave birth to two noble philanthropic schemes—the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, which circulates Bibles, Prayer-books, and Tracts; and in 1701 the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts was chartered." In 1747 Convocation was dissolved. See CONVOCATION.

"That the Church of England, after fighting for its very existence against Popery on the one hand, and against Puritanism on the other, should have subsided into inactivity during the dull reigns of the Georges, is less a matter of surprise than of regret. The peaceful enjoyment of her temporalities in a dull, irreligious, not to say infidel age, may easily account for, though it cannot excuse, her illness. But that in the rise of John Wesley, 1730, she should have failed to see a grand opportunity for herself, is a matter of both surprise and regret; she, however, let it pass; nor can she hope that such another will ever again present itself. See METHODISM; WESLEY. The utmost that can be hoped is that she has seen her error.

"The next important event in the history of the Church is the Act of Union, which came into effect on the 1st of January, 1801, and united the churches of England and Ireland in all matters of doctrine, worship, and discipline. The Reformation had made some progress in Ireland under Edward VI. Five Protestant bishops were appointed in 1560, and the English Bible and Liturgy were introduced in 1551; but, from a variety of causes, the Reformed doctrines have never found much acceptance with the native population, and, although a Protestant Church was established by law, it was and is the Church of the minority. See IRELAND. In 1635 the English Articles were received, and in 1662 the English Book of Common Prayer was adopted by Convocation. Before the political union of the countries, the two churches were in full communion. By an act of the imperial Parliament in 1833, ten of the Irish bishoprics were suppressed, and the funds thus obtained were applied to the augmentation of small livings, and the building and repair of churches" (Chambers, *Cyclopaedia*, s. v.). It is now proposed (1868) to "disestablish" the Episcopal Church in Ireland, and the proposal will doubtless be carried into effect.

In the progress of the 19th century great changes have passed over the Church of England. The formation of the Church Missionary Society (see MIS-

SIONARY SOCIETIES), of the Bible Society, etc., and especially the influence of Methodism, awakened the long dormant spirit of aggressive Christianity. Since 1800 more than 3000 churches have been erected. About 1830 several earnest young men in the University of Oxford gave signs of profound theological study, and of deep interest in Church questions. In reaction, perhaps, from the latitudinarianism of the 18th century, their studies lay chiefly in the fathers and mediæval writers, and in 1833 they began the publication of the Oxford tracts, calling for a revival of obsolete usages, and bringing up again Romanist or quasi-Romanist views in theology. A brief history of this movement is given under PUSEYISM; it must suffice to say here that many young clergymen, as the result of the movement, went over to Rome; and those of the school who remained gave rise to the modern RITUALISM (q. v.), which tends to import the spirit, doctrines, and practices of the Church of Rome into the Church of England. In the autumn of 1867 a conference of bishops of the Church of England, and of the churches in communion with the English, was held at Lambeth. The chief object of this synod was to promote a closer union between all branches of the Anglican Church. A resolution censuring bishop Colenso, of Natal, for his deviation from the doctrine of the Church, was adopted by all save three votes. The pastoral letter, signed by the bishops, warned the people against Romanizing tendencies, but made no reference to controversies within the Church. A Greek translation of the pastoral letter was officially transmitted by the archbishop of Canterbury to all the patriarchs and bishops of the Greek Church. See PAN-ANGLICAN SYNOD. In order to promote the interest of intelligent laymen in the affairs of the Church, a "Church Congress" was called in 1860, which from that time has held annual sessions. See CHURCH CONGRESS. Several attempts were made by the High-Church party to introduce monastic institutions. Thus the Rev. Mr. Lyne, assuming the name of father Ignatius, endeavored to establish an Anglican branch of the Benedictine order, but the first monastery of the order at Norwich had, after a trial of a few years, to be abandoned. At Bristol a community of the Third Order of St. Benedict was organized. The Rev. Mr. Macconochie, in 1867, established a Society of the Holy Cross, of which he was the first master. But thus far (1868) all these attempts have met with but little success. See MONASTICISM. The High-Church party exhibited a great desire to bring on a closer union with the Eastern churches. A special society, the Eastern Church Association (see below, *Statistics*), was established to promote the cause, and the Convocations of Canterbury and York gave their official approval of the scheme. See EASTERN CHURCHES, GREEK CHURCH, and PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH. Official communications for the same purpose were also opened with the Church of Sweden, but this step was strenuously opposed by one portion of the High-Church party on the ground that the Swedish Church held some heretical doctrines.

II. CONSTITUTION AND GOVERNMENT.—1. *Church and State*.—The constitution of the Reformed Church of England is that "of an authorized and paid establishment, which is not allowed to persecute those who dissent from it" (Short). The union of Church and State was completely secured by the statutes that followed the Reformation up to the Revolution of 1688. The English Church constitution remained nearly unchanged by the Reformation, only that the crown took the place of the pope. The course of subsequent legislation brought in, however, many important modifications of detail. The old statutes, though rarely enforced, were still law, excepting when expressly abrogated. One of the most important of these was the *Præmunire* (see above). The statute 25 of Henry VIII (1534), ch. xxi, declares entire independence of

Rome, and calls the king *supreme head* of the Church of England, according to the recognition of its prelates and clergy. This statute abolishes Peter's pence, and provides for the visitation of monasteries by royal commission.

During the reign of Mary Popery was restored, but all the statutes to that effect were repealed by stat. 1 of Elizabeth (1558-9), which transfers the headship of the Church from the pope to the English crown, and declares the *royal supremacy* perpetual. Every form of spiritual and ecclesiastical jurisdiction and prerogative is included in the declaration. The crown can exercise this authority through such officers as it may select, provided they be British subjects appointed by letters-patent. The act prescribes the oath of supremacy, to be taken by all civil and spiritual officers. See OATH OF SUPREMACY. The *Act of Uniformity* (1559) restored the Common Prayer, and required the clergy to conform strictly to it. The statute 13 Eliz. c. 11 (1571), incorporated the 39 articles which had been agreed upon by the Convocation of 1562 into the law of the land. This act, with the laws of supremacy and uniformity, and the articles, settled the government, the worship, and the doctrines of the Church. The queen, though subject to the Church order and doctrines, was invested with full power to govern the Church, and to fill the highest ecclesiastical offices. Church and State were fused together, for all citizens of the State were made members of the Church; the officers of the Church were officers of the State, and the head of the State was made head of the Church. The Revolution made several changes in the constitution of the Church. By stat. 1 William and Mary, ch. vi (April, 1689), the coronation oath was modified. In it the king swore not merely to govern according to the old laws and customs, but also to maintain the laws of God and the true confession of the Gospel, and of the Protestant Reformed religion as by law established; and to "preserve unto the bishops and clergy of this realm, and to the churches committed to their charge, all such rights and privileges as by law do or shall appertain unto them." The 8th chapter substituted a new form of the oath of allegiance, in which the recognition of the king's ecclesiastical supremacy is left out, and in its place stands a promise to obey the king truly; with an anathema of the impious doctrine that princes excommunicated by the pope should be deposed and executed, and that a foreign potentate can have ecclesiastical authority within the realm. The same statute (ch. xviii) removed some penalties from Dissenters, and made them eligible to office, provided they took the oath of allegiance personally, or by proxy, in case of conscientious objection to taking the special oaths of office. During the present century a number of acts have been passed annulling disabilities of Papists and Dissenters; and it is now the case that Dissenters and Romanists have religious freedom, are eligible to civil office, and are admitted to Parliament.

2. *Government*.—(1.) The king is the supreme head of the Church on earth, at least in name and form. Formerly the clergy made the following subscription: "That the king's (queen's) majesty, under God, is the only supreme governor of this realm, and of all other his highness's dominions and countries, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal," etc.; but by an act of Parliament of July 5, 1865 (28th and 29th Vict. cap. 122), persons to be ordained deacons or priests are required (1) to make a "Declaration of Assent" to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion and to the Book of Common Prayer, and of the Ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; (2) to take the *Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy* (21st and 22d Vict. cap. 38), by which they swear to be faithful and bear true allegiance to the queen, and declare that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power,

superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm. "The highest Church offices are filled by the ministry in the name of the crown. The Privy Council, in which only temporals vote, is the highest court of appeal."

(2.) The management of the Church is in the hands of a hierarchy of archbishops and bishops, subject to the authority of the king and Parliament. The United Church of England and Ireland is divided into four provinces: two English, Canterbury and York; two Irish, Armagh and Dublin. These are under four mutually independent archbishops. The bishops, as well as the archbishops, are spiritual peers, excepting the bishop last consecrated, and the bishop of Sodor and Man, who does not sit in the House of Lords unless he happens to be a peer in his own right. Archbishops are chosen by the crown from among the bishops. The sovereign also nominates the bishops. The Church is governed, "under her majesty, by archbishops, bishops, deans, archdeacons, and the rest that bear office in the same" (Can. vii). The archbishops and bishops alone have the power to ordain clergymen; and these ordinations take place, according to canon law, at "allotted certain times," and "only on the Sundays immediately following *jejunia quatuor temporum*, commonly called Ember weeks." Candidates for the ministry are usually graduates of Cambridge or Oxford, or Trinity College, Dublin, or else of Durham, Lampeter, or St. Bees; but the bishops are not bound to restrict ordination to members of any university or college. Approved candidates take "the oath of supremacy," sign a declaration that they will conform to the liturgy, and subscribe three articles: the first affirming the supremacy of the sovereign in the Church; the second asserting that the Book of Common Prayer contains nothing contrary to the word of God, and that the ordained person will use the form of the said book; and the third, that they hold all "the Thirty-nine Articles." The candidate is first ordained a deacon, and so continues for one year. At the expiration of this term he undergoes an examination; and when this is satisfactory, he is admitted by the bishop to the order of priest, or presbyter. Several of the presbyters, as well as the bishop, lay their hands simultaneously on the head of every candidate, while the bishop repeats the form prescribed in the ordination service. When once ordained a presbyter, he is competent to take any duty or to hold any preferment in the Church.

(3.) The country is divided into parishes, and many of these have been of late years subdivided. See PARISH. The property of the Church of England is obtained through many different channels, and is very valuable: the total revenues are estimated as being not under five millions a year; and yet so unequal is the distribution, that there are, out of 10,500 benefices, not less than 6800 with incomes under £300 a year; and of these there are 3460 livings whose annual value is under £150. The curates have a very inadequate compensation, the ordinary pay ranging, in large towns, from £70 to £150.

The total number of benefices in 1867 was 12,888. Of late some reforms have been effected by the Parliament. There is a special board of "ecclesiastical commissioners for England to administer the state patronage of ecclesiastical benefices. In their twentieth report, issued in 1868, they state that in the current year they expect to complete the scheme which, in their report of 1864, they proposed to accomplish within five years. Every living with less income than £300 a year which then existed, and contained, according to the census of 1861, a population of 4000 persons, will, on the 1st of March, 1869, have had its income raised to £300 a year, except those cases in private patronage where the one half of the augmentation which the patrons were required to provide from non-ecclesiastical sources has not been forthcoming.

In their report of 1853 the commissioners referred to an arrangement which had been entered into with the dean and chapter of York, whereby the capitular estates (subject to subsisting leases) had become vested in the commissioners, and in lieu thereof the dean and chapter were to receive an annuity until the commissioners should restore to them real estates in possession calculated to produce an income equal to such annuity; and it was estimated that the arrangement would at a future date yield a considerable surplus for the augmentation of small livings. At the close of 1852 the chapter of Carlisle effected a similar commutation. In 1855 the Cathedral Commission advised that all the improved revenue derived from the better management of capitular property should be appropriated to the augmentation of capitular incomes, and to the improvement of cathedral institutions. In 1856 a committee of the House of Commons sat to consider the proceedings of the ecclesiastical commissioners, and in their third report set out the details of the York chapter commutation, and observe, "Such agreements tend to facilitate enfranchisement, and to provide funds for the endowment of poor livings, as well as to afford a ready means of providing estates in possession for the ecclesiastical corporations." In the year 1854 the chapters of Peterborough and Chester; in 1855, the chapter of Gloucester; in 1856, St. Asaph; in 1857, Worcester; in 1860, Chichester; in 1861, Winchester and Salisbury; in 1862, Bristol, Canterbury, and Exeter; in 1866, Wells, Rochester, and St. David's; and in 1867, the chapters of Llandaff and Windsor, effected similar commutations of their capitular estates. All these arrangements have been successively sanctioned by orders in council. Commutations have thus been effected with no fewer than eighteen chapters. Under these commutations the chapters gave up their ancient estates in consideration of annual money payments to be received by them, pending their re-endowment with real estates in possession; and in 1862 the permanent estate of the chapter of York; in 1863, that of Peterborough; in 1865, those of Carlisle and Chichester; in 1866, those of Chester, Gloucester, and Canterbury; and in 1867, that of Winchester, were reassigned. As a consequence, the commissioners, in the period between 1864 and 1868, considered the local claims of the parochial cures upon the estates of the chapters of York, Peterborough, Carlisle, and Chichester, and, so far as the value of the property would permit, the requisite grants were made to such parochial cures." See below, *Patronage and Statistics*.

(4.) The only ecclesiastical assembly of the English Church is *Convocation* (q. v.), which is a convention of the clergy to discuss Church affairs in time of Parliament. As the Parliament consists of two distinct houses, so does this Convocation; the one called the upper house, where the archbishops and bishops sit severally by themselves; the other the lower house, where the rest of the clergy are represented by their deputies. The power of the Convocation is limited by a statute of Henry VIII. They are not to make any canons or ecclesiastical laws without the royal license; nor, when permitted to make any, can they put them in execution but under severe restrictions. In the year 1661 the English Convocation granted a subsidy to king Charles II, which was the last tax of this nature paid by the English clergy; for, by an arrangement made between archbishop Sheldon and lord chancellor Clarendon in 1664, the Convocation of the clergy thenceforward gave up the privilege of taxing themselves to the House of Commons, in consideration of being allowed to vote at the election of members of that house (Eden). Of late, the Convocations, both of Canterbury and York, have again been permitted to meet, talk, vote addresses to the crown, etc., but they have no real power. See CONVOCATION.

(5.) *Canons*.—In the Convocation which met at the time of the Parliament of 1604, the canons by which

the Church of England is still governed were passed. They are said to have been collected by Bancroft from the canons of the ancient Church, and the articles, injunctions, and acts of Convocation during the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth. They received the royal sanction, but were not carried through the two houses of Parliament, and are not, therefore, laws of the realm. They bind the clergy only, and that by virtue of their promise of canonical obedience. Many of them have been virtually repealed by subsequent enactments, especially the Toleration Act. Many of those that remain are such that the best and wisest members of the Church would gladly see them repealed. See CANONS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

(6.) *Patronage*.—The theory of the Church of England is that whoever originally built a church is entitled to choose its minister in perpetuity—i. e. is the *patron* of the living. What follows on this point is from a Church of England writer (Marsden, *Churches and Sects*, i, 332): “In a few instances this right is still vested in the descendants of the original patron, but these must be rare. The right of patronage is now a salable commodity, transferred, or sold by auction, to the highest bidder, like any other real property, and the patronage of the Church of England is consequently dispersed wherever wealth has found its way: 1144 benefices are in the gift of the crown; 1853 in that of the bishops; 938 in that of cathedral chapters and other dignitaries; 770 in that of the universities and collegiate bodies; 6092 in private persons; and 931 (vicarages or perpetual curacies) in the incumbent of the mother church. The good and evil of this system are so nearly balanced that thoughtful and wise men are to be met with every day who, as they look at the favorable or dark side of the question, are disposed to cherish it as the nearest approach that is ever likely to be made in practice to a perfect theory; or, on the other hand, to reject it as unjust and full of danger. Its evils lie upon the surface, and they are by no means slight. It has a tendency to promote a subservient spirit, inconsistent with the courage and simplicity of the Christian minister, towards those in whose hands patronage is vested, for upon them advancement in the Church depends. It excludes many valuable men from livings of importance, and thrusts many incompetent men into stations for which they are but meanly qualified. It fills our choicest parishes with men rather well bred than deeply learned—men of courtesy and benevolence rather than a fervent zeal; and, consequently, the parish church wears to the poor man too frequently something of a cold and aristocratic air. He is spoken to by his superior in the presence of his superiors, and he retires to the dissenting chapel, not that he prefers dissent, but that he meets with sympathy and feels himself at home. Patronage is either held by individuals, or vested in corporations or in trustees; but the individual may have little sense of religion; he may give away his church on considerations of friendship, or he may look upon it merely as a provision for a younger son. Corporate bodies have less conscience than individuals. Previous to the act for reforming municipal corporations twenty years ago, most of the livings in our ancient towns and boroughs were in the gift of our municipal corporations. Their appointments, on an average, were certainly not better than those of private patrons; religion slumbered in our great towns not less profoundly than in our country villages. Several trusts have been formed of late years for the purchase of advowsons (an advowson is the right of presentation in perpetuity), and none can deny them at least the praise of pure disinterestedness. They have expended large sums to obtain in return the right of placing zealous ministers of evangelical principles in populous places. But all these various methods of patronage labor under the same defect—the congregation whose spiritual interests are to be committed to

the new pastor, and the parishioners amongst whom, as their friend or their example, he is to live and die, have no voice whatever in the momentous choice. The party most interested looks on with indifference, or hope, or silent resignation. The English lay churchman, in the most important event that can affect his parish during his lifetime, finds everything done for him; it is only on trifling matters that he is consulted. He may help to build the school, he may discharge the duties of churchwarden, but with regard to the appointment of the minister he has no right to speak.” A remarkable illustration of the way in which ecclesiastical wealth is monopolized by certain families is afforded in the case of Richard and George Pretyman, sons of the bishop of Lincoln, which is stated in the *Methodist Quarterly*, 1853, p. 157.

III. DOCTRINES.—(1.) The doctrinal standards of the united Church of England and Ireland are, after the Scriptures, the Book of Homilies, the Thirty-nine Articles, and the Prayer-book. (a) *The Homilies* (q. v.) were composed by Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, men of unexceptionable learning and orthodoxy; or, according to others, the first book was written principally by Cranmer, and the second by Jewel. They were appointed to be read in churches at the beginning of the Reformation, when, by reason of the scarcity of learned divines, few ministers were found who could safely be trusted to preach their own compositions. (b) The first draught of the *Articles* was composed by archbishop Cranmer, assisted by bishop Ridley, in the year 1551; and after being corrected by the other bishops, and approved by the Convocation, they were published in Latin and English in 1553, and amounted to forty-two in number. In 1562 they were revised and corrected. Being then reduced to thirty-nine, they were drawn up in Latin only; but in 1571 they were subscribed by the members of the two houses of Convocation, both in Latin and English, and therefore the Latin and English copies are to be considered as equally authentic. See ARTICLES, XXXIX. (c) During the last century disputes arose among the clergy respecting the propriety of subscribing to any human formulæ of religious sentiments. Parliament, in 1772, was applied to for the abolition of the subscription by certain clergymen and others, whose petition received the most ample discussion, but was rejected by a large majority. It has been generally held by most, if not all Calvinists, both in and out of the Church, that the doctrinal parts of the articles are Calvinistic. This opinion, however, has been warmly controverted. It is no doubt nearer the truth to conclude that the articles are framed with comprehensive latitude, and that neither Calvinism nor Arminianism was intended to be exclusively established (Watson, s. v. *Church*). See Puller's *Moderation of the Church of England considered*, 1679 (new edit. Lond. 1843, 8vo); and also see ARMINIANISM, vol. i, p. 416, 417; ARTICLES LAMBETH, vol. i, p. 441. The articles contain, however, what the Church of England holds to be a fair scriptural account of the leading doctrines of Christianity, together with a condemnation of what she considers to be the principal errors of the Church of Rome and of certain Protestant sects. As far as they go (and there are many things unnoticed by them), they are a legal definition of the doctrines of the Church of England and Ireland, though the members of that communion look to the Prayer-book as well as to the articles for the genuine expression of her faith. The articles are far more thoroughly Protestant than the Prayer-book, taken as a whole. Although the articles expressly assert that the Church of Rome has erred, attempts have repeatedly been made by the High-Church party of the Church of England to show that there is no irreconcilable difference between the Thirty-nine Articles and the decrees of the Council of Trent, and that a construction can be put upon them fully harmonizing them. To show this was, in particular, the object of

Dr. Newman's celebrated tract (*Tracts for the Times*, No. 90, Oxf. 1839), and more recently of Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon* (Lond. 1865; N. Y. 1866). See also *Christ. Remembrancer*, Jan. 1866, art. vi.

(2.) For the preservation of doctrine and discipline in the Church of England, many provisions are made both by the civil and canon law. Whoever shall come to the possession of the crown of England shall join in communion with the Church of England, as by law established (12 and 13 Will. III, ch. ii, § 3). By the 1 Will. III, ch. vi, an oath shall be administered to every king or queen who shall succeed to the imperial crown of this realm, at their coronation; to be administered by one of the archbishops or bishops; to be thereunto approved by such king or queen, that they will do the utmost in their power to maintain the laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel, and Protestant Reformed religion established by law; and will preserve unto the bishops and clergy of this realm, and to the churches committed to their charge, all such rights and privileges as by law do or shall appertain unto them, or any of them. And by the 5 Anne, ch. v, the king, at his coronation, shall take and subscribe an oath to maintain and preserve inviolably the settlement of the Church of England, and the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government thereof, as by law established (§ 2).

(3.) In practice there is no definite creed or system of theology in the Church of England. Its members have always been divided into parties. There has always been a Sacramentarian party, approximating in doctrine to the teachings of Rome, though it has never had great influence since Laud's time until the recent rise of Puseyism (q. v.). And, on the other hand, there have never been wanting representatives of the Puritan or Evangelical school. The latter party finds its stronghold in the Articles, the former in the Liturgy. At present a division prevails into three great sections, which are styled High-Church, Low-Church (or Evangelical), and Broad-Church. The first party holds to apostolical succession, the divine right of episcopacy, and generally adheres to the sacramentarian view of the Church's life. The Puseyites have been drawn chiefly from this party. The Low-Church, or Evangelical party, holds, in general, that episcopacy is not *essential* to the being of the Church, though some evangelicals, so called, hold it in as high esteem as High-churchmen. The Low-churchmen recognise the claims of Presbyterians and dissenters as members of Christ's body. In doctrine they are chiefly Calvinists. The Broad-Church party, though of recent origin, embraces a large number of the most cultivated men in the Church, such as Kingsley, Maurice, Stanley, and, in fact, most of Dr. Arnold's pupils and sympathizers. The tendency of this party is towards what is called liberal Christianity.

At the present time (1868) the Church of England is agitated by proposals of change on many sides. Archdeacon Wilberforce, who went over to Rome some years ago, issued an "explanation," in which he inquires how far the popular principle of subscription to the English formularies is compatible with the rule of Church authority. The system he believes to be altogether bad, while it has not even the merit of being able to settle the differences which exist among individual churchmen. He says: "The difficulty becomes greater when it is considered that the clergy are divided into various parties, who are widely opposed to one another in almost every particular. It may be allowable, perhaps, to employ the phraseology of a recent reviewer, who has distributed them into three classes, which he designates as High, Low, and Broad. The last may be expected to be comparatively inattentive to matters of doctrine, regarding the Church chiefly as a social institution, designed merely to raise the standard of morals and ameliorate the manners of men. But the High and Low agree in one

point, if in nothing else, that to contend for the truth is the first duty of Christians. They differ, however, respecting almost every point of doctrine. One believes the Church to be the body of Christ, inhabited by his Spirit; the other supposes it to be little more than a religious club. One believes in baptismal regeneration and in the real presence; the other speaks of the sacraments as if they were only acted sermons. One affirms Christ to speak by the voice of his priests, and that deadly sin requires absolution; the other affirms that the priest's words are no more effective than those of his parish clerk. Yet both parties, as well as the Broad, who lie between them, subscribe to the same formularies, which they interpret avowedly in contradictory senses, and from which they deduce the most opposite results. If all this does not arise from the laxity of those who subscribe, but from the ingenuity of those who devised our formularies, they must certainly have been the greatest masters of equivocal expression whom the world has known." Subscription to the English formularies, he says, was originally imposed, and is still rendered by High-churchmen, on the principle that the Church's judgment should guide her members; but the Gorham case showed that the Church of England has transferred the decision respecting doctrines to the civil power, and that the most opposite statements respecting matters of faith are taught under her sanction. See GORHAM CASE. There exists in England a "Liturgical Revision Society," from whose "Declaration of Principles and Objects" we extract the following: "The members of this society are moved by such 'weighty and important considerations' as arise from 'the exigencies' of *these present times*, to seek further 'changes and alterations in the Prayer-book;' some of which, as the most necessary, they now proceed to specify: 1. The Rubric: the word priest to be changed. 2. The Ordination Service: words abused to the purposes of sacerdotal assumption to be altered. 3. The Visitation of the Sick: the absolution to be omitted or qualified. 4. The Baptismal Offices: words asserting the spiritual regeneration of each recipient to be altered. 5. The Catechism to be revised. 6. The Burial Service: general language to be employed in expressing hope for the departed. 7. The Athanasian Creed: the damnable clauses to be omitted. 8. The Apocryphal Lessons to be replaced by Scripture." The chief aim of this society is "to bring the Book of Common Prayer into closer conformity with the written word of God and the principles of the Reformation, by excluding all those expressions which have been assumed to countenance Romanizing doctrine or practice."

At present (1868) Romanizing tendencies are plainly on the increase in the Church of England, and there is apparent danger of a total separation of many ministers and members of this Church from the common faith of the reformed churches organized in the 16th century. The High-Church party has several schools, one of which (the Old School), while gladly concurring in all efforts for widening the breach between "the Church" and the "sects," yet continues in earnest opposition to the errors of Rome. Others, looking more at what is common to the Church of Rome and the Church of England than at what separates them, hope that the Church of Rome, by means of an "Episcopalian" movement, will gradually come over to the Anglican ground. This party builds great hopes especially upon the movements in Italy of such men as cardinal Andrea and Passaglia. There is, finally, an extreme party, which makes every other consideration subordinate to the desire to establish the union with Rome, and which has of late proceeded farther in this direction as a party than has ever been done before. It is this party which in 1867 sent a letter to cardinal Patrizi asking for some kind of recognition from Rome. It also aims at re-establishing monastic orders, and is specially conspicuous by "Ritualistic"

innovations in divine worship, endeavoring to conform the service altogether to that of the Roman and Eastern churches. Until recently this party was more noted for zeal and fervor than for intelligence and ecclesiastical standing, but of late they have gained an immense advantage by the open declaration of Dr. Pusey in their favor. In his *Eirenicon* (1866, 12mo) he explains away the chief doctrinal differences between the Articles and the Catechism of Trent, though, at the same time, he treats severely the personal infallibility of the pope, and the increasing Mariolatry of the Roman Church. Dr. Pusey also advocates the confessional and monastic life. The latest development of this school is to be found in the series of volumes entitled *The Church and the World* (edited by the Rev. Orby Shipley).

On the other hand, there is a large party of Rationalists in the Church of England whose type of opinion is to be found in the *Essays and Reviews* (1860), and whose extreme representative is perhaps bishop Colenso, of Natal, who has published several volumes of so-called criticisms, in which the inspiration and authenticity of the Old Testament are repudiated. No power has been discovered, either in the Church of England or in the laws of the land, to deal with the Romanizers on the one hand, or the Rationalists on the other.

IV. STATISTICS.—The Established Church of England is divided into two ecclesiastical provinces, Canterbury and York. Each province has a Convocation (q. v.) consisting of two houses, the upper house embracing the archbishop and all the bishops of the provinces, and the lower house a number of deans, archdeacons, and proctors. The bishops of the Church in England, in 1868, were as follows: 1. *Province of Canterbury*.—1. Canterbury (archbishop); 2. London; 3. Winchester; 4. Exeter; 5. St. David's; 6. Chichester; 7. Lichfield; 8. Oxford; 9. St. Asaph's; 10. Hereford; 11. Llandaff; 12. Lincoln; 13. Bath and Wells; 14. Salisbury; 15. Norwich; 16. Bangor; 17. Rochester; 18. Worcester; 19. Gloucester; 20. Ely; 21. Peterborough. II. *Province of York*.—1. York (archbishop); 2. Durham; 3. Manchester; 4. Ripon; 5. Carlisle; 6. Chester; 7. Sodor and Man (each diocese is treated of in a special article of the *Cyclopaedia*, where full statistics and the name of the present incumbents are given). The 32 dioceses of Ireland, formerly divided into four provinces) were reduced to 12 by the Church-Temporality Act (passed 1833). *Armagh* has 6 dioceses: Armagh, Derry, Down, Kilmore, Meath, Tuam. *Dublin*, 6: Dublin, Cashel, Cloyne, Killaloe, Limerick, Ossory. See IRELAND. In connection with the Church of England are also a number of colonial and missionary bishops. They were, in 1867, as follows: I. *Europe*.—Gibraltar. II. *Asia*.—1. Calcutta (metropolitan); 2. Bombay; 3. Labuan and Sarawak; 4. Madras; 5. Colombo; 6. Victoria; 7. Jerusalem. III. *Africa*.—1. Capetown (metropolitan); 2. Mauritius; 3. Grahamstown; 4. St. Helena; 5. Orange River State; 6. Central Africa; 7. Natal; 8. Sierra Leone; 9. Niger region. IV. *Australasia*.—1. Sydney (metropolitan); 2. Adelaide; 3. Melbourne; 4. Newcastle; 5. Perth; 6. Brisbane; 7. Goulburn; 8. Tasmania; 9. New Zealand (metropolitan); 10. Christ Church; 11. Nelson; 12. Wellington; 13. Waiapu; 14. Dunedin; 15. Melanesia; 16. Honolulu; 17. Grafton and Armidale. V. *America*.—1. Montreal (metropolitan); 2. Toronto; 3. Newfoundland; 4. Fredericton; 5. Nova Scotia; 6. Huron; 7. Colombia; 8. Quebec; 9. Ontario; 10. Rupert's Land; 11. New Westminster; 12. Jamaica; 13. Barbadoes; 14. Antigua; 15. Nassau; 16. Guiana.

The following is a list of the principal Church Societies, with a brief account of their work: 1. *Society for promoting the Employment of additional Curates in populous Places* (established in 1837). This society, besides making annual grants towards the maintenance of additional clergymen, grants sums, not exceeding

£500 in any single grant, in aid of endowments. Income for 1867-68, £32,464. 2. *The Church Pastoral Aid Society* (1836) aims at providing means for maintaining curates and lay agents in largely peopled districts. Total receipts in the year 1866-67, £47,829; in 1867-68, £61,745. 3. *The Incorporates Society for promoting the Enlargement, Building, and Repairing of Churches and Chapels in England and Wales* (1818) had, in 1867-68, an income of £8422. This society was incorporated by act of Parliament in 1828; until 1851 it was supported by a triennial royal letter, which produced about £30,000; since then it has been dependent on annual subscriptions, donations, church collections, and legacies. 4. *The London Diocesan Church Building Society and Metropolis Church Fund* (1854) had, in 1867-68, an income of £45,130. 5. *The Church of England Scripture Readers' Association* provides by readers of the Scriptures to the poor, under the superintendence of the parochial clergy. Its income was, in 1867-68, £13,440. 6. *The National Association for promoting Freedom of Worship* (1858) has for its object "to promote the restoration of the ancient freedom of parish churches as the true basis of the parochial system, and the only means of relieving spiritual destitution; and the scriptural system of weekly offerings as the most excellent way; especially enjoined by the Church of England, of raising money for Church purposes, and as a substitute for pew-rents where endowments are not obtainable." 7. *Society for promoting Christian Knowledge*. This is the oldest society in the country. It supplies Bibles and Prayer-books either gratuitously or far below cost price, issues books and tracts of a "sound Church tone," suitable for schools, lending libraries, workmen's clubs and reading-rooms, hospitals, workhouses, jails, etc.; also for the use of soldiers, sailors, and emigrants. The income (independent of sales) for 1866-67 was £28,547; for 1867-68, £29,700. 8. *National Society for promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church* (instituted 1811, incorporated 1817). The operations of this society embrace building school-rooms and teachers' dwelling-houses, maintaining colleges for the training of teachers, granting money towards paying the salaries of certificated teachers, etc. The National Society, during the time of its existence, has made grants to the amount of more than £400,000, and this amount has been supplemented by at least £1,200,000 of private contribution for the building of schools, besides originating the expenditure of an immense annual sum for their sustentation. The total number of schools in connection with this society in 1865 was 12,421, in which there were 1,186,515 scholars. The total number of scholars in the Sunday-schools was 1,818,476. The number of schoolmasters and mistresses trained in the colleges of the society is about 140 a year, and about 4750 have been sent out during the last twenty-two years. The income of the society for 1864-65 was £20,267. 9. *The Prayer-book and Homily Society* desires to promote the circulation of the "Book of Common Prayer and the Homilies" of the Church, which it has had translated into thirty-three languages. Its income for 1866-67 was £1163; for 1867-68, £1247. 10. *The Poor Clergy Relief Society* has, since its establishment in 1856, assisted 1165 poor clergymen, and widows and orphans of clergymen, with the sum of £8254. In 1864-65 the income was £2062, and grants were made to 101 applicants. 11. *The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts* (incorporated in 1701) is the oldest of all the English, and one of the oldest of all the Protestant missionary societies of the world. The society aims as much as possible at establishing complete churches, with bishops at their head, and which shall ultimately become altogether independent of the society, wherever England has any territorial possessions. Its income in 1866-67 was £91,186; in 1867-68, £114,546. 12. *The Church Missionary Society for Africa and the*

East was founded in 1799. Its work is chiefly among the natives of the countries in which its missions are established. Its income in 1866-67 was £150,357, and in 1867-68, £157,288. 13. *The Colonial and Continental Church Society.* Its leading object is to send clergymen, catechists, and teachers of the Church of England to settlers in the English colonies, and to British subjects in other parts of the world. The income for 1866-67 was £31,079; for 1867-68, £34,120. 14. *The English Church Union* was formed in 1859 for the purpose of "watching over the interests of the Church of England; of resisting, by a combination of its members, the attempts of dissenters and others to alienate the rights and injure the position of the Church; and also for the purpose of developing its internal energies." It is intended to be the central organ of the High-Church party. The union is managed by a council of twenty-four elected and five ex-officio members, thirteen of these being clergymen and the remaining sixteen laymen. 15. *The Association for the promotion of the Unity of Christendom* was formed in 1857 for the purpose of uniting in a bond of intercessory prayer members both of the clergy and the laity of the Roman Catholic, Greek, and Anglican communions. The members promise to use daily a brief prayer for the peace and unity of the Church. In 1865 the association numbered 8827 members, divided as follows: Roman Catholics, 1271; Orientals, including Servians and Armenians, 360; uncertain or miscellaneous, 75; Anglicans, 7121. 16. *The Eastern Church Association* was founded in 1864. Its objects were stated to be to inform the English public as to the state and position of the Eastern Christians; to make known the principles and doctrines of the Anglican Church to the Christians of the East; to take advantage of all opportunities which the providence of God shall afford for intercommunion with the orthodox Church, and also for friendly intercourse with the other ancient churches of the East; to assist, as far as possible, the bishops of the orthodox Church in their efforts to promote the spiritual welfare and the education of their flocks. It counts among its members English, Scotch, American, colonial, and Greek bishops. 17. *The Anglo-Continental Society* has for its object to make the principles of the English Church known in the different countries of Europe and throughout the world, and to aid in the reformation of national churches and other religious communities. 18. *The English Church Association* was established in 1865 as the central organization of Low-Churchmen. Its chief object is to counteract and prevent the spreading of High-Church and Romanizing tendencies in the Church. 19. *The South American Mission Society*, established in 1852. Its object is to send out missionaries to the native tribes of South America, to Englishmen in spiritual destitution there, and to take advantage of any opening for evangelization. Its means was in 1866-67, £7431, and in 1867-68, £9902. 20. *Irish Church Missions to Roman Catholics.* According to the nineteenth annual report, published in May, 1868, the income was £25,577; the year before it was £22,507. 21. *The London Society for promoting Christianity among the Jews*, established in 1809. The officers must be members of the United Church of England and Ireland, or, if foreigners, of a Protestant Church. Its income was in 1866-67, £33,327, and in 1867-68, £36,075.

At the last official census taken in Great Britain in 1861, in England and Scotland no inquiries were made as to the creed of the inhabitants. For Ireland, the population connected with the E-established Church was, in 1861, according to the official census, 678,661. As in England the Church herself makes no attempt to find out her statistics, nothing but estimates can be given on this point. As regards places of worship, number of sittings, and estimates of Church attendants, the statistics of the Established Church com-

pared as follows with the aggregate statistics of all other religious bodies :

Religious Bodies.	Places of Worship.	Number of Sittings.	Estimate of Church Attendants.
Church of England . . . . .	14,077	5,317,915	3,773,474
All other religious denominations . . . . .	20,300	4,894,648	3,487,558

According to this table, of all the church sittings, 51.9 per cent. belonged to the Church of England, and 48.1 per cent. to the other religious denominations; and of the Church attendants, likewise about 52 per cent. to the Church of England, and 48 to others. Other statistics, as, for instance, the annual marriage statistics, give to the population connected with the Church of England from 65 to 70 per cent. of the population. The two statements may be reconciled by taking 52 per cent. as that portion of the total population which is practically and actively connected with the Church, while it is, on the other hand, probable that fully 65 per cent. sustain a nominal connection with the Church. Since the beginning of the present century, the progress of the Church of England in point of places of worship and Church attendants has been less rapid than that of the other religious denominations taken together. For detailed comparative statistics, see GREAT BRITAIN.

Besides the national universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Durham University and King's College, London, the Church of England has the following theological training institutions: St. Bees (Cumberland), with 80 students, and St. Aidan's (Birkenhead), with 63 students; also a training department at Birmingham College, the London College of Divinity at St. John's Wood, and Lampeter College, Wales.

The following table gives the number of parishes and the number of clergy in each of the English dioceses; also the total population of the territory embraced in each diocese.

Dioceses.	Population of Dioceses in 1861.	Number of Clergy.	Number of Parishes.	Average Population to each Clergyman.
Canterbury . . . . .	474,602	536	357	887
York . . . . .	930,216	744	554	1259
London . . . . .	2,570,079	716	324	3590
Durham . . . . .	855,065	351	245	2445
Winchester . . . . .	1,267,794	1012	599	1252
St. Asaph . . . . .	246,337	250	185	985
Bangor . . . . .	195,390	195	134	1040
Bath and Wells . . . . .	422,527	660	481	640
Carlisle . . . . .	266,591	327	272	815
Chester . . . . .	1,248,416	598	370	2088
Chichester . . . . .	363,735	592	311	614
St. David's . . . . .	437,689	527	411	821
Ely . . . . .	489,716	720	529	667
Exeter . . . . .	953,763	954	694	950
Gloucester & Bristol . . . . .	568,574	648	459	877
Hereford . . . . .	223,491	466	358	498
Lichfield . . . . .	1,221,494	879	625	1350
Lincoln . . . . .	766,026	1029	801	675
Llandaff . . . . .	421,326	319	250	1320
Manchester . . . . .	1,679,326	601	385	2794
Norwich . . . . .	667,704	1161	908	575
Oxford . . . . .	515,083	856	699	602
Peterborough . . . . .	486,977	715	556	681
Ripon . . . . .	1,103,394	630	444	1751
Rochester . . . . .	609,914	84	54	758
Salisbury . . . . .	377,737	611	471	562
Sodor and Man . . . . .	52,460	45	31	1166
Worcester . . . . .	857,775	661	442	1294
Total for England and Wales . . . . .	20,269,671	17,067	12,539	1200

For farther accounts of the statistics of the Church of England, see the annual *Clergy List* (which also contains a complete list of all the benefices, with names of patrons, etc.); Rivington's *Ecclesiastical Year-book for 1865*; *Christian Year-book* (Lond. 1867 and 1868); Schem, *Amer. Eccles. Year-book for 1859* (N. Y. 1860), and *Amer. Eccles. Almanac for 1868* (N. Y. 1868).

V. *Literature.*—The early historians are Gildas (6th century), *De Britanniæ excidio*, etc. (transl. by Giles, Lond. 1841, 8vo); Bede, *Hist. Eccles. Anglorum* (*Opera*, ed. Giles, 12 vols. 1843, vol. ii); Giraldus Cambrensis,

*Vita Episcoporum*, in Wharton, *Anglia Sacra*, vol. ii.; Eadmer, *Vita*, Wharton, *Anglia Sacra*, vol. ii. and in Migne, *Patrol. Lat. vol. clx.*; Ingulphus, and William of Malmesbury, in Fulman, *Rev. Anglicar. Script. Vet.* (Oxon, 1684); and in Gale, *Historie Britannicæ*, etc. (Oxon, 1691, 2 vols. fol.). The *History of Ingulph*, the *History of Gaimur*, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and the *Chronicle of Florence of Worcester*, are reprinted in *The Church Historians of England* (Lond. 1853).

*Historians*: Stillingfleet, *Origines Britannicæ* (1710; new edit. Oxford, 1842, 2 vols. 8vo); Usher, *Brit. Ecclesiæ Antiquitates* (1638, 4to; *Works*, 16 vols. Dublin, 1847, vols. v, vi); Smith, *Religion of Ancient Britain* (Lond. 1846, 12mo); Churton, *Early English Church* (Lond. 1858, 3d edit. 18mo); Soames, *Anglo-Saxon Church* (Lond. 1828, 2d edit. 8vo); *Ib. Doctrines of Anglo-Saxon Church* (Bampton Lecture, 1830); *Ib. Latin Church during Anglo-Saxon Times* (Lond. 1848, 8vo); *Ib. Elizabethan Religious History* (Lond. 1839, 8vo); *Ib. Reformation* (Lond. 1826-8, 4 vols. 8vo); Fuller, *Church History of Great Britain* (1655, fol.; new edit. Lond. 1837, 3 vols. 8vo); Warner, *Ecclesiastical History of England* (1765, 2 vols. fol.); Inett, *Origines Anglicanæ*, History from 6th century to death of King John, 1216 (Lond. 1704-10, 2 vols. fol.; new edit. Oxford, 1855, 3 vols. 8vo); Carwithen, *History of the Church of England* (Oxford, 1849, 2d edit. 2 vols. 12mo); Grant, *Summary of the History of the English Church and of the Sects*, etc. (Lond. 1811-1826, 4 vols. 8vo); Collier, *Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain* (1708, fol.; new ed. by Barham, Lond. 1840, 9 vols. 8vo); Brown, *Compendious History of the British Churches* (Edinb. 1820; 2d edit. 1823, 2 vols. 8vo); Baxter, *Church History of England* (2d ed. Lond. 1849, 8vo); Short, *Sketch of the History of the Church of England to 1688* (Lond. 1840, 3d edit. 8vo); Anderson, *History of the Church of England in the Colonies* (Lond. 1856, 2d edit. 3 vols. 8vo); *Annual American Cyclopaedia*, 1863, and all the following volumes, art. Anglican Church.

On the history of the English Reformation, see REFORMATION. For general statistics of Christianity in the British Islands, see GREAT BRITAIN; IRELAND; SCOTLAND.

**Engles, Joseph Patterson**, D.D., was born in Philadelphia Jan. 3, 1793. He was educated at the University of Pennsylvania, and graduated in July, 1811. In 1813 he was appointed co-master of the grammar-school in the same institution with Rev. Dr. S. B. How. In 1817, Rev. Dr. S. B. Wylie and Mr. Engles founded an academy, under the name of the Classical Institute, which Mr. Engles continued until February, 1845, when he was elected publishing agent of the Presbyterian Board of Publication. He continued in this position until his death. Mr. Engles was a member and elder of the Scots Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, having joined that church at the age of twenty, and very soon after having been chosen an elder of the same. Besides writing several smaller volumes for children and youth, he edited an edition of the Greek Testament, with various readings. He died suddenly on the night of April 14, 1861, of a disease of the heart from which he had been suffering for about a year.

**Engles, William M.**, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Philadelphia Oct. 12, 1797, and was educated at the University of Pennsylvania, where he graduated A.B. in 1815. After studying theology under the Rev. Dr. S. B. Wylie (q. v.), he was licensed to preach in 1818, and in 1820 became pastor of the Seventh Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, which office he filled faithfully until his health failed in 1834, when he became editor of *The Presbyterian*. He edited that journal for over thirty years. In 1838 the Presbyterian Board of Publication made him their editor of books and tracts, and he continued in that work with great success till 1863. In one of their publica-

tions, it is stated that "the Board of Publication is probably more largely indebted to Dr. Engles than to any other one man for its existence and its usefulness, especially during the first twenty years of its history." Besides his constant editorial work, he wrote a number of small books on practical religion, many of which had a wide circulation. Of one of them, the *Soldier's Pocket-book*, in English and German, 300,000 were circulated among our soldiers during the civil war. He died in Philadelphia Oct. 12, 1867.—*American Annual Cyclopaedia*, vii, 296.

**English Versions of the Bible.** Passing over the lives of the individual translators, the long struggle with the indifference or opposition of men in power, the religious condition of the people as calling for, or affected by, the appearance of the translation, the time, and place, and form of the successive editions by which the demand, when once created, was supplied—all of which is given under more appropriate titles—we shall here aim to give an account of the several versions as they appeared; to ascertain the qualifications of the translators for the work which they undertook, and the principles on which they acted; to form an estimate of the final result of their labors in the received version, and, as consequent on this, of the necessity or desirableness of a new or revised translation; and, finally, to give such a survey of the literature of the subject as may help the reader to obtain a fuller knowledge for himself. In doing this we shall substantially adopt so much of Prof. Plumtre's art. in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v. Versions, as relates to the subject. The present article has been carefully revised by the Rev. T. J. Conant, D.D., of Brooklyn.

1. *Early Translations.*—It was asserted by Sir Thomas More, in his anxiety to establish a point against Tyndal, that he had seen English translations of the Bible which had been made before Wycliffe, and that these were approved by the bishops, and were allowed by them to be read by laymen, and even by devout women (*Dialogues*, ch. viii-xiv, col. 82). There seem good grounds, however, for doubting the accuracy of this statement. No such translations—versions, i. e. of the entire Scriptures—are now extant. No traces of them appear in any contemporary writer. Wycliffe's great complaint is that there is no translation (Forshall and Madden, *Wycliffe's Bible*, Pref. p. xxi, ProL p. 59). The Constitutions of archbishop Arundel (A. D. 1408) mention two only, and these are Wycliffe's own, and the one based on his and completed after his death. More's statement must therefore be regarded either as a rhetorical exaggeration of the fact that parts of the Bible had been previously translated, or as arising out of a mistake as to the date of MSS. of the Wycliffe version. The history of the English Bible will therefore begin, as it has begun hitherto, with the work of the first great reformer. One glance, however, we may give, in passing, to the earlier history of the English Church, and connect some of its most honored names with the great work of making the truths of Scripture, or parts of the books themselves, if not the Bible as a whole, accessible to the people. We may think of Cædmon as embodying the whole history of the Bible in the alliterative metre of Anglo-Saxon poetry (Bede, *Hist. Eccl. iv*, 24); of Aldhelm, bishop of Sherborne, in the 7th century, as rendering the Psalter; of Bede, as translating in the last hours of his life the Gospel of John (*Epist. Cuthberti*); of Alfred, setting forth in his mother tongue, as the great ground-work of his legislation, the four chapters of Exodus (xx-xxiii) that contained the first code of the laws of Israel (Pauli's *Life of Alfred*, chap. v). The wishes of the great king extended further. He desired that "all the free-born youth of his kingdom should be able to read the English Scriptures" ["*Englisc gewritt*," which, however, may merely denote English literature in general] (*Ibid.*). Portions of the



Bible, some of the Psalms, and extracts from other books, were translated by him for his own use and that of his children. The traditions of a later date, seeing in him the representative of all that was good in the old Saxon time, made him the translator of the whole Bible (*Ibid.*, supp. to chap. v).

The work of translating was, however, carried on by others. One Anglo-Saxon version of the four gospels, interlinear with the Latin of the Vulgate, known as the Durham book, is found in the Cottonian MSS. of the British Museum, and is referred to the 9th or 10th century. Another, known as the Rushworth Gloss, and belonging to the same period, is in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. Another, of a somewhat later date, is in the same collection, and in the library of Corpus-Christi College, Cambridge. The name of Aldhelm, bishop of Sherborne, is connected with a version of the Psalms; that of Ælfric with an epitome of Scripture history, including a translation of many parts of the historical books of the Bible (Lewis, *Hist. of Transl.* ch. i.; Forshall and Madden, *Preface*; Bagster's *English Hexapla*, Pref.). The influence of Norman ecclesiastics, in the reigns that preceded and followed the Conquest, was probably adverse to the continuance of this work. They were too far removed from sympathy with the subjugated race to care to educate them in their own tongue. The spoken dialects of the English of that period would naturally seem to them too rude and uncouth to be the channel of divine truth. Pictures, mysteries, miracle plays, rather than books, were the instruments of education for all but the few who, in monasteries under Norman or Italian superintendence, devoted themselves to the study of theology or law. In the remoter parts of England, however, where their influence was less felt, or the national feeling was stronger, there were those who carried on the succession, and three versions of the Gospels, in the University Library at Cambridge, in the Bodleian, and in the British Museum, belonging to the 11th or 12th century, remain to attest their labors. The metrical paraphrase of the Gospel history known as the Ormulum, in alliterative English verse, ascribed to the latter half of the 12th century, is the next conspicuous monument, and may be looked upon as indicating a desire to place the facts of the Bible within reach of others than the clergy. The 13th century, a time in England, as throughout Europe, of religious revival, witnessed renewed attempts. A prose translation of the Bible into Norman-French, circ. A.D. 1260, indicates a demand for devotional reading within the circle of the court, or of the wealthier merchants, or of convents for women of high rank. Farther signs of the same desire are found in three English versions of the Psalms—one towards the close of the 13th century; another by Schorham, circ. A.D. 1320; another, with other canticles from the O. T. and N. T., by Richard Rolle, of Ilampole, circ. 1349; the last being accompanied by a devotional exposition—and in one of the Gospels of Mark and Luke, and of all Paul's epistles (the list includes the apocryphal epistle to the Laodiceans), in the library of Corpus-Christi College, Cambridge. The fact stated by archbishop Arundel in his funeral sermon on Anne of Bohemia, wife of Richard II, that she habitually read the Gospels in the vulgar tongue, with divers expositions, was probably true of many others of high rank. It is interesting to note these facts, not as detracting from the glory of the great reformer of the 14th century, but as showing that for himself also there had been a preparation; that what he supplied met a demand which had for many years been gathering strength. It is almost needless to add that these versions started from nothing better than the copies of the Vulgate, more or less accurate, which each translator had before him (Lewis, ch. i.; Forshall and Madden, *Preface*).

II. WYCLIFFE (born 1324, died 1384).—I. It is singular, and not without significance, that the first

translation from the Bible connected with the name of Wycliffe should have been that of part of the Apocalypse. The *Last Age of the Church* (A.D. 1356) translates and expounds the vision in which the reformer read the signs of his own times, the sins and the destruction of "Antichrist and his meynce" (=multitude). Shortly after this he completed a version of the Gospels, accompanied by a commentary, "so that pore Cristen men may some dele know the text of the Gospel, with the comyn sentence of the olde holie doctores" (Preface). Wycliffe, however, though the chief, was not the only laborer in the cause. The circle of English readers was becoming wider, and they were not content to have the book which they honored above all others in a tongue not their own. Another translation and commentary appear to have been made about the same time, in ignorance of Wycliffe's work, and for the "manie lewid men that gladlie would kon the Gospelle, if it were draghen into the English tung." The fact that many MSS. of this period are extant, containing in English a Monotessaron, or Harmony of the Gospels, accompanied by portions of the Epistles, or portions of the O. T., or an epitome of Scripture history, or the substance of Paul's epistles, or the Catholic Epistles at full length, with indications more or less distinct of Wycliffe's influence, shows how widespread was the feeling that the time had come for an English Bible (Forshall and Madden, *Pref.* p. xiii-xvii). These preliminary labors were followed up by a complete translation of the N. T. by Wycliffe himself. The O. T. was undertaken by his coadjutor, Nicholas de Hereford, but was interrupted probably by a citation to appear before archbishop Arundel in 1382, and ends abruptly (following so far the order of the Vulgate) in the middle of Baruch. Many of the MSS. of this version now extant present a different recension of the text, and it is probable that the work of Wycliffe and Hereford was revised by Richard Purvey, circ. A.D. 1388. To him also is ascribed the interesting Prologue, in which the translator gives an account both of his purpose and his method (Forshall and Madden, *Pref.* p. xxv).

2. The former was, as that of Wycliffe had been, to give an English Bible to the English people. He appeals to the authority of Bede, of Alfred, and of Grosstete, to the examples of "Frenshe, and Beemers (Bohemians), and Britons." He answers the hypocritical objections that men were not holy enough for such a work; that it was wrong for "idiots" to do what the great doctors of the Church had left undone. He hopes "to make the sentence as trewe and open in Englishe as it is in Latine, or more trewe and open."

It need hardly be said, as regards the method of the translator, that the version was based upon the Vulgate (comp. Gen. iii, 15: "She shall trede thy head"). If, in the previous century, scholars like Grosstete and Roger Bacon, seeking knowledge in other lands, and from men of other races, had acquired, as they seem to have done, some knowledge both of Greek and Hebrew, the succession had, at all events, not been perpetuated. The war to be waged at a later period with a different issue between scholastic philosophy and "humanity" ended, in the first struggle, in the triumph of the former, and there was probably no one at Oxford among Wycliffe's contemporaries who could have helped him or Purvey in a translation from the original. It is something to find at such a time the complaint that "learned doctoris taken litel heede to the lettre," the recognition that the Vulgate was not all sufficient, that "the texte of oure bokis" (he is speaking of the Psalter, and the difficulty of understanding it) "discordeth much from the Ebreu" (which knowledge is, however, at second hand, "bi witness of Jerom, of Lire, and other expositouris"). The difficulty which was thus felt was increased by the state of the Vulgate text. The translator complains that what the Church had in view was not Jerome's ver-

sion, but a later and corrupt text; that "the comune Latyne Bibles han more nede to be corrected as manie as I have seen in my life, than hath the Englishe Bible late translated." To remedy this he had recourse to collation. Many MSS. were compared, and out of this comparison the true reading ascertained as far as possible. The next step was to consult the *Glossa Ordinaria*, the commentaries of Nicholas de Lyra, and others, as to the meaning of any difficult passages. After this (we recognise here, perhaps, a departure from the right order) grammars were consulted. Then came the actual work of translating, which he aimed at making idiomatic rather than literal. As he went on, he submitted his work to the judgment of others, and accepted their suggestions. It is interesting to trace these early strivings after the true excellence of a translator; yet more interesting to take note of the spirit, never surpassed, seldom equalled, in later translators, in which the work was done. Nowhere do we find the conditions of the work, intellectual and moral, more solemnly asserted. "A translator hath grete nede to studie well the sentence, both before and after," so that no equivocal words may mislead his readers or himself, and then also "he hath nede to lyve a clene life, and be ful devout in preiers, and have not his wit occupied about worldli things, that the Holie Spyrte, author of all wisdom, and cunningge, and truth, dresse (=train) him in his work, and suffer him not for to err" (Forshall and Madden, *Prolog.* p. 60).

3. The extent of the circulation gained by this version may be estimated from the fact that, in spite of all the chances of time, and all the systematic efforts for its destruction made by archbishop Arundel and others, not less than 150 copies are known to be extant, some of them obviously made for persons of wealth and rank, others apparently for humbler readers. It is significant as bearing, either on the date of the two works or on the position of the writers, that while the quotations from Scripture in Langton's *Vision of Piers Plowman* are uniformly given in Latin, those in the *Persones Tale* of Chaucer are given in English, which for the most part agrees substantially with Wycliffe's translation.

4. The following characteristics may be noticed as distinguishing this version: (1) The general homeliness of its style. The language of the court or of scholars is as far as possible avoided, and that of the people followed. In this respect the principle has been acted on by later translators. The style of Wycliffe is to that of Chaucer as Tyndale's is to Surrey's, or that of the A. V. to Ben Jonson's. (2) The substitution, in many cases, of English equivalents for quasi-technical words. Thus we find "fy" or "fogh" instead of "Raca" (Matt. v, 22); "they were washed" in Matt. iii, 6; "richesse" for "mammon" (Luke xvi, 9, 11, 13); "bishop" for "high-priest" (*passim*). (3) The extreme literalness with which, in some instances, even at the cost of being unintelligible, the Vulgate text is followed, as in 2 Cor. i, 17-19.

III. TYNDALE.—The work of Wycliffe stands by itself. Whatever power it exercised in preparing the way for the Reformation of the 16th century, it had no perceptible influence on later translations. By the reign of Henry VIII his English was already obsolescent, and the revival of classical scholarship led men to feel dissatisfied with a version which had avowedly been made at second-hand, not from the original. With Tyndale, on the other hand, we enter on a continuous succession. He is the patriarch, in no remote ancestry, of the Authorized Version. With a consistent, unswerving purpose, he devoted his whole life to this one work, and, through dangers and difficulties, amid enemies and treacherous friends, in exile and loneliness, accomplished it. More than Cranmer or Ridley, he is the true hero of the English Reformation. While they were slowly moving onwards, halting between two opinions, watching how the court-

winds blew, or, at the best, making the most of opportunities, he set himself to the task without which, he felt sure, reform would be impossible, which, once accomplished, would render it inevitable. "Ere many years," he said, at the age of thirty-six (A. D. 1520), he would cause "a boy that driveth the plough" to know more of Scripture than the great body of the clergy then knew (Foxe, in Anderson's *Annals of English Bible*, i, 36). We are able to form a fairly accurate estimate of his fitness for the work to which he thus gave himself. The change which had come over the universities of Continental Europe since the time of Wycliffe had affected those of England. Greek had been taught in Paris in 1458. The first Greek Grammar, that of Constantine Lascaris, had been printed in 1476. It was followed in 1480 by Craston's Lexicon. The more enterprising scholars of Oxford visited foreign universities for the sake of the new learning. Groeyn (d. 1519), Linacre (d. 1524), Colet (d. 1519), had, in this way, from the Greeks whom the fall of Constantinople had scattered over Europe, or from their Italian pupils, learned enough to enter, in their turn, upon the work of teaching. When Erasmus visited Oxford in 1497, he found in these masters a scholarship which even he could admire. Tyndale, who went to Oxford cir. 1500, must have been within the range of their teaching. His two great opponents, Sir Thomas More and bishop Tonstal, are known to have been among their pupils. It is significant enough that, after some years of study, Tyndale left Oxford and went to Cambridge. Such changes were, it is true, common enough. The fame of any great teacher would draw around him men from other universities, from many lands. In this instance, the reason of Tyndale's choice is probably not far to seek (Walter, *Biog. Notice to Tyndale's Doctrinal Treatises*). Erasmus was in Cambridge from 1509 to 1514. All that we know of Tyndale's character and life, the fact especially that he had made translations of portions of the N. T. as early as 1502 (Offor, *Life of Tyndale*, p. 9), leads to the conclusion that he resolved to make the most of the presence of one who was emphatically the scholar and philologist of Europe. It must be remembered, too, that the great scheme of cardinal Ximenes was just then beginning to interest the minds of all scholars. The publication of the Complutensian Bible, it is true, did not take place till 1520; but the collection of MSS. and other preparations for it began as early as 1504. In the mean time Erasmus himself, in 1516, brought out the first published edition of the Greek Testament, and it was thus made accessible to all scholars. Of the use made by Tyndale of these opportunities we have evidence in his coming up to London (1522), in the vain hope of persuading Tonstal (known as a Greek scholar, an enlightened Humanist) to sanction his scheme of rendering the N. T. into English, and bringing a translation of one of the orations of Isocrates as a proof of his capacity for the work. The attempt was not successful. "At the last I understood not only that there was no room in my lord of London's palace to translate the N. T., but also that there was no place to do it in all England" (*Pref. to Five Books of Moses*).

It is not so easy to say how far at this time any knowledge of Hebrew was attainable at the English universities, or how far Tyndale had used any means of access that were open to him. It is probable that it may have been known, in some measure, to a few bolder than their fellows, at a time far earlier than the introduction of Greek. The large body of Jews settled in the cities of England must have possessed a knowledge, more or less extensive, of their Hebrew books. On their banishment, to the number of 16,000, by Edward I, these books fell into the hands of the monks, superstitiously revered or feared by most, yet drawing some to examination, and then to study. Grostete, it is said, knew Hebrew as well as Greek.

Roger Bacon knew enough to pass judgment on the Vulgate as incorrect and misleading. Then, however, came a period in which linguistic studies were thrown into the background, and Hebrew became an unknown speech even to the best-read scholars. The first signs of a revival meet us towards the close of the 15th century. The remarkable fact that a Hebrew Psalter was printed at Soncino in 1477 (forty years before Erasmus's Greek Testament), the Pentateuch in 1482, the Prophets in 1486, the whole of the O. T. in 1488, that by 1496 four editions had been published, and by 1596 not fewer than eleven (Whitaker, *Hist. and Crit. Inquiry*, p. 22), indicates a demand on the part of the Christian students of Europe, not less than on that of the more learned Jews. Here also the progress of the Complutensian Bible would have attracted the notice of scholars. The cry raised by the "Trojans" of Oxford in 1519 (chiefly consisting of the friars, who from the time of Wycliffe had all but swamped the education of the place) against the first Greek lectures—that to study that language would make men pagans, that to study Hebrew would make them Jews—shows that the latter study as well as the former was the object of their dislike and fear (Anderson, i, 24; Hallam, *Lit. of Eur.*, i, 403).

Whether Tyndale had in this way gained any knowledge of Hebrew before he left England in 1524 may be uncertain. The fact that in 1530-31 he published a translation of Genesis, Deuteronomy, and Jonah (see a letter by the ven. lord Arthur Hervey to the *Bury Post* of Feb. 3, 1862, transferred shortly afterwards to the *Athenæum*), may be looked on as the first-fruits of his labors, the work of a man who was giving this proof of his power to translate from the original (Anderson, *Annals*, i, 209-288). We may perhaps trace, among other motives for the many wanderings of his exile, a desire to visit the cities Worms, Cologne, Hamburg, Antwerp (Anderson, p. 48-64), where the Jews lived in greatest numbers, and some of which were famous for their Hebrew learning. Of at least a fair acquaintance with that language we have, a few years later, abundant evidence in the table of Hebrew words prefixed to his translation of the five books of Moses, and in casual etymologies scattered through his other works, e. g. "Mammon" (*Parable of Wicked Mammon*, p. 63), "Cohen" (*Obedience*, p. 255), "Abel Mizraim" (p. 347), "Pesah" (p. 353). A remark (Preface to *Obedience*, p. 148) shows how well he had entered into the general spirit of the language. "The properties of the Hebrew tongue agreeth a thousand times more with the English than with the Latine. The manner of speaking is in both one, so that in a thousand places thou needest not but to translate it into English word for word." When Spalatin describes him in 1534, it is as one well-skilled in seven languages, and one of these is Hebrew (Anderson, i, 337).

The N. T. was, however, the great object of his care. First the gospels of Matthew and Mark were published tentatively, then in 1525 the whole of the N. T. was printed in 4to at Cologne, and in small 8vo at Worms (reproduced in fac-simile in 1862 by Mr. Francis Fry, Bristol). The work was the fruit of a self-sacrificing zeal, and the zeal was its own reward. In England it was received with denunciations. Tonstal, bishop of London, preaching at Paul's Cross, asserted that there were at least 2000 errors in it, and ordered all copies of it to be bought up and burnt. An act of Parliament (35 Hen. VIII. cap. 1) forbade the use of all copies of Tyndale's "false translation." Sir T. More (*Dialogues*, l. c. *Supplication of Souls, Confutation of Tyndal's Answer*) entered the lists against it, and accused the translator of heresy, bad scholarship, and dishonesty, of "corrupting Scripture after Luther's counsel." The treatment which it received from professed friends was hardly less annoying. Piratical editions were printed, often carelessly, by trading pub-

lishers at Antwerp. One of his own pupils, George Joye, undertook (in 1534) to improve the version by bringing it into closer conformity with the Vulgate, and made it the vehicle of peculiar opinions of his own, substituting "life after this life," or "verie life," for "resurrection," as the translation of *ἀνάστασις*. (Comp. Tyndale's indignant protest in Pref. to edition of 1534.) Even the most zealous reformers in England seemed disposed to throw his translation overboard, and encouraged Coverdale (see below) in undertaking another. In the mean time the work went on. Editions were printed one after another, namely, at Hamburg, Cologne, Worms, in 1525; Antwerp in 1526, '27, '28; Marlbrow (=Marburg) in 1529; Strasburg (Joye's edition) in 1531; Bergen-op-Zoom in 1533 (Joye's); John vi at Nuremberg in 1533; Antwerp in 1534 (Cotton, *Printed Editions*, p. 4-6). The last appeared in 1535, just before his death, "diligently compared with the Greek," presenting for the first time systematic chapter-headings, and with some peculiarities in spelling specially intended for the pronunciation of the peasantry (Offor, *Life*, p. 82). His heroic life was brought to a close in 1536. We may cast one look on its sad end—the treacherous betrayal, the Judas-kiss of the false friend, the imprisonment at Vilvorden, the last prayer, "Lord, open the king of England's eyes." He was tied to the stake, then strangled to death, and finally burnt. (See Offor's memoir prefixed to his edition of Tyndale's New Testament.)

The work to which a life was thus nobly devoted was as nobly done. To Tyndale belongs the honor of having given the first example of a translation based on true principles, and the excellence of later versions has been almost in exact proportion as they followed his. Believing that every part of Scripture had one sense and one only, the sense in the mind of the writer (*Obedience*, p. 304), he made it his work, using all philological helps that were accessible to attain that sense. Believing that the duty of a translator was to place his readers as nearly as possible on a level with those for whom the books were originally written, he looked on all the later theological associations that had gathered round the words of the N. T. as hindrances rather than helps, and sought, as far as possible, to get rid of them. Not "grace," but "favor," even in John i, 17 (in edition of 1525); not "charity," but "love;" not "confessing," but "acknowledging;" not "penance," but "repentance;" not "priests," but "seniors" or "elders;" not "salvation," but "health;" not "church," but "congregation," are instances of the changes which were then looked on as startling and heretical innovations (Sir T. More, *l. c.*). Some of them we are now familiar with. In others the later versions bear traces of a reaction in favor of the older phraseology. In this, as in other things, Tyndale was in advance, not only of his own age, but of the age that followed him. To him, however, it is owing that the versions of the English Church have throughout been popular, and not scholastic. All the exquisite grace and simplicity which have endeared the A. V. to men of the most opposite tempers and contrasted opinions—to J. H. Newman (*Dublin Review*, June, 1853) and J. A. Froude—is due mainly to his clear-sighted truthfulness. The testimony of a Roman Catholic scholar is worth quoting: "In point of perspicuity and noble simplicity, propriety of idiom and purity of style, no English version has as yet surpassed it" (Geddes, *Prospectus for a new Translation*, p. 89). The desire to make the Bible a people's book led Tyndale in one edition to something like a provincial rather than a national translation; but, on the whole, it kept him free from the besetting danger of the time, that of writing for scholars, not for the people; of a version full of "inkhorn" phrases, not in the spoken language of the English nation. And throughout there is the pervading stamp, so often wanting in other like works, of the

most thorough truthfulness. No word has been altered to court a king's favor, or please bishops, or make out a case for or against a particular opinion. He is working freely, not in the fetters of prescribed rules. With the most entire sincerity he could say, "I call God to record, against the day we shall appear before our Lord Jesus to give a reckoning of our doings, that I never altered one syllable of God's Word against my conscience, nor would this day, if all that is in the world, whether it be pleasure, honor, or riches, might be given me" (Anderson, i, 349).

IV. COVERDALE.—I. A complete translation of the Bible, different from Tyndale's, bearing the name of Miles Coverdale, printed probably at Zürich, appeared in 1535. The undertaking itself, and the choice of Coverdale as the translator, were probably due to Cromwell. Tyndale's controversial treatises, and the polemical character of his prefaces and notes, had irritated the leading ecclesiastics, and embittered the mind of the king himself against him. All that he had written was publicly condemned. There was no hope of obtaining the king's sanction to anything that bore his name. But the idea of an English translation began to find favor. The rupture with the see of Rome, the marriage with Anne Boleyn, made Henry willing to adopt what was urged upon him as the surest way of breaking forever the spell of the pope's authority. The bishops even began to think of the thing as possible. It was talked of in Convocation. They would take it in hand themselves. The work did not, however, make much progress. The great preliminary question whether "venerable" words, such as *hostia*, penance, pascha, holocaust, and the like, should be retained, was still unsettled (Anderson, i, 414). Not till "the day after doomsday" (the words are Cranmer's) were the English people likely to get their English Bible from the bishops (*ib.* i, 577). Cromwell, it is probable, thought it better to lose no further time, and to strike while the iron was hot. A divine whom he had patronized, though not, like Tyndale, feeling himself called to that special work (*Pref. to Coverdale's Bible*), was willing to undertake it. To him accordingly it was intrusted. There was no stigma attached to his name, and, though a sincere Reformer, neither at that time nor afterwards did he occupy a sufficiently prominent position to become an object of special persecution.

2. The work which was thus executed was done, as might be expected, in a very different fashion from Tyndale's. Of the two men, one had made this the great object of his life; the other, in his own language, "sought it not, neither desired it," but accepted it as a task assigned him. One prepared himself for the work by long years of labor in Greek and Hebrew; the other is content to make a translation at second hand "out of the Douche (Luther's German Version) and the Latine." The one aims at a rendering which shall be the truest and most exact possible; the other loses himself in weak commonplace as to the advantage of using many English words for one and the same word in the original, and in practice oscillates between "penance" and "repentance," "love" and "charity," "priests" and "elders," as though one set of words were as true and adequate as the other (*Preface*, p. 19). In spite of these weaknesses, however, there is much to esteem in the spirit and temper of Coverdale. He is a second-rate man, laboring as such contentedly, not ambitious to appear other than he is. He thinks it a great gain that there should be a diversity of translations. He acknowledges, though he dare not name it, the excellence of Tyndale's version, and regrets the misfortune which left it incomplete. He states frankly that he had done his work with the assistance of that and of five others. The five were probably: (1.) The Vulgate; (2.) Luther's; (3.) The German Swiss version of Zürich; (4.) The Latin of Pagninus; (5.) Tyndale's. Others, however, have conjectured a German translation of the Vulgate earlier

than Luther's, and a Dutch version from Luther (Whitaker, *Hist. and Crit. Inquiry*, p. 49). If the language of his dedication to the king, whom he compares to Moses, David, and Josiah, seems to be somewhat fulsome in its flattery, it is, at least, hardly more offensive than that of the Dedication of the A. V., and there was more to palliate it.

3. An inspection of Coverdale's version serves to show the influence of the authorities he followed. The proper names of the O. T. appear for the most part in their Latin form, "Elias," "Eliseus," "Ochozias;" sometimes, as in "Esay" and "Jeremy," in that which was familiar in spoken English. Some points of correspondence with Luther's version are not without interest. Thus "Cush," which in Wycliffe, Tyndale, and the A. V. is uniformly rendered "Ethiopia," is in Coverdale "Morians' land" (Psa. lxxviii, 31; Acts viii, 27, etc.), after the "Mohrenlande" of Luther, and appears in the form accordingly in the P.-B. version of the Psalms. The proper name *Rabshakch* passes, as in Luther, into the "chief butler" (2 Kings xviii, 17; Isa. xxxvi, 11). In making the sons of David "priests" (2 Sam. viii, 18) he followed both his authorities. "Ἐπίσκοποι" are "bishops" in Acts xx, 28 ("overseers" in A. V.). "Shiloh," in the prophecy of Gen. xlix, 10, becomes "the worthy," after Luther's "der Held." "They houghed oxen" takes the place of "they digged down a wall," in Gen. xlix, 6. The singular word "Lamia" is taken from the Vulg., as the English rendering of *Ziim* ("wild beasts," A. V.) in Isa. xxxiv, 14. The "tabernacle of witness," where the A. V. has "congregation," shows the same influence. In spite of Tyndale, the Vulg. "plena gratia," in Luke i, 28, leads to "full of grace;" while we have, on the other hand, "congregation" throughout the N. T. for ἑκκλησία, and "love" instead of "charity" in 1 Cor. xiii. It was the result of the same indecision that his language as to the Apocrypha lacks the sharpness of that of the more zealous reformers. "Baruch" is placed with the canonical books, after "Lamentations." Of the rest he says that they are "placed apart," as "not held by ecclesiastical doctors in the same repute" as the other Scriptures, but this is only because there are "dark sayings" which seem to differ from the "open Scripture." He has no wish that they should be "despised or little set by." "Patience and study would show that the two were agreed."

4. What has been stated practically disposes of the claim which has sometimes been made for this version of Coverdale's, as though it had been made from the original text (Anderson, i, 564; Whitaker, *Hist. and Crit. Inquiry*, p. 58). It is not improbable, however, that as time went on he added to his knowledge. The letter addressed by him to Cromwell (*Remains*, p. 492, Parker Soc.) obviously asserts, somewhat ostentatiously, an acquaintance "not only with the standing text of the Hebrew, with the interpretation of the Chaldee and the Greek," but also with "the diversity of reading of all sects." He, at any rate, continued his work as a pains-taking editor. Fresh editions of his Bible were published, keeping their ground in spite of rivals, in 1537, 1539, 1550, 1553. He was called in at a still later period to assist in the Geneva version. Among smaller facts connected with this edition may be mentioned the appearance of Hebrew letters—of the name Jehovah—in the title-page (יהוה), and again in the margin of the alphabetic poetry of Lamentations, though not of Psa. cxix. The plural form "Biblia" is retained in the title-page, possibly, however, in its later use as a singular feminine (comp. BIBLE). There are no notes, no chapter-headings, no divisions into verses. The letters A, B, C, D in the margin, as in the early editions of Greek and Latin authors, are the only helps for finding places. Marginal references point to parallel passages. The O. T., especially in Genesis, has the attraction of wood-cuts. Each book

has a table of contents prefixed to it. A careful reprint, though not a fac-simile, of Coverdale's version has been published by Bagster (Lond. 1838).

V. MATTHEW.—I. In the year 1537, a large folio Bible appeared as edited and dedicated to the king, by Thomas Matthew. No one of that name appears at all prominently in the religious history of Henry VIII, and this suggests the inference that the name was pseudonymous, adopted to conceal the real translator. The tradition which connects this Matthew with John Rogers, the protomartyr of the Marian persecution, is all but undisputed. It rests (1) on the language of the indictment and sentence which describe him (Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, p. 1029, 1563; Chester, *Life of Rogers*, p. 418–423) as Joannes Rogers, alias Matthew, as if it were a matter of notoriety; (2) the testimony of Foxe himself, as representing, if not personal knowledge, the current belief of his time; (3) the occurrence, at the close of a short exhortation to the study of Scripture in the preface, of the initials J. R.; (4) internal evidence. This last subdivides itself. (a.) Rogers, who had graduated at Pembroke College, Cambridge, in 1525, and had sufficient fame to be invited to the new Cardinal's College at Oxford, accepted the office of chaplain to the merchant adventurers of Antwerp, and there became acquainted with Tyndale two years before the latter's death. Matthew's Bible, as might be expected, if this hypothesis were true, reproduces Tyndale's work, in the N. T. entirely, in the O. T. as far as 2 Chron., the rest being taken, with occasional modifications, from Coverdale. (b.) The language of the Dedication is that of one who has mixed much, as Rogers mixed, with foreign reformers ("the godlie in strange countries").

2. The printing of the book was begun apparently abroad, and was carried on as far as the end of Isaiah. At that point a new pagination begins, and the names of the London printers, Grafton and Whitechurch, appear. The history of the book was probably something like this: Coverdale's translation had not given satisfaction—least of all were the more zealous and scholar-like reformers contented with it. As the only complete English Bible, it was, however, as yet, in possession of the field. Tyndale and Rogers, therefore, in the year preceding the imprisonment of the former, determined on another, to include O. T., N. T., and Apocrypha, but based throughout on the original. Left to himself, Rogers carried on the work, probably at the expense of the same Antwerp merchant who had assisted Tyndale (Poyntz), and thus got as far as Isaiah. The enterprising London printers, Grafton and Whitechurch, then came in (Chester, *Life of Rogers*, p. 29). It would be a good speculation to enter the market with this, and so drive out Coverdale's, in which they had no interest. They accordingly embarked a considerable capital, £500, and then came a stroke of policy which may be described as a miracle of audacity. The name of Rogers, known as the friend of Tyndale, is suppressed, and the simulacrum of Thomas Matthew disarms suspicion. The book is sent by Grafton to Cranmer. He reads, approves, rejoices. He would rather have the news of its being licensed than a thousand pounds (Chester, p. 425–427). Application is then made both by Grafton and Cranmer to Cromwell. The king's license is granted, but the publisher wants more. Nothing less than a monopoly for five years will give him a fair margin of profit. Without this, he is sure to be undersold by piratical, inaccurate editions, badly printed on inferior paper. Failing this, he trusts that the king will order one copy to be bought by every incumbent, and six by every abbey. If this was too much, the king might, at least, impose that obligation on all the popishly-inclined clergy. That will bring in something, besides the good it may possibly do them (Chester, p. 430). The application was to some extent successful. A copy was ordered, by royal proclamation, to be set up in

every church, the cost being divided between the clergy and the parishioners. This was, therefore, the first Authorized Version. It is scarcely conceivable, however, that Henry could have read the book which he thus sanctioned, or known that it was substantially identical with what had been publicly stigmatized in his Acts of Parliament (*ut supra*). What had before given most offence had been the polemical character of Tyndale's annotations, and here were notes bolder and more thorough still. Even the significant "W. T." does not appear to have attracted notice.

3. What has been said of Tyndale's version applies, of course, to this. There are, however, signs of a more advanced knowledge of Hebrew. All the technical words connected with the Psalms, Neginoth, Shiggaion, Sheminih, etc., are elaborately explained. Psa. ii is printed as a dialogue. The names of the Hebrew letters are prefixed to the verses of Lamentations. Reference is made to the Chaldee Paraphrase (Job vi), to Rabbi Abraham (Job xix), to Kimchi (Psa. iii). A like range of knowledge is shown in the N. T. Strabo is quoted to show that the magi were not kings, Macrobius as testifying to Herod's ferocity (Matt. ii), Erasmus's Paraphrase on Matt. xiii, xv. The popular identification of Mary Magdalene with "the woman that was a sinner" is discussed, and rejected (Luke x). More noticeable even than in Tyndale is the boldness and fulness of the exegetical notes scattered throughout the book. Strong and earnest in asserting what he looked upon as the central truths of the Gospel, there was in Rogers a Luther-like freedom in other things which has not appeared again in any authorized translation or popular commentary. He guards his readers against looking on the narrative of Job i as literally true. He recognises a definite historical starting-point for Psa. xlv ("The sons of Korah praise Solomon for the beauty, eloquence, power, and nobleness, both of himself and of his wife"), Psa. xxii ("David declareth Christ's dejection . . . and all, under figure of himself"), and the Song of Solomon ("Solomon made this balade for himself and his wife, the daughter of Pharaoh, under the shadow of himself, figuring Christ," etc.). The chief duty of the Sabbath is "to minister the fodder of the Word to simple souls," to be "pitiful over the weariness of such neighbors as labored sore all the week long." "When such occasions come as turn our rest to occupation and labor, then ought we to remember that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath" (Jer. xvii). He sees in the prophets of the N. T. simply "expounders of Holy Scripture" (Acts xv). To the man living in faith, "Peter's fishing after the resurrection, and all deeds of matrimony are pure spiritual;" to those who are not, "learning, doctrine, contemplation of high things, preaching, study of Scripture, founding of churches and abbeyes, are works of the flesh" (*Pref. to Romans*). "Neither is outward circumcision or outward baptism worth a pin of themselves, save that they put us in remembrance to keep the covenant" (1 Cor. vii). "He that desireth honor gasheth after lucre . . . castles, parks, lordships . . . desireth not a work, much less a good work, and nothing less than a bishop's" (1 Tim. iii). Ezek. xxxiv is said to be "against bishops and curates that despise the flock of Christ." The *ἄγγελος ἐκκλησίας* of Rev. ii and iii appears (as in Tyndale) as "the messenger of the congregation." Strong protests against Purgatory are found in notes to Ezek. xviii and 1 Cor. iii, and in the "Table of Principal Matters" it is significantly stated under the word Purgatory that "it is not in the Bible, but the purgation and remission of our sins is made us by the abundant mercy of God." The Preface to the Apocrypha explains the name, and distinctly asserts the inferiority of these books. No notes are added to them, and the translation of them is taken from Coverdale, as if it had not been worth while to give much labor to it.

4. A few points of detail remain to be noticed. In the order of the books of the N. T. Rogers follows Tyndale, agreeing with the A. V. as far as the Epistle to Philemon. This is followed by the Epistles of John, then that to the Hebrews, then those of Peter, James, and Jude. Wood-cuts, not very freely introduced elsewhere, are prefixed to every chapter in the Revelation. The introduction of the "Table" mentioned above gives Rogers a claim to be the patriarch of Concordances, the "father" of all such as write in Dictionaries of the Bible. Reverence for the Hebrew text is shown by his striking out the three verses which the Vulgate has added to Psa. xiv. In a later edition, published at Paris, not by Rogers himself, but by Grafton, under Coverdale's superintendence, in 1539, the obnoxious prologue and prefaces were suppressed, and the notes systematically expurgated and toned down. The book was in advance of the age. Neither booksellers nor bishops were prepared to be responsible for it.

VI. TAVERNER (1539).—1. The boldness of the pseudo-Matthew had, as has been said, frightened the ecclesiastical world from its propriety. Coverdale's version was, however, too inaccurate to keep its ground. It was necessary to find another editor, and the printers applied to Richard Taverner. But little is known of his life. The fact that, though a layman, he had been chosen as one of the canons of the Cardinal's College at Oxford indicates a reputation for scholarship, and this is confirmed by the character of his translation. It professes, in the title-page, to be "newly recognised, with great diligence, after the most faithful exemplars." The editor acknowledges "the labors of others (i. e. Tyndale, Coverdale, and Matthew, though he does not name them) who have neither indiligently nor unlearnedly travelled," owns that the work is not one that can be done "absolutely" (i. e. completely) by one or two persons, but requires "a deeper conferring of many learned wittes together, and also a juster time and longer leisure;" but the thing had to be done; he had been asked to do it. He had "used his talent" as he could.

2. In most respects this may be described as an expurgated edition of Matthew's. There is a table of principal matters, and there are notes; but the notes are briefer and less polemical. The passages quoted above are, e. g. omitted wholly or in part. The epistles follow the same order as before.

VII. CRANMER.—1. In the same year as Taverner's, and coming from the same press, appeared an English Bible, in a more stately folio, printed with a more costly type, bearing a higher name than any previous edition. The title-page is an elaborate engraving, the spirit and power of which indicate the hand of Holbein. The king, seated on his throne, is giving the *Verbum Dei* to the bishops and doctors, and they distribute it to the people, while doctors and people are all joining in cries of "Vivat Rex." It declares the book to be "truly translated after the verity of the Hebrew and Greek texts" by "divers excellent learned men, expert in the foresaid tongues." A preface, in April, 1540, with the initials "T. C.," implies the archbishop's sanction. In a later edition (Nov., 1540) his name appears on the title-page, and the names of his coadjutors are given, Cuthbert (Tonstal), bishop of Durham, and Nicholas (Heatff), bishop of Rochester; but this does not exclude the possibility of others having been employed for the first edition.

2. Cranmer's version presents, as might be expected, many points of interest. The prologue gives a more complete ideal of what a translation ought to be than we have as yet seen. Words not in the original are to be printed in a different type. They are added, even when "not wanted by the sense," to satisfy those who have "missed them" in previous translations, i. e. they represent the various readings of the Vulgate where it differs from the Hebrew. The sign \* indi-

cates diversity in the Chaldee and Hebrew. It had been intended to give all these, but it was found that this would have taken too much time and space, and the editors purposed therefore to print them in a little volume by themselves. The frequent hands (✚) in the margin, in like manner, show an intention to give notes at the end; but Matthew's Bible had made men cautious, and, as there had not been time for the "king's council to settle them," they were omitted, and no help given to the reader beyond the marginal references. In the absence of notes, the lay-reader is to submit himself to the "godly-learned in Christ Jesus." There is, as the title-page might lead us to expect, a greater display of Hebrew than in any previous version. The books of the Pentateuch have their Hebrew names given, *Bereschüh* (Genesis), *Velle Schemoth* (Exodus), and so on. 1 and 2 Chron. in like manner appear as *Dibre Huiamin*. In the edition of 1541, many proper names in the O. T. appear in the fuller Hebrew form, as e. g. Amaziah, Jeremiahu. In spite of this parade of learning, however, the edition of 1539 contains, perhaps, the most startling blunder that ever appeared under the sanction of an archbishop's name. The editors adopted the preface which, in Matthew's Bible, had been prefixed to the Apocrypha. In that preface the common traditional explanation of the name was concisely given. They appear, however, to have shrunk from offending the conservative party in the Church by applying to the books in question so damnatory an epithet as Apocrypha. They looked out for a word more neutral and respectful, and found one that appeared in some MSS. of Jerome so applied, though in strictness it belonged to an entirely different set of books. They accordingly substituted that word, leaving the preface in all other respects as it was before, and the result is the somewhat ludicrous statement that the "books were called *Hagiographa*," because "they were read in secret and apart!"

3. A later edition in 1541 presents a few modifications worth noticing. It appears as "authorized" to be "used and frequented" in every church in the kingdom. The introduction, with all its elaborate promise of a future perfection, disappears, and in its place there is a long preface by Cranmer, avoiding as much as possible all references to other translations, taking a safe *via media* tone, blaming those who "refuse to read" on the one hand, and "inordinate reading" on the other. This neutral character, so characteristic of Cranmer's policy, was doubtless that which enabled it to keep its ground during the changing moods of Henry's later years. It was reprinted again and again, and was the authorized version of the English Church till 1568—the interval of Mary's reign excepted. From it, accordingly, were taken most, if not all, the portions of Scripture in the Prayer-books of 1549 and 1552. The Psalms as a whole, the quotations from Scripture in the Homilies, the sentences in the Communion services, and some phrases elsewhere (such as "worthy fruits of penance"), still preserve the remembrance of it. The oscillating character of the book is shown in the use of "love" instead of "charity" in 1 Cor. xiii; and "congregation" instead of "church" generally, after Tyndale; while in 1 Tim. iv, 14, we have the singular rendering, as if to gain the favor of his opponents, "with authority of priesthood." The plan of indicating doubtful texts by a smaller type was adhered to, and was applied, among other passages, to Psa. xiv, 5, 6, 7, and the more memorable text of 1 John v, 7. The translation of 1 Tim. iii, 16, "All Scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable," etc., anticipated a construction of that text which has sometimes been boasted of, and sometimes attacked as an innovation. In this, however, Tyndale had led the way.

VIII. GENEVA.—1. The experimental translation of the Gospel of Matthew by Sir John Cheke into a purer English than before (Strype, *Life of Cheke*, vii,

3) had so little influence on the versions that followed that it hardly calls for more than a passing notice, as showing that scholars were as yet unsatisfied. The reaction under Mary gave a check to the whole work, as far as England was concerned; but the exiles who fled to Geneva entered upon it with more vigor than ever. Cranmer's version did not come up to their ideal. Its size made it too costly. There were no explanatory or dogmatic notes. It followed Coverdale too closely; and where it deviated, did so, in some instances, in a retrograde direction. The Geneva refugees—among them Whittingham, Goodman, Pullain, Sampson, and Coverdale himself—labored "for two years or more, day and night." They entered on their "great and wonderful work" with much "fear and trembling." Their translation of the N. T. was "diligently revised by the most approved Greek examples" (MSS. or editions?) (*Preface*). The N. T., translated by Whittingham, was printed by Conrad Badius in 1557, the whole Bible in 1560.

2. In point of general correctness in expressing the true sense of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, the Geneva version shows a very marked advance on all that preceded it, and for more than sixty years it was the most popular of all the English versions. Largely imported in the early years of Elizabeth, it was printed in England in 1561, and a patent of monopoly was given to James Bodleigh. This was transferred in 1576 to Barker, in whose family the right of printing Bibles remained for upwards of a century. Not less than eighty editions, some of the whole Bible, were printed between 1558 and 1611. It kept its ground for some time even against the later version of king James, and gave way, as it were, slowly and under protest. In the *Soldiers' Pocket Bible*, published in 1643 for the use of Cromwell's army, almost all the selections of Scripture were taken from the Geneva version. The causes of this general acceptance are not difficult to ascertain. The volume was, in most of its editions, cheaper and more portable—a small quarto, instead of the large folio of Cranmer's "Great Bible." It was the first Bible which laid aside the adolescent black letter, and appeared in Roman type. It was the first which, following the Hebrew example, recognised the division into verses, so dear to the preachers or hearers of sermons. It was accompanied, in most of the editions after 1578, by a Bible Dictionary of considerable merit. The notes were often really helpful in dealing with the difficulties of Scripture, and were looked upon as spiritual and evangelical. It was accordingly the version specially adopted by the great Puritan party through the whole reign of Elizabeth, and far into that of James. As might be expected, it was based on Tyndale's version, often returning to it where the intermediate renderings had had the character of a compromise.

3. Some peculiarities are worthy of special notice: (1) It professes a desire to restore the "true writing" of many Hebrew names, and we meet accordingly with forms like Izhak (Isaac), Jaacob, and the like. (2) It omits the name of Paul from the title of the Epistle to the Hebrews; and, in a short preface, leaves the authorship an open question. (3) It avows the principle of putting all words not in the original in italics. (4) It presents, in a Calendar prefixed to the Bible, something like a declaration of war against the established order of the Church's lessons, commemorating Scripture facts, and the deaths of the great reformers, but ignoring saints' days altogether. (5) It was the first English Bible which entirely omitted the Apocrypha. (6) The notes were characteristically Swiss, not only in their theology, but in their politics. They made allegiance to kings dependent upon the soundness of their faith, and in one instance (note on 2 Chron. xv, 16) at least seemed, to the easily startled James I, to favor tyrannicide.

4. The circumstances of the early introduction of

the Geneva version are worth mentioning, if only as showing in how different a spirit the great fathers of the English Reformation, the most conservative of Anglican theologians, acted from that which has too often animated their successors. Men talk now of different translations and various readings as likely to undermine the faith of the people. When application was made to archbishop Parker, in 1565, to support Bodleigh's application for a license to reprint the Geneva version in 12mo, he wrote to Cecil in its favor. He was at the time looking forward to the work he afterwards accomplished, of "one other special Bible for the churches, to be set forth as convenient time and leisure should permit," but in the mean time it would "nothing hinder, but rather doo much good, to have diversity of translations and readings" (Strype, *Life of Parker*, iii, 6). Many of the later reprints, instead of the Geneva version from the Greek, have Tomson's translation of Beza's Latin version; and the notes are said to be taken from Joae, Camer, P. Leseler, Villerius, and Fr. Junius. The Geneva version, as published by Barker, is that popularly known as the *Breeches Bible*, from its rendering of Gen. iii, 7. It had, however, been preceded in this by Wycliffe's.

IX. THE BISHOPS' BIBLE.—1. The facts just stated will account for the wish of archbishop Parker, in spite of his liberal tolerance, to bring out another version which might establish its claims against that of Geneva. Great preparations were made. The correspondence of Parker with his suffragans presents some points of interest, as showing how little agreement there was as to the true theory of a translation. Thus, while Sandys, bishop of Worcester, finds fault with the "common translation" (Geneva?), as "following Munster too much," and so "swerving much from the Hebrew," Guest, bishop of St. David's, who took the Psalms, acted on the principle of translating them so as to agree with the N.-T. quotations, "for the avoiding of offence;" and Cox, bishop of Ely, while laying down the sensible rule that "inkhorn terms were to be avoided," also went on to add "that the usual terms were to be retained so far forth as the Hebrew will well bear" (Strype, *Parker*, iii, 6). The principle of pious frauds, of distorting the truth for the sake of edification, has perhaps often been acted on by other translators. It has not often been so explicitly avowed as in the first of these suggestions.

2. The bishops thus consulted, eight in number, together with some deans and professors, brought out the fruit of their labors in a magnificent folio (1568 and 1572). Everything had been done to make it attractive. A long erudite preface vindicated the right of the people to read the Scriptures, and (quoting the authority of bishop Fisher) admitted the position which later divines have often been slow to admit, that "there be yet in the Gospel many dark places which, without all doubt, to the posterity shall be made much more open." Wood-engravings of a much higher character than those of the Geneva Bible were scattered profusely, especially in Genesis. Three portraits of the queen, the earl of Leicester, and lord Burleigh, beautiful specimens of copperplate engraving, appeared on the title-pages of the several parts. A map of Palestine was given, with degrees of latitude and longitude, in the edition of 1572. It also contained more numerous illustrated initials. Some of these caused very great dissatisfaction, being grossly offensive representations of heathen mythology; for which, however, the printer alone was responsible, who used such ornamental initials as he chose, following the taste of the age. From one of them, the initial letter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, this version is popularly known as the *Leda Bible*. A most elaborate series of genealogical tables, prepared by Hugh Broughton, the great rabbi of the age (of whom more hereafter), but ostensibly by Speed the antiquary (Broughton's name being in disfavor with the bishops), was prefixed

(Strype, *Parker*, iv, 20; Lightfoot, *Life of Broughton*). In some points it followed previous translations, and was avowedly based on Cramer's. "A new edition was necessary." "This had led some well-disposed men to recognise it again, not as condemning the former translation, which has been followed mostly of any other translation, excepting the original text" (Pref. of 1572). Cramer's Prologue was reprinted. The Geneva division into verses was adopted throughout.

3. Some peculiarities, however, appear for the first and last time. (1.) The books of the Bible are classified as legal, historical, sapiential, and prophetic. This was easy enough for the O. T., but the application of the same idea to the N. T. produced some rather curious combinations. The Gospels, the catholic Epistles, and those to Titus, Philemon, and the Hebrews, are grouped together as legal, St. Paul's other epistles as sapiential; the Acts appear as the one historical, the Revelation as the one prophetic book. (2.) It is the only Bible in which many passages, sometimes nearly a whole chapter, have been marked for the express purpose of being omitted when the chapters were read in the public service of the Church. (3.) In the edition of 1572, Cramer's version of the Psalms, as being the one used in the Book of Common Prayer (which could not be changed without an act of Parliament), was printed along with the Bishops' version in parallel columns. In the editions subsequent to this date the Bishops' version is omitted altogether, and that of Cramer is substituted in its place, in order that the Bible and the Prayer-book might have the same version. They are so far worthless, therefore, as editions of the Bishops' Bible. (4.) The initials of the translators were attached to the books which they had severally undertaken. The work was done on the plan of limited, not joint liability. (5.) Here, as in the Geneva, there is the attempt to give the Hebrew proper names more accurately, as e. g. in Heva, Isaac, Uziah, etc.

4. Of all the English versions, the Bishops' Bible had probably the least success. It did not command the respect of scholars, and its size and cost were far from meeting the wants of the people. Its circulation appears to have been practically limited to the churches which were ordered to be supplied with it. It had, however, at any rate, the right to boast of some good Hebrew scholars among the translators, one of whom, bishop Alley, had written a Hebrew Grammar; and, though vehemently attacked by Broughton (Townley, *Literary History of the Bible*, iii, 190), it was defended as vigorously by Fulke, and, together with the A. V., received from Selden the praise of being "the best translation in the world" (*Table Talk, Works*, iii, 2069).

X. RHEIMS AND DOUAY.—1. The successive changes in the Protestant versions of the Scriptures were, as might be expected, matter of triumph to the controversialists of the Latin Church. Some saw in it an argument against any translation of Scripture into the spoken language of the people. Others pointed decisively to the want of unity which these changes displayed. There were some, however, who took the line which Sir T. More and Gardiner had taken under Henry VIII. They did not object to the principle of an English translation. They only charged all the versions hitherto made with being false, corrupt, heretical. To this there was the ready retort that they had themselves done nothing; that their bishops in the reign of Henry had promised, but had not performed. It was felt to be necessary that they should take some steps which might enable them to turn the edge of this reproach. Accordingly, the English refugees who were settled at Rheims—Martin, Allen (afterwards cardinal), and Bristow—undertook the work. Gregory Martin, who had graduated at Cambridge, had signaled himself by an attack on the existing versions, and had been answered in an elaborate treatise by Fulke, master of Catherine Hall, Cambridge (*A Defence of the Sin-*

*cere and True Translation*, etc.). The charges are mostly of the same kind as those brought by Sir T. More against Tyndale. "The old time-honored words were discarded. The authority of the Septuagint and Vulgate was set at naught when the translator's view of the meaning of the Hebrew and Greek differed from what he found in them." The new model translation was to avoid these faults. It was to command the respect at once of priests and people. After an incubation of some years, it was published at Rheims in 1582. Though Martin was competent to translate from the Greek, it professed to be based on "the authentic text of the Vulgate." Notes were added, as strongly dogmatic as those of the Geneva Bible, and often keenly controversial. The work of translation was completed somewhat later by the publication of the O. T. at Douay in 1609. The language was precisely what might have been expected from men who adopted Gardiner's ideal of what a translation ought to be. At every page we stumble on "strange inhorn words," which never had been English, and never could be, such, e. g. as "the Pasche and the Azymes" (Mark xvi. 1), "the arch-synagogue" (Mark v. 35), "in prepuce" (Rom. iv, 9), "obdurate with the fallacie of sin" (Heb. iii. 13), "a greater hoste" (Heb. xi, 4), "this is the annuntiation" (1 John v, 5), "pre-ordinate" (Acts xiii, 48), "the justifications of our Lord" (Luke i, 6), "what is to me and thee" (John ii, 4), "longanimity" (Rom. ii, 4), "purge the old leaven that you may be a new paste, as you are azymes" (1 Cor. iv, 7), "you are evacuated from Christ" (Gal. v, 4), and so on.

2. A style such as this had, as might be expected, but few admirers. Among those few, however, we find one great name. Bacon, who leaves the great work of the reign of James unnoticed, and quotes almost uniformly from the Vulgate, goes out of his way to praise the Rhemish version for having restored "charity" to the place from which Tyndale had expelled it, in 1 Cor. xiii (*Of the Pacification of the Church*). Even Roman Catholic divines have felt the superiority of the A. V., and Challoner, in his editions of the N. T. in 1748, and the Bible, 1763, often follows it in preference to the Rheims and Douay translations.

XI. KING JAMES'S VERSION.—1. The position of the English Church in relation to the versions in use at the commencement of the reign of James was hardly satisfactory. The Bishops' Bible was sanctioned by authority. That of Geneva had the strongest hold on the affections of the people. Scholars, Hebrew scholars in particular, found grave fault with both. Hugh Broughton, who spoke Hebrew as if it had been his mother tongue, denounced the former as being full of "traps and pitfalls," "overthrowing all religion," and proposed a new revision to be effected by an English Septuagint (72), with power to consult gardeners, artists, and the like, about the words connected with their several callings, and bound to submit their work to "one qualified for difficulties." This ultimate reference was, of course, to be himself (Strype, *Whitgift*, iv, 19, 25). Unhappily, neither his temper nor his manners were such as to win favor for this suggestion. Whitgift disliked him, worried him, drove him into exile. Broughton's views were, however, shared by others; and among the demands of the Puritan representatives at the Hampton-Court Conference in 1604 (Dr. Reynolds being the spokesman), was one for a new, or, at least, a revised translation. The special objections which they urged were neither numerous (three passages only—1<sup>st</sup> Sa. cv, 28; evi, 30; Gal. iv, 25—were referred to) nor important, and we must conclude either that this part of their case had not been carefully got up, or that the bullying to which they were exposed had had the desired effect of throwing them into some confusion. The bishops turned the difficulties which they did raise with supercilious scorn. They were "trivial, old, and often answered." Bancroft raised the cry of alarm which a timid conservatism has so of-



ten raised since. "If every man's humor were to be followed, there would be no end of translating" (Cardwell, *Conferences*, p. 188). Cramer's words seemed likely to be fulfilled again. Had it been left to the bishops, we might have waited for the A.V. "till the day after doomsday." Even when the work was done, and the translators acknowledged that the Hampton-Court Conference had been the starting-point of it, they could not resist the temptation of a fling at their opponents. The objections to the Bishops' Bible had, they said, been nothing more than a shift to justify the refusal of the Puritans to subscribe to the Communion-book (*Preface* to A.V.). But the king disliked the politics of the Geneva Bible. Either repeating what he had heard from others, or exercising his own judgment, he declared that there was as yet no good translation, and that the Geneva was the worst of all. Nothing, however, was settled at the Conference beyond the hope thus held out.

2. But the king was not forgetful of what he thought likely to be the glory of his reign. The work of organizing and superintending the arrangements for a new translation was one specially congenial to him, and in 1606 the task was accordingly commenced. The selection of the fifty-four scholars to whom it was intrusted seems, on the whole, to have been a wise and fair one. Andrews, Saravia, Overal, Montague, and Barlow represented the "highier" party in the Church; Reynolds, Chaderton, and Lively that of the Puritans. Scholarship unconnected with party was represented by Henry Savile and John Boys. One name, that of Broughton, is indeed conspicuous by its absence. The greatest Hebrew scholar of the age—the man who had, in a letter to Cecil (1595), urged this very plan of a joint translation—who had already translated several books of the O. T. (Job, Ecclesiastes, Daniel, Lamentations), was ignominiously excluded. This may have been, in part, owing to the dislike with which Whitgift and Bancroft had all along regarded him. But in part, also, it was owing to Broughton's own character. An unmanageable temper, showing itself in violent language, and the habit of stigmatizing those who differed from him, even on such questions as those connected with names and dates, as heretical and atheistic, must have made him thoroughly impracticable; one of the men whose presence throws a committee or conference into chaos. Only forty-seven names appear in the king's list (Burnet, *Reform. Records*). Seven may have died or declined to act; or it may have been intended that there should be a final committee of revision. A full list is given by Fuller (*Ch. Hist.* x); and is reproduced, with biographical particulars, by Todd and Anderson. The Puritan side was, however, weakened by the death of Reynolds and Lively during the progress of the work.

3. What reward other than that of their own consciences and the judgment of posterity were the men thus chosen to expect for their long and laborious task? The king was not disposed to pay them out of his state revenue. Gold and silver were not always plentiful in the household of the English Solomon, and from him they received nothing (Heywood, *State of Auth. Bibl. Revision*). There remained, however, an ingenious form of liberality, which had the merit of being inexpensive. A king's letter was sent to the archbishops and bishops, to be transmitted by them to their chapters, commending all the translators to their favorable notice. They were exhorted to contribute in all 1000 marks, and the king was to be informed of each man's liberality. If any livings in their gift, or in the gift of private persons, became vacant, the king was to be informed of it, that he might nominate some of the translators to the vacant preferment. Heads of colleges, in like manner, were enjoined to give free board and lodging to such divines as were summoned from the country to labor in the great work (Strype, *Whitgift*, iv). That the king might take his place as

director of the whole, a copy of fifteen instructions was sent to each translator, and apparently circulated freely in both universities.

4. The instructions thus given will be found in Fuller (*l. c.*), and with a more accurate text in Burnet (*Reform. Records*). It will not be necessary to give them here in full; but it will be interesting to note the bearing of each clause upon the work in hand, and its relation to previous versions. (1) The Bishops' Bible was to be followed, and as little altered as the original will permit. This was probably intended to quiet the alarm of those who saw in the proposed new version a condemnation of that already existing. (2) The names of prophets and others were to be retained as nearly as may be in the form vulgarly used. This was to guard against forms like Izbak, Jeremiah, etc., which had been introduced in some versions, and which some Hebrew scholars were willing to introduce more copiously. To it we owe probably the forms Jeremy, Elias, Osee, Core, in the N. T. (3) The old ecclesiastical words were to be kept, as the word "church" not to be translated "congregation." The rule was apparently given for the sake of this special application. "Charity," in 1 Cor. xiii, was probably also due to it. The earlier versions, it will be remembered, had gone on the opposite principle. (4) "When any word hath divers significations, that to be kept which hath been most commonly used by the most eminent fathers, being agreeable to the propriety of the place and the analogy of faith." This, like the former, tends to confound the functions of the preacher and the translator, and substitutes ecclesiastical tradition for philological accuracy. (5) The division of the chapters to be altered either not at all, or as little as possible. Here, again, convenience was more in view than truth and accuracy, and the result is that divisions are perpetuated which are manifestly arbitrary and misleading. (6) No marginal notes to be affixed but only for the explanation of Hebrew and Greek words. This was obviously directed against the Geneva notes, as the special objects of the king's aversion. Practically, however, in whatever feeling it originated, we may be thankful that the A.V. came out as it did, without note or comment. The open Bible was placed in the hands of all readers. The work of interpretation was left free. Had an opposite course been adopted, we might have had the tremendous evil of a whole body of exegesis imposed upon the Church by authority, reflecting the Calvinism of the Synod of Dort, the absolutism of James, the high-flying prelacy of Bancroft. (7) "Such quotations of places to be marginally set down as may serve for fit reference of one Scripture to another." The principle that Scripture is its own interpreter was thus recognised, but practically the marginal references of the A.V. of 1611 were somewhat scanty, most of those now printed having been added in later editions. (8 and 9) State plan of translation. Each company of translators is to take its own books; each person to bring his own corrections. The company to discuss them, and, having finished their work, to send it on to another company, and so on. (10) Provides for differences of opinion between two companies by referring them to a general meeting. (11) Gives power, in cases of difficulty, to consult any scholars. (12) Invites suggestions from any quarter. (13) Names the directors of the work: Andrews, dean of Westminster; Barlow, dean of Chester; and the regius professors of Hebrew and Greek at both universities. (14) Names translations to be followed when they agree more with the original than the Bishops' Bible, namely, Tyndale's, Coverdale's, Matthew's, Whitlurch's, (Cramer's), and Geneva. (15) Authorizes universities to appoint three or four overseers of the work.

5. It is not known that any of the correspondence connected with this work, or any minute of the meetings for conference, is still extant. Nothing is more

striking than the silence with which the version that was to be the inheritance of the English people for at least two centuries and a half was ushered into the world. Here and there we get glimpses of scholars coming from their country livings to their old college haunts to work diligently at the task assigned them (Peck, *Desiderata Curiosa*, ii, 87). We see the meetings of translators, one man reading the chapter which he has been at work on, while the others listen, with the original, or Latin, or German, or Italian, or Spanish versions in their hands (Selden, *Table Talk*). We may represent to ourselves the differences of opinion, settled by the casting vote of the "odd man," or by the strong overbearing temper of a man like Baneroff, the minority comforting themselves with the thought that it was no new thing for the truth to be outvoted (Gell, *Essay towards Amendment of last English transl. of Bible*, p. 321). Dogmatic interests were in some cases allowed to bias the translation; and the Calvinism of one party, the prelatic views of another, were both represented at the expense of accuracy (Gell, l. c.). The following passages are those commonly referred to in support of this charge: (1.) The rendering "such as should be saved," in Acts ii, 47. (2.) The insertion of the words "any man" in Heb. x, 38 ("the just shall live by faith, but if *any man* draw back," etc.), to avoid an inference unfavorable to the doctrine of Final Perseverance. (3.) The use of "bishopric," in Acts i, 20, of "oversight," in 1 Pet. v, 2, of "bishop," in 1 Tim. iii, 1, etc., and "overseers," in Acts xx, 28, in order to avoid the identification of bishops and elders. (4.) The chapter-heading of Ps. cxlix in 1611 (since altered), "The prophet exhorteth to praise God for that power which he hath given the Church to bind the consciences of men." Blunt (*Duties of a Parish Priest*, lect. ii) appears, in this question, on the side of the prosecution, Trench (*On the A. V. of the N. T.* chap. x) on that of the defence. The charge of an undue bias against Rome in 1 Cor. xi, 27; Gal. v, 6; Heb. xiii, 4, is one on which an acquittal may be pronounced with little or no hesitation.

6. For three years the work went on, the separate companies comparing notes as directed. When the work drew towards its completion, it was necessary to place it under the care of a select few. Two from each of the three groups were accordingly selected, and the six met in London to superintend the publication. Now, for the first time, we find any more definite remuneration than the shadowy promise held out in the king's letter of a share in the 1000 marks which deans and chapters would not contribute. The matter had now reached its business stage, and the Company of Stationers thought it expedient to give the six editors thirty pounds each, in weekly payments, for their nine months' labor. The final correction, and the task of writing the arguments of the several books, was given to Bilson, bishop of Winchester, and Dr. Miles Smith, the latter of whom also wrote the Dedication and the Preface. Of these two documents, the first is unfortunately familiar enough to us, and is chiefly conspicuous for its servile adulation. James I is "that sanctified person," "enriched with singular and extraordinary graces," that had appeared "as the sun in his strength." To him they appeal against the judgment of those whom they describe, in somewhat peevish accents, as "popish persons or self-conceited brethren." The Preface to the Reader is more interesting, as throwing light upon the principles on which the translators acted. They "never thought that they should need to make a new translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one." "Their endeavor was to make a good one better, or, out of many good ones, one principal good one." They claim credit for steering a middle course between the Puritans who "left the old ecclesiastical words," and the obscurity of the Papists "retaining foreign words of purpose to darken the sense." They vindicate the practice, in

which they indulge very freely, of translating one word in the original by several English words, partly on the intelligible ground that it is not always possible to find one word that will express all the meanings of the Greek or Hebrew, partly on the somewhat childish plea that it would be unfair to choose some words for the high honor of being the channels of God's truth, and to pass over others as unworthy.

7. The version thus published did not all at once supersede those already in possession. The fact that five editions were published in three years shows that there was a good demand. But the Bishops' Bible probably remained in many churches (Andrews takes his texts from it in preaching before the king as late as 1621), and the popularity of the Geneva version is shown by not less than thirteen reprints, in whole or in part, between 1611 and 1617. It is not easy to ascertain the impression which the A. V. made at the time of its appearance. Probably, as in most like cases, it was far less for good or evil than friends or foes expected. The Puritans, and the religious portion of the middle classes generally, missed the notes of the Geneva book (Fuller, *Church History*, x, 50, 51). The Romanists spoke, as usual, of the unsettling effect of these frequent changes, and of the marginal readings as leaving men in doubt what was the truth of Scripture. Whitaker's answer, by anticipation, to this charge is worth quoting: "No inconvenience will follow if interpretations or versions of Scripture, when they have become obsolete or ceased to be intelligible, may be afterwards changed or corrected" (*Dissert. on Script.* p. 232, Parker Soc. ed.). The wiser divines of the English Church had not then learned to raise the cry of finality. One frantic cry was heard from Hugh Broughton, the rejected (*Works*, p. 661), who "would rather be torn in pieces by wild horses than impose such a version on the poor churches of England." Selden, a few years later, gives a calmer and more favorable judgment. It is "the best of all translations as giving the true sense of the original." This, however, is qualified by the remark that "no book in the world is translated as the Bible is, word for word, with no regard to the difference of idioms. This is well enough so long as scholars have to do with it, but when it comes among the common people, Lord! what gear do they make of it!" (*Table Talk*). The feeling of which this was the expression led, even in the midst of the agitations of the Commonwealth, to proposals for another revision, which, after being brought forward in the Grand Committee of Religion in the House of Commons in January, 1656, was referred to a sub-committee, acting under White Locke, with power to consult divines and report. Conferences were accordingly held frequently at White Locke's house, at which we find, mingled with less illustrious names, those of Walton and Cudworth. Nothing, however, came of it (White Locke, *Memoirs*, p. 564; Collier, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 9). No report was ever made; and with the Restoration the tide of conservative feeling, in this as in other things, checked all plans of further alteration. Many had ceased to care for the Bible at all. Those who did care were content with the Bible as it was. Only here and there was a voice raised, like R. Gell's (*ut sup.*), declaring that it had defects, that it bore in some things the stamp of the dogmatism of a party (p. 821).

8. The highest testimony of this period is that of Walton. From the editor of the Polyglot, the few words "inter omnes eminet" meant a good deal (*Pref.*). With the reign of Anne the tide of glowing panegyric set in. It would be easy to put together a long *catalogue* of praises stretching from that time to the present. With many, of course, this has been only the routine repetition of a traditional boast. "Our unrivalled Translation" and "our incomparable Liturgy" have been equally phrases of course. But there have been witnesses of a far higher weight. In pro-

portion as the English of the 18th century was infected with a Latinized or Gallicized style, did those who had a purer taste look with reverence to the strength and purity of a better time as represented in the A. V. Thus Addison dwells on its emobbling the coldness of modern languages with the glowing phrases of Hebrew (*Spectator*, No. 405), and Swift confesses that "the translators of the Bible were masters of an English style far fitter for that work than any we see in our present writings" (*Letter to Lord Oxford*). Each half century has naturally added to the prestige of these merits. The language of the A. V. has intertwined itself with the controversies, the devotion, the literature of the English people. It has gone, wherever they have gone, over the face of the whole earth. The most solemn and tender of individual memories are, for the most part, associated with it. Men leaving the Church of England for the Church of Rome turn regretfully with a yearning look at that noble "well of English undefiled" which they are about to exchange for the uncouth monstrosities of Rheims and Douay. In this case, too, as in so many others, the position of the A. V. has been strengthened, less by the skill of its defenders than by the weakness of its assailants. While from time to time scholars and divines (Lowth, Newcome, Waterland, Trench, Ellicott) have admitted the necessity of a revision, those who have attacked the present version and produced new ones have been, for the most part, men of narrow knowledge and defective taste (Purver, Harwood, Bellamy, Conquest, Sawyer), just able to pick out a few obvious faults, and committing others equally glaring. They have also generally entered on the work of translating or revising the whole Bible single-handed. One memorable exception must not, however, be passed over. Hallam (*Lit. of Europe*, iii, ch. ii, ad fin.) records a brief but emphatic protest against the "enthusiastic praise" which has been lavished on this translation. "It may, in the eyes of many, be a better English, but it is not the English of Daniel, or Raleigh, or Bacon. . . . It abounds, in fact, especially in the O. T., with obsolete phraseology, and with single words long since abandoned, or retained only in provincial use." The statement may, however, in some sense be accepted as an encomium. If it had been altogether the English of the men of letters of James's reign, would it have retained, as it has done for two centuries and a half, its hold on the mind, the memory, the affections of the English people?

XII. *Schemes for a Revision*.—1. A notice of the attempts which have been made at various times to bring about a revision of the A. V., though necessarily brief and imperfect, may not be without its use for future laborers. The first half of the 18th century was not favorable for such a work. An almost solitary *Essay for a New Translation* by H. R. (Ross), 1702, attracted little or no notice (Todd, *Life of Walton*, i, 134). A Greek Testament, with an English translation, singularly vulgar and offensive, was published in 1720, of which extracts are given by Lewis (*Hist. of Transl.*, ch. v). With the slight revival of learning among the scholars of the latter half of that period the subject was again mooted. Lowth in a visitation sermon (1758), and Seeker in a Latin speech intended for Convocation (1761), recommended it. Matt. Pilkington, in his *Remarks* (1759), and Dr. Thomas Brett, in an *Essay on Ancient Versions of the Bible* (1760), dwelt on the importance of consulting them with reference to the O. T. as well as the N. T., with a view to a more accurate text than that of the Masoretic Hebrew, the former insisting also on the obsolete words which are scattered in the A. V., and giving a useful alphabetic list of them. A folio *new and literal translation* of the whole Bible by Anthony Purver, a Quaker (1764), was a more ambitious attempt. He dwells at some length on the "obsolete, uncouth, clownish" ex-

pressions which disfigure the A. V. He includes in his list such words as "joyous," "solace," "damsel," "day-spring," "bereaved," "marvels," "bondmen." He substitutes "he hearkened to what he said" for "he hearkened to his voice;" "eat victuals" for "eat bread" (Gen. iii, 19); "was in favor with" for "found grace in the eyes of;" "was angry" for "his wrath was kindled." In spite of this defective taste, however, the work has considerable merit, is based upon a careful study of the original and of many of the best commentators, and may be contrasted favorably with most of the single-handed translations that have followed. It was, at any rate, far above the depth of degradation and folly which was reached in Harwood's *Literal Translation of the N. T.* "with freedom, spirit, and elegance" (1768). Here, again, a few samples are enough to show the character of the whole. "The young lady is not dead" (Mark v, 39). "A gentleman of splendid family and opulent fortune had two sons" (Luke xv, 11). "The clergyman said, You have given him the only right and proper answer" (Mark xii, 32). "We shall not pay the common debt of nature, but by a soft transition," etc. (1 Cor. xv, 51).

2. Biblical revision was happily not left entirely in such hands as these. A translation by Worsley "according to the present idiom of the English tongue" (1770) was, at least, less offensive. Durell (*Preface to Job*), Lowth (*Pref. to Isaiah*), Blayney (*Pref. to Jeremiah*, 1784), were all strongly in favor of a new or revised translation. Durell dwells most on the arbitrary additions and omissions in the A. V. of Job, on the total absence in some cases of any intelligible meaning. Lowth speaks chiefly of the faulty state of the text of the O. T., and urges a correction of it, partly from various readings, partly from ancient versions, partly from conjecture. Each of the three contributed, in the best way, to the work which they had little expectation of seeing accomplished, by laboring steadily at a single book, and committing it to the judgment of the Church. Kennicott's labors in collecting MSS. of the O. T. issued in *Lis State of the present Hebrew Text* (1753-59), and excited expectations that there might before long be something like a basis for a new version in a restored original.

A more ambitious scheme was started by the Roman Catholic Dr. Geddes, in his *Prospectus for a New Translation* (1786). His remarks on the history of English translations, his candid acknowledgment of the excellences of the A. V., and especially of Tyndale's work as pervading it, his critical notes on the true principles of translation, on the A. V. as falling short of them, may still be read with interest. He too, like Lowth, finds fault with the superstitious adherence to the Masoretic text, with the undue deference to lexicons, and disregard of versions shown by our translators. The proposal was well received by many Biblical scholars, Lowth, Kennicott, and Barrington being foremost among its patrons. The work was issued in parts, according to the terms of the Prospectus, but did not get further than 2 Chron. in 1792, when the death of the translator put a stop to it. Partly, perhaps, owing to its incompleteness, but still more from the extreme boldness of a Preface, anticipating the conclusions of a later criticism, Dr. Geddes's translation fell rapidly into disfavor. A sermon by White (famous for his Bampton Lectures) in 1779, and two pamphlets by J. A. Symonds, professor of modern history at Cambridge—the first on the Gospels and the Acts, in 1789; the second on the Epistles, in 1791—though attacked in an *Apology for the Liturgy and Church of England* (1795), helped to keep the discussion from oblivion.

3. The revision of the A. V., like many other salutary reforms, was hindered by the French Revolution. In 1792, archbishop Newcome had published an elaborate defence of such a scheme, citing a host of authorities (Doddridge, Wesley, Campbell, in addition to those already mentioned), and taking the same line as Lowth.

Revised translations of the N. T. were published by Wakefield in 1795, by Newcome himself in 1796, by Scarlett in 1798. Campbell's version of the Gospels appeared in 1788, that of the Epistles by Macknight in 1795. But in 1796 the note of alarm was sounded. A feeble pamphlet by George Burges (*Letter to the Lord Bishop of Ely*) took the ground that "the present period was unfit," and from that time conservatism, pure and simple, was in the ascendant. To suggest that the A. V. might be inaccurate was almost as bad as holding "French principles." There is a long interval before the question again comes into anything like prominence, and then there is a new school of critics in the *Quarterly Review* and elsewhere, ready to do battle vigorously for things as they are. The opening of the next campaign was an article in the *Classical Journal* (No. 36), by Dr. John Bellamy, proposing a new translation, followed soon afterwards by its publication under the patronage of the prince regent (1818). The work was poor and unsatisfactory enough, and a tremendous battery was opened upon it in the *Quarterly Review* (Nos. 37 and 38), as afterwards (No. 46) upon an unhappy critic, Sir J. B. Burges, who came forward with a pamphlet in its defence (*Reasons in favour of a new Translation*, 1819). The rash assertion of both Bellamy and Burges that the A. V. had been made almost entirely from the Septuagint and Vulgate, and a general deficiency in all accurate scholarship, made them easy victims. The personal element of this controversy may well be passed over, but three less ephemeral works issued from it, which any future laborer in the same field will find worth consulting. Whitaker's *Historical and Critical Inquiry* was chiefly an able exposure of the exaggerated statement just mentioned. H. J. Todd, in his *Vindication of the Authorized Translation* (1819), entered more fully than any previous writer had done into the history of the A. V., and gives many facts as to the lives and qualifications of the translators not easily to be met with elsewhere. The most masterly, however, of the manifestoes against all change was a pamphlet (*Remarks on the Critical Principles, etc.*, Oxford, 1820), published anonymously, but known to have been written by archbishop Laurence. The strength of the argument lies chiefly in a skilful display of all the difficulties of the work, the impossibility of any satisfactory restoration of the Hebrew of the O. T., or any settlement of the Greek of the N. T.; the expediency, therefore, of adhering to a *Textus receptus* in both. See VARIOUS READINGS. The argument, if conclusive, would unsettle our confidence in the text of the Holy Scriptures. Happily, more thorough critical research has fully refuted the archbishop's positions. But the scholarship and acuteness with which the subject is treated make the book instructive, and any one entering on the work of a translator ought at least to read it, that he may know what difficulties he has to face. About this period, also (1819), a new edition of Newcome's version was published by Belsham and other Unitarian ministers, and, like Bellamy's attempt on the O. T., had the effect of stiffening the resistance of the great body of the clergy to all proposals for a revision.

4. A correspondence between Herbert Marsh, bishop of Peterborough, and the Rev. H. Walter, in 1828, is the next link in the chain. Marsh had spoken (*Lectures on Biblical Criticism*, p. 295) with some contempt of the A. V. as based on Tyndale's, Tyndale's on Luther's, and Luther's on Münster's lexicon, which was itself based on the Vulgate. There was, therefore, on this view, no real translation from the Hebrew in any one of these. But it is evident that the Christian Hebraists of the period of the Reformation depended quite as much on the traditional learning of their Jewish teachers, often erroneous indeed, as on the earlier tradition preserved in the Latin Vulgate, and that they followed, as far as they were able, the Masoretic

punctuation, a much surer guide than the ancient versions, or the later rabbinic interpretation.

5. The last five-and-twenty years have seen the question of a revision from time to time gaining fresh prominence. If men of second-rate power have sometimes thrown it back by meddling with it in wrong ways, others, able scholars and sound theologians, have admitted its necessity and helped it forward by their work. Dr. Conquest's Bible, with "20,000 emendations" (1841), has not commanded the respect of critics, and is almost self-condemned by the silly ostentation of its title. The motions which have from time to time been made in the House of Commons by Mr. Heywood have borne little fruit beyond the display of feeble liberalism, and yet feebler conservatism, by which such debates are, for the most part, characterized; nor have the discussions in Convocation, though opened by a scholar of high repute (professor Selwyn), been much more productive. Dr. Beard's essay, *A revised English Bible the Want of the Church* (1857), though tending to overstate the defects of the A. V., is yet valuable as containing much information, and representing the opinions of the more learned Nonconformists. Far more important, every way, both as virtually an authority in favor of revision and as contributing largely to it, are professor Scholefield's *Hints for an improved Translation of the N. T.* (1832). In his second edition, indeed, he disclaims any wish for a new translation, but the principle which he lays down clearly and truly in his preface, that if there is "any adventitious difficulty resulting from a defective translation, then it is at the same time an act of charity and of duty to clear away the difficulty as much as possible," leads legitimately to at least a revision; and this conclusion Mr. Selwyn, in the last edition of the *Hints* (1857), has deliberately adopted. To bishop Ellicott also belongs the credit of having spoken at once boldly and wisely on this matter. Putting the question whether it would be right to join those who oppose all revision, his answer is, "God forbid. . . . It is in vain to cheat our own souls with the thought that these errors (in A. V.) are either insignificant or imaginary. There are errors, there are inaccuracies, there are misconceptions, there are obscurities. . . . and that man who, after being in any degree satisfied of this, permits himself to lean to the counsels of a timid or popular obstructiveness, or who, intellectually unable to test the truth of these allegations, nevertheless permits himself to denounce or deny them, will . . . have to sustain the tremendous charge of having dealt deceitfully with the inviolable word of God" (*Pref. to Pastoral Epistles*). The translations appended by Dr. Ellicott to his editions of Paul's epistles proceed on the true principle of altering the A. V. "only where it appears to be incorrect, inexact, insufficient, or obscure," uniting a profound reverence for the older translators with a bold truthfulness in judging of their work. The copious collection of all the earlier English versions makes this part of his book especially interesting and valuable. Dr. Trench (*On the A. V. of the N. T.*, 1858), in like manner, states his conviction that "a revision ought to come," though as yet, he thinks, "the Greek and the English necessary to bring it to a successful issue are alike wanting" (p. 3). The work itself, it need hardly be said, is the fullest contradiction possible of this somewhat despondent statement, and supplies a good store of materials for use when the revision actually comes. The *Revision of the A. V. by five Clergymen* (Dr. Barrow, Dr. Moberly, dean Alford, Mr. Humphry, and Dr. Ellicott) represents the same school of conservative progress, has the merit of adhering to the clear, pure English of the A. V., and does not deserve the censure which Dr. Beard passes on it as "promising little and performing less." As yet, this series includes only the Gospel of John, and the epistles to the Romans and Corinthians. The publications of the

American Bible Union are signs that there also the same want has been felt. The translations given respectively by Alford, Stanley, Jowett, and Conybeare and Howson, in their respective commentaries, are in like manner at once admissions of the necessity of the work and contributions towards it. Mr. Sharpe (1840) and Mr. Highton (1862) have ventured on the wider work of translations of the entire N. T. Mr. Sawyer (1858) has done the same, and proposes to continue the task over the whole Bible; but he lacks both the scholarship and the judgment necessary. Mr. Cookeley has published the Gospel of Matthew as Part I of a like undertaking. It might almost seem as if at last there was something like a *consensus* of scholars and divines on this question. That assumption would, however, be too hasty. Partly the *vis inertiae*, which, in a large body like the clergy of the Church, is always great, partly the fear of ulterior consequences, partly also the indifference of the majority of the laity, would probably, at the present moment, give at least a numerical majority to the opponents of a revision. Writers on this side are naturally less numerous, but the feeling of conservatism, pure and simple, has found utterance in four men representing different sections, and of different calibre—Mr. Scrivener (*Supp. to J. Eng. Ver. of N. T.*), Dr. M'Caul (*Reasons for holding fast the Authorized English Version*), Mr. C. S. Malan (*A Vindication*, etc.), and Dr. Cumming (*Revision and Translation*). A high American authority, Mr. Geo. P. Marsh, may also be referred to as throwing the weight of his judgment into the scale against any revision at the present moment (*Lectures on the English Language*, lect. xxviii).

XIII. *Present State of the Question.*—1. To take an accurate estimate of the extent to which the A. V. requires revision would call for nothing less than an examination of each single book, and would therefore involve an amount of detail incompatible with our present limits. To give a few instances only would practically fix attention on a part only of the evidence, and so would lead to a false rather than a true estimate. No attempt, therefore, will be made to bring together individual passages as needing correction. A few remarks on the chief questions which must necessarily come before those who undertake a revision will not, perhaps, be out of place. Examples, classified under corresponding heads, will be found in the book by Dr. Trench already mentioned, and, scattered in the form of annotations, in that of professor Scholefield.

2. The translation of the N. T. is from a text confessedly imperfect. What editions were used is a matter of conjecture; most probably one of those published with a Latin version by Beza between 1565 and 1598, and agreeing substantially with the *Textus receptus* of 1633. It is clear, on principle, that no revision ought to ignore the results of the textual criticism of the last hundred years. To shrink from noticing any variation, to go on printing as the inspired Word that which there is a preponderant reason for believing to be an interpolation or a mistake, is neither honest or reverential. To do so for the sake of greater edification is simply to offer to God the unclean sacrifice of a lie. The authority of the A. V. is, at any rate, in favor of the practice of not suppressing facts. In Matt. i, 11; xxvi, 26; Luke xvii, 36; John viii, 6; Acts xiii, 18; Ephes. vi, 9; Heb. ii, 4; James ii, 18; 1 John ii, 23; 1 Peter ii, 21; 2 Peter ii, 11, 18; 2 John, 8, different readings are given in the margin, or, as in 1 John ii, 23, indicated by a different type. In earlier versions, as has been mentioned, 1 John v, 7 was printed in smaller letters. The degree to which this should be done will, of course, require discernment. An apparatus like that in Tischendorf or Alford would obviously be out of place. Probably the useful Greek Testament edited by Mr. Scrivener might serve as an example of a middle course.

3. Still less had been done at the commencement of the 17th century for the text of the O. T. The Jewish teachers, from whom Protestant divines derived their knowledge, had given currency to the belief that in the Masoretic text were contained the *ipsissima verba* of revelation, free from all risks of error, from all casualties of transcription. The conventional phrases, "the authentic Hebrew," "the Hebrew verity," were the expression of this undiscerning reverence. They refused to apply the same rules of judgment here which they applied to the text of the N. T. They assumed that the Masorites were infallible, and were reluctant to acknowledge that there had been any variations since. Even Walton did not escape being attacked as unsound by the great Puritan divine, Dr. John Owen, for having called attention to the fact of discrepancies (*Proleg.* ch. vi). The materials for a revised text are, of course, scantier than with the N. T.; but the labors of Kennicott, De Rossi, J. H. Michaelis, and Davidson have not been fruitless, and here, as there, the older versions must be admitted as at least evidence of variations which once existed, but which were suppressed by the rigorous uniformity of the later rabbis. Conjectural emendations, such as Newcome, Lowth, and Ewald have so freely suggested, ought to be ventured on in such places only as are quite unintelligible without them. See CRITICISM, BIBLICAL.

4. All scholars worthy of the name are now agreed that as little change as possible should be made in the language of the A. V. Happily there is little risk of an emasculated elegance such as might have infected a new version in the last century. The very fact of the admiration felt for the A. V., and the general revival of a taste for the literature of the Elizabethan period, are safeguards against any like tampering now. Some words, however, absolutely need change, as being altogether obsolete; others, more numerous, have been slowly passing into a different, often into a lower or a narrower meaning, and are therefore no longer what they once were, adequate renderings of the original.

5. The self-imposed law of fairness, which led the A. V. translators to admit as many English words as possible to the honor of representing one in the Hebrew or Greek text, has, as might be expected, marred the perfection of their work. Sometimes the effect is simply the loss of the solemn emphasis of the repetition of the same word; sometimes it is more serious, and affects the meaning. While it would be simple pedantry to lay down unconditionally that but one and the same word should be used throughout for one in the original, there can be no doubt that such a limitation is the true principle to start with, and that instances to the contrary should be dealt with as exceptional necessities. Side by side with this fault there is another just the opposite of it. One English word appears for several Greek or Hebrew words, and thus shades of meaning, often of importance to the right understanding of a passage, are lost sight of. Taken together, the two forms of error, which meet us in well-nigh every chapter, make the use of an English Concordance absolutely misleading. Technical terms especially should be represented in as exact and uniform a manner as possible.

6. Grammatical inaccuracy must be noted as a defect pervading, more or less, the whole extent of the present version of the N. T. Instances will be found in abundance in Trench and Scholefield (*passim*), and in any of the better Commentaries. Such Gallicisms as "I am come," "Babylon is fallen," etc., to say nothing of outright French words, e. g. "briit" for noise (Nah. iii, 19), have often escaped detection. The true force of tenses, cases, prepositions, articles, is continually lost, sometimes at the cost of the finer shades which give vividness and emphasis, but sometimes also entailing more serious errors. In justice to the translators of the N. T., it must be said that, situ-

ated as they were, such errors were almost inevitable. They learned Greek through the medium of Latin. Lexicons and grammars were alike in the universal language of scholars; and that language was poorer and less inflected than the Greek, and failed utterly to represent, e. g. the force of its article, or the difference of its aorist and perfect tenses. Such books of this nature as were used by the translators were necessarily based upon a far scantier induction, and were therefore more meagre and inaccurate than those which have been the fruits of the labors of later scholars. Recent scholarship may in many things fall short of that of an earlier time, but the introduction of Greek lexicons and grammars in English has been beyond all doubt a change for the better.

7. The field of the O. T. has been far less adequately worked than that of the N. T., and Hebrew scholarship has made far less progress than Greek. Relatively, indeed, there seems good ground for believing that Hebrew was more studied in the early part of the 17th century than it is now. It was newer and more popular. The reverence which men felt for the perfection of the "Hebrew verity" made them willing to labor to learn a language which they looked upon as half-divine. But here, also, there was the same source of error. The early Hebrew lexicons represented partly, it is true, a Jewish tradition, but partly also were based upon the Vulgate (bishop Marsh, *Lectures*, ii, App. 61). The forms of cognate Shemitic languages had not been applied as a means for ascertaining the precise value of Hebrew words. The grammars, also in Latin, were defective. Little as Hebrew professors have, for the most part, done in the way of exegesis, any good commentary on the O. T. will show that here also there are errors as serious as in the N. T. In one memorable case, the inattention, real or apparent, of the translators to the force of the *Hiphil* form of the verb (Lev. iv, 12) has led to a serious attack on the truthfulness of the whole narrative of the Pentateuch (Colenso, *Pentateuch critically Examined*, pt. i, ch. vii).

8. The poetical character of many portions of the O. T. is wholly obscured by the arrangement of the A. V., and, indeed, its authors and editors seem to have ignored the poetical element altogether. This is a defect of very great importance, and should be remedied by a proper distribution of the clauses according to the Heb. laws of parallelism (q. v.), as well as by a more careful observance of that system of transposition of the terms of each hemistich that is characteristic of all poetry.

9. The division into chapters and verses is a matter that ought not to be passed over in any future revision. The former, it must be remembered, does not go further back than the 13th century. The latter, though answering, as far as the O. T. is concerned, to a long-standing Jewish arrangement, depends, in the N. T., upon the work of Robert Stephens. Neither in the O. T. nor in the N. T. did the verse-division appear in any earlier edition than that of Geneva. The inconveniences of changing both are probably too great to be risked. The habit of referring to chapter and verse is too deeply rooted to be got rid of. Yet the division, as it is, is not seldom artificial, and sometimes is absolutely misleading. No one would think of printing any other book, in prose or poetry, in short clauses like the verses of our Bibles, and the tendency of such a division is to give a broken and discontinuous knowledge, to make men good textuaries but bad divines. An arrangement like that of the paragraph Bibles of our own time, with the verse and chapter divisions relegated to the margin, ought to form part of any authoritative revision.

10. Other points of detail remain to be noticed briefly: (1.) The chapter-headings of the A. V. often go beyond their proper province. If it is intended to give an authoritative commentary to the lay reader, let it be done thoroughly. But if that attempt is abandon-

ed, as it was deliberately in 1611, then for the chapter-headings to enter, as they do, upon the work of interpretation, giving, as in Canticles, Psalms, and Prophets, *passim*, mystical meanings, is simply an inconsistency. What should be a mere table of contents becomes a gloss upon the text. (2.) The use of italics in printing the A. V., if of advantage in point of minute criticism, is at least open to some risks. At first they seem an honest confession on the part of the translators of what is or is not in the original. On the other hand, they tempt to a loose translation. Few writers would think it necessary to use them in translating other books. If the words do not do more than represent the sense of the original, then there is no reason for treating them as if they were added at the discretion of the translators. If they go beyond that, they are of the nature of a gloss, altering the force of the original, and have no right to be there at all, while the fact that they appear as additions frees the translator from the sense of responsibility. (3.) Good as the principle of marginal references is, the margins of the A. V., as now printed, are somewhat inconveniently crowded, and the references, being often merely verbal, tend to defeat their own purpose, and to make the reader weary of referring. They need, accordingly, a careful sifting; and though it would not be desirable to go back to the scanty number of the original edition of 1611, something intermediate between that and the present overabundance would be an improvement. (4.) Marginal readings, on the other hand, indicating variations in the text, or differences in the judgment of translators, might be profitably increased in number. The results of the labors of scholars would thus be placed within the reach of all intelligent readers, and so many difficulties and stumbling-blocks might be removed.

In all these points there has been, to a much larger extent than is commonly known, a work of unauthorized revision. Neither italics, nor references, nor readings, nor chapter-headings, nor, it may be added, punctuation, are the same now as they were in the A. V. of 1611. The chief alterations appear to have been made first in 1683, and afterwards in 1769, by Dr. Blayney, under the sanction of the Oxford delegates of the press (*Gentleman's Magazine*, Nov. 1789). A like work was done about the same time by Dr. Paris at Cambridge. There had, however, been some changes previously. The edition of 1638, in particular, shows considerable augmentations in the italics (Turton, *Text of the English Bible*, 1833, p. 91, 126). To Blayney also we owe most of the notes on weights and measures, and coins, and the explanation, where the text seems to require it, of Hebrew proper names. The whole question of the use of italics is discussed elaborately by Turton in the work just mentioned. The late issues of the American Bible Union (q. v.) have, too uniformly perhaps, rejected this mode of distinction; discarding it on the ground that, if the italicized words are not necessary to the sense, they have no business there; if necessary, then the reader is misled by marking them as though they were not.

11. What has been said will serve to show at once to what extent a new revision is required, and what are the chief difficulties to be encountered. The work, it is believed, ought not to be delayed much longer. Names of men competent to undertake the work, as far as the N. T. is concerned, will occur to every one; and if such alterations only were to be introduced as commanded the assent of at least two thirds of a chosen body of twenty or thirty scholars, while a place in the margin was given to such renderings only as were adopted by at least one third, there would be, it is believed, at once a great change for the better, and without any shock to the feelings or even the prejudices of the great mass of readers. Men fit to undertake the work of revising the translation of the O. T. are confessedly fewer, and, for the most part, occupied in

other things. The knowledge and the power, however, are there, though in less measure; and, even though the will be for the time absent, a summons to enter on the task from those whose authority they are bound to respect, would, we cannot doubt, be listened to. It might have the result of directing to their proper task, and to a fruitful issue, energies which are too often withdrawn to ephemeral and unprofitable controversies. As the revised Bible would be for the use of English-speaking people, the men appointed for the purpose ought not to be taken exclusively from any one Church, and the learning of all denominations should at least be fairly represented. The changes recommended by such a body of men, under conditions such as those suggested, might safely be allowed to circulate experimentally for two or three years. When they had stood that trial, they might, without risk, be printed in the new Authorized Version. Such a work would unite reverence for the past with duty towards the future. In undertaking it we should be not slighting the translators on whose labors we have entered, but following in their footsteps. It is the wisdom of the Church to bring out of its treasures things new and old.

XIV. *Literature.*—In addition to the works cited above, see especially Johnson's *Account of the several English Trans. of the Bible* (Lond. 1730, 8vo; reprinted in Bp. Watson's *Theolog. Tracts*); Bp. Marsh's *Hist. of the Translations which have been made of the Scriptures, from the earliest to the present Age* (Lond. 1812, 8vo); Lewis's *History of the principal Translations of the Bible* (3d ed. Lond. 1818, 8vo); Newcome's *Historical View of the English Biblical Translations* (Dublin, 1792, 8vo); Cotton's *List of Editions of the Bible* (2d ed. Oxford, 1852, 8vo); Walter's *Letter on the Independence of the Authorized Version of the Bible* (Lond. 1823, 8vo); Todd's *Vindication of our Authorized Translation*, etc. (Lond. 1819, 8vo); and especially Anderson's *Annals of the English Bible* (Lond. 1845, 2 vols. 8vo; in part reprinted, N. Y. 1856, 8vo); also Beard, *Revised English Bible the Want of the Church* (new ed. Lond. 1860, 8vo); Mrs. Conant, *History of the English Bible* (N. Y. 1856; Lond. 1859, 8vo); Bp. Hinds, *Scripture and the Authorized Version* (Lond. 1853, 12mo); Malan, *Vindication of the Authorized Version of the Bible* (Lond. 1856, 8vo); Anon. *Renderings of the principal English Translations of the Bible* (Lond. 1849, 4to); Scholefield, *Hints for an improved Translation of the New Testament* (Lond. 1857, 12mo); Dewes, *Plea for translating the Scriptures* (Lond. 1866, 8vo); comp. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April, 1858; *Ch. of Eng. Quarterly*, Oct. 1856; *Christian Review*, April, 1857; *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* July, 1857, July, 1858; *South. Presb. Review*, Jan. 1858; *Br. For. Evangelical Rev.* July, 1857, Jan. 1858, Ap. 1858, Oct. 1859, July, 1863; *Prot. Episc. Quart. Rev.* Jan. 1859; *North Am. Rev.* Jan. 1859; *New Englander*, Feb. 1859, May, 1859; *United Presb. Quart. Rev.* Jan. 1860; *Free-will Bapt. Quart. Rev.* July, 1863; *Meth. Quart. Review*, July, 1864; *Jour. Sac. Lit.* Apr. 1867. See AUTHORIZED VERSION.

**Engrave** (חָרַטְ, *pathach'*, to open, hence [in Piel] to carve or grave, whether on wood, gems, or stone; thrice חָרַשׁ, *charash'*, Exod. xxviii, 11; xxxv, 35; xxxviii, 23, elsewhere *artificer* in general; *ἐντυπῶω*, 2 Cor. iii, 7). The latter term, חָרַטְ, so translated in the A. V., applies broadly to any *artificer*, whether in wood, stone, or metal: to restrict it to the engraver in Exod. xxxv, 35; xxxviii, 23, is improper: a similar latitude must be given to the other term חָרַשׁ, which expresses the operation of the artificer; in *Zech.* iii, 9, ordinary stone-cutting is evidently intended. The specific description of an engraver was חָרַטְ אֲבִנִים (Exod. xxviii, 11), lit. a *stone-graver*, and his chief business was cutting names or devices on rings and seals; the only notices of engraving are in connection

with the high-priest's dress—the two onyx-stones, the twelve jewels, and the mitre-plate having inscriptions on them (Exod. xxviii, 11, 21, 36). The previous notices of signets (Gen. xxxviii, 18; xli, 42) imply engraving. The art was widely spread throughout the nations of antiquity (*For. Quar. Rev.* xxvi, 32; xxvii, 40), particularly among the Egyptians (Diod. i, 78; Wilkinson, iii, 373), the Æthiopians (Her. vii, 69), and the Indians (Von Bohlen, *Indien*, ii, 122).—Smith, s. v. See GRAVING.

**En-had'dah** (Hebrew *Eyn Chaldah'*, עֵינַי חַלְדָּה, *swift fountain*; Sept. *Hyaçêdâ*), a city on the border of the tribe of Issachar, mentioned between Engannim and Beth-pazzez (Josh. x, 21). Van de Velde (*Narrative*, i, 315) and Thomson (*Land and Book*, ii, 248) would identify it with *Ain-Haud*, on the western brow of Carmel, and about two miles from the sea; but this is out of the limits of the tribe of Issachar. Its site is possibly to be sought in that of the modern village *Ain-Mabil*, not far N. E. of Nazareth (Robinson, *Researches*, iii, 269).

**En-hak'korè** (Heb. *Eyn hak-korè'*, עֵינַי הַקִּירָה, *fountain of the caller*; Sept. Πηγῆ τοῦ ἐπακουμένον), a name given by Samson to the spring that burst forth in answer to his prayer in a dell of Lehi, when he was exhasted with the slaughter of the Philistines (Judg. xv, 19). The word מַקְתֵּשׁ, *maktesh'*, which in the narrative denotes the "hollow place" (literally the "mortar") or *socket* in the jaw, and also that for the "jaw" itself, *lechi*, are both names of places. See LEHI. Van de Velde (*Memoir*, p. 343) endeavors to identify Lehi with *Tell el-Lekiyeh*, 4 miles N. of Beer-sheba, and En-hakkore with the large spring between the tell and Khewelfeh. But Samson's adventures appear to have been confined to a narrow circle, and there is no ground for extending them to a distance of some 30 miles from Gaza, which Lekiyeh is, even in a straight line. It appears to have been the same place later known (Neh. xi, 29) as EN-RIMMON (q. v.).

**En-ha'rod** (Heb. *Eyn Charod'*, עֵינַי חָרוֹד, *fountain of Harod*; Sept. πηγῆ Ἁρόδ'), a spring in the vicinity of the town of Harod (Judg. vii, 1, where the name is translated "well of Harod"). See HAROD.

**En-ha'zor** (Heb. *Eyn Chatsor'*, עֵינַי חָצוֹר, *fountain of Hazor*, i. e. of the village; Sept. πηγῆ Ἀσόρ), a fortified city of the tribe of Naphtali, mentioned between Edrei and Iron (Josh. xix, 37), but apparently different from Hazor (ver. 36). It has been identified by Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 183) and Thomson (*Land and Book*, i, 515) with the *Ain-Hazir* not far N. W. of *Tell-Hazir* (between Rameh or Ramah and Yakuk or Hukkok), which latter (being marked as a ruined site by Van de Velde, although Dr. Robinson, who visited it, denies that there are any traces of structures on the summit; *Later Researches*, p. 81), was probably the location of the city itself. See HAZOR.

**Enlightenment.** See ILLUMINATI.

**En-mish'pat** (Heb. *Eyn Mishpat'*, עֵינַי מִשְׁפָּט, *fountain of judgment*; Sept. ἡ πηγῆ τῆς κρίσεως), the earlier name (Gen. xiv, 7) for KADESH (q. v.). In the borders of Idumea (comp. Num. xx, 13, 14). According to Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 214), there is found, about 10 miles south of Petra, a large spring, still called by the Bedouins *Ain el-Sedaka*, or *spring of justice*, which he holds to be the same as the ancient En-mishpat; but this would be very far south for the required locality [see EXODE]; and the spot he names is doubtless the *Ain el-Usdakah* marked on Robinson's *Map* as identical with the *Zodocatha* of the Roman post-routes (Reiland, *Palest.* p. 250).

**Enmity**: "opposition; very bitter, deep-rooted, irreconcilable hatred and variance. Such a constant enmity there is between the followers of Christ and

Šačan; nay, there is some such enmity between mankind and some serpents (Gen. iii, 15). Friendship with this world, in its wicked members and lusts, is *enmity with God*—is opposed to the love of him, and amounts to an actual exerting of ourselves to dishonor and abuse him (James iv, 4; 1 John ii, 15, 16). The carnal mind, or minding of fleshly and sinful things, is *enmity against God*—is opposed to his nature and will in the highest degree, and, though it may be removed, cannot be reconciled to him, nor he to it (Rom. viii, 7, 8). The ceremonial law is called *enmity*: it marked God's enmity against sin by demanding atonement for it; it occasioned men's enmity against God by its burdensome services, and was an accidental source of standing variance between Jews and Gentiles; or perhaps the *enmity* here meant is the state of variance between God and men, whereby he justly loathed and hated them as sinful, and condemned them to punishment; and they wickedly hated him for his holy excellence, retributive justice, and sovereign goodness: both are slain and abolished by the death of Christ (Eph. ii, 15, 16)."—Brown, *Dictionary of the Bible*, s. v.

**Ennodius**, MAGNUS FELIX, one of the Latin fathers, was born about A. D. 473, at Arles (according to others at Milan), of a noble Gallic family, having such names as Faustus and Boethius on its registers. His parents dying early, he was sent, on the invasion of the Visigoths, to an aunt in Milan, who took good care of his education. Soon after her death (A. D. 489) he married a rich wife, and lived very freely until a severe illness brought him to reflection; and on his restoration he was ordained deacon, and his wife became a nun. (One account says that he had been ordained deacon before, and lived a bad life as deacon.) In 494 he accompanied Epiphanius of Pavia on a mission to Burgundy to ransom some Italian prisoners. In 496 he went to Rome, where he soon gained great reputation. In 502 he wrote in vindication of pope Symmachus against his rival, pope Laurentius. In this defence he first asserted that the bishop of Rome is subject to no earthly tribunal (Gieseler, i, § 115). He was the first to give to the bishop of Rome exclusively the name of "Papa" (pope), and was, in general, very eager to enlarge the papal authority. After he had been chosen, about A. D. 511, to succeed Maximus as bishop of Pavia (Ticinum), he went, under direction of pope Hormisdas, on two missions (515 and 517) to the emperor Anastasius with reference to the union between the Eastern and Western churches. Both missions failed. Ennodius died at Pavia July 17, 521. Among his writings are, *Epistolarum ad Diversos lib. iv.*:—*Livellus adr. eos, qui contra Synodum scribere presumerunt*, containing the defence of Symmachus named above:—*Vita Epiphaniū Episcopi*:—*Vita Antonii Monachi Lirinensis*:—*Euchristicon de vita sua*, an autobiography:—*Patrensis didascalica ad Ambrosium et Beatum*:—*Orationes*:—*Carmina*. His writings were published in Basle, 1569, fol.; Tournay, 1610; and by Sirmond (best ed.), Paris, 1611. They are also in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* vol. lxxiii. Ennodius wrote strongly in favor of free will, and has been therefore styled a Semipelagian.—Cave, *Hist. Lit.* (Geneva, 1720), i, 322; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacrés* (Paris, 1861), x, 473 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* iv, 68; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirch.-Lex.* iii, 595.

**E'noch** (Heb. *Chanok'*, עֲנוֹךְ, *initiated*; according to Philo, *De poet. Caini*, § 11, from עָנָה, with the suffix עָנָה = עָנָה [ἐπιμνησται Ἐνοὺχ χάρις σου], i. e. *thy favor*; Sept. and N. T. Ἐνώχ, Josephus Ἐνώχος, Vulg. *Enoch*), the name of several men.

1. The eldest son of Cain (Gen. iv, 17), who called the city which he built after his name (Gen. iv, 18). B. C. post 4041. It is there described as being east of Eden, in the land of Nod, to which Cain retired after the murder of his brother. See NOD. Ewald (*Gesch.*

i, 356, note) fancies that there is a reference to the Phrygian Iconium, in which city a legend of Ἐννοχὸς was preserved, evidently derived from the biblical account of the father of Methuselah (Steph. Byz. s. v. Ἰκόνιον; Suid. s. v. Ἐννοχός). Other places have been identified with the site of Enoch with little probability; e. g. *Anuehta* (Ptolemy, vi, 3, 5) in Susiana, the *Heniochi* (Ptolemy, v, 9, 25; Strabo, xi, 492; Pliny, vi, 10, 12) in the Caucasus, etc. (Huetius, *De Paradiso*, c. 17; Hasse, *Entdeckung*, ii, 35; Gotter, *De Henochia ubi*, Jen. 1705 [of little value]; Sticht, *De urbe Henochia*, Jen. 1727).

2. Another antediluvian patriarch, the son of Jared and father of Methuselah (Gen. v, 21 sq.; Luke iii, 28; in 1 Chron. i, 3, the name is Anglicized "Henoch"). B. C. 3550-3185. He was born when Jared was 162 years old, and after the birth of his eldest son in his 65th year he lived 300 years. From the period of 365 years assigned to his life, Ewald (*Isr. Gesch.* i, 356), with very little probability, regards him as "the god of the new year," but the number may have been not without influence on the later traditions which assigned to Enoch the discovery of the science of astronomy (*ἀστρολογία*, Eupolemus ap. Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* ix, 17, where he is identified with Atlas). After the birth of Methuselah it is said (Gen. v, 22-24) that Enoch "walked with God 300 years . . . and he was not; for God took him" (עָנָה עִתָּה לְלוֹךְ אִתָּהּ). The phrase "walked with God" (עָנָה עִתָּה לְלוֹךְ אִתָּהּ) is elsewhere only used of Noah (Gen. vi, 9; comp. Gen. xvii, 1, etc.), and is to be explained of a prophetic life spent in immediate converse with the spiritual world (Book of Enoch, xii, 2, "All his action was with the holy ones, and with the watchers during his life"). There is no farther mention of Enoch in the O. T., but in Ecclesiasticus (xlix, 14) he is brought forward as one of the peculiar glories (οὐκ εἶς ἐκτίσθη οἷος 'Ε.) of the Jews, for he was taken up (ἀνεβήθη), Alex. *μετετέθη*) from the earth. "He pleased the Lord and was translated [Vulg. into Paradise], being a pattern of repentance" (Eccles. xlv, 14). In the Epistle to the Hebrews the spring and issue of Enoch's life are clearly marked. "By faith Enoch was translated (*μετετέθη*), that he should not see death . . . for before his translation (*μετάθεσις*) he had this testimony, that he pleased God." The contrast to this divine judgment is found in the constrained words of Josephus: "Enoch departed to the Deity (*ἀνεχώρησε πρὸς τὸ θεῖον*), whence [the sacred writers] have not recorded his death" (*Ant.* i, 3, 4). In the Epistle of Jude (v, 14; comp. Enoch ix, 8) he is described as "the seventh from Adam;" and the number is probably noticed as conveying the idea of divine completion and rest (comp. August. *c. Faust.* xii, 14), while Enoch was himself a type of perfected humanity, "a man raised to heaven by pleasing God, while angels fell to earth by transgression" (Irenæus, iv, 16, 2). Elijah was in like manner translated; and thus was the doctrine of immortality palpably taught under the ancient dispensation.

The biblical notices of Enoch were a fruitful source of speculation in later times. Some theologians disputed with subtlety as to the place to which he was removed, whether it was to Paradise or to the immediate presence of God (comp. Feuardentius, *ad Iren.* v, 5), though others more wisely declined to discuss the question (Thilo, *Col. Apoc.* X. T. p. 758). On other points there was greater unanimity. Both the Latin and Greek fathers commonly couple Enoch and Elijah as historic witnesses of the possibility of a resurrection of the body and of a true human existence in glory (Iren. iv, 5, 1; Tertull. *de Resurr. Carn.* p. 58; Jerome, *c. Journ. Hierosol.* § 29, 32, p. 437, 440); and the voice of early ecclesiastical tradition is almost unanimous in regarding them as "the two witnesses" (Rev. xi, 3 sq.) who should fall before "the beast," and afterwards be raised to heaven before the great



judgment (Hippol. *Fragm. in Dan.* xxii; *de Antichr.* xliii, Cosmas Indic. p. 73, ap. Thilo, *κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν παράδοσιν*; Tertull. *de Anima*, p. 59; Ambros. in *Psalms*. xlv, 4; *Evang. Nicod.* c. xxv, on which Thilo has almost exhausted the question, *Cod. Apoc. N. T.* p. 765 sq.). This belief removed a serious difficulty which was supposed to attach to their translation, for thus it was made clear that they would at last discharge the common debt of a sinful humanity, from which they were not exempted by their glorious removal from the earth (Tertull. *de Anima*, l. c.; August. *Op. imp. c. Jul.* vi, 59). In later times Enoch was celebrated as the inventor of writing, arithmetic, and astronomy (Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* ix, 17). He is said to have filled 300 books with the revelations which he received, and is commonly identified with *Edris* (i. e. *the learned*), who is commemorated in the Koran (cap. 19) as one "exalted [by God] to a high place" (comp. Sale, ad loc.; Hottinger, *Hist. Orient.* p. 30 sq.). Visions and prophecies were commonly ascribed to him, which he is said to have arranged in a book. This book was delivered to his son, and preserved by Noah in the ark. After the Flood it was made known to the world, and handed down from one generation to another (see *Yuchasin*, f. 134; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vii, 32; Cedren. *Hist.* p. 9; Barhebr. *Chron.* p. 5). But these traditions were probably due to the apocryphal book which bears his name (comp. Fabric. *Cod. Pseudep.* l. T. i, 215 sq.). See below. Some (Buttm. *Mythol.* i, 176 sq.; Ewald, *l. c.*) have found a trace of the history of Enoch in the Phrygian legend of Annaeus (*Ἀνανακός*, *Νάνακος*), who was distinguished for his piety, lived 300 years, and predicted the deluge of Deucalion.—Smith, s. v.; Kitto, s. v. See Heber, *De pietate et fide Enochii* (Bamb. 1789); Bredenkamp, in Paulus, *Memor.* ii, 152; Danz, in Meuschen's *N. T. Talm.* p. 722; Selmieder, *Comment. in Gal.* iii, 19 (Nurnb. 1826), p. 23; Buddei *Hist. Eccles.* l. T. i, 162; Drusus, *De Henoch*, in the *Crit. Sacri*, I, ii; Pfeiffer, *Decas select. exerc.* p. 12; D'Herbelot, *Biblioth. Or.* i, 624; Robertson, *The Prophet Enoch* (Lond. 1860); Pfaff, *De raytu Henochii* (Tüb. 1739); Hall, *Works*, xi, 185; Alexander, *Hist. Eccles.* i, 142; Calmet, *Commentary*, viii, 10, 27; Hunter, *Sacred Biog.* p. 24 sq.; Robinson, *Script. Char.* i; Rudge, *Lect. on Gen.* i, 72; Evans, *Script. Biog.* iii, 1; Kitto, *Bible Illustr.* i, 123; Bell, *Enoch's Walk* (Lond. 1658); Heidegger, *Hist. Patriarcharum*, i; Saurin, *Disc.* i, 65; Boston, *Sermons*, i, 230; Doddridge, *Works*, 329; Slade, *Sermons*, ii, 447; Williams, *Sermons*, ii, 367.

3. The third son of Midian, and grandson of Abraham by Keturah (Gen. xxv, 4, A. V. "Hanoch;" 1 Chron. i, 33, "Henoeh"). B. C. post 1988.

4. The eldest son of Reuben (A. V. "Hanoch," Gen. xlv, 9; Exod. vi, 14; 1 Chron. v, 3), from whom came "the family of the Hanochites" (Num. xxvi, 5). B. C. 1873.

5. In 2 Esdr. vi, 49, 51, "Enoch" stands in the Lat. (and Eng.) version for one of the two famous amphibious monsters, doubtless correctly *Behemoth* in the Ethiopic.

ENOCH, BOOK OF, one of the most important remains of early apocalyptic literature. The interest that once attached to it has now partly subsided; yet a document quoted, as is generally believed, by an inspired apostle (Jude, ver. 14, 15), can never be wholly devoid of importance or utility in sacred literature. From its vigorous style and wide range of speculation, the book is well worthy of the attention which it received in the first ages, and recent investigations have still left many points for further inquiry.

I. *History of the Book.*—The first trace of its existence is generally found in the epistle of Jude (14, 15; comp. Enoch, i, 9), but the words of the apostle leave it uncertain whether he derived his quotation from tradition (Hoffmann, *Schriftbeweis*, i, 420) or from writ-

ing (*ἔπροφήτησεν* . . . Ἐνὸχ λέγων), though the wide spread of the book in the 2d century seems almost decisive in favor of the latter supposition. In several of the fathers mention is made of Enoch as the author, not only of a prophetic writing, but of various productions. Some such work appears to have been known to Justin (*Apol.* ii, 5), Irenæus (*adv. Hæer.* iv, 16, 2), and Anatolius (Euseb. *H. E.* vii, 32). Clement of Alexandria (*Eclog.* p. 801) and Origen (yet comp. *c. Cels.* v, p. 267, ed. Spenc.) both make use of it, and numerous references occur to the "writing," books," and "words" of Enoch in the *Testament of the XII Patriarchs* (q. v.)—a document which Nitzsch has shown to belong to the latter part of the 1st century or the beginning of the second, and which presents more or less resemblance to passages in the present book (Fabricii *Cod. Pseudep.* l. T. i, 161 sq.; Gröföer, *Proph. Pseudep.* 273 sq.). Tertullian (*De cultu fem.* i, 3; compare *De Idol.* 4) expressly quotes the book as one which was "not received by some, nor admitted into the Jewish canon" (in armarium Judaicum), but defends it on account of its reference to Christ ("legimus omnem scripturam ædificationi habilem divinitus inspirari"). Augustine (*De Civ.* xv, 23, 4) and an anonymous writer, whose work is printed with Jerome's (*Brev. in Psalm.* cxxxii, 2; compare Hil. *ad Psalm.* l. c.), were both acquainted with it; but from their time till the revival of letters it was known in the Western Church only by the quotation in Jude (Dillmann, *Eind.* lvi). In the Eastern Church it was known some centuries later. In the 8th century, Georgius Syncellus, in a work entitled *Chronographia*, that reaches from Adam to Diocletian, made various extracts from "the first book of Enoch." In the 9th century, Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople, at the conclusion of his *Chronographia Compendium*, in his list of *canonical and uncanonical* books, refers to the book of Enoch, and assigns 4800 *στίχοι* as the extent of it. After this time little or no mention appears to have been made of the production until Scaliger printed the fragments of Syncellus regarding it, which he inserted in his notes to the *Chronicus Canon* of Eusebius. In consequence of such extracts, the book of Enoch excited much attention and awakened great curiosity. At the beginning of the 17th century an idea prevailed that it existed in an Ethiopic translation. A Capuchin monk from Egypt assured Peirce that he had seen the book in Ethiopic, a circumstance which excited the ardor of the scholar of Pisa so much that he never rested until he obtained the tract. But when Job Ludolph went afterwards to Paris to the Royal Library, he found it to be a fabulous and silly production. In consequence of this disappointment, the idea of recovering it in Ethiopic was abandoned. At length, in 1773, Bruce brought home three copies of the book of Enoch from Abyssinia in MSS., containing the Ethiopic translation complete. "Amongst the articles," he states, "I consigned to the library at Paris was a very beautiful and magnificent copy of the prophecies of Enoch in large quarto. Another is amongst the books of Scripture which I brought home, standing immediately before the book of Job, which is its proper place in the Abyssinian Canon; and a third copy I have presented to the Bodleian Library at Oxford by the hands of Dr. Douglas, bishop of Carlisle." As soon as it was known in England that such a present had been made to the Royal Library at Paris, Dr. Woide, librarian of the British Museum, set out for France with letters from the secretary of state to the ambassador at that court, desiring him to assist the learned bearer in procuring access to the work. Dr. Woide accordingly transcribed it, and brought back with him the copy to England. The Parisian MS. was first publicly noticed by the eminent Orientalist De Sacy in 1800, who translated into Latin ch. i, ii, iii, iv—xvi; also xxii and xxxi. These he also published in the *Magasin Encyclopédique* (VI, i, 382 sq.). Mr. Murray, editor of

*Bruce's Travels*, gave some account of the book from the traveller's own MS. The Ethiopic text, however, was not published till the edition of archbishop Laurence from the Bodleian MS. in 1838 (*Libri Enoch versio Æthiopicæ* . . . Oxon.). But in the interval Laurence published an English translation, with an introduction and notes, which passed through three editions (*The Book of Enoch*, etc., by R. Laurence; Oxford, 1821, 1833, 1838). The translation of Laurence formed the basis of the German edition of Hoffmann (*Das Buch Henoch* . . . A. E. Hoffmann, Jena, 1833-38); and Gfrörer, in 1840, gave a Latin translation constructed from the translations of Laurence and Hoffmann (*Propheta veteres Pseudepigraphi* . . . ed. A. F. Gfrörer, Stuttgartia, 1840). According to Angelo Mai, there is a MS. copy of the book of Enoch among the Ethiopic codices of the Vatican, which must have been brought into Europe earlier than Bruce's MSS. In 1834 Dr. Rüppell procured another MS. of Enoch from Abyssinia, from which Hoffmann made the second part of his German version. All these editions were superseded by those of Dillmann, who edited the Ethiopic text from five MSS. (*Liber Henoch, Æthiopicæ*, Lipsiæ, 1851), and afterwards gave a German translation of the book with a good introduction and commentary (*Das Buch Henoch* . . . von Dr. A. Dillmann, Leipzig, 1853). The work of Dillmann gave a fresh impulse to the study of the book. Among the essays which were called out by it, the most important were those of Ewald (*Ueber des Æthiopischen Buches Henoch Entstehung*, etc., Göttingen, 1856) and Hilgenfeld (*D. Jüdische Apokalypik*, Jena, 1857). The older literature on the subject is reviewed by Fabricius (*Cod. Pseudep. V. T.* i, 199 sq.).

The Greek translation, in which it was known to the fathers, appears to be irrecoverably lost. There is no trace of it after the 8th century. The last remnant of it is preserved by Syncellus.

II. *Identity of the extant Forms.*—There can be no doubt that the Ethiopic translation exhibits the identical book which, as most believe, Jude quoted, and which is also mentioned or cited by many of the fathers. The fragment preserved by Syncellus (reprinted by Laurence and Hoffmann) is obviously the same as chap. vii, etc., the deviations being of little importance (though one considerable passage quoted by Georg. Syncellus is wanting in the present book, Dillm. p. 85), and probably accidental. It is manifest, also, to any one who will compare the quotations made by the fathers with the Ethiopic version, that both point to the same original. The extracts in question could not have been interpolations, as they are essential to the connections in which they are found. The mention of books of Enoch in the Testament of Judah, in the Testament of Benjamin, in Origen (*c. Cels.* and *Homil. in Num.*), and of the "first book" of Enoch in the fragments preserved by Syncellus, consist with the idea that the whole was then, as now, divided into different books. Tertullian leads us to believe that it was of the same extent in the Greek text then existing as it is in the present Ethiopic.

III. *Canonicity.*—Notwithstanding the quotation in Jude, and the wide circulation of the book itself, the apocalypse of Enoch was uniformly and distinctly separated from the canonical Scriptures. Tertullian alone maintained its authority, while he admitted that it was not received by the Jews: his arguments, however, are exceedingly puerile (*De cultu faminarum*, i, 3). Origen, on the other hand (*c. Cels.* v, 267, ed. Spence.), and Augustine (*De Civ.* xv, 23, 4), definitively mark it as apocryphal, and it is reckoned among the apocryphal books in the Apostolic Constitutions (vi, 16), and in the catalogues of the *Synops. S. Scripturæ*, Nicephorus (Credner, *Zur Gesch. d. Kan.* p. 145), and Montfaucon (*Bibl. Coislin.* p. 193).

IV. *Original Language.*—The book of Zohar, in which are various allusions to Enoch, seems to speak

of it as an important Hebrew production which had been handed down from generation to generation. The Cabalists, whose opinions are embodied in Zohar, thought that Enoch was really the author, a sentiment quite at variance with any other hypothesis than that of a Hebrew original. At all events, a Hebrew book of Enoch was known and used by Jewish writers till the 13th century (Dillmann, *Einl.* lvii). One of the earliest references to the book occurs in the *Hebrew Book of Jubilees* (Dillmann, in *Ewald's Jahrb.* 1850, p. 90). The careful reader soon sees that the work was composed at first in Hebrew, or rather Hebrew-Aramaean. This was long ago perceived by Joseph Scaliger, though he had before him nothing but the Greek fragments preserved by Syncellus. Hottinger, however, observed, in opposition to Scaliger, that a Hebraizing style is no sure proof of a Hebrew original. Hoffmann adduces the Hebrew-Aramaean etymology of names, especially the names of angels, as an evidence of the Aramaean original—an argument which is more pertinent; and Laurence infers from the book of Zohar that Hebrew was its primitive language. The writer's thorough acquaintance with the canonical Scriptures of the Jews in the tongue in which they were composed; their use of them in the original, not the Greek translation of the Septuagint; their Hebrew etymologies of names, especially the appellations of angels and archangels; the fact that all words and phrases can easily be rendered back into Hebrew and Aramaean, and the many Hebrew idioms and terms that occur, prove that neither Greek nor Ethiopic was the original language, but the later Palestinian Hebrew. Thus Tamiel (viii, 7) is compounded of  $\text{מל}$  and  $\text{אל}$ , the upright of God; Samyaza of  $\text{שמ}$  and  $\text{יזא}$ , the name of the strong. The same conclusion follows from the term Ophanin (ix, 13), which is evidently identical with the Hebrew  $\text{אפנין}$ . It is remarkable, also, that as Ophanin occurs in connection with the Cherubim, so the Hebrew term  $\text{אפנין}$  is found in the same association (1 Kings vii, 30; Ezek. i, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21; x, 2, 6, 9, 10, etc.; Murray's *Enoch Restitutus*, p. 33 sq.). The names of the sun are *Oryares* and *Tomas* (lxxvii, 1), from  $\text{אור}$  and  $\text{אריס}$ . In lxxvii, 1, 2, we read that "the first wind is called the eastern, because it is the first," which can only be explained by the Hebrew  $\text{אפנין}$ ,  $\text{אפנין}$ ; "the second is called the south, because the Most High there descends," i. e.  $\text{אפנין}$ ,  $\text{אפנין}$  (Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, p. 235, 236). The names of the conductors of the month are also Hebrew (lxxxii, 13), as Murray (p. 46) and Hoffmann (p. 690) remark. See Joseph hal-Lewi, in the *Journal Asiatique*, 1867, p. 352 sq.

At what time the Greek version was made from the original can only be conjectured. It could not have been long after the final redaction of the whole, probably about the time of Philo. Having appeared in Greek, it soon became widely circulated. The Ethiopic version was made from the Greek probably about the same time as the Ethiopic translation of the other parts of the Bible with which it was afterwards connected, or, in other words, towards the middle or close of the 4th century. See ETHIOPIC VERSIONS.

V. *Contents.*—The book of Enoch is divided in the Ethiopic MSS. into twenty sections, which are subdivided into 108 chapters; but copies differ in their specification of chapters. Dillmann has properly departed from the MSS., and endeavored to make divisions of sections, chapters, and verses which may represent the text pretty nearly as it is preserved among the Abyssinians.

In its present shape the book consists of a series of revelations supposed to have been given to Enoch and Noah, which extend to the most varied aspects of na-

ture and life, and are designed to offer a comprehensive vindication of the action of Providence. See ENOCH. It is divided into five parts. The *first part* (chaps. i-xxxvi, Dillm.), after a general introduction (characterizing the book to which it belongs as a revelation of Enoch the seer respecting the future judgment of the world, and its results both towards the righteous and rebellious sinners, written to console the pious in the times of final tribulation), contains an account of the fall of the angels (Gen. vi, 1), and of the judgment to come upon them and upon the giants, their offspring (vi-xvi); and this is followed by the description of the journey of Enoch through the earth and lower heaven in company with an angel, who showed to him many of the great mysteries of nature, the treasure-houses of the storms, and winds, and fires of heaven, the prison of the fallen, and the land of the blessed (xvii-xxxvi). The *second part* (xxxvii-lxxi) is styled "a vision of wisdom," and consists of three "parables," in which Enoch relates the revelations of the higher secrets of heaven and of the spiritual world which were given to him. The first parable (xxxviii-xliv) gives chiefly a picture of the future blessings and manifestation of the righteous, with further details as to the heavenly bodies; the second (xlv-lvi) describes in splendid imagery the coming of Messiah, and the results which it should work among "the elect" and the gainsayers; the third (lviii-lxix) draws out at further length the blessedness of "the elect and holy," and the confusion and wretchedness of the sinful rulers of the world. The *third part* (lxxii-lxxxii) is styled "the book of the course of the lights of heaven," and deals with the motions of the sun and moon, and the changes of the seasons; and with this the narrative of the journey of Enoch closes. The *fourth part* (lxxxiii-xci) is not distinguished by any special name, but contains the record of a dream which was granted to Enoch in his youth, in which he saw the history of the kingdoms of God and of the world up to the final establishment of the throne of Messiah. The *fifth part* (xcii-cv) contains the last addresses of Enoch to his children, in which the teaching of the former chapters is made the groundwork of earnest exhortation. The signs which attended the birth of Noah are next noticed (evi-evii); and another short "writing of Enoch" (eviii) forms the close to the whole book (comp. Dillmann, *Einkl.* i sq.; Lücke, *Versuch einer vollständ. Einkl.* i, 93 sq.).

**VI. Design.**—The leading object of the writer, who was manifestly imbued with deep piety, was to comfort and strengthen his contemporaries. He lived in times of distress and persecution, when the enemies of religion oppressed the righteous. The outward circumstances of the godly were such as to excite doubts of the divine equity in their minds, or, at least, to prevent it from having that hold on their faith which was necessary to sustain them in the hour of trial. In accordance with this, the writer exhibits the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked. To give greater authority to his affirmations, he puts them into the mouths of Enoch and Noah. Thus they have all the weight belonging to the character of an eminent prophet and saint. Various digressions are not without their bearing on the author's main purpose. The narrative of the fallen angels and their punishment, as also of the flood, exemplifies the retributive justice of Jehovah; while the Jewish history, continued down to a late period, exhibits the final triumph of His people, notwithstanding all their vicissitudes. Doubtless the author lived amid a season of fiery trial, and, looking abroad over the desolation, sought to cheer the sufferers by the consideration that they should be recompensed in the Messianic kingdom. As for their wicked oppressors, they were to experience terrible judgments. The writer occasionally delights in uttering dire anathemas against the wicked. It is plain that the book grew out of the times and

circumstances by which he was surrounded. It gives us a glimpse not only of the religious opinions, but also of the general features which characterized the whole period. The book belongs to the apocalyptic literature of the period between the close of the O.-T. canon and the advent of Messiah. It is therefore of the same class of composition as the fourth book of Esdras and the Jewish Sibyllines. The principal interest attaching to it arises from its contributing to our knowledge of the development of Jewish Messianic ideas subsequently to the writings of inspired prophets. In tracing the gradual unfolding and growth of those ideas among the Jewish people, we are the better prepared for the revelation of the N. T.

**VII. Doctrines.**—In doctrine the Book of Enoch exhibits a great advance of thought within the limits of revelation in each of the great divisions of knowledge. The teaching on nature is a curious attempt to reduce the scattered images of the O. T. to a physical system. The view of society and man, of the temporary triumph and final discomfiture of the oppressors of God's people, carries out into elaborate detail the pregnant images of Daniel. The figure of the Messiah is invested with majestic dignity as "the Son of God" (cv, 2 only), "whose name was named before the sun was made" (xlviii, 3), and who existed "aforetime in the presence of God" (lxii, 6; comp. Laurence, *Prel. Diss.* li sq.). At the same time, his human attributes as "the son of man," "the son of woman" (lxii, 5 only), "the elect one," "the righteous one," "the anointed," are brought into conspicuous notice. The mysteries of the spiritual world, the connection of angels and men, the classes and ministries of the hosts of heaven, the power of Satan (xl, 7; lxxv, 6), and the legions of darkness, the doctrines of resurrection, retribution, and eternal punishment (xxii; comp. Dillm. p. xix), are dwelt upon with growing earnestness as the horizon of speculation was extended by intercourse with Greece. But the message of the book is emphatically one of "faith and truth" (comp. Dillm. p. 32), and while the writer combines and repeats the thoughts of Scripture, he adds no new element to the teaching of the prophets. His errors spring from an undisciplined attempt to explain their words, and from a proud exultation in present success. For the great characteristic by which the book is distinguished from the later apocalypse of Ezra [see *ESDRAS*, 2D BOOK] is the tone of triumphant expectation by which it is pervaded. It seems to repeat in every form the great principle that the world, natural, moral, and spiritual, is under the immediate government of God. Hence it follows that there is a terrible retribution reserved for sinners, and a glorious kingdom prepared for the righteous, and Messiah is regarded as the divine mediator of this double issue (xc, xci). Nor is it without a striking fitness that a patriarch translated from earth, and admitted to look upon the divine majesty, is chosen as "the herald of wisdom, righteousness, and judgment to a people who, even in suffering, saw in their tyrants only the victims of a coming vengeance."

As in the canonical prophecies of the O. T., so here, the final establishment of the Messianic kingdom is preceded by wars and desolations. In the eighth of the ten weeks into which the world's history is divided, the sword executes judgment upon the wicked, at the end of which God's people have built a new temple, in which they are gathered together. The tenth week closes with the eternal judgment upon angels (xc, xci).

With respect to the doctrine of a general resurrection, it is certainly implied in the work. But the mode of the resurrection of the wicked and the righteous is differently presented. The *spirits* of the former are taken out of Sheol and thrown into the place of torment (xcviii, 3; ciii, 8; cviii, 2-5); whereas the spirits of the righteous raised again will be reunited to their *bodies*, and share the blessedness of Messiah's kingdom on earth (lxi, 5; xci, 10; xcii, 3; c, 5). The

reunion of their *bodies* with their spirits appears a thing reserved for the righteous.

As various sects in Jerusalem were tolerably developed at the time of some of the writers, it has been a subject of inquiry whether the peculiar doctrines of any appear in the work. According to Jellinek (*Zeitschrift für deutsch-morgentänd. Gesellschaft*, vii, 249), the work originated in the sphere of Essenism. We learn from Josephus that the Essenes preserved as sacred the names of the angels; and put up certain prayers before sunrise, as if they made supplication for that phenomenon (*War*, ii, 8). Now there is a very developed angel-doctrine in the work before us, and we also find the following passage: "When I went out from below and saw the heaven, and the sun rise in the east, and the moon go down in the west, a few stars, and everything as he has known it from the beginning, I praised the Lord of judgment and magnified him, because he has made the sun go forth from the windows of the east," etc., lxxxiii, 11). This certainly reminds one of Essenism showing its influence on the mind of the writer. The 108th chapter is more plainly Essenic. The pious, whom God rewards with blessings, are described as having lived a life of purity, self-denial, and asceticism like to that of the Essenes. Yet Dillmann appears disinclined to find any reflection of Essenism in lxxxiii, 11, or elsewhere (*Das Buch Henoch, Allgemeine Einleitung*, p. liii). We admit that the other parts of the book are free from it. It is obvious that the writer did not belong to the school of the Pharisees. He was tolerably free from the sects of his people; rising above the narrow confines of their distinctive peculiarities, which were not then fully developed.

VIII. *Style*.—It is obvious that the author was a poet of no mean order. His inspiration was high, his ideas elevated and pure. He had a creative fancy which could body forth new forms and shapes. Speaking out of the midst of his own time, he could throw himself back into the past, and mould it suitably to his purpose. His language, too, has the living freshness of a master. He was well acquainted with the book of Daniel, as is obvious from the spirit of his production. Not that he was an imitator of that book—far from it; his mind was too powerful and independent. It is characteristic of him that he calls Jehovah *Lord of Spirits*, that he specifies as the seven spiritual beings that stand before God the four highest angels, Michael, Raphael, Gabriel, Phanuel; and the three highest hosts, the Cherubim, Seraphim, and Ophanim; that he speaks of the *Elect* by way of eminence, the *Son of Man*, i. e. the Messiah. The charm of the writer's descriptions is irresistible, transporting the reader into the highest regions of the spiritual world. With a genuine glow of feeling, and the elevation of purest hope, he carries us away, till we are lost in wonder at the poetic inspiration of one living at a period comparatively so late. His work must have created a new branch of writing at the time, leading to numerous imitations.

IX. *Authorship*.—The general unity which the book possesses in its present form marks it, in the main, as the work of one man. The several parts, while they are complete in themselves, are still connected by the development of a common purpose. But internal coincidence shows with equal clearness that different fragments were incorporated by the author into his work, and some additions have been probably made afterwards. Different "books" are mentioned in early times, and variations in style and language are discernible in the present book. To distinguish the original elements and later interpolations is the great problem which still remains to be solved, for the different theories which have been proposed are barely plausible. In each case the critic seems to start with preconceived notions as to what was to be expected at a particular time, and forms his conclusions to suit his prejudices. Hoffmann and Weisse place the composi-

tion of the whole work after the Christian æra, because the one thinks that Jude could not have quoted an apocryphal book (Hoffmann, *Schriftbeweis*, i, 420 sq.), and the other seeks to detach Christianity altogether from a Jewish foundation (Weisse, *Evangelienfrage*, p. 214 sq.). Stuart (*Am. Bibl. Repos.* 1840) so far anticipated the argument of Weisse as to regard the Christology of the book as a clear sign of its post-Christian origin. Ewald, according to his usual custom, picks out the different elements with a daring confidence, and leaves a result so complicated that no one can accept it in its details, while it is characterized in its great features by masterly judgment and sagacity. He places the composition of the groundwork of the book at various intervals between B.C. 144 and B.C. cir. 120, and supposes that the whole assumed its present form in the first half of the century before Christ. Lücke (2d ed.) distinguishes two great parts, an older part including chaps. i-xxxvi, and lxxii-cv, which he dates from the beginning of the Maccabean struggle, and a later, chaps. xxxvii-lxxi, which he assigns to the period of the rise of Herod the Great (B.C. 141, etc.). He supposes, however, that later interpolations were made without attempting to ascertain their date. Dillmann at first (*ut sup.*) upheld more decidedly the unity of the book, and assigned the chief part of it to an Aramæan writer of the time of John Hyrcanus (B.C. cir. 110). To this, according to him, "historical" and "Noachian additions" were made, probably in the Greek translation (*Einh.* lii). Latterly, however (in Herzog's *Encyklop.* xii, 309), he has greatly modified this opinion. Köstlin (in Zeller's *Jahrb.* 1856, p. 240 sq., 370 sq.) assigns chaps. i-xvi, xxi-xxxvi, lxxii-cv to about B.C. 110; chaps. xxxvii-lxxi to B.C. cir. 100-64; and the "Noachian additions" and chap. cviii to the time of Herod the Great. Hilgenfeld himself places the original book (chaps. i-xvi, xx-xxxvi, lxxii-xc, xci, 1-19; xciii, cv) about the beginning of the first century before Christ (*ut sup.* p. 145 n.). This book he supposes to have passed through the hands of a Christian writer who lived between the times "of Saturninus and Marcion" (p. 181), who added the chief remaining portions, including the great Messianic section, chaps. xxxvii, lxxi. In the face of these conflicting theories it is evidently impossible to dogmatize, and the evidence is insufficient for conclusive reasoning. The interpretation of the Apocalyptic histories (chaps. lvi, lvii, lxxxv-xc), on which the chief stress is laid for fixing the date of the book, involves necessarily minute criticism of details, which belongs rather to a commentary than to a general Introduction; but, notwithstanding the arguments of Hilgenfeld and Jost (*Gesch. Jud.* ii, 218 n.), the whole book appears to be distinctly of Jewish origin. Some inconsiderable interpolations may have been made in successive translations, and large fragments of a much earlier date were undoubtedly incorporated into the work, but, as a whole, it may be regarded as describing an important phase of Jewish opinion shortly before the coming of Christ. That the entire production appeared before the Christian æra is clearly deducible from the fact that the Roman empire never appears as a power dangerous to Israel. Volkmar, however, contends (in the *Zeitschr. der morg. Gesellsch.* 1860, p. 87 sq.) that it was written by a disciple of Akiba to encourage the Jewish revolt under Bar-Cocheba; a view which is ably controverted by Hilgenfeld (*Ib.* p. 111 sq.).

Stuart has laid considerable stress on the Christology of the book as indicative of an acquaintance on the authors' part with the N. T., especially the Apocalypse. But the Christological portions do not possess sufficient distinctness to imply a knowledge of the N. T. The name *Jesus* never occurs. Neither are the appellations *Lord*, *Lord Jesus*, *Jesus Christ*, or even *Christ* employed. The words *faith*, *believers*, *God* and *his anointed*, *deny*, etc., can hardly be claimed as Christian terms,

because they occur in the Ethiopic O. T. as the representatives of Hebrew-Greek ones. All that can be truly deduced from the Christology is that it is highly developed, and very elevated in tone, yet fairly derivable from the O. T. in all its essential and individual features. Nor is there anything in the eschatology or angelology to necessitate a Christian origin. We allow that the Messiah is spoken of in very exalted terms. His dignity, character, and acts surpass the descriptions presented in other Jewish books. But they are alike in the main, colored by the highly poetical imagination of the writers, in conformity with the sublimity and animation of their creations. We must therefore reject Stuart's opinion of a Jewish-Christian origin. All the arguments adduced on its behalf are easily dissipated, since Dillman's edition and Ewald's criticisms have led to a better acquaintance with the text of the work itself. Nor is Hilgenfeld's attempt to show that the so-called first Enoch book (xxxvii-lxxi) proceeded from Christian Gnostics more successful, as Dillman has remarked (*Pseudepigraphen des A. T.* in Herzog's *Encyclopädie*, xii, 309, 310). Equally futile is Hoffmann's endeavor to show that the work did not appear till after the destruction of Jerusalem in the first century, when both Jude's epistle and the Apocalypse had been written (*Zeitschr. d. morgenl. Gesellschaft*, vi, 87 sq.). Not very dissimilar is Böttcher's view, that the book, like the Sybilline oracles, was made up in the first and second centuries after Christ of pieces belonging to different times (*De Inferis*, i, § 505). Nothing is more certain than that the work belongs to an ante-Christian world; and therefore the only problem is how to distribute the different books incorporated, and when to date them separately and collectively. After Laurence, Hoffmann and Gfrörer had erred in placing the whole under Herod the Great; Krieger and Lücke assigned different portions to different times, putting chaps. i-xxxvi and lxxii-cviii to the early years of the Maccabæan struggle, and xxxvii-lxxi to B.C. 38-24. How far this apportionment is correct will be seen from the preceding statements (see Krieger's *Beiträge z. Kritik und Eregese*, 1845, and Lücke's *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes*, § 11).

X. *The Place where it was written.*—The place where the author lived and wrote is Palestine. This alone seems to suit the circumstances implied in the work, which is largely pervaded by the spirit of persons whose power, religion, and independence had been overborne by foreign interference. Laurence, however, endeavors to show from the 72d chapter (71st Laurence), where the length of the days at various periods of the year is given, that the locality must have been between the 45th and 49th degrees of north latitude, in the northern districts of the Caspian and Euxine seas. Hence he conjectures that the writer was one of the Jews who had been carried away by Shalmaneser and did not return. Krieger supposes (*Beiträge*, p. 53) that Enoch, the imaginary writer, drew from the astronomical traditions or writings of northern Asia, regardless of the difference of Palestine's geographical position. Murray has shown (p. 63 sq.) that one passage favors the idea that the author lived in Abyssinia; whence he infers that the production proceeded from various persons belonging to countries removed from one another. But De Saey has remarked that as the authors' astronomical system is partly imaginary, their geography may also be visionary. Neither Egypt, nor Chaldea, nor Palestine, suits the astronomy of the book. The scientific knowledge of the Israelites was imperfect. It is therefore idle to look for accuracy in geography or astronomy. The writer or writers systematized such knowledge as they had of natural phenomena after their own fashion, as appears from the fact that to every third month thirty-one days are assigned. The allusions to the Oriental theosophy and the opinions of Zoroaster do

not necessarily commend a Chaldean origin, at least of the astronomical part, since the images of fire, radiance, light, and other Oriental symbols may be satisfactorily accounted for by the Jews' intercourse with other nations, and their residence there for a time. The Oriental philosophy of Middle Asia was evidently not unknown to the authors. Zoroastrian doctrines are embodied in the work because Persian influences had been felt by the Israelites since the Babylonian captivity.

XI. *Did Jude really quote the Book of Enoch?*—A simple comparison of the language of the apostle and that found in the corresponding passage of the extant book seems to settle this question conclusively in the affirmative, especially as the Scripture citation is prefaced with the direct acknowledgment of quotation: "And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying," etc. The following are the words respectively:

<p>EPISTLE OF JUDE, VER. 14, 15;  <i>Authorized Version.</i>                  "Behold, the Lord cometh                  with ten thousands of his                  saints, to execute judgment                  upon them, upon all, and to                  convince all and destroy the                  wicked, and that are ungodly                  among them, to prove all the                  carnal for ever of all their                  ungodly deeds, whereby which                  the sinful and which they have                  ungodly com-ungodly have                  done, and committed, and of                  all their hard mitted against                  him."</p>	<p>BOOK OF ENOCH, chap. ii;  <i>Laurence's Version.</i>                  "Behold, he comes with ten                  thousands of his saints, to ex-                  aints, to execute judgment acute                  judgment upon them, upon                  all, and to convince all and                  destroy the wicked, and that                  are ungodly among them, to                  prove all the carnal for ever                  of all their ungodly deeds, wher-                  by which the sinful and which                  they have ungodly com-ungodly                  have done, and committed, and                  of all their hard mitted against                  him."</p>
--	--

Some, however, are most unwilling to believe that an inspired writer could cite an apocryphal production. Such an opinion destroys, in their view, the character of his writing, and reduces it to the level of an ordinary composition. But this is preposterous. The apostle Paul quotes several of the heathen poets, yet who ever supposed that by such references he sanctions the productions from which his citations are made, or renders them of greater value? All that can be reasonably inferred from such a fact is, that if the inspired writer cites a particular sentiment with approbation, it must be regarded as just and right, irrespective of the remainder of the book in which it is found. The apostle's sanction extends no farther than the passage to which he alludes. Other portions of the original document may exhibit the most absurd and superstitious notions. It has always been the current opinion that Jude quoted the book of Enoch, and there is nothing to disprove it. It is true that there is some variation between the quotation and its original, but this is usual even with the N. T. writers in citing the Old.

Others, as Cave, Simon, Witsius, etc., suppose that Jude quoted a *traditional* prophecy or saying of Enoch, and we see no improbability in the assumption. Others, again, believe that the words apparently cited by Jude were suggested to him by the Holy Spirit. But surely this hypothesis is unnecessary. Until it can be shown that the book of Enoch did not exist in the time of Jude, or that his quoting it is unworthy of him, or that such knowledge was not handed down traditionally so as to be within his reach, we abide by the opinion that Jude really quoted the book. While there are probable grounds for believing that he might have become acquainted with the circumstance independently of inspiration, we ought not to have recourse to the hypothesis of *immediate suggestion*. On the whole, it is most likely that the book of Enoch existed before the time of Jude, and that the latter really quoted it in accordance with the current tradition. Whether the prophecy ascribed to Enoch was *truly* ascribed to him is a question of no importance in this connection.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See *JUDE*.

XII. *Literature.*—Bange, *De libro Henochi* (in his *Cælum Orientis*, Hafn. 1657, 4to, p. 16-19; and *Exercitationes*, Cracov, 1691, 4to); Bruce, *Travels*, ii, 8vo; Butt, *Genuineness of Enoch* (Lond. 1827, 8vo); Dillmann, *Liber Henoch Æthiopicè* (Lpz. 1851, 8vo); Id.,

*Das Buch Henoch übersetzt und erklärt* (Leipz. 1853, 8vo); Id., *Pseudepigraphen des A. T.* (in Herzog's *Encyclopädie*, xii, 308 sq.); Dorsche, *De propheta Henochi* (in his *Auctarium Pentateuchis*, diss. i, p. 555 sq.); Drusius, *De propheta Henoch* (Franc. 1615, 4to); also in the *Critici Sacri*, i, 373; Ewald, *Abb. üb. d. Äthiopischen Buches Henoch* (Götting. 1854, 4to); Fabricius, *Cod. Pseudepigraphus V. T.* i, 160-224; Firnhaber, *De Henocho quæstiones* (Wittenberg, 1716, 4to); Gfrörer, in the *Tüb. Zeitschr. f. Theologie*, 1837, iv, 120 sq.; Id. *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, i, 93 sq.; Hilgenfeld, *Die Jüdische Apokalyptik* (Jen. 1857, 8vo); Hoffmann, *Das Buch Henoch* (Jen. 1833, 1838, 8vo); Hottinger, *De propheta Henochi* (in his *Ennead. Diss. Heidelb.*, 16 . . ., 4to); Köstlin, in Baur and Zeller's *Jahrbuch*, 1856, ii, iii; Laurence, *The Book of Enoch* (3d edit. Oxford, 1838, 8vo); Lücke, *Einkleitung in die Offenbarung Johannis* (Bonn, 1848, 8vo, § 11, 2d ed.); Von Meyer, in the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1841, iii, 63 sq.; Murray, *Enoch Restitutus* (London, 1836, 8vo); Pfeiffer, *De Henocho* (Wittemb. 1670, 8vo); also in his *Opera Philol.* Tr. ad Rh. 1704, 8vo, p. 519); De Sacy, in the *Magasin Encyclopédique* (VI, i, 382; transl. into Germ. by Rink, Königsb. 1801, 8vo); and in the *Journal des Savans*, Oct. 1822; Stuart, in the *Am. Bibl. Repository*, Jan. and July, 1840; Volkmar, in *Zeitschr. d. deutschen morgenl. Gesellschaft*, 1860, i; and in the *Zeitschr. f. wissenschaft. Theologie*, 1862, ii; Wieseler, *Apokalypt. Litteratur des A. u. N. T.* i, 162 sq.; Id., *Die 70 Wochen des Daniel* (Gott. 1839); Philipp, *D. B. Henoch, sein Zeitalter u. Verhältnisse zum Judasbriefe* (Stuttg. 1868).

ENOCH, CITY OF. See ENOCH, I.

Enon. See ENON.

**E'nos** (Heb. *Enosh'*, עֲנוֹשׁ, poet. a man; Sept. and N. T. *Ἐνώβ*; Josephus *Ἐνώβος*, *Ant.* i, 3, 2), the son of Seth, and grand-son of Adam (Gen. v, 6-11; Luke iii, 38). He lived 905 years (B.C. 3937-3052), and is remarkable on account of a singular expression used respecting him in Genesis iv, 26, "Then began men to call on the name of the Lord." This is not to be taken absolutely, as it would be absurd to suppose that none called on the name of the Lord before that time, and accordingly there are two interpretations given of the passage: one is the marginal reading of the A. V., "Then began men to call themselves by the name of the Lord," in order, it would seem, to distinguish themselves from those who were already idolaters, and were termed children of men; the other, "Then men *profane*ly called on the name of the Lord," intimating that at that period idolatry began to be practised among men. The latter is the interpretation adopted by the Jewish expositors generally, but the former has more currency among Christian commentators. It may be observed that they both unite in the common idea of the widening difference between the pious and the wicked. In either case the passage may be regarded as implying that divine worship, which till that time had been confined to private families, now became public—that is, religious services were held on fixed days and in public assemblies. In 1 Chron. i, 1, the name is Anglicized ENOSH.

**E'nosh**, a more correct mode of Anglicizing (1 Chron. i, 1) the name ENOS (q. v.).

**En-rim'mon** (Heb. *Eym Rimmôn*, עֵימֹן רִמּוֹן, *fountain of Rimmon*; Sept. ἐν Ῥεμμῶν v. r. ἐν Ῥεμῶν, Vat. MS. omits, Vulg. *et in Remmon*), a place occupied by the descendants of Judah after the exile (Neh. xi, 29). It appears from the associated places to be the same with the "Ain and Rimmon" of Josh. xv, 32 (comp. Josh. xix, 7; 1 Chron. iv, 32), where perhaps, in like manner, but one place is referred to, a spring adjoining the town of Rimmon. See AIN. Yet the enumeration ("five cities") of 1 Chron. iv, 32 ("Ain, Rimmon") requires them to be taken as distinct. In fact, there appears to have been a Levitical city en-

Rimmon near to, but originally distinct from the non-Levitical Rimmon, and indicated by a remarkable reservoir still extant in the vicinity. See RIMMON.

**En-ro'gel** (Heb. *Eym Rogel*, עֵימֹן רֹגֵל, *fount of the treader*, q. d. *foot-fountain*: construed by Fürst, after the Targums, with the Arabic and Syriac versions, "Fullers' Spring," because fullers trode the clothes in the water; but Gesenius renders "fountain of the spy;" Sept. πηγή Ῥογγή, Vulg. *fons Rogel*), a spring which formed one of the landmarks on the boundary-line between Judah (Josh. xv, 7) and Benjamin (xviii, 16). It was the point next to Jerusalem, and at a lower level, as is evident from the use of the words "ascended" and "descended" in these two passages. Here, apparently concealed from the view of the city, Jonathan and Abimeaz remained, after the flight of David, awaiting intelligence from within the walls (2 Sam. xvii, 17), and here, "by the stone Zoheleth, which is 'close to' (עֲצֵס) En-rogel," Adonijah held the feast, which was the first and last act of his attempt on the crown (1 Kings i, 9). By Josephus, on the last incident (*Ant.* vii, 14, 4), its situation is given as "without the city, in the royal garden," and it is without doubt referred to by him in the same connection, in his description of the earthquake which accompanied the sacrifice of Uzziah (*Ant.* ix, 10, 4), and which, "at the place called Eroze" (Ἐρωζή v. Ἐρόρωζή), shook down a part of the Eastern hill, "so as to obstruct the roads, and the royal gardens." In more modern times, a tradition, apparently first recorded by Quaresimus, would make En-rogel identical with what is now called by the Franks the *well of Nehemiah*, and by the natives that of *Job* (*Bir-Eyub*). Robinson describes it as "a deep well situated just below the junction of the valley of Hinnom with that of Jehoshaphat. The small oblong plain there formed is covered with an olive-grove, and with the traces of former gardens extending down the valley from the present gardens of Siloam. Indeed, this whole spot is the prettiest and most fertile around Jerusalem. The well is very deep, of an irregular quadrilateral form, walled up with large squared stones, terminating above in an arch on one side, and apparently of great antiquity. There is a small rude building over it, furnished with one or two large troughs or reservoirs of stone, which are kept partially filled for the convenience of the people. The well measures 125 feet in depth, 50 feet of which was now full of water. The water is sweet, but not very cold, and is at the present day drawn up by the hand. In the rainy season the well becomes quite full, and sometimes overflows at the mouth. Usually, however, the water runs off under the surface of the ground, and finds an outlet some forty yards below the well, whence it is said to flow for sixty or seventy days in winter, and the stream is sometimes large" (*Researches*, i, 490). In favor of this identification is the fact that in the Arabic version of Josh. xv, 7 the name of Ain-Eyub, or "spring of Job," is given for En-rogel, and also that in an early Jewish Itinerary (Uri of Biel, in Hottinger's *Cippi Hebraici*, p. 48) the name is given as "well of Job," as if retaining the memory of Job's connection with Adonijah—a name which it still retains in the traditions of the Greek Christians (Williams, *Holy City*, ii, 490). Against this general belief the following strong but not conclusive arguments are urged by Bonar in favor of identifying En-rogel with the present "Fountain of the Virgin," *Ain Ummeed-Daraj*—"spring of the mother of steps"—the perennial source from which the Pool of Siloam is supplied (*Lund of Promise*, App. v): 1. The *Bir Eyub* is a well and not a spring (En), while, on the other hand, the "Fountain of the Virgin" is the only real spring close to Jerusalem. This objection, however, as the above description shows, but partially applies. 2. The situation of the Fountain of the Virgin agrees somewhat better with the course of the boundary of Benjamin

than that of the *Bir Eyub*, which is rather too far south. This objection, however, does not apply to the original boundary of Benjamin, which necessarily followed the valley of Siloam. See TRIBE. 3. *Bir Eyub* does not altogether suit the requirements of 2 Sam. xvii, 17. It is too far off both from the city, and from the direct road over Olivet to the Jordan, and is in full view of the city (Van de Velde, i, 475), which the other spot is not. But we may readily suppose that a more retired route and a secluded spot would have been chosen for concealment. 4. The martyrdom of St. James (q. v.) was effected by casting him down from the temple wall into the valley of Kedron, where he was finally killed by a fuller with his washing-stick (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* ii, 23). The natural inference is that the martyred apostle fell near where the fullers were at work. Now *Bir Eyub* is too far off from the site of the temple to allow of this, but it might very well have happened at the Fountain of the Virgin. (See Stanley's *Sermons on the Apost. Age*, p. 333-4). But this is too remote and indirect an agreement, and one based upon a vague tradition. 5. *Daraj* and *Rogel* are both from the same root, and therefore the modern name may be derived from the ancient one, even though at present it is taken to allude to the "steps" by which the reservoir of the fountain is reached. 6. The Fountain of the Virgin is still the great resort of the women of Jerusalem for washing and treading their clothes. 7. The level of the king's gardens must have been above the *Bir Eyub*, even when the water is at the mouth of the well, and it is generally seventy or eighty feet below; while they must have been lower than the Fountain of the Virgin, which thus might be used without difficulty to irrigate them. The last considerations, however, have little weight (see Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 528).—Smith, s. v.; Kitto, s. v.; Fairbairn, s. v. See JERUSALEM.

**Enrolment** or ἀπογραφὴ (Luke ii, 1, "taxing"). See CENSUS.

**ENS** is "either *ens reale* or *ens rationis*. *Ens rationis* is that which has no existence but in the idea which the mind forms of it, as a golden mountain. *Ens reale*, in philosophical language, is taken *late et stricte*, and is distinguished as *ens potentiale*, or that which may exist, and *ens actuale*, or that which does exist. It is sometimes taken as the concrete of *essentia*, and signifies what has essence and may exist—as a rose in winter; sometimes as the participle of *esse*, and it then signifies what actually exists. *Ens* without intellect is *res* a thing."—Fleming, *Vocabulary of Philosophy*, s. v.

**Ensample.** See EXAMPLE.

**En-she'mesh** (Heb. *Eyn-She'mesh* עֵינ־שֶׁמֶשׁ, fountain of the sun; Sept. ἡ πηγὴ ἡλιου and πηγὴ Σάηε; Vulgate, *Ensimes, id est, Fons Solis*), a spring which formed one of the landmarks on the north boundary of Judah (Josh. xv, 7) and the south boundary of Benjamin (xviii, 17). From these notices it appears to have been between the "ascent of Adummim"—the road leading up from the Jordan valley south of the wady Kelt—and the spring of En-rogel, in the valley of Kedron. It was therefore east of Jerusalem and of the Mount of Olives. The only spring at present answering to this position is the *Ain-Haul* or *Ain-Chât*—the "Well of the Apostles"—about a mile below Bethany, the traveller's first halting-place on the road to Jericho (Toller, *Topog. von Jerus.* ii, 400). The aspect of this spring is such that the rays of the sun are on it the whole day. This is not inappropriate in a fountain dedicated to that luminary.—Smith, s. v. Dr. Robinson thinks that En-shemesh must have been either this spring or the fountain near St. Saba (*Researches*, i, 493).


**Ensign** is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. for two Hebrew words: עֹז, *oth* (the flag of a single tribe, Num. ii, 2), a *sign* or *token*, as elsewhere rendered;

עֶז, *nes* (a lofty signal, e. g. a "pole," Num. xxi, 3, 9), a ship's *standard* or *flag* ("sail," Isa. xxxiii, 23; Ezek. xxvii, 7), a *beacon* or *signal* on a hill, chiefly on the irruption of an enemy, in order to point out to the people a place of rendezvous. There is a third and more emphatic word relating to the subject, namely, עֶזֶל, *de'gel* (from עֶזֶל, to cover), which, however, is invariably rendered "standard" (except Cant. ii, "banner"). The distinction between these three Hebrew terms is sufficiently marked by their respective uses: *Nes* is a *signal*; *DEGEL*, a *military standard* for a large division of an army; and *OTH*, the same for a small one. Neither of them, however, expresses the idea which "standard" conveys to our minds, viz. a *flag*; the standards in use among the Hebrews probably resembled those of the Egyptians and Assyrians—a figure or device of some kind elevated on a pole. See BANNER.

1. The notices of the *nes* or "ensign" are most frequent; it consisted of some well-understood signal which was exhibited on the top of a pole from a bare mountain top (Isa. xiii, 2; xviii, 3)—the very emblem of conspicuous isolation (Isa. xxx, 17). Around it the inhabitants mustered, whether for the purpose of meeting an enemy (Isa. v, 26; xviii, 3; xxxi, 9), which was sometimes notified by the blast of a trumpet (Jer. iv, 21; li, 27); or as a token of rescue (Psa. lx, 4; Isa. xi, 10; Jer. iv, 6); or for a public proclamation (Jer. i, 2); or simply as a gathering point (Isa. xlix, 22; lxii, 10). What the nature of the signal was we have no means of stating; it has been inferred from Isa. xxxiii, 23, and Ezek. xxvii, 7, that it was a flag; we do not observe a flag depicted either in Egyptian or Assyrian representations of vessels (Wilkinson, iii, 211; Bonomi, p. 166, 167); but, in lieu of a flag, certain devices, such as the phoenix, flowers, etc., were embroidered on the sail, whence it appears that the device itself, and perhaps also the sail bearing the device, was the *nes* or "ensign." It may have sometimes been the name of a leader, as implied in the title which Moses gave to his altar, "Jehovah-nissi" (Exod. xvii, 15). It may also have been, as Michaelis (*Suppl.* p. 1648) suggests, a blazing torch. The important point, however, to be observed is, that the *nes* was an occasional signal, and not a military standard, and that *elevation* and *conspicuity* are implied in the use of the term: hence it is appropriately applied to the "pole" on which the brazen serpent hung (Num. xxi, 8), which was indeed an "ensign" of deliverance to the pious Israelite; and again to the censers of Korah and his company, which became a "sign" or beacon of warning to Israel (Num. xvi, 38). See SIGNAL.

2. The term *degel* is used to describe the standards which were given to each of the four divisions of the Israelitish army at the time of the Exodus (Num. i, 52; ii, 2 sq.; x, 14 sq.). Some doubt indeed exists as to its meaning in these passages, the Sept. and Vulgate regarding it not as the standard itself, but as a certain military division annexed to a standard, just as a *vevillum* is sometimes used for a body of soldiers (Tacitus, *Hist.* i, 70; Livy, viii, 8). The sense of *compact* and *martial array* does certainly seem to lurk in the word; for in Cant. vi, 4, 10, the brilliant glances of the bride's eyes are compared to the destructive advance of a well-arranged host, and a similar comparison is employed in reference to the bridegroom (Cant. v, 10); but, on the other hand, in Cant. ii, 4, no other sense than that of a "banner" will suit, and we therefore think the rendering in the A. V. correct. No reliance can be placed on the term in Psa. xx, 5, as both the sense and the text are matters of doubt (see Olshausen and Hengstenberg, in loc.). A standard implies, of course, a standard-bearer; but the supposed notice to that officer in Isa. x, 18, is incorrect, the words meaning rather "as a sick man pineth away;" in a somewhat

parallel passage (Isa. lix, 19) the marginal version is to be followed rather than the text. The character of the Hebrew military standards is quite a matter of conjecture; they probably resembled the Egyptian, which consisted of a sacred emblem, such as an animal, a boat, or the king's name (Wilkinson, i, 294). Rabbinical writers state the devices to have been as follows: for the tribe of Judah, a lion; for Reuben, a man; for Ephraim, an ox; and for Dan, an eagle (Carpov, *Crit. Ap.* p. 667); but no reliance can be placed on this. As each of the four divisions, consisting of three tribes, had its standard, so had each tribe its "sign" (*oth*) or "ensign," probably in imitation of the Egyptians, among whom not only each battalion, but even each company, had its particular ensign (Wilkinson, *l. c.*). We know nothing of its nature. The word occurs figuratively in Psa. lxxiv, 4, apparently in reference to the images of idol gods.—Smith, s. v. See STANDARD.



Various Forms of Ancient Egyptian Ensigns.

**Entablature** (Lat. *In, tabula*), "the superstructure which lies horizontally upon the columns in classic architecture: it is divided into *architrave*, the part immediately above the column; *frieze*, the central space; and *cornice*, the upper projecting mouldings. Each of the orders has its appropriate entablature, of which both the general height and the subdivisions are regulated by a scale of proportions derived from the diameter of the column."—Parker, *Glossary of Architecture*, s. v.

**En-Tannim** (Heb. *Eyn hat-tannim*, עֵינַי תַּנִּימַי, fountain of the dragons or jackals; Sept. πηγὴ τῶν ἀκκῶν), a reservoir on the west side of Jerusalem (Neb. ii, 13), probably the present upper pool of Gihon; Anglicized DRAGON-WELL (q. v.).

**En-tap'puäh** (Heb. *Eyn Tappu'ach*, עֵינַי תַּפְּוּאָה, fountain of Tappuah; Sept. ἡ πηγὴ Θαπφουέ v. r. Θαφφούε), a spring near the city Tappuah (q. v.), put for that place in Josh. xvii, 7 (comp. ver. 8).

**Entelechy** (ἐντελέχεια, from ἐντελής, perfect;

and ἔχειν, to have; in Latin *perfectihabia*). "In one of the books of the Pythagoreans, viz. *Ocellus Lucanus*, Περὶ τοῦ πάντος, the word *συντέλεια* is used in the same sense. Hence it has been thought that this was borrowed from the Pythagoreans" (Monboddo, *Ancient Metaphysics*, book i, chap. iii, p. 16, note). Cicero (*Tuscul. Quæst. lib. i, quæst. 1*) interprets it to mean *quandam quasi continuatam motionem et percipientem*. Melancthon (*Opera*, xiii, 12-14, ed. 1846) gives two interpretations of *entelechy*, as he writes it. He says that ἐντελεχίς signifies *continuum*, and ἐντελέχεια *continuitas*. According to him, Aristotle used it as synonymous with ἐνέργεια. Hence Cicero translated it by continuous movement or agitation. Argyropolus blames Cicero for this, and explains it as meaning "interior perfection," as if it were τὸ ἐντὸς τελειοῦν. But Melancthon thinks Cicero's explanation in accordance with the philosophy of Aristotle. According to others, ἐντελέχεια means *continuance*, and is a totally different word from ἐντελέχεια, which means *actuality* (Arist. *Metaphys.* Bohn's Libr. p. 68, 301; Donaldson, *New Cratylus*, p. 339-344). According to Leibnitz, "entelechiu is derived apparently from the Greek word which signifies *perfect*, and therefore the celebrated Hermoläus Barbarus expressed it in Latin, word for word, by *perfectihabia*, for act is the accomplishment of power; and he needed not to have consulted the devil, as he did, they say, to tell him this much (Leibnitz, *Theodicee*, pt. i, § 87). You may give the name of *entelechies* to all simple substances or created monads, for they have in them a certain perfection (ἔχουσι τὸ ἐντελέ), they have a sufficiency (αὐτάρχεια) which makes them the source of their internal actions, and, so to say, incorporeal automaton" (*Monadologie*, § 18). He calls a nomad an autarchic automaton, or first *entelechie*, having life and force in itself. "Entelechy is the opposite to *potentiality*, yet would be ill translated by that which we often oppose to potentiality, *actuality*. Εἶδος expresses the substance of each thing viewed in repose—its form or constitution; ἐνέργεια its substance, considered as active and generative; ἐντελέχεια seems to be the synthesis or harmony of these two ideas. The *effectio* of Cicero, therefore, represents the most important side of it, but not the whole" (Maurice, *Mor. and Metaphys. Philosophy*, p. 191, note). 'Entelechia ce qui a en soi sa fin, qui par consequent ne relève que de soi-même, et constitue une unité indivisible (Cousin, note to his transl. of Aristotle, *Metaph.* Lk. xii, p. 212). "L'Entelechie est opposée à la simple puissance, comme la forme à la matière, l'être au possible. C'est elle qui, par la vertu de la fin, constitue l'essence même des choses, et imprime le mouvement à la matière aveugle; et c'est en ce sens qu' Aristote a pu donner de l'âme cette célèbre définition, qu'elle est l'entelechie ou forme première de tout corps naturel qui possède la vie en puissance" (*Dict. des Sciences Philosophiques*). Aristotle defines the soul of man to be an *entelechy*, a definition of which Dr. Reid said he could make no sense.—Fleming, *Vocabulary of Philosophy*, s. v.

**Entertainment** (עֲוָרָה, a "feast," comp. עֲוָרָה, to "entertain" a stranger, Heb. xiii, 2). This took place among the Hebrews sometimes in connection with a public festival (Deut. xvi; Tob. ii, 1) and accompanied by offerings [see SACRIFICIAL FESTIVAL] (1 Sam. ix, 13; xvi, 3; 1 Kings i, 9; iii, 15; in token of alliance, Gen. xxvi, 30; xxxi, 54); sometimes with a domestic or social occurrence, and, so far as the latter reference is concerned, they were chiefly held at the weaning of children (Gen. xxi, 8; comp. Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* vi, 243 sq.), at weddings (Gen. xxix, 22; Judg. xiv, 10; John ii, 1 sq.), on birthdays (Job i, 4), particularly in royal courts (Gen. xl, 20 [2 Hos. vii, 5]; Matt. xix, 6; comp. Herod. i, 133; ix, 109; Lucian, *Gall.* 9; Athen. iv, 143; see *Doughty Analact.* i, 44; ii, 33; Lausent, *De notatit. convitiisque*



*quæ in iisdem agitabantur*, in Gronovii *Thesaur.* viii), on the reception and departure of dear friends or else respected personages (Gen. xix, 3; 2 Sam. iii, 20; xx, 4; 2 Kings vi, 23; Tobit vii, 9; viii, 20 sq.; 1 Macc. xvi, 15; 2 Macc. ii, 28; Luke v, 29; xv, 23 sq.; John xii, 2), at sheepshearing (2 Sam. xiii, 23; 1 Sam. xxv, 2, 36), and vintage (Judg. ix, 27), also at funerals (2 Sam. iii, 35; Jer. xvi, 7; Tob. iv, 18 [the  $\text{קָרַבְתָּם הַיָּמִים}$  of Hos. ix, 4]; comp. Josephus, *War*, ii, 1, 1; Homer, *Il.* xxiii, 29; xxiv, 802; see Harmer, iii, 203), and mostly occurred in the evening (Josephus, *War*, i, 17, 4). The guests were invited by servants (Prov. ix, 3; Matt. xxii, 3 sq.), in more honorable instances a second time (Matt. xxii, 4; comp. Luke xiv, 7; comp. Eskuiche, *Erlüuter.* ii, 410 sq.), and these summoners (like the Roman *vocatores* or *invitatores*) seem to have had the business of assigning the guests their relative position (Walch, *Observ. in Matt. ex inscript.* p. 62). On their arrival the guests were kissed (Tob. ix, 8; Luke vii, 45), their feet were washed (Luke vii, 44; comp. Homer, *Il.* x, 576 sq.; *Odys.* iii, 476; viii, 454; Petron. *Sat.* 31; see Douglai *Anal.* i, 52); the hair of their head and beard, even their clothes, oftentimes their feet (Luke vii, 38; John xii, 3; comp. Athen. xii, 553), anointed with costly oil (Psa. xxiii, 5; Amos vi, 6; comp. Homer, *Il.* x, 577; Plutarch, *Sympos.* iii, 6, p. 654; Petron. *Sat.* 65; Lucret. iv, 1125; see Walch, *De unctioibus vet. Ebraeor. concubialibus*, Jen. 1751), and their persons decked with garlands, with which their head was especially adorned (Isa. xxviii, 1; Wisd. ii, 7 sq.; comp. Joseph. *Ant.* xix, 9, 1; Athen. xv, 655; Plutarch, *Sympos.* iii, 1 p. 645; iii, 6, p. 654; Philostr. *Apoll.* ii, 27; Aristoph. *Av.* 460; Horace, *Od.* ii, 7, 23; *Sat.* ii, 3, 256; Plautus, *Menuechn.* iii, 1, 16; Lucretius, iv, 1125; Juvenal, v, 36; Petron. 65; Ovid, *Fast.* v, 337); and then, with consideration to the rank (Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 2, 4); comp. Becker, *Charicles*, i, 427), they were assigned their respective places (1 Sam. ix, 22; Luke xiv, 8; Mark xii, 39; Philo, ii, 78; comp. Buckingham, *Mesopot.* i, 279). All received, as a rule, like portions sent by the master of the house (1 Sam. i, 4; 2 Sam. vi, 19; 1 Chron. xvi, 3; comp. Homer, *Odys.* xx, 280 sq.; *Il.* xxiv, 626; Plutarch, *Sympos.* ii, 10, p. 642, 644), which, however, when special honor was intended, was doubled, or even increased fivefold (Gen. xliii, 34; comp. Herod. vi, 57), or a tid-bit sent in place of it (1 Sam. ix, 24; compare Homer, *Il.* vii, 321; see Köster, *Erlüuter.* p. 197 sq.). The management of the entertainment was in the hands of the *architriclinus* (q. v.) (John ii, 8), generally a friend of the family (comp. Sir. xxxii, 1, 23; see Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* v, 223). The pride of the entertainer exhibited itself partly in the number of the guests (Gen. xxix, 22; 1 Sam. ix, 22; 1 Kings i, 9, 25; Luke v, 29; xiv, 16), partly in expense of the eating and drinking vessels (Esth. i, 6 sq.; compare Curtius, viii, 12, 16; see Kype, *De apparatus conviv. regis Persar.* Regiom. 1755), partly and especially in the variety and excellence of the viands (Gen. xxvii, 9; Isa. xxv, 6; Amos vi, 4; Job viii, 21; comp. Psa. xxiii, 5; Job xxviii, 16; Niebuhr, *Trac.* iii, 385), as well as their richness (Gen. xviii, 6; 1 Sam. ix, 24; Judg. vi, 19). Such banquets also lasted longer than with Occidentals (3 Macc. vi, 28; comp. Esth. i, 3 sq.; Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* iii, 294), and in Persia weighty state interests were discussed and determinations reached at the royal table (Esth. i, 15; vii, 1 sq.; Herod. i, 113; Plutarch, *Sympos.* vii, 9; Ammian. Marc. xviii, 5, p. 169, Bip. ed.; Athen. iv, 144; comp. Tacit. *Germ.* 22). The amusement consisted in part of music and song (Isa. v, 12; Amos vi, 5; Psa. lxxix, 13; Sir. xxxii, 7; comp. Homer, *Odys.* xvii, 358; Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* v, 200), also the dance (Matt. xiv, 6), in part of jests and riddles (Judg. xiv, 12 sq.; compare Athen. x, 452, 457). At their departure the guests were again perfumed, especially on the beard (Maun-

drell, p. 400 sq.). The women feasted on such occasions probably not with the men (Buckingham, ii, 404), but in a separate apartment (Esth. i, 9; see Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* iii, 296; Bachelor, *Chron.* p. 98; comp. the later meretricious custom, Dan. v, 2; Judith xii, 11 sq.; Herod. v, 18); but in plebeian homes the sexes were intermingled (John xii, 8). The Israelites were forbidden heathenish sacrificial entertainments (Exod. xxxiv, 15; yet see Num. xxv, 1 sq.), partly because these were in honor of false worship, and partly because they would thus be liable to partake of unclean flesh (1 Cor. x, 28). See Buxtorf, *De conviv. Ebr.* in Ugolini *Thesaurus* xxx; Geier, *De Vet. Ebr. ratione canandi*, in the *Biblioth. Lubec.* vi, sq.; Stuck, *Antiquit. conviv.* (Tigur. 1597); Mercurial, *De arte gymnast.* p. 75 sq. ed. Amst. See MEAL-TIME.

An especial sort of entertainment were the *κόποι*, or *comissationes* ("revellings"), which played so conspicuous a part in the sensual times during which the apostles labored (Rom. xiii, 13; Gal. v, 21; 1 Pet. iv, 3). Young men assembled to banquetings on festival occasions, or in the crowd of public associations, became excited with song or music, and traversed the streets inspired with wine, jubilating, and committing many extravagances (comp. Wetstein, ii, 85 sq.; Bos, *Observ. in N. T.* p. 117 sq.; Schwarz, *De comissatione vet.* Altdorf, 1744; Ilgen, *De poes. scol.* p. 197 sq.; Apulej. ed. Oudenorp, i, 133 sq.). On the luxury and wantonness of entertainments generally in the Roman period, see Philo, ii, 477 sq. The rich Jews followed the example of their pagan masters.—Winer, i, 391. See FEAST.

**Enthusiasm** ( $\text{ἐνθουσιασμός}$ , from  $\text{ἐνθεος}$ , *inspired*; *God-possessed*; *rapt*) is used both in a good and a bad sense.

1. In the first, which springs from its derivation, it signifies divine inspiration in general; or, secondarily, any extraordinary mental or moral exaltation. "The raptures of the poet, the deep meditations of the philosopher, the heroism of the warrior, the devotedness of the martyr, and the ardor of the patriot, are so many different phases of *enthusiasm*." In this sense it "is almost a synonyme of genius; the moral life in the intellectual light, the will in the reason; and without it, says Seneca, nothing truly great was ever achieved" (Coleridge). "There is a temper of mind called *enthusiasm*, which, though rejecting the authority neither of reason nor of virtue, triumphs over all the vulgar infirmities of men, contemns their ordinary pursuits, braves danger, and despises obloquy, which is the parent of heroic acts and devoted sacrifices, and which devotes ease, pleasure, interest, ambition, and life to the service of one's fellow-men" (Mackintosh, *Miscellaneous Works*, Lond. 1851, p. 731).

2. The bad sense of the word was formerly in much more common use than now. According to it, an enthusiast is one who substitutes his own fancies for reason and truth, especially in matters of religion. "Every enthusiast is properly a madman; yet his is not an ordinary, but a religious madness. The enthusiast is generally talking of religion, of God, or of the things of God, but talking in such a manner that any reasonable Christian may discern the disorder of his mind. Such enthusiasm may be described, in general, as a religious madness arising from some falsely imagined influence or inspiration of God; at least, from imputing something to God which ought not to be imputed to him, or expecting something from God which ought not to be expected from him" (Wesley, *Sermon on Enthusiasm*, *Works*, ii, 331 sq.). Warburton similarly defines enthusiasm as "that temper of mind in which the imagination has got the better of the judgment" (*Div. Leg.* bk. v, Appendix). James Blair (*Sermons*, 1740, iv, 274) makes religious enthusiasm to consist especially in "setting up the private spirit to assert anything contrary to Scripture." So Waterland (*Works*, Oxford, 1843, iv, 422) says that

"enthusiasm, in the bad sense, is a subtle device of Satan upon ill-meaning or unmeaning instruments, making use of their ambition, self-admiration, or other weakness, to draw them by some plausible suggestions into a vain conceit that they have something within them either of equal authority with Scripture, or superior to it." On the stupid misapplication of the term enthusiasm by worldly men to designate true Christian life, see Wesley's sermon above, and also Taylor, *Natural Hist. of Enthusiasm* (N. Y. 1834, 4th ed. 12mo).

**Entity** (*entitas*), "in the scholastic philosophy, was synonymous with essence or form. To all individuals of a species there is something in common—a nature which transiently invests all, but belongs exclusively to none. This essence, taken by itself and viewed apart from any individual, was what the scholastics called an *entity*. It denoted the common nature of the individuals of a species or genus. It was the idea or model according to which we conceived of them. The question whether there was a reality corresponding to this idea divided philosophers into *Nominalists* and *Realists* (q. v.). *Entity* is also used to denote anything that exists, as an object of sense or of thought. See *ENS*."—Fleming, *Vocabulary of Philosophy*, p. 162.

**Entrance into the Church.** Certain ceremonies early grew into use as signs of reverence on the part of Christians on entering the church building. They washed their hands and faces in the fountains or cisterns which were generally found in the *atrium* or court before the church; probably referring to the Psalmist's expression, "I will wash my hands in innocency: so will I compass thine altar." Many took off their shoes or sandals, especially when they went to receive the Eucharist; interpreting as applicable to themselves the command to Moses, "Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground." In some instances bowing towards the altar was practised; and when emperors or kings went into the house of God, they not only left their arms and guard, but also their crowns, behind them. It was also not uncommon for men to kiss the doors, threshold, or pillars in token of their love. The germ of many of the absurd practices and ceremonies of the Roman Catholic Church may be found in these customs.—Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. viii, ch. x, § 12.

**Entwistle, Joseph**, a Wesleyan Methodist minister, was born in Manchester, England, April 15, 1767. At sixteen he began to preach, and in 1787 Mr. Wesley called him into the itinerant ministry. He devoted himself to his work, studying theology, under many difficulties, and also the ancient languages. He filled acceptably a number of the most important appointments, and in 1812 was chosen president of the Conference. In 1831 he was made governor of the Wesleyan Theological Institution, in which office he remained until 1838, when his infirm health compelled him to retire. He died at Tadcaster in 1841. See *Memoir of the Rev. Joseph Entwistle*, by his Son (London, 1850, 12mo); *Methodist Quarterly Review*, April, 1851, p. 305.

**Enzinas, or Encinas de Francisco**, a Spanish Protestant, was born at Burgos about 1520. He is commonly named Dryander, and also used the names Duchesne, Van Eyck, Eichman, all of the same meaning (*oak-mountain*) as the Spanish name Enzinas. After completing his academic studies in Italy, he went to Louvain, and studied there, and also spent some time with Melancthon at Wittemberg. Having wealthy relatives in the Netherlands, he fixed his abode there, and openly embraced the Reformed cause. He published a Spanish version of the N. T., dedicated to Charles V (1543). He was arrested Dec. 13, 1543, and imprisoned at Brussels. He escaped in February, 1545, to Antwerp, thence to Germany and England (1548). He carried letters of commendation from Melancthon

to Edward VI and to Cranmer, who received him warmly, and gave him a post at Oxford. After some time he returned to the Continent, and continued his literary labors at Strasburg, Basle, and Geneva. He died about 1570.—McCrie, *Reformation in Spain*, ch. v; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xv, 122.

**Enzinas de, Jayme**, a Spanish Protestant, brother of the preceding (known like his brother, by the name Dryander), studied at Louvain and Paris, and embraced Reformed principles. At the request of his father he returned to Italy, and remained there in great uneasiness for some years. He was preparing to rejoin his brother in Germany when he was denounced before the Inquisition as a heretic. He was tried, condemned, and burnt alive in 1546.—McCrie, *Reformation in Spain*, ch. v.

**Eon, or Eudo de Stella**, a fanatic nobleman who lived in the middle of the 12th century. He was a native of the Bretagne, and a man without education. In the form used in exorcising evil spirits he heard these words, "*per Eum, qui venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos*," and concluded, from the resemblance between the word *Eum* and his own name, that he was the person who should judge the quick and the dead. His views seem to be connected with those of the Cathari. He is said to have taught that baptism was of value only for believers; that the only true baptism was that of the Spirit by the imposition of hands; that the hierarchy had not been instituted by God; that the Church of Rome was not the true Church, because her priests did not lead a holy life. He denied the resurrection of the body, and rejected marriage as a sacrament. He went about preaching these doctrines, found many adherents, and was reported to possess the power of working miracles. In 1145 the cardinal-legate Albericus came from Ostia to the Bretagne, and preached against Eon and his adherents at Nantes. He also induced archbishop Hugo, of Rouen, to write a work against him, which is, however, rather a diffuse explanation of the doctrines of the Church of Rome than a refutation of Eon (*Dignitatum Christiane fidei contra hereticos sui temporis libri tres; Bibl. Patrum Mar.* tom. xxii). At the same time troops were sent out against the new heretics, and in the diocese of Alet many were burned. Eon withdrew into the province of Guienne; in 1148 he repaired to Champagne, where his band was scattered, and he, together with some of his prominent adherents, was captured. He was taken before the council at Rheims, and asked who he was. He replied, *Is qui venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos*. The synod declared him to be insane, and charged the archbishop of Rheims to take care of him. Many of his followers were sentenced to be burned. After Eon's death the sect soon died out.—Schmidt, in *Herzog's Real-Encyklop.* iv, 212; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 602; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* bk. iii, cent. xii, pt. iii, ch. v, § 16; Geseler, *Ch. Hist.* per. iii, div. iii, ch. vii, § 84. (A. J. S.)

**Eon.** See GNOSTICISM.

**Eonian.** See *EOX*.

**Equinians**, a sect of the 16th century; so called from one Equinus, who taught that Christ did not die for the wicked, but for the faithful only.—Buck, *Theol. Dictionary*, s. v.

**Epact**, "in chronology, is the excess of the solar month above the lunar synodical month; or of the solar year above the lunar year of twelve synodical months; or of several solar months above as many synodical months; or of several solar years above as many periods, each consisting of 12 synodical months. The menstrual epact is the excess of the civil calendar month above the lunar month. For a month of 31 days, this epact is 1 day 11 hours 15 minutes 57 seconds, if we suppose new moon to occur on the first day of the month. The annual epact is the excess of the

solar year above the lunar. As the Julian solar year is (nearly) 365 days, and the Julian lunar year is (nearly) 354 days, the annual epact is nearly 11 days. The epact for two Julian years is, therefore, nearly 22 days; for three years, 33 days; and so on. When, however, the epact passes 30 days, 30 falls to be deducted from it, as making an intercalary month. For three years, then, the epact is properly 3; and for 4 years, adding 11 days, it is 14 days; and so on. Following the cycle, starting from a new moon on the 1st of January, we find that the epact becomes 30 or 0 in the 19th year. The epact for the 20th year is again 11; and so on. The years in the cycle are marked by Roman numerals I, II, III, etc., called the Golden Numbers; and a table of the Julian epacts exhibits each year in the cycle with its golden number and epact. As the Gregorian year (see CALENDAR) differs from and is in advance of the Julian by 11 days (the number lost on the Julian account before the Gregorian computation of time was introduced in England), and as 11 days is the difference between the solar and lunar years, it follows that the Gregorian epact for any year is the same with the Julian epact for the year preceding it" (Chambers, *Encyclopædia*, s. v.).

**Epænetus** (Ἐπαίνετος, commendable), a Christian resident at Rome when Paul wrote his epistle to the Church in that city, and one of the persons to whom he sent special salutations (Rom. xvi, 5). A. D. 55. In the received text he is spoken of as being "the first-fruits of Achaia" (ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀχαιᾶς); but "the first-fruits of Asia" (τῆς Ἀσίας) is the reading of the best MSS. (S A B C D E F G 67), of the Coptic, Armenian, Æthiopic, Vulgate, the Latin fathers, and Origen (*In Ep. ad Rom. Comment.* lib. x, *Opera*, vii, p. 431; *In Numer. Hom.* xi, *Opera*, x, p. 109). This reading is preferred by Grotius, Mill, Bengel, Whitby, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Rückert, Olshausen, and Tholuck; and admitted into the text by Griesbach, Knapp, Tittmann, Schoiz, Lachmann, and Tischendorf; also by Bruder, in his edition of Schmidt's Concordance, Lips, 1842. Dr. Bloomfield, who also adopts it in his Greek Testaments (2d ed. 1836), remarks that "the very nature of the term ἀπαρχὴ suggests the idea of one person only (see 1 Cor. xv, 20), and, as in 1 Cor. xvi, 15, Stephanas is called the ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀχαιᾶς, Epænetus could have no claim to the name." With respect to the former part of this statement, the learned writer has strangely overlooked such passages as James i, 18, "that we should be a kind of first-fruits" (ἀπαρχὴν τῶν), and Rev. xiv, 4, "These were redeemed from among men, being the first-fruits" (ἀπαρχὴν); and as to the latter part, not Stephanas alone, but his house, is said to be the first-fruits, and to have added themselves (ἑταῖον ἐαυτοῦς) to the ministry of the saints. Macknight's remark in favor of the received reading, that if Epænetus was one of that house, he was a part of the first-fruits of Achaia, seems somewhat forced. The synopsis of the pseudo-Dorotheus makes him first bishop of Carthage, but Justinian remarks that the African churches do not recognise him.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

**Epaon, Synod of, Concilium Epaonense or Epaunense**, a general synod of the Catholic bishops of Burgundy, held in 517. A great change in the relation of the Catholic Church of Burgundy to the state government took place in 516, when the new king Sigmond, son of the Arian king Gundobald, joined it. The Catholic Church thus became the State Church, though it does not appear that Sigmond, like so many kings of his times, aspired to exercise a controlling influence upon Church affairs. The Council of Epaon, which was to establish Church discipline in the new Catholic kingdom upon a permanent basis, was not called by the king, but by Avitus, bishop of Vienne, and Viventius, metropolitan of Lyons. The letters of both bishops are still extant. That of Viventius

is addressed to all bishops, clergymen, lords, and notables of the land, complains of want of discipline among the clergy, and invites every one who has to bring charges against the moral conduct of any clergyman to appear before the council. The clergymen are commanded to be present, and the laymen are permitted to attend in order that the people may receive information of what the bishops will decree. The letter of Avitus complains that the Church law ordering the holding of two synods every year had entirely fallen into disuse, and states that he had been censured by the Pope on this account, and had been commanded to assemble a synod, to renew and enforce the old Church laws, as far as they were still applicable, and to add, if necessary, new ones. As no such censure can be found in a letter of the Pope to Avitus, written in Feb. 517, nor in any other papal letter extant, it has been inferred (Vogel, in Herzog's *Real-Encyclop.* s. v.) that Avitus, in order to secure the meeting of the council, used the papal authority to a greater extent than he was authorized to do. In compliance with the letters of invitation, 24 bishops appeared personally at Epaon, and one sent representatives. Their deliberations were of but short duration, and on Sept. 14, 517, the bishops signed the acts upon which, "under divine inspiration," they had agreed. The acts consist of a brief preface and 40 canons which concern the conduct of bishops, clergymen, monks, secular authorities, and laymen, the intercourse with the Arian heretics, the property and discipline of the Church. The provisions concerning the heretics are of special importance. Catholic clergymen, under severe penalties, are forbidden to sit at table with heretics. With a Jew no layman shall dine, under penalty of being never admitted to a clergyman's table. Heretics who wish to join the Church must apply to the bishops personally; only when they are on the death-bed they may be received by a priest. The church edifices of the heretics are declared to be objects worthy of special horror, and their purification is declared impossible. The 30th canon forbids marriages with near relatives, in particular with the sister of a deceased wife. This canon directly concerned a prominent officer at the royal court, Stephanus, who was married to his sister-in-law Palladia. The bishops seem to have anticipated trouble from the opposition of Stephanus, for, after the dissolution of the Council of Epaon, eleven bishops, among whom was Apollinaris, bishop of Valence and brother of Avitus, went to Lyons, where, under the presidency of Viventius, they agreed upon a line of conduct for the enforcement of the canon, providing even for the case that the king should leave the Church, and appoint Arian bishops for some of the episcopal sees.

A part of the canons of Epaon remained in force in Southern France, as canons of the Council of Agde ("Agathensis"). This council had been held in 504, and established 47 canons, to which subsequently, for the purpose of obtaining a complete code of discipline, 14 canons of other councils were added; of these 24, 15 were taken from the Council of Epaon.

The site of Epaon cannot be established with certainty. According to some, it is the little town of Yenne, in Savoy, on the left bank of the Rhone; according to others, a little village, Ponas, about half way between Lyons and Vienne.—Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 75; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 603; Hefele, *Concilien-geschichte*, ii, 660; Landon, *Manual of Councils*, p. 224; Mansi, *Coll. Concil.* viii, 310; Labbe, *Dissertatio de Concil. Epaunensi.* (A. J. S.)

**Ep'aphras** (Ἐπαφροῦς, usually considered a contraction of *Epaphroditus*, but the last syllable in that case is hardly regular), an eminent teacher in the Church at Colossæ, denominated by Paul "his dear fellow-servant," and "a faithful minister (ὑπάκουος) of Christ" (Coloss. i, 7; iv, 12). A. D. 57. It has been inferred from Coloss. i, 7 that he was the found-

er of the Colossian Church; and Dr. Neander supposes that the apostle terms him *ἡπίσι ἡμῶν ἑκάκωτος Χριστοῦ* (*a servant of Christ in our stead*) because he committed to him the office of proclaiming the Gospel in the three Phrygian cities Colossæ, Hierapolis, and Laodicea, which he could not visit himself (*Hist. of Planting*, i, 200, 373). This language, however, is by no means decisive; yet most probably Epaphras was one of the earliest and most zealous instructors of the Colossian Church (see Alford's prolegomena to that epistle, *Gr. Test.* iii, 35 sq.). Lardner thinks that the expression respecting Epaphras in Coloss. iv, 12, *ὁ ἐξ ἡμῶν*, is quite inconsistent with the supposition of his being the founder of the Church, since the same phrase is applied to Onesimus, a recent convert (*Hist. of the Apostles and Evangelists*, c. xiv; *Works*, vi, 153). But in both cases the words in question seem intended simply to identify these individuals as the fellow-townsmen of the Colossians, and to distinguish them from others of the same name in Rome (see Macknight on Coloss. iv, 2). He was at that time with Paul at Rome (Coloss. iv, 12), and seems by the expression there used to have been at least a Colossian by birth. We find him again mentioned in the epistle to Philemon (ver. 23), which was sent at the same time as that to the Colossians. Paul there calls him *ὁ συναγαλωτός μου*, *my fellow-prisoner*; but some regard the word there as only a tender and delicate expression of Epaphras's attention to the apostle in his imprisonment (comp. Rom. xvi, 13). The martyrologies make Epaphras to have been first bishop of Colossæ, and to have suffered martyrdom there.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.. See EPAPHRODITUS.

**Epaphroditus** (*Ἐπαφρόδιτος*, belonging to *Aphrodite*, or *Venus*), a messenger (*ἀπόστολος*) of the Church at Philippi to the apostle Paul during his imprisonment at Rome, who was intrusted with their contributions for his support (Phil. ii, 25; iv, 18). A. D. 57. Paul's high estimate of his character (see Evans, *Script. Biog.* ii, 300) is shown by an accumulation of honorable epithets (*τὸν ἀδελφόν, καὶ συνεργόν, καὶ ἀσφατωσίωτην μου*), and by fervent expressions of gratitude for his recovery from a dangerous illness brought on in part by a generous disregard of his personal welfare in ministering to the apostle (Phil. ii, 30). Epaphroditus, on his return to Philippi, was the bearer of the epistle which forms part of the canon. Grotius and some other critics conjecture that Epaphroditus was the same as the *Epaphras* mentioned in the epistle to the Colossians (see Sirk, *De Epaphrodito Philippensium apostolo*, Lips. 1741; Strohbach, *De Epaphra Colossensi*, Lips. 1710). But, though the latter name may be a contraction of the former, the fact that Epaphras was most probably in prison at the time, sufficiently marks the distinction of the persons. The name Epaphroditus was by no means uncommon (see Tacit. *Ann.* xv, 55; Sueton. *Domit.* 14; Joseph. *Life*, 76), as Weinstein has shown (*Nov. Test. Gr.* ii, 273).—Kitto, s. v.

**Eparch** (*ἐπαρχος*, ruler over a district), a commander (e. g. of vessels, Æschylus, *Ag.* 1227), hence *prefect* of a province (comp. *ἐπαρχία*, Acts xxiii, 24; xxv, 1); applied as a title to Sisinnus (q. v.), the Persian satrap of Syria (1 Esdr. vii, 1, "governor"). See TOPARCHY, etc.

**Eparchy** (*ἐπαρχία*) was the official term of a province in the administration of the Roman empire. It consisted of a number of communities, and was a subdivision of a diocese (*ἐπίσκοπος*). In the organization of the Church, the ecclesiastical heads of communities were called bishops, those of the capitals of eparchies, metropolitans; those of the dioceses, patriarchs. The term eparchy is thus used in can. 4 of the Council of Nice, and by Maerius of Ancyra (Suicer, *Thesaur. Eccles.* s. v.). The meaning of the term was subsequently changed in the Greek Church, so as to denote, in gen-

eral, the diocese of any bishop, archbishop, or metropolitan). In Russia the eparchies are divided into three classes, the first of which comprised in 1866 the four metropolitan sees of Petersburg, Moscow, Kiev, and Novgorod; the second twenty sees, the incumbents of which, with the exception of one, had the title archbishop; the third twenty-nine sees, six of which had the title archbishop, while the others were merely bishops. Eparchies can be transferred at the pleasure of the czar from one class to the other.—Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 80; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 604; *Churchman's Calendar for 1868*. See GREEK CHURCH and RUSSIA. (A. J. S.)

**Épée**, CHARLES MICHEL DE L', born in Versailles Nov. 25, 1712, was distinguished for his labors in behalf of the deaf and dumb. He entered into orders as a Roman Catholic priest, but, having been interdicted from the exercise of his functions, he devoted himself to the care of deaf mutes. Two young girls, mutes, had been under the care of father Vamin, at whose death L'Épée took charge of them. From this time his talents, time, and property were all consecrated to this cause. He framed a series of signs (the basis of the system now in use), and his success induced the duc de Penthièvre and others to aid him. He organized an asylum, which, after his death, was taken under the patronage of the French government, and placed under Sicard (q. v.), the worthy successor of L'Épée. He died at Paris Dec. 23, 1789. His writings give full accounts of his method; among them are *Institution des Sourds et des Muets*, 1774, 12mo; enlarged edition, 1776, 12mo; and again improved, 1784, 12mo. See especially his *Art d'enseigner à parler aux Sourds-Muets*, with notes by Sicard, and the *Éloge* of L'Épée by M. Bebian (Paris, 1820, 8vo).—Hoefler, *Nov. Biog. Génér.* xxx, 829.

**Epefanofschins**, a Russian sect, followers of a monk of Kiev, who was ordained bishop through forged letters of recommendation. He died in prison, but is esteemed a martyr by his followers. Their sentiments are nearly the same as the *Starobredsi*, or Old Ceremonialists.—Pinkerton's *Greek Church*, p. 304; Williams, cited by Buck, *Theological Dictionary*. See RUSSIA; RUSSIAN SECTS.

**Epen'etus**. See EPENETUS.

**É'phah** (Heb. *Epphah'*, עֵפָה, *gloom*), the name of a tribe (including that of the founder), also of a woman and of a man.

1. (Sept. *Γεφάρ* v. r. in Chron. *Γαφάρ*, Isa. *Γαφά*.) The first in order of the five sons of Midian (Gen. xxv, 4; 1 Chron. i, 33), B. C. cir. 1988; afterwards mentioned by Isaiah in the following words: "The multitude of camels shall cover thee, the dromedaries of Midian and Ephah: all they from Sheba shall come: they shall bring gold and incense; and they shall show forth the praises of the Lord. All the flocks of Kedar shall be gathered together unto thee, the rams of Nebaioth shall minister unto thee: they shall come up with acceptance on mine altar, and I will glorify the house of my glory" (Isa. lx, 6, 7). This passage clearly connects the descendants of Ephah with the Midianites, the Keturahite Sheba, and the Ishmaelites, both in the position of their settlements and in their wandering habits, and shows that, as usual, they formed a tribe bearing his name. But no satisfactory identification of this tribe has been discovered. The Arabic word *Ghaffah*, which has been supposed to be the same as Ephah, is the name of a town, or village, near Pelusium, or Bulbeys (the modern Bilbeys), a place in Egypt, in the province of Sharkiyeh, not far from Cairo; but the tradition that Ephah settled in Africa does not rest on sufficient authority.—Smith, s. v. See MIDIAN.

2. (Sept. *Γαφά*.) A concubine of Caleb, of the tribe of Judah, by whom she had several sons (1 Chron. ii, 46). B. C. post 1856.

3. (Sept. Γαφά.) A son of Jahdai, who was apparently the grandson of the oldest of the foregoing sons (1 Chron. ii, 47). B.C. long post 1856.

**Ephah** (ἑφάη, *ephah'*, rarely ἑφᾶ, *ephah'*), a measure of grain, containing "three seahs or ten omers," and equivalent in capacity to the bath for liquids (Exod. xvi, 36; 1 Sam. xvii, 17; Zech. v, 6; Judg. vi, 19; Ruth ii, 17; the "double ephah," Prov. xix, 10; Deut. xxv, 14; Amos viii, 5, means two ephahs, the one just, the other false). According to Josephus (*Ant.* viii, 2, 9), the ephah contained 72 sextarii, equal to the Attic (liquid) metretres, or 1933.95 Paris cubic inches, about 1½ bushels English (see Böckh, *Metrolog. Untersuch.* p. 259, 278). This is also confirmed by other testimony; so that there is doubtless an error in another passage of Josephus (*Ant.* xv, 9, 2), where the ephah seems to be equal to 96 sextarii, or the Attic medimnus. The origin of this word is to be sought in the Egyptian language, where it signifies a *measure*, especially of corn, from which comes the Sept. rendering οἰά (see Rödiger, in *Allg. Encyclop.* s. v.; Gesenius, *Thes. Ling. Heb.* in Appendix.). See MEASURES.

**E'phai** (Heb. *Ephayy'*, עֵפְאִי [text עֵפְאִי for עֵפְאִי, *Ophay'*], *languid*, hence *gloom*; Sept. Ἰωφῆ v. r. Ὠφῆ, Ὠφί, and Ὠφέτ, *Vulg. Ophi*), a Netophathite, whose sons were among the "captains (סִרְיָוֹ) of the forces" left in Judah after the deportation to Babylon, and who warned the Babylonian governor of the plots against him (Jer. xl, 8). B.C. 588. They submitted themselves to Gedaliah, the Babylonian governor, and were apparently massacred with him by Ishmael (xli, 3; comp. xl, 13).

**Ephéh.** See VIPER.

**E'pher** (Heb. *id.* עֵפֶר, the *gopher*, so called from its gray or ashy color), the name of a tribe (including that of its founder) and of two men.

1. (Sept. Ἀφῆρ v. r. Ὀφῆρ, in Chron. Ὀφῆρ, *Vulg. Opher* and *Epher*.) The second in order of the sons of Midian (Gen. xxv, 4; 1 Chron. i, 33), Abraham's son by Keturah. B.C. post 1988. According to Gesenius, the name is equivalent to the Arabic *Ghiffr*, signifying "a calf," and "a certain little animal, or insect, or animalcule." Two tribes bear a similar appellation, *Ghifvar*; but one was a branch of the first Amalek, the other of the Ishmaelite Kináneh (comp. Caussin, *Essai sur l'Hist. des Arabes*, i, 20, 297, 298; and Abulfeda, *Hist. Antislamica*, edit. Fleischer, p. 196); neither is ascribed to Midian. The first settled about Yethrib (El-Medineh); the second in the neighborhood of Mekkeh.—Smith, s. v. See MIDIAN.

2. (Sept. Ἀφῆρ v. r. Γαφῆρ, *Vulg. Epher*.) The third son of Ezra, a descendant of the tribe of Judah, and apparently of Caleb, the son of Jephunneh (1 Chron. iv, 17). B.C. cir. 1618.

3. (Sept. Ὀφῆρ, *Vulg. Epher*.) The head of one of the families of Manasseh east, who were carried away by Tiglath-Pileser (1 Chron. v, 24). B.C. ante 740. The name may be compared with that of Ophrah (q. v.), the native place of Gideon, in Manasseh, on the west of Jordan.

**E'phes-dam'mim** (Heb. *E'phes Dammim'*, עֵפְהִים דַּמִּיִּם, appar. *boundary of blood*; Sept. Ἀφῆσομιμῖν or Ἀφῆσομιμῖν v. r. Ἐφῆσῖν, *Vulg. fines Dammim*), a place in the tribe of Judah between Shochoh and Azekah, where the Philistines were encamped when David fought with Goliath (1 Sam. xvii, 1). The similar, but not parallel passage (1 Chron. xi, 13), has the shorter form *Pas-Dammim*. The name was probably derived from its being the scene of frequent sanguinary encounters between Israel and the Philistines. On his way from Beit-Jibrin to Jerusalem, Van de Velde came past a ruined site on the high northward-looking brow of wady Musur, about one hour E. by S. of Beit-Netif, called *Khirbet Damun*, which he has

no doubt represents the ancient Ephes-Dammim, and "which fixes the place of the camp of Goliath just at its foot, where the valley contracts, and may, indeed, be called the pass [or extremity] of Dammim" (*Memoir*, p. 290). In that case the narrative of 1 Sam. xvii, becomes plain: "the gorge" (סִרְיָוֹ) between the battle-lines of the two armies (ver. 3), and along which the first rout and pursuit occurred (ver. 52), was no other than the wady Musur itself, which is so narrow immediately at this spot. See ELAH (VALLEY OF).

**Ephes'ian** (Ἐφεσῖος), a native or resident of the city of Ephesus (q. v.), in Asia Minor (Acts xix, 28, 34, 35; xxi, 29). The similar adj. *Ephusius* (Ἐφεσῖος, "of Ephesus") also occurs (Rev. ii, 1).

**EPHESIANS, EPISTLE TO,** or Paul's letter addressed to the Christian Church at the ancient and famous city of Ephesus (see below), that church which the apostle had himself founded (Acts xix, 1 sq.; comp. xviii, 19), with which he abode so long (*ῥητερίαν*, Acts xx, 31), and from the elders of which he parted with such a warm-hearted and affecting farewell (Acts xx, 18-55). See PAUL.

I. *Authenticity.*—This epistle expressly claims to be the production of the apostle Paul (i, 1; iii, 1); and this claim the writer, in the latter of these passages, follows up by speaking of himself in language such as that apostle is accustomed to use in describing his own position as an ambassador of Christ (iii, 1, 3, 8, 9). The justice of this claim seems to have been universally admitted by the early Christians, and it is expressly sanctioned by several of the fathers of the second and third centuries (Irenæus, *adv. Hæc.* v, 2, 3; v, 14, 3; Clemens Alexandr. *Padagog.* i, 108; *Protript.* ix, 69, ed. Potter; *Strom.* iv, 8, p. 592; Origen, *cont. Cels.* iii, 20; iv, 211, ed. Spencer; Tertullian, *adv. Marc.* v, 11, 17; *De Præscr. Hæc.* ch. 36; Cyprian, *Testim.* iii, 7, etc.); and after them the constant and persistent tradition of the ancient Church. Even Marcion did not deny that the epistle was written by Paul, nor did heretics refuse occasionally to cite it as confessedly due to him as its author (Irenæus, *Hæc.* i, 8, 5; see Hug, *Introd.* Fosdick's transl. p. 551; Hippolytus, *Philosophumena*, vi, 34). In recent times, however, its genuineness has been somewhat vehemently called in question. The epistle is also cited as part of sacred Scripture by Polycarp (*Ep. ad Philipp.* c. 1; c. 12); and it is probably to it that Ignatius refers in writing to the Ephesians (c. 12; compare Cotelerii *Annot.* in loc.; Pearson, *Vind. Ignatiana.* pt. ii, p. 119; Lardner's *Works*, ii, 70, 8vo). De Wette has attempted, from internal evidence, to set aside this external proof of the Pauline origin of this epistle; but his cavils have been so fully and satisfactorily answered by Schott (*Isag. in N. T.* p. 260), Guericke (*Beiträge zur hist. krit. Einleitung ins N. T.* p. 106), Hlesem (*Der Ap. Paulus*, p. 130), Rückert (*Der Br. Pauli an die Epheser*, p. 289), and others, that later De Wette himself, both in the introductory pages of his *Commentary* on this epistle (ed. 2, 1847), and in his *Introduction to the N. T.* (ed. 5, 1848), only labors to prove that it is a mere spiritless expansion of the epistle to the Colossians, though compiled in the apostolic age. Schwegler (*Nachapost. Zeitalt.* ii, 330 sq.), Baur (*Paulus*, p. 418 sq.), and others advance a step farther, and reject both epistles as of no higher antiquity than the age of Montanism and early Gnosticism. The objections adduced are chiefly the following: 1. The absence of any friendly greetings in this epistle, coupled with what are alleged to be indications of want of previous acquaintance on the part of the writer with the Ephesians, facts which, it is asserted, are incompatible with the supposition that it was written by Paul, whose relations with the Ephesian Church were so intimate. 2. The occurrence of words, and phrases, and sentiments, which indicate acquaintance with those Gnostic ideas which were familiar only at a period much later than that of

the apostle. 3. The close resemblance of this epistle to the epistle to the Colossians, suggesting that the former is only an enlargement of the latter. The first of these objections may be passed by here, as the allegations on which it rests will be particularly considered when we come to the question of the destination of the epistle; at present it may suffice to cite the remark of Reuss in reference to the *unreasonableness* of such objections: "If Paul writes similar letters of friendship, they are pronounced insignificant, and so spurious, because there is a want of the didactic character in them; and, on the other hand, if this prevails, there is proof of the spuriousness of the writing in the absence of the other. What! must both elements always be united according to some definite rule? is it so with us? or are any two of Paul's epistles alike in this respect?" (*Die Geschichte d. H. Schr. Neuen Test.* p. 104, 3d ed.) The second of the above objections has reference to such passages as i, 21; ii, 7; iii, 21, where it is alleged the Gnostic doctrine of æons is recognised; and to the expression *πλήρωμα*, i, 23, as conveying a purely Gnostic idea; and to such words as *μυστήριον*, *σοφία*, *γνώσις*, *φῶς*, *σκοτία*, etc. On this it seems sufficient to observe, without denying the existence of Gnostic allusions in this epistle, that, on the one hand, the objection assumes that, because Gnostic schools and systems did not make their appearance till after the age of the apostles, the ideas and words in favor with the Gnostics were unknown at an earlier period, a position which cannot be maintained [see Gnostics]; and, on the other, that, because the apostle uses phraseology which was employed also by the Gnostics, he uses it in the same sense as they did, which is purely gratuitous and indeed untrue, for to confound the *αἰώνες* and *πλήρωμα* of the apostle with the *αἰώνες* and *πλήρωμα* of the Gnostics, as Baur does, only proves, as Lange has remarked, that "a man may write whole books on Gnostics and Gnosticism without detecting the characteristic difference between the Christian principle and Gnosticism" (*Apostol. Zeit.* i, 124). With regard to the resemblance between this epistle and that to the Colossians, it can surprise no one that, written at the same time, they should in many respects resemble each other (see Klöpffer, *De origine Epp. ad Eph. et Col.* Gryph. 1853); but it does not require much penetration to discover the many points of difference between them, especially in the point of view from which the writer contemplates his main subject, the Lord Jesus Christ, in each; in the one as the prehistoric, pre-existent, supreme source of all things; in the other as the incarnate, historical, exalted, glorified head of the Church, to whom all things are subjected (comp. Eph. i, 20-23, with Col. i, 15-20; and Lange, *Ap. Zeit.* i, 118). As for the alleged "copious expansion," that may be left to the judgment of the reader, as well as the counter notion of Schneckenburger, that the epistle to the Colossians is an epitome of that to the Ephesians made by Paul himself. On such objections in general, we may say with Reuss that "rash hypotheses, whatever acceptance they may have received, tell by their deficiency or strangeness, not against the epistle, but against themselves; and, in opposition to all cavils, the many traits which disprove the presence in the thoughts of a deceptive imitation by a foreign hand stand as valid arguments in its defence" (*Gesch.* p. 104). For a detailed reply to the arguments of De Wette and Baur, the student may be referred to Meyer, *Einleit. z. Eph.* p. 19 sq., ed. 2; Davidson, *Introd. to N. T.* ii, 352 sq., and Alford, *Prolegomena*, p. 8.

II. The Readers for whom this Epistle was designed. —In the opening words, "Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus by the will of God, to the saints that are in Ephesus and faithful in Christ Jesus," the words *ἐν Ἐφεσῶν*, are omitted by the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS., the cursive numbered 67, by Basil (expressly), probably by Origen, and possibly by Tertullian. This,

combined with the somewhat noticeable omission of all greetings to the members of a church with which the apostle stood in such affectionate relation, and some other internal objections, have suggested a doubt whether these words really formed a part of the original text. On the subject of the persons addressed, therefore, two hypotheses have been principally entertained, besides the common opinion which, following the (disputed) reading in i, 1, regards the party to whom it was sent as the Church at Ephesus. (See the *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.* 1866, p. 129 sq., 742 sq.)

1. Grotius, reviving the opinion of the ancient heretic Marcion, maintains that the party addressed in this epistle was the Church at Laodicea, and that we have in this the epistle to that Church which is commonly supposed to have been lost. The view of Grotius, which has been followed by some scholars of eminent name, among whom are found Hammond, Mill, Venema, Wetstein, and Paley, rests chiefly on two grounds, viz. the testimony of Marcion, and the close resemblance between this epistle and that to the Colossians, taken in connection with Coloss. iv, 16. With respect to the former of these grounds, it is alleged that, as Marcion was under no temptation to utter a wilful falsehood in regard to the destination of this epistle, he probably had the authority of the Church at Laodicea, and, it may be, the tradition of the churches generally of Asia Minor, for the opinion which he expresses (Grotius, *Proleg. ad Ephes.*; Mill, *Proleg. ad N. Test.* p. 9, Oxon. 1707). But, without charging Marcion with *designedly* uttering what was false, we may suppose that, like some critics of recent times, this view was suggested to him by the apostle's allusion, in Col. iv, 16, to an epistle addressed by him to the Laodiceans. Nor is there the least ground for supposing that Marcion spoke in this instance on the authority of the Asiatic churches; on the contrary, there is every reason to believe the opposite; for not only do Origen and Clement of Alexandria, who were fully acquainted with the views of the Eastern churches on such matters, give no hint of any such tradition being entertained by them, but Tertullian, to whom we are indebted for our information respecting the opinion of Marcion, expressly says that in that opinion he opposed the tradition of the orthodox churches, and imposed upon the epistle a false title, through conceit of his own superior diligence in exploring such matters (*adv. Marc.* v, 17). With regard to the other argument by which this view is advocated, admitting the fact of a close resemblance between the epistle to the Colossians and that before us, and the fact that Paul had, some time before sending the former epistle, written one to the Church at Laodicea, which he advises the Colossians to send for and read, how does it follow from all this that the epistle to the Laodiceans and that now under notice were one and the same? It appears more probable that, seeing the two extant epistles bear so close a resemblance to each other, had the one now bearing the inscription "to the Ephesians" been really the one addressed to the Laodiceans, the apostle would not have deemed it of so much importance that the churches of Colossæ and Laodicea should interchange epistles. Such being the chief arguments in favor of this hypothesis (for those which, in addition, Wetstein alleges from a comparison of this epistle with that to the Church at Laodicea, in the Apocalypse, are not deserving of notice; see Michaelis, *Introd.* iv, 137), we may venture to set it aside as without any adequate support. It may be observed, also, that it seems incompatible with what the apostle says, Col. iv, 15, where he enjoins the Church at Colossæ to send his greetings to the brethren at Laodicea, etc. No one sends greetings by another except when it is impossible to express them one's self. But if Paul wrote to Laodicea at the same time as to Colossæ, and sent both letters by the same bearer, Tychicus, there was manifestly no occasion whatever for his

sending his salutations to the latter of these churches through the medium of the former; it was obviously as easy, and much more natural, to send his salutations to the Church at Laodicea in the epistle addressed to themselves. This seems to prove that the epistle to the Laodiceans had been written some considerable time before that to the Colossians, and therefore could not have been the same with that now under notice. See LAODICEANS (EPISTLE TO).

2. The opinion that this epistle was not specially addressed to any one church, but was intended as a sort of circular letter for the use of several churches, was first broached by archbishop Usher (*Annal. Vet. et Nov. Test.* p. 680, Breme, 1686). To this opinion the great majority of critics have given their suffrage; indeed, it may be regarded as the received opinion of Biblical scholars in the present day. This may make it apparently presumptuous in us to call it in question, and yet it seems to us so ill supported by positive evidence, and exposed to so many objections, that we cannot yield assent to it. (1.) In the *first* place, it is to be observed that this is a hypothesis entirely of *modern* invention. No hint is furnished of any such notion having been entertained concerning the destination of this epistle by the early Church. With the solitary exception of Marcion, so far as we know, all parties were unanimous in assigning Ephesus as the place to which this epistle was sent, and Marcion's view is as much opposed to the supposition of its being a circular letter as the other. As respects the external evidence, therefore, this hypothesis is purely destitute of support. (2.) It is a hypothesis suggested for the purpose of accounting for certain alleged facts, some of which are, to say the least, doubtful, and others of which may be explained as well without it as with it. These facts are, *a.* The alleged omission of the name of any place at the commencement of the epistle; *b.* Marcion's assertion that this epistle was addressed to the Laodiceans, which, it is said, probably arose out of his having seen that copy of this circular epistle which had been sent to Laodicea; *c.* The want of any precise allusions to personal relations subsisting between the apostle and those to whom this epistle was addressed; and *d.* The expressions of unacquaintedness with those to whom he wrote, which occur in this epistle, e. g. iii, 1-4. How these facts may be reconciled with the supposition that this epistle was addressed to the Ephesians will be considered afterwards; at present the question is, How do they favor the hypothesis that this was a circular letter? Now, supposing them to be unquestionable, and admitting that they are not irreconcilable with this hypothesis, it must yet appear to all that they go very little way towards affording *primary* evidence in its support. It is not one which grows naturally out of these facts, or is suggested by them; it is plainly of foreign birth, and suggested for them. But when it is remembered that the *first* of these alleged facts is (to say the least) very doubtful; that the *second* is made to serve this hypothesis only by means of another as doubtful as itself, and that, were its services admitted, it would prove too much, for it would go to show that, to the Laodiceans, the apostle not only sent a peculiar epistle, mentioned Col. iv, 16, but gave them a share also in this circular epistle written some time after their own; and that the *third* and *fourth* are both either partially or wholly questionable, it must be admitted that this hypothesis stands upon a basis which is little better than none. (3.) Had the epistle been addressed to a particular circle of churches, some designation of these churches would have been given, by which it might have been known what churches they were to which this letter belonged. When it is argued that this must be a circular letter, because there is no church specified to which it is addressed, it seems to be forgotten that the designation of a particular set of churches is as necessary for a circular epistle as the designation of one church is for

an epistle specially addressed to it. If we must leave out the words *ἰν' Ἐφεσῶν* in chap. i, 1, what are we to put in their place? for if we take the passage as it stands without them, it will follow that the epistle was addressed to *all* Christians everywhere, which is more than the advocates of the hypothesis now under notice contend for. The supposition that the title was left blank is equally gratuitous, unreasonable, and unnecessary. (4.) In chap. vi, 21, 22, Paul mentions that he had sent to those for whom this epistle was destined Tychicus, who should make known to them all things, that they might know his affairs, and that he might comfort their hearts. From this it appears that Tychicus was not only the bearer of this letter, but that he was personally to visit, converse with, and comfort those to whom it was addressed. On the supposition that this was a circular letter, this could hardly have been practicable.

3. We return, then, to the question of the genuineness of the suspected words "at Ephesus," *ἰν' Ἐφεσῶν*. At first sight the doubts against them seem plausible; but when we oppose to these (*a*) the preponderating weight of diplomatic evidence for the insertion of the words, (*b*) the testimony of all the versions, (*c*) the universal designation of this epistle by the ancient Church (Marcion standing alone in his assertion that it was written to the Laodiceans) as an epistle *to the Ephesians*, (*d*) the extreme difficulty in giving any satisfactory meaning to the isolated participle (*τοῦτε ὁδοῖν, to those that are—*), and the absence of any parallel usage in the apostle's writings, we can scarcely feel any doubt as to the propriety of removing the brackets in which these words are enclosed in the 2d and later editions of Tischendorf, and of considering them an integral part of the original text. If called upon to supply an answer to, or an explanation of the internal objections, we must record the opinion that none on the whole seems so free from objection as that which regards the epistle as *also* designed for the benefit of churches either contemporaneous to, or dependent on that of Ephesus. The counter-arguments of Meyer, though ably urged, are not convincing. Nor can an appeal to the silence of writers of the ancient Church on this further destination be conceived to be of much weight, as their references are to the usual and *titular* designation of the epistle, but do not and are not intended to affect the question of its wider or narrower destination. It is not unnatural to suppose that the special greetings here omitted might have been separately intrusted to the bearer Tychicus, possibly himself an Ephesian, and certainly commissioned by the apostle (vi, 22) to inform the Ephesians of his state and circumstances.

III. *Occasion of writing this Epistle.*—It does not seem to have been called out by any special circumstances, nor even to have involved any distinctly precautionary teaching (compare Schneckenburger, *Beiträge*, p. 135 sq.), whether against Oriental or Judaic theosophy, but to have been suggested by the deep love which the apostle felt for his converts at Ephesus, and which the mission of Tychicus, with an epistle to the Church of Colossæ, afforded him a convenient opportunity of evincing in written teaching and exhortation. The epistle thus contains many thoughts that had pervaded the nearly contemporaneous epistle to the Colossians, reiterates many of the same practical warnings and exhortations, bears even the tinge of the same diction, but at the same time enlarges upon such profound mysteries of the divine counsels, displays so fully the *origin and developments of the Church in Christ*, its union, communion, and aggregation in him, that this majestic epistle can never be rightly deemed otherwise than one of the most sublime and consolatory outpourings of the Spirit of God to the children of men. To the Christians at Ephesus dwelling under the shadow of the great temple of Diana, daily seeing its outward grandeur, and almost daily hearing of its pompous ritualism, the allusions in this epistle to that

mystic building of which Christ was the corner-stone, the apostles the foundations, and himself and his fellow-Christians portions of the august superstructure (ii, 19-22), must have spoken with a force, an appropriateness, and a reassuring depth of teaching that cannot be overestimated.

IV. *Contents*.—These easily admit of being divided into two portions, the first mainly *doctrinal* (i-iii), the second *hortatory and practical*.

1. The doctrinal portion opens with a brief address to the saints in Ephesus, and rapidly passes into a sublime ascription of praise to God the Father, who has predestinated us to the adoption of sons, blessed and redeemed us *in Christ*, and made known to us his eternal purpose of uniting all in him (i, 3-14). This not unnaturally evokes a prayer from the apostle that his converts may be enlightened to know the hope of God's calling, the riches of his grace, and the magnitude of that power which was displayed in the resurrection and transcendent exaltation of Christ—the head of his body, the Church (i, 15-23). Then, with a more immediate address to his converts, the apostle reminds them how, dead as they had been in sin, God had quickened them, raised them, and even enthroned them with Christ; and how all was by grace, not by works (ii, 1-10). They were to remember, too, how they had once been alienated and yet were now brought nigh in the blood of Christ; how he was their Peace, how by him both they and the Jews had access to the Father, and how on him as the corner-stone they had been built into a spiritual temple to God (ii, 11-22). On this account, having heard, as they must have done, how to the apostle was revealed the profound mystery of this call of the Gentile world, they were not to faint at his troubles (iii, 1-13): nay, he prayed to the great Father of all to give them inward strength, to teach them the love of Christ, and fill them with the fulness of God (iii, 13-19). The prayer is concluded by a sublime doxology (iii, 20, 21), which serves to usher in the more directly *practical portion*.

2. This the apostle commences by entreating them to walk worthy of this calling, and to keep the unity of the Spirit: there was but one body, one Spirit, one Lord, and one God (iv, 1-6). Each, too, had his portion of grace from God (iv, 7-10), who had appointed ministering orders in the Church, until all come to the unity of the faith, and grow up and become united with the living Head, even Christ (iv, 11-16). Surely, then, they were to walk no more as darkened, feelingless heathen; they were to put off the old man, and put on the new (iv, 17-24). This, too, was to be practically evinced in their outward actions; they were to be truthful, honest, pure, and forgiving; they were to walk in love (iv, 25-v, 2). Fornication, covetousness, and impurity were not even to be named; they were once in heathen darkness, now they are light, and must reprove the deeds of the past (v, 3-14). Thus were they to walk exactly, to be filled with joy, to sing, and to give thanks (v, 15-21). Wives were to be subject to their husbands, husbands to love and cleave to their wives (v, 23-33); children were to honor their parents, parents to bring up holily their children (vi, 1-4); servants and masters were to perform to each other their reciprocal duties (vi, 5-9). With a noble and vivid exhortation to arm themselves against their spiritual foes with the armor of God (vi, 10-20), a brief notice of the coming of Tychicus (vi, 21, 22), and a twofold doxology (vi, 23, 24), this sublime epistle comes to its close.

V. *Date*.—This epistle was written during the latter part of the apostle's first imprisonment at Rome, at about the same time with that to the Colossians, A.D. 57. This appears from the following circumstances: Timothy was not yet with Paul (i, 1); Paul was then a prisoner (iii, 1; iv, 1), but had been allowed to preach (vi, 20; comp. Acts xxviii, 30, 31); Tychicus (on his first journey) carried this epistle (vi, 21; comp.

Coloss. iv, 7, 8). The question of order in time between this epistle and that to the Colossians is very difficult to adjust. On the whole, both internal and external considerations seem somewhat in favor of the priority of the Epistle to the Ephesians. Comp. Neander, *Planting*, i, 329 (Bohn), Schleiermacher, *Stud. u. Krit.* for 1832, p. 500, and Wiesler, *Chronol.* p. 450 sq.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See COLLOSSIANS (EPISTLE TO).

VI. *Commentaries, etc.*—The following is a full list of separate exegetical helps on this epistle, the more important having an asterisk (\*) prefixed: Victorinus, *In ep. ad Ephes.* (in Mai's *Script. Vet.* III, i, 87); Jerome, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* vii, 537; also in *Opp. Supp.* xi, 995); Chrysostom, *Homilicæ* (in *Opp.* xi, 1; *Bibl. Patr.* ix); Claudius Taurinensis, *Expositio* (in Mabillon, *Act. Anal.* 91); \*Calvin, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.*; also tr. into English, Lond. 1854, 8vo); also *Sermons* (tr. by Golding, Lond. 1577, 4to); Ridley, *Commentary* (in Richmond's *Fathers*, ii, 14); Megander, *Commentarius* (Basil. 1534, 8vo); Sarcet, *Adnotationes* (Freckf. 1541, 8vo); Major, *Enarratio* (Wittemb. 1552, 8vo); Nailant, *Enarrationes* (Ven. 1554; Lond. 1570, 8vo); Weller, *Commentarius* (Norimb. 1559, 8vo); Vellerus, *Enarrationes* (Norimb. 1559, 8vo); Bucer, *Praelectiones* (Basil. 1562, fol.); Musculus, *Commentarii* (Basil. 1569, fol.); Heminge, *Commentary* (Lond. 1581, 4to); Binemagn, *Expositio* (Lond. 1581, 4to); Anon., *Exposition* (Lond. 1581, 4to); Stewart, *Commentarius* (Ingolst. 1593, 4to); Rollock, *Commentarius* (Edinb. 1590, 4to; Gen. 1593, 8vo); Zanchius, *Commentaria* (Newstad. 1594, fol.); Weinrich, *Explicatio* (Lips. 1613, 4to); Battus, *Commentarii* (Ilost. 1620, 4to); De Quiros, *Commentarius* (Hisp. 1622, fol.; Lugd. 1623, 4to); Meeluehrer, *Commentarius* (Norimb. 1628, 4to); Hanneken, *Explicatio* (4to, Marp. 1631; Lips., 1718; Jen. 1731); Tarnovius, *Commentarius* (Rost. 1636, 4to); Cocecius, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* v); Althofer, *Animadversiones* (Alt. 1641, 4to); Crocius, *Commentarius* (Cassel, 1642, 8vo); Bayne, *Commentary* (Lond. 1643, fol.); Wandalin, *Paraphrasis* (Slesw. 1650, 8vo); Boyd, *Praelectiones* (fol., London, 1652; Gen. 1660); Anon., *Annotationes* (8vo, Cambr. 1653; Amst. 1703; also in the *Criticæ Sacræ*); Ferguson, *Expositio* (Edinb. 1659, 8vo); Crell, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* i, 4); Lagus, *Commentatio* (Gryph. 1664, 4to); Schmidt, *Paraphrasis* (Arg. 1684, 1699, 4to); Du Bosc, *Sermons* (Fr., Rotterdam, 1699, 3 vols. 8vo); Goodwin, *Expositio* (Strasb. 1699, 4to); Spener, *Erklär.* (Hal. 1706, 1730, 4to); Gerbaden, *Geopent Door* (Tr. ad Rh. 1707, 4to); Pffefinger, *Dissertationes* (Arg. 1711, 8vo); also, *De visitatione Pauli ap. Ephesios* (Arg. 1721, 4to); Röhl, *Commentarius* (Tr. ad Rh. 1715, 1731, 2 vols. 4to); Hazevoet, *Verklar.* (L. B. 1718, 4to); \*Dinant, *Commentarii* (Rotterd. 1721, 4to; also in Low Dutch, ib., 1711, 1722, 2 vols. 4to); Van Til, *Commentarius* (Amsterdam, 1726, 4to); Fend, *Erkläut.* (s. l. 1727, 4to); Ziegler, *Einleit.* (in Henke's *Maguz.* iv, 225); Crusius, *De statu Ephesinorum* (Hafn. 1733, 4to); Gude, *Erlent.* (Laub. 1735, 8vo); also, *De eccl. Eph. statu* (Lips. 1732, 8vo); Rooyards, *Verklar.* (Amst. 1735, 3 vols. 4to); Van Alphen, *Specimen* (Tr. ad Rh. 1742, 4to); Huth, *Ep. ex Laod.* (in *encycl. ad Eph.* (Erlang. 1751, 4to); Justi, *Br. a. Laod. d. Br. an d. Eph.* (in his *Verm. Abhandl.* p. 81); Pezold, *De sublimitate in ep. ad Eph.* (Lips. 1771, 4to); Moldenhauer, *Ubers.* (Hamb. 1773, 8vo); Chandler, *Paraphrase* (London, 1777, 4to); Schütze, *Commentarii* (8vo, Lips. 1778, 1785); Cramer, *Ausleg.* (Hamb. 1782, 4to); Esmarch, *Ubers.* (Alton. 1785, 8vo); Krause, *Anmerk.* (Frkf. 1789, 8vo); Brinkman, *Ubers.* (Hamb. 1793, 8vo); Müller, *Erklär.* (Hildb. 1793, 4to); Morus, *Acroases* (Lips. 1795, 8vo); Hänlein, *De vetricib. ep. ad Ep.* (Erl. 1797, 4to); Popp, *Erklär.* (Rost. 1799, 4to); Van Bemmen, *Epp. ad Eph. et Col. collatæ* (L. B. 1803, 8vo); Schneckenburger, *Apherismen d. Br. a. d. Eph.* (in his *Einl. ins N. T.* No. 13); Von Flatt, *Vorles.* (Tüb. 1828, 8vo); Holz-



hausen, *Erklär.* (Hanov. 1833, 8vo); *Simcoe, Illustration* (Lond. 1833, 4to); \*Meier, *Commentar* (Berl. 1834, 8vo); \*Harless, *Commentar* (8vo, Erl. 1834; Stuttg. 1858); \*Rückert, *Erklär.* (Lpz. 1834, 8vo); Matthies, *Berücks.* (Griefsw. 1834, 8vo); Löhlein, *Syrus interpret.* (Erl. 1835, 8vo); Passavant, *Ausleg.* (Basel, 1836, 8vo); Lünemann, *De ep. ad Eph. authentia* (Gött. 1842, 8vo); \*De Wette, *Handb.* (Lpz. 1843, 8vo, vol. ii.); \*Stier, *Auslegung* (Berl. 1848-9, 2 vols. in 3 parts, 8vo; abridged, 1859, 8vo); Perceval, *Lectures* (Lond. 1846, 12mo); McGhie, *Lectures* (Dublin, 1846, 2 vols. 8vo); \*Baumgarten-Crusius, *Commentar* (Jena, 1847, 8vo); \*Meyer, *Commentar* (Gött. 1853, pt. ii.); \*Eadie, *Commentary* (Glasg. 1854, 8vo); Bisping, *Erklär.* (Münst. 1855, 8vo); Kähler, *Predigten* (Kiel, 1855, 8vo); Hodge, *Commentary* (N. Y. 1856, 8vo); \*Turner, *Commentary* (N. Y. 1856, 8vo); \*Ellicott, *Commentary* (8vo, Lond. 1855, 1859, 1864; Andov. 1860); Neuland, *New Catena* (Lond. 1861, 8vo); Clergyman (4), *Revision* (Lond. 1861, 8vo); Pridham, *Notes* (Lond. 1862, 12mo); Lathrop, *Discourses* (Phila. 1864, 8vo); Bleek, *Vorlesungen* (Berl. 1865, 8vo). See *EPISTLES*.

**Eph'esus** (Ἐφέσος, according to one legend from ἔφεσις, the permission given by Hercules to the Amazons to settle here), an illustrious city (Athen. viii, 361) in the district of Ionia (πόλις Ἰωνίας ἐπιφανεστάτη, Steph. Byz. s. v.), on the western coast of the peninsula commonly called Asia Minor—not that this geographical term was known in the first century. The ASIA of the N. T. was simply the Roman province which embraced the western part of the peninsula. Of this province Ephesus was the capital. See *ASIA MINOR*.

1. *History*.—It was one of the twelve Ionian cities in Asia Minor in the mythic times (Herod. i, 142), and said to have been founded by the Amazons, but in later times inhabited by the Carians and Leleges (Strabo, xiv, 640), and taken possession of by the Ionians under Androclus, the son of Codrus (Cramer, *Asia Minor*, i, 363). Besides the name by which it is best known, it bore successively those of *Samorna*, *Trachea*, *Ortygia*, and *Ptelea*. Being founded by Androclus, the legitimate son of Codrus, it enjoyed a pre-eminence over the other members of the Ionian confederacy, and was denominated the royal city of Ionia. The climate and country which the colonists from Attica had selected as their future abode surpassed, according to Herodotus (i, 142), all others in beauty and fertility; and, had the martial spirit of the Ionians corresponded to their natural advantages, they might have grown into a powerful independent nation. The softness, however, of the climate, and the ease with which the necessities of life could be procured, transformed the hardy inhabitants of the rugged Attica into an indolent and voluptuous race: hence they fell successively under the power of the Lydians (B. C. 560) and the Persians (B. C. 557); and, though the revolt of Histieus and Aristagoras against the Persian power was for a time successful, the contest at length terminated in favor of the latter (Herod. vi, 7-22). The defeat of the Persians by the Greeks gave a temporary liberty to the Ionian cities; but the battle of Mycale transferred the virtual dominion of the country to Athens. During the Peloponnesian war they paid tribute indifferently to either party, and the treaty of Antalcidas (B. C. 387) once more restored them to their old masters the Persians. They beheld with indifference the exploits of Alexander and the disputes of his captains, and resigned themselves without a struggle to successive conquerors. Ephesus was included in the dominions of Lysimachus; but, after the defeat of Antiochus (B. C. 190), it was given by the Romans to the kings of Pergamum. In the year B. C. 129 the Romans formed their province of Asia. The fickle Ephesians took part with Mithridates against the Romans, and massacred the garrison: they had reason to be grateful for the unusual clemency of L. Cornelius

II.—Q

Sulla, who merely inflicted heavy fines upon the inhabitants. Thenceforward the city formed part of the Roman empire. While, about the epoch of the introduction of Christianity, the other cities of Asia Minor declined, Ephesus rose more and more. It owed its prosperity in part to the favor of its governors, for Lysimachus named the city Arsinoë in honor of his second wife, and Attalus Philadelphus furnished it with splendid wharves and docks; in part to the favorable position of the place, which naturally made it the emporium of Asia on this side the Taurus (Strabo, xiv, 641, 663). Under the Romans, Ephesus was the capital not only of Ionia, but of the entire province of Asia, and bore the honorable title of *the first and greatest metropolis of Asia* (Böckh, *Corp. Inscript. Græc.* 2968-2992). The bishop of Ephesus in later times was the president of the Asiatic dioceses, with the rights and privileges of a patriarch (Evagr. *Hist. Eccles.* iii, 6). Towards the end of the 11th century Ephesus experienced the same fate as Smyrna; and, after a brief occupation by the Greeks, it surrendered in 1308 to sultan Saysan, who, to prevent future insurrections, removed most of the inhabitants to Tyriæum, where they were massacred.



Early Silver Coin of Ephesus. From the British Museum. Actual Size. Weight  $17\frac{1}{2}$  grains.


2. *Biblical Notices*.—That Jews were established there in considerable numbers is known from Josephus (*Ant.* xiv, 10, 11), and might be inferred from its mercantile eminence; but it is also evident from Acts ii, 9; vi, 9. In harmony with the character of Ephesus as a place of concourse and commerce, it is here, and here only, that we find disciples of John the Baptist explicitly mentioned after the ascension of Christ (Acts xviii, 25; xix, 3). The case of Apollos (xviii, 24) is an exemplification further of the intercourse between this place and Alexandria. The first seeds of Christian truth were possibly sown at Ephesus immediately after the great Pentecost (Acts ii). Whatever previous plans Paul may have entertained (xvi, 6), his first visit was on his return from the second missionary circuit (xviii, 19-21), and his stay on that occasion was very short; nor is there any proof that he found any Christians at Ephesus, but he left there Aquila and Priscilla (ver. 19), who both then and at a later period (2 Tim. iv, 19) were of signal service. In Paul's own stay of more than two years (xix, 8, 10; xx, 31), which formed the most important passage of his third circuit, and during which he labored, first in the synagogue (xix, 8), and then in the school of Tyrannus (ver. 9), and also in private houses (xx, 20), and during which he wrote the First Epistle to the Corinthians, we have the period of the chief evangelization of this shore of the Ægæan. The direct narrative in Acts six receives but little elucidation from the Epistle to the Ephesians, which was written after several years from Rome; but it is supplemented in some important particulars (especially as regards the apostle's personal habits of self-denial, xx, 34) by the address at Miletus. This address shows that the Church at Ephesus was thoroughly organized under its presbyters. On leaving the city, the apostle left Timothy in charge of the Church there (1 Tim. i, 3), a position which he seems to have retained for a considerable period, as we learn from the second epistle addressed to him. See *TIMOTHY*. Among Paul's other companions, two, Trophimus and Tychicus, were

natives of Asia (xx, 4), and the latter probably (2 Tim. iv, 12), the former certainly (Acts xxi, 29), natives of Ephesus. In the same connection we ought to mention Onesiphorus (2 Tim. i, 16-18) and his household (iv, 19). On the other hand must be noticed certain specified Ephesian antagonists of the apostle, the sons of Sceva and his party (Acts xix, 14), Hymeneus and Alexander (1 Tim. i, 20; 2 Tim. iv, 14), and Phygellus and Hermogenes (2 Tim. i, 15). See **PART I.** Ephesus is also closely connected with the apostle John, not only as being the scene (Rev. i, 11; ii, 1) of the most prominent of the churches of the Apocalypse, but also in the story of his later life as given by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* iii, 23, etc.). According to a tradition which prevailed extensively in ancient times, John spent many years in Ephesus, where he employed himself most diligently for the spread of the Gospel, and where he died at a very old age, and was buried. See **JOHN (THE APOSTLE)**. Possibly his Gospels and Epistles were written here. There is a tradition that the mother of our Lord was likewise buried at Ephesus, as also Timothy. Some make John bishop of the Ephesian communities, while others ascribe that honor to Timothy. In the book of Revelation (ii, 1) a favorable testimony is borne to the Christian churches at Ephesus. Ignatius addressed one of his epistles to the Church of this place (τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ ἀξιωμακωρίστῳ, τῇ οὐσῇ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τῆς Ἀσίας, *Hefele, Pat. Apostol.* p. 154), which held a conspicuous position during the early ages of Christianity, and was, in fact, the metropolis of the churches of this part of Asia.

3. *Location.*—Ephesus lay on the Ægean coast, nearly opposite the island of Samos, 320 stadia from Smyrna (Strabo, xiv, 632). The ancient town seems to have been confined to the northern slope of Coressus (Herod. i, 26), but in the lapse of time the inhabitants advanced farther into the plain, and thus a new town

sprang up around the temple (Strabo, xiv, 640). All the cities of Ionia were remarkably well situated for the growth of commercial prosperity (Herod. i, 142), and none more so than Ephesus. With a fertile neighborhood (Strabo, xiv, 637) and an excellent climate, it was also most conveniently placed for traffic with all the neighboring parts of the Levant. In the time of Augustus it was the great emporium of all the regions of Asia within the Taurus (Strabo, xiv, 950); its harbor (named Panormus), at the mouth of the Cayster, was elaborately constructed, though alluvial matter caused serious hindrances both in the time of Atalus and in Paul's own time (Tacitus, *Ann.* xvi, 23). The apostle's life alone furnishes illustrations of its mercantile relations with Achaia on the W., Macedonia on the N., and Syria on the E. At the close of his second missionary circuit, he sailed across from Corinth to Ephesus (Acts xviii, 19), when on his way to Syria (Acts xviii, 21, 22): some think that he once made the same short voyage over the Ægean, in the opposite direction, at a later period. See **CORINTHIANS, FIRST EP. TO.** On the third missionary circuit, besides the notice of the journey from Ephesus to Macedonia (xix, 21; xx, 1), we have the coast voyage on the return to Syria given in detail (xx, xxi), and the geographical relations of this city with the islands and neighboring parts of the coast minutely indicated (xx, 15-17). To these passages we must add 1 Tim. i, 3; 2 Tim. iv, 12, 20; though it is difficult to say confidently whether the journeys implied there were by land or by water. See likewise Acts xix, 27; xx, 1.

As to the relations of Ephesus to the inland regions of the continent, these also are prominently brought before us in the apostle's travels. The "upper coasts" (τὰ ἄνωρτοκά μέρη, Acts xix, 1), through which he passed when about to take up his residence in the city, were the Phrygian table-lands of the interior: and it was probably in the same district that on a previous



Plan of Ephesus and its Environs.

1. Grove of Diana; 2. Temple of Diana; 3. Monument of Androclus; 4. City Port; 5. Great Gymnasium; 6. Agora civilis; 7. Agora venalis; 8. Theatre; 9. Stadium; 10. Odeon; 11. Castle of Adrian; 12. Mosque of Ainsaluk; 13. Arched aqueduct across the valley; 14. Tunnelled aqueduct; 15. Quarries.


occasion (Acts xvi, 6) he formed the unsuccessful project of preaching the Gospel in the district of Asia. Two great roads at least, in the Roman times, led eastward from Ephesus; one through the passes of Tmolus to Sardis (Rev. iii, 1), and thence to Galatia and the N.E., the other round the extremity of Pactyas to Magnesia, and so up the valley of the Mæander to Iconium, whence the communication was direct to the Euphrates and to the Syrian Antioch. There seem to have been Sardinian and Magnesian gates on the E. side of Ephesus corresponding to these roads respectively. There were also coast-roads leading northwards to Smyrna, and southwards to Miletus. By the latter of these it is probable that the Ephesian elders travelled when summoned to meet Paul at the latter city (Acts xx, 17, 18). Part of the pavement of the Sardinian road has been noticed by travellers under the cliffs of Galleus. (See Leake's *Asia Minor*, and *Map*.)

Among the more marked physical features of the peninsula are the two large rivers, Hermus and Mæander, which flow from a remote part of the interior westward to the Archipelago, Smyrna (Rev. ii, 8) being near the mouth of one, and Miletus (Acts xx, 17) of the other. Between the valleys drained by these two rivers is the shorter stream and smaller basin of the Cayster, called by the Turks Kutschuk-Mendere, or the Little Mæander. Its upper level (often called the Caystrian meadows) was closed to the westward by the gorge between Galleus and Pactyas, the latter of these mountains being a prolongation of the range of Messogis, which bounds the valley of the Mæander on the north, the former more remotely connected with the range of Tmolus, which bounds the valley of the Hermus on the south. Beyond the gorge and towards the sea the valley opens out again into an alluvial flat (Herod. ii, 10), with hills rising abruptly from it. The plain is now about 5 miles in breadth, but formerly it must have been smaller, and some of the hills were once probably islands. Here Ephesus stood, partly on the level ground and partly on the hills.

Of the hills, on which a large portion of the city was built, the two most important were Prion and Coressus, the latter on the S. of the plain, and being, in fact, almost a continuation of Pactyas, the former being in front of Coressus and near it, though separated by a deep and definite valley. Further to the N.E. is another conspicuous eminence. It seems to be the hill mentioned by Procopius (*De Edif.* v. i) as one on which a church dedicated to the apostle John was built; and its present name *Agasuluk* is absurdly thought to have reference to him, and to be a corruption of his traditional title *ὁ ἄγιος θεόλογος*. (See generally Cellarii *Notit.* ii, 80.)

4. *Government*.—It is well known that Asia was a proconsular province; and in harmony with this fact we find proconsuls (*ἀνθύπατοι*, A. V. "deputies") specially mentioned (Acts xix, 38). Nor is it necessary to inquire here whether the plural in this passage is generic, or whether the governors of other provinces were present in Ephesus at the time. Again, we learn from Pliny (v, 31) that Ephesus was an assize-town (*forum* or *convantus*); and in the N.-T. narrative (Acts xix, 38) we find the court-days alluded to as actually being held (*ἀγοραῖοι ἀγοραὶ*, A. V. "the law is open") during the uproar; though perhaps it is not absolutely necessary to give the expression this exact reference as to time (see Wordsworth in loc.). Ephesus itself was a "free city," and had its own assemblies and its own magistrates. The senate (*γερουσία*, or *βουλὴ*) is mentioned not only by Strabo, but by Josephus (*Ant.* xiv, 10, 25; xvi, 6, 4 and 7); and Luke, in the narrative before us, speaks of the *ἄμιος* (ver. 30, 33, A. V. "the people") and of its customary assemblies (*ἀνώρω ἐκκλησίαι*, ver. 39, A. V. "a lawful assembly"). That the tumultuary meeting which was gathered on the occasion in question should take place in the theatre

(ver. 29, 31) was nothing extraordinary. It was at a meeting in the theatre at Cæsarea that Agrippa I received his death-stroke (Acts xii, 23), and in Greek cities this was often the place for large assemblies (Tacitus, *Hist.* ii, 80; Val. Max. ii, 2). We even find conspicuous mention made of one of the most important municipal officers of Ephesus, the "town-clerk" (q. v.) (*γραμματεὺς*), or keeper of the records, whom we know from other sources to have been a person of great influence and responsibility. It is remarkable how all these political and religious characteristics of Ephesus, which appear in the sacred narrative, are illustrated by inscriptions and coins. An *ἀρχιεὼν*, or state-paper office, is mentioned on an inscription in Chishull. The *γραμματεὺς* frequently appears; so also the *Ἀσιαρχοὶ* and *ἀνθύπατοι*. Sometimes these words are combined in the same inscription; see, for instance, Böckh, *Corp. Inscr.* 2999, 2994, 2996. The later coins of Ephesus are full of allusions to the worship of Diana in various aspects. The word *πικώροσ* (warden, A. V. "worshipper") is of frequent occurrence. That which is given last below has also the word *ἀνθύπατος* (proconsul, A. V. "deputy"); it exhibits an image of the temple, and bearing as it does the name and head of Nero, it must have been struck about the time of Paul's stay in Ephesus. The one immediately preceding it bears the name (Cusinius) of the acting *γραμματεὺς* ("town-clerk") at the time.



Bronze Coins of Ephesus.

5. *The Asiarchs*.—Public games were connected with the worship of Diana at Ephesus. The month

of May was sacred to her. The uproar mentioned in the Acts very probably took place at this season. Paul was certainly at Ephesus about that time of the year (1 Cor. xvi, 8), and Demetrius might well be peculiarly sensitive if he found his trade failing at the time of greatest concert. However this may be, the Asiarchs (Ἀσιάρχαι, A. V. "chiefs of Asia") were present (Acts xix, 31). These were officers appointed, after the manner of the ædiles at Rome, to preside over the games which were held in different parts of the province of Asia, just as other provinces had their *Galatarchs*, *Lyciarchs*, etc. Various cities would require the presence of these officers in turn. In the account of Polycarp's martyrdom at Smyrna (Hefele, *Pat. Apost.* p. 286) an important part is played by the Asiarch Philip. It is a remarkable proof of the influence which Paul had gained at Ephesus that the asiarchs took his side in the disturbance. See Dr. Wordsworth's note on Acts xix, 31. Comp. ASIARCH.

6. *Religion*.—Conspicuous at the head of the harbor of Ephesus was the great temple of Diana or Artemis, the tutelary divinity of the city. She was worshipped under the name of *Artemis*. There was more than one divinity which went by the name of Artemis, as the Arcadian Artemis, the Taurian Artemis, as well as the Ephesian Artemis. (See Dougl'ty *Analect.* ii, 91; Münter, *Relig. d. Karthag.* p. 53.) Her worship in this instance was said to have originated in an image that fell from heaven (ἑπιπέτεις, Acts xix, 35; comp. Clem. Alex. *Protrep.* p. 14; Wetstein in loc.), and believed to have been an object of reverence from the earliest times (Pliny, xvi, 79). The material of which it was composed is disputed, whether ebony, cedar, or otherwise (see Spanheim, *ad Callim. Dian.* ver. 239). She was represented as many-breasted (πολύμαστορος, *multimania*, see Gronovii *Thesaur.* vii; Zorn, *Bibloth. Antiq.* i, 439 sq.; Creuzer, *Symbol.* ii, 176 sq.), although different explanations are given of her figure in this respect. The following is the description given by Mr. Falkener (*Ephesus*, p. 290, 291) of an antique statue of the Ephesian Diana now in the Naples Museum: "The circle round her head denotes the nimbus of her glory; the griffins inside of which express its brilliancy. In her breast are the twelve signs of the zodiac, of which those seen in front are the ram, bull, twins, crab, and lion; they are divided by the hours. Her necklace is composed of acorns, the primeval food of man. Lions are on her arms to denote her power, and her hands are stretched out to show that she is ready to receive all who come to her. Her body is covered with various beasts and monsters, as sirens, sphinxes, and griffins, to show she is the source of nature, the mother of all things. Her head, hands, and feet are of bronze, while the rest of the statue is of alabaster, to denote the ever-varying light and shade of the moon's figure. . . . Like Rhea, she was crowned with turrets, to denote her dominion over terrestrial objects."


ine strength, ease, and grace, and whose delights were in the pursuits of the chase. See DIANA.

Around the image of the goddess was erected, according to Callimachus (*Hymn. in Dian.* 248), her large and splendid temple. This building was raised (about B.C. 500) on immense substructions, in consequence of the swampy nature of the ground. The earlier temple, which had been begun before the Persian war, was burnt down in the night when Alexander the Great was born (B.C. 355), by an obscure person of the name of Eratostratus, who thus sought to transmit his name to posterity (Strabo, xiv, 640; Plutarch, *Alex.* 3; Solin, 43; Cicero, *De Nat. Deor.* ii, 27); and, as it seemed somewhat unaccountable that the goddess should permit a place which redounded so much to her honor to be thus recklessly destroyed, it was given out that Diana was so engaged with Olympias in aiding to bring Alexander into the world that she had no time nor thought for any other concern. At a subsequent period Alexander made an offer to rebuild the temple, provided he were allowed to inscribe his name on the front, which the Ephesians refused. Aided, however, by the whole of Asia Minor, they succeeded in erecting a still more magnificent temple, which the ancients have lavishly praised and placed among the seven wonders of the world. It took two hundred and twenty years to complete. Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* xxxvi, 21), who has given a description of it, says it was 425 feet in length, 220 broad, and supported by 127 columns, each of which had been contributed by some prince, and were 60 feet high; 36 of them were richly carved. Chersiphron, the architect, presided over the undertaking, and, being ready to lay violent hands on himself in consequence of his difficulties, was restrained by the command of the goddess, who appeared to him during the night, assuring him that she herself had accomplished that which had brought him to despair. The altar was the work of Praxiteles. The famous sculptor Scopas is said by Pliny to have chiselled one of the columns. Apelles, a native of the city, contrib-



Ancient representation of "Diana of the Ephesians."

It will be seen, from the figure given, that this last differed materially from the Diana, sister of Apollo, whose attributes are the bow, the quiver, the girt-up robe, and the hound; whose person is a model of fem-



Plan of the Temple of Diana at Ephesus.

ated a splendid picture of Alexander the Great. The rights of sanctuary, to the extent of a stadium in all directions round the temple, were also conceded, which, in consequence of abuse, the emperor Tiberius abolished. The temple was built of cedar, cypress, white marble, and even gold, with which it glittered (Spanh. *Observat. in Hymn. in Dian. 353*). Costly and magnificent offerings of various kinds were made to the goddess and treasured in the temple, such as paintings, statues, etc., the value of which almost exceeded computation. The fame of the temple, of the goddess, and of the city itself, was spread not only through Asia, but the world, a celebrity which was enhanced and diffused the more readily because sacred games were practised there, which called competitors and spectators from every country. In style, too, this famous structure constituted an epoch in Greek art (Vitruv. iv, 1), since it was here first that the graceful Ionic order was perfected. The magnificence of this sanctuary was a proverb throughout the civilized world (Philo Byz. *Spect. Maud. 7*). All these circumstances give increased force to the architectural allegory in the great epistle which Paul wrote in this place (1 Cor. iii, 9-17), to the passages where imagery of this kind is used in the epistles addressed to Ephesus (Ephes. ii, 19-22; 1 Tim. iii, 15; vi, 19; 2 Tim. ii, 19, 20), and to the words spoken to the Ephesian elders at Miletus (Acts xx, 32). The temple was frequently used for the safe custody of treasure. Of more questionable character was the privilege which, in common with some other Greek temples, it enjoyed of an asylum, within the limits of which criminals were safe from arrest (Strabo, xiv, 641; Plutarch, *De are al. c. 3*; Apollon. *Eph. epist. 65*). By Alexander this asylum was extended to a stadium, and by Mithridates somewhat further; Mark Antony nearly doubled the distance; but the abuses hence arising became so mischievous, that Augustus was compelled to abolish the privilege, or at least restrict it to its ancient boundary. Among his other enormities, Nero is said to have despoiled the temple of Diana of much of its treasure. It continued to conciliate no small portion of respect till it was finally burnt by the Goths in the reign of Gallienus. (See Hirt, *Der Tempel der Diana zu Ephesus*, Berlin, 1809.)

The chief points connected with the uproar at Ephesus in the case of PAUL (Acts xix, 23-41) are mentioned in the articles DIANA and PAUL; but the following details must be added. In consequence of this devotion, the city of Ephesus was called *νεωκόρος* (ver. 35) or "warden" of Diana (see Van Dale, *Dissert.* p. 309; Wolf and Kuinöl, in loc.). This was a recognised title applied in such cases, not only to individuals, but to communities. In the instance of Ephesus, the term is abundantly found both on coins and on inscriptions. Its *neocorate* was, in fact, as the "town-clerk" said, proverbial. Another consequence of the celebrity of Diana's worship at Ephesus was that a large manufactory grew up there of portable shrines (*ναοί*, ver. 24, the *ἀποθήματα* of Dionys. Halicarn. ii, 2, and other writers), which strangers purchased, and devotees carried with them on journeys or set up in their houses. Of the manufacturers engaged in this business, perhaps Alexander the "coppersmith" (ὁ χαλκεύς, 2 Tim. iv, 14) was one. The case of Demetrius the "silversmith" (*ἀργυροποιός* in the Acts) is explicit. He was alarmed for his trade when he saw the Gospel, under the preaching of Paul, gaining ground upon idolatry and superstition, and he spread a panic among the craftsmen of various grades, the *τεχνίται* (ver. 24) or designers, and the *ἐργάται* (v. 25) or common workmen, if this is the distinction between them. (See Schmid, *Templa Demetrii argentei*, Jena, 1695; Wilisch, *Naiōia vet.* Lips. 1716.) See DEMETRIUS.

6. *Magical Arts.*—Among the distinguished natives of Ephesus in the ancient world may be mentioned

Apelles and Parrhasius, rivals in the art of painting, Heraclitus, the man-hating philosopher, Hipponax, a satirical poet, Artemidorus, who wrote a history and description of the earth. The claims of Ephesus, however, to the praise of originality in the prosecution of the liberal arts are but inconsiderable, and it must be content with the dubious reputation of having excelled in the refinements of a voluptuous and artificial civilization. With culture of this kind, a practical belief in and a constant use of those arts which pretend to lay open the secrets of nature, and arm the hand of man with supernatural powers, have generally been found conjoined. Accordingly, the Ephesian multitude were addicted to sorcery; indeed, in the age of Jesus and his apostles, adepts in the occult sciences were numerous: they travelled from country to country, and were found in great numbers in Asia, deceiving the credulous multitude and profiting by their expectations. They were sometimes Jews, who referred their skill and even their forms of proceeding to Solomon, who is still regarded in the East as head or prince of magicians (Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 2, 5; Acts viii, 9; xiii, 6, 8). In Asia Minor Ephesus had a high reputation for magical arts (Ortob, *De Ephes. Libris combustis*, Lips. 1708). This also comes conspicuously into view in Luke's narrative (Acts xix, 11-20). The peculiar character of Paul's miracles (*ἐνθάμεις ὃν τὰς τυχοῖσας*, ver. 11) would seem to have been intended as antagonistic to the prevalent superstition. The books mentioned as being burned by their possessors in consequence of his teaching were doubtless books of magic. How extensively they were in use may be learned from the fact that "the price of them" was "fifty thousand pieces of silver" (more than \$30,000). Very celebrated were the Ephesian letters (*Ἐφέσια γράμματα*), which appear to have been a sort of magical formulæ written on paper or parchment, designed to be fixed as amulets on different parts of the body, such as the hands and the head (Plut. *Sym.* vii; Lake-macher, *Obs. Philol.* ii, 126; Deyling, *Observ.* iii, 355). Erasmus (*Adag. Cent.* ii, 578) says that they were certain signs or marks which rendered their possessor victorious in every thing. Eustathius (*ad Hom. Odys.* x, 634) states an opinion that Ceresus, when on his funeral pile, was very much benefited by the use of them; and that when a Milesian and an Ephesian were wrestling in the Olympic games, the former could gain no advantage, as the latter had Ephesian letters bound round his heel; but, these being discovered and removed, he lost his superiority, and was thrown thirty times. The faith in these mystic syllables continued, more or less, till the sixth century (see the Life of Alexander of Tralles, in Smith's *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s. v.). We should enter on doubtful ground if we were to speculate on the Gnostic and other errors which grew up at Ephesus in the later apostolic age, and which are foretold in the address at Miletus, and indicated in the epistle to the Ephesians, and more distinctly in the epistles to Timothy. See CURIOUS ARTS.

7. *Modern Remains.*—The ruins of Ephesus lie two short days' journey from Smyrna, in proceeding from which towards the south-east the traveller passes the pretty village of Sedekuy; and two hours and a half onwards he comes to the ruined village of Danizzi, on a wide, solitary, uncultivated plain, beyond which several burial-grounds may be observed; near one of these, on an eminence, are the supposed ruins of Ephesus, consisting of shattered walls, in which some pillars, architraves, and fragments of marble have been built. The soil of the plain appears rich. It is covered with a rank, burnt-up vegetation, and is everywhere deserted and solitary, though bordered by picturesque mountains. A few corn-fields are scattered along the site of the ancient city, which is marked by some large masses of shapeless ruins and stone walls. Towards the sea extends the ancient port, a pestilential marsh. Along the slope of the mountain and over

the plain are scattered fragments of masonry and detached ruins, but nothing can now be fixed upon as the great temple of Diana. There are some broken columns and capitals of the Corinthian order of white marble: there are also ruins of a theatre, consisting of some circular seats and numerous arches, supposed to be the one in which Paul was preaching when interrupted by shouts of "Great is Diana of the Ephesians." The ruins of this theatre present a wreck of immense grandeur, and the original must have been of the largest and most imposing dimensions. Its form alone can now be spoken of, for every seat is removed, and the proscenium is a hill of ruins. A splendid circus (Fellows's *Reports*, p. 275) or stadium remains tolerably entire, and there are numerous piles of buildings, seen alike at Pergamus and Troy as well as here, by some called *gymnasia*, by others temples; by others again, with more propriety, palaces. They all came with the Roman conquest. No one but a Roman emperor could have conceived such structures. In Italy they have parallels in Adrian's villa near Tivoli, and perhaps in the pile upon the Palatine. Many other walls remain to show the extent of the buildings of the city, but no inscription or ornament is to be found, cities having been built out of this quarry of worked marble. The ruins of the adjoining town, which arose about four hundred years ago, are entirely composed of materials from Ephesus. There are a few huts within these ruins (about a mile and a half from Ephesus), which still retain the name of the parent city, *Asalük*—a Turkish word, which is associated with the same idea as Ephesus, meaning the City of the Moon (Fellows). A church dedicated to St. John is thought to have stood near, if not on the site of the present mosque. Arundell (*Discoveries*, ii, 253) conjectures that the gate, called the Gate of Persecution, and large masses of brick wall which lie beyond it, are parts of this celebrated church, which was fortified during the great Council of Ephesus. The tomb of St. John was in or under his church, and the Greeks have a tradition of a sacred dust arising every year, on his festival, from the tomb, possessed of miraculous virtues: this dust they term *manna*. Not far from the tomb of St. John was that of Timothy. The tomb of Mary and the seven *παῖδες* (*boys*, as the *Synaecaria* calls the Seven Sleepers) are found in an adjoining hill. At the back of the mosque, on the hill, is the sunk ground-plan of a small church, still much venerated by the Greeks. The sites of two others are shown at *Asalük*. There is also a building, called the Prison of St. Paul, constructed of large stones without cement. The situation of the temple is doubtful, but it probably stood where certain large masses remain on the low ground, full in view of the theatre. The disappearance of the temple may easily be accounted for, partly by the rising of the soil, and partly by the incessant use of its materials for mediæval buildings. Some of its columns are said to be in St. Sophia at Constantinople, and even in the cathedrals of Italy.

Though Ephesus presents few traces of human life, and little but scattered and mutilated remains of its ancient grandeur, yet the environs, diversified as they are with hill and dale, and not scantily supplied with wood and water, present many features of great beauty. Arundell (ii, 241) enumerates a great variety of trees, which he saw in the neighborhood, among which may be specified groves of myrtle near Ephesus. He also found heath in abundance, of two varieties, and saw there the common fern, which he met with in no other part of Asia Minor. Dr. Chandler (p. 150, 4to) gives a striking description of Ephesus, as he found it on his visit in 1764: "Its population consisted of a few Greek peasants, living in extreme wretchedness, dependence, and insensibility, the representatives of an illustrious people, and inhabiting the wreck of their greatness—some the substructure of the glorious edifices which they raised; some beneath the vaults of

the stadium, once the crowded scene of their diversions; and some in the abrupt precipice, in the sepulchres which received their ashes. Such are the present citizens of Ephesus, and such is the condition to which that renowned city has been reduced. It was a ruinous place when the emperor Justinian filled Constantinople with its statues, and raised the church of St. Sophia on its columns. Its streets are obscured and overgrown. A herd of goats was driven to it for shelter from the sun at noon, and a noisy flight of crows from the quarries seemed to insult its silence. We heard the partridge call in the area of the theatre and of the stadium. The pomp of its heathen worship is no longer remembered; and Christianity, which was then nursed by apostles, and fostered by general councils, barely lingers on, in an existence hardly visible." However much the Church at Ephesus may (Rev. ii, 2), in its earliest days, have merited praise for its "works, labor, and patience," yet it appears soon to have "left its first love," and to have received in vain the admonition—"Remember, therefore, from whence thou art fallen, and repent and do the first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent." If any repentance was produced by this solemn warning, its effects were not durable, and the place has long since offered an evidence of the truth of prophecy, and the certainty of the divine threatenings, as well as a melancholy subject for thought to the contemplative Christian. Its fate is that of the once-flourishing seven churches of Asia: its fate is that of the entire country—a garden has become a desert. Busy centres of civilization, spots where the refinements and delights of the age were collected, are now a prey to silence, destruction, and death. Consecrated first of all to the purposes of idolatry, Ephesus next had Christian temples almost rivalling the pagan in splendor, wherein the image of the great Diana lay prostrate before the cross; and, after the lapse of some centuries, Jesus gave place to Mohammed, and the crescent glittered on the dome of the recently-Christian church. A few more scores of years, and Ephesus had neither temple, cross, crescent, nor city, but was "a desolation, a dry land, and a wilderness." Even the sea has retired from the scene of devastation, and a pestilential morass, covered with mud and rushes, has succeeded to the waters which brought up ships laden with merchandise from every part of the known world. (See Herod. i, 26; ii, 148; Livy, i, 45; Pausanias, vii, 2, 4; Philo Byz. *de 7 Orb. Mirac.*; Creuzer, *Symbol.* ii, 13; Hassel, *Erdteschr.* ii, 132.)—Smith, s. v.; Kitto, s. v.; Fairbairn, s. v.

7. *Literature.*—The site of ancient Ephesus has been visited and examined by many travellers during the last 200 years, and descriptions, more or less copious, have been given by Pococke, Tournefort, Spon and Wheler, Chandler, Ponsjoulat, Prokesch, Beaujour, Schubert, Arundell (*Seven Churches*, Lond. 1828, p. 26), Fellows (*Asia Minor*, Lond. 1839, p. 274), and Hamilton. The fullest accounts are, among the older travellers, in Chandler (*Travels*, Oxford, 1755, p. 131), and among the more recent, in Hamilton (*Researches*, Lond. 1842, ii, 22). Some views are given in the second volume of the *Ionian Antiquities*, published by the Dilettanti Society. Leake, in his *Asia Minor* (Lond. 1824, p. 258, 346), has a discussion on the dimensions and style of the temple. In Kiepert's *Hellas* is a map, more or less conjectural, the substance of which will be found in Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s. v. Ephesus. The latest and most complete work is Falkener's *Ephesus and the Temple of Diana* (London, 1862, 8vo). A railway now renders Ephesus accessible from Smyrna (Pressensé, *Land of Gospel*, p. 215). To the works above referred to must be added Perry, *De rebus Ephesiorum* (Gött. 1837), a slight sketch; Guhl, *Ephesiaca* (Berl. 1843), a very elaborate work, although his plans are mostly from Kiepert; Heimsen's *Paulus* (Gött.

1830), which contains a good chapter on Ephesus; Biscoe, *On the Acts* (Oxf. 1829), p. 274-285; Mr. Akerman's paper on the Coins of Ephesus in the *Trans. of the Numismatic Soc.* 1841; Gronovius, *Antiq. Græc.* vii, 387-401; and an article by Ampère in the *Rev. des Deux Mondes* for Jan. 1842. Other monographs are Anon. *Acta Pauli cum Ephesibus* (Helmst. 1768); Æpinus, *De duplici bapt. discip. Ephesinor.* (Aitorf, 1719); Benner, *De bapt. Ephesiorum in nomine Christi* (Giesl. 1733); Bircherode, *De cultu Diavæ Ephes.* (Hafn. 1723); Conrad, *Acta Pauli Ephes.* (Jena, 1710); Deyling, *De tumultu a Demetrio* (in his *Obs. sacr.* iii, 362 sq.); Lederlin, *De templis Diavæ Ephesiorum* (Argent. 1714); Schurzleish, *De literis Ephesior.* (Viteb. 1698); Siber, *De πνευματικῇ Ephesiorum* (Viteb. 1685); Wallen, *Acta Pauli Ephes.* (Gryph. 1783); Stieckel, *De Ephesibus literis lingue Semitice vindicandis* (Jen. 1860). See EPHESIANS, EPISTLE TO.

EPHESUS, GENERAL COUNCIL OF. The third œcumenical council, convoked by the emperor Theodosius II, was held at Ephesus in 431, upon the controversy raised by Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, who objected to the application of the title of Θεοτόκος to the Virgin Mary. For the circumstances which led to the convocation of this council, see the articles NESTORIUS, NESTORIANS, PELAGIUS. Celestine, the pope, not seeing fit to attend in person, sent three legates, Arcadius and Projectus, bishops, and Philip, a priest. Among the first who arrived at the council was Nestorius, with a numerous body of followers, and accompanied by Irenæus, a nobleman, his friend and protector. Cyril of Alexandria also, and Juvenal of Jerusalem came, accompanied by about fifty of the Egyptian bishops; Memnon of Ephesus had brought together about forty of the bishops within his jurisdiction; and altogether more than two hundred bishops were present. Candidianus, the commander of the forces in Ephesus, attended, by order of the emperor, to keep peace and order; but by his conduct he greatly favored the party of Nestorius. The day appointed for the opening of the council was June 7th; but John of Antioch, and the other bishops from Syria and the East not having arrived, it was delayed till the 22d of the same month. At the first session of the council (June 22), before the Greek and Syrian bishops had arrived, Cyril and the bishops present condemned the doctrines of Nestorius, and deposed and excommunicated him. This sentence was signed by one hundred and ninety-eight bishops, according to Tillemont, and by more than two hundred according to Fleury; it was immediately made known to Nestorius, and published in the public places. At the same time, notice of it was sent to the clergy and people of Constantinople, with a recommendation to them to secure the property of the Church for the successor of the deposed Nestorius. As soon, however, as Nestorius had received notice of this sentence, he protested against it, and all that had passed at the council, and forwarded to the emperor an account of what had been done, setting forth that Cyril and Memnon, refusing to wait for John and the other bishops, had hurried matters on in a tumultuous and irregular way. On the 27th of June twenty-seven Syrian bishops arrived, chose John of Antioch for their president, and deposed Cyril in their turn. In August, count John, who had been sent by Theodosius, arrived at Ephesus, and directed the bishops of both synods to meet him on the following day. Accordingly, John of Antioch and Nestorius attended with their party, and Cyril with the orthodox; but immediately a dispute arose between them, the latter contending that Nestorius should not be present, while the former wished to exclude Cyril. Upon this, the count, to quiet the dispute, gave both Cyril and Nestorius into custody, and then endeavored, but in vain, to reconcile the two parties. And thus matters seemed as far from a settlement as ever. The emperor at last permitted the fathers of the council to

send to him eight deputies, while the Orientals or Syrians, on their part, sent as many. The place of meeting was Chalcedon, whither the emperor proceeded, and spent five days in listening to the arguments on both sides; and here the Council of Ephesus may, in fact, be said to have terminated. Nothing is known of what passed at Chalcedon, but the event shows that Theodosius sided with the Catholics, since upon his return to Constantinople he ordered, by a letter, the Catholic deputies to come there, and to proceed to consecrate a bishop in the place of Nestorius, whom he had already ordered to leave Ephesus, and to confine himself to his monastery near Antioch. Afterwards he directed that all the bishops at the council, including Cyril and Memnon, should return to their respective dioceses. The judgment of this council was at once approved by the whole Western Church, and by far the greater part of the East, and was subsequently confirmed by the (œcumenical Council of Chalcedon, consisting of six hundred and thirty bishops. Even John of Antioch and the Eastern bishops very soon acknowledged it. But Nestorius protested to the last that he did not hold the heretical opinions anathematized by the council. See NESTORIUS.

Of the other councils of Ephesus, the following are all that need be mentioned: 1, in 245 (?), against the Patropassian Noetus; 2, in 400, under Chrysostom, where Heraclidus was consecrated bishop of Ephesus, and six simoniacal bishops deposed; and the ROMAN COUNCIL (see next article).—Landon, *Manual of Councils*, p. 235; Mansi, *Conc.* iv, 1212, 1320, et al.; Gieseler, *Ch. History*, § 88; Neander, *Church Hist.* ii, 468 sq.; Murd. Mosheim, *Church Hist.* i, 358; Palmer, *On the Church*, i, 385 sq.; Cunningham, *Historical Theology*, i, 328 sq.; Hefele, *Concilien-geschichte*, ii, 161 sq.; Smith, *Tables of Church History; Christian Examiner*, liv, 49.

EPHESUS, ROBER COUNCIL OF (σίνωδος λυστροική, *lutrocinium Ephesinum*), the so-called second general council at Ephesus, A. D. 449. Eutyches (q. v.), whom Flavianus, bishop of Constantinople, had in the preceding year deposed on account of heretical opinions, appealed to a general council, at which the patriarchs of Rome, Alexandria, Jerusalem, Thessalonica, and other heads of the Church should be present, and prevailed upon the emperor to convoke the council immediately. Theodosius wrote to Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria, desiring him to attend at Ephesus on the 1st of August, with ten metropolitan and as many Egyptian bishops, and no more, in order to inquire into a question of faith in dispute between Flavianus and Eutyches, and to remove from the Church the favorers of Nestorius. In the same manner he wrote to other bishops, always fixing the same number of metropolitans and bishops, and especially forbidding Theodoret to leave his diocese. He sent his own officers, Elpidus and Eulogius, with authority to provide such troops as they might deem necessary, in order to carry into effect what might be required. The bishops who had sat in judgment upon Eutyches at the council held by Flavianus at Constantinople in 448 were present at the council, but were allowed to take no part in the debates, and Dioscorus was allowed to take the lead in everything relating to the council. The council met August 8, and about 130 bishops attended. Dioscorus and his party ruled throughout; Eutyches was declared orthodox, and re-established in his priesthood and office of abbot; and sentence of deposition was pronounced upon Flavianus. Flavianus appealed from this decision to the bishop of Rome, whose legate, Hilary, boldly opposed the sentence; at the same time many of the bishops on their knees implored Dioscorus to reconsider the matter; but he, determined to carry it through, cried out for the imperial officers, upon which the proconsul Proclus entered, followed by a band of soldiers, armed with swords and sticks, and carrying chains, who by threats and blows


compelled the bishops to sign the sentence of deposition. This, at last, ninety-six of them did, many, however, being first severely wounded; Flavianus himself was treated with such excessive violence that he died of the injuries he had received within three days: it is said that Dioscorus jumped upon him as he lay upon the ground, and that Barsumas and the monks kicked him with the utmost brutality. To the condemnation of Flavianus that of Eusebius of Dorylaeum was added, which ended the first session; after which the legate Hilary, dreading fresh scenes of violence, fled secretly to Rome. In the following sessions Theodoret of Tyre was deposed, also Domnus of Antioch and Ibas of Edessa; after which Dioscorus departed, and the bishops withdrew from Ephesus. Thus ended the *σύνodus Ἀφροασική*, as the Greeks justly named this disgraceful assembly, in which violence and injustice were carried on to the utmost excess.—Landon, *Manual of Councils*, p. 236; Mansi, *Concil.* vi, 588 et al.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 509 sq.; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* § 89; Hefele, *Concilien-geschichte*, ii, 350 sq.; Schaff, *Church Hist.* ii, 348; iii, 738; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, i, 278; Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, iv, 81; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 610; Lewald, *Die sogenannte Räubersynode*, in Ilgen's *Zeitschrift für d. histor. Theol.* 1838, p. 39. See DIOSCORUS.

**Eph'al** (Heb. *Eph'al*, עֵפְאֵל, *judicator*; Sept. Ὀφλάδ v. r. Ἀφαμίη, Vulg. *Ophalad*), son of Zabab and father of Obad, of the lineage of Sheshan, of Judah (1 Chron. ii, 37). B.C. post 1618.

**E'phod** (Heb. *Ephod*, עֵפֹד, an *ephod* [q. v.]; Sept. Ὀφείδ v. r. Σουφί, Vulg. *Ephod*), the father of Hanniel, which latter, as head of the tribe of Manasseh, was one of the men appointed to assist Joshua and Eleazar in the apportionment of the land of Canaan (Num. xxxiv, 23). B.C. ante 1618.

**Ephod** (עֵפֹד [rarely עֵפֹד], *ephod*, twice [Exod. xxviii, 8; xxxix, 5] in the fem. עֵפֹדָה, *ephuddah*, something *girt*; ἐπωμίς, *Eclus.* xlv, 8), a sacred vestment originally appropriate to the high-priest (Exod. xxviii, 4), but afterwards worn by ordinary priests (1 Sam. xxii, 18), and deemed characteristic of the office (1 Sam. ii, 28; xiv, 3; Hos. iii, 4). A kind of ephod was worn by Samuel (1 Sam. ii, 18), and by David when he brought the ark to Jerusalem (2 Sam. vi, 14; 1 Chron. xv, 27); it differed from the priestly ephod in material, being made of ordinary linen (רְבֵשֶׁת), whereas the other was of fine linen (שָׂרָב); it is noticeable that the Sept. does not give ἐπωμίς or Ἐφοῦδ in the passages last quoted, but terms of more general import, *στολή ἔξωλλος, στολή βρασίην*. Attached to the ephod of the high-priest was the breast-plate with the Urim and Thummim; this was the ephod by eminence, which Abiathar carried off (1 Sam. xxiii, 6) from the tabernacle at Nob (1 Sam. xxi, 9), and which David consulted (1 Sam. xxiii, 9; xxx, 7). The importance of the ephod as the receptacle of the breast-plate led to its adoption in the idolatrous forms of worship instituted in the time of the judges (Judg. viii, 27; xvii, 5; xviii, 14 sq.). The amount of gold used by Gideon in making his ephod (Judg. viii, 26) has led Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 135), after Vatke (*Bibl. Theol.* i, 267), following the Peshito version, to give the word the meaning of an idol-image, as though that, and not the priest, was clothed with the ephod: but there is no evidence that the idol was so invested, nor does such an idea harmonize with the general use of the ephod. Idols of wood were often thus overlaid with plates of gold or silver, and are probably alluded to in Judg. xvii, 5; xviii, 17-20; Hos. iii, 4; Isa. xxx, 22. The ephod itself, however, would require a considerable amount of gold (Exod. xxviii, 6 sq.; xxxix, 2 sq.), but certainly not so large a sum as is stated to have been used by Gideon; may we not therefore assume that to *make an ephod* implied the introduction of a new system of

worship with its various accessories, such as the gilded image, which seems, from the prominence assign-



The Sacerdotal Ephod, according to Braun (*De vest. sacerdot.* ii, 475).

A. Front view; B. the back, similar, but without the straps, clasps, or space for the pectoral: together they constituted the two folds or leaves (עֵפֹדָה) of which it was composed, united over the shoulders.

a, a. The two slender-pieces (פְּתִילֵי) .

b, b. The belt (חֲבִילֵי), or two bands for girding it on.


c, c. The two golden rings (טְּבִיטֵי) for fastening the bottom of the breastplate.

d, d. The two bezels or settings (מְשִׁבֵּי) (A. V. "ouches"), each with its memorial gem (שֹׁהַם, "onyx stone") engraved with six of the tribal names; serving also as clasps or buttons for fastening the shoulder-pieces together, and likewise as attachments for the gold chains on the upper corners of the breast-plate.

e. The vacant space, a span wide (τὸ διακείμενον περιτμήματα σπιθαμῆς), left for the insertion of the gemmed breast-plate, according to Josephus (*Ant.* iii, 7, 5).



ed to it in Judg. xviii, 31, to represent the Urim and Thummin, the molten image, and the Teraphim (xvii, 4, 5), and would require a large consumption of metal? The ephod was worn over the tunic and outer garment or pallium (Exod. xxviii, 31; xxix, 5), without sleeves, and divided below the armpits into two parts or halves, of which one was in front, covering the breast and belly, and the other behind, covering the back. These were joined above on the shoulders by clasps or buckles of gold and precious stones, and reached down to the middle of the thighs; they were also made fast by a belt around the body (Exod. xviii, 6-12). The ancient Egyptian priests appear to have been arrayed in white garments of the same materials. The *hierogrammat*, or sacred scribe, especially wore, over the kelt or apron (corresponding to the Jewish sacerdotal "breeches" or drawers) which constituted the universal nether undergarment, a loose upper robe with full sleeves, which in all cases was of the finest linen, and was secured by a girdle round the loins. Sometimes a priest who offered incense was clad in like manner. At other times the priests wore, in addition to the apron, a shirt with short tight sleeves, over which was thrown a loose robe, leaving the right arm exposed (Wilkinson, *Ancient Egypt*, i, 334). See HIGH-PRIEST.




Ancient Egyptian Tunic. One of the two obtained by Gen. Reyner, when in Egypt with the French expedition, from the Arabs at Sakkarah, who said they had found them in a hole filled with sand. This is three feet square, shaped exactly like a modern shirt, but having patches of embroidery sewed upon the arms, shoulders, down the neck, and on the corners. The material is probably linen. The seams are covered with edging, the sleeves are bound, and the hole for the neck has strings for drawing it closer (*Egyptian Antiq.*, ii, 119). Its resemblance to the Jewish ephod is very striking, especially if, as Josephus says (*ut sup.*), the latter had sleeves.



Ancient Egyptian sacred Coat.

Eph'phatha (ἑφφαθά, a Græcized form of the Syro-Chaldee imperative ܦܦܗܐ or ܦܦܗܝܢ, strictly ܦܦܗܝܢܐ, meaning *be opened*, as it is immediately interpreted), an exclamation uttered by Christ in curing the deaf-mute (Mark vii, 34).

**Ephraem Manuscript** (CODEX EPHRAEMI, usually designated as C. of the New Test.), a very important uncial palimpsest, which derives its name from having been (about the 12th century) rewritten over with a portion of the Greek works of Ephraem the Syrian (q. v.). It seems to have been brought from the East by Andrew John Lascar, at whose death (A. D. 1535) it passed into the hands of cardinal Nicolas Ridolfi, and thence, through Pietro Strozzi, into the possession of Catharine de Medici, who deposited it in the Royal Library at Paris, where it still remains (numbered MS. 9). The old Greek writing, which is barely legible (having been partly effaced to make room for the later matter) contains portions of the Sept. version of the O. T. on 64 leaves, and fragments (enumerated in Scrivener's *Introduct.* p. 94 note) of every part of the N. T. on 145 leaves. It is elegantly written, very much resembling in form and arrangement of the books and general appearance the Codex Alexandrinus, and has but one column on a page, consisting of 40 to 46 lines. The characters vary in size, are somewhat elaborate, and have the characteristics of the Alexandrian recension, and of the 5th century. The Ammonian sections stand in the margin, but not the Eusebian canons; the latter, perhaps, having been washed out, as they were usually in red ink. There are no chapter divisions, and but few punctuation marks. Traces of at least three later correctors may be discovered; the first, perhaps of the 6th century, inserted many accents, and the *rough breathing*; by him or the third hand (whose changes are but few), small crosses were interpolated as stops; the second reviser, not earlier than the 9th century, appears to have clumsily added the ecclesiastical notes in the margin. A chemical preparation, applied to the MS. at the instance of Fleck in 1834, though it revived much that was before illegible, has defaced the vellum with stains of various color. The older writing was first noticed by Peter Allix nearly two centuries ago; various readings extracted from it were communicated by Boivin to Kuster, who published them in his edition of Mill's N. T., 1711. A complete collation of the N. T. portion was first made by Wetstein in 1716, for



Specimen of the *Codex Ephraemi*, containing 1 Tim. iii, 15, 16 (with the *anthesis*) | Καὶ οὐλοῦσθε ἄλλα ἅπαντα τὰ ἐπιτελεσθέντα ἐν ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἐδικαίωθ' ἐν πίστι; | the later passage from Ephraem Syrus written over it is τοῦ τῆν Ἀνοβίη τῶν ἐξ ἁμαρτημάτων ἑστῶτα ὅλα ὄντα μετὰ | τῆν γυναικῶν ἡμαρτοῦ.

Bentley's projected edition, and used by Wetstein in his own Greek Test. of 1751-2. In 1843 Tischendorf published the N.-T. part fully, and the O. T. in 1845, in a splendid and accurate form, page for page and line for line, in capital but not fac-simile letters, with valuable prolegomena, etc.—Tregelles, in *Horne's Introd.* iv, 166 sq.; *Christian Remembrancer*, Oct. 1862; Tischendorf, *Nor. Test. Gr.* 7th edit. p. cxlix sq. See MANUSCRIPTS, BIBLICAL.

**E'phraim** (Heb. *Ephra' yim*, עֲפְרַיִם, a dual form; Gesenius suggests = *twinn-land*; Fürst derives from a sing. עֲפְרַיִם = עֲפְרַיִם, *fruitful*; Sept. Ἐφραϊμ), the name of a man (including the tribe and tract named from him, with other kindred objects), and of one or two other places. Our account of them is in a large measure compiled from the articles in Kitto and Smith.

1. (Josephus Græcizes Ἐφραϊμης, *Ant.* ii, 7, 4.) The second son of Joseph by Asenath, the daughter of Potipherah (Gen. xlvii, 20), born during the seven years of plenteousness (B.C. cir. 1878), and an allusion to this is possibly latent in the name, though it may also allude to Joseph's increasing family: "The name of the second he called Ephraim (i. e. double fruitfulness), for God hath caused me to be fruitful (עֲפְרַיִם, *hiphrami*) in the land of my affliction" (Gen. xli, 52). Josephus (*Ant.* ii, 6, 1) gives the derivation of the name somewhat differently—"Restorer, because he was restored to the freedom of his forefathers" (ἀπο-ἰκούσας . . . ἐν τῷ ἀποδοθῆναι). The first incident in his history, as well as that of his elder brother Manasseh, is the blessing of the grandchildren by Jacob, Gen. xlviii—a passage on the age and genuineness of which the severest criticism has cast no doubt (Tuch, *Genesis*, p. 548; Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* i, 534, note). Like his own father, on an occasion not dissimilar, Jacob's eyes were dim so that he could not see (xlviii, 10; comp. xxvii, 1). The intention of Joseph was evidently that the right hand of Jacob should convey its ampler blessing to the head of Manasseh, his first-born, and he had so arranged the young men. But the result was otherwise ordained. Jacob had been himself a younger brother, and his words show plainly that he had not forgotten this, and that his sympathies were still with the younger of his two grandchildren. He recalls the time when he was flying with the birthright from the vengeance of Esau; the day when, still a wanderer, God Almighty had appeared to him at "Luz in the land of Canaan," and blessed him in words which foreshadowed the name of Ephraim ("I will make thee fruitful," עֲפְרַיִם, *ma-phreka*, Gen. xlviii, 4; "Be thou fruitful," עֲפְרַיִם, *pe-reh*, xxxv, 11; both from the same root as the name *Ephraim*); the still later day when the name of Ephrath (comp. Ewald, *Gesch.* i, 493, n.) became bound up with the sorest trial of his life (xlviii, 7; xxxv, 16). See EPHRAIMITE. Thus, notwithstanding the prearrangement and the remonstrance of Joseph, for the second time in that family, the younger brother was made greater than the elder—Ephraim was set before Manasseh (xlviii, 19, 20). Ephraim would appear at that time to have been about twenty-one years old (comp. Gen. xlvii, 28). Before Joseph's death Ephraim's family had reached the third generation (Gen. i, 23), and it may have been about this time that the affray mentioned in 1 Chron. vii, 21, occurred, when some of the sons were killed on a plundering expedition along the sea-coast to rob the cattle of the men of Gath, and when Ephraim named a son Beriah, to perpetuate the memory of the disaster which had fallen on his house. See BERIAH. Obscure as is the interpretation of this fragment, it enables us to catch our last glimpse of the patriarch, mourning inconsolable in the midst of the circle of his brethren, and at last commemorating his loss in the name of the new child, who, unknown to him, was to be the progenitor

of the most illustrious of all his descendants—Joshua, or Joshua, the son of Nun (1 Chron. vii, 27; see Ewald, i, 491). To this early period, too, has been referred the circumstance alluded to in Psa. lxxxviii, 9, when the "children of Ephraim, armed bowmen (עֲפְרַיִם יְהוּדָה, A. V. "being armed [and] carrying bows," which Gesenius and others support, from the Sept. and Vulg.; although Ewald strikingly renders "carrying slack bows"), turned back in the day of battle." Others, however, assign this defection to the failure of the tribe (in common with the rest of the Israelites) to expel the Canaanites (Judg. i, 29).

1. **TRIBE OF EPHRAIM.** This tribe, although, in accordance with the ancient laws of primogeniture, inferior, as being the junior, yet received precedence over that descended from the elder Manasseh by virtue of the blessing of Jacob (Gen. xli, 52; xlviii, 1). That blessing was an adoptive act, whereby Ephraim and his brother Manasseh were counted as sons of Jacob, in the place of their father; the object being to give to Joseph, through his sons, a double portion in the brilliant prospects of his house. Thus the descendants of Joseph formed *two* of the tribes of Israel, whereas every other of Jacob's sons counted but as one. There were thus, in fact, thirteen tribes of Israel; but the number twelve is usually preserved, either by excluding that of Levi (which had no territory) when Ephraim and Manasseh are separately named, or by counting these two together as the tribe of Joseph when Levi is included in the account. The intentions of Jacob were fulfilled, and Ephraim and Manasseh were counted as tribes of Israel at the departure from Egypt, and, as such, shared in the territorial distribution of the Promised Land (Num. i, 33; Josh. xvii, 14; 1 Chron. vii, 20). The precise position of the immediate descendants of Joseph in Egypt might form an interesting subject for speculation. Being the sons of one in eminent place, and through their mother connected with high families in Egypt, their condition could not at once have been identified with that of the sojourners in Goshen; and perhaps they were not fully amalgamated with the rest of their countrymen until that king arose who knew not Joseph.

The numbers of the tribe did not at all times correspond with the promise of the blessing of Jacob. At the census in the wilderness of Sinai (Num. i, 32, 33; ii, 19) its numbers were 40,500, placing it at the head of the children of Rachel—Manasseh's number being 32,200, and Benjamin's 35,400. But forty years later, on the eve of the conquest (Num. xxvi, 37), without any apparent cause, while Manasseh had advanced to 52,700, and Benjamin to 45,600, Ephraim had decreased to 32,500, the only smaller number being that of Simeon, 22,200. At this period the families of both the brother tribes are enumerated, and Manasseh has precedence over Ephraim in order of mention. It is very possible that these great fluctuations in number may, in part at least, have been owing to the various standards under which the "mixed multitude" (מִצְרַיִם), i. e. mongrel population of semi-Hebrew Egyptians that followed the emigrating host (Exod. xii, 38), ranged itself in its fickleness at different times (*Meth. Quart. Rev.* April, 1863, p. 305 sq.). During the march through the wilderness the position of the sons of Joseph and Benjamin was on the west side of the tabernacle (Num. ii, 18-24), and the prince of Ephraim was Elishama, the son of Ammihud (Num. i, 10).

It is at the time of the sending of the spies that we are first introduced to the great hero to whom the tribe owed much of its subsequent greatness. The representative of Ephraim on this occasion was "Oshea, the son of Nun," whose name was at the termination of the affair changed by Moses to the more distinguished form in which it is familiar to us. As among the founders of the nation Abram had acquired the name of Abraham, and Jacob of Israel, so Oshea, "help,"



Map of the Tribe of Ephraim.

became Jehoshua or Joshua, "the help of Jehovah" (Ewald, ii, 306).

According to the arrangement of the records of the book of Joshua—the "Domesday book of Palestine"—the two great tribes of Judah and Joseph (Ephraim and Manasseh) first took their inheritance; and after them the seven other tribes entered on theirs (Josh. xv, xvi, xvii, xviii, 5). The boundaries of the portion of Ephraim are given in xvi, 1-10, and a part of it apparently in duplicate in ver. 5, 7. The south boundary was coincident for part of its length with the north boundary of Benjamin (q. v.), which latter, however, is somewhat more exactly stated in Josh. xviii, 12 sq. See TRIBE. Commencing at the Jordan, at the reach opposite Jericho (strictly *Jordan of Jericho*, בְּרֵיחַ יְרִיחוֹ, an expression that would lead us to locate the boundary at the point nearest that city, did not the necessity of including within Benjamin certain other pretty well identified places compel us to carry it somewhat farther up the river), it ran to the "water of Jericho," probably the vicinity of the Ras el-Ain; thence by one of the ravines, perhaps the wady Samieh, it ascended through the wilderness—*Miabar*, the uncultivated waste hills—to Mount Bethel and Luz; and thence by Ataroth, "the Japhletite," Bethoron the lower, and Gezer—places two of which are known—along the northern boundary of Dan (q. v.) to the Mediterranean, probably about Joppa. This agrees with the enumeration in 1 Chron. vii, in which Bethel is given as the eastern, and Gezer—somewhere east of the present Ramleh—as the western limit. In Josh. xvi, 6, 8, we apparently have fragments of the northern boundary (compare xvii, 10), and as at least three of the points along that line (Asher, Tappuah, and Janohah) are pretty well identified (see each name), we are tolerably safe in fixing the eastern extremity on the Jordan at about the mouth of wady Fasail, and the western, or the torrent Kanah, at the modern Nahr Falaik, north of Apollonia. But it is

possible that there never was a very definite subdivision of the territory assigned to the two brother tribes. Such an inference, at least, may be drawn from Josh. xvii, 14-18, in which the two are represented as complaining that only one portion had been allotted to them. Among the towns named as Manasseh's were Bethshean in the Jordan valley, Endor on the slopes of the "Little Hermon," Taanach on the north side of Carmel, and Dor on the sea-coast south of the same mountain. Ephraim thus occupied the very centre of Palestine, embracing an area about 40 miles in length from E. to W., and from 6 to 25 in breadth from N. to S. It extended from the Mediterranean on the W. to the Jordan on the E.: on the N. it had the half-tribe of Manasseh, and on the S. Benjamin and Dan (Josh. xvi, 5 sq.; xvii, 7 sq.). This fine country included most of what was afterwards called Samaria, as distinguished from Judaea on the one hand, and from Galilee on the other. See SAMARIA.

The following is a list of all the Biblical localities within this tribe, with the probable sites; those not identified by any modern traveller are inclosed in brackets:

Antipatris.	Town.	<i>Kefr-Saba</i> .
Archi.	do.	[ <i>Kefr-Muss</i> ]?
Arumah.	do.	<i>El-Ormah</i> .
Ataroth (-addar).	do.	<i>Atara</i> .
Baal-hamon.	Vineyard.	[S. E. of Jenin]?
Baal-shalisha.	Town.	See SHALISHA.
Bah-horon.	do.	<i>Beit-T'</i> .
Bechim.	Altar Stone.	[ <i>Kharbet-Joradeh</i> ]?
Elal.	Mount.	[ <i>Jebel Sitti-S'hamiyeh</i> ]
Gaash.	do.	[Sepulchral Hill S. of Tihel]?
Gezer.	Town.	See GEZER.
Gerizim.	Mount.	<i>Jebel At-Tur</i> .
Gezer.	Town.	<i>Abi Shushch</i> .
Gibeah.	do.	<i>Kharbet-Jibia</i> ?
Gilgal (2 Kings ii, 2).	do.	<i>Jifilia</i> .
Gilgal (Josh. xii, 23).	do.	<i>Jifulyeh</i> .
Goh.	do.	See GEZER.
Jacob's Well.	Well.	<i>Bir-Yakub</i> .
Janohah.	Town.	<i>Yanou</i> .

Japhleti.	Village.	[ <i>Beit Unia</i> ]?
Jeshamah.	Town.	[ <i>Ain-Simā</i> ]?
Kanah.	Brook.	<i>Nahr Fulaik</i> ?
Lasharon.	Plain.	See SHARON.
Lebanah.	Plain.	<i>Lubban</i> .
Luz.	do.	[N. of Beitin]?
Micmethah.	do.	[On Wady Bidar]?
Moreh.	Hill.	[S. spur of Jebel Duhy]?
Pirathon.	Town.	<i>Perata</i> .
Salim.	do.	<i>Sheikh Salim</i> .
Samaria.	do.	<i>Sebustiyeh</i> .
Saron.	Region.	See SHARON.
Shalem.	Town.	<i>Salim</i> .
Shalisha.	Region.	[ <i>Kharbet Hatta</i> ].
Sharon.	do.	N. part maritime plain.
Shechem.	Town.	<i>Nablus</i> .
Shiloh.	do.	<i>Seilan</i> .
Sychem or Sychar.	do.	See SHECHEM.
Tappuah.	do.	' <i>Atāf</i> ?
Thebez.	do.	<i>Tubas</i> .
Tinnath (-heres or) -serah.)	do.	<i>Tibneh</i> .
Tipsah.	do.	[ <i>Asira</i> ]?
Tirzah.	do.	<i>Telusā</i> .
Uzzan-serah.	do.	[ <i>Suffa</i> ]?
Zalmon.	Mount.	[ <i>Jebel Sleiman</i> ].

Central Palestine consists of an elevated district which rises from the flat ranges of the wilderness on the south of Judah, and terminates on the north with the slopes which descend into the great plain of Esdraelon. On the west a flat strip separates it from the sea, and on the east another flat strip forms the valley of the Jordan. Of this district the northern half was occupied by the great tribe we are now considering. This was the *Har-Ephraim*, or "Mount Ephraim," a district which seems to extend as far south as Ramah and Bethel (1 Sam. i, 1; vii, 17; 2 Chron. xiii, 4, 19, compared with xv, 8), places but a few miles north of Jerusalem, and within the limits of Benjamin. (See below.) In structure it is limestone—rounded hills separated by valleys of denudation, but much less regular and monotonous than the part more to the south, about and below Jerusalem: with "wide plains in the heart of the mountains, streams of running water, and continuous tracts of vegetation" (Stanley, *Pal. st.*, p. 225). All travellers bear testimony to the "general growing richness" and beauty of the country in going northwards from Jerusalem, the "innumerable fountains" and streamlets, the villages more thickly scattered than anywhere in the south, the continuous corn-fields and orchards, the moist, vapory atmosphere (Martineau, p. 516, 521; Van de Velde, i, 386-8). These are the "precious things of the earth, and the fulness thereof," which are invoked on the "ten thousands of Ephraim" and the "thousands of Manasseh" in the blessing of Moses. These it is which, while Dan, Judah, and Benjamin are personified as lions and wolves, making their lair and tearing their prey among the barren rocks of the south, suggested to the lawgiver, as they had done to the patriarch before him, the patient "bullock" and the "bough by the spring, whose branches ran over the wall" as fitter images for Ephraim (Gen. xlix, 22; Deut. xxxiii, 17). And centuries after, when its great disaster had fallen on the kingdom of Israel, the same images recur to the prophets. The "flowers" are still there in the "olive valleys," "faded" though they be (Isa. xxxviii, 1). The vine is an empty, unprofitable vine, whose very abundance is evil (Hos. x, 1); Ephraim is still the "bullock," now "unaccustomed to the yoke," but waiting a restoration to the "pleasant places" of his former "pasture" (Jer. xxxi, 18; Hos. ix, 13; iv, 16)—"the heifer that is taught and loveth to tread out the corn," the heifer with the "beautiful neck" (Hos. x, 11), or the "kine of Bashan on the mountain of Samaria" (Amos iv, 1).

The wealth of their possession had not the same immediately enervating effect on this tribe that it had on some of its northern brethren, e. g. Asher (j. v.). Various causes may have helped to avert this evil. 1. The central situation of Ephraim in the highway of all communications from one part of the country to

another. From north to south, from Jordan to the Sea—from Galilee, or still more distant Damascus, to Philistia and Egypt—these roads all lay more or less through Ephraim, and the constant traffic along them must have always tended to keep the district from sinking into stagnation. 2. The position of Shechem, the original settlement of Jacob, with his well and his "parcel of ground," with the two sacred mountains of Ebal and Gerizim, the scene of the impressive and significant ceremonial of blessing and cursing; and the tomb and patrimony of Joshua, the great hero not only of Ephraim, but of the nation—the fact that all these localities were deep in the heart of the tribe, must have made it always the resort of large numbers from all parts of the country—of larger numbers than any other place, until the establishment of Jerusalem by David. Moreover, the tabernacle and the ark were deposited within its limits, at Shiloh; and the possession of the sacerdotal establishment, which was a central object of attraction to all the other tribes, must, in no small degree, have enhanced its importance, and increased its wealth and population. It is, perhaps, to this fact that David alludes in Psa. cxxxii, 6, if by "*Ephratuh*" this tribe is there meant. 3. But there was a spirit about the tribe itself which may have been both a cause and a consequence of these advantages of position. That spirit, early domineering and haughty (Josh. xvii, 14), though sometimes taking the form of noble remonstrance and reparation (2 Chron. xxviii, 9-15), usually manifested itself in jealous complaint at some enterprise undertaken on advantage gained in which they had not a chief share. To Gideon (Judg. viii, 1), to Jephthah (xii, 1), and to David (2 Sam. xix, 41-43), the cry is still the same in effect—almost the same in words—"Why did we despise us that our advice should not have been first had?" "Why hast thou served us thus that thou caldest us not?" The unsettled state of the country in general, and of the interior of Ephraim in particular (Judg. ix), and the continual incursions of foreigners, prevented the power of the tribe from manifesting itself in a more formidable manner than by these murmurs during the time of the Judges and the first stage of the monarchy. Samuel, though a Levite, was a native of Ramah in Mount Ephraim, and Saul belonged to a tribe closely allied to the family of Joseph, so that during the priesthood of the former and the reign of the latter the supremacy of Ephraim may be said to have been practically maintained. Certainly in neither case had any advantage been gained by their great rival in the south. But when the great tribe of Judah produced a king in the person of David, the pride and jealousy of Ephraim were thoroughly awakened, and it was doubtless chiefly through their means that Abner was enabled for a time to uphold the house of Saul; for there are manifest indications that by this time Ephraim influenced the views and feelings of all the other tribes. They were at length driven by the force of circumstances to acknowledge David upon conditions; and were probably not without hope that, as the king of the nation at large, he would establish his capital in their central portion of the land. Again, the brilliant successes of David, and his wide influence and religious zeal, kept matters smooth for another period, even in the face of the blow given to both Shechem and Shiloh by the concentration of the civil and ecclesiastical capitals at Jerusalem. Twenty thousand and eight hundred of the choice warriors of the tribe, "men of name throughout the house of their father," went as far as Hebron to make David king over Israel (1 Chron. xii, 30). Among the officers of his court we find more than one Ephraimite (1 Chron. xxvii, 10, 14), and the attachment of the tribe to his person seems to have been great (2 Sam. xix, 41-43). But as he not only established his court at Jerusalem, but proceeded to remove the ark thither, making his native Judah the seat both of the theocratic and civil government, the

Ephraimites, as a tribe, became thoroughly alienated, and longed to establish their own ascendancy. The building of the temple at Jerusalem, and other measures of Solomon, strengthened this desire; and although the minute organization and vigor of his government prevented any overt acts of rebellion, yet the train was then laid, and the reign of Solomon, splendid in appearance but oppressive to the people, developed both the circumstances of revolt and the leader who was to turn them to account. Solomon saw through the crisis, and if he could have succeeded in killing Jeroboam, as he tried to do (1 Kings xi, 40), the disruption might have been postponed for another century. As it was, the outbreak was deferred for a time, but the irritation was not allayed, and the insane folly of his son brought the mischief to a head. Rehoboam probably selected Shechem—the old capital of the country—for his coronation, in the hope that his presence and the ceremonial might make a favorable impression, but in this he failed utterly, and the tumult which followed shows how complete was the breach—"To your tents, O Israel! now see to thine own house, David!" Rehoboam was certainly not the last king of Judah whose chariot went as far north as Shechem, but he was the last who visited it as a part of his own dominion, and he was the last who, having come so far, returned unmolested to his own capital. Jehoshaphat escaped, in a manner little short of miraculous, from the risks of the battle of Ramoth-Gilead, and it was the fate of two of his successors, Ahaziah and Josiah—differing in everything else, and agreeing only in this—that they were both carried dead in their chariots from the plain of Esdraelon to Jerusalem.

Thenceforth the rivalry of Ephraim and Judah was merged in that between the two kingdoms; although still the predominance of Ephraim in the kingdom of Israel was so conspicuous as to occasion the whole realm to be called by its name, especially when that rivalry is mentioned. This title is particularly employed in the prophetic books (Isa. ix, 8; xvii, 3; xxviii, 3; Hos. iv, 17; v, 3; ix, 3). When the land of Ephraim is meant, the word is fem. in the original (Hos. v, 9); when the people, masc. (Isa. vii, 8). Thus in two senses the history of Ephraim is the history of the kingdom of Israel, since not only did the tribe become a kingdom, but the kingdom embraced little besides the tribe. This is not surprising, and quite susceptible of explanation. North of Ephraim the country appears never to have been really taken possession of by the Israelites. Whether from want of energy on their part, or great stubbornness of resistance on that of the Canaanites, certain it is that of the list of towns from which the original inhabitants were not expelled, the great majority belong to the northern tribes, Manasseh, Asher, Issachar, and Naphtali. In addition to this original defect there is much in the physical formation and circumstances of the upper portion of Palestine to explain why those tribes never took any active part in the kingdom. They were exposed to the inroads and seductions of their surrounding heathen neighbors—on one side the luxurious Phœnicians, on the other the plundering Bedouins of Midian; they were open to the attacks of Syria and Assyria from the north, and Egypt from the south; the great plain of Esdraelon, which communicated more or less with all the northern tribes, was the natural outlet of the no less natural high roads of the maritime plain from Egypt, and the Jordan valley for the tribes of the East, and formed an admirable base of operations for an invading army. But, on the other hand, the position of Ephraim was altogether different. It was one at once of great richness and security. Her fertile plains and well-watered valleys could only be reached by a laborious ascent through steep and narrow ravines, all but impassable for an army. There is no record of any attack on the central kingdom, either from the Jordan valley or the maritime plain.

On the north side, from the plain of Esdraelon, it was more accessible, and it was from this side that the final invasion appears to have been made. But even on that side the entrance was so difficult and so easily defensible—as we learn from the description in the book of Judith (iv, 6, 7)—that, had the kingdom of Samaria been less weakened by internal dissensions, the attacks even of the great Shalmaneser might have been resisted, as at a later date were those of Holofernes. There are few things more mournful in the sacred story than the descent of this haughty and jealous tribe, from the culminating point at which it stood when it entered on the fairest portion of the Land of Promise—the chief sanctuary and the chief settlement of the nation within its limits, its leader the leader of the whole people—through the distrust which marked its intercourse with its fellows, while it was a member of the confederacy, and the tumult, dissension, and ungodliness which characterized its independent existence, down to the sudden captivity and total oblivion which closed its career. Judah had her times of revival and of recurring prosperity, but here the course is uniformly downward—a sad picture of opportunities wasted and personal gifts abused. "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt. . . . I taught Ephraim also to go, taking them by their arms, but they knew not that I healed them. I drew them with cords of a man, with bands of love . . . but the Assyrian shall be their king, because they refused to return. . . . How shall I give thee up, Ephraim? how shall I deliver thee, Israel? how shall I make thee as Admah? how shall I set thee as Zeboim?" (Hos. xi, 1-8). See ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

2. MOUNT EPHRAIM, a mountain or group of mountains in Central Palestine, in the tribe of the same name, on or towards the borders of Benjamin (Josh. xvii, 15; xix, 50; xx, 7; Judg. vii, 24; xvii, 1; 1 Sam. ix, 4; 1 Kings iv, 8). From a comparison of these passages it may be collected that the name of "Mount Ephraim" was applied to the whole of the ranges and groups of hills which occupy the central part of the southernmost border of this tribe, and which are prolonged southward into the tribe of Benjamin. (See above.) In the time of Joshua these hills were densely covered with trees (Josh. xvii, 18), which is by no means the case at present. In Jer. 1, 19, Mount Ephraim is mentioned in apposition with Bashan, on the other side of the Jordan, as a region of rich pastures, suggesting that the valleys among these mountains were well watered and covered with rich herbage, which is true at the present day. Joshua was buried in the border of his own inheritance in Timnath-heres, "in the mount of Ephraim, on the north side of the hill Gaash" (Judges ii, 9).

EPHRAIM, GATE OF (עַרְוֹת עֵינָן; Sept. πόλις Ἐφραΐμ), one of the gates of the city of Jerusalem (2 Kings xiv, 13; 2 Chron. xxv, 23; Neh. viii, 16; xii, 39), doubtless, according to the Oriental practice, on the side looking towards the locality from which it derived its name, and therefore on the north, probably at or near the position of the present "Damascus gate." See JERUSALEM.

EPHRAIM, WOOD OF (עֵץ עֵינָן; Sept. δρυμός Ἐφραΐμ), a forest (the word *gaur* implying dense growth), in which the fatal battle was fought between the armies of David and of Absalom (2 Sam. xviii, 6), and the entanglement in which added greatly to the slaughter of the latter (ver. 8). It would be very tempting to believe that the forest derived its name from the place near which Absalom's sheep-farm was situated (2 Sam. xiii, 23), and which would have been a natural spot for his head-quarters before the battle, especially associated as it was with the murder of Amnon. Moreover, there appears to have been another woodland of Ephraim in the mountains belonging to that tribe in this neighborhood (Josh. xvii, 15-18).

But the statements of xvii, 24, 26, and also the expression of xviii, 3, "That thou succor us out of the city," i. e. Mahanaim, allow no escape from the conclusion that the locality was on the east side of Jordan, though it is impossible to account satisfactorily for the presence of the name of Ephraim on that side of the river. The suggestion is due to Grotius that the name was derived from the slaughter of Ephraim at the fords of Jordan by the Gileadites under Jephthah (Judg. xii, 1, 4, 5): but that occurrence took place at the very brink of the river itself, while the city of Mahanaim and the wooded country must have lain several miles away from the stream, and on the higher ground above the Jordan valley. Is it not at least equally probable that the forest derived its name from this very battle? The great tribe of Ephraim, though not specially mentioned in the transactions of Absalom's revolt, cannot fail to have taken the most conspicuous part in the affair, and the reverse was a more serious one than had overtaken the tribe for a very long time, and possibly combined with other circumstances to retard materially their rising into an independent kingdom. But others suppose that it was because the Ephraimites were in the habit of bringing their flocks into this quarter for pasture; for the Jews allege that the Ephraimites received from Joshua, who was of their tribe, permission to feed their flocks in the woodlands within the territories of any of the tribes of Israel; and that, as this forest lay near their territories on the other side the Jordan, they were wont to drive their flocks over to feed there (see Jarchi, Kimchi, Abarbanel, etc., on 2 Sam. xviii, 6). It is probably referred to under the name EPHRATAH (q. v.) in Psa. cxxxii, 6, where the other member of the verse has "fields of the wood." Others, however, not unreasonably suppose this to be a different locality. See FOREST.

2. In "Baal-hazor, which is 'by' Ephraim," was Absalom's sheep-farm, at which took place the murder of Amnon, one of the earliest precursors of the great revolt (2 Sam. xiii, 23). The Hebrew particle  $\text{בְּ}$ , rendered above "by" (A. V. "beside"), always seems to imply actual proximity, and therefore we should conclude that Ephraim was not the tribe of that name, but a town. The cities of Dan and Asher are other instances of localities beyond the tribes, yet bearing their names; and the former suggests that the appellation may in all these cases have arisen by colonization. Ewald conjectures that the place here in question is identical with EPHRAIM, EPHRON, and OPHRAH of the O. T., and also with the EPHRAIM which was for a time the residence of our Lord (*Gesch.* iii, 219, note). But with regard to the first three names there is the difficulty that they are spelt with the guttural letter *ayin*, and this is very rarely exchanged for the *aleph*, which commences the name before us. The Sept. makes the following addition to verse 34: "And the watchman went and told the king, and said, I have seen men on the road of the Oronen ( $\text{תַּרְצֵי הָאוֹרֹנִין}$ , Alex.  $\text{τῶν ὄρειωνῶν}$ ) by the side of the mountain." Ewald considers this to be a genuine addition, and to refer to Beth-horon, N.W. of Jerusalem, off the Nablús road, but the indication is surely too slight for such an inference. Any force it may have is against the identity of this Ephraim with that in John xi, 54, which was probably in the direction N.E. of Jerusalem. Nevertheless, the best solution of the question appears to be to identify this place with the one following. See BAAL-HAZOR.

3. A city ( $\text{Ἐφραὶμ λεγομένην πόλιν}$ ) "in the desert near the wilderness," to which our Lord retired with his disciples when threatened with violence by the priests in consequence of having raised Lazarus from the dead (John xi, 54). By the "wilderness" ( $\text{ἔρημος}$ ) is probably meant the wide unencultivated hill-country N.E. of Jerusalem, lying between the central towns and the Jordan valley (see Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*

p. 97, 953). In this case the conjecture of Dr. Robinson is very admissible, that OPHRAH (q. v.) of Benjamin (*Josh.* xviii, 23) and Ephraim are identical, and that their modern representation is *et-Ta'yibeh*, a village on a conspicuous conical hill, commanding a view "over the whole eastern slope, the valley of the Jordan and the Dead Sea" (*Researches*, ii, 121). It is placed by Eusebius (*Onomast.* s. v.  $\text{Ἐφρών}$ ) eight Roman miles north of Jerusalem, while Jerome, with more probability, makes the distance 20 Roman miles. This indication would seem to make it the same with the EPHRAIM or EPHRON which is mentioned in 2 Chron. xiii, 19, along with Bethel and Jeshanah, as towns taken from Jeroboam by Abijah. This, again, is doubtless the same which Josephus also names (*Ἐφραῖμα*) along with Bethel as "two small cities" ( $\text{πολιτεῖαι}$ ), which were taken and garrisoned by Vespasian while reducing the country around Jerusalem (*War*, iv, 9, 9). It is likewise probably identical with the EPHRAIM (see above) near Baal-Hazor (2 Sam. xiii, 23). See also APHEREMA.

E'phraimite, as a designation of a descendant of the patriarch Ephraim, is properly denoted in the Heb. by the patronymic  $\text{בְּנֵי עִפְרָיִם}$ , *son of Ephraim* (Num. x, 22, plur. A. V. "children of Ephraim"), or simply *Ephraim* (often rendered "Ephraimites" in the A. V.); but in *Judg.* xii, 5 it appears as a rendering of  $\text{אֶפְרַתִּיתִּים}$ , an *Ephrathite* (q. v.), meaning thereby, however, an Ephraimite, which is apparently likewise the meaning of the same Heb. word in 1 Sam. i, 1; 1 Kings xi, 26, in both which passages, however, the A. V. regularly Anglicizes "Ephrathite." The narrative in Judges raises the inquiry whether the Ephraimites had not a peculiar accent or *patois*, similar to that which in later times caused "the speech" of the Galileans to "betray" them to the inhabitants of Jerusalem (*Matt.* xxvi, 73).

E'phraim (Heb. in the margin  $\text{Ἐφραΐμ}$ ,  $\text{אֶפְרַיִם}$ , but in the text  $\text{Ἐφרון}$ ,  $\text{אֶפְרֹן}$ , i. e.  $\text{אֶפְרָתִּיתִּים}$ , which latter appears to be the genuine reading [see EPHRON]; Sept.  $\text{Ἐφρών}$ , Vulg. *Ephron*), a city of Israel, which, with its dependent hamlets ( $\text{בָּתוֹתֶיהָ}$  = "daughters," A. V. "towns"), Abijah and the army of Judah captured from Jeroboam with Bethel and Jeshanah (2 Chron. xiii, 19). It appears to be mentioned in the Talmud (*Menach.* ix, 1) as *Ephraim* ( $\text{אֶפְרַיִם}$ ). It has been conjectured that this Ephraim or Ephron is identical with the EPHRAIM by which Absalom's sheep-farm of Baal-hazor was situated (2 Sam. xiii, 23); also with the city called EPHRAIM, near the wilderness in which our Lord lived for some time (John xi, 54); and with OPHRAH ( $\text{אֶפְרָתָה}$ ), a city of Benjamin, apparently not far from Bethel (*Josh.* xviii, 23; comp. Josephus, *War*, iv, 9, 9), and which has been located by Dr. Robinson (*Researches*, new ed. i, 447), with much probability, at the modern village of *et-Ta'yibeh*. (See Ewald, *Geschichte*, iii, 219, 466; v, 365; Stanley, *Palestine*, p. 210.) See EPHRAIM 3.

Eph'ratah [some *Ephra'tah*] (Heb.  $\text{Ἐφραΐת}$ ,  $\text{אֶפְרַתָּה}$ , Gen. xxxv, 16, 19; xlviii, 7 twice; Psa. cxxxii, 6; Mic. v, 1; 1 Chron. ii, 50; iv, 4; Sept.  $\text{Ἐφραθά}$  or  $\text{Ἐφραθά}$ , Vulg. *Ephrata*, A. V. "Ephrathah" in all but Gen. and the last-named passage of Chron., where it gives "Ephrath"), a prolonged [or sometimes "directive"] form of *Eph'rath* (Hebrew  $\text{Ἐφραθ}$ ,  $\text{אֶפְרָת}$ , probably *fruitful*, 1 Chron. ii, 19; Sept.  $\text{Φραθ}$ , Vulg. *Ephrato*), the name of a woman and of one or two places.

1. The second wife of Caleb, the son of Hezron, mother of Hur, and grandmother of Caleb the spy, according to 1 Chron. ii, 19, 50, and probably 24 [see CALEB-EPHRATAH], and iv, 4, in which last passage Hur is apparently called "the father (i. e. founder) of Beth-lehem" (see below). B. C. post 1856.

2. The ancient name of Bethlehem in Judah, as is manifest from Gen. xxxv, 16, 10; xlviii, 7, both which passages distinctly prove that it was called Ephrath or Ephrath in Jacob's time, and use the regular formula for adding the modern name,  $\text{בֵּית לֶחֶם עֵפְרַת}$ , which is *Bethleh-em* (comp. e. g. Gen. xxiii, 2; xxxv, 27; Josh. xv, 10). It cannot, therefore, have derived its name from Ephrath, the mother of Hur, as the author of *Querst. Hebr. in Paraleip.* says, and as one might otherwise have supposed from the connection of her descendants, Salma and Hur, with Bethlehem, which is somewhat obscurely intimated in 1 Chron. ii, 50, 51; iv, 4. It seems obvious, therefore, to infer that, on the contrary, Ephrath, the mother of Hur, was so called from the town of her birth, and that she probably was the owner of the town and district; in fact, that her name was really gentilitious. But if this be so, it would indicate more communication between the Israelites in Egypt and the Canaanites than is commonly supposed. When, however, we recollect that the land of Goshen was the border country on the Palestine side; that the Israelites in Goshen were a tribe of sheep and cattle drovers (Gen. xlvii, 3); that there was an easy communication between Palestine and Egypt from the earliest times (Gen. xii, 10; xvi, 1; xxi, 21, etc.); that there are indications of communications between the Israelites in Egypt and the Canaanites, caused by their trade as keepers of cattle (1 Chron. vii, 21); and that, in the nature of things, the owners or keepers of large herds and flocks in Goshen would have dealings with the nomad tribes in Palestine, it will perhaps seem not impossible that a son of Hezron may have married a woman having property in Ephrath. Another way of accounting for the connection between Ephrath's descendants and Bethlehem, is to suppose that the elder Caleb was not really the son of Hezron, but merely reckoned so as the head of a Hezronite house. He may in this case have been one of an Edomitish or Horite tribe, an idea which is favored by the name of his son Hur [see CALEB], and have married an Ephrathite. Caleb the spy may have been their grandson. It is singular that "Salma, the father of Bethlehem," should have married a Canaanitish woman. Could she have been of the kindred of Caleb in any way? If she were, and if Salma obtained Bethlehem, a portion of Hur's inheritance, in consequence, this would account for both Hur and Salma being called "father of Bethlehem." Another possible explanation is, that *Ephrathah* may have been the name given to some daughter of Benjamin to commemorate the circumstance of Rachel his mother having died close to Ephrath. This would receive some support from the son of Rachel's other son Joseph being called *Ephraim*, a word of identical etymology, as appears from the fact that  $\text{בֵּית לֶחֶם}$  means indifferently an Ephrathite, i. e. *Bethlehemite* (Ruth i, 1, 2), or an *Ephraimite* (1 Sam. i, 1). But it would not account for Ephrath's descendants being settled at Bethlehem. From Ruth i, 2, where the sons of Naomi are called "Ephrathites of Bethlehem [of] Judah," it would seem that Ephrath was the name of a district of which Bethlehem was the chief town; and the designation of Mic. iv, 2 as "Bethlehem [of] Ephrath," is rendered in Matt. ii, 6, "Bethlehem [in the] land [ $\gamma\eta$ ] of Judah," as if to distinguish it by adding the name of a district, although a larger one (Lange, *Comment. on Matt.* in loc.). At all events we should note that in Gen., and perhaps in Chron., it is called *Ephrath* or *Ephrath*; in Ruth, *Bethlehem-Judah*, but the inhabitants *Ephrathites*; in Micah, *Bethlehem-Ephrath*; in Matt. *Bethlehem in the land of Juda*. The Sept. supplies [ $\text{ἐφραθὰ}$  ( $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\ \tau\epsilon\tau\iota\ \text{Βηθλεὲμ}$ )] its omission among the cities of Judah in Josh. xv, 60 (see Reineccius, *Progr.* on this point, Weissenfels, 1723). Jerome, and after him Kalisch, observe that Ephrath, *fruitful*, has the same meaning as Bethlehem, *house of bread*, a

view which is favored by the neighboring corn-fields. —Smith, s. v. Ver Poortenn has written monographs entitled *Tabernacula Dei in Ephrata* [Psa. cxxxii] (Coburg, 1739); *Initia Bethlehemi* (ib. 1728); also two entitled *Fata Bethlehemi* (both ib. eod.). See BETHLEHEM.

3. Gesenius and others think that in Psa. cxxxii, 6, "*Ephrath*" means EPHRAIM (q. v.). The meaning of that passage, however, is greatly disputed. The most obvious reference is to *Bethlehem*, which is elsewhere known by that name (see above), and may here be spoken of as the residence of David at the time when as a youth he first heard of the sacred ark (so Hengstenberg, in loc.). Others consider the name as equivalent to the *tribe Ephraim* (comp. Ephrathite for Ephraimite, Judg. xii, 5), which contained Shiloh, the depository of Jehovah's early favor (so Good, in loc., as most interpreters; Delitzsch, *Commentar. über d. Psalter*, ii, 265, argues at length in favor of this view). Perhaps the best explanation is that which refers the word to *Mt. Ephraim* (as a special designation of that part of the tribe which contained Shiloh), in parallelism with the other part of the verse alluding to the *forest*. Hupfeld (in loc.), however, considers it as merely a poetical term for fruitful *field*, e. g. Beth-she-mesh, the latter part of the verse alluding to Kirjath-jearim as the "wood" ( $\text{בְּעֵץ}$ , *wood*).

**Eph'rathite** (Heb. *Ephrathî'*,  $\text{עֵפְרַתִּי}$ ), the designation of the inhabitants of two widely different localities.

1. Properly BETHLEHEMITE, or citizen of Ephrath (q. v.) or Bethlehem (Ruth i, 2; 1 Sam. xvii, 12; Sept.  $\text{Ἐφραθῆαιος}$ , Vulg. *Ephrathæus*).

2. By some confusion or analogy, an EPHRAIMITE, or inhabitant of the tribe of Ephraim (q. v.) (Judg. xii, 5, with the art.  $\text{בְּעֵץ}$ , Sept.  $\text{ἐκ τοῦ Ἐφραϊμ}$  v. r.  $\text{Ἐφραθῆτης}$ , Vulg. *Ephrathæus*, A. V. "an Ephraimite" [the last clause; in the two previous occurrences of the verse, as well as in the context, the original is *Ephraim*]; 1 Sam. i, 1,  $\text{Ἐφραϊμ}$ , *Ephrathæus*, "an Ephrathite;" 1 Kings xi, 26,  $\text{ὁ Ἐφραθῆι}$ , *Ephrathæus*, "an Ephrathite").

**Ephrem or Ephraem Syrus**, an eminent Church father, and the greatest light of the Syrian Church, was born at Nisibis (Sozom. II. E. iii, 16), Syria, or at Edessa, and flourished A. D. 370. The accounts of his early life are variant and unreliable. His parents were heathen, according to one account, and drove him from home for becoming a Christian; but, according to other accounts, he was bred a Christian by his Christian parents. Jacob of Nisibis took care of his education, and took him to the Council of Nicea, A. D. 325. In 363 Nisibis was ceded by the emperor Jovian to the Persians, and Ephrem went to Edessa, whither the most distinguished Syrians came to receive his instruction. Here he lived as a hermit, only coming from his seclusion to teach and preach. His repute for piety and learning became so great that he was elected bishop; but when he heard of it he rushed forth into the market-place, and acted in such a manner that the people thought he was out of his senses. "He then absconded until another had been appointed to the office of bishop in his place. He now went to Caesarea in Cappadocia to see Basilus the Great, who formed the highest opinion of his learning and piety. Ephrem spent the greater part of his life in writing and preaching on devotional and moral subjects, and especially against the Arian heresy; but he was equally energetic whenever there was any occasion to show by his acts that he really was the benevolent man that he appeared to be. This was especially manifest at the time when Edessa was suffering from famine: he gave his assistance everywhere; he called upon the rich to help the poor, and he himself undertook the care of seeing that the poor received what was intend-

ed for them. He was looked up to with admiration and reverence by his contemporaries, who distinguished him by the honorable designation of 'the prophet of the Syrians.' He died about 378, having ordered in his will that no one should praise him, according to the common practice, in a funeral oration, that his body should not be wrapped up in costly robes, and that no monument should be erected on his tomb" (*English Cyclopædia*, s. v.). This "will" of Ephrem is, however, generally held to be spurious.

All accounts unite in testifying to the virtues of Ephrem. Sozomen (*Hist. Eccles.* iii, 16) tells the following story to illustrate his command of a naturally irascible temper. After a fast, his servant, presenting some food to him, let fall the dish on which it was placed. Ephrem, seeing him overwhelmed with shame and terror, said to him, "Take courage; as the food has not come to us, we will go to it." Whereupon Ephrem sat down on the floor, and ate the fragments left in the broken dish.

He was a voluminous author, writing commentaries, practical religious works, sermons, and numerous poems. The commentaries and hymns are in Syriac; the other writings exist only in Greek and other versions. It is doubtful whether he understood Greek; Sozomen (l. c.) expressly says that he knew only Syriac, but that his writings "were translated into Greek during his life, and preserve much of their original force and power, so that they are not less admired in Greek than in Syriac." One of the legends tells that in his visit to Basil both were miraculously enabled to speak the other's language—Basil the Syriac, and Ephrem the Greek. "His commentaries extended over the whole Bible, 'from the book of creation to the last book of grace,' as Gregory of Nyssa says. We have his commentaries on the historical and prophetic books of the Old Testament and the book of Job in Syriac, and his commentaries on the epistles of Paul in an Armenian translation. They have been but little used thus far by commentators. He does not interpret the text from the original Hebrew, but from the old Syriac translation, the Peshito, though he refers occasionally to the original. His sermons and homilies, of which, according to Photius, he composed more than a thousand, are partly expository, partly polemical, against Jews, heathen, and heretics. They evince a considerable degree of popular eloquence; they are full of pathos, exclamations, apostrophes, antitheses, illustrations, severe rebuke, and sweet comfort, according to the subject; but also full of exaggerations, bombast, prolixity, and the superstitions of his age, such as the over-estimate of ascetic virtue, and excessive veneration of the Virgin Mary, the saints, and relics. Some of his sermons were publicly read after the Bible lesson in many Oriental, and even Occidental churches. His hymns were intended to counteract the influence of the heretical views of Bardesanes and his son Harmonius, which spread widely by means of popular Syrian songs. 'When Ephrem perceived,' says Sozomen, 'that the Syrians were charmed with the elegant diction and melodious versification of Harmonius, he became apprehensive lest they should imbibe the same opinions; and therefore, although he was ignorant of Greek learning, he applied himself to the study of the metres of Harmonius, and composed similar poems in accordance with the doctrines of the Church, and sacred hymns in praise of holy men. From that period the Syrians sang the odes of Ephrem, according to the method indicated by Harmonius.' Theodoret gives a similar account, and says that the hymns of Ephrem combined harmony and melody with piety, and subserved all the purposes of valuable and efficacious medicine against the heretical hymns of Harmonius. It is reported that he wrote no less than three hundred thousand verses. But, with the exception of his commentaries, all his Syriac works are written in verse, i. e. in lines of an

equal number of syllables, and with occasional rhyme and assonance, though without regular metre (Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, iii, 952 sq.)."

The best edition of his collected works is *Ephraemi Syri Opera omnia*, Gr., Syr., et Lat., edita cum præfationibus, notis, var. lectionibus, studio J. S. Assemani et P. Benedetti (Romæ, 1732-46, 6 vols. fol.). Before this edition, many of his writings had been collected and translated from Greek into Latin by Gerard Voss, who published them (1) at Rome, A. D. 1589-93-97; (2) at Cologne in 1603 and 1616; and (3) at Antwerp in 1619 (3 vols. in one). "The first volume consists of various treatises, partly on subjects solely theological, as the priesthood, prayer, fasting, etc., with others partly theological and partly moral, as truth, anger, obedience, envy. The second volume contains many epistles and addresses to monks, and a collection of apophthegms. Vol. iii consists of several treatises or homilies on parts of Scripture, and characters in the Old Testament, as Elijah, Daniel, the three children, Joseph, Noah. Photius gives a list of 49 homilies of Ephrem (Cod. 196), but which of these are included in Voss's edition it is impossible to ascertain, though it is certain that many are not" (Smith, *Dictionary of Biography*, s. v.).

Of separate works there are numerous editions, of which lists may be found in Hoffmann, *Bibliographisches Lexikon*, ii, 3 sq., and in Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Græca*, ed. Harles, viii, 217 sq. An edition containing only the Greek writings of Ephrem was published by Thwaites (Oxford, 1709), edited from 28 MSS. in the Bodleian Library. An English translation from the Syrian by J. B. Morris (Oxf. 1847) contains 13 pieces of verse on the Nativity, 1 against the Jews, and 90 on the faith. The Rev. H. Burgess has published *Select metrical Hymns and Homilies of Ephraem Syrus*, translated from the original Syriac, with an Introduction, and historical and philological notes (Lond. 1853). In his introduction Mr. Burgess mentions, as extant in Syriac verse, "eleven exegetical discourses, more than a hundred controversial sermons, and nearly as many practical hortatory homilies, all in poetry; four pieces on the *freedom of the will*, not only in metre, but the strophes arranged in alphabetic order, like the verses of the 119th Psalm; and he assures us that all these compositions show a high degree of poetic talent, and are distinguished for their 'sonorousness and grace,' and have 'a charm which no translation can express.' Indeed, almost all the three folios of St. Ephraem's printed works in Syriac are poetical. In this volume the author gives us translations of 35 of Ephraem's Syriac hymns, and 9 of his metrical homilies or sermons. They are illustrated by a learned introduction and very instructive notes. More than half the hymns relate to death and eternity, and the others are on various topics pertaining to the Christian life. The subjects of the poetical sermons are the following: (1) Paradise, (2) Satan, (3) to the clergy, (4) the Trinity, (5) matter not eternal, (6) error counterfeits truth, (7) the Trinity, (8) two natures of Christ, (9) man ignorant of himself" (*Biblioth. Sacra*, Oct. 1853, p. 837). M. Cailiau published a Latin version of Ephrem in 8 vols. 8vo (Paris, 1832-35, forming vols. xxxiv-xli of the *Patres Selecti*), in which the following order is used: 1. Commentaries; 2. Exegetical homilies; 3. Sermons; 4. Epistles; 5. Prayers. The writings of Ephrem in Armenian were published at Venice, 4 vols. 8vo, 1836. Hahn und Sieffert's *Chrestomathia Syriaca* (Leipsic, 1825, 8vo) contains 19 select hymns of Ephrem; see also Hahn, *Bardesanes Gnosticus* (Leips. 1819). A German version of many of his poems is given by Zingerle, *Ausg. Schriften des heil. Ephraem* (Innspr. 1830-37, 6 vols.). His funeral sermons are translated into Italian (*Inni funebri di S. Efram Siro, tradotti per Angelo Paggi e Fausto Lasinio*, Firenze, 1851). In 1853 J. Alshein announced a complete edition of the Syriac works of Ephrem, in a



pamphlet (Berl. 8vo) containing a sketch of Ephrem's life, and some literary remarks of value. Many writings of Ephrem remain in MS., of which there is a valuable collection in the British Museum; among them a *Chronicle*, from Creation to the time of Christ, is ascribed to him.

See Cave, *Hist. Lit.* (Genev. 1720), i, 149 sq.; Oudin, *De Script. Eccles.* i, 493 sq.; Dupin, *Auteurs Ecclés.* (Paris, 1593), ii, 145 sq.; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacrés* (Par. 1860), vol. vi, chap. i; Lardner, *Works*, iv, 304 sq.; Clarke, *Succession of Sacred Literature*, i, 403; Von Lengerke, *Comm. de Ephraemo Syr. interprete* (Halle, 1828); the same, *De Eph. Syr. art. hermeneutica* (Königsb. 1831); Villemain, *Tableau de l'éloquence Chrét. au 4<sup>me</sup> Siècle* (Paris, 1840, 12mo), p. 242; Nève, *De la Renaissance des études Syriaques* (Annales de Philosophie, 1854); *North British Review*, Aug. 1853, p. 247; *Jour. of Sacred Literature* July, 1853, p. 389; Rüdiger, in Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iii, 85 sq.

**Ephron** (Heb. *Ephron'*, עֶפְרוֹן, signif. doubtful; Sept. Ἐφρών, Vulg. *Ephron*), the name of a man and also of two or three places.

1. The son of Zohar, a Hittite; the owner of a field which lay facing Mamre or Hebron, and of the cave contained therein, which Abraham bought from him for 400 shekels of silver (Gen. xxiii, 8-17; xxv, 9; xlix, 29, 30; i, 13). B.C. 2027. By Josephus (*Ant.* i, 14) the name is given as *Ephraim* (Ἐφράιμ), and the purchase-money 40 shekels. See ABRAHAM.

2. The textual reading (but with initial S) in the Masoretic Bible, and the marginal in the A. V. for EPHRAIM (q. v.), a city within the borders of the kingdom of Israel (2 Chron. xiii, 19).

3. A mountain, the "cities" of which formed one of the landmarks on the northern boundary of the tribe of Judah (Josh. xv, 9), between the "water of Nephtoth" and Kirjath-jearim. As these latter are with great probability identified with Ain Yalo and Kuriet el-enab, Mount Ephron is probably the elevated region on the south side of wady Beit-Hanina (traditional valley of the Terebinth), near its junction with wady Ain-Haniyeh or wady el-Werd. This seems to be the "high plain" indicated by Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 96) as appropriately called Mount Ephron, in comparison with the deep valleys adjoining. The "cities of Mount Ephron" may then be denoted by such ruined sites as el-Sus and Mar-Zakaria in this vicinity.

4. A very strong city (πόλις μεγάλη ὄχυρά σφόδρα) on the east of Jordan, between Carnaim (Ashteroth-Karnaim) and Bethshean, attacked and demolished by Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc. v, 46-52; 2 Macc. xii, 27, 28; Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 8, 5). From the description in these two passages it appears to have been situated in a defile or valley, and to have completely occupied the pass. It was possibly near the outlet of the Jab-bok into the Jordan. Klöden's conjectures (*Lauleskunde von Palästina*, Berl. 1817, p. 75) that it was the present *Kulat er-Rubud*, a strong Saracenic castle on the top of a hill up the wady Rajib, and the residence of the chief of Jebel Ajlun (Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 266 sq.; Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 121; iii, 166).

**Epicrätēs** (Ἐπικράτης, *controller*, a common Gr. name), one of the generals left by Antiochus Grypus, in connection with Callimander, in charge of the Syrian forces besieging Hircanus in Samaria, but whose cupidity led him to betray Scythopolis into the hands of the Jews (Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 10, 2, 3).

**Epicurean Philosophy—Epicurus.** The Epicurean philosophy received its name and its complete development from its founder Epicurus. Little was added to the system by its disciples. It was a reaction against the Socratic School, and constituted one of the most marked forms of speculation during the period of Greek decline. It exercised considerable influence over the Latin world in the decay of the Roman republic, and during the first two centuries of

the empire. With important changes of form, but with little modifications of spirit, it survived the overthrow of ancient civilization, perpetuated itself throughout the Middle Ages, reappeared with the revival of philosophy, and may still be recognised in many recent theories.

The Epicurean philosophy, which has survived so many successions of empire, and so vast mutations of thought, is intimately connected with the earlier speculations of the Greeks. Its ethical views are directly deducible from the Cyrenaic School; but its dependence on the Eleatics is unmistakable. See ELEATIC SCHOOL. In physics it displayed an inclination to return to the Ionic method. It is, however, in immediate affiliation with the doctrines of Democritus and Leucippus. From them it derived its atoms, and the casual formation of the universe.

Notwithstanding its connections with previous modes of thought, the Epicurean philosophy is so definite in principle and form that it may be more readily treated without regard to its descent than almost any other type of speculation, ancient or modern.

The Epicurean philosophy was fully developed by its founder, and was long contained almost entirely in his numerous productions. These perished early. Fragments only have been preserved in the philosophical treatises of Cicero, the moral lectures of Seneca, and the late compilation of Diogenes Laërtius. Epicurus's physical theory of the universe, which formed the basis of his theological and ethical conclusions, is transmitted to us in its integrity in the abstruse but brilliant poem of Lucretius. In consequence of the reverence of the disciples for the instructions of the master, and their abstinence from development of his teachings, Epicurus occupies a more prominent position in the exposition of his doctrine than any other Greek philosopher except Pythagoras. It is, accordingly, expedient to consider the circumstances of his life and the peculiarities of his character before entering upon the details of his system.

*Life of Epicurus.*—Epicurus was of pure Athenian descent; of a good family, though reduced to poverty; and settled in Samos, where his father Neocles was a *cleruchus*, and eked out a scanty support by the occupation of a school-master. His mother, Chærestrata, added to the resources of a poor household by practising enchantments and by other superstitious pretences, in which she was aided by her son, who may thus have acquired an early contempt for the current theology and superstition. Epicurus was born at Samos, A.C. 342-1, seven years after the death of Plato, and within a year of Aristotle's acceptance of the office of tutor to Alexander the Great. About the time of Alexander's death, Epicurus came to Athens, at the age of 18, where he is supposed to have attended the instructions of Xenocrates in the academy. Aristotle was still teaching in the lyceum. Epicurus made no long stay at this time in the metropolis, but removed to Colophon and opened a school. He adopted the atomistic doctrine of Democritus, and during five years undertook to teach philosophy at Mitylene and Lampsacus. At the age of 35 he returned to Athens, taught philosophy there for a period of 36 years till his death, and became the founder of a sect, having at first been content with declaring himself a follower of Democritus. The groves of the academy were frequented by the Platonists under Xenocrates; "the shady spaces" around the lyceum were occupied by the Peripatetics under Theophrastus, who possessed a house and garden of his own within the precincts, which were bequeathed to his successors. Epicurus imitated the Peripatetic example, and purchased a garden in the heart of the city for 80 minæ (about \$1400 in gold). This abode, the celebrated *horti Epicuri*, became the place of instruction and of convivial assemblage, and gave name to the school, "the philosophy of the Garden." The life of Epicurus was "simple, temperate, and cheer-

fal;" he was "a kind-hearted friend, and even a patriotic citizen." He kept aloof from the political distractions of the time, and took no part in public affairs. His maxim was *λάθε βιώσας*—avoid notice in life. The political and social disorders of the time, amid the wars of the *Diadochi* and the factious contentions of a city where liberty was supplanted by tyranny or anarchy, might suggest the philosophy which is supposed to have regulated his conduct, viz. that the mind alone is free; all without is at the mercy of capricious violence or incalculable contingencies. In the progress of civil discords and convulsions the only hope of tranquillity must be sought in absolute seclusion and disregard of public transactions.

In his quiet and graceful retreat, surrounded by affectionate pupils and admiring friends, enlivened by the frequent presence of brilliant *heteræ*, one half of the long life of Epicurus was passed. His intercourse was characterized by genial good-humor, and his establishment was conducted with frugal elegance. His temperament and his doctrine, his habits and his precepts, were in entire unison. He sought and obtained for himself the gentle pleasure, the unruffled serenity which he preached to his hearers. He was laborious in the dissemination of his opinions. He is designated as *πολυγραφώτατος* by Diogenes, and is said to have written three hundred volumes, filled, of course, with repetitions. This copious authentic promulgation of his philosophy dispensed with any necessity for expansion or commentary. The theory was, indeed, so simple and perspicuous that nothing remained to be stated after the first exposition.

Before the death of Epicurus in A.C. 270, a rival school had arisen in Athens under the colonnades of the Painted Porch, and nearly every one of his tenets was directly opposed by Zeno of Citium and the Stoic philosophy. The reaction excited by the extreme materialism and fortuitism of Epicurus occasioned an equal extravagance on the other side. With Epicurus the universe was an aggregate of blind atoms compacted and diversified by an equally blind chance; with Zeno it was a divine organism, vital in all its parts, and governed by the immutable decrees of fate. With Epicurus the deities were ineognizant or regardless of temporal affairs; with Zeno everything was controlled by a superintending Providence, whose will was an unalterable necessity, and manifested by the heavenly orbs (*sidera conscienti fati*).

The *Philosophy of Epicurus* divides itself naturally into three parts, Theology, Ethics, and Physics. The last alone received any thoroughly systematic development. It was devised as a scientific basis for the two former, which were rather foregone conclusions, in which "the wish was father to the thought," than strictly logical deductions from established principles. The philosophy of Epicurus was designed for his own immediate satisfaction, and for the practical uses of life. The logomachies of Eleatics and Sceptics, Sophists and Socratics, had produced no settled convictions, and had arrested neither public calamities nor private wretchedness; a doctrine was desired which might bring peace to the individual, and restore happiness or enjoyment to life. The canonization of pleasure, the regulation and sanctification of natural passions, seemed to afford the solution required, and Epicurus was to his time what Fourier was to the last generation. In order to sanction pleasure as the guide of existence, it was necessary to get rid of the menaces of conscience and the terrors of heaven. Hence Epicurus practically denied the gods by relegating them to the eternal isolation of unconcerned indolence and reverie. This was regarded by his votaries as the most essential service of his career (Lucret. i, 63-80). But to exercise the divinities and to abrogate religion, it was necessary to explain the marvelous order, economy, and variety of the creation, without recourse to a creator; to furnish, like La Place, a system of the world which

should exclude the notion of a divine architect. This task Epicurus undertook, with such materials as were at hand. The Eleatic School had asserted an absolute severance of the divine and the transitory, and had devoted their regards to the former. Epicurus repudiated the former, and confined his attention to the material and sensible, disproving all creative or divine agency by his physical doctrine, and maintaining the authority of carnal impulses and earthly pleasures by the repudiation of the gods and of their worship.

*Theology of Epicurus.*—Epicurus acquiesced in the existence of the gods, but denied them any participation in the process of the universe. He ascribed to them immortality and human form, and assigned to them attenuated and spectral bodies, as Milton also appears to have done ("*negat esse corpus deorum, sed tamquam corpus, nec sanguinem, sed tamquam sanguinem.*" Cic. *De Nat. Deor.* i. xxv). He accords to them indestructibility, immutability, and the serene happiness of eternal repose. Their tranquillity would have been disturbed by any care; accordingly, they are entirely unconcerned with everything that falls under human apprehension. This mode of recognising and at the same time cashiering divinity has been recently imitated by Herbert Spencer. So far as human actions or thoughts are concerned, the gods are practically non-existent, and religion is nothing better than a vague and irrational superstition, founded upon dreams, and cherished by ignorant fear.

*Ethics of Epicurus.*—Without divine sanction, without responsibility or existence hereafter, with neither reward nor penalty in a future life for "deeds done in the body," no real system of ethics is conceivable. There is no constraint, no obligation to rectitude; there is no moral compulsion; there is no domain for conscience; there can only be a more or less judicious and provident adaptation of actions to the judgments or dispositions of men, and to the supposed satisfaction of the individual. Morality without religion is a pretence and a delusion. A tranquil and pleasurable existence becomes the *summum bonum* of the sage; the gratification of every passion as it arises the sole duty of an eager and undisciplined nature. Every restraint is removed except such as may be voluntarily imposed; and though cool, impassive, and indolent dispositions may maintain an external propriety of demeanor when exposed to no temptation, there can be no guarantee for rectitude of conduct, and the license of all passions will be gratified by the unclean beasts who wallow in the Epicurean sty. The insufficiency of the doctrine as a rule of conduct was exhibited from the very first. Epicurus placed the highest pleasure in undisturbed repose, but he considered every pleasure to be good in itself; and his favorite disciple, Metrodorus, asserts that the dictates of natural reason would limit all care to the satisfaction of the belly, thus taking as the corner-stone of the system the declaration of Ecclesiastes, "All a man's labor is for his mouth." The stories which circulated in regard to the connection of Epicurus and his companions with Leontium, Marmarium, and other notorious ladies of the like persuasion, show that the tendencies of the doctrine were at once recognised, even if they were not illustrated in practice.

As all the religious foundations of virtue were removed, no logical foundation remained. The *æconomic* of Epicurus, which was at once his logic and his metaphysics, amounted to the negation of any absolute or immutable truth. The sensible impression was the sole criterion of truth. Every sensation, as every general conception, was necessarily true; and we are here reminded, though in different modes and degrees, of the positions assumed by Des Cartes and by Hume. No guidance is accorded for the conduct of the understanding more assured than the immediate impression or the unregulated fancy, and the passions are thus left without any valid control by the reason. A life

according to natural impulses becomes therefore the aim and the duty of a philosopher.

The *Physics of Epicurus* were devised as a means of escape from all divine authority and superintendence. They constitute the most elaborate, coherent, and original portion of the Epicurean system. Even here there was little real originality. Epicurus was a man of little learning, of little logical perspicacity; but he was actuated by a distinct purpose, and possessed of a clear rather than a penetrating mind. He diligently availed himself of everything subservient to his aims in previous systems, and worked out whatever accorded with his plans into a plausible and superficial scheme, in which consistency was little regarded, and acceptability assured by addressing the natural inclinations of men. The Physical Theory of Epicurus acquired more reputation in antiquity from its connection with theology and ethics, and from its exposition of Lucretius, than from any estimation in which it was held by the real students of science. The object of Epicurus was to explain, like Des Cartes, how the universe might have been formed and perpetuated without any foreign agency, though he went further than Des Cartes in rejecting even a divine agency for its first creation.

The leading lines of his physical doctrine are that matter is uncreated and indestructible. Its primitive elements are indivisible particles—atoms—which are eternal and imperishable, passing through various combinations, and assuming new properties and forms according to these mutable compositions. These atoms are infinite in number, and solid, though so small as to be imperceptible by the senses. They possess gravity, and move downwards in an infinite vacuum. Their descent, however, is not in a uniform line; they are deflected by a spontaneous impulse, due to mere contingency, and come into collision, conjunction, composition with each other. Thus worlds, infinite in number, and infinitely varied in their phenomena, are formed. These atoms are in a continual state of vibration or oscillation, and from their concretions and dissolutions, their coherences and dissidences, all the multitudinous changes of inorganic and organic nature are derived. All, however, are governed by chance alone; there is no compulsion, no necessity, no external law, no decree of fate. The cause of being is not extrinsic, but is involved in the process and act of being. No room is allowed for the operation of any conscious and ordaining intelligence; the world is nothing more than the curious result of uncomprehending, undesigned accidents. It will be observed that this theory of Epicurus differs from the vortices of Des Cartes in little more than in ascribing a straight, downward, but variable motion to the atoms in a vacuum, while Cartesianism assigns to them a gyratory movement and denies a vacuum. The difference is more obvious between this system and the recent doctrine of evolution, but the logical principle is the same—the construction and continuation of the universe by simple elements and simple forces generated within its own sphere, and independent of foreign determination. It is consequently not surprising that an attempt has been very recently made to bring the Epicurean Physics into harmony with modern science, whose present tendencies are in the direction of similar irrational self-sufficiency. A like attempt was made by Gassendi more legitimately, but without any permanent acceptance, in the 17th century; and it may be confidently asserted that, in an age of infidel appetencies, there will always be a revival of the Epicurean philosophy and Epicurean proclivities.

*Authorities.*—The historians of ancient philosophy: Bayle, tit. "*Leucippi Lucretæ*;" Gassendi, *De Vita et Moribus Epicuri* (Hag. Comit. 1656, 4to); *Synagoga philosophiæ Epicuri* (1659); Bremer, *Versuch einer Apologie des Epicur* (Berlin, 1776, 8vo); Rondel, *La Vie d'Epicure* (Par. 1679); Warnekros, *Apologie und Leben*

*Epicurs* (Greifswald, 1795, 8vo); Munro, *Lucretius, with a Translation and Notes* (Cambridge and London, 1864, 2 vols. 8vo); Lange, *Gesch. des Materialismus* (Iserlohn, 1866); *North Brit. Rev.* March, 1868. (G. F. H.)

**Epicure'ans** (*Ἐπικουροῖται*, Acts xvii, 18), followers of Epicurus or adherents of the Epicurean philosophy (q. v.).

**Epimenides**, a Greek poet, born in Crete, and highly revered as a prophet and natural sage at Athens, where he came by invitation B.C. cir. 596, and spent a long life. Our chief account of him is given by Diogenes Laertius (i, 10). He is said to have written prose works on sacrifices and the political constitution of Crete, together with two letters to Solon, which have all perished, as the extant copies of the last are spurious. Diogenes also attributes to him poetical works entitled the "Genesis and Theogony" of the Curetes and Corybantes (in 5000 verses), an epic on Jason and the Argonauts (in 6500 verses), and an epic on Minos and Rhadamanthys (in 4000 verses); but it is doubtful whether he ever wrote them. He may have been the author of poems called "Useful" and "Pure" (*Χρησιμῶι* und *Καθαροῖι*), which are ascribed to him by other ancient authorities (Suidas, s. v. *Ἐπιμηνίδης*; Strabo, x, p. 479; Pausan. i, 14, 4). But all these have equally perished. He is probably referred to by the apostle Paul in the words (Tit. i, 12; see Alford, *Gr. Test.* in loc.), "One of themselves [the Cretans], even a prophet of their own, said, 'The Cretans are always liars,' etc., apparently quoting from certain old-fashioned poems written upon skins, and popularly attributed to Epimenides.—Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biogr.* s. v.; Heinrich, *Epimenides aus Crete* (Lpz. 1801); also the monographs *De Epimenide* of Gottschalek (Aitorf, 1714), and Schuremann (Hafn. 1733).

**Epiph'anès** (*Ἐπιφάνης*, manifest, hence famous), an epithet given to the gods when appearing to men. The Syrian king Antiochus, brother of Selencus, coming fortunately into Syria a little after the death of his brother, was regarded as some propitious deity, and was hence called Epiphanes—the *splendid* (1 Macc. i, 10; x, 1; 2 Macc. iv, 17; x, 9). See ANTIOCHUS 3.

**Epiphānes, or Epiphanius**, son of Carpoerates, heretic and gnostic, like his father. He supposed an infinite eternal principle, and united with this fundamental principle the system of Valentinus. According to him, as according to some modern reformers, it is ignorance and passion which, in disturbing the equality and the community of goods, have introduced evil into the world; and the idea of property forms no part of the divine plan, but is of human invention. He concluded, therefore, that all laws should be suppressed, and equality re-established. He concluded, also, that the community of wives, as well as of the fruits of the earth, is necessary to the re-establishment of order. He died at the early age of seventeen years. A temple was consecrated to him in Cephalonia.—Neander, *Ch. Hist.* i, 449; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* bk. i, c. 2, pt. ii, ch. v, § 14, n. 17; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xvi, 159.

**Epiphania.** See ΗΑΜΑΤΗ.

**Epiphanius** (*Ἐπιφάνιος*), bishop of Constantia, one of the Church fathers, was born in Palestine, near Eleutheropolis, in the early part of the 4th century (between 310 and 320). His parents are said to have been Jews, but in his sixteenth year he embraced Christianity; the only case of the kind among the fathers, for the rest of them were either converts from heathenism, or born of Christian parents. He went to Egypt, and there gave himself to ascetic life among the monks; one record also says that he imbibed Gnostic errors, from which he was reclaimed by the monastic discipline. He became an earnest patron and friend of monasticism, and founded a monastery near

his native village, of which he became abbot. In 367 he was elected bishop of Constantia (Salamis), the metropolis of Cyprus. Here he remained thirty-six years, busy with the duties of his episcopate, and especially busy with his pen. He devoted himself to the vindication of orthodoxy with unquestioned learning, but with intemperate zeal and violence. He cherished a special hatred for Origen and his doctrines, and wrote, preached, and travelled in order to destroy their influence in the Church. This hatred led him into a quarrel with John, bishop of Jerusalem. "A report that Origen's opinions were spreading in Palestine, and sanctioned even by John, bishop of Jerusalem, excited Epiphanius to such a pitch that he left Cyprus (A.D. 394) to investigate the matter on the spot. At Jerusalem he preached so violent a sermon against any abettors of Origen's errors, and made such evident allusions to the bishop, that John sent his archdeacon to beg him to stop. Afterwards, when John preached against anthropomorphism (of a tendency to which Epiphanius had been suspected), he was followed up to the pulpit by his undaunted antagonist, who announced that he agreed in John's censure of anthropomorphites, but that it was equally necessary to condemn Origenists. Having excited sufficient commotion at Jerusalem, Epiphanius repaired to Bethlehem, where he was all-powerful with the monks; and there he was so successful in his denunciation of heresy, that he persuaded some to renounce their connection with the bishop of Jerusalem" (Smith, *Dict. of Biog.* s. v.). He also interfered with the diocesan jurisdiction of John, by ordaining one Paulinianus in Palestine. The quarrel became very bitter, and was for many years a source of great trouble and injury to the Church. Epiphanius formed an alliance with the violent and unscrupulous Theophilus of Alexandria (q. v.), who had been an Origenist, but, for his own purposes, changed his professed opinions on the subject, and ordered the Nitrian monks to give up all Origen's writings. They refused, and he called a council at Alexandria, A.D. 399, which condemned Origen, his writings, and his followers. Soldiers were sent to drive the monks from Nitria. Some of them went to Constantinople, where Chrysostom (q. v.) gave them his protection. Theophilus persuaded Epiphanius (now over 80 years old) to call a council of Cyprian bishops (A.D. 401). Here Origen was again condemned. Epiphanius wrote to Chrysostom to join in this condemnation. As Chrysostom did not reply, Epiphanius took it for granted that he favored Origenism, and determined to go in person to Constantinople to "crush Amalek," to use his own words (in a letter to Jerome). Sozomen (*Eccles. Hist.* viii, 14) gives a pretty full account of this visit, saying that, on the arrival of Epiphanius, Chrysostom went out with all his clergy to meet the visitor and do him honor; "but Epiphanius declared that he would neither reside with John, nor pray with him, unless he would denounce the works of Origen, and expel Dioscorus and his companions from the city. Not considering it just to act in the manner proposed until judgment had been passed on the case, John tried to postpone the adoption of further measures to some future time. In the mean time his enemies met together, and arranged that on the day when the people would be assembled in the Church of the Apostles, Epiphanius should publicly pronounce condemnation on the works of Origen, and on Dioscorus and his companions as the partisans of this writer; and also denounce the bishop of the city as the abettor of Dioscorus. By this means it was hoped that the affections of the people would be alienated from their bishop. The following day, when Epiphanius was about entering the Church, in order to carry his design into execution, he was stopped by Serapion, at the command of John, who had received intimation of the plot. Serapion proved to Epiphanius that while the project he had devised was unjust in itself, it could be of no personal advantage to him, for

that, if it should excite a popular insurrection, he would be regarded as responsible for the outrages that might follow. By these arguments Epiphanius was induced to relinquish his designs." About this time the empress Eudoxia sent for Epiphanius to pray for her son Theodosius, who was ill; Epiphanius replied that her son would recover provided she would not patronize the defenders of Origen. To this message the empress answered that Epiphanius had failed to save that of his own archdeacon, who had recently died. Finally, some of the Origenists had a conversation with Epiphanius, in which they seem to have convinced him that he had acted rashly. Soon after (Sozomen, *l. c.*), he embarked for Cyprus, either because he recognised the futility of his journey to Constantinople, or because, as there is reason to believe, God had revealed to him his approaching death, for he died while on his voyage back to Cyprus. It is reported that he said to the bishops who had accompanied him to the place of embarkation, "I leave you the city, the palace, and the stage, for I shall shortly depart." He died at sea, on his return to Cyprus, A.D. 403. He is commemorated as a saint in the Church of Rome on May 12.

Epiphanius was "a man of earnest monastic piety, and of sincere but illiberal zeal for orthodoxy. His good nature allowed him to be easily used as an instrument for the passions of others, and his zeal was not according to knowledge. He is the patriarch of heresy-hunters. He identified Christianity with monastic piety and ecclesiastical orthodoxy, and considered it the great mission of his life to pursue the hydra of heresy into all its hiding-places. His learning was extensive, but ill digested. He understood five languages—Hebrew, Syriac, Egyptian, Greek, and a little Latin. Jerome, who knew but three languages, though he knew these far better than Epiphanius, calls him *πεντάγλωσσος*, the five-tongued; and Rufinus reproachfully says of him that he considered it his sacred duty to slander the great Origen in all languages and nations. He was lacking in knowledge of the world and of men, in sound judgment, and in critical discernment. He was possessed of a boundless credulity, now almost proverbial, causing innumerable errors and contradictions in his writings. His style is entirely destitute of beauty or elegance; still, his works are of considerable value as a storehouse of the history of ancient heresies and of patristic polemics" (Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, iii, § 169). Scaliger calls Epiphanius an ignorant man, who committed the greatest blunders, told the greatest falsehoods, and knew next to nothing about either Hebrew or Greek.

Hook (*Eccles. Biography*, iv, § 3) cites Epiphanius as one of the writers to whom we can refer for proof of the errors of modern Romanism, and for justification of the Reformation. For example, against invocation of saints, "Neither Elias (he says), nor John, nor Thecla, nor any of the saints is to be worshipped. For that ancient error shall not prevail with us, that we should forsake the living God and worship the things that are made by him. For they worshipped and served the creature above the Creator, and became fools. For if he will not permit angels to be worshipped, how much more would he not have her who was born of Anna? Let Mary, therefore, be had in honor, but let the Lord be worshipped." Again he observes "that the creature cannot be worshipped without injuring the true faith, and falling back to the errors of the ancient pagans, who forsook the worship of the true God to adore the creature; or without incurring the malediction spoken of by St. Paul—that they worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever; therefore God gave them up to vile affections." "Sed neque Iellas, neque Joannes—neque quisquam sanctorum adoratur," etc. (*Ihar.* 79 and 62). As decisive is his testimony against the doctrine of a purgatorial state. "In the age to come (he says) there is no advantage of fasting, no call to repentance,

no display of charity; none are admitted after their departure hence, nor can we then correct what was before amiss. There Lazarus goeth not to Dives, nor Dives to Lazarus; the garners are sealed, the combat finished, the crowns distributed. Those who have not yet encountered have no more opportunity, and those who have conquered are not cast out. All is finished after we have departed hence" (*Har.* 59).

The extant writings of Epiphanius are the following, in the order in which they are given in the edition of his works by Petavius (Paris, 1622; Leipzig, 1682; and in Migne, *Patrologia Græca*, vols. xli, xlii, xliii):

1. *Ἰλιάρχιον*, Panarium (*medicine-chest*), a treatise against heresies. It was written at the request of two monks, named Paul and Acacius, belonging to a monastery near Berea, in Lower Syria. Prefixed to the work is a letter to these monks, which serves as a preface. The whole work is divided into three books, which are subdivided into seven tomes or sections. The first book contains three of these subdivisions, and each of the others two. The whole includes an account of eighty heresies, twenty of which were before Christ: 1, the Barbarians, from Adam to Noah; 2, the Scythians, from Nimrod to Terah; 3, the Hellenists, including all who paid divine honors to the creature, including idolatry proper, and also the philosophical arts of Stoics, Platonists, Pythagoreans, Epicureans; 4, the Samaritanism, arising from a mixture of Hellenism and Judaism, and including four sects; 5, the Judæans (Judaism), including the seven sects of Sadducees, Scribes, Pharisees, Hemerobaptists, Nazarenes, Essenes, and Herodians. Of Christian heresies he names the Simonians (followers of Simon Magus), the Basilidian, and other Gnostic sects. With the sixty-fourth heresy he begins his account of the heresies of his own age, Origenism, Arianism. A critical work of great ability on the information given by Epiphanius has been published by Lipsius, *Zur Quellenkritik des Epiphanius*. It limits itself to heresies 13 to 57, which are mostly Gnostic systems. Lipsius shows that Epiphanius, Philaster, and Pseudo-Tertullian made use of the same source, and that this source was the work of Hippolytus against 52 heresies called *σύνταγμα*, which was still known to Photius.

2. *Ἀγκυρωτός*, Ancoratus (*anchored*), i. q. *anchor* or defence of the faith, especially of the doctrine of the Trinity; so called "because," says Epiphanius, "I have collected, according to my slender abilities, all those passages of Scripture which are calculated to establish our faith; that this book may, like the *anchor of a ship*, establish believers in the orthodox faith, in the midst of the agitations and tempests of heresy."

3. *Ανακεφαλωσις* (Migne, xlii, 833), which is a summary or abridgment of the Panarium, the order of topics being somewhat varied.

4. *Περὶ μέτρων καὶ σταθμῶν*, De Mensuris et Ponderibus (*of measures and weights*), in which he gives an account of the weights and measures used in Scripture, a book still useful for Biblical archæology.

5. *Περὶ τῶν δώδεκα λίθων*, de xii gemmis quæ erant in veste Aaronis (*on the 12 gems which were in Aaron's breast-plate*).

A *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, under the name of Epiphanius, was published by Foggini, in a Latin version (Rome, 1750, 4to; and the same was published [in Greek and Latin], Rome, 1772, 4to), by Giacomellus, who attributes it to Philo Carpasius. See PHILO.

The complete editions of Epiphanius (by Petavius and Migne) have been named above. There is a new edition by Dindorf (Leips. 5 vols. 8vo, 1859–1863). The *Panarium* is given in vols. ii, iii, of Oehler, *Corpus Hæresiologicalum* (Berlin, 1859–1862, 5 vols. 8vo). There is a German translation of portions of Epiphanius, with notes, by Rosler (1778, 8vo). His account of the Arian and Meletian heresies was translated into English by Whiston, in his *Collection of Ancient Monuments on*

*the Trinity* (Lond. 1713, 8vo). A separate life of Epiphanius was published by Gervaise (Paris, 1738, 4to).

See Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* vi, 32; viii, 15; Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* vi, 10, 12, 14; Dupin, *Eccl. Writers*, ii, 234; the account of the Bollandists, in Migne, *Patrol. Græc.* xli; Oudin, *De Script. Eccl.* i, 527; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacrés* (Paris, 1860), vol. vi, ch. xv; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* (Genev. 1720), i, 147; Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Græca*, ed. Harles, viii, 255 sq.; Lardner, *Works*, iv, 185 sq.; Clarke, *Succession of Sacred Literature*, i, 324; Neander, *Church History* (Torrey's), ii, 680, 697; Schaff, *Ch. History*, vol. iii, § 169; Hoffmann, *Bibliog. Lexikon*, ii, 25 sq.

**Epiphanius, St.**, bishop of Pavia, was born in that city, of a noble family, in 439 (according to others 438). He received an education for the priesthood under the special superintendence of St. Crispin, bishop of Pavia. He was consecrated subdeacon in 456, deacon in 458, and on the death of Crispin in 456, he was unanimously chosen bishop by the clergy and people. He had long been noted for his rigid asceticism, and after his election his rigor greatly increased. He took only one meal a day, abstained altogether from wine and meat, never used a bath, and was present at divine service with feet locked together. At that time the West Roman empire was falling to pieces, and a prey to the incursions of northern tribes. During these disturbances, bishop Epiphanius seems to have gained to a high degree the esteem and the confidence of all the rulers. He mediated a peace between emperor Anthemius and his son-in-law Ricimer. In 474 he was sent by the emperor Nepos as envoy to Eurich, king of the Visigoths. In 476 king Odoacer conquered Pavia, and gave the city up to plundering, on which occasion the cathedral was destroyed. Epiphanius rebuilt the cathedral, and prevailed upon the king to exempt the city for five years from all taxes. During the war between Odoacer and Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths, he gained the confidence of both parties. Theodoric, who in 493 became the master of Italy, granted, upon the intercession of Epiphanius, an amnesty to all who had borne arms against him. Theodoric then (494) sent Epiphanius on a mission to Gundobald, king of the Burgundians, to treat with him for the release of the Ligurian prisoners, who were to re-people the desolated districts of Italy. The mission was successful, and Theodoric subsequently remitted to the Ligurians two thirds of the taxes. Epiphanius died in Pavia, Jan. 21, 497. In 962 the emperor Otho had his relics transported to Hildesheim, in Germany. The Church of Rome commemorates him as a saint on Jan. 21.—Butler, *Lives of Saints*, i, 191; *Acta Sanctorum*, Jan. 21 (biography by his successor Ennodius); Neander, *Light in Dark Places* (New York, 1853), p. 97; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xvi, 161; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iii, 100. (A. J. S.)

**Epiphanius, SCULASTICUS**, an ecclesiastical writer of the Latin Church, lived at the beginning of the 6th century, and is supposed to have been an Italian by birth. At the request of his friend Cassiodorus (q. v.) he translated from Greek into Latin the works of the Church historians Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret. Cassiodorus revised the translation, and made out of the three works one, which, under the name of *Historia Tripartita*, remained throughout the Middle Ages one of the standard historical works. Likewise, at the request of Cassiodorus, Epiphanius translated several other works, as the *Codex Encyclicus* (a collection of synodal epistles to the emperor Leo I in defence of the Council of Chalcedon); a Commentary of bishop Epiphanius of Cyprus on the Song of Songs; a Commentary of Didymus on the Proverbs and the catholic epistles.—Cave, *Hist. Lit.* (Genev. 1720), i, 320; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xvi, 162; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 100.

**Epiphany** (ἐπιφάνεια, τὰ ἐπιφάνια, the "mani-

festation" of Christ), one of the oldest festivals of the Christian Church, and mentioned as such by Clement of Alexandria (*Stromat.* i, 1). Until the time of Chrysostom, it opened in the Eastern Church the cycle of festivals. It denoted at first the baptism of Christ, which, as Chrysostom himself remarks, was, in a higher sense than his birth, his real manifestation to men. A special festival of the birth of Christ arose later than the festival of Epiphany, and up to that time the commemoration of the birth of Christ was included in that of Epiphany. According to the testimony of Clement of Alexandria, it was at first celebrated at Alexandria by the Basilidians, but soon it was introduced into the orthodox Church also. Neander thinks that it did not originate with the Basilidians, but that they derived it from Jewish Christians in Syria and Palestine. The first trace of the festival in the Latin Church is found in 360, when, as Ammianus Marcellinus (xxi, 2) mentions, the emperor Julian took part in a celebration of the festival at Vienne. In the Western Church it came early to denote the manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles, with especial reference to his appearance to the wise men of the East, who came to adore him and bring him presents (Matt. ii, 1-12). Gradually the commemoration of other events in the life of Christ was connected with the celebration of Epiphany, as the working of the first miracle at the wedding at Cana (hence it was called "bethphania," manifestation in a house), and the feeding of five thousand persons (hence the name "phagiphania"). Prominent, however, in the Latin Church remained the celebration of Epiphany as the manifestation of Christ to the wise men. The tradition of the Church venerated the wise men as the "Three Holy Kings," and the festival itself was commonly called in the Church the festival of the Three Kings (*festum trium regum, festum Magorum, festum stellæ*). Like other high festivals, Epiphany was celebrated by a vigil, by the preaching of homilies, by the reception of the Lord's Supper, and by granting liberty to slaves. During the Middle Ages a dramatic representation of the oblation of the wise men was incorporated into divine worship, and in some countries these performances have maintained themselves until the present century. Peculiar popular amusements also connected themselves with the celebration of the day in Roman Catholic countries, and partly exist even at the present day. In the city of Rome there is on the festival of Epiphany a great exhibition in the College of the Propaganda, young men from all countries making addresses in their native languages, in order thus to represent the appearance of Christ to all nations. In some Western churches, especially in Africa, Epiphany was used as a day of baptism (*dies luminum*); but Pope Leo I was a decided opponent of this custom, calling it *irrationaliâlem novitàatem* (an unreasonable novelty). Among the Franks the custom was also known, and Charlemagne mentions it in an epistle to the bishop Garibald, but without approving it. Previously Gregory II, in 726, had forbidden to baptize except on Easter and Pentecost. In the Greek Church it was customary to consecrate the water on this day, and the custom still prevails in Russia.—Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. xx, chap. iv; Herzog, *Real-Encyclopædie*, iv, 94; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 283; Augusti, *Handbuch d. christl. Archæologie*, i, 528; ii, 476; Binterim, *Denkwürdigkeiten der christl.-kath. K.* vol. v. See THEOPHANY. (A. J. S.)

**Epîphi** (Ἐπιφί, 3 Macc. vi, 38), the name of the eleventh month of the Egyptian Vague year, and the Alexandrian or Egyptian Julian year: Copt. *ēpîp*; Arab. *apîb*. Its beginning corresponds with the 25th of June in the Julian calendar (Ideler, *Handb. d. Chronol.* i, 98, 144). In ancient Egyptian it is called "the third month [of] the season of the waters." See EGYPT. The name Epiphany is derived from that of the goddess of the month, *Apopt* (Lepsius, *Chron. d. Äg.* i, 111). The supposed derivation of the Hebrew month-

name *Abîb* from Epiphany is discussed in other articles. See MONTH.

**Episcopacy** (ἐπίσκοπος, *bishop*; ἐπισκοπεῖν, *to superintend*), the government of bishops in the Church, whether as an order superior to presbyters or not. For the classes, duties, insignia, elections, and jurisdiction of bishops, see BISHOP. For the controversy as to the exclusive validity of Episcopal orders, see SUCCESSION, APOSTOLICAL. We give, in this article, a brief statement of the origin of Episcopacy, and of the theories of Episcopacy maintained in the prominent Episcopal churches of Christendom.

1. *Origin of Episcopacy.*—The high Episcopal writers, both of the Church of Rome and the Church of England, maintain that the order of bishops takes the place of the apostles in the Christian Church by direct divine appointment. Their view has been stated as follows: "While our Lord remained upon earth he acted as the immediate governor of his Church. Having himself called the apostles, he kept them constantly about his person, except at one time, when he sent them forth upon a short progress through the cities of Judea, and gave them particular directions how they should conduct themselves. The seventy disciples whom he sent forth at another time are never mentioned again in the New Testament. But the apostles received from him many intimations that their office was to continue after his departure; and as one great object of his ministry was to qualify them for the execution of this office, so, in the interval between his resurrection and his ascension, he explained to them the duties of it, and he invested them with the authority which the discharge of those duties implied (Matt. xxviii, 19, 20; John xx, 21, 22). Soon after the ascension of Jesus, his apostles received those extraordinary gifts of which his promise had given them assurance, and immediately they began to execute their commission as the rulers of that society which was gathered by their preaching. In Acts vi we find the apostles ordering the Christians at Jerusalem to 'look out seven men of honest report,' who might take charge of the daily ministrations to the poor, and to bring the men so chosen to them, that 'we,' said the apostles, 'may appoint them over this business.' The men accordingly were 'set before the apostles, and when they had prayed they laid their hands on them.' Here are the apostles ordaining deacons. Afterward we find St. Paul, in his progress through Asia Minor, ordaining in every church elders, *πρεσβυτέρους* (Acts xiv, 23). The men thus ordained by St. Paul appear, from the Acts and the Epistles, to have been teachers, pastors, overseers of the flock of Christ; and to Timothy, who was a minister of the Word, the apostle speaks of 'the gift which is in thee by the putting on of my hands' (2 Tim. i, 6). Over the persons to whom he thus conveyed the office of teaching he exercised jurisdiction, for he sent to Ephesus to the elders of the church to meet him at Miletus; and there, in a long discourse, gave them a solemn charge (Acts xx, 17-35), and to Timothy and Titus he writes epistles in the style of a superior. He not only directs Timothy, whom he had besought to abide at Ephesus, how to behave himself in the house of God as a minister, but he sets him over other ministers. He empowers him to ordain men to the work of the ministry (2 Tim. ii, 2). He gives him directions about the ordination of bishops and deacons; he places both these kinds of office-bearers in Ephesus under his inspection, instructing him in what manner to receive an accusation against an elder who labored in word and doctrine; and he commands him to charge some that they teach no other doctrine but the form of sound words. In like manner he describes to Titus the qualifications of a bishop or elder, making him the judge how far any person in Crete was possessed of these qualifications; he gives him authority over all orders of Christians there; and he empowers him to reject heretics. Here,

then, is that apostle with whose actions we are best acquainted seemingly aware that there would be continual occasion in the Christian Church for the exercise of that authority over pastors and teachers which the apostles had derived from the Lord Jesus; and by these two examples of a delegation, given during his lifetime, preparing the world for beholding that authority exercised by the successors of the apostles in all ages. Accordingly, the earliest Christian writers tell us that the apostles, to prevent contention, appointed bishops and deacons; giving orders, too, that upon their death other approved men should succeed in their ministry. We are told that the other apostles constituted their first-fruits, that is, their first disciples, after they had proved them by the Spirit, bishops and deacons of those who were to believe; and that the apostle John, who survived the rest, after returning from Patmos, the place of his banishment, went about the neighboring nations, ordaining bishops, establishing whole churches, and setting apart particular persons for the ministry, as they were pointed out to him by the Spirit" (Watson, s. v.). In substance, the high Episcopalians claim that "after the ascension of our Lord, and before the death of the inspired apostles, there were in the Church three orders in the ministry—apostles, presbyters, and deacons; and these three orders have continued ever since. The name apostle, out of respect to the memory of the *inspired* apostles, was changed to bishop, while the *office* remained the same."

The view above given, however satisfactory it may be to high Episcopalians, is not adopted by the more moderate writers on that side, nor by other denominations of Christians. The following brief account, from Neander's Introduction to Coleman's *Apostolical and Primitive Church*, is both lucid and impartial. "The earliest constitution of the Church was modelled, for the most part, after that religious community with which it stood in closest connection, and to which it was most assimilated—the Jewish synagogue. This, however, was so modified as to conform to the nature of the Christian community, and to the new and peculiar spirit with which it was animated. Like the synagogue, the Church was governed by an associated body of men appointed for this purpose. The name of *presbyters*, which was appropriated to this body, was derived from the Jewish synagogue. But in the Gentile churches formed by the apostle Paul they took the name of *ἐπίσκοποι*, *bishops*, a term more significant of their office in the language generally spoken by the members of these churches. The name *presbyter* denoted the dignity of their office, while *bishop*, on the other hand, was expressive rather of the nature of their office, *ἐπισκοπεῖν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*, *to take the oversight of the Church*. Most certainly no other distinction originally existed between them. But, in process of time, some one, in the ordinary course of events, would gradually obtain the pre-eminence over his colleagues, and, by reason of that peculiar oversight which he exercised over the whole community, might come to be designated by the name *ἐπίσκοπος*, *bishop*, which was originally applied to them all indiscriminately. The constant tumults, from within and from without, which agitated the Church in the time of the apostles, may have given to such a one opportunity to exercise his influence the more efficiently; so that, at such a time, the controlling influence of one in this capacity may have been very salutary to the Church. This change in the relation of the presbyters to each other was not the same in all the churches, but varied according to their different circumstances. It may have been as early as the latter part of the life of John, when he was sole survivor of the other apostles, that one, as president of this body of presbyters, was distinguished by the name of *ἐπίσκοπος*, *bishop*. There is, however, no evidence that the apostle himself introduced this change, much less that he author-

ized it as a perpetual ordinance for the future. Such an ordinance is in direct opposition to the spirit of that apostle. This change in the mode of administering the government of the Church, resulting from peculiar circumstances, may have been introduced as a salutary expedient, without implying any departure from the purity of the Christian spirit. When, however, the doctrine is, as it gradually gained currency in the third century—that the bishops are by divine right the head of the Church, and invested with the government of the same; that they are the successors of the apostles, and by this succession inherit apostolical authority; that they are the medium through which, in consequence of that ordination which they have received merely in an outward manner, the Holy Ghost, in all time to come, must be transmitted to the Church—when this becomes the doctrine of the Church, we certainly must perceive in these assumptions a great corruption of the Christian system. It is a carnal perversion of the true idea of the Christian Church. It is a falling back into the spirit of the Jewish religion. Instead of the Christian idea of a church, based on inward principles of communion, and extending itself by means of these, it presents us with the image of one like that under the Old Testament, resting in outward ordinances, and seeking to promote the propagation of the kingdom of God by external rites. This entire perversion of the original view of the Christian Church was itself the origin of the whole system of the Roman Catholic religion, the germ from which sprung the popery of the Dark Ages. We hold, indeed, no controversy with that class of Episcopalians who adhere to the Episcopal system as well adapted, in their opinion, to the exigencies of their Church. But the doctrine of the absolute necessity of the Episcopal as the only valid form of government, and of the Episcopal succession of bishops above mentioned in order to a participation in the gifts of the Spirit, we must regard as something foreign to the true idea of the Christian Church. It is in direct conflict with the spirit of Protestantism, and is the origin, not of the true catholicism of the apostle, but of that of the Romish Church. When, therefore, Episcopalians disown, as essentially deficient in their ecclesiastical organization, other Protestant churches which evidently have the spirit of Christ, it only remains for us to protest, in the strongest terms, against their setting up such a standard for the Christian Church. Far be it from us, who began with Luther in the Spirit, that we should now desire to be made perfect by the flesh (Gal. iii, 3)."

Bunsen gives the following view of the original character of the Episcopacy: "The episcopate was originally the independent position of a city clergyman, presiding over the congregation, with the neighboring villages, having a body of elders attached to him. Where such a council can be formed there is a complete Church—a bishopric. The elders are teachers and administrators. If an individual happen to be engaged in either of these offices more exclusively than the other, it makes no real alteration in his position, for the presbyters of the ancient Church filled both situations. Their office was literally an office, not a rank. The country clergymen were most probably members of the ecclesiastical council of the city church, as the bishops of the country towns certainly were members of the metropolitan presbytery" (*Hippolytus and his Age*, iii, 246).

Professor R. D. Hitchcock (*American Presbyterian Review*, Jan. 1867) gives a luminous sketch of the origin and growth of Episcopacy. Admitting that the Episcopal system was in full force in the Church before the end of the third century, he shows clearly, nevertheless, that it was not of apostolical origin, but a later growth of ecclesiastical development, as follows: (1.) The best Episcopal writers now admit that the Episcopal system is not to be found in the N. T. (2.) The earliest witness, outside of the N. T., is Clem-

ent of Rome (about A.D. 100), in whose *Epistle to the Corinthians* the words bishop and presbyter are used interchangeably. Dr. Hitchcock analyzes the letters of Ignatius († 115?) both in the Syriac version of his Epistles and in the shorter Greek version, giving every passage in which Episcopacy occurs. His conclusions are that, (1.) Admitting the substantial integrity of the texts, the strong infusion of Episcopacy in them "is best explained by supposing it to be a new thing, which Ignatius was doing, always and everywhere, his utmost to recommend. As special pleading for a novelty, the Episcopal tone of the Ignatian epistles is easily understood. (2.) The Ignatian Episcopacy is not diocesan, but Congregational. Each of the churches addressed had its own bishop, presbyters, and deacons. (3.) The apostolic succession (in Ignatius) is not Episcopal, but Presbyterian. The bishop is the representative of Christ, as Christ is of the Father; the presbyters are representatives of the apostles, and the deacons of the precept or commandment of Christ. In short, the Ignatian Episcopacy, instead of having the appearance of a settled polity, handed down from the apostles, has the appearance of being a new and growing institution, unlike what went before as well as what was coming after" (*Amer. Presb. Review*, Jan. 1867, p. 145).—The next witness is Irenæus († 202), who, according to Dr. Hitchcock, commonly uses the words "bishop," "episcopal," "episcopate" in the Ignatian Congregational sense; while in certain cited passages he uses "bishop" and "presbyter" interchangeably, as Clement does. This "wavering terminology is indicative, not of apostolic tradition, but of later genesis and growth, and that growth not yet completed."—Tertullian († 240?) draws the line distinctly between clergy and laity, and discriminates clearly between bishops, priests, and deacons. In Cyprian (248-258), as has been remarked above, Episcopacy is fully matured. (See CHURCH, ii, 328.)

II. *Episcopacy of the Roman Catholic Church.*—(1.) The theory of the Episcopacy according to Roman writers springs from the Romish doctrine of a visible Church. "An invisible Church" (Möhler, *Symbolism*, § 43) "needs only an inward, purely spiritual sacrifice, and a general priesthood;" but the visible Church, in its very idea, according to the Romish view, requires an external sacrifice, and the consecration of especial priests to perform it. The priest is supposed to receive the internal consecration from God through the external consecration of the Church—that is to say, he receives the Holy Ghost through the imposition of hands of the bishops. The stability of the visible Church is supposed to require, therefore, an ecclesiastical ordination, originating with Christ, and perpetuated in uninterrupted succession; so that, as the apostles were sent forth by Christ, they, in their turn, instituted bishops, and these have appointed their successors down to our days. But, if these bishops are to form a perpetual corporation, they need a centre and head connecting them firmly together, and exercising jurisdiction over them, and this head is found in the pope. The Episcopacy, with the pope at its head, is revered in the Church of Rome as a divine institution.

(2.) We say "with the pope at its head," for this point is essential to the Romish idea of an Episcopacy *jure divino*. The Roman Church has been divided on this question for ages. It formed one of the chief controversies in the Council of Trent, where many of the bishops earnestly endeavored to have their office pronounced to be of divine right apart from the pope, while the papal legates strenuously, but adroitly, resisted this claim, and managed to prevent its authorization by the council. The declarations of Trent on the subject are as follows (sess. xxiii, *De Reformatione*, ch. iv): "The sacred and holy synod declares that, besides the other ecclesiastical degrees, bishops, who have succeeded unto the place of the apostles, princi-

pally belong to the (*this*) hierarchical order; that they are placed, as the apostle says, by the Holy Ghost to rule the Church of God (Acts xx, 28); that they are superior to priests; confer the sacrament of ordination; ordain the ministers of the Church, etc." Further (same session, Can. vi): "If any one shall say that in the Catholic Church there is not a hierarchy instituted by divine ordination, consisting of bishops, priests, and ministers, let him be anathema." And also (Can. vii), "If any one shall say that bishops are not superior to priests, or that they have not the power of confirming and ordaining, etc., let him be anathema." Nothing is said here of the *divine right* of the Episcopal order. But, in fact, it is not even called an order at all. In chapter ii of the same session (*Touching the seven orders*) we have priests, deacons, subdeacons, acolytes, exorcists, readers, and door-keepers, but not a word about bishops. So far as order is concerned, the bishops are simply priests. *The Catechism of the Council of Trent* declares that the order of priesthood, though essentially one, has different degrees of dignity and power—1, simple priests; 2, bishops; 3, archbishops; 4, patriarchs; and, 5, superior to all, the sovereign pontiff. The history of the stormy 22d session of the council throws great light upon these decrees. A canon was proposed concerning "the institution of bishops," and the Spanish prelates demanded an addition to it, declaring the Episcopate to be of divine right. This question arose, in fact, in 1546, and was before the council, in some shape or other, until 1562 (sess. xxii), when it took the precise form, "Are bishops superior to priests by divine right, or only by ecclesiastical and papal right?" The pope knew that if it should be decided that the bishops held their power directly from God, there was no ground for the doctrine that they existed only through the pope, and feared that they would ultimately assert their entire independence. The dispute ended in dropping altogether the canon on the "institution of bishops," and substituting the vague decree and canon above cited.

(3.) Two theories, then, of the Episcopate exist in the Roman Church: 1, the so-called *Papal system*, according to which the pope is the sole bishop by divine right, and all other bishops exist only through him, and derive their superiority to presbyters solely from him; 2, the *Episcopal system*, which asserts an independent divine right on the part of each bishop. The former is the ultramontane view, and it is now prevalent throughout almost all the Roman world. The latter is the moderate or Gallic view. It holds that the bishops are the rightful governors of the Church, superior to presbyters by the direct appointment of God; and maintains that the pope is, with regard to other bishops, *primus inter pares*, appointed for the sake of keeping up the unity of the Church as a corporate body. The question, in fact, turns upon that of the primacy of the see of Rome. See PRIMACY. The *Episcopal* theory was adopted by the Gallican clergy (see GALLICANISM), by the Jansenists (q. v.), and by Hontheim (q. v.). The present tendency of the entire Romish Church, however, is to the ultramontane theory.

The Romish Episcopacy, as a whole, is *diocesan*. See DIOCESE. The clergy of the diocese are subject to the bishop, but his authority does not extend beyond the diocese. There are, besides the diocesan bishops, bishops *vacantes*, bishops *in partibus*, bishops *suffragan*, etc., for which distinctions, see BISHOPS. "The division of the Church into dioceses may be viewed as a natural consequence of the institution of the office of bishops. The authority to exercise jurisdiction, when committed to several hands, requires that some boundaries be defined within which each party may employ his powers, otherwise disorder and confusion would ensue, and the Church, instead of being benefited by the appointment of governors, might be exposed to the



double calamity of an overplus of them in one district, and a total deficiency of them in another. Hence we find, so early as the New-Testament history, some plain indications of the rise of the diocesan system in the cases respectively of James, bishop of Jerusalem; Timothy, bishop of Ephesus; Titus, of Crete, to whom may be added the angels or bishops of the seven churches in Asia. These were placed in cities, and had jurisdiction over the churches and inferior clergy in those cities, and probably in the country adjacent. The first dioceses were formed by planting a bishop in a city or considerable village, where he officiated stably, and took the spiritual charge, not only of the city itself, but the suburbs, or region lying round about it, within the verge of its [civil] jurisdiction, which seems to be the plain reason of that great and visible difference which we find in the extent of dioceses, some being very large, others very small, according as the civil government of each city happened to have a larger or lesser jurisdiction" (*Hook*). See Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. ix, ch. ii. The bishops are named from the principal city of the diocese, as Rome, Lyons, etc. There were bishops, not diocesan, in Ireland, until the 12th century (see *Christian Remembrancer*, Jan. 1855, p. 215). While the Romish bishops are independent of each other, they are all subordinate to the pope, and must make regular returns to him of the state of their dioceses. See BISHOPS.

III. (1.) *The Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States* hold that there are three orders of ministers in the Church, bishops, priests, and deacons, and that bishops are the successors of the apostles, and superior to priests and deacons. The High-Church theory maintains the *divine right* of Episcopacy, and its absolute necessity to the existence of the Church; the Low-Church party deny that there is any positive command upon the subject in Scripture, or that there is anything in the standards of the Church of England which makes episcopacy to be of the essence of a church. The High-Churchmen maintain, and the Low-Churchmen reject the theory of the "exclusive validity of episcopal orders." See SUCCESSION. In the preface to the ordinal of the Church of England, and of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, it is declared as "evident unto all men diligently reading holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church, bishops, priests, and deacons." The doctrine of those churches in general is, "That there is in the Church a superior order of office-bearers, the successors of the apostles, who possess in their own persons the right of ordination and jurisdiction, and who are called ἐπίσκοποι, as being the overseers not only of the people, but also of the clergy; and an inferior order of ministers, called presbyters, the literal translation of the word πρεσβύτεροι, which is rendered in our English Bibles *elders*, persons who receive from the ordination of the bishop power to preach and to administer the sacraments, who are set over the people, but are themselves under the government of the bishop, and have no right to convey to others the sacred office which he gives them authority to exercise under him." According to a phrase used by Charles I, who was by no means an unlearned defender of that form of government to which he was a martyr, the presbyters are *episcopi gregis* [bishops of the flock], but the bishops are *episcopi gregis et pastorum* [bishops of the flock and of the pastors.] "The liberal writers, however, in the Church of England do not contend that this form of government is made so binding in the Church as not to be departed from and varied according to circumstances. It cannot be proved, says Dr. Paley, that any form of church government was laid down in the Christian as it had been in the Jewish Scriptures, with a view of fixing a constitution for succeeding ages. The truth seems to have been, that such offices were at first erected in the Christian

Church as the good order, the instruction, and the exigencies of the society at that time required, without any intention, at least without any declared design of regulating the appointment, authority, or the distinction of Christian ministers under future circumstances." To the same effect, also, Bishop Tomline says, "It is not contended that the bishops, priests, and deacons of England are at present precisely the same that bishops, presbyters, and deacons were in Asia Minor seventeen hundred years ago. We only maintain that there have always been bishops, priests, and deacons in the Christian Church since the days of the apostles, with different powers and functions, it is allowed, in different countries and at different periods; but the general principles and duties which have respectively characterized these clerical orders have been essentially the same at all times and in all places, and the variations which they have undergone have only been such as have ever belonged to all persons in public situations, whether civil or ecclesiastical, and which are, indeed, indispensable from every thing in which mankind are concerned in this transitory and fleeting world. I have thought it right to take this general view of the ministerial office, and to make these observations upon the clerical orders subsisting in this kingdom, for the purpose of pointing out the foundation and principles of Church authority, and of showing that our ecclesiastical establishment is as nearly conformable as change of circumstances will permit to the practice of the primitive Church. But, though I flatter myself that I have proved episcopacy to be an apostolical institution, yet I readily acknowledge that there is no precept in the New Testament which commands that every church should be governed by bishops. No church can exist without some government; but, though there must be rules and orders for the proper discharge of the offices of public worship, though there must be fixed regulations concerning the appointment of ministers, and though a subordination among them is expedient in the highest degree, yet it does not follow that all these things must be precisely the same in every Christian country; they may vary with the other varying circumstances of human society, with the extent of a country, the manners of its inhabitants, the nature of its civil government, and many other peculiarities which might be specified. As it has not pleased our Almighty Father to prescribe any particular form of civil government for the security of temporal comforts to his rational creatures, so neither has he prescribed any particular form of ecclesiastical polity as absolutely necessary to the attainment of eternal happiness. But he has, in the most explicit terms, enjoined obedience to all governors, whether civil or ecclesiastical, and whatever may be their denomination, as essential to the character of a true Christian. Thus the Gospel only lays down general principles, and leaves the application of them to men as free agents." Bishop Tomline, however, and the High-Episcopalians of the Church of England, contend for an original distinction in the office and order of bishops and presbyters; which notion is contradicted by the founder of the Church of England, Archbishop Cranmer, who says, "The bishops and priests were at one time, and were not two things; but both one office in the beginning of Christ's religion" (*Watson*). On the inconsistency of the position of that portion of the so-called evangelical Episcopalians which holds that bishops are really successors of the apostles, see an admirable article in the *Princeton Review*, January, 1856 (art. i).

(2.) The episcopacy of the Church of England is *diocesan*, like that of the Church of Rome, and the bishops are named from the chief city of the diocese (London, York, etc.). In the Protestant Episcopal churches the dioceses are generally coterminous with the States of the Union, and the bishops are named accordingly (Delaware, Connecticut, etc.). The larger

states are in some instances subdivided. "In the American Church the bishops are all of equal authority, each ruling his own diocese independently of the control of an ecclesiastical superior. No bishop is amenable to any central authority." There are no archbishops; but *assistant* and *missionary* bishops are authorized. See BISHOPS, and PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

IV. *Methodist Episcopal Church*.—(1.) The episcopacy of the Methodist Episcopal Church is believed to be nearer to the apostolic model than that of the churches which maintain the apostolical succession. Its simple idea is, that certain elders are chosen from the body of the presbyters to superintend the Church, and are called *bishops* or *superintendents*, both terms being used in the Methodist ritual. The bishops, in virtue of their functions, naturally stand above their brethren. With regard to the ordinary functions of the ministry, they do not differ from other ministers; but extraordinary functions, such as ordaining, presiding in assemblies, and the like, are devolved upon them by their brethren, and exercised by them exclusively and of right—right not divine, but ecclesiastical and human, founded upon the will of the body of pastors. The primitive principle that bishops and presbyters are of equal rank in the N. T. is fully recognised; nor are bishops regarded as the successors of the apostles. "As soon as a church has more than one pastor, it is natural and necessary that one should preside over the rest," and that "certain functions should be reserved to him" (Bungener, *Council of Trent*, bk. v, ch. ii). It is not contrary to the essence of the ministry, but rather in harmony with its missionary and pastoral aims, that the presidency thus arising should last for life, and that he who exercises it should govern the body of pastors according to laws adopted and approved by them, should appoint the ministers to their work, and should exercise all the functions necessary to an effective and vigorous superintendency; and if the superintendent or bishop is appointed for life, it is quite in accordance with scriptural usage that he should be set apart for his work by "the laying on of hands." Accordingly, the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church are elected by the General Conference (q. v.) for life, and are ordained according to a special form, modified from the ordinal of the Church of England (*Discipline*, pt. ii, chap. iii). The limits of their authority are clearly set forth in the Book of Discipline (pt. i, ch. iv). A bishop is amenable, not to the bench of bishops, but to the General Conference, which may even "expel him for improper conduct if they deem it necessary" (*Discipline*, pt. i, ch. ix). "In the American branch of the Methodist Church, episcopacy exists not only in the form in which it does in every English circuit—which is the old parochial episcopacy—but by formally committing general oversight into the hands of bishops, who have no other charge. These claim no superiority in order over their brethren, but exercise well-defined powers, simply as an arrangement of the Church for its own welfare—an arrangement which has worked admirably; and it may be questioned whether any form of church government in the world has more of the elements of power and permanence than this, which expresses Wesley's own idea of a fully organized church" (*London Quarterly Review*, July, 1856, p. 520).

It has been objected to the Methodist episcopacy that, while the theory of the Church admits but two orders in the ministry, the separate ordination of bishops really implies three. But the objection is groundless. (See above, II, 2.) In fact, the number of "orders" has always been an open question, even in the Roman Church; the Council of Trent did not settle it (compare *Canons of Trent*, sess. xiii, can. 2). The "balance of authority, ever from the earliest ages, certainly inclines to consider the episcopate, as an order, to be identical with the priesthood, not the com-

pletion of it" (Maskell, *Monumenta Ritualia*, iii, lxxxii, So also Palmer: "If we understand the word *order* in the sense of *degree*, we may say that there are three orders of the Christian ministry; but if we distribute it according to its *nature*, there are but two, viz. bishops (or presbyters) and deacons" (*On the Church*, pt. vi, § 1).

Some Methodist writers have maintained that three orders, bishops, priests, and deacons, belong to the constitution of the Church as laid down in Scripture, and therefore that the episcopal office is not simply an ecclesiastical one. See especially Grayson, *The Church and the Ministry* (Louisville, 1853, 8vo).

(2.) The Methodist episcopacy is not *diocesan*, like that of the churches of Rome and England, but *general* and *itinerant*. Instead of being confined to a city or district, the bishop is required to "travel at large;" and if "he cease from travelling without the consent of the General Conference, he cannot thereafter exercise the episcopal office." See CONFERENCES, and METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH. While, under the Methodist system, the bishops do not claim to be "successors of the apostles," or to be endowed, either as individuals or collectively, with superior authority to teach or to govern, apart from power given them by the body of presbyters as represented in the General Conference, it yet appears to be clear that, as to their functions and jurisdiction, they approach nearer to the apostolical idea than bishops under the diocesan system. Dollinger (perhaps the ablest of living Romanist writers), in maintaining that "bishops are the successors of the apostles, and have received their authority," is yet forced to admit that, under the Roman episcopal system, the authority of bishops is strictly limited to a particular diocese, while the jurisdiction of the apostles "extended to every part of the earth, wheresoever their universal vocation to convert the nations and to found churches conducted them" (*Church History*, i, 226, Lond. 1840). Under the Methodist system, a bishop may preside in a Conference and ordain presbyters in March in New York, in May in Illinois, in July in California, in October in China, and in December in Germany.

(3.) The Methodist episcopacy was instituted by Wesley. During the Revolutionary War in America, most of the clergy of the Church of England left the country. Before the war, the American preachers, like those in England, had been forbidden to administer the sacraments: the people were sent to the clergy of the Church of England for baptism and the Lord's Supper. After the war the societies were without the ordinances, and were likely to be disbanded in consequence. After duly considering the exigency, Mr. Wesley (who had previously in vain urged the bishop of London to ordain preachers for America) determined to organize the American Methodists into an independent Episcopal Church, and ordained the Rev. Thomas Coke, LL.D., as superintendent, and Richard Whatcoat and Thomas Vasey as elders. In 1784 the Rev. Francis Asbury was ordained by Dr. Coke, and the Methodist Episcopal Church was duly organized—the first American Episcopal Church. See METHODISM. Mr. Wesley did not pretend to ordain bishops in any other sense than according to his view of primitive episcopacy, in which, as he maintained, bishops and presbyters are the same order. The grounds of his procedure in the case are stated in his "Letter to Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury," prefixed to "Sunday Service of the Methodists" (1784); given also in *Watson's Life of Wesley* (p. 244). An excellent sketch of the rise of the Methodist episcopacy is given by Stevens, *History of Methodism*, vol. ii.

V. The Moravian Church (*Unitas Fratrum*) holds to episcopacy. Their bishops, however, are not diocesan. The history of the preservation of the episcopate is given in De Schweinitz, *The Moravian Episcopate* (Bethlehem, 1865). See MORAVIANS.

See *Canones et Decreta Concil. Trident.*, sess. xxiii; *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, pt. ii, *Sacrament of Orders*; Bunneger, *History of the Council of Trent*, bk. v, ch. ii; Elliott, *Delimitation of Romanism*, bk. ii, chap. xv; Möhler, *Symbolism*, § 43; Rothe, *Anfänge d. christlichen Kirche*, vol. i; Baur, *Ursprung des Episcopats* (Tübingen, 1838, 8vo); Neander, *Church History*, i, 190; Mosheim, *Ch. History*, vol. i; Killen, *Ancient Church*, sect. iii, chaps. vi, vii; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity*, chap. viii; Coleman, *Apostolical and Primitive Church*, ch. vi; Lord King, *Primitive Church* (12mo); Bangs, *Original Church of Christ* (N. Y. 12mo); Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, vol. i, § 167, 108; Emory, *On Episcopacy*; Emory, *Defence of our Fathers* (N. York, 8vo); Wesley, *Works*, vii, 312; Stillingfleet, *Irenicum*, 8vo; Stevens, *History of Methodism*, vol. ii, chaps. vi, vii; Watson, *Life of Wesley*, ch. xliii; Burnet, *History of English Reformation*, i, 400, 586; iv, 176; Porter, *Compendium of Methodism*; *Princeton Review*, January, 1856; Lightfoot, *On Philipppus* (1868), Appendix; *The Rise of the Episcopate* (*New Englander*, July, 1867); Palmer, *On the Church* (High-Church view), ii, 319 sq.; Hinds, *Rise and Early Progress of Christianity* (*Encyclop. Metropol.* London, 1859, 12mo); and the article *SUCCESSION*. The High-Episcopal view is well stated for modern readers in *Vox Ecclesie* (Philadelphia, 1866, 12mo); the moderate, in Litton, *The Church of Christ* (Lond. 1851, 8vo; Phila. 1853, 8vo).

**Episcopalians**, members of those churches which adopt the Episcopal form of Church government. See *EPISCOPACY*; *METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH*; *MORAVIANS*; *LUTHERAN CHURCH*; *ENGLAND, CHURCH OF*; *PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH*.

**Episcopus**. SIMON (Dutch, *Bischoep*), an eminent and learned Arminian theologian, was born in January, 1583, at Amsterdam, where he received his school education. In 1600 he went to the University of Leyden, where he took his degree of M.A. in 1606. He thenceforward devoted himself to the study of theology. "Earnestly," says Curcellæus (in his eulogy on Episcopus), "did he listen to the lectures of those very learned professors, Francis Gomarus, Luke Trelcatius, and James Arminius; and in the exercises of debates and harangues, which they commonly called *theses*, he left many of his equals far in the distance, and was highly esteemed as one worthy of being called to the ministry of the divine word. But when, especially after the death of Trelcatius, that terrible discussion on predestination, which afterwards agitated all Holland, finally arose, and was not only secretly carried on between the two professors, but also broke forth into open violence, our Episcopus became favorably inclined towards the Arminian doctrines. For this reason he received little favor from the pastors on the opposite side of the controversy, so that when the very illustrious councils of the state of Amsterdam, to whom the singular learning and piety of Episcopus had become known, would have invited him to become their preacher, these pastors, by causing delays, entirely frustrated the plans of the councils. Episcopus, disheartened at this affair, determined to leave the academy at Leyden, and in the year 1609 (in which year Arminius died) he betook himself to the Franeker Academy, belonging to the Frisii, incited especially by the fame of that most illustrious man and learned professor of the sacred language, John Drusius. But there he displayed, as youths of a bold mind are wont, such a zeal in the theological discussions, that he gave not a little offence to Sibrandus Lubbertus, a professor of that academy. Accordingly, a few months after, he departed and came into France, where in a brief space of time he obtained so fair a mastery of the French language that he not only understood it, but could speak it with considerable ease and purity. Finally, in the year 1610, he returned to his native land, only to receive the same tokens of ill will." In that year he

was ordained pastor of Bleyswick, a village near Rotterdam. In 1611 a colloquy was held at the Hague, by order of the States General, with a view to ending the agitating controversy between the Gomarists and Arminians, between six Remonstrant pastors and six Contra-Remonstrants. Episcopus, as one of the six Remonstrants, displayed so much learning and skill that his fame spread through all the country. In 1612 he was appointed professor of theology in the University of Leyden, as successor of Gomarus. Here his pre-eminent talents had full scope, and his reputation grew rapidly. The Gomarist controversy, however, waxed hotter and hotter; the orthodoxy of Episcopus was called in question by his theological opponents; and the rage of the Calvinistic party among the populace even went so far as to threaten violence. In 1614 he went to Amsterdam to attend a baptism, and the minister, Heyden, having stigmatized him as a heretic, he was saved from stoning only by the zeal of his friends. A blacksmith once ran after him with a hot iron with the cry, "Stop the Arminian disturber of the Church," and would probably have murdered him but for the interference of by-standers.

The Synod of Dort was held in 1618. See *DORT*. Episcopus was the chief spokesman of the Arminians. At the 23d session he delivered a discourse of great power, which is to be found in his *Works*, in *Limborch's Vita Episcopi*, and in *Calder's Life of Episcopus* (N. Y. 1837, chap. x). The synod condemned the Arminians, and by the aid of the civil government banished the Remonstrant ministers. Episcopus retired first to Antwerp, where he wrote his *Responsio ad duas Petri Wadingii Jesuitæ Epistolæ* (1621, on the Rule of Faith and on the Worship of Images); his celebrated *Confessio Fidei Remonstrantium* (Remonstrants' Confession of Faith, 1622; *Opera*, vol. iii); *Antidotum, sive genuina Declaratio sent. Synodi Dordruenæ* (*Opera*, vol. ii, Lond. 1678). When the war between Spain and the Netherlands was renewed, Episcopus took refuge in France, residing chiefly in Paris (1621-1626). Here he published *Paraphrasés* in cap. viii-xi *Epist. ad Romanos* (Paraphrase on Romans viii-xi, *Opera*, vol. i); *Bodecherus Inepticus* (Bodecherus the Simple; a defence of the Remonstrants against the charge of Socinianism; *Examen thesium J. Capelli* (on the Calvinistic and Arminian Controversy in Belgium); *Tractatus de Libero Arbitrio* (*Opera*, vol. i); Correspondence with Joh. Cameron on Grace and Free Will (*Opera*, vol. i). On the death of Prince Maurice (1625) the persecution of the Remonstrants slackened, and it became safe for Episcopus to return to his country in 1626, when he became minister to the Remonstrants of Rotterdam. Here he published *Apologia pro Confessione*, etc. (Apology for the Confession of the Remonstrants), and other controversial tracts (*Opera*, vol. iii). In 1634 he was made rector of the newly-established college of the Remonstrants at Amsterdam, where the rest of his life was spent in diligent and successful teaching, and in constant literary and pastoral activity. The fruits of his lectures appear in permanent form in his *Institutiones Theologicæ*, lib. iv, which, however, was left unfinished, and published posthumously (*Opera*, vol. i); and also in *Responsio ad Questiones Theologicæ Livæ* (Answers to 64 questions in theology proposed by students). He died April 4, 1643.

Episcopus was acknowledged, even by his enemies, to be a man of very rare abilities, as well as of great learning. Heidanus (one of his opponents) says he was endowed with "great learning, penetration, eloquence, and skill." His friend Uitenbogaert declared that he had never met a theologian "to be compared with Episcopus for his knowledge of the Scriptures and of divine subjects." Mabillon recommends his *Institutes* as of great value to students of divinity, except the parts in which he speaks against Romanist doctrines. Bull (in his *Judgment of the Catholic Church*) speaks of him as the "very learned Episcopus." His

talent for controversy was of a very high order; but his *Institutes* shows that he also possessed the power of clear and luminous statement to a rare degree. The theology of Episcopius is, in substance, that of Arminius. He has been charged with Socinianism, but his writings, controversial and other, sufficiently refute that charge as brought not only against him, but against the early Remonstrants in general. The charge was in part due to the fact that he held the ethical side of Christianity to be the test of communion rather than the doctrinal; holding that Christianity is not so much a doctrine as a life, and that it has its doctrines only with a view to its life. The two great champions of the doctrine of the Trinity in England, Waterland and Bull, both wrote against Episcopius. Waterland (*Importance of the Doctrine of the Trinity, Works*, Oxford, 1853, iii, 440 sq.) states that Episcopius holds "the doctrine of the Trinity, as to the main substance of it, to be certain and clear, but yet not necessary to be believed in order to salvation," and adds that the doctrine is "taught in full and strong terms in the 'Confession of the Remonstrants,' and in other places in the works of Episcopius." He then goes on, and successfully, to show the error and danger of the unguarded statement of Episcopius as to its importance. Bull's *Judgment of the Catholic Church on the necessity of believing that our Lord Jesus Christ is very God* (*Works on the Trinity*, Oxford, 1854, vol. iii), was written expressly to refute the statement of Episcopius (*Institutes*, bk. iv, ch. xxxiv, § 2), that "in the primitive churches, during at least three centuries, the belief and profession of the special divine sonship of Christ was not judged necessary to salvation." It is hardly necessary to say that Bull makes out his case. He does not, however, charge Episcopius with doctrinal error, but with too great and even dangerous liberality. He states also that, "although Episcopius was a man of unquestionably great ability, and in many respects possessed learning of no ordinary kind, yet he but little consulted or regarded, nay, he actually despised the writings of the ancient fathers and doctors." But on this see Limborch (cited by Calder, *Life of Episcopius*, N. Y. ed. p. 433). After the death of Episcopius, Jurieu charged him with Socinianism, which gave rise to a sharp letter from Clericus (Le Clerc) refuting the charge (see Bayle, s. v. Episcopius).

The writings of Episcopius were collected by Curcellæus, who published vol. i, Amst. 1650, with a sketch of the author's life; vol. ii, edited by Poelenburg, appeared in 1665. A second edition was published under the title *S. Episcopii opera omnia theologica, cum autographo collata, et à mendis aliquot gravioribus purgata* (Lond. 1678, 2 vols. fol.). His life was also written by Philip Limborch, first in Dutch, and afterwards enlarged in Latin (*Hist. Vitæ S. Episcopii*, etc., Amst. 1701). There is an English version of his *Labyrinthus Pontificius* under the title *Papish Labyrinth, or a Treatise on Infallibility* (Lond. 1763). See also Calder, *Memoirs of Simon Episcopius* (New York, 1837, 12mo); Heppé, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* iv, 100; a translation of Curcellæus's sketch, in the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1863, p. 612; Nichols, *Calvinism and Arminianism compared* (Lond. 1824, 2 vols. 8vo); Morison, *On the ninth of Romans*, p. 40 (Kilmarnock, 1849, 8vo); Schröckh, *Kirchengeschichte seit d. Reformation*, v, 239-296; and the articles ARMINIANISM; DORT; REMONSTRANTS.

**Episcōpus Episcōporum**, *bishop of bishops*, a title assumed by the popes.

**Episcōpus in Partibus**, *bishop in partibus infidelium*, see BISHOP, vol. i, p. 821, col. 2.

**Episcōpus Œcumenicus**, *Œcumenical bishop*, a title of the Patriarch of Constantinople.

**Epistle** (ἐπιστολή, something sent, as a "letter"). The use of written letters implies, of course, considerable progress in the development of civilized life.

There must be a recognised system of notation, phonetic or symbolic; men must be taught to write, and have writing materials at hand. In the early nomadic stages of society accordingly, like those which mark the period of the patriarchs of the O. T., we find no traces of any but oral communications. In the Homeric poems, though messages are usual, yet a sort of hieroglyphical letters is not unknown (*Il.* vi, 168). Messengers were sent instructed what to say from Jacob to Esau (*Gen.* xxxii, 3), from Balak to Balaam (*Num.* xxii, 5, 7, 16), bringing back in like manner a verbal, not a written answer (*Num.* xxiv, 12). See MESSENGER. The negotiations between Jephthah and the king of the Ammonites (*Judg.* xi, 12, 13) were conducted in the same way. It was still the received practice in the time of Saul (*1 Sam.* xi, 7, 9). The reign of David, bringing the Israelites, as it did, into contact with the higher civilization of the Phœnicians, witnessed a change in this respect also. See AMBASSADOR. The first recorded letter (כְּתוּבָה = "book;" comp. use of βιβλίον, *Herod.* i, 123) in the history of the O. T. was that which "David wrote to Joab, and sent by the hand of Uriah" (*2 Sam.* xi, 14), and this must obviously, like the letters that came into another history of crime (in this case also in traceable connection with Phœnician influence, *1 Kings* xxi, 8, 9), have been "sealed with the king's seal," as at once the guarantee of their authority, and a safeguard against their being read by any but the persons to whom they were addressed. The material used for the impression of the seal was probably the "clay" of *Job* xxxviii, 14. The act of sending such a letter is, however, pre-eminently, if not exclusively, a kingly act, where authority and secrecy were necessary. Hence they contained simply royal commands, and nothing is said of salutation or even address in connection with them. Joab, on the other hand, answers the letter which David had sent him after the old plan, and receives a verbal message in return. The demand of Benhadad and Ahab's answer to it are conveyed in the same way (*1 Kings* xx, 2, 5). Jehu wrote letters, and sent them to Samaria to authorities, respecting Ahab's children, the form of which, or of the one transcribed, is the first instance in the Bible of anything like a formula. It begins, "Now as soon as this letter cometh to you," but ends without any like phrase. It was apparently replied to by a message, and Jehu wrote another letter, which, as given, has not the same peculiarity as the first. That Jehu, who, though perhaps well born, was a rough soldier, should have written—and there is no ground for supposing that he used a scribe, but, from the extremely characteristic style, rather evidence against such an idea—indicates that letter-writing was then common (*2 Kings* x, 1-7). In this case secrecy may have been thought desirable, but the importance of the matter would have been a sufficient reason for writing. Written communications, however, become more frequent in the later history. The letter which the king of Syria, Benhadad, sent by Naaman to Jehoram, king of Israel, though to a sovereign with whom the writer was at peace, is in the same peremptory style, with no salutation (*2 Kings* v, 5, 6), from which we may conjecture that only the principal contents are given in this and like instances. The "writing" (כְּתוּבָה) to Jehoram, king of Judah, from Elijah (q. v.) must have been a written prophecy rather than a letter (*2 Chron.* xxi, 12-15); though it must be observed that such prophecies when addressed to persons are of an epistolary character. Hezekiah, when he summoned the whole nation to keep the Passover, sent letters "from the king and his princes," as had been determined at a council held at Jerusalem by the king, the princes, and all the congregation. The contents of these letters are given, or the substance. The form is that of an exhortation, without, however, address. The

character is that of a religious proclamation (2 Chron. xxx, 1-9). Hezekiah, in fact, introduced a system of couriers like that afterwards so fully organized under the Persian kings (comp. Herod. viii, 98, and Esth. viii, 10, 14). The letter or letters of Sennacherib to Hezekiah seem to have been written instructions to his messengers, which were given to Hezekiah to show him that they had their master's authority. It is to be observed that the messengers were commanded, "Thus shall ye speak to Hezekiah," and that Hezekiah "received the letter" from them. What he received was probably a roll of papyrus, as that which Jehoiakim burnt seems to have been (Jer. xxxvi, 23), for when he took it to the Temple he "spread it before the Lord" (2 Kings xix, 9-14; Isa. xxxvii, 9-14; comp. 2 Chron. xxxii, 17). It does not appear to have been usual for the prophets to write letters. Generally they seem, when they did not go themselves to those whom they would address, either to have sent a messenger, or to have publicly proclaimed what they were commissioned to say, knowing that the report of it would be carried to those whom it specially concerned. When Nebuchadnezzar had carried captive some of the people of Judah, we read how Jeremiah addressed them by a letter, which is a written exhortation and prophecy (xxix, 1-23). It can scarcely be said that here we perceive a positive distinction between the later prophets and the earlier, for Elijah sent a letter or "writing" to Jehoram, king of Judah, as already noticed. The distance of Babylon from Jerusalem, and of Jerusalem from the kingdom which was the scene of Elijah's ministry, seems to afford the true explanation. That letters were not uncommon between the captives at Babylon and those who remained at Jerusalem before it was destroyed, appears probable from the mention of letters to Zephaniah the priest, and to others from a false prophet Shemaiah, at Babylon, in contradiction of Jeremiah's letter (24-29). Jeremiah was commanded to send to the captives a condemnation of this man (30-32), and it is therefore probable that at least three letters passed on this occasion. Though with the little evidence we have we cannot speak positively, it seems as if the custom of letter-writing had become more common by degrees, although there is no ground for inferring any change in its character. Still we find nothing of an address or signature. The letter seems to be always a document, generally a message written for greater security or to have full authority, and was probably rolled, tied up, and sealed with the writer's seal. See LETTER.

Although no Hebrew letters are preserved of the time before David, it might be supposed that the form might have been derived from Egypt. We have papyrus containing copies by Egyptian scribes of the kings of the Rameses family about the 13th century B.C., of letters of their own correspondence. These show a regular epistolary style, the conventionalism of which at once removes us from all ideas of Shenitic literature. There is an air of the monuments about it that strikes us in the descriptive character of certain of the formulas. Some letters, from a superior to an inferior, commence in the manner shown in the following example: "The chief librarian Amen-em-an, of the royal white house, says to the scribe Penta-ur, Whereas, this letter is brought to you, saying—communication." A usual ending of such letters is, "Do thou consider this." Some begin with the word "Communication." The fuller form also seems to be an abbreviation. An inferior scribe, addressing his superior, thus begins: "The scribe Penta-ur salutes his lord, the chief librarian, Amen-em-an, of the royal white house. This comes to inform my lord. Again I salute my lord. Whereas I have executed all the commissions imposed upon me by my lord, well and truly, completely and thoroughly [?] I have done no wrong. Again I salute my lord." He ends, "Behold, this message is to

inform my lord." A more easy style is seen in a letter of a son to his father, which begins, "The scribe Amen-mesu salutes [his] father, captain of bowmen, Bek-en-ptah," and ends "Farewell." A military officer writing to another, and a scribe writing to a military officer, appear to begin with a prayer for the king before the formula "Communication." A royal or government letter is a mere written decree, without any formal introduction, and ending with an injunction to obey it. The contents of these letters are always addresses to, the persons written to, the writer using the first person singular. The subject-matter is various, and perhaps gives us a better idea of the literary ability of the Egyptians, and their lively national character, than any other of their compositions (see Goodwin on the "*Horatic Papyrus*," in the *Cambridge Essays*, 1855, p. 226 sq.). Indeed in Egypt everything of importance was committed to writing (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* ii, 176, abridgm.), and the monuments constantly depict scribes taking an inventory or check of all sorts of operations. See EGYPT.



Ancient Egyptian giving an account to two scribes of the stock on the estate.

Before fig. 1 is the satchel, and above fig. 2 the box for holding writing implements and papyrus. They are writing on boards: in their left hands are the ink-stands with black and red ink.

In the books of Scripture written after the return from Babylon, mention is made of letters of the enemies of the Jews to the kings of Persia, and of the kings to these persons, the Jews, or their officers, some of which are given. These are in an official style, with a greeting, and sometimes an address. The letter to Artaxerxes contains the form, "Be it known unto the king," "Be it known now unto the king" (Ezra iv, 11-16); and his answer thus begins, "Peace [or "welfare"], and so forth" (17-22), the expression "and so forth" occurring elsewhere in such a manner that it seems to be used by the transcriber for brevity's sake (10, 11; vii, 12). It must, therefore, not be compared to the common modern Arabic formula of commencement, "After the [usual] salutations." The letter of the opponents of the Jews to Darius (Hystaspis) thus begins: "Unto Darius the king, all peace. Be it known unto the king (v, 6-17)." The letter of Artaxerxes (Longimanus) to Ezra is a written decree, and not an ordinary letter, save in form (vii, 11, 26). Nehemiah asked for, and was granted, letters from the same king to the governors and the keeper of the king's forest (Neh. ii, 7, 9). When he was rebuilding Jerusalem, Sanballat sent him "an open letter" by his servant, repeating an invented rumor of the Jews' intention to rebel (vi, 5, 7): no doubt it was left not sealed purposely, either in order that the rumor should be so spread as if by accident, or to show disrespect. At this time many letters passed between the nobles of Judah and Tobiah, and letter-writing seems to have been common (17; see also 19). In Esther we read of exactly the same custom as that spoken of in the case of Jezebel's letter, the authority

of writings with the king's name and seal, even if not written by him. It is related that Abasuerus "took his signet from his hand and gave it unto Haman," who caused letters to be written containing a mandate: "In the name of king Abasuerus was it written, and sealed with the king's signet" (Esth. iii, 10, 12, 13). In like manner, the same authority was given to Esther and Mordecai, and it is remarked, "For the writing which is written in the king's name, and sealed with the king's signet, may not be reversed" (viii, 7, 8). The influence of Persian, and yet more, perhaps, that of Greek civilization, led to the more frequent use of letters as a means of intercourse. Whatever doubts may be entertained as to the genuineness of the epistles themselves, their occurrence in 1 Macc. xi, 30; xii, 6, 20; xv, 1, 16; 2 Macc. xi, 16, 34, indicates that they were recognised as having altogether superseded the older plan of messages orally delivered. See LETTER.

The two stages of the history of the N. T. present in this respect a very striking contrast. The list of the canonical books shows how largely epistles were used in the expansion and organization of the Church. Those which have survived may be regarded as the representatives of many others that are lost. We are perhaps too much in the habit of forgetting that the absence of all mention of written letters from the Gospel history is just as noticeable. With the exception of the spurious letter to Abgarus (q. v.) of Edessa (Euseb. *H. E.* i, 13) there are no epistles of Jesus. The explanation of this is to be found partly in the circumstance of one who, known as the "carpenter's son," was training as his disciples those who, like himself, belonged to the class of laborers and peasants, partly in the fact that it was by personal rather than by written teaching that the work of the prophetic office, which he reproduced and perfected, had to be accomplished. See JESUS CHRIST. In the Acts of the Apostles we have the short epistle addressed by the apostolic council held at Jerusalem to the Gentile converts in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia (Acts xv, 23-24). There is also a letter from Claudius Lysias to Felix, which may be supposed to preserve the official style of the provinces. Both these use the common Greek formulas, beginning, after the names of the writer and the person written to, with the salutation, and ending with the adieu. The epistles of the N. T. in their outward form are such as might be expected from men who were brought into contact with Greek and Roman customs, themselves belonging to a different race, and so reproducing the imported style with only partial accuracy. They begin (the Epistle to the Hebrews and 1 John excepted) with the names of the writer, and those to whom the epistle is addressed. Then follows the formula of salutation (analogous to the *εὖ πᾶσιν* of Greek, the *S., S. D.,* or *S. D. M., salutem, salutem dicit, salutem dicit nullam,* of Latin correspondence)—generally in Paul's Epistles in some combination of the words "grace, mercy, and peace" (*χάρις, ἔλεος, εὐοίη*); in others, as in Acts xv, 23; James i, 1, with the closer equivalent of *χαίρειν*, "greeting," which last is never used by Paul. Then the letter itself commences in the first person, the singular and plural being used, as in the letters of Cicero, indiscriminately (comp. 1 Cor. ii; 2 Cor. i, 8, 15; 1 Thess. iii, 1, 2; and *passim*). When the substance of the letter has been completed, questions answered, truths enforced, there come the individual messages, characteristic, in Paul's Epistles especially, of one who never allowed his personal affections to be swallowed up in the greatness of his work. The conclusion in this case was probably modified by the fact that the letters were dictated to an amanuensis. When he had done his work, the apostle took up the pen or reed, and added, in his own large characters (Gal. vi, 11), the authenticating autograph, sometimes with special stress on the fact that this was his writing (1 Cor. xvi, 21; Gal. vi, 11; Col. iv, 18; 2

Thess. iii, 17), always with one of the closing formulas of salutation, "Grace be with thee"—"the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit." In one instance, Rom. xvi, 22, the amanuensis in his own name adds his salutation. In the "farewell" (*ἔρρωσο* of Acts xxiii, 30, *ἔρρωθε* of Acts xv, 29) we have the equivalents to the *vale, valete*, which formed the customary conclusion of Roman letters. It need hardly be said that the fact that Paul's Epistles were dictated in this way accounts for many of their most striking peculiarities, the frequent digressions, the long parentheses, the vehemence and energy as of a man who is speaking strongly as his feelings prompt him rather than writing calmly. An allusion in 2 Cor. iii, 1 brings before us another class of letters which must have been in frequent use in the early ages of the Christian Church, the *ἐπιστολαὶ συστατικαὶ*, or *letters of recommendation*, by which travellers or teachers were commended by one church to the good offices of others. Other persons (there may be a reference to Apollos, Acts xviii, 27) had come to the Church of Corinth relying on these. Paul appeals to his converts as Christ's epistle (*ἡ ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ*, 2 Cor. iii, 3), written, "not with ink, but with the spirit of the living God."—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. For other particulars as to the material and implements used for epistles, see WRITING.

EPISTLES, APOSTOLICAL. All the revelations of God to mankind rest upon history. Therefore in the Old, as well as in the New Testament, the history of the deeds of God stands *first*, as being the basis of holy writ; thereupon follow the books which exhibit the doctrines and internal life of the men of God—in the Old Testament the Psalms, the writings of Solomon, etc., and in the New Testament the epistles of the apostles; finally, there follow in the Old Testament the writings of the prophets, whose vision extends into the times of the New Testament; and at the conclusion of the New Testament stands its only prophetic book, the Revelation of John.

1. The PAULINE epistles are thirteen in number, or fourteen, if we add to them the epistle to the Hebrews. Three of these are distinctively styled the *Pastoral Epistles*, namely, those to Timothy and Titus, as being chiefly on the duties of the pastorate. Up to our days the genuineness of the first thirteen epistles of Paul has almost unanimously been recognised in Germany, with the exception only of the pastoral epistles, and more especially the first letter to Timothy. Eichhorn and Bauer have attacked the genuineness of all the three pastoral epistles, and Schleiermacher that of the first epistle to Timothy. Indeed, the very peculiar character of the Pauline epistles is so striking to any one who is not ignorant of the want of ease and originality conspicuous in the counterfeited writings of early times, as to leave not the least doubt of their genuineness. Depth of thought, fire of speech, firmness of character—these many features, joined withal to the indulgence of feelings of the most devoted love and affection, characterize these epistles. The amiable personal character of the apostle may be most beautifully traced in his epistle to the Philippians and in that to Philemon. (On many peculiarities of the Pauline epistles, see Laurent, *Neutestam. Studien*, Gotha, 1866.) See PAUL.

All Paul's epistles, except the one to the Romans, were called forth by circumstances and particular occasions in the affairs of the communities to which they were addressed. It is believed that all the apostolical epistles of Paul have been preserved; for the inference from 1 Cor. v, 9, that a letter to the Corinthians has been lost, is not warranted by the language and circumstances. See CORINTHIANS, FIRST EPISTLE TO. From Col. iv, 16, it has also been concluded—though probably erroneously, since there perhaps the letter to the Ephesians is referred to—that another letter to the community of Laodicea has like-

wise been lost. See LAODICEANS, EPISTLES TO AND FROM. Press of business usually compelled Paul—as was, besides, not uncommon in those times—to use his companions as amanuenses. He mentions (Gal. vi, 11), as something peculiar, that he had written this letter with his own hand. This circumstance may greatly have favored the temptation to forge letters in his name, because, since the period of Alexandrine literature, it was not unusual to indite spurious books, as is evident from Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* p. 23); and even Christian bishops made complaints about the falsification of their letters. Paul alludes to this (2 Thess. ii, 2), and therefore writes the greeting (2 Thess. iii, 17) with his own hand. Paul himself exhorted the communities mutually to impart to each other his letters to them, and read them aloud in their assemblies (Col. iv, 16). It is therefore probable that copies of these letters had been early made by the several communities, and deposited in the form of collections. So long, therefore, as the various communities transmitted the manuscripts to each other, no other letters, it is obvious, could come into the collections than those to whose genuineness the communities to whom they were originally addressed bore witness. Even Peter (2 Pet. iii, 16) seems to have had before him a number of Paul's letters, as, about forty years later, a number of letters of Ignatius were transmitted by Polycarp to Smyrna, while the church of Philippi forwarded to him those directed to them (*Ep. Polic.* sub. fin.; Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* iii, 36). The Pauline collection, in contradistinction to the Gospels, passed by the name of ὁ ἀπόστολος, or “The Apostle.”

The letters of Paul may be chronologically arranged as those written before his first Roman imprisonment, those written during it, and those written after it: thus, (a), beginning with his first letter to the Thessalonians, and concluding with that to the Romans, embracing an interval of about six years (A.D. 49–55); (b), from the letter to the Ephesians to that to the Hebrews, about two years (A.D. 57–8); and (c), his letter to Titus and his second to Timothy, about two years (A.D. 63–4). See ACTS (OF THE APOSTLES). In our Bibles, however, the letters are arranged according to the pre-eminent parts and stations of the communities to whom they were addressed, and conclude with the epistles to the two bishops and a private letter to Philemon. (See each in its proper place.)

That these epistles offered great difficulties was already felt in the earliest times (2 Peter iii, 16). In the Roman Church their true understanding was more particularly lost by the circumstance that it understood by the law only the *opus operatum* of the ceremonial law; consequently the Roman Church could not comprehend justification by faith, and taught instead justification by works. As soon, therefore, as the true understanding of the Pauline epistles dawned upon Luther, his breach with the Roman Church was decided. See JUSTIFICATION.

2. The CATHOLIC epistles. There is, in the first instance, a diversity of opinion respecting their name: some refer it to their *writers* (letters from all the other apostles who had entered the stage of authorship along with Paul); some, again, to their *contents* (letters of no special, but general Christian tenor); others, again, to the *recipients* (letters addressed to no community in particular). None of these views, however, is free from difficulties. The first and the second views—and more especially the first—cannot be brought to harmonize with the idiomatic expressions in the extant pages of the ancient writers; the second is, besides, contradicted by the fact that the letter of James is of a special tenor, while, on the contrary, that to the Romans is of such a general character as to deserve the name “Catholic” (q. v.) in that sense. The third opinion is most decidedly justified by passages from the ancient writers (Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* v, 18; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iv, 15, ed. Potter, p. 606; Orig. c. Cels. i, 63).

The Pauline epistles all had their particular directions, while the letters of Peter, James, 1 John, and Jude were circular epistles. The epistles 2 and 3 John were subsequently added, and included on account of their shortness, and to this collection was given the name *Catholic Letters*, in contradistinction to the *Pauline*, which were addressed to particular churches or individuals.—Kitto, s. v. The dates of nearly all of them are later than those of Paul, but their precise time is uncertain. See each in its order; also under ACTS (OF THE APOSTLES).

3. *Literature*.—Besides the general Introductions (q. v.) to the N. T., or parts of it, and the Prolegomena in most modern commentaries on each epistle, there is a wide range of general discussion relating to them which cannot here be profitably reviewed: special treatises only can be enumerated, and even these not exhaustively. On the *autograph* letters there are monographs in Latin by Rathlef (Hannov. 1752) and Stosch (Guelc. 1751); on *ecclesiastical letters* in general, and their various *descriptions*, by Berg (Jen. 1666), Bencini (Taurin. 1780), Bröndley (Hafn. 1711–1712), Friderici (Gotha, 1754), Kiessling (Lips. 1744), Müller (Stad. 1682), Pezold (Lips. 1698), Schmid (Helmst. 1713), Spies (Altorf. 1745); also Dodwell (*Dissert. Cyprian.* Oxon. 1684, p. 17 sq.), Cassabritius (*Notit. Concil. Lugd.* 1670, p. 275 sq.); *introductory* in general, by Braun (*Selecta Sancta*, p. 1–162), Kleuker (German. Hamb. 1799), Köhler (Germ. Lpz. 1830); and of the catholic epistles specially, by Storr (Tub. 1789), Tiegler (Rost. 1807), Ständler (Gott. 1790).

Special COMMENTARIES on all the epistles of the N. T. are the following, of which the most important are denoted by an asterisk (\*) prefixed: Cassiodorus, *Complexiones* (ed. Chandler, Lond. 1722, 12mo); Card. Cajetan, *Enarratio* (Ven. 1531, Par. 1532, 1537, 1546, Antw. 1611, fol.; Paris, 1540, Lugd. 1556, 1558, Paris, Par. 1571, 8vo; also in *Opp.* v); Titelmann, *Elucidatio* (Antw. 1532, 1543, 8vo; Par. 1553, Ant. 1540, Ven. 1547, Lugd. 1553, 12mo); Bullinger, *Commentarii* (Tigur. 1537, 1549, 1558, 1582, 1588, 1603, fol.); Pellican, *Commentarii* (Tigurin. 1539, fol.); Gagneus, *Scholæ* (Par. 1543, 1547, 1550, 1563, 1629, 1633, 8vo); Politus (or Catharinus), *Commentarius* (Rom. 1546, Ven. 1551, Par. 1566, fol.); \*Calvin, *Commentarii* (Geneva, 1551, fol.); Buonricci, *Parafraſi* (Ven. 1565, 4to); Beza, *Explicatio* (Genev. 1565, 1570, 8vo); Hemming, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1572, Vitemb. 1576, Freft. 1579, Argent. 1589, fol.); Arias Montanus, *Elucidationes* (Antw. 1588, 8vo); Gualther, *Homilæ* (Tigurin. 1599, fol.); Erythrophilus, *Auslegung* (Gosl. 1695, sq., 4 vols. 4to); \*Lubin, *Exercitationes* [on nearly all the epistles] (Rost. 1610, 4to); \*Este, *Commentarius* (Duoci, 1614–6, Colon. 1631, Paris, 1633, 1640, 1653, 1659, 1666, 1679, fol.); Vorstius, *Commentary* [on most of the epistles] (Amst. and Hæder. 1631, 4to); Fabricius, *Analysis* (in *Catena*, Lips. 1634, 1639, fol.); Gomarus, *Explicatio* (in *Opp.* 1614, fol.); \*Dickson, *Commentarius* (Glasg. 1645, 4to; in English, Lond. 1659, fol.); Trapp, *Commentary* (Lond. 1647, 4to); Godeau, *Paraphrases* (Par. 1651, 6 vols., Rouen, 1657, Lyons, 1685, 3 vols. 12mo); Fromond, *Commentarius* (Lovan. 1653, Paris, 1674, fol.); Anon. *Verklärung* (Amst. 1679, 4to); \*Whitby, *Commentary* (London, 1700, fol., and since with others); Hunn, *Commentarii* (Vitemb. 1707, fol.); Noel Alexander, *Commentarius* (Rothm. 1710, 2 vols. fol.); Pyle, *Paraphrase* (London, 1725, 8vo); \*Lang, *Erklärung* (Halle, 1729, fol.); Locke, Pierce, and Benson, *Paraphrase* (published separately, London, 1733–52, 3 vols. 4to; upon the same plan, and together forming a commentary on all the epistles); Dale, *Analysis* (London, 1737, 2 vols. 8vo); Weitenauer, *Explicatio*, etc. (Aug. Vind. 1769, 8vo); Hess, *Schr. der Apostel* (Zür. 1773, 1820 sq., 3 vols. 8vo); Leutwein, *Erklärung* (Leipzig, 1782–9, 3 vols. 8vo); Nisbit, *Illustration* (Lond. 1787, 1789; in Germ., Nürnberg. 1790, 8vo); Bahrdt, *Erklärung* (Berlin, 1787–9, 3 vols. 8vo); Przipceovius, *Cogitationes*

(in *Opp.* Amst. 1792, fol., xxxvi); Jaspis, *Annotationes* (Lips. 1793 7, enlarged, 1821, 2 vols. 8vo); Küster, *Anmerkungen* (Chemn. 1794, Berl. 1803, 8vo); \*MacKnight, *Commentary* (London, 1795, 4 vols. 4to; 1806, 1816, 8 vols. 8vo; without the Greek text, 1795, 3 vols. 4to; 1809, 1816, 4 vols. 8vo; 1832, 1 vol. 8vo); Roberts, *Harmony* (Camb. 1800, 4to); Shuttleworth, *Paraphrase* (Oxf. 1829, 8vo); Slade, *Annotations* (4th ed. London, 1836, 8vo); Schott and Winzer, *Commentar* (Lpz. 1834 sq., 2 vols. 8vo); Barlee, *Version* (London, 1837, 8vo); Peile, *Annotations* (Lond. 1848-52, 4 vols. 8vo); \*Prichard, *Commentary* (Lond. 1864 sq., 3 vols. 8vo have appeared). See NEW TESTAMENT.

On the whole of the *Pauline* epistles alone, the following: Origen, *Fragmenta* (in *Opp.* iv, 690); Ambrosiaster, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* ii, 15); Chrysostom, *Homilie* (in *Opp.*); Pelagius, *Commentarii* [on the first 13 epistles] (in Augustini *Opp.* Append.); Theodoret, *Commentarius* (London, 1636, fol.; also in *Opp.* III, i; and *Bibl. Patr.* [Oxf. 8vo] viii); Avitus, *Fragmenta* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* ix, etc.); Primasius, *Commentaria* (ib. x, 142); Bede, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* vi, 31); St. John Damascenus, *Excerpta* [from Chrysostom] (in *Opp.* ii, 1); Claudius Taurinensis, *Prologus* (in Mai, *Script. Vet.* VII, i, 274); Sedulius, *In epp. P.* (Basil. 1528; also in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* vi, 458); Cæcumenius, *In epp. P.* (Gr. and Lat. Ver. 1532, Paris, 1631, 2 vols. fol.; also in *Opp.*); Lanfranc, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.*; also in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* xviii, 621); Raban Maurus, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.*); Remigius Autiss. [Haimo] *Explanations* (Col. 1618, fol.; also in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* viii, 885); Theophylact, *Commentarius* (Gr. and Latin, Lond. 1636, fol.; also in *Opp.* ii); Anselm, *Commentaria* (in *Opp.* ed. 1612); Hugo à St. Victor, *Questiones* (in *Opp.* i, 266); Aquinas, *Expositio* (Basil, 1475; Lugd. 1689, fol.; also in *Opp.* vi, vii); Bruno, *Commentarius* (Paris, 1509, fol.); Dionysius Carthus., *Commentaria* (Paris, 1531, 8vo); Peter the Lombard, *Collectanea* [from the fathers] (Paris, 1535, fol.; 1537, 1541, 1543, 1555, 8vo); Salmeron, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* xiii-xv); Contarini, *Scholia* (Par. 1571; Ven. 1589, fol.; also in *Opp.*); Faber, *Commentarius* (Par. 1512, 1515, 1531, Basil. 1527, fol.; Col. 1531, 4to; Antw. 1540, 8vo); Bugenhagen, *Adnotationes* [on most of these epistles] (Argent. 1524, Basil. 1525, 1527, 8vo); \*Calvin, *Commentaria* (Argent. 1539, Genev. 1548, 4to; Genev. 1551, 1556, 1600, 1617, fol.; also since, and in French and English); Guiliand, *Collationes* (Lugd. 1542, 1543, 4to; Par. 1550, 8vo); Arboreus, *Commentarius* (Par. 1553, fol.); \*Musculus, *Commentarii* [on nearly all of these epistles] (in parts, Basil. 1555 sq., 4 vols. fol.); Sashout, *Commentarius* [on most of these epistles] (Antw. 1561, 8vo); Major, *Enarrationes* (in *Opp.* Vitemb. 1569, fol., i); Hyperius, *Commentarii* (Tigurini, 1583, fol.); \*Selnecker, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1595, fol.); Hespus, *Commentarius* (Muhlh. 1604, Lips. 1605, fol.); Weinrich, *Commentarii* [on most of these epistles] (in separate volumes, Lips. 1608-18, together 1620, 1670, 4to); \*Baldwin, *Commentarius* (in separate vols. Vitemb. 1608-18; together, Freft. 1644, 1664, 1680, 4to; 1691, 1700, 1710, Vitemb. 1655, fol.); Justinianus, *Explanations* (Lugd. 1612, 1613, 2 vols. fol.); à Lapide, *Commentaria* (Antwerp, 1614, 1617, 1622, 1627, 1633, 1656, 1665, 1679; Paris, 1621, 1625, 1631, 1638; Lugd. 1644, 1683, fol.); Gorcom, *Epitome* [from Este and others] (Antw. 1619, Par. 1623, 8vo); Quistorp, *Commentarius* (partly in separate vols. Rost. 1636 sq.; complete, 1652, 4to); Laurence, *Explicatio* (Amst. 1642, 4to); Scultetus, *Annotata* [on Tim., Titus, and Philem.] (in the *Crucis Sacri*, vii); Crell, *Commentarius* [on many passages of these epistles] (in *Opp.* iii, 167); De Launay, *Paraphrase* (Cur. 1650, 4to); Ambianus, *Commentaria* (Par. 1659-64, 3 vols. fol.); \*Crocius, *Commentarius* [on the smaller of these epistles] (Marp. 1663, Cas. 1670, 2 vols. fol.); Calixtus, *Expositiones* [on most of these epistles] (in parts, Helmst. 1664-6, 4to); Woodhead, Allestry, and Walker [ed. Fell], *Paraphrase* (Oxon.

1674, 1702; Lond. 1707, 8vo); Schomer, *Exegesis* (vol. i, Rost. 1669, 1705; ii, 1700, 1706, 4to); Heidegger, *Exercitia* (Tigur. 1700, 4to); à Picon, *Expositio* (Par. 1703, fol.); Schmid, *Commentarii* [on most of these epistles] (at first in separate parts; together, Hamb. 1704, 4to); Locke, *Paraphrase* [on several of these epistles] (in parts, London, 1705 sq.; together, 1709, 1733, 4to); Wells, *Help* [on many of these epistles] (Lond. 1715, 8vo); Lang, *Commentatio* (Hal. 1718, 4to); Van Til, *Commentarius* [on four of these epistles] (Amst. 1726, 4to); Pierce, *Notes* [on the smaller of these epistles] (in parts, London, 1729 sq.; together, 1733, 4to); G. Benson, *Paraphrase* (London, 1734 sq.; in several vols. separately, and together, 1752-6, 2 vols.; in Germ., Lips. 1761, 4 vols. 4to); Remy, *Commentarius* (Aug. Vind. 1739, 4to); Van Alphen, *Specimena* [on five of these epistles] (Tr. ad Rh. 1742, 4to); \*Michælis, *Anmerkungen* [on most of these epistles] (Gött. 1750, 1791, 4to); Baumgarten, *Auslegung* [on the smaller of these epistles] (Hal. 1767, 4to); Zachariä, *Erklärung* [on the smaller of these epistles] (Götting. 1771, 1787, 8vo); Addington, *Remarks* (in his *Life of Paul*, London, 1784, 8vo); Krause, *Anmerk.* [on Philem. and Thess.] (Frkft. 1790, 8vo); Anonymous, *Uebers.*, etc. (Hirsch. 1791, 8vo); Struve, *Uebers.*, etc. (Alton. 1792, 8vo, pt. i); Morus, *Acroases* [on Gal. and Ephes.] (Lips. 1795, 8vo); Rullmann, *Observationes* [on the Roemerian MS.] (Rint. 1795, 4to); Bp. Burgess, *Introductio* [excerpted from old writers on many of these epistles] (Lond. 1804, 12mo); Bevan, *Notes* (in his *Life of Paul*, London, 1807, 8vo); Weingert, *Commentarius* [on the smaller epistles, chiefly compiled] (Goth. 1816, 8vo); Belsbam, *Expositio* (Lond. 1823, 4 vols. 8vo); \*Flatt, *Commentar* (Tübing. 1826-32, 5 vols. 8vo); Stenerson, *Commentarius* (Christ. 1829-30, 2 vols. 8vo); Hensen, *Schriften*, etc. (in his *Leben Paulus*, Gött. 1830, 8vo); Schrader, *Paulus* (Leipzig, 1830-3, 5 vols. 8vo); Paulus, *Erläut.* [on Rom. and Gal.] (Heidelberg, 1831, 8vo); Eyre, *Illustration* (London, 1832, 2 vols. 8vo); Steiger, *Earleitung* [on the smaller of these epistles] (Erlang. 1835, 8vo); Latham, *Arrangement* (Lond. 1837, 8vo); Morehead, *Explanation* (Lond. 1843, 8vo); Whately, *Essays* (London, 1845, 6th ed. 1849, 8vo); Sumner, *Exposition* (London, 1845 sq., 3 vols. 8vo); Lewin, *Life and Epist. of Paul* (Lond. 1851, 2 vols. 8vo); \*Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Ep. of Paul* (Lond. 1852, 2 vols. 4to; 1856, 1858, N. Y. 1855, 2 vols. 8vo); Jowett, *Notes* [on Rom., Gal., and Thess.] (Lond. 1855, 2 vols. 8vo); \*Ewald, *Erklärung* (Gött. 1857, 8vo); Linton, *Notes* (Lond. 1858, 12mo); \*Ellicott, *Commentary* [on several of these epistles] (in separate vols. Lond. 1859 sq.; Andover, 1865, 8vo); Newland, *Catena* [on Eph. and Phil.] (Lond. 1860, 8vo); Macevilly, *Exposition* (2d ed. Lond. 1860, 2 vols. 8vo); Bisping, *Handb.* (Münst. 1864 sq. 8vo). See COMMENTARY.

On the three *pastoral* epistles alone (1 and 2 Tim., and Titus), the following: Jereme, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* Suppos. xi); Chrysostom, *Homilie* (tr. in *Lib. of Fathers*, Oxf. 1843, 8vo, xii); Calvin, *Sermons* (Genev. 1563, fol.; tr. Lond. 1579, 4to; different from his *Commentary* on these epistles, Edimb. 1856, 8vo, tr. from his *Commentarii*, in *Opp.*); Dailié, *Sermons* (Geneva, 1555-61, 5 vols. 8vo); Magalianus, *Commentaria* (Lugd. 1609, 4to); Soto, *Commentarius* (Par. 1610, fol.); Scultetus, *Observationes* (Franf. 1624, Vitemb. 1630, 4to; also in the *Cruc. Sacri*, vii); Habertus, *Expositio* (Par. 1656, 8vo); Heydenreich, *Erläuter.* (Hadamar. 1826-8, 2 vols. 8vo); \*Flatt, *Anmerk.* (Tübing. 1831, 8vo); Anon. *Μετάρρασις* (Par. 1831, 8vo); Mack, *Commentar* (Tübing. 1831, 1841, 8vo); Malthies, *Erläut.* (Greifsw. 1840, 8vo); Moller, *Commentar* (Kopenh. 1842, 8vo); Paterson, *Commentary* (London, 1848, 8vo); \*Ellicott, *Commentary* (London, 1856, Andover, 1864, 8vo). See TIMOTHY; TITUS (EPISTLES TO).

On all the *Catholic* epistles alone (James, 1 and 2 Pet., 1, 2, and 3 John, and Jude), the following: Theophylact, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* iii); also *Enarrationes*



(in *Bibl. Patr. Gall.* vi, 286); Œcumenius, *Expositio* (Freft. 1610, 4to; also in *Opp.* ii); Bede, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* v, 673; *Works*, xii, 157; comp. *Works*, i, 215); Cramer, *Commentarij* [from the fathers] (in his *Catena*, viii); Aquinas, *Expositio* (Paris, 1543, 1563; Lugdun. 1556, Antwerp, 1592, 8vo; etc.); Hus, *Commentarij* (in *Monumenta*, ii, 105); Faber, *Commentarius* (Basil, 1527, fol.; Antw. 1540, 8vo); Imler, *Commentarius* (Freft. 1542, 2 vols. 8vo); Horne, *Expositio* (Brunswick, 1554, 4to); Hemming, *Commentarius* (in separate volumes, Havn. 1563, and Vitemb. 1569, 8vo; together, in English, Lond. 1577, 4to); Ferus, *Exegesis* (Complut. 1570, fol.); Aretius, *Commentarius* (Morg. 1589, Berne, 1608, 8vo); Grynaeus, *Explicatio* (Basil, 1593, 8vo); Salmeron, *Disputationes* (in *Opp.* xvi); Crell, *Commentarius* [on many passages of these epistles] (in *Opp.* iii, 318); Cocceius, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* vi); Various, *Annotations* (in the *Critici Sacri*, viii); Serarius, *Commentarius* (Moguntiac. 1612, fol.); Lorinus, *Commentarius* (Lugd. 1619, 2 vols. fol.); Justinianus, *Explanations* (Lugd. 1621, fol.); Turnemann, *Meditationes* (Freft. 1625, 4to); Alsted, *Notationes* (Herb. 1631, 1640, 8vo); Lenaus, *Commentarij* (Holm. 1645, 4to); Benson, *Paraphrase* (London, 1706, 4to); Gramlich, *Anmerkungen* (Stuttgart. 1721, 8vo); Rielt, *Paraphrase* (Metz, 1727, 12mo); Collet, *Paraphrase* (Lond. 1734, 8vo); Boysen, *Erklär.* [on Pet. and Jude] (Halle, 1775, 8vo); Zachariä, *Erklär.* (Gött. 1776, 8vo); Schirmer, *Erklär.* [on Pet., Jas., and Jude] (Breslau, 1778, 8vo); Schröder, *Erklär.* [on Peter and Jude] (Schwabach, 1781, 8vo); Schlengel, *Anmerk.* (Halle, 1783, 8vo); Seemiller, *Annotations* [on Jas. and Jude] (Norimburg, 1783, 8vo); Seutler, *Paraphrasis* [on Pet. and Jude] (Halle, 1784, 8vo); Pott, *Annotations* (in parts, Gött. 1786-90, 8vo; also in the *N. T. Koppian.* ix); E. Bengel, *Erklärung* (Tüb. 1788, 8vo); Carpoz, *Scholäa* (Hal. 1790, 8vo); Göpfert, *Anmerk.* (Zwickau and Lpz. 1791, 8vo); Morus, *Predlectiones* [on Pet. and Jas.] (Lips. 1794, 8vo); Roos, *Auslegung* [on Pet. and Jude] (Tüb. 1798, 8vo); Augusti, *Erklär.* (Lemgo, 1801-8, 3 vols. 8vo); Hottinger, *Commentarius* [on 1 Pet. and James] (Lips. 1815, 8vo); Grashof, *Erklär.* (Essen. 1830, 8vo); Sumner, *Exposition* (Lond. 1840, 8vo); Diedrich, *Erklär.* (Lpz. 1861, 8vo). See each epistle in its place.

EPISTLES OF BARNABAS. See BARNABAS.

EPISTLES OF CLEMENT. See CLEMENT.

EPISTLES OF THE APOSTOLICAL FATHERS. See BARNABAS; CLEMENT OF ROME; IGNATIUS; POLYCARP.

EPISTLES, SPURIOUS. Of these many are lost; but there are several extant, of which the following are the principal (see Jones, *A new Method of settling the Canon*, vol. ii). See CANON.

1. *The Epistle of Paul to the Laodiceans*.—There was an "Epistle to the Laodiceans" extant in the beginning of the second century, which was received by Marcion, but whether this is the same with the one now extant in the Latin language is more than doubtful. "There are some," says Jerome, "who read the Epistle to the Laodiceans, but it is universally rejected." The original epistle was most probably a forgery founded on Coloss. iv, 16. "And when this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the Church of the Laodiceans, and that ye likewise read the Epistle from Laodicea." The apparent ambiguity of these last words has induced some to understand Paul as speaking of an epistle written by him to the Laodiceans, which he advises the Colossians to procure from Laodicea and read to their Church. "Some," says Theodoret, "imagine Paul to have written an epistle to the Laodiceans, and accordingly produce a certain forged epistle; but the apostle does not say the epistle to, but the epistle from the Laodiceans." Belarmine among the Roman Catholics, and among the Protestants Le Clerc and others, suppose that the passage in Colossians refers to an epistle of Paul, now

lost, and the Vulgate translation—*eam que Laodicensium est*—seems to favor this view. Grotius, however, conceives that the Epistle to the Ephesians is here meant, and he is followed by Hammond, Whitby, and Mill, and also by archbishop Wake (*Epistles of the Apostolic Fathers*). Theophylact, who is followed by Dr. Lightfoot, conceives that the epistle alluded to is 1 Timothy. Others hold it to be 1 John, Philemon, etc. Mr. Jones conjectures that the epistle now passing as that to the Laodiceans (which seems entirely compiled out of the Epistle to the Philippians) was the composition of some idle monk not long before the Reformation; but this opinion is scarcely compatible with the fact mentioned by Mr. Jones himself, that when Sixtus of Sienna published his *Bibliotheca Sancta* (A. D. 1560), there was a very old manuscript of this epistle in the library of the Sorbonne. This epistle was first published by James le Fevre, of Estaples, in 1517. It may be found in Gr. and Lat. in Fabricius, *Codez Apocr.* ii, 871; and translated in Hone's *Apocryphal N. T.* p. 94. See LAODICEANS (EPISTLE TO).

2. *The Third Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*.—It was the opinion of Calvin, Louis Capell, and many others, that the apostle Paul wrote several epistles besides those now extant. One of the chief grounds of this opinion is the passage 1 Cor. v, 9. There is still extant, in the Armenian language, an epistle from the Corinthians to St. Paul, together with the apostle's reply. This is considered by Mr. La Croze to be a forgery of the tenth or eleventh century, and he asserts that it was never cited by any one of the early Christian writers. In this, however, he is mistaken, for this epistle is expressly quoted as Paul's by St. Gregory the Illuminator in the third century, Theodore Chrethonor in the seventh, and St. Nierses in the twelfth. Neither of them, however, is quoted by any ancient Greek or Latin writer (Henderson, *On Inspiration*, p. 497. The passages are cited at length in father Paschal Aucher's *Armenian and English Grammar*, Venice, 1819. Lord Byron's translation of them is given by Stanley in his *Commentary on Corinthians*, ii, 303). See CORINTHIANS (FIRST EPISTLE TO).

3. *The Epistle of Peter to James* is a very ancient forgery. It was first published by Cotelierius, and is supposed to have been a preface to the *Preaching of Peter*, which was in great esteem among some of the early Christian writers, and is several times cited as a genuine work by Clement of Alexandria, Theodotus of Byzantium, and others. It was also made use of by the heretic Heraclion, in the second century. Origen observes of it that it is not to be reckoned among the ecclesiastical books, and that it is neither the writing of Peter nor of any other inspired person. Mr. Jones conceives it to be a forgery of some of the Ebionites in the beginning of the second century. It is given in Gr. and Latin by Fabricius, *Codez Apocr.* N. T. ii, 907. See PETER.

4. *The Epistles of Paul and Seneca* consist of eight extended Latin letters from the philosopher Seneca to the apostle Paul, and six from the latter to Seneca. (See Fabricius, *Codez Apocr.* N. T. ii, 872; and the translation in Hone's *Apocryphal N. T.* p. 95 sq.) Their antiquity is undoubted. St. Jerome had such an idea of the value of these letters that he was induced to say, "I should not have ranked Seneca in my catalogue of saints, but that I was determined to it by those epistles of Paul to Seneca and Seneca to Paul, which are read by many. . . . He was slain by Nero two years before Peter and Paul were honored with martyrdom." St. Augustine also observes (*Epistle to Macedonius*) that "Seneca wrote certain epistles to St. Paul which are now read." The epistles are also referred to in the spurious "Acts" of Linus, the first bishop of Rome after the apostles. But these *Acts* are a manifest forgery, and were first alluded to by a monk of the eleventh century. The letters do not appear to have been mentioned by any other ancient writer; but

it seems certain that those now extant are the same which were known to Jerome and Augustine. The genuineness of these letters has been maintained by some learned men, but by far the greater number reject them as spurious. Mr. Jones conceives them to be a forgery of the fourth century, founded on Philip. iv, 22. Indeed, there are few persons mentioned in the New Testament as companions of the apostle who have not had some spurious piece or other fathered on them. See *SENECA*.

5. Among the apocryphal letters now universally rejected are the well-known *Epistle of Lentulus* to the Roman senate, giving a description of the person of Christ (*Orthodoxographia*, p. 2, Basil. 1555; Fabricii *Cod. Epig.* 1719), and some pretended epistles of the Virgin Mary. One of these is said to be written in Hebrew, and addressed to the Christians of Messina in Sicily, of which a Latin translation has been published, and its genuineness gravely vindicated (*Veritas Vindicata*, 1692, fol.). It is dated from Jerusalem, in the 42d year "of our Son," nones of July, *Luna 17, Feria quinta*. The metropolitan church of our Lady of the Letter, at Messina, takes its name from the possession of this celebrated epistle, of which some have pretended that even the autograph still exists. An epistle of the Virgin to the Florentines has been also celebrated, and there is extant a pretended letter from the same to St. Ignatius, together with his reply. (For three of these spurious letters, see Fabricius, *Cod. Apoc. N. T.* ii, 842.)—Kitto, s. v. See *JESUS CHRIST*.

For other spurious epistles, see *APOCRYPHA*.

**Epistolæ.** When the ancient Christians were about to travel into a foreign country, they took with them letters of credence from their own bishop, in order that they might communicate with another church. These letters were of three kinds: *epistolæ commendatorie*, given to persons of quality, or persons whose reputation had been called in question, or to the clergy who had occasion to travel into foreign countries; *epistola communitoria*, given to such as were in peace and communion with the Church; *epistolæ dimissoria*, such as were given by the bishops to the clergy when removing from one diocese to another. All these were called *epistolæ formate*, because they were written in a peculiar form, with certain marks, which served to distinguish them from counterfeits.—Farrar, *Eccles. Dictionary*, s. v.; Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. ii, ch. iv.

**Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum** (*Epistles of obscure Men*), a celebrated collection of letters by anonymous authors, in which the opponents of Humanism, and the Church of Rome in general, were castigated with pungent satire. The special occasion for the publication of these epistles was a bitter controversy between the learned Reuchlin (q. v.) on the one hand, and a converted Jew named Pfefferkorn, and the Dominicans of Cologne (headed by Hochstraten [q. v.], the inquisitor, and by Prior Ortunus Gratius) on the other. The latter advocated the expulsion of all Jews from Germany, the burning of their books, and the forcible education of their children in the Christian religion. Reuchlin, being asked for his opinion, advised that only the writings of the Jews against Christianity should be burned. The bishop of Spire declared in favor of Reuchlin. Pope Leo X, who personally cared more about the friendship of the Humanists than about the Church, but who, as pope, dared not to offend the monks, delayed his decision. The Humanists now organized themselves everywhere into a league, and flooded Germany with books against the fanatical monks. Among these books, the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum* are the most celebrated. They successfully imitate the barbaric Latin of the monks. The types, which were of very poor quality, and abounding in abbreviations, were a studious imitation of those used by Quantil of Cologne, the publisher of Pfefferkorn and the Dominicans. The name of Al-

dus Manutius was used as publisher, and Venice as the place of printing, and a pretended papal privilege guaranteed it for ten years against counterfeited editions. They were addressed to Ortunus Gratius, a leading man among the band of literary fanatics at Cologne, who was regarded as the real author of the writings of Pfefferkorn against Reuchlin. They give a vivid picture of the opinions, the talk, and the writings of the monks and their friends, and expose their ignorance, hypocrisy, arrogance, and licentiousness. The satire was so skilful, and the imitation of the monkish language and spirit so successful, that, according to the testimony of Erasmus, the Franciscans and Dominicans of England at first received the epistles with great applause, and a Dominican prior circulated a number of copies among members of his order, believing them to be written in its honor. When the real character was discovered, the rage of the monks was great, and the pope was prevailed upon to issue against the epistles a brief of condemnation. Pfefferkorn wrote a book against the epistles in 1516 (*Defensio Jov. Pepericorni contra fimosos et criminales obscurorum virorum epistolas*), and the monks, in 1518, published against it a work called *Lamentationes obscurorum virorum*; but all these books were so poor and insipid that they increased rather than weakened the effect of the epistles. The *Lamentationes* in particular, as a defence of the monks, are so ineffective that some Roman Catholic writers, though without good reason, ascribe the authorship to the Humanists themselves. The epistles consist of three parts. The first was printed in 1515 at Hagenau by the learned printer Wolfgang Angst, a friend of Reuchlin, under the title *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum ad venerabilem virum Mag. Ortunum Gratium, Daventriensem* ("a native of Deventer") *Colonia Agrippinae bonas litteras docentem, variis et locis et temporibus misse ac denum in volumen coactæ*. The second part was printed at Basel in 1517 by Froben; the third, which is much inferior to the two former, appeared much later. Sir William Hamilton (*Edinburgh Review*, liii, 193) remarks that "the *Epistolæ* are at once the most cruel and the most natural of satires, and, as such, they were the most effective. They converted the tragedy of Reuchlin's persecution into a farce; annihilated, in public consideration, the enemies of intellectual improvement; and even the friends of Luther, in Luther's lifetime, acknowledged that no other writing had contributed so powerfully to the downfall of the papal domination."

As to the authorship of the *Epistolæ*, there has been much dispute. It appears certain that neither Erasmus nor Reuchlin had any part in the compilation. The recent German critics generally incline to think that the first part was chiefly compiled by Wolfgang Angst and Crotus Rubianus, and the second by Crotus Rubianus, Hutten, and Pirkheimer; but Hamilton, in the article above cited, shows almost decisively that Hutten, Crotus, and Buschius were the joint authors. A late writer, Chauflour-Kestner (*Ulrich von Hutten*, translated by A. Young), attributes the work exclusively to Hutten (see *British and For. Eclog. Review*, Oct. 1867, p. 775). The *Epistolæ* have frequently been printed; among the earlier editions, those of Frankfurt (1643), London (1710), and another London edition (without date), with nine pictures, are the best. There are modern editions by Dr. Münch (Lpz. 1827), by Rotermond (Hanov. 1827), and by Boecking (Lpz. 1858). The London edition of 1710 is the most elegant in form. It was edited by the learned Maittaire, who really believed it to be the genuine work of the monks, as did Steele, to whom Maittaire's edition was dedicated, and who noticed it, as if genuine, in *The Tatler*. This edition was reprinted by Clements, London, 1742. The literary history of the *Epistolæ* is very fully given in Sir W. Hamilton's article above referred to, which criticizes Münch's edition with some severity. Very full information on the *Epistolæ* is given in the

three last-named editions. See, besides the authors already cited, Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* iv, 111; Wetzler u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 633.

**Epistolæ Præstantium Virōrum**, a valuable collection of letters illustrating the history of the Arminians and Remonstrants. Its full title is *Præstantium ac Eruditōrum virorum Epistolæ Ecclesiastica et Theologica variū argumenti, inter quas eminenti vix, quæ a Jac. Arminio, Conr. Vorstio, Sim. Episcopio, Hug. Grotio, Casp. Barlaeo, conscripte sunt.* (Amst. 1660, 8vo; 2d ed. Amst. 1684, fol.).

**Epistolārē** (plur. *-arīa*), a term used in Biblical criticism (q. v.) to distinguish those MS. Lctionaries (q. v.) or selections from the Greek Test. anciently employed in Church service that contained selections from the *epistles* only. See MANUSCRIPTS OF THE BIBLE.

**Epistolarium**. The office of the Holy Communion was in the early ages of the Church contained in four volumes, viz. the Antiphoner, the Lctionary, the Books of the Gospels, and the Sacramentary. The second of these, the *Lctionary*, was the book of the epistles read at mass (Du Cange, *Glossarium*, s. v. *Lctionarius*), generally called the *Epistolarium*, also *Comes* and *Apistolus*.—Procter, *On the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 9.

**Epitaphia** (ἐπιτάφια), funeral orations. It was usual in the early Church to make funeral orations (λόγοι ἐπικήδειοι) in praise of those who had been distinguished during life by their virtues and merits. Several of these are extant, as that of Eusebius at the funeral of Constantine; those of Ambrose on the deaths of Theodosius and Valentinian, and of his own brother Satyrus; those of Gregory of Nazianzus upon his father, his brother Cæsarius, and his sister Gorgonia; and that of Gregory of Nyssa upon the death of Melitus, bishop of Antioch.—Riddle, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. vii, ch. iii.

**Epoch**. 1. The point of time, usually marked by some important event, from which a series of years, termed an *æra*, is computed or dated; although "epoch" and "æra" are often used synonymously for either a chronological period or date in general (see *Penny Cyclopediā*, s. v. *Æra*). An *æra* properly so called the ancient Hebrews did not possess. Signal events seem to have been made use of as points from which to date. Moses, like Herodotus, reckoned by generations. The Exodus, as may be seen in Exod. xix, 1, and Num. xxxiii, 38, probably, also, the building of the first Temple (1 Kings ix, 10; 2 Chron. iii, 2), were employed as starting-points to aid in assigning events their position in historical succession. Also the destruction of the first Temple, or the beginning of the Babylonish captivity (in the summer of the year B.C. 586), and the liberation of the Jews from the Syrian yoke by the valor of the Maccabees (in the autumn of the year B.C. 143), were used as epochs from which time was reckoned. After the manner of other nations, the Hebrews computed time by the succession of their princes, as may be seen throughout the books of Kings and Chronicles. At a later period, and in the first book of the Maccabees, what is termed the Greek *æra*, or that of the Seleucids, began to be employed. This *æra*, which is also called the *æra* of the Syro-Macedonians, commences from the year of Rome 442, twelve years after the death of Alexander, and 311 years and four months before the birth of our Saviour, the epoch of the first conquest of Seleucus Nicator in that part of the West which afterwards composed the immense empire of Syria (see Noris, *Annus et epocha Syro-Macedonum*, Lips. 1696). The Julian year, formed of the Roman months, to which Syrian names were given, was used. The *æra* prevailed not only in the dominions of Seleucus, but among almost all the people of the Levant, where it still exists. The Jews did not abandon the use of this *æra* until within

the last 400 years. At present they date from the Creation, which they hold to have taken place 3760 years and three months before the commencement of the Christian *æra*. In order to fix their new moons and years, as well as their feasts and festivals, they were obliged to make use of astronomical calculations and cycles. The first cycle they used for this purpose was one of 84 years, but this being discovered to be faulty, they had recourse to the Metonic cycle of 19 years, which was established by the authority of rabbi Hillel, prince of the Sanhedrim, about the year 360 of the Christian *æra*. This they still use, and say it is to be observed till the coming of the Messiah. Indeed, some contend that their present practice of dating from the Creation of the world is of great antiquity. Their year is luni-solar, consisting either of 12 or 13 months each, and each month of 29 or 30 days; for in the compass of the Metonic cycle there are 12 common years, consisting of 12 months, and seven intercalary years, consisting of 13 months, which are the third, sixth, eighth, eleventh, fourteenth, seventeenth, and nineteenth of the cycle. See CHRONOLOGY.

The birth of the Saviour of the world probably took place somewhat earlier than the date which is usually assigned to it. Usage, however, has long fixed the *æra* to which it gave rise, namely, the *Christian æra*, or the *æra* of the Incarnation, to begin on the 10th day of January, in the middle of the fourth year of the 194th Olympiad, the 753d year of the building of Rome, and in the 4714th of the Julian period. The use of the Christian *æra* was introduced in the sixth century; in France it was first employed in the seventh. About the eighth it was generally adopted; but considerable difference has existed not only in various countries, but even in the same place in the same country and at the same period, respecting the commencement of the year. Nor did the use of the *æra* become universal in Christendom till the fifteenth century. The Christian year consists of 365 days for three successive years, and of 366 in the fourth, which is termed leap-year. This computation subsisted for 1000 years without alteration, and is still used by the Greek Church. The simplicity of this form has brought it into very general use, and it is customary for astronomers and chronologists, in treating of ancient times, to date back in the same order from its commencement. There is, unfortunately, a little ambiguity on this head, some persons reckoning the year immediately before the birth of Christ as 1 B.C., and others noting it with 0, and the second year before Christ with 1, thus producing one year less than those who use the former notation. The first, however, is the usual mode. The Christian year, arranged as has been shown, was 11' 11" too long, an error which amounted to a day in nearly 129 years. Towards the end of the sixteenth century the time of celebrating the Church festivals had advanced ten days beyond the periods fixed by the Council of Nice in 325. It was, in consequence, ordered by a bull of Gregory XIII that the year 1582 should consist of only 355 days, which was brought about by omitting ten days in the month of October, namely, from the 5th to the 14th. And to prevent the recurrence of a like irregularity, it was also ordered that in three centuries out of four the last year should be a common instead of a leap-year, as it would have been by the Julian Calendar. The year 1600 remained a leap-year, but 1700, 1800, and 1900 were to be common years. This amended mode of computing was called "The New Style." It was immediately adopted in all Catholic countries, but Protestants came to use it only gradually. In England the reformed calendar was adopted in the year 1752 by omitting eleven days, to which the difference between the styles then amounted. The alteration was effected in the month of September, the day which would have been the third being called the fourteenth. See VULGAR ÆRA.

The following summary shows the correspondence of the principal epochs, aras, and periods with that of the birth of Christ, or Christian era. (A valuable treatise on *Eras of ancient and modern Times* may be found in the *Companion to the Almanac*, 1830.)—Kitto, s. v. Chronology. See also *ÆRA*.

Æras.	Commencement.	Abbrev.
Greek year of the World	5508, Sept. 1.	A. M. Gr.
Constantinopolit. eccles.	5508, Mar. 21 or Ap. 1.	A. M. Const.
tan era . . . . . (civil.	5508, Sept. 1.	A. M. Const.
Alexandrian era . . . . .	5592, Aug. 29.	A. M. Al.
Eccles. era of Antioch . . . . .	5492, Sept. 1.	A. M. Ant.
Julian period . . . . .	4713, Jan. 1.	J. P.
Mundane era . . . . .	4008, Oct.	A. M.
Jewish mundane era . . . . .	3761, vern. equinox.	A. M. Jud.
Jewish civil era . . . . .	3761, Oct.	A. M. Jud.
Hindu year of the World	3102.	Caliyuga.
Year of Abraham's call . . . . .	2015, Oct.	Æ. Abr.
Destruction of Troy . . . . .	1184, June 12 or 24.	Æ. Troj.
Ep. of Solomon's Temple	1015, May.	Æ. Templ.
Æra of the Olympiads	776, n. moon of summer solstice.	Æ. Olymp.
Year of Rome . . . . .	753, April 21.	A. U. C.
Æra of Nabonassar . . . . .	747, Feb. 26.	Æ. Nab.
Ep. of Daniel's 70 weeks.	458, vern. equinox.	Æ. 70 W.
Metonic cycle . . . . .	432, July 15.	Met. Cyc.
Calippic period . . . . .	330, n. moon of summer solstice.	Æ. Cal. Per.
Philippean era . . . . .	325, June.	Æ. Phil.
Syro-Macedonian era . . . . .	312, Sept. 1.	Æ. Seleuc.
Tyrian era . . . . .	1275, Oct. 19.	Æ. Tyr.
Sidonian era . . . . .	1110, Oct.	Æ. Sid.
Hindu era of Vicerama-ditya . . . . .	57.	Æ. Vier.
Cæsarean era of Antioch	48, Sept. 1.	Æ. Cæs. Ær. Ant.
Julian era . . . . .	45, Jan. 1.	Æ. Jul.
Spanish era . . . . .	38, Jan. 1.	Æ. Hisp.
Æra of Actium . . . . .	30, Jan. 1.	Æ. Act.
Actean era in Egypt . . . . .	30, Sept. 1.	Æ. Act.
Augustan era . . . . .	27, Feb. 14.	Æ. Aug.
Pontifical indiction . . . . .	3, Dec. 25 or Jan. 1.	Pont. Ind.
Indic. of Constantinople.	5, Sept. 1.	Ind. Const.
	A. D.	A. D.
Vulgar Christian era . . . . .	1, Jan. 1.	A. D.
Destruction of Jerusalem	69, Sept. 1.	Exc. Hier.
Hindu era of Sulwana . . . . .	78.	Saca.
Æra of the Maccabees . . . . .	166, Nov. 24.	Æ. Macc.
Æra of Diocletian . . . . .	284, Sept. 17.	Æ. Diocl.
Æra of Ascension . . . . .	295, Nov. 12.	Æ. Asc.
Æra of Martyrs . . . . .	303, Feb. 28.	Æ. Mart.
Æra of Armenians . . . . .	552, July 7.	Æ. Arm.
Year of the Hegira . . . . .	622, July 16.	A. H.
Persian era of Yazdegerd	632, June 16.	Æ. Pers.

This golden rule, says Dr. Watts, has many excellent properties in it. 1. It is a rule that is easy to be understood, and easy to be applied by the meanest and weakest understanding (Isa. xxxv, 8). 2. It is a very short rule, and easy to be remembered: the weakest memory can retain it; and the meanest of mankind may carry this about with them, and have it ready upon all occasions. 3. This excellent precept carries greater evidence to the conscience, and a stronger degree of conviction in it, than any other rule of moral virtue. 4. It is particularly fitted for practice, because it includes in it a powerful motive to stir us up to do what it enjoins. 5. It is such a rule as, if well applied, will almost always secure our neighbor from injury, and secure us from guilt if we should chance to hurt him. 6. It is a rule as much fitted to awaken us to sincere repentance upon the transgression of it as it is to direct us to our present duty. 7. It is a most extensive rule, with regard to all the stations, ranks, and characters of mankind, for it is perfectly suited to them all. 8. It is a most comprehensive rule with regard to all the actions and duties that concern our neighbors. It teaches us to regulate our temper and behavior, and promote tenderness, benevolence, gentleness, etc. 9. It is also a rule of the highest prudence with regard to ourselves, and promotes our own interest in the best manner. 10. This rule is fitted to make the whole world as happy as the present state of things will admit. See Watts, *Sermons*, serm. 33, vol. i; Evans, *Sermons*, serm. 28."—Buck, *Theol. Dict.* s. v. See *ETHICS*.

**Equivocation** ("æque, roco, to use one word in different senses). "How absolute the knave is! We must speak by the card, or *equivocation* will undo us' (*Hamlet*, act v, scene 1). In morals, to *equivocate* is to offend against the truth by using language of double meaning, in one sense, with the intention of its being understood in another—or in either sense according to circumstances. The ancient oracles gave responses of ambiguous meaning. *Aio, te, Æacide, Romanos vincere posse* may mean either, 'I say that thou, O descendant of Æacus, canst conquer the Romans,' or 'I say that the Romans can conquer thee, O descendant of Æacus.' *Latronem Petrum occidisse* may mean 'a robber slew Peter,' or 'Peter slew a robber.' *Edwardum occidere nolite timere bonum est*. The message penned by Adam Orleton, bishop of Hereford, and sent by queen Isabella to the jailers of her husband, Edward II. Being written without punctuation, the words might be written two ways: with a comma after *timere*, they would mean, 'Edward, to kill fear not, the deed is good;' but with it after *nolite*, the meaning would be, 'Edward kill not, to fear the deed is good.' Henry Garnet, who was tried for his participation in the Gunpowder Plot, thus expressed himself in a paper dated March 20, 1605-6: 'Concerning *equivocation*, this is my opinion: in moral affairs, and in the common intercourse of life, when the truth is asked among friends, it is not lawful to use *equivocation*, for that would cause great mischief in society; wherefore, in such cases, there is no place for *equivocation*. But in cases where it becomes necessary to an individual for his defense, or for avoiding any injustice or loss, for obtaining any important advantage, without danger or mischief to any other person, then equivocation is lawful' (Jardine, *Gunpowder Plot*, p. 233). Dr. Johnson would not allow his servant to say he was not at home when he really was. 'A servant's strict regard for truth,' said he, 'must be weakened by such a practice. A philosopher may know that it is merely a form of denial, but few servants are such nice distinguishers. If I accustom a servant to tell a lie for me, have I not reason to apprehend that he will tell many lies for himself?' (Boswell, *Letters*, p. 32.) There may be *equivocation* in sound as well as in sense. It is told that the queen of George III asked one of the dignitaries of the Church if ladies might *knot* on

2. The term epoch is used by modern writers to denote "critical junctures in the development of history, the signals of a new creation; hence termed *εποχαι*, pauses or resting-places for contemplation. What exists at the epoch in the germ is developed to a more advanced stage, and thus afterwards becomes the *Period*. The former denotes the fountain-head, the latter the stream; their limits are where a new form of culture again appears in an epoch. The epochs are either critical and destructive, or creative and organizing."—Neander, *Hist. of Dogmas*, i, 20.

**Equitius**, a lay abbot of many monasteries, both male and female, in the province of Valeria, who lived in the 6th century. The year both of his birth and death are unknown. He had not taken orders, but was nevertheless very active in preaching. He was therefore denounced at Rome, and the pope summoned him before his tribunal, but the great and general reputation of Equitius induced the pope to dismiss the case. Equitius led a very ascetic life, and is said to have always, during his many travels, carried the Bible with him. According to Baronius, pope Gregory I was a monk according to the rule of St. Equitius, but this is denied by other writers.—Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* iv, 113; Wetzler u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, iii, 638. (A. J. S.)

**Equity** "is that exact rule of righteousness or justice which is to be observed between man and man. Our Lord beautifully and comprehensively expresses it in these words: 'All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets' (Matt. vii, 12).

Sunday. His reply was, Ladies may *not*; which, in so far as sound goes, is *equivocal*."—Fleming, *Vocabulary of Philosophy*, s. v.

**Er** (Heb. *עֵר*, *watchful*; Sept. and N. T. "Ἠρ, Vulg. *Her.*), the name of three men. See also **ERR**.

1. The oldest son of the patriarch Judah by Bath-Shuah (daughter of Shuah), a Canaanitess. His wife was Tamar, but he had no issue, and his widow eventually became the mother of Pharez and Zarah by Judah. Er "was wicked [*עֵר*, a paronomasia of *עֵר*] in the sight of the Lord; and the Lord slew him" (Gen. xxxviii, 3-7; Num. xxvi, 19). B.C. cir. 1896. It does not appear what the nature of his sin was; but, from his Canaanitish birth on the mother's side, it was probably connected with the abominable idolatries of Canaan.

2. A "son" of Shelah (Judah's son), and "father" of Leeah (1 Chron. iv, 21). B.C. prob. ante 1618.

3. Son of Jose and father of Elmodan, in Christ's genealogy, of David's private line prior to Salathiel (Luke iii, 28). B.C. cir. 725.

**Era**. See **ERA**.

**Erakim**. See **TALMUD**.

**Er'an** (Heb. *עֵרָאן*, *watchful*; Sept. *Ἐρέων*, appar. reading *עֵרָאן*, with the Samar. and Syr.; Vulg. *Heran*), son of Shuthelah (eldest son of Ephraim), and progenitor of the family of the Eranites (Num. xxvi, 36). B.C. post 1856. The name does not occur in the genealogies of Ephraim in 1 Chron. vii, 20-29, though a name, ELADAN (ver. 20) or ELEAD (ver. 21), is found which may be a corruption of it.

**E'r'anite** (Heb. with the art. *ha-Eranî*, *הַעֵרָאנִי*, Sept. *ὁ Ἐρέων* [like the Samar. and Syr. reading *Ἠ* for *Ἠ*], Vulg. *Heranite*, A. V. "the Eranites"), a patronymic designation of the descendants of the Ephraimite ERAN (Num. xxvi, 36).

**Erasmus**, DESIDERIUS, was born at Rotterdam, October 28, 1467 (1465). His father's name was Gerhard, his mother's Margaretha; they were never married. The boy was called Gerhardus Gerhardt, which he changed into the name Desiderius Erasmus (properly Erasmus), having the same meaning in Latin and Greek (*amiable*). The father went to Rome. Being informed there that Margaretha was dead, he entered into orders; but, finding her alive on his return, he and she devoted themselves to the training of their son. At six he was a chorister in the cathedral at Utrecht. At nine he was sent to school at Deventer, where he had for school-fellow a youth who afterwards became pope Adrian VI. He displayed so great talent at Deventer that it was even then predicted that he would one day be the most learned man in Germany. After the death of his parents, when he was under fourteen, his guardians determined to make a monk of him, in order, it is said, that they might secure his patrimony for themselves. He refused to enter the monastic life; but his guardians placed him in the seminary at Herzogenbusch, where, as he says, he spent three useless and unhappy years. He was then put at the monastic house of Zion, near Delft, and finally he entered the Augustinian monastery of Emaüs, or Stein, near Gouda. Here, after sturdy resistance, he entered on his novitiate in 1486. His life at Stein was unhappy, except so far as it was relieved by study, to which he devoted all the time possible. His hatred of monkery increased with each year of his stay in the monastery. In 1491, the bishop of Cambray, desiring a capable Latinist as his secretary for a projected journey to Rome, obtained permission for Erasmus to leave the convent. The journey did not come off, and Erasmus (who was ordained priest in 1492) remained some years under the bishop of Cambray, who authorized him to proceed to Paris to continue his studies, instead of returning to the monastic life. At Paris, Eras-

mus barely supported himself, by taking pupils, and he suffered greatly from sickness and poverty. He afterwards attributed his weakness of constitution to his wretched food and unwholesome lodgings in Paris. After a short visit to Cambray and to Holland for his health, he returned to Paris, where his pension from the bishop failed, and he taught for his bread. Among his pupils was lord William Mountjoy, who ever after remained his friend and patron. For him he wrote the treatise



Statue of Erasmus at Rotterdam.

*De Ratione conscribendi epistolas*. Mountjoy offered him a pension to accompany him to England. Erasmus passed a year there (1498-9), chiefly at London, Oxford, and Cambridge, and became acquainted with many Englishmen distinguished for piety and learning. At Oxford he studied in St. Mary's College, and formed many connections which were afterwards of use to him. Among his special friends were Colet, Grocyn, Latimer, and the celebrated chancellor Thomas More. From England Erasmus returned to Paris, where he again supported himself by pupils. In 1499 he returned to the Continent, and spent his time chiefly in studying Greek, and in translating Greek authors into Latin. He had no fixed abode; now he was in Paris, and again in the provinces of France or in Holland. The *Adagia* and the *Enchiridion Militis Christiani* were published between 1500 and 1504. He began his Biblical studies also about this time, publishing in 1505 a new edition of the *Remarks of Laurentius Valla on the N. T.* In 1505 he spent a short time in England, where he made the acquaintance of archbishop Warham, to whom he dedicated his translation of the *Hebna*. In 1506 he accomplished his long-cherished desire of visiting Italy, where he succeeded in obtaining from pope Julius II a dispensation from his monastic vows. At Turin he was made D.D. (1506), and his time was divided between Bologna, Rome, Florence, and Padua, where he improved his knowledge of Greek under the instruction of the best Greek and Italian scholars. In 1507 he superintended, at Venice, a new edition of his *Adagia*, printed by the celebrated Aldus Manutius. "At Rome he met with a flattering reception, and promises of high advancement; but, having engaged to return to England, he did so in 1510, in the expectation that the recent accession of Henry VIII, with whom he had for some time maintained a correspondence, would insure to him an honorable provision." On the journey he wrote the work which gave him his greatest celebrity for the time, the *Enconium Morie* (Panegyric on Folly), which he dedicated to Thomas More. He lived "for some time at Cambridge, where he was appointed Lady Margaret professor (in divinity), and also lectured on Greek. His lodging was in Queen's College, in the grounds of which Erasmus's Walk is still shown. In 1509, at the request of Colet, he published *Copia Verborum ac rerum*, long in use as a school-book. He accepted an invitation from the archduke, afterwards Charles V, and went to Brabant in 1514, with the office of councillor, and a salary of 200 florins. After this we find him resident sometimes in the Netherlands, sometimes at Basel, where the great work in which he had been

many years engaged, the first edition of the New Testament in Greek, was published in 1516, accompanied by a new Latin translation. Some amusing specimens of the objections made to this undertaking by the ignorant clergy will be found in his 'Letters' (vi, 27) (*Engl. Cyclop.*). It was dedicated to pope Leo X. His fame had by this time spread all over Europe; he and Reuchlin were called the *Eyes of Germany*. From this period onward he resided chiefly at Basel, though his wandering habits were never entirely shaken off. The second edition of his *N. T.* appeared in 1519, and prefixed to it was his *Ratio seu Methodus compendio perveniendi ad veram Theologiam* (also published separately, 1522). In 1521 he published his *Colloquia*, "composed ostensibly to supply young persons with an easy school-book in the Latin language, and at the same time to teach them religion and morals. For the purpose of teaching the Latin language this little book seems peculiarly well adapted: it was long used for this purpose in England. In these 'Colloquies,' which are generally very amusing, Erasmus has made some of his smartest attacks on various superstitions of the Roman Catholic Church. On this account the book was prohibited" (*Engl. Cyclop.*). His *Annotations in N. T.* appeared at Basel (1516-22, many editions), and his *Paraphrases in N. T.* (1524, fol.; Berlin, 1777-80, 3 vols. fol.) The *Paraphrases* were so much esteemed in England that it was made the duty of every parish church, by an order in council (1547), to possess a copy of the English translation (Lond, 1548, 2 vols. fol., by Udall, Coverdale, and others; 2d edit, 1551).

As Erasmus had decided to remain in the Church of Rome, his residence at Basel became an uneasy one when the Reformation got possession of that city. In 1529 he removed to Freiburg, in Breisgau, where he built a house with a view to permanent residence, but never liked it. His later years were embittered by literary and religious quarrels. His pecuniary affairs, however, which had always been embarrassed in his early years, were now easy. In 1535 he returned to Basel, intending, however, only a short stay before returning to his native land to die. He was soon taken ill, but recovered sufficiently to continue his literary labors, especially on his edition of Origen. He suffered from gravel; an attack of dysentery supervened, and carried him off on the night of July 11-12 (O.S.), 1536. He left his property to the poor.

The literary industry of Erasmus during his whole life was prodigious. He early imbibed a love for the ancient classics, and contributed largely to increase the taste for ancient culture by his writings in praise of them, by his editions of classic authors, and by his attacks on the scholastic theology and on the ignorance of the monks. "He worked incessantly in various branches, and completed his works with great rapidity; he had not the patience to revise and polish them, and accordingly most of them were printed exactly as he threw them out; but this very circumstance rendered them universally acceptable; their great charm was that they communicated the trains of thought which passed through a rich, acute, witty, intrepid, and cultivated mind, just as they arose, and without any reservations. Who remarked the many errors which escaped him? His manner of narrating, which still rivets the attention, then carried every one away" (Ranké, *Reformation*, by Austin, bk. ii, chap. i). His *Ciceronianus* is "an elegant and stinging satire on the folly of those pedants who, with a blind devotion, refused to use in their compositions any words or phrases not to be found in Cicero. Erasmus's own Latin style is clear and elegant; not always strictly classical, but like that of one who spoke and wrote Latin as readily as his mother tongue. His 'Letters,' comprising those of many learned men to himself, form a most valuable and amusing collection to those who are interested in the manners and literary histories of the age in which they were written; and several of

them in particular are highly valuable to Englishmen as containing a picture of the manners of the English of that day" (*Engl. Cyclop.*). But, of all his writings, the only ones that are likely to retain a lasting place in literature are the *Colloquies*, and the *Panegyric on Folly*—writings of his comparative youth, and regarded by him rather as pastime. "For neither as a wit nor as a theologian, nor perhaps even as a critic, does Erasmus rank among master intellects; and in the other departments of literature no one has ventured to claim for him a very elevated station. His real glory is to have opened at once new channels of popular and of abstruse knowledge—to have guided the few, while he instructed the many—to have lived and written for noble ends—to have been surpassed by none in the compass of his learning, or the collective value of his works—and to have prepared the way for a mighty revolution, which it required moral qualities far loftier than his to accomplish. For the soul of this great man did not partake of the energy of his intellectual faculties. He repeatedly confesses that he had none of the spirit of a martyr, and the acknowledgment is made in the tone of sarcasm rather than in that of regret. He belonged to that class of actors on the scene of life who have always appeared as the harbingers of great social changes—men gifted with the power to discern and the hardihood to proclaim truths of which they want the courage to encounter the infallible results; who outrun their generation in thought, but lag behind it in action; players at the sport of reform so long as reform itself appears at an indefinite distance; more ostentations of their mental superiority than anxious for the well-being of mankind; dreaming that the dark page of history may hereafter become a fairy tale, in which enchantment will bring to pass a glorious catastrophe, unthought by intervening strife, and agony, and suffering; and therefore overwhelmed with alarm when the edifice begins to totter, of which their own hands have sapped the foundation. He was a reformer until the Reformation became a fearful reality; a jester at the bulwarks of the papacy until they began to give way; a propagator of the Scriptures until men betook themselves to the study and the application of them; depreciating the mere outward forms of religion until they had come to be estimated at their real value; in short, a learned, ingenious, benevolent, amiable, timid, irresolute man, who, bearing the responsibility, resigned to others the glory of rescuing the human mind from the bondage of a thousand years. The distance between his career and that of Luther was therefore continually enlarging, until they at length moved in opposite directions, and met each other with mutual animosity" (*Edinburgh Review*, lxxviii, 302).

The relations of Erasmus to the Reformation have been summarily stated in the paragraph just cited. He was the literary precursor of the Reformation. His exegetical writings prepared the way for later expositors, opened a new era in Biblical criticism, and also aided in giving the Bible its Protestant position as the rule of faith. His satires upon the monks, upon the scholastic theology, and upon Church abuses generally, contributed largely to prepare the minds of literary men throughout Europe for a rupture with Rome. He taught, in anticipation of Protestantism, that Christian knowledge should be drawn from the original sources, viz. the Scriptures, which he said should be translated into all tongues. In his *Encomium Morie*, Folly is introduced as an interlocutor who "turns into ridicule the labyrinth of dialectic in which theologians have lost themselves, the syllogisms with which they labor to sustain the Church as Atlas does the heavens, the intolerant zeal with which they persecute every difference of opinion. She then comes to the ignorance, the dirt, the strange and ludicrous pursuits of the monks, their barbarous and objuratory style of preaching; she attacks the bishops, who are more solicitous

for gold than for the safety of souls; who think they do enough if they dress themselves in theatrical costume, and under the name of the most reverend, most holy, and most blessed fathers in God, pronounce a blessing or a curse; and, lastly, she boldly assails the court of Rome and the pope himself, who, she says, takes only the pleasures of his station, and leaves its duties to St. Peter and St. Paul. Among the curious wood-cuts, after the marginal drawings of Hans Holbein, with which the book was adorned, the pope appears with his triple crown. It produced an indescribable effect: twenty-seven editions appeared even during the lifetime of Erasmus; it was translated into all languages, and greatly contributed to confirm the age in its anticlerical dispositions" (Ranke, *l. c.*). But the personal character of Erasmus was not fitted for such storms as those of the Reformation. Intellectually, he was too many-sided and too undecided; morally, he was of too flaccid a fibre, too timid, and too fond of ease, to devote himself to a certain strife with very uncertain issues. Moreover, he never had profound religious convictions or experience. The monks, nevertheless, were right to a certain extent in their saying that "Erasmus laid the egg; Luther hatched it." At first Erasmus regarded Luther with favor as a coadjutor in his attacks upon the ignorance of the monks, and in his plans for the reformation of literature. But Luther saw the weakness and spiritual poverty of Erasmus, and expressed his fears in letters to Spilatin and Lange as early as 1517; while Erasmus, in letters to Zwingli, deprecated the haste and vehemence of Luther. In 1519 (March 28) Luther wrote a friendly letter to Erasmus, who says in reply (April 30): "I hold myself aloof from the controversies of the times to devote my whole strength to literature. After all, more is to be gained by moderation than by passion; so Christ conquered the world. It is better to write against those who have abused the authority of the papacy than against individual popes." In 1520, Frederick, elector of Saxony, meeting Erasmus at Cologne, asked his opinion of Luther; his reply was, *Lutherus peccavit in dubio, nempe quod tetigit coronam pontificis et ventres monachorum*: "Luther has committed two blunders; he has ventured to touch the crown of the pope and the bellies of the monks. . . but his language is too violent," etc. He expressed similar cautions in a letter to Justus Jonas at the time of the Diet of Worms (1521). The earnest Ulrich von Hutten sought to draw Erasmus openly to the Protestant side, but in vain. In 1522 Hutten published an *Expostulatio cum Erasmo*, abounding in bitter invective, to which Erasmus replied in *Spongia adversus Hutteni aspergines* (Basel, 1523) (see Gieseler, *Church History*, ed. by Smith, iv, § 3). Luther is said to have condemned both these pamphlets as disgraceful. Luther wrote (1524) to Erasmus an earnest letter, urging him, if he would not join the Reformers, at least to refrain from open opposition. "You might, indeed, have aided us much by your wit and your eloquence; but, since you have not the disposition and the courage for this, we would have you serve God in your own way. Only we feared, lest our adversaries should entice you to write against us, and that necessity should compel us to oppose you to your face. If you cannot, dear Erasmus, assert our opinions, be persuaded to let them alone, and treat of subjects more suited to your taste" (*Biblioth. Sacra*, 1862, p. 129). "From this time Erasmus complains incessantly of the hostility of the Evangelicals. The haughty style in which Luther offered him peace (in the letter above cited) could only have the effect upon that ambitious man of giving additional weight to the request which reached him at the same time from England, that he would take revenge upon Luther for his attack upon the royal author (Henry VIII). And so, to assail the formidable Luther in the weakest part of his theological system, Erasmus wrote his treatise *De Libero Arbitrio*

(Sept. 1524). Luther replied with his usual bitterness in his *De Seruo Arbitrio* (Dec. 1525). Erasmus replied in like coin in his *Hyperaspistes* (1526). Thus the renowned Erasmus now passed over into the ranks of the enemies of the Reformation, though he did not cease to recommend conciliatory measures towards it" (Gieseler, *l. c.*).

The writings of Erasmus were collected and published in 1510-11 (9 vols. fol.), and also by Clericus (Leclerc), under the title *Des. Erasmi Opera Omnia, emendatorum et auctiora*, etc. (L. Bat. 1703-6, 10 vols. in 11, fol). He edited many of the fathers, viz. Origen, Irenæus, Cyprian, Augustine, Chrysostom, Lactantius, and translations of selections from them are given in his *Opera*. The separate editions of his more popular works (the *Encomium, Adagia, Colloquia*, etc.) are very numerous. There are English versions of the following: *Panegyric upon Folly* (two translations: one by Chaloner, the other by Kennet; often printed); *Colloquies* (1671, and often, especially in selections); *Enchiridion Militis*, by W. de Worde (1533, 16mo, and often); *Christian's Manual* (from the *Enchiridion Militis*, London, 1816, 8vo); *Ecclesiastes*, or *the Preacher* (chiefly from Erasmus, London, 1797, small 8vo); *De Contemptu Mundi* (Lond. 1533, 16mo); *De Immensa Dei Misericordia* (1533, and often). Many of Erasmus's smaller tracts were also translated. There are several biographies of Erasmus (none very good), viz. *Beatus Rhenanus*, in *Erasmi Opera*, tom. i (1540); *Leclerc's*, in vol. i of *Erasmi Opera* (1703); *Merula, Vita Erasmi* (Leyden, 1607, 4to); *Knight, Life of Erasmus* (London, 1726, 12mo); *Barigny, Vie d'Erasme* (Par. 1757, 2 vols. 12mo); *Jortin, Life of Erasmus* (Lond. 1758, best ed. 1803, 3 vols. 8vo; abridged by Laycey, London, 1805, 8vo); *Pless, Leben des Erasmus* (Zurich, 1790); *Butler, Life of Erasmus* (London, 1825, 8vo); *Nisard*, in *Etudes sur la Renaissance* (Par. 1855); *Müller, Leben des Erasmus* (Hamb. 1828, 8vo; reviewed by U.E.M., *Studien u. Krit.* 1829, p. 1); *Gasius, On Erasmus as Church Reformer* (a crowned prize-essay in the Dutch language, The Hague, 1850). See also Bayle, *Dictionary* (s. v. Erasmus); *Dupin, Auteurs Ecclési.* tom. xiii; *Waddington, History of the Reformation* (London, 1841), ch. xxiii; *Merle d'Aubigné, History of the Reformation*, vol. i; *Hofer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xvi, 207; *Hallam, History of Literature* (Harper's ed.), i, 134 sq.; *Mackintosh, Miscellaneous Works* (London, 1851), i, 190 sq.; *Christ. Examiner*, xlix, 80; *Christian Review*, April, 1858; *Quart. Review*, 1859, art. i; *Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1859, p. 531; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, xix, 106; *Brit. and For. Ev. Review*, July, 1867, p. 517; H. Rogers, in *Good Words*, Feb. 1868.

**Erastianism**, the title generally given to "that system 'which would rest the government of the Church spiritual as well as civil altogether in the Christian magistrate.' This, however, 'was far from being an invention of Erastus, since in every kingdom of Europe the Roman claims had been resisted on the like principles for centuries before he was born; the peculiarity of Erastus's teaching lay rather in his refusing the right of excommunication to the Christian Church' (see *Oxf. Hooker*, Ed. Pref. p. lviii) (Elen, *Churchman's Dictionary*, s. v.). Hardwick proposes "Byzantinism" as the proper title for the theory named instead of "Erastianism" (*History of the Reformation*, chap. viii, p. 356). See also *Nichols, Anecdotes of Bourger* (London, 1782, 4to), p. 71; *Pretzman, The Church of England and Erastianism* (Lond. 1854); *Hagenbach, History of Doctrines* (Smith's ed.), ii, 299; *Cunningham, Historical Theology*, ii, 569; *Orme, Life and Times of Baxter*, i, 71; *Christian Review*, viii, 579; and the articles CHURCH; DISCIPLINE; ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY; ERASTUS, THOMAS.

**Erastus** (Ἐραστος, *Erastus*), an old Grecian name, *Diog. Laert.* iii, 81), a Corinthian, and one of Paul's disciples, whose salutations he sends from Corinth to

the Church at Rome as those of "the chamberlain (q. v.) of the city" of Corinth (Rom. xvi, 23). The word so rendered (*οικονόμος*, Vulg. *ararius*) denotes the city treasurer or steward (Suicer, *Thesaur.* ii, 464; see Flessa, *De arcariis*, Baruth, 1725-6, ii, § 11; also Elsner, *Obs.* ii, 68), an officer of great dignity in ancient times (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* vii, 8, 2); so that the conversion of such a man to the faith of the Gospel was a proof of the wonderful success of the apostle's labors in that city. We find Erastus with Paul at Ephesus as one of his attendants or deacons (*οἱ διακονοῦντες αὐτῷ*), whence he was sent, along with Timothy, into Macedonia, while the apostle himself remained in Asia (Acts xix, 22), A. D. 51. They were both with the apostle at Corinth when he wrote, as above, from that city to the Romans, A. D. 55; and at a subsequent period (A. D. 64) Erastus was still at Corinth (2 Tim. iv, 20), which would seem to have been the usual place of his abode (*ἐμνεῖν*). According to the traditions of the Greek Church (*Menol. Græcum*, i, 179), he was first *aconomus* to the Church at Jerusalem, and afterwards bishop of Pnceas, and died a natural death. Many critics, however (Grotius, Kype, Kuinöl, De Wette, Winer, etc.), regard the Corinthian Erastus as a different person from Paul's companion, on the ground that the official duties of the former would not allow such an absence from the city (Neander, *Planting and Training*, i, 392, note), or that, if he was with Paul at Ephesus, we should be compelled to assume that he is mentioned in the epistle to the Romans by the title of an office which he had once held and afterwards resigned (Meyer, *Kommentar.* in loc.).

Erastus, THOMAS (properly LIEBER or LIEBLER, which he put into the Greek form, *Erastus*), was born at Baden, in Switzerland (according to another account, at Auggen, in Baden-Durlach), Sept. 7, 1524. He studied divinity and philosophy at Basel, and afterward at Pavia and Bologna, where he graduated M. D. In 1558 he became physician to the prince of Hesseberg. The elector palatine, Frederick III, also appointed him first physician and professor of medicine in the University of Heidelberg. In 1560 and 1561 he attended the conferences of Lutheran and Reformed divines at Heidelberg and Maulbronn on the Lord's Supper, and vigorously maintained the Zuinglian view. He maintained the same doctrine in a treatise *De Cæna Domini* (1565; transl. by Shute, Lond. 1578, 16mo). He was charged with Socinianism, but without just ground. But his name is chiefly preserved for his views on Church authority and excommunication. "A sort of fanaticism in favor of the use of ecclesiastical censures and punishments had been introduced by Olevianus, a refugee from Treves, and by several fugitives from the cruelties of the duke of Alva in the Low Countries, and had spread among the Protestants of the Palatinate. Erastus termed it 'febris excommunicatoria,' and thought it an unwise policy for the Protestants, surrounded by their enemies, to be zealous in cutting off members from their own communion. He examined the principles and Biblical authority of ecclesiastical censures, and carried on a controversy in which he was violently opposed by Dathenus, and more mildly by his friend Beza. This controversy would have probably died as a local dispute had it not been revived by Castelvetro, who had married the widow of Erastus, publishing from his papers the theses called *Explicatio Questionis gravissimæ de Excommunicatione*, which bears to have been written in 1568, and was first published in 1589. The general principle adopted by Erastus is, that ecclesiastical censures and other inflictions are not the proper method of punishing crimes, but that the administration of the penal law, and of the law for compelling performances of civil obligations, should rest with the temporal magistrate. He held that the proper ground on which a person could be prohibited from receiving the ordinances of a church—such as the sacra-

ment or communion of the Lord's Supper—was not vice or immorality, but a difference in theological opinion with the church from which he sought the privilege. The church was to decide who were its members, and thereby entitled to partake in its privileges, but was not entitled to take upon itself the punishment of offences by withholding these privileges, or by inflicting any other punishments on the ground of moral misconduct. Few authors so often referred to have been so little read as Erastus. The original theses are very rare. An English translation was published in 1669, and was re-edited by the Rev. Robert Lee in 1845. By some inscrutable exaggeration, it had become the popular view of the doctrines of Erastus that his leading principle was to maintain the authority of the civil magistrate over the conscience, and to subject all ecclesiastical bodies to his direction and control, both in their doctrine and their discipline. In the discussions in the Church of Scotland, of which the result was the secession of a large body of the clergy and people because it was found that the Church could not make a law to nullify the operation of lay patronage, those who maintained within the Church the principle that it had no such power were called Erastians as a term of reproach. As in all cases where such words as Socinian, Arian, Antiochian, etc., are used in polemical debates, the party rejected with disdain the name thus applied to it. But it is singular that in the course of this dispute no one seems to have thought of explaining that the controversy in which Erastus was engaged was about a totally different matter, and that only a few general and very vague remarks in his writings have given occasion for the supposition that he must have held the principle that all ecclesiastical authorities are subordinate to the civil. Erastus died at Basel on the 31st Dec.—Jan. 1, 1583."—*English Cyclopædia*: Wordsworth, *Eccles. Biography*; Hoefler, *Nov. Liog. Gêner.* xxxi, 174; Herzog, *Real Encyclop.* iv, 121.

Erdt, PAULINUS, a German Franciscan monk, professor of theology at the University of Freiburg, was born at Verloch in 1737. He displayed much zeal in opposing infidelity, both by his translations from English and French as well as his own works. The most important of his works is *Historiæ literariæ theologiæ rudimenta octodecim libris comprehensa, seu via ad historiam literariam theologiæ revelatæ, annotationibus literariis instructa* (Augsburg, 1783, 4 vols. 8vo). Erdt died Dec. 16, 1800.

Erebinthi, VILLAGE OF (*Ἐρεβινθῶν οἶκος*, house of chick-peas), a place on the line of Titus's wall of circumvallation around Jerusalem during the final siege (Josephus, *War*, v, 12, 2); apparently on the brow of the hill opposite Mount Zion, on the west. See JERUSALEM. Eusebius speaks of a village *Eremintha* (*Ἐρεβινθα*, *Onomast.* s. v.), situated, however, in the south of Judea, which Reland thinks (*Palæst.* p. 766) is the same as the *Eetherene* (*Βαζῆρεβιν*) mentioned by Sozomen (*Hist. Eccl.* ix, 27).

E'rech (Heb. *E'rek*, עֶרֶךְ, length; Sept. *Ἐρέχ*; Vulg. *Arach*), one of the cities which formed the beginning of Nimrod's kingdom in the plain of Shinar (Gen. x, 10). It is not said that he built these cities, but that he established his power over them; from which we may conclude that they previously existed. It was probably also the city of the ARCHEVITES, who were among those who were transplanted to Samaria by Assnapper (Ezra iv, 9). Until recently, the received opinion, following the authority of St. Ephrem, Jerome, and the Targumists, identified E'rech with Edessa or Callirhoë (now Urfa), a town in the north-west of Mesopotamia. This opinion is supported by Von Bollen (*Introd. to Gen.* p. 233), who connects the name Callirhoë with the Biblical E'rech through the Syrian form *Eurhok*, suggesting the Greek word *ἑρρόπος*. This identification is, however, untenable: Edessa was



probably built by Seleucus, and could not, therefore, have been in existence in Ezra's time (Ezra iv, 9), and the extent thus given to the land of Shinar presents a great objection. Erech must be sought in the neighborhood of Babylon. Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 151), following Bochart (*Phaleg*, iv, 16), rather seeks the name in the *Açacka* or *Aracha* of the old geographers, which was on the Tigris, upon the borders of Babylonia and Susiana (Ptolemy, vi, 3; Ammian. Marcell. xxxiii, 6, 26). This was probably the same city which Herodotus (i, 185; vi, 119) calls *Ardericca* (Ἀρδερικα), i. e. Great Erech. Rosenmüller happily conjectures (*Alterth.* I, ii, 25) that Erech probably lay nearer to Babylon than Aracca; and this has lately been confirmed by Col. Taylor, the British resident at Bagdad, who is disposed to find the site of the ancient Erech in the great mounds of primitive ruins, indifferently called *Irak*, *Irka*, *Werka*, and *Senkerah*, by the nomadic Arabs, and sometimes *El-Asajjah*, "the place of pebbles" (Bonomi, *Niveveh*, p. 40). These mounds, which are now surrounded by the almost perpetual marshes and inundations of the lower Euphrates, lie some miles east of that stream, about midway between the site of Babylon and its junction with the Tigris. This is doubtless the same as *Orchoë* (Ὀρχοῖν) 82 miles south, and 42 east of Babylon (Ptolemy, vi, 20, 7), the modern designations of the site bearing a considerable affinity to both the original names. It is likewise probable that the *Orcheni* (Ὀρχηνῶν) described by Strabo as an astronomical sect of the Chaldeans dwelling near Babylon (xxi, p. 739); in Ptolemy as a people of Arabia living near the Persian Gulf (v, 19, 2); and in Pliny as an agricultural population, who banked up the waters of the Euphrates, and compelled them to flow into the Tigris (vi, 27, 31), were really inhabitants of Orchoë and of the district surrounding it. This place appears to have been the necropolis of the Assyrian kings, the whole neighborhood being covered with mounds, and strewed with the remains of bricks and coffins. Some of the bricks bear a monogram of "the moon," and Col. Rawlinson surmises that the name Erech may be nothing more than a form of עֶרֶךְ, the Heb. name for that luminary (*Athenæum*, 1854, No. 1377); but the orthography does not sustain this conjecture. Some have thought that the name of Erech may be preserved in that of Irak (*Irak-Arabi*), which is given to the region inclosed by the two rivers in the lower part of their course. (See Chesney, *Euphrates Expedition*, i, 116, 117; Ainsworth, *Researches*, p. 178; Loftus, *Chaldea*, p. 160 sq., where a full description is given.) For another Erech, probably in Palestine, see ARCH.

**Eremita** (ἐρημιταί, *desert*), one who lives in a wilderness, or other solitude, for purposes of religious contemplation. The name was given in the ancient Church to those Christians who fled from the persecutors of Christianity into the wilderness, and there, isolated from all other men, gave themselves up to a life of rigid asceticism. Paul of Thebes is called the first eremite, and he soon found numerous followers. From the association of eremites the cœnobites arose, who, in turn, form the transition to the monastic orders, which became in the Church of Rome and in the Eastern Church the most common form of organized asceticism. The name eremite remained, however, in use both for those who, in opposition to monastic association, preferred the eremitic life, and for a number of orders or branches of orders (orders of eremites), which either retained some customs in the life of the original eremites, or which made special provisions that their members could live in entire isolation from each other, meeting only for the celebration of divine service. Thus the proper name of the Augustinians (q. v.) was the Ermites of St. Augustine, although they became, in fact, a regular order. There were also eremites belonging to the orders of Franciscans (q. v.), Camaldu-

lenses (q. v.), Cœlestines (q. v.), Hieronymites (q. v.), and Servites (q. v.). Among the other orders of the eremites were the Ermites of St. John the Baptist (see JOHN THE BAPTIST, EREMITES OF), and the Ermites of St. Paul.—Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 501. See PAUL, ST., EREMITES OF. (A. J. S.)

**Erez.** See CEDAR.

**Erfurt**, a city in the Prussian province of Saxony, with, in 1864, 40,200 inhabitants. In 741, Erfurt became the seat of a bishop, but St. Adalar was the last as well as the first bishop, the see being united with that of Meutz. In 1378 the city received permission from the pope residing at Avignon (Clement VII) to establish a university, and the permission was in 1389 confirmed by the Roman pope Urban VI. In 1392 the university was opened, being the fifth university of Germany. At the beginning of the 16th century, Luther was for some time one of its professors. Subsequently its reputation dwindled down, and it was abolished in 1816.—Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, iii, 661. (A. J. S.)

**Erhard**, BISHOP. See HILDULF.

**E'ri** (Heb. *Eri'*, עֵרִי, *watchful*), the fifth son of the patriarch Gad (Gen. xlv, 16; Sept. Ἐριδίε, Vulg. *Ieri*), and progenitor (Num. xxvi, 16; Sept. Ἀδδῖ, Vulg. *Ier*) of the ERITES (q. v.). B. C. 1856.

**Eric IX** (according to some historians VIII), surnamed the Saint, a king of Sweden. He was the son of Jedward, a "good and rich yeoman," as he is called in an old Swedish chronicle, and of Cecilia, the sister of king Eric Arsal. Having become king of Sweden, his chief endeavor was the Christianization of Sweden. He conquered southern Finland, and compelled the inhabitants to adopt the Christian religion. He also united Norway with Sweden. In the war against the Danish prince Magnus, he fell in a battle near the town of Upsala, May 18, 1160.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Génér.* xvi, 243. (A. J. S.)

**Erigena.** See SCOTUS ERIGENA.

**E'rite** (Heb. collect. with the art. *ha-Eri'*, עֵרִיִּים, Sept. [appar. everywhere with this name reading עֵרִי for עֵרִי] ὁ Ἀδδῖ, Vulg. *Ierite*, A. V. "the Erites"), a patronymic designation (Num. xxvi, 16) of the descendants of the Gadite ERI (q. v.).

**Erizatsop** (SARGIS or SERGIUS), a learned Armenian bishop, born towards the middle of the 13th century, at Eriza or Arzendjan, a city of Armenia. In 1286, James I, patriarch of Sis, called him to his court, and made him his secretary. In 1291 he was consecrated bishop of Arzendjan, and, a short time after, the king of the Armenians of Cilicia (Hayton or Hathoum II) made him almoner of his palace. In 1306 he was present at the national council which was held at Sis, capital of Cilicia, and died a short time after. He wrote a treatise on *The Hierarchy*, and several other works, which remain in MS.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Génér.* xvi, 258.

**Erlangen**, a city in Bavaria, with a population of 10,900 inhabitants, mostly Protestant. It is the seat of one of three universities of Bavaria, with a Lutheran theological faculty. The University was founded in 1742 by the margrave Friedrich of Brandenburg-Baireuth for his residence, but in 1743 transferred to Erlangen. The University has in modern times been a chief seat of the Confessional party in the Lutheran Church. (A. J. S.)

**Ernesti**, JOHANN AUGUST, an eminent critic and scholar, was born Aug. 4, 1707, at Tennstadt, in Thuringia. He completed his academical studies at Wittenberg and Leipsic. In 1742 he became professor of ancient literature at Leipsic, and in 1758 doctor and professor of theology there. He held the two last-named professorships together till 1770, when he gave up the former to his nephew, August Wilhelm. He

died Sept. 11, 1781. He distinguished himself greatly by his philological and classical publications, and also by the new light which his theory of interpretation threw upon the sacred Scriptures. He adopted from Wetstein the *grammatico-historical* method of interpretation, and gave it general currency. Among the most important of his critical and philological writings are *Opuscula philologico-critica* (Amster. 1762, 8vo):—*Opuscula oratoria, orationes, prologus et oblogii* (Leyd. 1762 and 1767, 8vo):—*Archæologia litteraria* (Leips. 1768 and 1790, 8vo):—*Initia doctrinæ solidioris* (Leips. 1736, 7th ed. 1783, 8vo). The style of this work gave to Ernesti the name of the Cicero of Germany. His most important work in the field of theology is his *Institutio interpretis Novi Testamenti* (Leips. 1761, 8vo; 5th ed. 1809). This work first clearly set forth what is called the *grammatico-historical* method of interpretation. It was translated by Terrot, and published in the *Biblical Cabinet* (Edinb. 1843, 2 vols. 16mo); there is also an edition, with notes and appendix, by Moses Stuart (Andover, 1827, 12mo). Some valuable essays may be found in his *Opuscula theologica* (1792, 8vo). He rendered great service to theological literature by the publication of the *Neue theologische Bibliothek* (1760–1779, 14 vols.). His *Lectiones Academicæ in Epistolam ad Hebræos* was published by G. J. Dindorf in 1815 (Lips. 8vo). Ernesti's reputation as a classical scholar rests chiefly upon his excellent editions of Homer (Leips. 1759, 8vo), of Callimachus (Leyd. 1761, 2 vols. 8vo), of Polybius (Leips. 1763–64, 3 vols. 8vo), of Xenophon, Aristotle, and of Cicero (*ib.* 1776, 3d ed. 7 vols.), of Tacitus (*ib.* 1772, 2 vols. 8vo); also of Suetonius, Aristophanes, etc. His *Eulogy*, by Augustus William Ernesti, was published at Leipsic (1781, 8vo). See Hagenbach, *German Rationalism*, transl. by Gage, p. 76; Teller, *Ernesti's Verdienste um Theologie und Religion* (Leips. 1783); Van Voorst, *Oratio de J. A. Ernestio* (Leyd. 1804); Hoefcr, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xvi, 296; Kahnis, *German Protestantism*, p. 119.

**Erōgē** (Ἐρωγή), a place "before the city" (πρὸ τῆς πόλεως) Jerusalem, according to Josephus (*Ant.* ix, 10, 4), where the mountain (Mt. of Olives) split asunder for a space of half a mile, filling the king's gardens with the detritus of the avalanche: an account which is evidently an embellishment in the prophetic commentary (Zech. xiv, 5) upon the earthquake (Amos i, 1) on the occasion of Uzziah's usurpation of the sacerdotal functions (2 Chron. xxvi, 16–21). Schwarz ingeniously explains (*Palest.* p. 263 note) the name *Erogē* as a Graecized transcription for Zechariah's expression *gorge of my mountains* (גֵּרְגֵּרֵי הַרֵּי מְנַחֵם, *gey-haray'*, Sept. φάραγγεῖ ὄρεων, *Vulg. vallis montium eorum*, A. V. "valley of the mountain"). For another identification, see EN-ROGEL.

**Erpen**, THOMAS VAN (Latin form ERPENIUS), a celebrated Orientalist, was born at Gorkum, Holland, September 7, 1584. He studied theology at Leyden, where, under the guidance of J. J. Scaliger, he also devoted himself particularly to the study of Oriental languages. He travelled in England, France, Italy, and Germany, everywhere enlarging his knowledge of Oriental literature: and in 1613 became professor of Oriental languages at Leyden. A second Hebrew chair in the university was founded expressly for him in 1619. "Soon after this he was appointed Oriental interpreter to the government, in which capacity he read and wrote replies to all official documents coming from the East. Such was the elegance and purity of his Arabic, as written at this time, that it is said to have excited the admiration of the emperor of Morocco. Towards the close of his life tempting offers of honors and distinction came pouring in upon him from all parts of Europe; but he was never prevailed upon to leave his native country, where, in the midst of an eminent career, he died November 13, 1624. Although the present standard of Oriental knowledge in Europe

is much in advance of that of Erpen's day, there is no doubt that it was through him principally that Eastern, especially Arabic, studies have become what they are. With hardly any better material than a few awkwardly printed Arabic alphabets, he contrived to write his famous grammar (*Grammatica Arabica, quinque libris methodice explicata*, Leyden, 1613; recent edition by Michaelis, Gott. 1771), which for 200 years, till the time of Silvestre de Sacy, enjoyed an undisputed supremacy; and there are many who think his *Rudimenta* unsurpassed, even at the present day, as a work for beginners. Among his other important works the best known is his *Proverbiaum Arabicorum Centuria Duæ* (Leyden, 1614)" (Chambers, s. v.); Hoefcr, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xvi, 308; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* xix, 487.

**Error.** "Knowledge being to be had only of visible certain truth, error is not a fault of our knowledge, but a mistake of our judgment, giving ascent to that which is true (Locke, *Essay on Human Underst.* bk. iv, ch. xx). 'The true,' said Bossuet, after Augustine, 'is that which is, the false is that which is not.' To err is to fail of attaining to the true, which we do when we think that to be which is not, or think that not to be which is. Error is not in things themselves, but in the mind of him who errs, or judges not according to the truth. Our faculties, when employed within their proper sphere, are fitted to give us the knowledge of truth. We err by a wrong use of them. The causes of error are partly in objects of knowledge and partly in ourselves. As it is only the true and real which exists, it is only the true and real which can reveal itself. But it may not reveal itself fully, and man, mistaking a part for the whole, or partial evidence for complete evidence, falls into error. Hence it is that in all error there is some truth. To discover the relation which this partial truth bears on the whole truth is to discover the origin of the error. The causes in ourselves which lead to error arise from wrong views of our faculties and of the conditions under which they operate. Indolence, precipitation, passion, custom, authority, and education may also contribute to lead us into error (Bacon, *Novum Organum*, lib. i; Malebranche, *Recherche de la Vérité*; Descartes, *On Method*; Locke, *On Human Understand.* bk. vi, c. xx)."—Fleming, *Vocabulary of Philosophy*, p. 166–167.

**Erskine, Ebenezer**, an eminent and pious Scotch divine, founder of the "Secession Church." He was born in the prison of the Bass Rock, June 22, 1680, and educated at the University of Edinburgh. He acted for some time as tutor and chaplain in the family of the earl of Rothes, and became a licentiate in divinity in 1702. In 1703 he was chosen minister of Portmoak, in the shire of Kinross, and became a very popular preacher. He accepted a charge in Stirling in 1731. "Mr. Erskine's first difference with his colleagues of the Church of Scotland was in his support of the principles of 'the Marrow of Modern Divinity,' a subject of great contention during the early part of the 18th century. He was one of several clergymen who, in connection with this subject, were 'rebuked and admonished' by the General Assembly. The secession of the body, headed by Mr. Erskine, was occasioned by the operation of the act of queen Anne's reign restoring lay patronage in the Church of Scotland, and, though not in all respects technically the same, it was virtually on the same ground as the late secession of 'The Free Church.' The presbytery of Kinross, led by Erskine's brother Ralph, had refused to induct a presentee forced on an objecting congregation by the law of patronage. In 1732, the General Assembly enjoined the presbytery to receive the presentee. At the same time they passed an act of Assembly regulating inductions, which, as it tended to enforce the law of patronage, was offensive to Mr. Erskine, and he preached against it. After some discus-

sion, the General Assembly decided that he should be 'rebuked and admonished,' confirming a decision of the inferior ecclesiastical courts. Against this decision Mr. Erskine entered a 'protest,' in which he was joined by several of his brethren. He was afterwards suspended from his functions. The Assembly subsequently endeavored to smooth the way for his restoration, but he declined to take advantage of it, and he and his friends, including his brother Ralph, formally seceded in 1736. When the Secession was divided into the two sects of Burghers and anti-Burghers, Mr. Erskine and his brother were of the Burgher party. He died on the 22d of June, 1736. The Secession Church, reunited by the junction of the Burghers and anti-Burghers in 1820, remained a distinct body till 1847, when a union being effected with the Relief Synod (a body which arose from Mr. Gillespie's secession from the Established Church of Scotland in 1752), the aggregate body assumed the name of the United Presbyterian Church" (*English Cyclopædia*). Erskine bore a very high reputation as a scholar. His writings are collected in *The whole Works of Ebenezer Erskine*, consisting of sermons and discourses on the most important and interesting subjects (Lond. 1799, 3 vols. 8vo). See Hetherington, *Church of Scotland*, ii, 297 sq. See SECEDERS; SCOTLAND, CHURCH OF; UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

**Erskine, John, D.D.**, an eminent Scotch divine, was born in Edinburgh, June 2, 1721, and was educated at the University of Edinburgh. His father (author of the *Institutes of the Laws of Scotland*) wished him to devote himself to law, but finally yielded to his son's desire that he should study theology. At twenty he published an essay on *The Law of Nature sufficiently propagated to the Heathen World*, aiming to show that the ignorance and unbelief of the heathen is not due to want of evidence (Rom. i, 29). In 1743 he was licensed to preach by the presbytery of Dunblane, and in 1744 he became minister of Kirkintilloch. In 1748, Mr. Erskine, and other evangelical clergymen of the Established Church, invited Whitefield into their pulpits. An animated discussion took place, in which Mr. Erskine triumphantly defended himself. Such a course required courage at a time when the character and doctrines of Whitefield, as well as his open-air preaching, were looked upon by many with suspicion or dislike. In the following year Mr. Erskine published *An Essay intended to promote the more frequent dispensation of the Lord's Supper*. In 1753 he was translated to Culross, and in 1758 to New Greyfriars' church, Edinburgh. Here he prepared his *Theological Dissertations* (Lond. 1765, 12mo), including the two essays above mentioned: one on the *Covenant of Sinai*, one on *Saving Faith*, and one on the *Apostolic Churches*. He also edited a new edition of *Hervey's Theron and Aspasio*, with a preface against John Wesley, written with some bitterness, which gave rise to some letters between Erskine and Wesley, in which the latter appears to decided advantage (Wesley, *Works*, N. York ed. vi, 125 sq., 744). In 1769 he published anonymously a pamphlet under the title "*Shall I go to war with my American brethren?*" to expose the impolicy of such a contest. On the outbreak of hostilities he republished it with his name, following it up with another, entitled *Reflections on the Rise, Progress, and probable Consequences of the present Contentions with the Colonies*, in which he urged the duty of the mother country resorting to conciliatory measures. In 1776 he issued a third pamphlet, under the title *The Equity and Wisdom of the Government in the Measures that have occasioned the American Revolt tried by the sacred Oracles*. On this subject Erskine was one of the few clear-sighted men of the time in Great Britain. When nearly sixty he studied Dutch and German in order to read the Continental divines; the fruit of these studies appeared in *Sketches and Hints of Church History and theological Controversy, translated or abridged from foreign Writers* (Edin-

burgh, 1790-97, 2 vols. 12mo). He died January 19, 1803. After his death appeared his *Discourses* (Edinburgh, 1818, 2 vols. 12mo).—Jamieson, *Religious Biography*, p. 139; Jones, *Christian Biography*, p. 191; Wellwood, *Life of Erskine*.

**Erskine, Ralph**, brother of Ebenezer, was born at Moniklaw, Northumberland, 1685, and was educated at the University of Edinburgh. In 1711 he became minister at Dunfermline. In 1734 he joined his brother and others in their secession from the Church. See SECEDERS. He died 1752. He was a preacher of great popular abilities, devotional and zealous. His writings are collected under the title *Sermons and other practical Works*, consisting of above 150 sermons, besides his poetical pieces, to which is prefixed an account of the author's life and writings (Falkirk, 10 vols. 8vo, 1794-96).—Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, i, 1063.

**Erubim.** See TALMUD.

**Erythrian Sibyl.** See SIBYL.

**Esa'ias** (Rec. Text Ἡσαΐας, Lachm. with Codex B Ἡσαΐα; Vulg. *Isaias*, Cod. Amiat. *Esaias*), the Grecized form, constantly used in the N. T. (Matt. iii, 3; iv, 14; viii, 17; xii, 17; xiii, 14; xv, 7; Mark vii, 6; Luke iii, 4; iv, 17; John i, 23; xii, 38, 39, 41; Acts viii, 28, 30; xxviii, 25; Rom. ix, 27, 29; x, 16, 20; xv, 12) for ISAAH (q. v.). Comp. ESAÿ.

**E'sar-had'don** (Heb. *Esar'-Haddon'*, אַסַרְחַדְדִּן, perhaps akin with Pers. *Athro-dant*, *gift of fire*; Sept. Ἀσορῶν [in Ezra Ἀσαράδων] v. r. Ἀσαράδων, in Tob. i, 21, Σαορηθός; Josephus, *Ant.* x, 1, 5, Ἀσσαραχόδδω; the son and successor of Sennacherib (2 Kings xix, 37; Isa. xxxvii, 38). The date apparently assigned by these passages is B. C. 712, but, as he seems to be the *Asaradinus* (Ἀσαράδινος) of Ptolemy's *Civitas*, whose reign bears date from B. C. 680, we may either suppose that the death of Sennacherib occurred some years after his defeat before Jerusalem, or that an interregnum occurred before the accession of Esar-haddon. It has generally been thought that he was Sennacherib's eldest son, and this seems to have been the view of Polyhistor, who made Sennacherib place a son, *Asordanes*, on the throne of Babylon during his own lifetime (ap. Euseb. *Chron. Can.* i, 5). The contrary, however, appears by the inscriptions, which show the Babylonian viceroys—called *Asordanes* by Polyhistor, but *Aparanadius* (Assaranadius?) by Ptolemy—to have been a distinct person from Esar-haddon, who is called in cuneiform (q. v.) *Ashur-akki-iddina* (Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, i, 386 sq.). Thus nothing is really known of Esar-haddon until his succession (B. C. cir. 680; see Col. Rawlinson in the *Lond. Athenæum*, Aug. 22, 1865), which seems to have followed quietly and without difficulty on the murder of his father and the flight of his guilty brothers (2 Kings xix, 37; Isa. xxxvii, 38). It may, perhaps, be concluded from this that he was *at the death of his father* the eldest son, Assaranadius, the Babylonian viceroys, having died previously. It is impossible to fix the length of Esar-haddon's reign, or the order of the events which occurred in it. Little is known to us of his history but from his own records, and they have not come down to us in the shape of annals, but only in the form of a general summary (see them translated by H. F. Talbot, in the *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* April, 1859, p. 68-79). That he reigned thirteen years at Babylon is certain from the Canon of Ptolemy, and he cannot have reigned a shorter time in Assyria. He may, however, have reigned longer, for it is not improbable that after a while he felt sufficiently secure of the affections of the Babylonians to re-establish the old system of viceregal government in their country. Saosduchinus may have been set up as ruler of Babylon by his authority in B. C. 667, and he may have withdrawn to Nineveh, and continued to reign there for some time

longer. His many expeditions and his great works seem to indicate, if not even to require, a reign of some considerable duration. It has been conjectured that he died about B. C. 660, after occupying the throne for twenty years. He appears to have been succeeded by his son Asshur-bani-pal, or Sardanapalus II, the prince for whom he had built a palace in his own lifetime. No farther mention is made of this monarch in Scripture but that he settled certain colonists in Samaria (Ezra iv, 2). See ASSAPPER.

Esar-haddon appears by his monuments to have been one of the most powerful, if not the most powerful of all the Assyrian monarchs. He carried his arms over all Asia between the Persian Gulf, the Armenian mountains, and the Mediterranean. Towards the east he engaged in wars with Median tribes "of which his fathers had never heard the name;" towards the west he extended his influence over Cilicia and Cyprus; towards the south he claimed authority over Egypt and Ethiopia. In consequence of the disaffection of Babylon, and its frequent revolts from former Assyrian kings, Esar-haddon, having subdued the sons of Merodach-Baladan who headed the national party, introduced the new policy of substituting for the former government by viceroys a direct dependence upon the Assyrian crown. He did not reduce Babylonia to a province, or attempt its actual absorption into the empire, but united it to his kingdom in the way that Hungary was, until 1848, united to Austria, by holding both crowns himself, and residing now at one and now at the other capital. He is the only Assyrian monarch whom we find to have actually reigned at Babylon, where he built himself a palace, bricks from which have been recently recovered bearing his name. His Babylonian reign lasted thirteen years, from B. C. 680 to B. C. 667, and it was undoubtedly within this space of time that Manasseh, king of Judah, having been seized by his captains at Jerusalem on a charge of rebellion, was brought before the Assyrian monarch at Babylon (2 Chron. xxxiii, 11), and detained for a time as prisoner there. This must therefore have been Esar-haddon, who, persuaded of his innocence, or excusing his guilt, eventually restored him to his throne (comp. ver. 13), thus giving a proof of clemency not very usual in an Oriental monarch. It seems to have been in a similar spirit that Esar-haddon, according to the inscriptions, gave a territory upon the Persian Gulf to a son of Merodach-Baladan, who submitted to his authority and became a refugee at his court. As a builder of great works Esar-haddon is particularly distinguished. Besides his palace at Babylon, which has already been mentioned, he built at least three others in different parts of his dominions, either for himself or his son, while in a single inscription he mentions the erection by his hands of no fewer than thirty temples in Assyria and Mesopotamia. His works appear to have possessed a peculiar magnificence. He describes his temples as "shining with silver and gold," and boasts of his Nineveh palace that it was "a building such as the kings his fathers who went before him had never made." The south-west palace at Nimrud is the best preserved of his constructions. This building, which was excavated by Mr. Layard, is remarkable for the peculiarity of its plan as well as for the scale on which it is constructed. It corresponds in its general design almost exactly with the palace of Solomon (1 Kings vii, 1-12), but is of larger dimensions, the great hall being 220 feet long by 100 broad (Layard's *Nin. and Bab.* p. 558, Harpers' edit.), and the porch or antechamber 160 feet by 60. It had the usual adornment of winged bulls, colossal sphinxes, and sculptured slabs, but has furnished less to our collections than many inferior buildings, from the circumstance that it had originally been destroyed by fire, by which the stones and alabaster were split and calcined. This is the more to be regretted as there is reason to believe that Phœnician and Greek artists

took part in the ornamentation.—Smith, s. v. See ASSYRIA.

**E'sau** (Heb. *Esav'*, עֵשָׂו, *hair* [see Gen. xxv, 25; his surname EDOM was given him from the red pottage, Gen. xxv, 30]; Sept. and N. T. Ἡσαῦ), the eldest son of "Isaac, Abraham's son" (Gen. xxv, 19) by Rebekah, "the daughter of Bethuel the Syrian, of Padanaram, the sister to Laban the Syrian." The marriage remaining for some time (about 19 years; comp. xxv, 20, 26) unproductive, Isaac entreated Jehovah, and Rebekah became pregnant. Led by peculiar feelings "to inquire of Jehovah," she was informed that she should give birth to twins, whose fate would be as diverse as their character, and, what in those days was stranger still, that the elder should serve the younger. On occasion of her delivery, the child that was born first was "red, all over like a hairy garment; and they called his name Esau." Immediately afterwards Jacob was born. B. C. 2004. This was not the only remarkable circumstance connected with the birth of the infant. Even in the womb the twin brothers struggled together (xxv, 22). Esau was the first-born; but, as he was issuing into life, Jacob's hand grasped his heel. The bitter enmity of two brothers, and the increasing strife of two great nations, were thus foreshadowed (xxv, 23, 26). From the special attention drawn to his hairy appearance, one would suppose that the name Esau (עֵשָׂו), or Esav, was intended to give expression to that quality. So have many learned men in recent as well as former times held, though they are obliged to resort to the Arabic for the etymological explanation; a word very similar in Arabic, signifying *hairy*. The older Hebrew commentators, however, derived it from the verb עָשָׂו, *asav'*, to *make*, and explained the word as signifying "made," "complete," "full-grown"—viewing the hair as an indication of premature manly vigor. But the Jews of the present day seem more disposed to fall in with the other derivation (for example, Raphall in loco). The unusual covering of hair, which not only distinguished Esau as a child, but kept pace with his growth, and in mature life gave his skin a kind of goat-like appearance (Gen. xxvii, 16), was undoubtedly meant to be indicative of the man; it was a natural sign, coeval with his very birth, by which his parents might descry the future man—as one in whom the animal should greatly preponderate over the moral and spiritual qualities of nature—a character of rough, self-willed, and untamed energy. From the word designating his hairy aspect, *sear* (עֵשָׂו), it is not improbable that the mountain-range which became the possession of his descendants was called Mount *Seir*, though it is also possible that the rough, wooded appearance of the mountain itself may have been the occasion of the name. See SEIR.

In process of time the different natural endowments of the two boys began to display their effects in dissimilar aptitudes and pursuits. While Jacob was led by his less robust make and quiet disposition to fulfil the duties of a shepherd's life, and pass his days in and around his tent, Esau was impelled, by the ardent and lofty spirit which agitated his bosom, to seek in the toils, adventures, and perils of the chase his occupation and sustenance; and, as is generally the case in natures like his, he gained high repute by his skill and daring, which allied him to the martial exercises of the Canaanites (xxv, 27). He was, in fact, a thorough *Bedawy*, a "son of the desert" (so we may translate עֵשָׂו בֶּדָוָה, *man of the field*), who delighted to roam free as the wind of heaven, and who was impatient of the restraints of civilized or settled life. His old father, by a caprice of affection not uncommon, loved his wilful, vagrant boy; and his keen relish for savory food being gratified by Esau's venison, he liked him all the better for his skill in hunting (xxv, 28). A

hunter's life is of necessity one of uncertainty as well as hardship; days pass in which the greatest vigilance and the most strenuous exertions may fail even to find, much less capture game (see Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 399). The hunting tribes of North America often find themselves, after severe and long-continued labor and watching, unprovided with food, and necessitated to a length of abstinence which would be fatal to persons bred in towns or living by the ordinary pursuits of the field. Esau had on one occasion experienced such a disappointment, and, wearied with his unproductive efforts, exhausted for want of sustenance, and despairing of capturing any prey, he was fain to turn his steps to his father's house for succor in his extremity. On reaching home he found his brother enjoying a carefully prepared dish of pottage: attracted by the odor of which, he besought Jacob to allow him to share in the meal. His brother saw the exigency in which Esau was, and determined not to let it pass unimproved. Accordingly, he put a price on the required food. Esau was the elder, and had, in consequence, immunities and privileges which were of high value. The surrender of these to himself Jacob made the condition of his complying with Esau's petition. Urged by the cravings of hunger, alarmed even by the fear of starvation, Esau sold his birthright to his younger brother, confirming the contract by the sanction of an oath. Jacob, having thus got his price, supplied the famishing Esau with needful refreshments. Jacob took advantage of his brother's distress to rob him of that which was dear as life itself to an Eastern patriarch. The birthright not only gave him the headship of the tribe, both spiritual and temporal, and the possession of the great bulk of the family property, but it carried with it the *covenant blessing* (Gen. xxvii, 23, 29, 36; Heb. xii, 16, 17). Yet, though Esau, under the pressure of temporary suffering, despised his birthright by selling it for a mess of pottage (Gen. xxv, 34), he afterwards attempted to secure that which he had deliberately sold (Gen. xxvii, 4, 34, 38; Heb. xii, 17). It is evident the whole transaction was public, for it resulted in a new name being given to Esau. He said to Jacob, "Feed me with that same *red* (עֵדֶם); therefore was his name called *Edom*" (עֲדָם; Gen. xxv, 30). It is worthy of note, however, that this name is seldom applied to Esau himself, though almost universally given to the country he settled in, and to his posterity. See *EDOM*. The name "Children of Esau" is in a few cases applied to the Edomites (Deut. ii, 4; Jer. xlix, 8; Obad. 18), but it is rather a poetical expression.

Arrived now at forty years of age, Esau married two wives in close succession. B.C. cir. 1963. Some unhappy feelings appear to have previously existed in the family; for while Esau was a favorite with his father, in consequence, it appears, of the presents of venison which the youth gave him, Jacob was regarded with special affection by the mother. These partialities, and their natural consequences in unamiable feelings, were increased and exaggerated by Esau's marriage. His wives were both Canaanites, and, on account of their origin, were unacceptable to Isaac and Rebekah. The latter was especially grieved. "I am weary," she said (Gen. xxvii, 46), "of my life, because of the daughters of Heth." Esau thus became alienated from the parental home. Even his father's preference for him may have been injuriously affected. The way was in some measure smoothed for the transference of the coveted birthright to the younger son.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.; Fairbairn, s. v.

There is much apparent confusion in the accounts of Esau's wives and their relations and posterity, as given in Gen. xxvi, 34; xxviii, 9; xxxvi, 2-5, 10-30, 40-43; 1 Chron. i, 35-42, 51-54, which may be adjusted by the following combination: (1.) His first wife was Adah, the daughter of Elon the Hittite (Gen. xxxvi, 2), or an aboriginal Canaanite. See *HITTITE*.

In Gen. xxvi, 34, she is incorrectly called Bashemath, apparently by confusion with the name of his third wife, although her parentage is correctly given. Her only child was Eliphaz, who was therefore Esau's first-born (Gen. xxxvi, 10, 15; 1 Chron. i, 35). (2.) Esau's second wife was Aholibamah, the daughter of Anah, as all the accounts agree except that in Gen. xxvi, 34, where, by some error or variation of names, she is called Judith, the daughter of Beeri the Hittite. This Anah, in Gen. xxxvi, 2, 14, is called the daughter of Zibeon, but from ver. 20, 24, 25, and 1 Chron. i, 38, it is evident that he was the son of Zibeon, his brother being Ajah, and his only children a son Dishon and this daughter Aholibamah. We may also remark that this Anah and this Dishon had each an uncle of the same name respectively (Gen. xxxvi, 20, 21), and the name Aholibamah belonged subsequently to a chieftain of an Edomitish tribe (ver. 41). Zibeon was a son of Seir, the original settler of the mountain which went by his name. His descendants were properly called Horites (Gen. xxxvi, 20, 29), but in ver. 20 he is called a Hivite, a term frequently interchangeable for heathenish tribes, as Hittite, in chap. xxvi, 34, is twice used for the same purpose. This connection of Esau with the original inhabitants of Idumæa will explain his subsequent removal to that region, and the eventual supremacy of his descendants there. His children by Aholibamah were Jeush, Jaalam, and Korah. (3.) Esau's third wife, taken, not like the former, from foreign families, but from kindred stock, was Bashemath (otherwise called Mahalath), sister of Nebajoth and daughter of Ishmael, who bore him Reuel (Gen. xxxvi, 3, 4; xxviii, 9). This elucidation substantially agrees with that proposed by Prof. Turner (*Companion to Genesis*, p. 323), after Hengstenberg.—These sons of Esau rose to the importance of sheikhs ("dukes") in their respective families (those by Aholibamah being especially so styled, Gen. xxxvi, 18); and this was naturally more emphatically the case with his grandsons (Gen. xxxvi, 15, 16, where the name Korah is an interpolation, and Amalek is reckoned along with the legitimate children of Eliphaz; comp. the parallel account in 1 Chron. i, 36, where the name Timna is in like manner interpolated), who were probably cotemporaneous with the native sheikhs mentioned in ver. 29, 30, or but little later—the gradual superiority of the Esauites over the Horites appearing from the fact that the heirs of the latter (ver. 22-28) are not named with this distinction (comp. ver. 20, 21). This double line of chieftains of the respective tribes appears to have continued for a long time; for in the subsequent list of native kings (ver. 31-39) and heads of the Edomitish part of the inhabitants (ver. 40, 43), coming down in parallel lines to about the time of the Exode (but from what point dated is uncertain), each appears to have regularly succeeded his predecessor, not by hereditary right indeed, but by that species of common consent, founded upon acknowledged pre-eminence, which is to this day recognised in the election of Arab emirs. See *EDOMITE*.

The time for the fulfilment of the compact between the brothers has at length arrived. Isaac is "sick unto death." His appetite, as well as his health, having failed, is only to be gratified by provocatives. He desires some savory venison, and gives the requisite instructions to Esau, who accordingly proceeds in quest of it. On this Rebekah begins to feel that the critical time has come. If the hated Hittites are not to enter with her less favored son into possession of the family property, the sale of the birthright (the original idea of which she may have suggested to the "plain man," her son Jacob) must now in some way be confirmed and consummated. One essential particular remained—the father's blessing. If this should be given to Esau, all hope was gone; for this, like our modern wills, would hand the inheritance and the accompanying headship of the tribe to Esau and his wives.

Isaac, however, had lost his sight—indeed, all his senses were dull and feeble. It was therefore not very difficult to pass off Jacob upon him as Esau. Rebekah takes her measures, and, notwithstanding Jacob's fears, succeeds. Isaac, indeed, is not without suspicion, but a falsehood comes to aid Jacob in his otherwise discreditable personation of Esau. The blessing is pronounced, and thus the coveted property and ascendancy are secured. The affectionate endearments which pass between the deceiver and the abused old blind father stand in painful contrast with the base trickery by which the mother and the son accomplished their end. This episode in the history of Esau and Jacob is still more painful than the former, as it fully brings out those bitter family rivalries and divisions which were all but universal in ancient times, and which are still a disgrace to Eastern society. Esau, however, returns from the field, approaches his decrepit and sightless father, declaring who he is. "And Isaac trembled very exceedingly, and said, Who? where is he that hath taken venison and brought it me, and I have eaten of all before thou camest, and have blessed him? yea, and he shall be blessed." On this Esau becomes agitated, and entreats a blessing for himself—"Bless me, even me also, O my father." Urging this entreaty again and again, even with tears, Isaac at length said to him, "Behold, thy dwelling shall be the fatness of the earth, and of the dew of heaven from above; and by thy sword shalt thou live, and shalt serve thy brother; and it shall come to pass when thou shalt have the dominion that thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck" (Gen. xxvii). Thus, deprived forever of his birthright, in virtue of the irrevocable blessing, Esau but too naturally conceived and entertained a hatred of Jacob, and he vowed vengeance. But, fearing his aged father's patriarchal authority, he secretly congratulated himself: "The days of mourning for my father are at hand, then will I slay my brother Jacob" (Gen. xxvii). Thus he imagined that by one bloody deed he would regain all that had been taken from him by artifice. But he knew not a mother's watchful care. Not a sinister glance of his eyes, not a hasty expression of his tongue, escaped Rebekah. Words to the above effect which Esau let drop were repeated to his mother, who thereupon felt that the life of her darling son, whose gentle nature and domestic habits had won her heart's affections, was now in imminent peril; and she prevailed on her younger son to flee to his uncle Laban, who lived in Haran, there to remain until time, with its usual effect, should have mitigated Esau's wrath. B. C. 1927. The sins of both mother and child were visited upon them by a long and painful separation, and all the attendant anxieties and dangers. By a characteristic piece of domestic policy, Rebekah succeeded both in exciting Isaac's anger against Esau, and obtaining his consent to Jacob's departure—"And Rebekah said to Isaac, I am weary of my life because of the daughters of Heth; if Jacob take a wife such as these, what good shall my life do me?" Her object was attained at once. The blessing was renewed to Jacob, and he received his father's commands to go to Padan-aram (Gen. xxvii, 46; xxviii, 1-5).

When Esau heard that his father had commanded Jacob to take a wife of the daughters of his kinsman Laban, he also resolved to try whether by a new alliance he could propitiate his parents. He accordingly married his cousin Mahalath, the daughter of Ishmael (xxviii, 8, 9). This marriage appears to have brought him into connection with the Ishmaelitic tribes beyond the valley of Arabah. He soon afterwards established himself in Mount Seir; still retaining, however, some interest in his father's property in Southern Palestine. It is probable that his own habits, and the idolatrous practices of his wives and rising family, continued to excite and even increase the anger of his parents; and that he, consequently, considered it more

prudent to remove his household to a distance. He was residing in Mount Seir when Jacob returned from Padan-aram, and had then become so rich and powerful that the impressions of his brother's early offences seem to have been almost completely effaced. Jacob, however, feared lest his elder brother might intercept him on his way, to take revenge for former injuries. He accordingly sent messengers to Esau, in order, if possible, to disarm his wrath. Esau appears to have announced in reply that he would proceed to meet his returning brother. When, therefore, Jacob was informed that Esau was on his way for this purpose with a band of four hundred men, he was greatly distressed, in fear of that hostility which his conscience told him he had done something to deserve. What, then, must have been his surprise when he saw Esau running with extended arms to greet and embrace him? and Esau "fell on his neck, and kissed him, and they wept." Jacob had prepared a present for Esau, hoping thus to conciliate his favor; but, with the generous ardor which characterizes, and somewhat of the disinterestedness which adorns, natures like his, Esau at first courteously refused the gift: "I have enough, my brother; keep that thou hast unto thyself" (Gen. xxxiii). But doubts and fears still lurked in the mind of Jacob, and betrayed him into something of his old duplicity; for, while he promises to go to Seir, he carefully declines his brother's escort, and immediately after his departure turns westward across the Jordan (Gen. xxxii, 7, 8, 11; xxxiii, 4, 12, 17). B. C. 1907. The whole of this encounter serves to show that, if Jacob had acquired riches, Esau had gained power and influence as well as property; and the homage which is paid to him indirectly and by implication on the part of Jacob, and directly, and in the most marked and respectful manner, by the females and children of Jacob's family, leads to the supposition that he had made himself supreme in the surrounding country of Idumæa. See EDOM.

It does not appear that the brothers again met until the death of their father, about twenty years afterwards. Mutual interests and mutual fear seem to have constrained them to act honestly, and even generously towards each other at this solemn interview. They united in laying Isaac's body in the cave of Machpelah. B. C. 1888. (See Rosé, *Pietas Esavi in parentibus*, Bautzen, 1788.) Then "Esau took all his cattle, and all his substance, which he had got in the land of Canaan"—such, doubtless, as his father, with Jacob's consent, had assigned to him—"and went into the country from the face of his brother Jacob" (xxxv, 29; xxxvi, 6). He now saw clearly that the covenant blessing was Jacob's, that God had inalienably allotted the land of Canaan to Jacob's posterity, and that it would be folly to strive against the divine will. He knew also that as Canaan was given to Jacob, Mount Seir was given to himself (comp. xxvii, 39; xxxii, 3; and Deut. ii, 5), and he was therefore desirous, with his increased wealth and power, to enter into full possession of his country, and drive out its old inhabitants (Deut. ii, 12). Another circumstance may have influenced him in leaving Canaan. He "lived by his sword" (Gen. xxvii, 40), and he felt that the rocky fastnesses of Edom would be a safer and more suitable abode for such as by their habits provoked the hostilities of neighboring tribes than the open plains of Southern Palestine. Esau is once more presented to us (Gen. xxxvi) in a genealogical table, in which a long line of illustrious descendants is referred to "Esau, the father of the Edomites" (Gen. xxxvi, 43). The country to which Esau, with his immense family and flocks, retired, was the tract of Mount Seir, from which they gradually dispossessed the thinly scattered population that preceded them in its occupancy, and which they continued to hold for many generations. It was a region entirely suited to the nomadic and roving character of the race. But in regard to the rela-

relationship between them and the seed of Israel, the remote descendants of Esau proved less pliant or generous than their progenitor; for from the time that Israel left the land of Egypt, when the two families again came into contact, the posterity of Esau seemed to remember only the old quarrel between the respective heads of the races, and to forget the brotherly reconciliation. A spirit of keenest rivalry and spite characterized their procedure towards Israel; through many a bloody conflict they strove to regain the ascendancy which the decree of heaven had destined in the other direction; and in the times of Israel's backsliding and weakness they showed themselves ever ready, according to the prophetic word of Isaac, "to break his yoke from off their neck," and to drive the evil to the uttermost. But it was a fruitless struggle; the purpose of Heaven stood fast; the dominion remained with the house of Jacob; and in the course of the Maccabean wars the children of Esau finally lost their independent existence, and became substantially merged in the house of Israel. The decree of Heaven, as we have said, had so fixed it; but that decree did not realize itself arbitrarily; the preference for Israel and his seed was no senseless favoritism; from the first the qualities were there which inevitably carried along with them the superiority in might and blessing; while, on the other hand, in Esau's carnalism, sensuality, godlessness, the destiny of his race was already indicated. See IDUMEA.

If the historical outline now given is supported by the scriptural narrative, the character of Esau has not ordinarily received justice at the hands of theologians. The injurious impression against him may be traced back to a very ancient period. The Targum of Jonathan (at Gen. xxv, 34) sanctioned and spread, if it did not originate, the misjudgment by unwarrantable additions to the account given in Genesis. The reason, it states, why Esau did not at once slay his brother was lest, as happened in the case of Cain and Abel, another man-child might be born, and thus he should still be deprived of his inheritance; he therefore resolved to wait till the death of Isaac, when the murder of Jacob would leave him in safe and undisputed possession. Representations made in the Talmud are of a similar tendency (Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 207; Wetstein, *N. T.* ii, 437; comp. Philo, *Opp.* i, 551; ii, 441, 675). The Arabians likewise commemorate him (Hottinger, *Hist. Orient.* p. 53 sq.). Cedrenius gives (*Hist. Eccl.* p. 31) the story of his having been killed by an arrow discharged by Jacob. The fathers of the Church, particularly Augustine, regard Esau as the representative of the damned, while they admire Jacob as that of the elect (see Stempel, *De salute Esavi*, Jena, 1678), basing these views upon an erroneous interpretation of such passages as Rom. xii, 16; ix, 13. (Shuckford's *Connections*, ii, 174; Clarke's *Comment.* on Gen. xxvii, xxv; Kitto's *Daily Illustr.* in loc.; Niemeyer, *Charakt.* ii, 153 sq.; Baumgarten, *Allg. Welthist.* ii, 50 sq.; Bauer, *Hebr. Gesch.* i, 147; Hoelheimer, *Im Orient*, 1841, No. 35; Sherlock, *Works*, v; Dupin, *Nouv. Bibl.* iv; Evans, *Script. Biog.* i; Roberts, *Sermons*, p. 134; Puckle, *Sermons*, i, 96; Simeon, *Works*, i, 211; Alcock, *Apology for Esau*, Plymouth, 1791; Townsend, *Sermons* [1849], p. 253; Goodwin, *Parish Sermons*, ii, 1.) See JACOB.

ES'AU (Ἡσαῦ, Vulg. *Sed*), given (1 Esd. v, 29) as the name of the head of one of the families of "Temple servants" or Nethinim that returned from the captivity; in place of the ΖΗΛΑ (q. v.) of the Hebrew text (Ezra ii, 43).

ES'say (Ἡσαίας, Vulg. *Isaia*, *Isaïas*), the form in which the name of the prophet ISAIAH (q. v.) constantly appears in the A. V. of the Apocrypha (Eccles. xviii, 20, 22; 2 Esd. ii, 18). See ESAIAS.

ES'chatology (a discussion of the *last things*, ἔσχατα), a branch of theology which treats of the doc-

trines concerning death, the condition of man after death, the end of this world period, resurrection, final judgment, and the final destiny of the good and the wicked. We treat it here,

I. In its *Biblical aspects*, especially as to the doctrine of the Bible concerning the end of the world, denoted by the use of the phrase "last days," which is applied in the O. T. to the consummation of the Jewish economy by the introduction of the Messianic (Isa. ii, 2; Mic. iv, 1; comp. Acts iii, 1; Heb. i, 2), and in the N. T. is extended to the still expected developments of the divine purposes respecting the Church (2 Tim. iii, 1; 2 Pet. iii, 3). See LAST DAY.

1. *The Maccabean Age.*—In the O.-T. prophets the return from Babylon is often made a type of the incoming of the more glorious dispensation of the Gospel. This is the first, more obvious, and most literal eschatological symbol, and much of the language (especially of Isaiah) bearing upon it has therefore a double sense (q. v.) or twofold application. See RESTORATION (OF THE JEWS).

2. *The Chiliastic Period.*—This is the Christian, as the preceding was the Jewish view of the consummation of the existing divine economy, *so far as relates to the administration of this world.* It will be treated under MILLENNIUM.

3. *The final Denouement of all terrestrial Affairs.*—This whole branch of the subject is particularly exhibited in our Lord's discourse to his disciples upon the Mount of Olives (Matt. xxiv, xxv), in which the two scenes of the retribution impending over Jerusalem, and the final judgment, are intimately associated together, in accordance with that almost constant practice in the Hebrew prophets by which one event is made the type and illustration of another much farther in the future. See HYPONOTA. This is emphatically exemplified in the vaticinations of ISAIAH (q. v.), who perpetually refers to the coming glory of Christ under the figure of the nearer deliverance from Babylon, both these *denouements* being projected upon the same plane of prophecy, without any note of the interval of time between; likewise in the visions of John in the Revelation (q. v.), where the *dramatis personæ* are generic representations of certain principles constantly reappearing in the history of the Church rather than confined to particular characters at one time only. Such often-repeated developments of divine providence are the "coming of the Son of Man" and its attendant phenomena, in the sketches or rather glimpses afforded us by the Scriptures into the future. See SIGN (OF THE SON OF MAN).

As to the passage in Matthew, which forms the leading proof-text of eschatological treatises, the following expository hints will serve to clear up much of the obscurity and ambiguity which has been thrown around the text by the confused manner in which many interpreters have treated its predictions (see Strong's *Harmony and Exposition of the Gospels*, § 123; Stier, *Words of Jesus*, in loc.; Whedon, *Commentary*, in loc.; Nast, *Commentary*, in loc.).

(1.) The question of the apostles (Matt. xxiv, 3) relates to two distinct subjects, namely, the "coming of the 'Son of man' to do these things," and the "end of the world;" these two topics, therefore, are discussed by Christ in his reply. (More strictly, there are two questions concerning the *first* event, namely, "when," and "the sign." Mark and Luke evidently mean to confine their reports of this discourse to this former catastrophe, and therefore they do not mention the second inquiry as to the "end of the world" at all.) Yet, as the questioners apparently supposed that these two events would be simultaneous, or at least intimately connected (as the constant tenor of all former prophecies had naturally made them think), the answer also uses very similar language in treating them both, a style which their analogous nature peculiarly required. Still, the Great Teacher could not fail to give them

true criteria by which to separate these two catastrophes, and for these we are to look in his language. That all the events predicted in Matthew's account as far as xxiv, 34 are connected with the former of these themes, namely, the demolition of Jerusalem and abolition of the Jewish polity, is certain from the declaration at that verse, that they should ALL occur within the then living generation; and the following verses are so intimately connected with these, both by continuity of idea and notes of simultaneousness, that a disruption anywhere before ch. xxv, 31 would be very harsh and arbitrary. At this point, however, we discover clear intimations of a transition (*easy* indeed, as the typical correspondence of the two catastrophes would lead us to expect, yet a real and marked one) to the second subject, the general judgment. The change is introduced by the notes of time, "*But* [unwarrantably omitted in our translation] *when . . . then,*" and by the loftier tone of the style, besides the distinctive mention of "*all nations*" as the subjects of that adjudication (ver. 32). In the latter portion of Christ's discourse alone is employed the briefer and more general mode of prediction usual with the prophets in prefiguring far-distant events, and here only is the language *all exclusively* applicable to the final judgment. The expressions deemed by some to point out such a transition at other points than those assumed above (xxiv, 35, and especially xxv, 31) will be noticed presently; it is sufficient here to say in general that, as the passages embraced within the medial portion (xxiv, 27-xxv, 30) are designed to be a link of connection between two judicial events so correlative in character, they naturally assume a style that might be applied to either, borrowing some expressions in describing the former which otherwise would belong exclusively to the latter. See a similarly blended style in describing the former of these two events in 2 Thess. i, 7-9; comp. with ii, 2; and comp. Matt. xvi, 27, 28.

Many place at the end of Matt. xxiv, 28 the transition to the final judgment; but it is difficult to extend the intimations of consecutiveness that follow ("[But] immediately after," "But in those days") over such a chasm. It is true, the description ensuing in verses 29-31 is unusually allegorical for a prose discourse, but this is explained by the fact that it is evidently borrowed almost wholly from familiar poetic predictions of similar events. Many of these particulars, moreover, may refer, partially at least, in a literal sense, to the concurrent natural phenomena intimated in Luke xxi, 11; and in their utmost stretch of meaning they also *hint* at the collapse of nature in the general judgment. The objection of anachronism in this application of the "tribulation" of verse 29 as a *subsequent* event, is obviated by considering that this term here refers to the incipient stages of the "tribulation" of verse 21, where the previous context shows that the distress of the *first* siege and preliminary campaign are specially intended; Luke (verse 24) there gives the *personal* incidents of the catastrophe itself as succeeding, with an allusion to the long desolation of the land that should follow; so that Christ here resumes the thread of prophetic history (which had been somewhat interrupted by the caution against the impostors who were so rife in the brief interim of the suspension of actual hostilities) by returning to the *national* consequences of the second and decisive onset of the Romans. The assignment of these events contained in the ensuing verses, as to take place "*after* the tribulation" (presumed to be that of the acme of the Jewish struggle), is the strongest argument of those who apply this whole following passage to the final judgment. But they overlook the equally explicit limit "*immediately after,*" and, moreover, fail to discriminate the precise date indicated by "*that tribulation.*" This latter is made (in verse 21 of Matthew) simultaneous with the flight of the Christians, which could not have been practicable in the extremity of the siege, but is

directed (in verse 15) to be made on the approach of the besiegers. The consummation intimated here, therefore, refers to the *close* of the siege (i. e. the *sack* itself), and the preceding rigors are those of its *progress*. It ought, moreover, to be considered that the fall of the capital was but the precursor of the extinction of the Jewish nationality (here typified by celestial prodigies); the utter subjugation of the country at large of course following that event. Another interpretation is, that the following passage refers to a second overthrow (the final extermination of the Jewish metropolis under the emperor Adrian in a subsequent war), as distinguished from the first under Titus; this is ingenious, but would hardly justify the strong language here employed, and would, moreover, require the limit "*immediately*" to be extended half a century farther, when the living "generation" must have entirely passed away. Nor at this later event could the "redemption" of the Christians properly be said to "draw nigh" (verse 28 of Luke), the Jews having then long ceased to have any considerable power to persecute; compare the deliverance prophetically celebrated in Rev. xi, especially verses 8, 13.

(2.) In the highly-wrought description of Matt. xxiv, 29; Luke xxi, 25, 26 (which constitutes the transition-point or intermediate part of our Saviour's discourse), the political convulsions during the acme of the Jewish struggle with the Romans are compared with a contest among the elements, in which the sun, moon, stars, earth, and waves join in one horrible war to aggravate human misery and desperation (comp. Judg. v, 20); the individual terms are therefore to be understood as merely heightening the general idea. To those who suppose the final judgment referred to in the expressions of this and the following verses, it may here be remarked that these symbolical phenomena of nature are all said to take place "*immediately after* [Mark, 'in'] . . . those days," while the subsequent "*coming*" is made simultaneous by the word "*then*" used by all the evangelists; and all these events are specially noted as signals of a "*deliverance*" (Luke, verse 28), evidently the same with that of the Christians from Jerusalem's ruin and power to oppress before alluded to; the whole being limited by all the evangelists in distinct terms to the present generation. In order to understand many of the phrases of this representation (as especially those of verses 30, 31), the *induction* (so to speak) of a style of language usually appropriated to the second catastrophe (as intimated at the close of paragraph 1 above), must be borne in mind.

The first element of this "*tribulation*" (that affecting the celestial luminaries, a statement common to all the evangelists here) is cited from Isa. xiii, 10, a passage spoken with reference to the fall of Babylon; comp. Joel iii, 15, and many similar passages, in which the prophets represent great national disasters by celestial phenomena of an astounding character. All the following quotations, as they appear in the evangelists, are cited by our Saviour with considerable latitude and irregularity of order, as his object was merely to afford brief specimens of this style; but the general resemblance to the original pictures is too strong to be mistaken. See Isa. xxxiv, 4; xiii, 13; Ezek. xxxii, 7, and especially Joel ii, 30, a prediction expressly quoted by the apostle Peter (Acts ii, 19) as referring to the destruction of Jerusalem.

In illustration of the *angels* spoken of in connection with these incidents (Matt. xxiv, 31; Mark xiii, 27), it should be borne in mind that the Jew naturally associated a retinue of angelic servants with the advent of the Messiah in his triumphant career, and this idea Christ here accommodates, in order to assimilate this first with his final judicial appearance, and thus impress it more deeply upon his volatile disciples' mind (comp. Dan. vii, 10). The "*angels*" in this case are the providential means (including particularly the Roman



invaders), by which the Christians' rescue from siege, sack, and especially persecution, was effected; and the "trumpet sound" refers to the warning intimations which the belligerent preparations afforded them, thus giving them at once an assurance and a signal of deliverance. In the similar language of Matt. xiii, 41, 49, the primary reference is to the general judgment. But in the passage before us it is to be specially noted that the "trumpet" is to "gather together his *elect*" only, in distinction from the "all nations" of Matt. xxv, 32.

At Matt. xxiv, 44 (comp. Luke xii, 41), the discourse, which previously had been slightly tinged with allusions to the second judicial coming of Christ (verses 29-31), now begins to verge more distinctly to that final stage, as the reply to Peter that follows indicates. Still, there is no *mark* that the transition to the last judgment is effected till ch. xxv, 31.

In the conclusion of the first topic of Christ's discourse (Matt. xxv, 1-13; comp. Luke xii, 35-38; the parable in Matt. xxv, 14-30 is parallel with an earlier one of our Lord, Luke xix, 11 sq.), the near anticipation of the second topic produces almost a *double* sense in this (and to a degree, in the preceding) parable, which is not so much the effect of direct design as the natural moulding of the language while on a kindred subject, by the vivid presence to the mind of a sublime one which is soon to be introduced; and, indeed, scarcely any phraseology (especially in the far-reaching style of allegory) could have been consistently adopted which would not have been almost equally applicable to both events. Still, a comparison of verse 13 with ch. xxiv, 36, 42 shows that the same occurrences (Jerusalem's siege and fall) are here *chiefly* referred to.

3. The imaginative style of the representation of the judgment day (Matt. alone, xxv, 31-36), which is especially betrayed in the comparison with the shepherd, shows that many of its descriptive particulars are designed only for poetic "*drapery*," needed to portray the actualness of that scene of the invisible world; the *body* of reality coched under it consists in the fact of a universal discrimination of mankind at a future set time by Christ in the capacity of judge, according to their religious character, followed by the assignment of a corresponding destiny of happiness or misery Comp. Rom. xiv, 10, 12; 2 Cor. v, 10; 1 Thess. iv, 16.

See Cramer, *Eschatologische Rede Christi* (Stuttg. 1860); Dörner, *De oratione Christi eschatologica* (Stuttg. 1844); Lippold, *De Christo venturo oracula* (Dresd. 1776); also the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1836, ii, 269; 1846, iv, 965; 1861, iii; *Jour. Sac. Lit.* Jan. 1857; Stowe, in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vii, 452. There are special exegetical treatises on Matt. xxiv and xxv, in Latin, by Jachmann (Lips. 1749), Brandes (Aboe, 1792), Rintsch (Neost. ad Oril. 1827), Kenon (Abo, 1798), Schmid (Jen. 1777), Masch (*Nov. Bibl. Lubec.* ii, 69), Anon. (Lips. 1809); in German, by Crome (*Erem. u. Verd. Bibl.* ii, 349), Ammon (*N. theol. Journ.* i, 365), Jahn (in Bengel's *Archiv.* ii, 79), Anon. (in Eichhorn's *Biblioth.* iii, 669; *Beiträge z. Beförd.* xi, 118; Töllner's *Kurz- u. verm. Aufsätze*, II, i, 221-50); on Christ's coming (*παρουσία*, see ADVENT), in Latin, by Tychsen (Gott. 1785), Schott (Jen. 1819); in German, by Baumeister (in Klüber's *Stud.* I, ii, 219-41; iii, 1-59; II, i, 1-104; ii, 3-48), Schulthess (*Neueste theol. Nachtr.* 1829, p. 18-48): on the phrase *οὐκὲν ὁ βίος*, in Latin, by Osiander (Tub. 1754); on the parallel passage of Luke, in German, by Göze (*Sendsehr.* Hamb. 1783, 1784), Moldenhauer (*ib.* 1784, bis). See Kahle, *Biblische Eschatologie* (Gotha, 1870).

II. *Theological Eschatology* is a subdivision of systematic, and more particularly of dogmatic theology. It generally constitutes the concluding part of dogmatic theology, as it treats of what constitutes both for the individual Christian and for the Christian Church, as a whole, the completion of their destiny. As eschatology presupposes a belief in the immortality of the soul, some writers on dogmatic theology (as Haase) treat

of it in connection with the doctrine of man, and before they treat of the Church. Others connect the doctrine of death with the doctrine of sin. On some points of eschatology, different views were held at an early period of the Church. Origen understood a passage in the Epistle to the Romans on the Apocatastasis (q. v.) as meaning a final reconciliation and salvation of the wicked, and this view has found some adherents at all times. See RESTORATIONISTS. In modern times, some go so far as to deny all punishment after the present life, and asserting the immediate salvation of all men [see UNIVERSALISTS]; while others teach that immortality will be the lot of only the good, and that the wicked, after their death, will be annihilated. See ANNIHILATIONISTS. See also the articles DEATH, INTERMEDIATE STATE, JUDGMENT, HEAVEN, HELL, RESURRECTION, IMMORTALITY. The Church of Rome developed the theory of a future state, different from heaven and hell, for which see the article PURGATORY. No point connected with eschatology has from the earliest period of the Church been more productive of excited controversy than the doctrine of the second advent of Christ and of the Millennium. For the history of this doctrine, see the article MILLENNIUM. In German there are separate treatises on eschatology, e. g. Richter, *die Lehre von den letzten Dingen* (Bresl. 1833, 8vo); Lau, *Paulus Lehre v. d. letzt. Dingen* (Brandenb. 1837, 8vo); Valenti, *Eschatologie* (Basel, 1840, 8vo); Karsten, *Lehre von d. letzten Dingen* (Rostock, 3d ed. 1861); Schultz, *Voraussetzungen der christl. Lehre von der Unsterblichkeit* (Göttingen, 1861); Wilmarshof, *Das Jenseits* (Leipzig, 3 parts, 1863-1866); Nöldechen, *Grade der Seligkeit* (Berlin, 1863); Splittgerber, *Tod, Fortleben u. Auferstehung* (Halle, 1863); Rink, *Vom Zustande nach dem Tode* (Ludwigsburg, 2d ed. 1865); Oswald, *Eschatologie* (Paderborn, 1868).—Hagenbach, *Encycl.* § 89; Herzog, *Real-Encycl.* iv, 155. (A. J. S.)

Escobar y Mendoza, ANTONIO, a Spanish Jesuit and noted casuist, was born at Valladolid in 1589, and took the vows of the order of Jesuits in 1604. He became very eminent as a preacher, and is said to have preached daily (sometimes twice a day) for fifty years. He was also a prolific writer, leaving more than forty folio volumes of ascetic divinity, sermons, casuistry, etc. His *Liber Theologicus Moralís* (Lyon, 1646, 7 vols. 8vo) passed through many (39 in Spain) editions, and was long the favorite text-book of the Jesuits. He also wrote *Universæ Theologie Moralís problemata* (Lyon, 1652, 2 vols. fol.);—*Universæ Theol. Moral. receptiores sententiæ*, etc. (Lyon, 7 vols. fol.). Escobar became the butt of Pascal's wit in the *Provincial Letters*, a fact which will carry his name to the latest posterity. His "liberality" in morals was so excessive that even Rome was compelled to disavow some of his doctrines. His complete works fill 42 volumes. He died July 4, 1669.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xvi, 375; Alegambe, *Biblioth. Scriptorum Soc. Jesu* (Louvain, 1854).

Escorial, or Escorial, a city of Spain, twenty-four miles N.W. of Madrid, containing a celebrated convent-palace generally called *Escorial*. The convent, built for 160 monks of the order of Jerome, was erected 1563-84, by Philip II, in fulfilment of a vow made at the battle of St. Quentin, fought on the anniversary of St. Lawrence. It is built in the form of a gridiron, in commemoration of the martyrdom of the saint, and the king's palace forms the handle. The buildings are 740 feet long, inclosing 20 courts, in which are 63 fountains; there are 17 cross paths, 890 doors, 1000 columns, 5000 windows, 9 towers surmounted by cupolas, a magnificent church with 48 altars in side chapels. The main altar is adorned by a statue of St. Lawrence in solid silver, weighing 450 pounds. Underneath is the costly burying vault of the king, of marble and jasper. The library of the convent contains some 4000 MSS., mostly Arabic, and is the principal collection of Ori-

ental history and literature. Many of the MS. and other treasures were lost when the place was sacked by the French in 1808. Besides these, there are some 24,000 vols. of ancient authors, principally on history. The picture-gallery contains some 465 original paintings. A park surrounds the king's palace, or Casa del Principe.—*Penny Cyclopædia*; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 157.

**Esdraëla.** See JEZREEL.

**Esdraë'lon.** See ESDRAELON.

**Esdraë'lon** [from v. r. *Ἐσδραῖλῶν*] (or rather *Esdrēlon*, *Ἐσδραῖλῶν*, Judith, iii, 9; iv, 6; but "*Esdrēlom*," *Ἐσδραῖλῶμ*, Judith, i, 8; "*Esdraelom*," vii, 3, where it is called "the great plain," as simply in Josephus everywhere, τὸ πῆϊον μέγα), the name of a valley or large bottom, a Grecized form derived from the old royal city of *Jezeel*, which occupied a commanding site, near the eastern extremity of the plateau, on a spur of Mount Gilboa. "The great plain of Esdraclon" extends across central Palestine from the Mediterranean to the Jordan, separating the mountain ranges of Carmel and Samaria from those of Galilee. The western section of it is properly the plain of Aecho or Acre ('Akka). The main body of the plain is a triangle. Its base on the east extends from Jenin (the ancient Engannim) to the foot of the hills below Nazareth, and is about 15 miles long; the north side, formed by the hills of Galilee, is about 12 miles long; and the south side, formed by the Samaria range, is about 18 miles. The apex on the west is a narrow pass opening into the plain of 'Akka. This vast expanse has a gently undulating surface—in spring all green with corn where cultivated, and rank weeds and grass where neglected—dotted with several low gray tells, and near the sides with a few olive groves. This is that *valley of Megiddo* (מִגִּדּוֹ מְגִדּוֹ, so called from the city of Megiddo [q. v.], which stood on its southern border), where Barak triumphed, and where king Josiah was defeated and received his death-wound (Judg. v; 2 Chron. xxv). Probably, too, it was before the mind of the apostle John when he figuratively described the final conflict between the hosts of good and evil who were gathered to a place called *Armageddon* (Ἀρμαγεδδών, from the Heb. מִגְדּוֹן מְגִדּוֹן, that is, the city of *Megiddo*; Rev. xvi, 16). The river Kishon—"that ancient river" so fatal to the army of Sisera (Judg. v, 21)—drains the plain, and flows off through the pass westward to the Mediterranean.

From the base of this triangular plain three branch plains stretch out eastward, like fingers from a hand, divided by two bleak gray ridges—one bearing the familiar name of Mount Gilboa; the other called by Franks Little Hermon, but by natives Jebel ed-Duby. The northern branch has Tabor on the one side, and Little Hermon on the other; into it the troops of Barak defiled from the heights of Tabor (Judg. iv, 6); and on its opposite side are the sites of Nain and Endor. The southern branch lies between Jenin and Gilboa, terminating in a point among the hills to the eastward; it was across it that Ahaziah fled from Jehu (2 Kings ix, 27). The central branch is the richest as well as the most celebrated; it descends in green, fertile slopes to the banks of the Jordan, having Jezeel and Shumem on opposite sides at the western end, and Bethshean in its midst towards the east. This is the "valley of Jezeel" proper—the battle-field on which Gideon triumphed, and Saul and Jonathan were overthrown (Judg. vii, 1 sq.; 1 Sam. xxix and xxxi). Indeed, a large part of the most sanguinary battles fought in Palestine in every age have been waged upon this eventful plain.

Two things are worthy of special notice in the plain of Esdraclon: 1. *Its wonderful richness.*—Its unbroken expanse of verdure contrasts strangely with the gray, bleak crowns of Gilboa, and the rugged ranges on the

north and south. The gigantic thistles, the luxuriant grass, and the exuberance of the crops on the few cultivated spots, show the fertility of the soil. It was the frontier of Zebulon—"Rejoice, Zebulon, in thy going out" (Deut. xxxiii, 18). But it was the special portion of Issachar—"And he saw that rest was good, and the land that it was pleasant; and bowed his shoulder to bear, and became a servant unto tribute" (Gen. xlix, 15). 2. *Its desolation.*—If we except the eastern branches, there is not a single inhabited village on its whole surface, and not more than one sixth of its soil is cultivated. It is the home of the wild, wandering Bedouin, who scour its smooth turf on their fleet horses in search of plunder; and when hard pressed can speedily remove their tents and flocks beyond the Jordan, and beyond the reach of a weak government. It has always been insecure since history began. The old Canaanitish tribes drove victoriously through it in their iron chariots (Judg. iv, 3, 7); the nomad Midianites and Amalekites—those "children of the East," who were "as grasshoppers for multitude," whose "camels were without number"—devoured its rich pastures (Judg. vi, 1-6; vii, 1); the Philistines long held it, establishing a stronghold at Bethshean (1 Sam. xxix, 1; xxxi, 10); and the Syrians frequently swept over it with their armies (1 Kings xx, 26; 2 Kings xiii, 17). In its condition, thus exposed to every hasty incursion and to every shock of war, we read the fortunes of that tribe which for the sake of its richness consented to sink into a half-nomadic state—"Rejoice, O Issachar, in thy tents . . . Issachar is a strong ass, crouching down between two burdens; and he saw that rest was good, and the land that it was pleasant, and bowed his shoulder to bear, and became a servant unto tribute" (Gen. xlix, 14, 15; Deut. xxxiii, 18). Once only did this tribe shake off the yoke—when under the heavy pressure of Sisera, "the chiefs of Issachar were with Deborah" (Judg. v, 15). Their exposed position and valuable possessions in this open plain made them anxious for the succession of David to the throne, as one under whose powerful protection they would enjoy that peace and rest which they loved; and they joined with their neighbors of Zebulon and Naphtali in sending to David presents of the richest productions of their rich country (1 Chron. xii, 32, 40). See ISSACHAR.

The whole borders of the plain of Esdraclon are dotted with places of high historic and sacred interest. Here we group them together, while referring the reader for details to the separate articles. On the east we have Endor, Nain, and Shnnem, ranged round the base of the "hill of Moreh;" then Bethshean in the centre of the plain where the "valley of Jezeel" opens towards the Jordan; then Gilboa, with the "well of Harod," and the ruins of Jezeel at its western base. On the south are Engannim, Taanach, and Megiddo. At the western apex, on the overhanging brow of Carmel, is the scene of Elijah's sacrifice; and close by the foot of the mountain below runs the Kishon, on whose banks the false prophets of Baal were slain. On the north, among places of less note, are Nazareth and Tabor. The modern Syrians have forgotten the ancient name as they have forgotten the ancient history of Esdraclon, and it is now known among them only as *Merj ibn-Amer*, "the Plain of the Son of 'Amer." A graphic sketch of Esdraclon is given in Stanley's *Syr. and Pales.* p. 327 sq.; see also Porter, *Handbook for Syria and Palestine*, p. 351 sq.; Jowett, *Christian Researches*, p. 146, 222; Robinson, *Researches*, new ed. ii, 315-30, 366; iii, 113 sq.; Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 216 sq.; Walthers, *De Meγαλοπείλιῳ Παλαιστίνῃ* (Lips. 1792).—Smith, s. v. See JEZREEL.

**Es'dras** (*Ἐσδρας*; Vulg. *Esdras*), the Grecized form, used throughout the Apocrypha (1 Esd. viii, 1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 19, 23, 25, 91, 92, 96; ix, 7, 16, 39, 40, 42, 45, 46, 49; 2 Esd. i, 1; ii, 10, 33, 42; vi, 10; vii, 2, 25; viii, 2, 19; xiv, 1, 38), of the name of the scribe EZRA

(q. v.). In several manuscripts of the Latin Vulgate, as well as in all the printed editions anterior to the decree of the Council of Trent, and in many since that period, there will be found four books following each other, entitled the 1st, 2d, 3d, and 4th books of Ezra. The first two are the canonical books of Ezra and Nehemiah, the 3d and 4th form the subject of the articles below. They are the same which are called 1st and 2d Esdras in the English Authorized Version. For their use and relation to the canonical books see Josippon ben-Gorion (ed. Breithaupt, 1710), p. 47 sq.; Trenchelenburg, in Eichhorn's *Biblioth.* i, 189 sq.; Eichhorn, *Einleit. in d. Apocr.* p. 335 sq.; Herzfeld, *Gesch. d. Israel*, p. 320 sq.; Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* iv, 131 sq.; Keil, *Einleit. in d. A. T.* (ed. 1859), p. 677 sq.; Davidson, *Text of O. T.* p. 937 sq. See ΑΠΟΚΡΥΦΑ.

**ESDRAS, FIRST BOOK OF.** This is the first of the apocryphal books in the English translations of the Bible (viz., Coverdale, Matthews, Taverner, the Geneva Bible, Cranmer's Bible, the Bishops' Bible, the A. V.), which follow Luther and the translators of the Zurich version, who were the first that separated the apocryphal from the canonical books. It must, however, be observed that Luther himself never translated the apocryphal portions of Ezra, because he regarded them as unworthy of a place among the apocrypha (see below, sec. 5).

**I. Title and Position.**—This book has different titles. In some editions of the Sept. it is called ὁ ἱερεὺς, *the Priest* (Cod. Alex.), which is equivalent to Ezra, who, by way of eminence, was styled "the priest" or "the scribe," in others it is designated Ἐσδραῖος, *Ezra*, while in the Vatican and many modern editions of the Sept., as well as in the *old Latin* and the Syriac, it is called "the first book of Ezra," and accordingly is placed before the canonical Ezra, which is called "the second book of Ezra," because the history it gives is in part anterior to that given in the canonical Ezra. In the Vulg., again, where Ezra and Nehemiah are respectively styled the *first* and *second* book of Ezra, this apocryphal book, which comes immediately after them, is called "the third book of Ezra." Others, again, call it "the second book of Ezra" (Isidore, *Orig.* vi, 2), because Ezra and Nehemiah, which it follows, were together styled "the first book of Ezra," according to a very ancient practice among the Jews, who, by putting the two canonical books together, obtained the same number of books in the Scriptures as the letters in the Hebrew alphabet; and others call it *Pseudo-Ezra*, in contradistinction to the canonical Ezra. The name *first* Esdras given to it in the A. V. is taken from the Geneva Bible; the older English translations (viz. Coverdale's Bible, Matthew's Bible, the Bishops' Bible), as well as the sixth article of the Church of England (1571), following Luther and the Zurich Bible, call it the *third* Esdra, according to the Vulg. Since the Council of Trent (1546), this book has been removed from its old position to the end of the volume in the Sixtine and Clementine editions of the Vulg. In the list of revisers or translators of the *Bishops' Bible*, sent by Archbishop Parker to Sir William Cecil, with the portion revised by each, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, and the apocryphal books of Esdras seem to be all comprised under the one title of **ESDRAS**. Barlow, bishop of Chichester, was the translator, as also of the books of Judith, Tobias, and Sapientia (*Corresp. of Archbp. Parker*, Park. Soc. p. 335).

**II. Design and Contents.**—The object of this book, as far as its original portion is concerned (iii, 1-v, 6), is to excite the heathen rulers of Judæa to liberality and kindness towards the Jews, by depicting the good example of Darius, from whom Zerubbabel obtained permission, by the aid of wisdom, to return with his brethren to Palestine, and to rebuild the city and the Temple. This design is worked out in the following attractive story. Darius, having given a sumptuous feast to all his subjects in the second year of his reign,

retired to rest (iii, 1-3); when asleep, his three body-guards, Zerubbabel being one of them, proposed each to write a maxim stating what he thought was the most powerful thing, in the hope that the king would reward the wisest writer (ver. 4-9). Accordingly, they all wrote: one said "Wine is the most powerful;" the other, "A king is the most powerful;" while Zerubbabel wrote, "Women are very powerful, but truth conquers all." The slips containing these maxims were put under the king's pillow, and were given to him when he awoke (ver. 10-12). When he had read them he immediately sent for all his magnates, and, having read these maxims before them (ver. 13-15), called upon the three youths to explain their sayings (ver. 16, 17). The first spoke elaborately about the great power which wine manifests in different ways (ver. 18-24); the second descanted upon the unlimited power of royalty, illustrating it by various examples (iv, 1-12); while Zerubbabel discoursed upon the mighty influence of women, frequently contravening the power of wine and monarchs, and then burst forth in praise of truth so eloquently, that all present exclaimed, "Great is truth, and mightiest above all things" (ver. 13-41). Darius then offered to Zerubbabel anything he should ask (ver. 42), whereupon he reminded the king of his vow to rebuild Jerusalem and return the sacred vessels when he ascended the throne (ver. 43-47). The king stood up, kissed Zerubbabel, wrote to all officials to convey him and all his brethren to Palestine, and to supply all the necessary materials for the rebuilding of the Temple (ver. 48-63).

This is preceded and followed by descriptions of events which present the whole as one continuous narrative, relating in historical order the restoration of the Temple-service first under Josiah, then under Zerubbabel, and finally under Ezra, and which are compiled from the records contained in the books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, as follows:

1. Chap. i corresponds to 2 Chron. xxxv and xxxvi, giving an account of Jo-shiah's magnificent celebration of the Passover-feast in the eighteenth month of his reign, and continuing the history till the Babylonian captivity.
2. Chap. ii, 1-15, corresponds to Ezra i, 1-11, recording the return of the Jews from Babylon under the guidance of Sanabassar in the reign of Cyrus.
3. Chap. ii, 16-30, corresponds to Ezra iv, 7-24, giving an account of Artaxerxes' prohibition to build the Temple till the second year of Darius.
4. Chap. iii, 1-v, 6, contains the original piece.
5. Chap. v, 7-78, corresponds to Ezra ii, 1-iv, 5, giving a list of the persons who returned with Zerubbabel, describing the commencement of the building of the Temple and the obstacles whereby it was interrupted "for the space of two years" until the reign of Darius.
6. Chap. vi, 1-vii, 15, corresponds to Ezra v, 1-vi, 22, giving an account of the building of the Temple by Zerubbabel under Darius, of its completion in the sixth year of this monarch's reign, and of the commencement of the Temple service.
7. Chap. viii, 1-ix, 36, corresponds to Ezra vii, 1-x, 44, describing the return of Ezra with his colony, and the putting away of the strange wives.
8. Chap. ix, 57-55, corresponds to Neh. vii, 23-viii, 12, giving an account of Ezra's public reading of the law.

The original piece around which all this clusters has evidently been the cause of this transposition and remodelling of the narrative contained in the canonical books. Having assumed that Zerubbabel returned to Jerusalem with a portion of his brethren in the second year of Darius, the compiler naturally placed Ezra ii, 1-iv, 5, which gives the list of those that returned, after the original piece, for it belongs to Zerubbabel's time, according to ii, 2, and the original piece he placed after Ezra iv, 7-24, because Ezra (Ezra iv, 24) led him to suppose that Artaxerxes reigned before Darius. Hence a twofold design in the compiler is discernible. One was to introduce and give scriptural sanction to the legend about Zerubbabel, which may or may not have a historical base, and may have existed as a separate work; the other was to explain the great obscurities of the book of Ezra, and to present the narrative, as the author understood it, in historical order, in which, however, he has signally failed. For, not to advert to

innumerable other contradictions, the introducing of the opposition of the heathen, as offered to Zerubbabel after he had been sent to Jerusalem in such triumph by Darius, and the describing of that position as lasting "until the reign of Darius" (v, 73), and as put down by an appeal to the decree of Cyrus, is such a palpable inconsistency as is alone sufficient quite to discredit the authority of the book. It even induces the suspicion that it is a farrago made up of scraps by several different hands. At all events, attempts to reconcile the different portions with each other, or with Scripture, is lost labor.

III. *Unity and Original Language.*—The above analysis of its contents shows that the book gives us a consecutive history *de templi restitutione*, as the *old Latin* tersely expresses it. It is, however, not complete in its present state, as is evident from the abrupt manner in which it concludes with Neh. viii, 12. We may therefore legitimately presume that the compiler intended to add Neh. viii, 13-18, and perhaps also ch. ix. Josephus, who follows the history given in this book, continues to speak of the death of Ezra (*Ant.* xi, 5, 5), from which it may be concluded that it originally formed part of this narrative. More venturesome are the opinions of Zuntz, that Neh. i-vii originally belonged to this book (*Die Gottesdienstl. Vorträge*, p. 29), and of Eichhorn, that 2 Chron. xxxiv followed the abrupt breaking off (*Einführung in d. Apokr.* p. 345 sq.).

As to its original language, this compilation is undoubtedly made directly from the Hebrew, and not from other parts of the present Sept. This is evident from the rendering of עֲזָרָה לְבָנָיָהּ by Ἐμμοροσθεν τοῦ λαοῦ, reading עֲזָרָה (compare i, 11 with 2 Chron. xxxiv, 12), and of הִתְחַנְּפוּ בְּלֵבָיְכֶם לַיהוָה by καὶ συνετέλεσαν πάντα τὰ ἐνδόξα αὐτῆς, reading בְּבָרְכֶיךָ (comp. i, 53 with 2 Chron. xxxvi, 19; see also ii, 7-9 with Ezra i, 4, 6; ii, 17 with Ezra iv, 9; ii, 16 with Ezra iv, 7; ii, 24 with Ezra iv, 16; ix, 10 with Ezra x, 4), since these can only be accounted for on the supposition that the book was compiled and translated from the Hebrew. The translator, however, did not aim so much to be literal as to produce a version compatible with the Greek idiom. Hence he sometimes abbreviated the Hebrew (comp. i, 10 with 2 Chron. xxxv, 10-12; ii, 15, 16 with Ezra iv, 7-11; v, 7 with Ezra v, 6, 7; vi, 4 with Ezra v, 3, 4; viii, 6 with Ezra vii, 6; viii, 14 with Ezra vii, 17; viii, 20 with Ezra vii, 22), and sometimes tried to make it more intelligible by adding some words (comp. i, 56 with 2 Chron. xxvi, 20; ii, 5 with Ezra i, 3; ii, 9 with Ezra i, 4; ii, 16 with Ezra iv, 6; ii, 18 with Ezra iv, 12; v, 40 with Ezra ii, 63; v, 47 with Ezra iii, 1; v, 52 with Ezra iii, 5; v, 66 with Ezra iv, 1; vi, 41 with Ezra ii, 64; vi, 8 with Ezra iv, 14; vi, 9 with Ezra v, 8; vii, 9 with Ezra vi, 18). The original portion, too, is a Palestinian production, embellished to suit the Alexandrian taste. The Hebrew forms of it may be seen in Josephus (*Ant.* xi, 3, 1) and Josippon ben-Gorion (i, c. 6, p. 47 sq., ed. Breithaupt).

IV. *Author and Date.*—As regards the time and place when the compilation was made, the *original* portion is that which alone affords much clew. This seems to indicate that the writer was thoroughly conversant with Hebrew, even if he did not write the book in that language. He was well acquainted, too, with the books of Esther and Daniel (1 Esdr. iii, 1, 2 sq.), and other books of Scripture (*ib.* 20, 21, 39, 41, etc., and 45 compared with Psa. cxxxvii, 7). But that he did not live under the Persian kings, and was not contemporary with the events narrated, appears from the undiscriminating way in which he uses promiscuously the phrase *Medes and Persians*, or *Persians and Medes*, according as he happened to be imitating the language of Daniel or of the book of Esther. The allusion in iv, 23 to "sailing upon the sea and upon the rivers," for the purpose of "robbing and stealing,"

seems to indicate a residence in Egypt, and an acquaintance with the lawlessness of Greek pirates there acquired. The phraseology of v, 73 savors also strongly of Greek rather than Hebrew. If, however, as seems very probable, the legend of Zerubbabel appeared first as a separate piece, and was afterwards incorporated into the narrative made up from the book of Ezra, this Greek sentence from ch. v would not prove anything as to the language in which the original legend was written. The expressions in iv, 40, "She is the strength, kingdom, power, and majesty of all ages," is very like the doxology found in some copies of the Lord's Prayer, and retained by us, "Thine is the kingdom, and the power and the glory forever." But Lightfoot says that the Jews in the Temple service, instead of saying Amen, used this antiphon, Blessed be the Name of the Glory of His Kingdom forever and ever (*Works*, vi, 427). Thus the resemblance may be accounted for by their being both taken from a common source.

Whoever the author was, he seems to have lived in Palestine (comp. v, 47), and certainly was a master of Greek, as is evident from his superior style, which resembles that of Symmachus, and from his successfully turning the Hebraisms into good Greek (comp. viii, 5 with Ezra viii, 17; ix, 13 with Ezra x, 14). The compiler must have lived at least a century before Christ, since Josephus follows his narrative of the times of Ezra and Nehemiah (*Ant.* xi, 5; xi, 45). The book must therefore have existed for some time, and have acquired great reputation and authority, to make the Jewish historian prefer its description of those days to that of the canonical books.

V. *Canonicity and Importance.*—This book was never included in the Hebrew canon, nor is it to be found in the catalogues of the Hebrew Scriptures given by the early fathers, e. g. Melito, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Gregory Nazianzen, Hilary of Poitiers, Cyril of Jerusalem, the Council of Laodicea, and many others; and St. Jerome emphatically warns us "not to take pleasure in the dreams of the 3d and 4th apocryphal books of Ezra" (*Pref. in Esdr. et Nehem.*). The councils of Florence (1438) and Trent (1546) decided against its canonicity. The reason of this last exclusion seems to be that the Tridentine fathers were not aware that it existed in Greek; for it is not in the Complutensian edition (1515), nor in the *Biblia Regia*. Vatablus (1540) had never seen a Greek copy, and, in the preface to the apocryphal books, speaks of it as only existing in some MSS. and printed *Latin* Bibles. Baduel also, a French Protestant divine (*Bibl. Crit.*) (about 1550), says that he knew of no one who had ever seen a Greek copy. For this reason it seems it was excluded from the Canon, though it has certainly quite as good a title to be admitted as Tobit, Judith, etc. It has indeed been stated (Bp. Marsh, *Compar. View*, ap. Soames, *Hist. of Ref.* ii, 608) that the Council of Trent, in excluding the two books of Esdras, followed Augustine's Canon; but this is not so. Augustine (*de Doctr. Christ.* lib. ii, 13) distinctly mentions among the libri canonici *Esdræ duo*; and that one of these was our 1st Esdras is manifest from the quotation from it given in his *De Civit. Dei*. Hence it is also sure that it was included among those pronounced as canonical by the third Council of Carthage, A.D. 397 or 419, where the same title is given, *Esdræ libri duo*; here it is to be noticed by the way that Augustine and the Council of Carthage use the term canonical in a much broader sense than we do; and that the manifest ground of considering them canonical in any sense is their being found in the Greek copies of the Sept. in use at that time. Luther would not even translate it, "because there is nothing in it which is not better said by Esop in his Fables, or even in much more trivial books" (*Vorrede auf den Baruch*); the version given in the later editions of Luther's Bible is the work of Daniel Cramer, and the Protestant

Church generally has treated it with great contempt, because it contradicts the canonical books of Ezra and Nehemiah. On the other hand, Josephus, as we have seen, regards it as a great authority, and it was treated with great reverence by the Greek and Latin fathers. St. Augustine mentions it among the canonical books (*De Doctr. Christ.* lib. ii, 13), and quotes the famous passage, "Truth is the strongest" (ch. iii, 12), as Ezra's prophecy respecting Christ (*De Civitat. Dei*, xviii, 16); the same sentence is quoted as Scripture by Cyprian (*Epist.* lxxiv; comp. also Clemens Alexandrinus, *Strom.* i; Athanasius, *Orat.* iii, *cont. Arianos*; Justin Martyr, *Diad. cum Tryph.*). Modern criticism has justly taken the middle course between treating it with contempt and regarding it as canonical, and has recognised in it an important auxiliary to the settling of the text, and to the adjusting of the facts recorded in Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, since this book has evidently been made from a different recension of the Hebrew, and has some readings and divisions preferable to those contained in the canonical books (comp. v, 9 with Ezra ii, 12; ix, 12 with Ezra x, 6; ix, 16 with Ezra x, 16). Both Bertheau in his commentary on Ezra and Nehemiah (*Exeget. Handb.* pt. xviii), and Fritzsche in his commentary on the apocryphal Ezra (*Exeget. Handb.* z. d. Apokr. pt. i), have shown the important services which the canonical and uncanonical records may render to each other. —Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

VI. There are no separate commentaries on the first book of Esdras, and the literature pertaining to it is given under foregoing heads.

ESDRAS, SECOND BOOK OF, i. e. the second in the order of the apocryphal books as given in the English translations of the Bible, which follow the Zurich Bible.

I. *Title and Position.*—The original designation of this book, by which it is appropriately called in the Greek Church, is Ἀποκάλυψις Ἐσδρά, or προφητεία Ἐσδρά, the *Revelation or Prophecy of Ezra* (comp. Nicephorus, apud Fabric. *Cod. Pseud. V. T.* ii, 176; *Cod. Apocr. N. T.* i, 951 sq.; Montfaucou, *Biblioth. Coislin.* p. 194). The designation "1 Ezra," which it has in the Arabic and Ethiopic versions, arises from the fact that it was placed before the canonical Ezra because it begins a little earlier (i. e. B.C. 558) than the Hebrew Ezra. It is called "2 Ezra" in the Latin version because it follows the canonical books Ezra and Nehemiah, which were together styled the *first* Ezra, and it is still more generally denominated "4 Ezra," a name given to it by St. Jerome (comp. *Præf. in Esdr. et Nehem.*), because it is in most of the Latin MSS. the fourth of the books which go by the name of Ezra, and which are placed in the following order: 1 Ezra, i. e. the canonical Ezra; 2 Ezra, i. e. Nehemiah; 3 Ezra, i. e. 1 apocryphal Ezra; and 4 Ezra, i. e. this book. The name "4 Ezra" is retained by Luther, the Zurich Bible, Coverdale, Matthew's Bible, Cramer's Bible, the Bishops' Bible, and in the 6th article of the Church of England (1571). The name "2 Esdras," given to it in the A. V., is taken from the Geneva Bible, and is the title given to it by the author himself (2 Esdr. i, 1). This book, like the former one, is placed at the end of the Vulgate in the Sixtine and Clementine editions, because it has been excluded from the Canon by the Council of Trent.

II. *Design and Plan.*—The object of this book was to comfort the chosen people of God who were suffering under the grinding oppression of the heathen, by assuring them that the Lord has appointed a time of deliverance when the oppressors shall be judged, and the ten tribes of Israel, in union with their brethren, shall return to the Holy Land to enjoy a glorious kingdom which shall be established in the days of the Messiah. This is gradually developed in an *introduction*, and *seven angelic revelations, or visions*, in which Ezra is instructed in the mysteries of the moral world, as follows:

1. *Introduction* (iii, 1-36, A. V.; or i, 1-36, Ethiopic Vers.).—When on his couch in Babylon, in the 30th year after the destruction of Jerusalem (B.C. 558), mourning over the deplorable fate of his brethren (ver. 1-3), and recounting the dealings of God with mankind generally (ver. 4-12), and with his chosen people in particular, in consequence of their sinful nature inherited from Adam (ver. 13-22), for which the Temple was destroyed and the city delivered into the hands of Gentiles (ver. 23-27), Ezra asked God why the heathen sinners of Babylon are spared, whilst the people of his covenant are so unsparingly punished (ver. 28-36)?

2. *First Revelation* (iv, 1-v, 15, A. V.; ii, 1-iii, 23, Eth.).—In answer to this, the angel Uriel is sent, who, after censuring the presumptuousness of a short-sighted man in trying to fathom the unsearchable dealings of the Most High, when he cannot understand the things below (ver. 1-21), and after Ezra's earnest reiteration of the question (ver. 22-25), says that sin has not yet reached its climax (ver. 26-31), enumerates the signs whereby the fulness of that time will be distinguished, and promises to reveal to him still greater things if he will continue to pray and fast seven days (ver. 32-v, 15).

3. *Second Revelation* (v, 16-vi, 34, A. V.; iii, 24-iv, 37, Eth.).—Having fasted seven days according to the command of the angel, and against the advice of the prince of the Jews (ver. 16-21), Ezra again appeals to God, asking why he does not punish his sinful people himself rather than give them over to the heathen (ver. 22-30)? Uriel, who appears a second time, after referring again to the inscrutable judgments of God (ver. 31-56), reveals to Ezra, according to promise, more distinctly what shall be the signs of the latter days, saying that with Esau [the Idumæans] the present world will terminate, and the world to come will begin with Jacob (vi, 1-10), whereupon the day of judgment will follow, and be announced by the blast of a trumpet (ver. 11-25); Enoch and Elias, the fore-runners of the Messiah, shall appear (ver. 26), and sin and corruption will be destroyed (ver. 27, 28); tells him to be comforted, patient, and resigned, and that he shall hear something more if he will fast again seven days (ver. 29-34).

4. *Third Revelation* (vi, 35-ix, 25, A. V.; iv, 38-ix, 27, Eth.).—The fasting being over, Ezra again appeals to God, to know how it is that his chosen people, for whom this wonderful world was created, are deprived of their inheritance (ver. 35-59)? Whereupon Uriel appears a third time, tells him that it is because of their sin (vii, 1-25), describes the death of the Messiah, the resurrection, the judgment, and the things which will come to pass, concluding with an admonition to Ezra to fast and pray again (ver. 26-ix, 25).

5. *First Vision* (ix, 26-x, 59, A. V.; ix, 28-x, 74, Eth.).—After appealing again to God in behalf of his brethren (ver. 26-37), Ezra suddenly saw a woman in the deepest mourning for her only son, who had been born to her after being married thirty years, and who died on the day of his nuptials (ver. 38-x, 1), and she would not be comforted (ver. 2-4). He rebuked her for being so disconsolate about the loss of one son, when Sion was bereaved of all her children (ver. 2-14), and recommended her to submit to the dealings of God (ver. 15-24); her face speedily shone very brightly, and she disappeared (ver. 25-27); whereupon Uriel appeared to Ezra, and told him that the woman is Sion, the thirty years of her barrenness are "the thirty years wherein no sacrifice was offered in her," her first-born is the Temple built by Solomon, his death on the day of his marriage is the destruction of Jerusalem, and the extraordinary brightness of the mother's face is the future glory of Sion (ver. 28-59).

6. *Second Vision* (xi, 1-xii, 51, A. V.; xi, 1-xii, 58, Eth.).—Ezra in a dream had a revelation of the latter days under the figure of an eagle coming up from the

sea with three heads and twelve wings, which afterwards produced eight smaller wings spread over all things, and reigning over all the world (ver. 1-7). These wings, beginning from the right side, according to a voice which proceeded from the body of the eagle, reigned successively over all the earth, and perished, so that there remained six small wings (ver. 8-23), which, however, in attempting to rule, also perished, and the three heads only were left on the eagle's body (ver. 24-31). These now reigned, one after the other, and perished, so that a single head remained (ver. 32-35). A lion (the Messiah) declared to the eagle that all his wings and heads were destroyed because he ruled the earth wickedly (ver. 36-46); then the body and whatever was left of the eagle were burnt in fire (xii, 1, 2). Ezra awoke, and having prayed for the interpretation of this vision (ver. 3-9), was told by the angel that the eagle was the fourth monarchy which Daniel saw, and was admonished again to fast and pray (ver. 10-51).

7. *Third Vision* (xiii, 1-58, A. V.; xiii, 1-64, Eth.).—Ezra then had another dream, in which he saw a mighty spirit (*πνεῦμα*) arise from the sea resembling a man, who destroyed all his enemies with the blast of his mouth, and gathered around him large multitudes (ver. 1-13). On awaking, Ezra was told by the angel that it was the Messiah, who shall gather together the ten tribes, lead them to their holy land, and give them Sion "prepared and builded for them" (ver. 14-58).

8. *Conclusion* (xiv, 1-48, A. V.; xiv, 1-52, Eth.).—Three days later, the voice which spoke to Moses in the bush tells Ezra that the latter days are at hand (ver. 1-12), bids him set his house in order, reprove those that are living (ver. 13-18), and write down, for the benefit of those who are not yet born, ninety-four books, i. e. the twenty-four inspired books of the O. T. which have been burnt, and seventy books of divine mysteries, which he duly did with the help of scribes (ver. 19-44), the recovered Scriptures to be communicated to all, and the Cabalistic books only to the sages (ver. 45-48).

The chief characteristics of the "three-headed eagle," which refer apparently to historic details, are "twelve feathered wings" (*duodecim alae pennarum*), "eight counter-feathers" (*contrariae pennae*), and "three heads;" but, though the writer expressly interprets those of kings (xii, 14, 20) and "kingdoms" (xii, 23), he is, perhaps intentionally, so obscure in his allusions that the interpretation only increases the difficulties of the vision itself. One point only may be considered certain—the eagle can typify no other empire than Rome. Notwithstanding the identification of the eagle with the fourth empire of Daniel (comp. Barnabas, *Epist.* p. 4), it is impossible to suppose that it represents the Greek kingdom (Hilgenfeld; compare Volkmar, *Dias recte Buch Esra*, p. 36 sq.). The power of the Ptolemies could scarcely have been described in language which may be rightly applied to Rome (xi, 2, 6, 40); and the succession of kings quoted by Hilgenfeld to represent "the twelve wings," preserves only a faint resemblance to the imagery of the vision. But when it is established that the interpretation of the vision is to be sought in the history of Rome, the chief difficulties of the problem begin. The second wing (i. e. king) rules twice as long as the other (xi, 17). This fact seems to point to Octavianus and the line of the Cæsars; but thus the line of "twelve" leads to no plausible conclusion. If it is supposed to close with Trajan (Lücke, 1st ed.), the "three heads" receive no satisfactory explanation. If, again, the "three heads" represent the three Flavii, then "the twelve" must be composed of the nine Cæsars (Jul. Cæsar—Vitellius) and the three pretenders, Piso, Vindex, and Nymphidius (Gröner), who could scarcely have been brought within the range of a Jewish Apocalypse. Volkmar proposes a new interpretation, by which two

wings are to represent one king, and argues that this symbol was chosen in order to conceal better from strange eyes the revelation of the seer. The twelve wings thus represent the six Cæsars (Cæsar—Nero); the eight "counter-feathers," the usurping emperors Galba, Otho, Vitellus, and Nerva; and the three heads the three Flavii. This hypothesis offers many striking coincidences with the text, but at the same time it is directly opposed to the form of interpretation given by Ezra (xii, 14, *regnabunt . . . duodecim reges*; v. 18, *octo reges*), and Volkmar's hypothesis that the *twelve* and *eight* were marked in the original MS. in some way so as to suggest the notion of division, is extremely improbable. Van der Vlis and Lücke, in his later edition, regard the twelve kings as only generally symbolic of the Roman power; and while they identify the three heads with the triumvirs, they seek no explanation of the other details. All is evidently as yet vague and uncertain, and will probably remain so till some clearer light can be thrown upon Jewish thought and history during the critical period B.C. 100–A.D. 100.

In tone and character, the Apocalypse of Ezra offers a striking contrast to that of Enoch (q. v.). Triumphant anticipations are overshadowed by gloomy forebodings of the destiny of the world. The idea of victory is lost in that of revenge. Future blessedness is reserved only for "a very few" (vii, 70; viii, 1, 3, 52-55; vii, 1-13). The great question is "not how the ungodly shall be punished, but how the righteous shall be saved, for whom the world is created" (ix, 13). The "woes of Messiah" are described with a terrible minuteness which approaches the despairing traditions of the Talmud (v; xiv, 10 sq.; ix, 3 sq.); and after a reign of 400 years (vii, 28-35); the clause is wanting in Eth., v, 29), "Christ," it is said, "my Son, shall die (Arab. omits), and all men that have breath; and the world shall be turned into the old silence seven days, like as in the first beginning, and no man shall remain" (vii, 29). Then shall follow the resurrection and the judgment, "the end of this time and the beginning of immortality" (vii, 43). In other points the doctrine of the book offers curious approximations to that of Paul, as the imagery does to that of the Apocalypse (e. g. 2 Esdr. xiii, 43 sq.; v, 4). The relation of "the first Adam" to his sinful posterity, and the operation of the law (iii, 20 sq.; vii, 48; ix, 36); the transitoriness of the world (iv, 26); the eternal counsels of God (vi, sq.); his providence (vii, 11) and long-suffering (vii, 64); his sanctification of his people "from the beginning" (ix, 8), and their peculiar and lasting privileges (vi, 59), are plainly stated; and, on the other hand, the efficacy of good works (viii, 33), in conjunction with faith (ix, 7), is no less clearly affirmed.

III. *Unity and Original Language.*—For a long time this book of Ezra was known only by an old Latin version, which is preserved in some MSS. of the Vulgate. This version was used by Ambrose, and, like the other parts of the *Vetus Latina*, is probably older than the time of Tertullian. It is published in Walton's *Polyglot*, vol. iv. An Arabic text was discovered by Mr. Gregory, about the middle of the 17th century, in two Bodleian MSS., and an English version made from this by Simon Ockley was inserted by Whiston in the last volume of his *Primitive Christianity* (London, 1711). Fabricius added the various readings of the Arabic text to his edition of the Latin in 1723 (*Cod. Pseudep.* V. T. ii, 174 sq.). An Ethiopic text was published by [archbishop] Laurence, with English and Latin translations (*Primi Esrae libri, versio Æthiopica . . . Latine Anglicæque rediita*, Oxon. 1820); likewise from a Bodleian MS. which had remained wholly disregarded, though quoted by Ludolf in his dictionary. The Latin translation has been reprinted by Gröner, with the various readings of the Latin and Arabic (*Prof. Pseudep.* Stuttg. 1840, p. 66 sq.); but the original Arabic text has not yet been published.

The three versions were all made directly from a Greek text. This is evidently the case with regard to the Latin (Lücke, *Versuch einer vollst. Einleitung*, i, 149) and the Ethiopic (Van der Vliet, *Disputatio critica de Ezrae lib. apocr.* p. 75 sq.), and apparently so with regard to the Arabic. A clear trace of a Greek text occurs in the Epistle of Barnabas (c. xii=2 Ezra v, 5), but the other supposed references in the apostolic fathers are very uncertain (e. g. Clem. i, 20; Herm. *Past.* i, 1, 3, etc.). The next witness to the Greek text is Clement of Alexandria, who expressly quotes the book as the work of "the prophet Ezra" (*Strom.* iii, 16, § 100). A question, however, has been raised whether the Greek text was not itself a translation from the Hebrew (Bretschneider, in Henke's *Mus.* iii, 478 sq., ap. Lücke *l. c.*); but the arguments from language, by which the hypothesis of a Hebrew (Aramaic) original is supported, are wholly unsatisfactory; and, in default of direct evidence to the contrary, it must be supposed that the book was composed in Greek. This conclusion is farther strengthened by its internal character, which points to Egypt as the place of its composition.

The idea of a Hebrew original has now been pretty generally given up by scholars, despite the positive assertion of Galatinus (*De Arcanis Catholice Veritatis*) that a copy of it was reported to exist among the Jews at Constantinople in his day, and it is commonly believed that it was written in Greek. Although the Greek is lost, yet there can be no doubt that the *Old Latin* version, through which alone this book has been known to us till lately, was a translation from that language. This is evident from the fact that it imitates the Greek idiom in making the adjective in the comparative degree govern a *genitive case*, and not, as in Latin, an *ablative*, and introduces other Græcisms, which are barbarous, in the version (comp. ii, 24; v, 13, 26, 39; vi, 25, 31, 46, 57; vii, 5; viii, 7, 8, 38, 44; ix, 14; xi, 42). This is, moreover, corroborated by the Arabic and Ethiopic versions, as well as the quotation from this book in the fathers (see below, sect. v), which prove the very early existence of it in Greek. It is, however, equally certain that many of the things contained in this book are of Palestinian origin, and are still to be found in Hebrew or Aramaic dispersed through the Talmud and Midrashim.

The common Latin text, which is followed in the English version, contains two important interpolations (ch. i, ii; xv, xvi) which are not found in the Arabic and Ethiopic versions, and are separated from the genuine Apocalypse in the best Latin MSS. Both of these passages are evidently of Christian origin: they contain traces of the use of the Christian Scriptures (e. g. i, 30, 33, 37; ii, 13, 26, 45 sq.; xv, 8, 35; xvi, 54), and still more they are pervaded by an anti-Jewish spirit. Thus, in the opening chapter, Ezra is commanded to reprove the people of Israel for their continual rebellions (i, 1-23), in consequence of which God threatens to cast them off (i, 24-32), and to "give their houses to a people that shall come." But, in spite of their desertion, God offers once more to receive them (ii, 1-32). The offer is rejected (ii, 33), and the heathen are called. Then Ezra sees "the Son of God" standing in the midst of a great multitude "wearing crowns and bearing palms in their hands" in token of their victorious confession of the truth. The last two chapters (xv, xvi) are different in character. They contain a stern prophecy of the woes which shall come upon Egypt, Babylon, Aria, and Syria, and upon the whole earth, with an exhortation to the chosen to guard their faith in the midst of all the trials with which they shall be visited (? the Decian persecution; comp. Lücke, p. 186 sq.). Another smaller interpolation occurs in the Latin version in vii, 28, where *filius meus Jesus* answers to "*My Messiah*" in the Ethiopic, and to "*My Son Messiah*" in the Arabic (comp. Lücke, p. 170, n., sq.). On the other hand, a long passage oc-

curs in the Ethiopic and Arabic versions after vii, 35 which is not found in the Latin (Ethiopic, c. vi), though it bears all the marks of genuineness, and was known to Ambrose (*De bono mort.* x, xi). In this case the omission was probably due to dogmatic causes. The chapter contains a strange description of the intermediate state of souls, and ends with a peremptory denial of the efficacy of human intercession after death. Vigilantius appealed to the passage in support of his views, and called down upon himself by this the severe reproof of Jerome (*Lib. c. Vigil.* c. 7). This circumstance, combined with the Jewish complexion of the narrative, may have led to its rejection in later times (comp. Lücke, p. 155 sq.).

Despite the arbitrary division into chapters in our English version which sometimes interrupts a vision in the middle of a sentence, few readers will fail to see the intimate connection and the beautiful adjustment of these angelic revelations, and how every one of them forms an essential part in leading us farther and farther till we reach the climax of the apocalypse. It is owing to this remarkable unity which the whole work displays that the numerous interpolations made for dogmatic purposes have so easily been detected.

IV. *Author and Date.*—The greatest divergency of opinion prevails on this subject. The author has successively been described as a true prophet who lived B.C. 336; an impostor who flourished A.D. 160; a Jew, a Christian, a converted Jew, and as a Montanist. The whole complexion of the book, however, incontestably shows that the author of it was a Jew. His personating Ezra, the contempt and vengeance which he breathes against the Gentiles (vi, 50, 57), the intense love he manifests for the Jews, who alone know the Lord and keep his precepts (iii, 30-36), declaring that for them alone was this world created (iv, 63, 66; vi, 55, 59; vii, 10, 11), and reserving all the blessings of salvation for them (vii, 1-13); his view of righteousness, which consists in doing the works of the law, and that the righteous are justified and rewarded for their good works (viii, 33, 36); the purport of his questions, referring exclusively to the interests of this people (iv, 35; vi, 59); the Hagadic legends about the Behemoth and Leviathan which are reserved for the great Messianic feast (vi, 49-52); the ten tribes (xiii, 39-47); the restoration of the Scriptures and the writing of cabalistic books for the sages or rabbins of Israel (xiv, 20-22, 37-47)—all this proves beyond doubt that the writer was a thorough Hebrew. Chapters i, ii, xv, and xvi, which contain allusions to the N. T. (compare i, 30 with Matt. xxxiii, 37-39; ii, 11 with Luke xvi, 9; ii, 12 with Rev. xxii, 2; xv, 8 with Rev. vi, 10; xvi, 29 with Matt. xxiv, 10; xvi, 42-44 with I Cor. vii, 29), and especially the anti-Jewish spirit by which they are pervaded, as well as the name of *Jesus* in ch. viii, 28, which have been the cause why some have maintained that this book is the production of a Christian, are now generally acknowledged to be later interpolations made by some Christian. (See above, sect. iii.)

As to the *date* of the book, the limits within which opinions vary are narrower than in the case of the book of Enoch. Lücke (*Versuch einer vollst. Einl.* etc., ed. 2, i, 209) places it in the time of Cæsar; Van der Vliet (*Disput. crit.* l. c.) shortly after the death of Cæsar. Laurence (*l. c.*) brings it down somewhat lower, to B.C. 28-25, and Hilgenfeld (*Jud. Apokr.* p. 221) agrees with this conclusion, though he arrives at it by very different reasoning. On the other hand, Gröner (*Jahrb. d. Heils.* i, 69 sq.) assigns the book to the time of Domitian, and in this he is followed by Wieseler and by Bauer (Lücke, p. 189 sq.), while Lücke, in his first edition, had regarded it as the work of a Hellenist of the time of Trajan. The interpretation of the details of the vision of the eagle, which furnishes the chief data for determining the time of its composition, is extremely uncertain, from the difficulty of regarding the

history of the period from the point of view of the author; and this difficulty is increased by the allusion to the desolation of Jerusalem, which may be merely suggested by the circumstances of Ezra, the imaginary author; or, on the contrary, the last destruction of Jerusalem may have suggested Ezra as the medium of the new revelation. (Comp. Fabricius, *Cod. Pseudep.* ii, p. 189 sq., and Lücke, p. 187, n., sq., for a summary of the earlier opinions on the composition of the book.) But no two expositors agree in their explanation of the vision in ch. xi and xii, and every one finds in the "three heads," the "twelve feathered wings," and the "eight counter-feathers" such emperors, kings, and demagogues as will square with his preconceived notions as to what they shall describe. So, for instance, the learned Whiston makes the three heads to mean the kingdom of France since Francis the Great, A.D. 1515; of Spain since Ferdinand, the author of the Inquisition, A.D. 1468; and the house of Austria since the emperor Albert, A.D. 1438—all of whom persecuted the Protestants (*Authen. Records*, i, 81). The safest and most satisfactory data for determining its age are—1. The quotations from it in the epistle of St. Barnabas (ch. xii with 2 Ezra v, 3) and in Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* iii, 16), showing beyond doubt that the book was well known at the commencement of the Christian æra, and must therefore have been written some time before to have obtained such general currency and acceptance; and, 2. The minute description which the writer gives of the pre-existence and death of the Messiah (vii, 29; xiv, 7), such as no Jew would have given at the very outset of Christianity, to which we have traced the book, when these very points were the stumbling-block to the ancient people, and formed the points of contest between Judaism and Christianity, thus showing that it must have been written before Christ. We may therefore safely assign it to about B.C. 50.

But, while the date of the book must be left undetermined, there can be no doubt that it is a genuine product of Jewish thought. Weisse (*Evangelienfrage*, p. 222) alone dissents on this point from the unanimous judgment of recent scholars (Hilgenfeld, p. 190 sq.); and the contrast between the tone and style of the Christian interpolations and the remainder of the book is in itself sufficient to prove the fact. The Apocalypse was probably written in Egypt; the opening and closing chapters certainly were.

V. *Canonicity and Importance.*—By many of the fathers this book was undoubtedly regarded as canonical. The quotation from it in the epistle of Barnabas is described as the saying of a prophet (ch. xii); the quotation by Clemens Alexandrinus is introduced in the same manner ("Ἐσδρας ὁ προφήτης λέγει, *Strom.* iii, 16); and Ambrose speaks of it as containing *divine revelations* (*De Bono Mortis*, x, xi). The famous story about Ezra being inspired to write again the law, which was burned (xiv, 20-48), has been quoted by Irenæus (*adv. Hæc.* iii, 21, 2); Tertullian (*De Cult. fem.* i, 3); Clemens Alexandrinus (*Stromat.* i, 22); Chrysostom (*Homil.* viii in *Heb.*), and many others. The Ethiopian Church regards it as canonical, which may be seen from the manner in which it is alluded to in the Book of Devotions called "The Organon of the blessed Virgin Mary" (written in A.D. 1240), "Open my mouth to praise the virginity of the mother of God, as thou didst open the mouth of Ezra, who rested not for forty days until he had finished writing the words of the law and the prophets, which Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, had burnt" (*Prayer for Monday*; see also *Prayer for Tuesday*). St. Jerome was the first who denounced it. In reply to Vigilantius, who, regarding this book as inspired, appealed to xii, 36-45, to prove that "none would venture to intercede for others in the day of judgment," this father, playing upon the name Vigilantius, remarked, "Tu vigilans dormis, et dormiens scribis, et propinas mihi li-

brum apocryphum, qui sub nomine Esdræ a te et similibus tui legitur, ubi scriptum est, quod post mortem nullus pro aliis gaudeat deprecari, quem ego Iulium nunquam legi, quid enim necesse est in manus sumere, quod Ecclesia non recipit. Nisi forte Balsamum et Barbelum, et thesaurum Manichæi, et ridiculum nomen Leusiboræ proferas; et quia radices Pyrenæi habitus, vicinusque es Hiberiæ, Basilidis, antiquissimi hæretici, et imperitiæ scientiæ incredibilia portentosa prosequeris, et proponis, quoad totius orlīs auctoritate damnatur" (*Ep.* liii ad *Vigilant.*). This is a most important passage, inasmuch as it shows that those of the primitive Church who, from their knowledge of Hebrew, had the best means of ascertaining what were the canonical Scriptures of the ancient synagogue, repudiated this book as uncanonical. In the Council of Trent, the second Ezra, like the first, was excluded from the canon, and Luther denounced it as worse than Æsop's Fables. See *ESDRAS, FIRST BOOK OF*. But this is going too far. Historic-critical expositors of the Bible, and those who are engaged in Christological works, while regarding 2 Esdras as not belonging to the Canon, yet see in it a most important record of Jewish opinion on some vital points. It shows that the Jews, before the rise of Christianity, most distinctly believed in the immortality of the soul, that the Messiah was denominated the *Son of God*, that he existed in heaven previous to his appearance upon earth (xiv, 7), and that he was to die (vii, 29).

One tradition which the book contains obtained a wide reception in early times, and served as a pendant to the legend of the origin of the Septuagint. Ezra, it is said, in answer to his prayer that he might be inspired to write again all the law which was burnt, received a command to take with him tablets and five men, and retire for forty days. In this retirement a cup was given him to drink, and forthwith his understanding was quickened and his memory strengthened; and for forty days and forty nights he dictated to his scribes, who wrote ninety-four books (*Latin*, 204), of which twenty-four were delivered to the people in place of the books which were lost (xiv, 20-48). This strange story was repeated in various forms by Irenæus (*adv. Hæc.* iii, 21, 2), Tertullian (*De cult. fam.* i, 3, "Omne instrumentum Judaicæ literaturæ per Esdram constat restauratum"), Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* i, 22, p. 410, P.; compare p. 592), Jerome (*adv. Hæc.* 7; comp. Pseudo-Augustine, *De Mirab. S. Scr.* ii, 32), and many others; and probably owed its origin to the tradition which regarded Ezra as the representative of the men of "the Great Synagogue" (q. v.), to whom the final revision of the canonical books was universally assigned in early times. See *CANON*.

Although Esdras is included in the 6th article of the Church of England, among the other books read for edification, etc. [see *DETEREO-CANONICAL*], it will be observed that no lessons are taken from it in the offices of the Church of England. References are, however, made from it in the Authorized Version to parallel passages in the Old and New Testament. Grabe and others have conceived that this was the book cited as the "Wisdom of God" (Luke xi, 9; comp. with 4 Esdras i, 32).

VI. *Literature.*—Lee, *Dissertation upon the second Book of Esdras* (Lond. 1722); Whiston, *Authentic Records* (Lond. 1727), i, 44 sq.; Van der Vliet, *Disputatio Critica de Ezræ Libro Apocrypho* (Amst. 1839); Gröber, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils* (Stuttgart, 1838), i, C9 sq., and *Prophecia veteres Pseudepigraphi* (Stuttgart, 1840), p. 66 sq.; Lücke, *Einkleitung in d. Offenbarung Johannis*, 2d ed., p. 138 sq.; Davidson, *The Old Testament Text Considered* (Lond. 1856), p. 90 sq.; Hilgenfeld, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik* (Jena, 1857), p. 187 sq.; Volkmar, *Das vierte-Buch Ezra* (Zurich, 1858); Keil, *Einkleitung in d. Alte Testament* (1859, 1863), p. 734 sq.; Treseureuter, *De libro quarto Esdræ* (Cobl. 1742); Vogel, *De quarto libro Esdræ* (in his *Progr. de Conjectura usu*



in *crisi* N. T. p. 48 sq.); Ewald, *Das vierte Esrabuch* (Gött. 1864); Calmet, *Sur le quatrième livre d'Esdras* (in his *Commentaire*, iii, 253 sq.); Greswell, *Second Book of Esdras* (in his *Parables*, V, ii, 280 sq.). The book has been the subject of a prolonged discussion, especially by Hilgenfeld in the *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1858-67.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

**Es'ebon**, THEY of (οἱ Ἐσεβωνῖται v. r. οἱ Ἐσεβών, Vulg. *Hesebon*), a Græcized form of the name of certain Canaanites beyond Jordan referred to in the Apocrypha (Jud. v, 15) as having been destroyed by the Israelites; evidently the inhabitants of HESUBON (q. v.) of the O. T. (Num. xxi, 26).

**Ese'briasis** (Ἐσεβριας, Vulg. *Sedebias*), the first named of the ten priests separated with ten others by Ezra to transport the silver and gold from Babylon to Jerusalem (1 Esd. viii, 54); evidently the SHEREBIAI (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra viii, 24).

**E'selk** (Heb. *id.* עֶסְלַק, *quarrel*; Sept. and Vulg. translate Ἀδικία, *calumnia*, as if reading עֶסְלַק), a well (עֶסְלַק) containing a spring of water, which the herdsmen of Isaac dug in the valley of Gerar, and which received its name because the herdsmen of Gerar evaded (עֶסְלַק עֶסְלַק, *evangled*, Sept. ἠέκισσαν, Vulg. evasively, A. V. "stroke;" but different from the עֶסְלַק of the preceding clause, *μαχίσαντο*, *jurgingum fuit*, "stroke") with him for the possession of it (Gen. xxvi, 20). Isaac seems to have therefore relinquished it. It appears not to have been one of those which Abraham had previously dug (ver. 18); the contest there was a question of *title*, here of *possession*. There are still several wells in this vicinity. See GERAR.

**Esh'baäl** [some *Esh-ba'al*] (Heb. *Eshba'al*, עֶשְׁבַּאֵל, in pause עֶשְׁבַּאֵל, *man of Baal*; Sept. Ἐσαβιάλ v. r. Ἰεβιάλ and Βαάλ, Vulg. *Esbau*), the appropriate name of the fourth son of king Saul, according to the genealogy of 1 Chron. viii, 33 and ix, 39. He is doubtless the same person (see 1 Sam. xxxi, 2, compared with 2 Sam. ii, 8) as ISH-BOSHETHI (q. v.), since it was the practice to change the obnoxious name of *Baal* into *Bosheth* or *Besheth*, as in the case of Jerub-besheth for Jerub-baal, and (in this very genealogy) of Merib-baal for Mephi-bosheth: compare also Ilos. ix, 10, where Bosheth (A. V. "shame") appears to be used as a synonym for Baal. See BAAL.

**Esh'ban** (Heb. *Eshban'*, עֶשְׁבַּנִּי, *man of consideration*; Sept. Ἀσεβάν and Ἐσεβάν v. r. Ἀσεβών, Vulg. *Eseban*), the second named of the four sons of Dishan (Gen. xxxvi, 26, A. V. "Dishon") or Dishon (1 Chron. i, 41), the son of Seir the Horite. B. C. post 1963.

**Esh'ool** (Heb. *Eshkol'*, עֶשְׁכֹּל, [twice plenē עֶשְׁכֹּל, Num. xiii, 24; xxxiii, 9], a *bunch of grapes*), the name of a man and also of a place.

1. (Sept. Ἐσχῶλ, Josephus Ἐσχῶλης, Vulg. *Eschol*) A young Amoritish chieftain, who, with his brothers Mamre and Aner, being in alliance with Abraham, when the latter resided near Hebron, joined him in the recovery of Lot from the hands of Chedorlaomer and his confederates (Gen. xiv, 13, 24; comp. xiii, 18). B. C. cir. 2085. According to Josephus (*Ant.* i, 10, 2) he was the foremost of the three brothers, but the Bible narrative leaves this quite uncertain (comp. ver. 13 with 24). Some have thought that the name of Eschol remained attached to one of the fruitful valleys in that district till the arrival of the Israelites (Num. xiii, 24), who then interpreted the appellation as significant of the gigantic "cluster" (in Hebr. *eshkol*) which they obtained there; but this does not accord with the independent origin of the latter name as assigned in the narrative (see below).

2. A *wady* (עֶשְׁכֹּל, winter-torrent; Sept. and Vulg. [translating likewise the name itself] φάραξ βότρωος, *vallis botri*, or [Num. xiii, 24] *Nehescol*; A. V. "brook"

and "valley") in which the Hebrew spies obtained the fine cluster of grapes which they took back with them, borne "on a staff between two," as a specimen of the fruits of the Promised Land (Num. xiii, 24). The cluster was doubtless large; but the fact that it was carried in this manner does not, as usually understood, imply that the bunch was as much as two men could carry, seeing that it was probably so carried to prevent its being bruised in the journey. See GRAPE. From the fact that the name had existed in this neighborhood centuries before, when Abraham lived there with the chiefs Aner, Eschol, and Mamre, not Hebrews, but Amorites (see Gen. xiv, 13), many have supposed that the appellation in this instance ("because of the cluster," עֶשְׁכֹּל, Sept. βότρωος, Vulg. *torrens botri*) was merely the Hebrew way of appropriating the ancient name derived from that hero into the language of the conquerors, consistently with the paronomastic turns so much in favor at that time, and with a practice traces of which are deemed to appear elsewhere; but it is more probable that the same reason which led the Israelites to apply to the valley such a designation, had operated also among the original possessors of the soil. In that case the Amoritish chieftain may have been so called (that dialect being doubtless akin to the Heb.) from his fertile region. From the terms of two of the notices of this transaction (Num. xxxii, 9; Deut. i, 24), it might be inferred that Eschol was the farthest point to which the spies penetrated; but this would contradict the express statement of Num. xiii, 21, that they went as far northward as Rehob. They must, therefore, either have carried the bunch of grapes this whole distance and back, or, as is more likely, they cut it on their return. From the context (Num. xiii, 22), the valley in question seems to have been in the vicinity of Hebron. Accordingly, the valley through which lies the commencement of the road from Hebron to Jerusalem is traditionally indicated as that of Eschol. This valley is now full of vineyards and olive-yards, the former chiefly in the valley itself, the latter up the sides of the inclosing hills. "These vineyards are still very fine, and produce the finest and largest grapes in all the country" (Robinson, *Researches*, i, 317). Ensebius, however (*Onomast.* s. v. φάραξ βότρωος), places it, with some hesitation, at Gophna, 15 miles north of Jerusalem, on the Neapolis road. By Jerome it is given as north of Hebron, on the road to Bethsur (*Epitaph. Paulæ*). The Jewish traveller Ha-Parchi speaks of it as north of the mountain which in the (ancient) city of Hebron stood (Benjamin of Tudela, ed. Asher, ii, 437); and here the name has apparently been observed still attached to a spring of remarkably fine water called *Ain-Eskali*, in a valley which crosses the vale of Hebron north-east and south-west, and about two miles north of the town (Van de Velde, *Narrative*, ii, 64). Dr. Rosen, however, still more recently, writes the name as *Ain el-Rashkula* (*Zeitschr. d. morgenl. Gesellsch.* 1858, p. 481).

**Esh'eän** [some *E'sheän'*] (Heb. *Esh'eän'*, עֶשְׁעָן, a *prop*; Sept. Ἐσάν v. r. Σοτά, Vulg. *Esam*), a city in the mountains of Judah, mentioned between Dumah and Janum (Josh. xv, 52), situated in the group west by south of Hebron (Keil, *Comment.* in loc.). Van de Velde thinks (*Memoir*, p. 310, 311) the place may be the same as Ashan (q. v.); but this is inadmissible, partly because of the difference in the name (עֶשְׁעָן), and partly because the only Ashan mentioned in Scripture lay in the low country (Josh. xv, 42; comp. ver. 33), while Eshean is expressly placed in the hill country of Judah (ver. 48, 52). To escape this last and fatal objection, Van de Velde follows Von Raumer (*Paläst.* p. 173) in supposing two Ashans, one in the mountains of Judah, and the other in the southern plain of Palestine, belonging to Simeon; but that the Ashan of Judah and that of Simeon were one and the same, is evident from comparing Josh. xv, 42 and xix, 9, where

Ether appears as in the vicinity of both, and Josh. xix, 7 with 1 Chron. iv, 32, where the same is the case with Ain-Rimmon. Still, although Eshek cannot thus be identified with the Chor-ashan of 1 Sam. xxx, 30, we may perhaps adopt Van de Velde's location of the former at the ruins of *Khursa* (Robinson's *Researches*, iii, Append. p. 116), not far south-west of Hebron (Stewart, *Tent*, p. 224).

**E'shek** (Heb. *id.* עֶשֶׁק, *oppression*; Sept. Ἐσεῖς v. r. Ἀσιή, Vulg. *Esec*), brother of Azel (q. v.), a Benjamite, one of the late descendants of king Saul; he was the father of several sons, among them Ulam, the founder of a large and noted family of archers, lit. "treaders of the bow" (1 Chron. viii, 39). B. C. ante 588. They are omitted in the parallel list of 1 Chron. ix, 35-41.

**Eshel**. See TAMARISK.

**Esh'kalonite** (Heb. collect. with the art. *ha-Eshkeloni*, הַיִּשְׁכָּלוֹנִי, Sept. ὁ Ἀσκαλωνίτης, Vulg. *Ascalonite*, A. V. "the Eshkalonites"), the patrial designation (Josh. xiii, 3) of the inhabitants of ASHKELON (q. v.).

**Esh'ta'öl** (Heb. *Eshtaol*, הֶשְׁתָּאֹל [but defectively הֶשְׁתָּאֹל in Judg. xiii, 25; xviii, 2, 8, 11], according to Fürst, narrow *pass*, but Gesenius suggests perhaps *petition*; Sept. Ἀσθαὸλ v. r. [in Judg. xiii, 5] Ἐσθαὸλ, Vulg. *Ethaol* or [in Josh. xv, 33] *Estaub*), a town in the low country of Judah, the Shephelah or plain of Philistia. It is the first of the first group of cities in that district (Josh. xv, 33) enumerated with Zorah (Heb. *Zareah*), or Zorah, in company with which it is commonly mentioned. Zorah and Eshtaol were two of the towns allotted to the tribe of Dan out of Judah (Josh. xix, 41). Between them, and behind Kirjath-jearim, was situated Mahaneh-Dan, the camp or stronghold which formed the head-quarters of that little community during their constant encounters with the Philistines. Eshtaol was one of the great strongholds of the Danites, and its inhabitants, with those of Zorah, were noted for their daring. See DAN. The 600 men who captured and colonized Laish were natives of these two towns (Judg. xvii). Here, among the old warriors of the tribe, Samson spent his boyhood, and experienced the first impulses of the Spirit of Jehovah; and hither, after his last exploit, his mangled body was brought, up the long slopes of the western hills to its last rest in the burying-place of Manoah his father (Judg. xiii, 25; xvi, 31; xviii, 2, 8, 11, 12). In the genealogical records of 1 Chron. the relationship between Eshtaol, Zareah, and Kirjath-jearim is still maintained (1 Chron. ii, 53). In the *Onomasticon* of Eusebius and Jerome (s. v. Ἀσθαὸλ and Ἐσθαὸλ), Eshtaol is twice mentioned—(1) as *Estaal* of Judah, described as then existing between Azetuz and Ascalon under the name of *Astho* (Ἀσθῶ); (2) as *Esthaol* of Dan, ten miles north of Eleutheropolis. The latter position is quite in accordance with the indications of the Bible. It is connected with Zorah, Zanoah, and Bethshemesh (Josh. xv, 33; xix, 41); and as these three places have been identified, we may conclude that Eshtaol was situated close to the foot of the mountains of Judah, and in or near wady Surâr. Schwarz (*Palst.* p. 102) mentions a village named *Staal*, west of Zorah, but, apart from the fact that this is corroborated by no other traveller and by no map, the situation is too far west to be "behind Kirjath-jearim" if the latter be Kuryet el-Enab. The village marked on the maps of Robinson and Van de Velde, as *Yeshua*, and alluded to by the former (*Researches*, new ed., iii, 154, who states that the name is pronounced *Eshua*), is nearer the requisite position. Yeshua lies at the eastern extremity of the broad valley which runs up among the hills between Zorah and Bethshemesh. The mountains rise steep and rugged immediately behind it, but the village is encompassed

by fruitful fields and orchards. Zorah occupies the top of a conical hill scarcely two miles westward, and a lower ridge connects the hill with the mountains at Yeshua. Upon that ridge the permanent camp, or gathering-place of Dan (Judg. xiii, 25) was probably fixed (Robinson, *Later Res.* p. 153 sq.).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See MAHANEH-DAN.

**Esh'taülite** [many *Esh'taülite*] (Heb. collect. with the art. *ha-Esh'taül*, הַיִּשְׁתָּאֻלִּי, Sept. οἱ Ἐσθαυαλιῶται v. r. υἱοὶ Ἐσθαύου, Vulg. *Esh'taülite*, A. V. "the Eshtaülites"), the designation of the inhabitants of ESHTAOL (q. v.), who, with the Zareathites, were at a later period among the families of Kirjath-jearim (1 Chron. ii, 53).

**Eshtemo'ä** [many *Eshtem'öä*] (Heb. *Eshtemo'ä*, הֶשְׁתֵּמוֹאִי [but defectively הֶשְׁתֵּמוֹאִי in 1 Chron.], *obedience*; Sept. in Josh. xxi, 14 Ἐσθεμόω, in 1 Sam. Ἐσθεμόω, in 1 Chron. iv, 17, 19 Ἐσθαμόων v. r. Ἐσθεμόων and Ἐσθεμόων, in 1 Chron. vi, 57 [42] Ἐσθαμόω v. r. Ἐσθαμόω; Vulg. *Eshtemo*, but *Estemo* in Josh., and *Eshtemo* in 1 Chron. vi) or **Esh'temoh** (Heb. *Esh'temoh*, הֶשְׁתֵּמוֹה, by an interchange of final gutturals, Josh. xv, 50; Sept. Ἐσθεμόω, Vulg. *Istemo*), a town of Judah, in the mountains; mentioned between Jattir and Holon (Josh. xxi, 14; 1 Chron. vi, 57), and between Anab and Anim (Josh. xv, 50). With its "suburbs" Eshtemoa was allotted to the priests (Josh. xxi, 14; 1 Chron. vi, 57). It was one of the places frequented by David and his followers during the long period of their wanderings; and to his friends there he sent presents of the spoil of the Amalekites (1 Sam. xxx, 28; comp. ver. 31). In the lists—half genealogical, half topographical—of the descendants of Judah, Eshtemoa occurs as having been founded or rebuilt by an Ezrahite called Ishbah (1 Chron. iv, 17) (q. v.), perhaps the same with Naham of ver. 19 [see MERED], where the place has the dubious epithet of "Maachathite" (q. v.). Others, however, regard the Eshtemoa there named as a *person* from Maachah. Eusebius and Jerome simply mention the place as "a very large village" in the Daroma, in the province of Eleutheropolis (*Onomast.* s. v. Ἐσθεμόω, Eshtemo). There is little doubt that it has been discovered by Dr. Robinson at *Senu'a*, a village seven or eight miles south of Hebron, on the great road from el-Milh, containing considerable ancient remains, and in the neighborhood of other villages still bearing the names of its companions in the list of Josh. xv: Debir, Socoh, Jattir, etc., and at the last inhabited place toward the desert (*Researches*, ii, 194; comp. Schwarz, *Palst.* p. 105). It is a considerable village, situated on a low hill, with broad valleys round about; not susceptible of much tillage, but full of flocks and herds all in fine order. In several places there are remains of walls built of very large stones, bevelled, but left rough in the middle, several of them more than ten feet in length. There are the ruins of a castle at this place, with one tower tolerably perfect, but it is probably of Saracenic origin (Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 627; Wilson, *Lands of Bible*, i, 355). A city Shema is also mentioned in the south of Judah (Josh. xv, 26); too far south, however, to correspond to Senua.

**Es'hton** (Heb. *Eshton*, הֶשְׁתֹּן, according to Gesenius *uvorius*, according to Fürst *careless*; Sept. Ἀσασθῶν, Vulg. *Eshton*), a son of Mehir, and grandson of Chelub, of the tribe of Judah (1 Chron. iv, 11). B. C. ante 1618. Among his four sons and one grandson enumerated (ver. 12) as "the men of Reeah," two (Beth-rapha and Ir-nahash) seem, however, to be rather names of places.

**Eskridge**, VERNON, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church (South), was born in Westmoreland County, Va., Oct. 26, 1803. His early education was neglected, and on this account he hesitated to enter the ministry, to which he felt strong leanings; but on

the death of his young wife and child he hesitated no longer, and in 1827 he began to preach as an itinerant minister. In this service he labored faithfully until 1837, when ill health compelled him to retire from the itineracy, though he still preached diligently as his health would allow. In 1851 he was appointed chaplain in the U. S. Navy, and during his service in the Cumberland in 1852 some twenty were converted, including captain Upshur. On his return to Portsmouth, Va., the yellow fever was raging there. He devoted himself night and day to the service of the sick, and on Sept. 4, 1855, he was taken with the disease, and died Sept. 11.—Sprague, *Annals*, vii, 735.

**Es'li** (Εσλί v. r. Έσλει), son of Naggai and father of Naum, of the maternal ancestors of Christ after the exile (Luke iii, 25); apparently identical with ELIOENAI, the son of Meariah and father of Johanan (1 Chron. iii, 23, 24). See GENEALOGY (OF CHRIST).

**Esné, Esna, or Esneh**, "the hieroglyphic *Sen*, and the Greek *Latopolis* or *Λαττόπολις*—the city of the latus fish or *Latus nobilis*, from the fish there worshipped—is a small and badly-built town of Upper Egypt, and is situated on the left bank of the Nile, in lat. 25° 15' N. The central portion of Esne has edifices of colored brick. It contains about 4000 inhabitants, of whom 1500 are Copts, and has some manufactories of blue cotton and pottery. There are famous ruins at Esne, which consist of a sandstone temple, with a portico of four rows of six columns, which appears to have been founded by Thothmes III, whose name is seen on the jambs of a door. The temple, however, seems to have been restored or principally constructed by Ptolemy Euergetes (B.C. 216–222), and the pronaos was erected in the reign of the emperor Claudius (A.D. 41–54), and completed in that of Vespasian. The interior is of the date of Trajan, the Antonines, and Geta, whose name, erased or replaced by that of Caracalla, is there found. The great temple was dedicated to Chnumis, Satis, and Har-Hek. It has a zodiac like that of Denderah, formerly thought to be of the most remote antiquity, but now known to be no older than the Romans. A smaller temple with a zodiac, erected in the reign of Ptolemy Euergetes, formerly stood at E'Deyr, 2½ miles north of Esne, but it has been destroyed. At Esne is also a stone quay, bearing the names of M. Aurelius. This city was the capital of a nome, and the coins struck in it in the reign of Hadrian (A.D. 127–128) represent the fish latus. See Champollion, *Not. Descrip.* p. 283; Wilkinson, *Mod. Egypt.* ii, 268; Tochon d'Anneey, *Médailles*.—Chambers, *Encyclopædia*, s. v.

**Esnig** (or **ESNAG, EZNIG, EZNAG**), one of the most prominent men of the Armenian Church. He was born in 397, at Gochp or Golp, a place near Mount Ararat, and was one of the pupils of the patriarch Isaak and of Saint Mesrop. As he was acquainted with the Syrian language, he was sent in 425, together with Joseph of Palin, to Edessa, in order to translate the writings of the Syrian Church fathers into Armenian. After finishing this work they went to Constantinople, learned the Greek language, and began the translation of Greek works. On returning home in 431 they took with them many writings of Greek fathers, the acts of the synods of Nice and Ephesus, and a correct copy of the Alexandrine version. From the latter the Armenian version of the Bible, in which Esnig co-operated, was made. Many other theological works were translated by him, and he is one of the six learned Armenians to whom the honorary title "Targmanitschk" (translators) was given. In 449 Esnig was present at the national synod of Artachad, which replied to the Persian king's demand upon the Armenians to embrace the doctrine of Zoroaster. He died about 478, as bishop of Bagrewand. Besides the numerous translations of foreign works, Esnig wrote an original work against heresies. It is divided

into four books, of which the first is directed against the pagans, the second against the Parsees, the third against the Greek philosophers, and the fourth against the Marcionites and Manichaans. This work contains some valuable information on the Parsees and on the system of Marcion which is not known from any other source. It has been published at Smyrna (1762) and at Venice (1826), and a French translation has appeared by Le Vaillant de Florival (*Revue des différentes Sectes des païens*, Paris, 1853. Parts of it have been translated into German by Neumann (in *Hermes*, vol. xxxiii, and in *Zeitschrift für histor. Theolog.* 1834) and by Dr. Windischmann (*Bayrische Annalen*, 1834), and into Latin by Dr. Petermann (in his *grammat. ling. Armen.* p. 44–48). A Latin translation of the whole work was promised by the distinguished Orientalist, Dr. Windischmann, but it has never appeared. An appendix to the Venice edition contains a "collection of sentences drawn from the Greek fathers, and in particular from St. Nilus." In point of style, Esnig is counted among the classics of Armenian literature.—Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 163; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xvi, 886; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 711; Neumann, *Versuch einer Gesch. der armen. Lit.* (Tab. 1841). (A. J. S.)

**Eso'ra** (properly *Ēsōra*, Αἰσωρά, Vulg. omits), a place fortified by the Jews on the approach of the Assyrian army under Holofernes (Judith iv, 4). The name may be the representative of the Hebrew word HAZOR or ZORAH (Simonis, *Onom.* N. T. p. 19). The Syriac reading (*Bethchoron*) suggests BETH-HORON, which is not impossible.

**Esoteric** (Greek ἑσωτερικός), scientific as opposed to popular; applied, especially with regard to the ancient mysteries, to doctrines taught only to the initiated, as distinguished from *exoteric* (ἔξω, without) doctrines, which could be taught to the vulgar and uninitiated. "The philosophy of the Pythagoreans, like that of the other sects, was divided into the *exoteric* and the *esoteric*; the open, taught to all; and the secret, taught to a select number" (Warburton, *Div. Leg.* bk. ii, note B B). "According to Origen, Aulus Gellius, Porphyry, and Jamblichus, the distinction of *esoteric* and *exoteric* among the Pythagoreans was applied to the disciples, according to the degree of initiation to which they had attained, being fully admitted into the society, or being merely postulants (Ritter, *Hist. Philos.*, French transl., i, 248). Plato is said to have had doctrines which he taught publicly to all, and other doctrines which he taught only to a few, in secret. There is no allusion to such a distinction of doctrines in the writings of Plato. Aristotle (*Physica*, iv, 2) speaks of opinions of Plato which were not written. But it does not follow that these were secret. Aristotle himself frequently speaks of some of his writings as *exoteric*, and others as *acroamatic* or *esoteric*. The former treat of the same subjects as the latter, but in a popular and elementary way, while the *esoteric* are more scientific in their form and matter (Ravaisson, *Essai sur la Métaph. d'Aristote*, t. i, c. i; Tucker, *Light of Nature*, vol. ii. ch. ii).—Fleming, *Vocabulary of Philosophy*, s. v.

**Espen, ZEGER BERNHARD VAN**, one of the most celebrated writers on the ecclesiastical law in the 18th century, was born at Louvain July 9, 1646. He studied theology and philosophy at the university of his native city, and after having been ordained priest in 1673, he was two years later made *Doctor Juris* (doctor of law), and appointed professor of canonical law at the *Collegium Adriaticum* at the University. He lived very retired, devoting his whole time to study; but such became soon his reputation that he was consulted by a number of princes, bishops, tribunals, and learned corporations. Many of his opinions, however, particularly on the Congregation of the Index, on dispensations, immunities, exemptions, the royal

placet, and the appeal from the ecclesiastical to civil power, were not favorable to the pretensions of the popes, and in 1704 and 1734 all his works were put on the Index. His defense of the consecration of a Jansenist archbishop at Utrecht caused in 1728 his suspension from all priestly functions, as well as from his chair at the University. All demands made upon him by the archbishop of Malines to revoke his opinions he firmly refused. He fled to Amersfort, a common refuge of Jansenist exiles, where he died Oct. 2, 1728, at the advanced age of 82 years. Van Espen is universally classed among the ablest writers on ecclesiastical law, and even pope Benedict did not withhold a recognition of his ability. The best edition of his works is the one published by Baren (*Jus Ecclesiasticum Universum*, 5 vols. Louvain, 1753-65; also Cologne, 1777, 5 vols.; Mentz, 1791, 3 vols.). An abstract of this work was published by Oberhauser (Augsburg, 1782; Cilli, 1791).—Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirch.-Lex.* iii, 711; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xvi, 410; Herzog, *Real-Encycl.* iv, 164; G. du Pac de Bellegarde, *Vie de Van Espen* (Louvain, 1767). (A. J. S.)

**Espousals.** 1. Among the Jews this was the ceremony of betrothing, or coming under obligation for the purpose of marriage, and was a mutual agreement between the parties which usually preceded the marriage some time. The espousals frequently took place years before the parties were married. See BETROTHAL; MARRIAGE.

2. In the early Christian Church espousals differed from marriage. The two terms are in early writers *sponsalia* and *nuptiæ*. Certain preliminaries were necessary before persons could complete a marriage: they consisted in a mutual contract or agreement between the parties concerning their marriage to be performed within a certain limited time, which contract was confirmed by certain gifts or donations, called *arrhæ* or *arrhabones*, the earnest of marriage; as also by a ring, a kiss, a dowry, a writing or instrument of dowry, with a sufficient number of witnesses to attest it. The free consent of parties contracting marriage was declared necessary by the old Roman law, which was confirmed by Diocletian, and inserted by Justinian in his code. When the contract was made, it was usual for the man to bestow presents on the woman: these were sometimes called *sponsalia*, espousals, and sometimes *sponsalitiæ donatiæ*, espousal-gifts, or *arrhæ* and *pignora*, pledges of future marriage, because the giving and receiving them was a confirmation of the contract. These donations were publicly recorded. The ring was then presented to the woman as a further confirmation of the contract, and does not appear to have been given in the actual solemnization of marriage. Bingham, in proof of this, quotes the words of pope Nicholas I, and also refers to Ambrose and Tertullian. The origin of the marriage-ring has been traced to the tenth century, and is supposed to have been introduced in imitation of the ring worn by bishops. Isidorus Hispalensis refers to the marriage-ring in this language: *Quod autem in nuptiis annulus a sponso sponse datur, id fit vel propter mutue dilectionis signum, vel propter id magis, ut hoc pignore corda eorum jungantur; unde et quarto digito annulus inscribitur, ideo quod vena quadam (ut fertur) sanguinis ad cor usque peruenit.* "The reason why a ring is given by the bridegroom to the bride is either as a mark of mutual love, or rather a pledge of the union of their hearts; and the reason for its being placed on the fourth finger is because a certain vein (as it is said) reaches thence to the heart." The kiss was solemnly given, with the joining together of the hands of the betrothed. The dowry settled upon the woman was by a stipulation made in writing, or by public instruments under hand and seal. Chosen witnesses were present, the friends of each party, and their number was generally ten. Occasionally a ministerial benediction was used in espousals as well as in marriage. See MARRIAGE.

—Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. xxii, ch. iii; Procter, *On Common Prayer*, p. 401.

**Espouse** (properly (אָרָא, *aras*, 2 Sam. iii, 14, to betroth, as elsewhere rendered; *ἡμετέροια*, Matt. i, 18; Luke i, 27; ii, 5; less correctly for הַרְתָּהּ, *chathunnah'*, Cant. iii, 11, *nuptials*; כְּלִינִים, *kelulim*, Jer. ii, 2, the *bridal state*, i. e. condition of a bride before marriage; ἀγοζόμενα, 2 Cor. xi, 2, to *cause to be married*, i. e. negotiate the match). Espousal was a ceremony of betrothing, or coming under obligation for the purpose of marriage, and was a mutual agreement between the two parties which usually preceded the marriage some considerable time. See MARRIAGE. The reader will do well carefully to attend to the distinction between espousals and marriage, as espousals in the East are frequently contracted years before the parties are married, and sometimes in very early youth. This custom is alluded to figuratively, as between God and his people (Jer. ii, 2), to whom he was a husband (xxi, 32), and the apostle says he acted as a kind of assistant (*pro-nuba*) on such an occasion: "I have espoused you to Christ" (2 Cor. xi, 2); have drawn up the writings, settled the agreements, given pledges, etc., of your union (compare Isa. liv, 5; Matt. xxv, 6; Rev. xix). See BETROTH.

**Es'ril** (עֶזְרָא v. r. עֶזְרָא, Vulg. omits), one of the Israelites, "sons of Ozora," who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (1 Esd. ix, 34); corresponding in position with the SHARAI (q. v.) of the Hebrew text (Ezra x, 40), although the form is confused with that of Azazel = Azareel following it.

**Es'rom** (עֶשְׂרֹם v. r. עֶשְׂרֹן), a Grecized form (Matt. i, 3; Luke iii, 35) of the name of ΗΕΣΡΟΝ (q. v.), the grandson of Judah (1 Chron. ii, 5).

**Ess, Karl van**, a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born at Warburg, in Westphalia, Sept. 25, 1770. He entered the Benedictine order in 1788, and in 1801 became prior of the Abbey of Huysburg, near Halberstadt. Together with his cousin, Leander van Ess (q. v.), he published a German translation of the Bible (Brunswick, 1807, and a great many editions since), which had an immense circulation until it was forbidden by the pope. Being appointed in 1811, by the bishop of Paderborn, episcopal commissary, he abandoned his liberal views. He wrote a brief history of religion (*Entwurf einer kurzen Geschichte der Religion*, Halberstadt, 1817), which called forth several replies. He died Oct. 22, 1824.—Herzog, *Real-Encycl.* xix, 488. (A. J. S.)

**Ess, Leander van**, a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, and cousin of the preceding one, was born at Warburg, in Westphalia, Feb. 15, 1772. At an early age he entered the Benedictine abbey of Mariemünster, in the diocese of Paderborn. In 1813 he was appointed pastor at Marlburg, and extraordinary professor at the university of that city; and later he also became assistant director of the normal school. No priest in the Roman Catholic Church of the 19th century showed so great a zeal for the circulation of the Bible as Leander van Ess. Aided by his cousin Karl (q. v.), he prepared a German translation of the New Testament, and enlisted the British and Foreign Bible Society in its circulation. A translation of the Old Testament he published in 1819 (Nuremberg). He also published an edition of the Vulgate (1822), and an edition of the Greek New Testament cut from the Vatican manuscript (1824). The pope was highly indignant at his undertaking, and on this occasion issued one of the notorious papal bulls against Bible societies. Karl van Ess timidly receded from his liberal position, but Leander bravely maintained it. He resigned his offices at Marlburg, and devoted his time chiefly to a literary defence of his efforts in circulating the Bible. He compiled, to encourage Roman Catholic readers of the Bible, "a selection from the works of Church fathers and other great Catholic writers concerning the necessary

and useful reading of the Bible" (*Auszüge aus den heil. Vütern*, etc., Leips. 1808); a Latin treatise on the authority of the original text of the Bible as compared with the Vulgate (*Pragmatica doctorum Catholicorum Tridentini circa Vulgatum decreti sensum testamentum historia*, Salzburg, 1816; in German, Tüb. 1824); and several other works, urging a frequent reading of the Bible by the people (*Was war die Bible der ersten Christen?* 1816; *Gedanken über Bibel u. Bibellesen*, 1816; *Die Bible nicht ein Buch nur für Priester*, 1818). He also wrote a book in defence of marriages between Protestants and Roman Catholics (*Rechtfertigung der gemischt. Ehen*, 1821). He died Oct. 13, 1847. His very valuable library, rich in manuscripts and incunables, was purchased by the Union Theological Seminary in New York.—Herzog, *Real-Encycl.* xix, 489. (A. J. S.)

**Essence** (*essentia*, from *essens*, the old participle of *esse*, to be), a term in philosophy corresponding to *οὐσία* in Greek, and sometimes to *nature*, sometimes to *being* or *substance* in English. Augustine (*De Civ. Dei*, xii, 11) derives it as follows: "Sicut ab eo quod est sapere, vocatur sapientia; sic ab eo quod est esse, vocatur essentia." Chauvin (*Lex. Phil.*) gives the definition, "Totum illud per quod res est, et est id quod est." Locke (*Essay*, bk. iii, chap. iii, § 15) says: "Essence may be taken for the very being of anything, whereby it is what it is." Locke distinguishes the *real* and the *nominal essence*. "The nominal essence depends upon the real essence; thus the nominal essence of gold is that complex idea which the word 'gold' represents, viz. 'a body yellow, heavy, malleable, fusible, and fixed; but its real essence is the constitution of its insensible parts, on which these qualities and all its other properties depend, which is wholly unknown to us. The essence of things is made up of that common nature wherein it is founded, and of that distinctive nature by which it is formed. This latter is commonly understood when we speak of the formality, or *formalis ratio* (the formal consideration) of things; and it is looked upon as being more peculiarly the essence of things, though it is certain that a triangle is as truly made up in part of figure, its common nature, as of the three lines and angles which are distinctive and peculiar to it" (Fleming, *Vocab. of Philosophy*, s. v.).

With regard to the Trinity, the Greek writers (Athanasius and others) distinguish *οὐσία* (*essentia*, *substantia*), which denotes what is common to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, from *ὑπόστασις* (*persona*), which denotes what is individual, distinctive, and peculiar to the three in one. Shedd (*History of Doctrines*, ii, 363) distinguishes the various scholastic terms carefully, and says of *οὐσία*, or *essence*, that it "denotes that which is common to Father, Son, and Spirit. It denominates the substance, or constitutional being of the Deity, which is possessed alike and equally by each of the personal distinctions. The essence is in its own nature one and indivisible, and hence the statement in the creed respecting it affirms simple unity, and warns against separation and division. The terms 'generation' and 'procession' do not apply to it." McOsh discusses the term and its uses in his *Intuitions of the Mind* (1866, 8vo, p. 152).

**Essènes** (Ἐσσηνοί, Josephus generally; *Esseni*, Pliny) or **Ess.EANS** (Ἐσσηαῖοι, Josephus, *War*, i, 3, 5, etc.; Philo), a Jewish sect of mystico-ascetics, which combined foreign elements, especially Oriental and Greek, with Jewish doctrines, and with certain peculiar views and practices of their own. They rejected most of the Jewish sacrifices, and made their fellowship an exclusive one.

**I. Signification of the Name.**—This has been very variously explained, as follows: 1. Philo (*Quod omnis prob. lib.* § 12) derives it from the Greek ἕσος, *holy*. 2. Josephus, according to Jost (*Geschichte d. Juden-thums*, i, 207), seems either to derive it from the Chaldee נְשֻׁתָּי, *to be quiet, to be mysterious*, because he re-

fers נְשֻׁתָּי, *the high-priest's breastplate*, for which the Sept. has λογίον, by ἰσσίην, or directly from נְשֻׁתָּי, in the sense of λογίον or λόγιον, *endowed with the gift of prophecy*. 3. Epiphanius (*Har.* xix) takes it to be the Hebrew נְשֻׁתָּי = שְׁטִיבָאוֹן גְּלוֹר, *the stout race*. 4. Suidas (s. v.) and Hilgenfeld (*Die Jud. Apokal.* p. 278) make it out to be the Aramaic form נְשֻׁתָּי = Ξεωρητικοί, *seers*, and the latter maintains that this name was given to the sect because they pretended to see visions and to prophesy. 5. Josippon ben-Gorion (*lib.* iv, § 6, 7, p. 274 and 278, ed. Breithaupt) takes it for the Heb. נְשֻׁתָּי, *the pious, the puritans*. 6. De Rossi (*Meor Enaim*, c. iii), Gfrörer (*Philo*, ii, 341), Dähne (Erseh und Gruber's *Encyclop.* s. v.), Nork (*Real-Wörterbuch*, s. v.), Herzfeld (*Geschichte d. V. Israel*, ii, 395), and others, insist that it is the Aramaic נְשֻׁתָּי = Ξεραπεινή, *physician*, and that this name was given to them because of the spiritual or physical cures they performed. 7. Aboth R. Nathan (c. xxxvi) and a writer in Jost's *Annalen* (i, 145), derive it from נְשֻׁתָּי, *to do, to perform*; the latter says that it is the Aramaic from נְשֻׁתָּי, and that they were so called because of their endeavors to perform the law. 8. Rappaport (*Erech Millin*, p. 41) says that it is the Greek ἴσος, *an associate, a fellow of the fraternity*. 9. Frankel (*Zeitschrift*, 1846, p. 449 sq.) and others think that it is the Hebrew expression נְשֻׁתָּי, *the retired*. 10. Ewald (*Geschichte d. V. Israel*, iv, 420) is sure that it is the Rabbinic נְשֻׁתָּי, *servant (of God)*, and that the name was given to them because it was their only desire to be ξεραπεινῶν θεοῦ. 11. Grätz (*Geschichte d. Juden*, iii, 525) will have it that it is from the Aramaic נְשֻׁתָּי, *to bathe*, with Aleph prosthetic, and that it is the shorter form for נְשֻׁתָּי נְשֻׁתָּי = נְשֻׁתָּי נְשֻׁתָּי, ἡμεροβαστισαί, *hemerobaptists*, a name given to this sect because they baptized themselves early in the morning. 12. Dr. Löw (*Ben Chananja*, i, 352) never doubts but that they were called *Essenes* after their founder, whose name he tells us was נְשֻׁתָּי, or *Jesse*, the disciple of Joshua b. Perachja. 13. Others, again, say that it alludes to *Jesse*, the father of David. 14. Others, again, submit that it is derived from the town *Essa*, or the place *Vadi Ossis* (compare Ewald, *Geschichte d. V. I.* iv, 420). 15. Dr. Adler (*Volkstheuer*, vi, 56), again, derives it from the Hebrew נְשֻׁתָּי, *to bind together, to associate*, and says that they were called נְשֻׁתָּי, because they united together to keep the law. 16. Dr. Cohn suggests the Chaldee root נְשֻׁתָּי, *to be strong*, and that they were called נְשֻׁתָּי because of their strength of mind to endure sufferings and to subdue their passions (Frankel's *Monatsch.* vii, 272). 17. Oppenheim thinks that it may be the form נְשֻׁתָּי, and stands for נְשֻׁתָּי נְשֻׁתָּי or נְשֻׁתָּי נְשֻׁתָּי, *observers of the laws of purity and holiness* (ib.). 18. Jellinek (*Ben Chananja*, iv, 374), again, derives it from the Hebrew נְשֻׁתָּי, *sinus, περιζώμα*, alluding to the נְשֻׁתָּי mentioned in the Talmud (*Bechoroth*, 30, a), i. e. *the apron which the Essenes wore*. 19. Others, again, derive it from a supposed form נְשֻׁתָּי, in the sense of *pious*, because it connects the Essenes with the *Chasidim*, from which they are thought to have originated. See **ASSIDEANS**.

**II. Tenets and Practices.**—The cardinal doctrine of this sect was the sacredness of the inspired law of God. To this they adhered with such tenacity that they were led thereby to pay the greatest homage to Moses the lawgiver, and to consider blasphemy of his name a capital offence. They believed that to obey diligently the commandments of the Lord, to lead a pure and holy life, to mortify the flesh and the lusts thereof, and to be meek and lowly in spirit, would

bring them in closer communion with their Creator, and make them the temples of the Holy Ghost, when they would be able to prophesy and perform miracles, and, like Elias, be ultimately the forerunners of the Messiah. This last stage of perfection, however, could only be attained by gradual growth in holiness, and by advancement from one degree to another. Thus, when one was admitted a member of this order, and had obtained the  $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\zeta\omega\mu\alpha$ , *apron*, which, from its being used to dry one's self with after the baptisms, was the symbol of purity, he attained, 1. To the state of outward or bodily purity by baptisms (*זריזות מביאה לירו פרישה*). 2. From this stage, again, he attained to that of inward or spiritual purity (*פרישה מביאה לירו נהרה*). 3. From this stage, again, he advanced to that which required the banishing of all anger and malice, and the cultivation of a meek and lowly spirit (*נהרה מביאה לירו עניה*). 4. Thence he advanced to the stage of holiness (*עניה מביאה לירו חסידות*). 5. Thence, again, he advanced to that wherein he was fit to be the temple of the Holy Spirit, and to prophesy (*חסידות מביאה לירו רהק*). 6. Thence, again, he advanced to that state when he could perform miraculous cures and raise the dead (*רהק מביאה לירו הרהק*); and, 8. Attained finally to the position of Elias, the forerunner of the Messiah (*הרהק מביאה לירו אליה*). Comp. Jerusalem Talmud, *Sabbath*, c. i.; *Shekalim*, c. iii.; Bably, *Aboda Zara*, xx, 6; Midrash Rabba, *Shir Hushirim*, init.; and *Ben Chananja*, iv, 374.

As contact with any one who did not practise their self-imposed Levitical laws of purity, or with anything belonging to such a one, rendered them impure, the Essenes were, in the course of time, obliged to withdraw altogether from general society, to form a separate community, and live apart from the world. Their manner of life and practices were most simple and self-denying. They chiefly occupied themselves with tilling the ground, tending flocks, rearing bees, and making the articles of food and dress required by the community (as it was contrary to their laws of Levitical purity to get anything from one who did not belong to the society), as well as with healing the sick, and studying the mysteries of nature and revelation. Whatever they possessed was deposited in the general treasury, of which there were appointed by the whole fraternity several managers, who supplied therefrom the wants of every one, so that they had all things in common; hence there were no distinctions amongst them of rich and poor, or of masters and servants. They reprobated slavery and war, and would not even manufacture martial instruments. They rose before the sun, and did not talk about any worldly matters till they had all assembled together and offered up their national prayer for the renewal of the light of the day (*המאיר לארץ*), whereupon they dispersed to their respective engagements, according to the directions of the overseers, till the fifth hour, or eleven o'clock, when the labor of the forenoon terminated, and all re-assembled, had a baptism in cold water, after which they put on their white garments, entered their refectory with as much religious solemnity as if it were the holy Temple, sat down together in mysterious silence to a common meal, which had the character of a sacrament—and may be the reason why they did not offer sacrifices in the Temple—the baker placed before each one a little loaf of bread, and the cook a dish of the most simple food, the priest invoked God's blessing upon the repast, and concluded with thanks to the Bountiful Supplier of all our wants. This was the signal of their dismissal, when all withdrew, put off

their sacred garments, and resumed their several employments till the evening, when they again partook of a common meal. Such was their manner of life during the week. On the Sabbath, which they observed with the utmost rigor, and on which they were more especially instructed in their distinctive ordinances, Philo tells us, "They frequent the sacred places which are called synagogues, and there they sit, according to their age, in classes, the younger sitting below the elder in becoming attire, and listening with eager attention. Then one takes up the holy volume and reads it, whilst another of the most experienced ones expounds, omitting that which is not generally known; for they philosophize on most things in symbols, according to the ancient zeal" (*Quod omnis prob. lib. sec. xii*). The study of logic and metaphysics they regarded as injurious to a devotional life. They were governed by a president, who was chosen by the whole body, and who also acted as judge. In cases of trial, however, the majority of the community, or at least a hundred members of it, were required to constitute the tribunal, and the brother who walked disorderly was excommunicated, yet he was not regarded as an enemy, but was admonished as a brother, and received back after due repentance.

As has already been remarked, the Essenes generally were celibates; their ranks had therefore to be recruited from the children of the Jewish community at large, whom they carefully trained for this holy and ascetic order. Previous to his final admission, the candidate for the order had to pass through a novitiate of two stages. Upon entering the first stage, which lasted twelve months, the novice (*νοσούταρος*) had to cast in all his possessions into the common treasury, and received a *spade* (*σαλις, ἀνάρονον* = *קדף*) to bury the excrement (compare Deut. xxiii, 12-15), an *apron* (*περιζώμα* = *קריץ*), used at the baptisms, and a *white robe* to put on at meals, which were the symbols of purity, and, though still an outsider, he had to observe some of the ascetic rules of the society. If, at the close of this stage, the community found that he had properly acquitted himself during the probationary year, the novice was then admitted into the second stage, which lasted two years. During this period he was admitted to a closer fellowship with the brotherhood, and shared in their laustral rites, but was still excluded from the common meals. Having passed satisfactorily through the second stage of probation, the novice was then fully received into the community (*εἰς τὸν ὄμιλον*), when he bound himself by awful oaths (the only occasion on which they allowed swearing) "that, in the first place, he will exercise piety towards God; and then that he will observe justice towards all men; and that he will do no harm to any one, either of his own accord or by the command of others; that he will always hate the wicked, and help the righteous; that he will ever be faithful to all men, especially his rulers, for without God no one comes to be ruler, and that if he should be ruler himself he will never be overbearing, nor endeavor to outshine those he rules either in his garments or in finery; that he will always love truth, and convince and reprove those that lie; that he will keep his hand from stealing, and his soul clear from any unjust gain; that he will not conceal anything from the members of his society, nor communicate to any one their mysteries, not even if he should be forced to it at the hazard of his life; and, finally, that he will never deliver the doctrines of the Essenes to any one in any other manner than he received them himself; that he will abstain from all species of robbery, and carefully preserve the books belonging to their sect and the names of the angels" (*War*, ii, 8, 7). This last expression refers to the secrets connected with the *Tetragrammaton* (*שם* = *המפורש*), and the other names of God and the angels comprised in the theosophy (*מטענה מרובה*), and to

the mysteries connected with the cosmogony (מִצְדָּתֵי בְרֵאשִׁית) which played so important a part both among the Essenes and the Cabbalists.

III. *Origin and Relationship to Judaism and Christianity.*—The origin of this sect has been greatly mystified by Philo and Josephus, who, being anxious to represent their co-religionists to cultivated Greeks in a Hellenistic garb, made the Essenes resemble as much as possible the Ascetic, Pythagorean, Platonic, and other philosophers. It has been still more mystified by the account of Pliny, who tells us that this community has prolonged its existence for thousands of ages ("per seculorum millia—incredibile diu—gens æterna est in qua nemo nascitur," *Hist. Nat.* v, 15). Most modern writers have shaped their description of this community according to these accounts, supposing that the Essenes are neither mentioned in the N. T. nor in the ancient Jewish writings, and hence concluding that the sect originated in Egypt or Greece, or in the philosophic systems of both countries. Hilgenfeld (*Zeits. für wiss. Theol.*, 1867, i, art. vi) undertakes to show the historical connection of Essenism with Parnism and Buddhism. Frankel seeks, from a number of passages in the Talmud and Midrashim, to show that Essenism is simply an order of Pharisaism, that both are sections of the Chasidim or Assideans [see CHASIDIM], and that all these three orders are frequently spoken of under the same name. That the Essenes are an order of Pharisees is distinctly stated in *Aboth R. Nathan*, c. xxxvii, where we are told that there are eight distinctions or orders among the Pharisees, and that those *Pharisees who live in celibacy are the Essenes* (ח' פְּרִישִׁים הֵם—פְּרִישֵׁי מְחֻבְּבֵי שְׂאֵנִי). This will, moreover, be seen from a comparison of the following practices, which Josephus describes as peculiar characteristics of the *Essenes*, with the practices of the Pharisees, as given in the Talmud and Midrashim:

1. The Essenes had four classes of Levitical purity, which were so marked that a member of the upper class had to bathe himself when he touched anything belonging to the lower class, or when he came in contact with a stranger; so also the Pharisees (comp. Josephus, *War*, ii, 8, 10, with *Chagiga*, ii, 7).

2. The Essenes regarded ten persons as constituting a complete number for divine worship, and held the assembly of such a number as sacred; so the Pharisees (comp. *War*, 2, 8, 9, with *Aboth*, iii, 6; *Berachoth*, 54, a).

3. The Essenes would not spit out in the presence of an assembly, or to the right hand; so the Pharisees (comp. *War*, ii, 8, 9, with Jerusalem, *Berachoth*, iii, 5).

4. The Essenes regarded their social meal as a sacrament; so the Pharisees (compare *War*, ii, 8, 5, with *Berachoth*, 55, a).

5. The Essenes bathed before meals; so the Pharisees (comp. *War*, ii, 8, 5, with *Chagiga*, 18, b).

6. The Essenes put on an apron on the lower part of the body when bathing; the Pharisees covered themselves with the *talith* (comp. *War*, ii, 8, 5, with *Berachoth*, 24, b).

7. The Essenes bathed after performing the duties of nature; so the priests (comp. *War*, ii, 8, 9, with *Yoma*, 28, a).

8. The Essenes abstained from taking oaths; so the Pharisees (compare *War*, ii, 8, 6, with *Shewoth*, 39, b; *Gittin*, 35, a; *Bemidbar Rabba*, xxii).

9. The Essenes would not even remove a vessel on the Sabbath; so the Pharisees (compare *War*, ii, 8, 9, with *Tosiphtha Succa*, iii).

10. The Essenes had a steward in every place where they resided to supply the needy strangers of this order with articles of clothing and food; so the Pharisees (comp. *War*, ii, 8, 4, with *Peah*, viii, 7; *Baba Bathra*, 8, a; *Sabbath*, 118).

11. The Essenes believed that all authority comes

from God; so the Pharisees (comp. *War*, ii, 8, 7, with *Berachoth*, 58, a).

12. An applicant for admission to the order of the Essenes had to pass through a novitiate of twelve months; so the פְּרִישִׁים among the Pharisees (compare *War*, ii, 8, 7, with *Berachoth*, 30, b).

13. The novice among the Essenes received an *apron* (περιζώμα) the first year of his probation; so the Chaber among the Pharisees (compare *War*, ii, 8, 7, with *Tosiphtha Demay*, c. ii; Jerusalem, *Demay*, ii, 3, b; *Echoroth*, 30, b).

14. The Essenes delivered the theosophical books, and the sacred names, to the members of their society; similarly the Pharisees (comp. *War*, ii, 8, 7, with *Chagiga*, ii, 1; *Kiddushim*, 71, a).

The real differences between the Essenes and the Pharisees developed themselves in the course of time, when the extreme rigor with which the former sought to perform the laws of Levitical purity made them withdraw from intercourse with their fellow-men, and led them, 1. To form an isolated order; 2. To keep from marriage, because of the perpetual pollutions to which women are subject in menstruation and childbirth, and because of its being a hindrance to a purely devotional state of mind; 3. To abstain from frequenting the Temple and offering sacrifices (compare Josephus *Ant.* xviii, 1, 5); and, 4. Though they firmly believed in the immortality of the soul, yet they did not believe in the resurrection of the body (*War*, ii, 8, 11). To the Pharisees they stood nearly in the same relation as that in which the Pharisees themselves stood with regard to the mass of the people. The difference lay mainly in rigor of practice, and not in articles of belief. See PHARISEE.

But the best among the Jews felt the peril of Essenism as a system, and combined to discourage it. They shrank with an instinctive dread from the danger of connecting asceticism with spiritual power, and cherished the great truth which lay in the saying, "Doctrine is not in heaven." The miraculous energy which was attributed to mystics was regarded by them rather as a source of suspicion than of respect, and theosophic speculations were condemned with emphatic distinctness (Frankel, *Monatsschrift*, 1853, p. 62 sq., 68, 71).

As to their connection with Christianity, there can be no difficulty in admitting that Christ and the apostles recognised those principles and practices of the Essenes which were true and useful. Though our Saviour does not mention them by the name *Essenes*, which Philo and Josephus coined for the benefit of the Greeks, yet there can be no doubt he refers to them in Matt. xix, 12, when he speaks of those "who abstain from marriage for the kingdom of heaven's sake," since they were the only section of Jews who voluntarily imposed upon themselves a state of celibacy in order that they might devote themselves more closely to the service of God. Also 1 Cor. vii can hardly be understood without bearing in mind the notions about marriage entertained by this God-fearing and self-denying order. As to other coincidences, Matt. v, 34, etc., and James v, 12, urge the abstinence from using oaths which was especially taught by the Essenes. The manner in which Christ commanded his disciples to depart on their journey (Mark vi. 8-10) is the same which these pious men adopted when they started on a mission of mercy. The primitive Christians, like the Essenes, sold their land and houses, and brought the prices of the things to the apostles, and they had all things in common (Acts iv, 32-34). John the Baptist was a parallel to this holy order, as is evident from his ascetic life (Luke xi, 22); and when Christ pronounced him to be *Elias* (Matt. xi, 14), he may almost be said to have declared that the Baptist had really attained to that spirit and power which the Essenes strove to obtain in their highest stage of purity. From the nature of the case, however, Essenism, in its extreme form, could exercise very little direct influ-

ence on Christianity. In all its practical bearings it was diametrically opposed to the apostolic teaching. The dangers which it involved were far more clear to the eye of the Christian than they were to the Jewish doctors. The only real similarity between Essenism and Christianity lay in the common element of true Judaism; and there is little excuse for modern writers who follow the error of Eusebius, and confound the society of the Therapeutæ with Christian brotherhoods. Nationally, however, the Essenes occupy the same position as that to which John the Baptist was personally called. They mark the close of the old, the longing for the new, but without political aspirations. In place of the message of the coming "kingdom" they could proclaim only individual purity and isolation. At a later time traces of Essenism appear in the Clementines, and the strange account which Epiphanius gives of the *Osseni* (Ὀσσηνοί) appears to point to some combination of Essene and pseudo-Christian doctrines (*Iher.* xix.). After the Jewish war the Essenes disappear from history. The character of Judaism was changed, and ascetic Pharisaism became almost impossible.

IV. *Date, Settlements, and Number of this Order.*—The fact that the Essenes developed themselves gradually, and at first imperceptibly, through intensifying the prevalent religious notions, renders it impossible to say with exactness at what degree of intensity they are to be considered as detached from the general body. The Saviour and the ancient Jewish writers do not speak of them as a separate body. Josephus, however, speaks of them as existing in the days of Jonathan the Maccabæan, B.C. 143 (*Ant.* xiii, 5, 9); he then mentions Judas, an Essene, who delivered a prophecy in the reign of Aristobulus I, B.C. 106 (*War.* i, 3, 5; *Ant.* xiii, 11, 2). The third mention of their existence occurs in connection with Herod (*Ant.* xv, 10, 5). These accounts distinctly show that the Essenes at first lived among the people, and did not refrain from frequenting the court, as Menachem the Essene was a friend of Herod, who was kindly disposed towards this order (*ib.*). This is, moreover, evident from the fact that there was a gate at Jerusalem which was named after them (Ἐσσηνῶν πύλη, *War.* v, 4, 2). When they ultimately withdrew themselves from the rest of the Jewish nation, the majority of them settled on the north-west shore of the Dead Sea (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* v, 17; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* ii, 17), and the rest lived in scattered communities throughout Palestine and other places. Their number is estimated both by Philo and Josephus at 4000.

The obscurity of the Essenes as a distinct body arises from the fact that they represented originally a tendency rather than an organization. The communities which were formed out of them were a result of their practice, and not a necessary part of it. As a sect they were distinguished by an aspiration after ideal purity rather than by any special code of doctrines; and, like the Chasidim of earlier times, they were confounded in the popular estimation with the great body of the zealous observers of the law (Pharisees). The growth of Essenism was a natural result of the religious feeling which was called out by the circumstances of the Greek dominion, and it is easy to trace the process by which it was matured. From the Maccabæan age there was a continuous effort among the stricter Jews to attain an absolute standard of holiness. Each class of devotees was looked upon as practically impure by their successors, who carried the laws of purity still further; and the Essenes stand at the extreme limit of the mystic asceticism which was thus gradually reduced to shape. The associations of the "Scribes and Pharisees" (סוֹפְרֵי וְפָרִישִׁים, "the companions, the wise") gave place to others bound by a more rigid rule; and the rule of the Essenes was made gradually stricter. Those whom Josephus speaks of as allowing marriage may be supposed to have be-

longed to such bodies as had not yet withdrawn from intercourse with their fellow-men. But the practice of the extreme section was afterwards regarded as characteristic of the whole class, and the isolated communities of Essenes furnished the type which is preserved in the popular descriptions.

The character of Essenism limited its spread. Out of Palestine, Levitical purity was impossible, for the very land was impure; and thus there is no trace of the sect in Babylonia. The case was different in Egypt, where Judaism assumed a new shape from its intimate connection with Greece. Here the original form in which it was moulded was represented, not by direct copies, but by analogous forms, and the tendency which gave birth to the Essenes found a fresh development in the pure speculation of the Therapeutæ (q. v.). These Alexandrine mystics abjured the practical labors which rightly belonged to the Essenes, and gave themselves up to the study of the inner meaning of the Scriptures. The impossibility of fulfilling the law naturally led them to substitute a spiritual for a literal interpretation; and it was their object to ascertain its meaning by intense labor, and then to satisfy its requirements by absolute devotion. The "whole day, from sunrise to sunset, was spent in mental discipline." Bodily wants were often forgotten in the absorbing pursuit of wisdom, and "meat and drink" were at all times held to be unworthy of the light (Philo, *De vit. contempl.* § 4).

According to Credner, *Über Essener und Ebioniten* (in Winer's *Zeitschr.* I, ii-iii, 217 sq.), the Ebionites descended from the Essenes. Grässe says (*ib.* p. 653) that the Therapeutæ, who lived in Egypt (Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* ii, 138 sq., 725), were a class of the Essenes (see Bâld, *Diss. Essæos Pythagorissantes delineatura*, Upsal, 1746); and he presumes that they existed as early as the time of Alexander the Great, and, spreading from Egypt to Palestine, there became acquainted with the Pythagorean or Oriental philosophy (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 13). Dr. Wise thinks that the founder of the Essenes must have been an Egyptian Jew who was acquainted with the Pythagorean order, and came to Palestine about B.C. 200; and says farther that the Therapeutæ (founded about B.C. 170) of Egypt and elsewhere were in name and essence an imitation of the Essenes. He asserts also that no positive traces of their messianic views are left either by Josephus or Philo, or even by the Talmud, but that, in consideration of their numerous similarities to the Egyptian Jews, they may be supposed to have entertained messianic hopes similar to the Egyptians (*The Israelite*, Nov. 1, 1867).

V. *Literature.*—The oldest accounts we have of the Essenes are those given by Josephus, *War.* ii, 8, 2-15; *Ant.* xii, 5, 9; xv, 10, 4 sq.; xviii, 1, 2 sq.; Philo, *Quod omnis probus liber*, § 12 sq.; Pliny, *Hist. Natur.* v, c. xvi, xvii; Solinus, *Polyhist.* c. xxxv; Porphyry, *De Abstinentia*, p. 381; Epiphanius, *adv. Hær.* lib. i; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* ii, c. xvii. Of modern productions we have Bellermin, *Geschichtliche Nachrichten aus dem Alterthume über Essäer und Therapeuten* (Berlin, 1821), who has studiously collected all the descriptions of this order: Gfrörer, *Philo und die jüdisch-schule andrinische Theosophie* (Stuttgart, 1835), p. 299 sq.; Prideaux, *Connection of the O. and N. T.*, part ii, bk. v, 5; Dähne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Religions Philosophie*, i, 467 sq.; and by the same author, the article *Essäer*, in Ersch und Gruber's *Encyclopädie*: Neander, *History of the Church*, ed. Bohn, vol. i. The Essays of Frankel, in his *Zeitschrift für die religiösen Interessen d. Judenthums* (Lpz. 1848), p. 441 sq.; and *Monatsschrift für Geschichte u. Wissenschaft d. Judenthums*, ii, 30 sq., 61 sq., are most important, and may be considered as having created a new epoch in the treatment of the history of this order. Adopting the results of Frankel, and pursuing the same course still further, Grätz has given a masterly treat-



tise upon the Essenes in his *Geschichte der Juden* (Leipzig, 1856), iii, 96 sq., 518 sq.; treatises of great value are also given by Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Secten* (Leipzig, 1857), p. 207 sq.; and Herzfeld, *Geschichte d. V. Israel* (Nordhansen, 1857), ii, 368, 388 sq. The accounts given by Ewald, *Geschichte d. Volkes Israel* (Göttingen, 1852), iv, 420 sq., and Hilgenfeld, *Die jüdische Apokalypitk* (Jena, 1857), p. 245 sq., though based upon Philo and Josephus, are important contributions to the literature of the Essenes; that of the latter is interesting and ingenious, but essentially one-sided and subservient to the writer's theory (compare Volkmar, *Das vierte B. Ezra*, p. 60). To these must be added the very interesting and important relics of the Essenes, published by Jelinek, with instructive notices by the learned editor, in *Beth Ha-Midrash*, vol. ii (Leipzig, 1853), p. xviii sq.; vol. iii (Leipzig, 1855), p. xx sq.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

See also Ginsburg, *History and Doctrines of the Essenes* (Lond. 1864); Hermes, *De Essais* (Hal. 1720); Lund, *De Phar. Sadd. et Essais* (Aboe, 1689); Sauer, *De Essenis et Therapeutis* (Vratisl. 1829); Willemer, *De Essenis* (Viteb. 1680); Zeller, *Ueb. d. Zusammenh. d. Essäismus mit Griechenthum in the Tüb. theol. Jahrb.* 1856, p. 401-433; Roth, *De Essenis* (Jen. 1669); Willemer, *id.* (Viteb. 1680); Lange, *id.* (Hal. 1721); Tresenreuter, *De Essavorum nomine* (Alt. 1743); Van der Hude, *Num discipuli Joh. Bapt. fuerunt Essaei* (Helmst. 1754); Carpov, *Dank-cyfer an Gott*, p. 282 sq.; Ernesti, *Ueb. "Porphyrinus de Abstinencia"* (in his *Theol. Bibl.* ix, 63 sq.); Grave, *De Pythagor. et Essenor. disciplina* (Gött. 1808); Bielleke, *De Essenis et Therapeutis* (Starg. 1755); Büttner, *De Essenis* (Jen. 1670); Credner, *Ueb. Essäer und Ebioniten* (in Winer's *Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* ii, 211-264); Grossmann, *De ascetis Judaorum* (Altenb. 1833); Zinck, *De Therapeutis* (Lips. 1724). On the supposed relations of Essenism to Christianity, there are special treatises in Latin by Zorn (in his *Opusc. Saec.* ii, 62 sq.), Kaiser (in his *Question. Synodal.* [Curia, 1801], p. 25 sq.), Dorf Müller (Wunsiedel, 1803), Tinga (Groning. 1805); in German by Lüderwald (in Henke's *Magaz.* iv, 371 sq.), Bengel (in Flatt's *Magaz.* vii, 126 sq.). See likewise the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1845, iii, 549; *Jour. Sac. Lit.* Oct. 1852, p. 176-186; April, 1853, p. 170 sq.; *Blackwood's Magazine*, 1840, p. 105, 463, 639; *Amer. Bibl. Repos.* Jan. 1849, p. 162 sq.; Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theologie*, 1867, i, art. 6; Illgen's *Zeitschr. für hist. Theol.* 1841, ii, 3 sq.; the *Strasb. Revue de théol.* 1867, p. 221 sq.; Zeller's *Theol. Jahrb.* 1855, p. 315 sq.; 1850, p. 401 sq.; *Meth. Quart. Rev.* July, 1867, p. 450; *North British Rev.* Dec. 1867, p. 151; Pressensé, *Religions before Christ*, p. 231-234; Schaff, *Apostolic Church*, p. 175, 657 sq.; Holzmann, *Gesch. d. Volkes Israel*, i, 206 sq. Comp. SECTS, JEWISH.

**Essenius, ANDREW**, a Dutch theologian, was born at Bommel in February, 1618, and was educated at Utrecht, where he became pastor in 1651. In 1653 he was made professor of theology in the University of Utrecht. He died May 18, 1677. Among his writings are *Triumphus Crucis* (Amst. 1649);—*De Moralitate (Sabbati 1658)*;—*Systema Theologicum* (1659);—*Compendium Theol. Dogmat.* (1669);—Hoefcr, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xvi, 441.

**Essentia.** See ESSENCE.

**Establishment.** This term is applied to the position that that religious denomination in any country which solely or peculiarly enjoys the patronage of the state, and the clergy of which have, in consequence, their several endowments and incomes especially settled and maintained by the Legislature or government. The general tendency of opinion in all countries is now against established churches, and in favor of the voluntary principle for the support of churches. The subject is discussed at length, historically and otherwise, in the article CHURCH AND STATE (ii, 329). W

present here a summary of the arguments on both sides, chiefly taken from Buck (*Theolog. Dict.* s. v.).

(1.) The partisans for religious establishments observe (1.) that they have prevailed universally in every age and nation. The office of prophet, priest, and king were united in the same patriarch (Gen. xviii, 19; xvii and xxi; xiv, 18). The Jews enjoyed a religious establishment dictated and ordained by God. In turning our attention to the heathen nations, we shall find the same incorporation of religious with civil government (Gen. xlvii, 22; 2 Kings xvii, 27, 29). Every one who is at all acquainted with the history of Greece and Rome knows that religion was altogether blended with the policy of the state. The Koran may be considered as the religious creed and civil code of all the Mohammedan tribes. Among the Celts, or the original inhabitants of Europe, the Druids were both their priests and their judges, and their judgment was final. Among the Hindoos the priests and sovereigns are of different tribes or castes, but the priests are superior in rank; and in China the emperor is sovereign pontiff, and presides in all public acts of religion. (2.) Again: it is said that, although there is no form of Church government absolutely prescribed in the New Testament, yet from the associating law, on which the Gospel lays so much stress, by the respect for civil government it so earnestly enjoins, and by the practice which followed and finally prevailed, Christians cannot be said to disapprove, but to favor religious establishments. (3.) Religious establishments also, it is observed, are founded on the nature of man, and interwoven with all the constituent principles of human society: the knowledge and profession of Christianity cannot be upheld without a clergy; a clergy cannot be supported without a legal provision; and a legal provision for the clergy cannot be constituted without the preference of one sect of Christians to the rest. An established church is most likely to maintain clerical respectability and usefulness by holding out a suitable encouragement to young men to devote themselves early to the service of the Church, and likewise enables them to obtain such knowledge as shall qualify them for the important work.

(11.) They who reason on the contrary side observe, (1.) that the patriarchs sustaining civil as well as religious offices is no proof at all that religion was incorporated with the civil government in the sense above referred to, nor is there the least hint of it in the sacred Scriptures. That the case of the Jews can never be considered in point, as they were under a theocracy and a ceremonial dispensation that was to pass away, and consequently not designed to be a model for Christian nations. That, whatever was the practice of heathens in this respect, this forms no argument in favor of that system which is the very opposite to paganism. (2.) The Church of Christ is of a spiritual nature, and ought not, yea, cannot in fact be incorporated with the state without sustaining material injury. In the three first and purest ages of Christianity the Church was a stranger to any alliance with temporal powers; and, so far from needing their aid, religion never flourished so much as while they were combined to suppress it. (3.) As to the support which Christianity, when united to civil government, yields to the peace and good order of society, it is observed that this benefit will be derived from it in at least as great a degree without an establishment as with it. Religion, if it have any power, operates on the conscience of men; and, resting solely on the belief of invisible realities, it can derive no weight or solemnity from human sanctions. Human establishments, it is said, have been, and are, productive of the greatest evils; for in this case it is requisite to give the preference to some particular system; and as the magistrate is no better judge of religion than others, the chances are as great of his lending his sanction to the false as the true. The thousands that have been persecuted

and suffered in consequence of establishments will always form an argument against them. Under establishments also, it is said, corruption cannot be avoided. Emolument must be attached to the national church, which may be a strong inducement to its ministers to defend it, be it ever so remote from the truth. Thus, also, error becomes permanent; and that set of opinions which happens to prevail when the establishment is formed, continues, in spite of superior light and improvement, to be handed down, without alteration, from age to age. Hence the disagreement between the public creed of the Church and the private sentiments of its ministers. (4.) Finally, though all Christians should pay respect to civil magistrates as such, and all magistrates ought to encourage the Church, yet no civil magistrates have any power to establish any particular form of religion binding upon the consciences of the subject; nor are magistrates ever represented in Scripture as officers or rulers of the Church. As Mr. Coleridge observes, the Christian Church is not a kingdom, realm, or state of the world, nor is it an estate of any such kingdom, realm, or state; but it is the appointed opposite to them all collectively—the sustaining, correcting, befriending opposite of the world—the compensating counterforce to the inherent and inevitable evils and defects of the state as a state, and without reference to its better or worse construction as a particular state; while, whatever is beneficent and humanizing in the aims, tendencies, and proper objects of the state, it collects in itself as in a focus, to radiate them back in a higher quality; or, to change the metaphor, it completes and strengthens the edifice of the state, without interference or commixture, in the mere act of laying and securing its own foundations. And for these services the Church of Christ asks of the state neither wages nor dignities; she asks only protection, and to be let alone. These, indeed, she demands; but even these only on the ground that there is nothing in her constitution nor in her discipline inconsistent with the interests of the state; nothing resistant or impedimental to the state in the exercise of its rightful powers, in the fulfilment of its appropriate duties, or in the effectuation of its legitimate objects. (5.) As to the provision made for the clergy, this may be done without an establishment, as matter of fact shows in hundreds of instances in the Dissenting and Methodist churches in England, and universally by all churches in America. Indeed, the question of the value of the voluntary principle may be considered as finally settled by the experience of the English and American churches. In England, in 1855, the Established Church had church accommodation for 5,300,000, and all other denominations could seat 4,900,000, making in all church-room for 10,200,000 of the population. In the United States there were church accommodation in 1850 for 14,000,000, and it is computed by Dr. Baird (*Religion in America*) that there must be altogether far more than one minister for each 990 inhabitants. In England they have an establishment of untold wealth. For centuries they have been accumulating edifices for worship the most costly and durable that the world knows, and yet the United States, without any aid from the government, seats a larger proportion of the inhabitants in houses of worship, and raises \$25,000,000 annually for religious benevolence. That which has been the cause of this superior success in America is the more perfect action of the voluntary principle. Even in England this principle has worked in the same manner. Fifty years ago the population of that country was less than half what it now is. Then the Church of England could seat 4,000,000, now 5,300,000. But at that time the Dissenters could seat only *one fifth* of the numbers they can at present. In America the population has doubled itself five or six times since the Revolution, and yet *then* there was but about one minister to every 2000 inhabitants, *now* there is one to every 1000. See

Warburton, *Alliance between Church and State*; Christie, *Essay on Establishments*; Paley, *Mor. Phil.* v. ii. c. 10; Bp. Law, *Theory of Religion*; Watts, *Civil Power in Things Sacred*, third volume of his *Works*; Hall, *Liberty of the Press*, sec. 5; Conder, *Protestant Nonconformity*; Baird, *Religion in America* (N. Y. 1856, 8vo); Buck, *Dict.* s. v.; and art. CHURCH AND STATE.


**Es'ther** [vulgarly pronounced *Es'ter*], a beautiful Jewish maiden, the heroine of the Biblical book that bears her name.

1. *Name*.—Her proper Hebrew name was *Hadassah* (q. v.), but on her introduction into the royal harem she received, in accordance with Oriental usage (comp. Dan. i. 7), the new and probably Persian name of *Esther* (אֶסְתֵּר, *Ester'*; Sept. Ἑσθήρ, and so Josephus [Gen. ἡγοῦσ', *Ant.* xi. 6, 2, etc.; Vulg. *Esther*], which thenceforth became her usual and better-known designation, as appears from the formula אֶסְתֵּר הַיְהוּדָיָה, "that is, Esther" (*Esth.* ii. 7), exactly analogous to the usual addition of the modern names of towns to explain the use of the old obsolete ones (Gen. xxxv. 19, 27; Josh. xv. 10, etc.). As to its signification, Gesenius (*Thest. Heb.* p. 134, a) cites from that diffuse Targum on this book, which is known as the second Targum on Esther, the following words: "She was called Esther from the name of the star Venus, which in Greek is *Aster*" (i. e. ἀστήρ, Lat. *aster*, Engl. *star*; see Lassen, *Ind. Biblioth.* iii. 8, 18). Gesenius then points to the Persian word *satarah*, star, as that of which Esther is the Syro-Arabian modification; and brings it, as to signification, into connection with the planet *Venus*, as a star of good fortune, and with the name of the Syrian goddess *Ash-tareth* (q. v.). In this etymology Fürst acquiesces (*Heb. Jew. Lex.* s. v.).

2. *History*.—She was the daughter of Abihail (who was probably the son of Shimei), a Benjamite, and uncle of Mordecai (q. v.). Her ancestor Kish had been among the captives led away from Jerusalem (part of which was in the tribe of Benjamin) by Nebuchadnezzar when Jehoiachin was taken captive. The family did not avail itself of the permission to return to Palestine under the edict of Cyrus. Her parents being dead, Esther was brought up as a daughter by her cousin Mordecai, who had an office in the court or household of the Persian monarch "at Shushan, in the palace." The reigning king of Persia, Ahasuerus, having divorced his queen, Vashti, on account of the becoming spirit with which she refused to submit to the indignity which a compliance with his drunken commands involved, search was made throughout the empire for the most beautiful maiden to be her successor. Those whom the officers of the harem deemed the most beautiful were removed thither, the eventual choice among them remaining with the king himself. That choice fell on Esther, who found favor in the eyes of Ahasuerus, and was advanced to a station enviable only by comparison with that of the less favored inmates of the royal harem. B. C. 479. The king was not aware, however, of her race and parentage; and so, with the careless profusion of a sensual despot, on the representation of Haman the Agagite, his prime minister, that the Jews scattered through his empire were a pernicious race, he gave him full power and authority to kill them all, young and old, women and children, and take possession of all their property. The circumstance that Esther herself, though queen, seemed to be included in this doom of extirpation, enabled her to turn the royal indignation upon Haman, whose resentment against Mordecai had led him to obtain from the king this monstrous edict. The laws of the empire would not allow the king to recall a decree once uttered; but the Jews were authorized to stand on their defence; and this, with the known change in the intentions of the court, averted the worst consequences of the decree. The Jews established a yearly feast in memory of this deliverance, which is observed

among them to this day. See PURIM. Such is the substance of the history of Esther, as related in the book which bears her name. (See below.) The details, as given in that book, afford a most curious picture of the usages of the ancient Persian court, the accuracy of which is vouched for not only by the historical authority of the book itself, but by its agreement with the intimations afforded by the ancient writers, as well as by the fact that the same usages are in substance preserved in the Persian court at the present day. See HAREM.

Sir John Malcolm tells us that the sepulchre of Esther and Mordecai stands near the centre of the city of Hamadan. It is a square building, terminated by a dome, with an inscription in Hebrew upon it, translated and sent to him by Sir Gore Ouseley, ambassador to the court of Persia, as follows: "Thursday, fifteenth of the month Adar, in the year 4474 from the creation of the world, was finished the building of this temple over the graves of Esther and Mordecai, by the hands of the good-hearted brothers Elias and Samuel, the sons of the deceased Ishmael of Kashan." According to the vulgar Jewish æra, this would have been not more than eleven centuries ago; but the date may be after the computation of the Eastern Jews, which would make it about A.D. 250. Local tradition says that it was thoroughly repaired about 175 years since by a Jewish rabbi named Ismael (Kitto, *Pict. Bible*, at Esth. x, 1). See ACHMETHA.



Tomb of Mordecai and Esther.

3. *Proposed Identifications with Personages in Profane History.*—The question as to the identity of the Persian king referred to in connection with Esther is discussed under AHASUERUS, and the reasons there given lead to the conclusion that he was Xerxes, the son of Darius Hystaspis. (See, however, a contrary view in the *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* July, 1860, p. 406 sq.)

A second inquiry remains, Who, then, was Esther? *Artaxana*, *Alosa*, and others are indeed excluded by the above decision; but are we to conclude, with Scaliger, that because Ahasuerus is Xerxes, therefore Esther is *Amestris*? Surely not. None of the historical particulars related by Herodotus concerning Amestris (Herod ix, 108; comp. Ctesias, ap. Photius, *Cod.* 72, p. 57) make it possible to identify her with Esther. Amestris was the daughter of Otanes (Onophas in Ctesias), one of Xerxes's generals, and brother to his father Darius (Herod. vii, 61, 82). Esther's father and mother had been Jews. Amestris was wife to Xerxes before the Greek expedition (Herod. vii, 61), and her sons accompanied Xerxes to Greece

(Herod. vii, 39), and had all three come to man's estate at the death of Xerxes in the 20th year of his reign. Darius, the eldest, had married immediately after the return from Greece. Esther did not enter the king's palace till his 7th year, just the time of Darius's marriage. These objections are conclusive, without adding the difference of character of the two queens. The truth is that history is wholly silent both about Vashti and Esther. Herodotus only happens to mention one of Xerxes's wives; Scripture only mentions two, if indeed either of them were wives at all. But since we know that it was the custom of the Persian kings before Xerxes to have several wives, besides their concubines; that Cyrus had several (Herod. iii, 3); that Cambyses had four whose names are mentioned, and others besides (iii, 31, 32, 68); that Smerdis had several (ib. 68, 69); and that Darius had six wives, whose names are mentioned (ib. *passim*), it is most improbable that Xerxes should have been content with one wife. Another strong objection to the idea of Esther being his one legitimate wife, and perhaps to her being strictly his wife at all, is that the Persian kings selected their *wives* not from the harem, but, if not foreign princesses, from the noblest Persian families, either their own nearest relatives, or from one of the seven great Persian houses. It seems therefore natural to conclude that Esther, a captive, and one of the harem, was not of the highest rank of wives, but that a special honor, with the name of queen, may have been given to her, as to Vashti before her, as the favorite concubine or inferior wife, whose offspring, however, if she had any, would not have succeeded to the Persian throne. This view, which seems to be strictly in accordance with what we know of the manners of the Persian court, removes all difficulty in reconciling the history of Esther with the scanty accounts left us by profane authors of the reign of Xerxes.

It may be convenient to add that the day of Xerxes, in which the banquet that was the occasion of Vashti's divorce was held, was B.C. 488, his 7th, B.C. 479, and his 12th, B.C. 474 (Clinton, *F. L.*), and that the simultaneous battles of Plataea and Mycale, which frightened Xerxes from Sardis (Diod. Sic. xi, 36) to Susa, happened, according to Prideaux and Clinton, in September of his 7th year. For a fuller discussion of the identity of Esther, and different views of the subject, see Prideaux's *Connection*, i, 116, 243, 297 sq., and Petav. *De doctr. temp.* xii, 27, 28, who make Esther wife of Artaxerxes Longim., following Joseph. *Ant.* xi, 6, as he followed the Sept. and the apocryphal Esther; J. Scalig. (*De emend. temp.* vi, 591; *Animadv. Euseb.* p. 100) making Ahasuerus, Xerxes; Usher (*Annal. Vet. Test.*) making him Darius Hystaspis; Loftus, *Chaldaea*, etc. Eusebius (*Canon. Chron.* 138, ed. Mediol.) rejects the hypothesis of Artaxerxes Longim. on the score of the silence of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, and adopts that of Artaxerxes Mnemon, following the Jews, who make Darius Codomannus to be the same as Darius Hystaspis, and the son of Artaxerxes by Esther! It is most observable that all Petavius's and Prideaux's arguments against Scaliger's view apply solely to the statement that Esther is Amestris. See XERXES.

4. *The character of Esther*, as she appears in the Bible, is that of a woman of deep piety, faith, courage, patriotism, and caution, combined with resolution; a dutiful daughter to her adoptive father, docile and obedient to his counsels, and anxious to share the king's favor with him for the good of the Jewish people. That she was a virtuous woman, and, as far as her situation made it possible, a good wife to the king, her continued influence over him for so long a time warrants us to infer. There must have been a singular grace and charm in her aspect and manners, since she "obtained favor in the sight of all that looked upon her" (ii, 15). That she was raised up as an instrument in the hands of God to avert the destruction of the

Jewish people, and to afford them protection, and forward their wealth and peace in their captivity, is also manifest from the Scripture account. But to impute to her the sentiments put in her mouth by the apocryphal author of ch. xiv. or to accuse her of cruelty because of the death of Haman and his sons, and the second day's slaughter of the Jews' enemies at Shushan, is utterly to ignore the manners and feelings of her age and nation, and to judge her by the standard of Christian morality in our own age and country instead. In fact, the simplicity and truth to nature of the scriptural narrative afford a striking contrast both with the forced and florid amplifications of the apocryphal additions, and with the sentiments of some later commentators.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See Debaeza, *Historia Esther* (in his *Comment. Allegor.* vi); Anon, *De Assuero* (in the *Crit. Sac. Thes.* Nov. i, 761); Robinson, *Script. Char.* ii; Hughes, *Esther and her People* (London, 1846); Justi, *Ueb. d. Ahasuerus in Esther* (in *Eichhorn's Repertor.* xv, 1 sq.); Tyrwhitt, *Esther and Ahasuerus* (London, 1868, 2 vols. 8vo).

ESTHER, Book of, the last of the historical books of the O. T., according to the arrangement in the Auth. Eng. Version. (See Davidson, in *Horne's Introd.*, new ed., ii, 697 sq.)

I. *Contents, Name, and Place in the Canon.*—In this book we have an account of certain events in the history of the Jews under the rule of the Persian king Ahasuerus (Achashverosh), doubtless the Xerxes of the Greek historians. See AHASUERUS 3. The writer informs us of a severe persecution with which they were threatened at the instigation of Haman, a favorite of the king, that sought in this way to gratify his jealousy and hatred of a Jew, Mordecai, who, though in the service of the king, refused to render to Haman the homage which the king had enjoined, and which his other servants rendered; he describes in detail the means by which this was averted through the influence of a Jewish maiden called "Hadassah, that is, Esther," the cousin of Mordecai, who had been raised to be the wife of the king, along with the destruction of Haman and the advancement of Mordecai; he tells us how the Jews, under the sanction of the king, and with the aid of his officers, rose up against their enemies, and slew them to the number of 75,000; and he concludes by informing us that the festival of Purim was instituted among the Jews in commemoration of this remarkable passage in their history. From the important part played by Esther in this history, the book bears her name. It is placed among the hagiographa (q. v.) or *Kethubim'* (כְּתוּבִים) by the Jews, and in that first portion of them which they call the five *Megilloth* (מֵגִלּוֹת, *rolls*), or books read in the synagogue on special festivals; the season appropriate to it being the feast of Purim, held on the 14th and 15th of the month Adar, of the origin of which it contains the account. Hence it stands in the Hebrew Canon after Koheleth or Ecclesiastes, according to the order of time in which the *Megilloth* are read. By the Jews it is called the *Megillah*, by way of eminence, either from the importance they attach to its contents, or from the circumstance that from a very early period it came to be written on a special roll (מֵגִלָּה) for use in the synagogue (*Hottinger, Thes. Phil.* p. 494). In the Sept. it appears with numerous additions, prefixed, interspersed, and appended; many of which betray a later origin, but which are so inwrought with the original story as to make with it a continuous and, on the whole, harmonious narrative. By the Christians it has been variously placed; the Vulgate places it between Tobit and Judith, and appends to it the apocryphal additions [see next article]; the Protestant versions commonly follow Luther in placing it at the end of the historical books.

II. *Canonicity.*—Among the Jews this book has always been held in the highest esteem. There is some

ground for believing that the feast of Purim was by some of the more ancient Jews opposed as an unlicensed novelty (*Talm. Mieros. Megilloth*, fol. 70; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* ad Joh. x, 22); but there is no trace of any doubt being thrown by them on the canonicity of the book. By the more modern Jews it has been elevated to a place beside the law, and above the other hagiographa, and even the prophets (*Pfeiffer, Thes. Hæretic.* p. 597 sq.; *Carpoz, Introd.* p. 366 sq.). Indeed, it is a saying of Maimonides that in the days of the Messiah the prophetic and hagiographical books will pass away, except the book of Esther, which will remain with the Pentateuch. This book is read through by the Jews in their synagogues at the feast of Purim, when it was, and is still in some synagogues, the custom at the mention of Haman's name to hiss, and stamp, and clench the fist, and cry, Let his name be blotted out; may the name of the wicked rot. It is said, also, that the names of Haman's ten sons are read in one breath, to signify that they all expired at the same instant of time. Even in writing the names of Haman's sons in the 7th, 8th, and 9th verses of Esth. ix, the Jewish scribes have contrived to express their abhorrence of the race of Haman; for these ten names are written in three perpendicular columns of 3, 3, 4, as if they were hanging upon three parallel cords, three upon each cord, one above another, to represent the hanging of Haman's sons (*Stehelin's Rabbinical Literature*, ii, 349). The Targum of Esth. ix, in Walton's Polyglot, inserts a very minute account of the exact position occupied by Haman and his sons on the gallows, the height from the ground, and the interval between each; according to which they all hung in one line, Haman at the top, and his ten sons at intervals of half a cubit under him. It is added that Zeresh and Haman's seventy surviving sons fled, and begged their bread from door to door, in evident allusion to Psa. cix, 9, 10. Some of the ancient Jewish teachers were somewhat staggered at the peculiarity of this book, that the name of God does not once occur in it; but others accounted for it by saying that it was a transcript, under divine inspiration, from the Chronicles of the Medes and Persians, and that, being meant to be read by heathen, the sacred name was wisely omitted. Baxter (*Saint's Rest*, pt. iv, chap. iii) speaks of the Jews using to cast to the ground the book of Esther because the name of God was not in it. (See Pareau's *Principles of Interpretation*, and Hottinger's *Thes. Phil.* p. 488.) But Wolf (*Bibl. Hebr.* part ii, p. 90) denies this, and says that if any such custom prevailed among the Oriental Jews, to whom it is ascribed by Sandys, it must have been rather to express their hatred of Haman. Certain it is that this book was always reckoned in the Jewish canon, and is named or implied in almost every enumeration of the books composing it, from Josephus downwards.

It has been questioned whether Josephus considered the book of Esther as written before or after the close of the canon. Du Pin maintains that, as Josephus asserts [see DEUTERO-CANONICAL] that the sacred books were all written between the time of Moses and the reign (*ἀνοχῆ*) of Artaxerxes, and (*Ant.* xi) places the history of Esther in that reign, he consequently includes it among those books which he says were of inferior authority, as written under and since the reign of that prince (*Complete Hist. of the Canon*, p. 6). Eichhorn, on the other hand, favors the opinion that Josephus meant to include the reign of that prince within the prophetic period, and concludes that this historian considered the book of Esther as the latest of the canonical writings.

In the Christian Church the book of Esther has not been so generally received. Jerome mentions it by name in the *Prolog. Gal.*, in his Epistle to Paulinus, and in the preface to Esther; as does Augustine, *De Civit. Dei*, and *De Doctr. Christ.*, and Origen, as cited by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* vi, 25), and many others.

Whilst apparently accepted without question by the churches of the West in the early centuries, the testimony of the Eastern Church concerning it is more fluctuating. It is omitted in the catalogue of Melito, an omission which is shared with Nehemiah, and which some would account for by supposing that both these books were included by him under Ezra, a supposition that may be admitted in reference to Nehemiah, but is less probable in reference to Esther. Origen inserts it, though not among the historical books, but after Job, which is supposed to indicate some doubt regarding it on his part. In the catalogues of the Council of Laodicea, of the apostolical canons, of Cyrill of Jerusalem, and of Epiphanius, it stands among the canonical books; by Gregory of Nazianzus it is omitted; in the *Synopsis Scrip. Sac.* it is mentioned as said by some of the ancients to be accepted by the Hebrews as canonical; and by Athanasius it is ranked among the *ἀναγνώσκόμενα*, not among the canonical books. These differences undoubtedly indicate that this book did not occupy the same unquestioned place in general confidence as the other canonical books of the O. T.; but the force of this, as evidence, is greatly weakened by the fact that it was not on historical or critical grounds, but rather on grounds of a dogmatical nature, and of subjective feeling, that it was thus treated. On the same grounds, at a later period, it was subjected to doubt, even in the Latin Church (Junilius, *De partibus Leg. Div.* c. 3). At the time of the Reformation, Luther, on the same grounds, pronounced the book more worthy to be placed "extra canonem" than "in canone" (*De sermo arbitrio*; comp. his *Tischreden*, iv, 403, Berlin ed. 1848), but in this he stood alone in the Protestant churches of his day; nor was it till a comparatively recent period that his opinion found any advocates. The first who set himself systematically to impugn the claims of the book was Semler, and him Oeder, Corrodi, Augusti, Bertholdt, De Wette, and Bleek have followed. Eichhorn with some qualifications, Jahn and Havernick unreservedly, have defended its claims.

The objections urged against the canonicity of the book resolve themselves principally into these three—1. That it breathes a spirit of narrow, selfish, national pride and vindictiveness, very much akin to that displayed by the later Jews, but wholly alien from the spirit which pervades the acknowledged books of the O. T.; 2. That its untheocratic character is manifested in the total omission in it of the name of God, and of any reference to the divine providence and care of Israel; and, 3. That many parts of it are so incredible as to give it the appearance rather of a fiction or romance than the character of a true history (Bertholdt, De Wette, etc.). In regard to the first of these, whilst it must be admitted that the spirit and conduct of the Jews, of whom the author of this book writes, are not those which the religion of the O. T. sanctions, it remains to be asked whether, in what he narrates of them, he has not simply followed the requirements of historical fidelity; and it remains to be proved that he has in any way indicated that his own sympathies and convictions went along with theirs. There can be little doubt that among the Jews of whom he writes a very different state of religious and moral feeling prevailed from what belonged to their nation in the better days of the theocracy. The mere fact that they preferred remaining in the land of the heathen to going up with their brethren who availed themselves of the permission of Cyrus to return to Judea, shows how little of the true spirit of their nation remained with them. This being the case, the historian could do nothing else than place before us such a picture as that which this book presents; had he done otherwise he would not have narrated the truth. It does not follow from this, however, that he himself sympathized with those of whom he wrote, in their motives, feelings, and conduct, or that the spirit dominant in them

is the spirit of his writing. It is true, occasions may frequently present themselves in the course of his narrative when he might have indulged in reflections of an ethical or didactic character on what he has narrated, but to do this may not have been in the plan and conception of his work, and he may therefore have intentionally avoided it.

Observations to the same effect may be made on the second objection. If the purpose of the author was to relate faithfully and without comment the actions and words of persons who were living without any vital recognition of God, the omission of all reference to God in the narrative will be sufficiently accounted for by this circumstance. If it be said, But a pious man would have spontaneously introduced some such reference, even though those of whom he wrote gave him no occasion to do so by their own modes of speech or acting, it may suffice to reply that, as we are ignorant of the reasons which moved the author to abstain from all remarks of his own on what he narrates, it is not competent for us to conclude from the omission in question that he was not himself a pious man. If again it be said, How can a book which simply narrates the conduct of Jews who had to a great extent forgotten, if they had not renounced the worship of Jehovah, without teaching any moral lessons in connection with this, be supposed to have proceeded from a man under God's direction in what he wrote, it may be replied that a book may have a most excellent moral tendency, and be full of important moral lessons, even though these are not formally announced in it. That it is so with the book of Esther may be seen from such a work as M'Crie's *Lectures* on this book, where the great lessons of the book are expounded with the skill of one whose mind had been long and deeply versed in historical research. As the third objection above noticed rests on the alleged unhistorical character of the book, its force will be best estimated after we have considered the next head.

III. *Credibility.*—In relation to this point three opinions have been advanced: 1. That the book is wholly unhistorical, a mere legend or romance; 2. That it has a historical basis, and contains some true statements, but that with these much of a fabulous kind is intermixed; 3. That the narrative is throughout true history. Of these opinions the first has not found many supporters: it is obviously incompatible with the reception of the book into the Jewish canon; for, however late be the date assigned to the closing of the canon, it is incredible that what must have been known to be a mere fable, if it is one, could have found a place there; it is incompatible with the early observance by the Jews of the feast of Purim, instituted to commemorate the events recorded here (comp. 2 Macc. xv, 36); and it is rendered improbable by the minuteness of some of the details, such as the names of the seven eunuchs (i, 10), the seven officers of the king (i, 14), the ten sons of Haman (ix, 7-10), and the general accurate acquaintance with the manners, habits, and contemporary history of the Persian court which the author exhibits. (See the ample details on this head collected by Eichhorn and Hävernick, *Einhüt.* 11, i, 338-357). The reception of the book into the canon places a serious difficulty in the way of the second opinion; for if those who determined this would not have inserted a book wholly fabulous, they would as little have inserted one in which fable and truth were indiscriminately mixed. It may be proper, however, to notice the parts which are alleged to be fabulous, for only thus can the objection be satisfactorily refuted. First, then, it is asked, How can it be believed that if the king had issued a decree that all the Jews should be put to death, he would have published this twelve months before it was to take effect (iii, 12, 13)? But, if this seem incredible to us, it must, if true, have appeared no less incredible to those for whom the book was written; and nothing can be more im-

probable than that a writer of any intelligence should by *mistake* have made a statement of this kind; indeed, a fiction of this sort is exactly what a fabulist would have been most certain to have avoided; for, knowing it not to be in accordance with fact and usage, he must have been sure that its falsehood would be at once detected. Secondly, it is said to be incredible that the king, when he repented of having issued such an edict, should, as it could not be recalled, have granted permission to the Jews to defend themselves by the slaughter of their enemies, and that they should have been permitted to do this to such an extent as to destroy 75,000 of his own subjects. To our habits of thinking this certainly appears strange; but we must not measure the conduct of a monarch like Xerxes by such a standard: the caprices of Oriental despots are proverbially startling, their indifference to human life appalling; and Xerxes, as we know from other sources, was apt even to exceed the limits of ordinary Oriental despotism in these respects (comp. Herod. i, 183; vii, 35, 39, 238; ix, 108-113; Justin, ii, 10, 11). Now if it be true, as Diodorus Siculus relates, that Xerxes put the Medians foremost at Thermopylae on purpose that they might all be killed, because he thought they were not thoroughly reconciled to the loss of their national supremacy, it is surely not incredible that he should have given permission to Haman to destroy a few thousand strange people like the Jews, who were represented to be injurious to his empire, and disobedient to his laws. Nor, again, when we remember what Herodotus relates of Xerxes in respect to promises made at banquets, can we deem it incredible that he should perform his promise to Esther to reverse the decree in the only way that seemed practicable. It is likely, too, that the secret friends and adherents of Haman would be the persons to attack the Jews, which would be a reason why Ahasuerus would rather rejoice at their destruction. Thirdly, it is asked how can we believe that the king would issue an edict to all his subjects that every man should bear rule in his own house (i, 22)? We reply that, as the edicts of Oriental despots are not all models of wisdom and dignity, here seems to us nothing improbable in the statement that such an edict, under the circumstances, issued by Ahasuerus. Fourthly, is it credible, it is asked, that Esther should have been so long a time in the palace of the king without her descent being known to the king or to Haman, as appears to have been the case? We reply that it does not appear certain that her Jewish descent was unknown; and, if it were, we are too little acquainted with the usages of the Persian royal harem to be able to judge whether this was an unlikely thing to occur or not: we may suggest, however, that the writer of the history was somewhat more likely to know the truth on such points than German professors in the 19th century.

The usual way in which the author of 2 Macc. xv, 35 alludes to the feast of Purim, under the name of "Mithrochæus's day," as kept by the Jews in the time of Nicom, is another strong testimony in its favor, and tends to justify the strong expression of Dr. Lee (quoted in Whiston's Josephus, xi, ch. vi), that "the truth of this history is demonstrated by the feast of Purim, kept up from that time to this very day."

The style of writing is remarkably chaste and simple, and the narrative of the struggle in Esther's mind between fear and the desire to save her people, and of the final resolve made in the strength of that help which was to be sought in prayer and fasting, is very touching and beautiful, and without any exaggeration. Even De Wette observes that the book is simple in its style, free from declamation, and thus advantageously distinguished from the similar stories in the Apocrypha (*Introduction*, Parker's translation, Boston, 1843).

IV. *Authorship and Date.*—Augustine (*De Civitate Dei*) ascribes the book to Ezra. Eusebius (*Chronic.*

xlvii, d. 4), who observes that the facts of the history are posterior to the time of Ezra, ascribes it to some later but unknown author. Clemens Alexandrinus (*Stromata*, lib. i, p. 329) assigns it and the book of Maccabees to Mordecai. The pseudo-Philo (*Chronographia*) and Rabbi Azarias maintain that it was written at the desire of Mordecai by Jehoiakim, son of Joshua, who was high-priest in the 12th year of the reign of Artaxerxes. The subscription to the Alexandrian version states that the epistle regarding the feast of Purim was brought by Dositheus into Egypt, under Ptolemy and Cleopatra (B.C. cir. 160); but it is well known that these subscriptions are of little authority. The authors of the Talmud say that it was written by the members of the Great Synagogue (q. v.), who also wrote Ezekiel and the twelve Prophets. But the whole account of the Great Synagogue, said to have been instituted by Ezra, and concluded by Simon the Just, who is said to have closed the canon, and whose death took place B.C. 292, is by some looked upon as a rabbinical romance. Of all these suppositions, the ascription to Mordecai seems the most probable. The minute details given of the great banquet, of the names of the chamberlains and eunuchs, and Haman's wife and sons, and of the customs and regulations of the palace, betoken that the author lived at Shushan, and probably at court, while his no less intimate acquaintance with the private affairs both of Esther and Mordecai well suits the hypothesis of the latter being himself the writer. It is also in itself probable that as Daniel, Ezra, and Nehemiah, who held high offices under the Persian kings, wrote an account of the affairs of the nation, in which they took a leading part, so Mordecai should have recorded the transactions of the book of Esther likewise. The termination of the book with the mention of Mordecai's elevation and government agrees also with this view, which has the further sanction of many great names, as Aben Ezra, and most of the Jews, Vat. Abr., Carpov, and many others. Those who ascribe it to Ezra, or the men of the Great Synagogue, may have merely meant that Ezra edited and added it to the canon of Scripture, which he probably did, bringing it, and perhaps the book of Daniel, with him from Babylon to Jerusalem. See MORDECAI.

That the book was written after the downfall of the Persian monarchy in the time of the Maccabees is the conclusion of Bertholdt, De Wette, and Bleek. The reasons, however, which they assign for this are very feeble, and have been thoroughly nullified by Hävernick. The latter supposes it to have been written at a much earlier date, and the reasons he urges for this are—1. The statement in ix, 52, compared with x, 2, where the author places what he himself has written on a par in point of authenticity with what is recorded in the Persian annals, as if contemporary productions; 2. The vividness, accuracy, and minuteness of his details respecting the Persian court; 3. The language of the book, as presenting, with some Persianisms, and some words of Chaldaic affinity, which do not occur in older Hebrew (such as מִצְרַיִם, מִצְרַיִת, מִצְרַיִת, מִצְרַיִת, מִצְרַיִת, מִצְרַיִת), those idioms which characterize the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles; and, 4. The fact that the closing of the canon cannot be placed later than the reign of Artaxerxes, so that an earlier date must be assigned to this book, which is included in it. See EZRA. Whether the book was written in Palestine or in Persia is uncertain, but probability inclines to the latter supposition.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

VI. *Commentaries.*—The following are separate exegetical works on the canonical portion of the book of Esther, in addition to the formal *Introductions* to that portion of Scripture, and exclusive of the purely rabbinical treatises on the Jewish usages referred to in the book; the most important have an asterisk (\*) prefixed: Raban Maurus, *Commentarij* (in *Opp.*); Arama, מִצְרַיִת (Constantinople, 1518, 4to); Bañolas, מִצְרַיִת

(Riva di Trento, 1560, 4to); Strigel, *Scholía* (Lips. 1571, 1572, 8vo); Brentius, *Commentarii* (Tubing. 1575, 4to; in Engl. by Stockwood, Lond. 1584, 8vo); Askenazi, *מִשְׁנֵי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ* (Cremona, 1576, 4to, etc.); Fear-  
dent, *Commentaria* (Par. 1585, 8vo, etc.); Melammed, *מִשְׁנֵי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ* (Constantpl. 1585, 4to); \*Drusius, *Annotaciones* (Leyd. 1586, 8vo); \*Senarius, *Commentarii* (Mogunt. 1590, fol., etc.); Zahalon, *מִשְׁנֵי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ* (Ven. 1594, 4to); Alsheich, *מִשְׁנֵי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ* (Ven. 1601, 4to); Cooper, *Notes* (London, 1609, 4to); D'Acquino, *Ruschi Scholia* (Par. 1622, 4to); Wolder, *Dispositiones* (Dantz. 1625, 4to); \*Sanctius, *Commentarii* (Leyd. 1628, fol.); Conzio, *Commento* (Chiari, 1628, 4to); Duran, *מִשְׁנֵי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ* (Ven. 1632, 4to); Crommius, *Theses* (Lovan. 1632, 4to); Merkel, *מִשְׁנֵי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ* (Lublin, 1637, 4to); \*Bonnat, *Commentarius* (Col. Agr. 1647, fol.); Montanus, *Commentarius* (Madr. 1648, fol.); Trapp, *Commentary* (London, 1656, fol.); De Celada, *Commentarii* (Lugd. 1658, fol.); Jackson, *Explanation* (London, 1658, 4to); Barnes, *Paraphrasis poetica* (Lond. 1679, 8vo); Adam, *Observaciones* (Groningen, 1710, 4to); Rambach, *Nota* (in his *Adnot. V. T. ii, 1043*); Heumann, *Estheræ auctoritas* (Gotting. 1736, 4to); Meir, *מִשְׁנֵי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ* (Fürth, 1737, 8vo); Nestorides, *Annotazioni* (Ven. 1746, 4to); Ancher, *De auctoritate Estheræ* (Havn. 1772, 4to); Crusius, *Nützl. Gebrauch der B. Esther* (from the Latin, Lpz. 1773, 4to); \*Vos, *Oratio* (Ultr. 1775, 4to); Zinck, *Commentarius* (Augsb. 1780, 4to); De Rossi, *Var. Lect.* (Rome, 1782, 8vo); Pereles, *מִשְׁנֵי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ* (Prague, 1784, 4to); Wolfsohn, *מִשְׁנֵי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ* (Berl. 1788, 8vo); Lamson, *Discourses* (Edinb. 1804, 12mo); Löwe, *מִשְׁנֵי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ* (Noydwor, 1801, 4to); \*Schirmer, *Observaciones* (Vratislav. 1820, 8vo); \*Kele, *Vinilize* (Freib. 1820, 4to); \*Calmborg, *Commentarius* (Hamb. 1837, 4to); \*M'Crie, *Lectures* (Works, 1838, 8vo); \*Baumgarten, *De fide Estheræ* (Hal. 1839, 8vo); Morgan, *Esther typical* (London, 1855, 8vo); Crosthwaite, *Lectures* (London, 1858, 12mo); Davidson, *Lectures* (Edinb. 1859, 8vo); \*Bertheau (in the *Kurzgef. evang. Handb.* Lpz. 1862, 8vo); Oppert, *Commentaire d'après les inscriptions Perses* (Par. 1864, 8vo). See OLD TESTAMENT.

ESTHER, APOCRYPHAL ADDITIONS TO THE *Book of*.—Besides the many minor deviations from the Hebrew, there are six important additions in the Septuagint and the other ancient versions of the book of Esther.

1. *Title and Position*.—In the Sept. and the *Old Latin* these additions are dispersed through the canonical book, forming therewith a well-adjusted whole, and have therefore no separate title. St. Jerome, however, separated them in his translation, and removed them to the end of the book, because they are not found in the Hebrew. They are, therefore, in this position in the MSS. and the printed editions of the Vulgate, and form, according to cardinal Hugo's division, the last seven chapters of the canonical Esther. Luther, who was the first that separated the apocryphal from the canonical books, entirely detached these additions, and placed them among the Apocrypha under the title "*Stücke in Esther*." In the Zurich Bible, where the apocryphal and canonical books are also separated, the canonical volume is called 1 *Esther*, and these additions are denominated 2 *Esther*. Our English versions, though following Luther's arrangements, are not uniform in their designation of these additions. Thus Coverdale calls them "*The chapters of the book of Hester, which are not found in the text of the Hebrew, but in the Greek and Latin*." In Matthews and the Bishops' Bible, which are followed by the A. V., they are entitled, "*The rest of the chapters of the book of Esther, which are found neither in the Hebrew nor in the Chaldee*," whilst the Geneva version adopts Luther's title.

The reason of their present confused arrangement seems to be this: When Jerome translated the book

of Esther, he first gave the version of the Hebrew only as being alone authentic. He then added at the end a version in Latin of those several passages which he found in the Sept., and which were not in the Hebrew, stating where each passage came in, and marking them all with an obelus. The first passage so given is that which forms the continuation of ch. x (which of course immediately precedes it), ending with the entry about Dositheus. Having annexed this conclusion, he then gives the *Proœmium*, which he says forms the beginning of the Greek Vulgate, beginning with what is now ver. 2 of ch. xi; and so proceeds with the other passages. But in subsequent editions all Jerome's explanatory matter has been swept away, and the disjointed portions have been printed as ch. xi, xii, xiii, xiv, xv, xvi, as if they formed a narrative in continuance of the canonical book. The extreme absurdity of this arrangement is nowhere more apparent than in ch. xi, where the verse (1) which closes the whole book in the Greek copies, and in St. Jerome's Latin translation, is actually made immediately to precede that (ver. 2) which is the very first verse of the *Proœmium*. As regards the place assigned to Esther in the printed Sept., in the Vatican edition (not MS.), and most others, it comes between Judith and Job. Its place before Job is a remnant of the Hebrew order, Esther there closing the historical, and Job beginning the metrical *Megilloth*. Tobit and Judith have been placed between it and Nehemiah, doubtless for chronological reasons. But in the ancient MSS. the position is different. See BIBLE.

II. *Design and Contents*.—The object of these additions is to give a more decidedly religious tone to the record contained in the book of Esther, and to show more plainly how wonderfully the God of Israel interposed to save his people and confound their enemies. This the writer has effected by elaborating upon the events narrated in the canonical volume as follows:

1. Ch. i, 1 of the canonical volume is preceded in the Sept. by a piece which tells us that Mordecai, who was in the service of Artaxerxes, dreamt of the dangers which threatened his people, and of their deliverance (ver. 1-12). He afterwards discovered a conspiracy against the king, which he discloses to him, and is greatly rewarded for it (ver. 13-18). This is, in the Vulgate and Eng. version, ch. xi, 2-xii, 6.

2. Between ver. 13 and 14 of ch. iii in the canonical book, the Septuagint gives a copy of the king's edict addressed to all the satraps, to destroy without compassion that foreign and rebellious people, the Jews, for the good of the Persian nation, in the fourteenth day of the twelfth month of the coming year. This is, in the Vulg. and Eng. version, ch. xiii, 1-7.

3. At the end of ch. iv, 17 of the canonical book, the Sept. has two prayers of Mordecai and Esther, that God may avert the impending destruction of his people. This is, in the Vulg. and Eng. version, ch. xiii, 8-xiv, 19.

4. Between ver. 1 and 2 of ch. v in the canonical book, the Sept. inserts a detailed account of Esther's visit to the king. This is, in the Vulg. and Eng. version, ch. xv, 1-16.

5. Between ver. 13 and 14 of ch. viii in the canonical books, the Sept. gives a copy of the edict, which the king sent to all his satraps, in accordance with the request of Mordecai and Esther, to abolish his former decree against the Jews. This is, in the Vulg. and Eng. version, ch. xvi, 1-24.

6. At the close of the canonical book, ch. x, 3, the Sept. has a piece in which we are told that Mordecai had now recalled to his mind his extraordinary dream, and seen how literally it had been fulfilled in all its particulars. It also gives us an account of the proclamation of the Purim festival in Egypt.

The whole book is closed with the following entry: "In the fourth year of the reign of Ptolemaeus and Cleopatra, Dositheus, who said he was a priest and

Levite, and Ptolemy his son, brought this epistle of Phurim, which they said was the same, and that Ly-simachus, the son of Ptolemy, that was in Jerusalem, had interpreted it." This entry was apparently intended to give authority to this Greek version of ESTHER by pretending that it was a certified translation from the Hebrew original. Ptolemy Philometor, who is here meant, began to reign B.C. 181. He is the same as is frequently mentioned in 1 Macc. (e. g. x, 57; xi, 12; comp. Joseph. *Ant.* xiii, 4, 1 and 5, and Clinton, *F. H.* iii, 393). Dositheus seems to be a Greek version of Mattithiah; Ptolemy was also a common name for Jews at that time.

III. *Origin, historical Character, and Unity.*—The patriotic spirit with which the Jewish nation so fondly expatiated upon the remarkable events and characters of by-gone days, and which gave rise to those beautiful legends preserved in their copious literature, scarcely ever had a better opportunity afforded to it for employing its richly inventive powers to magnify the great Jehovah, embalm the memory of the heroes, and brand the names of the enemies of Israel, than in the canonical book of Esther. Nothing could be more natural for a nation who "have a zeal of God" than to supply the name of God, and to print out more distinctly his interposition in their behalf in an inspired book, which, though recording their marvellous escape from destruction, had for some reasons omitted avowedly to acknowledge the Lord of Israel. Besides, the book implies and suggests far more than it records, and it cannot be doubted that there are many other things connected with the history it contains which were well known at the time, and were transmitted to the nation. This is evident from the fact that Josephus (*Ant.* xi, 6, 6 sq.) gives the edict for the destruction of the Jews in the Persian empire, the prayers of Mordecai and Esther, and the second edict authorizing the Jews to destroy their enemies, also mentioning the name of the eunuch's servant, a Jew, who betrayed the conspiracy to Mordecai, and citing other passages from the Persian chronicles read to Ahasuerus, besides that relating to Mordecai, and amplifications of the king's speech to Haman, etc.; and that the second Targum, the Chaldee, published by De Rossi, and Josippon ben-Gorion (ed. Breithaupt, p. 74 sq.), give the dream of Mordecai, as well as his prayer and that of Esther.

The first addition which heads the canonical book, and in which Mordecai foresees in a dream both the dangers and the salvation of his people, is in accordance with the desire to give the whole a more religious tone. The second addition originated from the fact that ch. iii, 13 of the canonical book speaks of the royal edict, hence this piece pretends to give a copy of the said document; the same is the case with the third addition, which follows ch. iv, 17, and gives the prayers of Mordecai and Esther, for the said passage in the canonical volume relates that Esther ordered prayers to be offered. The fourth addition after ch. v, 1, giving a detailed account of Esther's interview with the king, originated from a desire to give more information upon the fact, which is simply alluded to in the canonical passage. The fifth addition, after ch. viii, 13, originated in the same manner as the second, viz. in a desire to supply a copy of the royal edict, while the sixth addition, after ch. x, 3, beautifully concludes with an interpretation of the dream with which the first addition commences the canonical volume. From this analysis it will be seen that these supplementary and embellishing additions are systematically dispersed through the book, and form a well-adjusted and continuous history. In the Vulgate, however, which is followed by the versions of the Reformers on the Continent and our English translations, where these additions are torn out of the proper connection and removed to a separate place, they are most incomprehensible.

IV. *Author, Date, and original Language.*—From

what has been remarked in the foregoing section, it will at once be apparent that these apocryphal additions were neither manufactured by the translator of the canonical Esther into Greek, nor are they the production of the Alexandrian nor of any other school or individual, but embody some of the numerous national stories connected with this marvellous deliverance of God's ancient people, the authorship of which is lost in the nation. Many of them date as far back as the nucleus of the event itself, around which they cluster, and all of them grew up at first in the vernacular language of the people (i. e. in Hebrew or Aramaic), but afterwards assumed the complexion and language of the countries in which the Jews happened to settle down. Besides the references given in the preceding section which lead us to these conclusions, we also refer to the two Midrashim published by Jelinek in his *Beth Ha-Midrash*, i (Lpz. 1853), 1 sq. In ch. iii the pretended copy of Artaxerxes's decree for the destruction of the Jews is written in thorough Greek style; the prayer of Esther excuses her for being wife to the uncircumcised king, and denies her having eaten anything or drunk wine at the table of Haman; the pretended copy of Artaxerxes's letter for reversing the previous decree is also of manifestly Greek origin in ch. viii, in which Haman is called a Macedonian, and is accused of having plotted to transfer the empire from the Persians to the Macedonians, a palpable proof of this portion having been composed after the overthrow of the Persian empire by the Greeks.

V. *Canonicity of these Additions.*—It is of this Sept. version that Athanasius (*Fest. Epist.* p. 39, Oxf. translation) spoke when he ascribed the book of Esther to the non-canonical books; and this, also, is perhaps the reason why, in some of the lists of the canonical books, Esther is not named, as, e. g. in those of Melito of Sardis and Gregory Nazianzen (see Whitaker, *Disput. on H. Scr.* Park. Soc. p. 57, 58; Cosin in the *Canon of Scr.* p. 49, 50), unless in these it is included under some other book, as Ruth or Esdras ("this book of Esther, or sixth of Esdras, as it is placed in some of the most ancient copies of the Vulgate," *Lee's Dissert. on 2d Esdras*, p. 25). The fathers, who regarded the Septuagint as containing the sacred scriptures of the O. T., believed in the canonicity of these additions. Even Origen, though admitting that they are not in the Hebrew, defended their canonicity (*Ep. ad African.* ed. West, p. 225), and the Council of Trent pronounced the whole book of Esther, with all its parts, to be canonical. These additions, however, were never included in the Hebrew canon, and the fact that Josephus quotes them only shows that he believed them to be historically true, but not inspired. St. Jerome, who knew better than any other father what the ancient Jews included in their canon, most emphatically declares them to be spurious ("Librum Esther variis translatoribus constat esse vitiatum; quem ego de archivis Hebræorum relevans, verbum e verbo expressis transtuli. Quem librum editio vulgata laciniis hinc inde verborum sinibus [al. funibus] trahit, addens ea quæ ex tempore dici poterant et audiri; sicut solum est scholaribus disciplinis sumto themate excogitare, quibus verbis uti potuit, qui injuriam passus est, vel qui injuriam fecit," *Pref. in 1 Esth.*). Sixtus Senensis, in spite of the decision of the council, speaks of these additions after the example of Jerome (as "laciniis hinc inde quorundam scriptorum temeritate insertas"), and thinks that they are chiefly derived from Josephus; but this last opinion is without probability. The manner and the order in which Josephus cites them (*Ant.* xi, vi) show that they had already, in his days, obtained currency among the Hellenistic Jews as portions of the book of Esther, as we know from the way in which he cites other apocryphal books that they were current likewise, with others which are now lost; for it was probably from such that Josephus derived his stories about Moses, about Sanballat, and the



temple on Mount Gerizim, and the meeting of the high-priest and Alexander the Great.

VI. *Literature*.—Josephus, *Ant.* xi, 6, 6 sq.; the *Mid-rash Esther*; Targum *Sheni* on Esther, in Walton's *Polyglot*, vol. iv.; Josippon ben-Gorion (ed. Breithaupt, 1740), p. 72 sq.; Whitaker, *Disputation on Scripture* (Park. Soc., ed. 1849), p. 71, etc.; Usher, *Synagoga de Græca LXX interpretum versione* (London, 1655); De Rossi, *Specimen Variarum Lectionum sacri Textus et Chaldaica Estheris Additamenta* (Romæ, 1782); Eichhorn, *Einleitung in d. Apokr. Schriften d. A. T.* (Leip. 1795), p. 483 sq.; Fritzsche, *Ἐσθήρ, Duplex libri textum ad optimos cdd. emend. et cum selecta lectionis varietate* (ed. Torici, 1848); and by the same author, *Exegetisches Handbuch z. d. Apokr. d. A. T.* i, 69 sq.; Davidson, *The Text of the O. T. considered* (Lond. 1856), p. 1010 sq.; Herzfeld, *Geschichte d. Volkes Israel*, vol. i (Nordhausen, 1857), p. 365 sq.; Keil, *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung*, etc. (ed. 1859), p. 705 sq.; Wolf's *Bibl. Hebr.* p. 11, 88 sq.; Hotting, *Thesaur.* p. 494; Walton, *Proleg.* ix, § 13; Nickes, *De Esther libro* (Rom. 1857, 1858); Baumgarten, *De Fide Lib. Esther* (Hal. 1839); Schaurer (ed.), *Var. Lect. Estheris* (2d ed. Tubing. 1788).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See APOCRYPHA.

ESTHER, FAST OF (אֶסְתֵּר וְיָמֵי צוּמָה), so called from the fact that it was ordered by Esther to avert the impending destruction which at that time threatened the whole Jewish population of the Persian dominions (comp. Esther iv, 16, 17). The Jews to this day keep this fast on the 13th of Adar, the day which was appointed for their extirpation, and which precedes the *feast of Purim*, because it was ordained both by Esther and Mordecai, that it should continue a national fast, to be observed annually in commemoration of that eventful day (comp. Esther ix, 31). During the Maccabæan period, and for some time afterwards, this fast was temporarily superseded by a festival which was instituted to celebrate the anniversary of the victory obtained by Judas Maccabæus over Nicanor on the 13th of Adar (comp. 1 Macc. vii, 49; Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 10, 5; *Megillath Taanith*, c. xii; Josippon ben-Gorion, iii, 22, p. 244, ed. Breithaupt). But this festival has long since ceased to be celebrated, and as early as the ninth century of the Christian era we find that the *fast of Esther* was again duly observed (comp. *Sheelthoth* of R. Achai, Purim 4), and it has continued ever since to be one of the fasts in the Jewish calendar. The Jews entirely abstain from eating and drinking on this day, and introduce into the daily service penitential psalms, and offer prayers which have been composed especially for this occasion. If the 13th of Adar happens to be on a Sabbath, this fast is kept on the Friday, because fasting is not allowed on the Sabbath day. Some Jews go so far as to fast *three days*, according to the example of Esther (comp. iv, 6).—Kitto, s. v. See CALENDAR, JEWISII.

Estienne. See STEPHENS.

Estius, GULIELMUS (*William Hessels van Est*), an eminent Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Gorcum, Holland, 1542, and studied at Utrecht and Louvain. He was for ten years professor at Louvain; in 1580 he became professor of divinity at Douai, and in 1603 chancellor of the University. Estius obtained great repute for learning and piety. Benedict XIV named him *doctor fœdatusissimus*. He died at Douai Sept. 20, 1613. His principal writings are *Commentarii in Epistolas Apostolicas* (Douai, 1614–16; Col. 1631, 3 vols. fol. in 1; Paris, 1679, fol.; Rouen, 1709, 2 vols. fol.);—*In quat. libros sententiarum commentarii* (Par. 1638, fol.; Naples, 1720);—*Annot. in præcipua difficultiora S. S.* (Antw. 1621, fol.). His Commentary on the Epistles is extolled alike by Romanists and Protestants. There is a new edition, edited by Sausen (Mayence, 1841, 8vo).—Horne, *Introd. Bib. Appendix*, p. 134; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiv, 588.

Estrangelo. See SYRIAC LANGUAGE.

E'tam (Hebrew *Eytam'*, עֵיטָם, *eyrie*, i. e. place of ravenous birds; Sept. Ἐτάμ in Judges, Αἰτάμ in 1 Chron. iv, 3, elsewhere Αἰτάρ; Josephus Αἰτάρ in *Ant.* v, 8, 8; Ἐτάμ in *Ant.* viii, 10, 1; Ἡτάμ in *Ant.* viii, 7, 3; Vulg. *Etam*), the name apparently of two places in Palestine.

1. A village (עֵיטָם) of the tribe of Simeon, specified only in the list in 1 Chron. iv, 32 (comp. Josh. xix, 7); but that it is intentionally introduced appears from the fact that the number of places is summed as five, though in the parallel list as four. Near this place (hence its name, q. d. eagle's nest) was probably situated a "rock" (עֵיטָם, *πίτρα*, *silva*) or cliff, into a cleft or chasm (עֵיטָם, A. V. "top") of which Samson retired after his slaughter of the Philistines, in revenge for their burning the Timnite woman who was to have been his wife (Judg. xv, 8, 11). This natural stronghold (πίτρα δ' ἱστὴν ἔχουσα, Josephus, *Ant.* v, 8, 8) was in the territory usually assigned to the tribe of Judah, yet not far from the Philistine border; and near it, probably at its foot, was Lchi or Ramath-Jehi, and En-hak-kore (xv, 9, 14, 17, 19). As Van de Velde has, with great probability, identified Lchi with Leiyich, on the edge of the Philistine plain S. E. of Gaza (*Narrative*, ii, 141), he is probably also right in locating this Etam at *tell Kheuefjeh*, a little north of it (*Memoir*, p. 311), in the immediate vicinity of tell Hara or En-hakkore (q. v.). Schwarz's location of Etam at *Khadna* (he says *Gutna*, i. e. Utma, *Palest.* p. 124) is without support.

2. A city in the tribe of Judah, fortified and garrisoned by Rehoboam (2 Chron. xi, 6). From its position in this list we may conclude that it was near Bethlehem and Tekoah; and in accordance with this is the mention of the name among the ten cities which the Sept. insert in the text of Josh. xv, 60, "Theco and Ephrath, which is Bethleem, Phagor and *Etan* (Αἰτάρ)," etc. Here, according to the statements of the Talmudists, were the sources of the water from which Solomon's gardens and pleasure-grounds were fed, and Bethlehem and the Temple supplied. (See Lightfoot, on *John* v.) Hence we may perhaps infer that the site was identical with that of Solomon's Pools at *El-Euruk*, near Bethlehem (see Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 268). See JERUSALEM; WATER. Josephus (*Ant.* viii, 7, 3) places it at fifty stadia (in some copies sixty) from Jerusalem (southward), and alleges that Solomon was in the habit of taking a morning drive to this favored spot in his chariot. It is thus probable that this was the site of one of Solomon's houses of pleasure, where he made him gardens and orchards, and pools of water (Ecl. ii, 5, 6). The same name occurs in the lists of Judah's descendants (1 Chron. iv, 3), but probably referring to the same place, Bethlehem being mentioned in the following verse. See JEZREEL 3. Dr. Robinson (*Researches*, i, 515; ii, 168) inclines to find Etam at a place about a mile and a half south of Bethlehem, where there is a ruined village called *Urtas*, at the bottom of a pleasant valley of the same name. Here there are traces of ancient ruins, and also a fountain, sending forth a copious supply of fine water, which forms a beautiful purling rill along the bottom of the valley. This location is in accordance with all the foregoing notices, and is adjacent to Solomon's Pools (Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 431). Williams (*Holy City*, ii, 500) fully accredits the above Rabbinical account, and also states that the old name is perpetuated in a *wady Etam*, which is on the way to Hebron from Jerusalem, and that there are still connected with it the largest and most luxuriant gardens to be met with in the hilly region of Judea.

Eternal is in general the rendering in the A. V. of the Heb. עוֹלָם, *olam'*, and the Greek αἰών or αἰώνιος (both frequently "everlasting," "ever," etc.),

besides occasionally of  $\text{קֶדֶם}$ , *ke'dem* (strictly *early*, of *yore*, referring to the past, Deut. xxxiii, 27, elsewhere "ancient," "of old," etc.), and  $\text{אֵלְעוֹלָם}$  (Rom. i, 20; "everlasting," Jude 6), which is kindred in etymology and import with  $\text{αἰώνιος}$ . Both  $\text{קֶדֶם}$  and  $\text{אֵלְעוֹלָם}$  are properly represented by "eternal," inasmuch as they usually refer to indefinite time *past* as well as *future*. The former is from the root  $\text{קִדַּם}$ , *to hide*, and thus strictly designates the occult time of the past, q. d. "time out of mind," or time immemorial (Psa. cxxix, 24; Jer. vi, 16; xviii, 15; Job xxii, 15; Amos ix, 11; Deut. xxxii, 7; Prov. xxii, 28; Psa. xxiv, 7; cxliii, 3; Ezek. xxvi, 20), but not necessarily remote antiquity (Psa. cxxxix, 24; Job xxii, 15; Jer. vi, 16; xviii, 15; Dan. ix, 24; and especially Isa. lviii, 12; lxi, 4). Prospectively it denotes an indefinite time to come, *forever*, i. e. relatively, e. g. to an individual life (Deut. xv, 17; Exod. xxi, 6; 1 Sam. xxvii, 12, etc.), that of a race (1 Sam. ii, 20; xiii, 12; 2 Sam. vii, 16; 1 Chron. xvii, 12, etc.), or of the present constitution of the universe (Eccles. i, 4; Psa. civ, 5; lxxviii, 69, etc.); or absolutely (Gen. xvii, 7; xvii, 8; Exod. xii, 14; Jer. li, 39; Eccles. xii, 5, etc.). Yet that the nature of the subject is to apply the only limitation is shown by the fact that while the term is used of God in the widest sense, both of the past and future (Gen. xxi, 33; Isa. xl, 28; Dan. xii, 7), it is also employed hyperbolically or poetically of a "good long period" (Isa. xxx, 14, 15), especially in salutations and invocations (1 Kings i, 31; Neh. ii, 3). In all these significations and applications it is often used in the plural ( $\text{קֶדֶמֶת}$ ), whether past (Isa. li, 9; Dan. ix, 24; Eccles. i, 10) or future (Psa. lxi, 5; lxxvii, 6, etc.), and this sometimes in a reduplicated form, like "ages of ages" ( $\text{אֵלְעוֹלָם}$ ). Peculiar is the Rabbinical usage (Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* col. 1620) for the *world* (so Greek  $\text{αἰών}$ ), but only in Eccles. iii, 11.—Gesenius's and Fürst's *Heb. Lex.* s. v.; Hommel, *De vi vocis קֶדֶם* (Wittemb. 1795).

The Greek term  $\text{αἰών}$  remarkably corresponds to the Hebrew  $\text{קֶדֶם}$  in nearly all these senses, and is its usual rendering in the Sept. It is derived from  $\text{אָו}$ , *āw*, *to breathe*, or directly from the adverb  $\text{אֵי}$  (originally  $\text{אֵי}$ ), *always* (itself an old dative from an obsolete noun  $\text{אֵיָה$  or  $\text{אֵיוֹן}$  = Lat. *ævum*, probably derived from  $\text{אָו}$ , and the same in root with the English *ever*, and also, perhaps, *age*), with the *locative* termination  $\text{-וֹן}$  appended to the root. The adjective  $\text{αἰώνιος}$ , with which we are here more directly concerned, follows most of the shades of meaning and appropriations of the primitive. Its general import is *enduring*, *perpetual*. In the N. T. it is spoken of the past in a restricted manner, in the sense of ancient or primeval (Rom. xvi, 25; 2 Tim. i, 9; Titus i, 2); or of the past and future absolutely (Rom. xvi, 26; Heb. ix, 14); elsewhere of the future, in an unlimited sense, *endless* (2 Cor. iv, 18; v, 1; Luke xvi, 9; Heb. xiii, 20; ix, 12; Rev. xiv, 6; 1 Tim. vi, 16; Philem. 15), as of the prospect of Christ's kingdom (2 Pet. i, 11), but especially of the happy future of the saints in heaven (particularly in the phrase "life everlasting," Matt. xix, 16, 29; xxv, 46, and often), or the miserable fate of the wicked in hell (e. g. as punishment, Matt. xxv, 46; condemnation, Mark iii, 29; judgment, Heb. vi, 2; destruction, 2 Thess. i, 9, or fire, Matt. xviii, 8; xxv, 41; Jude 7).—Robinson, *Lex. of the N. T.* s. v.; Leavitt, in the *Christian Month. Spect.* ix, 617; Goodwin, in the *Chris. Exam-iner*, ix, 20; x, 34, 166; xii, 97, 169; Stuart, in the *Spirit of the Pilgrims*, ii, 405; Creuer, *Wörterbuch d. N. T. Gräcität*, p. 46.

**Eternal Life** ( $\text{ζωὴ αἰώνιος}$ ). I. *Biblical Usage of the Terms*.—1. In the O. T. we find this expression occurring only in Dan. xii, 2: *Some shall awaken*  $\text{קִיְּוֹנוֹתֵיכֶם}$ , Sept. *εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον*, the others  $\text{קִיְּוֹנוֹתֵיכֶם}$ .

For the first indication on this point, Lev. xviii, 5; Ezek. xx, 11; xviii, 21; Habak. ii, 4 (comp. Gal. iii, 11, 12); Psa. xxxiv, 13 (comp. 1 Pet. iii, 10) are to be referred to.

2. In the N. T. it is of frequent occurrence. In the first three evangelists we find  $\text{ζωὴ αἰώνιος}$  (eternal life), or sometimes only  $\text{ζωὴ}$  (life), represented as the object and destiny of man, e. g. Matt. vii, 14; xviii, 8, 9; Luke x, 28; comp. ver. 25, and xviii, 18. The resurrection of the dead precedes it (Luke xiv, 14). It therefore comprises the whole future of the disciple of Christ, his full reward; and the idea is thus connected with that of felicity ( $\text{μισθὸς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς}$ , *reward in heaven*, Matt. v, 12; reception into the  $\text{αἰώνια σκηναί}$ , *everlasting habitations*, Luke xvi, 9). In Matt. xix, 29; xxv, 46, we find it opposed to  $\text{κόλασις αἰώνιος}$  (*eternal punishment*). Paul considers the  $\text{ζωὴ αἰώνιος}$  as the supreme reward of well-doing (Rom. ii, 7; 1 Tim. vi, 12, 19), the result of continually walking in the holiness secured to us by Christ; the  $\text{τέλος}$  (Rom. vi, 22), the reward (Gal. vi, 8), as also the object of our faith (1 Tim. i, 16), and of saving grace (Rom. v, 21), and consequently also the object of our hopes (Tit. i, 2; iii, 7; comp. Jude 21). It appears synonymous with the  $\text{ἐπαγγελία ζωῆς τῆς μελλούσης}$  (promise of the life to come) (1 Tim. iv, 8), the receiving of the incorruptible crown of righteousness (1 Cor. ix, 25; 2 Tim. iv, 8), the preservation into the heavenly kingdom (2 Tim. iv, 18). By Peter it is described as the  $\text{κληρονομία}$ , which consists in the  $\text{σωτηρία ψυχῆς}$ , revealed as  $\text{ἐὸς ἄ}$ , and retained in heaven (1 Pet. i, 4, 9; v, 1, 10). James considers it as the promised crown of life and inheritance of the kingdom (Jas. i, 12; ii, 5). In the epistle to the Hebrews it is described as the Sabbath of the people of God (iv, 9; compare xii, 22 sq., etc.). While, however, life everlasting thus belongs to the future, we must not forget that, according to Paul's exposition, it appears in its essence indissolubly connected with our present life. As our relation to God, as altered by sin, can but lead to death, so in the restoration of the original relation there must necessarily, and, indeed, as an ethical religious principle, be  $\text{ζωὴ}$  (life) presented in the  $\text{δικαιοσύνη}$ , *righteousness* (Rom. v, 21; viii, 10; Gal. iii, 21); so that  $\text{δικαιοσύνη}$ , in its connection with  $\text{ζωὴ}$  (Rom. v, 18,  $\text{δικαίωσις ζωῆς}$ , *justification of life*), constitutes the very essence of the  $\text{σωτηρία}$  (*salvation*) imputed to the subject, even though in the Judaic epistles of the apostle the  $\text{ζωὴ}$  itself is dwelt upon more than the fundamental idea of the  $\text{δικαιοσύνη}$ . Christ is  $\text{ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν}$  (*our life*); though yet concealed (Col. iii, 3, 4; Phil. i, 21; Gal. ii, 20; Eph. iii, 17; 1 Cor. xv, 45), he is found in us (Gal. iv, 19); we have put him on, and become parts of his body (Eph. v, 30; Gal. iii, 27; Col. i, 18, etc.). From this it results that his life of glory must also become ours, which idea is presented to us in various ways (Rom. vi, 8; 2 Tim. ii, 11, 12; Rom. v, 17, 21; viii, 30; Eph. ii, 5, 6). The Spirit gives also the  $\text{πνεῦμα ζωῆς}$  (*Spirit of life*), as the element of new life (Rom. viii, 2; comp. 2 Cor. iii, 17), the foundation of that life which overcomes that which is mortal (2 Cor. v, 4, 5; Eph. i, 14); our mortal body is by it made alive (Rom. viii, 11); its results are peace and life (Rom. viii, 6, 10, 13). In this respect eternal life is the "gift of God in Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. vi, 23). As  $\text{λόγος ζωῆς}$  (the word of life) (Phil. ii, 16), Christ has destroyed death, and brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel (2 Tim. i, 10).

Aside from this evident connection between eternal life and the newness of life of the Christian derived from Christ (Rom. vi, 4), the  $\text{ζωὴ αἰώνιος}$  (eternal life) is still always considered in Paul's writings as posterior to the casting off of the mortal body, and the exchange of the corruptible for the incorruptible. The consequences of these premises in their full development are first presented to us, however, in the epistles

of John. Here we find the most important principle for the subjective aspect of Christianity: ὁ πισθίων εἰς τὸν υἱὸν ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον (he that believeth on the Son hath eternal life) (John iii, 36; iii, 15, 16; v, 24; vi, 47, 53-58; x, 28; xvii, 2, 3; xx, 31; 1 John v, 12, 13). Having passed from death unto life, death has no longer dominion over him (John v, 24), and he is free from the law and from the anger of God; he becomes partaker of the fulness of salvation. On the contrary, those who do not hearken to the Son have not life, neither shall they see it, but the anger of God abides with them. Thus, while Paul distinguishes between the actual state of grace, with its accompanying hope on the one hand, and the future attainment of the object of our hope, John unites these in his conception of eternal life, and thus uses the expressions ζωὴ αἰώνιος (eternal life) and ζωὴ (life), which stand in the relation of form and contents, indifferently with or without the article (John iii, 36; v, 24; 1 John iii, 14, 15; v, 11, 12, 13, etc.). The life of the faithful on this earth is inseparably connected with their eternal life, from the fact of their absolute deliverance from the sentence of death resulting from a state of estrangement from God (John vi, 53). It is a result of the birth of the Spirit (John iii; comp. v, 21; 1 John i, 5; John iii, 36). See also John iv, 14; v, 28; vi, 40; xvii, 24; 1 John iii, 2.

This eternal life, with its divine cause and its victorious power, finds its ground in the communion of life with Christ, which is the result of faith. For while God as the absolute being is He whose life is "of himself" (John vi, 57), and is Himself "eternal life" (1 John v, 20), the source of all life, yet the communication of life to the world, i. e. to mankind, has from the beginning, even before time began (John viii, 56), been irrevocably vested in the Son. He is the λόγος (word) as well in his relation to God as in his relation to the world. He has received the fulness of divine life from the Father in such a manner that it belongs to him as thoroughly his (John v, 26; 1 John v, 11). Now, inasmuch as the Logos became flesh, the eternal life, which was of God, became manifested in him. It is, in the next place, the revealed light of life. Christ, in his relation to the world, is therefore as well ὁ λόγος τῆς ζωῆς as ἡ ζωὴ (1 John i, 1, 2; John i, 3, 4; vi, 53 sq.; xiv, 6); in one word, the really sole source of life, the universal principle of life in the world, both spiritual and material (John v, 21-29; x, 9, 28; xi, 25; xiv, 19; vi, 27, 35, 39, 63; vii, 38, 39). From this it is easily seen how eternal life is designated in the N. T. as the command of the Father, the knowledge of God and of Christ, or also as the commandment of Christ (John xii, 50; comp. viii, 51; xvii, 3; 1 John ii, 25; iii, 14, 15; comp. John xii, 25).

Confirmations of this view, by which the ζωὴ comes to occupy the first place in the plan of salvation in Christ, are to be found in numerous passages of the N. T. Christ is represented as the ever-living (Rev. i, 18), the ἀρχηγός τῆς ζωῆς (Acts iii, 15), the κύριος ζωῆς, by virtue of whom those who follow him become λίθοι ζώντες, living stones (1 Pet. ii, 4, 5). In 1 Pet. iii, 7 (comp. iv, 6) we read of a κληρονομία χάριτος ζωῆς, and in the apocalyptic description of the heavenly Jerusalem we still read of a ποταμὸς ῥέων ζωῆς (river of the water of life) which flows from the throne of God and of the Lamb, as also of a ξύλον ζωῆς (tree of life) by the shores of the stream (Rev. xxii, 1, 2, 14, 19; ii, 7). See the different interpretations given to John's ζωὴ αἰώνιος in Kaenfer, *De bibl. ζ. ἀ. notionē*, p. 22.

II. *History of the Doctrine.*—1. The Talmudists speak only of the עולם הבא, in which all Israelites have part, but nowhere of an eternal life; while the Targumists make use of the expression, for instance, in Lev. xviii, 5.

2. It was long before even the Christian Church

was able to understand the full scope of the idea. In early times the ζωὴ αἰώνιος (eternal life) was represented only as future happiness, to be fully accomplished only after the resurrection and the judgment of the world. Irenæus (*adv. Hæc.* i, c. 10) states what the per universum orbem usque ad fines terræ seminata ecclesia (the Church dispersed throughout the whole world, even to the ends of the earth) believes on this point, the reditum—*at justis et sanctis*—in corruptibilem statum largiatur et vitam æternam tribuat (coming of Christ to confer eternal life upon the righteous and holy). So also Tertullian (*De præser. Hæret.* c. xiii). Augustine (*De Sp. et Lit. e. xxiv*): "Cum venerit, quod perfectum est, tunc erit vita æterna; ita est totum præmium, ejus promissione gaudemus" (that is, the complete reward, in the promise of which we joy) (*De morib. eccl. cath.* p. 25; *De Trin.* i, 13; *Enchir.* § 29, etc. Basil (*Euar. Psalm xlv*) connects it with the eternal membership of heaven. The Apostles' Creed and the Athanasian Creed end the enumeration of their articles of faith with the dogma concerning eternal life as emanating from God, the absolute cause, and represent it as the final object of all ordained development (*Const. Apost.* vii, 41). John of Damascus, at the end of his *Orthod. fid.*, where he treats of the resurrection, says expressly, αἰώνιος ζωὴ τὸ ἀτελεύτατον τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος ἐπιλαῖν μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἡμετέρας καὶ πρὸς τὸν ὁ χρόνος ἀρξήμιθισται ἔστι δὲ μάλλον μία ἡμέρα ἀνίσταστος, τοῦ ἡλίου τῆς δικαιοσύνης τοῦ κυρίου φαιδρῶς ἐπιλάμπουτος. Even when the fathers speak of Christ as the ζωὴ they refer almost exclusively to the imparting of future blessedness: Cyril of Alexandria and Ammonius (*Catena on John xiv*, 6), Gregory Nazianzenus (*Orat.* 10, c. *Eunom.*). At all events, they call the assurance of life resting on communion with Christ merely ζωὴ, ἡ κερύον ζωὴ, but not ζωὴ αἰώνιος. Yet occasionally they touch upon nearly all the questions connected with that point, without, however, arriving at any definite system of doctrine. In their description of the state of the blessed they mention as the most important points its endless duration, freedom from evil, and absolute satisfaction. The latter was sometimes defined as complete knowledge, perfect moral liberty, inner and outer peace, or immediate intercourse with God and the saints, together with personal reunion with those who have preceded us; or, again, as the contemplation of God, as the fulfilment of all human desire, or as several of these different points together. The *finis desideriorum nostrorum* is God himself, *qui sine fine videtur, sine fastidio amabitur, sine fatigatione laudabitur* (Justin, *Apol.* i, 8; Origen, *De princ.* iii, 318, 321; Cyprian, *De mortal.* [1726], p. 166; Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xvi, 9; viii, 23; Greg. Nyss. *Orat. fin. de Placilla et Orat. de Mortuis*; Basil, *Hom. vi in Hexæm. et Hom.* in *Psa.* cxiv; August. *De civ. Dei.* xxii, 29, 30; Chrysost. *Hom.* xiv in *Ep. ad Rom.*; Ambros. in *Gal.* vi; Cassiodor. *De anima.* c. xii). The idea of different degrees of felicity in future life, as differences of reward, was widely prevalent, without, however, making it lose its character as *gratia pro gratia* (grace for grace) (August. *Tract.* xiii in John; Theodoret on *Rom.* vi, 23, and in *Continent.* i). According to the ἀζήτη (desert) of every one, there are πολλὰ ἀζήτημάτων εὐαφοραί, βαζμοὶ πολλοὶ and μέτρα (Orig. i, 1, 2, 11; Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xxvii, 8; xiv, 5; xix, 7; xxxii, 33; Basil in *Eunom.* i, 3; August. *De Civ. Dei.* xxii, 30, 2; Hieron. *ad Job.* 2). The fathers say also very positively that the joys of heaven cannot be described in words, and human imagination can only form an approximative idea of them. So Greg. Nyss. (*Orat. Catech.* c. xi). "Bona vitæ æternæ tam multa sunt ut numerum, tam magna ut mensuram, tam præciosa ut estimationem omnem excedant" (August. *De tripl. habit.* c. i, *Conf. Orth.*).

(3.) The divines of the Middle Ages brought to light no new truths on this point, but assembled those

already recognised into a system. They also established a doctrinal distinction between *vita eterna* (eternal life) and *beatitudo* (happiness), defining them both. Anselm (*De simil.* c. xlvii) counts fourteen *partes beatitudinis*, seven of which relate to the glorifying of the body, and seven to the soul. The occupations of the saints are generally connected also with the number seven. Yet it was more customary to divide the different aspects of that state—of course subject to all kinds of occasional modifications—into twelve parts (Bonaventura, *Dieta salut.* x, c. iv; Peter d'Ailly, *Spec. consid.* iii, c. xi; Johan. de Turre crem. *Tract.* xxxvi *in reg.*); "Duodecim considerationes vite eterne: 1. Illa sola est vita vera; 2. Possidetur sanitas sine quacunque infirmitate, molestia aut passione; 3. Pulchritudo sine quacunque deformitate; 4. Copia omnium bonorum; 5. Satietas et adimpletio omnium desideriorum sine quocunque defectu; 6. Securitas et pacis tranquillitas sine timore quocunque; 7. Visio beata clarissima et jucundissima divinitatis; 8. Delectatio summa; 9. Sapientia et plenissima cognitio absque ignorantia (an especially gratifying prospect for the scholastics; so that, for instance, Dans Scotus wonders whether the saints knew the real essence of things); 10. In illa viventis summo ibi honore et gloria sublimantur; 11. Est in ea jucunditas ineffabilis; 12. Laus interminabilis." (The twelve points are: 1. Eternal life is the only true life; 2. It has health without infirmity or passion; 3. Beauty without disfigurement; 4. All blessings in abundance; 5. Satisfaction of all desires; 6. Peace and tranquillity without fears; 7. Beatific vision of the Divinity; 8. Supreme delight; 9. Wisdom and perception without ignorance; 10. The highest honor and glory; 11. Ineffable sweetness; 12. Endless praise.) Thomas Aquinas recognised, besides, the general and common *beatitudo*, especial *dona*, gifts. Thus, aside from the *corona aurea*, he reserves a special *aureola* to the martyrs and saints, and also to monks and nuns, as a sort of superadded reward. According to him, the organ of transmission of the blessings of future life is knowledge; according to Scotus, the will. After the times of Anselm, and among the scholastics and mystics, we find very attractive descriptions of the blessed state, full of elevated ideas. "Præmium est," says Bernard (*De meditat.* c. iv), "videre Deum, vivere cum Deo, esse cum Deo, esse in Deo, qui erit omnia in omnibus; habere Deum, qui est summum bonum; et ubi est summum bonum, ibi summa felicitas." (The reward is, to see God, to dwell with God, to exist with God and in God, who shall be All in All; to possess God, who is the highest Good; and where the highest Good is, there is perfect bliss.)

(1.) The Roman Catholic Church has simply gathered the teachings of the scholastics into a whole on this point, and has established them in a more fixed and dogmatic manner, as is shown in the exposition given in the Roman Catechism. According to it, the *vita eterna* (eternal life), by which believers are, after their resurrection, to attain the perfection after which they aim, is *non magis perpetuitas vite, quam in perpetuitate beatitudo, quæ beatiorum desiderium expleat* (not only perpetuity of life, but also bliss in that perpetuity, satisfying all the desires of the blessed). It is evident, moreover, that the nature of the blessedness of the saints cannot be appreciated by our minds in any but an empirical, not an absolute manner. According to the scholastics, the eternal blessings can be divided into, 1. Essential; the contemplation of God in his nature and substance, and the consequent participation in his essence, which is identical with his possession. 2. Accessory; glory, honor, perfect peace, etc. They are expressly represented as incentives to lead a virtuous life. On their connection with good works in the Romanist system, see Council of Trent (*Sess.* vi, c. xxvi).

(5.) With the exception of the part relating to pur-

gatory, the doctrine of the elder Protestantism on this subject does not essentially differ from that of the Romish Church. The symbolical books of the evangelical Church afford us but little information on this point. In general, the *vita eterna* continued to be considered as *salutis nostræ complementum, spei metæ, finis fidei* (the goal of hope, the end of faith). By it was understood the position of the just, partly after this life in general, and partly after the resurrection. (Comp. *Augsburg Conf.* art. 17; *Apol.* iv, 212; *Cat. Min.* ii, 3; *Formulu Concordiæ*, 633, 723; *Conf. Belg.* art. 67; Luther, *Works*, i, 360, 887, 997; xi, 1487; Melancthon, *loci*, 1553, 75; Calvin, *Institutes*, iii, 9, 1.) Still the effects of a deeper study of Scripture (a result of the Reformation) became manifest in various ways, and especially in the idea of a beginning of eternal life in the heart of the believer, which was recognised as connected with regeneration (*Apol. Confessionis*, iv, 140, 148, 99, 187, 209, 210, 285, mostly in the German text; Buddeus, 445, 503; Zwingli, *Exp. fid.* 12; P. Martyr, *Loc.* 442; *Cat. Pal.* 58; Altung, *Exp. Catech.* 280; Alsted, 759; Perkins, *Cat.* 778; Confessio Bohem. *Niem.* 846). Compare also Jansenius, *Comm. Conc. Ev.* c. 136, 976. Yet this truly evangelical view was not steadily persisted in, but, on the contrary, it was soon asserted again that the expression "eternal life" occurred only in Scripture to designate the reward of Christian fidelity. Nevertheless, the fundamental points of the idea of eternal life remained in the doctrine of a mystical union with Christ, and in the doctrine concerning the Eucharist. Many draw a distinction between the *vita spiritualis* (spiritual life), of which Christ is the *alimentum* (food), and the *vita eterna* (eternal life). The former was also designated as *vita gratiæ* (the life of grace), and the latter as *vita gloriæ* (the life of glory). There were three degrees of eternal life recognised: 1, initialis, in this world; 2, partialis, after the death of the individual; 3, perfectio, after the last judgment. (So Pearson, *On the Creed*, Oxford, 1820, i, 598.) Gerhard's definition (*Cotta*, 20, 533) is an excellent exposition of the Protestant scholastic views on this subject: "Vita eterna est felicissimum ac beatissimum ille status, quo Deus ex immensa misericordia (causa efficiens principalis) propter Christum mediatorem (causa efficiens meritoria) perseverante fide (causa instrumentalis) adprehensum pios post hanc vitam beabit, ut primum quidem animarum eorum a corporibus separatæ, postmodum vero eadem in die resurrectionis glorificatis corporibus reunite, ab omnibus miseriis, doloribus et malis liberatæ, cum Christo, angelis sanctis et omnibus electis in sempiterna letitia, gloria et felicitate vivant, perfecta Dei cognitione, perfecta sanctitate et justitia ornatæ Deum a facie ad faciem sine fine videant, sine fastidio amant ac sine defatigatione glorificent." The early Protestant theologians speak of the felicity of the future life as incomprehensible and ineffable (*Conf. Belg.* 37; *Bohem.* in *Niem.* 846; Calvin, 3, 15, 10; Gerhard, 20, 340). Its blessings are partly privative, partly positive: the meeting again and recognition of Christians was considered one of them (Zwingli *In exp. fid.* 12); this is called a positive blessing. That individual blessedness will not be disturbed by the knowledge of the damnation of others is called a privative blessing. In opposition to Rome, the influence of personal merit on the future state was denied by these theologians; but some of them, while admitting that blessedness is essentially the same for all, hold to several degrees of blessedness. A number of other questions as to the language of the blessed, the manner of the contemplation of God, if he shall be praised in word, etc., are generally treated by the ancient theologians after the example of Calvin, *Inst.* 3, 25, 6, as irrelevant, and of no religious importance. In later times they have been discussed anew.

7. *Later Views.*—The evangelical Protestant churches probably would all agree that eternal life com-

mences in Christian experience in this world. So Wesley (*Sermons*, ii, 180): "This is the testimony, that God hath given us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life [the eternal life here spoken of]; and he that hath not the Son hath not life." As if he had said, This is the sum of the testimony which God hath testified of his Son, that God hath given us not only a title to, but the real beginning of eternal life; and this life is purchased by, and treasured up in his Son, who has all the springs and the fulness of it in himself, to communicate to his body, the Church. This eternal life, then, commences when it pleases the Father to reveal his Son in our hearts; when we first know Christ, being enabled to "call him Lord by the Holy Ghost;" when we can testify, our conscience bearing us witness in the Holy Ghost, "The life which I now live I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." And then it is that happiness begins—happiness real, solid, substantial. Then it is that heaven is opened in the soul, that the proper heavenly state commences, while the love of God, as loving us, is shed abroad in the heart, instantly producing love to all mankind; general pure benevolence, together with its genuine fruits, lowliness, meekness, patience, contentedness in every state; an entire, clear, full acquiescence in the whole will of God, enabling us to "rejoice evermore, and in everything to give thanks."

As to the nature of the blessedness of the future life, "the sum of what we are taught by reason and Scripture on this point may be comprehended under the three following particulars: (a) We shall hereafter be entirely freed from the sufferings of this life; (b) Our future blessedness will be a continuation of the happiness of this life; (c) But it will also be increased by the addition of many new joys, which stand in no natural or necessary connection with our preceding condition in this life. But, for want of accurate knowledge of the state of things in the future world, we can say nothing definite and certain as to the nature of these positive rewards. In the doctrine of the New Testament, however, positive rewards are considered most obviously as belonging to our future felicity, and as constituting a principal part of it. For it always represents the joys of heaven as resulting strictly from the *favor of God*, and as being *undescried* by those to whom they are given. Hence there must be something more added to the natural good consequences of our actions, something which cannot be considered as the necessary and natural consequences of the good actions we may have before performed. Some theologians have supposed that the saints in heaven may be taught by *immediate divine revelations* (*lumen gloriæ*); especially those who may enter the abodes of the blessed without knowledge, or with only a small measure of it; e. g. children, and others who have died in ignorance for which they themselves were not to blame. On this subject nothing is definitely taught in the Scriptures; but both Scripture and reason warrant us in believing that provision will be made for all such persons in the future world. A principal part of our future happiness will consist, according to the Christian doctrine, in the enlargement and correcting of our knowledge respecting God, his nature, attributes, and works, and in the salutary application of this knowledge to our own moral benefit, to the increase of our faith, love, and obedience. There has been some controversy among theologians with regard to the *vision of God* (*visio Dei intuitiva*, or *sensitiva*, or *beatifica*, or *comprehensiva*); but Christ is always represented as one who will be *personally visible* by us, and whose personal, familiar intercourse and guidance we shall enjoy. And herein Christ himself places a chief part of the joy of the saints (John xiv, xvii, etc.). And so the apostles often describe the blessedness of the pious by the phrase *being with Christ*. To his guidance has God intrusted the human

race in heaven and on earth. And Paul says (2 Cor. iv, 6) we see 'the brightness of the divine glory in the face of Christ;' he is 'the visible representative of the invisible God' (Colos. i, 15). Paul says expressly (1 Thess. iv, 17) that we shall be with Christ, *in company with our friends who died before us* (*ἀπαρὸν ἀβραϊκῶν*); and this presupposes that we shall recognise them, and have intercourse with them, as with Christ himself. Paul advises that Christians should comfort themselves under the loss of their friends by considering that they are at home with the Lord, and that they shall be again united together" (Knapp, *Christ. Theology*, sec. clx, p. 490-494). See also Cotta, *Hist. Dogm. de Vita æterna*; Cotta, *Theses Theol. de Vita æterna* (Tübing. 1758); Storr, *Opuscula Academica*, ii, 75; Wesley, *Sermons*, ii, 180 sq.; Baxter, *Saints' Rest*; Isaac Taylor, *Physical Theory of another Life*; Naville, *Vie Eternelle* (1865); Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* viii, 254 (from which this article is in part a translation); Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics*, § 283-290. See IMMORTALITY; RESURRECTION; HEAVEN.

**Eternity of God.** See GOD.

**E'tham** (Heb. *Etham'*, עֶתָם, supposed by Jablonsky [*Opusc.* ed. te Water, ii, 157] to be i. q. Coptic *ation*, i. e. "boundary of the sea;") Sept. Ὀζόψω, but omits in Num. xxxiii, 8; Vulg. *Etham*, the third station of the Israelites when they left Egypt; a place described as lying "in the edge of the wilderness," where they encamped after the journey from Succoth (Exod. xiii, 20; Num. xxxiii, 6). This description, and the route pursued by them, seem to fix upon some spot on the east of Egypt, north of the Red Sea, near the desert tract stretching thence along the whole eastern shore as far as Marah, to which the same name, "desert of Etham," is therefore naturally applied in the text (Num. xxxiii, 8). The precise locality of Etham has been a matter of dispute, according to the various theories of the passage across the sea. No spot more likely has been indicated than a point in the valley of the bitter lakes opposite the foot of wady Abu-Zeid, in the direct route around the point of the sea, but from which there is a passage sharply deflecting, up wady Em-hesh, around Jebel Attaka, which the Israelites were at this point commanded to take. See EXODE; DESERT. The sense of the passage Num. xxxiii, 6, 8, is evidently this: At the end of the second day they had already arrived at the borders of the Arabian desert, at Etham, from which the tract of country lying next to Egypt receives the name, desert of Etham; but, instead of advancing directly into the desert, they turned down again farther into Egypt, to the Arabian Gulf. Afterwards, instead of going round the sea, they proceeded through it into the desert of Etham. See SHUR. Schwarz says (*Palest.* p. 211) that the part of the desert north of the Red Sea, near Suez, is still called *Ethia*, but this lacks confirmation.

**E'than** (Heb. *Eythan'*, עֵיטָן, *perpetuity*, as often), the name of three men.

1. (Sept. Αἰθάν, v. r. Γαιζάν and Αἰζάν.) One of four persons ("Ethan the Ezrahite, and Heman, and Chalcol, and Darda, the sons of Mahol") who were so renowned for their sagacity that it is mentioned to the honor of Solomon that his wisdom excelled theirs (1 Kings iv, 31 [Heb. v, 11]), Ethan being distinguished as "the Ezrahite" from the others, who are called "sons of Mahol;" unless, indeed, this word *Mahol* (q. v.) be taken, not as a proper name, but appellatively for "sons of music, dancing," etc., in which case it would apply to Ethan as well as to the others. This interpretation is strengthened by our finding the other names associated with that of Ethan in 1 Chron. ii, 6, as "sons of Zerah," i. e. of Ezra, the same as Ezrahites, or descendants of the son of Judah. See EZRAHITE. With this agrees the Jewish chronology, which counts them as prophets during the sojourn in Egypt (*Seder*

*Olam Rabbir*, p. 52), although the Jews have also a tradition confounding Ethan with Abraham, Heman with Moses, and Chalcol with Joseph (Jerome, *Comment. on Kings*, in loc.). In 1 Chron. ii, 8, Ethan's "sons" are mentioned, but only one name is given, that of Azariah. B.C. post 1856. In the title to the 89th Psalm an "Ethan the Ezrahite" is named as the author; but there seems to be some confusion here in the latter epithet. See No. 3 below.

2. (Sept. Αἰθάρι v. r. Οὐρί) Son of Zimmah and father of Adaiiah, in the ancestry of the Levite Asaph (1 Chron. vi, 42 [27]). B.C. cir. 1585. In ver. 21 he seems to be called JOAH, the father of Iddo.

3. (Sept. Αἰθάν v. r. Αἰθάρμ.) A Levite, son of Kushi or Kushaiah, of the family of Merari; appointed one of the leaders of the Temple music by David (as singer, 1 Chron. vi, 44 [29], or player on cymbals, xv, 17, 19). B.C. 1014. In the latter passages he is associated with Heman and Asaph, the heads of two other families of Levites; and inasmuch as in other passages of these books (1 Chron. xxv, 1, 6) the names are given as Asaph, Heman, and ΙΕΡΟΥΤΙΟΥ, it has been conjectured that this last and Ethan were identical. There is at least great probability that Ethan the singer was the same person as Ethan the Ezrahite (comp. No. 1 above), whose name stands at the head of Psa. lxxxix, for it is a very unlikely coincidence that there should be two persons named Heman and Ethan so closely connected in two different tribes and walks of life. The difficulty is even greater in the case of Heman (q. v.), who, in the title to Psalm lxxxviii, is likewise expressly called an Ezrahite, and yet identified in its authorship with the sons of Korah. Hengstenberg supposes (*Comment. on Psalms*, Clark's ed. iii, 89) that both Heman and Ethan, although descendants of Judah, were adopted into the ranks of the Levites; but this will not meet the above genealogy of this Ethan, who is moreover classed with the Merarites, and not with the Korahites. Comp. HEMAN, and see EZRAHITE.

**Eth'ananim** (Heb. *Eythanim'*, עֵתָנִים, perennial streams; Sept. Αἰθάνιν), another name for the month TISRI (q. v.); so called from the fulness of the brooks at that time of the year, being swelled with the autumnal rains (1 Kings viii, 2). See CALENDAR.

**Eth'baäl** (Heb. *Ethba'al*, עֵתְבַּאֵל, with Baal, i. e. enjoying his favor and help; Sept. Ἐθβαάλ), a king of Sidon, father of the infamous Jezebel, the wife of Ahab (1 Kings xvi, 31). According to Josephus (*Ant.* viii, 13, 1 and 2; *Apion*, i, 18), Ethbaal is called *Ithobalrus* (Ἰθόβαλος or Εἰθόβαλος, i. e. עֵתְבַּאֵל = *Baal with him*) by Menander, who also says that he was a priest of Astarte, and, having put the king Pheles to death, assumed the sceptre of Tyre and Sidon, lived sixty-eight years, and reigned thirty-two (comp. Theophil. *Autol.* iii, p. 132). As fifty years elapsed between the deaths of Hiram and Pheles, the date of Ethbaal's reign may be given as about B.C. 940-908. The worship of Baal was no doubt closely allied to that of Astarte, and it is even possible that a priest of Astarte might have been dedicated also to the service of Baal, and borne his name. We here see the reason why Jezebel, the daughter of a priest of Astarte, was so zealous a promoter of idolatry, the taint of which, with its attendant tyranny, eventually extended to the throne of Judah in the person of Athaliah; and as, twenty-one years after the death of Ethbaal, his granddaughter Dido built Carthage, and founded that celebrated commonwealth (Josephus, as above), we may judge what sort of a spirit animated the females of this royal family. See AHAAB. Another Phœnician king of the same name (Ἰθόβαλος or Εἰθόβαλος) appears as a contemporary of Nebuchadnezzar (Josephus, *Ant.* x, 11, 1; *Apion*, i, 21; Eusebius, *Chron. Armen.* i, 74). See PHŒNICIA.

**Ethelbert**, king of Kent, was born A.D. 545 or 552, and succeeded to the throne about A.D. 560 (?). About A.D. 590 he was acknowledged as Bratwaldra (president of the Heptarchy). In 570 he married Bertha, a Christian, and daughter of Charibert, a Frankish king. It had been agreed before her marriage that she should be allowed to enjoy her own religion. The most important event of his reign was the introduction of Christianity into his kingdom by Augustine, who landed in Kent in 596. See AUGUSTINE (vol. i, p. 544). In 597 the king himself was baptized. He founded the bishopric of Rochester, and, with his nephew Sebert, king of Essex, erected the church of St. Paul's in London. Ethelbert died in 616.—Maclear, *Christian Missions during the Middle Ages* (1863), chap. v; Collier, *Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain*, i, 156 sq.

**Ethelwold**, the principal reformer of monastic orders in England, was born in Winchester about 925. From early youth he distinguished himself by his learning, and obtained the favor of king Athelstan. He was ordained priest simultaneously with Dunstan, and when the latter became abbot of Glastonbury, about 947, Ethelwold entered his monastery and became a companion of his studies. He distinguished himself as a poet, grammarian, and theologian. He is also reported to have been familiar with the mechanical arts, and to have constructed two bells. When he declared his intention to go to France, in order to perfect himself in his studies, king Edred, who wished to retain him in England, refused to him permission to travel, and appointed him abbot of Abingdon. This monastery was then in ruins, and was rebuilt by Ethelwold. In 963 king Edgar appointed him bishop of Winchester. The great task of his life henceforth was the reorganization of the Anglo-Saxon monasteries, which were at that time administered by secular priests (*clerici, canonici, presbyteri*). The discipline in the monastery was anything but severe, and many of the priests were married. Ethelwold substituted for the secular priests regular monks, and displayed great activity in rebuilding the monasteries that had been destroyed by the Danes, and in repopulating those that had been abandoned. The monastery of Winchester, under his direction, became a celebrated school, from which proceeded several distinguished abbots and bishops. He died Aug. 1, 984, at Winchester. The chief work of Ethelwold is an Anglo-Saxon translation of the Latin rule of St. Benedict. It has never been printed. He also wrote a mathematical treatise, still extant in manuscript.—Hofer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xvi, 598; Wright, *Biog. Brit. Lit.* 435 sq. (A. J. S.)

**E'ther** (Heb. *id.* אֶתֶר, abundance), one of the cities in the plain (Shephelah) of Judah (mentioned between Libnah and Ashan, Josh. xv, 42, Sept. Αἶθρ v. r. Ἰθάκ), eventually assigned to Simeon (mentioned between Remmon and Ashan, Josh. xix, 7, Sept. Αἶθρ v. r. Ἰεζέρο). In the parallel list of the towns of Simeon in 1 Chron. iv, 32, TOCHEN is substituted for Ether. In the *Onomasticon* Eusebius and Jerome mention it twice (s. v. Ἐζέρο, Ether; Ἰεζέρο, Jether—in the latter case confounding it with JATHIR, a city of priests, which contained friends of David during his troubles under Saul), and state that it was then a considerable place (κόμη μεγάλη), retaining the name of *Jethira* (Ἰεθιρά, Ἰεζορά), very near Malatha, in the interior of the district of Daroma, that is, in the desert country below Hebron and to the east of Beersheba. At Beit-Jibrin Van de Velde heard of a *tell Athar* in this neighborhood, but could not learn its distance or direction (*Memoir*, p. 311). For the present, we may conjecturally place it at *Beit-Awca*, in the vicinity of the associated localities, S. of Beit-Jibrin and W. of Hebron; a ruined village, covering low hills on both sides of the path, and exhibiting foundations of hewn stones,

leading to the inference that it was once an extensive town (Robinson, *Researches*, iii, 10).

**Etheridge**, JOHN WESLEY, Ph.D., a Methodist minister and eminent scholar, was born at Grange-woods, Isle of Wight, February 24, 1804, and died at Camborne May 24, 1866. His parents were Methodists, and he was brought up with religious care. In 1827 he entered the ministry of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, and was appointed to the Hull Circuit. In 1838 his health failed, and he became "super-numerary." In 1846 he was able to return to the itinerant ministry, in which service he remained until his death. "He was an eminently holy man. Whether in the pulpit or in the social circle, he appeared clothed with humility, and radiant with Christian benevolence. Constrained by the love of Christ, he lived only to promote the interests of the Church. He was 'a burning and shining light,' and consumed himself in the service of his Lord and Saviour" (*Minutes*, 1867).

Dr. Etheridge's devotion to letters, amid the engrossing labors of the Methodist ministry, was very remarkable. Early in life he showed extraordinary aptitude for languages, and by continued study he learned to read and write Hebrew and Syriac with facility. In the literature of these two languages he became pre-eminent before his death. His published writings include *The Syrian Churches, their early History, Liturgies, and Literature* (London, 1846, 12mo: this work contains a translation, also, of the four Gospels from the Peschito):—*The Apostolical Acts and Epistles, from the Peschito, with the remaining Epistles and the Revelation, after a later Syriac Text* (London, 1849, 12mo):—*Howe Aramaica* (London, 1843, 12mo: a useful series of Essays on the Shemitic, Aramaic, and Syriac languages and literature):—*Jerusalem and Tiberias, a Survey of the religious and scholastic Learning of the Jews, designed as an Introduction to Hebrew Literature* (London, 1856, 12mo):—*The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan ben-Uzziel*, etc. (London, 1862, 12mo). Besides these, he published *Misericordia, or Contemplations on the Mercy of God* (Lond. 1842):—*The Life of Dr. Adam Clarke* (London, 1858: N. Y. 1860):—*The Life of Dr. Thomas Coke* (Lond. 1860):—*The Life of the Rev. John Fletcher*.—*Minutes of Conferences* (English) for 1867; *Christian Examiner*, lxi, 346.

**Ethics**, from ἠθικός, originally the Ionic form of ἔθος, in Germ. *Sittenlehre*, in English *moral philosophy*, though this last phrase sometimes covers the whole science of mind. Ethics are related to *law and duty*, and to *virtue and vice*. "Aristotle says that ἠθικός, which signifies moral virtue, is derived from ἔθος, custom, since it is by repeated acts that virtue, which is a moral habit, is formed" (see Flening's *Vocab. Phil.* p. 171). "Ethics, taken in its widest sense, as including the moral sciences or natural jurisprudence, may be divided into, 1. Moral philosophy, or the science of the relations, rights, and duties by which men are under obligations towards God, themselves, and their fellow-creatures. 2. The law of nations, or the science of those laws by which all nations, as constituting the society of the human race, are bound in their mutual relations to one another. 3. Public or political law, or the science of the relations between the different ranks in society. 4. Civil law, or the science of those laws, rights, and duties by which individuals in civil society are bound—as commercial, criminal, judicial, Roman, or modern. 5. History, profane, civil, and political" (Peemans, *Introd. ad Philosoph.* p. 96). Ethics, then, covers the science of all that is moral, whether it relates to law or action, to God or the creature, to the individual or the state. It goes wherever the ideas of right and wrong can enter.

1. Ethical science may be divided into philosophical ethics, theological ethics, and Christian ethics.

(a.) *Philosophical Ethics*.—The science, in this aspect, must find its root and its life, its forms and its

authority, in the depths of the human constitution. This leads necessarily to the idea of God. We do not affirm that ethics cannot be discussed at all without bringing in the notion of a supreme being. On the contrary, it is undeniable that we find in man a moral nature; whatever may be the character of his morality, the very doubts about that imply the *fact* of morality. He manifestly has relations to virtue and vice, to right and wrong, to blame and praise, to guilt and innocence. True, if he does not accept the idea of God, morals seem to lose their foundation. Why should a man obey the dictates of his nature, even when obedience seems to be right and useful, unless his nature is a product of wisdom, and reveals the law and the nature of an infinite intelligence? But truth is stubborn, and even a fragment of it, swinging in the air without a foundation, will live. Pulled up out of the soil of the doctrine of God, the moral ideas, however shorn of their strength and withered, still assert their authority and insist on obedience, from motives of utility, or fitness, or happiness. A genuine philosophical ethics, however, will find a Creator from the study of the creature, and will raise from the nature of man a law which will ground itself in the idea of God.

(b.) *Theological Ethics*.—This is grounded upon some religion or theology. But in this aspect the science is broad enough to cover every religion. The ethics might be theological, and at the same time Buddhistic, or Mohammedan, or Brahminical. Theological ethics, therefore, might be a system on which the fundamental principle of morals had been perverted by the admixture of cruel and impure superstitions, just as so-called philosophical ethics might be atheistic or pantheistic.

(c.) *Christian Ethics*.—Christian ethics is theological ethics limited by Christianity. As thus stated, it might appear to be narrower than either philosophical or theological ethics, but in reality it is far otherwise. Philosophical ethics is Christian so far as it is true and just, and, from the very nature of Christianity, as containing a complete account of human duty, it must even be broader and deeper than all human philosophies which relate to it. As to the relation of Christian ethics to any other supposed theological ethics, or to all other theologies in their moral aspects taken together, its position must be that of judge among them all; it must measure them all, eliminating whatever is false, restoring what is lacking, or rather supplanting them one and all as the only standard of moral truth and duty.

Besides, Christian ethics, considered as a science, and hence as a field for speculation, covers the whole ground. Philosophy and theology, in their ethical relations, are entirely within its scope. It must judge them both wherever it touches them. It has made ethics, and indeed all speculation, a different thing from what it was before it entered into human thought, and it aims to master all human thinking within its sphere. It is, to be sure, amenable to philosophical thought, and cannot repel the tests of right reason; it readily enters into the struggle with every adverse intellectual tendency, carrying with it a divine confidence that alone contains the infallible and indestructible norm of humanity regarded as moral.

Christian ethics, indeed, considered as speculative, is not infallible. God has given the ethical norm, but man is obliged to speculate for himself. Evidently the complete form of Christian ethics, considered as philosophical, has not yet been reached. Its condition is yet militant, both in relation to false systems and to its own development. The genuine Christian ethics, in the scientific sense, lies scattered in various human treatises, in part is yet to be born, and remains to be evolved in the coming ages, and to be wrought into a system of beneficence and beauty which shall settle down on the whole human race, at once an atmosphere

of divine and filial love, and an antidote to discord, injustice, and all impurity.

"As between theological and philosophical speculation, so between theological and philosophical ethics, in so far as they are speculative, we must make a strong distinction. The latter pair differ precisely as the former do. But, much as philosophical and theological ethics differ, they are not opposites. Within the Christian world, Christian ethics, like philosophy in general, must always be essentially Christian. It has always been so, as the result of an inviolable historical necessity, but in different degrees at different periods of time, and in the several stages of its progress. There may, indeed, arise a relative hostility between philosophical ethics and the contemporaneous Christian teaching, or even a hostility between ethical writers and Christianity in general; or, rather, such a hostility is unavoidable precisely in the degree in which humanity fails to be penetrated by Christianity. But, so long as this continues to be the case, it must be a proof of imperfection, not in philosophy only, but also in Christian piety. For even if Christian piety, looking at the doctrine in itself, should be convinced that it possessed the true results, yet she possesses her treasure without the scientific ability to understand it, or to vindicate it to the understanding of others. It is, therefore, as science, still imperfect. A result of this will be that theological ethics will share in the imperfection. So long as the moral consciousness of the Christian, which is specifically determined by the church of which he is a member, does not clearly recognise itself in the forms of morality prevailing in his circle, a Christian ethical philosophy must remain a want—a desideratum. This, however, is only to say that this want will last while the general moral sentiment and that of the Church remain apart. The more nearly each approaches perfection in its own sphere, the nearer they come to being one. If we conceive of each as perfect, they remain two only in form, i. e. not different in their method, but only in the order according to which, under the same method, they scientifically arrange themselves.

"What has now been said of the relation between philosophical and theological ethics, holds of the latter only so far as it is conceived of as speculative. In other modes of treating theological ethics, especially in the traditional, it is easy to conceive that the relation would be different. . . . It must be distinctly affirmed that a Christian character belongs to philosophical ethics throughout the Christian world. We do not mean that it *ought* to be so, but that it really *is* so: not, indeed, always in the highest and fullest sense, and as it ought to be, but still, in such a sense, whatever men may be conscious of, that without Christianity it never could have been what it is. In the Christian world there is no element of the moral or intellectual life which is not associated with some result of Christianity, itself undeniably the ground-principle of the historical development of our whole Christian times. It can never be sufficiently remembered, especially in our own times, that what is actually Christian, and, indeed, what is essentially and specifically Christian, reaches, in all the relations of life, far beyond the sphere to which usage gives the name of *Christian*, or of which the present generation is at all conscious as Christian. The Christian element inheres in the very blood of that portion of humanity which passes under the name of Christendom. This is not the less true because certain individuals belonging to the Christian community may not feel its regenerating power. Besides, that would be a poor ethical system, considered as philosophy, which should ignore the great facts through which morality becomes Christian, and which should refuse to those facts the controlling position which actually belongs to them in making the moral world what, in point of science, it has become. These great facts, let men close their eyes as they will, are

the breaking out of sin and the development of its destructive power in the world on the one hand, and the entrance of Jesus, the God-man, and the historical redeeming power proceeding from him on the other. Even philosophical morality, if it would not degenerate into mere unphilosophical abstractions, must make the moral life, considered as historical and concrete, scientifically comprehensible; the concrete historical form of the moral world, however, is, for us at least, before everything else, Christian, just as general history since the time of Christ is itself Christian.

"But, so long as we follow Schleiermacher, and, in explaining the relation between philosophical and theological ethics, make the religious consciousness the opposite of speculation, we shall never escape confusion. The religious consciousness finds its antithesis not in speculation, but in the *not religious*, and speculation finds its opposite not in piety, but in empirical reflection: empirical reflection and speculation stand in very similar relations to piety. The larger number of theological writers are still of the opinion that the distinction between philosophical and theological ethics lies in the former being the universal, the abstract, the ethics of humanity, and the latter the concrete and specifically Christian, because it rests on history. Thus Schmid and Wuttke. These writers hold that the great facts which form the angles of the Christian theory of the world, namely, sin and redemption by Christ, are, according to their nature, inadequate as the basis of any purely *à priori* or speculative theory. They lay great stress on this. But why reason thus? At bottom, because they start with the presupposition that there is no other necessity but the necessity of *nature*. But, in spite of all the confident assertions of the contrary, we cannot doubt that from the specifically Christian consciousness of God, which is the subject treated here, sin and redemption should be deduced as a logical necessity" (Rothe, *Theologische Ethik*, i, 57).

II. *Position of Ethics in Theology.*—<sup>1</sup> Ethics is a part of systematic theology, which also includes dogmatics. As systematic science, it is to be distinguished from *exegetical and historical* theology. Its office is not merely to show what is the original, and thus normative Christian ethics, nor what has been accepted as such, but rather to teach that Christian ethics is the genuine ethical truth." . . . "On the other hand, ethics must be separated from the various branches of practical theology among which it has often been placed. The two sciences are different both in scope and aim. Ethics embraces the whole Christian idea of *good*, and not merely the Church, in which it finds only its culmination, and points away from itself to practical theology, the aim of which is, of course, practical" (Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* art. Ethik).

*Place in Systematic Theology.*—<sup>2</sup> "In ancient times, and down to the Reformation, it was not independent, but held a subordinate place in the science of dogmatics. From the 17th century the two have been separated, and, following P. Ramus, most writers have distinguished between them as between theory and practice. In point of fact, dogmatics has practical importance, and ethics, as the science of the *good*, has a theory" (Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* art. Ethik). "Dogmatics and ethics are as certainly independent *discipline* as God and man are separate beings. Only a point of view like that of Spinoza, in his *Ethics*, which denies the existence of a real creation and a moral world separate from God, can controvert the independent position of ethics by the side of dogmatics" (*idem*).

These views are substantially correct. "Christian ethics has a right to an independent position in the sphere of systematic theology, and it and dogmatics are as certainly distinct as are God and man." Still it is none the less true that, God and man conceived to be such as they are, ethics cannot be practically separated from religion. Ethics finds its highest sanctions



in religion, as religion must consist largely in prescribing ethics. God and man being presented to the mind, ethics must cover the character of each, and also the relation between them.

III. *The Ethical Faculty—Conscience.*—There has been a great waste of controversy on the question whether or not conscience is a distinct and separate faculty of the soul, or only an application of the reason or judgment to moral subjects. The truth is that, the mind being a unit, all its faculties are only so many powers of applying itself differently according to demand. A faculty is a power of doing or acting, and a separate faculty is the power of acting in a particular direction, as distinguished from other directions. The mind is as certainly and distinctly moral as it is intellectual, or imaginative, or volitional. Each of these expresses a distinct power of the one mind.

This faculty of forming moral judgments we call conscience; and, if the views now expressed be correct, there is little propriety in discussions respecting the origin of conscience. It has no origin but that of its possessor; it is born with him, though from its nature it is only developed farther on in life, just as reason and imagination are. It has been asked, in reply to this view, whether conscience is not made what it is in any given case by the circumstances about it—by teaching, by the man's own acts—in short, by all the influences brought to bear upon him. We answer it is as to its form, but there was first conscience, a moral faculty in the man to be shaped. We concede that neither moral ideas, nor ideas of any sort, are innate; but the capacity, nay, the constitutional necessity for moral ideas is innate.

IV. *The Ethical Standard* is, of course, according to Christianity, to be found in the Scriptures, but there is still in the sphere of science a wide diversity as to their meaning. But when the standard is supposed to be understood on a given question, and the conscience submits to it, there must follow a perfect self-abnegation; degradation must result from disobedience. In the case of a conflict between the conscience and the law of the state, for example, in which case the conscience of the lawgiving majority collides with the individual conscience, who shall yield? The answer, from the very nature of the case, is, neither. They must fight it out. The state, from its nature, is supreme, and cannot yield; but for the man the conscience is also supreme. The man can only die, or make some other atonement, and thus maintain allegiance to the highest tribunal.

V. *History of Ethics.*—(a.) The sources of knowledge here are Christ, his person and teaching; also the writings of the apostles, as shown in the New Testament. In the Old Testament the whole contents are authoritative, except as modified or repealed by the New Testament. By the side of these objective sources we have a subjective source in the New Covenant; it is the influence of the Holy Spirit in the faithful. To this Barnabas, Justin, and Clement of Alexandria bear witness. This life of the Spirit in the Church was by-and-by supplanted by the supposed efficacy of ordination, by which the Spirit was bound to the priesthood exclusively. There came now an outward law of the Church to modify the New Testament, and it controlled the ethical consciousness of Christendom until the Reformation.

(b.) Abundance of ethical material is found in the apostolical fathers, who base ethics on individual personality, on marriage, the family, etc. The most effective of the earlier writers was Tertullian (220). His ethical writings were very numerous, such as *concerning spectacles, concerning the veiling of virgins, monogamy, penitence, patience*, etc. His idea of Christianity was that it was a vast and defiant war power, separated from all the heathen customs of the Old World, and resolved to bring upon that world the judgment of Heav-

en. Cyrian, with his high claims for the episcopate, exercised great influence on the ethical sphere of the Church. He concentrated the truth of the Church in the episcopacy, in which he saw the vehicle of the Holy Ghost, and the instrument by which unity and the Holy Spirit should be assured to the Church forever. He carried this idea of the dignity of the episcopate, and the sanctity and sanctifying power of orders, to a ridiculous extent. His doctrine of the efficacy of orders and the dignity of bishops was set over against certain sects—Novatians, Montanists, Donatists—who held that the holiness and unity of the Church demanded that none but holy persons should be members. Augustine fell heir to this controversy. As the Church grew into an earthly kingdom, her ethics took more and more the direction of a so-called higher virtue, whose chief forms were celibacy, poverty, conventual life, and self-imposed torture.

Asceticism not only formed a part of the Church life, it became also the centre from which the Christian life was forced to receive rule and law. It determined what was sin, and what was right and good: it dictated to councils; and, getting control of the state, it dispensed at will its spiritual and temporal awards; penitential books in great numbers were compiled, and, bad as the system was in itself, it became a powerful instrument in bringing to order the various heathen peoples. For the books and writers on these subjects, see Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* iv, 194, where the relation of asceticism to mysticism is well presented, and it is shown that all these terrible struggles had their root in the consciousness of the infinite demerit of sin, and found their happy solution in Luther's doctrine of faith.

The Reformation not only conquered the prevailing errors by leading men back to the holy Scriptures, but it established positively the real principle of Christian ethics. It did this through justifying faith, which, working by love, creates the possibility of Christian ethics. Love, springing from faith, is the fulfilling of the law. It is ethics in the soul, ready to take shape in noble action. This, working in the community inwardly, proceeds to mould all relations, private and public—marriage, family, church, state, science, art, and culture. The great reformers did not write complete ethical treatises, though they discussed many ethical subjects, such as prayer, oaths, marriage, etc.; but they especially discussed ethics in their explanations of the Decalogue in the Catechism. Indeed, the original form of Christian ethics is the Catechism. See Paul of Eitzen, *Ethice doctrine*, lib. iv (1751), with later additions; also David Chyträus, 1600, *Virtutum descriptiones in precepta Decalogi distributa* (1555); Lambert Daneau († 1596), *Ethices Christianae*, lib. iii (Geneva, 1577); Thomas Venatorius, *De Virtute Christiana*, lib. iii; comp. Schwarz, *Thomas Venatorius, and the beginnings of Protestant ethics, in connection with the doctrine of justification*, *Stud. u. Krit.* (1850), heft. i. See also Melancthon, in his *Philosophia Moralis* (1539), his *Enarratio aliquot librorum Aristotelis* (1545), and his *Physica*. Add to these Keckermann, *Systema ethice tribus libris adornatum* (Geneva, 1614); Weigel, Johann Arndt, Valentin Andrea, Spener, Nitzsch, Henry Müller, Seriver, and others, all mystics. The Reformed have also done something in this line, especially G. Voetius, C. Vitringa, H. Witsius, Amesius, Amyraldus (*Morale Chrétienne*, 6 vols. 1652–1660).

Three men, according to J. A. Dorner (in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* iv, 199), form the transition stage to the emancipation of philosophy—Hugo Grotius (*De jure pacis et belli*), Puffendorf, with his school, and Christian Thomasius. Then come Wolf, Mosheim (in his *Moral*, 9 vols.), Steinhart, Bahrdt, Buddeus, Chr. Aug. Crusius, and J. F. Reuss (*Elementa theologie Moralis*, 1767). Even the Rom in Catholic Church of the last two centuries has felt the influence of the modern

philosophy; the following Romanist writers are Wolfians: Luby, Schwarzhuber, Schanza, and Stadler; and the following are Kantians: Wanker, Mutschelle, Hermes, with his disciples Braun, Elvenich, and Vogelsang. Weiller is a Schellingian; independent, and, at the same time, mild and evangelical, pious and rich in thought, are Michael Sailer and Hirscher. Geishütner is a Fichtian.

Kant's "practical reason," the metaphysics of ethics, occupies in the philosophy of morals a most important place, and, notwithstanding certain defects, it has the immortal honor to have discovered that the most certain of all things is the conscience in its relation to the practical reason, and to have made an end of the eudæmonism of ethics by means of the majesty of the moral law, which he compares with the glory of the starry heavens. To his "categorical imperative" certain rationalistic Kantians adhere; for example, J. W. Schmid, Karl Christian Schmid, and Krug. Some of the supernaturalists, as Stäudlin and Tieftrunk, Ammon and Vogel, incline to Jacobi's philosophy. See also Fichte, *System of Ethics* (1797). To the Jacobi-Friesian school belong De Wette (*Christliche Sittenlehre*, 4 bde. 1819-23), Kähler, and Baumgarten-Crusius. To the school of Hegel belong Michelet (*System der Philosoph. Moral*, Berlin, 1828), L. V. Henning (*Princip. der Ethik in historischer Entwicklung*, 1824), Vatke, *Von der menschl. Freiheit im Verhältnis zu Sünde und Gnade*, 1843; Marheineke (*Christliche Moral*, 1847), Daub (*Christliche Moral*, 1840). Of this school, yet more under the influence of Schleiermacher, are Martensen (*Syst. Moral Philos.* 1841), Wirth (*Syst. specul. Ethik*, 1841), H. Merz (*Syst. Christl. Sittenlehre, nach den Grundsätzen des Protestantismus*, etc., 1841).

The activity of Schleiermacher in Christian ethics, as in other departments of theology, was immense. From 1819 he published his treatises on "the idea of virtue," "the idea of duty," and on "the relation between the moral law and the law of nature;" also on the idea of what may be "allowed" and the "chief good." His system was not further published by himself, but after his death A. Schweizer edited his *Philos. Ethik* in 1835, and Jonas his *Christl. Sitten* in 1843. See also Sartorius, *Heil. Liebe*; Harless, *Christliche Ethik*; and especially Rothe, *Theolog. Ethik* (2d edit. 1867). Rothe (translated by Morrison, Clark's Library, Edinburgh, 1868, 8vo) seeks to combine Hegel's standpoint of objective knowledge with Schleiermacher's fine moral tact and organizing power, and to excel them both in his highly original method. See also Rutenick's *Christl. Sittenlehre* (1845); Gelzer, *Die Religion im Leben*, etc. (1854); Schwarz, *Evang. Chr. Ethik* (1836, 3d ed.); Wendt, *Kirchliche Ethik v. Standpunkte d. christl. Freiheit* (2 vols. 8vo, Leipz. 1864-65); Culman, *D. christliche Ethik* (Stuttgart, 1864-66, 2 vols. 8vo). This sketch of the history of ethics is chiefly condensed from Dörner's article (*Ethik*) in Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 165 sq. (B. H. N.)

*Appendix.*—It is proper to add to the above a brief account of the history of ethics, or moral philosophy, in England. A survey of this field will be found in Mackintosh, *General View of the Progress of Ethical Philosophy* (*Encyc. Britannica*, Prelim. Diss.), separately printed in his *Miscellaneous Works* (Lond. 1851, 12mo), and in a separate volume (Phila. 1832, 8vo); also in Whewell, *Lectures on the Hist. of Moral Philosophy in England* (Lond. 1852, 8vo); there is also a summary sketch of the history in Brande, *Dictionary of Science, Literature, and Art*, i, 821 sq. (Lond. 1865, 3 vols. 8vo). From these and other sources we condense the following sketch:

The modern English theories may be classed as selfish or disinterested, according as they found virtue on a selfish or a benevolent principle. The selfish theory is advocated by Hobbes († 1679), who makes self-love the exclusive passion, and consid-

ers pleasure the only motive to action (see his *Human Nature*, his *Leviathan*, and our article HOBBS). The same theory is adopted in substance by Jeremy Bentham († 1832), who assumes Hobbes's principle as self-evident, that every object is indifferent, except for its fitness to produce pleasure or pain, which he declares are the sole motives to action. "Bentham is the most distinguished propounder of the principle of utility as the basis of morals, a principle explained by him as in contrast, first, to asceticism, and next to 'sympathy and antipathy,' by which he meant to describe all those systems, such as the moral-sense theory, that are grounded in internal feeling, instead of a regard to outward consequences. In opposing utility to asceticism, he intended to imply that there was no merit attaching to self-denial as such, and that the infliction of pain or the surrender of pleasure could only be justified by being the means of procuring a greater amount of happiness than was lost" (Chambers, s. v.). See Bentham, *Treatise on Morals and Legislation*; and our article BENTHAM, JEREMY. Locke († 1704) denied the existence of a separate faculty for perceiving moral distinctions. In his *Essay on the Human Understanding* (bk. i, ch. iii), he maintains that virtue is approved of, not because it is innate, but because it is profitable. Paley († 1805) also rejected the doctrine of a moral sense, and held, in substance, the utilitarian theory, maintaining that "virtue is the doing good to mankind, in obedience to the will of God, and for the sake of everlasting happiness" (*Moral and Political Philosophy*). The utilitarian theory is taught by all the recent English writers of the materialistic school: see James Mill, *Analysis of the Human Mind* (Lond. 1829; see MILL, JAMES); Austin, *Province of Jurisprudence determined* (2d ed. Lond. 1861); John Stuart Mill, *Dissertations and Discussions* (1859); and his *Utilitarianism*, reprinted from Fraser's Magazine (1862; 2d ed. 1864); Bain, *The Emotions and the Will* (Lond. 1859); *The Senses and the Intellect* (Lond. 1855); also his *Mental and Moral Science* (Lond. 1868, 8vo), where he teaches that conscience is solely the product of education. See also, in reply to these writers, *The North British Review*, September, 1867, art. i; *The British Quarterly*, January, 1868, art. vi.

Opposed to the utilitarian theory there are two theories, which may be called the *instinctive* and the *rational*. The former refers the moral principle to the sensitive or emotive part of man's nature; the latter, to the perception of moral good and evil by the intellect. To the first class belongs Adam Smith († 1790), whose *Theory of the Moral Sentiments* (Glasgow, 1759; Lond. 1790, and often) refers the moral sense to *sympathy*. His view is thus stated by Mackintosh (*Ethical Philosophy*, Philadelphia, 1852, p. 149): "That mankind are so constituted as to sympathize with each other's feelings, and to feel pleasure in the accordance of these feelings, are the only facts required by Dr. Smith, and they certainly must be granted to him. To adopt the feelings of another is to *approve* them. When the sentiments of another are such as would be excited in us by the same objects, we approve them as *morally proper*. To obtain this accord, it becomes necessary for him who enjoys or suffers to lower his expression of feeling to the point to which the by-stander can raise his fellow-feelings, on which are founded all the high virtues of self-denial and self-command; and it is equally necessary for the by-stander to raise his sympathy as near as he can to the level of the original feeling. In all unsocial passions, such as anger, we have a *divided sympathy* between him who feels them and those who are the objects of them. Hence the propriety of extremely moderating them. Pure malice is always to be concealed or disguised, because all *sympathy* is arrayed against it. In the private passions, where there is only a *simple sympathy*—that with the original passion—the expression has more liberty. The benevolent affections, where there

is a *double sympathy*—with those who feel them and those who are their objects—are the most agreeable, and may be indulged with the least apprehension of finding no echo in other breasts. Sympathy with the gratitude of those who are benefited by good actions prompts us to consider them as deserving of reward, and forms the *sense of merit*; as fellow-feeling with the resentment of those who are injured by crimes leads us to look on them as worthy of punishment, and constitutes the *sense of demerit*. These sentiments require not only beneficial actions, but benevolent motives for them; being compounded, in the case of merit, of a direct sympathy with the good disposition of the benefactor, and an indirect sympathy with the person benefited; in the opposite case with the precisely opposite sympathies. He who does an act of wrong to another to gratify his own passions must not expect that the spectators, who have none of his undue partiality to his own interest, will enter into his feelings. In such a case he knows that they will pity the person wronged, and be full of indignation against him. When he is cooled, he adopts the sentiments of others on his own crime, feels *shame* at the *impropriety* of his former passion, pity for those who have suffered by him, and a dread of punishment from general and just resentment. Such are the constituent parts of remorse. Our moral sentiments respecting *ourselves* arise from those which others feel concerning us. We feel a self-approbation whenever we believe that the general feeling of mankind coincides with that state of mind in which we ourselves were at a given time. 'We suppose ourselves the spectators of our own behavior, and endeavor to imagine what effect it would in this light produce in us.' We must view our own conduct with the eyes of others before we can judge it. The sense of duty arises from putting ourselves in the place of others, and adopting their sentiments respecting our own conduct. In utter solitude there could have been no self-approbation. The *rules* of morality are a summary of those sentiments, and often beneficially stand in their stead when the self-delusion of passion would otherwise hide from us the nonconformity of our state of mind with that which, in the circumstances, can be entered into and approved by impartial bystanders. It is hence that we learn to raise our mind above local or temporary clamor, and to fix our eyes on the surest indications of the general and lasting sentiments of human nature. 'When we approve of any character or action, our sentiments are derived from four sources: first, we sympathize with the motives of the agent; secondly, we enter into the gratitude of those who have been benefited by his actions; thirdly, we observe that his conduct has been agreeable to the general rules by which these two sympathies generally act; and, last of all, when we consider such actions as forming part of a system of behavior which tends to promote the happiness either of the individual or of society, they appear to derive a beauty from this utility not unlike that which we ascribe to any well-contrived machine' (*Theory*, ii, 304, Edinb. 1801).

Lord Shaftesbury († 1713) published in 1699 his *Inquiry concerning Virtue* (also London, 1709, and in his *Characteristics*), which, according to Mackintosh, "is unquestionably entitled to a place in the first rank of English tracts on moral philosophy, and contains more intimations of an original and important nature on the theory of Ethics than perhaps any preceding work of modern times." This praise rests on the fact that Shaftesbury developed the doctrine of a *moral sense*. The "most original, as well as important of his suggestions is, that there are certain affections of the mind which, being contemplated by the mind itself through what he calls a *reflex sense*, become the objects of love, or the contrary, according to their nature. So approved and loved, they constitute *virtue* or *merit* as distinguished from mere *goodness*, of which

there are traces in animals who do not appear to reflect on the state of their own minds, and who seem, therefore, destitute of what he elsewhere calls a *moral sense*. These statements are, it is true, far too short and vague. He nowhere inquires into the origin of the reflex sense. What is a much more material defect, he makes no attempt to ascertain in what state of mind it consists. We discover only by implication, and by the use of the term *sense*, that he searches for the fountain of moral sentiments, not in mere reason, where Cudworth and Clarke had vainly sought for it, but in the heart, whence the main branch of them assuredly flows. It should never be forgotten that we owe to these hints the reception into ethical theory of a moral sense, which, whatever may be thought of its origin, or in whatever words it may be described, must always retain its place in such theory as a main principle of our moral nature. His demonstration of the utility of virtue to the individual far surpasses all attempts of the same nature, being founded, not on a calculation of outward advantages or inconveniences, alike uncertain, precarious, and degrading, but on the unshaken foundation of the delight, which is of the very essence of social affection and virtuous sentiment; on the dreadful agony inflicted by all malevolent passions upon every soul that harbors the hellish inmates; on the all-important truth that to love is to be happy, and to hate is to be miserable; that affection is its own reward, and ill-will its own punishment; or, as it has been more simply and more affectingly, as well as with more sacred authority, taught, that to give is more blessed than to receive, and that to love one another is the sum of all human virtue" (Mackintosh, *History of Ethical Philosophy*, p. 95).

Bishop Butler († 1752) sets forth his moral doctrine in his *Sermons* (often reprinted), which have been recently published as a text-book by the Rev. J. C. Passmore, under the title *Bishop Butler's Ethical Discourses* (Philadelphia, 1855, 12mo). He is undoubtedly the greatest of modern English writers on the true nature of ethics. "Mankind," he says, "have various principles of action, some leading directly to the private good, some immediately to the good of the community. But the private desires are not self-love, or any form of it; for self-love is the desire of a man's own happiness, whereas the object of an appetite or passion is some outward thing. Self-love seeks things as means of happiness; the private appetites seek things, not as means, but as ends. A man eats from hunger, and drinks from thirst; and though he knows that these acts are necessary to life, that knowledge is not the motive of his conduct. No gratification can indeed be imagined without a previous desire. If all the particular desires did not exist independently, self-love would have no object to employ itself about, for there would be no happiness, which, by the very supposition of the opponents, is made up of the gratification of various desires. No pursuit could be selfish or interested if there were not satisfactions first gained by appetites which seek their own outward objects without regard to self, which satisfactions compose the mass which is called a man's interest. In contending, therefore, that the benevolent affections are disinterested, no more is claimed for them than must be granted to mere animal appetites and to malevolent passions. Each of these principles alike seeks its own object for the sake simply of obtaining it. Pleasure is the result of the attainment, but no separate part of the aim of the agent. The desire that another person may be gratified seeks that outward object alone, according to the general course of human desire. Resentment is as disinterested as gratitude or pity, but not more so. Hunger or thirst may be, as much as the purest benevolence, at variance with self-love. A regard to our own general happiness is not a vice, but in itself an excellent quality. It were well if it prevailed more generally over crav-

ing and short-sighted appetites. The weakness of the social affections and the strength of the private desires properly constitute selfishness, a vice utterly at variance with the happiness of him who harbors it, and, as such, condemned by self-love. There are as few who attain the greatest satisfaction to themselves as who do the greatest good to others. It is absurd to say with some that the pleasure of benevolence is selfish because it is felt by self. Understanding and reasoning are acts of self, for no man can think by proxy; but no one ever called them *selfish*. Why? Evidently because they do not regard self. Precisely the same rule applies to benevolence. Such an argument is a gross confusion of self, as it is a *subject* of feeling or thought, with self considered as the *object* of either. It is no more just to refer the private appetites to self-love because they commonly promote happiness, than it would be to refer them to self-hatred in those frequent cases where their gratification obstructs it. But, besides the private or public desires, and besides the calm regard to our own general welfare, there is a principle in man, in its nature supreme over all others. This natural supremacy belongs to the faculty which surveys, approves, or disapproves the several affections of our minds and actions of our lives. As self-love is superior to the private passions, so conscience is superior to the whole of man. Passion implies nothing but an inclination to follow it, and in that respect passion differs only in force. But no notion can be formed of the principle of reflection or conscience which does not comprehend judgment, direction, superintendency. Authority over all other principles of action is a constituent part of the idea of conscience, and cannot be separated from it. Had it strength as it has right, it would govern the world. The passions would have their power but according to their nature, which is to be subject to conscience. Hence we may understand the purpose at which the ancients, perhaps confusedly, aimed when they laid it down that virtue consisted in following nature. It is neither easy, nor, for the main object of the moralist, important to render the doctrines of the ancients by modern language. If Butler returns to this phrase too often, it was rather from the remains of undistinguishing reverence for antiquity than because he could deem its employment important to his own opinions. The tie which holds together religion and morality is, in the system of Butler, somewhat different from the common representations, but not less close. Conscience, or the faculty of approving or disapproving, necessarily constitutes the bond of union. Setting out from the belief of theism, and combining it, as he had entitled himself to do, with the reality of conscience, he could not avoid discovering that the being who possessed the highest moral qualities is the object of the highest moral affections. He contemplates the Deity through the moral nature of man. In the case of a being who is to be perfectly loved, 'goodness must be the simple actuating principle within him, this being the moral quality which is the immediate object of love.' 'The highest, the adequate object of this affection, is perfect goodness, which, therefore, we are to love with all our heart, with all our soul, and with all our strength.' 'We should refer ourselves implicitly to him, and cast ourselves entirely upon him. The whole attention of life should be to obey his commands' (Sermon xiii, *On the Love of God*). Moral distinctions are thus presupposed before a step can be made towards religion: virtue leads to piety; God is to be loved, because goodness is the object of love; and it is only after the mind rises through human morality to divine perfection that all the virtues and duties are seen to hang from the throne of God" (Mackintosh, *History of Ethical Philosophy*, 116 sq.).

To the same school belong Hutcheson († 1747), who taught that moral good is simply what the word itself expresses, which is not explicable by any other phrase.

From this he argues that moral good must be perceived by a sense, because the senses alone are percipient of simple qualities (see his *Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue*, Glasgow, 1725, and often). Hume (*Inquiry concerning the Principles of Morals*) asserts, indeed, that general utility constitutes a uniform ground of moral distinctions, and that reason judges of the utility of actions. But he asserts also that we *approve* of good and *disapprove* of evil in virtue of a primary sentiment of our nature (distinct from self-love), which he calls benevolence or humanity, but which is identical with conscience, or the moral sense. As to the idea of moral obligation, he makes it simply a judgment of the understanding that happiness flows from obedience to the moral faculty rather than from obedience to self-love. For the doctrines of Mackintosh, we must refer our readers to his admirable sketch (so often cited in this article) of the *History of Ethical Philosophy*.

Of the so-called *Rational* school, the distinctive characteristic is "that it considers the idea of good to be an *à priori* conception of reason, in which the idea of obligation is necessarily and essentially implied. As to the nature of the idea itself, two opinions have been held, viz. 1, that it is simple and immediate; 2, that it derives its explanation and authority from some higher notion of the intellect. The most distinguished representatives of the latter opinion are Clarke and Wollaston, while the former has found able advocates in Cudworth, Price, and Stewart" (Brande, *l. c.*).

Dr. McCosh (*American Presbyt. Review*, Jan. 1868, art. i) classes the modern views on ethics in Great Britain into the two schools of Sensational and Rational (or *à priori*), "corresponding to the two schools of philosophy which have divided Europe since Descartes and Locke." Under the latter he classes Cudworth, Clarke, Coleridge, Reid, Stewart, and Sir W. Hamilton; "none of them, however, except Coleridge, taking up so high *à priori* grounds as Descartes and Cousin in France, or Kant and Hegel in Germany." The Protestants of England, in the main, at this time, according to the same writer, do not agree with those Roman Catholic writers who deny an independent morality apart from the authority of the Church; while, on the other hand, they do not agree with the philosophers who assert not only the independence, but the *sufficiency* of ethnic or natural morality. (See the article cited for a view of the relations of the modern sensational doctrine to theology and religion.)

Among American writers, Jonathan Edwards († 1758) is first to be named in this field. In his *Discertation concerning the End of true Virtue*, and that *On the End for which God created the World* (both contained in his *Works*, N. Y. ed. vol. ii), he sets forth an ethical theory marked by the subtlety and originality which characterize all his speculations. Mackintosh sums it up as follows: "True virtue, according to him, consists in benevolence, or love to being 'in general,' which he afterwards limits to 'intelligent being,' though *sentient* would have involved a more reasonable limitation. This good will is felt towards a particular being, first, *in proportion to his degree of existence* (for, says he, 'that which is great has more existence, and is farther from nothing, than that which is little'); and, secondly, *in proportion to the degree in which that particular being feels benevolence to others*. Thus God, having infinitely more existence and benevolence than man, ought to be infinitely more loved; and for the same reason, God must love himself infinitely more than he does all other beings. He can act only from regard to himself, and his end in creation can only be to manifest his whole nature, which is called acting for his own glory." See also, on his ethical theory, the article EDWARDS in Appleton's *Cyclopadia*, vii, 18; and the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April, 1853, p. 402 sq. There are many excellent manuals, prepared for text-books,

by American writers, such as those of Adams, Wayland, Alexander, Haven, Alden, Hopkins, etc., for farther mention of which we have not space. Hickok (*System of Moral Science*, 1853, 8vo) treats the subject from the *à priori* point of view, and also in its relations to Christian theology, in a very masterly manner. He makes duty an end in and of itself. The voice of conscience is imperative. "There is an awful sanctuary in every immortal spirit, and man needs nothing more than to exclude all else, and stand alone before himself, to be made conscious of an authority he can neither dethrone nor delude. From its approbation comes self-respect; from its disapprobation comes self-contempt. A stern behest is ever upon him that he do nothing to degrade the real dignity of his spiritual being. He is a law to himself, and has both the judge and executioner within himself, and inseparable from him." "We may call this the imperative of the reason, the constraint of conscience, or the voice of God within him; but, by whatever terms expressed, the real meaning will be that every man has consciously the bond upon him to do that, and that only, which is due to his spiritual excellency." "To be thus worthy of spiritual approbation is the end of all ends; and as worthy of happiness, this may now righteously be given and righteously taken, but not righteously paid as price or claimed as wages. The good is to be worthy, not that he is to get something for it. The highest good—the *summum bonum*—is worthiness of spiritual approbation" (*Moral Science*, p. 45-49).

Christian ethics, as distinguished from moral philosophy in general, has not received the same attention from English and American writers as from German. The earlier books on Casuistry (q. v.) and Cases of Conscience, however, belong under this head. Most of the standard English and American writers commingle philosophical morals with Christian ethics. Butler brings out with clearness the relations of ethics to the Christian religion. Wardlaw's *Christian Ethics* (3d ed. Lond. 1837, Boston; 5th ed. Lond. 1852) asserts that "the science of morals has no province at all independently of theology, and that it cannot be philosophically discussed except upon theological principles (Boston ed. p. 367, note). Watson (*Theolog. Instit.* pt. iii) treats of Christian ethics under the title "The Morals of Christianity," and denies the *à priori* method (see Cocker, in *Meth. Quart.* Jan. 1864). Spalding (*Phil. of Christian Morals*, Lond. 1843, 8vo) has "recourse both to science as derived from an examination of man's moral nature, and to revelation as derived from an examination of the Scriptures."

In France, the orthodox Roman Catholic writers have generally confined themselves to the so-called Moral Theology (q. v.). The Cartesian school [see DES CARTES] cultivated Ethics in the new philosophical spirit; its best representative is Malebranche. Virtue he defines to be the love of universal order, as it eternally existed in the divine reason, where every created reason contemplates it. Particular duties are but the applications of this love. He abandoned the ancient classification of four cardinal virtues, and for it substituted the modern distinction of duties toward God, men, and ourselves. The French school of Sensualism, of which Condillac was the head [see CONDILLAC], regarded all intellectual operations, even judgment and volition, as transformed sensations; and Helvetius, applying the theory to morals, held that self-love or interest is the exclusive motor of man, denied disinterested motives, made pleasure the only good, and referred to legislative rewards and punishments as illustrating the whole system of individual action. La Mettrie maintained an atheistic Epicurism, and Condorcet wished to substitute an empirical education for the ideas and sanctions of religion and morality. The most complete and logical elaboration of the materialism, atheism, and fatalism of the period,

which had pleasure for its single aim and law, was given in D'Holbach's *Système de la nature*. Of the later French writers, Jouffroy is perhaps the most important. He gave a peculiar explanation of good and evil. Every thing is good in proportion as it aids in the fulfilment of our destiny. The problem of human destiny, therefore, lies at the foundation of morality. There can be no *à priori* judgment as to the moral quality of actions, since that is relative to the agent, depending on the influence they may have on the destiny for which he was created. Good, in the case of any particular being, is the fulfilment of its own specific destiny; good, in itself, is the fulfilment of the destiny of all beings; and an interruption in the accomplishment of destiny constitutes evil. His system of Ethics is chiefly laid down in his *Cours du Droit naturel* (2 vols., Par. 1835; a third vol. was edited after his death by Damiron, 1842), his most eloquent work, which, besides ethics, treats of psychology and theodicy. Some points are more fully developed in a series of essays, which first appeared in periodicals, and of which subsequently two collections (*Mélanges philosophiques* and *Nouveaux mélanges philosophiques*) were published.

See, besides the authors named in the course of this article, *A Sketch of the History of Moral Philosophy*, in the introduction to St. Hilaire's translation of Aristotle's *Politics* (*Politique d'Aristote*, Paris); Meiners, *Allgem. Krit. Geschichte d. älteren u. neueren Ethik* (Göttingen, 1801, 2 vols.); Hagenbach, *Encyclop. u. Methodologie*, § 92; Cousin, *Œuvr. Philosophiques* (Paris, 1846-52); Batain, *Morale* (Paris, 1842, 2 vols.); Damiron, *Cours de Philosophie*, vols. iii and iv (Paris, 1842); Jouffroy, *Introd. to Ethics*, transl. by Channing (Boston, 1840, 2 vols. 8vo); Janet, *Hist. des idées morales et politiques* (Paris, 1856); Neander, *Vorlesungen u. d. Geschichte d. christl. Ethik* (Berl. 1865, 8vo); Neander, *Relation of Grecian to Christian Ethics*; *Christ. Exam.* xxix, 153; xxx, 145; *Bibl. Sac.* 1853, 476 sq.; article *Ethics* in Chambers's *Encyclopædia*, and in the *Penny Cyclopædia*, both in the interest of the sensational philosophy; *North British Review*, Dec. 1867, art. iv; Wuttke, *Handbuch der christl. Sittenlehre* (2 vols. 8vo, 1861-62; 2d edit. 1866); Maurice, *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*; Maurice, *The Conscience: Lectures on Casuistry* (London, 1868). On the nature of evil, see *EVIL*; *SIN*. On liberty and necessity, see *WILL*. For the Roman Catholic way of treating ethics, see *MORAL THEOLOGY*.

**Ethiopia** (1 Esdr. iii, 2; Est. xiii, 1; xvi, 1; Judith i, 10; Acts viii, 27; the Hebrew *קוש*, *Kush*, i. e. *Cush*, as it is generally rendered, Gen. ii, 13; 2 Kings xix, 9; Esth. i, 1; Job xxviii, 19; Psa. lxxviii, 31; lxxxvii, 4; Isa. xviii, 1; xx, 3, 5; xxxvii, 9; xlv, 14; Ezek. xxx, 4, 5; xxxviii, 5; Nah. iii, 9), a country which, as thus designated by the ancients, lay to the south of Egypt, and embraced, in its most extended sense, the modern *Nubia*, *Sennar*, *Kordofan*, and northern *Abyssinia*, and in its more definite sense the kingdom of Meroë, from the junction of the Blue and White branches of the Nile to the border of Egypt. In one passage in the description of the garden of Eden, an Asiatic Cush or Ethiopia must be intended (Gen. ii, 13), and the distribution of the descendants of Cush, with later Biblical historical indications, should be compared with the classical mentions of eastern and western Ethiopians, and other indications of profane history. In all other passages, the words *Ethiopia* and the *Ethiopians*, with one possible exception, "the Arabians, that [were] near the Ethiopians" (2 Chron. xxi, 16), which may refer to Arabians opposite to Ethiopia, may be safely considered to mean an African country and people or peoples. In the Bible, as in classical geography, but one limit of Ethiopia is laid down, its northern frontier, just beyond Syene, the most southern town of Egypt. Egypt is spoken of as to be desolate "from Migdol to Syene, even unto the

border of Ethiopia" (Ezek. xxix, 10), or "from Migdol to Syene" (xxx, 6), showing that then, as now, the southern boundary of Egypt was at the First Cataract. In other directions the boundaries can only be generally described as the Red Sea on the E., the Libyan desert on the W., and the Abyssinian highlands on the S. The extent assigned to Ethiopia in ancient times may have been very great, as it was the land of the negroes, and therefore represented all that was known of inner Africa, besides that part of the continent south of Egypt which is washed by the Red Sea. The references in the Bible are, however, generally, if not always, to the territory which was at times under Egyptian rule, a tract watered by the Upper Nile, and extending from Egypt probably as far as a little above the confluence of the White and Blue Rivers.

The Hebrews do not appear to have had much practical acquaintance with Ethiopia itself, though the Ethiopians were well known to them through their intercourse with Egypt. They were, however, perfectly aware of its position (Ezek. xxix, 10), and they describe it as a well-watered country lying "from the side of" (A.V. "beyond") the waters of Cush (Isa. xviii, 1; Zeph. iii, 10), being traversed by the two branches of the Nile, and by the Astaboras or Tacazze. The Nile descends with a rapid stream in this part of its course, forming a series of cataracts: its violence seems to be referred to in the words of Isa. xviii, 2, "whose land the rivers have spoiled." The Hebrews seem also to have been aware of its tropical characteristics, the words translated in the A.V. "the land shadowing with wings" (Isa. xviii, 1), admitting the sense of "the land of the shadow of both sides," the shadows falling towards the north and south at different periods of the year, a feature which is noticed by many early writers (compare the expression in Strabo, ii, p. 13; ἀμφοτέρωθεν; Virgil, *Ecl.* x, 68; Pliny, ii, 75). The papyrus boats ("vessels of bulrushes," Isa. xviii, 2), which were peculiarly adapted to the navigation of the Upper Nile, admitting of being carried on men's backs when necessary, were regarded as a characteristic feature of the country. The Hebrews carried on commercial intercourse with Ethiopia, its "merchandise" (Isa. xlv, 14) consisting of ebony, ivory, frankincense, and gold (Herod. iii, 97, 114), and precious stones (Job xxviii, 19; Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 6, 5).

The following close translation of Isaiah's splendid summons (chap. xviii) to the Ethiopians, as auxiliaries to the Egyptians in the struggle against Sennacherib, is inserted here as graphic of many salient features of that warlike state:

Ho! land of whirling wings,  
That art across the rivers of Cush;  
That sendest on the sea ambassadors,  
Even in vessels of papyrus upon the face of the waters.  
Go, ye light messengers,  
To a nation drafted and drilled,  
To a people fearful henceforth and onward,  
A nation most valiant and dominant,  
Whose land rivers have split:  
All ye inhabitants of the world,  
And dwellers of the land,  
At the lifting of the standard of the mountains you shall see,  
And at the clanging of the trumpet you shall hear.  
For thus has Jehovah said to me:  
I will calmly look on my place—  
Like serene heat above sunlight,  
Like the cloud of dew in the heat of harvest;  
Yet before the harvest, when the blossom has grown perfect,  
Or a plump green grape can the flower become,  
Then has one cut the shoots with the pruning-knives,  
And the twigs has he removed, lopped.  
And they shall be left together for the buzzard of the mountains,  
And for the beast of the earth;  
And upon him shall the buzzard summer,  
And every beast of the earth shall winter upon him.  
In that time shall a present be led to Jehovah of armies,  
Of a people drafted and drilled,  
Even from a people fearful henceforth and onward,  
A nation most valiant and dominant,  
Whose land rivers have split,  
To the place of the name of Jehovah of armies, Mount Zion.

The inhabitants of Ethiopia were a Hamitic race (Gen. x, 6), and are described in the Bible as a dark-complexioned (Jer. xliii, 23) and stalwart race (Isa. xlv, 14, "men of stature;" xviii, 2, for "scattered," some substitute "tall"). Their stature is noticed by Herodotus (ii, 20, 114) as well as their handsomeness. Not improbably the latter quality is intended by the term in Isa. xviii, 2, which in the A.V. is rendered "peeled," but which may mean "fine-looking." Their appearance led to their being selected as attendants in royal households (Jer. xxxviii, 7). The Ethiopians are on one occasion coupled with the Arabians, as occupying the opposite shores of the Red Sea (2 Chron. xxi, 16); but elsewhere they are connected with African nations, particularly Egypt (Isa. lxxviii, 31; Isa. xx, 3, 4; xliii, 3; xlv, 14), Phut (Jer. xli, 9), Lub and Lud (Ezek. xxx, 5), and the Sukkim (2 Chron. xii, 3). They were divided into various tribes, of which the Sabæans were the most powerful. See SEBA; SUKKIM.

The name Cush is found in the Egyptian KISH, which is evidently applied to the same territory, though we have the same difficulty in determining its limits, save on the north. The classical *Æthiopia* (Αἰθιοπία) may have the same origin, through the Coptic *ethos*, of which, unless it be derived from *thos*, "a boundary," the Sahidic form *esos* may be the purest, and connect the classical with the ancient Egyptian name. The Greeks themselves regarded it as expressive of a dark complexion (from αἶθεω, "to burn," and ἄν, "a countenance"). In the Bible there is no certain notice of any Ethiopian race but Cushites.

According to Dr. Brugsch, the first country above Egypt was TA-MERU-PET, or TA-KENS, corresponding to Nubia, and extending, under the Pharaohs, at least as far south as Napata. Dr. Brugsch supposes that TA-KENS was, in the earlier times, the whole tract south of Syene under Egyptian rule [therefore governed by the prince of KISH, and corresponding to or included in that country], and, in the later times, little more than the Dodecaschennus of the Ptolemies and Romans, the remains of the older territory (*Geographische Inschriften*, i, 100). As a nome, Nubia, before the formation of the Ombite Nome, included Omlos, Silsilis being probably the first city of the Egyptian Apollinopolite Nome. Although it is not impossible that at Silsilis was anciently the great natural barrier of Egypt on the south, we think that this extension of Nubia was simply for purposes of government, as Dr. Brugsch seems to admit (*Geogr. Inschr.* i, 100). South of the Nubia of the Pharaohs he places a region of which the name perhaps reads PENT-HEN?-NUFTE, which, however, was probably a district of the former country. Still further, and near Meroë, he puts the land of KISH, and in and about Meroë the land of the NEISI or negroes. Others, however, think that KISH commenced immediately above Egypt, probably always at the First Cataract, and included all the known country south of Egypt, TA-MERU-PET or TA-KENS, save as a nome, being a part of it, the modern Nubia. Names of conquered negro nations, tribes, or countries occur on the monuments of the empire: of these, the most suggestive are the BARBARTA and TAKRERR (see Brugsch, *Geogr. Inschr.* i, 100-107, 150-164; ii, 4, 13, 20; iii, 3, 4, and indices s. v. *Æthiopian*, Kes, etc.).

Ethiopia comprises two very different tracts. North of the region of tropical rains, it is generally an extremely narrow strip of cultivated land, sometimes but a few yards wide, on both sides, or occasionally on one side only, of the Nile. Anciently the watered tract was much broader, but the giving way of a barrier at Silsilis (Jebel es-Silsileh) or Syene (Asswân) has lowered the level of the river for some distance above the First Cataract; exactly how far cannot be accurately determined, but certainly for the whole space below the Third Cataract. The cultivable soil which was

anciently productive is now far above the highest level of the stream. The valley is, however, never broad, the mountains seldom leaving a space of more than a mile within the greater part of the region north of the limit of tropical rains. The aspect of the country is little varied. On either side of the river, here narrower than in its undivided course in Upper Egypt, rise sterile sandstone and limestone mountains, the former sometimes covered by yellow sand-drifts. At the First Cataract, at Kalab'sheb, and at the Second Cataract, the river is obstructed, though at the second place not enough to form a rapid, by red granite and other primary rocks. The groves of date-palms, here especially fine, are the most beautiful objects in the scene, but its general want of variety is often relieved by the splendid remains of Egyptian and Ethiopian civilization, and the clearness of the air throws a peculiar beauty over everything that the traveller beholds. As he ascends the river, the scenery, after a time, becomes more varied, until on the east he reaches the Abyssinian highlands, on the west the long meadows, the pasture-lands of herds of elephants, through which flows the broad and sluggish White Nile. In this upper region the climate is far less healthy than below, save in Abyssinia, which, from its height, is drained, and enjoys an air which is rare and free from exhalations. The country is thus for the most part mountainous, the ranges gradually increasing in altitude towards the S., until they attain an elevation of about 8000 feet in Abyssinia.

The Nile is the great fertilizer of the northern regions of Ethiopia, which depend wholly upon its yearly inundation. It is only towards the junction of the two great streams that the rains take an increasingly important share in the watering of the cultivable land. In about N. lat.  $17^{\circ} 40'$ , the great river receives its first tributary, the Astaboras, now called the Atbarah. In about N. lat.  $15^{\circ} 40'$  is the confluence of the Blue and White Niles. The Blue Nile, which has its source in Abyssinia, is a narrow, rapid stream, with high, steep mud-banks, like the Nile in Egypt; it is strongly charged with alluvial soil, to which it owes the dark color which has given it its distinctive name. From this stream the country below derives the annual alluvial deposits. The White Nile is a colorless river, very broad and shallow, creeping slowly through meadows and wide marsh-lands. Of the cultivation and natural products of Ethiopia little need be said, as they do not illustrate the few notices of it in Scripture. It has always been, excepting the northern part, productive, and rich in animal life. Its wild animals have gradually been reduced, yet still the hippopotamus, the crocodile, and the ostrich abound, though the second alone is found throughout its extent. The elephant and lion are only known in its southernmost part.

In the Bible a Cushite appears undoubtedly to be equivalent to a negro, from this passage, "Can the

Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his stripes?" (Jer. xiii, 23); and it is to be observed, that whenever the race of KISH is represented on the Egyptian monuments by a single individual, the type is that of the true negro (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* i, 404, abridgm.). It is therefore probable that the negro race anciently extended further to the north than at present, the whole country watered by the Nile, as far as it is known, being now peopled by a race intermediate between the negro race and the Caucasian. There is no certain mention in the Bible of this intermediate race in Ethiopia, but the Egyptian and Ethiopian monuments afford us indications of its ancient existence in its modern territory, though probably it did not then extend as far south as now. At the present day, Ethiopia is inhabited by a great variety of tribes of this race: the Kunúz, said to be of Arab origin, nearest to Egypt, are very dark; the Núbeh, the next nation, much lighter; beyond them are some fair Arabs, the Caucasian Abyssinians, with scarcely any trace of negro influence save in their dark color, and tribes as black as the true negro, or nearly so, though not of the pure negro type. The languages of Ethiopia are as various as the tribes, and appear to hold the same intermediate place between the Shemitic group and the Nigritian, if we except the Ethiopic, which belongs to the former family. See ETHIOPIC LANGUAGE.

In all that relates to the civilization of ancient Ethiopia we see the same connection with Egypt that is constantly indicated in the Bible. So far as the Egyptian sway extended, which was probably, under the empire, as far as somewhat above the junction of the two Niles, the religion of Egypt was probably practised. While the tract was under Egyptian rule this was certainly the case, as the remains of the temples sufficiently show. We find it as the religion of Tirhakah in his Ethiopian as well as his Egyptian sculptures, and this is also the case with the later kings of Ethiopia who held no sway in Egypt. There were evidently local differences, but apparently nothing more. Respecting the laws and forms of government the same may be supposed. We have very little evidence as to the military matters of the Ethiopians, yet, from their importance to Egypt, there can be little doubt that they were skilful soldiers. Their armies were probably drawn from the Ethiopian or intermediate race, not from the negro. Of the domestic life of this people we have but slight hints. Probably they were more civilized than are their modern successors. Their art, as seen in the sculptures of their kings in Ethiopian temples from Tirhakah downwards, is merely a copy of that of Egypt, showing, after the first, an inferiority in style to the contemporary works of the original art. Their character can scarcely be determined from scanty statements, applying, it may be, to extremely different tribes. In one particular all accounts agree: they were warlike, as, for instance, we equally see in the defiance the Ethiopian king sent to Cambyses (Herod. iii, 21), and in the characteristic inscription at Kalab'sheb of Silco, "king (*βασιλευς*) of the Nubæe and all the Ethiopians" (*Modern Egypt and Thebes*, ii, 311, 312), who is to be regarded as a very late Ethiopian king or chief in the time of the Roman empire. The ancients, from Homer downwards, describe them as a happy and pious race. In the Bible they are spoken of as "secure" or "careless" (Ezek. xxx, 9), but this may merely refer to their state when danger was impending.

Probably the modern inhabitants of Ethiopia give us a far better picture of their predecessors than we can gather from the few notices to which we have alluded. If we compare the Nubians with the representations of the ancient Egyptians on the monuments, we are struck by a similarity of type, the same manner of wearing the hair, and a like scantiness of clothing. There can be



Ancient Ethiopians, as suppliants.—From the Egyptian Monuments. (The first cut shows their color.)

no question that the Nubians are mainly descended from an Egyptianized Ethiopian people of two thousand years ago, who were very nearly related to the Egyptians. The same may be said of many tribes further to the south, although sometimes we find the Arab type and Arab manners and dress. The Ethiopian monuments show us a people like the ancient Egyptians and the modern Nubians. The northern Nubians are a simple people, with some of the vices, but most of the virtues of savages. The chastity of their women is celebrated, and they are noted for their fidelity as servants. But they are inhospitable and cruel, and lack the generous qualities of the Arabs. Further south manners are corrupt, and the national character is that of Egypt without its humanity, and untouched by any but the rudest civilization.

In speaking of the history of the country, we may include what is known of its chronology, since this is no more than the order in which kings reigned. Until the time of the 12th dynasty of Egypt we have neither chronology nor history of Ethiopia. We can only speculate upon the earlier conditions of the country with the aid of some indications in the Bible. The first spread of the descendants of Cush seems to be indicated by the order in which the Cushite tribes, families, or heads are enumerated in Gen. x. All the names, excepting Nimrod, might be thought to indicate a colonization of Southern and Eastern Arabia, were there not good reason to suppose that Seba, though elsewhere mentioned with Sheba (Psa. lxxii, 10), is connected with Ethiopia, and is probably the Hebrew name of the chief Ethiopian kingdom from the time of Solomon downwards. (Josephus calls Meroë Saba, *Ant.* ii, 10, 2, and Seba of Cush he calls Sabas, *ib.* i, 6, 2.) If this be the case, it would be remarkable that Nimrod is mentioned at the end of the list and Seba at the beginning, while the intervening names, mostly if not all, are Arabian. This distribution may account for the strongly-Caucasian type of the Abyssinians, and the greater indication of Nigrinian influence in all the other Ethiopian races; for a curve drawn from Nimrod's first kingdom—there can, we think, be little doubt that the meaning in Genesis is, that he went northward and founded Nineveh—and extending along the South Arabian coast, if carried into Africa, would first touch Abyssinia. The connection of Southern Arabia and Abyssinia has been so strong for about two thousand years that we must admit the reasonableness of this theory of their ancient colonization by kindred tribes. The curious question of the direction from which Egyptian civilization came cannot here be discussed. It is possible that it may have descended the Nile, as was, until lately, supposed by many critics, in accordance with statements of the Greek writers. The idea or tradition on which these writers probably build may be due to the Nigrinian origin of the low nature-worship of the old Egyptian religion, and perhaps, as far as it is picture-writing, of the hieroglyphic system, of which the characters are sometimes called Ethiopic letters by ancient writers.

The history of Ethiopia is closely interwoven with that of Egypt. The two countries were not unfrequently united under the rule of the same sovereign. The first Egyptian king who governed Ethiopia was one of the 12th dynasty, named Osirtasen I, the Sesostris of Herod. ii, 110. During the occupation of Egypt by the Hyksos, the 13th dynasty retired to the Ethiopian capital, Napata; and again we find the kings of the 18th and 19th dynasties exercising a supremacy over Ethiopia, and erecting numerous temples, the ruins of which still exist at Semneh, Amada, Soleb, Abusimbel, and Jebel Berkel. The tradition of the successful expedition of Moses against the Ethiopians, recorded by Josephus (*Ant.* ii, 10), was doubtless founded on the general superiority of the Egyptians at that period of their history.

Under the 12th dynasty we find the first materials

for a history of Ethiopia. In these days Nubia seems to have been thoroughly Egyptianized as far as beyond the Second Cataract, but we have no indication of the existence at that time in Ethiopia of any race but the Egyptian. We find an allusion to the negroes in the time between the 12th dynasty and the 18th, in the name of a king of that period, which reads RA?NEUSI, or "the Sun? of the Negroes," rather than "the Negro Sun?" (*Turin Papyrus of Kings*, ap. Lepsius *Königsbuch*, pl. xviii, 197; xix, 278). The word NEUSI is the constant designation of the negro race in hieroglyphics.

Before passing to the beginning of the 18th dynasty, when the Egyptian empire definitely commenced [see EGYPT], we may notice two possible references to the Ethiopians in connection with the Exodus, an event which probably occurred at an early period of that empire. In Isa. xliii, which, though relating to the future, also speaks of the past, and especially mentions or alludes to the passage of the Red Sea (see particularly ver. 16, 17), Ethiopia is thus apparently connected with the Exodus: "I gave Egypt [for] thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee" (ver. 3). It can scarcely be supposed that this is an emphatic relation of future events, and it is difficult to connect it with any other known past event, as the conquest of Egypt by Sennacherib, which may have already occurred. If this passage refer to the Exodus, it would seem to favor the idea that the Israelites went out during the empire, for then Ethiopia was ruled by Egypt, and would have been injured by the calamities that befel that country. In Amos there is a passage that may possibly connect the Ethiopians with the Exodus: "[Are] ye not as children of the Ethiopians unto me, O children of Israel? saith the LORD. Have not I brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt? and the Philistines from Caphtor, and the Syrians from Kir?" (ix, 7). But the meaning may be that the Israelites were no better than the idolatrous people of Cush.

At the beginning of the 18th dynasty we find the Egyptians making expeditions into Ethiopia, no doubt into its farther regions, and bringing back slaves. At this time the Egyptians seem to have intermarried with people of Ethiopia, probably of the intermediate race, darker than the Egyptians, but not of the negro race. One of the wives of Aämwes, or Amosis, the first king of the 18th dynasty, is represented as black, though not with negro features. A later sovereign of the same dynasty, Amenoph III, is seen by his statues to have been partly Ethiopian, and this may have been one cause of his identification by the Greeks with Memnon. During this and the dynasty which succeeded it, the 19th, we have no proof that the regularly-governed Egyptian dominions extended beyond Napata, but it is probable that they reached a little beyond the junction of the White and Blue Niles. There can be no doubt that Ethiopia remained subject to Egypt as late as the reign of Rameses VI, soon after whom the proper Egyptian empire may be said to have closed, having lasted three centuries from the beginning of the 18th dynasty. Under that empire, Ethiopia, or at least the civilized portion, was ruled by a governor, who bore the title SUTEN-SA-EN-KISU, "Prince," literally "Royal son," "of Cush," etc. The office does not seem to have been hereditary at any time, nor is it known to have been held by a son of the reigning king, or any member of the royal family.

After the reign of Rameses VI, the feebleness of the later Theban kings may have led to the loss of Ethiopia, and we know that in Solomon's time there was a kingdom of Seba. Shishak, the first king of the 22d dynasty, probably made Ethiopia tributary. When this king, the Sheshonk I of the monuments, invaded the kingdom of Judah, he had in his army "the Lubim, the Sukkiim, and the Cushim" (2 Chron. xii, 13). The Lubim are a people of Northern Africa, near Egypt, and the Sukkiim are of doubtful place. The



indications are of an extensive dominion in Africa; for, though the Lubim and Sukkim may have been mercenaries, it is unlikely that the Cushim were also. There can be no doubt that Shishak was a powerful king, especially as he was strong enough to invade Judah, and it is therefore probable that he restored the influence of the Egyptians in Ethiopia. See SHISHAK, Zerah the Ethiopian, on account of his army being of Cushim and Lubim, and thus, as well as in consisting of chariots, horsemen, and foot, of like composition with that of Shishak (2 Chron. xvi, 8; xiv, 9, 12, 13; xii, 2, 3), seems certainly to have been either a king of this dynasty, or else a general of such a king. In the former case he would probably correspond to Osorkon II. The names Osorkon and Zerah seem very remote, but it must be remembered that Egyptian words transcribed in Hebrew are often much changed, and that in this case it is probable that both Egyptian and Hebrew forms, if they be two orthographical representations of one word, come from a third source. The style "Zerah the Cushite" is unlike that applied to kings of Egypt who were foreigners, or of foreign extraction, as in the cases of "So, king of Egypt," and "Shishak, king of Egypt." On this account, and especially from the omission of the word king, or any royal appellation, though we cannot infer positively from the few instances in Scripture, Zerah may be rather supposed to have been a general, but the army that he commanded must, from the resemblance of its composition to that of Shishak's, have been that of a king of the same line. Mr. Kenrick rather too hastily remarks as to the term Cushite, that "no king of the Bubastite [22d] dynasty could have been so designated," and is at some pains to explain what he considers to be a mistake (*Ancient Egypt*, ii, 297 sq.). It is recorded that Asa had an army of 580,000, and that Zerah the Ethiopian came against him with 1,000,000, and 300 chariots. These high numbers have been objected to; but the history of our times shows that war upon this large scale is not alone possible to great kingdoms, but also to states of no very large population which put forth their whole strength. It is to be noticed that Asa was evidently struck by the greatness of the hostile army, to which the prophet Hanani alludes, reproving him at a later time (2 Chron. xvi, 8). See NUMBER. Asa encountered Zerah "in the valley of Zephathah at Mareshah," and, praying for God's aid against this huge army, it was put to the rout, and he pursued it to Gerar, and smote all the cities round Gerar, which seem to have been in alliance with the invaders, and took much spoil from the cities, and also smote the tents of cattle, from which he took many sheep and camels (xiv, 8-15). This great overthrow may have been a main cause of the decline of the power of the 22d dynasty, which probably owed its importance to the successes of Shishak. See ZERAH.

During the later period of this dynasty, it is probable that Ethiopia became wholly independent. The 23d dynasty appears to have been an Egyptian line of little power. The 24th, according to Manetho, of but one king, Bocchoris the Saite, was probably contemporary with it. In the time of Bocchoris, Egypt was conquered by Sabaco the Ethiopian, who founded the 25th dynasty of Ethiopian kings. The chronology and history of this line is obscure. We take Manetho's list for the chronology, with a few necessary corrections in the length of the reigns, in the following table [see EGYPT]:

The duration here given to the first and second reigns can only be considered to be conjectural. Herodotus assigns 50 years as the duration of the Ethiopian dominion in Egypt (ii, 137, 139), and as he lived at no great distance from the time, and is to be depended upon for the chronology of the next dynasty, we should lay some stress upon his evidence did he not speak of but one Ethiopian king, Sabacos. Perhaps he includes in this single reign that of Tirhakah, and omits that of the first Sabacos. There are two Hebrew synchronisms and one Egyptian point of evidence which aid us in endeavoring to fix the chronology of this dynasty. Either the first or second king of the dynasty is supposed to be the So of the Bible, with whom Hoshea, who began to reign B.C. 729-8, made a treaty at least three years before the taking of Samaria: the latter event is fixed at B.C. 720; therefore one of these two Ethiopians was probably reigning in B.C. 723, or somewhat, perhaps seven years, earlier. See So. Nor is it supposable that the treaty may have been made before the conquest of Egypt; for So is expressly called "king of Egypt" (2 Kings xvii, 4), whereas Zerah and Tirhakah are distinctively styled Cushites (2 Chron. xiv, 9; 2 Kings xix, 9). Tirhakah was contemporary with Hezekiah and Sennacherib at the time of the destruction of the Assyrian army. The chronology of Hezekiah's reign is, with respect to these synchronisms, difficult; but we are disposed to think that the common reckoning, varying not more than three years, is correct, and that the preferable date of the accession of Hezekiah is B.C. 726. Some chronologers follow Dr. Oppert in supposing that the date of Sennacherib's invasion should be Hezekiah's 24th year instead of the 14th year (*Chronologie des Assyriens et des Babyloniens*, p. 14, 15), but we rather infer a long interval between two wars. See HEZEKIAH. The last year of Hezekiah is thus B.C. 697, unless we suppose that his reign was longer than is stated in the Masoretic text, and that it was for the latter part contemporary with Manasseh's. Tirhakah's reign is nearly determined by the record in a tablet of the tombs of the Bulls Apis, that one of them was born in his twenty-sixth year, and died at the end of the 20th of Psammetichus I. The length of its life is unfortunately not stated, but it exceeded twenty years, and the longest age recorded is twenty-six. Supposing it to have lived twenty-one years, the first year of Tirhakah's reign would fall in B.C. 690 (see Rawlinson's *Herod*, ii, 319, where the successor of Psammetichus is proved to date from B.C. 664), which would correspond to the 8th year of Manasseh. The contemporaneousness of Tirhakah and Hezekiah can be explained by one of two suppositions, either that Hezekiah's reign exceeded twenty-nine years, or that Tirhakah ruled in Ethiopia before coming to the throne of Egypt. It must be remembered that it cannot be proved that the reigns of Manetho's 25th dynasty form a series without any break, and also that the date of the taking of Samaria is considered fixed by the Assyrian scholars. At present, therefore, we cannot venture on any changes. See CHRONOLOGY.

We do not know the cause of the rise of the 25th dynasty. Probably the first king already had an Ethiopian sovereignty when he invaded Egypt. That he and his successors were natives of Ethiopia is probable from their being kings of Ethiopia and having non-Egyptian names. Though Sabaco conquered Bocchoris and put him to death, he does not seem to have overthrown his line or the 23d dynasty: both proba-

TABLE OF THE TWENTY-FIFTH DYNASTY.

B.C.	Monuments.	Manetho.			Highest Date on Monuments.	Biblical Events.
		YEARS.				
		Africanus.	Eusebius.	Corrected.		
728	SHEBEK.	Sabaco . . .	8	12	12th year.	Treaty with Hoshea, B.C. 724.
716	SHEBTEK, or SHEBEK II.	Sebichos . .	14	12	26	War with Sennacherib, B.C. 713.
690	TEHARKA, or TEHRAK.	Tarkus . . .	18	20	26th year.	
664	End of Dynasty.					

bly continued in a tributary or titular position, as the Sethos of Herodotus, an Egyptian king of the time of Tirhakah, appears to be the same as Zet, who, in the version of Manetho by Africanus, is the last king of the 23d dynasty, and as kings connected with Psammetichus I of the Saite 26th dynasty are shown by the monuments to have preceded him in the time of the Ethiopians, and probably to have continued the line of the Saite Bocchoris. We think it probable that Sabaco is the "So, king of Egypt," who was the cause of the downfall of Hoshea, the last king of Israel. The Hebrew name שֹׁ, if we omit the Masoretic points, is not very remote from the Egyptian SUEBEK. It was at this time that Egypt began strongly to influence the politics of the Hebrew kingdoms, and the prophecies of Hosea, denouncing an Egyptian alliance, probably refer to the reign of So or his successor; those of Isaiah, of similar purport, if his book be in chronological order, relate to the reign of Tirhakah. Tirhakah is far more fully commemorated by monuments than his predecessors. At Thebes he has left sculptures, and at Jebel-Berkel, Napata, one temple and part of another. There seems to be no doubt that Sethos (Zet?) was at least titular king of part of Egypt, or the whole country, under Tirhakah, on the following evidence: In the Bible, Tirhakah, when mentioned by name, is called "king of Cush (Ethiopia)," and a Pharaoh is spoken of at the same period (Isa. xxx, 2, 3; xxxvi, 6; 2 Kings xviii, 21); in the Assyrian inscriptions a Pharaoh is mentioned as contemporary with Sennacherib; and the Egyptian monuments indicate that two or three royal lines centred in that of the 26th dynasty. The only event of Tirhakah's reign certainly known to us is his advance against Sennacherib, apparently in fulfilment of a treaty made by Hezekiah with the Pharaoh whom we suppose to be Sethos. This expedition was rendered needless by the miraculous destruction of the Assyrian army, but it is probable that Tirhakah seized the occasion to recover some of the cities of Palestine which had before belonged to Egypt. Herodotus gives a traditional account of Sennacherib's overthrow, relating that when Egypt was ruled by Sethos, a priest-king, the country was invaded by Sennacherib, against whom Sethos, who had offended the military class, marched with an army of artificers and the like, and encamped near Pelusium, where in the night a multitude of field-mice gnawed the bow-strings and shield-straps of the Assyrians, who, being thus unable to defend themselves, took to flight (ii, 141). It has been well observed that it is said by Herodotus that a mouse denoted "disappearance" in hieroglyphics (*Hierog.* i, 50). Here we have evidently a confused tradition of the great overthrow of the Assyrians. Strabo, on the authority of Megasthenes, tells us that Tirhakah, in his extensive expeditions, rivalled Sesostris, and went as far as the Pillars of Hercules (xv, 686).

The beginning of the 26th dynasty was a time of disaster to Egypt. Tirhakah was either dead or had retired to Ethiopia, and Egypt fell into the hands of several petty princes, probably the dodecarchs of Herodotus, whose rule precedes, and perhaps overlaps, that of Psammetichus I, who is said to have been at first a dodecarch. In this time Esarhaddon twice invaded and conquered the country; but, after his second invasion, Psammetichus seems to have entirely thrown off the Assyrian yoke, and restored Egypt to somewhat of its ancient power. There are several passages in Scripture which probably refer to these invasions, and certainly show the relation of Ethiopia to Egypt at this time. The prophet Nahum, warning Nineveh, describes the fall of Thebes, "Art thou better than No Amion, that was situate among the rivers, [that had] the waters round about it, whose rampart [was] the sea, [and] her wall from the sea? Cush and Mizraim [were her] strength, and [it was] infi-

nite; Put and Lubim were in thy help" (iii, 8, 9). The sack and captivity of the city are then related. The exact period of Nahum is not known, but there is much probability that he lived about the time of the invasion of Judaea by Sennacherib (i, 11, 12). See NAHUM. He therefore appears to refer to one of the conquests of Egypt by Sennacherib, Sargon, or Shalmaneser. See No. The close alliance of Cush and Mizraim seems to point to the period of the Ethiopian rule, when the states would have united against a common enemy. Three chapters of Isaiah relate to the future of Ethiopia and Egypt, and it is probable that they contain what is virtually one connected subject, although divided into a prophecy against Ethiopia, the burden of Egypt, and the record of an event shown to prefigure the fall of both countries, these divisions having been followed by those who separated the book into chapters. The prophecy against Ethiopia is extremely obscure. (See the version above.) It appears to foretell the calamity of Ethiopia to its farthest people, to whom messengers should be sent in vessels of papyrus, by the sea, here the Nile, as in the description of Thebes by the prophet Nahum (*L. c.*), bearing, probably, that news which is related in the next chapter. In the end the Ethiopians would send a present to the Lord at Zion (chap. xviii). Then follows "the burden of Egypt," apparently foretelling the discord and strife of the dodecarchy, the delivering of the people into the hand of a cruel lord, probably the Assyrian conqueror, the failure of the waters of Egypt and of its chief sources of revenue, and the partial conversion of the Egyptians, and, as it seems, their ultimate admission to the Church (chap. xix). We then read how a Tartan, or general, of Sargon, the king of Assyria, took Ashdod, no doubt with a garrison from the Egyptian army. At this time Isaiah was commanded to walk "naked and barefoot," probably without an outer garment, three years, as a sign to show how the Egyptians and Ethiopians, as no doubt had been the case with the garrison of Ashdod, probably of both nations, should be led captive by the king of Assyria. This captivity was to be witnessed by the Jews who trusted in Ethiopia and Egypt to be delivered from the king of Assyria, and the invasions of Egypt by Esarhaddon are therefore probably foretold (chap. xx). In the books of later prophets Ethiopia does not take this prominent place: no longer a great power, it only appears as furnishing part of the Egyptian forces or sharing the calamities of Egypt, as in the history of Egypt we find Ethiopia occupying a position of little or no political importance, the successors of Tirhakah in that country being perhaps tributaries of the kings of the 26th dynasty. In the description by Jeremiah of Pharaoh-Necho's army, the Ethiopians (Cush) are first spoken of among the foreign warriors mentioned as serving in it (xli, 9). Ezekiel prophesies the fear of Ethiopia at the overthrow of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar (xxx, 4-9), and though the helpers of Egypt were to fall, it does not seem that the invasion of their lands is necessarily to be understood. One passage illustrates the difficult 18th chapter of Isaiah: "In that day shall messengers go forth from me in ships to make ["secure" or] careless Ethiopia afraid, and great pain shall come upon them as in the day of Egypt" (Ezek. xxx, 9). Zephaniah, somewhat earlier, mentions the Ethiopians alone, predicting their overthrow (ii, 12). It is probable that the defeat of the Egyptian army at Carchemish by Nebuchadnezzar is referred to, or else the same king's invasion of Egypt.

The kings of Egypt do not appear to have regained the absolute rule of Ethiopia, or to have displaced the native kings, though it is probable that they made them tributary. Under Psammetichus I a revolt occurred in the Egyptian army, and a large body of rebels fled to Ethiopia, and there established themselves. A Greek inscription on one of the colossi of the great

temple of Abu-Simbil, not far below the Second Cataract, records the passage of Greek mercenaries on their return from an expedition up the river, "king Psamatichus" having, as it seems, not gone beyond Elephantine. This expedition was probably that which Herodotus mentions Psammetichus as having made in order to bring back the rebels (ii, 30), and, in any case, the inscription is valuable as the only record of the 26th dynasty which has been found above the First Cataract. It does not prove, more especially as the king remained at Elephantine, that he governed any part of Ethiopia. The next event of Ethiopian history is the disastrous expedition of Cambyses, defeated by the desert-march, and not by any valor of the invaded nation. From this time the country seems to have enjoyed tranquillity, until the earlier Ptolemies acquired part of Lower Nubia that was again lost to them in the decline of their dynasty. When Egypt became a Roman province, Syene was its frontier town to the south; but when, under Augustus, the garrison of that town had been overwhelmed by the Ethiopians, the prefect Petronius invaded Ethiopia, and took Napata, said to have been the capital of queen Candace. The extensive territory subdued was not held, and though the names of some of the Cæsars are found in the temples of Lower Nubia, in Strabo's time Syene marked the frontier. This part of Ethiopia must have been so unproductive, even before the falling of the level of the Nile, which Sir Gardner Wilkinson supposes to have happened between the early part of the 13th dynasty and the beginning of the 18th, that it may well have been regarded as a kind of neutral ground.

The chronology of the kings of Ethiopia after Tirhakah cannot yet be attempted. Professor Lepsius arranges all the Ethiopians under four periods: 1st. The 25th dynasty, first and second kings. 2d. Kings of Napata, beginning with Tirhakah, who, in his opinion, retired from Egypt, and made this his capital: of these kings, one, named NASTES-SES, or NASTES-NEN, has left a tablet at Dongolah, recording the taking in his wars of enormous booty in cattle and gold (Lepsius, *Denkmäler*, v, 16; Brugsch, *Geogr. Inscr.* i, 163, 164). 3d. Older kings of Meroë, among whom is a queen KENTAH, in whom a Candace is immediately recognised, and also MI-AMEN ASRU and ARKAMEN, the latter Ergamenes, the contemporary of Ptolemy Philadelphus, who had, according to Diodorus Siculus, received a Greek training, and changed the customs of Ethiopia (iii, 6). Some of these princes had an extensive dominion. The name of Ergamenes is found from Lower Nubia to Meroë. 4th. Later kings of Meroë, some, at least, of whom ruled both Meroë and Napata, though the former seems to have been the favorite capital in the later period (*Königsbuch*, pl. lxxi, lxxii, lxxiii). The importance of queens is remarkably characteristic of an African people. See MEROË.

The spread of Christianity in Ethiopia is a remarkable event in the history of the country, and one in which the truth of "the sure word of prophecy" has been especially evident. In this case, as in others, the Law may have been the predecessor of the Gospel. The pious eunuch, "Ebed-melech the Ethiopian," who befriended Jeremiah (xxxviii, 7-13; xxxix, 15-18), may have been one of many converts from paganism, but it is scarcely likely that any of these returned to their native land. The Abyssinian Jews, being probably a colony of those of Arabia, were perhaps of later origin than the time of the introduction of Christianity. But in the case of the Ethiopian eunuch, who had charge of all the treasure of Candace, queen of the Ethiopians, and who, on his return from worshipping at Jerusalem, was baptized by Philip the deacon, we see evidence of the spread of the old dispensation in Ethiopia, and of the reception there of the new (Acts viii, 27-39). In Psalm lxxviii (31), in Isaiah (xlv, 14), and probably in Zephaniah (iii, 10), the calling of Ethi-

opia to God's service is foretold. Whether conversion to the Law or to Christianity, or indeed to both, is intended, it is remarkable that, though long deprived of its actual geographical contact with the Coptic Church, of which it is a branch, by the falling away of Nubia, the Abyssinian Church yet remains, and the empire and the kingdom of Shoa are the only Christian sovereignties in the whole of Africa. See ABYSSINIAN CHURCH.

The ancient monuments of Ethiopia may be separated into two great classes, the Egyptian and the Egypto-Ethiopian. In Lower Nubia the Egyptian are almost universal; at Napata we find Egypto-Ethiopian, as well as higher up in the island of Meroë. In the monuments north of Napata, of which the chief lie between the first and second cataracts, we perceive no difference from those of Egypt save in the occurrence of the names of two Ethiopian kings—ARKAMEN, or Ergamenes, and ATSHERAMEN. The remains attest the wealth of the kings of Egypt rather than that of the country in which they are found; their abundance is partly owing to the scanty modern population's not having required the ancient masonry for building materials. The nearness of the mountains on either side to the river, and the value of the little tracts of alluvial soil, have rendered wholly or partly rock-hewn temples numerous here. Tombs are few and unimportant. Above the second cataract there are some similar remains, until the traveller reaches Jebel Berkel, the sacred mountain beneath which stood Napata, where, besides the remains of temples, he is struck with the sight of many pyramids. Other pyramids are seen in the neighborhood. They are peculiar in construction, the proportion of the height to the base being much greater than in the pyramids of Egypt. The temples are of Egyptian character, and one of them is wholly, and another partly, of the reign of Tirhakah. The pyramids are later, and are thoroughly Ethiopian. Yet higher up the river are the monuments of Meroë and neighboring places. They are pyramids, like those of Napata, and temples, with other buildings, of a more Ethiopian style than the temples of the other capital. The size and importance of these monuments prove that the sovereigns who ruled at Meroë must have been very rich, if not warlike. The farthest vestiges of ancient civilization that have been found are remains of an Egyptian character at Sôbah, on the Blue Nile, not far south of the junction of the two rivers. The name suggests the Biblical Seba, which, as a kingdom, may correspond to that of Meroë; but such resemblances are dangerous. The tendency of Ethiopian art was to imitate the earliest Egyptian forms of building, and even subjects of sculpture. This is plain in the adoption of pyramids. The same feeling is strongly evident in Egypt under the 26th dynasty, when there was a renaissance of the style of the pyramid period, though no pyramids seem to have been built. This renaissance appears to have begun under, or immediately after, the later part of the 25th dynasty, and is seen in the subjects of sculpture and the use of titles. The monuments of Ethiopian princes, at first as good as those of Egypt at the same time, become rapidly inferior, and at last are extremely barbarous, more so than any of Egypt. The use of hieroglyphics continues to the last for royal names, but the language seems, after the earlier period, to have been little understood. An Ethiopian demotic character has been found of the period, which succeeded the hieroglyphic for common use, and even for some inscriptions. We do not offer any opinion on the language of this character. The subject requires full investigation. The early Abyssinian remains, as the obelisk at Axum, do not seem to have any connection with those of more northern Ethiopia: they are of later times, and probably are of Arab origin. Throughout Ethiopia we find no traces of an original art or civilization, all the ancient monuments,

save those of Abyssinia, which can scarcely be called ancient, showing that the country was thoroughly Egyptianized. Lepsius has published the Ethiopian monuments in his *Denkmäler* (pt. v; pl. 1-75), as well as the inscriptions in Ethiopian demotic (pt. vi; pl. 1-11; see also 12, 13).—Kitto, s. v.

For the Christian history and relations of Ethiopia, see Titelmann, *De fide, religione et moribus Æthiopum* (Antwerp, 1534); De Goes, *id.* (Par. 1541, and since); Dresser, *De statu eccles. Æthiopiæ* (Lips. 1584); De Vereta, *Historia de Etiopia* (Valentia, 1590); *Predicadores en la Etiopia* (ib. 1611); Godiger, *De rebus Abassinorum* (Lugd. 1615); Machalt, *De rebus in Æthiopia* (Paris, 1624-6); Da Viega, *Christ. religio in Æthiopia* (Lans. 1628); Dannhauer, *Ecclesia Æthiopia* (Argent. 1664); Ludolf, *Historia Æthiopia* (Fr. ad M. 1681; with the supplemental *Specimen*, ib. 1687; *Commentarius*, ib. 1691; and *Appendix*, ib. 1693; the original work in English, Lond. 1684; abridged in French, Par. 1684); Cavatus, *Descriptio Congo, Matambe et Angola* (Bonn, 1687); Geddes, *Hist. of Ethiopia* (Lond. 1696); Windham, *Einleitung in d. äthiop. Theologie* (Helmst. 1719); Lolo, *Iter hist. in Abyssiniam* (publ. only in a transl. *Relation historique d'Abyssinie*, Par. 1727, Amst. 1728); La Croze, *Christianisme d'Ethiopie* (Hague, 1739, in Germ. 1740); Oertel, *Theologia Æthiopia* (Wittemb. 1746); Koeker, *Fasti Habassinorum* (Berne, 1760); Bruce, *Travels in Abyssinia* (Edinb. 1790). See ABYSSINIA.

**Ethio'pian** (Ἀἰθίοψ, Acts viii, 27; כּוּשִׁי, *Kushí'*, Num. xii, 1; 2 Chron. xii, 3; xiv, 9, 12, 13; xvi, 8; xxi, 16; Jer. xiii, 23; xxxviii, 7, 10, 12; xxxix, 16; Dan. xi, 43; Amos ix, 7; Zeph. ii, 12; i. e. *Cushite*; elsewhere as a rendering of the simple כּוּשִׁי, *Kush*), an inhabitant of the land of ETHIOPIA (q. v.) or CUSH; properly "Cushite" (Jer. xiii, 23); used of Zerah (2 Chron. xiv, 9 [8]) and Elbedmelech (Jer. xxxviii, 7, 10, 12; xxxix, 16). See also CUSH.

**ETHIOPIAN EUNUCH** (ἀνήρ Αἰθίοψ, εὐνοῦχος), a person described (Acts viii, 27) as a chief officer (vizier) of the Ethiopian queen Candace (κυβερνήτης Κανδάκης τῆς βασιλίσσης Αἰθίοπων), who was converted to Christianity through the instrumentality of the evangelist Philip (q. v.). Ethioptic tradition calls him *Isidich* (see *Bzovii Annal.* ad 1524, p. 542; but comp. Ludolf, *Hist. Æth.* iii, 2), and Ireneus (iii, 12) and Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* ii, 1) make him the founder of Christianity in Arabia Felix and Ethiopia, but according to Sophronius he preached in the island of Ceylon, and suffered martyrdom there. His official title does not necessarily indicate an emasculated person [see ΕΥΝΟΥΧΟΝ], but probably here denotes a prime minister of state rather than a simple *cubicularius* or chamberlain (q. v.). Kuinöl (ad loc.) thinks he was a Jew of the *Diaspora*; and certainly he was at least a proselyte (q. v.). As to the place of his power, it is not quite certain that the passage in Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* vi, 5) refers to Meroë as the seat of government of the female sovereigns (comp. βασιλίσσας, Strabo, xvii, 2, 3); but possibly rather to Napata (Γαπάπη, Dion Cass. liv, 5), the capital of a different part of Ethiopia (Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, ii, 35), or perhaps an uncertain locality (Ritter, *Erdk.* i, 592). On the historical elements of the question, see Laurent, *Neuestenamen. Studien* (Gotha, 1866), p. 140 sq.; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1866, p. 515; on the religious teachings of the narrative, see Sam. Smith, *Sermon on the Eth. Eunuch's Conversion* (Lond. 1632). See CANDACE.

**ETHIOPIAN WOMAN** (Heb. *Kushít*, כּוּשִׁיָּת, fem. of *Cushite*; Sept. Αἰθιοπίσσα, Vulg. *Æthiopiassa*). Zipporah, the wife of Moses, is so described in Num. xii, 1. She is elsewhere said to have been the daughter of a Midianite (Exod. ii, 21, compared with 16), and, in consequence of this, Ewald and others have supposed that the allusion is to another wife whom Moses

married after the death of Zipporah; but the Arabian Ethiopia is probably referred to in this case. See ZIPPORAH.

**ETHIOPIANS** (עַמֵּי כּוּשׁ, Isa. xx, 4; Jer. xli, 9, עַמֵּי כּוּשׁ; Sept. Αἰθίοπες, Vulg. *Æthiopia, Æthiopes*), properly "Cush" or "Ethiopia" in two passages (Isa. xx, 4; Jer. xli, 9); elsewhere "Cushites," or inhabitants of Ethiopia (2 Chron. xii, 3; xiv, 12 [11], 13 [12]; xvi, 8; xxi, 16; Dan. xi, 43; Amos ix, 7; Zeph. ii, 12). See CUSHITE.

**Ethiopic Language.** As it is maintained by competent judges that the Amharic and the Tigré are really dialects of the ancient Ethiopic or Geez (which is doubted by Adelung and Vater in the *Mithridates*), it may be expected, from the recent progress of comparative grammar, that future scholars will apply them to elucidate the structure of the other Syro-Arabian languages. At present, however, as even the Amharic is not yet able to boast of adequate and accessible means for its study, and as neither possesses any ancient version of any part of the Bible, the Geez is the only one which claims a particular notice here. See AMHARIC LANGUAGE.

The ancient Ethiopic or Geez, which is the only one of the three dialects that either has been or is now generally used in written documents of a sacred or civil kind, is to be classed as an ancient branch of the Arabic. This affinity is evident from the entire grammatical structure of the language; it is confirmed by the relation of its written character to that of the Himyarite alphabet; and either supports, or is supported by, the assumption that Habesh or Abyssinia was actually peopled by a colony from Southern Arabia. The grammatical structure of the Geez shows a largely predominant identity with that of Arabic; but it also possesses some traits which are in closer accordance with the other Syro-Arabian idioms, and some which are peculiar to itself alone. The main features of its structure are as follows: The verb possesses the first ten conjugations of the Arabic verb, with the exception of the eighth and ninth; besides these it has two other conjugations which are unknown to the Arabic. There is a special conjunctive mood; the double infinitive is often used as a noun, irrespective of the absolute or construct form; the participle is wanting. The formation of nouns resembles most that of Hebrew; but nouns often have superfluous end-vowels, which are modified in particular cases, and are analogous to the Arabic nunation. As for the flexion of nouns, the masculine and feminine plurals are either formed by affixed syllables (*ân, ât*) on the principle common to the whole Syro-Arabian family, or by changes within the compass of the radical letters, after the manner of the so-called *broken* plurals of the Arabic grammar. The "construct state," and that relation of the noun which is equivalent to our objective case, are denoted by changes in the final vowels, or by employing the relative pronoun; the dative is indicated by prepositions. The comparative and superlative are expressed by means of particles. There is no form for the dual number either in the verb or the noun. With regard to the vocabulary of the language, one third of the roots are to be found in the same state in Arabic. By making allowance for commutations and transpositions, many other roots may be identified with their Arabic correspondents: some of its roots, however, do not exist in our present Arabic, but are to be found in Aramaic and Hebrew. Besides this, it has native roots peculiar to itself; it has adopted several Greek words, but shows no traces of the influence of Coptic.

The alphabet possesses twenty-six consonants, arranged in a peculiar order, twenty-four of which may, however, be regarded as essentially equivalent (although with different sounds in many instances) to the letters in the Arabic alphabet. The remaining two are letters adopted to express the Greek Φ and Ψ.

ETHIOPIC ALPHABET.

Name.	With a	With á	With e	With é	With i	With í	With o	With ó	Power.	Heb.
Hoi	ሀ ha	ሁ há	ሀ he	ሁ hé	ሀ hi	ሁ hí	ሀ hó	ሁ hó	h	ה
Lawi	ለ la	ሉ lá	ለ le	ሉ lé	ለ li	ሉ lí	ለ lô	ሉ lô	l	ל
Hhaut	ሐ hba	ሑ hhá	ሐ hba	ሑ hhé	ሐ hbi	ሑ hbí	ሐ hbo	ሑ hbo	hh	הה
Mai	መ ma	ሙ má	መ me	ሙ mé	መ mi	ሙ mí	መ mô	ሙ mô	m	מ
Çaut	ሠ ça	ሡ çá	ሠ çe	ሡ çé	ሠ çi	ሡ çí	ሠ çò	ሡ çó	ç	ç Fr.
Rees	ረ ra	ሩ rá	ረ re	ሩ ré	ረ ri	ሩ rí	ረ rò	ሩ ró	r	ר
Sat	ሰ sa	ሱ sá	ሰ se	ሱ sé	ሰ si	ሱ sí	ሰ só	ሱ só	s	ס
* Shat	ሸ sha	ሹ shá	ሸ she	ሹ shé	ሸ shi	ሹ shí	ሸ shò	ሹ shó	sh	ש
Qaf	ቀ qa	ቁ qá	ቀ qe	ቁ qé	ቀ qi	ቁ qí	ቀ qò	ቁ qó	q	ק
Beth	በ ba	ቡ bá	በ be	ቡ bé	በ bi	ቡ bí	በ bó	ቡ bó	b	ב
Thawi	ተ tha	ተ thá	ተ the	ተ thé	ተ thi	ተ thí	ተ thò	ተ thó	th	ת
* Tjawi	ቸ tjá	ቹ tjá	ቸ tje	ቹ tjé	ቸ tji	ቹ tjí	ቸ tjò	ቹ tjó	tj	ת
Kharm	ኀ kha	ኁ khá	ኀ khe	ኁ khé	ኀ khi	ኁ khí	ኀ khò	ኁ khó	kh	ח
Nahas	ኀ na	ኁ ná	ኀ ne	ኁ né	ኀ ni	ኁ ní	ኀ nó	ኁ nó	n	נ
* Gnahas	ኀ gna	ኁ gná	ኀ gne	ኁ gné	ኀ gni	ኁ gní	ኀ gnò	ኁ gnó	gn	gn Fr.
'Alph	አ 'a	አ 'á	አ 'e	አ 'é	አ 'i	አ 'í	አ 'ò	አ 'ó	'a	א
Kaf	ኀ ka	ኁ ká	ኀ ke	ኁ ké	ኀ ki	ኁ kí	ኀ kò	ኁ kó	k	כ
* Chaf	ቸ cha	ቹ chá	ቸ che	ቹ ché	ቸ chi	ቹ chí	ቸ chò	ቹ chó	ch	ch Ger.
Wawe	ወ wa	ዐ wá	ወ we	ዐ wé	ወ wi	ዐ wí	ወ wò	ዐ wó	w	ו
'Ain	ሀ 'a	ሁ 'á	ሀ 'e	ሁ 'é	ሀ 'i	ሁ 'í	ሀ 'ò	ሁ 'ó	'a	ע
Zai	ሀ za	ሁ zá	ሀ ze	ሁ zé	ሀ zi	ሁ zí	ሀ zò	ሁ zó	z	ז
* Jai	ሀ ja	ሁ já	ሀ je	ሁ jé	ሀ ji	ሁ jí	ሀ jò	ሁ jó	j	j Fr.
Jaman	ሀ ja	ሁ já	ሀ je	ሁ jé	ሀ ji	ሁ jí	ሀ jò	ሁ jó	j	j Ger.
Dent	ደ da	ደ dá	ደ de	ደ dé	ደ di	ደ dí	ደ dò	ደ dó	d	ד
* Djent	ደ dja	ደ djá	ደ dje	ደ djé	ደ dji	ደ djí	ደ djò	ደ djó	dj	ד
Geml	ገ ga	ገ gá	ገ ge	ገ gé	ገ gi	ገ gí	ገ gò	ገ gó	g	ג
Tait	ጠ ta	ጠ tá	ጠ te	ጠ té	ጠ ti	ጠ tí	ጠ tó	ጠ tó	t	ט
* Tshait	ጠ tsha	ጠ tshá	ጠ tshe	ጠ tshé	ጠ tshi	ጠ tshí	ጠ tshò	ጠ tshó	tsh	טש
Pait	ጸ pa	ጸ pá	ጸ pe	ጸ pé	ጸ pi	ጸ pí	ጸ pò	ጸ pó	p	פ
Tsaddai	ጸ tsa	ጸ tsá	ጸ tse	ጸ tsé	ጸ tsi	ጸ tsí	ጸ tsò	ጸ tsó	ts	פס
Dzappa	ዐ dza	ዐ dzá	ዐ dze	ዐ dzé	ዐ dzi	ዐ dzí	ዐ dzò	ዐ dzó	dz	פז
Af	ፈ fa	ፈ fá	ፈ fe	ፈ fé	ፈ fi	ፈ fí	ፈ fò	ፈ fó	f	(פ)
Psa	ፑ psa	ፑ psá	ፑ pse	ፑ psé	ፑ psi	ፑ psí	ፑ psò	ፑ psó	ps	(פס)

DIPHTHONGS.

ቁ qua	ቁ quá	ቁ que	ቁ qué	ቁ qui
ኀ khua	ኁ khua	ኀ khue	ኁ khue	ኀ khui
ኀ kua	ኁ kuá	ኀ kuc	ኁ kué	ኀ kui
ጐ gua	ጐ guá	ጐ gue	ጐ gué	ጐ gui

∴ Separatrix of words.


\* Exclusively Amharic.

The vowel-sounds, which are seven, are not expressed by separable signs, as in the Hebrew and Arabic punctuation, but are denoted by modifications in the original form of the consonants, after the manner of the Dēvanāgarī alphabet. The mode of writing is from left to right. The position of the accent depends upon many complicated rules. As for the written characters, Gesenius has traced the relation between some of them and their equivalents in the Phœnician alphabet. There is, however, the most striking resemblance between the Geez letters generally and those in the Himyarite inscriptions, a circumstance which accords well with the supposed connection of Southern Arabia and Habesh. Moreover, Lepsius, in an interesting essay, *Ueber die Anordnung und Verwandtschaft des Semitischen, Indischen, Äthiopischen, etc. Alphabets* (in his *Zwei sprachvergleichende Abhandlungen*, Berlin, 1836, 8vo, p. 74-80), has adduced some striking arguments to prove that the Dēvanāgarī alphabet must have had some influence on the development of the Geez.

The literature of the Geez language is very scanty indeed, and that little is almost exclusively of a Biblical or ecclesiastical character. Dr. Laurence has lately added considerably to this by the publication of the Book of Enoch (q. v.), the Ascension of Isaiah (q. v.), and the first Book of Esdras (q. v.), in the Ethiopic version. There also exist in Ethiopic the Christian *Book of Adam* (in Germ. by Dillmann, Gött. 1853), and several other apocryphal works relating the miracles of Christ, Mary, &c. It possesses nothing, not even an imitation of the national poetry, nor of the lexicographical and grammatical works of the Arabs. Some few historical works in the shape of chronicles, and a few medical treatises, constitute the main body of their profane literature. The Geez has ceased, ever since the beginning of the 14th century, to be the vernacular language of any part of the country, having been supplanted at the court of the sovereign by the Amharic. It still continues, however, to be the language used in religious rites, in domestic affairs of state, and in private correspondence.—Kitto, s. v. See Ludolf, *Grammatica Æthiopia* (2d edit. Freft. 1702, fol.), and his *Lexicon Æthiopicum-Latinum* (2d edit. ib. 1699, fol., originally Lond. 1661, 4to); Hase, *Prakt. Hdb. d. arab. u. äthiop. Sprache* (Jen. 1793, 8vo); Hupfeld, *Exercit. Æthiopicæ* (Lips. 1826, 4to); Gesenius, in Ersch und Gruber's *Allgemeine Encyclopædie*, s. v. *Äthiopische Sprache*; Dillmann, *Lexicon Ling. Æthiopicæ* (Lpz. 1862 sq., 4to); *Chrestomathia Æthiopia* (Lpz. 1865, 8vo); Castell, *Lexicon Heptaglotton* (Lond. 1669, fol.); Schrader, *De Lingue Æthiop. indole* (Vien. 1860 sq., 4to). See SUEMITIC LANGUAGES.

**Ethiopic Version.** The libraries of Europe contain some, although very rarely complete, manuscript copies of a translation of the Bible into the Geez dialect (see Ludolf, *Historia Æthiopia*, Lond. 1684; also Platt's *Catalogue of Æth. MSS.*, London, 1823). This version of the Old Testament was made from the Greek of the Septuagint, according to the Alexandrian recension, as is evinced, among other things, by the arrangement of the Biblical books, and by the admission of the Apocrypha without distinction. Tradition assigns it to Frumentius as the author, but this is probably proceeded from various Christian hands. Doorn supposes (*De Psalterio Æthiopicæ*, Lips. 1825) that the translator consulted the Heb. original, but this is disputed by Gesenius and Rödiger (*Allgem. Litt. Zeit.*

1832). It is divided into four parts: *The Law*, or the Octateuch, containing the Pentateuch and the books of Joshua, Judges, and Ruth; *The Kings*, in thirteen books, consisting of two books of Samuel, two of Kings, two of Chronicles, two of Ezra (Ezra and Nehemiah), Tobit, Judith, Esther, Job, the Psalms; *Solomon*, in five books, consisting of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Wisdom, and Sirach; *Prophets*, in eighteen books, consisting of Isaiah, Jeremiah's prophecy and Lamentations, Baruch, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the twelve minor prophets; lastly, they have also two books of the Maccabees. Besides this, they possess an apocryphal book of Enoch, which they place next to that of Job. The critical uses of this version are almost exclusively confined to the evidence it gives as to the text of the Septuagint. The version of the New Testament was made directly from the Greek original (see Bode, *N. T. Æth. cum Græco collatum*, Brunswick, 1753). It follows the verbal arrangement of the Greek very closely, and has mistakes that are only to be explained by the confusion of words which resemble each other in that language. It is difficult to determine what recension it follows, but it frequently agrees with the Peshito and the Itala. It is impossible to ascertain the date of the



Specimen of an Ethiopic MS. in the possession of the Church Missionary Society of London (containing Num. xxiv, 17).

execution of either of these translations, but they may both be ascribed with much probability to the beginning of the fourth century.—Kitto, s. v. Although there are several MSS. in Europe containing the Ethiopic version entire, only parts have yet been printed: the Psalter, first by Potken, along with Canticles (Rom. 1513, 4to); also by the Bible Soc. (Lond. 1815), with notes by Ludolf (Freft. 1701, 4to); the Canticles alone, by Nissel (Lugd. 1660, 4to); Jonah, in Lat. by Petrus (ib. eod. 4to); Ruth, by Nissel (ib. eod. 4to); Malachi, in Lat. by Petrus (ib. 1661, 4to); Joel, by the same (ib. eod. 4to); first 4 chapters of Genesis, by Bürcklin (Freft. 1696, 4to); Jonah, with a glossary, &c., by Staudacher (ib. 1706, 8vo); various fragments, by Bode (Helmst. 1755, 4to). Dillmann is publishing for the first time the O. T. entire (*Biblia V. T. Æth.*, Lips. 1860 sq., 4to). The whole New Testament has, however, appeared. It was first published by three Abyssinians (Rome, 1548-9, 3 vols. 4to), reprinted in Walton's *Polyglot* (London, 1857, fol.; vol. v, with a Latin version, also 1698). Platt has edited the entire O. T. in Amharic (Lond. 1840, 4to). The Gospels were edited anew from MSS. by Platt (Lond. 1826, 4to), and the whole N. T. by the same in 1830. Bode published transla-

tions and critical editions of several portions: Ep. to Heb. (Rome, 1548, 4to), Matthew's Gosp. (Hal. 1749, 4to). See Rosenmüller, *Handb. f. d. Lit. d. bibl. Krit.* iii, 65 sq.; Davidson, *Biblical Criticism*, ii, 202 sq.; Dillmann, in Herzog's *Encyklopädie*, s. v. See VER- SIONS OF THE BIBLE.

**Eth'ma** (Ἐθμά v. r. *Noomá*, Vulg. *Nobei*), given (1 Esd. ix, 35) as the name of the head of one of the families of Israelites, several of whose "sons" divorced their Gentile wives after the exile; apparently a corruption of NEBO (q. v.) in the Heb. list (Ezra x, 43).

**Eth'nán** (Heb. *Ethnan'*, עֶתְנָן, a *gift*; Sept. Ἐσθανάμ v. r. Ἐρθαῖ; Vulg. *Ethnan*), a descendant of Judah; one of the sons of Helah, the wife of Ashur, "the father of Tekoa" (1 Chron. iv, 7). B.C. post 1618.

**Ethnarch** (ἔθναρχος), properly *ruler of a nation*; hence generally a *prefect* of a district or city (Lucian, *Macrob.* 17), e. g. Simon Maccabæus, as head of the Jewish commonwealth (1 Macc. xiv, 47, "governor;" xv, 1, 2, "prince;" Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 6, 6); Archelaus, appointed by his father's will and the emperor's ratification, his viceroy in Judæa (Josephus, *War*, ii, 6, 3), of the national head (modern "*patriarch*") of the Jews in Egypt (Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 7, 2; comp. Strabo, xvi, 798). Spoken of the "governor" or *mayor* of the city of Damascus (2 Cor. xi, 32), under the Arabian king Aretas (q. v.). (See Walch, *Dissert. in Acta Apost.* ii, 85.)

**Eth'ni** (Heb. *Ethni'*, עֶתְנִי, *munificent*, Sept. Ἐθαρί v. r. Ἐθαρεί), son of Zerah and father of Adaiab, of the Levitical family of Gershon (1 Chron. vi, 41 [26]). B.C. cir. 1420. In ver. 21, the same person appears to be designated by the name of JEATARA. See ASAPH.

**Ethnology** may be defined as that branch of modern science which treats of the various nations of the earth with respect to their *races*, i. e. their relative origin, and their linguistic and social affinities; and it is thus distinguished from political geography, which discusses their association under their several civil governments. In the Bible, this subject, like all other scientific questions, is rather touched upon incidentally as connected with the history of mankind than in any formal and exact manner; yet the information thus afforded is of inestimable value, being, in fact, the only trustworthy clew to guide the investigator through the labyrinth in which later complications, and especially recent speculations, have involved the whole matter. Infidelity has striven hard to impugn the statements of Scripture on this ground especially; and it is therefore satisfactory to know that the most candid and general researches strongly tend to corroborate the positions of Holy Writ relative to all the main points involved in the discussion. These, so far as the Bible is directly concerned, all centre in one cardinal topic, the unity of the human race; and they bear upon this chiefly in two lines of argument, namely, 1st, the analogous and common elements of various languages, showing an origin from one source; and, 2dly, the manner in which men are distributed, or, rather, grouped, over the surface of the earth, as illustrating the ethnological chart laid down in the tenth chapter of Genesis. This last only, or "the *Dispersion of Nations*," we propose to discuss in the present article, referring the other two to the article ADAM, and, especially, the article MAN, and articles there referred to; TONGUES (CONFESSION OF), and other articles there referred to. For the physiological part of the argument we refer to the researches of Blumenbach, Dr. Prichard in his elaborate volumes on this subject, the notes in J. Pye Smith's *Scripture and Geology*, and a dissertation by Samuel Forrey, M.D., entitled *The Mosaic Account of the Unity of the Human Race confirmed by the Natural History of the American Aborigines*, in the *American Biblical Repository*, July, 1843. For a complete synoptical view of the present races of men, see Prichard's

*Ethnological Maps* (London, 1843, fol.). The following account is chiefly compiled from Kitto, s. v. Nations.

I. *Fact of an early Dissemination of the Race.*—Many obvious reasons incline us to suppose that the small number of mankind which divine mercy spared from the extirpation of the Deluge, eight persons, forming at the utmost five families, would continue to dwell near each other as long as the utmost stretch of convenience would permit them. The undutiful conduct of Ham and his fourth son cannot well be assigned to a point of time earlier than twenty or thirty years after the Flood. So long, at least, family affection and mutual interests would urge the children of Noah not to break up their society. The dread of dangers, known and unknown, and every day's experience of the benefit derived from mutual aid, would strengthen other motives. It is evident from Gen. xi, 10-16, that about 100 years, according to the Hebrew text, were spent in this state of family propinquity, yet with a considerable degree of proximate diffusion, which necessity would urge; but the dates of the Septuagint, without including the generation of the post-diluvian Cainan (q. v.), give 400. The Hebrew period, much more the others, will afford a sufficient time for such an increase of mankind as would render an extensive outspread highly expedient. A crowded population would be likely to furnish means and incentives to turbulence on the one hand, and to some form of tyranny on the other. Many of the unoccupied districts would become dangerously unwholesome by stagnating waters and the accumulation of vegetable and animal putrescence. The products of cultivation and of other arts would have been acquired so slowly as to have retarded human improvement and comfort. Tardy expansion would have failed to reach distant regions till many hundreds or thousands of years had run out. The noxious animals would have multiplied immoderately. The religious obedience, associated, by the divine command, with the possession and use of the earth, would have been checked and perverted to a greater degree than the world's bitter experience proves that it actually has been. Thus it may appear with pretty strong evidence that a dispersion of mankind was highly desirable to be in a more prompt and active style than would have been effected by the impulses of mere convenience and vague inclination. See GEOGRAPHY.

That this dictate of reasonable conjecture was realized in fact, is determined by the Mosaic writings. Of the elder son of Eber, the narrative says his "name was Peleg (פֶּלֶג, *division*), because in his days the earth was divided" (Gen. x, 25); and this is repeated, evidently as a literal transcript, in 1 Chron. i, 19. If we might coin a word to imitate the Hebrew, we might show the paronomasia by saying "the earth was *pelegged*" (פֶּלֶגְגָּה). Some are of opinion that the event took place about the time of his birth, and that his birth-name was given to him as a memorial of the transaction. But it was the practice of probably all nations in the early times that persons assumed to themselves, or imposed upon their children and other connections, new names at different epochs of their lives, derived from coincident events in all the variety of associated ideas. Of that practice many examples occur in the Scriptures. The conjecture is more probable that, in this instance, the name was applied in the individual's maturer age, and *on account* of some personal concern which he had in the commencement or progress of the separation. But the signification usually given is by no means a matter of indubitable certainty. The verb occurs only in the two passages mentioned (strictly but one), and in Psa. lv, 9, "divide their tongues," and Job xxxviii, 25, "who hath divided a channel for the torrent" (produced by a heavy thunder-shower)? Respectable philologists have disputed whether it refers at all to a separation of man-

kind, and think that the event which singularly marked Peleg's life was an occurrence in physical geography, an earthquake which produced a vast chasm, separating two considerable parts of the earth in or near the district inhabited by men. That earthquakes and dislocations of land have taken place in and around that region at various times before the historical period, the present very different levels, and other results of volcanic agency, afford ample proofs. The possibility, therefore, of some geological convulsion cannot be denied; or that it might have been upon a great scale, and followed by imperfect effects upon the condition of mankind. The transpiration of some comparatively local interest, however, would seem a more appropriate occasion for the name of an individual than so world-wide an occurrence as the general distribution of mankind. But if the race was as yet confined to a narrow circle and a single community, the breaking up of that society would be a very signal event to celebrate in his name. See PELEG.

But neither the affirming nor the rejecting of this interpretation of "the earth's being divided" can affect the question upon the primeval separation and migratory distributions of men. The reasons which we have mentioned render it certain that some such event, and successive events, have taken place; and, without urging the passage of disputed interpretation, it is evident that Gen. x and xi assume the fact, and may be considered as rather a summary recognition of it than as a detailed account. Thus (ix, 19), "These are the three sons of Noah, and from these all the earth was scattered over" (נִפְּצָה). Again (x, 32), "These are the families of the sons of Noah, [according] to their generations, in their nations; and from these the nations were dispersed (נִפְּצָה) in the earth after the Flood." Here another verb is used, often occurring in the Old Testament, and the meaning of which admits of no doubt. We find it also at ver. 5, "From these the isles of the nations were dispersed (נִפְּצָה) in their lands, each [according] to its language, [according] to their families in their nations." The Biblical date thus assigned to the dispersion is not inconsistent with the most careful estimate of the antiquity of nations, such as Egypt and Assyria. See CHRONOLOGY.

In the latest composition of Moses is another passage, which, in this inquiry, must not be neglected (Deut. xxxii, 8, 9): "In the Most High's assigning abodes to the nations, in his dispersing the sons of Adam, he fixed boundaries to the peoples according to the number (מִסְפָּר, numeration) of the sons of Israel: for the assigned portion of Jehovah is his people; Jacob, the lot of his inheritance." Of this 8th verse the Septuagint translation is remarkable, and it thus became the source of extraordinary interpretations: "When the Most High apportioned nations, when he scattered abroad the sons of Adam he fixed boundaries of nations according to the number of the *angels of God*." There might be a reading (*El* or *Elohim* instead of *Israel*) which would yield that meaning from comparison with Job i, 6; ii, 1; xxxviii, 7. Also the Alexandrine translators might welcome a colorable reasoning for the rendering, that it might haply serve as a protection from the danger of the Maccdonico-Egyptian government, taking up the idea that the Jews claimed a divine right of supremacy over all other nations. This reading, however, gave occasion to the Greek fathers (Justin Martyr, Origen, Eusebius, etc.) to maintain the doctrine of a later Jewish origin, that the grandsons of Noah being seventy, each was the ancestor of a nation, each nation having its own language derived from the confusion of Babel, and each also its guardian angel set over it by the Creator, excepting the nation of Israel, of which Jehovah himself was the tutelary deity. The only real difficulty of this passage lies in its seeming to assert that the nascent population was distributed into groups with

the express design of effecting a numerical correspondence with the Israelitish family eight hundred years after. The names assigned to the third degree, that is, the sons (rather tribes or nations) of Noah's three sons, are, Japhet fourteen, Ham thirty-one, Shem twenty-five, making seventy; and the whole family of Jacob, when it came to be domiciliated in Egypt, was seventy (Gen. xli, 26; Exod. i, 5; Deut. x, 22). Some have also fancied a parallel in the seventy elders (Exod. xxiv, 1, 9; Num. xi, 16, 24, 25; see also Kitto, *Pictorial Palestine*, Civil History, Index, "Elders"). These puerilities might have been prevented had men considered that נִפְּצָה does not signify merely an arithmetical amount, but is used to denote an exact narration (Judg. vii, 15). The passage is in the highly poetical style of the magnificent ode in which it occurs, and, reduced to plain terms, simply declares that the Almighty Sovereign, in whose hands of necessity lies the disposal of human birth-places, had so arranged these, in mapping out the world, as best to subserve the future occupancy of Canaan by his chosen people.

But the main passage of Scripture usually relied upon to prove the fact of a sudden and violent disruption of primeval society into the germs of the early nations, as well as to explain its circumstances and cause, is the account of the building of the tower of Babel (Gen. xi, 1-9), in which the dispersion of those engaged in that enterprise has been regarded as a part of the disseverance commemorated in the name of Peleg. There are, however, some objections to this view of the narrative. In the first place, these two events are not thus connected in the account itself. The sporadic varieties of language, which is the grand distinction between the different tribes that have founded the ancient monarchies and cities, had not yet appeared; nor could they be accounted for in this manner if the original community had already begun to separate into the more modern states. The only supposition that would make the two occurrences compatible, if connected, is that the whole body of the Noachites, while in process of migration westward (מִן הַיָּם הַמִּזְבְּחוֹן), with a view to settling in different localities, were arrested by the inviting character of the plain of Shinar, until their purpose of diffusion (פְּנִי, the same word in ver. 4 and 8) was renewed by the divine interference. In the second place, it is not certain that either of the incidents thus associated is of so cosmopolitan a character as this theory assumes. By simply rendering נִפְּצָה, land or region, instead of "earth," the whole affair is reduced to a petty dispute or misunderstanding among the workmen engaged upon a public edifice, and a consequent dissolution of that particular cluster of inhabitants. Certain it is that all the dialects of this polyglot globe cannot be referred to a single incident or occasion like this. Such, at least, are in substance the arguments that have been offered against interpreting the sacred narrative here as having a general application to the whole race, nor can it be denied that they possess a certain degree of plausibility (see Bryant, *Ancient Mythology*, 2d ed. iv, 23-44, 92 sq.). On the other hand, if, as everything in the context seems to require, we conceive the descendants of Noah to have been at this time (say about the birth of Peleg, i. e. one hundred years after the Flood) quite limited in numbers and extent (as the longevity of the patriarchs and their pastoral habits both indicate), we shall find no particular difficulty in taking the entire statement in its broadest and most literal sense, as the opening wedge of that universal split, which has since widened more and more, in language and abode, among the sons of men. This narrative, then, of the Dispersion begins with the remarkable statement: "Now the whole earth was of one language and of one speech. And it came to pass, as they journeyed from [or "in"] the East, that they found a plain in the land of Shinar; and they dwelt there" (Gen. xi, 1, 2). The



expressions "language" (lip) and "speech" (words) are too precise to be understood (as Vitringa, *Obs. Sacra*, ch. ix, p. 109) as indicating merely an agreement in purpose. The journeying together shows that the time spoken of was before the Noachians had ceased to be a single nation, and perhaps when they formed but a great tribe, and were journeying (שׁוֹרְרִים, to pull up stakes, as a tent or encampment) after the manner of the Arabs across the plains watered by the Tigris and Euphrates. It cannot be doubted that Shinar was Babylonia. The name, indeed, is perhaps traceable in Mesopotamia in the modern Sinjâr, and it is noticeable that the ancient Egyptian transcription of Shinar (𓆎𓆏𓆑) is SANKAR.T (this *k* corresponding to the Hebrew שׁ, as though the שׁ had been pronounced like the Arabic *Gâin*). But there is no evidence that the Hebrews called any country except Babylonia "the land of Shinar." The direction of the journey, if it be indicated as "from the East," probably would only mark the previous halting-place of the Noachians, not the place at which they first began to repeople the earth. The narrative then relates the attempt to build a city and a tower in order to prevent the scattering of mankind, and the punishment of the builders by the confusion of their language and their being scattered abroad from the unfinished city Babel, or Confusion. Leaving the subject of the Confusion of Tongues for later discussion, we must observe the general agreement of profane historians as to the antiquity of Babylon, and the reminiscence of the Tower in the towers of the Babylonian temples. The Pyramids of Egypt and those of Mexico should be compared with these towers; and, in the case of the former, on account of their extreme antiquity, the comparison is very important. The exact character of the scattering is difficult to infer. The cause, according to the ordinary explanation of the narrative, was the Confusion of Tongues, but some have supposed the latter to have been the consequence of the Dispersion. From ver. 4 compared with ver. 9, it would appear to have been but a resumption of the original plan of immigration, now that their holding together had become impossible, for the want of a common medium of vocal communication. Whatever difficulties we may discover in this and the preceding chapter of Genesis, "it is no longer probable only, but it is absolutely certain, that the whole race of man proceeded from *Ira*n [the proper and native name of Persia and some connected regions] as from a centre, whence they migrated first in *three great colonies*; and that those three branches grew from a common stock, which had been miraculously preserved in a general convulsion and inundation of this globe" (Sir William Jones, *On the Origin and Families of Nations*, Works, ed. by Lord Teignmouth, 8vo, iii, 196). There is, perhaps, no distinct reference to the building of the Tower and the Dispersion in the traditions of any heathen nation. The Greek story of the giants who piled mountains one upon another to reach Olympus is perhaps the most probable trace. Unlike the case of the Flood, there is no clear evidence that the Dispersion made a strong impression upon the minds of those who witnessed and shared in it. This would indicate that it was unaccompanied by any great outward manifestation of God's anger, and was the immediate consequence of such difficulties as would arise from the sudden division of mankind into tribes speaking different languages or dialects. See BABEL (TOWER OF).

II. *Preliminary Considerations in examining the List of Gen. x.*—1. The enumeration comprises only nations existing in the age of Moses, and probably of them only the most conspicuous, as more or less connected with the history of the Israelites. Many nations have been formed in subsequent times, and, indeed, are still forming, by separation and by combination; these can be considered only as included on the ground of long

subsequent derivation. Such are the populations of Eastern Asia, Medial and South Africa, America, and Australasia.

2. It cannot be affirmed with certainty that we are here presented with a complete *Table of Nations*, even as existing in the time of Moses. Of each of the sons of Noah it gives the sons; but of their sons (Noah's great-grandsons) it is manifest that all are not mentioned, and we have no possible means of ascertaining how many are omitted. Thus, of the sons of Japheth, the line is pursued only of Gomer and Javan; Magog, Madai, Tubal, Meshech, and Tiras are dropped without any mention of their issue; yet we have evidence that nations of great importance in the history of mankind have descended from them. Ham had four sons; of three of them the sons, or rather clanish or national descendants, are specified; but to Phut, the fourth, no posterity is assigned. Shem had five sons, but the descendants of only two of them are recorded. It cannot be supposed that those whose sequence is thus cut off died without children; for, as we shall presently see, nations of great historical interest may be traced up to them.

3. Mere similarity, or even identity of name, is not a sure guide. So remarkable a name as Hazarmaveth can scarcely be mistaken when we find it in Hadramaut. Such a name would not be repeated, and the Hadramaut which we discover in Arabia cannot be doubted to indicate the settlement of Joktan's son Hazarmaveth; but this is an exceptional case. When the similarity of Dodanim to Dodona is considered to be a sufficient proof of identity, all criticism is set at defiance. For the investigation before us we have an aid, invaluable both for its ample comprehension and its divine authority, in the account of the traffic of Tyre (Ezek. xxvii).

4. The list is, in one aspect, a kind of geographical table: many names in its descents are found in later places of Scripture as geographical terms designating nations, or at least important tribes. Therefore—

(1.) We must not look for a name in that of a town. There is an exception, probably not the only one, in the case of Sidon, the city of the Sidonians, who were doubtless a Canaanitish tribe, but to trace names in general in those of towns is very hazardous.

(2.) The tracing of a nation or tribe to a name in the list is of little value, unless neighboring or kindred nations, or nations otherwise markedly connected with it, can also be traced to the same part of the list.

5. Preference must always be given to the oldest documents in seeking for identifications. Next to the O. T., the Egyptian, Assyrian, and Babylonian monuments must be cited. In each set of documents, the notices nearest in point of time are always likely to be the best commentators; for it must be remembered that migrations and deportations are less likely to affect evidence the earlier it is.

6. Although the list is geographical, its form is genealogical; and it does sometimes, and may frequently, state or convey the name of the founder of a nation or tribe—thus, all those terminating in the plural *im*, and those specified by the Gentilitian adjective, the Jebusite, the Hivite, etc. Yet

(1.) We must not attempt to identify a founder's name in the traditions of nations, except when it is distinctly mentioned there as such.

(2.) As before, we must not be satisfied unless the identification is supported by the geographical position of the founder's nation, or its ethnological character, or else by some marked characteristics connecting it with other names identified in the same part of the list.

III. *The Immediate Sons of Noah.*—Shem is always mentioned first of the three sons of Noah when their names occur together, the order being Shem, Ham, and Japheth. In Gen. x, 21 he is called "the elder brother of Japheth," which the A. V. incorrectly trans-

lates "the brother of Japheth the elder," where a comma after "Japheth" gives the correct sense. In the list of that chapter, notwithstanding the occurrence of the usual order in ver. 1, the sons of Japheth are first mentioned, then those of Ham, and lastly those of Shem, the order being inverted. It has been supposed that Shem was put at the close of the list in order that the insertion of the other descendants of Noah might not form a digression in the history of the Shemites and their Hebrew branch. The Japhethites may have been put at the head of the list as the most widely spread, and so the most distant; and, for a like reason, the Hamites may have preceded the Shemites, the order being that of the extent of colonization. Or, again, the order may be geographical, from west to east, in accordance with the western, central, and eastern positions of the three great stocks. We shall see that the details favor the last view.

Shem (שֵׁם) signifies "name, good name, fame;" Ham (חָם), "hot, warm;" Japheth (יָפֶתֶת), "spread," from יָפַתּ. The names are probably prophetic of the future renown of the Shemites, of the hot land of the Hamites, and the spread of the Japhethites. The prophecy of Noah (Gen. ix, 25, 26, 27) indicates the appropriateness of Japheth's name to his future; and a prophetic sense of the names of his brethren may therefore be conjectured. But there is no distinct allusion to any such sense in their cases. It might be thought that the appropriateness of Shem's name as illustrious could be traced in the prediction that his should be the believing stock, but there is no indication whatever of any moral significance in the name of Ham.

1. *Shem*.—There is no trace of any single nation or country named after Shem, probably because the Shemites, by an instinct afterwards remarkable in their descendants, early separated into distinct tribes, though not migrating very far. This was the case with the Israelites; and with the Arabs the same process is still in constant operation. See *SHEM*.

2. *Ham*.—The name of Ham has been connected with an appellation of Egypt in Hebrew, only occurring in three passages in the poetical books—"the land of Ham" (Psa. lxxvii, 51; cv, 23; cvi, 22), and with the most usual Egyptian name of the country, KEM, "the black (land)." The former term we cannot doubt contained the patriarch's name. Is the latter identical with it? The significations of Ham and KEM are sufficiently near. Ham may reasonably be derived from חָם, "he or it was warm," and compared with חָמָה, "he or it was black," and the Arabic *cham*, of the same signification as the last, and *chama*, "black fetid mud" (*Kāmis*), or "black mud" (*Sihāh* MS.). KEM cannot be taken for an Egyptian transcription of Ham, but it may be a word of cognate origin (comp. KAR, "a circle," חֶרֶב, חָרַב, "he or it turned, turned round;" KARR, "a furnace," חָרָה, "it burned;" חָה, "to bend," חָתָה, "he or it bowed down, inclined"). There can, therefore, be no reasonable doubt that the Egyptian name of the country is identical with the Hebrew name of the patriarch. Are they of separate origin? We must either suppose this, or that "the land of Ham" became changed to "Ham-land," or "black land." The genius of the Egyptian language would account for such a change, which seems not improbable. That Ham should have given his name to a country might be accounted for by the supposition that, except the Canaanites, the Hamites penetrated into Africa, and at first established themselves in Egypt. See *HAM*.

3. *Japheth*.—It is impossible not to see the name of Japheth in the Greek Japetus the Titan, son of Uranus and Ge, and the supposed ancestor of the human race; for, as we shall see, the Greeks, or at least those

of the Hellenic stock, are classed among the Japhethites in the list of Genesis. See *JAPHETH*.

IV. *The Descendants of Japheth*.—The following is the table of the Japhethites:

Japheth.	1. Gomer.	a. Ashkenaz.
		b. Riphath.
		c. Togamah.
	2. Magog.	
	3. Madai.	a. Elishah.
	4. Javan.	b. Tarshish.
		c. Kittim.
		d. Dodanim.
	5. Tubal.	
	6. Meshech.	
	7. Tiras.	

1. *Gomer*.—This name occurs in but one later place in connection with geography, as that of a nation or tribe allied with Magog, and it is there mentioned immediately before Togamah, distinguished as northern (Ezek. xxxviii, 6). It has therefore been supposed to point to a remote northern nation, Scythic, or perhaps European. Two great gentile names have been compared, the Cimmerians of the Tauric Chersonese, who invaded the west of Asia Minor early in the 7th century B.C., and the Cimbr and Cymry, whose ethnic and nominal identity cannot be doubted. Considering the migratory character of the Cimmerians and Cimbr, it is reasonable to suppose that they had the same origin. In the cuneiform inscriptions of Darius Hystaspes, Gimiri occurs as the Semicitic equivalent of the Arian name *Saka* (Σάκαι). (Sir H. Rawlinson, in Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, iii, 150, note 1.) See *GOMER*.

a. *Ashkenaz*.—In a single later mention Ashkenaz occurs, in a confederacy against Babylon, with Ararat, Minni, and Middai (Jer. ii, 27, 28). It was therefore a nation in the direction of Armenia.

b. *Riphath*, written in 1 Chron. i, 6, Diphath, does not occur elsewhere in Scripture. It has been compared with the Riphæan Mountains of Greek geography; but the statement of Josephus, commenting on this list, that the Paphlagonians were anciently called Riphathæans, is worthy of notice (*Ant. i, 6, 1*).

c. *Togamah* is mentioned in Ezekiel among the traders with Tyre, after Tarshish, Javan, Tubal, and Meshech, all Japhethites, and before Dedan, here probably the country of which the inhabitants, called Dodanim, are classed among the sons of the Japhethite Javan (Ezek. xxvii, 12-15); and, in a later place, "the house of Togamah, of the north quarters," follows Gomer in the list of the army of Gog, prince of a northern people not remote from Greece. Togamah traded with Tyre "with horses and horsemen, and mules" (xxvii, 14), whence we may suppose these traffickers came by land. All the indications agree very well with the opinion that Togamah may be connected with the Armenians.

2. *Magog* is elsewhere mentioned by Ezekiel only, first among the countries ruled by Gog, and especially associated with Rosh, Meshech, and Tubal (Ezek. xxxviii, 2, 3), and apparently spoken of as dwelling "in the isles" (xxxix, 6). The term "isles" certainly must not be taken necessarily to indicate islands, but it is apparently limited to maritime, transmarine, and very remote regions. It has generally been held that Magog, used for a nation, is applied to the Scythians of the Greeks, though perhaps in a restricted sense. Certainly, in the time of Ezekiel, the Scythians who invaded Western Asia were the most powerful nation of the country to which the confederacy mentioned by the prophet may reasonably be assigned; and the agreement of Josephus (*Ant. i, 6, 1*) and Jerome (*Quest. in Gen. x, 2*) in the identification is not to be overlooked. See *MAGOG*.

3. *Madai*, always later applied to the country Media, very appropriately follows Magog, if the latter, when used geographically, indicates the Scythian neighbors of the Medes. Madai, like other names af-

terwards employed for a country rather than a people, may originally have been a man's name (comp. *Mizraim*, infra). See MADAI.

4. *Javan*.—Except where applied to an Arabian place or tribe (Ezek. xxvii, 19; and perhaps Joel iii, 6), this is, in all later places, the name of the Greeks, or at least of the Hellenic Greeks. The Persians, like the Hebrews, called all the Greeks Iouians. See JAVAN.

a. Elishah, at the head of the descendants of Javan, is to be looked for in Hellenic geography. It is mentioned in Ezekiel as trading with Tyre, "Blue and purple, from the isles of Elishah, was that which covered thee" (xxvii, 7). The name has been compared with Elis, Hellas, and the Ælians. Etymologically the first and third are equally probable, but other circumstances seem almost decisive in favor of the latter. The coast of the Æolian settlements in Asia Minor produced purple, and the name of so important a division of the Hellenic nation would suit better than that of a city which never was rich and powerful enough to be classed with Sidon, Tyre, or Carthage.

b. Tarshish is in later Biblical history the name of a great mart, or, as some hold, of two. The famous Tarshish, supposing there were two, was one of the most important commercial cities of the period of the kings; second only, if second, to Tyre. It was accessible from the coast of Palestine, but its trade was carried on in large ships, "ships of Tarshish," which implies a distant voyage from Palestine. It brought to Tyre "silver, iron, tin, and lead" (Ezek. xxvii, 12). These products seem to point incontestably to a Spanish emporium, and the majority of modern commentators agree in fixing on the celebrated Tartessus, said to have been founded by the Phœnicians, and with which the Phœnicians traded. In some places Tarshish seems to be evidently a country.

c. Kittim.—This Gentile noun, usually written Chittim in the A. V., is generally connected with Citium of Cyprus. Other indications of Scripture seem not unfavorable to this identification, which would make the Kittim or Chittim a seafaring population of Cyprus.

d. Dodanim, closely connected in the table by construction as well as in form with Kittim—"Elishah and Tarshish, Kittim and Dodanim" (Gen. x, 4)—was a maritime or insular people. Ezekiel says of Tyre, "The men of Dedan [were] thy merchants; many isles [were] the merchandise of thine hand: they brought thee [for] a present horns of ivory and ebony" (xxvii, 15). The reading in the list as given in 1 Chron. (i, 7) is Rodanim, a form which is probably the true one, as supported by the Sept. and Samaritan versions. The Sept. identifies this people with the Rhodians in all instances, including that in Ezekiel. In the prophet's time Rhodes was a great seat of Phœnician commerce, and at the site of Camirus, one of its three important cities before the city Rhodes was founded, many objects of Phœnician style have been discovered. It may be added that ivory is one of the materials of its antiquities. The identification, considering the probable place of the Kittim, is very likely.

5. *Tubal*, and 6. *Meshech*, are in later places mentioned together (Ezek. xxvii, 13; xxxviii, 2, 3; xxxix, 1), and were evidently northern nations (xxxix, 2). They have been traced in the Moschi and Tibareni mentioned together by Herodotus (iii, 94; vii, 78), and as Muskai and Tuplai, in the Assyrian inscriptions (Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, i, 530), which inhabited the northern coast of Asia Minor towards the Caucasus.

7. *Tiras*, last in the list of the sons of Japheth, has not been satisfactorily identified. The best comparison is perhaps with the Thyrrenians or Tyrsenians, as then all the chief territories of Japhethite civilization would seem to have been indicated—Armenia, Asia Minor, Thrace, the Asiatic Islands, European Greece, Italy, and Spain.

### V. Descendants of Ham, or Hamites:

Ham.	1. Cush.	a. Seba.	
		b. Havilah.	
		c. Sabtah.	
		d. Raamah.	a. Sheba.
			b. Dedan.
		e. Sabtechah.	
		f. Nimrod.	
	2. Mizraim.	a. Ludim.	
		b. Anamim.	
		c. Lechabim.	
		d. Naphtuhim.	
		e. Pathrusim.	
		f. Casluhim.	a. Philistim.
		g. Caphtorim.	
	3. Phut.		
	4. Canaan.	a. Sidon.	
		b. Heth.	
		c. Jebusite.	
		d. Amorite.	
		e. Gizzasite.	
		f. Hivite.	
		g. Arkite.	
		h. Sinite.	
		i. Arvadite.	
		j. Zemarite.	
		k. Hamathite.	

1. *Cush* is immediately recognised in KISH, the ancient Egyptian name of Ethiopia above Egypt. With this identification all geographical mentions in Scripture, except that in the account of Paradise (Gen. ii, 13), agree. The latter may refer to a primaeva CUSH, but an Asiatic settlement is positively indicated in the history of Nimrod, and we shall see that the settlements of the Cushites extended from African Ethiopia to Babylon, through Arabia. See CUSH.

a. Seba is connected by Isaiiah with Egypt and Cush (xliii, 3; xlv, 14), and the statement of Josephus that the island and city of Meroë bore this name is therefore to be noticed. In the ancient Egyptian geographical lists, SAHABA and SABARA occur among names of tribes or places belonging to Ethiopia (Brugsch, *Geogr. Inschr.* ii, p. 9, pl. xii, k. l.).

b. Havilah.—The identification of Havilah is difficult, as the name recurs in the list of the sons of Joktan; and in Biblical geography, except only in the description of Eden, it is found in Arabia alone. If the two stocks intermixed, and thus bore a common name, a single localization would be sufficient.

c. Sabtah can only be doubtfully traced in Arabian geography.

d. Raamah, in the Sept. Περύα, is well traced in the Πέρυα of Ptol. (vi, 7), and Πήγμα of Steph. Byz. (s. v.), a city of Arabia on the Persian Gulf.

a. Sheba, and b. Dedan, bear the same names as two descendants of Keturah (Gen. xxv, 3), from which it has reasonably been supposed that we have here an indication of a mixture of Cushite and Abrahamite Arabs, like that of Cushite and Joktanite Arabs inferred in the case of the two Havilahs. It is to be remarked that the name of Dedan has been conjecturally traced in the modern name of the island of Dádan, on the east coast of Arabia, and that of Sheba in the ruins of an ancient city called Sebà, in the neighboring island of Awál.

e. Sabtechah is not identified.

f. Nimrod is generally thought to have been a remoter descendant of Cush than son, and this the usage of Hebrew genealogies may be held to sanction. He is the first and only known instance in the list of the leader of a dynasty rather than the parent of a nation or tribe. His name is followed by a parenthetical passage relating to his power and the establishment and extension of his kingdom. It is probable that this narrative is introduced to mark the commencement of the first Noachian monarchy. It may be compared with the notices of inventions in the account of Cain's descendants (Gen. iv, 20-22). The name of Nimrod is probably Shemitic, from נִמְרוֹד, "he was rebellious." It occurs in ancient Egyptian, in the form NAMURET, in the family of the 22d dynasty, which was certainly, at least in part, of foreign origin. The

like names SHESHENK, USARKEN, TEKERUT, appear to be Shemitic.

2. *Mizraim*, literally "the two Mazors," is the common name of Egypt in the Bible; the singular, Mazor, being rarely used. It has been thought to be a purely geographical name, from its having a dual form, but it has been discovered in ancient Egyptian as the name of a Hittite or kindred chief, B.C. cir. 1300, contemporary with Ramesses II, written in hieroglyphics MATIRMA, where the MA is known to express the Hebrew dual, as in MAHANMA for Mahanaim. That it should be used at so early a time as a proper name of a man suggests that the fact that Egypt was so called may be due to a Noachian's name having had a dual form, not to the division of the country into two regions. If, however, we suppose that in Gen. x Mizraim indicates the country, then we might infer that Ham's son was probably called Mazor. It is remarkable that Mazor appears to be equivalent to Ham: as we have seen, the meaning of the latter is evidently "hot" or "black," perhaps both, and a cognate word is used in Arabic for "black mud;" among the meanings of *misr*, the Arabic equivalent of Mazor, the *Ká-mús* gives "red earth or mud." Thus Ham and Mazor or Mizraim would especially apply to darkness of skin or earth; and, since both were used geographically to designate the "black land," as cultivated Egypt always was from the blackness of its alluvial soil, it is not surprising that the idea of earth came to be included in one of the significations of each. If Mizraim were purely geographical in the list, then we might perhaps suppose that it was derived from Mazor as a Shemitic equivalent of Ham. It is certainly remarkable that all the descendants of Mizraim are mentioned as tribes in the plurals of gentile nouns. See MIZRAIM.

a. Ludim, perhaps mentioned in passages of the prophets as Lud or Ludim (Isa. lxvi, 19; Jer. xlv, 9; Ezek. xxvii, 10; xxxviii, 5; xxx, 4, 5), where, however, the Shemitic Lud may be intended. There would be no doubt that in at least one of these passages (Ezek. xxx, 4, 5), where Egypt, and, as far as they are identified, African nations or countries are spoken of, the Ludim are those of the Mizraite stock, were it not possible that under the term Ludim or Lydian the Ionian and Carian mercenaries of the Pharaohs may be indicated.

b. Ananim, a nation as yet not identified.

c. Lehabim, no doubt the same as the Lubim or Libyans mentioned in later places of Scripture as allies or mercenaries contributing to the armies of the Pharaohs, and supporting or dependent on Egypt as a race in very close relations. They correspond to the REBU or LEBU of the Egyptian inscriptions, western neighbors of Egypt, conquered by the kings of the 19th and 20th dynasties.

d. Naphthulim strikingly resembles the Coptic name of the westernmost part of Lower Egypt, the territory of the city Mareia, probably the older Marœotic nome *Niphait* or *Niphaiad*, a plural form commencing with the definite article *ni*.

e. Pathrusim, a tribe of which the territory, "the country of Pathros," is mentioned in later places. The latter has been compared with the Egyptian Pathyrite or Phaturite Nome; in Coptic *papithours*, *papithoures*; in ancient Egyptian PA-HAT-HER; the chief objection to which identification is, that the geographical importance of the name seems scarcely sufficient.

f. Casluhim, not as yet identified.

g. Caphtorim, and the land of Caphtor, have given rise to much discussion. Poole has proposed as the equivalent of Caphtor the ancient Egyptian name of Coptos, KEBTU, KEBTA, KEBHER, probably pronounced Kubit, Kabt, Kelthor, the Coptic *Keft*, *Kepth*, *Kepth*, *Kebth*, Gr. *Κόπτος*, Arab. *Kufi*, and ventured to compare *Αἰγυπτος* with *כְּפִתּוֹר*. See CAPHTOR. It

must be remembered that the city Coptos, or its nome, has given its name to the whole nation of Egyptians, who were known as Copts by the Arabs at the time of the conquest. But good reasons have been urged in favor of Cyprus, especially the circumstance of the Philistine migration.

a. Philistim.—The Philistines are here said to have come forth from the Casluhim; elsewhere they are called Caphtorim, and said to have come out of Caphtor. It is not allowable to read that the Philistim and Caphtorim came from the Casluhim. Perhaps there is a transposition in the text. The origin of the Philistines from a Mizraite stock is a very important fact for the explanation of the list.

3. *Phut*.—In later places, Put or Phut occurs as the name of an African country or nation, closely connected with Egypt, like the Lubim. It may be compared with those geographical names in the ancient Egyptian inscriptions in which the element PUT, "the bow," occurs. Nubia was called the "bow-land," TU-PUT, where it is usual to read TU-KENS, but the bow has not the sound KENS elsewhere; and it is probable that a part of Nubia was called KENS, and that the bow was written as a determinative symbol to show that KENS was included in "the bow-land;" but the question is full of difficulties. See PUTT.

4. *Canaan*, in Gen. ix (18, 22, 25, 26, 27), is distinctly mentioned as the son of Ham. It has been thought that his name means the "degraded," "the subdued" man, "the lowlander," for both senses are possible. See CANAAN.

a. Sidon, "the first-born" of Canaan, like Heth, immediately following, is a proper name, whereas all the remaining names are gentile nouns in the singular. Sidon is thought to signify "the fishing-place," so that the name of the place would seem here to be put for that of the founder, "the fisherman." *Ἀλιεύς* of Sanchoniathon or Philo of Byblus. But it must be noticed that the next name, Heth, is treated in later places as that of a man. The position of the Sidonians, like that of most of the Canaanitish tribes, need not here be described.

b. Heth, ancestor of the "Children of Heth," or Hittites, a very important nation of Palestine and Syria. There are indications in Scripture of Hittites out of Palestine, and the ancient Egyptians warred with the KHEA in the valley of the Orontes, whose names show that they spoke a Shemitic language. The Egyptian monumental representations show that their armies were composed of men of two races, the one apparently Shemite in type, the other beardless, and resembling the Tatar type. See HITTITE.

c. The Jebusite, d. Amorite, e. Girsagite (properly Girsagshite), f. Hivite, all inhabitants of Palestine; but the Amorite, like the Hittite nation, seems to have had a wider extension, for the territory in which stood KETESH, the great stronghold of the KHEA on the Orontes, is called in Egyptian "the land of AMAR" (Brugsch, *Geogr. Inschr.* ii, p. 21, 22, pl. xviii, 44, 47).

g. The Arkite, compared with the Phœnician town of Arca.

h. The Sinite, not satisfactorily identified. Perhaps one of their settlements may be traced in Sin or Pelusium.

i. The Arvadite, no doubt the people of Aradus. The derivation from *רד*, with the sense "wandering," "place of fugitives," is in accordance with the tradition referred to by Strabo, who says that Aradus was built by Sidonian fugitives (xvi, 2, 13, 14). Aradus was a Phœnician city.

j. The Zemarite, conjecturally traced in the town Simyra, which has nothing to recommend it but its neighborhood to Arka and Aradus.

k. The Hamathite, well known to have been seated in Upper Syria, where Hamath, on the Orontes, was long a capital of an important kingdom.



Ethnographic Map of the World according to Moses.

## VI. Descendants of Shem, or Shemites:

- |              |          |                   |  |  |               |
|--------------|----------|-------------------|--|--|---------------|
| Shem.        |          |                   |  |  |               |
| 1. Elam.     |          |                   |  |  | (j.) Sheba.   |
| 2. Asshur.   |          |                   |  |  | (k.) Ophir.   |
| 3. Arphaxad. |          |                   |  |  | (l.) Havilah. |
| a. Salah.    | a. Eber. | (a.) Peleg.       |  |  | (m.) Jobab.   |
|              |          | (b.) Joktan.      |  |  |               |
|              |          | (a.) Almodad.     |  | 4. Lud.  |               |
|              |          | (b.) Sheleph.     |  | 5. Aram.   |               |
|              |          | (c.) Hazarmaveth. |  | a. Uz.   |               |
|              |          | (d.) Jerah.       |  | b. Hul.  |               |
|              |          | (e.) Hadoram.     |  | c. Gether.   |               |
|              |          | (f.) Uzal.        |  | d. Mash.   |               |
|              |          | (g.) Diklah.      |  | 1. Elam, when used geographically, held to corre-    |               |
|              |          | (h.) Obal.        |  | spond to Susiana, not to Persia Proper.              |               |
|              |          | (i.) Abimael.     |  | 2. Asshur, afterwards the Assyrian nation. In the    |               |
|              |          |                   |  | euneiform inscriptions Asshur is the chief object of |               |
|              |          |                   |  | worship of the kings. See ASSHUR.                    |               |

3. *Arphaxad*, probably well traced in the province Arrapachitis.

a. Salah seems to be only a genealogical link. In the Shemitic family the list is clearly something more than ethnological and geographical; it is of the nature of a pedigree, at least as far as it deals with the ancestry of Abraham.

a. Eber.—It is impossible here to discuss the difficult question whether to this patriarch the name of the Hebrews owed its origin. The argument based on the mention in this list that Shem was "the father of all the children of Eber" (x, 21) seems to us almost unanswerable on the affirmative side. See EBER.

(a.) Peleg seems, like Salah, to be but a genealogical link.

(b.) Joktan is perhaps only a similar link; his descendants form an important series.

(a.) Almodad, supposed to be traceable in Arabian names.

(b.) Sheleph, traced in El-Yemen.

(c.) Hazarmaveth, identical in name with the great region of Hadramaut, in Southern Arabia.

(d.) Jerah, not certainly identified, and (e.) Hadoram, not traced.

(f.) Uzal, the same name as Awzâl, the ancient name of San'a, capital of El-Yemen.

(g.) Diklah, (h.) Obal, (i.) Abimael, not traced.

(j.) Sheba is the same name as the Arabic Sebâ, the old kingdom of El-Yemen. The mentions in the Bible of the kingdom of Sheba point towards Arabia, and the Arabic indication thus fixes the position of Joktanite Sheba in the south.

(k.) Ophir, perhaps traced in Southern Arabia.

(l.) Havilah, as already remarked under the head of the Cushite Havilah, may indicate a mixture of Cushite and Joktanite settlers in Arabia.

(m.) Jobab, not certainly identified.

4. *Lud* has been compared to Lydus, the traditional ancestor of the Lydians. The Shemitic character of the Lydian civilization is confirmatory of this view. The Egyptian monuments of the empire mention a powerful Asiatic people of Shemitic type, apparently living not far from Mesopotamia, called RUTEN or LUDEN. It is possible that the Lydians may have migrated into Asia Minor after the time of the Egyptian empire, or that there may have been two Lydian settlements. It is not clear whether the Lud or Ludim of later places of Scripture were of this stock, or the same as the Mizraite Ludim, as already remarked.

5. *Aram* is, in later places, the geographical designation of Syria, though the term is not of the same extent as our Syria. We read of Aram-naharaim, "Aram of the two rivers," either Mesopotamia, according to the general opinion, or the country of the Orontes and Leontes, of Padan-Aram, perhaps a part of the same tract, or another name for it; and also of Aram-Zobah, Aram-Beth-rehob, Aram-Maachah, and Aram-Damme-sek, or Syria of Damascus, all kingdoms in the country Aram (q. v.).

a. Uz. Mention is made of "the land of Uz" in the book of Job, where other indications seem to point to the north of Arabia.

b. Hul, and, c. Gether, are not identified; d. Mash is but conjuncturally traced in Mesene, in Lower Babylonia, or Mons Masius, at the north of Mesopotamia.

VII. *Results*.—These are twofold:

## RACES.

- I. Caucasian.
  1. White (as Greek).
  2. Tawny (Arab).
  3. Brown (Abyssinian).
- II. Lower Nilotic (Egyptian).
- III. Nigritian (Negro).
- IV. Tatar (Chinese).

## LANGUAGES.

- I. Shemitic (as Hebrew).
- II. Iranian (Greek).
- III. Barbaric.
  1. Egyptian.
  2. Nigritian.
  3. Tatar.

ethnological evidence from Egyptian (Eg.), Assyrian (As.), or other sources; the fourth exhibits the like philological evidence.

Name.	Identification.	Race.	Language.
Hain	Egypt?	Lower Nilotic	Barbaric, Egypt-
Gomer	Cimbri	Caucasian	Iranian [tiau]
Madal	Media	Caucasian	Iranian
Javin	Greeks	Caucasian, white	Iranian
Tubal	Phœneci		
Meshech	Moschi		
Cush	Ethiopia	Nigritian?	Barbaric, Nigri-
Seba	Meroc		tian?
Raamah	Regina (E. Arabia)		
Nimrod	King of Babylonia and Assyria		
Mizraim	Egypt	Lower Nilotic	Barbaric Egypt-
Lehabim	Libyans	Caucas., white (Eg.)	[tiau]
Naphthum	Egypt?		
Philistin	Philistines	L. Nilotic (Eg.)	
Canaan	Palestine and Syria	Caucasian (Eg.)	Shemitic
Sidon	Sidon		Shemitic
Hittites	Hittites	Caucasian and Ta-	Shemitic
Jebusite	Jebusite	(tar? (Eg.)	
Amorite	Amorite		
Girgassite	Girgassite		
Hivite	Hivite		
Arkite	Arkite		
Arvadite	Arvadite		
Hamathite	Hamathite		
Elam	Susiana	Caucasian (As.)	
Asshur	Assyria	Caucasian (As.)	Shemitic
Arphaxad	Arphaxad		
Eber	Hebrews?	Caucasian, tawny.	Shemitic
Sheph	Sheph		
Hazarmaveth	Hazarmaveth		
Uzal	Southern Arabia	Caucasian, tawny	Shemitic
Sheba	Sheba	(and brown)	
Lud	Ludia?	Caucasian	
Aram	Syria	Caucasian	Shemitic

From this evidence we may draw the following inferences on several important points:

1. *Order of Names*.—The Japhethites seem to be placed first, as the most distant nations. In the list of the Hamites, the southern, and, therefore, most distant Cushites, are arranged from west to east, Seba (Meroc) being followed by Raamah (in Arabia), and the series closing with Nimrod, who ruled in Babylonia and Assyria. North of Cush is Mizraim, in the enumeration of whose tribes the western Lehabim (Libyans) are followed after an interval by the easternmost Philistin, apparently the only Mizraites of Palestine. The list of the Canaanites begins with Sidon, the Phœnicians of the sea-coast north of the Philistines; then mentions under Heth the Hittites, perhaps on account of their southern settlement, and, going northwards, enumerates tribes near Lebanon, closing with the Syrian Hamathites. The Shemitic tribes begin in the east, extending regularly from Susiana to Arabia, and then ascending to Syria. Lud may be an exception, but, as we have seen, the Lydians may have been settled near Syria, otherwise Lud may be mentioned between the Arabs and Aram as an outlying Shemitic tribe, to be spoken of before the enumeration of those nearest Palestine.

2. *Race*.—All the names identified with a high degree of probability are, with six exceptions, of Caucasian nations. The exceptions are: three certainly of the Lower Nilotic race, which is intermediate between the Caucasian and Nigritian races, showing strong traits of both, a fourth probably of the same race, and two others which require more particular investigation. Cush, in ancient Egyptian, applies to Nigritians, for the race of Kisu is represented on the Egyptian monuments as of the most marked Nigritian type: the kings and other royal personages of Meroc, and the Ethiopians of rank under them, are, however, represented on their monuments as similar to the Lower Nilotic race. This suggests that Cush may indicate a country mainly peopled by Nigritians, yet with a governing mixed race. The remaining exception is the case of the Hittites, who are represented on the Egyptian monuments as of two types—the one Caucasian, the other apparently Tatar. This may show that two different races were ruled by those Hittite kings with whom the Pharaohs warred, as Og, the king of Bashan, was a Rephaite, not an Amorite.

3. *Language*.—The languages are all Iranian or Shemitic, with three exceptions. Egyptian, occurring twice in our table, has a monosyllabic barbaric

In the table which follows, the first column gives those names from Gen. x for which there are highly-probable geographical identifications; the second column states these identifications; the third contains

vocabulary, with an amalgamate Shemitic grammar. Here, therefore, as in race, there is a departure from the unmixed type. To Cush we have conjecturally assigned a barbaric Nigritian language, because the names of Ethiopian tribes conquered by the Egyptians, and of Ethiopian sovereigns of later times, are not readily traceable to either an Egyptian or a Shemitic source; but we cannot say certainly that a Shemitic element is wholly wanting in the languages to which these words belong.

The order indicates that the intention of the list is partly geographical. In the detail of each division the settlements of races are probably indicated rather in the order of position than of ancestral relationship, though the principle of relationship is never departed from, as far as we can see.

4. *Date*.—The list of Gen. x contains certain statements which may now be examined, in order to infer the date to which the document refers. It is said, "Afterward were the families of the Canaanites spread abroad" (x. 18); which may indicate the formation of the great Hittite settlement in the valley of the Orontes, or other like extensions. In any case it points to an event, or series of events almost certainly prior to the establishment of the Israelites in Palestine. So, too, the definition of the otherwise unknown Resen, as "the great city" (Gen. x, 12), indicates a period anterior to that of the kings who ruled at Asshur (Kal'ah Sherg'hat) and Calah (Nimrud), the earliest of whom is placed about B.C. 1270. At the time of the Egyptian empire the capital appears to have been Nineveh, and the date of the list would therefore be anterior to that time, or at least to the reign of Thothmes III, to whom it was tributary about 1450 B.C. It would appear, therefore, that the list was either written or put into its present form not long after, or at the time of Moses, if not earlier, and that it refers to a yet earlier period—that of the first spread of the Noachians.

VIII. *Omissions*.—The nations omitted in the list must now be noticed, as far as they seem to be of a like high antiquity. In Deut. ii there is mention of several tribes or nations which had been destroyed by other tribes or nations who reached Palestine or its neighborhood before the Israelitish occupation. Certain of these are called Rephaim, others not. The particulars are as follows, as far as they relate to our present subject:

1. *Emim, Rephaim*, succeeded by Moabites (Deut. ii, 9-11).

2. *Horim*, succeeded by Edomites (ver. 12, 22).

3. *Zamzummin*, elsewhere called *Zuzim* (Gen. xv, 5), Rephaim, succeeded by Ammonites (Deut. ii, 19-21).

4. *Avim*, succeeded by Caplitorim, that is, Philistines (ver. 23).

5. *Anakim*, here mentioned as Rephaim (ver. 10, 21), still occupying the south of Palestine at the time when the Israelites entered it.

The Avim were probably also a Rephaite nation, for as late as David's time giants were found among the Philistines. Elsewhere in Palestine the Israelites seem to have found, besides "the three sons of Anak," or the Anakim of Hebron, Og, the king of Bashan, who "remained of the remnant of Rephaim" (ii, 11), a man of gigantic stature. The position of these Rephaim is that of a few powerful chiefs among the Canaanites and Philistines, representing tribes destroyed by Hebrews, the only exceptional case being that of the Philistines, if, as we suppose, the Avim were Rephaim, for in that case the former must have first attacked, but ultimately changing their policy, abstained from annihilating the older population.

At an earlier time we find a very different condition of the country. The powerful confederacy of which Chedorlaomer was chief, attacked and conquered, besides the kings of the cities of the plain, the Rephaim, Zuzim, Emim, Horim, Amalekites, and Amorites. Here the Canaanites occupy a very inferior position

in the south and east of Palestine, but one Canaanitish nation being mentioned, and besides undoubted Rephaites, the Horim probably of the same stock, and the ancient and pedigreeless nation of Amalek.

We thus find an indication of an old population of Palestine distinct from both Canaanites and Hebrews, and especially remarkable for their great height. That they were in race still more remote from their successors than has usually been held, has been argued from the Anakim's being spoken of as "of the Nephilim" (Num. xiv, 33), the term applied to the giants before the Flood, where it is said "the Nephilim were in the earth in those days" (Gen. vi, 4). On this subject, compare Poole, *The Genesis of the Earth and of Man*, 2d ed. p. 80-82, 284, 285, where it is maintained that the Nephilim were a pre-Adamite race.

IX. *Literature*.—Bochart, *Phaleg et Canaan, sive Geographia Sacra* (Cadomi, 1646); Michaelis, *Spicilegium Geographiæ extera Hebræorum* (Gotting, 1769, 1780); Forster, *Epistole ad J. D. Michaelen* (Gotting, 1772); Volney, *Recherches nouvelles* (Paris, 1814), ch. xviii; Feldhoif, *Völkertafel der Genesis* (Elberf. 1837); Höhlenberg, *Comment. de cap. x. Genesios* (Hafn. 1828); Eichhorn, *De Cusechvis verisimilitudo* (Amst. 1774); Krebs, *De divisione Phalegræ* (Lips. 1750); Nagel, *Commentatio exeget.* in Act. xvii, 26 (Altd. 1740); Zachariä, *Dissert. philol.* in loc. eund. (Hal. 1754); Schulthess, *Das Paradies* (Zür. 1816); Krücke, *Erklar. d. Völkertafeln in erst B. Moses* (Bonn. 1837); Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Alterthumsk.* I, i, 221 sq.; Knobel, *Die Völkertafel der Genesis* (Giess. 1850); Müllenhoff, in the *Götting. Anzeiger*, 1851, p. 17 sq.; Joseph v. Görres, *Die Japhiden und ihr Auszug aus Armenien* (Regensb. 1845); Beke, *Origines Biblicæ* (Lond. 1834); Forster, *Hist. Geography of Arabia* (Lond. 1844); Hengstenberg, *Egypt and the Books of Moses* (in Clarke's Library); Brace, *Races of the Old World* (N. Y. 1863). COMP. DISPERSION OF MANKIND; DIVISION OF THE EARTH; MAN.

**Ets-Aboth.** See THICK-TREE.

**Ets-Gopher.** See GOPHER-WOOD.

**Ets-Hadar.** See GOODY-TREE.

**Etshmiadzin**, a remarkable Armenian convent in Erivan, a Transcaucasian province of Russia, and about 16 miles west of the town of Erivan. "It is of great extent, is surrounded by a wall 50 feet in height, and  $1\frac{1}{2}$  miles in circuit. This wall incloses several distinct churches, each of which is presided over by a bishop; is cruciform in shape, and is surmounted by a kind of cupola crowned by a low spire. For many centuries this has been the seat of the Catholics (the head or patriarch of the Armenian Church). This patriarch presides at the synodical meetings, but cannot pass a decree without its having the approval of the moderator, an official appointed by the Russian emperor, in whose hands the control of the convent virtually rests. In the convent library there are 635 manuscripts, 462 of which are in the Armenian language."—Chambers, *Encycl.* s. v.

**Ets-Shemen.** See OIL-TREE.

**Ettwein**, JOHN, a distinguished divine of the Moravian Church, was born June 29, 1721, at Freudentstadt, Wurtemberg. In 1754 he came to America, where for nearly half a century he labored as an evangelist, as a member of the executive board, and finally as a bishop, to which latter office he was appointed in 1784. He travelled thousands of miles, often afoot, and preached the Gospel in eleven of the original thirteen colonies, as also in what is now the State of Ohio, to white people, negroes, and Indians. In 1772 he was the leader of the Christian Indians on their exodus from the Susquehanna country in Pennsylvania to the Tuscarawas in Ohio, exposing himself to great hardships and dangers. During the Revolutionary War he was in frequent intercourse and correspondence with Washington and several members

of Congress; and when the general hospital of the American army was transferred to Bethlehem, Pa., he devoted himself with singular disinterestedness to the spiritual wants of the sick, in spite of his many other duties. To him, too, must be ascribed the honor of originating, in 1787, "the Society of the United Brethren for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen," which still exists, and now has a large funded capital, and to which Congress made a grant of several townships on the Tuscarawas, in trust for the Christian Indians. He died January 2, 1802. (E. de S.)

**Etun.** See LIXEN.

**Eubu'lus** (Ἐϋβούλιος, *good in counsel*), a Christian at Rome whose greeting Paul sent to Timothy during his last imprisonment (2 Tim. iv, 21), A.D. 64.

**Eucharist**, one of the names of the Lord's Supper, from εὐχαριστία, *giving of thanks*. See LORD'S SUPPER.

**Euchel**, ISAAC BEN ABRAHAM, a Jewish scholar, born in 1756, was a distinguished member of the Society for the Promotion of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, which was formed in the days of Mendelssohn (q. v.). He is the author of a very learned treatise on the ancient mode of burial among the Jews, *Ist nach jüdischen Gesetzen das Uebernachten der Todten wirklich verboten?* (Breslau, 1797.) He published also a translation of the Jewish Prayers, מִתְפָּלֵי נְבוּכַדְרֶצַּר, or *Mose Maimini's Mose Nebuchim*, with the Commentary of Mose Narboni, called מְפָרְשֵׁי נְבוּכַדְרֶצַּר, and others (Sulzbach, 1828, 3 vols. 4to); a history of the life of Moses Mendelssohn (Berlin, 1798, 8vo; Vienna, 1812); and as a part of the great Bible work started by Mendelssohn, *Die Sprüche Salomo's im Original ins Deutsche übersetzt und hebräisch commentirt* (8vo, Berlin, 1789, 1790, and often).—Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, p. 259, 260; Kitto, *Cyclop. of Biblical Literature*, s. v.

**Euchelaion**, *the oil of prayer*, a ceremony in the Greek Church answering to *extreme unction* in the Latin. To such penitents as are conscious of the guilt of any "mortal sin," as adultery, fornication, or pride, this sacrament is administered by the bishop or archbishop, assisted by seven priests, who commences with this prayer: "O Lord, who with the oil of thy mercies hast healed the wounds of our souls, do thou sanctify this oil, that they who are anointed therewith may be freed from their infirmities, and from all corporeal and spiritual evils." The *oil of prayer* is pure and unmixed, having in it no other ingredient. A quantity sufficient to serve for the whole year is consecrated on Wednesday in the Holy Week by the archbishop or bishop. In the administration, the priest dips some cotton at the end of a stick, and thereby anoints the penitent in the form of a cross on the forehead, on the chin, on each cheek, and on the backs and palms of the hands; after which he repeats this prayer: "Holy Father, physician of souls and bodies, who hast sent thine only Son Jesus Christ, healing infirmities and sins, to free us from death, heal this thy servant of corporeal and spiritual infirmities, and give him salvation and the grace of thy Christ, through the prayers of our more than holy lady, the mother of God, the eternal virgin, through the assistance of the glorious, celestial, and incorporeal persons, through the virtue of thy life-giving and holy cross, of the holy and glorious prophet, the forerunner, John the Baptist, and the holy and glorious apostles."—Farrar, *Eccles. Dictionary*, s. v.; Pinkerton, *Present State of the Greek Church*, 193.

**Eucherius**, bishop of Lyons in the 5th century, was born of a noble family at Lyons. He was a senator, happily married, and the father of two sons, Veranius and Salonius, who at an early age were sent to the monastery of Lerins (now St. Honorat) for education. In 422 Eucherius entered the same convent as a monk, having obtained the consent of his wife Galla, who likewise devoted herself to monastic life. Soon

after, Eucherius retired into solitude on the island of Lero (St. Marguerite). In 434 he was, in consequence of the reputation of his great piety, elected bishop of Lyons, and, as such, was present at the two synods of Orange (441 and 442). He died in 454 (according to others, in 450 or 449). He is commemorated as a saint on the 16th of November. He was followed on the see of Lyons by his son Veranius, while the second, Salonius, became bishop of Geneva. Eucherius wrote, about the year 427, *Epistola parennetica de contentu mundi et secularis philosophiæ* (edit. by Rosweid, Antwerp, 1621); in 428, *Epistola de laude eremi seu vita solitaria* (edit. by Rhenanus, Basel, 1516, and by Erasmus, Basel, 1520).—*Liber formularum spiritalis intelligentiæ*.—*Institutionum libri II*.—*Ehortatio ad Monachos*; and several homilies. Several other works are wrongly attributed to him. It seems that he sympathized with the Semiarians. A collection of all his works was published by Brassicanus (Basel, 1531), in the *Biblioth. Patr. Max. Lugd.* tom. vi and xxvii; and in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* tom. l. See Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* xix, 490. (A. J. S.)

**Euchites.** See MESSALIANS.

**Euchologion** (εὐχὴ λόγος), the common name of the liturgical books of the Greek Church, containing the services for the sacraments, conferring of orders, and other religious offices. There is an edition by Goar, entitled *Euchologion, sive Rituale Græcorum, complectens ritus et ordines diviniæ Liturgiæ, officiorum, sacramentorum, etc., juxta usum Orientalis ecclesiæ* (Par. 1647). See Covell, *Some Account of the Greek Church* (Lond. 1722, fol.), chaps. ii, iii; Neale, *History of the Holy Eastern Church*, pt. i (Lond. 1850), i, 317.

**Eudæmon**, JOHN ANDREW, a Greek Jesuit, was born at Canea, in Candia, about 1560. He derived his descent from the imperial family of the Paleologi; went to Italy when very young, and in 1581 entered the Society of Jesus. After having taught philosophy at Rome and theology at Padua, he was appointed rector of the Greek College, which pope Urban VIII had just established at Rome. He accompanied, as theologian, the papal legate, cardinal Barberini, to France, and died at Rome in 1625. He wrote a large number of controversial works against Casaubon, Brightman, John Barclay, Robert Abbot, and many others. Pamphlets against Henry IV and Louis XIII were also ascribed to him.—Hofer, *Nouv. Biogr. Génér.* xvi, 663. (A. J. S.)

**Eudæmonism** (Gr. εὐδαιμονία, happiness), a principle in philosophical ethics according to which the attainment of happiness is represented as the true aim of life. Those who hold this view are called EUDÆMONISTS. Opposed to eudæmonism are all those systems of ethics which regard not the pleasure of the individual, but the recognition of some universal law as the higher principle. Eudæmonism lay at the basis of the Cyrenaic school founded by Aristippus, and of the Epicurean philosophy (q. v.). It was developed to its utmost consequences by Hegesias, who taught that if no enjoyments are to be expected by men, death is preferable to life. Essentially different from this class of Eudæmonists is the system of Aristotle, who regarded virtue as a spiritual enjoyment, and in this sense represented ethics as the doctrine of seeking and finding a happy life. This view has found adherents among Christian writers on ethics, who define and treat ethics as the doctrine of a happy life. Others have combined with eudæmonism common usefulness, moral sentiment, and perfection, and thus have purified and ennobled it. Belonging properly to the schools of Aristippus and Epicurus are in modern times the different systems of sensualism (q. v.) and materialism (q. v.). In an ennobled form, Eudæmonism reappears in some representatives of the Scotch school, who, in opposition to the self-love of Hobbes, develop the longing for universal happiness as the supreme



ethical principle. In direct and keen opposition to every form of eudæmonism, Kant established the principle of the categorical superlative, according to which the good must be done for its own sake, and the moral law, with the duties emanating from it, can alone be made the central principle of ethics. See KANT. Schleiermacher assigned to the idea of the highest good the highest position in ethics, and likewise rejected Eudæmonism as a principle. This is now, in general, the attitude of writers on Christian ethics; the thirst of man for happiness is not absolutely rejected, but it is found unsuited for a fundamental principle, which must be sought in a universal divine law, not in the natural longings of the individual. See ERNICKS. Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 207. (A. J. S.)

**Eudes**, JEAN, founder of the congregation called the Eudists, was born at Rye, Normandy, November 14, 1601, and died at Caen, August 19, 1680. At 14 he commenced his studies under the Jesuits at Caen, entered the Congregation of the Oratory in 1623, and was ordained priest in 1625. From 1627 to 1632 he was engaged in missionary labors among the plague-stricken people of Normandy, and in 1642 he became superior of the Congregation of the Oratory at Caen. Much of his time was spent in missions throughout France to reform the clergy. In 1643 he organized a new society, which took the name "Eudists," or the "Congregation of Jesus and Mary," and soon had numerous branches in France. Its members were devoted to the education of young candidates for the priesthood, and to "missions" (in the Roman Catholic sense) among the clergy. Eudes wrote a number of books of devotion. The Eudists were scattered at the Revolution, but were revived by the abbé Blanchard in 1826. They have a college, called St. Gabriel's, in the State of Indiana.

**Eudists.** See EUDES.

**Eudo de Stella.** See EON DE STELLA.

**Eudocia**, wife of the emperor Theodosius II, was the daughter of Leontius, an Athenian sophist. She was called Athenais, and was carefully instructed by her father in Greek letters. She was also noted for personal beauty. On the death of her father, the jealousy and avarice of her brothers compelled her to go to Constantinople, where she appealed to Pulcheria, sister of Theodosius II, who was so fascinated by her beauty and talent that she induced Theodosius to marry her, A.D. 421. She was baptized under the name of Eudocia, and long retained great influence with the emperor. In A.D. 438 she made a splendid pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Soon after she was charged with aspiring to the government of the Eastern empire; and later, with an intrigue with one Paulinus, a courtier. About A.D. 449, "the emperor, through jealousy, dismissed all her court, and had her exiled to Palestine, where she continued to reside after his death. She there embraced the opinions of Eutyches, and supported by her liberality and influence the monk Theodosius, who forced himself into the see of Jerusalem, after driving away Juvenal, the orthodox bishop, and kept it until he was himself driven away by order of the emperor Marcianus. Euthymius, called the Saint, by his reasonings brought back Eudocia to the orthodox faith, after which she spent the remainder of her days at Jerusalem, where she died in 460, protesting her innocence of the crime with which her husband had charged her." Eudocia wrote several works: (1) Photius quotes a translation in verse of the first eight books of the Old Testament. (2) There is also attributed to her a *Life of Christ*, composed of lines taken from Homer, translated into Latin by Eucharid, and published under the title of *Iliomero-centra*, or *Iliomericæ Centones* (Gr. and Lat. Francof. 1541, 1554; Par. 1578, 12mo; Lips. 1793, 8vo); an account of the martyrdom of St. Cyprian, Greek and Latin, ed. by Bandini, in his *Græcæ Eccles. vet. Monumenta*, i, 130-189.—Hoff-

mann, *Bibliogr. Lex.* ii, 63; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, ch. xxxii.

**Eudoxia**, wife of the emperor Arcadius, was born in the year 375, and was married to Arcadius in 395. She was the mother of Theodosius II, or the younger. Her name is mentioned here on account of her difficulties with Chrysostom. She used her influence for the banishment of Chrysostom, against whom her hatred was incited by the unsparing attacks which he made against all evil-doers, and especially, it is said, by his declaration that she was "a new Herodias, thirsting after the blood of John." She died in 404.—*Netzler und Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon*, iii, 736; Hoefler, *Nouvelle Biog. Générale*, xiii, 687; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (Harper's ed.), iii, 343 et sq.

**Eudoxians.** See EUDOXUS.

**Eudoxius**, an Arian, and bishop of Constantinople, was born at Arabissus, in Armenia, first mentioned as bishop of Germanicia (near Mount Taurus). About 356 he obtained by artifice the patriariate of Antioch, where he soon came forward as a patron of the Aëtians (Theodoret, *H. E.* bk. ii, chap. 25, 26). Sozomen says that "when Eudoxius found himself in possession of the Church of Antioch he ventured to uphold the Aëtian heresy openly. He assembled in Antioch all those who held the same opinions as himself, among whom were Acacius, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, and Uranius, bishop of Tyre, and rejected the terms of 'like substance' and 'con-substantial,' under the pretext that they had been denounced by the Western bishops" (*H. E.* bk. ii, ch. 12). Although he was deposed at the synod of Seleucia, yet he does not appear to have ever vacated his see; and on Macedonius being ejected from the see of Constantinople, says Sozrates, Eudoxius, who now despised that of Antioch, was promoted to the vacant bishopric (*H. E.* bk. ii, c. xliii). He obtained the see of Constantinople in 359, and retained it until his death in 370. Some fragments remain of a treatise of his *De Incarnatione Dei Verbi*.—Hोक, *Ecl. Biog.* v, 7; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 403-11; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* (Geneva, 1720), i, 138.

**Euergetes** (Ἐυεργέτης, *a benefactor*; see Josephus, *War*, iii, 9, 8; Diod. Sic. xi, 26; Xenoph. *Anab.* vii, 6, 38; sometimes Anglicized EUERGETES), a common surname and title of honor (comp. Plato, *Gorg.* p. 506 C, and Stallb. ad loc.) in Greek states, conferred at Athens by a public vote (Demosth. p. 475), and so notorious as to pass into a proverb (Luke xxii, 25). It was bestowed by states upon those who had conferred benefits upon them, and was taken by several kings. See PROLEMY; ANTIOCHUS.

A king is mentioned by this title in the 2d prologue to Ecclesiasticus, wherein the translator states that, having gone into Egypt in the 38th year of king Euergetes, and been there some time, he found this book by his grandfather (Ἐν γὰρ τῷ ὀνόματι καὶ τριακοστῷ ἔτι ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἐυεργέτου βασιλέως παραγενθῆς εἰς Αἴγυπτον, καὶ συγγροῦσας, εὗρον ὃν μὲν πρός ταύτας ἀπόμοιον). There can be no question that a king of Egypt is here meant; for, though a king of Syria could be intended by this title, Alexander I, Antiochus VII, and Demetrius III being shown by their coins to have been styled Euergetes, no one of them reigned more than a few years. It is more probable, on *primæ facie* grounds, that an Egyptian Euergetes is here spoken of, if the same discrepancy should not be found. Two of the Ptolemies bore this title: Ptolemy III, always known as Euergetes, who reigned twenty-five years, B.C. 247-222, and Ptolemy VII (or IX), Euergetes II, more commonly called Physcon, who began to reign jointly with his brother Ptolemy VI (or VIII), Philometor, B.C. 170, and became sole king in B.C. 146, dying in his fifty-fourth year, reckoned from the former date, and the twenty-ninth year of his sole reign, B.C. 117 (Fynes Clinton, *Fastæ Hellenicæ*, iii, 382, 383, 386, 399; Lepsius, *Königsbuch*, Synoptische Tafeln, p. 9). A

great difficulty has arisen in the attempt to decide which of these kings is intended. Everything hinges upon the manner in which the reigns were reckoned. There is no satisfactory evidence for supposing that Euergetes I counted his regnal years from a time before his accession; the evidence of the inscription at Adule, that Fynes Clinton adduces in favor of as high a date as the 27th year, is wholly inconclusive (p. 382, 383); besides, the 27th year is far short of the 38th. To ascertain the official reckoning of the years of Euergetes II, during the latter part of his rule, and thus to determine from what date he then counted his regnal years, we have only to examine the demotic papyri of his reign. From these Dr. Young collected a list of dates which appeared thirty years ago in his posthumous *Rudiments of an Egyptian Dictionary*. These dates are year 29, 34, 45, 46, 47 or 43, 52, 53 (p. 27-31). It is thus proved incontestably that Physcon counted his years from the commencement of his joint reign with Philometor, without any separate reckoning from his accession as sole king of Egypt. The hieroglyphic inscriptions, as we would expect, follow the same reckoning. Thus one of the Apis tablets gives the dates of the 28th, 31st, 51st, and 52d years of this king (Lepsius, *The 22d Egyptian Royal Dynasty*, transl. by Dr. Bell, p. 41). We must not pass by the idea of Jahu (*Einkünig*, ii, 930 sq.), that the 38th year refers to the translator's age instead of a king's reign. It would be better to suppose an æra. Three seem possible, the æra of the Seleucids, that of Simon the Maccabee, used in Palestine, and the æra of Dionysius used in Egypt. The æra of the Seleucids began B.C. 312, and its 38th year is therefore too early for the reign of Euergetes I; the æra of Simon the Maccabee began B.C. 143, or a little later, and its 38th year is too late for the reign of Euergetes II. The æra of Dionysius commenced B.C. 285 (Lepsius, *Königsbuch*, l. c.), and its 38th year was therefore the last of Ptolemy II, Euergetes I coming to the throne in the next year. The construction that does not allow the year of the reign of Euergetes to be intended, and thus necessitates some such explanation, is certainly the more correct; but as Dr. Davidson, who has laboriously collected upon this question much criticism which we have shown to be needless, observes, we need not here look for correct grammar (*Horne's Introd.* 1856, ii, 1026-1028). With this admission the usual reading cannot be doubted, and the date mentioned would be B.C. 133. Other evidence for the time of the composition of Ecclesiasticus, which, of course, can be approximately inferred from that of the translation, is rather in favor of the second than the first Euergetes.—Kitto, s. v. See ECCLESIASTICUS; JESUS, SON OF SIRACH.

**Eugenicus**, a Greek theologian, lived in the first half of the 15th century. He began public life as an instructor in rhetoric, but his learning and eloquence soon procured him the first positions in the Church, and towards 1436 he was made archbishop of Ephesus. Two years later he accompanied the emperor (John Palæologus) to the Council of Florence. Here he not only represented his own diocese, but acted also for the patriarchs of Antioch and of Jerusalem. A zealous defender of the Greek Church and adversary of the Roman, Eugenienus was the only one who, at the close of the council, refused to recognise the pretensions of the pope and to sign the acts of the council. On his return to Constantinople the people received him with great enthusiasm. Even upon his death-bed in 1447, he solemnly adjured George the Scholastic to continue the strife against the Latins. The numerous writings of Eugenienus are of a polemical nature, directed against the Latin Church and those prelates of the Greek Church who were favorable to the former. Many have never been published, but they are recorded by Fabricius. We make mention here only of his printed works: *Letter to the Emperor Palæologus*,

in which he advises the Greeks against the Council of Florence, and exposes the intrigues of the Latinists. This letter has been translated into Latin, with a reply by Joseph of Methone, in Labbe, *Concilia*, xiii, 677. An encyclical letter upon the same subject in Labbe, *Concilia*, xiii, 714; *A Treatise on Liturgical Topics*; *A Profession of Faith*, a fragment of which is given by Allatius, *De Consensu*, iii, 3.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gen.* xvi, 706; Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Græca*, xi, 670; Oudin, *Script. Eccles.* iii, 2343.

**Eugenius Bulgaris.** See BULGARIS.

**Eugenius I**, Pope, a son of the Roman Rufinianus, was elected by the Romans Sept. 8, 654, as successor to Martin I, who had been sent into banishment to the Thracian Chersonesus by order of the emperor Constant II, who favored the schism of the Monothelites. Martin dying in the following year, Eugenius continued in dispute with the court of Constantinople till he died, June 1, 657, and was succeeded by Vitalianus. In order to establish peace with the Greeks, his legates made an arrangement with Peter, the Monothelite patriarch of Constantinople, that instead of one or two wills in Christ three should be assumed—one *substantial*, the two others *natural*.—Bower, *History of the Popes*, iii, 70.

**II**, Pope, a native of Rome, succeeded Paschal I Feb. 14, 824, in the midst of great disorder, which occurred at Rome, owing to the corrupt state of society and maladministration of that city. To reform these, the emperor Louis the Good sent his son Lotharius to Rome, who corrected many abuses, which, by the account of Eginhardt and other chroniclers, had grown to an enormous extent. He confirmed the right of electing the pope to the clergy and people of Rome; and the Council of Rome, which he convoked on Nov. 1, 826, issued many beneficent decrees for the restoration of Church discipline, for the establishment of schools, and against the worldly occupations of clergymen. He died Aug. 827.—Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, iv, 214; Bower, *History of the Popes*, iv, 205.

**III**, Pope. He was a monk of Citeaux, disciple and friend of St. Bernard, and afterwards abbot of St. Anastasius. He was elected to the pontifical chair of Rome Feb. 27, 1145. He appears to have been a very sincere disciple of Bernard, and anxious, like him, to reform the manners of the clergy and consolidate the papal power. Through the greater part of his pontificate, owing to the turbulence of the Roman people [see ARNOLD OF BRESCIA], he was unable to reside in the city. This circumstance, however, did not hinder his being acknowledged as pope, or his exercising the functions of his office. During his reign the second crusade, under the preaching of St. Bernard, was undertaken. See CRUSADERS. Shortly after its mortifying failure the pontiff died at Tivoli, July 8, 1153. See Neander, *Bernard und s. Zeit.* 190-296; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 214.

**IV**, Pope, Gabriele Condolmiere, a native of Venice, succeeded Martin V as pope March 3, 1431. At the early age of twenty-four he was made by pope Gregory XII, with whom he was related, bishop of Siena, and soon after (1408) cardinal. "His was a most stormy pontificate. He drove away the powerful family of Colonna, including the nephews of the late pope, from Rome, charging them with having enriched themselves at the expense of the papal treasury. He afterwards made war against the various lords of Romagna, who were supported by the Visconti of Milan. But the greatest annoyance to Eugenius proceeded from the Council of Basle, which had been convoked by his predecessor, and which protracted its sittings year after year, broaching doctrines very unfavorable to the papal supremacy. See BASLE, COUNCIL OF. Eugenius, who had been obliged to escape from Rome in disguise on account of a popular revolt, and had taken up his residence at Bologna in 1437, issued a bull dis-

solving the council, recalling his nuncio who presided at it, and convoking another council at Ferrara. See FERRARA. Most of the fathers assembled at Basle refused to submit, and summoned the pope himself to appear before them, to answer the charge of simony, schism, and others, and after a time proceeded against him as contumacious, and deposed him. Eugenius meanwhile had opened in person his new council at Ferrara in February, 1438, in which, after annulling all the obnoxious decrees of the Council of Basle, he launched a bull of excommunication against the bishops who remained in that assembly, which he characterized as a 'satanic conclave, which was spreading the abomination of desolation into the bosom of the Church.' The Catholic world was divided between the two councils; that of Basle proceeded to elect a new pope in the person of Amadeus VIII of Savoy, who assumed the name of Felix V, and was solemnly crowned at Basle. Eugenius encouraged the Hungarians and Poles to break the peace they had solemnly sworn with the Turks, under pretence that their oaths were not valid without the sanction of the pope; he even sent cardinal Julian as his nuncio to attend the Christian army. The result was the battle of Varna, 1444, in which the Christians were completely defeated, and king Ladislaus of Poland and cardinal Julian lost their lives. Eugenius died at Rome Feb. 23, 1447. He left the Church in a state of schism between him and his competitor Felix, his own states a prey to war, and all Christendom alarmed at the progress of the Turkish arms" (*English Cyclopædia*). See Bower, *History of the Popes*, vii, 238.

**Eugippius**, or **Eugyppius**, a learned monk, who lived at the close of the fifth and the beginning of the sixth century. He seems to have been the descendant of an Italian family, and was at first monk in the monastery of St. Severin (q. v.) at Fariana, in Noricum (near the present Pöchlarn, in Austria), subsequently in the monastery of Castrum Lucullanum (now Castello del Novo, belonging to the city of Naples). He is sometimes called "abbot," but it is doubtful whether he was, in the later years of his life, abbot of Lucullanum, or whether the name was only given him as an honorary title. He is the author of a life of his teacher, St. Severinus (*Vita St. Severini*, publ. by Canisius, *Antiq. Lect.* t. vi, in *Acta Sanctorum*, Jan. 8; and by Welsch, Augsb. 1594), which is a very important contribution to the Church history of Germany. He also compiled a collection of Thoughts and Sentences from the works of St. Augustine (*Thesaurus Augustinæus* (Basle, 1542; Venice, 1543), which was dedicated to the Roman virgin Proba. The author of the second work was formerly believed by some writers to be a different person from the author of the life of St. Severin, but this opinion has now been generally abandoned. Among the letters of Fulgentius (q. v.) of Ruspe, there is one addressed to Eugippius; a letter of Eugippius to Fulgentius is lost. Eugippius was also in literary connection with Dionysius Exiguus. There is a monastic rule which is ascribed to Eugippius, but it was early superseded by that of St. Benedict.—Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 217. (A. J. S.)

**Euhemerus**, a Greek historian, philosopher, and traveller, lived about the year B.C. 300. It is not exactly known whether he was born at Messina (in Sicily), at Tegea (in the Peloponnesus), on the island of Cos, or at Agrigentum. He belonged to the Cyrenaic school, well known for its scepticism in religious matters. As bold as the other philosophers of this school, and more systematic, Euhemerus proposed a general interpretation of the myths, which has been justly compared with modern German Rationalism. An exposition of his doctrine is given by Diodorus Siculus. "Euhemerus," he says, "friend of Cassander (king of Macedonia B.C. 320-296), was intrusted by this prince with certain missions to some of the Southern

countries. On his way he passed in the Indian Ocean a group of isles, of which the largest was called Panchæia. The Panchæans were distinguished for their piety, and honored the gods by sacrifice and offerings of gold and silver." They worshipped Jupiter, and such other gods as we meet with in Grecian mythology; but all these gods were really men distinguished for great actions, and deified on account of them. On his return from the voyage Euhemerus wrote a *Sacred History* (*Ἱερά ἀναγχαίη*), in about nine books, in which he showed, according to Lactantius and Arnobius, that these gods were but men (Lactantius, *De Falsa Religione*, i, 11). A Latin translation was made by the poet Ennius. Of this translation only ninety-five lines now remain (Amsterdam, 1707). This work contains the history of the gods of the Panchæans, of the people and their manners, Euhemerus himself leaning in fact to the doctrines of the Panchæans. The form in which he presented his system was not entirely new, for Plato had adopted a similar course in his *Republic*; the germ of the system itself is to be found in some passages of Herodotus and Thucydides. The originality of Euhemerus consists in exaggerating, and in carrying out even to absurdity, the idea that Mythology contains certain historical elements. In effect, he resolved all mythology into history, maintaining that the gods "were originally illustrious kings, deified after death either by the spontaneous reverence of the people or by the cunning of the rulers." But mythology contains, aside from this, so much that bears on astronomy, the physical sciences, metaphysics, and, most of all, so much of fiction, that it is next to impossible to determine what in this confusion is truly historical. Some historians, like Diodorus Siculus, who have attempted to interpret mythology after the plan of Euhemerus, have succeeded only in substituting prosaic fiction for the imaginative popular legends. The pagan writers generally treat Euhemerus with severity. After the origin of Christianity, the views of Euhemerus, as containing the satires of a pagan on pagan religions, were made great use of in argument by the Church fathers against paganism, with some exaggerations, perhaps, of the doctrines of Euhemerus. Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Minucius Felix, Cyprian, Lactantius, Chrysostom, in arguing against paganism, adopt the view of Euhemerus, that the worship of great men was the original source of all idolatry, and gave birth to all the pagan divinities. In 1611, Vossius, following an idea of Tertullian, sought to show that the gods of paganism were the patriarchs of the O. T.: Serapis was Joseph; Janus, Noah; Minerva, Naomi, etc. Huët, bishop of Avranches, discovered Moses in Osiris and Bacchus, as well as in many other pagan divinities. Euhemerism, as a method of interpreting the ancient mythology, was supplanted by the symbolism of Kreuzer, a system infinitely superior to the other two above mentioned, but still containing much that is illusory and erroneous.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xvi, 828; Donaldson, *History of Christian Literature and Doctrine* (see Index); Gerlach, *Historische Studien* (Hamb. 1841, 8vo); Lecky, *History of Rationalism*, i, 327; Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Philosophie*, i, 604 sq.; Clinton, *Fasti Hellenici* (Oxon. 1830), ii, 481; Meiners, *Hist. Doct. apud Grecos*, ii, 664 sq.; Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Græca*, iii, 616; Hoffman, *Bibliographisches Lexikon*, i, 65; Milman, *History of Christianity* (New York, 1866), i, 49, note. See MYTHOLOGY.

**Eulalia**, a saint of the Church of Rome, was born at Merida, Spain, in 290. She was the descendant of a noble Christian family. When the general persecution of Christians began under Maximian, Eulalia, contrary to the directions given by the Church, voluntarily sought martyrdom by presenting herself to the prefect of Lusitania, remonstrating with him against idolatry and the persecution of Christianity, and by personally insulting him (spitting in his face, etc.).

She was consequently burned alive Dec. 10 (or 12), 303 (or 304). Her relics were preserved at Merida, and many miracles were ascribed to them at the time of the invasion of the Goths and Vandals. Barcelona also claims the possession of the relics of St. Eulalia, and the legend of this saint is so much like that of Eulalia of Merida that it is generally believed that the two are only one person, and that, as is common in the Church of Rome, the same relics are claimed by two cities.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xvi, 708. (A. J. S.)

**Eulalius**, anti-Pope, lived in the first part of the fifth century. Created arch-cardinal by Innocent I, he was, after the death of pope Zosimus, near the close of the year 418, through the influence of Symmachus, elected pope in opposition to Boniface I, who had been elected by a legal majority. For several months he contended against Boniface, but finally the emperor Honorius decided in favor of Boniface, being persuaded that Eulalius had been illegally elected, and gave orders to Symmachus, the governor of the city of Rome, to drive Eulalius from the city, and to put Boniface in possession of the see. Eulalius thereupon left Rome, and became bishop of Nepi. After the death of Boniface, at the election of Celestine I, the friends of Eulalius offered to contend again in his favor, but he promptly declined the papal dignity.—Bower, *History of the Popes*, i, 358 sq.; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xvi, 709; Wetzer and Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 750; Jaffé, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum.* (J. H. W.)

**Eulogia** (εὐλογία). (1.) A term used in reference to the consecrated bread of the Eucharist. In the early Church, at the end of mass, the loaves offered by the faithful (not consecrated) were blessed by the celebrant, and distributed as a sign of communion, as they now are in the Greek Church, to those who had not communed, and formerly to catechumens who were not admissible. They were called eulogies or *antidora*, compensations, by the Council of Antioch in 341.

(2.) *Eulogia* was one of the early titles of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and appears to have been taken from the language of Paul when he says, "The cup of blessing which we bless"—τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας. Down to the time of Cyril and Chrysostom, *eulogia* is used synonymously with *εὐχαριστία*, but after the fifth century the term was appropriated to the bread set apart from the oblations for the poor and the clergy. To this custom we may refer the origin of private masses, and of communion in one kind.

(3.) The practice of giving the *eulogia* also tends to explain the custom of non-communication which sprang up in the Church about the same time. The faithful who did not communicate retired from the assembly before the celebration of the Lord's Supper began, but not without receiving the benediction of the minister. The *fuldeles* were soon divided into two classes—*communicantes* and *non-communicantes*—of which the Church knew nothing in earlier ages. The Council of Nantes, about A.D. 890, ordered the presbyters to keep some portions of the oblations in a proper vessel, so that those persons who were not prepared to communicate might, on every festival and Lord's day, receive some of the *eulogia*, previously blessed with a proper benediction.—Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. x, ch. ii, §16; bk. xv, ch. iv, §3; Riddle, *Christ. Antiquities*, p. 545, 578.

**Eulogius**, patriarch of Alexandria from 581 to 608. Pope Gregory I makes particular mention of him as a successful polemic against the Nestorians, Severians, Theodosians, Cainites, Acephalians, and Agnoete. Photius preserves numerous fragments of his writings. He died in 608.—Wetzer and Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 753, 754; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, (ed. Harles), x, 753.

**Eulogius** of Cordova was in 859 elected archbishop of Toledo, but, by the opposition of the Moors, he was not permitted to enter upon the duties of his office. He was a learned and brave defender of

Christianity against Mohammedanism, and sealed his love for the cause by his own blood, being beheaded by the Moors, March 11, 859, for the assistance which he had rendered a young girl who had been converted and by him baptized in the Christian faith. His writings are: *Memoriale Sanctorum sive libri iii de Martyribus Cordubensibus*, a work in which the glory of the Spanish martyrs of his times is recorded:—*Exhortatio ad martyrrium sive documentum martyriale ad Floram et Marium virgines confessores*:—*Apologeticus pro martyribus adversus calumniatores*, in which he denies the assertion that the Christians desired martyrdom. He also wrote letters to the bishop Wilifindus of Pampeluna, his friend Alvarus, and others. His remains are to be found in Schott, *Hispania Illustrata*, vol. iv; in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, xv, 242; also in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* tom. cxv. A biography of Eulogius, written by his friend Alvarus, is also in Migne, t. cxv.—Ceillier, *Hist. des Aut. Sac. et Eccl.* xix, 64; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 754, 755; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xvi, 719; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 220; Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Græca*, iv, 257; Clarke, *Sacred Literature*, vol. ii.

**Eulogy.** See FUNERAL.

**Eū'natan** (Ἐννατάν v. r. Ἐνναθάν, Vulg. *Ennatum*), given (1 Esd. viii, 44, where it is perhaps but an original misprint for *Ennaton*) as the name of one of the principal men directed by Ezra to procure priests for the returning party of exiles; apparently a corruption for the second ELNATHAN (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra viii, 16).

**Euni'cè** (Ἐνίκη, *good victory*, originally the name of one of the Nereids), the mother of Timothy, and the wife of a Greek; spoken of (2 Tim. i, 5) as possessing unfeigned faith, and described in Acts xvi, 1 as a believing Jewess (γυνὴ Ἰουδαία πιστῆ). A. D. ante 47. See TIMOTHY.

**Eū'menès** (Εὐμένης, *well-disposed*) II, king of Pergamus, and son of Attalus I. His accession to the throne is fixed by the death of his predecessor to B.C. 197 (Clinton, *F. H.* iii, 403). He inherited from his father the friendship and alliance of the Romans, and when peace was made in B.C. 196 with Philip V, king of Macedonia, he was presented with the towns of Oreus and Eretria in Eubœa (Livy, xxxiii, 34). In B.C. 191 Eumenes and the Romans engaged the fleet of Antiochus (Livy, xxxvi, 43-45), and, seeing more than ever the policy of adhering to the Romans, he, in the following year, rendered them valuable assistance at the battle of Magnesia, commanding his own troops in person (Livy, xxxvii, 39-44; Justin, xxxi, 8; Appian, *Syr.* 34). As soon as peace was concluded, B.C. 188, Eumenes set out for Rome to ask some rewards for his services. The senate were pleased with the modesty of his behavior, and conferred upon him the Thracian Chersonese, Lysimachia, both Phrygias, Mysia, Lycaonia, Lydia, and Ionia, with some exceptions. One province only would have much enlarged his dominions, but by this large addition to his territory he found himself one of the most powerful of monarchs (Livy, xxxvii, 56; xxxviii, 39; Polyb. xxii, 27; Appian, *Syr.* 44). About the same time he married the daughter of Ariarathes IV, king of Cappadocia (Livy, xxxviii, 39). Eumenes continued in good favor with the Romans for several years, and repeatedly sent embassies to them. In B.C. 172 he again visited Rome, and in returning nearly lost his life through the treachery of Perseus, king of Macedonia (Livy, xlii, 11-16). In B.C. 169 Eumenes is said to have had secret correspondence with Perseus, by which act he lost the favor of the Romans (Polyb. *Frag. Vat.* xxix, Didot ed. p. 39, 40), and two years after he was forbidden to enter Rome (Livy, *Epit.* xlvi). The latter part of his reign was disturbed by frequent wars with Prusias, king of Bithynia. The Romans favorably received his brother Attalus, apparently for the purpose of exciting him

against Eumenes, who had sent him to Rome. Attalus, however, was induced, through the entreaties of a physician named Stratus, to abandon any such ideas. Eumenes thus managed to keep on friendly terms with his brother and the Romans till his death (Livy, xlv, 19, 20; Polyb. xxx, 1-3; xxxi, 9; xxxii, 5). The exact date of his death is not mentioned by any writer, but it must have taken place in B.C. 159 (Clinton, *F. H.* iii, 406). Eumenes II much improved the city of Pergamus by erecting magnificent temples and other public buildings. His greatest act was the foundation of a splendid library, which rose to be a rival in extent and value even to that of Alexandria (Strabo, xiii, 4, Diolot ed. p. 533; Pliny, xxii, 11 (see Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s. v.).—Kitto, s. v. See PERGAMUS.

The large accession of territory which was granted to Eumenes from the former dominions of Antiochus is mentioned 1 Macc. viii, 8, but the present reading of the Greek and Latin texts offers insuperable difficulties. "The Romans gave him," it is said, "the country of India and Media, and Lydia, and parts of his (Antiochus's) fairest countries (*ἀπὸ τῶν καλλ. χωρῶν αὐτοῦ*)." This is particularly out of the question, for neither India nor Media ever belonged to Antiochus or the Romans. Various conjectures have been proposed to remove these obvious errors; but, though it may reasonably be allowed that *Mysia* may have stood originally for Media (מדיא for מדי, Michaelis), it is not equally easy to explain the origin of *χωρῶν τῆν Ἰνδικήν*. Grotius was meant, which agrees with the account of Livy (xxxvii, 55). It is possible that *Ἰνδικήν* may have been substituted for *Ἰωνικήν* after *Μητιά* was already established in the text. Other explanations are given by Grimm, *Ereg. Handb.* ad loc.; Wernsdorf, *De file Libr. Macc.* p. 50 sq., but they have less plausibility. Josephus states the matter but summarily (*Ant.* xi, 10, 6).—Smith, s. v.

**Eunomians**, a sect of Arians, so called after their founder, EUNOMIUS. See EUNOMIUS.

**Eunomius**, a bishop and founder of a sect of Arians. He was born in the village of Dacora, in Cappadocia, and is described by his admirer, Philostorgius, as ugly in appearance, and somewhat stammering. He was educated by his father until, under the advice of the Arian bishop Secundus, of Antioch, he went to Alexandria, where he became the disciple, associate, and notary of Aëtius (q. v.), the head of the Anomœans. On a journey which he undertook to visit the emperor, he was seized by the Semiarious and sent to Phrygia; but in 360, his friend Eudoxius, formerly bishop of Antioch, but who had recently been called to Constantinople, procured for him the see of Cyzicum. There he proclaimed his views, first cautiously and moderately, but soon openly and unreservedly. The people of Cyzicum loudly complained of him, and, though he defended himself at Constantinople with great eloquence, he was abandoned by Eudoxius, who prevailed upon him to resign, since he was unwilling to subscribe the formula of Ariminum, or approve the deposition of Aëtius. After this time Eunomius acted as the acknowledged head of the party. Under Julian, who recalled all the exiled bishops, Eunomius was with Aëtius in Constantinople, disseminating their views, collecting adherents, and consecrating bishops, who settled in many regions of Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt. Being suspected of intimate relations with Procopius, a rebel against the authority of emperor Valens, he was twice exiled, but each time soon recalled. In 383 the emperor Theodosius demanded from all the prominent men of the several religious parties an explanation of their theological views, rejected the profession of faith made by Eunomius, had him arrested at Chalcedon and exiled to Halmyris, in Mœsia, and from there to Cæsarea, in Cappadocia. From there, when his longer stay was not tolerated,

he returned to his native place, where he died about 396.

Eunomius wrote a commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, and a number of letters, which were known to Photius. Both the commentary and the letters are lost. His first defence (*ἀπολογητικός*), which was written either in 360 or (according to Rettberg) in 365, called forth a long reply from Basil. From several manuscripts of the latter, the text of this work of Eunomius has been restored. It is partly given by Cave (*Hist. Liter.* Genev. 1720, i, 130), and completely by Fabricius (*Biblioth. Græca*, viii), Canisius (*Lect. Antiq.* i), and Thilo (*Biblioth. dogmat.* ii). A second defence (*ἐπιτε ἀπολογία ἀπολογία*, as Gregory calls it) elicited in reply the twelve orations of Gregory of Nyssa. The fragments of Eunomius contained in the work of Gregory have been collected by Rettberg (*Marcelliana*, p. 125). His profession of faith (*ἐκθεσις τῆς πίστεως*), which Eunomius in 383 presented to the emperor Theodosius, has been published by Valsius (notes to Socrates, v, 10), Fabricius (*l. c.*), Cave (*l. c.*), and Rettberg (*Marcelliana*, p. 149).

Eunomius was one of the prominent leaders of the Arians. He was capable, keen, undaunted, and full of contempt for his opponents. He had a keener dialectic faculty than Arius, and anticipated Des Cartes in making clearness the test of truth. "An opponent of whatever was inconceivable and transcendental, he pursued knowledge in a one-sided direction, not deeply speculative, but proceeding from an empirical understanding to make everything clear, which was his principal aim. In short, he advocated an intelligent supernaturalism, in which a rationalistic tendency was concealed, similar to what we find in Socinus" (Neander, *Hist. of Dogmas*, ed. Ryland, i, 264). The following account of the confession of faith of the Eunomians is given by Cave (vol. i, p. 140), from a manuscript in archbishop Tension's library: "There is one God, uncreated and without beginning, who has nothing existing before him, for nothing can exist before what is uncreate; nor with him, for what is uncreate must be one; nor in him, for God is a simple and uncompounded Being. This one simple and eternal Being is God, the Creator and Ordainer of all things. For God created, begot, and made the Son only, by his direct operation and power, before all things, and every other creature; not producing, however, any being like himself, or imparting any of his own proper substance to his Son; for God is immortal, uniform, and indivisible, and therefore cannot communicate any part of his own proper substance to another. He alone is unbegotten, and it is impossible that any other being should be formed of an unbegotten substance. He did not use his own substance in begetting his Son, but his will only; nor did he beget him in the likeness of his substance, but according to his own good pleasure. He then created the Holy Spirit, the first and greatest of all spirits, by his own power and operation mediately, yet by the immediate power and operation of the Son. After the Holy Spirit, he created all other things in heaven and in earth, visible and invisible, corporeal and incorporeal, mediately by himself, by the power and operation of his Son."

The adherents of Eunomius, who were very numerous, were, together with those of Aëtius, condemned as heretics by the second Ecumenical Council. After the death of Eunomius, the Eunomians fully separated from the communion of the predominant Church. Some factions called themselves after prominent teachers, as Eutycheus, Theophrastus. The Church gave them a number of nicknames, as *ἀνοβόσται*, *σπαδονες*. They baptized, not upon the Trinity, but upon the death of Christ. They did not exist long as a sect, but soon died out, in consequence of internal dissensions and numerous secessions to the dominant Church.—Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 220; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* i, 248, 301; Tillmont; Dörner, *Lehre Christi*, i, 815

(Edinb. transl., div. i, vol. ii, p. 243); Neander, *Church Hist.* ii, 319-425; Clarke, *Sacred Liter.* i, 318; Schaff, *Church History*, iii, § 121. (A. J. S.)

**Eunuch** (εὐνοῦχος) has, in its literal (Greek) sense, the harmless meaning of "bed-keeper," i. e. one who has the charge of beds and bed-chambers; but as only persons deprived of their virility have, from the most ancient times, been employed in Oriental harems, and as such persons are employed almost exclusively in this kind of service, the word "bed-keeper" became synonymous with "castratus." Castration, according to Josephus (*Ant.* iv, 8, 40), was not practised by the Jews upon either men or animals (see BEAST); yet the custom is frequently referred to in the Bible by the Hebrew term סַרִּיס (*saris*), Sept. εὐνοῦχος; Vulg. *spado*; A. V. "eunuch," "officer," and "chamberlain," apparently as though the word intended a class of attendants who were not always mutilated), which (from the Arabic root *saras*, to be impotent ad Venerem) clearly implies the incapacity which mutilation involves (*Isa.* lvi, 3; *Sirach* xx, 20 [21]), and perhaps includes all the classes mentioned in *Matt.* xix, 12, not signifying, as the Greek εὐνοῦχος, an office merely. The law, *Deut.* xxiii, 1 (comp. *Lev.* xxii, 24), is repugnant to thus treating any Israelite; and Samuel, when describing the arbitrary power of the future king (1 *Sam.* viii, 15, marg.), mentions "his eunuchs," but does not say that he would make "their sons" such. This, if we compare 2 *Kings* xx, 18; *Isa.* xxxix, 7, possibly implies that these persons would be foreigners. It was a barbarous custom of the East thus to treat captives (*Herod.* iii, 49; vi, 32), not only of tender age (when a non-development of beard, and feminine mould of limbs and modulation of voice ensues), but, it would seem, when past puberty, which there occurs at an early age. Physiological considerations lead to the supposition that in the latter case a remnant of animal feeling is left, which may explain *Ecclesi.* xx, 4; xxv, 20 (comp. *Juv.* vi, 366, and *Mart.* vi, 67; *Philostr.* *Apoll.* *Tyan.* i, 37; *Ter. Eun.* iv, 3, 24), where a sexual function, though fruitless, is implied. *Busbecq* (*Ep.* iii, 122, *Oxf.* 1600) seems to ascribe the absence or presence of this to the total or partial character of the mutilation; but modern surgery would rather assign the earlier or later period of the operation as the real explanation. (*Comp. Juv.* xii, 35; *Philo.* *Opp.* ii, 264; *Mishna.* *Yebain.* viii, 2; *Deut.* xxiii, 2; see *Gesenius*, *Thes.* p. 338; *Paul.* *Egin.* vi, 68; *Fischer*, *Profuss.* p. 497; *Pierer*, *Medic. Reali.* I, ii, 63.) It is total among modern Turks (*Tournefort*, ii, 8, 9, 10, ed. *Par.* 1717, *taille à fleur de ventre*); a precaution arising from mixed ignorance and jealousy. The "officer" Potiphar (*Gen.* xxxvii, 36; xxxix, 1, marg. "eunuch") was an Egyptian, was married, and was the "captain of the guard." The Jewish tradition is that Joseph was made a eunuch on his first introduction to Egypt; and yet the accusation of Potiphar's wife, his marriage and the birth of his children, are related subsequently without any explanation. (See *Targum Pseudojon.* on *Gen.* xxxix, 1, xli, 50; and the details given at xxxix, 13.) On the Assyrian monuments a eunuch often appears, sometimes armed and in a warlike capacity, or as a scribe, noting the number of heads and amount of spoil, as receiving the prisoners, and even as officiating in religious ceremonies (*Layard*, *Ninereh*, ii, 324-6, 334.) A bloated beardless face and double chin is there their conventional type. See ATTIRE. *Chardin* (*Voyages en Perse*, ii, 283, ed. *Amst.* 1711) speaks of eunuchs having a harem of their own. If Potiphar had become such by operation for disease, by accident, or even by malice, such a marriage seems, therefore, according to Eastern notions, supposable. (See *Grotius* on *Deut.* xxiii, 1; comp. *Barckhardt*, *Trav. in Arab.* i, 290.) Nor is it wholly repugnant to that barbarous social standard to think that the prospect of rank, honor, and royal confidence might even

induce parents to thus treat their children at a later age, if they showed an aptness for such preferment. The characteristics as regards beard, voice, etc., might then perhaps be modified, or might gradually follow. The Potiphar of *Gen.* xli, 50, whose daughter Joseph married, was "priest of On," and no doubt a different person. (See *Delphini*, *Eunuchi conjugium*, Hal. 1680.) The origination of the practice is ascribed to Semiramis (*Amm. Marcell.* xiv, 6), and is no doubt as early, or nearly so, as Eastern despotism itself. Their incapacity, as in the case of mutes, is the ground of reliance upon them (*Clarke's Travels*, pt. ii, § 1, 13; *Busbecq*, *Ep.* i, 33). By reason of the mysterious distance at which the sovereign sought to keep his subjects (*Herod.* i, 99; comp. *Esth.* iv, 11), and of the malignant jealousy fostered by the debased relation of the sexes, such wretches, detached from social interests and hopes of issue (especially when, as commonly, and as amongst the Jews, foreigners), the natural slaves of either sex (*Esth.* iv, 5), and having no prospect in rebellion save the change of masters, were the fittest props of a government resting on a servile relation, the most complete organs of its despotism or its lust, the surest (but see *Esth.* ii, 21) guardians (*Xenoph.* *Cyrop.* vii, 5, § 15; *Herod.* viii, 105) of the monarch's person, and the sole confidential witnesses of his unguarded or undignified moments. Hence they have in all ages frequently risen to high offices of trust. Thus the "chief" of the cup-bearers (q. v.) and of the cooks of Pharaoh were eunuchs, as being near his person, though their inferior agents need not have been so (*Gen.* xl, 1). (*Wilkinson* [*Anc. Egypt.* ii, 61] denies the use of eunuchs in Egypt. *Herodotus*, indeed [ii, 9], confirms his statement as regards Egyptian monogamy; but if this as a rule applied to the kings, they seemed, at any rate, to have allowed themselves concubines [p. 181]. From the general beardless character of Egyptian heads, it is not easy to pronounce whether any eunuchs appear in the sculptures or not.) The complete assimilation of the kingdom of Israel, and latterly of Judah, to the neighboring models of despotism, is traceable in the rank and prominence of eunuchs (2 *Kings* viii, 6; ix, 32; xxiii, 11; xxv, 19; *Isa.* lvi, 3, 4; *Jer.* xxxix, 2; xxxiv, 19; xxxviii, 7; xli, 16; li, 25). They mostly appear in one of two relations—either military, as "set over the men of war," greater trustworthiness possibly counterbalancing inferior courage and military vigor, or associated, as we mostly recognise them, with women and children. (2 *Chron.* xxviii, 1 is remarkable as ascribing eunuchs to the period of David, nor can it be doubted that Solomon's polygamy made them a necessary consequence; but in the state they do not seem to have played an important part at this period.) We find the Assyrian Rab-Saris, or chief eunuch (2 *Kings* xviii, 17), employed, together with other high officials, as ambassador. Similarly, in the details of the travels of an embassy sent by the duke of Holstein (p. 136), we find a eunuch mentioned as sent on occasion of a state-marriage to negotiate, and of another (p. 275) who was the *Meheter*, or chamberlain of Shah Abbas, who was always near his person, and had his ear (comp. *Chardin*, iii, 37), and of another, originally a Georgian prisoner, who officiated as supreme judge. *Fryer* (*Travels in India and Persia*, p. 1698) and *Chardin* (ii, 283) describe them as being the base and ready tools of licentiousness, as tyrannical in humor, and pertinacious in the authority which they exercise; *Clarke* (*Travels in Europe*, etc., pt. ii, § 1, p. 22), as eluded and ridiculed by those whom it is their office to guard. A great number of them accompany the shah and his ladies when hunting, and no one is allowed, on pain of death, to come within two leagues of the field, unless the king sends a eunuch for him. So eunuchs run before the closed arabahs of the sultanas when abroad, crying out to all to keep at a distance. This illustrates *Esth.* i, 10, 12, 15, 16; ii, 3, 8, 14. The moral tendency of this

sad condition is well known to be the repression of courage, gentleness, shame, and remorse, the development of malice, and often of melancholy, and a disposition to suicide. The favorable description of them in Xenophon (*l. c.*) is overcharged, or, at least, is not confirmed by modern observation. They are not more liable to disease than others, unless of such as often follows the foul vices of which they are the tools. The operation itself, especially in infancy, is not more dangerous than an ordinary amputation. Chardin (ii, 285) says that only one in four survives; and Clot Bey, chief physician of the pasha, states that two thirds die. Burckhardt, therefore (*Nub.* p. 329), is mistaken when he says that the operation is only fatal in about two out of a hundred cases. See HAREM.

It is probable that Daniel and his companions were thus treated, in fulfilment of 2 Kings xx, 17, 18; Isa. xxxix, 7; comp. Dan. i, 3, 7. The court of Herod of course had its eunuchs (Josephus, *Ant.* xvi, 8, 1; xv, 7, 4), as had also that of queen Candace (Acts viii, 27). Michaelis (ii, 180) regards them as the proper consequence of the gross polygamy of the East, although his further remark that they tend to balance the sexual disparity which such monopoly of women causes is less just, since the countries despoiled of their women for the one purpose are not commonly those which furnish male children for the other.

In the three classes mentioned in Matt. xix, 12, the first is to be ranked with other examples of defective organization; the last, if taken literally, as it is said to have been personally exemplified in Origen (Euseb. *Ecl. Hist.* vi, 8; see Zorn, *De eunuchismo Origenis*, Giess, 1708), is an instance of human ways and means of ascetic devotion being valued by the Jews above revealed precept (see Schöttgen, *Hor. Heb.* i, 159). Our Saviour in that passage doubtless refers to the voluntary and ascetic celibacy of the Essenes (q. v.). But a figurative sense of *ἐνοσίχθωνος* (comp. 1 Cor. vii, 32, 34) is also possible. See CELIBACY.

In the A. V. of Esther the word "chamberlain" (marg. "eunuch") is the constant rendering of סָרִיס, *saris*, and as the word also occurs in Acts xii, 20, and Rom. xvi, 23, where the original expressions are very different, some caution is required. In Acts xii, 20, τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ κοιτωνοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως may mean a "chamberlain" merely. Such were persons of public influence, as we learn from a Greek inscription preserved in Walpole's *Turkey* (ii, 559), in honor of P. Aelius Alcibiades, "chamberlain of the emperor" (ἐπὶ κοιτωνοῦ Σεβ.), the epithets in which exactly suggest the kind of patronage expressed. In Rom. xvi, 23, the word *ἐπίτροπος* is the one commonly rendered "steward" (e. g. Matt. xx, 8; Luke viii, 3), and means the one to whom the care of the city was committed. See generally Salden, *Otia Theol. de Eunuchis*, p. 494 sq.—Smith, s. v. See CHAMBERLAIN.

In Deut. xxiii, 1 (סָרִיס, מְטֻמָּא, one mutilated by crushing, i. e. the testicles, Sept. technically Ἐνακτίας), and also probably in Lev. xxi, 20 (מְטֻמָּא, מְטֻמָּא, one crushed as to his testicles, Sept. partially μονόρχις), the allusion is to a peculiar kind of emasculation still practised in the East, according to the Greek physicians (Paulus Ægineta, bk. vi), which consists in softening the testicles of very young boys in warm water, and then rubbing and pressing them till they disappear. As the heathen priests were often thus qualified for office, persons so mutilated were excluded from the Jewish Church. See ASHORETH.

**Eunuchs**, a sect of heretics in the third century, who were said to be mad enough to emasculate themselves under the assumption that they should thus eradicate their evil propensities, and qualify themselves for performing, in a more holy and acceptable manner, the duties of religion. Origen was the subject of this miserable delusion. The practice is pre-

alent at this day in Russia, among the sect of the Skoptzi (q. v.). In the Council of Nicaea persons of this class were condemned, and excluded from holy orders (Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.). See CELIBACY and VALESIAINS.

**Euo'dias**, or, rather, EUODIA (*Ἐβόδια*, a good journey; for, as found in Phil. ix, 2, *Ἐβόδιαν* is fem., since the following verse refers to that and the associated name by ἀνδρῶν and ἀνδρες), a female member of the Church at Philippi, who seems to have been at variance with another female member named Syntyche. A. D. 57. Paul describes them as women who had "labored much with him in the Gospel," and implores them to be of one mind (Philip. iv, 2, 3).

**Euodius**. See EVODIUS.

**Euphemites**. See MESSALIAINS.

**Euphra'tès** is the Greek form (*Ἐβφράτης*) of the river designated in Heb. by the name פְּרָתִי or *Perath'* (פְּרָתִי, which Gesenius regards as i. q. "sweet water," referring to the present Arabic name *Frah* as having that signif.; but Fürst refers to an obsolete root indicating the impetuous character of the stream), and is probably a word of Arian origin, the initial element being 'u, which is in Sanscrit *su*, in Zend *hu*, and in Greek *eu*; and the second element being *fra*, the particle of abundance. The Euphrates is thus "the good and abounding river." It is not improbable that in common parlance the name was soon shortened to its modern form of *Frát*, which is almost exactly what the Hebrew literation expresses. But it is most frequently denoted in the Bible by the term הַנְּהַר, *han-nahar'*, i. e. "the river," the river of Asia, in grand contrast with the shortlived torrents of Palestine, being by far the most considerable stream in that part of the continent. Thus, in Exod. xxiii, 31, we read, "from the desert unto the river" (comp. Isa. viii, 7). In like manner, it is termed in Deut. i, 7 "the great river." The Euphrates is named in the cuneiform inscriptions (q. v.).

1. It is first mentioned in Gen. ii, 14, where the Euphrates is stated to be the fourth of the rivers which flowed from a common stream in the garden of Eden. Its celebrity is there sufficiently indicated by the absence of any explanatory phrase, such as accompanies the names of the other streams. See EDEX. We next hear of it in the covenant made with Abraham (Gen. xv, 18), where the whole country from "the great river, the river Euphrates," to the river of Egypt is promised to the chosen race. In Deuteronomy and Joshua we find that this promise was borne in mind at the time of the settlement in Canaan (Deut. i, 7; xi, 24; Josh. i, 4); and from an important passage in the first book of Chronicles it appears that the tribe of Reuben did actually extend itself to the Euphrates in the times anterior to Saul (1 Chron. v, 9). Here they came in contact with the Hagarites, who appear upon the Middle Euphrates in the Assyrian inscriptions of the later empire. It is David, however, who seems for the first time to have entered on the full enjoyment of the promise by the victories which he gained over Hadadezer, king of Zobah, and his allies, the Syrians of Damascus (2 Sam. viii, 3-8; 1 Chron. xviii, 3). The object of his expedition was "to recover his border," and "to establish his dominion by the river Euphrates;" and in this object he appears to have been altogether successful, in so much that Solomon, his son, who was not a man of war, but only inherited his father's dominions, is said to have "reigned over all kingdoms from the river (i. e. the Euphrates) unto the land of the Philistines and unto the border of Egypt" (1 Kings iv, 21; comp. 2 Chron. ix, 26). Thus, during the reigns of David and Solomon, the dominion of Israel actually attained to the full extent both ways of the original promise, the Euphrates forming the boundary of their empire to the north-east, and the river of

Egypt to the south-west. This wide-spread dominion was lost upon the disruption of the empire under Rehoboam; and no more is heard in Scripture of the Euphrates until the expedition of Necho against the Babylonians in the reign of Josiah. The "Great River" had meanwhile served for some time as a boundary between Assyria and the country of the Hittites (see ASSYRIA), but had repeatedly been crossed by the armies of the Ninevite kings, who gradually established their sway over the countries upon its right bank. The crossing of the river was always difficult, and at the point where certain natural facilities fixed the ordinary passage the strong fort of Carchemish had been built, probably in very early times, to command the position. See CARCHEMISH. Hence, when Necho determined to attempt the permanent conquest of Syria, his march was directed upon "Carchemish by Euphrates" (2 Chron. xxxv, 20), which he captured and held, thus extending the dominion of Egypt to the Euphrates, and renewing the old glories of the Rameside kings. His triumph, however, was short-lived. Three years afterwards the Babylonians—who had inherited the Assyrian dominion in these parts—made an expedition under Nebuchadnezzar against Necho, defeated his army, "which was by the river Euphrates in Carchemish" (Jer. xlvi, 2), and recovered all Syria and Palestine. Then "the king of Egypt came no more out of his land, for the king of Babylon had taken from the river of Egypt unto the river Euphrates all that pertained to the king of Egypt" (2 Kings xxiv, 7).

These are the chief events which Scripture distinctly connects with the "Great River." The prophets made use of the Euphrates as a figurative description of the Assyrian power, as the Nile with them represented the power of Egypt; thus, in Isa. viii, 7, "The Lord bringeth up upon them the waters of the river, strong and many, even the king of Assyria" (Jer. ii, 18; comp. Rev. ix, 14; xvi, 12). It is probably included among the "rivers of Babylon," by the side of which the Jewish captives "remembered Zion" and "wept" (Psa. cxxxvii, 1); and no doubt is glanced at in the threats of Jeremiah against the Chaldean "waters" and "springs," upon which there was to be a "drought" that should "dry them up" (Jer. I, 38; ii, 26). The fulfilment of these prophecies has been noticed under the head of CHALDEA. The river still brings down as much water as of old, but the precious element is wasted by the neglect of man; the various water-courses along which it was in former times conveyed are dry, the main channel has shrunk, and the water stagnates in unwholesome marshes.

It is remarkable that Scripture contains no clear and distinct reference to that striking occasion when, according to profane historians (Herod. i, 191; Xenoph. *Cyrop.* vii, 5), the Euphrates was turned against its mistress, and used to effect the ruin of Babylon. The brevity of Daniel (v, 30, 31) is perhaps sufficient to account for his silence on the point; but it might have been expected from the fulness of Jeremiah (ch. I and li) that so remarkable a feature of the siege would not have escaped mention. We must, however, remember, in the first place, that a clear prophecy may have been purposely withheld, in order that the Babylonians might not be put upon their guard. And, secondly, we may notice that there does seem to be at least one reference to the circumstance, though it is covert, as it was necessary that it should be. In immediate conjunction with the passage which most clearly declares the taking of the city by a surprise is found an expression which reads very obscurely in our version—"the passages are stopped" (Jer. li, 32). Here the Hebrew term (פְּתָחֵי הַנְּהַרִּים) applies most properly to "fords or ferries over rivers" (comp. Judg. iii, 28); and the whole passage may best be translated, "the ferries are seized" or "occupied;" which agrees very

well with the entrance of the Persians by the river, and with the ordinary mode of transit in the place, where there was but one bridge (Herod. i, 186). The fords were at Thapsacus (Xenoph. *Anab.* i, 4, 11).

2. The Euphrates is the largest, the longest, and by far the most important of the rivers of Western Asia. It rises from two chief sources in the Armenian mountains, one of them at Domli, 25 miles N.E. of Erzeroum, and little more than a degree from the Black Sea; the other on the northern slope of the mountain range called Ala-Tagh, near the village of Diyadin, and not far from Mount Ararat. The former, or Northern Euphrates, has the name *Frât* from the first, but is known also as the *Kara-Su* (Black River); the latter, or Southern Euphrates, is not called the *Frât*, but the *Murad Chai*, yet it is in reality the main river. Both branches flow at the first towards the west or south-west, passing through the wildest mountain districts of Armenia; they meet at Kebban-Maden, nearly in long. 39° E. from Greenwich, having run respectively 400 and 270 miles. Here the stream formed by their combined waters is 120 yards wide, rapid, and very deep; it now flows nearly southward, but in a tortuous course, forcing a way through the ranges of Taurus and anti-Taurus, and still seeming as if it would empty itself in the Mediterranean, but prevented from so doing by the longitudinal ranges of Amanus and Lebanon, which here run parallel to the Syrian coast, and at no great distance from it; the river at last desists from its endeavor, and in about lat. 36° turns towards the south-east, and proceeds in this direction for above 1000 miles to its embouchure in the Persian Gulf (Herod. i, 180; Strabo, ii, 521; Ptolem. v, 13; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* v, 20; Q. Curt. i, 13; *Orbis Terrarum*, C. Kaercher Auct.). In conjunction with the Tigris, it forms the rich alluvial lands of Mesopotamia (q. v.), over which it flows or is carried by canals, and thus diffuses abroad fertility and beauty. At Bagdad and Hillah (Babylon), the Euphrates and Tigris approach comparatively near to each other, but separate again, forming a kind of ample basin, till they finally become one at Koorma. Under the Cæsars the Euphrates was the eastern boundary of the Roman empire, as under David it was the natural limit of the Hebrew monarchy. See TIGRIS.

The last part of its course, from Hit downwards, is through a low, flat, and alluvial plain, over which it has a tendency to spread and stagnate; above Hit, and from thence to Sumeisat (Samosata), the country along its banks is for the most part open, but hilly; north of Sumeisat the stream runs in a narrow valley among high mountains, and is interrupted by numerous rapids. The entire course is calculated at 1780 miles, nearly 650 more than that of the Tigris, and only 200 short of that of the Indus; and of this distance more than two thirds (1200 miles) is navigable for boats, and even, as the expedition of colonel Chesney proved, for small steamers. The width of the river is greatest at the distance of 700 or 800 miles from its mouth—that is to say, from its junction with the Khabour to the village of Werai. It there averages 400 yards, while lower down, from Werai to Lamlun, it continually decreases, until at the last-named place its width is not more than 120 yards, its depth having at the same time diminished from an average of 18 to one of 12 feet. The causes of this singular phenomenon are the entire lack of tributaries below the Khabour, and the employment of the water in irrigation. The river has also in this part of its course the tendency already noted, to run off and waste itself in vast marshes, which every year more and more cover the alluvial tract west and south of the stream. From this cause its lower course is continually varying, and it is doubted whether at present, except in the season of the inundation, any portion of the Euphrates water is poured into the *Shut-el-Arab*.

In point of current it is for the most part a slug-



ish stream; for, except in the height of the flooded season, when it approaches 5 miles an hour, it varies from  $2\frac{1}{2}$  to  $3\frac{1}{2}$ , with a much larger portion of its course under 3 than above. Its general description for some distance below Erzingan is that of a river of the first order, struggling through high hills, or rather low mountains, making an exceedingly tortuous course as it forces its way over a pebbly or rocky bed from one natural barrier to another. As it winds round its numerous barriers, it carries occasionally towards each of the cardinal points a considerable body of water, and is shallow enough in some places for loaded camels to pass in autumn, the water rising to their bellies, or about  $4\frac{1}{2}$  feet. The upper portion of the river is inclosed between two parallel ranges of hills, covered for the most part with high brushwood and timber of moderate size, having a succession of long, narrow islands, on several of which are moderate-sized towns; the borders of this ancient stream being still well inhabited, not only by Bedouins, but by permanent residents. The following towns may be named: Sumeis-at, Haorom, Romkala, Bir, Giaber, Deir, Rava, Anna, Hadisa, El-'Us, Jibba, Hit, Hillah, Lemlum, Korna, and Bussora. The scenery above Hit, in itself very picturesque, is greatly heightened by the frequent recurrence of ancient irrigating aqueducts, beautiful specimens of art, which are attributed by the Arabs to the Persians when fire-worshippers: they literally cover both banks, and prove that the borders of the Euphrates were once thickly inhabited by a highly civilized people. They are of stone. Ten miles below Hit is the last of these. The country now becomes flatter, with few hills; the river winds less; and the banks are covered with Arab villages of mats or tents, with beautiful mares, cattle, and numerous flocks of goats and sheep. From Hit to Babylon the black tent of the Bedouin is almost the only kind of habitation to be seen. This distance is cultivated only in part; the rest is desert, with the date-tree showing in occasional clusters. In descending, the irrigating cuts and canals become more frequent. Babylon is encircled by two streams, one above, the other below the principal ruin, beyond which they unite and produce abundance. For about thirty miles below Hillah both banks have numerous mud villages, imbedded in date-trees: to these succeed huts formed of bundles of reeds. The country lower down towards Lemlum is level, and little elevated above the river; irrigation is therefore easy: in consequence, both banks are covered with productive cultivation, and fringed with a double and nearly continuous belt of luxuriant date-trees, extending down to the Persian Gulf. At one mile and a half above the town of Devania is the first considerable deviation from this hitherto majestic river; another takes place 22 miles lower; and nine miles farther—at Lemlum—it again separates into two branches, forming a delta not unlike that of Damietta, and, when the river is swollen, inundating the country for a space of about 60 miles in width with a shallow sheet of water, forming the Lemlum marshes, nearly the whole of which is covered with rice and other grain the moment the river recedes (in June). Here mud villages are swept away by the water every year. Below Lemlum the Tigris sends a branch to the Euphrates, which is thus increased in its volume, and, turning to the east, receives the chief branch of the Tigris, thence running in one united stream, under the name of the *Shat-el-Arab*, as far as the sea (the Persian Gulf). In this last reach the river has a depth of from 3 to 5 fathoms, varies in breadth from 500 to 900 yards, and presents banks covered with villages and cultivation, having an appearance at once imposing and majestic. The length of that part of the river, reckoning from Bir to Bussora, navigable for large vessels at all times of the year, is 143 miles. It is very abundant in fish. The water is somewhat turbid, but, when purified, is pleasant and salubrious. The Ara-

bians set a high value on it, and name it *Morad-Su*; that is, Water of desire, or longing.

The annual inundation of the Euphrates occurs in the month of May. The river begins to rise in March, and continues rising till the latter end of May. The consequent increase of its volume and rapidity is attributable to the early rains, which, falling in the Armenian mountains, swell its mountain tributaries; and also, in the main, to the melting of the winter snows in these lofty regions. About the middle of November the Euphrates has reached its lowest ebb, and, ceasing to decrease, becomes tranquil and sluggish. The greatest rise of the Tigris is earlier, since it drains the southern flank of the great Armenian chain. The Tigris scarcely ever overflows [see HIDEKEL], but the Euphrates inundates large tracts on both sides of its course from Hit downwards. The great hydraulic works ascribed to Nebuchadnezzar (Abyden. *Fr.* 8) had for their great object to control the inundation by turning the waters through sluices into canals prepared for them, and distributing them in channels over a wide extent of country. "When the Euphrates," says Rich, "reaches its greatest elevation, it overflows the surrounding country, fills up, without the necessity of any human labor, the canals which are dug for the reception of its waters, and thus amazingly facilitates the operations of husbandry. The ruins of Babylon are then inundated, so as to render many parts inaccessible, the intermediate hollows being converted into marshes" (*Babylon and Persepolis*, p. 54). Raewolf observes, "The water of the Euphrates, being always troubled, and consequently unfit for drinking, is placed in earthen jars or pitchers for an hour or two, until the sand and other impurities sink to the bottom, where they are soon found lying to the thickness of a man's finger" (comp. Jer. ii, 18; xiii, 4-7). Mr. Ainsworth says, "The period at which the waters of the Euphrates are most loaded with mud, are in the first floods of January; the gradual melting of the snows in early summer, which preserves the high level of the waters, does not at the same time contribute much sedimentary matter. From numerous experiments made at Bir in December and January, 1836, I found the maximum of sediment mechanically suspended in the waters to be equal to one eightieth part of the bulk of fluid, or every cubic inch of water contained one eightieth part of its bulk of suspended matters; and from similar experiments, instituted in the month of October of the same year, at the issue of the waters from the Lemlum marshes, I only obtained a maximum of one two hundredth part of a cubic inch of water (mean temp. 74°). The sediments of the river Euphrates, which are not deposited in the upper part of the river's course, are finally deposited in the Lemlum marshes. In navigating the river in May, 1836, the water flowing into the marshes was colored deeply by mud, but left the marshes in a state of comparative purity" (*Researches*, p. 110, 111).

The Euphrates has at all times been of some importance as furnishing a line of traffic between the East and the West. Herodotus speaks of persons, probably merchants, using it regularly on their passage from the Mediterranean to Babylon (Her. i, 185). He also describes the boats which were in use upon the stream (i, 194), and mentions that their principal freight was wine, which he seems to have thought was furnished by Armenia. It was, however, more probably Syrian, as Armenia is too cold for the vine. Boats such as he describes, of wicker-work, and coated with bitumen, or sometimes covered with skins, still abound on the river (Chesney, *Euphrates*, ii, 639-651). Men wishing to swim across or along the stream simply throw themselves upon an inflated skin and thus float, precisely in the manner described by ancient writers, and depicted on the Assyrian sculptures (Botta, *Nineveh*, p. 238 sq.). Alexander appears to have brought to Babylon by the Euphrates route vessels of some considera-

ble size, which he had made in Cyprus and Phœnicia. They were so constructed that they could be taken to pieces, and were thus carried piecemeal to Thapsacus, where they were put together and launched (Aristobol. ap. Strab. xvi, 1, 11). The disadvantage of the route was the difficulty of conveying return cargoes against the current. According to Herodotus, the boats which descended the river were broken to pieces and sold at Babylon, and the owners returned on foot to Armenia, taking with them only the skins (i, 194). Aristobolus, however, related (ap. Strab. xvi, 3, 3) that the Gerrhæans ascended the river in their rafts not only to Babylon, but to Thapsacus, whence they carried their wares on foot in all directions. The spices and other products of Arabia formed their principal merchandise. On the whole, there are sufficient grounds for believing that throughout the Babylonian and Persian periods this route was made use of by the merchants of various nations, and that by it the east and west continually interchanged their most important products (see Layard's *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 456, 457). Caravans were employed above Thapsacus (Heeren, *Asiatic Nations*, i, 429, 430). The emperor Trajan constructed a fleet in the mountains of Nisibis, and floated it down the Euphrates. The emperor Julian also came down the river from the same mountains with a fleet of not fewer than 1100 vessels. A great deal of navigation is still carried on from Bagdad to Hillah, the ancient Babylon, but the disturbed state of the country prevents any above the latter place. In the time of queen Elizabeth merchants from England went by this river, which was then the high road to India. There were anciently many canals which connected the Tigris with the Euphrates; many of them are still in being. The Euphrates steamer passed from the Euphrates to the Tigris by the Iva canal, which leaves the former a few miles above Felugo, and enters the latter a short way below Bagdad. The steam navigation of the Euphrates must be a question of considerable importance, and colonel Chesney has proved that it may be navigated as high as Bir by steamers drawing four feet of water; yet it can hardly be expected that it can ever be made available as an ordinary channel between Europe and India. Its navigation would undoubtedly confer the greatest advantages on the inhabitants of the vast and fertile countries through which it flows, should they once more be emancipated from the barbarism under which they have so long been oppressed.

3. See, for a general account of the Euphrates, colonel Chesney's *Euphrates Expedition*, vol. i.; and, for the lower course of the stream, compare Loftus's *Chaldea and Susiana*. See also Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, vol. i, Essay ix; and Layard's *Nineveh and Babylon*, chaps. xxi and xxii; Wahl's *Asien*, p. 700; Ritter's *Erdk.* ii, 120; *Traité Élément. Géographique* (Bruxelles, 1832), vol. ii; Mannert's *Geogr.* ii, 142; Reichard's *Kl. Geogr. Schrif.* p. 210; *Parliam. Rep. of Steam Navigation to India* (1834); McCulloch's *Geograph. Dict.* s. v.; Ainsworth's *Travels in Asia Minor*, etc. (1842); Ker Porter, *Travels*, ii, 403; Forbiger, *Alle Geographie*, ii, 69 sq.; Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* i, 188 sq.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See BABYLON.

**Euphrates**, bishop of Cologne, was the successor of bishop Maternus. He was present at the Synod of Sardica in 347, and was sent by the bishops of that synod with commendatory letters from the emperor Constance to the emperor Constantius to obtain the recall of the exiled catholic bishops. The report that a synod held at Cologne in 346 deposed Euphrates for not believing in the divinity of Christ is now generally regarded as spurious. The acts of this pretended synod were probably compiled in the eighth century, and are from beginning to end a forgery.—Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexik.* xii, 241; Kettberg, *Kirchen-Geschichte Deutschlands*, vol. i. (A. J. S.)

**Eupo'emus** (Ἐπόλεμος, *good in war*, a frequent

Greek name), the "son of John, the son of Accos" (q. v.), one of the envoys sent to Rome by Judas Maccabæus, B. C. cir. 161, to negotiate an alliance with the Romans (1 Macc. viii, 17; Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 10, 6). He has been identified (Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* ix, 17 sq.) with the historian of the same name (Josephus, *Apion*, i, 23), who wrote several works on the affairs of the Jews (Kuhlmeijer, *Eupolemi fragmenta*, Berlin, 1840, 8vo); but it is by no means clear that the historian was of Jewish descent (yet comp. Jerome, *de Vir. Illustr.* 38). His father, John (q. v.), is spoken of as having procured special privileges for the Jews from the Syrian kings (2 Macc. iv, 11).

**Euroclydon** (Ἐυροκλύδων, q. d. *south-east billow*), the name given (Acts xxvii, 14) to the gale of wind in the Adriatic Gulf, which off the south coast of Crete seized the ship in which Paul was ultimately wrecked on the coast of Malta. See SHIPWRECK OF PAUL. The circumstances of this gale are described with much particularity, and they admit abundant illustration from the experience of modern seamen in the Levant. In the first place it came down from the island (*κατ' ἀντίε*), and therefore must have blown more or less from the northward, since the ship was sailing along the south coast, not far from Mount Ida, and on the way from Fair-Havens towards Phœnicæ. So Captain Spratt, after leaving Fair-Havens with a light southerly wind, fell in with "a strong northerly breeze blowing direct from Mount Ida" (Smith, *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, 1856, p. 97, 245). Next, the wind is described as being like a *typhoon* (mod. *tuffone*, i. e. "striker") or whirlwind (*τυφονικός*, A. V. "tempestuous;" comp. *τυφών*, Aristot. *Meteor.* 1; *De Mundo*, iv, 18); and the same authority speaks of such gales in the Levant as being generally "accompanied by terrific gusts and squalls from those high mountains" (Conybeare, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, 1856, ii, 401). It is also observable that the change of wind in the voyage before us (xxvii, 13, 14) is exactly what might have been expected; for Captain J. Stewart observes, in his remarks on the Archipelago, that "it is always safe to anchor under the lee of an island with a northerly wind, as it dies away gradually, but it would be extremely dangerous with southerly winds, as they almost invariably shift to a violent northerly wind" (Purdy's *Sailing Directory*, pt. ii, p. 61). The long duration of the gale ("the fourteenth night," ver. 27), the overclouded state of the sky ("neither sun nor stars appearing," ver. 20), and even the heavy rain which concluded the storm (*τὸν ἕτερον*, xxviii, 2), could easily be matched with parallel instances in modern times (see Smith, *Voyage and Shipwreck*, p. 144; Conybeare, *Life and Epp.* ii, 412). We have seen that the wind was more or less northerly. The context gives us full materials for determining its direction with great exactitude. The vessel was driven from the coast of Crete to Clauda (xxvii, 16), and apprehension was felt that she would be driven into the African Syrtis (v. 17). Combining these two circumstances with the fact that she was less than half way from Fair-Havens to Phœnicæ when the storm began (v. 14), we come to the conclusion that it came from the N.E. or E.N.E., and hence might fitly be termed a *north-easter*. This is quite in harmony with the natural sense of Ἐυροκλύδων (Vulg. *Euro-aquilo*, i. e. north-east wind, the modern *Gregalia* of those seas), which is regarded as the true reading by Bentley, and is found in some of the best MSS.; but we are disposed to adhere to the received text, more especially as it is the more difficult reading, and the phrase used by Luke (*ὁ καλούμενος Ἐυροκλύδων*) seems to point to some peculiar word in use among the sailors. Alford thinks that the true name of the wind was *ευρακίλων*, but that the Greek sailors, not understanding the Latin termination, corrupted the word into *εὐροκλύδων*, and that so Luke wrote it (*Comment.* in loc.).—Smith, s. v. Such winds are known to modern mariners in the Mediterranean by

the name of *Levanter*. They are not confined to any single point, but blow in all directions from the north-east round by the north to the south-east. The "great wind" or mighty tempest experienced by the prophet Jonah on his way from Joppa to Tarshish (1, 4; comp. the destructive "east wind" of *Psa. xlviii, 7*) appears to have been one of these gales (comp. *Josephus, War, iii, 8, 3*, who calls it the "black north wind," *μελαμβόροτο*). See *WIND*.

**Europe**, the smallest, but also the most highly civilized and most populous of the three great divisions of the old continent.

I. It is separated from America on the west and north-west by the Atlantic; from Africa on the south by the Mediterranean; and from Asia by the Archipelago, Sea of Marmora, Black Sea, Caucasian ridge, Caspian Sea, Ural River and Mountains, and the Kara River. It is in the form of a huge peninsula, projecting from the north-west of Asia. Its extent from Cape St. Vincent on the south-west to the mouth of the Kara River on the north-east is 3400 miles; and from Cape Nordkun, the most northerly point of the Scandinavian main land, to Cape Matapan, the southmost point of Greece, 2400 miles. The continent of Europe, irrespective of islands, lies within lat.  $36^{\circ} 1' - 71^{\circ} 6' N.$ , and long.  $9^{\circ} 30' W. - 68^{\circ} 30' E.$  Its area is estimated at nearly 3,800,000 square miles; and its coastline, more extensive in proportion to its size than that of any other great natural division of the globe, is estimated at 19,500 miles, giving a proportion of 1 linear mile of coast for every 190 square miles of surface. It had in 1868 a population of 293,000,000, which gives an average of about 77 for every square mile.

II. *Church History*.—Europe early received the seed of Christianity from the apostles themselves. The territory embraced in what is now Turkey, Greece, and Italy was for many years the scene of the apostolic labors of Paul, who founded a number of churches, and wrote epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, and Thessalonians. Whether he visited Spain, England, and other countries of Europe, as has been asserted by some writers, is doubtful. Peter is claimed by the Roman Catholic Church to have been for twenty-five years bishop of Rome. The fact of his having been in Rome, and having presided for several years over the Church there, is generally recognised by most of the historians. The share of the other apostles in the Christianization of Europe is doubtful, and the accounts of their missionary labors rest more on legends than historic documents (see the articles on each of the apostles, and each of the European countries); but it is a well-established fact that, even before the close of the first century, numerous churches were established in Turkey, Greece, Malta, Italy, France, Spain, and Southern and Western Germany. The growing authority of the bishops of Rome [see *ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH*] soon made Europe the centre of the Christian world. When Constantine became a Christian, the Christianization of all that portion of Europe which belonged to the Roman empire made rapid progress, and was soon completed. In the fifth and sixth centuries, Spain, France, Scotland, England, and several German tribes became Christian. Christianity steadily advanced in all directions, but it was not until the sixteenth century that every pagan people of Europe had adopted the Christian doctrine. In the mean while, however, part of the Christian territory in Southern Europe had been conquered by the Mohammedans, who at one time even hoped for the conquest of all Europe. They lost, however, in the course of the following centuries, most of their conquests, retaining only the control of one empire in Eastern Europe. Thus Europe has been for many centuries a predominantly Christian division of the world, while of both Asia and Africa only small sections became Christian. The schism between the Greek and the Latin churches became complete in the ninth century,

and the ecclesiastical connection between Eastern and Western Europe has been interrupted ever since. Still greater became the alienation between the countries which adhered to the Reformation of the sixteenth century and those over which the Church of Rome retained control, and more than one destructive war grew out of this division. See *REFORMATION*; *PROTESTANTISM*.

III. *Ecclesiastical Statistics*.—The following tabular statement of the statistics of the Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Eastern churches, prepared by Prof. A. J. Schem, is taken from the *American Year-book* for 1869.

Countries.	Total Population.	Roman Catholic.	Protestant.	Eastern Churches.
Portugal. . . . .	3,937,861	4,340,000	7,000	
Azores and Madeira. . . . .	363,658			
Spain. . . . .	16,302,625	16,250,000	10,000	
Andorra. . . . .	12,000	12,000		
France. . . . .	38,067,094	36,000,000	1,600,000	
N. German Confed. . . . .	29,332,834	7,875,000	20,682,000	2,000
S. Germ. States	8,524,460	4,935,000	3,351,000	
Austria. . . . .	35,292,547	27,000,000	3,600,000	3,200,000
Italy. . . . .	24,308,787	24,000,000	60,000	
Papal States. . . . .	723,121	710,000	1,000	
San Marino. . . . .	5,700	5,700		
Monaco. . . . .	1,887	1,800		
Switzerland. . . . .	2,510,494	1,023,000	1,482,000	
Holland. . . . .	3,552,665	1,450,000	2,200,000	
Luxemburg. . . . .	296,574			
Belgium. . . . .	4,984,451	4,850,000	25,000	
Great Britain. . . . .	29,935,404			
Helligo'd, Gibraltar, and Malta. . . . .	163,683	6,100,000	23,400,000	
Denmark. . . . .	1,608,095			
Faro and Iceland. . . . .	75,909	1,000	1,075,000	
Sweden. . . . .	4,070,061		5,000	5,760,000
Norway. . . . .	1,701,478			
Turkey. . . . .	13,544,000			
Roumania. . . . .	3,864,848	700,000	50,000	12,500,000
Servia. . . . .	1,078,281			
Montenegro. . . . .	196,238			
Greece. . . . .	1,096,810	60,000	3,000	1,270,000
Ionian Islds. . . . .	251,712			
Russia. . . . .	67,260,431	6,763,000	4,122,000	52,810,000
Total. . . . .	293,083,708	142,717,500	68,028,000	69,782,000

It will be seen from the above table that the Eastern churches (or, more particularly, the Greek Church) prevail in Russia, Turkey, and Greece. In Turkey the government is Mohammedan, but the majority of the population belong to the Greek Church. The Roman Catholic Church prevails in Portugal, Spain, France, the South German States, Austria, Italy (inclusive of the Papal States, San Marino and Monaco), and Belgium, while Protestantism is the prevailing religion in the North German Confederation, Switzerland, Holland, Great Britain, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. (A. J. S.)

**Eusebians**, a name given to the Arians from Eusebius of Nicomedia. See *EUSEBIUS OF NICOMEDIA*.

**Eusebius**, the only pope of this name, and, according to a tradition, the son of a physician, became bishop of Rome in 310, after the death of Marcellus. The time of his pontificate is variously stated at from four months to six years. No events of importance are recorded of his pontificate. According to an epitaph published by Baronius (but which Baronius himself refers, not to the pope, but to some priest of the same name), the *lapsi* (q. v.) in Rome demanded immediate absolution, which Eusebius refused. Tumult arose, in consequence of which Eusebius was exiled by the usurper Maxentius to Sicily. He is commemorated as a saint on the 26th of September. Several decrees circulating under his name, as well as three letters to the bishops of Gaul, to the Egyptians, and to the bishops of Tusciana and Campania, are spurious.—*Herzog, Real-Encyclopädie*, iv, 246; *Acta Sanct. ad 26 Septbr.*; *Pagi, Breviarum pontific. Roman.* (i, p. 65); *Bower, Hist. of the Popes*; *Ersch u. Gruber, Allgem. Encyclop.* (sect. i, vol. xl, p. 445).

**Eusebius of Alexandria.** I. In the Eastern churches, a number of homilies, ascribed to one Eusebius of Alexandria, enjoyed a great reputation, especially during the 6th and 7th centuries. They are either dramatic representations of the chief events in the life of Christ, or discussions of moral and practical questions. Their author is variously designated as monk, bishop, archbishop, or papa; most frequently bishop or archbishop of Alexandria. An ancient biography, published by cardinal Mai (*Spicil. Rom.* ix, p. 103), represents him as a sainted monk living near Alexandria, and endowed with the faculty of working miracles, who became successor of Cyril in the see of Alexandria, transferred his episcopal functions, after seven years (another reading says twenty years), to a noble Alexandrine named Alexander, and died in the retirement of a monastery. That this account is false we know from the list of bishops of Alexandria, which nowhere leaves room for a bishop Eusebius. According to Thilo (*Ueber die Schriften des Eusebius von Alexandria und des Eusebius von Emesa*, Halle, 1832), the author was either one of the four monks known in the Origenistic controversies under the name of the four "tall brothers," and distinguished among the monks of the Nitrian desert for piety and theological learning, or a presbyter at the court of Justinian I, who, honored with the title Papa, took an active part in the dogmatic controversies of the 6th century. Semisch (in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.) thinks that neither of those two men has all the qualifications which one would expect from the author of the Homilies. The only thing certain, in his opinion, is that the homilies were compiled in the 5th or 6th century. The number of homilies that are at present known is twenty-one. Some of them were published at Paris, 1575, and Antwerp, 1602. Augusti (*Euseb. Emes. quæ supersunt opuscula*, Elberfeld, 1829) wrongly attributed three of the homilies (of the dramatic class) to Eusebius of Emesa. Thilo, in the work already mentioned, combated the views of Augusti, and in an appendix published a revised text of four of the homilies, to which, in 1834, he added an edition of a new homily on astrology. His views were confirmed by cardinal Mai (*Spicil. Roman.* ix), who, from a Vatican manuscript, published a number of homilies for the first time. A homily on alms, which has never been printed, is to be found in the Vienna Imperial Library.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* iv, 226; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* (ed. Harles), vii, 409. (A. J. S.)

II. Eusebius, bishop of Laodicea, being a native of Alexandria, is sometimes called Eusebius of Alexandria.

**Eusebius**, with the surname **Bruno**, after 1047 bishop of Angers. Little is known of his early life. Soon after becoming bishop he was suspended with a number of other bishops, being suspected, it is thought, of simony. But he seems to have fully justified himself, for in 1049 he was present at the reformatory council of Rheims, and was chosen a member of the committee to welcome pope Leo IX in the name of the council. In a letter written from Rome (1049), he complained of the measures taken by the pope against Berengar, who, in his opinion, was free from any heresy. Berengar himself counted Eusebius among his patrons, and it was the advice of Eusebius which induced him to take, at the Synod of Tours in 1054, the oath which the synod demanded from him. One of the foremost opponents of Berengar, bishop Theotwin of Liege, calls Eusebius one of the chief renewers of the heresy which finds in the Lord's Supper nothing but a shadow and an image of the body of Christ. But when count Geoffroi of Anjou, the powerful protector of the French heretics, died (1060), the courage of Eusebius was at an end. At the Episcopal Convention of Angers in 1062 he showed an inclination to accept the doctrine of the Church, though he still made a profession of personal friendship for Berengar. The

same indecision shows itself in the celebrated letter, written between 1063 and 1066, in which Eusebius declines to act as arbiter at a theological disputation which Berengar desired to hold with the priest Gaurid Martini, and defines his dogmatical position. The letter (which is regarded by Lessing as the ablest theological essay of the 11th century) deprecates new dogmatic explanations concerning the Eucharist, and declares that we ought not to appeal to the fathers, but to adhere to Scripture, and abide by the simple words that the bread and wine are the true body and blood of Christ as a duty of pious faith. The letter may be found in Menardus (*Augustini c. Juliani operis imperfecti l. 2 priores*), with arbitrary alterations in De Roye (*Vita, hæres. et poenit. Berengar.*), and Boulay (*Hist. Univer. Paris*). Two other letters of Eusebius are given by Sudendorf (*Bereng. Turon.* 1850). Eusebius died at Angers Aug. 27, 1061.—*Real-Encyklop.* iv, 228; Lessing, *Werke* (edit. Lachmann), vol. viii; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xvi, 778; Neander, *Church History* (Torrey), iii, 576; Neander, *Hist. of Dogmas* (Ryland), ii, 462. (A. J. S.)

**Eusebius of Cæsarea**, the "father of Church history," was born about 270. The place of his birth is not certainly known, but it is supposed to have been Cæsarea in Palestine. Coming to Antioch towards the end of the 3d century, he there studied the Scriptures under Dorotheus (Eusebius, *H. E.* vii, 32). On his return to Cæsarea he was ordained by Agapius, then bishop of that place. Here he became intimate with Pamphilus, a learned presbyter, who was head of a divinity school at Cæsarea, and who had gathered many books illustrative of Scripture and theology, especially the writings of Origen. This friendship was lifelong, and from it Eusebius took the name *Ἐπισκοπικός* (*ὁ φίλος*) *τοῦ Παμφίλου*, Eusebius Pamphili. It was probably under Pamphilus that Eusebius imbibed his fondness for the writings of Origen. During the persecution by Dioclesian, Pamphilus was imprisoned, and finally died a martyr (A. D. 309). Eusebius taught in the school of Pamphilus for years, but during the persecution he went to Tyre and to Egypt, where he himself was imprisoned as a confessor, and where he witnessed the sufferings of the faithful described in his *Church History* (bk. viii, c. 7, 9). Epiphanius (*Hæc.* lxxviii, 7) tells us that Eusebius was charged at the Synod of Tyre (A. D. 335, where he sided against Athanasius), by Potamon, bishop of Hæraclea, with having shown cowardice during the persecution in Egypt, and even with having offered incense to idols. But the charge doubtless arose from party feeling, as it is not likely that he could, with such a character, have been made bishop in that age. In 313 or 315 he was chosen bishop of Cæsarea, which see he administered with eminent success for twenty-five years.

The part taken by Eusebius in the Arian controversy has been the subject of much dispute. When Arius was deposed by Alexander, he enlisted numerous bishops in his behalf, especially Eusebius of Nicomedia, namesake and friend of Eusebius of Cæsarea; and the latter wrote to Alexander, bishop of Alexandria (two letters, of which fragments are extant), aiming, not to settle the doctrinal dispute, but rather to show that the views of Arius were misrepresented. He sought to reconcile the contending parties, and this conciliatory, if not compromising temper, characterized Eusebius through life. See **ARIUS**; **ATHANASIUS**. The part taken by Eusebius in the Council of Nicea (Nice, A. D. 325) is described by Valesius (Introduct. to his edit. of Eusebius) as follows: "In this greatest and most celebrated council, Eusebius was far from an unimportant person; for he both had the first seat on the right hand, and in the name of the whole synod addressed the emperor Constantine, who sat on a golden chair, between the two rows of the opposite parties. This is affirmed by Eusebius himself (*Life of Constantine*), and by Sozomen (*Eccl. Hist.*). Afterwards, when there

was a considerable contest amongst the bishops relative to a creed or form of faith, Eusebius proposed a formula at once simple and orthodox, which received the general commendation both of the bishops and of the emperor himself. Something, notwithstanding, seeming to be wanting in the creed, to confute the impuety of the new opinion, the fathers of the Nicene Council determined that these words, 'VERY GOD OF VERY GOD; BEGOTTEN, NOT MADE; BEING OF ONE SUBSTANCE WITH THE FATHER,' should be added. They also annexed anathemas against those who should assert that the Son of God was made of things not existing, and that there was a time when he was not. At first, indeed, Eusebius refused to admit the term *ὁμοούσιος*, but when the import of that word was explained to him by the other bishops he consented, and, as he himself relates in his letter to his diocese at Cæsarea, subscribed to the creed (Socrates, *H. E.* i, 8). Some affirm that it was the necessity of circumstances, or the fear of the emperor, and not the conviction of his own mind, that induced Eusebius to subscribe to the Nicene Council. Of some present at the synod this might be believed, but we cannot think it of Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea. After the Nicene Council, too, Eusebius always condemned those who asserted that the Son of God was made of things not existing. Athanasius likewise affirms the same concerning him, and, though he frequently mentions that Eusebius subscribed to the Nicene Council, nowhere intimates that he did it insincerely. Had Eusebius subscribed to that council, not according to his own mind, but fraudulently and in pretence, why did he afterwards send the letter we have mentioned to his diocese at Cæsarea, and therein ingenuously profess that he had embraced the faith which had been published in the Nicene Council?" (For details, see Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* i, 8, 9.)

After the deposition of Eustathius (q. v.), A.D. 331, the see of Antioch was offered to Eusebius, but he declined the honor, probably in fear of tumult, and even bloodshed, from the excited state of the popular mind in Antioch. The conduct of Eusebius in this case greatly gratified the emperor Constantine, who wrote him a letter praising his prudence, and saying that he was worthy of being bishop, "not of the city merely, but of almost the whole world" (Socrates, *H. E.* i, 24). In the later course of the Arian dispute, Eusebius, though theoretically orthodox, substantially acted with the Arians to a great extent. Even in his *Church History* he avoids even mentioning the controversy, ending his book with A.D. 324. He presided at the Council of Tyre, A.D. 335 (Epiphanius, *Her.* lxxviii, 7), summoned for the trial of Athanasius, and joined in the condemnation of that great man (see art. ATHANASIVS, vol. i, p. 505). The prelates assembled at Jerusalem, and deputed Eusebius to the emperor Constantine, to obtain his approval of their decision, and he seems to have used his influence with the emperor to secure both the recall of Arius and the exile of Athanasius.

In his last years Eusebius lived in close intimacy with the emperor Constantine, who cherished the warmest esteem and affection for him. In A.D. 336 Eusebius wrote his *Panegyric on Constantine*. The emperor had assigned him the task of superintending the transcription of fifty copies of the Scriptures on parchment, for the use of the churches of Constantinople. This was the last literary labor in which he was engaged (*Vita Constant.* iv, 35) before his death, which took place A.D. 340.

From the general tenor of his life as sketched above, it is not to be wondered that Eusebius has been charged with a leaning towards Arianism. "So thought, among the ancients, Hilary, Jerome (who otherwise speaks favorably of Eusebius), Theodoret, and the second Council of Nicea (A.D. 787), which unjustly condemned him, even expressly, as an Arian heretic; and so have thought, among moderns, Baroni-

us, Petavius, Clericus, Tillemont, Gieseler; while the Church historian Socrates, the Roman bishops Gelasius and Pelagius II, Valesius, G. Bull. Cave (who enters into a full vindication, vol. i, p. 111), and Samuel Lee (and most Anglicans), have defended the orthodoxy of Eusebius, or at least mention him with very high respect. The Gallican Church has even placed him in the catalogue of saints. Athanasius never expressly charges him with apostasy from the Nicene faith to Arianism, or to semi-Arianism, but frequently says that before 325 he held with Arius, and changed his opinion at Nicea. This is the view of Möhler also (*Christology*, i, 792) inaccurately reckons among the opponents of the orthodoxy of Eusebius. The testimonies of the ancients for and against Eusebius are collected in Migne's edition of his works, tom. i, p. 68-98. Among recent writers, Dr. Samuel Lee has most fully investigated the orthodoxy of Eusebius in the preliminary dissertation to his translation of the Theophania from the Syriac, p. xxiv-xxcix. He arrives at the conclusion (p. xcvi) 'that Eusebius was no Arian, and that the same reasoning must prove that he was no semi-Arian; that he did in no degree partake of the error of Origen, ascribed to him so positively and so groundlessly by Photius.' But this is merely a negative result."—Schaff, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, ii, 874. Compare also Dupin, *Ant. Eccl.* (Paris, 1683), ii, 1-15.

It is in the field of Church history that the merits and services of Eusebius stand pre-eminent among early writers. He had large acquaintance with both Christian and pagan learning, and used it, if not with critical or philosophical skill, yet with patient industry and with literary integrity. He was the first to collect the scattered annals of the first three centuries of the Church in his *Ecclesiastical History*, the most important of all his writings, which traces the history of Christianity from the advent of the Messiah to the defeat of Licinius, A.D. 324. In this work he rejects, with greater care than is usually attributed to him, the doubtful facts and the fabulous narratives. And this is not his only merit. A living sympathy with the fortunes of Christianity, and earnest admiration for the heroism of its martyrs and confessors, inspires him throughout. "Others," he says in the beginning of the fifth book, "that compose historical narratives, would record nothing but victories in battle, the trophies of enemies, the warlike achievements of generals, the bravery of soldiers, sullied with blood and innumerable murders, for the sake of children, and country, and property. But our narrative embraces that conversation and conduct which is acceptable to God—the wars and conflicts of a most pacific character, whose ultimate tendency is to establish the peace of the soul." In Dr. Schaff's opinion (*Ch. Hist.* iii, 877), the *Church History* of Eusebius "gives a colorless, defective, incoherent, fragmentary, yet interesting picture of the heroic youth of the Church, and owes its incalculable value not to the historic art of the author, but almost entirely to his copious and mostly literal extracts from foreign, and, in some cases, now extinct sources."

In the 8th book of the *Ecclesiastical History* (c. ii) Eusebius states that it is no part of his plan to relate all the wickedness and dissensions of the Christians before the persecution, or to name those who were untrue to the faith; adding, "we shall only, upon the whole, introduce those events into our history that may be profitable first to us of the present day, and hereafter to posterity." In the *Martyr. Palestin.* (ch. xii) he states as a historical principle that the "events most suitable to be recorded in a history of the martyrs are those which redound to their honor." Gibbon (*Decline and Fall*, ch. xvi) remarks that "such an acknowledgment will naturally excite a suspicion that a writer who has so openly violated one of the fundamental laws of his-

tory has not paid a very strict regard to the observance of the other." Certainly it was an error of judgment in Eusebius to hold back anything in his accounts. The Scripture might have taught him better; it does not omit the faults of patriarchs or saints. If nothing, moreover, is to be told of martyrs but "what redounds to their honor," one's admiration of these honorable facts must be lessened by the fear that what is kept back might counterbalance what is told. The principle of Eusebius is here historically bad. But Gibbon attacks Eusebius still more strongly in his *Vindication of Chapters xv and xvi* of his history. Eusebius gives as the title of ch. xxxi, bk. xii, of the *Preparat. Evang.*, the question "How far it may be lawful to use falsehood as a medicine for the benefit of those who need such a procedure?" He begins the chapter with a citation from Plato (*De Legibus*, ii), as follows: "A legislator of any value, even if the fact were not such as our discourse has just established it, if in any case he might make bold to deceive young persons for their advantage; could he possibly inculcate any falsehood more profitable than this, or more potent to lead all without force or compulsion to the practice of all justice? 'Truth, my friend, is honorable and permanent; but not, it would seem, very easy of persuasion.' To this passage of Plato, Eusebius adds: "You may find a thousand such instances in the Scriptures, where God is described as jealous, or sleeping, or angry, or liable to other human affections, so expressed for the advantage of those who require such a method (ἐπ' ὀφελεία τῶν δεομένων τοῦ τοιοῦτου τρόπου)." This is all that is said on the subject, and it may be interpreted to mean nothing more than that one's statements must be adapted to the understanding of his hearers or readers. But the use of the word "falsehood" in the heading of the chapter shows that, in the mind of Eusebius, either there was no just appreciation of the difference between "falsehood" and "accommodation," or else that his moral sense as to veracity had been vitiated by the ecclesiastical casuistry which even in his time had begun to show itself. It is easily to be seen, however, that Gibbon really misleads his readers by his statement of the case: "In this chapter," says he, "Eusebius alleges a passage of Plato which approves the occasional practice of pious and salutary frauds; nor is he ashamed to justify the sentiments of the Athenian philosopher by the example of the sacred writers of the Old Testament." This is not warranted by the passage, which is fully cited above. We adopt, nevertheless, the remark of Waddington (*History of the Church*, ch. vi, ad fin.): "It was disgraceful to the less enlightened fathers of the second and third centuries that, even in the midst of trial and tribulation, they borrowed a momentary succor from the profession of falsehood; but the same expedient was still more shameful to Eusebius, who flourished during the prosperity of the Church, whose age and more extensive learning left him no excuse in ignorance or inexperience, and whose great name and unquestionable piety gave sanction and authority to all his opinions. There can be no doubt, then, that the publication of that detestable principle in any one of his writings, however modified and limited by his explanation, must to a certain extent disturb our confidence in the rest; the mind which does not profess to be constantly guided by truth possesses no claim to our implicit submission. Nevertheless, the works of Eusebius must at last be judged by the character which severally pervades them, not by any single principle which the author has once only laid down, to which he has not intended (as it would seem) to give general application, and which he has manifestly proposed rather as a philosophical speculation than as a rule for his own composition. At least we feel convinced that whoever shall calmly peruse his *Ecclesiastical History* will not discover in it any deliberate intention to deceive; in the relation of miraculous stories he is more

sparing than most of the Church historians who succeeded him, and seemingly even than those whom he has copied; and, upon the whole, we shall not do him more than justice if we consider him as an avowed but honest advocate, many of whose statements must be examined with suspicion, while the greater part bear direct and incontestable marks of truth."

Of his *Chronicon* it has also been justly asserted, "that for centuries it was the source of all synchro-nical knowledge of history in the Greek, Latin, Oriental, and Christian world, everywhere translated, continued, excerpted, and made the basis of the different works on this subject." His panegyric writings on Constantine, however, afford, with much that is commendable and historically useful, abundant proofs of the weakness of his moral fibre, and of his sycophancy in dealing with the emperor. But it is to his credit that he never used his influence at court for merely personal ends. When Constantine on one occasion at Caesarea asked Eusebius to demand a favor for his Church, he declared "his Church was not in need of any favors. The only boon he asked was permission to use the public archives to enable him to write a history of the martyrs, which favor was readily granted him" (Jerome, *Ep. ad Chromatium et Heliodorum*; comp. Hefele in the *Freib. Kirchen-Lex.* vi, 135 et sq.). Less important than the historical works of Eusebius, but nevertheless very meritorious, are his *Apologetical* writings, the most extensive in ancient apologetics. His notices of the oldest mythologies in the *Preparatio Evangelica* are a valuable storehouse for theologians and philologists. In the field of doctrinal theology (*contra Marcellum*) the writings of Eusebius appear to less advantage than in any other. They touch upon the great question of his time, the Person of Christ. In these writings, as in his practical life, he appears to waver between orthodoxy and subordinationism.

The writings of Eusebius are here classified as A. Historical; B. Apologetic; C. Dogmatic; D. Exegetical.

A. *Historical*.—1. The *ἱστορία ἐκκλησιαστικῆ, Ecclesiastical History*, in ten books, beginning with the incarnation of Christ, relates the history of the Church, including accounts of writers, martyrs, persecutions, etc., up to A.C. 324. It was probably composed before the Nicene Council (325), as, near its close, Crispus, the eldest son of Constantine, is very favorably mentioned, which could hardly have happened after the execution of Crispus (325). The best editions of the *History*, with the Greek text, are Valesius, with life of Eusebius prefixed (Par. 1659-1673, 3 vols. fol., often reprinted); Reading's edition of Valesius's Eusebius (Gr. and Lat.), with the fragments of Theodoret, Evagrius, and Philostorgius (Camb. 1720 and 1746, 3 vols. fol.); Zimmermann, *Hist. Eccles.* (Frankfort, 1822, Gr. and Lat., 2 vols. 8vo); Heinichen, *Hist. Eccles.*, Reading's edition of Valesius, with Stroth's notes, and additional notes and indices by the editor (Leips. 1827-8, 3 vols. 8vo; also see below); Burton, *Hist. Eccles.* (Gr.) (Oxon, 1838, 1845, 1856, 8vo), also *Annotations Variorum*, 2 vols. 8vo (Oxon, 1842, 2 vols. 8vo); cheap edition by Schwegler (Tübing. 1852, 8vo); Laemmer, *Hist. Eccles.*, cum tabulis specimen cod. vii cont. (Schaffhausen, 1862, large 8vo, pp. 836, with tables in fol.).

*English Translations*.—Hammer, *Ch. History of Eusebius, Socrates, and Evagrius, with the Life and Panegyric of Constantine* (Cambridge, 1577, and often, fol.); the same, with Saltonstall's translation of *The Life of Constantine* (1650, fol.; 1663, fol.); Wells (based on the preceding, 1709, fol.); Parker's abridged (Lond. 1729, 4to); best translation, Cruse's (with Boyle's *Council of Nice*, Philadelphia, 1846; 10th ed. N. Y. 1856, 8vo; also in Bohn's *Ecclesiastical Library*, Lond. 12mo; and in Bagster's *Greek Eccl. Historians*, Lond. 1843, 8vo).

*German Translations.*—Hedion (Strasb. 1545, fol.); Stroth (Quedlinburg, 1777, 3 vols. 8vo); Closs (in two editions, one for Romanists, the other for Protestants, Stuttgart, 1839, 8vo). *French translation* by Cousin (Paris, 1675, and often). On the Moscow MS. of the *Ecl. Hist.*, see *Zeits. Hist. Theol.* 1861, p. 311, and *Theolog. Stud. u. Krit.* 1858, heft iii.

2. The *χρονικῶν κανόνων παντοδαπῆ ἱστορία*, generally called *Chronicon*, lib. ii, is an abridgment of the history of the world from its creation up to A.D. 325, with chronological tables, in which the chronography of Julius Africanus is largely made use of. For the arbitrary changes made by Eusebius in the text of Africanus, see Brunet de Presle, *Dynasties Egyptiennes* (Paris, 1850, 8vo). Of this chronicle there remain fragments in Greek and two translations: one in Latin by Jerome, and one in Armenian. The latter was first edited by Zohrab (Milan, 1818), Latin, by A. Mai; better ed. by Aucher (Lat. version from the Armenian, with the Greek fragments, Venet. 1818, 4to; reprinted in Migne, *Patrol. Grec.* tom. xix); new edition by Schöne (the Armenian translated by Petermann and Rödiger, Berlin, 1866).

3. *The Life of Constantine*, εἰς τὸν βίον Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ βασιλέως λόγος iv; de vita Constantini, lib. iv; generally printed with the *Ecclesiastical Hist.* (see above); also separately, ed. by Heinichen, with Reading's and Stroth's notes, etc. (Leipsic, 1829, 8vo); English translation in Bohn's *Eccles. Library* (London, 12mo).

4. *Panegyric on Constantine*, εἰς Κωνσταντίνου τριακόντα ετήριος, an oration in praise of Constantine on the thirtieth anniversary of his accession; generally printed with the *Church History*; also in Heinichen's *Life of Constantine* (see above, §).

5. *Σύγγραμμα περὶ τῶν κατ' αὐτὸν μαρτυρισάντων*, de martyribus Palestine; really, de martyribus suis temporis; containing reports of numerous martyrs of the Diocletian persecution (A.D. 303-310), printed as an appendix to the eighth book of the *Eccles. History*; specially interesting is Cureton's *History of the Martyrs of Palestine*, by Eusebius, discovered in a very ancient Syrian MS., and transl. into English (Lond. 1860, 8vo); given also in Migne, *Patrol. Grec.* tom. xx.

6. The *Acta St. Pamphili et sociorum* (on the martyrdom of his teacher Pamphilus) is only a fragment of a work on the life of Pamphilus, in three books, which seems to have been lost.

B. *Apologetic*.—1. The *Preparation of the Gospel History*, προπαρασκευὴ εὐαγγελικῆ, preparatio evangelica, in fifteen books. In the first six books Eusebius vindicates Christianity by extracts from Grecian and Roman writers, and by criticisms on them and on the Phœnician and Egyptian mythologies and worship. In books 7-15 he treats of Judaism, its religion, history, and institutions, showing its superiority to heathenism. The work pictures the condition of the world previous to the advent of Christ. Ed. by Rob. Stephens (Gr. 1544), and with Latin version by Viger (Paris, 1628, Cologne, 1688); ed. by Heinichen (Lips. 1842-3, 2 vols. 8vo); ed. by Gaisford (Oxf. 1843, 4 vols. 8vo); also in Migne, *Patrol. Grec.* t. xxi. Cumberland translated Sanchoniathon's *Phœnician History* from bk. i of the *Præp. Evang.* (Lond. 1720, 8vo).

2. The *Evangelical Demonstration*, ἀπόδειξις εὐαγγελικῆ, demonstratio evangelica, in twenty books, of which only ten remain. Eusebius wrote in order to prove that the Christian religion is demonstrably true, from its internal character, and from the fulfilment of the Jewish prophecies. He points out the true relations between Judaism and Christianity, and the provisional character of the latter; and in books 3-10 he comments on the Messianic prophecies. This work is intended to be the complement of the *Præp. Evang.* (see above). Translated into Latin by Donatus of Verona, and published either at Rome or Venice in 1498, and at Cologne in 1542. The Greek text appear-

ed, with that of the *Preparatio*, at Paris in the editions both of Robt. Stephens and Viger (see above, 1); also separately by Stephens (Paris, 1545, fol.), edited by Gaisford (Gr. and Latin, Oxford, 1852, 2 vols. 8vo); abridged German version in Rössler, *Bibl. der Kirchenväter* (1778, 8vo), v, 203 sq.

3. Of a similar character are (a) the ἐκλογαὶ προφητικαί, *Eloge Propheticæ*, of which four books only are preserved. They give mostly allegorical interpretations of Old-Test. Messianic passages (edited by Gaisford, Oxon. 1842, 8vo; also in Migne, *Patrologia Græc.*). (b) The five books of *The Theophany*, Θεοφάνεια, preserved in a Syriac translation, long lost, but discovered by Tattam in 1839 in a Nitrian monastery, and published under the title *Eusebius on the Theophania, or divine Manifestation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, translated from an ancient Syriac Version of the Greek Original now lost, with Notes, and a Vindication of the Orthodoxy and prophetic Views of the Author*, by Prof. S. Lee (Camb. 1843, 8vo). Dr. Lee assigns the MS. (now in the British Museum) to the year A.D. 411. The Greek fragments, with Lat. version, compared also with Lee's edition, are given in Migne, *Patrol. Grec.* xxiv, 607 sq. See a full treatment of this subject in Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* (Par. 1865, 8vo), p. 258 sq.

4. The small work, *Against Hierocles*, πρὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Φιλοστράτου εἰς Ἀπολλώνιον τὸν Τυανῆα διὰ τὴν Ἱεροκλεῖ παραληφθεῖσαν αὐτοῦ τε καὶ Χριστοῦ σύγκρισιν, generally cited *Adversus Hieroclem*, shows very ably that the magician and philosopher Apollonius of Tyana cannot bear comparison with Christ. It is to be found in Morell's *Philostratus* (Gr. and Lat., Paris, 1608); edited, with new transl. and notes, by Olearius (Leips. 1709); and, with the *libri contra Marcellum*, ed. by Gaisford (Oxon, 1852, 8vo); also in Migne, *Patrol. Grec.* xxii, 795 sq.

C. *Dogmatical and Polemical*.—1. Two books, κατὰ Μαρκέλλον, contra Marcellum, written by desire of the Council of Constantinople (held A.D. 336) to vindicate the condemnation of Marcellus for Sabellianism by that council (see Hefele, *Concilieneschichte*, vol. i, § 51). It is given in Viger's ed. of the *Præp. Evang.* (1628 and 1688); also in Gaisford's edition of the *Liber cont. Hieroclem* (Oxon, 1852, 8vo); and in Migne, *Patrol. Grec.* xxiv, 707.

2. The three books, *Of the Ecclesiastical Theology*, περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς Θεολογίας, De ecclesiastica theologia, are likewise intended against Marcellus, as evangelogia here means sermo de Filio Dei ejusque natura divina, with a biblico-dogmatical proof of the hypostatical existence of the Son. It is given (Greek and Latin) by Retberg (Göttingen, 1794); in *Cont. Hieroclem*, ed. by Gaisford (Oxon, 1852, 8vo); and in Migne, *Patrol. Grec.* xxiv, 826 sq.

3. The short treatise, περὶ τῆς τοῦ πάσχα ἱορτῆς, De solemnitate paschali, treats of the typical character of the Jewish Passover, and of its consummation in the new covenant. It is in Migne, *Patrologia Græc.* xxiv, 694 sq.

4. Fourteen smaller treatises, among which the most important are, *De fide adv. Sabellium*, *De resurrectione*, *De incorporati anima*; quod Deus Pater incorporalis sit, which remain only in Latin, and are all contained in Migne, *Patrologia Græca*, tom. xxiv.

D. *Ezegetical*.—These are partly introductory, partly commentaries, written upon the allegorical method of Origen, and without any knowledge of Hebrew. (1) The *Onomasticon*, or περὶ τῶν τοπικῶν ὀνομάτων ἐν τῇ Σεία γραφῆ, De locis Hebraicis, a topographical and alphabetical index of the names of places occurring in the Bible. It was translated into Latin by Jerome, and edited in Greek by Bouffrierus (Paris, 1631 and 1659, fol.); Gr. and Lat. in Hieron. *Opera*, t. ii (Paris, 1699); by Clericus (Amst. 1707, fol.); by Larsson and Parthey (Berlin, 1862, 8vo).

2. *Evangelicæ canonæ*, a kind of Gospel harmony, to

be found in the editions of the N. T. by Erasmus, Stephens, and Mill; also in Migne, *Patrolog. Græc.* xxii, 1273 sq.

3. *Ἐπιτομὰ καὶ λύσεις, Questiones evangelicæ*, in three books, containing solutions of seeming contradictions of the evangelists; edited by Mai in his *Coll. Script. Vet.* (1825, 4to), i, 101 sq.

4. *Commentaries on the Psalms and On Isaiah*, which are preserved to a great extent, and given in Migne, *Patrol. Græca*, tom. xxiv and xxv. Of his commentary on *Solomon's Song*, *Proverbs*, *Daniel*, and *Luke*, only fragments are left us, which are given in Migne, *Patrol. Græc.* tom. xxiv, who prints also Mai's newly-discovered fragments from his *Nov. Patr. Bibliotheca*, vol. iv.

There is no absolutely complete edition of the works of Eusebius. The nearest to such are Eusebii Pamphili *Opera Omnia*, Lat. (Basil. 1542, 4 vols. fol.; 1559, 2 vols. fol.; Paris, 1581, fol.); most complete of all (following Valesius, Montfaucon, Mai, and Gaisford), Migne, *Patrol. Græc.* vols. xix-xxiv. A new edition of the *Scripta Historica*, by Heinichen, was begun in 1837 (vol. i, 8vo, the *Hist. Eccles.*); and of the *Opera Omnia* by Dindorf (Leipsic, 1865-67, vols. i-iii, 8vo).

See Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i, 111; Dupin, *Auteurs Eccl.* ii, 1-15; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, ed. Harles, vii, 335 sq.; Oudin, *Script. Eccles.* i, 312 sq.; Lardner, *Works*, iv, 69 sq.; Hoffmann, *Biblog. Lexikon*, i, 98 sq.; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacrés* (Paris, 1865), iii, 168 sq.; Neander, *Ch. History*, Torrey's transl., ii, 367, 383; Jortin, *Remarks on Eccles. Hist.* (London, 1767), ii, 252; Waddington, *Church History* (in 1 vol.), ch. vi; Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, vol. iii, § 161; Alzog, *Patrologie*, § 44; Lardner, *Works*, iv, 69; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* i, 233 et al.; Dowling, *On the Study of Eccles. Hist.* p. 13 sq.; Kestner, *De Fide Eusebii* (Göttingen, 1817); Baur, *Comp. Euseb. cum Herodoto* (Tübing. 1834, 12mo); Hännell, *De Eusebio Relig. Christ. Defensore* (Götting. 1843); Lamson, *Church of the First Three Centuries*, 233 sq.; Dorner, *Person of Christ* (Edinb. transl.), div. i, vol. ii, 218 sq.; Waterland, *Works*, ii, 475 sq.

**Eusebius of DORYLÆUM**, born at the end of the fifth century, began his public life as a lawyer, and obtained the place of imperial commissioner (*agens in rebus*). Evagrius (*Hist. Eccles.* i, 9) says of him that, "while still practising as a rhetorician, he was the first to expose the blasphemy of Nestorius." It seems to have been he who interrupted Nestorius in a sermon about A. D. 430 (when he denied to Mary the title *θεοτόκος*), by crying aloud "No; the eternal Logos himself subjected himself to a second birth." This, at least, is the conclusion of Neander (*Church History*, Torrey's transl., ii, 504). He also thinks it probable that Eusebius was the author of the formal complaint publicly posted against Nestorius in the church of Constantinople, comparing him to Paul of Samosata (Neander, *l. c.*). It is possible that it was as a reward for this zeal that he was made bishop.

At all events, he entered into orders, and became bishop of Dorylæum, in Phrygia. In the year 448, at the *Home Council* (*σύνδος ἐνὶ οἴκῳ*), held at Constantinople, he entered complaint against Eutyches (whom he had previously warned privately), as holding false and blasphemous doctrines, contrary to the fathers, as to the person of Christ (Mansi, *Concil.* vi, 495, 650). See **EUTYCHES**. At this synod Eutyches was condemned, but in the next year, at the Robber-Council (see **EPHESUS, ROBBER-COUNCIL OF**), Eutyches was restored, and Eusebius condemned and deprived of his see. When he attempted at this council to explain the doctrine of two natures in Christ, voices exclaimed, "Burn Eusebius! As he has cut Christ asunder, so let him be cut asunder." He fled to Rome. The tide was turned by the death of Theodosius, A. D. 450. Leo the Great, bishop of Rome, prevailed upon Marcian, the successor of Theodosius, to convene another general council, which met at Chalcedon A. D.

451, and Eusebius was restored to his see. A few polemical writings of Eusebius are still extant, as *Conservatio adversus Nestorium* (in the works of Marius Mercator, ii, p. 18):—*Libellus adversus Eutycheten* (in Labbe, vol. iv, p. 151):—*Libellus adversus Dioscurum* (ib. vol. iv, p. 380):—*Epistola ad Marcianum imperatorem* (ib. p. 95).—Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 505-513; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xvi, 777.

**Eusebius**, bishop of Emesa, fourth century. Sozomen (*Hist. Eccles.* ii, 9) gives the following account of him: "Who this person was, George, bishop of Laodicea, who was present on this occasion, informs us; for he says, in the book which he has composed on his life, that he was descended from a noble family of Edessa, in Mesopotamia, and that from a child he had studied the Holy Scriptures; that he was afterwards instructed in Greek literature by a master resident at Edessa; and finally, that the sacred books were expounded to him by Patrophilus and Eusebius, the latter of whom presided over the church at Cæsarea, and the former over that at Scythopolis. Having afterwards gone to Antioch, about the time that Eustathius was deposed on the accusation of Cyrus of Beroea for holding the tenets of Sabellius, he lived on terms of familiar intercourse with Euphronius, that prelate's successor. When, however, a bishopric was offered him, he retired to Alexandria to avoid the intended honor, and there devoted himself to the study of philosophy. On his return to Antioch he formed an intimate acquaintance with Placitus or Flaccillus, the successor of Euphronius. At length he was ordained bishop of Alexandria by Eusebius, bishop of Constantinople, but did not go thither in consequence of the attachment of the people of that city to Athanasius. He was therefore sent to Emesa, where the inhabitants excited a sedition on account of his appointment, for they reproached him with the study and practice of judicial astrology; whereupon he fled to Laodicea and abode with George, who has given so many historical details of him. George, having taken him to Antioch, procured his being again brought back to Emesa by Flaccillus and Narcissus; but he was afterwards charged with holding the Sabellian heresy. His ordination is elaborately described by the same writer, who adds at the close that the emperor (Constantius) took him with him in his expedition against the barbarians, and that miracles were wrought by his hand" (see also Sozomen, *Hist. Ecclesiast.* iii, 6). During the latter years of his life he lived at Antioch, devoted to study. He died at Antioch about A. D. 360. Among the numerous works of Eusebius, Jerome mentions treatises against the Jews, the Pagans, and Novatians; a Commentary, in 10 books, to the Epistle to the Galatians, and Homilies on the Gospels. Theodoret mentions works of Eusebius against the Marcionites and Manichæans; Ebedjesu, Questions on the Old Testament; and Xenajas (Asseman, *Bibl.* ii, p. 28) a work on faith, and other addresses. Of all these works only fragments are extant. Two homilies (against Marcellus) undoubtedly belonging to him were falsely ascribed to Eusebius of Cæsarea. Some homilies are of a more recent date. See **EUSEBIUS OF ALEXANDRIA**. A biography of Eusebius, by bishop George, of Laodicea, is lost. A work on Eusebius and his writings has been written by Augusti (*Euseb. Emes. opuscula quæ supersunt græca*, Elberfeld, 1829); and some of the statements in this work have been refuted by Thilo (*Ueber d. Schriften des Euseb. v. Alex. u. des Euseb. von Emisa* (Halle, 1832). Some of the homilies ascribed to Eusebius of Cæsarea are attributed to Eusebius of Emesa.

**Eusebius**, a Nitrian monk (beginning of 5th century), one of the "four tall brothers" condemned by Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, for defending the opinions of Origen. The three others were Dioscurus, Ammonius, and Euthymius. They retired first to Je-



rusalem and Scythopolis, and then to Constantinople, where Chrysostom received them kindly, but did not admit them to communion. They were "pious men, though not wholly exempt from a certain fanatical ascetic tendency."—Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 691; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* viii, 12, 13; Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* vi, 7.

**Eusebius of LAODICEA**, a native of Alexandria, and therefore sometimes called Eusebius of Alexandria. As deacon in Alexandria, he accompanied his bishop, Dionysius, in the Valerian persecution of Christians before the proconsul Emilianus (257), and by nursing the imprisoned Christians and burying the martyrs gave a shining testimony of his undaunted faith. When (from 260 to 263) a terrible epidemic and civil war devastated Alexandria, Eusebius again distinguished himself by his zeal in nursing the sick, both pagan and Christian, and, in union with his friend Anatolius, procured relief to thousands of inhabitants who were threatened with starvation. In 264 he attended, as the representative of bishop Dionysius, whom old age and sickness retained in Alexandria, the Synod of Antioch, which was to take action on the heresy of Paul of Samosata. Subsequently he became bishop of Laodicea in Syria, where he died in 270. He was succeeded by his friend Anatolius.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* iv, 240; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vii, 32. (A. J. S.)

**Eusebius of NICOMEDIA**, who may be called the leader, if not the organizer, of the Arian party in the fourth century, was a distant relative of the emperor Julian, and was born about A. D. 324 (Ammianus Marcellinus, *Hist.* xxii, 9). He was first bishop of Berytus, in Phœnicia, but got himself translated to Nicomedia—Theodoret says (i, 19) in violation of the canons—by the influence of Constantia, sister of the emperor Constantine, whose confidence he had completely won. After the excommunication of Arius by Alexander, bishop of Alexandria (A. D. 321), Eusebius took Arius (who had written him a letter asking his aid) under his protection, offered him an asylum in his own house, and wrote urgently, though at the present time respectfully, in his favor, to Alexander, the patriarch of Alexandria (for details, see **ARIANISM**, vol. i, p. 389). As Eusebius had been a disciple of Lucian, he probably held the opinions of Arius at the time. Socrates says that "Eusebius of Nicomedia and his partisans, with such as embraced the sentiments of Arius, demanded by letter that the sentence of excommunication which had been pronounced against him should be rescinded, and that those who had been excluded should be readmitted into the Church, as they held no unsound doctrine" (*Hist. Eccl.* i, 6; see also Sozomen, i, 15).

At the Council of Niceæ (A. D. 325), Eusebius and his friends used all possible efforts first to carry their own opinions through, and then to hinder a definitive sentence. Their opposition was finally concentrated against the application of the term *ὁμοούσιος* (*consubstantial*) to the Son. All opposition failed, and the orthodox doctrine was established by the council. See **ARIANISM**, vol. i, p. 389; **NICEÆ, COUNCIL OF**. Eusebius, finding himself standing nearly alone, affixed his signature at last. Philostorgius (i, 9) asserts that instead of the term *ὁμοούσιος* (of the same essence), Eusebius and his friends secretly introduced the semi-Arian term *ὁμοεισίστος* (of like essence); but the statements of Philostorgius are not to be implicitly believed. The decree of the council contained not only the Nicene Creed, but also an anathema of certain propositions of Arius. This last Eusebius refused to sign, declaring to the council that he "submitted to their determinations concerning the faith, and consented to subscribe to it, even admitting the word *consubstantial*, according to the genuine signification of it, and consequently that he held no erroneous opinion; but that as for the condemnation of Arius, he could

not subscribe to it; not that he had a mind to reject the points of faith which they had decided, but because he did not think that he, whom they accused, was in the error that they laid to his charge: that, on the contrary, he was entirely persuaded, by the letters which he received from him, and by the conferences which he had had with him, that he was a man whose sentiments were entirely different from those for which he was condemned." Theognis of Nice, Theonas of Marmorica, and Secundus of Ptolemais, agreed with him in this. The council condemned them as heretics, and Constantine condemned them to banishment. But Arius, Theonas, and Secundus having submitted, Eusebius and Theognis finally signed, and were forgiven by the emperor.

Soon after the close of the council "Eusebius showed a desire to revive the controversy, for which he was deprived of his see and banished into Gaul. On this occasion Constantine addressed a letter to the people of Nicomedia, censuring their exiled bishop in the strongest manner as disaffected to his government, as the principal supporter of heresy, and a man wholly regardless of truth (Theodoret, *Eccl. Hist.* i, 20). But he did not long remain under the imperial displeasure; indeed, he subsequently so completely regained Constantine's favor as to be selected to baptize him, not long before his death (A. D. 337). His Arian feelings, however, broke out again. He procured the deprivation of Eustathius (q. v.), bishop of Antioch, and, if we may believe Theodoret (i, 21), by suborning a woman to bring against him a false accusation of the most infamous kind. He was, perhaps, the most bitter opponent of Athanasius (see **ATHANASIUS**), and exerted himself to procure the restoration of Arius to the full privileges of churchmanship, menacing Alexander, bishop of Constantinople, with deposition unless he at once admitted him to the holy communion, in which he would have succeeded but for the sudden death of Arius. In 339 Eusebius managed to procure his election to the see of Constantinople, in defiance of a canon against translations agreed to at Niceæ. He died about A. D. 342. Though Eusebius lies under the disadvantage of having his character handed down to posterity almost entirely by the description of theological enemies, yet it is difficult to imagine that he was in any way deserving of esteem. His signature to the Nicene Creed was a gross evasion; nor can he be considered to have signed it merely as an article of peace, since he was ever afterwards a zealous opponent of its principles. It can scarcely be doubted that he was worldly and ambitious. Athanasius considers him as the teacher rather than the disciple of Arius; and afterwards, when the Arians were divided among themselves into parties, those who maintained the perfect likeness which the substance of the Son bore to that of the father (*Homoiouians*) against the Consubstantialists on the one hand, and the pure Arians or *Anomoiouians* on the other, pleaded the authority of this Eusebius. The tenets of this party were sanctioned by the Council of Seleucia, A. D. 359" (Smith, *Dict. of Biography*, s. v.). See, besides the works already cited, Cave, *Hist. Lit.* (Genev.) i, 118; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 367 sq.; Newman, *History of the Arians*; Lardner, *Works*, iii, 594; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* iv, 242; Waterland, *Works* (Oxf. 1843), ii, 369 sq.

**Eusebius of VERCELLI**, was born in Sardinia; was baptized in Rome by pope Eusebius; and became *lector*, or ecclesiastical reader at Rome. He was ordained bishop of Vercelli, in Piedmont, A. D. 340, with the unanimous consent of clergy and people. He was the first in the West who united the monastic life with the clerical (Ambrose, cited by Ceillier, v, 500). Pope Liberius requested him to go with Lucifer of Cagliari, and other legates, on an embassy to Constantius, by whom the persecution of Athanasius had been sanctioned. They visited the emperor (at Arles or Valence), and prevailed on him to summon the Council

of Milan, which met A.D. 355. The Eusebians (Arians) at this council urged the condemnation of Athanasius, and the emperor sided with them. Eusebius of Vercelli having received the emperor's order to sign the condemnation of Athanasius, refused, but expressed his willingness to subscribe the Nicene Creed. Lucifer of Cagliari and Dionysius of Milan refused also. The third session was held in the palace, the Arian party fearing the violence of the people. The emperor himself then sent for the three above-mentioned bishops, and commanded them either to sign the document or to prepare for banishment; they, on their part, earnestly entreated him to remember the account he would be called upon to give in the day of judgment, and besought him not to introduce the heresy of Arius into the Church; but all was of no avail, and Eusebius, Dionysius, and Lucifer were sentenced to banishment. At Scythopolis, in Palestine, his place of exile, he was warmly welcomed, and also encouraged by an embassy from his people at Vercelli. But at last he was brutally outraged, dragged naked through the streets, and imprisoned in a dungeon. He was then transferred to Cappadocia, and thence to the Thebaid (Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* iii, 4; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* v, 12). After the death of Constantius, his successor, Julian, issued an edict recalling the exiled bishops. Eusebius went first to Alexandria, where he stood by Athanasius in the council of A.D. 362 in taking measures to heal the Antiochian schism. See **EUSTATHIANS**. The council sent him to Antioch to end the strife there, but the ordination of Paulinus (q. v.) by Lucifer of Cagliari had made matters worse than ever. After travelling through the East he returned to Italy, where he was welcomed with enthusiasm, particularly in his own diocese. He showed himself, in the latter years of his life, a great admirer of monasticism, and introduced among the clergy of his diocese the common life. Having learned that the bishop Auxentius, of Milan, with the support of the emperor Valentinian, was very actively laboring for the triumph of Arianism, Eusebius, in 364, suddenly appeared in Milan to attack Arianism in its stronghold, but the emperor soon ordered him back to his diocese. He died in 371. An inscription on his tomb calls him a martyr, and, according to a later legend, he was killed by the Arians; but the writers that are best informed about him (Ambrose, Gregory of Tours, etc.) know nothing of his martyrdom. The Church of Rome formerly commemorated him as a martyr on the 1st of August, and now on the 16th of December. We possess three *Epistole* of Eusebius: 1. *Ad Constantium Augustum*.—2. *Ad presbyteros et plebes Italie*, written on the occasion of his banishment, to which is attached *Libellus facti*, a sort of protest against the violent conduct of the Arian bishop Patrophilus, who was in some sort his jailor during his residence at Scythopolis:—3. *Ad Gregorium Episc. Hisp.*, found among the fragments of Hilary (xi, § 5). He executed, also, a translation of the Commentary of his namesake, Eusebius of Cæsarea, on the Psalms; and an edition of the Evangelists, from a copy said to be transcribed by his own hand, preserved at Vercelli, was published at Milan (1748, 4to) by J. A. Irico; and again by Bianchini, at Rome, 1748. This edition is given also in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* vol. xii. The *Epistole* will be found in *Bibl. Patr. Galland.* vol. v; part of them in *Bib. Max. Patr.* vol. v; and all in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* vol. xii.—Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, iv, 245; Möhler, *Athanasius der Grosse*; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacrés* (Paris, 1865), iv, 271 sq.

**Eusebius, Sr.**, of SAMOSATA, one of the pillars of the orthodox Church of the fourth century in its conflicts with Arianism. Nothing is known of his early life. He was appointed bishop of Samosata in 361, and in the same year was present at the Synod of Antioch, at which both Arians and Catholics elected Meletius patriarch of Antioch. The document of elec-

tion, signed by both parties, was deposited with Eusebius. When Meletius, in his very first sermon, declared himself strongly in favor of the doctrine of the Council of Nice, the Arians induced the emperor to demand from Eusebius the surrender of the certificate of election. On his refusal he was threatened with having his right hand cut off; but he resolutely held out both hands, declaring his readiness to lose both his hands rather than "resign a document containing so manifest a demonstration of the impiety of the Arians" (Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* ii, 32). During the persecution of the orthodox by Valens, he travelled, disguised as a soldier, through Syria, Phœnicia, and Palestine, everywhere consecrating orthodox priests, and confirming the people in the Nicene faith. At the disputed election of a bishop for Cæsarea, in Cappadocia (370), he aided in securing the success of the orthodox Basil (q. v.). He ever after remained an intimate friend of Basil, and with him, in 372 and 373, took a leading part in the effort to secure, with the support of the Western churches, the success of the Nicene party also in the East. He was, therefore, a special object of hatred to the Arians, who in 373 prevailed upon the emperor to exile him to Thracia. After the death of Valens (378) Eusebius was allowed to return to his diocese. He at once began to display an extraordinary activity in appointing Nicene in the place of Arian bishops. While entering the town of Dolica for this purpose in 379 (or 380), he was killed by a stone thrown by the hand of some Arian woman (Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* v, 4). The Church of Rome venerates him as a saint on July 21, and the Greek Church on July 22.—Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 499; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacrés* (Paris, 1865), v, 1 sq. (A. J. S.)

**Eusebius**, bishop of Thessalonica, A.D. 601, wrote against the *Aphthartodoctes*, especially in reply to a monk Andreas, "who taught that Christ's body became incorruptible when joined to his divinity; that Adam's body was not created liable to corruption; and that the world, in its original form, was incorruptible also." These and other errors Eusebius wished him to retract; but, instead of prevailing, Andreas attempted to fortify his posts by farther defences, which induced Eusebius to write ten books against the positions he had before attacked, showing that Andreas had misunderstood Scripture and wilfully misquoted the fathers. Of these works there are no remains except what are preserved by Photius in his *Biblioth. Cod.* 162.—Cave, *Hist. Lit.* (Genev. 1720), i, 373; Clarke, *Succ. Sac. Lit.* ii, 376.

**Eustathians**. 1. Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, was deposed at the Arian Council of A.D. 331. See **EUSTATHIUS**. The orthodox people of Antioch refused to receive an Arian bishop as his successor, and kept aloof, thereby gaining the name "Eustathians." In A.D. 360, Meletius (q. v.) was transferred by the Arians from the see of Sebaste to Antioch; but, though he adhered to the Nicene Creed, the "Eustathians" would not recognise him, as they refused to regard an Arian ordination. A moderate party, however, of the orthodox in Antioch did recognise him, and so arose the opposition of the "Meletians" to the "Eustathians." The schism was made worse by the appointment of Paulinus (A.D. 362) as bishop of the Eustathians. The Western churches, with the Egyptian, recognised Paulinus, while the Orientals recognised Meletius.—Neander, *Ch. Hist.* Torrey's transl. ii, 411; Guericke, *Ch. Hist.* Shedd's transl. § 85. See **MELETIUS**.

2. A sect in the fourth century, which taught that married people were excluded from salvation, prohibited their followers from praying in their houses, and obliged them to quit all their possessions as incompatible with the hope of salvation. They wore a particular habit; appointed Sunday as a fast, and taught that the ordinary fasts of the Church are needless after

people have attained to a certain degree of purity. The sect probably derived its name from Eustathius, semi-Arian bishop of Sebaste († 380), who was condemned in the Council of Gangra, in Paphlagonia, held between the years 326 and 341. But it has been strongly argued on the other hand that the Eustathius who founded the sect was a different person, an Armenian monk. Walch (*Hist. d. Ketzereien*, iii, 536) has treated the subject at large.—Murd. Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* bk. ii, c. iv, pt. ii, ch. iii, § 19, n. 39; Socrates, *H. E.* ii, 43; Sozomen, *H. E.* iii, 14; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 419; Dupin, *Hist. Eccl.* cent. iv; Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. xxii, ch. i, § 8. See EUSTATHIUS OF SEBASTE.

**Eustathius of Antioch** was born at Sida, in Pamphylia (Hieron. *Catal.* 85). He was for some time bishop of Berea, from whence he was translated to the see of Antioch in 325 by the unanimous suffrage of clergy and people (Theodoret, *H. E.* i, 7). At the Council of Nice, in 325, he earnestly opposed the Arians, who, at the (Arian) Synod of Antioch, A. D. 331, took their revenge upon him. Eusebius of Nicomedia (or Cyrus of Berea) charged him with Sabellianism (Socrates, *H. E.* i, 24); but, according to Sozomen (*H. E.* ii, 19), the pretext resorted to for his deposition was that he "had defiled the priesthood by unholy deeds." The synod deposed him, and the people of Antioch were stirred by the act almost to the point of sedition. This angered Constantine, who, moreover, was now, under the influence of Eusebius of Nicomedia, favorable to the Arians. Eustathius had also incurred the ill will of Eusebius of Caesarea, whom he charged with unfaithfulness to the Nicene Creed. He was banished to Thrace, where he died before A. D. 337 (Socrates, i, 24, 25; Sozomen, *l. c.*). His innocence as to the charge of immorality was fully shown by the confession of the woman who had sworn against him. The orthodox people of Antioch refused to acknowledge any other bishop, and, so long as they remained in this separate condition (until the fifth century), they were called Eustathians (Neander, *Ch. Hist.* Torrey's, ii, 411). Eustathius was a thorough opponent of the school of Origen, and this constituted one of the points of antagonism between him and Eusebius of Caesarea. He was a copious writer, but only one work of his known to be genuine is now extant, viz. "Κατὰ Ωριγίνου διαγνωστικός εἰς τὸ τῆς ἑγγαστρομύθου θεώρημα," against Origen, on the subject of the Pythoness consulted by Saul. Origen had asserted that the witch of Endor had really brought up the spirit of Samuel; Eustathius refutes him with great acuteness, but also not without an unworthy disdain in replying to so great a man. This treatise is to be found at the end of Leo Allatius's edition of the *Heptameron* (1629, 4to, improperly ascribed to Eustathius). It is also given in the *Critica Sacra*, viii, 331 sq., and in *Bibl. Mus. Patr.* xvii. There are fragments of a treatise of his on *The Soul*, and of his *Homilies*; all of which, with the treatise against Origen above named, are given in Migne, *Patrol. Græc.* xviii, 614 sq. See Fabricius, *Bib. Græca*, ed. Harles, ix, 131 sq.; Oudin, *Script. Eccles.* i, 317 sq.; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacrés*, Paris, 1865, iii, 168 sq.; Cave, *Hist. Lit. Genev.* 1720, i, 119; Lardner, *Works*, iv, 149; Dorner, *Person of Christ*, Edinburgh transl., div. i, vol. ii, p. 518 sq.

**Eustathius of Thessalonica**, one of the most learned bishops of the Greek Church in the Middle Ages, was a native of Constantinople. He was at first a monk, subsequently a deacon of the church of St. Sophia, and a teacher of eloquence. He also held a position at the court, having charge of all petitions, and in this capacity presented to the emperor a petition of the city of Constantinople on the occasion of a great scarcity of water. In this period of his life Eustathius compiled his celebrated commentaries on Greek classics, which give proof of an immense amount of reading, and are the more valuable as they contain many extracts from works which are now lost. It is

especially the commentary on Homer (Rome, 1542-50, 4 vols.; Basel, 1559-60, 3 vols.; with register by Devarius, edited by Stallbaum, Leips. 1825-30, 6 vols.), which is a storehouse of learning. Of his commentary on Pindar, only the *proemium* is now extant (published by Schneidewin, Götting, 1837). In 1174 (or 1175) he was elected bishop of Myra, in Lycia, but before he had assumed the administration of this diocese the emperor appointed him metropolitan of Thessalonica. In 1180, when the emperor Manuel desired a mitigation of the formula of abjuration which the converts from Mohammedanism had to pronounce, Eustathius, at the synod, firmly opposed the emperor, who was greatly displeased with this opposition, but nevertheless remained a patron of Eustathius. When, in 1185, Thessalonica was conquered and plundered by the Normans under William II of Sicily, Eustathius was indefatigable in his efforts in behalf of the city. His theological writings were for the first time published by Dr. Tafel (*Opuscula e codd. Basil. Paris. Veneto, nunc primum editi* Th. L. F. Tafel, Francof. 1832; and with an Appendix, in Tafel, *De Thessalonica*, Berlin, 1839). They are noted for outspoken evangelical sentiments. Of special importance in this respect is the work *Meditations on the Monastic State* (εὐσεβείας βίου μοναχικοί; transl. into German [*Betrachtungen über d. Mönchsstand*] by G. L. F. Tafel, Berlin, 1847). Some of his works, e. g. a commentary on John of Damascus, are still extant in MS. Eustathius died in Thessalonica about 1194.—Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* iv, 247; Wetzler u. Welte, *Kirch.-Ler.* iii, 771; Neander, *Karakteristik des Eustathius in seiner reformator. Richtung*, in Neander, *Wissenschaftliche Abhandl.* (Berlin, 1851). (A. J. S.)

**Eustathius**, semi-Arian bishop of Sebaste, in Armenia, in the fourth century, was a great advocate of monasticism, which he introduced into Armenia. The ascetic fanatics called Eustathians are supposed to have taken their name and their practices from him (but see EUSTATHIANS, 2). He also founded in Sebaste a hospital for the poor, over which he placed Ærius, then his devoted friend. But later Ærius charged him with avarice, and they quarrelled. See ÆRIANS. Eustathius died about A. D. 380.—Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* ii, 43; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* iii, 14; Neander, *Church Hist.* Torrey's transl. ii, 342; Helefer, *Conciliengeschichte*, i, 652 sq.

**Eustochium**, JULIA, was born at Rome about A. D. 365. A daughter of Paula (q. v.), she imitated the ascetic piety of her mother. In 382 she took the vow of virginity, and put herself under the direction of Jerome, who gave her instructions relative to the life she had chosen. It was for her that he wrote (383) his treatise on *Virginity*. On his departure from Rome, Paula and Eustochium accompanied him, and settled near him in a monastery near Bethlehem. After the death of Paula (403), Eustochium succeeded her as superior of the monastery. So greatly was she profited by Jerome's instructions that she gained a knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew languages. To her Jerome dedicated his Commentaries on Ezekiel and Isaiah. He translated also the rules of Pachomius into Latin for the use of the members of the monastery at Bethlehem. In 416 the Pelagians burned this monastery and outraged the inmates. She is celebrated as a saint in the Roman Church on the 28th of September.—Hoefler, *Now. Biog. Générale*, xvi, 792; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, ix, 775; Milman, *Hist. of Christianity* (N. Y. 1866), iii, 234.

**Euthalius**, bishop of Sulce, 5th century, is supposed to have been the first to divide the N. T. into verses. Some of the poetical parts of the O. T. had been arranged in lines (στίχοι), and Euthalius (A. D. 438) divided Paul's epistles into verses. Afterwards he so arranged Acts and the Catholic Epistles. The division into chapters had been made by a previous writer (A. D. 396), and Euthalius adopted it. Erasmus,

in his N. T., inserts the Arguments of Euthalius to the Acts and to Paul's epistles. His *Prologue to St. Paul's Epistles*, including a sketch of Paul's life, was published by J. H. Boecelerus at the end of his N. T. (Argentero, 1645, 1660). All the remains of Euthalius are given by Zaccagni, *Coll. Mon. Vet. Eccles. Græc.* (Rome, 1698, 4to).—Horne, *Introduction*, pt. i, ch. ii, § 3; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* (Genev. 1720), i.

**Euthymius Zigabēnus** (or ZIGADENUS), a Greek monk and theologian of the 12th century. He lived in the time of the emperor Alexius Comnenus (about A. D. 1120), and was his intimate friend. Of his life little is known, except from the *Alexius* of Anna Comnena (lib. xv), who praises his talent and scholarship. The following writings of his have been published: (1.) *Πανοπλία δογματική, Παροπλία Δογματικά*, against all heresies, written by the order of Alexius Comnenus, and divided into two parts and 24 sections, each treating of a heresy. It consists chiefly of digested extracts from preceding writers. A Latin translation of it was published by Zinus (Venice, 1555, fol.; reprinted at Lyons, 1556 and 1580, 8vo); also in *Bibl. Patrum* (Lyons), xix. This translation omits the 12th and 13th titles "against the Pope and the Italians." The Greek original was published at Tergovist, in Wallachia (1710, fol.), and is very rare. It omits the last title, which is contained in Sylburg's *Saraceniæ*, p. 1-54. (2.) *Victoria et triumphus de impiâ Massaliamorum secta*, etc. (Victory and Triumph over the impious, manifold, and execrable sect of the Messalians, etc.), together with fourteen anathemas against them; edited, Gr., with Latin version and notes, by Tollius, in his *Insignia Itineris Italici* (Traject. ad Rhen. 1696, 4to); also in Gallandii *Bibl. Patr.* xiv; 293. (3.) *Commentarius in Psalmos* (*Commentary on all the Psalms of David*); Latin version by Saulus (Verona, 1530, fol.; often reprinted); also (Gr. and Lat.) in Theophylacti *Opera Omnia*, vol. iv (Venet. 1763, fol.). (4.) A *Commentary on the four Gospels*, his most important work, compiled from St. Chrysostom and other fathers; Latin version by J. Hentenius (Louvain, 1544, fol.; Paris, 1547, 1560, and 1602, 8vo); best edited, by C. F. Matthæi, Gr. and Lat. (Lips. 1792, 4 vols.). The work is still considered one of great value. See Matthæi's preface for full notices of Euthymius, and for the judgments of the learned concerning his writings. Many of his writings yet remain in MS. All his published works are given in Migne, *Patrologia Græca*, vol. cxxviii-cxxxii.—Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, ed. Harles, viii, 328 sq.; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* (Genev. 1720), i, 567; Oudin, *Script. Eccles.* ii, 979; Lardner, *Works*, v, 164; Ullmann, in *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1833, p. 647 sq.

**Eutyches**, the so-called founder of Eutychianism, though the opinions advocated by him existed before (see Selig, *De Eutychianismo ante Eutychen*). His name Eutyches means "the Fortunate, but his opponents said he should rather have been named *Atyches*, the Unfortunate. He must not be confounded with the deacon Eutyches, who attended Cyril to the Council of Ephesus. Leo the Great, in his renowned letter to Flavian, calls him very 'ignorant and unskilled,' multum imprudens et nimis imperitus, and justly attributes his error rather to imperitia than to versutia. So also Petavius and Hefele (ii, 300). His relation to the Alexandrian Christology is like that of Nestorius to the Antiochian; that is, he drew it to a head, brought it to popular expression, and adhered obstinately to it; but he is considerably inferior to Nestorius in talent and learning. His connection with this controversy is in a great measure accidental" (Schaff, *Hist. of Christ. Church*, iii, 736). He led, from his early age, an ascetic life; was for thirty years archimandrite of a monastery near Constantinople, and had reached his 70th year without being known for anything except his illiterate fanaticism, his intimate relations with the all-powerful Chrysaphius, minister of Theodosius, and his

influence with the monastic party which blindly followed the lead of Cyril of Alexandria. He used his influence in favor of Cyril at the Œcumenical Council of Ephesus, a copy of the minutes of which was sent to him by Cyril. After the death of Cyril he was on intimate terms with Cyril's successor, Dioscurus (q. v.). In 448 Eutyches wrote a letter to the Roman bishop Leo to prejudice him against the school of Antioch (q. v.), which, he insinuated, was bent on reviving Nestorianism. To counteract his operations, patriarch Domnus, of Antioch, in 448 charged Eutyches with renewing the heresy of Apollinaris. No notice seems to have been taken at the imperial court of this charge; but the charges brought against him before the Synod of Constantinople (448) by his former friend Eusebius, bishop of Dorylæum (q. v.), had more effect. Patriarch Flavian, of Constantinople (q. v.), wished to avoid taking any decisive action, but Eusebius prevailed upon the synod to summon Eutyches. The latter, after making several excuses, obeyed the third summons, and presented himself before the synod, attended by a large number of monks and imperial officers. He defended his views in a long speech, but the synod, largely consisting of adherents of the Antioch school, found him guilty of heresy, and, in spite of all the secular pressure brought to bear upon them in favor of Eutyches, deprived him of his position of archimandrite, and excommunicated him. Eutyches, with the aid of his friend Chrysaphius, obtained from the emperor a revision of the trial by a new general council to be convoked at Ephesus. Flavian and Leo of Rome strenuously opposed the holding of the council. Leo, who had been written to by both parties, was encouraged by this circumstance to claim a right to decide the controversy, and for this purpose wrote the celebrated epistle to Flavian (Mansi, v, 1266 sq.). See the article CHALCEDON, vol. ii, p. 196; and LEO. But, owing to the influence of Eutyches and Dioscurus of Alexandria, the council was held, under the presidency of Dioscurus, and, amidst scenes of unheard-of violence, which have given to the council the name of the Robber Council, the bishops were compelled to restore Eutyches to the Church and his former position, and to condemn the prominent men of the Antioch school. See EPHESUS, ROBBER-COUNCIL OF. The emperor promptly sanctioned this decision, and thus Eutychianism was on the point of becoming the predominant doctrine of the Eastern Church, when the death of Theodosius (450) gave a new turn to the controversy. The empress Pulcheria and her husband Marcian sympathized with the opponents of Eutyches, recalled the exiled bishops, and convened the Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon (451), which condemned the views held by Eutyches, and declared that "in Christ two distinct natures are united in one person, and that without any change, mixture, or confusion." See CHALCEDON, COUNCIL OF. Even before the meeting of the council Eutyches had again been excommunicated by patriarch Anatolius of Constantinople, and expelled from his monastery by Marcian. The council did not again condemn him by name. Of the last years of Eutyches we only know that he died in exile.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* iv, 251; Baur, *Lehre von d. Dreieinigkeith*, i, 800; Neander, *Church History* (Torrey's), iii, 501-505; Dörner, *Person of Christ*, div. ii, vol. i and ii; Waterland, *Works* (Oxford), iii, 411, 481. (A. J. S.)

**Eutychianism**, the name of a doctrinal system called after Eutyches, according to which there was in Christ only one nature, that of the incarnate Word, his human nature having been absorbed in a manner by his divine nature. Eutyches, like Cyril, laid chief stress on the divine in Christ, and denied that two natures could be spoken of after the incarnation. In our Lord, after his birth, he worshipped only one nature, the nature of God become flesh and man: *μὴν φύσιν προσκυνεῖν, καὶ ταύτην Θεοῦ σαρκωθέντος καὶ ἰαν-*

Ἐρωπήσαντος, or, as he declared before the synod at Constantinople, 'Ὁμολογῶ ἐκ δύο φύσεων γεγενῆσθαι τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν πρὸ τῆς ἐνίσεως· μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἔνωσιν μίαν φύσιν ὁμολογῶ (Mansi, vi, 744). In behalf of his view he appealed to the Scriptures, to Athanasius and Cyril, and to the Council of Ephesus in 431. The impersonal human nature is assimilated, and, as it were, deified by the personal Logos, so that his body is by no means of the same substance (ὁμοούσιον) with ours, but a divine body. All human attributes are transferred to the one subject, the humanized Logos. Hence it may and must be said, God is born, God suffered, God was crucified and died. He asserted, therefore, on the one hand, the capability of suffering and death in the Logos-personality, and, on the other hand, the deification of the human in Christ. The other side imputed to Eutychianism the doctrine of a heavenly body, or of an apparent body, or of the transformation of the Logos into flesh. So Theodoret (*Fab. her.* iv, 13). Eutyches said Christ had a σῶμα ἀνθρώπου, but not a σῶμα ἀνθρώπινον, and he denied the consubstantiality of his σῶμα with ours. Yet he expressly guarded himself against Docetism, and against all speculation: Φυσιολογεῖν ἡμαντῆρ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω. He was really neither a philosopher nor a theologian, but only insisted on some theological opinions and points of doctrine with great tenacity and obstinacy" (Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, iii, 737 sq.).

Bishop Forbes cites Photius and Johannes Damascenus aptly on Eutychianism as follows, viz.: "If there be one nature in Christ, it is either the divine or the human nature; if it be only the divine nature, where is the human? and if there be only the human, you cannot escape from denying the divine. But if it be something different from these (for this is the only other alternative they have, and they seem to lean that way), how shall not in that case Christ be of a different nature, both from his Father and from us? Can anything be more impious or absurd to say that the Word of God, who is God, became man, to the corruption of his own deity, and to the annihilation of the humanity he assumed? For this absolutely follows with those who have dared to speak of Christ as of neither nature, but of one besides these" (Photius, *Epist.* i, cont. *Eutych. cū. Suicer*). "The two natures were without conversion or alteration joined together, and the divine nature did not depart from its own simplicity, nor did the nature of man turn into the nature of God, nor was it deprived of existence, nor was one composite nature made out of two; for a composite nature cannot be consubstantial with either of those natures from whence it is compounded. If, therefore, according to the heretics, Christ exist in one compounded nature after the union, he is changed from a simple into a compounded nature, and is not consubstantial with his Father, who is of a simple nature, nor with his mother, for she is not made up of the Godhead and manhood. And he will be neither in the Godhead nor in the manhood, nor will he be called God or man, but Christ only; and Christ will be the name not of his person, but of his own nature, as they deem. But we do not hold Christ to be of a composite nature, as the body and soul make the man, but we believe and confess that he is of the Godhead and manhood; perfect God and perfect man from and in two natures. Were he of one nature, the same nature would be at once created and increate, simple and composite, mortal and immortal. And the union of two natures in Jesus Christ has taken place neither by disorder (ἁρμογῆς) nor by mixture (syncrasis or anacrisis), as Eutyches, Dioscorus (of Alexandria), and Severus say; neither is it personal (προσωπικῶς) nor relative, nor κατ' ἄξιαν, nor from identity of will, nor from equality of honor, nor from the same name, as Nestorius, Diodorus (of Tarsus), and Theodorus (of Mopsuestia) said; but by synthesis; or personally

(κατ' ὑπόστασιν), immutably, inconfusedly, unalterably, inherently, inseparably, in two perfect natures in one person. And we term this union essential (ὀυσιωδῶς), that is, true and not fantastic; essential, not in that one nature is made of the two, but that they are mutually united in truth into one composite person of the Son of God. And their substantial differences are preserved, for that which is created remains created, and that which is increate remains increate; the mortal remains mortal, the immortal abides immortal. The one shines forth in miracles, the other submits to injuries; and the Word appropriates to itself that which is of man. For its are the things that pertain to the Sacred Flesh, and it gives its own properties to the flesh, according to the law of the communication of properties and the unity of person, for he is the same who performs both the God-like and the man-like actions in either form with the communion of the other. Wherefore the Lord of glory is said to be crucified, although the divine nature did not suffer, and the Son of man, even before his passion, is confessed to be in heaven, as the Lord himself said (John iii) For there is one and the same Lord of glory, who is naturally and in truth the Son of man, that is, made man. We acknowledge both his miracles and his sufferings, though the first were performed according to one nature, the latter endured according to the other. Thus we know that his one person and his two natures are preserved. By the difference of the natures he is, on the one hand, one with the Father and the Holy Ghost; on the other hand, he is one with his mother and with us. And these two natures are joined in one composite person, in which he differs as from the Father and the Holy Ghost, so from his mother and us also" (Joh. Damascenus, *Fid. Orth.* iii, 3, abr.). Bishop Forbes adds: "Now we have all a great tendency to Eutychianism. It gets over a great difficulty in the reception of truth to believe the humanity of our Lord destroyed. For faith now requires of us to believe that the human body of Jesus Christ still is, and that to it the Word is hypostatically joined, and that beyond the spheres and systems of which we are cognizant, it, partaking of our nature, is at the right hand of God" (*On the Nicene Creed*, Oxford, 1852, p. 201 sq.).

The Council of Chalcedon (A. D. 451) adopted the doctrine stated by pope Leo in his letter to Flavianus [see *Leo*], viz. in substance, "that in Christ two distinct natures were united in one person, without any change, mixture, or confusion." The Creed of Chalcedon states that "the one Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, is of one substance with the Father according to the Godhead, and of one substance with us according to the manhood—like to us in all things except sin; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, in two natures, without confusion, without conversion, without division, without separation—the difference of the natures not being taken away by reason of the unity, but the propriety of each being preserved and joined together to form one person." The creed of the council was not by any means universally received in the East. But the name Eutychianism gave way to that of Monophysitism. The ecclesiastical organizations adhering to the heresy are commonly known by the names of Jacobites, Armenian Church, Copts, and Abyssinian Church (see the special articles on these churches). For a sketch of the fortunes of the theory known as Eutychianism, see *MONOPHYTES*. See also *CHALCEDON*; *CHRISTOLOGY*; *EUTYCHES*; *DIOSCURI*; and consult Pearson, *On the Creed* (Oxford, 1820), ii, 179 sq.; Schaff, *Ch. History*, i. c.; Waterland, *Works* (Oxford), iii, 115, 411; Heffele, *Conciliengeschichte*, ii, 249 et al.; Baur, *Dogmengeschichte*, i, 2, 256 sq.; Cunningham, *Historical Theology*, ch. x, § 1.

**Eutychianus**, pope and martyr, succeeded Felix I, bishop of Rome, Jan. 275; died as martyr and confessor Dec. 8, 283. Some decretals are ascribed to him,

which may be found in Migne's ed. of the remains of *Sixti Pope*, et al. (*Patrol. Latina*, vol. v).

**Euty chius** OF CONSTANTINOPLE "was originally a monk of the town of Amaseia, whence he was sent by his fellow-citizens to Constantinople as proxy for their bishop. The great talent he displayed in some theological controversy gained him general admiration, and the emperor, in A.D. 553, raised him to the highest dignity in the Church at Constantinople. In the same year he accordingly presided at an oecumenical synod which was held in that city. In A.D. 564 he incurred the anger of the emperor Justinian by refusing to give his assent to a decree respecting the incorruptibility of the body of Christ previous to his resurrection, and was expelled from his see in consequence. He was at first confined in a monastery, then transported to an island, Princeps, and at last to his original convent, Amaseia. In 578 the emperor Tiberius restored him to his see, which he henceforth retained until his death in 585, at the age of 73. There is extant by him a letter addressed to pope Vigilius on the occasion of his elevation in A.D. 553. It is printed in Greek and Latin among the *Acta Synodi quintæ Concil.* v, 425, etc. He also wrote other treatises, which, however, are lost" (Smith, *Dict. of Biography*, s. v.).—Evagrius, *Hist. Eccl.* iv, 38; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* (Genev. 1720) i, 341.

**Euty chius**, patriarch of Alexandria, was born at Postat (ancient Cairo) in 876. His Arabic name was *Said-ibn-Batrik*. He was originally a physician, applied himself to the study of theology towards the close of his life, and was elected Melchite (or orthodox) patriarch of Alexandria in 933, and died about A.D. 946. He wrote, in Arabic, a *Chronicle* or *Annals* from the creation of the world to A.D. 937, under the Arabic title *Natlm-el-Ganhar, String of Pearls*; translated and edited by E. Pococke under the title *Contectio Gemmarum, sive Annales*, Arab. et Lat. (Oxonii, 1658-59, some copies 1656-64, 2 vols. 4to).—*Fragmenta duo de Paschute*, et de *SS. Eucharistie institutione* (in Mai, *Script. Vet.* ix, 623). Selden published an extract under the title *Eclesiæ sue origines, ex Arabico cum vers. Lut.* (Lond. 1642, 4to), to which Abraham Ecchelenis replied in *Euty chius vindicatus, sive Responso ad J. Seldeni Origines* (Rom. 1661, 4to).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xvi, 810; Graesse, *Trésor de Livres Rares*, i, 530.

**Euty chius** (Εὐτυχός, of good fortune, a frequent name; see Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 6, 5; xix, 4, 4), a young man of Troas, who sat in the open window of the third floor while Paul was preaching late in the night, and who, being overcome by sleep, fell out into the court below, May, A.D. 55. He was "taken up dead" (ἵσθη νεκρός); but the apostle, going down, extended himself upon the body and embraced it, like the prophets of old (1 Kings xvii, 21; 2 Kings iv, 34); and when he felt the signs of returning life, restored him to his friends, with the assurance that "his life was in him." Before Paul departed in the morning the youth was brought to him alive and well (Acts xx, 5-12). All the intimations of the narrative forbid us for a moment to entertain the view of those critics who suppose that animation was merely suspended (Bloomfield, Hackett, in loc.). See PAUL.

Mr. Jowett states that, during his residence at Hainvali in May, 1818, the house in which he abode gave him a correct idea of the falling of Euty chius from the upper loft while Paul was preaching at Troas. "According to our idea of houses," he remarks, "the scene of Euty chius's falling from the upper loft is very far from intelligible; and besides this, the circumstance of preaching generally leaves on the mind of cursory readers the notion of a church. To describe this house, which is not many miles distant from the Troad, and perhaps, from the unchanging character of Oriental customs, nearly resembles the houses then built, will fully illustrate the narrative. On entering my host's

door, we find the ground floor entirely used as a store; it is filled with large barrels of oil, the produce of the rich country for many miles round; this space, so far from being habitable, is sometimes so dirty with the dripping of the oil that it is difficult to pick out a clean footing from the door to the first step of the staircase. On ascending, we find the first floor, consisting of a humble suite of rooms, not very high; these are occupied by the family for their daily use. It is on the next story that all their expense is lavished; here my courteous host has appointed my lodging; beautiful curtains, and mats, and cushions to the divan, display the respect with which they mean to receive their guest; here, likewise, their splendor, being at the top of the house, is enjoyed by the poor Greeks with more retirement and less chance of molestation from the intrusion of the Turks; here, when the professors of the college waited upon me to pay their respects, they were received in ceremony and sat at the window. The room is both higher and also larger than those below; it has two projecting windows; and the whole floor is so much extended in front beyond the lower part of the building, that the projecting windows considerably overhang the street. In such an upper room—secluded, spacious, commodious—Paul was invited to preach his parting discourse. The divan, or raised seat, with mats or cushions, encircles the interior of each projecting window; and I have remarked, that when the company is numerous, they sometimes place large cushions behind the company seated on the divan, so that a second tier of company, with their feet upon the seat of the divan, are sitting behind, higher than the front row. Euty chius, thus sitting, would be on a level with the open window, and, being overcome with sleep, he would easily fall out from the third loft of the house into the street, and be almost certain, from such a height, to lose his life. Thither Paul went down, and comforted the alarmed company by bringing up Euty chius alive. It is noted that there were many lights in the upper chamber. The very great plenty of oil in this neighborhood would enable them to afford many lamps; the heat of these and so much company would cause the drowsiness of Euty chius at that late hour, and be the occasion likewise of the windows being open." See HOUSE.

**Evagrius Ponticus** (Ἐβάργιος), monk and ascetic writer, was born at Iberis, on the Black Sea, about A.D. 345. He was made deacon by Gregory of Nyssa or Gregory of Nazianzum, and received his theological culture to some extent under the latter, who took him to Constantinople in 379 or 380, and made him archdeacon. In the Origenistic controversies he took the side of Origen. After some experience of the dangers of personal beauty and vanity, he renounced the world, assumed the monastic garb, and departed for Egypt in 383 or 384, where he lived as an ascetic up to the day of his death in (probably) 399. Socrates speaks very highly (*H. E.* iv, 23) of his character and writings, of which there remain, 1. *Μοραχός* (in Cotelierus, *Mon. Græc.* iii, 68);—2. *Ἀπὸ ἁγριώσεως* (in Pallad. *Vita Chrysost.* p. 349);—3. *Rerum Monachalium rationes*; and a few other tracts, collected in Galland. *Bibl. Patrol.* vii, 553; also in Migne, *Patrol. Græc.* xl, 1219 sq. See Tillemont, *Mémoires*, x, 368; Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* iii, 7; iv, 23; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* vi, 30; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* Anno 380.

**Evagrius Scholasticus**, the Church historian, was probably born at Epiphaneia, on the Orontes, in or about A.D. 536, and had a good education. He lived in Antioch, where he was a lawyer (*scholasticus*), whence his surname. He rendered essential service to the patriarch Gregory, whom he defended (against charges of adultery and incest) at a synod in Constantinople, A.D. 589. He was made *questorium*, as a reward for his professional skill, by the emperor Tiberius. Evagrius wrote *An Ecclesiastical History*, in con-

tinuation of Eusebius and Theodoret, which extends from the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, to the twelfth year of the reign of the emperor Maurice, A.D. 593-4. He is credulous and superstitious, but orthodox. The best edition, Gr. and Lat., is that of Valesii (Henri de Valois), which includes Eusebius and the other early Greek ecclesiastical historians (Par. 1659-73, fol.; reprinted, with some additional "variorum" notes, under the title *Ecl. Scriptores cum notis Valesii et Reading*, Cantab. 1720, 3 vols.); also in Migne, *Patrol. Græca*, vol. lxxxix; translated into English, *A History of the Church, with an account of the Author and his Writings*, trans. by Meredith Hanmer, in Bagster's *Ecl. Historians* (Lond. 6 vols. 8vo); and in Bohn's *Eccles. Library* (Lond. 1851, 12mo); into German by Rössler, in his *Bibl. d. Kirchenväter*, vol. vii (1775, 8vo).—Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Græca*, ed. Harles, ix, 284 sq.; Hoffmann, *Bibliog. Lexikon*, ii, 37; Schaif, *History of the Christian Church*, iii, 882.

**Evangeliarium.** See EVANGELISTARY.

**Evangelical**, *appertaining to, or characteristic of, the Gospel.* (1.) The term "has been applied to a portion of the English Church who either profess, or are supposed to 'know and inculcate the Gospel' in an especial manner, and to give peculiar prominence to the doctrine of salvation by faith in the atonement. It is probably true that among this portion of the Church of England many, but not all, maintain the *peculiar* doctrines of Calvinism; and there may have been a time when (in the opinion of some) lower views of the sacraments and of Church authority prevailed among them than what are generally received among other members of that Church. Very many persons lament the use of this term, and consider that, like all party appellations, it tends to perpetuate division in the Church; and accordingly, they desire that it should be disused as a party term, and carefully confined to its original meaning" (Eden).

(2.) In Prussia, the United Established Church (since 1817) has been called the "Evangelical Church." See PRUSSIA and UNITED EVANGELICAL CHURCH.

(3.) In England and America the term "evangelical" is frequently used to distinguish those churches which believe in the divinity of Christ and the atonement from those that do not.

**Evangelical Alliance** is the name of an association of Christians belonging to the denominations collectively called Evangelical, and having for its object to represent the unity of these churches in all the more important articles of faith, notwithstanding their separation by external organization. The Alliance originated in Great Britain, and the rupture in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland seems to have greatly contributed to its establishment. On Aug. 5, 1845, a number of persons belonging to different denominations drew up a proposal of closer union. The advantages promised by such a movement were at once appreciated in England, and an assembly was convoked at Liverpool Oct. 1, 1845, which was in session three days, and at which were present 216 persons, representing 20 different religious societies. The first General Assembly of the Evangelical Alliance was held in Freemasons' Hall, Great Queen Street, London, and lasted from Aug. 19 to Sept. 2, 1846; 921 Christians from all parts of the world took part in its 26 sessions; among them were 47 from the European continent, and 87 from America and other parts. Among them we find the names of Dr. Barth, of Calw, in Württemberg; Dr. Baird, of New York; Rev. Dr. Bonnet, of Frankfort on the Maine (editor of the letters of Calvin); Dr. Buchanan, of Glasgow; Dr. Cunningham, of Edinburgh; William Jones, president of the Tract Society; Dr. Marriott, of Basel; the missionary Mögling, of Mangalur; the missionary inspector (subsequently superintendent general), Dr. Hoffmann; Rev. Adolphe Monod (then in Montauban); Rev. Dr. Oncken, of

Hamburg; Rev. Dr. Panchaud, of Brussels; Rev. Baptist Noel, of London; and Dr. Tholuck, of Halle. Some fifty different denominations were represented, some of which, however, as the reformed churches of France and Geneva, and the Lutheran churches of North America and Württemberg, differed only on local points. Some colored preachers also took part in the proceedings. Sir Culling Eardley (q. v.) was chosen as chairman, and remained the head of the Alliance until his death. The platform was clearly and unanimously defined: the Evangelical Alliance is not to be a union of the different denominations, neither is it its aim to bring about such as its result; its object is only to promote Christian feelings, loving, friendly intercourse between the different denominations, and an effective co-operation in the efforts to repulse the common enemies and dangers. As the means of effecting this purpose, it advocates, not a sort of official or semi-official representative assembly of the different denominations, but rather the union of individuals. It is to be a Christian union, not a Church union; one in which a number of earnest, faithful Christians of the different denominations may join. Being a union of Christians, not of churches, the doors of the Evangelical Alliance are open to all who admit the fundamental principles of Christianity, without inquiring into the minutæ of their particular confessions. It only asks its members to accept (whether because or in spite of their particular confession does not matter) the fundamental principles and doctrines of the Gospel. This naturally led to a definition of these fundamental principles, the admission of which should be considered the basis of the Alliance. On the motion being made by Dr. Edward Bickersteth, the following nine articles were, after mature deliberation, received as the fundamental principles of the Evangelical Alliance:

"The parties composing the Alliance shall be such parties only as hold and maintain what are usually understood to be evangelical views in regard to the matter of doctrines understated, namely: 1. The divine inspiration, authority, and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures. 2. The right and duty of private judgment in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. 3. The unity of the Godhead, and the trinity of persons therein. 4. The utter depravity of human nature in consequence of the Fall. 5. The incarnation of the Son of God, his work of atonement for sinners and mankind, and his mediatorial intercession and reign. 6. The justification of the sinners by faith alone. 7. The work of the Holy Spirit in the conversion and sanctification of the sinner. 8. The immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, the judgment of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ, with the eternal blessedness of the righteous, and the eternal punishment of the wicked. 9. The divine institution of the Christian ministry, and the obligation and perpetuity of the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper."

These principles were embodied in a document entitled *Societatis Evangelicæ constitutionis et statutorum expressio brevis*. The members bind themselves to pray zealously for the Holy Spirit to descend upon all believers, and to employ jointly the morning of the first weekday as a season of prayer, as also the first week of each year; as also to use Christian circumspection in their speech and writings when touching on points of difference. The Alliance was organized on the 2d of September. They organized a series of seven branch associations: 1. Great Britain and Ireland; 2. United States of North America; 3. France, Belgium, and the French portion of Switzerland; 4. Northern Germany; 5. South Germany, and the German portion of Switzerland; 6. British North America; 7. West Indies. These branch associations went into actual operation afterwards. The Alliance spread in France, Switzerland, and Belgium, without agreement with its definition of the evangelical creed being insisted on. It met with

much opposition in Germany from the Lutherans, who did not find the creed sufficiently explicit on certain points, and from the disciples of Schleiermacher, who disapproved of some of the articles. A *second assembly* was held in Paris in 1855 on the occasion of the World's Exhibition. The *third meeting* was held in Berlin in 1857. The ("Confessional") Lutherans became more determined in their opposition, while the evangelical party of Germany, though approving of the general scope of the Alliance, deemed it inexpedient to insist on the acceptance of the nine principles as a condition of membership. This meeting was largely attended, delegates from Macao, Africa, and Australia being present, and brought the Alliance more prominently before the churches of Continental Europe. The *fourth meeting* was held at Geneva in 1860. It was successful, notwithstanding the declension of the Genevan National Church to sympathize with its objects. Dr. Guthrie, of Scotland; Dr. Baird, of the United States; Monod, Pressensé, and Gasparin, of France; Krummacher and Dörner, of Germany; Groen van Prinsterer, of Holland; and Merle d'Aubigné, of Switzerland, were among the most prominent and active members. The fifth meeting was to have been held at Amsterdam in 1866, but was postponed on account of the prevalence of the cholera at the appointed time till 1867. The *fifth General Conference* actually took place at Amsterdam on Aug. 18, 1867, and was largely attended. There were delegates from France, Germany, Switzerland, Holland, Great Britain, the United States, the British American provinces, Italy, Spain, Sweden, and Eastern countries. Baron Van Wassenaar Catwijk presided. Among the more prominent delegates were Dr. Krummacher, Prof. Herzog, Dr. Tholuck, and Prof. Lange, of Germany; Pasteur Bersier, Dr. de Pressensé, and Prof. St. Hilaire, of France; Dr. Guthrie, of Scotland; John Pye Smith, archdeacon Philpot, and S. Gurney, M.P., of England; Merle d'Aubigné, of Switzerland; the Rev. Dr. Prime, of the United States, and many others. The opening sermon was preached by Prof. Van Oosterzee. Among the subjects discussed were the religious condition of the Church of England, the Scottish churches, the connection of missions with civilization, Christianity, and literature, and art and science; the methods of operating missions; the religious condition of Germany, France, Holland, Belgium, and Italy; evangelical non-conformity; Christianity and the nationalities; and various subjects of theology and philosophy. Interesting reports were received of the progress of religious liberty in Turkey, and of the thralldom of opinion in Spain. The observance of the Sabbath received especial consideration, resulting in the adoption of a resolution calling upon the members of the Alliance to use in their several places of abode and spheres of influence earnest endeavors to secure from states, municipalities, and masters of establishments, from every one, the weekly day of rest from labor, "in order that all may freely and fully participate in the temporal and spiritual benefits of the Lord's day." A letter of affection and sympathy was adopted to Christians scattered abroad, particularly to those who are laboring against the hostile influences of heathenism or of superstition, and whose rights of public worship are restrained or abridged. A protest against war was adopted. Special meetings were held on Sunday-schools and systematic benevolence. A series of meetings for the poor were held in one of the mission-rooms of the city with wholesome effect, and two temperance meetings. The assembly adjourned on Tuesday, Aug. 27.

The Evangelical Alliance of the United States was organized in New York city on Jan. 30, 1867. Eminent divines and laymen of the Methodist Episcopal, Presbyterian, Protestant Episcopal, German Reformed, Reformed, and Baptist churches, and from various parts of the country, signified their approval of the movement either by attendance in person or by letter. A

letter of co-operation was read from the secretary of the British branch of the Alliance. The Hon. William E. Dodge was elected president of the American branch. At a meeting held in New York Nov. 12, 1868, it was resolved to convene a new General Conference of the Evangelical Alliance in the city of New York in the autumn of 1869. The British branch only of the national branches has been in the practice of holding annual meetings.

"Among the results already attained by the Alliance as incidental and secondary to its great object may be mentioned, The supply of an obvious want, namely, the existence of an organized body with and by whom correspondence and co-operation may be easily and effectually carried on between Christians in different parts of the world, and which may greatly aid in uniting Christians in this country separated by ecclesiastical differences and other causes; the holding of conferences of Christians from all parts of the world, for devotion and mutual consultation, in London, Paris, Berlin, and other cities; aiding in the revival of religion both at home and abroad; the convening of very many meetings for united prayer for the outpouring of the Spirit, and in reference to passing events of importance; the communication of much information as to the religious condition of Christendom; the encouragement of Christians exposed to trials and difficulties by the expression of sympathy, and in several instances by eliciting pecuniary aid; successful interference on behalf of Christians and others when persecuted in Roman Catholic and Mohammedan countries; the mitigation or removal of the persecution of Protestants by their fellow-Protestants in Germany and elsewhere; the presentation of memorials to the sovereigns of Europe, including the sultan himself, on behalf of liberty of conscience for Mussulmen; the encouragement and assistance of the friends of pure evangelical doctrine in all Protestant countries in their struggle with Rationalism or infidelity; the uniting of evangelical Christians in different countries for fraternal intercourse and for mutual protection; opposition, in common with other bodies, to the progress of popery; the resistance of projects which would tend to the desecration of the Lord's day; the origination and extensive circulation of prize essays on the Sabbath, and on Popery and infidelity; and the origination of societies established on the principle of united action among evangelical Christians, such as the Turkish Missions Aid Society, the Continental Committee for Religious Liberty, Christian Vernacular Education Society for India, and German Aid Society. Although these practical results are thus referred to, yet it is to be understood that, even if no such secondary objects had been accomplished or attempted, the great value of the Alliance would still remain in its adaptation to promote and manifest union among Christians. The preceding is from an authoritative statement made by the Alliance" (*Eadie, Ecclesiastical Encyclopedia*, s. v.).—Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, p. 270; Schem, *American Ecclesiastical Almanac for 1868*; the full reports of the General Assemblies of the Alliance; Dr. Massie, *The Evangelical Alliance, its Origin and Development* (Lond. John Snow, 1847); L. Bonnet, *L'unité de l'esprit par le lieu de la paix; Lettres sur l'alliance évangélique* (Paris, Delay, 1847); *Am. and For. Ch. Union*, Sept. 1856, p. 269; Dec. 1856, p. 367; *Princeton Rev.* Oct. 1846. (A. J. S.)

**Evangelical Association**, an ecclesiastical body which took its rise in the year 1800, in the eastern part of Pennsylvania, and resulted from an organization into classes and congregations of the disciples of Rev. Jacob Albright, a native of Eastern Pennsylvania, who, being impressed by the general decline of religious life, and the corruption of doctrines and morals that prevailed in the German churches in that portion of country, undertook, about 1790, to work a reform among them. The effect of his first labors encouraged



him to travel through a great part of the country at his own expense, preaching the Gospel as he had opportunity in churches, schools, private houses, on public roads, etc. Although he commenced his labors without any ulterior design of forming a distinct ecclesiastical organization, yet he soon found it necessary to unite his converts, scattered over several counties, into small societies for mutual support and sympathy. At a meeting called for the purpose of consulting upon the best measures to be adopted for the furtherance of a cause in which they all felt a deep interest, the assembly, without regard to the teachings of High-Churchism respecting a valid ministry, unanimously elected and ordained Mr. Albright as their pastor or bishop, authorizing him to exercise all the functions of the ministerial office over them, and declared the Bible to be their rule of faith and practice. This organization, incomplete at first, was soon after considerably improved by the adoption of a creed and rules for Church government. In course of time, as laborers increased and the society spread, annual conferences were held; and in 1816, sixteen years after the first organization of the Church, a general conference was held, for the first time, in Union County, Pa., which consisted of all the elders in the ministry. Since 1843 a general conference, composed of delegates elected by the annual conferences from among their elders, has held quadrennial sessions. For the first thirty years of its existence the society struggled against violent opposition; but for the last thirty-eight years it has made rapid progress, so that it now (1868) comprises 14 annual conferences, and 486 itinerant and 379 local preachers, whose field of labor extends over the Northern, Western, and Pacific states, and into Canada and Europe. The membership approximates 65,000, all adults; the number of churches is 791 and parsonages 297, valued together at \$1,600,000; Sunday-schools 834, and scholars 45,000; catechetical classes, exclusive of those connected with Sunday-schools, 341, with 3559 catechumens. In the year 1838 a missionary society was formed, which has up to this time supported about 600 home missions, most of which are now self-supporting stations, circuits, or even conferences. At present this society supports 153 missions in America and Europe. For a number of years it has been gathering funds for heathen missions, and is expected to enter upon that field ere long. There is also a Sunday-school and tract society in operation, publishing Sunday-school books and religious tracts. A charitable society was founded in the year 1835, which has received funds amounting to a considerable sum, by bequests, the interest of which is annually applied to the support of the widows and orphans of poor itinerant preachers. There are also church-building societies established in several conferences. The North-western College, a flourishing institution of learning located at Plainfield, Ill., has been founded, and is supported by the Western conferences of the Church, and an endowment is being collected which now amounts to \$65,000. Several seminaries are also patronized by the Church. An orphan institution, favorably located at Flat Rock, Ohio, has been founded within a few years, and is in successful operation. A prosperous publishing-house at Cleveland, Ohio, issues four periodicals: one, its German organ, *Der Christliche Botschafter*, a large weekly, and the oldest German religious paper published in America; another, its English organ, *The Evangelical Messenger*, also a weekly; and the third and fourth, *Der Christliche Kinderfreund*, and the *Sunday-school Messenger*, are monthly juvenile papers, intended chiefly for Sunday-schools. The weekly papers have together a circulation of 25,000, and the juveniles 30,000. Perhaps no other religious denomination in America is better organized and disciplined for work than the Evangelical Association. In doctrine and theology this Church is Arminian; with regard

to sanctification, Wesleyan; but generally holds the essential doctrines of the Gospel as they are held in common by the evangelical churches of the land, with all of whom it aims to cultivate a fraternal spirit. The ministry is divided into two orders, deacons and elders; and, faithful to the principles and examples of their founder, they practise itinerancy. The highest permanent order is the eldership; for, although the society has its bishops (elected by General Conference) and presiding elders (elected by the individual conferences), yet these, to be continued, must be re-elected every four years; and if not re-elected they hold no higher rank or privilege than an elder. The General Conference meets every four years, and constitutes the highest legislative and judicial authority recognised in the Church; then come the annual and quarterly conferences, whose transactions are mostly of an executive and practical nature for the promotion of the work. In its mode of worship and usages the Evangelical Association is Methodistic; and for this reason, as well as the fact that Mr. Albright was a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church until he commenced his labors among the Germans of Pennsylvania, it is sometimes, though erroneously, called the German Methodist Church. For a number of years after its rise the Evangelical Association labored almost exclusively in the German language; but the rising generation, and the success of some preachers who labored also in the English language, have, during the last fifteen years, demanded considerable attention to the English, and the Church is now energetically engaged in both languages to accomplish her mission, to which she believes herself to be providentially called—to save souls, and bring glory to God in the highest. (R. Y.)

The following table, taken from the *Almanac of the Evangelical Association* for 1869, gives the names of the annual conferences, the year of the organization of each, the number of itinerant preachers, local preachers, Church members, Probationers, Sunday-schools, S. school scholars, and Sunday-school scholars:

Conferences.	When organized.	Itinerant preachers.	Local preachers.	Church members.	Probationers.	Sunday-schools.	S. school scholars.	Churches.
East Pennsylvania.	1839	77	80	9,554	757	115	8,677	188
Gen. Pennsylvania.	1839	52	43	6,918	566	78	4,957	94
Ohio	1839	43	59	6,079	148	83	4,420	104
Illinois	1843	54	59	6,568	305	89	4,757	74
New York	1847	27	6	3,041	91	45	2,177	49
Pittsburg	1851	35	28	5,223	183	70	4,200	79
Indiana	1851	45	29	4,672	119	85	3,971	75
Wisconsin	1855	41	20	6,372	34	107	3,414	69
Iowa	1859	25	11	2,553	134	38	1,775	19
Canada	1863	26	11	2,966	15	52	2,269	52
Michigan	1863	23	23	2,144	85	27	952	21
Kansas	1865	12	2	607	13	2	2,145	4
Germany	1863	19	2	3,701	37	27	1,006	4
Minnesota	1867	18	6	1,536	3	32	1,006	13
California & Oregon				150		2	120	3
Total		500	377	62,344	2470	863	45,175	798

**Evangelical Church Conference**, the name of periodical meetings of delegates of the Protestant state churches of Germany. The object of these meetings is to have a free exchange of opinion on important questions of ecclesiastical life, to furnish a bond of union for the several Protestant state churches of Germany, and to advance their harmonious development. The impulse to meetings of this kind proceeded, in 1815, from king Wilhelm of Würtemberg. Invitations to a conference were issued conjointly by Prussia and Würtemberg to the governments of South Germany, and by Prussia and Hanover to the governments of Northern Germany. At the first conference, which met at Berlin in 1846, the Church boards of all the German states except Austria, Bavaria, Oldenburg, and the Free Cities were represented. This meeting was secret, and the proceedings have never been officially published. It is known, however, that they concerned

the periodical holding of conferences of this kind, confessions, liturgy, and Church constitution. The second meeting was to have been held at Stuttgart in 1848, but did not take place, in consequence of the disturbances caused by the revolution. At the Church diets (q. v.) of Stuttgart (1850) and Elberfeld (1851), ecclesiastical officers of several countries deliberated on the resumption of the official Church conferences, and suggested the establishment of a central organ, which was to contain the decrees of all the supreme Church boards of the German States. Accordingly, the conference met again at Eisenach in June, 1852, and in the same year an official central organ of the German Church governments was established at Stuttgart (*Allgem. Kirchenblatt für das evangel. Deutschland*). Since then the conference has met always at Eisenach, in 1855, 1857, 1859, 1861, 1863, 1865, and 1868. One of the first results of the conferences was a compilation of 150 of the best German Protestant hymns (*Kirchenlieder*), which was recommended to the several states as a proper basis of, or appendix to, the hymn-books of the several churches. In 1855 some resolutions concerning the treatment of sects by the state churches were unanimously adopted. These resolutions declared against the principle of full religious liberty, but recommended that the members of sects be allowed to contract valid civil marriages. The same conference adopted resolutions in behalf of a better observance of Sunday; of giving to congregations the right of co-operation (*totum negativum*) in the appointment of ecclesiastical officers, and of introducing special liturgical devotions during the week of Passion. The conference of 1857 held important discussions on the revival of Church discipline, on reforms in the legislation concerning divorces, and on Christian burial. Among the results of the later meetings of the conference were the following: The introduction of a prayer for the German fatherland, to be used every Sunday in every Protestant church; resolutions on Church patronage, on liturgical matters, on the examinations of theological students, on catechization, on the revision of the Lutheran Bible, on the best way of collecting the statistics of the German Lutheran Church, on the construction of evangelical churches, on the State-Church system, etc. An account of each meeting of the conference since 1855 is given in Matthes, *Allgem. Kirchliche Chronik*; see also Herzog, *Real-Encycl.* iv, 273.

**Evangelical Councils.** See CONSILIA EVANGELICA.

**Evangelical Union,** "the name assumed by a religious body constituted in Scotland in 1843 by the Rev. James Morison, of Kilmarnock, and other ministers, whose doctrinal views had been condemned in the United Secession Church, to which they previously belonged, and the congregations adhering to them. They were soon afterwards joined by a number of ministers and congregations of similar views previously connected with the Congregational Union or Independents of Scotland, and have since extended themselves considerably in Scotland and the north of England. Their doctrinal views are those which, from the name of Mr. Morison, have now become known in Scotland as *Morisonian*. See MORISONIANISM. Their church government is Independent, but in some of the congregations originally Presbyterian the office of the eldership is retained. A notable practice of this denomination is the very frequent advertising of sermons and their subjects" (Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. y.). In 1851 the Union had in Scotland 28 places of worship, with 10,319 sittings.

**Evangelist** (*εὐαγγελιστής*), the name of an order or body of men included in the constitution of the Apostolic Church (q. v.). The term is applied in the New Testament to a certain class of Christian teachers who were not fixed to any particular spot, but travelled either independently, or under the direction of

one or other of the apostles, for the purpose of propagating the Gospel. The absence of any detailed account of the organization and practical working of the Church of the first century leaves us in some uncertainty as to their functions and position. The meaning of the name, "The publishers of glad tidings," seems common to the work of the Christian ministry generally, yet in Eph. iv, 11 the "evangelists" appear, on the one hand, after the "apostles" and "prophets" on the other, before the "pastors" and "teachers" (thus: *αὐτὸς ἔδωκε τοῖς μὲν ἀποστόλοις, τοῖς δὲ προφήταις, τοῖς δὲ εὐαγγελιστάς, τοῖς δὲ ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους*). Assuming that the apostles here, whether limited to the twelve or not, are those who were looked upon as the special delegates and representatives of Christ, and therefore higher than all others in their authority, and that the prophets were men speaking under the immediate impulse of the Spirit words that were mighty in their effects on men's hearts and consciences, it would follow that the evangelists had a function subordinate to theirs, yet more conspicuous, and so far higher than that of the pastors who watched over a church that had been founded, and of the teachers who carried on the work of systematic instruction. This passage, accordingly, would lead us to think of them as standing between the two other groups—sent forth as missionary preachers of the Gospel by the first, and as such preparing the way for the labors of the second. The same inference would seem to follow the occurrence of the word as applied to Philip in Acts xxi, 8. He had been one of those who had gone everywhere "preaching" (*εὐαγγελιζόμενοι*) the word (Acts viii, 4), now in one city, now in another (viii, 40); but he has not the power or authority of an apostle, does not speak as a prophet himself, though the gift of prophecy belongs to his four daughters (xxi, 9), and he exercises apparently no pastoral superintendence over any portion of the flock. The omission of evangelists in the list of 1 Cor. xii may be explained on the hypothesis that the nature of Paul's argument led him there to speak of the settled organization of a given local Church, which of course presupposed the work of the missionary preacher as already accomplished, while the train of thought in Eph. iv, 11 brought before his mind all who were in any way instrumental in building up the Church universal. It follows, from what has been said, that the calling of the evangelist is expressed by the word *κηρύσσειν*, "preach," rather than *ἐδασκῶν*, "teach," or *παρακαλεῖν*, "exhort;" it is the proclamation of the glad tidings to those who have not known them, rather than the instruction and pastoral care of those who have believed and been baptized. This is also what we gather from 2 Tim. iv, 2, 5. Timothy is "to preach the word;" in doing this he is to fulfil "the work of an evangelist." It follows, also, that the name denotes a *work* rather than an *order*. The evangelist might or might not be a bishop-elder or a deacon. The apostles, so far as they evangelized (Acts viii, 25; xiv, 7; 1 Cor. i, 17), might claim the title, though there were many evangelists who were not apostles. The brother "whose praise was in the Gospel" (2 Cor. viii, 18) may be looked upon as one of Paul's companions in this work, and probably known by the same name. In short, the *itinerant* and temporary character of their calling chiefly serves to distinguish them from the other classes of Christian laborers. In this, as in other points connected with the organization of the Church in the apostolic age, but little information is to be gained from later writers. The name was no longer explained by the presence of those to whom it had been specially applied, and it came to be variously interpreted. Theodoret (on Eph. iv, 11) describes the evangelists (as they have been described above) as travelling missionaries. Chrysostom, as men who preached the Gospel, but without going everywhere (*ὡς περιηγητοὶ πανταχοῦ*); by which he probably denotes a re-

stricted sphere to their labors, in contrast with the world-wide commission of the apostles. The account given by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* iii, 37), though somewhat rhetorical and vague, gives prominence to the idea of itinerant missionary preaching. Referring to the state of the Church in the time of Trajan, he says, "Many of the disciples of that time, whose souls the divine word had inspired with an ardent love of philosophy, first fulfilled our Saviour's precept by distributing their substance among the poor. Then traveling abroad, they performed the work of evangelists (*ἔργον ἐπιτέλουον εὐαγγελιστῶν*), being ambitious to preach Christ, and deliver the Scripture of the divine Gospels. Having laid the foundations of the faith in foreign nations, they appointed other pastors (*ποιμίνας τε καθιστάντες ἐτέρους*), to whom they intrusted the cultivation of the parts they had recently occupied, while they proceeded to other countries and nations." One clause of this description indicates a change in the work, which before long affected the meaning of the name. If the Gospel was a written book, and the office of the evangelists was to read or distribute it, then the writers of such books were *κατ' ἐξοχήν* THE evangelists. It is thus, accordingly, that Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* iii, 39) speaks of them, though the old meaning of the word (as in *Hist. Eccles.* v, 10, where he applies it to Pantænus) is not forgotten by him. Soon this meaning so overshadowed the old that Ecumenius (Estius on Eph. iv, 11) has no other notion of the evangelists than as those who have written a Gospel (compare Harless on Eph. iv, 11). Augustine, though commonly using the word in this sense, at times remembers its earlier signification (*Sermon* xcix and cclxvi). Ambrosianus (Estius, *l. c.*) identifies them with deacons. In later liturgical language the work was applied to the reader of the Gospel for the day (comp. Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, bk. lxxviii, 7, 9). In modern phraseology the term is almost exclusively applied to the writers of the canonical Gospels (q. v.). See Campbell's *Lectures on Ecclesiastical History*, i, 148-150; Neander's *History of the Planting of the Christian Church*, i, 173; Middelboe, *De evangelistis ecclesie apostolicæ* (Hafn. 1779); Schaff, *Apostolical Church*, § 131.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

**Evangelistarium** (*Book of the Gospels*), the name given in the earlier ages to a volume containing the portions appointed to be read from the Gospels. If the four Gospels complete were contained in the book, it was called *Evangelistarium Plenarium*.—Procter, *Common Prayer*, p. 9; Siegel, *Alterthümer*, iii, 249. See MANUSCRIPTS OF THE BIBLE.

**Evangelium Æternum** (*Everlasting Gospel*), the name given to a book published in the 13th century (A. D. 1254), which was properly entitled *Introductorius in Evangelium æternum*, probably written by the Franciscan Gerhardus. The idea of a new "everlasting Gospel" was one of the peculiar notions of Joachim of Floris († 1202), who attacked the corruptions of the Church, and predicted an approaching renovation. See JOACHIM OF FLORIS. These predictions were appropriated by the Franciscans as really referring to the rise and character of their order, which was founded by Francis of Assisi six years after Joachim's death. An apocalyptic party arose among the Franciscans, which seems to have been led by Gerhardus, and by Johannes of Parma (q. v.). The *Introductorius in Evangelium æternum* seems to have been chiefly made up from three of the writings of Joachim, viz. *Concordiæ Veter. et Nov. Test.*; *Psalm. decem Chordarum*; and *Apocalypsis nova*. It set forth Joachim's doctrine of the "dispensations" (*status*) of the Church, the last of which, the dispensation of the Spirit, was to be opened about A. D. 1200. The movement was a new form of Montanism. "Many vague notions were entertained about the Eternal Gospel of the Franciscans, arising from superficial views, or a superficial understanding

of Joachim's writings, and the offspring of mere rumor of the heresy-hunting spirit. Men spoke of the Eternal Gospel as of a book composed under this title, and circulated among the Franciscans. Occasionally, also, this Eternal Gospel was confounded perhaps with the above-mentioned *Introductorius*. In reality, there was no book existing under this title of the Eternal Gospel, but all that is said about it relates simply to the writings of Joachim. The opponents of the Franciscan order objected to the preachers of the Eternal Gospel, that, according to their teaching, Christianity was but a transient thing, and a new, more perfect religion, the absolute form, destined to endure forever, was to succeed it. William of St. Amour (*De periculis novissimorum temporum*, p. 38) says: 'For the past fifty-five years some have been striving to substitute in place of the Gospel of Christ another gospel, which is said to be a more perfect one, which they call the Gospel of the Holy Spirit, or the Everlasting Gospel;' whence it is manifest that the anti-Christian doctrine would even now be preached from the pulpits if there were not still something that *withholdeth* (2 Thess. ii, 6), namely, the power of the pope and the bishops. It is said in that accursed book, which they called the Everlasting Gospel, which had already been made known in the Church, that the Everlasting Gospel is as much superior to the Gospel of Christ as the sun is to the moon in brightness, the kernel to the shell in value. The kingdom of the Church, or the Gospel of Christ, was to last only till the year '1200.' In a sermon, St. Amour points out the following as doctrines of the Everlasting Gospel: that the sacrament of the Church is nothing; that a new law of life was to be given, and a new constitution of the Church introduced; and he labors to show that, on the contrary, the form of the hierarchy under which the Church then subsisted was one resting on the divine order, and altogether necessary and immutable" (Neander, *Church Hist.* iv, 619). The *Introductorius* has not come down to us, but its contents are partly known from a writing of Hugo of Caro, preserved in Quetif and Echard, *Script. Ord. Prædic.* i, 262 sq., and partly from extracts given by the inquisitor Nicolas Eymeric, in his *Directorium Inquisitorium*, pt. ii, qu. ix, No. 4. The theologians of Paris attacked the book upon its first appearance, and it was formally condemned by Alexander IV, A. D. 1255.—Neander, *Church History* (Torrey's transl.), iv, 618; Engelhardt *Kircheng. Abhandlungen* (Erlang. 1832); Engelhardt in Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 275; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* per. iii, § 70.

**Evans, Caleb**, D. D., son of the Rev. Hugh Evans, was born at Bristol about the year 1737, and was educated at the Ilomerton Academy. In 1767 he became colleague to his father as pastor of the church, and tutor in the academy at Broadmead. In 1770 he originated "The Bristol Education Society," to supply the dissenting congregations, and especially the Baptist, with able and evangelical ministers, as well as missionaries for propagating the Gospel in the world. From this time to the period of his death, August 9, 1791, Dr. Evans continued to discharge the duties of president of the society. He published an *Answer to Dr. Priestley's Appeal*, and a small volume entitled *Christ Crucified, or the Scripture Doctrine of the Atonement* (Bristol, 1789, sm. 8vo), besides occasional sermons. On the breaking out of the American War he advocated the freedom of the colonies, and wrote *A Letter to John Wesley, in reply to his Calm Address to the American Colonies* (London, 1775, 12mo); also a *Reply to Fletcher's Vindication of Wesley's Address* (Bristol, 1776, 12mo).—Jones, *Christian Biography*, p. 144; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, s. v.

**Evans, Christmas**, an eloquent Welsh preacher, was born December 25, 1766, at Llandyssul, Cardiganshire. His father was poor, and he had no school education. At seventeen he was converted, and joined

the Baptist Church. He then first learned to read the Welsh Bible, and soon after began to exhort. His first settlement as a preacher was at Lley'n; two years after he went to Anglesea to labor as an evangelist at ten preaching places, on a salary at first of £17 a year. Here he spent thirty-four years. He early showed oratorical powers, but in Anglesea he began to be a wonder. For a series of years he made preaching tours through South Wales, and the memory of his sermons remains to this day. The following sketch of one of these sermons is given by his biographer, the Rev. D. M. Evans: "In the midst of a general hum and restlessness the preacher had read for his text, 'And you that were some time alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblamable, and unapproachable in his sight.' His first movements were stiff, awkward, and wrestling, while his observations were perhaps crude and commonplace rather than striking or novel; but he had not proceeded far before, having thus prepared himself, he took one of his wildest flights, bursting forth at the same time into those unmelodious but all-piercing shrieks under which his hearers often confessed his resistless power. Closer and closer draw in the scattered groups, the weary loungers, and the hitherto listless among the motley multitude. The crowd becomes dense with eager listeners as they press on insensibly towards the preacher. He gradually gets into the thickening plot of his homely but dramatic representation, while, all forgetful of the spot on which they stood, old men and women, accustomed to prosy thoughts and ways, look up with open mouth through smiles and tears. Big burly country folk, in whom it might have been thought that the faculty of imagination had long since been extinguished, became engrossed with ideal scenes. Men 'whose talk is of bullocks' are allured into converse with the most spiritual realities. The preachers present become dazzled with the brilliance of this new star on the horizon; they start on their feet round the strange young man, look hard at him in perfect amazement; loud and rapturous confirmations break forth from their lips: 'Amen,' 'Ben digedig,' 'Dioelch byth,' fall tumultuously on the ear; the charm swells onwards from the platform to the extreme margin of the wondering crowd, and to the occasional loud laugh there has now succeeded the baptism of tears. The excitement is at its highest; the preacher concludes, but the weeping and rejoicing continue till worn out nature brings the scene to an end." His chief qualities as a preacher "include passion, or ardent excited feeling, a dramatic imagination, and grotesque humor. The published scraps of sermons which remain, and have been translated into English, illustrate these qualities, and almost only these."—*Christian Spectator* (London) Sept. 1863, reprinted in *The Theolog. Eclectic*, i, 147; Evans, *Memoir of Christmas Evans* (1862); Stephen, *Life of Christmas Evans* (London, 1847); *Sermons of C. Evans, with Memoir by Jas. Cross* (Phila. 1854, 8vo).

**Evans, John, D. D.**, an eminent Nonconformist divine, was born in 1680, at Wrexham, in Denbighshire. His father was minister of Wrexham. The son was first placed under the care of Mr. Thomas Rowe, near London, and studied afterwards at the seminary of Mr. Timothy Jollie. He was ordained and settled at Wrexham, August 18, 1702. "Dr. Daniel Williams, of London, hearing that Mr. Evans was invited to Dublin, to prevent his leaving England sent for him to the metropolis, where he first assisted the doctor, afterwards became co-pastor, and at length succeeded him at his death. In the Arian controversy he refused to subscribe to any articles, but maintained the orthodox sentiments. In the public services of the dissenters he was often called to preside, and was appointed to assist in completing Matthew Henry's Commentary, of which he supplied the notes on the Epistles

to the Romans so well, that Dr. Doddridge says, 'The exposition of the Romans, begun by Henry, and finished by Dr. Evans, is the best I ever saw.' He was for some years preparing to write a history of non-conformity from the Reformation to the civil wars, but, by his death, the work devolved on Mr. Neal. He died May 16, 1730." Besides a number of separate sermons, he published *Discourses concerning the Christian Temper*, 38 Sermons (4th ed. London, 1737, 2 vols. 8vo), with *Life by John Erskine* (1825, 8vo), which are called by Dr. Watts "the most complete summary of those duties which make up the Christian life," and by Doddridge "the best practical pieces in our language." See Bogue and Bennett, *History of Dissenters*, ii, 364; Jones, *Christian Biography*, p. 143; Skeats, *Free Churches of England* (London, 1868, 8vo), p. 249.

**Evanson, Edward**, a minister of the Church of England, was born at Warrington, Lancashire, in 1731, and was educated at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, where he passed M.A. in 1753. In 1768 he became vicar of South Mimms; in 1770, rector of Tewkesbury. He soon began to manifest doubts about the Christian doctrines of the Incarnation and the Trinity. For a sermon preached in 1771 he was prosecuted. In 1778 he resigned his preferments in the Church, and retired to Mitcham, where he kept a school. He died Sept. 25, 1805. Among his writings are, *On the Observance of Sunday* (Ipswich, 1792);—*The Dissonance of the four Evangelists, and their Authority* (Gloucester, 1805, 8vo). In this work Evanson rejects all the Gospels but Mark, and also Romans, Ephesians, Colossians, Hebrews, James, Peter, John, and Jude. It was refuted by Falconer, *Bampton Lectures*, 1810.

**Evaristus**, bishop of Rome, is said to have been born at Bethlechem, and to have succeeded Clement as bishop of Rome about A.D. 100. He is said to have first organized Rome into parishes, and to have fallen a martyr A.D. 109.

**Evarts, Jeremiah**, secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, was born in Sunderland, Vt., Feb. 3, 1781, and graduated at Yale College in 1802. He studied law, and practised it at New Haven up to 1810, when he removed to Charlestown in order to edit *The Panoplist*, which he continued up to 1820. In 1811 he entered the service of the American Board as treasurer. He continued in that work, first as treasurer, then as secretary (in 1821), during the rest of his life. In 1820 *The Panoplist* was discontinued, and the publication of *The Missionary Herald* was begun by the American Board, with Mr. Evarts as its editor. He died in Charleston, S. C. (whither he had gone for the benefit of his health), May 10, 1831. The Reports of the Board during his connection with it were generally from his pen, and that of 1830, the last which he wrote, is a document of great power. His essays, under the signature of William Penn, on the rights and claims of the Indians, were published in 1829. See Tracy, *Memoirs of Jeremiah Evarts* (Boston, 1845); *Christian Review*, xi, 20; *Spirit of Pilgrims*, iv, 599.

**Eve** (Heb. *Chavak'*, חַוָּה, *life or living*, so called as the progenitor of all the human family; Sept. accordingly translates *Zoë* in Gen. iii, 20, elsewhere *Eva*, N. Test. *Eva*, Josephus *Evea*, *Ant.* i, 1, 2, 4), the name given by Adam to the first woman, his wife (Gen. iii, 20; iv. 1). B.C. 4172. The account of her creation is found at Gen. ii, 21, 22. It is supposed that she was created on the sixth day, after Adam had reviewed the animals. Upon the failure of a companion suitable for Adam among the creatures which were brought to him to be named, the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon him, and took one of his ribs (according to the Targum of Jonathan, the thirteenth from the right side!), which he fashioned into a woman.

an, and brought her to the man (comp. Plato, *Sympos.* p. 189, 191). The Almighty, by declaring that "it was not good for man to be alone," and by providing for him a suitable companion, gave the divine sanction to marriage and to *monogamy*. "This companion was taken from his side," remarks an old commentator, "to signify that she was to be dear unto him as his own flesh. Not from his head, lest she should rule over him; nor from his feet, lest he should tyrannize over her; but from his side, to denote that species of equality which is to subsist in the marriage state" (Matthew Henry, *Comment.* in loc.). Perhaps that which is chiefly adumbrated by it is the foundation upon which the union between man and wife is built, viz. identity of nature and oneness of origin. Through the subtlety of the serpent (q. v.), Eve was beguiled into a violation of the one commandment which had been imposed upon her and Adam. She took of the fruit of the forbidden tree and gave it her husband (comp. 2 Cor. xi, 3; 1 Tim. ii, 13). See ADAM. The apostle seems to intimate (1 Tim. ii, 14, 15) that she was less aware than her husband of the character of her sin; and that the pangs of maternity were to be in some sort an expiation of her offence. The different aspects under which Eve regarded her mission as a mother are seen in the names of her sons. At the birth of the first she said "I have gotten a man from the Lord," or, as some have rashly rendered it, "I have gotten a man, *even* the Lord," mistaking him for the Redeemer. When the second was born, finding her hopes frustrated, she named him Abel, or *vanity*. When his brother had slain him, and she again bare a son, she called his name Seth, and the joy of a mother seemed to outweigh the sense of the vanity of life: "For God," said she, "hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel, for Cain slew him." See ABEL.

The Eastern people have paid honors to Adam and Eve as to saints, and have some curious traditions concerning them (see D'Herbelot, *Bibliothèque Orientale*, s. v. Havah; Fabricius, *Pseudepigr. V. Test.* i, 103 sq.). There is a remarkable tradition preserved among the Rabbis that Eve was not the first wife of Adam, but that previous to her creation one had been created in the same way, which, they sagaciously observe, accounts for the number of a man's ribs being equal on each side. *Lilith*, or *Lilis*, for this was the name of Adam's first consort, fell from her state of innocence without tempting, or, at all events, without successfully tempting her husband. She was immediately ranked among the fallen angels, and has ever since, according to the same tradition, exercised an inveterate hatred against all women and children. Up to a very late period she was held in great dread lest she should destroy male children previous to circumcision, after which her power over them ceased. When that rite was solemnized, those who were present were in the habit of pronouncing, with a loud voice, the names of Adam and Eve, and a command to Lilith to depart (see Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, ii, 421). She has been compared with the *Pandora* of classic fable (Bauer, *Mythol.* i, 96 sq.; Buttman, *Mythologus*, i, 48 sq.; Hasse, *Entdeckung*, i, 232).

See Olmsted, *Our First Mother* (N. Y. 1852); Reineccius, *De Adamo androgyno* (Weissenf. 1725); Thilo, *Filius matris viventium in virum Jehovam* (Erlangen, 1748); Köcher, *Comment. philol. ad Gen. vi*, 18-20 (Jen. 1779); Schulthess, *Exeget. theolog. Forschungen*, i, 421 sq.; Bastard, *Doctrine of Geneva*, ii, 61; Hughes, *Female Characters*, p. 1.

**Evelyn, JOHN**, was born Oct. 31, 1620, at his father's seat of Wotton, in Surrey. He was educated at Balliol College, Oxford, served a short time as a volunteer in the Low Countries, and returned at the breaking out of the Civil War to rejoin the king's forces; but, on the king's defeat at Gloucester, he left England, and during the rest of the troubles he travelled in France and Italy. In 1652 he returned

to England, and on the restoration he took an honorable part in public business. He died Feb. 27, 1706. He was one of the original members of the Royal Society, and a frequent contributor to its transactions. His most valuable work was *Sylva, or a Discourse on Forest Trees*. His *Diary* (not published till 1818) is exceedingly useful for the knowledge it conveys of the times in which Evelyn lived. The *Diary and Correspondence* has lately been re-edited, with much new matter (Lond. 1850-52, 4 vols. 8vo). His *History of Religion, a rational Account of the true Religion*, was also first published from the MS. in 1850 by the Rev. N. M. Evanson (London, 2 vols. 8vo); and in 1848 his *Life of Mrs. Godolphin* (from MSS.) was published by bishop Wilberforce.—Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, s. v.

**Evening** (עֶרֶב, *e' reb, dusk*; ἑσπέρα, ὄψια), the period following sunset, with which the Jewish day (νύχθήμερον) began (Gen. i, 5; Mark xiii, 35). See DAY. Some writers have argued that the first creative day (Gen. i, 5) is reckoned from the *morning*, when light first appeared (ver. 3), as if "evening" then designated not a *portion* of time, but a *termination* of the first creative period or age; but this does violence to the whole order of the narrative, in which a period of night invariably precedes one of daylight, precisely in accordance with the conventional Hebrew usage of a νύχθήμερον or "evening-and-morning," and as the terms are expressly defined in the former clause of ver. 5. If "evening" in the phrase in question be distinguishable from the "night" as a terminus, it is certainly a *terminus à quo*, as dating the latter from the aboriginal "darkness," ver. 2, and not a *terminus ad quem* of the ensuing day. See NIGHT.

The Hebrews appear to have reckoned *two* evenings in each day; as in the phrase בֵּין עֶרְבָיִם בֵּין, *between the two evenings* (Exod. xvi, 12; xxx, 8), by which they designated that part of the day in which the paschal lamb was to be killed (Exod. xii, 6; Lev. xxiii, 5; Num. ix, 3, 5; in the Heb. and margin); and, at the same time, the evening sacrifice was offered, the lamps lighted, and the incense burned (Exod. xxix, 39, 41; Num. xxviii, 4). But the ancients themselves disagreed concerning this usage; for the Samaritans and Caraites (comp. Reland, *De Samarit.* § 22, in his *Diss. Miscell.* vol. ii; Trigland, *De Caraitis*, chap. iv) understood the time to be that between sunset and twilight, and so Aben Ezra at Exod. xii, 6, who writes that it was about the third hour (9 o'clock P.M.); the Pharisees, on the other hand, as early as the time of Josephus (*War*, vi, 9, 3), and the Rabbins (*Pesach*, v, 3), thought that "the first evening" was that period of the afternoon when the sun is verging towards setting (Gr. *ἑσπέρα πρώτη*), "the second evening" the precise moment of sunset itself (*ἑσπέρα ὄψια*), according to which opinion the paschal lamb would be slaughtered from the ninth to the eleventh hour (3 to 5 o'clock P.M.). The former of these opinions seems preferable on account of the expression in Deut. xvi, 6, "when the sun goeth down," בְּבֹאֵי הַשָּׁמֶשׁ; and also on account of the similar phraseology among the Arabs (Borhaneddin, *Enchiridion Studiosi*, viii, 36, ed. Caspin, Lips. 1838; *Kamis*, p. 1917; on the contrary, see Pococke, *Ad Carmen Tograi*, p. 71; Talmud Hieros. *Berach.* chap. i; *Babyl. Sabb.* ii, 346, fol.; Bochart, *Hieroz.* i, 634, Lips.).—Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 1065. See PASSOVER.

**EVENING SACRIFICE.** See DAILY OFFERING.

**Even-Song**, the form of divine service appointed to be "said or sung" in the evening of each day in the Church of England, the expression "sung" meaning not an intonation of the voice, where the service is otherwise professedly read, but the chanting of the service, as in cathedrals.—Eden, *Churchman's Dictionary*, s. v.

**Everett, JOSEPH**, an early Methodist Episcopal

minister, was born in Queen Anne's Co., Md., June 17, 1732; was converted in the time of Whitefield, under the preaching of the Presbyterians (then called "New Lights"), in June, 1763, but soon lost his religion, and remained in sin until in 1778 or 1779 he was reclaimed through Asbury's preaching. In 1780 he entered the itinerant ministry, and labored as pastor and presiding elder with great unction and success until 1804, when he became superannuated, and died in Dorchester, Md., Oct. 16, 1809, having preached Christ earnestly for thirty years, and been instrumental in the salvation of many souls. He was a preacher "mighty through God," and died in great triumph. See *Minutes of Conferences*, i, 179; also *Autobiographical Sketch in the Arminian Magazine*, vol. ii; Sprague, *Annals*, vii, 71; Stevens, *Hist. M. E. Church*. (G. L. T.)

**Everlasting.** See ETERNAL.

**Everlasting Gospel.** See EVANGELIUM ÆTERNUM.

**Eves, or Vigils,** the nights or *evenings* before certain holidays of the Church. In the primitive times, it was the custom for Christians to pass great part of the nights that preceded certain holidays in religious exercises; these, from their being performed in the night-time, were called vigils or watchings. One of the most remarkable in the early Church was the Easter vigil. According to the testimony of Lactantius and Jerome, the early Christians expected the second coming of Christ on this night, and prepared themselves, by fasting, prayer, and other spiritual exercises, for that great event. The illuminations on these vigils were often splendid. The night-watchings, in all probability, owed their origin to the necessity under which the primitive Christians lay of meeting by night: when the occasion ceased, the custom still continued. These night-meetings came to be much abused. Vigilantius, in the 4th century, strongly inveighed against them on the ground of their being injurious to the morals of young persons. He was opposed in this view by Jerome. Complaints, however, continued to increase, till at length the custom was abolished. The fasts, however, were retained, keeping the former name of vigils. The Church of England has assigned vigils to several of her festivals, but has prescribed no other observance of them than the reading of the collect peculiar to the festival. The holidays which have vigils may be seen in the English Prayer-book, in the table of the vigils, fasts, and days of abstinence to be observed in the year. There are no vigils recognised in the Protestant Episcopal Church, the table of vigils being left out by the revisers. The Methodist Episcopal Church observes one vigil in the year, the *Watch-night*, Dec. 31, in which service is kept up until midnight.—Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. viii, ch. x, § 1; xiii, 111, 4; Eden, *Churchman's Dict.* s. v.

**E'vi** (Heb. *Evi'*, עֵבִי, *desire* or *dwelling*; Sept. *Ebi', Ebit'*), one of the five kings ("dukes") of the Midianites (near Sihon) slain by the Israelites in the war arising out of the idolatry of Balaam, induced by the suggestion of Balaam (Num. xxxi, 8), and whose lands were afterwards allotted to Reuben (Josh. xiii, 21). See MIDIAN.

**Evidence.** I. Evidence is the rendering in the A. V. of עֵדוּת, *se'pher*, a *book* (as usually rendered), or writing (q. v.) generally, hence a document of title, i. q. *deed* or *bill of sale* (Jer. xxxii, 10, 11, 14, 41); ἔλεγχος, *proof* (Heb. xi, 1; "reproof," 2 Tim. iii, 16, i. e. *conviction*).

II. Evidence is defined by Blackstone "to signify that which demonstrates, makes clear, or ascertains the truth of the very fact or point in issue, either on the one side or the other" (*Comm.* iii, 23). "*Intuitive evidence* comprehends all first truths, or principles of common sense, as 'every cause implies the operation of a cause;' axioms in science, as 'things equal to the

same thing are equal to one another;' and the evidence of *consciousness*, whether by sense, or memory, or thought, as when we touch, or remember, or know, or feel anything. Evidence of this kind arises directly from the presence or contemplation of the object, and gives knowledge without any effort upon our parts. *Deductive evidence* is distinguished as demonstrative and probable. *Demonstrative evidence* rests upon axioms, or first truths, from which, by ratiocination, we attain to other truths. It is scientific, and leads to certainty. It admits not of degrees; and it is impossible to conceive the contrary of the truth which it establishes. *Probable evidence* has reference, not to necessary, but contingent truth. It admits of degrees, and is derived from various sources; e. g. experience, analogy, and testimony" (Fleming, *Vocabulary of Philosophy*, s. v.).

The Scotch school of metaphysics presents the doctrine of evidence as follows: "The theory of evidence was not unknown to Aristotle and the ancient writers, but it is chiefly to the researches of modern logicians, from Bacon downwards, that we are indebted for a complete exposition of it. The grounds on which we believe a statement to be either true or false are termed the evidence. These grounds, it is obvious, may vary in kind as well as in degree. Some truths are capable of being established with undoubted certainty; others, again, admit of a proof more or less strong. It is of great importance, therefore, to know by what kind of evidence any fact or statement can be supported, and thus we may readily ascertain to what extent our belief in it may be carried. The two great classes into which all kinds of evidence are usually reduced are *intuitive* and *deductive*, the former calling for immediate and irresistible belief, independently of any process of argumentation whatever; the latter requiring for its proof various consecutive steps of reasoning. Some writers are in the habit of dividing evidence into three classes: intuitive, deductive, and demonstrative, and the evidence of testimony. Under intuitive evidence, which commands instant and irresistible belief, are generally included, besides those *à priori* truths which are necessarily involved in an act of consciousness, the evidence of sense, of memory, and of axioms or general principles. It is well, however, to bear in mind that consciousness and intuitive evidence are convertible terms, and that in no sense entitled to be considered as resting on intuitive evidence which is not involved in an act of consciousness. This view of the subject to doubt limits the number of intuitive, and therefore dogmatically certain truths; sufficient, however, remains to establish a sure foundation for all future reasonings of every kind. And this is all that ought to be desired. Those truths only are entitled to be ranked as intuitions which we cannot deny without involving ourselves in an obvious contradiction. What is essentially necessary to the operation of our intellectual and moral nature is intuitive. We cannot think, for example, without being subjected to the influence of the evidence of consciousness. To these, then, in so far as man is concerned, dogmatical certainty belongs. He cannot doubt their truth without disclaiming the nature with which he has been endowed. The evidence of intuition, or consciousness, is certain in itself, but from its truths no other truths can be deduced. Hence the distinction drawn between this and all the other species of evidence, which are classed under one head, termed deductive. Deductive evidence, or that which is chiefly available in the evolution of unknown from known truths, is usually distinguished into two kinds, demonstrative and moral, or probable evidence, giving rise to a corresponding distinction in modes of reasoning. It is of great importance that the difference between demonstrative and probable evidence be kept constantly in view, that we may be prevented from confounding two species of truth so completely distinct from

one another. The evidence of demonstration applies to necessary, moral or probable evidence to contingent, truth. The great mass of objects upon which our judgment and reasonings are exercised rests upon probable evidence. Demonstrative evidence is very limited in the range of its application, extending no farther than to the relations of number and quantity, which are capable of being expressed in language so strictly definite as to admit of no misunderstanding or mistake. On the strict definition of terms rests the whole certainty of mathematical truth, which is not an absolute, therefore, but a hypothetical certainty; and to the great mass of phenomena, and events with which we are familiarly conversant, such a mode of reasoning would be altogether inapplicable. The language employed is too vague and ambiguous to admit of strict definition; and such is the imperfection of language that, however desirable it might be to have words used in a fixed meaning, it is impracticable. The idea has, no doubt, been entertained of reducing words, expressive of our views on general subjects, to a fixed and certain signification; and even the illustrious names of Leibnitz and Locke are found in connection with such a plan, and yet we fear the experience of all past ages must pronounce it utopian. However advantageous, indeed, such a plan in some respects might be, it is very doubtful whether it might not so fetter and constrain the mind that no scope would be given for the exercise of those powers which the labor required in procuring probable evidence summons into action. It is very injurious to the mind to entertain too strong a partiality for one species of evidence rather than another. We thereby lose sight of the important fact that the same kind of evidence is not equally applicable in all cases, and that therefore we ought only to require such evidences as the particular circumstances of the case admit. Instead, therefore, of being dissatisfied with the kind of evidence adduced, it ought to be our chief inquiry whether, in any given case, we have obtained the strongest evidence of that kind which is applicable."

On the distinction between probable and demonstrative evidence, see Butler, *Analogy of Religion* (Introduction). See also Gardner, *Christian Cyclopaedia*, p. 352; Bergier, *Dict. de Théologie*, ii, 531; Brown, *On Cause and Effect*, notes E, F; Abercrombie, *On Intellectual Powers*, pt. ii; Starkie, *On Evidence*, i, 471; Gambier, *On Moral Evidence* (London, 1824, 8vo); Locke, *Essay*, bk. iv, ch. 15.

**Evidences of Christianity**, the title generally given by English writers to the proofs of the divine origin of the Christian revelation. This branch of theology does not include demonstrations of the being of God against the atheists, but is directed against all who deny the divine authority of Christianity and of the Scriptures on which it rests. The term *Apologetics* has been adopted in Germany for the name of this science, and under that title and that of *Apoloogy* we have given an account of the forms which the proofs and defences of Christianity have assumed in the various periods of Church history. In this article we give (I.) a summary of the evidences as they are commonly stated by English writers; (II.) a summary of the views held by different writers as to the relative value of the several branches of evidence.

I. *Summary of Christian Evidences*.—The evidences of Christianity are usually classed by English writers under three heads—External, Internal, and Collateral. The *External* evidences are those which demonstrate the authenticity, credibility, and divine authority of the Scriptures, including the arguments from miracles and prophecy. The *Internal* evidence is drawn from the excellence and beneficial tendency of the doctrines and morals of Scripture, from the character of Christ, and from the marks of integrity, consistency, and inspiration which are inherent in the record. The *Collateral* evidence is drawn from the history of Chris-

tianity itself, from its marvellous diffusion, its effects upon human nature, upon the progress of society, and upon what is generally called civilization. One of the best sketches of the evidences, according to this classification of them, is that given by Watson (*Institutes*, vol. i). Preliminary to a consideration of these direct evidences, he gives an excellent sketch of the *presumptive* evidence, of which the following is a brief outline. Man is universally admitted, by all who admit the being of God, to be a moral and responsible agent, under the dominion of the law of God. But deists assert that this law is given in nature sufficiently, and that revelation is unnecessary. It can be shown, on the other hand, that human reason, unaided, has never afforded to man any clear standard of moral quality for actions, and that, even if it could do so, its decisions lack authority to control the will; they are, at best, but *opinions*, which may be received or not, at pleasure. History shows that sober views of religion have been found nowhere since the times of the patriarchs, except in the writings of the O. and N. T., and in writings drawn from them; and that whatever truth has been found in the religious systems of the heathen can be traced to revelation. Their notions as to the very rudimentary doctrines of religion, e. g. God, providence, immortality, etc., clearly show the necessity of revelation. Admitting, then, the presumption that a revelation should be given in some way, we may show, *à priori*, that it must (1) contain information on the subjects most important to man; (2) that it must accord with the principles of former revelations; (3) that it must have an external authentication; and (4) that it must contain provisions for its own effectual promulgation. All these conditions are fulfilled by the revelation given in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and nowhere else.

1. The *external* evidences include miracles and prophecy. "We need not inquire whether external evidence of a revelation is in all cases requisite to him who immediately and at first receives it; for the question is not whether private revelations have ever been made by God to individuals, and what evidence is required to authenticate them, but what is the kind of evidence which we ought to require of one who professes to have received a revelation of the will of God, with a command to communicate it to us, and to enjoin it upon our acceptance and submission as the rule of our opinions and manners. He may believe that a divine communication has been made to himself, but *his* belief has no authority to command *ours*. He may have actually received it, but we have not the means of knowing it without *proof*. That proof is not the high and excellent nature of the truths he teaches; in other words, that which is called the *internal evidence* cannot be that proof. For we cannot tell whether the doctrines he teaches, though they should be capable of a higher degree of rational demonstration than any delivered to the world before, may not be the fruits of his own mental labor. He may be conscious that they are not, but *we* have no means of knowing that of which he is conscious except by his own testimony. To us, therefore, they would have no authority but as the opinions of a man whose intellectual attainments we might admire, but to whom we could not submit as to an infallible guide, and the less so if any part of the doctrine taught by him were either mysterious or above our reason, or contrary to our interests, prejudices, and passions. If, therefore, any person should profess to have received a revelation of truth from God to teach to mankind, and that he was directed to command their obedience to it on pain of the divine displeasure, he would be asked for some external authentication of his mission; nor would the reasonableness and excellence of his doctrines be accepted in place of this. The latter might entitle him to attention, but nothing short of the former would be thought a ground sufficiently strong for yielding to

him an absolute obedience. Without it he might reason and be heard with respect, but he could not *command*. On this very reasonable ground the Jews on one occasion asked our Lord, "By what authority doest thou these things?" and on another, "What sign showest thou unto us?" Agreeably to this, the authors both of the Jewish and the Christian revelations profess to have authenticated their mission by the two great external proofs, *MIRACLES* and *PROPHECY*, and it remains to be considered whether this kind of authentication be reasonably sufficient to command our faith and obedience.

The question is not whether we may not conceive of external proofs of the mission of Moses, and of Christ and his apostles, differing from those which are assumed to have been given, and more convincing. In whatever way the authentication had been made, we might have conceived of modes of proof differing in kind, or more ample in circumstance; so that to ground an objection upon the absence of a particular kind of proof, for which we have a preference, would be trifling. But this is the question: Is a mission to teach the will of God to man, under his immediate authority, sufficiently authenticated when *miracles* are really performed, and *prophecies* actually and unequivocally accomplished? We have, then, first to show that miracles and prophecies are possible, that their credibility can be established by human testimony, and that, when thus authenticated, they afford the necessary evidence of revelation. These topics will be treated under the heads of *MIRACLES* and *PROPHECY* (q. v.). The records of both miracles and prophecy are found in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. The *antiquity* of these writings is demonstrated by the very fact of the existence, on the one hand, of the Jewish polity, and, on the other, of the Christian religion, as well as by the concurrent testimony of ancient profane authors. These books can be shown, by testimony more accurate and minute than exists with regard to any other ancient records, to be substantially the same now as when originally written, nay, that they have come down to our times without any material alteration whatsoever. The credibility of the testimony of the sacred writers themselves is fairly proved by the character of the men, by the circumstances under which they wrote, and by the entire absence of motive for falsification. Allowing, then, the New Testament to be genuine, it follows, "1. That the writers knew whether the facts they state were true or false (John i, 3; xix, 27, 35; Acts xxvii, 7, 9). 2. That the character of these writers, so far as we can judge by their works, seems to render them worthy of regard, and leaves no room to imagine they intended to deceive us. The manner in which they tell their story is most happily adapted to gain our belief. There is no air of declamation and harangue; nothing that looks like artifice and design: no apologies, no encomiums, no characters, no reflections, no digressions; but the facts are recounted with great simplicity, just as they seem to have happened, and those facts are left to speak for themselves. Their integrity, likewise, evidently appears in the freedom with which they mention those circumstances which might have exposed their Master and themselves to the greatest contempt amongst prejudiced and inconsiderate men, such as they knew they must generally expect to meet with (John i, 45, 46; vii, 52; Luke ii, 4, 7; Mark vi, 3; Matt. viii, 20; John vii, 48). It is certain that there are in their writings the most genuine traces not only of a plain and honest, but a most pious and devout, a most benevolent and generous disposition, as every one must acknowledge who reads their writings. 3. The apostles were under no temptation to forge a story of this kind, or to publish it to the world knowing it to be false. 4. Had they done so, humanly speaking, they must quickly have perished in it, and their foolish cause must have died with them, without

ever gaining any credit in the world. Reflect more particularly on the nature of those grand facts, the death, resurrection, and exaltation of Christ, which formed the great foundation of the Christian scheme, as first exhibited to the apostles. The resurrection of a dead man, and his ascension into an abode in the upper world, were such strange things that a thousand objections would immediately have been raised against them, and some extraordinary proof would have been justly required as a balance to them. Consider the manner in which the apostles undertook to prove the truth of their testimony to these facts, and it will evidently appear that, instead of confirming their scheme, it must have been sufficient utterly to have overthrown it, had it been itself the most probable imposture that the wit of man could ever have contrived. See Acts iii, ix, xiv, xix, etc. They did not merely assert that they had seen miracles wrought by Jesus, but that he had endowed them with a variety of miraculous powers; and these they undertook to display, not in such idle and useless tricks as sleight of hand might perform, but in such solid and important works as appeared worthy of divine interposition, and entirely superior to human power. Nor were these things undertaken in a corner, in a circle of friends or dependents; nor were they said to be wrought, as might be suspected, by any confederates in the fraud; but they were done often in the most public manner. Would impostors have made such pretensions as these? or, if they had, must they not immediately have been exposed and ruined? Now, if the New Testament be genuine, then it is certain that the apostles pretend to have wrought miracles in the very presence of those to whom their writings were addressed; nay, more, they profess likewise to have conferred those miraculous gifts in some considerable degrees on others, even on the very persons to whom they write, and they appeal to their consciences as to the truth of it. And could there possibly be room for delusion here? 5. It is likewise certain that the apostles did gain early credit, and succeeded in a most wonderful manner. This is abundantly proved by the vast number of churches established in early ages at Rome, Corinth, Ephesus, Colosse, etc. 6. That, admitting the facts which they testified concerning Christ to be true, then it was reasonable for their contemporaries, and is reasonable for us, to receive the Gospel which they have transmitted to us as a divine revelation. The great thing they asserted was, that Jesus was the Christ, and that he was proved to be so by prophecies accomplished in him, and by miracles wrought by him, and by others in his name. If we attend to these, we shall find them to be no contemptible arguments, but must be forced to acknowledge that, the premises being established, the conclusion most easily and necessarily follows; and this conclusion, that Jesus is the Christ, taken in all its extent, is an abstract of the Gospel revelation, and therefore is sometimes put for the whole of it (Acts viii, 37; xvii, 18)" (Buck, *Theol. Dict.* s. v. Christianity).

2. The *Internal* evidence of Christianity is drawn from a consideration of the doctrines of Scripture, of their consistency with the character of God, and their tendency to promote the virtue and happiness of men. It takes note also of the morals of Christianity, and of their superiority to all other systems of ethics; and especially of the character of Christ, as a real life far transcending even the highest imaginations of merely human moralists. "Of its just and sublime conceptions and exhibitions of the divine character; of the truth of that view of the moral state of man upon which its disciplinary treatment is founded; of the correspondence that there is between its views of man's mixed relation to God as a sinful creature, and yet pitied and cared for, and that actual mixture of good and evil, penalty and forbearance, which the condition of the world presents; of the connection of its



doctrine of atonement with hope; of the adaptation of its doctrine of divine influence to the moral condition of mankind when rightly understood, and the affecting benevolence and condescension which it implies; and of its noble and sanctifying revelations of the blessedness of a future life, much might be said—they are subjects, indeed, on which volumes have been written, and they can never be exhausted. Nowhere except in the Scriptures have we a perfect system of morals; and the deficiencies of pagan morality only exalt the purity, the comprehensiveness, the practicability of ours. The character of the Being acknowledged as supreme must always impress itself upon moral feeling and practice, the obligation of which rests upon his will. The God of the Bible is ‘holy,’ without spot; ‘just,’ without partiality; ‘good,’ boundlessly benevolent and beneficent; and his law is the image of himself, ‘holy, just, and good.’ These great moral qualities are not made known to us merely in the abstract, so as to be comparatively feeble in their influence, but in the person of Christ, our God incarnate, they are seen exemplified in action, displaying themselves amidst human relations, and the actual circumstances of human life. With pagans the authority of moral rules was either the opinion of the wise, or the tradition of the ancient, confirmed, it is true, in some degree, by observation and experience; but to us they are given as commands immediately issuing from the supreme Governor, and ratified as his by the most solemn and explicit attestations. With them many great moral principles, being indistinctly apprehended, were matters of doubt and debate; to us, the explicit manner in which they are given excludes both: for it cannot be questioned whether we are commanded to love our neighbor as ourselves; to do to others as we would that they should do to us, a precept which comprehends almost all relative morality in one plain principle; to forgive our enemies; to love all mankind; to live righteously and soberly, as well as godly; that magistrates must be a terror only to evil-doers, and a praise to them that do well; that subjects are to render honor to whom honor, and tribute to whom tribute, is due; that masters are to be just and merciful, and servants faithful and obedient. These, and many other familiar precepts, are too explicit to be mistaken, and too authoritative to be disputed; two of the most powerful means of rendering law effectual. Those who never enjoyed the benefit of revelation, never conceived justly and comprehensively of that moral state of the heart from which right and beneficent conduct alone can flow; and, therefore, when they speak of the same virtues as those enjoined by Christianity, they are to be understood as attaching to them a lower idea. In this the infinite superiority of Christianity displays itself. The principle of obedience is not only a sense of duty to God and the fear of his displeasure, but a tender love, excited by his infinite compassions to us in the gift of his Son, which shrinks from offending. To this influential motive as a *reason* of obedience is added another, drawn from its *end*: one not less influential, but which heathen moralists never knew—the testimony that we please God, manifested in the acceptance of our prayers, and in spiritual and felicitous communion with him. By Christianity, impurity of thought and desire is restrained in an equal degree as are their overt acts in the lips and conduct. Humanity, meekness, gentleness, placability, disinterestedness, and charity are all as clearly and solemnly enjoined as the grosser vices are prohibited; and on the unruly tongue itself is impressed ‘the law of kindness.’ Nor are the injunctions feeble; they are strictly LAW, and not mere advice and recommendations: ‘Without holiness no man shall see the Lord;’ and thus our entrance into heaven, and our escape from perdition, are made to depend upon this preparation of mind. To all this is added possibility, nay, certainty of attainment, if we

use the appointed means. A pagan could draw, though not with lines so perfect, a *beau idéal* of virtue which he never thought attainable; but the ‘full assurance of hope’ is given by the religion of Christ to all who are seeking the moral renovation of their nature, because ‘it is God that worketh in us to will and to do of his good pleasure.’ When such is the moral nature of Christianity, how obvious is it that its tendency, both as to individuals and to society, must be in the highest sense beneficial! From every passion which wastes, and burns, and frets, and enfeebles the spirit, the individual is set free, and his inward peace renders his obedience cheerful and voluntary; and we might appeal to infidels themselves whether, if the moral principles of the Gospel were wrought into the hearts and embodied in the conduct of all men, the world would not be happy; whether if governments ruled, and subjects obeyed, by the laws of Christ; whether if the rules of strict justice which are enjoined upon us regulated all the transactions of men, and all that mercy to the distressed which we are taught to feel and to practise came into operation; and whether, if the precepts which delineate and enforce the duties of husbands, wives, masters, servants, parents, children, did, in fact, fully and generally govern all these relations—whether a better age than that called *golden* by the poets would not then be realized, and Virgil’s

*Jam redit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna,  
[Now Astræa returns, and the Saturnian reign.]*

be far too weak to express the mighty change? [It was in the reign of Saturn that the heathen poets fixed the Golden Age. At that period, according to them, Astræa (the goddess of justice), and many other deities, lived on earth, but, being offended with the wickedness of men, they successively fled to heaven. Astræa staid longest, but at last retired to her native seat, and was translated into the sign Virgo, next to Libra, who holds her balance.] Such is the tendency of Christianity. On immense numbers of individuals it has superinduced these moral changes; all nations, where it has been fully and faithfully exhibited, bear, amidst their remaining vices, the impress of its hallowing and benevolent influence: it is now in active exertion in many of the darkest and worst parts of the earth, to convey the same blessings; and he who would arrest its progress, were he able, would quench the only hope which remains to our world, and prove himself an enemy not only to himself, but to all mankind. What, then, we ask, does all this prove, but that the Scriptures are worthy of God, and propose the very ends which rendered a revelation necessary? Of the whole system of practical religion which it contains we may say, as of that which is embodied in our Lord’s sermon on the mount, in the words of one who, in a course of sermons on that divine composition, has entered most deeply into its spirit, and presented a most instructive delineation of the character which it was intended to form, ‘Behold Christianity in its native form, as delivered by its great author. See a picture of God, as far as he is imitable by man, drawn by God’s own hand. What beauty appears in the whole! How just a symmetry! What exact proportion in every part! How desirable is the happiness here described! How venerable, how lovely is the holiness!’ ‘If,’ says Jeremy Taylor, ‘wisdom, and mercy, and justice, and simplicity, and holiness, and purity, and meekness, and contentedness, and charity be images of God and rays of divinity, then that doctrine, in which all these shine so gloriously, and in which nothing else is ingredient, must, needs be from God. If the holy Jesus had come into the world with less splendor of power and mighty demonstrations, yet the excellency of what he taught makes him alone fit to be the master of the world;’ and agreeable to all this has been its actual influence upon mankind. Although, says Bishop Porteus, Christianity has not always been so well understood or so honestly practised as it ought

to have been; although its spirit has been often mistaken and its precepts misapplied, yet under all these disadvantages it has gradually produced a visible change in those points which most materially concern the peace and quiet of the world. Its beneficent spirit has spread itself through all the different relations and modifications of life, and communicated its kindly influence to almost every public and private concern of mankind. It has insensibly worked itself into the inmost frame and constitution of civil states. It has given a tinge to the complexion of their governments, to the temper and administration of their laws. It has restrained the spirit of the prince and the madness of the people. It has softened the rigors of despotism and tamed the insolence of conquest. It has, in some degree, taken away the edge of the sword, and thrown even over the horrors of war a veil of mercy. It has descended into families; has diminished the pressure of private tyranny; improved every domestic endearment; given tenderness to the parent, humanity to the master, respect to superiors, to inferiors ease; so that mankind are, upon the whole, even in a temporal view, under infinite obligations to the mild and pacific temper of the Gospel, and have reaped from it more substantial worldly benefits than from any other institution upon earth. As one proof of this among many others, consider only the shocking carnage made in the human species by the exposure of infants, the gladiatorial shows, which sometimes cost Rome twenty or thirty lives in a month; and the exceedingly cruel usage of slaves allowed and practised by the ancient pagans. These were not the accidental and temporary excesses of a sudden fury, but were legal, and established, and constant methods of murdering and tormenting mankind. Had Christianity done nothing more than brought into disuse, as it confessedly has done, the two former of these inhuman customs entirely, and the latter to a very great degree, it has justly merited the title of the benevolent religion. But this is far from being all. Throughout the more enlightened parts of Christendom there prevails a gentleness of manners widely different from the ferocity of the most civilized nations of antiquity; and that liberality with which every species of distress is relieved is a virtue peculiar to the Christian name. But we may ask farther, What success has it had on the mind of man as it respects his eternal welfare? How many thousands have felt its power, rejoiced in its benign influence, and under its dictates been constrained to devote themselves to the glory and praise of God! Burdened with guilt, incapable of finding relief from human resources, the mind has here found peace unspokeable in beholding that sacrifice which alone could atone for transgression. Here the hard and impenitent heart has been softened, the impetuous passions restrained, the ferocious temper subdued, powerful prejudices conquered, ignorance dispelled, and the obstacles to real happiness removed. Here the Christian, looking round on the glories and blandishments of this world, has been enabled, with a noble contempt, to despise all. Here death itself, the king of terrors, has lost all his sting; and the soul, with a holy magnanimity, has borne up in the agonies of a dying hour, and sweetly sung itself away to everlasting bliss. In respect to its future spread, we have reason to believe that all nations shall feel its happy effects. The prophecies are pregnant with matter as to this belief. It seems that not only a nation or a country, but the whole habitable globe, shall become the kingdom of our God and of his Christ" (Watson, *Dictionary*, s. v. Christianity).

3. The *Collateral* evidence treats of the marvellous diffusion of the Gospel, and of its actual effects upon mankind and upon the history of civilization, as proofs of its divine origin. "Of its early triumphs, the history of the Acts of the Apostles is a splendid record; and in process of time it made a wonderful progress through Europe, Asia, and Africa. In the third cen-

tury there were Christians in the camp, in the senate, and in the palace; in short, everywhere, as we are informed, except in the temples and the theatres: they filled the towns, the country, and the islands. Men and women of all ages and ranks, and even those of the first dignity, embraced the Christian faith, inasmuch that the pagans complained that the revenues of their temples were ruined. They were in such great numbers in the empire, that, as Tertullian expresses it, if they had retired into another country, they would have left the Roman territory only a frightful solitude. For the illustration of this argument, we may observe that the Christian religion was introduced everywhere in opposition to the sword of the magistrate, the craft and interest of the priests, the pride of the philosophers, the passions and prejudices of the people, all closely combined in support of the national worship, and to crush the Christian faith, which aimed at the subversion of heathenism and idolatry. Moreover, this religion was not propagated in the dark by persons who tacitly endeavored to deceive the credulous, nor delivered out by little and little, so that one doctrine might prepare the way for the reception of another; but it was fully and without disguise laid before men all at once, that they might judge of the whole under one view. Consequently mankind were not deluded into the belief of it, but received it upon proper examination and conviction. Besides, the Gospel was first preached and first believed by multitudes in Judæa, where Jesus exercised his ministry, and where every individual had the means of knowing whether the things that were told him were matters of fact; and in this country, the scene of the principal transactions on which its credibility depended, the history of Christ could never have been received unless it had been true, and known to all as truth. Again: the doctrine and history of Jesus were preached and believed in the most noted countries and cities of the world, in the very age when he is said to have lived. On the fiftieth day after our Lord's crucifixion, three thousand persons were converted in Jerusalem by a single sermon of the apostles; and a few weeks after this, five thousand who believed were present at another sermon preached also in Jerusalem (Acts ii, 41; iv, 4; vi, 7; viii, 1; ix, 1, 20). About eight or ten years after our Lord's death, the disciples were become so numerous at Jerusalem and in the adjacent country that they were objects of jealousy and alarm to Herod himself (Acts xii, 1). In the twenty-second year after the crucifixion, the disciples in Judæa are said to have been many myriads (Acts xxi, 20). The age in which Christianity was introduced and received was famous for men whose faculties were improved by the most perfect state of social life, but who were good judges of the evidence offered in support of the facts recorded in the Gospel history; for it should be recollected that the success of the Gospel was not restricted to Judæa, but it was preached in all the different provinces of the Roman empire. The first triumphs of Christianity were in the heart of Greece itself, the nursery of learning and the polite arts, for churches were planted at a very early period at Corinth, Ephesus, Berea, Thessalonica, and Philippi. Even Rome herself, the seat of wealth and empire, was not able to resist the force of truth at a time when the facts related were recent, and when they might, if they had been false, have easily been disproved. From Greece and Rome, at a period of cultivation and refinement, of general peace and extensive intercourse, when one great empire united different nations and distant people, the confutation of these facts would very soon have passed from one country to another, to the utter confusion of the persons who endeavored to propagate the belief of them. Nor ought it to be forgotten that the religion to which such numbers were proselyted was an exclusive one. It denied, without reserve, the truth of every article

of heathen mythology, and the existence of every object of their worship. It accepted no compromise; it admitted of no comprehension. If it prevailed at all, it must prevail by the overthrow of every statue, altar, and temple in the world. It pronounced all other gods to be false, and all other worship vain. These are considerations which must have strengthened the opposition to it, augmented the hostility which it must encounter, and enhanced the difficulty of gaining proselytes; and more especially when we recollect that, among the converts to Christianity in the earliest age, a number of persons remarkable for their station, office, genius, education, and fortune, and who were personally interested by their emoluments and honors in either Judaism or heathenism, appeared among the Christian proselytes. Its evidences approved themselves not only to the multitude, but to men of the most refined sense and most distinguished abilities, and it dissolved the attachments which all powerful interest and authority created and upheld" (Watson, *l. c.*).

Paley's *View of the Evidences of Christianity* for a long time held the first place as a text-book on evidences in England. Paley even goes so far as to say we can conceive of no way in which a revelation could be made except by miracles. "In whatever degree it is probable, or not very improbable, that a revelation should be communicated to mankind at all, in the same degree it is probable, or not very improbable, that miracles should be wrought. Therefore, when miracles are related to have been wrought in the promulgation of a revelation manifestly wanted, and, if true, of inestimable value, the improbability which arises from the miraculous nature of the things related is not greater than the original improbability that such a revelation should be imparted by God." The book is divided into two parts: I. The direct historical evidence of Christianity, and wherein it is distinguished from the evidence alleged for other miracles; II. The auxiliary evidences of Christianity. The first part is then divided into two propositions: (I.) "That there is satisfactory evidence that many, professing to be original witnesses of the Christian miracles, passed their lives in labors, dangers, and sufferings, voluntarily undergone in attestation of the accounts which they delivered, and solely in consequence of their belief in those accounts; and that they also submitted, from the same motives, to new rules of conduct." (II.) "That there is not satisfactory evidence that persons pretending to be original witnesses of any other similar miracles have acted in the same manner, in attestation of the accounts which they delivered, and solely in consequence of their belief in the truth of those accounts." The argument rests on the credibility of testimony, and aims to show that the testimony in this case is indubitable. The second part treats briefly the argument from prophecy, from the morality of the Gospel, and the internal evidences afforded both by the sacred writings, and by the doctrines and histories which they contain.

Coleridge, who disparaged the comparative value of evidence from miracles and prophecy, dictated to a friend the following scheme of evidences: "I. Miracles, as precluding the contrary evidence of no miracles. II. The material of Christianity, its existence and history. III. The doctrines of Christianity, and the correspondence of human nature to these doctrines, illustrated, 1st, historically, as the actual production of the new world, and the dependence of the fate of the planet upon it; 2d, individually, from its appeal for its truth to an asserted fact, which, whether it be real or not, every man possessing reason has an equal power of ascertaining within himself, namely, a will which has more or less lost its freedom, though not the consciousness that it ought to be and may become free; the conviction that this cannot be achieved without the operation of a principle connatural with

itself; the evident rationality of an entire confidence in that principle, being the condition and means of its operation; the experience in his own nature of the truth of the process described by Scripture as far as he can place himself within the process, aided by the confident assurances of others as to the effects experienced by them, and which he is striving to arrive at. All these form a practical Christian. Add, however, a gradual opening out of the intellect to more and more clear perceptions of the strict coincidence of the doctrines of Christianity, with the truths evolved by the mind from inflexions on its own nature. To such a man one main test of the objectivity, the entity, the objective truth of his faith, is its accompaniment by an increase of insight into the moral beauty and necessity of the process which it comprises, and the dependence of that proof on the causes asserted. Believe, and, if thy belief be right, that insight which gradually transmutes faith into knowledge will be the reward of that belief. The Christian, to whom, after a long profession of Christianity, the mysteries remain as much mysteries as before, is in the same state as a school-boy with regard to his arithmetic, to whom the *fact* at the end of the examples in his ciphering-book is the whole ground for his assuming that such and such figures amount to so and so. 3d. In the above I include the increasing discoveries in the correspondence of the history, the doctrines, and the promises of Christianity with the past, present, and probable future of human nature; and in this state a fair comparison of the religion as a divine philosophy with all other religions which have pretended to revelations and all other systems of philosophy, both with regard to the totality of its truth and its identification with the manifest march of affairs. I should conclude that, if we suppose a man to have convinced himself that not only the doctrines of Christianity, which may be conceived independently of history or time, as the Trinity, spiritual influences, etc., are coincident with the truths which his reason, thus strengthened, has evolved from its own sources, but that the historical dogmas, namely, of the incarnation of the creative Logos, and his becoming a personal agent, are themselves founded in philosophical necessity, then it seems irrational that such a man should reject the belief of the actual appearance of a religion strictly correspondent therewith, at a given time recorded, even as much as that he should reject Caesar's account of his wars in Gaul after he had convinced himself *à priori* of their possibility. As the result of these convictions, he will not scruple to receive the particular miracles recorded, inasmuch as it would be miraculous that an incarnate God should not work what must to mere man appear as miracles, inasmuch as it is strictly accordant with the ends and benevolent nature of such a being to commence the elevation of man above his mere senses by attracting and enforcing attention, first, through an appeal to those senses. But with equal reason will he expect that no other or greater force should be laid on those miracles as such; that they should not be spoken of as good in themselves, much less as the adequate and ultimate proof of that religion; and, likewise, he will receive additional satisfaction should he find these miracles so wrought, and on such occasions, as to give them a personal value as symbols of important truths when their miraculousness was no longer needful or efficacious" (Coleridge, *Works*, N. Y., v, 555).

On the argument of Butler's *Analogy*, see the article BUTLER (vol. i, p. 937).

II. As to the comparative value of the different classes of the Christian evidences there has been much dispute. Coleridge admitted the value of the testimony from miracles for the Jews at the beginning of Christianity, but considered that argument as much less valuable *now* than the internal evidence. "It was only to overthrow the usurpation exercised in and through the senses that the senses were miraculously

appealed to. *Reason and religion are their own evidence.* The natural sun is in this respect a symbol of the spiritual. Ere he is fully risen, and while his glories are still under veil, he calls up the breeze to chase away the usurping vapors of the night season, and thus converts the air itself into the minister of its own purification: not surely a proof or elucidation of the light from heaven, but to prevent its interception. Wherever, therefore, similar circumstances coexist with the same moral causes, the principles revealed and the examples recorded in the inspired writings render miracles superfluous; and if we neglect to apply truths in expectation of wonders, or under pretext of the cessation of the latter, we tempt God, and merit the same reply which our Lord gave to the Pharisees on a like occasion. I shall merely state here what my belief is concerning the true evidences of Christianity.

1. Its consistency with right reason I consider as the outer court of the temple, the common area within which it stands. 2. The miracles, with and through which the religion was first revealed and attested, I regard as the steps, the vestibule, and the portal of the temple. 3. The sense, the inward feeling in the soul of each believer of its exceeding *desirableness*, the experience that he *needs* something, joined with the strong foretoking that the redemption and the graces propounded to us in Christ are *what* he needs—this I hold to be the true *foundation* of the spiritual edifice. With the strong *a priori* probability that flows in from 1 and 3 on the correspondent historical evidence of 2, no man can refuse or neglect to make the experiment without guilt. But, 4, it is the experience derived from a practical conformity to the conditions of the Gospel; it is the opening eye, the dawning light, the terrors and the promises of spiritual growth, the blessedness of loving God as God, the nascent sense of sin hated as sin, and of the incapability of attaining to either without Christ; it is the sorrow that still rises up from beneath, and the consolation that meets it from above; the bosom treacheries of the principal in the warfare, and the exceeding faithfulness and long-suffering of the uninterested ally; in a word, it is the actual *trial* of the faith in Christ, with its accompaniments and results, that must form the arched roof, and faith itself is the completing KEY-STONE. In order to an efficient belief in Christianity a man must have been a Christian, and this is the seeming *argumentum in circulo* incident to all spiritual truths, to every subject not presentable under the forms of time and space, as long as we attempt to master by the reflex acts of the understanding what we can only *know* by the act of *becoming*. 'Do the will of my father, and ye shall *know* whether I am of God.' These four evidences I believe to have been, and still to be, for the world, for the whole Church, all necessary, all equally necessary; but that at present, and for the majority of Christians born in Christian countries, I believe the third and the fourth evidence to be the most operative; not as superseding, but as involving a glad, undoubting faith in the two former" (Oleridge, *Biographia Literaria*, c. xxiv).

Ullmann (*Sinlessness of Jesus*, § 1) remarks "that the nature of the case, and the necessities of their contemporaries, justified the apostles in proving the divine mission of Christ by the argument from miracles and prophecy. But the necessity of the times and of individuals may in this respect vary; and although the Gospel in its *essence* remains the same, and contains eternal, unchangeable truth, yet in a different age a different method of proof may lead more immediately to the acknowledgment of this truth. In our own time it seems proper to fix our eyes especially upon the spiritual character of Jesus in order to obtain satisfactory proof of the divinity of his mission and instructions, not because the apostolical mode of proof has become untenable, but because the other mode has a more vital efficacy on account of the style of ed-

ucation prevalent at the present day. We do not find ourselves in immediate, conscious connection with the spirit and prophecies of the Old Testament, as the Jews were in the time of the apostles; we live among contemporaries to whom miracles are more a ground of doubt than of faith; we should not forget that the proof from miracles exerts its full power, properly speaking, on none but the eye-witnesses of them, and conducts us to the desired conclusion only by a circuitous path. On the other hand, a vivid apprehension of the inward character of Jesus brings us nearer to the operative centre of Christianity, and at the same time makes us feel the influence of the moral power which goes forth from that centre. Here faith in Jesus rests immediately on himself; it is free, spiritual confidence in his person. As with his contemporaries everything depended on the yielding confidence with which they received the favors which he brought them, so likewise with us this confidence may be the element of a full belief in Christianity, and is, at all events, a condition of receiving benefit from our Redeemer."

The tendency of German theology has gone against the external evidences of Christianity, but this very tendency opened the door to rationalism and infidelity, above which German orthodoxy has only recently begun to emerge. On this point, see the *New York Review*, ii, 141 sq. See also bishop Butler's admirable discussion of the "particular" evidence for Christianity in his *Analogy of Religion*, pt. ii, ch. vii. See also Mansell, in *Aids to Faith*, Essay i (London, 1861, 8vo). The tendency of the best modern apologists is not to thrust the argument from miracles into the background, but to vindicate it afresh. So Auberlen, *Göttliche Offenbarung* (1864); Mozley, *On Miracles*; Fisher, *Essays on the supernatural Origin of Christianity*, p. 12 sq., 503 sq. The rejection of miracles generally leads to a rejection of the doctrine of the personality of God. See, for a fuller treatment of this branch of the subject, the article MIRACLES. The chief task of the apologist for Christianity in the present age (apart from the metaphysical conflict with Pantheism and Positivism, for which see articles under those heads) is to vindicate the authenticity and the early date of the books of the N. T. against the assaults not merely of avowed skeptics, but also of theologians within the Christian Church, such as those of the Tübingen school (q. v.). This task resolves itself, again, into that of vindicating the historical reality of the scriptural miracles. "The recent criticism of the N.-T. canon, embracing the attempt to impeach the genuineness of various books, is only a part of the great discussion of the historical truth of the N. T.; for it is difficult to attack the credibility of the Gospel historians without first disproving their genuineness" (Fisher, *Essays*, p. 14). In the noted *Essays and Reviews* (Boston ed. 1865, 12mo), Prof. Baden Powell has an article on "The Study of the Evidences of Christianity," in which he undertakes to state the present condition of the discussion, and to indicate the true line of Christian evidences. He disparages the "professed advocates of an external revelation and historical evidence" by innuendo as well as by direct attack, and *assumes* the inconceivability and impossibility of miracles. See Goodwin's article in the *American Theological Review*, July, 1861, which closes as follows: "It is one thing to urge other evidences of Christianity as stronger and more satisfactory than that from miracles; it is another thing to reject all miracles as incredible and absurd. He who takes the former course may show an eminently Christian spirit, and for ourselves we cordially sympathize with his position; but he who takes the latter course, if not an infidel himself, is certainly playing into the hands of infidels and atheists."

One of the chief forms taken by recent Christian apologetics is the argument drawn from the actual

phenomena of Christianity, the *existing facts* which nobody can deny. The first of these is the *character of Christ*, which has been so described by rationalistic and infidel writers (e. g. Strauss, Renan, Schenkel) as to bring the argument down almost, if not quite, to the point whether Jesus were an impostor or no. The replies to these attacks within the last twenty years have brought with greater force than ever the eternal light of evidence which the person and life of the Redeemer contain in favor of the whole system of Christianity. See the works on this subject of Neander, Lange, Schaff, Pressensé, Ellicott, Young, Plumtree, and others. Dr. Schaff sums up the result of a study of Christ in one strong passage: "Jesus of Nazareth is the one absolute and unaccountable exception to the universal experience of mankind. He is the great central miracle of the whole Gospel history; and all his miracles are but the natural and necessary manifestations of his miraculous person, performed with the same ease with which we perform our ordinary daily works." The second of these phenomena is found in the *books of the New Testament* themselves, as affording abundant internal evidence of reality and truthfulness. The third is the specific Christian doctrine, which can be traced up (through the Epistles to the Thessalonians, Corinthians, Romans, and Galatians, the genuineness and early date of which are admitted even by the Tübingen school) to within thirty years after the death of Christ. (See an excellent article on the *Unexhausted Resources of Christian Evidence*, by Prof. Lorimer, in *B. and F. Ev. Review*, Jan. 1865, reprinted in *The Theolog. Eclectic*, New Haven, iii, 30 sq.) Dr. H. Schmidt, of Meiningen, taking the Tübingen critics at their word, undertakes to find in the four unquestioned epistles (Galatians, 1st and 2d Corinthians, and Romans) a full vindication of the truth and divine origin of Christianity. See his *Der Paulinische Christus* (Weimar, 1867, 8vo).

The *comparison of Christianity with heathen religions* is opening a new and rich mine of Christian evidences. The science of "Comparative Religion," so called, is yet in its infancy, but all contributions to it only tend to bring out the argument for the divine origin of Christianity into clearer relief. See Maurice, *Religions of the World* (1846, 12mo); Pressensé, *Religions before Christ* (1866, 8vo); Müller, *Chips from a German Workshop* (1867, 2 vols, 12mo); Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters* (Lond. 2d ed., 1863, 2 vols, 12mo); and an article by Caldwell, *Bapt. Quart. Rev.* Oct. 1868.

The question of the origin and dates of the several gospels is treated under the separate articles Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. The Tübingen school, and the modern critics who follow them, put the dates forward into the second century. See TÜBINGEN SCHOOL. On the questions involved, see Fisher, *Essays*, already cited; Westcott, *On the Canon of the N. T.* (Cambridge, 1855); Tischendorf, *Wann wurden unsere Evangelien verfasst* (Leipsig, 1865; transl. by W. L. Gage, under the title *Origin of the four Gospels*, Lond. 1868; Amer. Tract Society, 1868).

*Literature.*—For a pretty copious account of the literature of the subject, see APOLOGETICS; APOLOGY. We add here the following: Translation of Luthardt's *Apol. Vorträge* (noticed in vol. i, p. 305), entitled *Apologetic Lectures on the fundamental Truths of Christianity* (1867, crown 8vo); and Anberlen's *Offenbarung* (see our vol. i, p. 301), entitled *The Divine Revelation* (Edinburgh, 1867); Norton's *Genuineness of the Gospels*, abridged edit. (Boston, 1867, 12mo); Barnes, *Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity in the Nineteenth Century* (New York, 1868, 12mo); M'Cosh, *The Supernatural in its Relations to the Natural*; Westcott, *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* (Boston, 1867), chap. iii; Schaff, *Person of Christ* (Am. Tract Society); Plumtree, *Christ and Christendom* (Lond. 1867, 8vo); Grady, *Les Sophistes et la Critique* (Paris, 1864, 8vo); *Princeton Review*, April, 1852, art. vi; Bartlett on "Christi-

anity and prominent Forms of Assault," in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, January, 1868; *Brit. and For. Evang. Review*, July, 1868, art. vi. See APOLOGETICS; APOLOGY; INSPIRATION; JESUS; MIRACLES.

Evil is discord or disturbance in the order of the universe. Leibnitz divides it into metaphysical evil, i. e. imperfection; physical evil, i. e. suffering; moral evil, i. e. sin. Origen defined evil to be the negation of good; and in this he has been followed by many Christian thinkers. The distinction into natural and moral evil is the only one now generally recognised. 1. "Natural evil is whatever destroys or any way disturbs the perfection of natural beings, such as blindness, diseases, death, etc. But as *all* that we call natural evil is not the penalty of sin, nor, as some have supposed, *only* the penalty of it, such disturbance is not necessarily an evil, inasmuch as it may be counterpoised, in the whole, with an equal if not greater good, as in the afflictions and sufferings of good men. When such disturbance occurs as the penalty of transgression, it is the necessary consequence of moral evil." The tendency of modern thought is towards the doctrine that the (apparent) disturbances of the physical world are likely to be reconciled with universal law as science advances. 2. "Moral evil is the disagreement between the actions of a moral agent and the rule of those actions, whatever it be. Applied to choice, or acting contrary to the revealed law of God, it is termed *wickedness* or *sin*. Applied to an act contrary to a mere rule of fitness, it is called a *fault*" (Buck, s. v.).

On the origin of evil, and its relations to the government of God, see SIN; THEODICY.

**E'vil-mer'odach** (Heb. *Evil' Merodak'*, עִוִּיל מְרֹדַךְ; Sept. *Εὐιλμερωδᾶκ*, Οὐλαμερῶαχαρ), son and successor of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, who, on his accession to the throne (B.C. 561), released the captive king of Judah, Jehoiachin, from prison, after 37 years of incarceration, treated him with kindness and distinction, and set his throne above the other conquered kings who were detained at Babylon (2 Kings xxv, 27; Jer. lii, 31-34). See CHALDEAN. A Jewish tradition (noticed by Jerome on Isa. xiv, 29) ascribes this kindness to a personal friendship which Evil-merodach had contracted with the Jewish king when he was himself consigned to prison by Nebuchadnezzar, who, on recovering from his seven years' monomania, took offence at some part of the conduct of his son, by whom the government had in the mean time been administered. This story was probably invented to account for the fact. His name is naturally written by other ancient authors (*Εὐειλμερῶδονκος* by Berosus, in Josephus, *Apion*, i, 20; *Εὐιλμερῶδονχος* by Megasthenes and Abydenus, in Euseb. *Chron. Armen.* p. 28; *Ἐβειλμερῶαχος* by Josephus, *Ant.* x, 11, 2). Hales identifies him with the king of Babylon who formed a powerful confederacy against the Medes, which was broken up, and the king slain by Cyrus, then acting for his uncle Cyaxares. But this rests on the authority of Xenophon's *Cyropædia*, the historical value of which he estimates far too highly. See CYRUS. He is doubtless the same as the *Iloradani* of Ptolemy's "Canon," who reigned but a short time, having ascended the throne on the death of Nebuchadnezzar in B.C. 561, and being himself succeeded by Neriglissar in B.C. 559. See BABYLON. He thus appears to have reigned but two years, which is the time assigned to him by Abydenus (*Fr.* 9) and Berosus (*Fr.* 14). At the end of this brief space Evil-merodach was murdered by Neriglissar [see NEIGAL-SHAREZER], a Babylonian noble married to his sister, who then seized the crown. The other ancient authorities assign him different lengths of reign. According to Berosus, Evil-merodach provoked his fate by lawless government and intemperance. Perhaps the departure from the policy of his father, and the substitution

of mild for severe measures, may have been viewed in this light.

The latter half of the name Evil-merodach is that of a Babylonian god MERODACH (q. v.). Two modes of explaining the former part of it have been attempted. Since *evil*, as a Hebrew word, means "foolish," Simonis proposes to consider it the derivative of עֵוֶל, in the Arabic signification of "to be first," affording the sense of "prince of Merodach." This rests on the assumption that the Babylonian language was of Syro-Arabian origin. Gesenius, on the other hand, who does not admit that origin, believes that some Indo-Germanic word, of similar sound, but reputable sense, is concealed under *evil*, and that the Hebrews made some slight perversion in its form to produce a word of contemptuous signification in Hebrew, just as is assumed in the case of Beelzebul.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

**Evil-speaking**, "the using language either reproachful or untrue respecting others, and thereby injuring them. It is an express command of Scripture 'to speak evil of no man' (Titus iii, 2; James iv, 11); by which, however, we are not to understand that there are no occasions on which we are at liberty to speak of others that which may be considered as evil. 1. Persons in the administration of justice may speak words which in private intercourse would be reproachful. 2. God's ministers may inveigh against vice with sharpness and severity, both privately and publicly (Isa. lviii, 1; Titus i, 13). 3. Private persons may reprove others when they commit sin (Lev. xix, 17). 4. Some vehemence of speech may be used in defence of truth and impugning errors of bad consequence (Jude iii). 5. It may be necessary, upon some important occasions, with some heat of language, to express disapprobation of notorious wickedness (Acts viii, 23). Yet in all these the greatest equity, moderation, and candor should be used; and we should take care, 1. Never to speak in severe terms without reasonable warrant or apparent just cause. 2. Nor beyond measure. 3. Nor out of bad principles or wrong ends; from ill will, contempt, revenge, envy, to compass our own ends; from wantonness or negligence, but from pure charity for the good of those to whom or of whom we speak. This is an evil, however, which greatly abounds, and which is not sufficiently watched against; for it is not when we openly speak evil of others only that we are guilty, but even in speaking what is true we are in danger of speaking evil of others. There is sometimes a malignant pleasure manifested; a studious recollection of everything that can be brought forward; a delight in bearing anything spoken against others; a secret rejoicing in knowing that another's fall will be an occasion of our rise. All this is base to an extreme. The impropriety and sinfulness of evil-speaking will appear if we consider, 1. That it is entirely opposite to the whole tenor of the Christian religion. 2. Expressly condemned and prohibited as evil (Psa. lxiv, 3; James iv, 11). 3. No practice hath more severe punishments denounced against it (1 Cor. v, 11; vi, 10). 4. It is an evidence of a weak and distempered mind. 5. It is even indicative of ill breeding and bad manners. 6. It is the abhorrence of all wise and good men (Psa. xv, 3). 7. It is exceedingly injurious to society, and inconsistent with the relation we bear to each other as Christians (James iii, 6). 8. It is branded with the epithet of folly (Prov. xviii, 6, 7). 9. It is perverting the design of speech. 10. It is opposite to the example of Christ, whom we profess to follow. See SLANDER." (Barrow, *Works*, vol. i, serm. xvi: Tillotson, *Sermons*, serm. xlii; Jack, *Sermons on Evil Speaking*; Seed, *Sermons*, i, 339; Campbell, *Dissertations*, diss. iii, § 22).—Buck, *Theol. Dictionary*, s. v.

**Evodius**, a Latin theologian, was born about the middle of the fourth century, at Tagaste, in Africa. He was a countryman of St. Augustine, and was united

with him in an intimate and lifelong friendship. After following in his youth a secular profession, he became, in 396 or 397, bishop of Uzalis. Augustine asserts that while there he performed several miracles by means of the relics of St. Stephen, which Orosius, in 416, had brought from Palestine. Evodius took an active part in the controversy against the Donatists and Pelagians, and in 427 wrote on this subject a letter to the monks of Adrumetum. He died about 430. We have from him four letters to St. Augustine (160, 161, 163, and 177 in the edition of the Benedictines); a letter addressed by him, conjointly with four other bishops, to bishop Innocent I, of Rome (published in vol. vi of the Benedictine edit. of the works of Augustine); fragments of a letter to the monks of Adrumetum (joined to the letter 216 of St. Augustine). His treatise on the miracles performed by the relics of St. Stephen is lost; for the *Libri duo de Miraculis S. Stephani*, appended to Augustine's *De Civitate Dei* (in vol. vii of his works), cannot be attributed to him. A treatise *De Fide*, or *De Unitate Trinitatis contra Manichæos*, is by some likewise ascribed to Evodius.—Hoefler, *Nov. Biog. Gén.* xvi, 842. (A. J. S.)

**Ewald**, JOHANN LUDWIG, theologian, was born at Dreieichenhain, Hesse, September 16, 1747. He studied at the University of Marburg. After serving two years as tutor to the children of the prince of Hesse-Philippsthal, he became pastor at Offenbach, 1768. He began preaching as a Rationalist, but in a few years he found reason alone inadequate for his personal guidance and for his public teaching. In 1778 he announced publicly this change of conviction. In 1781 he became general superintendent and court preacher at Detmold; but his pungent preaching soon got him into trouble. He founded at Detmold a seminary for teachers. In 1796 he accepted a pastoral charge at Breichen; and here, also, he greatly promoted the schools, visiting the establishments of Pestalozzi and Fellenberg, in Switzerland, to inform himself on their systems. In 1805 he was called to Heidelberg as professor of ethics, and in 1807 became church councillor at Carlsruhe, where he died, March 19, 1822. He was a voluminous author. Doering gives a list of eighty-nine different publications of his. The chief are, *Predigerbeschäftigung* (Lemgo, 1783-94, 9 parts);—*Christenthum und Kosmopolitismus* (Lemgo, 1788-89, 2 vols. 8vo);—*Salomo; Versuch einer psychologisch-biographischen Darstellung* (Gera, 1800, 8vo);—*Die Göttlichkeit d. Christenthums* (Brem. 1800, 8vo);—*Briefe über die alte Mystik u. d. neuen Mysticismus* (Leipzig, 1822, 8vo); besides numerous sermons and books on practical religion and education.—Doering, *Die deutschen Kanzel-Redner*, i, 46.

**Ewe** stands in the Auth. Vers. as the representative of the following Heb. words: רַחֵל (*rachel*, fem.), a "ewe" (Gen. xxxi, 38; xxxii, 14) or "sheep" generally (Cant. vi, 6; Isa. liii, 7); שֶׁה (*seh*, masc. Exod. xii, 5; fem. Jer. i, 17; Ezek. xxxiv, 20), a sheep or goat from a flock generally, variously rendered ("cattle," "sheep," "goat," "ewe"); קִבְסָה (*kibshah*) or קִבְסָה (*kabsah*), fem., so called from being fit for *coupling*, a "ewe-lamb," i. e. from one to three years old (Gen. xxi, 28, 29, 30; Lev. xiv, 10; Num. vi, 14; 2 Sam. xii, 3, 4, 6); אֹלוֹת (*aloth*, 'milk-giving, fem. plur.), *milk* ("[ewes] with young," Psa. lxxviii, 71; Isa. xl, 11). See SHEEP, etc.

**Ewer**, or picher (q. v.) accompanying a wash-hand basin (q. v.). It is stated as a description of Elisha (2 Kings iii, 11) that he "poured water on the hands of Elijah." This was the act of an attendant or disciple; and it was so much his established duty, that the mere mention of it sufficed to indicate the relation in which Elisha had stood to Elijah. It is also an indication that the Hebrews were accustomed to wash their

hands in the manner which is now universal in the East, and which, whatever may be thought of its convenience, is unquestionably more refreshing and cleanly than washing in the water as it stands in a basin, which is a process regarded by the Orientals with great dislike. The hands are therefore held over a basin, the use of which is only to receive the water which has been poured upon the hands, sometimes of several persons successively, from the jug or ewer held above them (Lane, *Modern Egyptians*, i, 212). A servant or some other person approaches with the ewer in his right hand and the basin in his left; and when the hands have been placed in proper position over the basin, which he continues to hold, lets fall a stream of water upon them from the ewer, suspending it occasionally to allow the hands to be soaped or rubbed together. No towel is offered, as every one dries his hands in his handkerchief, or however else he pleases. The water is usually tepid, and always so after a meal, in order to clear the grease contracted by eating with the hands. In the East, the basin, which, as well as the ewer, is usually of tinned copper, has commonly a



Oriental Ewer and Basin.

sort of cover, rising in the middle and sunk into the basin at the margin, which, being pierced with holes, allows the water to pass through, thus concealing it after it has been defiled by use. The ewer has a long spout, and a long, narrow neck, with a cover, and is altogether not unlike our coffee-pots in general appearance: it is the same which the Orientals use in all their ablutions. It is evident that a person cannot conveniently thus wash his own hands without assistance. If he does, he is obliged to fix the basin, and to take up and lay down the ewer several times, changing it from one hand to the other. Therefore a person never does so except when alone. If he has no servant, he asks some by-stander to pour the water upon his hands, and offers a return of the obligation, if it seems to be required (Kitto, *Pict. Bible*, note ad loc.). See WASHING OF HANDS.

**Ewing, Finis**, one of the founders of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, was born July 10, 1773, in Bedford County, Va. His father was of Scotch-Irish descent, and both his parents were eminent for their piety, the father for many years being an elder in the Presbyterian Church. Mr. Ewing had but little early education. He spent some time in college, but where is not known. His biographer says, "Like Franklin, he seems very early to have acquired a fondness for books. His varied and extensive reading made him emphatically a learned man, though not systematically educated, and the brilliancy of his success as a minister of the Gospel evinced intellectual endowments of a high order." His parents having died in Virginia, the surviving family moved to what was called the "Cumberland Country," and settled in Davidson County, Tennessee, near Nashville. On Jan. 15, 1793, he married the daughter of general William Davidson, of North Carolina. The county was named from him (Davidson), in honor of his many valuable services during the war of the Revolution. Here Mr. Ewing and his wife united with Rev. Dr. Craighead's church, and lived in its communion some years before either of them knew anything about experimental religion. After the birth of their first child (but at what time is not known) Mr. Ewing removed to Kentucky, and settled in what was afterwards Logan County, near Red River Church, of which Rev. James McGready was pastor. In the great revival of 1800, which swept over all the Western States, and out of which originated the Cumberland Presbyte-

rian Church, Mr. Ewing heard for the first time in his life the doctrines of regeneration and *personal* holiness insisted upon from the pulpit. He became satisfied that he had not a saving knowledge of the truth, and communicated his feelings to his wife, whom he found in a similar state of mind. After many prayers and tears, while engaged in family worship, he "became filled with joy and peace in believing." Some time after this (the precise period is not known) he told his impressions to preach the Gospel to Transylvania Presbytery, which body, at the advice of Rev. David Rice, D.D., one of the oldest ministers in the presbytery, licensed Mr. Ewing and three others to exhort. His success was wonderful; scores of sinners were converted wherever he went. His talents, piety, commanding language, and zeal carried everything before them. He was soon licensed to preach as a probationer, but the prevailing party in the presbytery opposed his licensure. He went on preaching very successfully, however, revival attending his labors wherever he travelled. His labor was so much called for, and so marked with success, that at the urgent call of several congregations he was ordained, in November, 1803, to the work of the ministry. The revival went on with unabated power for several years; in the mean time Kentucky Synod had pretended to dissolve Cumberland Presbytery, which had ordained him, because of alleged irregularities. The presbytery remained for four years not attempting to exercise its functions as a presbytery; after which, failing to secure a redress of their grievances from the General Assembly, they determined to organize again, even contrary to the wishes of a majority of Kentucky Synod. On February 4, 1810, Mr. Ewing and two other ordained ministers united and formed the first presbytery of the new Cumberland Presbyterian Church, giving it the name of the presbytery Kentucky Synod had dissolved, viz. *Cumberland Presbytery*; hence the name "Cumberland Presbyterians." Mr. Ewing removed after some years to Todd County, Ky., and became pastor of Lebanon congregation, near Ewingsville. Here under his eye was sustained for many years a flourishing classical seminary of learning. In 1820, at the urgent call of many friends and brethren, he removed to the State of Missouri, and settled in what is now Cooper County. It was not long until he built up a large congregation at New Lebanon, which still flourishes. Here he prepared and published his *Lectures on Divinity*, which have been extensively circulated and read, and which contain the germ of the peculiarities of Cumberland Presbyterians. He labored here with great acceptance and success until 1836, when he removed to the town of Lexington, Lafayette County, Mo. Here he soon gathered a congregation, built a church, and, with others, was the means of extending the work of grace all over the vast incoming territories of the West. Mr. Ewing died here July 4, 1841, in his 68th year. He was tall, portly in appearance, had a keen, penetrating eye, always bore a dignified look, was a man of extraordinary pulpit talents, and of great success among all classes in winning souls to the Redeemer. In our troubles with Great Britain in 1812 he did not hesitate to give all the weight of his great influence in favor of his country. He was no politician, yet at one time, being an intimate friend and acquaintance of general Jackson, he was by him appointed register of the land office at Lexington, Mo. He died lamented by a large and growing denomination, and by many others, as a great and good man. His remains rest in the cemetery at Lexington, Mo. (J. B. L.)

**Ewing, John, D.D.**, a Presbyterian minister, and provost of the University of Pennsylvania, was born in Nottingham, Cecil County, Md., June 22, 1732, and graduated in 1754 in New Jersey College, of which he remained tutor for two years. Having completed his

theological course, he was ordained, became instructor in the College of Philadelphia, and was installed pastor of the first Presbyterian church, Philadelphia, in 1759. He visited England and Scotland in 1773 in behalf of the academy in Newark, Del., and returned in 1775 to the duties of his ministry. In 1779 he was appointed provost of the University of Pennsylvania, and professor of natural philosophy, in which science he delivered annually a course of learned lectures. In this station, united with that of pastor, he continued to the end of life. He was also one of the vice-presidents of the American Philosophical Society. He died Sept. 8, 1802. He published *Lectures on Natural Philosophy* (2 vols. 8vo), and *Sermons* (8vo).—Sprague, *Annals*, iii, 216.

**Exactions** (Lat. *exactiones, talie*), the name given in ecclesiastical law to taxes of an extraordinary kind, which either were not in use before, or the rate of which has been increased. As a general rule, taxes of this kind are forbidden. Thus the third Council of Toledo prohibited the bishops from "imposing exactions upon the diocese," and Leo IV designates as unlawful exactions any "gifts beyond the statutes of the fathers" that bishops may impose upon clergymen or laymen. The prohibition was renewed at the Council of Lateran in 1179 by Alexander III, who "prohibited bishops or abbots, or any other prelates, from imposing new taxes upon the churches, or from increasing the old ones, or from appropriating for their private uses any portion of the revenue." The imposition of exactions requires a reasonable cause, and limitation to what is necessary. State churches cannot impose an exaction without previously obtaining the permission of the state government.—Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 280. (A. J. S.)

**Exactor**, the rendering (Isa. lx, 17) of *נֹגֵס׳*, *noges'*, *z driver* (task-master, Exod. iii, 7; Job iii, 18; Isa. ix, 3; or simply driver of animals, Job xxxix, 7); hence *exactor* of a debt (or tribute, Dan. xi, 20; Zech. ix, 8); hence (in accordance with Oriental ideas and customs) a ruler, king, tyrant (Isa. iii, 12; xiv, 2; Zech. x, 4), as the parallel term "prince" in the above passage of Isaiah shows to be there the meaning.

**Exaltation of Christ** (*status exaltationis*), a theological phrase, including in its scope the resurrection of Christ, his ascension into heaven, his sitting at the right hand of God the Father, and his coming to judge the world at the last day. See articles on these heads; also **CHRISTOLOGY** (vol. ii, p. 281); and Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, Smith's ed., ii, 352.

**Exaltation of the Cross.** See **CROSS**, **EXALTATION OF THE**, vol. ii, p. 581.

**Example** (*ἔδειγμα*, Jude 7), especially **CHRIST'S** (*ὑπόδειγμα*, 1 Pet. ii, 21) for the imitation of his followers (*ὑπόδειγμα*, John xiii, 15; elsewhere in other relations, 1 Th. iv, 11; viii, 5; ix, 23; Jas. v, 10; 2 Pet. ii, 6), and subordinately pastors for their flock (*ἄριστος*, Phil. iii, 17; 2 Thess. iii, 9; 1 Tim. iv, 12; 1 Pet. v, 3, etc.). See Flatt, *Das Beispiel Jesu* (in the *Magaz. für chr. Dogmat.* i, 179 sq.); Keil, *De Exemplo Christi* (Lips. 1792; *Opusc.* i, 100-135); Oeder, *De Christi imitatione* (in his *Obs. sacr.* i, 33-56); Schmid, *De perverso Christi imitatione* (Lips. 1710); Stöber, *De exemplorum imitatione* (Argent. 1771-6); Wolf, *De exemplis cuncte adhibendis* (Lips. 1785-6); Kempis, *Imitation of Christ* (often published).

**Example**, "a copy or pattern, in a moral sense, is either taken for a type, instance, or precedent for our admonition, that we may be cautioned against the faults or crimes which others have committed, by the bad consequences which have ensued from them; or example is taken for a pattern for our imitation, or a model for us to copy after. - That good examples have a peculiar power above naked precepts to dispose us to the practice of virtue and holiness may appear by con-

sidering, '1. That they most clearly express to us the nature of our duties in their subjects and sensible effects. General precepts form abstract ideas of virtue, but in examples, virtues are most visible in all their circumstances. 2. Precepts instruct us in what things are our duty, but examples assure us that they are possible. 3. Examples, by secret and lively incentive, urge us to imitation. We are touched in another manner by the visible practice of good men, which reproaches our defects, and obliges us to the same zeal, which laws, though wise and good, will not effect.' The life of Jesus Christ forms the most beautiful example the Christian can imitate. Unlike all others, it was absolutely perfect and uniform, and every way accommodated to our present state. In him we behold all light without a shade, all beauty without a spot, all the purity of the law and the excellency of the Gospel. Here we see piety without superstition, and morality without ostentation; humility without meanness, and fortitude without temerity; patience without apathy, and compassion without weakness; zeal without rashness, and beneficence without prodigality. The obligation we are under to imitate this example arises from duty, relationship, engagement, interest, and gratitude. See art. **JESUS CHRIST**. Those who set bad examples should consider, 1. That they are the ministers of the devil's designs to destroy souls. 2. That they are acting in direct opposition to Christ, who came to save and not to destroy. 3. That they are adding to the misery and calamities which are already in the world. 4. That the effects of their example may be incalculable on society to the end of time, and perhaps in eternity; for who can tell what may be the consequence of one sin on a family, a nation, or posterity? 5. They are acting contrary to the divine command, and thus exposing themselves to final ruin" (Tillotson, *Sermons*, ser. clxxxix, cxc; Barrow, *Works*, vol. iii, ser. ii and iii; Flavel, *Works*, i, 29, 30; Dwight, *Theology*, ser. liv; *Christ our Example*, by Caroline Fry).—Buck, *Theological Dictionary*, s. v.

**Exarch** (*ἐξαρχος*), (1.) the title given, under the Byzantine emperors, to their viceroys in Italy and Africa, after Justinian's reconquest of those provinces.

(2.) The title was adopted in the early Church for the highest orders of the hierarchy. Primates or metropolitans were styled *ἐξαρχοι τῆς ἐπαρχίας*, and the patriarchs were called *ἐξαρχοι τῆς οἰκουμένης*. In the 6th canon of Sardica (A.D. 344) the former title (exarch of the eparchy) is given to primates; the third Council of Carthage, A.D. 397, forbade its use (Riddle, *Antiquities*, bk. iii, ch. iii). The *exarch*, as primate, was "inferior to the patriarch, and superior to the metropolitan. In the third century there were three exarchs, viz. Ephesus, with the diocese of Asia, 12 provinces and 300 sees; Hæraclæa, with the diocese of Thrace, and 6 provinces; Cæsarea, 13 provinces and 104 sees. The privileges of these exarchates were transferred by the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) to the patriarch of Constantinople" (Walcot, *Sacred Archaeology*, p. 268).

(3.) The *exarch* in the Greek Church at the present day is the patriarch's deputy, whose duty it is to visit the provinces under his inspection, to inform himself as to the lives and morals of the clergy; to take cognizance of ecclesiastical causes—the manner of celebrating divine ordinances—the sacraments, particularly confession, the observance of the canons, monastic discipline, affairs of marriages, divorces, etc.; but, above all, to take account of the revenues which the patriarch receives from the several churches.—Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* Bohn's ed. i, 61, 67.

**Exchanger** (*τραπέζιτης*, so called from the *table* used for holding the coin [see **CHANGER OF MONEY**]), a broker or banker (i. e. bench-man) [see **BANK**], one who exchanged money, and also received money on deposit at interest, in order to loan it out to others at a



higher rate (Matt. xxv, 27). (See Smith's *Dict. of Class. Ant.* s. v. *Mensarii*.) See MONEY-CHANGER; LOAN.

**Excommunication**, the judicial exclusion of offenders from the religious rites and privileges of the particular community to which they belong. It is a power founded upon a right inherent in all religious societies, and is analogous to the powers of capital punishment, banishment, and exclusion from membership which are exercised by political and municipal bodies. If Christianity is merely a philosophical idea thrown into the world to do battle with other theories, and to be valued according as it maintains its ground or not in the conflict of opinions, excommunication, and ecclesiastical punishments and discipline are unreasonable. If a society has been instituted for maintaining any body of doctrine and any code of morals, they are necessary to the existence of that society. That the Christian Church is an organized polity, a spiritual "kingdom of God" on earth, is the declaration of the Bible; and that the Jewish Church was at once a spiritual and a temporal organization is clear. Among the Jews, however, excommunication was not only an ecclesiastical, but also a civil punishment, because in their theocracy there was no distinction between the divine and the statutory right (Exod. xxxi, 14; Ezra x, 3, 11; Neh. xiii, 28). But among Christians excommunication was strictly confined to ecclesiastical relations, as the situation and constitution of the Church during the first three centuries admitted of no intermingling or confounding of civil and religious privileges or penalties. Excommunication, in the Christian Church, consisted at first simply in exclusion from the communion of the Lord's Supper and the love-feasts: "with such a one, no, not to eat" (1 Cor. v, 11). It might also include a total separation from the body of the faithful; and such a person was, with regard to the Church, "as a heathen man and a publican." But this excision did not exempt him from any duties to which he was liable in civil life, neither did it withhold from him any natural obligations, such as are founded on nature, humanity, and the law of nations (Matt. xviii, 17; 1 Cor. v, 5, 11; x, 16-18; 2 Thess. iii, 6, 14; 2 John 10, 11). See CHURCH.

I. *Jewish*.—The Jewish system of excommunication was threefold. For a first offence a delinquent was subjected to the penalty of *קידוּן* (*quiddun*). Rambam (quoted by Lightfoot, *Hore Hebraica*, on 1 Cor. v, 5), Morinus (*De Penitentia*, iv, 27), and Buxtorf (*Lexicon Talm.* col. 1203 sq.) enumerate the twenty-four offences for which it was inflicted. They are various, and range in heinousness from the offence of keeping a fierce dog to that of taking God's name in vain. Elsewhere (Talm. Bab. *Moad Katon*, fol. 16, 1) the causes of its infliction are reduced to two, termed money and epicurism, by which is meant debt and wanton insolence. The offender was first cited to appear in court, and if he refused to appear or to make amends, his sentence was pronounced—"Let M. or N. be under excommunication." The excommunicated person was prohibited the use of the bath, or of the razor, or of the convivial table; and all who had to do with him were commanded to keep him at four cubits' distance. He was allowed to go to the Temple, but not to make the circuit in the ordinary manner. The term of this punishment was thirty days, and it was extended to a second and to a third thirty days when necessary. If at the end of that time the offender was still contumacious, he was subjected to the second excommunication termed *כְּרֵמ* (*cherem*), a word meaning something devoted to God (Lev. xxvii, 21, 28; Exod. xxii, 20 [19]; Num. xviii, 14). Severer penalties were now attached. The offender was not allowed to teach or to be taught in company with others, to hire or to be hired, nor to perform any commercial transactions beyond purchasing the necessaries of life. The sentence was delivered

ed by a court of ten, and was accompanied by a solemn malediction, for which authority was supposed to be found in the "Curse ye Meroz" of Judg. v, 23. Lastly followed *שַׁמְמָתָה* (*shammathá*), which was an entire cutting off from the congregation. It has been supposed by some that these two latter forms of excommunication were undistinguishable from each other. See BAN.

The punishment of excommunication is not appointed by the law of Moses. It is founded on the natural right of self-protection which all societies enjoy. The case of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram (Num. xvi), the curse denounced on Meroz (Judg. v, 23), the commission and proclamation of Ezra (vii, 26; x, 8), and the reformation of Nehemiah (xiii, 25), are appealed to by the Talmudists as precedents by which their proceedings are regulated. In respect to the principle involved, the "cutting off from the people" commanded for certain sins (Exod. xxx, 33, 38; xxxi, 14; Lev. xvii, 4), and the exclusion from the camp denounced on the leprous (Lev. xiii, 46; Num. xii, 14), are more apposite.

In the New Testament, Jewish excommunication is brought prominently before us in the case of the man that was born blind and restored to sight (John ix). "The Jews had agreed already that if any man did confess that he was Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue. Therefore said his parents, He is of age, ask him" (ver. 22, 23). "And they cast him out. Jesus heard that they had cast him out" (ver. 34, 35). The expressions here used, *ἀποσυναγωγος γίνηται*—*ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἐξω*, refer, no doubt, to the first form of excommunication, or *niddui*. Our Lord warns his disciples that they will have to suffer excommunication at the hands of their countrymen (John xvi, 2), and the fear of it is described as sufficient to prevent persons in a respectable position from acknowledging their belief in Christ (John xii, 42). In Luke vi, 22, it has been thought that our Lord referred specifically to the three forms of Jewish excommunication, "Blessed are ye when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company [*ἀφορίσωσιν*], and shall reproach you [*ἐνεικίσωσιν*], and cast out your name as evil [*ἐκβάλοσιν*], for the Son of man's sake." The three words very accurately express the simple separation, the additional malediction, and the final exclusion of *niddui*, *cherem*, and *shammathá*. This verse makes it probable that the three stages were already formally distinguished from each other, though, no doubt, the words appropriate to each are occasionally used inaccurately. See the monographs in Latin on Jewish excommunication by Musculus (Lips. 1703), Opitz (Kilon. 1680).

II. *In the New Testament*.—Excommunication in the New Testament is not merely founded on the natural right possessed by all societies, nor merely on the example of the Jewish Church and nation. It was instituted by our Lord (Matt. xviii, 15, 18), and it was practised by and commanded by Paul (1 Tim. i, 20; 1 Cor. v, 11; Tit. iii, 10).

1. *Its Institution*.—The passage in Matthew has led to much controversy, into which we do not enter. It runs as follows: "If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone; if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church; but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican. Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Our Lord here recognises and appoints a way in which a member of his Church is to become to his brethren as a heathen man and a publican, i. e. be reduced to a state analogous to

that of the Jew suffering the penalty of the third form of excommunication. It is to follow on his contempt of the censure of the Church passed on him for a trespass which he has committed. The final excommunication is to be preceded, as in the case of the Jew, by two warnings.

2. *Apostolic Example.*—In the Epistles we find Paul frequently claiming the right to exercise discipline over his converts (comp. 2 Cor. i, 23; xiii, 10). In two cases we find him exercising this authority to the extent of cutting off offenders from the Church. One of these is the case of the incestuous Corinthian: "Ye are puffed up, and have not rather mourned, that he that hath done this deed might be taken away from among you. For I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already, as though I were present, concerning him that hath so done this deed, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such a one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus" (1 Cor. v, 2-5). The other case is that of Hymeneus and Alexander: "Holding faith and a good conscience, which some, having put away concerning faith, have made shipwreck; of whom is Hymeneus and Alexander, whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme" (1 Tim. i, 19, 20). It seems certain that these persons were excommunicated, the first for immorality, the others for heresy. What is the full meaning of the expression "deliver unto Satan" is doubtful. All agree that excommunication is contained in it, but whether it implies any further punishment, inflicted by the extraordinary powers committed specially to the apostles, has been questioned. The strongest argument for the phrase meaning no more than excommunication may be drawn from a comparison of Col. i, 13. Addressing himself to the "saints and faithful brethren in Christ which are at Colosse," Paul exhorts them to "give thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light: who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son: in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." The conception of the apostle here is of men lying in the realm of darkness, and transported from thence into the kingdom of the Son of God, which is the inheritance of the saints in light, by admission into the Church. What he means by the power of darkness is abundantly clear from many other passages in his writings, of which it will be sufficient to quote Eph. vi, 12: "Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil; for we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." Introduction into the Church is therefore, in Paul's mind, a translation from the kingdom and power of Satan to the kingdom and government of Christ. This being so, he could hardly more naturally describe the effect of excluding a man from the Church than by the words "deliver him unto Satan," the idea being that the man ceasing to be a subject of Christ's kingdom of light, was at once transported back to the kingdom of darkness, and delivered therefore into the power of its ruler, Satan. This interpretation is strongly confirmed by the terms in which Paul describes the commission which he received from the Lord Jesus Christ when he was sent to the Gentiles: "To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me" (Acts xxvi, 18). Here again the act of being placed in Christ's kingdom, the Church, is pronounced to be a translation from darkness to light, from the power of

Satan unto God. Conversely, to be cast out of the Church would be to be removed from light to darkness, to be withdrawn from God's government, and delivered into the power of Satan (so Balsamon, and Zonaras, in *Basil. Can.* 7; Estius, in *1 Cor.* v; Beveridge, in *Crit. Apost.* x). If, however, the expression means more than excommunication, it would imply the additional exercise of a special apostolical power, similar to that exerted on Ananias and Sapphira (Acts v, 1), Simon Magus (viii, 20), and Elymas (xiii, 10). (So Chrysostom, Ambrose, Augustine, Hammond, Grotius, Lightfoot.)

3. *Apostolic Precept.*—In addition to the claim to exercise discipline, and its actual exercise in the form of excommunication by the apostles, we find apostolic precepts directing that discipline should be exercised by the rulers of the Church, and that in some cases excommunication should be resorted to: "If any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed. Yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother," writes Paul to the Thessalonians (2 Thess. iii, 14). To the Romans: "Mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have heard, and avoid them" (Rom. xvi, 17). To the Galatians: "I would they were even cut off that trouble you" (Gal. v, 12). To Timothy: "If any man teach otherwise, . . . from such withdraw thyself" (1 Tim. vi, 8). To Titus he uses a still stronger expression: "A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject" (Tit. iii, 10). John instructs the lady to whom he addresses his second epistle not to receive into her house, nor bid God speed to any who did not believe in Christ (2 John 10); and we read that in the case of Cerinthus he acted himself on the precept that he had given (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iii, 28). In his third epistle he describes Diotrephes, apparently a Judaizing presbyter, "who loved to have the pre-eminence," as "casting out of the Church," i. e. refusing Church communion to the stranger brethren who were travelling about preaching to the Gentiles (3 John 10). In the addresses to the Seven Churches the angels or rulers of the church of Pergamos and of Thyatira are rebuked for "suffering" the Nicolaitans and Balaamites "to teach and to seduce my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols" (Rev. ii, 20). There are two passages still more important to our subject. In the epistle to the Galatians, Paul denounces, "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed [*ἀνάθεμα ἔστω*]." As I said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed" (*ἀνάθεμα ἔστω*, Gal. i, 8, 9). And in the second epistle to the Corinthians: "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maran-atha" (1 Cor. xvi, 22). It has been supposed that these two expressions, "let him be Anathema," "let him be Anathema Maran-atha," refer respectively to the two later stages of Jewish excommunication—the *cherem* and the *shammudhā*. This requires consideration.

The words *ἀνάθεμα* and *ἀνάθημα* have evidently the same derivation, and originally they bore the same meaning. They express a person or thing set apart, laid up, or devoted. But whereas a thing may be set apart by way of honor or for destruction, the words, like the Latin "sacer" and the English "devoted," came to have opposite senses—*τὸ ἀπυλοποιεῖν Θεοῦ*, and *τὸ ἀφοραστῆναι Θεῷ*. The Sept. and several ecclesiastical writers use the two words almost indiscriminately, but in general the form *ἀνάθημα* is applied to the votive offering (see 2 Macc. ix, 16; Luke xxi, 5; and Chrysost. *Hom.* xvi in *Ep. ad Rom.*), and the form *ἀνάθεμα* to that which is devoted to evil (see Deut. vii, 26; Josh. vi, 17; vii, 13). Thus Paul de-

clares that he could wish himself an *ánáthema* from Christ if he could thereby save the Jews (Rom. ix, 3). His meaning is that he would be willing to be set apart as a vile thing, to be cast aside and destroyed, if only it could bring about the salvation of his brethren. Hence we see the force of *ánáthema éstō* in Gal. i, 8. "Have nothing to do with him," would be the apostle's injunction, "but let him be set apart as an evil thing, for God to deal with him as he thinks fit." Hammond (in loc.) paraphrases it as follows: "You are to disclaim and renounce all communion with him, to look on him as on an excommunicated person, under the second degree of excommunication, that none is to have any commerce with in sacred things." Hence it is that *ánáthema éstō* came to be the common expression employed by councils at the termination of each canon which they enacted, meaning that whoever was disobedient to the canon was to be separated from the communion of the Church and its privileges, and from the favor of God, until he repented (see Bingham, *Ant.* xvi, 2, 16). See ANATHEMA.

The expression *Áνάθημα μακαρανά,* as it stands by itself without explanation in 1 Cor. xvi, 22, is so peculiar, that it has tempted a number of ingenious expositions. Parkhurst hesitatingly derives it from מְרִירָה מְרִירָה, "Cursed be thou." But this derivation is not tenable. Buxtorf, Morinus, Hammond, Bingham, and others identify it with the Jewish *shammáthá*. They do so by translating *shammáthá*, "The Lord comes." But *shammáthá* cannot be made to mean "The Lord comes" (see Lightfoot, in loc.). Several fanciful derivations are given by rabbinical writers, as "There is death," "There is desolation;" but there is no mention by them of such a signification as "The Lord comes." Lightfoot derives it from מְרִירָה, and it probably means a thing excluded or shut out. Maranatha, however peculiar its use in the text may seem to us, is a Syro-Chaldaic expression, signifying "The Lord is come" (Chrysostom, Jerome, Estius, Lightfoot), or "The Lord cometh." If we take the former meaning, we may regard it as giving the reason why the offender was to be anathematized; if the latter, it would either imply that the separation was to be in perpetuity, "donec Dominus redeat" (Augustine), or, more properly, it would be a form of solemn appeal to the day on which the judgment should be ratified by the Lord (comp. Jude 14). In any case it is a strengthened form of the simple *ánáthema éstō*. And thus it may be regarded as holding towards it a similar relation to that which existed between the *shammáthá* and the *cherem*, but not on any supposed ground of etymological identity between the two words *shammáthá* and *maron-atha*. Perhaps we ought to interpunctuate more strongly between *ánáthema* and *μαραναθά*, and read *ήνω άνάθημα μαραναθά*, i. e. "Let him be anathema. The Lord will come." The *anathema* and the *cherem* answer very exactly to each other (see Lev. xxvii, 28; Num. xxi, 3; Isa. xlili, 28). See MARANATHA.

4. *Restoration to Communion.*—Two cases of excommunication are related in Holy Scripture, and in one of them the restitution of the offender is specially recounted. The incestuous Corinthian had been excommunicated by the authority of Paul, who had issued his sentence from a distance without any consultation with the Corinthians. He had required them publicly to promulgate it and act upon it. They had done so. The offender had been brought to repentance, and was overwhelmed with grief. Hereupon Paul, still absent as before, forbids the further infliction of the punishment, pronounces the forgiveness of the penitent, and exhorts the Corinthians to receive him back to communion, and to confirm their love towards him.

5. *The Nature of Excommunication* is made more evident by these acts of Paul than by any investigation of Jewish practice or of the etymology of words. We

thus find (1) that it is a spiritual penalty, involving no temporal punishment except accidentally; (2) that it consists in separation from the communion of the Church; (3) that its object is the good of the sufferer (1 Cor. v, 5), and the protection of the sound members of the Church (2 Tim. iii, 17); (4) that its subjects are those who are guilty of heresy (1 Tim. i, 20) or gross immorality (1 Cor. v, 1); (5) that it is inflicted by the authority of the Church at large (Matt. xviii, 18), wielded by the highest ecclesiastical officer (1 Cor. v, 3; Tit. iii, 10); (6) that this officer's sentence is promulgated by the congregation to which the offender belongs (1 Cor. v, 4), in deference to his superior judgment and command (2 Cor. ii, 9), and in spite of any opposition on the part of a minority (*ib.* 6); (7) that the exclusion may be of indefinite duration or for a period; (8) that its duration may be abridged at the discretion and by the indulgence of the person who has imposed the penalty (*ib.* 8); (9) that penitence is the condition on which restoration to communion is granted (*ib.* 7); (10) that the sentence is to be publicly reversed as it was publicly promulgated (*ib.* 10).—Smith, *Appendix*, s. v.

III. *In the Post-Apostolic Christian Church.*—(I.) *In general.*—Such a power is necessarily inherent in every community; and although "the only sense in which the apostles, or, of course, any of their successors in the Christian ministry, can be empowered to 'forgive sins' as against God is by pronouncing and proclaiming his forgiveness of all those who, coming to him through Christ, repent and forsake their sins," yet since offences *as against a community* may "be visited with penalties by the regular appointed officers of that community, they may enforce or remit such penalties. On these principles is founded the right which the Church claims both to punish ecclesiastical offences, and to pronounce an absolute and complete pardon of a particular offender on his making the requisite submission and reparation" (Eden, s. v.).

(II.) *In the early Christian Church.*—1. In the discipline of the primitive Church, according to the apostolic injunction, recourse was not had to excommunication until "after the first and second admonition" (*προβοήθεια*). If the offender proved refractory after the time granted for repentance (Siegel, *Alterthümer*, ii, 131), he was liable to excommunication, which at first consisted simply in the removal of the offender from the Lord's Supper and the love-feasts; hence the word *excommunication*, separation from *communio*. The practice was founded on the words of the apostle (1 Cor. v, 11), "with such an one, no, not to eat;" which do not refer to ordinary meals and the common intercourse of life, but to the *agape* and other solemnities. The chief difference between Jewish and Christian excommunication consisted in this: the former extended in its consequences to the affairs of civil life, whereas the latter was strictly confined to ecclesiastical relations. It was impossible, in the constitution and situation of the Church during the three first centuries, that there should have been any confounding or intermingling of civil and religious privileges or penalties. But, though instituted at first for the purpose of preserving the purity of the Church, excommunication was afterwards by degrees converted by ambitious ecclesiastics into an engine for promoting their own power, and was often inflicted on the most frivolous occasions (Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. xv, chap. ii). The primitive Church was very cautious in exercising its power of excommunication. No man could be condemned to it in his absence, or without being allowed liberty to answer for himself. Legal conviction was always required, i. e. by his own confession, by credible evidence, or by open notoriety. Minors were subjected to corporal discipline rather than to this censure (Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. xvi, ch. ii; Cave, *Prim. Christianity*, iii, 5).

2. There were two excommunications, the greater

(*major*) and lesser (*minor*). The *excommunicatio minor* (*ἀφορισμός*) excluded from participation in the Eucharist and prayers of the faithful, but did not expel from the Church; for the person under its sentence might stay to hear the psalmody, reading of the Scripture, sermons and prayers of the catechumens and penitents, and then depart as soon as the first service, called the *service of catechumens*, was ended (Theod. Ep. 77; *ad Eubul.* iii, 797). This punishment was commonly inflicted upon lesser crimes, or if upon greater, upon such sinners only as showed a willingness to repent—upon those who had lapsed rather through infirmity than maliciousness. The *excommunicatio major*, greater excommunication (*παρατέλλης ἀφορισμός*), was a total expulsion from the Church, and separation from communion in all holy offices with it (*Encyclop. Metropolitana*). When attended with execrations, excommunication was called *anathema* (see article, vol. i, p. 219). The several churches mutually informed each other of their own separate excommunications, in order that a person excommunicated by one church might be held so by all; and any church which received him was held deserving of similar punishment. He who was guilty of any intercourse with an excommunicated person, himself incurred a like sentence, which deprived him of Christian burial and insertion in the diptychs or catalogues of the faithful. No gifts or oblations were received from the excommunicated. No intermarriages might take place with them. Their books might not be read, but were to be burned (Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. xv). For the restoration of excommunicated persons, penances (q. v.) and public professions of repentance were required; and in Africa and Spain the absolution of *lapsed* persons (i. e. those who, in time of persecution, had yielded to the force of temptation, and fallen away from their Christian profession by the crime of actual sacrifice to idols) was forbidden, except at the hour of death, or in cases where martyrs interceded for them. See LAPSE.

(III.) *The Roman Church.*—As the pretensions of the hierarchy increased, excommunication became more and more an instrument of ecclesiastical power, as well as a means of enlarging it. When the Church had full control of the state, its sentences were attended with the gravest civil as well as ecclesiastical consequences. There are three degrees of excommunication, the *minor*, the *major*, and the *anathema*.

1. The *minor* is incurred by holding communion with an excommunicated person: *oratiōne, locutiōne, bibendo, comedendo*—praying, speaking, drinking, eating; and absolution may be given by any priest on confession. Priests who have incurred the *minor* ban may administer the Eucharist, but cannot partake of it.

2. The *major excommunicatio* falls upon those who disobey the commands of the pope, or who, having been found guilty of any offence, civil or criminal, refuse to submit to certain points of discipline; in consequence of which they are excommunicated from the Church triumphant, and delivered over to the devil and his angels. It requires a written sentence from a bishop after three admonitions. It deprives the condemned person of all the blessings of the Church in any shape, except that he is not debarred from hearing the Word. So long as the State obeyed the Church, civil disabilities followed the sentence of excommunication; no obedience was due to the excommunicated; the laws could give them no redress for injuries; and none could hold intercourse with them under penalty of excommunication. On this last point, however, a distinction has been made since the 15th century between those who are called *tolerati* (tolerated) and those who are designated as *vivendi* (persons to be shunned). Only in the case of the latter (a case extremely rare, and confined to heresiarchs, and other signal offenders against the faith or public order of the Church) are the ancient rules for prohibition of intercourse enforced. With the 'tolerated,' since the

celebrated decree of Pope Martin V in the Council of Constance, the faithful are permitted to maintain the ordinary intercourse. By the 12th century the word ban (*bannus, bannum*), which in ancient jurisprudence denoted a declaration of outlawry, had come into ecclesiastical use to denote the official act of excommunication. See BAN.

The professed aim of excommunication was the reform of the offender as well as the purification of the Church. Absolution can be granted, in case of the major ban, only by the authority which laid the ban, or its successor. Before absolution the authorities must be satisfied of penitence. The "penitent must first swear to obey the commands of the Church, and to make all necessary atonement for his special offence; he must then be *reconciled* by kneeling, bare-headed and stripped to his shirt, before the bishop sitting at the church gates. Here he again repeats his oath, and the bishop, reciting the psalm *Deus misericorditer*, strikes him with a rod during each verse. Then, after certain prayers, he absolves him and leads him into the church."

3. The *anathema* is attended with special ceremonies. "The bishop must be attended by twelve priests, each of whom, as well as himself, bears a lighted candle. He then sits before the high altar, or any other public place which he prefers, and delivers his sentence, which adjudges the offender to be *anathematizatum et damnatum cum diabolo et angelis ejus et omnibus reprobis in aeternum ignem*—cursed and damned with the devil and his angels and all the reprobate to eternal fire. The candles are then dashed down. The ceremonies of absolution from this sentence are not very different from the last, although the form of prayer is varied" (*Encyclop. Metrop.* s. v.). The effects of the anathema were summed up in the monkish lines

Si pro delicto anathema quis efficiatur,  
Os, orare, vale, communiō, mensa negatur.

See ANATHEMA; BELL, BOOK, AND CANDLE.

"In the Roman Catholic Church the power of excommunicating is held to reside, not in the congregation, but in the bishop; and this is believed to be in exact accordance with the remarkable proceeding commemorated in the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians (1 Cor. v, 3, 5), and with all the earliest recorded examples of its exercise. Like all the powers of the episcopate, it is held to belong, in an especial and eminent degree, to the Roman bishop, as primate of the Church; but it is by no means believed to belong to him exclusively, nor has such exclusive right ever been claimed by the bishops of Rome. On the contrary, bishops within their sees, archbishops while exercising visitatorial jurisdiction, heads of religious orders within their own communities, all possess the power to issue excommunication, not only by the ancient law of the Church, but also by the most modern discipline" (Chambers, s. v.). But Aquinas held that excommunication, as not belonging to the keys of order, not to those of jurisdiction, and as not referring to grace directly, but only accidentally, might be exercised by persons not in holy orders, but yet having jurisdiction in ecclesiastical courts (*Summa, Suppl.* iii, qu. 22). See Marshall, *Penitential Discipline*, Oxf. 1844, p. 139. The Council of Trent declares (sess. xxv, ch. iii, *de Reform.*) that, "Although the sword of excommunication is the very sinews of ecclesiastical discipline, and very salutary for keeping the people in their duty, yet it is to be used with sobriety and great circumspection; seeing that experience teaches that if it be rashly or for slight causes wielded, it is more despised than feared, and produces destruction rather than safety. . . . It shall be a crime for any secular magistrate to prohibit an ecclesiastical judge from excommunicating any one, or to command that he revoke an excommunication issued, under pretext that the things contained in the present decree have not

been observed; whereas the cognizance hereof does not pertain to seculars, but to ecclesiastics. And every excommunicated person soever who, after the lawful monitions, does not change his mind, shall not only not be received to the sacraments and to communion and intercourse with the faithful, but if, being bound with censures, he shall, with obdurate heart, remain for a year in the defilement thereof, he may even be proceeded against as suspected of heresy." The popes have exercised the power of excommunication against entire communities at once. The *Capitularies* of Pepin the Less, in the 8th century, ordained that the greater excommunication should be followed by banishment from the country. On the claim of the popes to excommunicate and depose monarchs, and to free subjects from their allegiance, see McClintock, *Temporal Power of the Pope* (N. Y. 1855, 12mo). "The latest examples of papal excommunication of monarchs were Napoleon I in 1809, and Victor Emmanuel, king of Italy, in 1860; neither of whom, however, was excommunicated by name, the pope having confined himself to a solemn and reiterated publication of the penalties decreed by his predecessors against those who unjustly invaded the territories of the Holy See, usurped or violated its rights, or violently impeded their free exercise. The excommunication of a sovereign was regarded as freeing subjects from their allegiance; and, in the year 1102, this sentence was pronounced against the emperor Henry IV, an example which subsequent popes likewise ventured to follow. But the fearful weapons with which the popes armed themselves in this power of excommunication were rendered much less effective through their incautions employment, the evident worldly motives by which it was sometimes governed, and the excommunications which rival popes hurled against each other during the time of the great papal schism" (Chambers, s. v.).

(IV.) *The Greek Church.*—In the Greek Church excommunication cuts off the offender from all communion with the 318 fathers of the first Council of Nicea, consigns him to the devil and his angels, and condemns his body to remain after death as hard as a piece of flint, unless he humbles himself and makes atonement for his sins by a sincere repentance. "The form abounds with dreadful imprecations; and the Greeks assert that, if a person dies excommunicated, the devil enters into the lifeless corpse; and, therefore, in order to prevent it, the relations of the deceased cut his body in pieces and boil them in wine. Every year, on a fixed Sunday, the greater ban is pronounced against the pope and the Church of Rome, on which occasion, together with a great deal of idle ceremony, he drives a nail into the ground with a hammer as a mark of malediction" (Buck, s. v.). Sir Paul Rycout (*Present State of the Greek and Armenian Churches*, Lond. 1679, 8vo), who wrote his observations on the state of that communion in 1678, has given, in the original Greek, the form of an excommunication issued against an unknown thief whom the authorities were seeking to discover. It runs as follows: "If they restore not to him that which is his own, and possess him peaceably of it, but suffer him to remain injured and damned, let him be separated from the Lord God Creatour, and be accursed, and unpardoned, and undissolvable after death in this world, and in the other which is to come. Let wood, stones, and iron be dissolved, but not they: may they inherit the leprose of *Gehazi* and the confusion of *Judas*; may the earth be divided, and devour them like *Dathan* and *Abiram*; may they sigh and tremble on earth like *Cain*, and the wrath of God be upon their heads and countenances; may they see nothing of that for which they labor, and beg their bread all the days of their lives; may their works, possessions, labors, and services be accursed; always without effect or success, and blown away like dust; may they have the curses of the holy and righteous patriarchs *Abram*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*; of the 318 saints

who were the divine fathers of the Synod of *Nicee*, and of all other holy synods; and being without the Church of Christ, let no man administer unto them the things of the Church, or bless them, or offer sacrifice for them, or give them the *ἀγρῖσσορον*, or the blessed bread, or eat, or drink, or work with them, or converse with them; and after death let no man bury them, in penalty of being under the same state of excommunication; for so let them remain until they have performed what is here written."

(V.) *In Protestant Churches.*—New relations between Church and State followed hard upon the Reformation, and new limits were soon assigned to the exercise of discipline. According to the view of the Wittenberg reformers, the ban could have no civil effect unless ratified by the State. The necessity of the power of excommunication in the Church was asserted by all the Reformers. They maintained that excommunication is the affair of the whole Church, clergy and laity (Calvin, *Institut.* vol. iv, chap. xi; Melancthon, *Corpus Ref. ed. Bretschneider*, iii, 965). See ERASTIANISM. They disclaimed the right of using the *excommunicatio major*. In general, the "Reformers retained only that power of excommunication which appeared to them to be inherent in the constitution of the Christian society, and to be sanctioned by the Word of God; nor have any civil consequences been generally connected with it in Protestant countries. To connect such consequences with excommunication in any measure whatever is certainly inconsistent with the principles of the Reformation" (Chambers, s. v.).

The causes of excommunication in the established Church of England are, contempt of the bishops' court, heresy, neglect of public worship and the sacraments, incontinency, adultery, simony, etc. If the judge of any spiritual court excommunicates a man for a cause of which he has not the legal cognizance, the party may have an action against him at common law, and he is also liable to be indicted at the suit of the king (*Can.* 65, 68; see also the Homily *On the Right Uses of the Church*). The 33d Article of Religion is as follows: "That person which, by open denunciation of the Church, is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful as a heathen and publican until he be openly reconciled by penance, and received into the Church by a judge that hath authority thereunto." "By old English law an excommunicated person was disabled from doing any act required to be done by one that is *probus et legalis homo*. He could not serve on juries, nor be witness in any court, nor bring an action real or personal to recover lands or money due to him. By stat. 5 and 6 Edward VI, cap. 4, striking, or drawing a weapon to strike, in a church or church-yard, incurred *ipso facto* excommunication; *ipso facto* excommunication, or *lute sententia*, meaning some act so clear or manifest that no sentence is requisite, in contradistinction from *sententia ferenda*, i. e. when sentence must be passed before the offender be considered excommunicated. The offences which, in the reign of Edward III, 1373, were punished by *ipso facto* excommunication, are enumerated in some *articuli* issued when Wittlesey was archbishop of Canterbury; most of them are such as might be injurious to the persons or properties of the clergy. The document may be found in *Conc. Magn. Britt.* iii, 95. By 3 James I, cap. 5, every popish recusant convict stands to all intents and purposes disabled, as a person lawfully excommunicated. The ecclesiastical law denies Christian burial to those excommunicated *majori excommunicatione*, and an injunction to the ministers to that effect will be found in the sixty-eighth canon, and in the rubric of the burial service. The law acknowledged two excommunications: the *lesser* excluded the offender from the communion of the Church only; the *greater* from that communion, and also from the company of the faithful, etc. The sixty-

fifth canon enjoins ministers solemnly to denounce those who stand lawfully excommunicated every six months, as well in the parish church as in the cathedral church of the diocese in which they remain, 'openly in time of divine service, upon some Sunday,' 'that others may be thereby both admonished to refrain their company and society, and excited the rather to procure out a writ de excommunicato capiendo, thereby to bring and reduce them into due order and obedience.' By statute 52 George III, cap. 127, excommunications, and the proceedings following thereupon, are discontinued, except in certain cases specified in the act; which may receive definitive sentences as spiritual censures for offences of ecclesiastical cognizance; and instead of sentence of excommunication, which used to be pronounced by the ecclesiastical courts in cases of contumacy, the offenders are to be declared contumacious, and to be referred to the court of chancery, by which a writ de contumace capiendo is issued instead of the old writ de excommunicato capiendo. Formerly this writ de excommunicato capiendo was issued by the court of chancery upon it being signified by the bishop's certificate that forty days have elapsed since sentence of excommunication has been published in the church without submission of the offender. The sheriff then received the writ, called also a *significavit*, and lodged the culprit in the county jail till the bishop certified his reconciliation. A similar method of proceeding to that now adopted was recommended by a report of a committee of both houses of Parliament as far back as March 7, 1710, and again on April 30, 1714. No person excommunicated for such offences as are still liable to the punishment can now be imprisoned for a longer term than six months (Burns, *Eccle. Law*, by Tyrwhit, *ad v.*). In Scotland, when the lesser excommunication, or exclusion from the sacraments has failed, the minister pronounces a form by which the impenitent offender is declared 'excommunicated, shut out from the communion of the faithful, debarred from their privileges, and delivered unto Satan for the destruction of his flesh, that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.' The people are then warned to avoid all unnecessary intercourse with him. Anciently, in Scotland, an excommunicated person was incapable of holding feudal rights, but at present the sentence is unaccompanied by any civil penalty or disqualification (*Encyclopædia Metropolitana*, s. v.).

The law of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, as expressed by the 42d canon of 1832, is as follows: Sec. 1. If any persons within this Church offend their brethren by any wickedness of life, such persons shall be repelled from the holy communion, agreeably to the rubric. Sec. 2. On information being laid before the bishop that any one has been repelled from communion, it shall not be his duty to institute an inquiry unless there be a complaint made to him in writing by the repelled party. But on receiving complaint, it shall be the duty of the bishop, unless he think fit to restore him from the insufficiency of the cause assigned by the minister, to institute an inquiry, as may be directed by the canons of the diocese in which the event has taken place. Sec. 3. In the case of a great heinousness of offence on the part of members of this Church, they may be proceeded against to the depriving them of all privileges of church membership, according to such rules or process as may be provided by the General Convention, and, until such rules and process shall be provided, by such as may be provided by the different State Conventions. See also the 33d Article of Religion.

In the Methodist Episcopal Church the power of excommunication lies with the minister after trial before a jury of the peers of the accused party. The grounds and forms of trial are given in the *Discipline*, part iii, chap. i. It is provided in the Constitution that no law shall ever be made doing away the privilege of accused

ministers or members to have trial and right of appeal (*Discipline*, pt. ii, ch. i, § 1).

"Among the *Independents, Congregationalists, and Baptists*, the persons who are or should be excommunicated are such as are quarrelsome and litigious (Gal. v, 12); such as desert their privileges, withdraw themselves from the ordinances of God, and forsake his people (Jude 19); such as are irregular and immoral in their lives, railers, drunkards, extortioners, fornicators, and covetous (Eph. v, 5; 1 Cor. v, 11). In the United States these simple principles of Church discipline are very generally followed by all evangelical denominations" (Buck, s. v.). See particularly the *Form of Government of the Presbyterian Church*, bk. ii of Discipline; Dexter, *On Congregationalism* (Boston, 1865), p. 191-2; Ripley, *On Church Polity* (Bost. 1867), p. 81 sq.; Edwards, *Nature and Use of Excommunication* (*Works*, N. Y., 1848), iv, 638.

*Literature.*—See, besides the works already cited, Ferraris, *Promta Bibliotheca*, ed. Migne, iii, 846 sq.; Siegel, *Christ-kirchl. Alterthümer*, ii, 131 sq.; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. xvi, chap. ii, iii; Van Espen, *De Censuris Ecclesiasticis* (*Opera*, Paris, 1753, 4 vols.); Scheele, *Die Kirchenzucht* (Halle, 1852, 8vo); Hooker, *Eccle. Polity*, viii, 1, 6; Calvin, *Institutes*, 1k. iv, ch. xii; Thorndike, *Works* (Oxford, 1856), vi, 21; Waterland, *Works* (Oxford, 1853), iii, 456; Winer, *Comp. Darstellung*, § 20; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, ed. Smith, § 255; Herzog, *Real-Encyclopædie*, s. v. Bann; Palmer, *On the Church*, i, 96; ii, 277, 304; Watson, *Theological Institutes*, ii, 574; Burnet, *On the Articles*, Browne, *On the Articles*, Forbes, *On the Articles* (each on Article XXXIII); Wheatly, *On Common Prayer*, Bohn's ed., p. 442 sq.; Scott, *Synod of Dort* (Philadelphia Presb. Board), p. 249; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, ch. xv, pt. v. See ANATHEMA; BAN; DISCIPLINE.

**Exeat**, a Latin term, signifying either the permission given by a bishop to a clergyman of his diocese that he may for a time go out of his diocese, or the same permission given by an abbot to one of the "religious" of his monastery, or by the authorities of a college (in England), to a student (Eden).

**Execration** (עֲרִיצָה, *alah*, Jer. xlii, 18; xlv, 12; a "curse" or "oath," abstractly, as elsewhere) is properly the representative of the Greek word *κατάρα*, which occurs (in the verb *καταράσθαι*) in the Sept. at Num. xxiii, 8; xxiv, 9; Josh. vi, 26; 1 Sam. xvii, 43, etc., as a rendering of various Heb. terms (עֲרִיצָה, עֲרִיצָה, עֲרִיצָה, etc.), and also in the N. T. ("curse," Matt. v, 44; Mark ii, 21, etc.). It is used also in profane authors to denote the imprecations which it was customary among ancient nations to pronounce upon their enemies for the purpose of calling down the divine wrath, branding them with infamy, and exciting against them the passions of the multitude. By this means they also devoted their enemies to the ruin they considered them to deserve. These imprecations were chiefly pronounced by priests, enchanters, or prophets. See BALAAM. The Athenians made use of them against Philip of Macedon. They convened an assembly, in which it was decreed that all statues, inscriptions, or festivals among them, in any way relating to him or his ancestors, should be destroyed, and every other possible reminiscence of him profaned; and that the priests, as often as they prayed for the success of the Athenian affairs, should pray for the ruin of Philip. It was also customary, both among the Greeks and Romans, after having destroyed cities in war, the revival of whose strength they dreaded, to pronounce execrations upon those who should rebuild them. Strabo observes that Agamemnon pronounced execrations on those who should rebuild *Troy*, as Cræsus did against those who should rebuild *Sidena*; and this mode of execrating cities Strabo calls an ancient custom (*κατὰ παλαιὴν ἔθος*, xiii, p. 898, edit. 1707). The Romans published a decree full of execrations against

those who should rebuild Carthage (Zonaras, *Annal.*). An incident somewhat analogous is related (Josh. vi, 26) after the taking of Jericho. From the words "and Joshua adjured them at that time," it is likely that he acted under a divine intimation that Jericho should continue in ruins, as a monument of the divine displeasure and a warning to posterity. The words "cursed be the man (the individual) before the Lord that riseth up and buildeth this city Jericho," although transformed into an execration by the word supplied by the translators, amount to no more than a prediction that "he shall lay the foundation thereof in his first-born, and in his youngest son shall he set up the gates of it," that is, he shall meet with so many impediments to his undertaking that he shall outlive all his children, dying in the course of nature before he shall complete it. See JERICHO. Execrations were also pronounced upon cities and their inhabitants before undertaking a siege (Macrobius has preserved two of the ancient forms used in reference to the destruction of Carthage, *Saturnal.* iii, 9), and before engaging with enemies in war. Tacitus relates that the priestesses of ancient Britain devoted their Roman invaders to destruction with imprecations, ceremonies, and attitudes, which for a time overwhelmed the soldiers with terror (*Annal.* xiv, 29). The execrations in the 83d Psalm, probably written on the occasion of the confederacy against Jehoshaphat, and other instances of a like nature, partake of the execrations of the heathen in nothing but form, being the inspired predictions or denunciations of divine vengeance against the avowed enemies of the God of Israel, notwithstanding the proofs they had witnessed of his supremacy; and the object of these imprecations, as in many other instances, is charitable, namely, their conversion to the true religion (ver. 18; see also Psa. lix, 12).—Kitto, s. v. See ANATHEMA; IMPRECATION.

**Execution**, or capital punishment, among the Jews, when lawful and regular, was of one of the following kinds. 1. *Death by the sword* (כָּרַח הַחֶבֶד, or כָּרַח הַחֶבֶד, also simply כָּרַח הַחֶבֶד, 2 Sam. i, 15; 2 Kings x, 25; Jer. xxvi, 23), by which, however, we are not to understand beheading (in 2 Kings x, 7, the bodies were probably decapitated after death), as the Rabbins will have it (Mishna, *Sanhedr.* vii, 3), a penalty that early occurs in Egypt (Gen. xl, 19), and later in the Roman period among the Jews, as the introduction of foreign princes (Matt. xiv, 10 sq.), and as is probably meant in Acts xii, 2 (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 1, 2); but the offender was stabbed or cut to death, as the case might be. 2. *Stoning* (q. v.); since the shooting with a dart, mentioned in Exod. xix, 13, was only selected in place of this when an individual was to be put to death at a distance. These punishments were intensified by indignities to the corpse; namely, (a.) *Burning* (שָׂרַף הַחַי, Lev. xx, 14; xxi, 9; compare Josh. vii, 15, 25; Gen. xxxviii, 24; 1 Macc. iii, 5; [see Michaelis in loc.]). That we are here not to think of a burning alive, we may gather from Josh. vii, 25; and it is the more probable from the procedure detailed in the Mishna (*Sanhedr.* vii, 2), which directs that the delinquent's mouth should be forced open by a cloth drawn around the neck, and melted lead then be poured in! (b.) *Hanging* (הָרַח הַחַי) on a tree or post (Deut. xxi, 22; Num. xxv, 4; comp. Josh. x, 26; 2 Sam. iv, 12; 1 Sam. xxxi, 8, 10), with which mutilation of the dead body was often connected (2 Sam. iv, 12). The person hung was regarded as execrated (Deut. xxi, 23; comp. Gal. iii, 13), and was not allowed to remain suspended over night (Deut. xxi, 23; comp. Josh. viii, 29; x, 26 sq.), through fear of tainting the atmosphere, since putrescence soon began. The opposite treatment was deemed an extraordinary severity (2 Sam. xxi, 6, 9 sq.). The hanging of a living person (Ezra vi, 11) is a Persian punishment. Under

the Herods this custom was likewise introduced among the Jews (Josephus, *Ant.* xvi, 11, 6), as in the Roman period in Egypt (Philo, ii, 529). (c.) Finally, a heap of stones (בְּרֹחַ אֲבָבִים) was thrown over the body, i. e. the grave (Josh. vii, 25 sq.; viii, 29; 2 Sam. xviii, 17). This dishonor is still common in the East (Paulus, *Nen. Repert.* ii, 53; Jahn, *Archäol.* II, ii, 353). One of these kinds of punishment is constantly referred to by the legislative precept, "That soul shall be cut off from the people" (כָּרַח הַחַי הַחַי הַחַי הַחַי, or כָּרַח הַחַי), as especially appears from Exod. xxxi, 14; Lev. xvii, 4; xx, 17 (see Michaelis, *Mos. Recht.* v, 37 sq.); the cases are specified in the Mishna, *Cherithuth.* i, 1; but the Rabbins are not altogether agreed; comp. Abarbanel on Num. xv, 30; also in Ugolini *Thesaur.* xxx); not, as most will have it, a mere interdiction from political or religious privileges. See EXCOMMUNICATION. All penal inflictions were usually speedy (Josh. vii, 24 sq.; 1 Sam. xxii, 16), and originally inflicted directly by the populace, but under the kings by their body-guard, or one of their attendants. See CHERETHITE.

Foreign punishments, unknown to the Jewish law, were the following: 1. *Sawing* in pieces (2 Sam. xii, 31). See SAW. 2. *Dichotomy*, i. e. cutting asunder (ἐξοτομῆν or μελιζίναι = "quartering") or dismemberment (כָּרַח הַחַי, 1 Sam. xv, 33; μελιστὶ διαρῆν, Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 8, 4; a barbarous instance is given in Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 12, 6; and an inhuman murder in Judg. xix, 29; but 1 Kings iii, 25, does not belong here) of the living being (see Krumholz, *De pœna per τὸ ἐξοτομῆν significata*, in the *Bibl. Brem.* vii, 234 sq.), which was universal among the Babylonians (Dan. ii, 5; iii, 29; in 2 Sam. iv, 12; 2 Macc. i, 16, mangling after death is indicated by way of infamy; compare Livy, viii, 28; in Ezek. xvi, 40; xx, 47, dichotomy is not to be understood), as well as Egyptians (Herod. ii, 139; iii, 13) and Persians (Herod. vii, 39; Diod. Sic. xvii, 83; comp. Horace, *Sat.* i, 1, 99 sq.; 2 Macc. vii, 8; Matt. xxiv, 51; Luke xii, 46; Koran, xx, 74; xxvi, 49; Assemani, *Martyrol. Or.* i, 241 sq.). 3. *Precipitation* (כָּרַח הַחַי, 2 Chron. xxv, 12; comp. Psa. cxli, 6; κατακοιμισμός, Luke iv, 29; comp. 2 Macc. vi, 10) from a rock ("dejecere de saxo Tarpeio" or "ex aggere," Suetonius, *Calig.* 27) is well known as a Roman mode of execution (for the Athenians, see Wachsmuth, *Hellen. Alterth.* ii, 20). 4. *Tyrannism* (τυρπανισμός), or beating to death (Heb. xi, 35; A. V. "torture;"; comp. Aristot. *Rhet.* ii, 5; Lucian, *Jup. Trag.* 19, etc.), of which the instrument was a cudgel (τύμπανον, 2 Macc. vi, 19, 28, A. V. "torment;"; Aristophanes, *Plut.* 476); but it is uncertain whether we are thereby to understand simply a club with which the unfortunates were dispatched, or a wooden hoop upon which they were stretched in the manner of a rack (comp. Josephus, *De Maccab.* viii, 5 and 9). See TYRANNISM.

Besides the above, the following methods of execution are named in the Bible as practised by nations in the neighborhood of Palestine: 1. *Burning* alive in a furnace (Dan. iii, 6, 11, 15, 19 sq.), which occurs in modern Persia (Chardin, *Voyage*, vi, 218), is of very early date (if we may trust the traditions concerning Abraham [q. v.], Targ. on 2 Chron. xxviii, 3); likewise roasting or boiling convicts over a slow fire (Jer. xxix, 22 [see Hebenstreit, *De Achabi et Zedekie supplicio*, Lips. 1736]; 2 Macc. vi, 5). See JOHN (THE APOSTLE). An example of burning alive does not occur (2 Sam. xxi, 31, marg. כָּרַח הַחַי; see Thenius, in loc.) until the time of Herod (Josephus, *War.* i, 33, 4); but in Egypt the vindictive Roman magistrates took pleasure in burning Jews (Philo, ii, 612, 527). No instances of burying alive (Ctesias, *Pers.* xli. 53; Livy, viii, 15, etc.) are found in the Scriptures (Num. xvi, 30 sq., is not in point). 2. *Casting into the lions' den* (Dan. vi). See LION; DEN. 3. *Suffocation* in hot

ashes (2 Macc. xiii, 5 sq.; comp. Valer. Max. ix, 2, 6, "He filled with ashes a place inclosed by high walls, with a beam projecting within, upon which he placed the doomed, so that, when overcome with drowsiness, they fell into the insidious ash-heap below;" see Ctesias, *Pers.* 47 and 52). See ASHES. 4. Dashing in pieces children (sucklings) on the corners of walls, which occurred on the sack of cities (Isa. xiii, 16, 18; Hos. xiv, 1; Nah. iii, 10; comp. Psa. cxxxvii, 9), like the ripping open of pregnant women (2 Kings viii, 12; xv, 16; Hos. xiv, 1; Amos i, 13), is, with the exception of 2 Kings xiv, 16, only a heathenish barbarity. On crucifixion, see CRUCIFY. 5. Finally, drowning (*καταποντισμός*, Matt. xviii, 6), and fighting with wild beasts (*θηρομαχία*, 1 Cor. xv, 32), are but casually alluded to in the N. T. Drowning, as a mode of inflicting death, is old (comp. Exod. i, 22). Among the Romans, those guilty of parricide were sewed in sacks (*culei*) and then drowned (Cicero, *Rosc. Am.* 25; *ad Herem.* i, 13; Seneca, *Clem.* i, 15; Juvenal, viii, 214); but this in the time of the emperors came to be deemed an inhuman mode of execution (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 15, 10; *War.* i, 22, 2; Lactantius, *Mort. persec.* xv, 3); and thus remaining under the water (Jer. li, 63) was thought a peculiarly severe fate (Josephus, *Apion.* i, 34; comp. Matt. xviii, 6; see Götz, *De pistrinis vett.* p. 131 sq.; Gräfe, *De καταποντισμῷ, νῦν fuerit supplic. Judaeorum*, Lips. 1662; Welleins, *De supplicio submers.* Havn. 1701; Scherer, *De καταποντ. ap. antiq.* Argent. xvii, 4). Such cruel punishments sometimes followed the mutilations of martyrdom (2 Macc. vii, 4, 7, 10). On *theriomachy*, see GAMES; and on the passage 3 Macc. 5, comp. Porphyry, *Abst. in.* ii, 57. See generally Carpov, *Appar.* p. 581 sq.; Michaelis, *De judiciis pœnitæ capitulibus in S. S.* (Hal. 1749; also in Ugolini *Thesaur.* xxvi, and Pott's *Sylloge*, iv, 177 sq.); Jahn, *Archæol.* II, ii, 347 sq.; Michaelis, *Mos. Recht*, v, 11 sq.—Winer, ii, 11. Compare PUNISHMENT.

**Executioner** (*σπεκουλάτωρ*, for Lat. *speculator*, originally a *scout*, afterwards a *life-guard* under the emperor), a member of the royal body-guard adopted by Herod in imitation of the Romans (see Tacitus, *Hist.* ii, 11; Suetonius, *Claud.* 35), and in accordance with Oriental despotism, and employed to execute his sanguinary orders (Mark vi, 27). (See Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s. v. *Speculatores*; Schwarz, *De Speculatoribus vett. Romanorum*, Altd. 1726.) See CHIERE-TIITE.

In ancient times persons of the highest rank and station were employed to execute the sentence of the law. The office of Potiphar, in the Egyptian court, mentioned in Genesis xxxvii, 36, is thought to have been "chief of the executioners," as in the margin of our version. See GUARD. This is still a high office in the East as a *court* office. Such executioners have nothing to do with carrying into effect the awards of the law in its ordinary course, but only with those of the king. It is there an office of great responsibility; and to insure its due and strict fulfilment, it is intrusted to an officer of the court, who has necessarily under his command a body of men whose duty it is to preserve the order and peace of the palace and its precincts, and to attend and guard the royal person on public occasions; and, under the direction of their chief, to inflict such punishment as the king awards upon those who incur his displeasure. Potiphar, therefore, in this sense might be called captain of the guard. He had his official residence at the public jail (Gen. xl, 2). Nebuzaradan (2 Kings xxv, 8; Jer. xxxix, 9) and Arioch (Dan. ii, 14) held the same office. That the "captain of the guard" himself occasionally performed the duty of an executioner appears from 1 Kings ii, 25, 34. Nevertheless the post was one of high dignity, and something beyond the present position of the *zâbit* of modern Egypt (comp. Lane, i, 163), with which Wilkinson (ii, 45) compares it. It is still

not unusual for officers of high rank to inflict corporal punishment with their own hands (Wilkinson, ii, 43). It does not appear that the Jews had public executioners, but the prince or general laid his commands on any of his attendants. Gideon commanded Jether, his eldest son, to execute his sentence on the kings of Midian; Saul ordered the footmen who stood around him, and were probably a chosen body of soldiers for the defence of his person, to put to death the priests of the Lord, and when they refused, Doeg, an Edomite, one of his principal officers, executed the command (1 Sam. xxii, 18). Long after the days of Saul, the reigning monarch commanded Benaiah, the chief captain of his armies, to perform the duty of putting Joab to death. Sometimes the chief magistrate executed the sentence of the law with his own hands; for when Jether shrank from the duty which his father required, Gideon, at that time the supreme magistrate in Israel, did not hesitate to do it himself. Thus also in Homer (*Odyss.* xxi, fin.; xxii, init.) we read that the exasperated Ulysses commanded his son Telemachus to put to death the suitors of Penelope, which was immediately done. In condemnations under the Mosaic law, the congregation or assembly of people executed the criminal, but the witnesses commenced the work of death (Lev. xxiv, 16; Dent. xvii, 7; John viii, 7; Acts vii, 57-60). Executions in the East are often very prompt and arbitrary. In many cases, among the Turks and Persians, the suspicion is no sooner entertained, or the cause of offence given, than the fatal order is issued, the messenger of death hurries to the unsuspecting victim, shows his warrant, and executes his order that instant in silence and solitude (2 Kings vi, 32; Prov. xvi, 14; Mark vi, 27). See PUNISHMENT.

**Exedrae**, buildings contiguous to the church. See CHURCH EDIFICES.

**Exegesis**. See EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

**Exegetical Collections**. See CATENA; COMMENTARIES.

**Exegetical Theology**, that branch of theology which treats of the exposition and interpretation of the Old and New Testaments. See ENCYCLOPEDIA OF THEOLOGY. Exegesis (*ἐξηγησις*) is *statement, explanation*, from *ἐξηγεῖσθαι*, *I lead, describe, explain*; and from this, an *exegete*, *ἐξηγητής*, *guide, interpreter*. The word exegetical, then, includes all that belongs to *explanation*, and Exegetical Theology includes all that belongs to the explanation and interpretation of the holy Scriptures.

**I. Matter of Exegetical Theology**.—The Bible, including both the O. and N. T., is the material on which the science of exegetical theology is employed. Some writers therefore designate it as Biblical theology; but the real work of exegesis is to gather from the word the material of Biblical theology, leaving the arrangement and co-ordination of this material to fall into a separate branch of the science. See BIBLICAL THEOLOGY; THEOLOGY. In fact, the results of exegetical study may fall, according to their nature, into historical, doctrinal, or practical theology. See BIBLE. As the Bible comes to us as the record of a revelation from God, its claims in this respect form the subject of a separate branch, entitled INSPIRATION (q. v.). The study of inspiration leads to the general question of the possibility and nature of REVELATION (q. v.).

**II. Method of Exegetical Theology**.—1. *Philology*.—As the Bible comes to us in ancient languages (Hebrew, Chaldee, Hellenistic Greek), the first requisite of exegesis is the knowledge of these languages, both as to their grammatical structure and their vocabulary. This branch is called *Sacred Linguistics*, or *Sacred Philology*. The knowledge of classical Greek is of course presupposed, while Syriac, Samaritan, and Arabic are cognate and auxiliary. For details, see



the separate articles in this work on the various topics named.

2. *Archæology*.—Not only does the Bible come to us in ancient languages, but it was also written at various times, in various countries, and under various conditions of life (social, political, religious, etc.). Thus arise the various branches of Bible history (belonging partly to exegetical and partly to historical theology), Biblical geography, chronology, ethnography, natural history of the Bible, laws, usages, domestic economy, agriculture, sacred rites, and worship. All these branches are summed up under the general title Antiquities, or Archæology. See both these heads in this Cyclopædia, and also the other topics named, for the details and the literature.

3. *Canon*.—As these books come to us claiming to be authoritative, we must be able to answer the question, What books belong to the Bible as a sacred book? The answer to this question gives rise to that branch called the science of the *Canon* of Scripture. It is divided into canon of the O. T. and canon of the N. T. See the article CANON OF SCRIPTURE.

4. *Criticism*.—Granting that we have certain books admitted to be canonical, the farther question arises, Have we these writings in their original and correct forms? The answer to this question gives rise to *Criticism*, which is divided into the lower or text-criticism, which seeks to ascertain the true and original reading of the text as accurately as possible, and the higher criticism, which examines into the integrity, genuineness, and authenticity of the books. The higher criticism seeks to distinguish the true from the false, and forms, to a certain degree, the basis of Apologetics (q. v.); the text-criticism distinguishes the original from the altered or corrupted. See CRITICISM.

5. *Interpretation*.—All the studies heretofore named are preparatory to the work of getting at the meaning of the sacred Scriptures, which is the function of *Interpretation*, or *Hermeneutics* (ἑρμηνεία). The general principles on which any other writings would be interpreted are of course applicable here (General Hermeneutics); but the special character of these writings as sacred gives rise to an enlargement of those general principles of interpretation (Sacred Hermeneutics). When the sense of Scripture is sought simply by the use of linguistics or criticism, the interpretation is called *Grammatical*. When not only linguistics and criticism, but also all the knowledges embraced above under archæology are employed, the interpretation is called *Grammatico-Historical*. When, in addition, the traditional sense of the Church as to the substantial facts and doctrines of revelation is brought to bear upon the Word, the interpretation is called *Doctrinal*, or *Dogmatical*. Finally, when a farther sense than that conveyed in the words of the writer is sought, the interpretation is called *Allegorical*. For the nature, history, and value of these, see HERMENEUTICS; INTERPRETATION.

III. *Results or Products of Exegetical Theology*.—The application of the laws of hermeneutics, and of the preparatory or propædæutic sciences mentioned above, in practical work, is *Exegesis*. The fruit of this labor may appear, within the sphere of exegetical theology itself, in translations of the Bible, or of any of its parts [see VERSIONS]; or in commentaries on the Bible, or on separate books of the Bible, or on separate passages in any of the books. See COMMENTARIES. The principles and rules of exegesis are also to be used by the preacher in the preparation of his discourses for the congregation. See HOMILETICS; SERMON.

Most of the topics of exegetical theology are embraced in what is called *Introduction to the Scriptures*, a vague title, formerly much in use, but now giving way to more scientific and distinctive terms, such as *Literary History of the Bible*, for a general name, and the several titles mentioned above for special branches. The books on Introduction are often rather useful

collections of propædæutic knowledge than scientific treatises. See INTRODUCTION. There are no books in English treating exegetical theology as a separate branch in scientific form; but English literature abounds in excellent works on the several branches, which will be found indicated under the several titles in this Cyclopædia. The most important general works are the so-called books of "Introduction," such as Horne, *Introduction* (new ed., London, 1860, 4 vols. 8vo); Davidson, *Introduction to N. T.* (Lond. 1848-51 [Dr. Davidson's later writings are not so trustworthy as his earlier]); Westcott, *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* (reprinted, Bost. 1867, 12mo). On the literature, see farther under the head INTRODUCTION. On the scope of exegetical theology, and its relations to the other branches of the science, see Hagenbach, *Encyklopædie und Methodologie* (Leipzig, 1864, 7th edit., § 34-56); Marsh, *Lectures on the Arrangement of the several Branches of Divinity* (Cambridge, 1809, 8vo); Pelt, *Theologische Encyklopædie als System* (Hamburg, 1843, 8vo), § 10-28; Clarisse, *Encyklopædie Theologica Epitome* (Lugd. Bat. 1835, 8vo), sect. i, ii; and our articles ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF THEOLOGY; THEOLOGY.

**Exemption** designates, in ecclesiastical law, the release of persons or institutions from the jurisdiction of the regular superior, and their subordination to a higher or special superior.

1. *Roman Catholic Church*.—The first example of formal exemption is the release of monasteries from the episcopal jurisdiction. Many wealthy convents induced the popes, emperors, and kings to allow them a free election of their superiors, and a free administration of their property. Subsequently many of the monastic orders were altogether exempted from the jurisdiction of the bishops, the members being subordinate only to their monastic superiors and the pope. The bishops incessantly labored for a restoration of their full jurisdiction, and the Council of Constance favored them, but most of the popes sided with the monks rather than with the bishops. The Council of Trent granted most of the demands of the bishops, but the difficulties between bishops and monastic orders have never wholly ceased. Bishops sometimes are exempt from the usual subordination to an archbishop, being subordinate directly to the pope. Sometimes (as in Austria) the army was exempted from the jurisdiction of the bishops, and placed under the jurisdiction of a special army-bishop.

2. *Protestant Churches*.—The Protestant state churches retained, with other parts of the ecclesiastical law, the idea of exemption. The princes claimed for themselves exemption from the usual ecclesiastical jurisdiction; later, the same exemption was claimed for civil and military officers. In some countries the nobility also were exempt. In Prussia, a circular of the government in 1817 abolished all exemptions, but it was not executed. Churches which are based on the voluntary principle know of no exemption, because they compel none of their members to belong to any particular congregation.

In many districts in Germany, Roman Catholic, Lutheran, and Reformed pastors had jurisdiction even over members of the two other churches; and the exemption of Protestants from Roman Catholic jurisdiction, and vice versa, is not yet fully carried through.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* iv, 286; Wetzler und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 841. (A. J. S.)

**Exercise**, BODILY (σωματικὴ γυμνασία, i. e. *physical training*, i. q. *gymnastics*, 1 Tim. iv, 8). What the apostle seems to disparage under this term is not the athletic discipline which it classically imports (Arrian, *Epict.* i, 27, 6; Polyb. iv, 7, 6), and which his frequent allusions to the Grecian games (q. v.) might imply, but rather that ascetic mortification of the fleshly appetites, and even innocent affections (comp. ver. 3; Col. ii, 23), which characterized some of the Jewish

fanatics (ver. 7), especially the Essenes (q. v.).—Fleischmann, *Interpretatio*, in loc.; Seelen, *De Gymnastiis ad que Paulus* (in hoc loc.) *alludit* (Lubec, 1758). See TIMOTHY.

**EXERCISES, SPIRITUAL** (*exercitia spiritualia*), a title given by Romanists to certain exercises held under the leadership generally of a confessor (*magister exercitiorum*), for spiritual edification. They consist, generally, in alternate meditations and prayers at regularly appointed hours, with seclusion, mortification, etc. These exercises are practised both by clergy and laity, especially before communion, and as preparatory to the great Church festivals. Especially before ordination to the priesthood, such exercises are not only commended, but required of candidates. The most elaborate form of the exercises is that of Ignatius Loyola. His method received the approbation of the pope, and Alexander VII granted, in a brief dated Oct. 12, 1657, full absolution to all, whether priests or laymen, who should submit to them for eight days in the houses of the Company of Jesus. These exercises consist in alternate meditations, readings, oral prayers, and self-scrutiny, as special preparation for the reception of the sacraments of penitence and communion. In case of there being several persons exercising together, silence is recommended as a duty. The new missions established by the Jesuits and Redemptorists make use of these exercises, transforming the work of sanctification into a dead mechanical action.—Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iii, 289; Aschbach, *Allg. Kirchen-Lex.* ii, 707; Ferraris, *Promta Bibliotheca*, iii, 916 sq. See Bellocius, *Medulla asceseos seu exercitia Sancti Patris Ignatii* (new ed. by Westhoff); and the articles JESUITS and LOYOLA.

**Exhortation** (*παράκλησις*, strictly a *calling near*, invitation, and so “*entreaty*,” 2 Cor. viii, 4; hence *almonition*, special hortatory instruction in public, Luke iii, 18; Acts xiii, 15; 1 Tim. iv, 13; also “*consolation*” or comfort, Rom. xv, 4, etc.) seems to have been recognised in the Apostolic Church as a distinct supernatural or prophetic office or function (*χάρισμα*, “*gift*”) bestowed by the Holy Spirit (Rom. xii, 8). As such, it was doubtless a subordinate exercise of the general faculty of teaching (1 Cor. xiv, 31). Olshausen (*Comment.* in loc.) thinks that Paul does not distinguish it as a special *charism*, but rather regards it as co-ordinate with eldership. See GIFT (SPIRITUAL).

2. It is defined as “the act of laying such motives before a person as may excite him to the performance of any duty. It differs only from *suasion* in that the latter principally endeavors to convince the understanding, and the former to work on the affections. It is considered as a great branch of preaching, though not confined to that, as a man may exhort, though he do not preach; though a man can hardly be said to preach if he do not exhort. See EXHORTERS. The Scriptures enjoin ministers to exhort men, that is, to rouse them to duty by proposing suitable motives (Isa. lviii, 1; 1 Tim. vi, 2; 1leb. iii, 13; Rom. xii, 8); it was likewise the constant practice of prophets, apostles, and Christ himself (Isa. i, 17; Jer. iv, 14; Ezek. xxxvii; Luke iii, 18; xii, 3; Acts xi, 23)” (Buck, *Theological Dictionary*, s. v.). “The above, and numerous other passages of Scripture, indicate several important particulars: 1. That it was not beneath the dignity, or foreign to the office of the inspired apostles, frequently to *exhort*. 2. That they enjoined a similar practice and the duty of exhortation upon young ministers of their day. 3. That exhortation, as separate from preaching, was the special office of a certain class of religious teachers in the New-Testament Church. 4. That mutual exhortation for their own profit and edification was enjoined by the apostles upon Christians generally” (Kidder, *Homiletics*, p. 105). See EXHORTERS.

3. In the book of Common Prayer, the short addresses of the minister to the people in the daily service, in

the communion office, and in the office for the visitation of the sick, are called *Exhortations*. The first of these, beginning “Dearly beloved brethren, the Scripture moveth us,” etc., was introduced into the English formulary at the Reformation. Palmer (*Orig. Liturg.* i, 211) compares it to a passage in a sermon of Avitus of Vienne, fifth century. Procter (*Common Prayer*, p. 206) remarks that “it was constructed partly from the preceding sentences, and partly by adaptations from previously existing forms.” But, in fact, this exhortation, with the other opening portions of morning prayer, is chiefly due to a ritual drawn up by Calvin for the church at Strasburg, entitled *La Forme des Prières et Chantes ecclesiastiques* (Strasburg, 1545). See Baird, *Eutaxia* (N. York, 1855, p. 191). The exhortations to the communion were also introduced at the Reformation. “The ancient Church, indeed, had no such exhortations, for their daily, or at least weekly communions made it known that there was then no solemn assembly of Christians without it, and every one (not under censure) was expected to communicate. But now, when the time is somewhat uncertain, and our long omissions have made some of us ignorant, and others forgetful of this duty; most of us unwilling, and all of us more or less indisposed for it, it was thought both prudent and necessary to provide these exhortations, to be read when the minister gives warning of the communion, which he is always to do upon the Sunday or some holy day immediately preceding” (Wheatly, *On Common Prayer*, p. 284). The second exhortation was compiled apparently by Peter Martyr at the instance of Bucer (Procter, *On Common Prayer*, p. 344).

**Exhorters**, a class of lay persons licensed in the Methodist Episcopal Church to *exhort*, not to preach. The leaders’ meeting (q. v.), or class (q. v.), recommend such persons, and the preacher issues the license. The duties of an exhorter are “to hold meetings for prayer and exhortation wherever opportunity is afforded, subject to the direction of the preacher in charge; to attend all the sessions of the Quarterly Conference; to be subject to an annual examination of character in the Quarterly Conference, and renewal of license annually by the presiding elder, or preacher having the charge, if approved by the Quarterly Conference.” This office has been found very useful, both in the edification of the Church, and in developing the talent of persons likely to be called to the ministry.—*Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, 1868, p. 113, 114.

**Exile** (only occurs of an expatriated person, *גלות*, *tsolk*, *beut*, “captive exile,” Isa. li, 14; *גולה*, *goleh*, a transported captive, as elsewhere often [see BANISH]), ASSYRIO-BABYLONIAN, of the Israelitish nation (comp. Cellarii *Dissertat.* p. 178 sq.). See also CAPTIVITY.

1. Of the kingdom of Israel, as early as the time of Pekah (q. v.), B.C. cir. 741. Tiglath Pileser (q. v.), in accordance with a formal maxim of Oriental despots (compare Heeren, *Idea*, I, i, 405 sq.; Gesenius, *Jesa*, i, 949), transported to Assyria (2 Kings xv, 29; comp. Isa. viii, 23) a part of the inhabitants of Galilee and the Trans-Jordanic provinces (Gilead). A still earlier deportation (1 Chron. v, 26) seems to have been made by Pul (q. v.). After the destruction of Samaria (q. v.) and the entire northern state (B.C. 720) by Shalmaneser (q. v.), the same fate overtook all the distinguished and serviceable Israelites (2 Kings xvii, 6; xviii, 9 sq.; 1 Chron. v, 26). They were assigned a residence on the Chaboras, in Mesopotamia [see HABOR], and in Media (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* ix, 14, 1), and there established the worship of Jehovah after their corrupt fashion (2 Kings xvii, 27 sq.). See WITSIUS, *Δεκάβουρ*, *sive de decem tribubus Isr.* (in his *Ægyptiacis*, p. 318 sq.); Michaelis, *De exilio decem tribuum* (in his *Commentt. Soc. Gott. Brem.* 1774, p. 31 sq.). Compare ISRAEL (KINGDOM OF).

2. Respecting the carrying away of the *Jews* in several colonies, there are various accounts in the Hebrew historical books, which modern writers have not carefully distinguished (see Bauer, *Heb. Gesch.* ii, 370 sq.; Jahn, *Archäol.* II, i, 195 sq.; Bertholdt, *Zeittafel zum Daniel*, p. 503 sq.). (a.) The books of Kings mention only two deportations: the first occurred after the surrender of Jerusalem to Nebuchadnezzar, in the time of Jehoiachin (2 Kings xxiv, 14 sq.; comp. Jer. xxvii, 20 sq.; in this was involved Mordecai (Esth. ii, 6), and it befel (besides the king himself) the affluent and useful citizens, 10,000 and upwards in number (Josephus says 10,832, *Ant.* x, 7, 1); the second was the result of a formal capture of Jerusalem by assault of the Chaldeans in the time of Zedekiah, and was effected by Nebuchadnezzar's general (in that prince's 19th year) Nebuzaradan (2 Kings xxv, 11). Only the common people, devoted to agriculture, remained (2 Kings xxv, 12, 22). (b.) The books of Chronicles expressly record only the carrying away under Zedekiah (2 Chron. xxvi, 20), while (ver. 10), in mentioning the transportation of king Jehoiachin, they say nothing of a deportation of the people at that time. (c.) Jer. lii, 28 sq., specifies three distinct carryings away, and assigns to each not only the number of those deported, but also a date: namely, the first deportation in the 7th year (of Nebuchadnezzar, comp. ver. 29, 30), which consisted of 3023 Jews; the second in the 18th of Nebuch., of 832 chiefs of Jerusalem; the third in the 23d of Neb., of 745 individuals. Finally (d.), according to Dan. i, 1, 3 sq., as early as the 3d year of Jehoiachin's reign, some Jewish youths of noble families (among them Daniel himself) must have been carried to Babylon. These difficulties (see Hengstenberg, *Genuineness of Daniel* [Clarke's ed.], p. 43 sq., against De Wette, in the *Hall. Encyclop.* xxiii, 7 sq.; Lengerke, *Daniel*, p. 13 sq.) are readily adjusted by observing, 1st, that the years of Nebuchadnezzar in this passage of Jeremiah bear date from his full accession to the throne of Babylon (the beginning of B.C. 604), while those in Kings are reckoned from the epoch of his viceroyship, a little over one year earlier [see NEBUCHADNEZZAR]; and, 2dly, that the apparent discrepancy in the number of citizens transported naturally arises from the different manner in which they are enumerated and classified in the several narratives. Thus viewed, the transactions will appear concisely as follows:

1. (Early in B.C. 604.) Nebuchadnezzar's invasion, in the 3d year of Jehoiachin (Dan. i, 1).

2. (Summer of B.C. 606.) Subjugation by Nebuchadnezzar in his first associate year, and the 4th of Jehoiachin (Jer. xxv, 1); when, besides some of the sacred vessels (2 Chron. xxxvi, 5), a few royal youths were taken away as hostages, including Daniel and his companions (Dan. i, 2 sq.).

3. (Spring of B.C. 598.) First general deportation, in the 7th year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign (Jer. lii, 28), or the 8th of his viceroyship (2 Kings xxiv, 12), and the beginning of Jehoiachin's reign (2 Kings xxiv, 8), when 3023 eminent Jews (Jer. lii, 28), including the king (2 Chron. xxxvi, 10), his family, and officers (2 Kings xxiv, 12), with such men as Mordecai (Esth. ii, 6), also some 700 warriors (2 Kings xxiv, 16), were carried away, making about 10,000 individuals of note (2 Kings xxiv, 14), besides about 1000 artisans (2 Kings xxiv, 16), and leaving only the poorer classes of the city and its neighborhood (2 Kings xxiv, 14).

4. (Late in B.C. 588.) Second general deportation, in Nebuchadnezzar's 18th year of reign (Jer. lii, 29), or the 19th of his viceroyship (2 Kings xxv, 8), when, besides the rest of the sacred vessels (2 Chron. xxxvi, 18), 832 more of the principal men who had by that time rallied to Jerusalem were taken away (Jer. lii, 29), including especially the refugees (2 Kings xxv, 11), and leaving but the commonest agricultural laborers (2 Kings xxv, 12).

5. (Early in B.C. 582.) Final deportation. In Nebuchadnezzar's 23d year (Jer. lii, 30), when the last 745 private persons (Jer. lii, 30) who had not fled to Egypt (Jer. xliii, 5-7), nor been destroyed in the previous massacres (2 Chron. xxxvi, 20), were taken away—making 4500 definitely enumerated (Jer. lii, 30), but in all some 12,600 male heads of families, with their wives, children, and dependents, from Jerusalem and its vicinity alone, and a proportionate number from the residue of the country of Judæa.

The Babylonian exile thus began with the Jews

partially in B.C. 598, but generally in B.C. 588. It ended in the first year of the reign of Cyrus (over Babylon), i. e. B.C. 536, and therefore lasted strictly 51-52 years. The reckoning of Jeremiah, however (xxv, 11 sq.; xxix, 10; compare 2 Chron. xxxvi, 21; Zech. i, 12; vii, 5; Josephus, *War*, v, 9, 4), which assigns it a length of 70 years, is to be understood as computed from Nebuchadnezzar's invasion of Western Asia in B.C. 606, when, as appears from Dan. i, 1 sq., some of the members of the royal family of Judah were carried into captivity, in fulfilment of Isa. xxxix, 6, 7. (See Offerhaus, *Spicilegium*, p. 181 sq.; Schröer, *Regn. Babyl.* p. 286 sq.). This was the more natural epoch to the Jews, inasmuch as from that time Nebuchadnezzar became to all intents and purposes the liege lord of the Jewish kings, and in the above table we see the years of his reign are dated accordingly. It is a remarkable coincidence that from the date of the destruction of the Temple, B.C. 588 (2 Kings xxv, 8), to the time of its complete restoration, B.C. 517 (Ezra vi, 15), is precisely the commensurate (and sacred) term of 70 years; and this period is sometimes employed as an æra by the sacred writers (Ezek. xl, 1). Other very strained conjectures as to this time are those of Behm (in Iken and Hase's *Theaur. theol. philol.* i, 954 sq.), Bengel (*Ordo temporum*, p. 196 sq.), etc. Ideler deems the desolation of the Temple to be exclusively referred to (*Handbuch d. Chronol.* i, 530). Gramberg (*Religiösiid.* ii, 388 sq.) and Hitzig (*Jerem.* p. 230) think the 70 years merely a round number. See SEVENTY YEARS' CAPTIVITY.

The condition of the Hebrews in the exile was certainly, as a general thing, not so severe (Jahn, *Archäologie*, II, i, 209; comp. Leydecker, *De var. reip. Hebr. statu*, p. 299 sq., especially p. 310 sq.; Verbrugge, *De statu ac condit. Judæorum tempore erit. Babyl.*, in his work *De nomin. Hebr. plur. num.* [Groning. 1730], p. 71 sq.) as is usually held. Most of them became settled (Jer. xxix, 5 sq.), and acquired property, even to affluence (Tob. i, 22, 25; ii, 1; vi, 13; viii, 21; ix, 3; x, 11; xiv, 15, etc.), and the possession of slaves (Tob. viii, 14 sq.; xi, 10). Several were taken to court (Dan. i, 3 sq., 19), and even promoted to high station (Dan. ii, 48 sq.; vi, 2; compare Esth. x, 3), or were honored with important trusts (Tob. i, 16); indeed, in one instance a Jewess actually reached queenly dignities (Esth. ii, 17). They also appear to have kept up in some sort their national constitution (Ezek. xiv, i; xx, 1; Susan, v, 28), and to have maintained among themselves an observance of the Mosaic law (Tob. vii, 14; Susan, v, 62). According to the Talmud (R. Gedaliah in *Shalsheh. Hakkab.* folio 13; Gemara, *Makkoth*, i, 1; *Sanhedr.* i, 12 and 21), they were under the general direction of an *aichmalotarch* (q. v.), or "chief of the exiles" (אַיְחַמְלוֹתָרְחַי), one of their own nation (Buddæi *Hist. Vet. T.* ii, 863). Religious discipline was exercised among them; but, as they could not lawfully offer sacrifice outside Jerusalem, their worship necessarily consisted of prayer (and public reading, out of which naturally grew expounding) in stated assemblies (comp. Psal. cxxxvii). See SYNAGOGUE. They did not lack strong comfort and exhortation: Ezekiel (q. v.) lifted in their midst his prophetic voice, and Jeremiah (q. v.) sent them from afar a monitory epistle (chap. xxix). Probably many surrendered themselves to levity and vice (Ezek. xxxiii, 31), and yielded an ear to false prophets (Jer. xxix, 21; but comp. Tob. ii, 14 sq., 22).

Of the permission to return to Palestine, which Cyrus granted to the entire people (Ezra i, 5; vii, 13), Jews alone, in the first instance at least, availed themselves (Ezra ii; Neh. vii; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* xi, 5, 2: "But the whole people of the Israelites remained in the same country . . . The ten tribes are beyond the Euphrates to this day, unknown and innumerable myriads"); for the return mentioned in Ezra ii, 1, is

only of such exiles as had been carried away by Nebuchadnezzar, and in the list there following there are (besides priests and Levites) only recited Judahites and Benjaminites; nor can "Israel" (ver. 59; compare Neh. vii, 61) be there referred to the former kingdom so called. The indications of Jer. l, 4 sq., 17, 19; Ezek. xxxvii, 11 sq., had, moreover, not at that time been fulfilled (the date in 1 Chron. v, 26 is uncertain; Keil, *On Kings*, p. 497, n.). (See Witsius, *Δεκάλογος*, p. 344 sq.; Ritter, *Ersk.* x, 250.) Yet it cannot well be doubted that many of the exiles from the northern kingdom, who were likewise embraced in the decree of Cyrus, and at the time included in his dominions, did eventually join their Jewish brethren, if not in some of the homeward expeditions named in Scripture as having taken place under Ezra, Zerubbabel, and Nehemiah, yet in some smaller, later, or less distinguished companies. This supposition is not only justified by the nature of the case, but fortified by the numerous intimations in the prophets (e. g. Jer. l, 4, 5, 17-20, 33-35) coupling the return of both the kingdoms (see *Metb. Quart. Review*, July, 1855, p. 419 sq.), and is well-nigh established by the Palestinian occurrence in a late age of individuals from the northern tribes (e. g. Luke ii, 36; comp. Acts xxvi, 7). What proportion thus returned we have no means of determining; it was doubtless small, as was indeed that of the exiles from the southern tribes compared with the great mass who still remained in the land of their captivity, now become their home. Community of lot must have drawn both branches of the common stock of Israel nearer together during the captivity under the same heathen government, and it is altogether likely that in a few centuries those who permanently remained lost all trace of the sectarian distinction that had once estranged "Judah and Ephraim." See RESTORATION (OF THE JEWS).

The descendants of those who did not return either centred at certain points, especially Babylon (q. v.), where they afterwards became celebrated for their Jewish schools of Rabbinical literature; or, as was chiefly the case, it may be presumed, with the more distant and earlier removed ten tribes, wandered still farther in numerous Jewish colonies into the Medo-Babylonian provinces (Lightfoot, *Append. to Hor. Hebr.* in Acts, p. 264 sq.), remnants of which have survived to a late day (Benj. of Tndela, quoted in Ritter, *Ersk.* x, 241 sq.). It is possible even that the *Samaritans* may have owed their mongrel origin to some such source (Gesenius, *De Pentat. Samar.* p. 4), as they were transplanted to Palestine before the deportation of the Jews, and yet sufficiently late to have allowed a partial amalgamation with the heathen whence they came to have taken place, and especially as they had only the Pentateuch (Paulus, in *Eichhorn's Biblioth.* i, 931). From the provinces of the Persian empire the Jewish colonists may readily have spread into Arabia, India, and even China. Wild attempts at their discovery have been abundantly made, such as those of Adair (*History of the American Indians*, Lond. 1775), Noah (*The Amer. Indians the Descendants of the ten Lost Tribes of Israel*, N. Y. 1835), and Grant (*Nestorians, or the Lost Tribes*, N. Y. 1841).—Winer, i, 257. See DISPERSED JEWS.

**Exinanition.** See CHRISTOLOGY (vol. ii, p. 281, col. 2).

**Existence of God.** See GOD.

**Exocontians** (or EXOUCONTIANS, Ἐξοκόντιοι), a name given to the strict Arians, because they maintained that Christ was created ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, before the beginning of things. They were also called Anomæans, Aëtians. See these titles, and also ARIANS.

**Exode OF THE ISRAELITES FROM EGYPT TO CANAAN** (usually referred to in Heb. by the phrase הַיְצִיאָה מִמִּצְרַיִם אֶת־בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל־אֶרֶץ־כְּנָעַן, "The

Lord did bring the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt," Exod. xii, 51; to which is often emphatically added, בְּיָמָיו הַיְצִיאָהוּ אֶת־בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־אֶרֶץ־מִצְרָיִם, "with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm," Deut. xxvi, 8, to express the miraculous interventions of Providence in the series of events), the great national epoch of the Hebrew people, in fact their "independence day," and as such constantly referred to in all their subsequent history and vaticinations. Several of the Psalms are but a poetical rehearsal of its scenes (e. g. Ps. cxiv, cxxxvi); it is the burden of Habakkuk's lofty ode (Hab. iii); and besides the recapitulation of many of its incidents by Moses in Deuteronomy, it constitutes the main topic of one of the books of Scripture. The following account, with the exception of the date of the event, and the identifications of the place of crossing the Red Sea and of the stations in the desert, is chiefly compiled from the articles in Kitto and Smith. See EXODUS.

**I. Date.**—The particular Egyptian monarch under whom this great event, the first definite link of the Hebrew with other ancient history, occurred, is so differently identified with those of early profane chronicles, and of the monuments by various Egyptologists, that but little reliance, unfortunately, can be placed upon any of them, based as they almost entirely are upon conjectural adaptations or arbitrary premises. The only one of these hypotheses that seems to afford any independent evidence of agreement is that lately propounded by Osburn (in the *Journ. of Sac. Lit.* for July, 1860), who conceives that the Egyptian king in question was Sethos II, the grandson of the great Sesostris, but of so odious a character and so inglorious a reign that his sarcophagus was demolished and his cartouche effaced by the early Egyptians themselves. See PHARAON. This king, however, began to reign about B. C. 1240, a date entirely too late for the event under consideration. The historical questions connected with this point are noticed under EGYPT. Hales places the Exode in B. C. 1648, Usher in B. C. 1491, Bunsen in B. C. 1320, and Poole in B. C. 1652. A careful collation of the Biblical elements of the calculation, the only definite and trustworthy data, point to the spring of B. C. 1658 as the most probable date of the beginning of the series of exodic transactions. See CHRONOLOGY. As to the account of the Exode given by Manetho, it was confessedly a mere popular story, for he admitted it was not a part of the Egyptian records, but a tale of uncertain authorship (Josephus, *c. Apion.* i, 16). A critical examination shows that it cannot claim to be a veritable tradition of the Exode: it is, indeed, if based on any such tradition, so distorted that it is impossible to be sure that it relates to the king to whose reign it is assigned. Yet, upon the supposition that the king is really Menptah, son of Rameses II, the advocates of the Rabbinical date entirely base their adjustment of Hebrew with Egyptian history at this period. See MANETHO.

**II. The Outset.**—The Exode is a great turning-point in Biblical history. With it the patriarchal dispensation ends and the law begins, and with it the Israelites cease to be a family and become a nation. It is therefore important to observe how the previous history led to this event. The advancement of Joseph, and the placing of his kinsmen in what was, to a pastoral people at least, "the best of the land," yet, as far as possible, apart from Egyptian influence, favored the multiplying of the Israelites and the preservation of their nationality. The subsequent persecution bound them more firmly together, and at the same time loosened the hold that Egypt had gained upon them. It was thus that the Israelites were ready, when Moses declared his mission, to go forth as one man from the land of their bondage. See JOSEPH.

The intention of Jehovah to deliver the Israelites from Egyptian bondage was made known to Moses from the

burning bush at Mount Horeb, while he kept the flock of Jethro, his father-in-law. Under the divine direction, Moses, in conjunction with Aaron, assembled the elders of the nation, and acquainted them with the gracious design of Heaven. After this they had an interview with Pharaoh, and requested permission for the people to go, in order to hold a feast unto God in the wilderness. The result was not only refusal, but the doubling of all the burdens which the Israelites had previously had to bear. Moses hereupon, suffering reproach from his people, consults Jehovah, who assures him that he would compel Pharaoh "to drive them out of his land." "I will rid you out of their bondage, and I will redeem you with a stretched-out arm and with great judgments" (Exod. iii-vi, 6). Then ensue a series of miracles (Exod. vi-xii), commonly called the **PLAGUES OF EGYPT** (q. v.). At last, overcome by the calamities sent upon him, Pharaoh yielded all that was demanded, saying, "Rise up, and get you forth from among my people, both ye and the children of Israel; and go serve the Lord as ye have said; also take your flocks and your herds, and be gone." Thus driven out, the Israelites, to the number of about 600,000 adults, besides children, left the land, attended by a mixed multitude, with their flocks and herds, even very much cattle (Exod. xii, 31 sq.). Being "thrust out" of the country, they had not time to prepare for themselves suitable provisions, and therefore they baked unleavened cakes of the dough which they brought forth out of Egypt. See **MOSES**.

On the night of the self-same day that terminated a period of 430 years, during which they had been in Egypt, were they led forth from Rameses or Goshen. They are not said to have crossed the River Nile, whence we may infer that Goshen lay on the eastern side of the river. Their first station was at Succoth (Exod. xii, 37). See **SUCCOTH**. The nearest way into the Land of Promise was through the land of the Philistines. This route would have required them to keep on in a north-east direction. It pleased their divine conductor, however, not to take this path, lest, being opposed by the Philistines, the Israelites should turn back at the sight of war into Egypt. If, then, Philistia was to be avoided, the course would lie nearly direct east, or south-east. Pursuing this route, "the armies" come to Etham, their next station, "in the edge of the wilderness" (Exod. xiii, 17 sq.). Here they encamped. Dispatch, however, was desirable. They journey day and night, not without divine guidance, for "the Lord went before them by day in a pillar of a cloud, to lead them the way, and by night in a pillar of fire, to give them light, to go by day and night." This special guidance could not well have been meant merely to show the way through the desert, for it can hardly be supposed that in so great a multitude no persons knew the road over a country lying near to that in which they and their ancestors had dwelt, and which did not exceed more than some forty miles across. The divine guides were doubtless intended to conduct the Israelites in that way and to that spot where the hand of God would be most signally displayed in their rescue and in the destruction of Pharaoh. See **PILLAR**.

The Land of Goshen may be concluded, from the Biblical narrative, to have been part of Egypt, but not of what was then held to be Egypt proper. It must therefore have been an outer eastern province of Lower Egypt. It is enough here to say that it was on the eastern side of the Nile, probably in the province of Esh-Shurkiyeh. Rameses was the place of rendezvous. But it is evident, from the frequent communications of Moses with the Egyptian court on the one hand, and with the Israelites on the other, that the latter must have been, at the time of starting, congregated at a point not far from the capital. They could only, therefore, have gone by the valley now called the wady et-Tumeylat, for every other cultivated or

cultivable tract is too far from the Red Sea. In the Roman time, the route to Gaza from Memphis and Heliopolis passed the western end of the wady et-Tumeylat, as may be seen by the *Itinerary of Antoninus* (Parthey, *Zur Erdk. d. Alt. Egyptens*, map vi), and the chief modern route from Cairo to Syria passes along the wady et-Tumeylat and leads to Gaza (Wilkinson, *Handbook*, new ed. p. 209). Rameses, as we shall see, must have lain in this valley, which thus corresponded in part at least to Goshen. That it wholly corresponded to that region is evident from its being markedly a single valley, and from the insufficiency of any smaller territory to support the Israelites. See **GOSHEN**. It is not difficult to fix very nearly the length of each day's march of the Israelites. As they had with them women, children, and cattle, it cannot be supposed that they averaged more than fifteen miles daily; at the same time, it is unlikely that they fell far short of this. The three journeys would therefore give a distance of about forty-five miles. There seems, however, as we shall see, to have been a deflexion from a direct course, so that we cannot consider the whole distance from the starting-point, Rameses, to the shore of the Red Sea, as much more than about forty miles in a direct line. Measuring from the western shore of the Arabian Gulf south-east of the wady et-Tumeylat, a distance of forty miles in a direct line places the site of Rameses near the ruins called in the present day Abu Kesheib, not far from the middle of the valley. This is in accordance with the location of Robinson and Lepsius. That the Israelites started from a place in this position is farther evident from the account of the two routes that lay before them: "And it came to pass, when Pharaoh had let the people go, that God led them not [by] the way of the land of the Philistines, although that [was] near; for God said, Lest peradventure the people repent when they see war, and they return to Egypt; but God let the people turn to the way of the wilderness of the Red Sea" (Exod. xiii, 17, 18). The expression used, **וּבְדֶרֶךְ**, does not necessarily imply a change in the direction of the journey, but may mean that God did not lead the Israelites into Palestine by the nearest route, but took them about by the way of the wilderness. Were the meaning that the people turned, we should have to suppose Rameses to have been beyond the valley to the west, and this would probably make the distance to the Red Sea too great for the time occupied in traversing it, besides overthrowing the reasonable identification of the land of Goshen. Rameses is evidently the Rameses of Exod. i, 11. It seems to have been the chief town of the land of Goshen, for that region, or possibly a part of it, is called the land of Rameses in Gen. xlvii, 11; comp. 4, 6. See **RAMESES**.

1. The direct route thence to the Red Sea was along the valley of the ancient canal. If, however, they rendezvoused near the metropolis, their route would be different. From the vicinity of Cairo there runs a range of hills eastward to the Red Sea, the western extremity of which, not far from Cairo, is named *Jebel Mokatten*; the eastern extremity is termed *Jebel-Ataka*, which, with its promontory *Ras Ataka*, runs into the Red Sea. Between the two extremes, somewhere about the middle of the range, is an opening which affords a road for caravans. Two routes offered themselves here. Supposing that the actual starting-point lay nearer Cairo, the Israelites might strike in from the north of the range of hills at the opening just mentioned, and pursue the ordinary caravan road which leads from Cairo to Suez; or they might go southward from *Mokatten*, through the wady et-Tih, that is, the Valley of Wandering, through which also a road, though less used, runs to Suez. According to Niebuhr, they took the first; according to ancient tradition, *Father Sicard* (*Ueber der Weg der Israeliten*), *Paulus* (*Samml. v, 211 sq.*), and others, they took the

last. Sicard found traces of the Israelites in the valley. He held Rameses to be the starting-point, and Rameses he placed about six miles from ancient Cairo, where Bezatin is now found. Here is a capacious sandy plain, on which Sicard thinks the Israelites assembled on the morning when they began their journey. In this vicinity a plain is still found, which the Arabs call the Jews' Cemetery, and where, from an indefinite period, the Jews have buried their dead. In the Mokattam chain is a hill, a part of which is called Mejanat Musa, "Moses's Station." On another hill in the vicinity ruins are found, which the Arabs name Meravad Musa, "Moses's Delight." Thus several things seem to carry the mind back to the time of the Hebrew legislator. Through the valley which leads from Bezatin (the Valley of Wandering) to the Red Sea, Sicard travelled in three days. He reckons the length to be twenty-six hours, which, if we give two miles to each hour (Robinson), would make the distance fifty-two miles. This length is also assigned by Girard (*Descrip. Topograp. de la Vallée de l'Egarement*). The valley, running pretty much in a plain surface, would afford a convenient passage to the mixed bands of Israelites. About eighteen miles from Bezatin you meet with Gendelhy, a plain with a fountain. The name signifies a military station, and in this Sicard finds the Succoth (tents) of Exodus, the first station of Moses. The haste with which they left (were driven out) would enable them to reach this place at night-fall of their first day's march. Sicard places their second station, Etham, in the plain Ramlyeh, eighteen miles from Gendelhy, and sixteen from the sea. From this plain is a pass four miles in length, so narrow that not more than twenty men can go abreast. To avoid this, which would have caused dangerous delay, the order was given them to turn (Exod. xiv, 2). Etham is said (Exod. xiii, 20) to be on the edge of the wilderness. Jablonski says the word means "terminus maris," the termination or boundary of the sea. Now, in the plain where Sicard fixes Etham (not to be confounded with the Eastern Etham, through which afterwards the Israelites travelled three days, Numb. xxxiii, 8), is the spot where the waters divide which run to the Nile and to the Gulf of Suez, and Etham is therefore truly *terminus maris*.

On the other hand, if, as the position of Rameses, and the nature of the ground between that point and the head of the gulf seems to indicate, they pursued the direct route thence down the valley of the bitter lakes, we may locate Succoth not far from the ruins of Serapeum, and Etham at a point about half way between that spot and the head of the gulf; for we may suppose that the encumbered multitude made but little progress the first day, whereas on the third their march may have been quickened by apprehensions of the approaching Egyptians in pursuit. See ETHAM.

2. At the end of the second day's march, for each camping-place seems to mark the close of a day's journey, the route appears to have been altered from the natural thoroughfare around the head of the gulf. The first passage relating to the journey, after the mention of the encamping at Etham, is this, stating a command given to Moses: "Speak unto the children of Israel that they turn [or 'return'] and encamp [or 'that they encamp again,' וּשְׁבוּ וַיִּחַן] before Pi-hahiroth, between Migdol, and the sea, over against Baal-zephon" (Exod. xiv, 2). This explanation is added: "And Pharaoh will say of the children of Israel, They [are] entangled in the land, the wilderness hath shut them in" (ver. 3). The rendering of the A. V., "That they turn and encamp," seems to us the most probable of those we have given; "return" is the closer translation, but appears to be difficult to reconcile with the narrative of the route; for the more likely inference is that the direction was changed, not that the people returned: the third rendering does not

appear probable, as it does not explain the entanglement. It is most likely that they at once turned, although they may have done so later in the march. The direction cannot be doubted, for they would have been entangled (ver. 5) only by turning southward, not northward. They encamped for the night by the sea, probably after a full day's journey. Pi-hahiroth (the mouth of the hiding-places) Sicard identifies with Tuarek (small caves), which is the name still given to three or four salt springs of the plain Baideah, on the south side of Mount Attaka, which last Sicard identifies with Baal-zephon, and which is the northern boundary of the plain Baideah, while Kulalah (Migdol) is its southern limit. But we would prefer to transpose these names, assigning Migdol to Jebel Attaka, and Baal-zephon to Jebel Deraj or Kulalah, while Wady Tuwarik will remain for Pi-hahiroth. (See each in its order.) The pass which leads to Suez, between Attaka and the sea, is very narrow, and could easily be stopped by the Egyptians. In this plain of Baideah Pharaoh had the Israelites hemmed in on all sides. This, then, according to all appearance, is the spot where the passage through the sea was effected. Such is the judgment of Sicard and of Raumer (*Der Zug der Israeliten*, Leipzig, 1837; for a description of the Valley of Wandering, see also Ritter, *Erkunde*, i, 858). It cannot be denied that this route satisfies all the conditions of the case. Equally does the spot correspond with the miraculous narrative furnished by holy writ. A different route is laid down by Niebuhr (*Arab.* p. 407). Other writers, who, like him, endeavor to explain the facts without the aid of miracle, imitate his example. (See below.)

It is no small corroboration of the view now given from Sicard and Raumer that in substance it has the support of Josephus, of whose account we shall, from its importance, give an abridgment. The Hebrews, he says, took their journey by Latopolis, where Babylon was built afterwards when Cambyses laid Egypt waste. As they went in haste, on the third day they came to a place called Baal-zephon, on the Red Sea. Moses led them this way in order that the Egyptians might be punished should they venture in pursuit, and also because the Hebrews had a quarrel with the Philistines. When the Egyptians had overtaken the Hebrews they prepared to fight them, and by their multitude drove them into a narrow place; for the number that went in pursuit was 600 chariots, 50,000 horsemen, and 200,000 infantry, all armed. They also seized the passages, shutting the Hebrews up between inaccessible precipices and the sea; for there was on each side a ridge of mountains that terminated at the sea, which were impassable, and obstructed their flight. Moses, however, prayed to God, and smote the sea with his rod, when the waters parted, and gave the Israelites free passage. The Egyptians at first supposed them distracted; but when they saw the Israelites proceed in safety, they followed. As soon as the entire Egyptian army was in the channel, the sea closed, and the pursuers perished amid torrents of rain and the most terrific thunder and lightning (*Ant.* ii, 15).

III. *Passage of the Red Sea.*—This was the crisis of the Exode. It was the miracle by which the Israelites left Egypt and were delivered from the oppressor. All the particulars relating to this event, and especially those which show its miraculous character, require careful examination.

1. It is usual to suppose that the most northern place at which the Red Sea could have been crossed is the present head of the Gulf of Suez. This supposition depends upon the idea that in the time of Moses the gulf did not extend farther to the northward than at present. An examination of the country north of Suez has convinced some geographers, however, that the sea has receded many miles, and that this change has taken place within the historical period, possibly in fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah (xi, 15; xix, 5; comp.

Zech. x, 11). The old bed is thought by them to be indicated by the Birket et-Timsàh, or "Lake of the Crocodile," and the more southern bitter lakes, the northernmost part of the former corresponding to the ancient head of the gulf. In previous centuries it is not supposed that the gulf extended farther north, but that it was deeper in its northernmost part. We are inclined to believe, however, that such a change, if it ever took place, cannot materially affect the question of the place of the Israelites' passage.

From Pi-hahiroth the Israelites crossed the sea. The only points bearing on geography in the account of this event are that the sea was divided by an east wind, whence we may reasonably infer that it was crossed from west to east, and that the whole Egyptian army perished, which shows that it must have been some miles broad. Pharaoh took at least six hundred chariots, which, three abreast, would have occupied about half a mile, and the rest of the army cannot be supposed to have taken up less than several times that space. Even if in a broad formation some miles would have been required. It is more difficult to calculate the space taken up by the Israelitish multitude, but probably it was even greater. On the whole, we may reasonably suppose about twelve miles as the smallest breadth of the sea.

2. A careful examination of the narrative of the passage of the Red Sea is necessary to a right understanding of the event. When the Israelites had departed, Pharaoh repented that he had let them go. News is carried to the monarch which leads him to see that the reason assigned (namely, a sacrifice in the wilderness) is but a pretext; that the Israelites had really fled from his yoke; and also that, through some (to him) unaccountable error, they had gone towards the south-east, had reached the sea, and were hemmed in on all sides. He summons his troops and sets out in pursuit—"all the horses and chariots of Pharaoh, and his horsemen and his army;" and he "overtook them encamping by the sea, beside Pi-hahiroth, before Baal-zephon" (Exod. xiv, 9). It might be conjectured, from one part of the narrative (ver. 1-4), that he determined to pursue them when he knew that they had encamped before Pi-hahiroth, did not what follows this imply that he set out soon after they had gone, and also indicate that the place in question refers to the pursuit through the sea, not to that from the city whence he started (ver. 5-10). This city was most probably Zoan, and could scarcely have been much nearer to Pi-hahiroth, and the distance is therefore too great to have been twice traversed, first by those who told Pharaoh, then by Pharaoh's army, within a few hours. The strength of Pharaoh's army is not farther specified than by the statement that "he took six hundred chosen chariots, and [or 'even'] all the chariots of Egypt, and captains over every one of them" (ver. 7). The war-chariots of the Egyptians held each but two men, an archer and a charioteer. The former must be intended by the word סוּרְמָיִם, rendered in the A. V. "captains." Throughout the narrative the chariots and horsemen of Pharaoh are mentioned, and "the horse and his rider" (xv, 21) are spoken of in Miriam's song, but we can scarcely infer hence that there was in Pharaoh's army a body of horsemen as well as of men in chariots, as in ancient Egyptian the chariot-force is always called ḤTAR or ḤETRA, "the horse," and these expressions may therefore be respectively pleonastic and poetical. There is no evidence in the records of the ancient Egyptians that they used cavalry, and, therefore, had the Biblical narrative expressly mentioned a force of this kind, it might have been thought conclusive of the theory that the Pharaoh of the Exode was a shepherd-king. With this army, which, even if a small one, was mighty in comparison with the Israelitish multitude, encumbered with women, children, and cattle, Pharaoh overtook the people "en-

camping by the sea" (ver. 9). When the Israelites saw the oppressor's army they were terrified, and murmured against Moses. "Because [there were] no graves in Egypt, hast thou taken us away to die in the wilderness?" (ver. 11.) Along the bare mountains that skirt the valley of Upper Egypt are abundant sepulchral grottoes, of which the entrances are conspicuously seen from the river and the fields it waters: in the sandy slopes at the foot of the mountains are pits without number and many built tombs, all of ancient times. No doubt the plain of Lower Egypt, to which Memphis, with part of its far-extending necropolis, belonged politically, though not geographically, was throughout as well provided with places of sepulture. The Israelites recalled these cities of the dead, and looked with Egyptian horror at the prospect that their carcases should be left on the face of the wilderness. Better, they said, to have continued to serve the Egyptians than thus to perish (ver. 12). Then Moses encouraged them, bidding them see how God would save them, and telling them that they should behold their enemies no more. There are few cases in the Bible in which those for whom a miracle is wrought are commanded merely to stand by and see it. Generally the divine support is promised to those who use their utmost exertions. It seems from the narrative that Moses did not know at this time how the people would be saved, and spoke only from a heart full of faith, for we read, "And the Lord said unto Moses, Wherefore criest thou unto me? Speak unto the children of Israel that they go forward; but lift thou up thy rod, and stretch out thine hand over the sea, and divide it; and the children of Israel shall go on dry [ground] through the midst of the sea" (ver. 15, 16). That night the two armies, the fugitives and the pursuers, were encamped near together. Here a very extraordinary event takes place: "The angel of God, which went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them; and the pillar of the cloud went from before their face and stood behind them; and it came between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel; and it was a cloud and darkness to them, but it gave light by night to these; so that the one came not near the other all the night" (ver. 19, 20). The monuments of Egypt portray an encampment of an army of Rameses II during a campaign in Syria; it is well-planned and carefully guarded: the rude modern Arab encampments bring before us that of Israel on this memorable night. Perhaps in the camp of Israel the sounds of the hostile camp might be heard on the one hand, and on the other the roaring of the sea. But the pillar was a barrier and a sign of deliverance. The time had now come for the great decisive miracle of the Exode. "And Moses stretched out his hand over the sea: and the Lord caused the sea to go [back] by a strong east wind all that night, and made the sea dry [land], and the waters were divided. And the children of Israel went through the midst of the sea upon the dry [ground]; and the waters [were] a wall unto them on their right hand and on their left" (ver. 21, 22; comp. 29). The narrative distinctly states that a path was made through the sea, and that the waters were a wall on either hand. The term "wall" does not appear to oblige us to suppose, as many have done, that the sea stood up like a cliff on either side, but should rather be considered to mean a barrier; as the former idea implies a seemingly needless addition to the miracle, while the latter seems to be not discordant with the language of the narrative. It was during the night that the Israelites crossed, and the Egyptians followed. In the morning watch, the last third or fourth of the night, or the period before sunrise, Pharaoh's army was in full pursuit in the divided sea (ver. 23-25). Delays are now occasioned to the Egyptians; their chariot-wheels are supernaturally taken off, so that "in the morning-watch they drove them heavily." The Egyptians are troubled; they urge each

other to fly from the face of Israel. Then was Moses commanded again to stretch out his hand, and the sea returned to its strength and overwhelmed the Egyptians, of whom not one remained alive (ver. 26-28). The statement is so explicit that there could be no reasonable doubt that Pharaoh himself, the great offender, was at last made an example, and perished with his army, did it not seem to be distinctly stated in Psa. cxxxvi that he was included in the same destruction (ver. 15). The sea cast up the dead Egyptians, whose bodies the Israelites saw upon the shore. From the song of triumph which Moses sang upon this occasion we learn some other particulars, as that "the depths covered Pharaoh's host, they sank to the bottom as a stone;" language which, whatever deduction may be made for its poetic character, implies that the miracle took place in deep water (Exod. xv; comp. Psa. cvi, 9 sq.). In a later passage some particulars are mentioned which are not distinctly stated in the narrative in Exodus. The place is indeed a poetical one, but its meaning is clear, and we learn from it that at the time of the passage of the sea there was a storm of rain, with thunder and lightning, perhaps accompanied by an earthquake (Psa. lxxvii, 15-20). To this Paul may allude where he says that the fathers "were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea" (1 Cor. x, 2); for the idea of baptism seems to involve either immersion or sprinkling, and the latter could have here occurred: the reference is evidently to the pillar of the cloud: it would, however, be impious to attempt an explanation of what is manifestly miraculous. These additional particulars may illustrate the troubling of the Egyptians, for their chariots may have been thus overthrown.

Here, at the end of their long oppression, delivered finally from the Egyptians, the Israelites glorified God. In what words they sang his praise we know from the Song of Moses, which, in its vigorous brevity, represents the events of that memorable night, scarcely of less moment than the night of the Passover (Exod. xv, 1-18; ver. 19 is probably a kind of comment, not part of the song). Moses seems to have sung this song with the men, Miriam with the women also singing and dancing, or perhaps there were two choruses (ver. 20, 21). Such a picture does not recur in the history of the nation. Neither the triumphal song of Deborah, nor the rejoicing when the Temple was recovered from the Syrians, celebrated so great a deliverance, or was joined in by the whole people. In leaving Goshen, Israel became a nation; after crossing the sea, it was free. There is evidently great significance, as we have suggested, in Paul's use of this miracle as a type of baptism; for, to make the analogy complete, it must have been the beginning of a new period of the life of the Israelites.

3. The importance of this event in Biblical history is shown by the manner in which it is spoken of in the books of the O. T. written in later times. In them it is the chief fact of Jewish history. Not the call of Abraham, not the rule of Joseph, not the first Passover, not the conquest of Canaan, are referred to in such a manner as this great deliverance. In the Psalms it is related as foremost among the deeds that God had wrought for his people. The prophet Isaiah recalls it as the great manifestation of God's interference for Israel, and an encouragement for the descendants of those who witnessed that great sight. There are events so striking that they are remembered in the life of a nation, and that, like great heights, increasing distance only gives them more majesty. So no doubt was this remembered long after those were dead who saw the sea return to its strength and the warriors of Pharaoh dead upon the shore.

It may be inquired how it is that there seems to have been no record or tradition of this miracle among the Egyptians. This question involves that of the time in Egyptian history to which this event should

be assigned. The date of the Exode, according to different chronologers, varies more than three hundred years; the dates of the Egyptian dynasties ruling during this period of three hundred years vary fully one hundred. The period to which the Exode may be assigned therefore virtually corresponds to four hundred years of Egyptian history. If the lowest date of the beginning of the 18th dynasty be taken, and the highest date of the Exode, both which we consider the most probable of those that have been conjectured in the two cases, the Israelites must have left Egypt in a period of which monuments or other records are almost wholly wanting. Of the 18th and subsequent dynasties we have as yet no continuous history, and rarely records of events which occurred in a succession of years. We know much of many reigns, and of some we can be almost sure that they could not correspond to that of the Pharaoh of the Exode. We can in no case expect a distinct Egyptian monumental record of so great a calamity, for the monuments only record success; but it might be related in a papyrus. There would doubtless have long remained a popular tradition of the Exode; but if the king who perished was one of the shepherd strangers, this tradition would probably have been local, and perhaps indistinct. Josephus, indeed, gives us some extracts from the last work of Manetho, who appears, if we may trust the criticisms of the Jewish historian (*contra Apionem*, § 14, 26), to have greatly garbled the account in favor of the Egyptians. See HuxsOL.

Endeavors have been made to explain away the miraculous character of the passage of the Red Sea. It has been argued that Moses might have carried the Israelites over by a ford, and that an unusual tide might have overwhelmed the Egyptians. But no real diminution of the wonder is thus effected. How was it that the sea admitted the passing of the Israelites, and drowned Pharaoh and his army? How was it that it was shallow at the right time, and deep at the right time? Some writers (*Wolfenb. Fragm.* p. 64 sq.) have at once declared the whole fabulous, a course which appears to have been taken as early as the time of Josephus (*Ant.* ii, 16, 5). Others, who do not deny miracles as such, yet with no small inconsistency seek to reduce this particular miracle to the smallest dimensions. Writers who see in the deliverance of the Hebrews the hand of God and the fulfilment of the divine purposes, follow the account in Scripture implicitly, placing the passage at Ras Attaka, at the termination of the Valley of Wandering; others, who go on rationalistic principles, find the sea here too wide and deep for their purpose, and endeavor to fix the passage a little to the south or the north of Suez. The most recent advocate of the passage at or near Suez is the learned Dr. Robinson (*Biblical Researches in Palestine*). The route taken by Moses was, according to Robinson, from Rameses to the head of the Arabian Gulf, through Succoth to Etham. The last place he fixes on the edge of the desert, on the eastern side of the line of the gulf. Instead of passing down the eastern side, at the top of which they were, the Israelites thence marched down the western side of the arm of the gulf, stopping in the vicinity of Suez, where the passage was effected. This view of the miracle, however, entirely fails to satisfy the Scripture account, and has been amply refuted by Dr. Olin (*Travels in the East*, N. Y. 1843) and others. (See the account of Mr. Blumhardt's visit, Oct. 1836, in the *Church Missionary Record*, Jan. 1836; Kitto's *Scripture Louls*, p. 58; *Daily Bible Illustrat.* ii, 95.) Some have supposed the Red Sea anciently extended farther north, and have sought to identify the localities of the passage on that theory (see Sharpe in Bartlett's *Forty Days in the Desert*, p. 23 sq.); but this is quite improbable and without evidence. Another explanation (Dr. Durbin, *Observations in the East*, i, 254) makes the Israelites to have turned from the vicinity of the bitter lakes to the western side of the head of Suez, and



50 to have followed the shore to the plain of Baideah at the mouth of wady Tuwarik, and there crossed; but if (as some travellers affirm) there is room for such a passage along the shore by Ras Attaka, the Israelites might have escaped by the same route by simply retreating, or, if that had been prevented by the Egyptians following along the same path behind them, they might still have fled up the wady Tih, and thence around Jebel Attaka and the head of the sea. A still later view (Captain Moyses, in Aiton's *Lands of the Messiah*, p. 107) places the scene of the passage still farther south, at the mouth of the next valley opening on the Red Sea near Ras Abu Deraj; but it would be difficult to show how the Israelites could have reached this spot from their former position in the edge of the wilderness, and it would also bring them out too far south on the other side of the Red Sea. Indeed, the mountains approach so steeply the shore all along at these points, that they could only have arrived at the valley or plain of Baideah, where we have supposed the passage to have been made, by turning sharply at Etham around the western base of Mount Attaka, and so partly back into the wady et-Tih, through which they were immediately pursued by the Egyptians. The latter thus hemmed them in completely, and drove them forward to the extreme edge of the shore projecting in front of Mount Attaka, around which they were unable to escape. Here it was that Providence opened to them a miraculous path through the deep waters to the opposite point (at the mouth of wady Beyaneh), near which are situated the wells of Moses, which doubtless derived their name from the first encampment of the Hebrews after their rescue. See RED SEA.

IV. *The Route from the Red Sea to Sinai*.—When safe on the eastern shore, the Israelites, had they taken the shortest route into Palestine, would have struck at once across the desert in a south-easterly direction to el-Arish or Gaza. But this route would have brought them into direct collision with the Philistines, with whom they were as yet quite unable to cope. Or they might have traversed the desert of Paran, following the pilgrim road of the present day to Elath, and, turning to the north, have made for Palestine. In order to accomplish this, however, hostile hordes and nations would have to be encountered, whose superior skill and experience in war might have proved fatal to the newly-liberated tribes of Israel. Wisely, therefore, did their leader take a course which necessitated the lapse of time, and gave promise of affording intellectual and moral discipline of the highest value. He resolved to lead his flock to Sinai, in order that they might see the wonders there to be exhibited, and hear the lessons there to be given. At Sinai, and on the journey thither, might the great leader hope that the moral brand which slavery had imprinted on his people would be effaced, and that they would acquire that self-respect, that regard to God's will, that capacity of self-guidance which alone could make liberty a blessing to the nation, and enable Moses to realize on their behalf the great and benign intentions which God had led him to form. There were, however, two ways by which he might reach Sinai. By following a south-easterly direction, and proceeding across the desert et-Tih, he would have reached at once the heart of the Sinaitic region. This was the shorter and the more expeditious road. The other route lay along the shore of the Red Sea, which must be pursued till an opening gave the means of turning suddenly to the east, and ascending at once into the lofty district. The latter was preferable for the reason before assigned, namely, the additional opportunities which it offered for the education of the undisciplined tribes of recently emancipated slaves.

Moses did not begin his arduous journey till, with a piety and a warmth of gratitude which well befitted the signal deliverance that his people had just been

favoured with, he celebrated the power, majesty, and goodness of God in a triumphal ode, full of the most appropriate, striking, and splendid images; in which commemorative festivity he was assisted by "Miriam the prophetess, the sister of Aaron," and her associated female band, with poetry, music, and dancing. The nature of these festivities gives us full reason to conclude that, if the people at large were still slaves in intellect and morals, there were not wanting individuals in the camp who were eminently skilled in the best refinements of the age. The spot where these rejoicings were held could not have been far from that which still bears the name of *Ayûn Mûsa*, "the fountains of Moses," the situation of which is even now marked by a few palm-trees. This was a suitable place for the encampment, because well supplied with water. Here Robinson counted seven fountains, near which he saw a patch of barley and a few cabbage-plants.

1. In tracing the track pursued by the host, we should bear in mind the limitation that a variety of converging or parallel routes must often have been required to allow of the passage of so great a number (Robinson, *Researches*, i, 106). Assuming the passage of the Red Sea to have been effected at the spot indicated above, they would march from their point of landing a little to the E. of S. Here they were in the wilderness of Shur, and in it "they went three days and found no water." The Israelites seem to have proceeded along the coast, probably following the route usually pursued by modern travellers, being at a short distance from the shore and parallel with it. The district is hilly and sandy, with a few water-courses running into the Red Sea, which, failing rain, are dry. "These wadis," says Robinson, "are mere depressions in the desert, with only a few scattered herbs and shrubs, now withered and parched with drought." See SHUR.

At the end of three days the Israelites reached the fountain Marah, but the waters were bitter, and could not be drunk. The stock which they had brought with them being now exhausted, they began to utter murmurings on finding themselves disappointed at Marah. Moses appealed to God, who directed him to a tree, which, being thrown into the waters, sweetened them. The people were satisfied and admonished. The present *Ain el-Hawâra* has been thought by most travellers since Burckhardt's time to be Marah. The basin is six or eight feet in diameter, and the water Robinson found about two feet deep. Its taste is unpleasant, saltish, and somewhat bitter. The Arabs pronounce it bitter, and consider it as the worst water in all these regions. Near the spring are numerous bushes of the shrub *ghurkud*—a low, bushy, thorny shrub, producing a small fruit, which ripens in June, not unlike the blackberry, very juicy, and slightly acidulous. It delights in a saline soil, and is found growing near the brackish fountains in and around Palestine, affording a grateful refreshment to travellers. By means of the berries, or, if they were not ripe, the leaves of this plant, the bitterness may have been removed from the waters of Marah. Not improbably the miracle in the case lay in this, that Jehovah directed Moses to use the tree (bush) itself, instead of what was usual, the berries, as from the time of year, shortly after Easter, they could hardly have been ripe. Between Ain Howarah and Ayûn Mûsa the plain is alternately gravelly, stony, and sandy, while under the range of Jebel Wardân (a branch of et-Tih) chalk and flints are found. There is no water on the direct line of route (Robinson, i, 127-134). Hawâra stands in the lime and gypsum region which lines the eastern shore of the Gulf of Suez at its northern extremity. Seetzen (*Reisen*, iii, 117) describes the water as salt, with purgative qualities; but adds that his Bedouins and their camels drank of it. He argues, from its inconsiderable size, that it could not be the Marah of Moses. This, however, seems an inconclusive reason. It would not be too near the point of

landing assumed, as above, as Dr. Stewart argues (p. 55), when we consider the encumbrances which would delay the host, and, especially while they were new to the desert, prevent rapid marches. But the whole region appears to abound in brackish or bitter springs (Seetzen, *ib.* iii, 117, etc.; *Anmerk.* p. 430). For instance, about  $1\frac{1}{2}$  hours nearer Suez than the wady Ghüründel (which Lepsius took for Marah, but which Niebuhr and Robinson regard as more probably Elim), Seetzen (*ib.* iii, 113, 114) found a wady Tâl, with a salt spring and a salt crust on the surface of its bed, the same, he thinks, as the spot where Niebuhr speaks of finding rock-salt. This corresponds in general proximity with Marah. The neighboring region is described as a low plain girt with limestone hills, or more rarely chalk. On this first section of their desert march, Dr. Stanley (*Sinai and Palest.* p. 37) remarks, "There can be no dispute as to the general track of the Israelites after the passage (of the Red Sea). If they were to enter the mountains at all, they must continue in the route of all travellers, between the sea and the table-land of the Tih, till they entered the low hills of Ghüründel." He adds in a note, "Dr. Graul, however, was told . . . of a spring near Tih el-Amâra, right (i. e. south) of Hawâra, so bitter that neither men nor camels could drink of it. From hence the road goes straight to wady Ghüründel." Seetzen also inclines to view favorably the identification of el-Amâra with Marah. He gives it the title of a "wady," and precisely on this ground rejects the pretensions of el-Hawâra as being no "wady," but only a brook; whereas, from the statement "they encamped" at Marah, Marah must, he argues, have been a wady. See MARAH.

2. The next station mentioned in Scripture is Elim, where were twelve wells of water, and threescore and ten palm-trees. As is customary with travellers in these regions, "they encamped there by the waters" (Exod. xvi, 1). The indications given in the Bible are not numerous nor very distinct. Neither time nor distance is accurately laid down. Hence we can expect only general accuracy in our maps, and but partial success in fixing localities. Elim, however, is generally admitted to be wady Ghüründel, lying about half a day's journey south-east from Marah. The way from Egypt to Sinai lies through this valley, and, on account of its water and verdure, it is a chief caravan station at the present day. It seems certain, at all events, that wady Ghüründel—whether it be Marah, as Lepsius and (although doubtfully) Seetzen thought, or Elim, as Niebuhr, Robinson, and Kruse—must have been on the line of march, and almost equally certain that it furnished a camping station. In this wady Seetzen found more trees, shrubs, and bushes than he anywhere else saw in his journey from Sinai to Suez. He particularizes several date-palms and many tamarisks, and notes that the largest quantity of the vegetable manna, now to be found anywhere in the Peninsula, is gathered here (iii, 116) from the leaves of the last-named tree, which here grows "with gnarled boughs and hoary head; the wild acacia, tangled by its desert growth into a thicket, also shoots out its gray foliage and white blossoms over the desert" (Stanley, *Sinai and Palest.* p. 68). The "scenery" in this region becomes "a succession of water-courses" (*ib.*); and the wady Taiyibeh, connected with Ghüründel by Useit, is so named from the goodly water and vegetation which it contains. These three wadys encompass on three sides the Jebel Himmâm; the sea, which it precipitously overhangs, being on the fourth. They are the principal ones of those which the Israelites, going from north-west to south-east along the coast, would come upon in the following order—wady Ghüründel, wady Useit, wady Thâl, and wady Shubeikeh, the last being in its lower part called also wady Taiyibeh, or having a junction with one of that name. Between Useit and Taiyibeh, the coast-range of these

hills rises into the Jebel Himmâm, "lofty and precipitous, extending in several peaks along the shore, apparently of chalky limestone, mostly covered with flints . . . its precipices . . . cut off all passage along-shore from the hot springs (lying a little west of south from the mouth of wady Useit, along the coast) to the mouth of wady Taiyibeh" (Robinson, i, 150; compare Stanley, *Sin. and Palest.* p. 35). Hence, between the courses of these wadys the track of the Israelites must have been inland. Stanley says "Elim must be Ghüründel, Useit, or Taiyibeh (p. 37); elsewhere (p. 68) that "one of two valleys, or perhaps both, must be Elim;" these appear from the sequel to be Ghüründel and Useit, "fringed with trees and shrubs, the first vegetation he had met with in the desert;" among these are "wild palms," not stately trees, but dwarf or savage, "tamarisks," and the "wild acacia." To judge from the configuration as given in the maps, there seems to be no reason why all three should not have combined to form Elim, or, at any rate, as Stanley suggests, two of them. Only, from Num. xxxiii, 9, 10, as Elim appears not to have been on the sea, we must suppose that the encampment, if it extended into three wadys, stopped short of their seaward extremities. The Israelitish host would scarcely find in all three more than adequate ground for their encampment. Beyond (i. e. to the south-east of Ghüründel), the ridges and spurs of limestone mountain push down to the sea, across the path along the plain (Robinson, i, 101, and *Map*). This portion of the question may be summed up by presenting, in a tabular form, the views of some leading travellers or annotators on the site of Elim:

Wady Ghüründel.	One or both, Stanley.	Wady Useit. Laborde "possibly."	Some warm springs north of <i>Tîr</i> , which feed the rich date plantations of the convent there, Seetzen.
Niebuhr, Robinson, Kruse.			

[By Lepsius identified with Marah.]

Dr. Kruse (*Anmerk.* p. 418) singularly takes the words of Exod. xv, 27, "they encamped there (in Elim) by the waters," as meaning "by the sea;" whereas, from Num. xxxiii, 9, 10, it appears they did not reach the sea till a stage farther, although their distance from it previously had been but small. See ELIM.

3. From Elim the Israelites marched, encamping on the shore of the Red Sea, for which purpose they must have kept the high ground for some time, since the precipices of Jebel Himmâm—a lofty and precipitous mountain of chalky limestone—run down to the brink of the sea. They therefore went on the land side of this mountain to the head of wady Taiyibeh, which passes down south-west through the mountains to the shore. On the plain of *Ius Zetima*, at the mouth of this valley, was probably (Stanley, p. 37) the encampment "by the Red Sea" (Num. xxxiii, 10).

4. According to Num. xxxii, 11, the Israelites removed from the Red Sea, and encamped next in the wilderness of Sin; an appellation no doubt representing some natural feature, and none more probably than the alluvial plain, which, lying at the edge of the sea, about the spot we now regard them as having reached, begins to assume a significant appearance. The modern name for this is *el-Kâa*, identified by Seetzen with this wilderness (iii, pt. iii, 412). Stanley calls el-Kâa, at its initial point, "the plain of *Mîrk-hâh*," and thinks it is probably this wilderness (p. 37). Robinson likewise identifies it with "the great plain, which, beginning near el-Mîrk-hâh, extends with greater or less breadth almost to the extremity of the peninsula. In its broadest part it is called el-Kâ-a" (i, 106). Thus they kept along the shore, and did not yet ascend any of the fruitful valleys which run up towards the centre of the district. The account in Exod.

xvi knows nothing of the foregoing encampment by the sea, but brings the host at once into "the wilderness of Sin;" but we must bear in mind the general purpose there of recording not the people's history so much as God's dealings with them, and the former rather as illustrative of the latter, and subordinate to it. The evident design, however, in Num. xxxiii being to place on record their itinerary, this latter is to be esteemed as the *locus classicus* on any topographical questions as compared with others having a less special relation to the track. Indeed, we may regard the encampment by the Red Sea as being essentially in the wilderness of Shur itself. See SIN (DESERT OF).

The Israelites arrived in the wilderness of Sin on the fifteenth day of the second month after their departure out of the land of Egypt (Exod. xxi, 1), and being now wearied of their journey and tired of their scanty fare, they began again to murmur. Indeed, it is not easy to see how the most ordinary and niggardly food could have been supplied to them, constituting as they did nearly two millions of persons, in such a country as that into which they had come. It is true that some provision might have been made by individuals ere the march from Suez began. It is also probable that the accounts of encampments which we have are to be regarded as chiefly those of Moses and his principal men, with a chosen body of troops, while the multitude were allowed to traverse the open country and forage in the valleys. Still the region was unfavorable for the purpose, and some have hence concluded that here we have one of those numerical difficulties which are not uncommon in the Old-Testament Scripture, and which make many suspect some radical error in our conceptions of the Hebrew system of numbers. The contrast between the scanty supply of the desert and the abundance of Egypt furnished the immediate occasion of the outbreak of dissatisfaction. Bread and flesh were the chief demand; bread and flesh were miraculously supplied; the former by manna, the latter by quails (Exod. xvi, 13). Manna grows in some of the neighboring valleys; but the Israelites were in the wilderness, so that the supply could not have proceeded from natural resources, even had such existed to a sufficient extent for the purpose. The modern confection sold under that name is the exudation collected from the leaves of the tamarisk-tree (*tamarix Orientalis*, Linn.; Arab. *tarfu*, Heb. תַּרְפּוּ) only in the Sinaitic valleys, and in no great abundance. If it results from the punctures made in the leaf by an insect (the *coccus manniparus*, Ehrenberg) in the course of June, July, and August, this will not precisely suit the time of the people's entering the region, which was about May. It is said to keep as a hardened sirup for years (Laborde, *Comment. Geogr.* on Exod. xvi, 13, 14), and thus does not answer to the more striking characteristics described in Exod. xvi, 14-26. Seetzen thought that the gum Arabic, an exudation of the acacia, was the real manna of the Israelites; i. e. he regards the statement of "bread from heaven" as a fiction (*Reisen*, iii, 75-79). A caravan of a thousand persons is said by Hasselquist (*Voyages*, etc., *Materia Medica*, p. 298, transl. ed. 1766) to have subsisted solely on this substance for two months. See MANNA.

5. The next station mentioned in Exodus is Rephidim; but in Numbers Dophkah and Alush are added. The two latter were reached after the people had taken "their journey out of the wilderness of Sin." Exact precision and minute agreement are not to be expected. The circumstances of the case forbid us to look for them. In a desert, mountainous, and rarely frequented country, the names of places are not lasting. There was the less reason for permanence in the case before us, because the Israelites had not taken the shorter and more frequented road over the mountains to Sinai, but kept along the shore of the Red Sea. It still deserves notice, that in Exodus (xvii, 1) there is

something like an intimation given of other stations besides Rephidim in the words "after their journeys." Dophkah is probably to be found near the spot where wady Feirân runs into the Gulf of Suez. See DOFKAH. Alush may have lain on the shore near Ras Jehan. See ALUSH. From this point a range of calcareous rocks, termed Jebal Hemam, stretches along the shore, near the southern end of which the Hebrews took a sudden turn to the north-east, and, going up wady Hibrân, reached the central Sinaitic district. On the opposite side, the eastern, the Sinaitic mountains come to a sudden stop, breaking off, and presenting like a wall nearly perpendicular granite cliffs. These cliffs are cut by wady Hibrân, and at the point of intersection with the plain which runs between the two ranges probably lay Rephidim. The tabernacle was not yet set up, nor the order of march organized, as subsequently (Numb. x, 13, etc.); hence the words "track" or "route," as indicating a line, can only be taken in the most wide and general sense. See REPHIDIM.

This was the last station before Sinai itself was reached. Naturally enough it is recorded that "there was no water for the people to drink." The road was an arid gravelly plain; on either side were barren rocks. A natural supply was impossible. A miracle was wrought, and water was given. The Scripture makes it clear that it was from the Sinaitic group that the water was produced (Exod. xvii, 6). The plain received two descriptive names: Massah, "Temptation," and Meribah, "Strife." It appears that the congregation was not allowed to pursue their way to Sinai unmolested. The Arabs thought the Israelites suitable for plunder, and fell upon them. These hordes are termed Amalek. The Amalekites may have been out on a predatory expedition, or they may have followed the Israelites from the north, and only overtaken them at Rephidim; any way, no conclusion can be gathered from this fact as to the ordinary abode of these nomades. It appears, however, that the conflict was a severe and doubtful one, which by some extraordinary aid ended in favor of the children of Israel. This aggression on the part of Amalek gave occasion to a permanent national hatred, which ended only in the extermination of the tribe (Numb. xxiv, 20; Exod. xvii, 14-16). In commemoration of this victory, Moses was commanded to write an account of it in a book: he also erected there an altar to Jehovah, and called the name of it "Jehovah, my banner." There is no occasion to inquire whether or not there was space for a battle in the spot where Moses was. It was a nomade horde that made the attack, and not a modern army. The fight was not a pitched battle. See AMALEK.

The word Horeb, applied by Moses to the place whence the water was gained, suggests the idea that Horeb was the general, and Sinai the specific name; Horeb standing for the entire district, and Sinai for one particular mountain. Many passages sanction this distinction; but in the New Testament Sinai only is read, having then apparently become a general name, as it is at the present day (Acts vii, 30-38; Gal. iv, 24). It is a monkish usage which gives the name Sinai to Jebel Mûsa, and Horeb to the northern part of the same ridge. See HOREB.

6. The route from Rephidim to Horeb is usually supposed to have been by way of wady Feirân, but we can see no good reason for so circuitous a course, supposing that we have correctly located Rephidim. The Israelites may more probably have ascended wady Hibrân as far as its junction with wady Bughabigh, and through this first south-easterly, and then north-easterly between Jebel Madsus and Jebel es-Sik; thence, in a northerly direction, along the western base of Jebel Katherin, through wady Um-Kuraf, across wady Tulah. Here they may have followed the path between Jebel Hunir and Jebel el-Ghubshah, which comes out at the modern gardens in the recess of the

hills. We thus place them before Mount Horeb, in the capacious plain Râhah, which, having its widest part in the immediate front of that immense mass of rock, extends as if with two arms, one towards the north-west, the other towards the north-east. The review of the plain by so competent a person as Robinson is of great consequence for the interests of scientific geography, and the yet more important interests of religious truth; the rather because a belief prevailed, even among the best informed, that there was no spot in the Sinaitic district which answered to the demands of the scriptural narrative. Even the accurate Wiener (*Real-Wört.* in art. "Sinai," not "Horeb," as referred to by Robinson, i, 17; ii, 550) says, "Which-ever mountain may be considered as the place for the promulgation of the law, the common representation still remains false—that at the foot of the hill there spreads out a great plain, on which the people of Israel might assemble" (comp. Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* iii, 129). We shall therefore transcribe Robinson's words in extenso: "We came to Sinai with some incredulity, wishing to investigate the point whether there was any probable ground, beyond monkish tradition, for fixing upon the present supposed site. We were led to the conviction that the plain er-Râhah is the probable spot where the congregation of Israel were assembled; and that the mountain impending over it, the present Horeb, was the scene of the awful phenomena in which the law was given. We were surprised as well as gratified to find here, in the inmost recesses of these dark granite cliffs, this fine plain spread out before the mountain, and I know not where I have felt a thrill of stronger emotion than when, in first crossing the plain, the dark precipices of Horeb rising in solemn grandeur before us, we became aware of the entire adaptedness of the scene to the purposes for which it was chosen by the great Hebrew legislator. Moses doubtless, during the forty years in which he kept the flocks of Jethro, had often wandered over these mountains, and was well acquainted with their valleys and deep recesses, like the Arabs of the present day. At any rate, he knew and had visited the spot to which he was to conduct his people—this *olytum* in the midst of the great circular granite region; a secret holy place, shut out from the world amid lone and desolate mountains" (i, 175 sq.). We subjoin what Robinson reports of the climate: "The weather, during our residence at the convent (of Sinai), as, indeed, during all our journey through the peninsula (March and April), was very fine. At the convent the thermometer ranged only between 47° and 67° F. But the winter nights are said here to be cold; water freezes as late as February, and snow often falls upon the mountains. But the air is exceedingly pure, and the climate healthy, as is testified by the great age and vigor of many of the monks; and if in general few of the Arabs attain to so great an age, the cause is doubtless to be sought in the scantiness of their fare, and their exposure to privations, and not to any injurious influence of the climate" (p. 175). Other travellers, however, have since contended for the plain of wady es-Sebaiyeh, at the south-eastern base of Sinai, as the scene of the giving of the law (Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* ii, 123). This appears a less favorable position for that purpose, but it might easily have been reached by the Israelites by keeping along the shore of the Red Sea, and ascending by the next valley opposite Jebel Um-Shaamer. See SINAI.

V. *From Sinai to Kadesh.*—The sojourn of a year in the neighborhood of Mount Sinai was an eventful one. The statements of the scriptural narrative which relate to the receiving of the two tables, the golden calf, Moses's vision of God, and the visit of Jethro, are too well known to need special mention here; but, besides these, it is certain, from Numb. iii, 4, that before they quitted the wilderness of Sinai the Israelites were thrown into mourning by the untimely death of Aaron's

two sons, Nadab and Abihu. This event is probably connected with the setting up of the tabernacle and the enkindling of that holy fire, the sanctity of which their death avenged. That it has a determinate chronological relation with the promulgations which from time to time were made in that wilderness, is proved by an edict in Lev. xvi, being fixed as subsequent to it (Lev. x; comp. xvi. 1). The only other fact of history contained in Leviticus is the punishment of the son of mixed parentage for blasphemy (xxiv, 10-14). Of course the consecration of Aaron and his sons is mentioned early in the book in connection with the laws relating to their office (viii, ix). In the same wilderness region the people were numbered, and the exchange of the Levites against the first-born was effected; these last, since their delivery when God smote those of Egypt, having incurred the obligation of sanctity to him. The offerings of the princes of Israel were here also received. The last incident mentioned before the wilderness of Sinai was quitted for that of Paran is the intended departure of Hobab the Kenite, which it seems he abandoned at Moses's urgency. See HOBAB.

1. After having been thus about a year in the midst of this mountainous region, the Israelites broke up their encampment and began their journey in the order of their tribes, Judah leading the way with the ark of the covenant, under the guidance of the directing cloud (Numb. ix, 15 sq.; x, 11 sq.). They doubtless proceeded down wady Sheik, having the wilderness of Paran (Debbet er-Ramleh) before them, in a northerly direction; but having come to a gorge in the mountains not far from Sinai, they appear to have struck in a north-easterly direction across some low swells into *wady Sal*, where the subsequent route obliges us to place the station Taberah. It took the army three days to reach this station. Whatever name the place bore before, it now received that of Taberah (fire), from a supernatural fire with which murderers, in the extreme parts of the camp, were destroyed as a punishment for their guilt. Here, too, the mixed multitude that was among the Israelites not only fell a-lusting themselves, but also excited the Hebrews to remember Egyptian fish and vegetables with strong desire, and to complain of the divinely supplied manna. The discontent was intense and widely spread. Moses became aware of it, and forthwith felt his spirit misgive him. He brings the matter before Jehovah, and receives divine aid by the appointment of seventy elders to assist him in the important and perilous office of governing the gross, sensuous, and self-willed myriads whom he had to lead to Canaan. Moreover, an abundance of flesh-meat was given in a most profuse supply of quails. It appears that there were now 600,000 footmen in the congregation. See TABERAH.

2. The next station was Kibroth-hattaavah (probably at the intersection of their north-easterly course with *wady Murrah*), near which there are fine springs and excellent pasturage. This spot, the name of which signifies "graves of lust," was so denominated from a plague inflicted on the people in punishment of their rebellious disposition (Numb. xi, 33; 1 Cor. x, 6). Raumer (*Beiträge z. bib. Geog.* p. 6, also *Poläst.* 1850, p. 442) infers from Dent. i, 3, that Dizahab (now Dahab) lay on the route of the Israelites, and therefore identifies it with Kibroth-hattavah; but this is improbable, and requires a large detour. See KIBROTH-HATTA AVAH.

3. Thence they journeyed to Hazeroth, which Robinson, after Burckhardt, finds in *el-Hudherah*, where is a fountain, together with palm-trees. "The determination of this point," says Robinson, "is perhaps of more importance in Biblical history than would at first appear; for, if this position be adopted for Hazeroth, it settles at once the question as to the whole route of the Israelites between Sinai and Kadesh. It shows that they must have followed the route upon

which we now were to the sea, and so along the coast to Akabah (at the head of the eastern arm of the Red Sea), and thence, probably, through the great wady el-'Arabah to Kadesh. Indeed, such is the nature of the country, that, having once arrived at this fountain, they could not well have varied their course so as to keep aloof from the sea, and continue along the high plateau of the western desert' (i, 223). A glance at Kiepert's, or any map showing the region in detail, will show that a choice of two main routes exists, in order to cross the intervening space between Sinai and Canaan, which they certainly approached in the first instance on the southern, and not on the eastern side. Here the higher plateau surmounting the Tih region would almost certainly, assuming the main features of the wilderness to have been then as they are now, have compelled them to turn its western side nearly by the route by which Setzen came in the opposite direction from Hebron to Sinai, or to turn it on the east by going up the 'Arabah, or between the 'Arabah and the higher plateau. Over its southern face there is no pass, and hence the roads from Sinai, and those from Petra towards Gaza and Hebron, all converge into one of two trunk-lines of route (Robinson, i, 147, 151, 2; ii, 186). One reason for thinking that they did not strike northwards across the Tih range from Sinai is Moses's question when they murmur, "Shall all the fish of the sea be gathered together for them, to suffice them?" which is natural enough if they were rapidly nearing the Gulf of 'Akabah, but strange if they were posting towards the inland heart of the desert. Again, the quails are brought by "a wind from the sea" (Numb. xi, 22, 31); and various travellers (Burchardt, Schubert, Stanley) testify to the occurrence of vast flights of birds in this precise region between Sinai and 'Akabah. Again, Hazeroth, the next station after these, is coupled with Dizahab, which last seems undoubtedly the Dahab on the shore of that gulf (Deut. i, 1, and Robinson, ii, 600, note). This makes a seaward position likely for Hazeroth. Now as Taberah, previously reached, was three days' journey or more from the wilderness of Sinai, they had probably advanced that distance towards the north-east and 'Akabah; and the distance required for this will bring us so near el-Hüdheräh (the spot which Robinson thought represented Hazeroth in fact, as it seems to do in name), that it may be accepted as a highly probable site. Thus they were now not far from the coast of the Gulf of 'Akabah. A spot which seems almost certain to attract their course was the wady el-'Ain, being the water, the spring of that region of the desert, which would have drawn around it such "nomadic settlements as are implied in the name of Hazeroth, and such as that of Israel must have been" (Stanley, p. 82). Stanley nevertheless thinks this identification of Hazeroth a "faint probability," and the more uncertain as regards identity, "as the name Hazeroth is one of the least likely to be attached to any permanent or natural feature of the desert," meaning "simply the inclosures, such as may still be seen in the Bedonin villages, hardly less transitory than tents" (*Sinai and Palestine*, p. 81, 82). We rely, however, as much on the combination of the various circumstances mentioned above as on the name. The wady Hüdheräh and wady el-'Ain appear to run nearly parallel with each other, from south-west to north-east, nearly from the eastern extremity of the wady es-Sheikh, and their north-east extremity comes nearly to the coast, marking about a midway distance between the Jebel Músa and 'Akabah. After reaching the sea, however, at Ain el-Wáseit, the Israelites may have made a detour by way of wady Wetir nearly to its head, and thence passed through the water-course running directly northward into the Derb es-Sanna, thence around the northern face of Jebel Herte, down wady Hessi and wady Kureiyeh to the sea again; thus avoiding the narrow shore and the difficult pass across

the hill between wady el-Huweimiraty and wady el-Huweimirat. (See Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 84). See HAZEROTH.

At Hazeroth, where the people seem to have remained a short time, there arose a family dissension to increase the difficulties of Moses. Aaron, apparently led on by his sister Miriam, who may have been actuated by some feminine pique or jealousy, complained of Moses on the ground that he had married a Cushite, that is, an Arab wife, and the malcontents went so far as to set up their own claims to authority as not less valid than those of Moses. An appeal is made to Jehovah, who vindicates Moses, rebukes Aaron, and punishes Miriam (Numb. xii). See MIRIAM.

The two preceding stations seem from Numb. x, 11-13, 33-36, to have lain in the wilderness of Paran; but possibly the passage in x, 11-13 should come after that of 33-36, and the "three days' journey" of ver. 33 lie still in the wilderness of Sinai; and even Taberah and Hazeroth, reached in xi, xii, also there. Thus the Israelites would reach Paran only in xii, 16; and x, 12 would be either misplaced, or mentioned by anticipation only. See PARAN (WILDERNESS OF).

4. The next permanent encampment brought them into the wilderness of Paran, and here the local commentator's greatest difficulty begins. "And afterwards the people removed from Hazeroth, and pitched in the wilderness of Paran," at Kadesh (Numb. xii, 16; xiii, 26). In Deut. i, 19-21, we read, "And when we departed from Horeb we went through all that great and terrible wilderness which ye saw by the way of the mountain of the Amorites, as the Lord our God commanded us; and we came to Kadesh-barnea. And I said unto you, Ye are come unto the mountain of the Amorites, which the Lord our God doth give unto us. Behold, the Lord thy God hath set the land before thee: go up and possess it; fear not, neither be discouraged." Accordingly, here it was that twelve men (spies) were sent into Canaan to survey the country, who went up from the wilderness of Zin (Numb. xiii, 21) to Hebron, and returning after forty days, brought back a very alarming account of what they had seen. Let it, however, be remarked that the Scriptures here supply several local data to this effect: Kadesh-barnea lay not far from Canaan, near the mountain of the Amorites, in the wilderness of Zin, in the wilderness of Paran. It is evident that there is here a great *lacuna*, which some have attempted to fill up by turning the route a little to the west to Rithmah (q. v.), on the borders of Idumæa, and then conducting it with a sudden bend to the west and the south, into what is considered the wilderness of Paran (*Relievo Map of Arabia Petraea*, published by Dobbs, London). In this view, however, we cannot concur. Both Robinson and Raumer are of a different opinion. At the same time it must be admitted that so great a gap in the itinerary is extraordinary. If, however, we find ourselves in regard to the journey from Horeb to Kadesh possessed of fewer and less definite materials of information, we have also the satisfaction of feeling that no great scriptural fact or doctrine is concerned. It is certain that the narrative in the early part of Numbers goes at once from Hazeroth to Kadesh; and although the second account (in Numb. xxxiii) supplies other places, these seem to belong properly to a second route and a second visit to Kadesh. The history in the book of Numbers is not, indeed, a consecutive narrative; for after the defeat of the Israelites in their foolish attempt to force an entrance into Canaan contrary to the will of God (Numb. xiv, 45), it breaks suddenly off, and, leaving the journeyings and the doings of the camp, proceeds to recite certain laws. Yet it offers, as we think, a clear intimation of a second visit to the wilderness of Zin and to Kadesh. Without having said a word as to the removal of the Israelites southward, and therefore leaving them in the wilder-

ness of Zin, at Kadesh, it records in the twentieth chap. (ver. 1), "Then came the children of Israel, the whole congregation, into the desert of Zin, in the first month, and the people abode in Kadesh." And this view appears confirmed by the fact that the writer immediately proceeds to narrate the passage of the Israelites hence on by Mount Hor southwards to Gilgal and Canaan. Robinson's remarks (ii, 611) on this point have much force: "I have thus far assumed that the Israelites were twice at Kadesh, and this appears from a comparison of the various accounts. They broke up from Sinai on the twentieth day of the second month in the second year of their departure out of Egypt, corresponding to the early part of May; they came into the desert of Paran, whence spies were sent up the mountain into Palestine, 'in the time of the first ripe grapes;' and these returned after forty days to the camp at Kadesh. As grapes begin to ripen on the mountains of Judah in July, the return of the spies is to be placed in August or September. The people now murmured at the report of the spies, and received the sentence from Jehovah that their carcasses should fall in the wilderness, and their children wander in the desert forty years. They were ordered to turn back into the desert 'by the way of the Red Sea,' although it appears that they abode 'many' days in Kadesh. The next notice of the Israelites is, that in the first month they came into the desert of Zin and abode again at Kadesh; here Miriam dies; Moses and Aaron bring water from the rock; a passage is demanded through the land of Edom, and refused; and they then journeyed from Kadesh to Mount Hor, where Aaron dies in the fortieth year of the departure from Egypt, in the first day of the fifth month, corresponding to a part of August and September. Here, then, between August of the second year and August of the fortieth year, we have an interval of thirty-eight years of wandering in the desert. With this coincides another account. From Mount Hor they proceeded to Elath on the Red Sea, and so around the land of Edom to the brook Zered, on the border of Moab; and from the time of their departure from Kadesh (meaning, of course, their first departure) until they thus came to the brook Zered, there is said to have been an interval of thirty-eight years."

In this way the scriptural account of the journeyings of the Israelites become perfectly harmonious and intelligible. The eighteen stations mentioned only in the general list in the book of Numbers as preceding the arrival at Kadesh are then apparently to be referred to this eight-and-thirty years of wandering, during which the people at last approached Zion-geber, and afterwards returned northwards a second time to Kadesh, in the hope of passing directly through the land of Edom. Their wanderings extended, doubtless, over the western desert, although the stations named are probably only those head-quarters where the tabernacle was pitched, and where Moses, and the elders, and priests encamped, while the main body of the people was scattered in various directions.

Where, then, was Kadesh? Clearly on the borders of Palestine. We agree with Robinson and Raumer in placing it nearly at the top of the wady 'Arabah, where, indeed, it is fixed by Scripture, for in Numb. xii, 16 we read, "Kadesh, a city in the uttermost of thy (Edom's) border." The precise spot it may be difficult to ascertain; but here, in the wilderness of Zin, which lay in the more comprehensive district of Paran, is Kadesh to be placed. Raumer, however, has attempted to fix the locality, and in his views Robinson and Schubert generally concur. Raumer places it south from the Dead Sea, in the low lands between the mountain of the Edomites and that of the Amorites. The country gradually descends from the mountains of Judah southward, and where the descent terminates Raumer sets Kadesh. With this view the words of Moses entirely correspond, when, at Kadesh, he said

to the spies, "Get you *up southward* (rather on the south,  $\text{זָרְדָּה}$ ), and go up into the mountain" (Numb. xiii, 17). The ascent may have been made up the pass es-Sufah; up this the self-willed Hebrews went, and were driven back by the Canaanites as far as to Hormah, then called Zephath (Numb. xii, 17; xiv, 40-45; Judg. i, 17). The spot where Kadesh lay Robinson finds in the present Ain el-Weibeh. But Raumer prefers a spot to the north of this place—that where the road mounts by wady el-Khurur to the pass Sufah. It ought, he thinks, to be fixed on a spot where the Israelites would be near the pass, and where the pass would lie before their eyes. This is not the case, according to Schubert, at Ain el-Weibeh. Raumer, therefore, inclines to fix on Ain Hash, which lies near Ain el-Khurur. This is probably Kadesh. The distance from the pass Sufah to Ain Hash is little more than half the length of that from the same pass to Ain el-Weibeh. According to the Arabs, there is at Ain Hash a copious fountain of sweet water, surrounded by verdure and traces of ruins, which must be of considerable magnitude, as they were seen by Robinson at a distance of some miles. These may be the ruins of Kadesh; but at Ain el-Weibeh there are no ruins (see Raumer, *Palist.* 1850, p. 445). See KADESH.

By what route, then, did the Israelites come from Hazeroth to Kadesh? We are here supplied with scarcely any information. The entire distance, which is considerable, is passed by the historian in silence. Nothing more remains than the direction of the two places, the general features of the country, and one or two allusions. The option seems to lie between two routes. From Hazeroth, pursuing a direction to the north-east, they would come upon the sea-coast, along which they might go till they came to the top of the Bahr Akabah, and thence up wady Arabah to Kadesh, nearly at its extremity. Or they might have taken a north-western course and crossed the mountain Jebel et-Tih. If so, they must still have avoided the western side of Mount Araf, otherwise they would have been carried to Beer-sheba, which lay far to the west of Kadesh. Robinson prefers the first route, Raumer the second. "I," says the latter, "am of opinion that Israel went through the desert et-Tih, then down Jebel Araf, but not along wady 'Arabah." This view is thought to be supported by the words found in Deut. i, 19, "When we departed from Horeb we went through all that great and terrible wilderness which we saw by the way of the mountain of the Amorites [as if Jebel Araf], and we came to Kadesh-barnea." This journey from Horeb to Kadesh-barnea took the Hebrews eleven days (Deut. i, 2). But in this last passage the route is expressly said to be "by the way of Mount *Sir*" (which must therefore be the "mount of the Amorites" above referred to), and in ver. 1 the "wilderness is said to be in the 'Arabah ("plain"), with several places designated as extreme boundary points. See ARABAH.

VI. *The Wanderings in the Desert.*—At the direct command of Jehovah the Hebrews left Kadesh, came down to the wady 'Arabah, and entered the wilderness by the way of the Red Sea (Numb. xiv, 25). In this wilderness they wandered eight-and-thirty years, but little can be set forth respecting the course of their march. It may in general be observed that their route would not resemble that of a regular modern army. They were a disciplined horde of nomades, and would follow nomadic customs. It is also clear that their stations, as well as their course, would necessarily be determined by the nature of the country, and its natural supplies of the necessaries of life. Hence regularity of movement is not to be expected. A common error is that of supposing that from station to station (in Numb. xxxiii) always represents a day's march merely, whereas it is plain, from a comparison of two passages in Exod. (xv, 22) and Numb. (x, 23),

that on two occasions three days formed the period of transition between station and station, and therefore that not day's marches, but intervals of an indefinite number of days between permanent encampments are intended by that itinerary; and as it is equally clear from Numb. ix, 22 that the ground may have been occupied for "two days, or a month, or a year," we may suppose that the occupations of a longer period only may be marked in the itinerary; and thus the difficulty of apparent chasms in its enumeration, for instance the greatest, between Ezion-Geber and Kadesh (xxxiii, 35-37), altogether vanishes. How, except by a constant miracle, two millions of people were supported for forty years in the peninsula of Sinai, has been thought, under the actual circumstances of the case, to be inexplicable; nor will such scanty supplies as an occasional well or a chance oasis do much to relieve the subject. Much of the difficulty experienced by commentators on this head, however, arises from a misconception of the nature of the so-called "desert" (דֶּשֶׁת), which is rather an open uninhabited country than a desolate wilderness in the strict sense. Indeed, Jobath (q. v.), one of the stations named in this part of the route, is explicitly called "a land of rivers of waters" (Deut. x, 8). Modern travellers through the region in question speak of many parts of it as well watered, and actually sustaining a numerous nomadic population (comp. *Meth. Quart. Rev.* April, 1863, p. 301 sq.). See WILDERNESS.

1. In the absence of detailed information, any attempt to lay down the path pursued by the Israelites after their emerging from the 'Arabah can be little better than conjectural. Some authorities carry them quite over to the eastern bank of the Red Sea; but the expression "by the way of the Red Sea" denotes nothing more than the western wilderness, or the wilderness in the direction of the Red Sea. The stations over which the Israelites passed are set down in Numb. xxxiii, 18 sq. (comp. Deut. x, 6, 7), and little beyond the bare record can be given. Only it seems extraordinary, and is much to be regretted, that for so long a period as eight-and-thirty years our information should be so exceedingly small. Raumer, indeed, makes a feeble effort (*Beiträge zur biblische Geographie*, Leips, 1843) to fix the direction in which some of the stations lay to each other, but he locates them all in the valley of the 'Arabah, without being able to identify one of the names with a modern locality (see his *Palästina*, 1850, p. 446; also map). Were the interior of the peninsula thoroughly explored, we doubt not many of the ancient names might be found still subsisting, which would serve as landmarks to determine the route. As it is, we do not altogether despair of finding some clew to the subject. [See below.] It may be of service to subjoin the following table of the places through which the Israelites passed (not all of them exactly stations) from the time of their leaving Egypt to their arrival in Canaan, which we take with some alterations) from Dr. Robinson's paper in the *Biblical Repos.* for 1832, p. 794-797.

(1.) From Egypt to Sinai.

[1.] From Rameses (xii, 27).	(EXODUS xii-xix.)	(NUMBERS xxxiii.)
[2.] Succoth (xii, 37).	From Rameses (ver. 3).	Succoth (ver. 6).
[3.] Etham (xiii, 20).	Etham (ver. 6).	Etham (ver. 7).
[4.] Pi-hahiroth (xiv, 2).	Pi-hahiroth (ver. 7).	The passage through the Red Sea (xv, 22).
[5.] Passage through the Red Sea (xv, 22).	(ver. 8).	Three days' march in the desert of Shur (xv, 22).
[6.] Three days' march into the desert of Shur (xv, 22).	Three days' march in the desert of Etham (ver. 8).	Marah (ver. 23).
[7.] Marah (xv, 23).	Marah (ver. 8).	Elim (xv, 27).
[8.] Elim (xv, 27).	Elim (ver. 9).	[9.] Encampment by the Red Sea (ver. 10).
[10.] Desert of Sin (xvi, 1).	Desert of Sin (ver. 11).	[11.] Dophkah (ver. 12).
[12.] Alush (ver. 15).	Alush (ver. 15).	[13.] Rephidim (xvii, 1).
[14.] Desert of Sinai (xix, 1).	Rephidim (ver. 14).	Desert of Sinai (ver. 15).

(2.) From Sinai to Kadesh the second time. (NUMBERS x-xx.)	From the desert of Sinai (x, 12).	From the desert of Sinal (ver. 16).
[15.] Taberah (xi, 3; [Deut. ix, 22].)	[16.] Kibroth-hattaavah (xi, 34), in the edge of the desert of Paran (x, 12).	Kibroth-hattaavah (ver. 16).
[17.] Hazereth (xi, 35).	[18.] The desert of 'Arabah, by the way of Mount Seir [Deut. i, 1, 2].	Hazereth (ver. 17). Dreadful desert by the way of the mount of the Amorites [Deut. i, 19].
[19.] Kadesh, in the desert of Paran (xii, 16; xiii, 26); [Deut. i, 2, 19]. [Hence they turn back and wander for 35 years (Numb. xiv, 25 sq.) through the desert (Deut. ii, 1).]	[21.] Rimmon-parez (ver. 19).	[22.] Libnah (ver. 20).
[23.] Rissah (ver. 21).	[24.] Kehelathah (ver. 22).	[25.] Mount Shapher (ver. 23).
[26.] Haradah (ver. 24).	[27.] Makheloth (ver. 25).	[28.] Tahath (ver. 26).
[29.] Tarah (ver. 27).	[30.] Mithcah (ver. 28).	[31.] Hashmonah (ver. 29).
[32.] Moseroth (ver. 30).	[33.] Bene-jaakan (ver. 31).	[34.] Hor-hagidgad (ver. 32).
[35.] Jothathah (ver. 33).	[36.] Ebronah (ver. 34).	[37.] Ezion-geber (ver. 35), by the way of the Red Sea [Deut. ii, 1].
[38.] Return to Kadesh, in the desert of Zin (Numb. xx, 1), by the way of Mt. Seir (Deut. ii, 1).	Kadesh, in the desert of Zin (ver. 36).	

(3.) From Kadesh to the Jordan.

(NUMB. xx, xxi; DEUT. i, ii, x.)	(NUMBERS xxxiii.)
From Kadesh (Numb. xx, 22).	From Kadesh (ver. 37).
[39.] Beeroth Bene-jaakan (Deut. x, 6).	Mount Hor (ver. 37).
[40.] Mount Hor (Numb. xx, 22), or Mosera (Deut. x, 6), where Aaron died.	
[41.] Gudgodah (Deut. x, 7).	
[42.] Jotbath (Deut. x, 7).	
[43.] Way of the Red Sea (Numb. xxi, 4), by Ezion-geber (Deut. ii, 8).	
[44.] Elath (Deut. ii, 8).	Zalmonah (ver. 41).
[45.] Panon (ver. 42).	
[46.] Oboth (Numb. xxi, 10).	Oboth (ver. 43).
[47.] Ije-abarim (Numb. xxi, 11).	Ije-abarim, or Iim (ver. 44, 45).
[49.] The brook Zered (Numb. xxi, 12; Deut. ii, 13, 14).	
[50.] The brook Arnon (Numb. xxi, 13; Deut. ii, 24).	
[51.] Dibon-gad (ver. 45).	
[52.] Almon-diblathaim (ver. 46).	
[53.] Beer (well), in the desert (Numb. xxi, 16, 18).	
[54.] Mattanah (xxi, 18).	
[55.] Nahaliel (xxi, 19).	
[56.] Bamoth (xxi, 19).	
[57.] Pisgah, put for the range of Abarim, of which Pisgah was part (xxi, 20).	Mountains of Abarim, near Nebo (ver. 47).
[58.] By the way of Bashan to the plains of Moab by Jordan, near Jericho (Numb. xxi, 33; xxii, 1).	Plains of Moab by Jordan, near Jericho (ver. 48).

The points indicated in the above route as far as Kadesh have already been identified with considerable precision. It remains to consider how far the residue are capable of identification. For this purpose we have a few coincidences with modern or well-known



Map of the Arabian Peninsula, exhibiting the Route of the Israelites. (The dotted parts are uncertain. The numbers show the order and direction of the journeys.)

localities, and several repetitions of the same or similar names, indicating a passage through the same spot from different directions. The rest must be supplied by conjecture, assisted by such suggestions as the nature of the region furnishes. It is a question whether the station Rithmah (Numb. xxxiii, 18) was one reached by the Israelites before or after their first arrival at Kadesh; but as it is mentioned in immediate connection with Hazeroth, we may infer that it was either another name for Kadesh itself, or a locality so near it as to permit the omission of Kadesh in the summary where it occurs. After their repulse by the Canaanites at the pass called Nukb es-Sufah, the Israelites may be supposed to have retreated along the westerly shore of the 'Arabah till they reached the wady el-Kafatiyeh, or that of Abu Jeradeh, which would afford them an ascent to the mountainous region occupying the northern interior of the desert, somewhere near the summit of which we may place their next encampment, called Rimmon-parez. Libnah, where they next encamped, may not improbably be the same with Laban, given (Deut. i, 1) as one of the extreme points of their region of wandering, and may have been situated on the western declivity of the mountains, in the neighborhood of the wady el-Ain, running down from

Ain el-Kudeirat. Thence they may have proceeded down wady el-Ain to its junction with the large wady el-Arish, where we may place the next station, Rissah, in the vicinity of el-Kusaby, opposite Jebel el-Helal. Pursuing this last valley southward, they next halted at Kehelathah, perhaps at its junction with wady el-Hasana, opposite Jebel Achmar, and thence eastward up wady el-Mayein, around the northern base of the Arait en-Nakah, which we may identify with Mount Shapher, to the summit just beyond Ain el-Mayein, where we may locate their next station, Haradah. Makheloth and Tahath may be located at suitable intervals along the northern base of the ridge el-Mukrah, and Tara: at the intersection of the route southeasterly thence with the wady el-Jerafeh, which they would be likely to pursue (stopping at Mithcah on the way) to its intersection with the wady el-Jeib, in the 'Arabah, where we may locate Hahshmonah. Thence is an easy stage to the next station, Moseroth, which is doubtless the same with Mosera, afterwards visited (Deut. x, 6), and there identified with the vicinity of Mount Hor, where Aaron died. Here we have a fixed point, whatever may be thought of the preceding conjectural circuit, which doubtless occupied several years. We notice that Schwarz, although unable to fix the



stations at this portion of the itinerary of the Israelites, believes that they must have been in this high, rocky plateau, now occupied by the tribe Azazumeh (*Palestine*, p. 215).

From Mount Hor the next station indicated is Bene-jaakan (q. v.), evidently identical with the wells (Beeroth) of the same name, mentioned subsequently in the reverse order between Kadesh and Mosera (Deut. x, 6), and probably a general term for the well-watered region including the fountains el-Hufeiry, el-Buweirideh, el-Webeh, and el-Ghamr. At this last-named spot, having crossed the 'Arabah in a north-easterly direction, the Israelites may have pursued their route up wady el-Ghamr, avoiding their late track in that vicinity (for the same names do not reappear), and thus by a south-westerly, and then southerly course, have fallen again into wady el-Jerafeh, and followed it up to where it forks into wady el-Ghudhagidh. This last name is probably a relic of that of their next station, Hor-hagidgad, essentially the same with the Gudgodah (q. v.) afterwards visited by them (Deut. x, 7) in retracing their steps through this region; for although the letters of the Arabic and Heb. names are not identical (as given in Robinson's lists, *Researches*, iii, Appendix, 210, where the orthography was probably taken only by ear), yet they are equivalent in sound, and in both cases contain the same peculiar reduplication. Thence making a southerly circuit across the heads of several wadys running easterly from the little Jebel et-Tih, their next encampment was Jotbathah, coincident with the Jotbath of Deut. x, 7, and there described as "a land of rivers and streams," which we may naturally locate at the intersection of the route thus indicated with the upper wady Jerafeh, where is a confluence of several branch wadys. Following up the chief of these, wady Mukutta et-Tawarik, in a south-easterly direction, they would fall in (at the station Ebronah) with the modern Haj route from Cairo, and follow it through the pass of 'Akabah to Ezion-geber on the Red Sea. Thence they appear to have taken their first path through the 'Arabah to Kadesh again. The following is a table of a few of the most definite of these results:

NUMB. xxxiii, 30-35.	DEUT. x, 6, 7.	CONJECTURAL SITE.
(1.) Moseroth.	(2.) Mosera.	<i>Ain et - Tu'iyibeh</i> , near the foot of Mount Hor.
(2.) Bene-jaakan.	(1.) Beeroth of the children of Jaakan.	<i>'Ain el - Webeh</i> .
(3.) Hor-hagidgad.	(3.) Gudgodah.	<i>Wady el - Ghudhagidh</i> .
(4.) Jotbathah.	(4.) Jotbath.	Confluence of <i>wady el - A'bbeh</i> with <i>el - Jerafeh</i> .

2. The only events recorded during this period (and these are interspersed with sundry promulgations of the ceremonial law), are the execution of the offender who gathered sticks on the Sabbath (Numb. xv, 32-36), the rebellion of Korah (ch. xvi), and, closely connected with it, the adjudgment of the pre-eminence to Aaron's house with their kindred tribe, solemnly confirmed by the judicial miracle of the rod that blossomed. This seems to have been followed by a more rigid separation between Levi and the other tribes as regards the approach to the tabernacle than had been practically recognised before (xxvii; xviii, 22; comp. xvi, 40).

We are not told how the Israelites came into possession of the city Kadesh-Barnea, as seems implied in the narrative of their second arrival there, nor who were its previous occupants. The probability is that these last were a remnant of the Horites, who, after their expulsion by Edom from Mount Seir [see Edom], may have here retained their last hold on the territory between Edom and the Canaanitish Amorites of "the south." Probably Israel took it by force of arms, which may have induced the attack of "Arad the Canaanite," who would then feel his border immediately

threatened (Numb. xxxiii, 40; comp. xxi, 1). This warlike exploit of Israel may perhaps be alluded to in Judg. v, 4 as the occasion when Jehovah "went out of Seir" and "marched out of the field of Edom" to give his people victory. The attack of Arad, however, though with some slight success at first, only brought defeat upon himself and destruction upon his cities (xxi, 3). We learn from xxxiii, 36 only that Israel marched without permanent halt from Ezion-geber upon Kadesh. This sudden activity, after their long period of desultory and purposeless wandering, may have alarmed king Arad. The itinerary takes here another stride from Kadesh to Mount Hor. There their being occupied with the burial of Aaron may have given Arad his fancied opportunity of assaulting the rear of their march, he descending from the north whilst they also were facing southwards. In direct connection with these events we come upon a single passage in Deuteronomy (x, 6, 7), which is a scrap of narrative imbedded in Moses's recital of events at Hor-be long previous. This contains a short list of names of localities, on comparing which with the itinerary we get some clew to the line of march from the region Kadesh to Ezion-geber southwards. See KADESH.

#### VII. From Kadesh to Canaan.

1. This third division of the Israelites' route is more susceptible of identification than either of the others, after having fixed by the foregoing process some important points, and in its latter portion is quite unmistakable. The Israelites evidently retraced their steps down the 'Arabah, perhaps keeping along its western side, at the farthest distance from the borders of Edom, till they arrived once more at the well-watered tract of the descendants of Jaakan, about half way between Kadesh and Mount Hor, or Mosera, to which they next crossed over, and where Aaron died (Deut. x, 6). From this point, again avoiding the territory of the Edomites, they passed over by a considerable deflection, in a south-westerly direction, through wady el-Jerafeh to wady el-Ghudhagidh (which we have before identified with Gudgodah, or Hor-hagidgad), on their former track, around through Jotbath (Deut. x, 7), and back again to the Red Sea at Ezion-geber and Elath (Deut. ii, 8, where, however, the two latter names occur in the reverse order). From this last point, having crossed the plain of the 'Arabah, they doubled the southern extremity of Mount Seir, through wady el-Ithm, and pitched at Zalmonah, probably in the edge of the eastern desert plain, near the junction of wady el-Amran. Pursuing thence their route north-easterly along the present road that skirts the base of Mount Seir, they next arrived at Punon, which we may locate near the intersection of their route with the Haj road from Damascus. Keeping still along the base of the Mount-Seir range, they next halted at Oboth, situated probably in the region of wady el-Ghuweit, where the first stream takes its rise, emptying into the Dead Sea from the south. Pursuing the same road northwards that travellers at this day take along this route, they doubtless passed near Tufileh (Topel), one of the points in their wanderings, Deut. i, 1), and halted at Ije-abarim, probably near the wady el-Ahsy, which runs into wady el-Kurahy, the southern border of Moab. Their next stations are easily identified: the brook Zered can be no other than wady el-Deraah, the two forks of which inclose Kerak; the brook Arnon is conceded to be wady Mojeb; and Dibon-gad is evidently the modern Dhiban. From this last point they appear to have diverged considerably (apparently with a view to meet the hostile Sihon at Jahaz) to the east of the modern road, into the desert, where they passed through several unknown localities (in short stages, while waiting for the return of messengers asking leave of passage), Almon-Diblathaim, Beer, Mattanah, and Nahaliel [see each in its alphabetical place], and then returned by a slight north-westerly circuit to Bamoth (perhaps Jebel-Humej), apparently some point

opposite Pisgah, a peak (specially corresponding probably to Jebel Attarus) of the mountains inclosing the valley of the Jordan on the east. About this time the expedition was sent out against Sihon, Og, and the inhabitants of Bashan; upon the successful return of which they passed northward around the heights of Nebo (probably west of Heshbon), and so across the general range of Abarim by one of the valleys running south-westerly into the Jordan (probably wady Heshban). In this last vicinity they encamped in the plains of Moab, preparatory to crossing the Jordan opposite Jericho. (See each of the stations above-named in its alphabetical place.)

2. When we begin to take up the thread of the story at the second visit to Kadesh, we find that time had, in the interval, been busy at its destructive work, and we thus gain confirmation of the view which has been taken of such second visit. No sooner has the sacred historian told us of the return of the Israelites to Kadesh, than he records the death and burial of Miriam, and has, at no great distance of time, to narrate that of Aaron and Moses. While still at Kadesh a rising against these leaders takes place, on the alleged ground of a want of water. Water is produced from the rock at a spot called hence Meribah (strife). But Moses and Aaron displeased God in this proceeding, probably because they distrusted God's providence and applied for extraordinary resources. On account of this displeasure, it was announced to them that they should not enter Canaan. A similar transaction has been already spoken of as taking place in Replidim (Exod. xvii, 1). The same name, Meribah, was occasioned in that as in this matter. Hence it has been thought that we have here two versions of the same story. But there is nothing surprising, under the circumstances, in the outbreak of discontent for want of water, which may well have happened even more than twice. The places are different, very wide apart; the time is different; and there is also the great variation arising out of the conduct and punishment of Moses and Aaron. On the whole, therefore, we judge the two records to speak of different transactions.

Relying on the ties of blood (Gen. xxxii, 8), Moses sent to ask of the Edomites a passage through their territory into Canaan. The answer was a refusal, accompanied by a display of force. We suggest as an explanation of this unnatural churlishness that perhaps the request chanced to be preferred to the native Horite "king" (probably the very Hadad last mentioned in the list in Gen. xxxvi, 29) rather than to the phylarch of the Esauites contemporary with him (Gen. xxxvi, 43). See Esau. The Israelites, therefore, were compelled to turn their face southward, and, making a turn around the end of the Elanitic gulf, reached Mount Hor, near Petra, on the top of which Aaron died. Finding the country bad for travelling, and their food unpleasant, Israel again broke out into rebellious discontent, and was punished by fiery serpents which bit the people, and many died, when a remedy was provided in a serpent of brass set on the flag-staff (Numb. xxi, 4 sq.). There is near Elath a promontory known as the *Rds Um Haye*, "the mother of serpents," which seem to abound in the region adjacent; and, if we may suppose this the scene of that judgment, the event would thus be connected with the line of march, rounding the southern border of Mount Seir, laid down in Deut. ii, 8 as being "through the way of the plain (i. e. the 'Arabah) from Elath and from Ezion-geber," whence "turning northward," having "compassed that mountain (Mount Seir) long enough," they "passed by the way of the wilderness of Moab" (v, 3, 8). Still going northward, and probably pursuing the caravan route from Damascus, they at length reached the valley of Zered (the brook), which may be the present wady Kerek, that runs from the east into the Dead Sea. Hence they "removed and pitched on the other side of Arnon, which is in the

border of Moab, between Moab and the Amorites" (Numb. xxi, 13). Beer (the well) was the next station, where, finding a plentiful supply of water, and being rejoiced at the prospect of the speedy termination of their journey, the people indulged in music and song, singing "the song of the well" (Numb. xxi, 17, 18). The Amorites being requested, refused to give Israel a passage through their borders, and so the nation was again compelled to proceed still in a northerly course. At length, having beaten the Amorites, and Og, king of Bashan, they reached the Jordan, and pitched their tents at a spot which lay opposite Jericho. Here Balak, king of the Moabites, alarmed at their numbers and their successful prowess, invited Balaam to curse Israel, in the hope of being thus aided to overcome them and drive them out. The intended curse proved a blessing in the prophet's mouth. While here the people gave way to the idolatrous practices of the Moabites, when a terrible punishment was inflicted, partly by a plague which took off 24,000, and partly by the avenging sword. Moses, being commanded to take the sum of the children of Israel, from twenty years upwards, found they amounted to 600,730, among whom there was not a man of those whom Moses and Aaron numbered in the wilderness of Sinai (Numb. xxvi, 47, 64). Moses is now directed to ascend Abarim, to Mount Nebo, in the land of Moab, over against Jericho, in order that he might survey the land which he was not to enter on account of his having rebelled against God's commandment in the desert of Zin (Numb. xxvii, 12; Deut. xxxii, 49). Conformably with the divine command, Moses went up from the plains of Moab unto the mountains of Nebo, to the top of Pisgah, and there he died, at the age of 120 years: "His eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated" (Deut. xxxiv). Under his successor, Joshua, the Hebrews were forthwith led across the Jordan, and established in the Land of Promise.

Thus a journey, which they might have performed in a few months, they spent forty years in accomplishing, bringing on themselves unspeakable toil and trouble, and, in the end, death, as a punishment for their gross and sensual appetites, and their unbending inobedience to the divine will (Numb. xiv, 23; xxvi, 65). Joshua, however, gained thereby a great advantage, inasmuch as it was with an entirely new generation that he laid the foundations of the civil and religious institutions of the Mosiac polity in Palestine. This advantage may be assigned as the reason why so long a period of years was spent in the wilderness.

VIII. *Literature*.—Besides the incidental treatment of this subject in general works on sacred geography, the writings of travellers through the region in question, and commentaries on the parts of Scripture relating to it, the following special treatises exist:—Laborde, *Commentaire Géographique sur l'Exode et les Nombres* (Paris and Leipzig, 1811, fol.); Hase, *Tabula Synoptica stat'orum Israelitarum*, etc. (Norimb. 1789, fol.); Berthold, *De rebus a Mose in Ægypto gestis* (Erl. 1795, 8vo); Plitt, *Die 40 jährige Reisen d. Israeliten durch d. Wüste* (Cassel, 1775, 8vo); Calmet, *De transfretatione Erythraei* (in vol. i, p. 214 sq. of his *Dissertationes in V. T.*, Wirceb. 1789, 8vo); Benzell, *De transitu Israel. per Mare Rubrum* (in his *Syntagma Dissert.* ii, 137 sq.); Michaelis (ed.), *Essai sur l'heure du passage des Hébreux de la Mer Rouge* (Göttingen, 1758, 8vo); Zeibich, *Durchgang d. Israeliten*, etc. (in his *Verm. Beitr.* i, 42 sq.); also *De dissidio in enarrando itinere Isr. per Mare* (Viteb. 1752, 4to); Reimarus, *Durchg. d. Israel. durchs rothe Meer* (in Lessing's *Beitrage*, fragm. 3); Richter, *Meer durch welches d. Israel. gegangen*, etc. (Lpz. 1778, 8vo); Kleuker, *Wanderung d. Israel. durchs rothe Meer* (Frankf. 1778, 8vo); Moldenhauer, *Prüfung d. dritten Fragments* (Hamb. 1779, 8vo); Lüderwald, *Durchg. d. Isr. durchs rothe Meer* (Helmst. 1779, 8vo); Döderlein, *Fragmente u. Antifragmente*, i, 35-112; Ritter, *Ueberg.*

d. *Isr. durch d. rothe Meer* (in Henke's *Magaz.* iv, 291 sq.); treatises, *De transitu populi Israel.* etc., in the *Critici Sacri*, *Theor. Nos.* i, 274, 292, 300; Auspitz, מַצֵּי־הַיָּם (s. l. 1818, 8vo); Dietz, *Vestimenta Israel. in deserto* (Witten. 1676, 4to); Dorsche, *De educ. Israel ex Ægypto* (Strasb. 1652, 4to); Holste, *Iter Isr. ex Ægypt. ad Canaan* (Rost. 1707, 4to); Klein, *Israel's Wanderungen* (Bamberg, 1839, 8vo); Raumer, *Zug der Isr. aus Ægypto nach Canaan* (Leipzig 1837, 8vo); Thierbach, *id.* (ib. cod. 8vo); also *Durchg. d. Isr. durch einen Theil d. s. mittell. Meeres* (Erfurt, 1830, 8vo); Unruh, *Zug der Isr. aus Æg. nach Canaan* (Langensl. 1860, 8vo); Zinck, *De transitu Maris Erythraei* (Augsb. 1778, 4to); Banadius, *Itinerarium filiorum Israel* (Antw. 1621, fol.); Lightfoot, *Itinera Israelitarum* (*Works*, ii, 415); Anon. *Journeys of the Children of Israel* (Lond. 1832, 18mo); Seaton, *Church in the Wilderness* (London, 1821, 2 vols. 12mo); Alexander, *De exitu ex Ægypto* (*Hist. Eccles.* ii, 137); Bp. Lloyd, *Origins of Jewish Church* (in Whiston's *Sacred History*, i, 46); Berton, *L'itinéraire des Israélites* (Par. 1860, 4to); Fischendorf, *De Isr. per Mare Rubrum transitu* (Lips. 1847, 8vo); Miss Corbaux, *Exodus Papyri* (London, 1855, 8vo); Krummacher, *Israel's Wanderings in the Wilderness* (London, 1837-8, 2 vols. 12mo); Bräm, *Israel's Wanderung von Gosen bis zum Sinai* (Elbeuf, 1859, 8vo); Forster, *Israel in the Wilderness* (Lond. 1865, 8vo); see the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1839, ii, 397 sq.; *Jour. Sac. Lit.* April, 1859; April, 1860. The best map of the region where the passage of the Red Sea was effected is Linant's, in the Atlas of the official surveys for the Suez Canal, entitled "*Percement de l'isthme de Suez*" (Paris, 1855 sq.). See WILDERNESS.

**Ex'odus** (Gr. Ἔξοδος, an exit; in the Hebrew canon מִצֵּי־הַיָּם, *ve-el'leh shemoth'*, its initial words, or simply מִצֵּי־הַיָּם; in the Masora to Gen. xxiv, 8 called מִצֵּי־הַיָּם, see Buxt. *Lex. Talm.* col. 1325; Vulg. *Exodus*), the second book of the law or Pentateuch, so called from the principal event recorded in it, namely, the departure of the Israelites from Egypt. See EXODE. With this book begins the proper history of that people, continuing it until their arrival at Sinai, and the erection of the sanctuary there.

I. *Contents*.—1. *Preparation for the Deliverance of Israel from their Bondage in Egypt*.—This first section (j, 1-xii, 36) contains an account of the following particulars: The great increase of Jacob's posterity in the land of Egypt, and their oppression under a new dynasty, which occupied the throne after the death of Joseph (ch. i); the birth, education, and flight of Moses (ch. ii); his solemn call to be the deliverer of his people (iii, 1-iv, 17), and his return to Egypt in consequence (iv, 18-31); his first ineffectual attempt to prevail upon Pharaoh to let the Israelites go, which only resulted in an increase of their burdens (v, 1-21); a farther preparation of Moses and Aaron for their office, together with the account of their genealogies (v, 22-vii, 7); the successive signs and wonders, by means of which the deliverance of Israel from the land of bondage is at length accomplished, and the institution of the Passover (vii, 8-xii, 36).

2. *Narrative of Events from the Departure out of Egypt to the Arrival of the Israelites at Mount Sinai*.—We have in this section (a) the departure and (mentioned in connection with it) the injunctions then given respecting the Passover and the sanctification of the first-born (xii, 37-xiii, 16); the march to the Red Sea, the passage through it, and the destruction of Pharaoh and his host in the midst of the sea, together with Moses's song of triumph upon the occasion (xiii, 17-xv, 21); (b) the principal events on the journey from the Red Sea to Sinai, the bitter waters at Marah, the giving of quails and of the manna, the observance of the Sabbath, the miraculous supply of water from the rock at Rephidim, and the battle there with

the Amalekites (xv, 22-xvii, 16); the arrival of Jethro in the Israelitish camp, and his advice as to the civil government of the people (xviii).

3. *The Solemn Establishment of the Theocracy on Mount Sinai*.—The people are set apart to God as "a kingdom of priests and a holy nation" (xix, 6); the ten commandments are given, and the laws which are to regulate the social life of the people are enacted (xxi, 1-xxiii, 19); an angel is promised as their guide to the Promised Land, and the covenant between God and Moses, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy elders, as the representatives of the people, is most solemnly ratified (xxiii, 20-xxiv, 18); instructions are given respecting the tabernacle, the ark, the mercy-seat, the altar of burnt-offering, the separation of Aaron and his sons for the priest's office, the vestments which they are to wear, the ceremonies to be observed at their consecration, the altar of incense, the laver, the holy oil, the selection of Bezaleel and Aholiab for the work of the tabernacle, the observance of the Sabbath and the delivery of the two tables of the law into the hands of Moses (xxv, 1-xxxi, 18); the sin of the people in the matter of the golden calf, their rejection in consequence, and their restoration to God's favor at the intercession of Moses (xxxii, 1-xxxiv, 35); lastly, the construction of the tabernacle, and all pertaining to its service in accordance with the injunctions previously given (xxxv, 1-xl, 38).

This book, in short, gives a sketch of the early history of Israel as a nation: and the history has three clearly marked stages. First we see a nation enslaved; next a nation redeemed; lastly a nation set apart, and through the blending of its religious and political life, consecrated to the service of God. The close literary connection between the books of Genesis and Exodus is clearly marked by the Hebrew conjunctive particle וְ (*etw*), "and," with which the latter begins, and still more by the recapitulation of the name of Jacob's sons who accompanied him to Egypt, abridged from the fuller account in Gen. xli, 8-17. Still the book of Exodus is not a continuation in strict chronological sequence of the preceding history; for a very considerable interval is passed over in silence, saving only the remark, "And the children of Israel were fruitful and increased abundantly, and multiplied, and waxed exceedingly mighty; and the land was filled with them" (Exod. i, 7). The premission of all that concerned Israel during this period and their intercourse with the Egyptians, instead of being an indication, as Rationalists allege, of the fragmentary character of the Pentateuch, only shows the sacred purpose of the history, and that, in the plan of the writer, considerations of a merely political interest were entirely subordinate to the divine intentions already partially unfolded in Genesis, and to be still farther developed in the course of the present narrative regarding the national constitution of the seed of Abraham.

II. *Unity*.—According to Von Lengerke (*Kenaan*, lxxxviii, xc), the following portions of the book belong to the original or Elohist document: Chap. i, 1-14; ii, 23-25; vi, 2-vii, 7; xii, 1-28, 37, 38, 40-51 (xiii, 1, 2, perhaps); xvi; xix, 1; xx; xxv-xxxi; xxxv-xl. Stähelin (*Krit. Unterss.*) and De Wette (*Einleitung*) agree in the main with this division. Knobel, the most recent writer on the subject, in the introduction to his commentary on Exodus and Leviticus, has sifted these books still more carefully, and with regard to many passages has formed a different judgment. He assigns to the Elohist: i, 1-7, 13, 14; ii, 23-25, from מִצֵּי־הַיָּם, vi, 2-vii, 7; except vi, 8; vii, 8-13, 19-22; viii, 1-3, 11 from יָלַד, and 12-15; ix, 8-12 and 35; xi, 9, 10; xii, 1-23, 28, 37 a, 40-42, 43-51; xiii, 1, 2, 20; xiv, 1-4, 8, 9, 15-18 (except בַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה אֵלֶי in ver. 15, and אֵלֶּי יִבְטַח in ver. 16), 21-23, and 26-29 (except מִיָּדָם in ver. 27 from יָיִשָׁב); xv, 19, 22, 23, 27; xvi, 1, 2, 9-26, 31-

36; xvii, 1; xix, 2 a; xxv-xxxi, 11, 12-17 in the main; xxxv, 1-xl, 38.

A mere comparison of the two lists of passages selected by these different writers as belonging to the original document is sufficient to show how very uncertain all such critical processes must be. The first, that of Lengerke, is open to many objections, which have been urged by Hävernick (*Einleit. in der Pent.* § 117), Ranke, and others. Thus, for instance, vi, 6, which all agree in regarding as Elohistie, speaks of "great judgments" (גְּדוּלֹת שְׁפָטִים גדולים in the plural), wherewith God would redeem Israel, and yet not a word is said of these in the so-called original document. Again, xii, 12, 23, 27 contains the announcement of the destruction of the first-born of Egypt, but the fulfilment of the threat is to be found, according to the critics, only in the later Jehovistic additions. Hupfeld has tried to escape this difficulty by supposing that the original documents did contain an account of the slaying of the first-born, as the institution of the Passover in xii, 12, etc., has clearly a reference to it: only he will not allow that the story as it now stands is that account. But even then the difficulty is only partially removed, for thus *one* judgment only is mentioned, not *many* (vi, 6). Knobel has done his best to obviate this glaring inconsistency. Feeling no doubt that the ground taken by his predecessors was not tenable, he retains as a part of the original work much which they had rejected. It is especially worthy of notice that he considers some at least of the miraculous portions of the story to belong to the older document, and so accounts for the expression in vi, 6. The changing of Aaron's rod into a serpent, of the waters of the Nile into blood, the plague of frogs, of mosquitoes (A. V. lice), and of boils, and the destruction of the first-born, are, according to Knobel, Elohistie. He points out what he considers here links of connection, and a regular sequence in the narrative. He bids us observe that Jehovah always addresses Moses, and that Moses directs Aaron how to act. The miracles, then, are arranged in order of importance: first there is the sign which serves to accredit the mission of Aaron; next follow three plagues, which, however, do not touch men, and these are sent through the instrumentality of Aaron; the fourth plague is a plague upon man, and here Moses takes the most prominent part; the fifth and last is accomplished by Jehovah himself. Thus the miracles increase in intensity as they go on. The agents likewise rise in dignity. If Aaron with his rod of might begins the work, he gives way afterwards to his greater brother, whilst for the last act of redemption Jehovah employs no human agency, but himself with a mighty hand and outstretched arm effects the deliverance of his people. The passages thus selected have no doubt a sort of connection, but it is in the highest degree arbitrary to conclude that because portions of a work may be omitted without seriously disturbing the sense, these portions do not belong to the original work, but must be regarded as subsequent embellishments and additions.

Again, all agree in assigning chaps. iii and iv to the Jehovist. The call of Moses, as there described, is said to be merely the Jehovistic parallel to vi, 2-vii, 7. Yet it seems improbable that the Elohist should introduce Moses with the bare words, "And God spake to Moses" (vi, 2), without a single word as to the previous history of so remarkable a man. So argues Hävernick, and, as it appears to us, not without reason. It will be observed that none of these critics attempt to make the divine names a criterion whereby to distinguish the several documents. Thus, in the Jehovistic portion (i, 15-22), De Wette is obliged to remark, with a sort of uneasy candor, "but ver. 17, 20, *Elohim* (?)," and again (iii, 4, 6, 11-15), "here seven times *Elohim*." In other places there is the same difficulty as in xix, 17, 19, which Stähelin, as well as Knobel, gives to the

Jehovist. In the passages in chaps. vii, viii, ix, which Knobel classes in the earlier record, the name Jehovah occurs throughout. It is obvious, then, that there must be other means of determining the relative antiquity of the different portions of the book, or the attempt to ascertain which are earlier and which are later must entirely fail.

Accordingly, certain peculiarities of style are supposed to be characteristic of the two documents. Thus, for instance, De Wette (*Einl.* § 151, S. 183) appeals to חָסִים הָיָה בְּעַצְמָם ה' הוּזָהוּ, i, 7; פָּרַח וְרִבְבָה יְדִדְבָר יְרָ אֶל מֹשֶׁה לְאָמַר בְּרִיחַ, vi, 4; xxv, i; xxx, 11, etc.; צְבָאוֹת, vi, 26; vii, 4; xii, 17, 41, 51; בֵּין הַתְּרַבִּים, xii, 6; xxix, 41; xxx, 8, and other expressions, as decisive of the Elohist. Stähelin also proposes on very similar grounds to separate the first from the second legislation. "Wherever," he says, "I find mention of a pillar of fire, or of a cloud (Exod. xxxiii, 9, 10), or an 'angel of Jehovah,' as Exod. xxiii, xxiv, or the phrase 'flowing with milk and honey,' as Exod. xiii, 5; xxxiii, 3 . . . where mention is made of a coming down of God, as Exod. xix, xxxiv, 5, or where the Canaanitish nations are numbered, or the tabernacle supposed to be without the camp (Exod. xxxiii, 7), I feel tolerably certain that I am reading the words of the author of the second legislation (i. e. the Jehovist)." But these nice critical distinctions are very precarious, especially in a stereotyped language like the Hebrew.

Unfortunately, too, dogmatical prepossessions have been allowed some share in the controversy. De Wette and his school chose to set down everything which savored of a miracle as proof of later authorship. The love of the marvellous, which is all they see in the stories of miracles, according to them could not have existed in an earlier and simpler age. But on their own hypothesis this is a very extraordinary view; for the earlier traditions of a people are not generally the least wonderful, but the reverse; and one cannot thus acquit the second writer of a *design* in embellishing his narrative. However, this is not the place to argue with those who deny the possibility of a miracle, or who make the narration of miracles proof sufficient of later authorship. Into this error Knobel, it is true, has not fallen. By admitting some of the plagues into his Elohistie catalogue, he shows that he is at least free from the dogmatic prejudices of critics like De Wette. But his own critical tests are not conclusive. And the way in which he cuts verses to pieces, as in viii, 11, and xiii, 15, 16, 27, where it suits his purpose, is so completely arbitrary, and results so evidently from the stern constraint of a theory, that his labors in this direction are not more satisfactory than those of his predecessors.

On the whole, there seems much reason to doubt whether critical acumen will ever be able plausibly to distinguish between the original and the supplement in the book of Exodus. There is nothing indeed forced or improbable in the supposition either that Moses himself incorporated in his memoirs ancient tradition, whether oral or written, or that a writer later than Moses made use of materials left by the great legislator in a somewhat fragmentary form. There is an occasional abruptness in the narrative, which suggests that this may possibly have been the case, as in the introduction of the genealogy, vi, 13-27. The remarks in xi, 3; xvi, 35, 36, lead to the same conclusion. The apparent confusion at xi, 1-3 may be explained by regarding these verses as parenthetical. Inasmuch, however, as there exists no definite proof or knowledge of any later editor, except it be Joshua or Ezra, to whom isolated and unimportant additions may be attributed, we are not warranted in attributing the book to any other author than Moses. See PENTATEUCH.

III. *Credibility*.—Almost every historical fact mentioned in Exodus has at some time or other been called

in question; but it is certain that all investigation has hitherto only tended to establish the veracity of the narrator. A comparison with other writers and an examination of the monuments confirm, or at least do not contradict, the most material statements of this book. Thus, for instance, Manetho's story of the Hyksos, questionable as much of it is, and differently as it has been interpreted by different writers, points at least to some early connection between the Israelites and the Egyptians, and is corroborative of the fact implied in the Pentateuch that, at the time of the Israelitish sojourn, Egypt was ruled by a foreign dynasty. See EGYPT. Manetho speaks, too, of strangers from the East who occupied the eastern part of Lower Egypt; and his account shows that the Israelites had become a numerous and formidable people. According to Exod. xii, 37, the number of men, besides women and children, who left Egypt was 600,000. This would give for the whole nation about two millions and a half. There is no doubt some difficulty in accounting for this immense increase, if we suppose (as on many accounts seems probable) that the actual residence of the children of Israel was only 215 years. We must remember, indeed, that the number who went into Egypt with Jacob was considerably more than "threescore and ten souls" [see CRYPTOLOGY]; we must also take into account the extraordinary fruitfulness of Egypt (concerning which all writers are agreed—Strabo, xv, 478; Aristot. *Hist. Anim.* vii, 4; Pliny, *H. N.* vii, 3; Seneca, *Qu. Nat.* iii, 25, quoted by Hävernick), and especially of that part of it in which the Israelites dwelt; and, finally, we must take into the account the "mixed multitude" that accompanied the Israelites (Exod. xii, 38).

According to De Wette, the story of Moses's birth is mythical, and arises from an attempt to account etymologically for his name. But the beautiful simplicity of the narrative places it far above the stories of Romulus, Cyrus, and Semiramis, with which it has been compared (Knobel, p. 14). As regards the etymology of the name, there can be very little doubt that it is Egyptian (from the Copt. *mo*, "water," and *si*, "to take"), and if so, the author has merely played upon the name. But this does not prove that the whole story is nothing but a myth. Philology as a science is of very modern growth, and the truth of history does not stand or fall with the explanation of etymologies. The same remark applies to De Wette's objection to the etymology in ii, 22.

Other objections are of a very arbitrary kind. Thus Knobel thinks the command to destroy the male children (i, 15 sq.) extremely improbable, because the object of the king was not to destroy the people, but to make use of them as slaves. To require the midwives to act as the enemies of their own people, and to issue an injunction that every son born of Israelitish parents should be thrown into the Nile, was a piece of downright madness of which he thinks the king would not be guilty. But we do not know that the midwives were Hebrew; they may have been Egyptian; and kings, like other slave-owners, may act contrary to their interest in obedience to their fears or their passions; indeed, Knobel himself compares the story of king Bochoris, who commanded all the unclean in his land to be cast into the sea (Lysim. ap. Josephus, c. *Apion.* i, 34), and the destruction of the Spartan helots (Plutarch, *Lycorg.* 28). He objects further that it is not easy to reconcile such a command with the number of the Israelites at their exode. But we suppose that in very many instances the command of the king would be evaded, and probably it did not long continue in force.

Again, De Wette objects to the call of Moses that he could not have thus formed the resolve to become the saviour of his people, which, as Hävernick justly remarks, is a dogmatical, not a critical decision.

It has been alleged that the place, according to the

original narrative, where God first appeared to Moses was Egypt, God making himself known as Jehovah, that being the first intimation of the name (Exod. vi, 2). Another account, it is further alleged, places the scene at Horeb (ch. iii, 2), God appearing as the God of the patriarchs (ver. 6), and declaring his name Jehovah (ver. 14); while a third makes Midian the scene of the interview (ch. iv, 19). These assumptions require no refutation. It need only be remarked that the name Jehovah in ch. vi, 2 necessarily presupposes the explanation given of it in chap. iii, 14. Further, Moses's abode in Midian, and connection with Jethro, were matters, Knobel affirms, quite unknown to the older writer, while his statement that Moses was eighty years old when he appeared before Pharaoh (chap. vii, 7), is declared irreconcilable with the supplementary narrative which represents him as a young man at the time of his flight from Egypt (ch. ii, 11), and a son by Zipporah, whom he married probably on his arrival in Midian, is still young when he returned to Egypt (ch. iv, 20, 25; xviii, 2). There can be no question that from Moses's leaving Egypt till his return thither a considerable time elapsed. It is stated in Exod. ii, 23 as "many days," and by Stephen (Acts vii, 30) as forty years. But it is not necessary to suppose that his abode in Midian extended over the whole of that period. The expression *וַיֵּשֶׁב*, "he sat down," or settled (Exod. ii, 15), may only point to Midian as the end of his wanderings; or if otherwise, his marriage need not have followed immediately on his arrival, or there may have been a considerable interval between the birth of his two sons. The silence, indeed, of this part of the narrative regarding the birth of the second son may possibly be referrible to this circumstance, more probably indicated, however, by the different feelings of the father as expressed in the names Gershom and Eliezer (ch. ii, 22; xviii, 4). The order of these names is perplexing to expositors who conceive that the first thoughts of the fugitive would have been thankfulness for his safety, and that only afterwards would spring up the feelings of exile. But if the name Eliezer was bestowed in connection with the preparation to return to Egypt, and particularly with the intimation "all the men are dead which sought thy life" (ch. iv, 19), the whole is strikingly consistent. Another instance of the alleged discrepancies is that, according to one account, Moses's reception from his brethren was very discouraging (chap. vi, 9), whereas the other narrative describes it as quite the reverse (ch. iv, 31). De Wette calls this a striking contradiction, but it is only such when the intermediate section (ch. v, 19-23), which shows the change that in the interval had occurred in the prospects of the Israelites, is violently ejected from the narrative—a process fitted to produce contradictions in any composition. See MOSES.

The only alleged anachronism of importance in this book is the remark relative to the continuance of the manna (chap. xvi, 35), which would seem to extend it beyond the time of Moses, particularly when compared with Josh. v, 11, 12, according to which the manna ceased not until after the passage of the Jordan. But, as remarked by Hengstenberg, it is not of the cessation of the manna that the historian here writes, but of its continuance. Besides, "forty years" must be taken as a round number, for the manna, strictly speaking, lasted about one month less (ch. xvi, 1). See MANNA.

The ten plagues are physically, many of them, what might be expected in Egypt, although in their intensity and in their rapid succession they are clearly supernatural. Even the order in which they occur is an order in which physical causes are allowed to operate. The corruption of the river is followed by the plague of frogs. From the dead frogs are bred the gnats and flies; from these came the murrain among the cattle

and the boils on men; and so on. Most of the plagues, indeed, though of course in a much less aggravated form, and without such succession, are actually experienced at this day in Egypt. Of the plague of locusts it is expressly remarked that "before them were no such locusts, neither after them shall be such." And all travellers in Egypt have observed swarms of locusts, brought generally by a south-west wind (Denon, however, mentions their coming with an east wind), and in the winter or spring of the year. This last fact agrees also with our narrative. Lepsius speaks of being in a "regular snow-drift of locusts," which came from the desert in hundreds of thousands to the valley. "At the edge of the fruitful plain," he says, "they fell down in showers." This continued for six days, indeed in weaker flights much longer. He also saw *hail* in Egypt. In January, 1843, he and his party were surprised by a storm. "Suddenly," he writes, "the storm grew to a tremendous hurricane, such as I have never seen in Europe, and hail fell upon us in such masses as almost to turn day into night." He notices, too, an extraordinary cattle *murrain* "which carried off 40,000 head of cattle" (*Letters from Egypt*, Eng. transl. p. 49, 27, 14). See PLAGUES (OF EGYPT).

The institution of the Passover (ch. xii) has been subjected to severe criticism. This has also been called a mythic fiction. The alleged circumstances are not historical, it is said, but arise out of a later attempt to explain the origin of the ceremony and to refer it to the time of Moses. The critics rest mainly on the difference between the directions given for the observance of this the first, and those given for subsequent passovers. But there is no reason why, considering the very remarkable circumstances under which it was instituted, the first Passover should not have had its own peculiar solemnities, or why instructions should not then have been given for a somewhat different observance for the future. See PASSOVER.

In minor details the writer shows a remarkable acquaintance with Egypt. Thus, for instance, Pharaoh's daughter goes to the river to bathe. At the present day, it is true that only women of the lower orders bathe in the river. But Herodotus (ii, 35) tells us (what we learn also from the monuments) that in ancient Egypt the women were under no restraint, but apparently lived more in public than the men. To this must be added that the Egyptians supposed a sovereign virtue to exist in the Nile-waters. The writer speaks of chariots and "chosen chariots" (xiv, 7) as constituting an important element in the Egyptian army, and of the king as leading in person. The monuments amply confirm this representation. The Pharaohs lead their armies to battle, and the armies consist entirely of infantry and chariots. See CHARIOT.

As the events of this history are laid in Egypt and Arabia, we have ample opportunity of testing the accuracy of the Mosaic accounts, and surely we find nowhere the least transgression against Egyptian institutions and customs; on the contrary, it is most evident that the author had a thorough knowledge of the Egyptian institutions and of the spirit that pervaded them. Exodus contains a mass of incidents and detailed descriptions which have gained new force from the modern discoveries and researches in the field of Egyptian antiquities (comp. Hengstenberg, *Die Bücher Moses und Ägypten*, Berlin, 1841). The description of the passage of the Israelites through the desert also evinces such a thorough familiarity with the localities as to excite the utmost respect of scrupulous and scientific travellers of our own time for the authenticity of the Pentateuch (comp. *ex. gr.* Kaumer, *Der Zug der Israeliten aus Ägypten nach Canaan*, Leipz. 1837).

The arrangements of the tabernacle, described in the second part of Exodus, likewise throw a favorable light on the historical authenticity of the preceding events; and the least tenable of all the objections against it are, that the architectural arrangements of

the tabernacle were too artificial, and the materials and richness too costly and precious for the condition and position of the Jews at that early period, etc. But the critics seem to have overlooked the fact that the Israelites of that period were a people who had come out from Egypt, a people possessing wealth, Egyptian culture and arts, which we admire even now, in the works which have descended to us from ancient Egypt; so that it cannot seem strange to see the Hebrews in possession of the materials or artistic knowledge requisite for the construction of the tabernacle. Moreover, the establishment of a tent as a sanctuary for the Hebrews can only be explained from their abode in the desert, being in perfect unison with their then roving and nomadic life; and it is therefore a decided mistake in those critics who give to the sacred tent a later date than the Mosaic; while other critics (such as De Wette, Von Bohlen, Vatke) proceed much more consistently with their views by considering the narrative of the construction of a sacred tabernacle to be a mere fiction in Exodus, introduced for the purpose of ascribing to the Temple of Solomon a higher antiquity and authority. However, independently of the circumstance that the Temple necessarily presupposes the existence of a far older analogous sanctuary, the whole process of such a forced hypothesis is but calculated to strike out a portion from the Jewish history on purely arbitrary grounds.

The extremely simple and sober style and views throughout the whole narrative afford a sure guarantee for its authenticity and originality. Not a vestige of a poetical hand can be discovered in Exod. xviii; not even the most sceptical critics can deny that we tread here on purely historical ground. The same may fairly be maintained of ch. xx-xxiii. How is it then possible that one and the same book should contain so strange a mixture of truth and fiction as its opponents assert to be found in it? The most striking proofs against such an assumption are, in particular, the accounts, such as in Exod. xxxii sq, where the most vehement complaints are made against the Israelites, where the high-priest of the covenant-people participates most shamefully in the idolatry of his people. All these incidents are described in plain and clear terms, without the least vestige of later embellishments and false extolling of former ages. The Pentateuch, some critics assert, is written for the interest and in favor of the hierarchy; but can there be more anti-hierarchical details than are found in that book? The whole representation indicates the strictest impartiality and truth.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.; Fairbairn, s. v.

IV. The *authorship and date* of the book will be discussed under PENTATEUCH.

V. *Commentaries, etc.*—The following is a list of exegetical helps on the whole book, the most important being designated by an asterisk (\*) prefixed: Origen, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* ii, 110); *Selecta* (ib. ii, 121); also *Homilæ* (ib. ii, 129); Ephraem Syrus, *Explanatio* (in his *Opp.* iv, 194); Isidore, *Commentaria* (in his *Opp.*); Theodoret, *Questiones* (in his *Opp.* i, 1); Hugo à St. Victoire, *Adnotationes* (in his *Opp.* i); Aben-Esra, *Commentar.* (Prague, 1840, 8vo); Bede, *Explanatio* (in his *Opp.* iv); *Questiones* (ib. viii); Rupert, *In Exod.* (in his *Opp.* i, 150); Zuingle, *Adnotationes* (Tigurini, 1527); Brent, *Commentatio* (in his *Opp.* i); Ziegler, *Commentarii* (Basil. 1540, fol.); Phrygius, *Commentarius* (Tub. 1543, 4to); Lippoman, *Catena* (Par. 1550; Leyd. 1657, fol.); Chytraeus, *Enarrationes* (Vitemb. 1556, 1563, 1579, 8vo); Galasius, *Commentarius* (Genev. 1560, fol.); Strigel, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1566, 1572; Brem. 1585, 8vo); Simler, *Commentarius* (Tigur. 1584, 1605, fol.); Ystella, *Commentaria* (Rom. 1601, fol.); Pererius, *Disputationes* (Ingolst. 1601, 4to); \*Mechilta, *Commentarius* (in Ugolini *Theaurus*, xiv); Willet, *Conventio* (London, 1608, 1622, 2 vols. fol.); Rung, *Prolectiones* (Vitemb. 1614, 8vo); Babington, *Notes* (in *Works*, p.

165); Reuter, *Commentarius* (Francf. 1616, 4to); \*Rivet, *Commentarii* (L. B. 1634, 4to); Jackson, *Paraphrase* (in *Works*, ix, 384); De la Haye, *Commentarii* (Paris 1639, 1641, 2 vols. fol.); Lightfoot, *Cleanings* (London, 1643, 4to); Sylvius, *Commentarius* (Duac. 1644, 4to); Cartwright, *Adnotationes* (Lond. 1653, 8vo); Calixtus, *Erpösio* (Helmst. 1641, 1654, 4to); Cocceius, *Observationes* (in his *Opp.*, i, 136); Hughes, *Erposition* (Lond. 1672, fol.); \*Patriek, *Commentary* (Lond. 1697, 4to); Hagemann, *Betrachtungen* (Brunsw. 1738, 4to); Torellius, *Animalversiones* (Lips. 1746, 4to); Haitsma, *Commentarii* (Franc. 1771, 4to); Hopkins, *Notes* (London, 1784, 4to); à St. Cruce, *Hermeneia* (Heidell. 1787, 4to); \*Horsley, *Notes* (in *Bib. Criticism*, i, 47); Cockburn, *Credibility*, etc. (Lond. 1809, 8vo); \*Rosenmüller, *Scholia* (Lips. 1822, 8vo); Newham, *Illustrations* (Lond. n. d. 8vo); Vizard, *Commentary* (London, 1838, 12mo); Buddicom, *Exodus* (2d ed. Liverp. 1839, 2 vols. 12mo); Trower, *Sermons* (Lond. 1843, 8vo); Kitto, *Illustration* (*Daily Bible Illust.*, ii); \*Bush, *Notes* (N. Y. 1852, 2 vols. 12mo); Cumming, *Readings* (Lond. 1853, 8vo); \*Kalisch, *Commentary* (London, 1853, 8vo); Osburn, *Israel in Egypt* (London, 1856, 12mo); \*Knobel, *Erklärung* (Lpz. 1857, 8vo); Howard, *Notes* (Camb. 1857, 8vo); \*Keil and Delitzsch, *Comment.* (from their *Bibelwerk*, Edinb. 1864, 8vo); \*Lange, *Comment.* (in his *Bibelwerk*, ii, Lpz. 1864, 8vo); \*Murphy, *Comment.* (Edinb. 1866, Andov. 1868, 8vo). See OLD TESTAMENT.

**Exomologesis** (ἔξομολόγησις, *confession*). The word was used in the ancient Church to denote not only confession in words, but also the various acts required of penitents to give expression to sorrow for sin, and resolution of amendment.

1. It is common with Romanist writers, when "they meet with the word *exomologesis* in any of the ancient writers, to interpret it as private or auricular confession, such as is now practised in the communion of that Church, and imposed upon men as absolutely necessary to salvation. But they who, with greater judgment and ingenuity among themselves, have more narrowly considered the matter, make no scruple to confess that the *exomologesis* of the ancients signifies a quite different thing, viz. the whole exercise of public penance, of which public confession was a noted part. The learned Albaspinæus very strenuously sets himself to refute this error in the writers of his own party. Cardinal Bellarmine, says he (*Observatt.*, lib. ii, cap. 26), and Baronius, and Maldonat in his controversies, and Pamelius in his commentaries upon Tertullian and Cyprian, lay it down as a certain truth that the fathers generally take the word *exomologesis* for private and auricular confession; but, having long and accurately considered all the places where it is mentioned, I cannot come in to their opinion. The fathers, adds he, always use this word when they would describe the external rites of penance, viz. weeping, and mourning, and self-accusation, and other the like things, which penitents usually practised in the course of public penance" (Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.*, bk. xviii, ch. iii).

2. So anxious was the primitive Church to preserve the voluntary character of penance, that it was deemed unlawful to exhort or invite any one to submit to this kind of discipline. It was required that the offenders should seek it as a favor, and should supplicate for admission among the penitents. The following are the duties or burdens imposed upon them. Penitents of the first three classes—the mourners (*flentes*), the hearers (*audientes*), the kneelers or prostrators (*genuflectentes* or *substrati*)—were never allowed to stand during public prayers, but were obliged to kneel. Open and public confession before the whole church was to be made with lamentations, tears, and other expressions of grief, and these were to be often repeated. All ornaments of dress were to be laid aside, and all expressions of joy or pleasure to be abandoned. Male penitents were required to cut their hair and shave their beard in token of sorrow, and females

were to appear with their hair dishevelled, and wearing a veil. During the whole time of penance the candidates were required to abstain from bathing, feasting, and corporeal pleasures lawful at other times. They were forbidden to marry during this period of humiliation. In addition, they were obliged to be present at every religious ceremony, and to perform works of love and charity, particularly almsgiving. They were also expected to perform the office of the *parabolani* in visiting and relieving the sick and burying the dead (Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, bk. iv, ch. iv).

3. The greater litanies are sometimes termed *exomologeses*, confessions; because fasting, and weeping, and mourning, and confession of sins was usually joined with supplication to avert God's wrath and reconcile him to a sinful people (Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.*, bk. xiii, ch. i, § 11).

**Exorcism, Exorcist** (ἔξορκιστής, Acts xix, 13). I. In General.—The belief in dæmoniacal possessions, which may be traced in almost every nation, has always been attended by the professed ability, on the part of some individuals, to release the unhappy victims from their calamity. In Greece, men of no less distinction than both Epicurus (Diog. Laertius, x, 4) and Æschines were sons of women who lived by this art, and both were bitterly reproached, the one by the Stoics, and the other by his great rival orator Demosthenes (*De Cor.*), for having assisted their parents in these practices. In some instances this power was considered as a divine gift; in others it was thought to be acquired by investigations into the nature of dæmons and the qualities of natural productions, as herbs, stones, etc., and of drugs compounded of them, by the use of certain forms of adjurations, invocations, ceremonies, and other observances. Indeed, the various forms of exorcism, alluded to in authors of all nations, are innumerable, varying from the bloody human sacrifice down to the fumes of brimstone, etc. See SORCERY.

II. In the Old and New Testaments.—The verb ἔξορκίζω occurs once in the New Testament and once in the Sept. version of the Old Testament. In both cases it is used, not in the sense of *exorcise*, but as a synonym of the simple verb ὀρκίζω, to charge with an oath, to adjure. Compare Gen. xxiv, 3 (עָרַבְתִּיךָ, A. V. "I will make thee swear") with 37, and Matt. xxvi, 63 with Mark v, 7; and see 1 Thess. v, 27 (ἐνορκίζω, Lachmann, Tischendorf). The cognate noun, however, together with the simple verb, is found once (Acts xix, 13) with reference to the ejection of evil spirits from persons possessed by them (comp. ἔξορκωσις, ὀρκίζω, Josephus, *Ant.*, viii, 2, 5). The use of the term exorcists in that passage, as the designation of a well-known class of persons to which the individuals mentioned belonged, confirms what we know from other sources as to the common practice of exorcism amongst the Jews (see the Talm. *Babyl. Yoma*, fol. lviii, 1). That some, at least, of them not only pretended to, but possessed the power of exorcising, appears by our Lord's admission when he asks the Pharisees, "If I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your disciples (*υἱοί*) cast them out?" (*Matt.*, xii, 27). What means were employed by real exorcists we are not informed. David, by playing skilfully on a harp, procured the temporary departure of the evil spirit which troubled Saul (1 Sam. xvi, 23). The power of expelling dæmons Josephus places among the endowments of Solomon, and relates that he *l fl behind him* the manner of using exorcisms by which they drive away dæmons (for the pretended fragments of these books, see Fabricius, *Cod. Pseud. Vet. Test.*, p. 1054). He declares that he had seen a man, named Eleazar, releasing people that were dæmoniacal, in the presence of Vespasian, his sons, captains, and the whole multitude of his soldiers. He describes the manner of cure thus: "He put a ring that had a *root* of one of those sorts mentioned by Solomon to the nos-

trils of the *dæmoniac*; after which he drew out the *dæmon* through his nostrils, and when the man fell down he adjured him to return no more, making still mention of Solomon and reciting the incantations he composed." He further adds, that when Eleazar would persuade and demonstrate to the spectators that he had such a power, he set a cup or basin full of water a little way off, and commanded the *dæmon* as he went out of the man to overturn it, and thereby to let the spectators know he had left the man (*Ant.* viii, 2, 5). He also describes the mode of obtaining the root *baaras*, which, he says, "if it be only brought to sick persons, it quickly drives away the *dæmons*," under circumstances which, for their strangeness, may vie with any prescription in the whole science of exorcism (*War*, vii, 6, 3). Among all the references to exorcism, as practised by the Jews, in the New Testament (*Matt.* xii, 27; *Mark* ix, 38; *Luke* ix, 49, 50), we find only one instance which affords any clew to the means employed (*Acts* xix, 13); from which passage it appears that certain professed exorcists took upon them to call over a *dæmoniac* the name of the Lord Jesus, saying, "We adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preacheth." Their proceeding seems to have been in conformity with the well-known opinions of the Jews in those days, that miracles might be wrought by invoking the names of the Deity, or angels, or patriarchs, etc., as we learn from Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Origen, etc., and Lucian (*Frag.* p. 141). The epithet applied in the above text to these exorcists (*περιοχόμενοι*, Vulgate, *circumvenientes Judæi*) indicates that they were travelling mountebanks, who, besides skill in medicine, pretended to the knowledge of magic. Justin Martyr has an interesting suggestion as to the possibility of a Jew successfully exorcising a devil, by employing the name of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (*Dial. cum Tryph.* c. 85, p. 311, C. See also *Apol.* II, c. 6, p. 45, B, where he claims for Christianity superior but not necessarily exclusive power in this respect. Compare the statements of Irenæus, *adv. Hæres.* ii, 5, and the authorities quoted by Grotius on *Matt.* xii, 27). But Justin goes on to say that the Jewish exorcists, as a class, had sunk down to the superstitious rites and usages of the heathen (*comp.* Pliny, xxx, 2). See *DEMON*.

The power of casting out devils was bestowed by Christ while on earth upon the apostles (*Matt.* x, 8), and the seventy disciples (*Luke* x, 17-19), and was, according to his promise (*Mark* xvi, 17), exercised by believers after his ascension (*Acts* xvi, 18); but to the Christian miracle, whether as performed by our Lord himself or by his followers, the N.-T. writers never apply the terms "exorcise" or "exorcist." Nor is the office of the exorcist mentioned by Paul in his enumeration of the miraculous gifts (*1 Cor.* xii, 9). Mosheim says that the particular order of exorcists did not exist till the close of the third century, and he ascribes its introduction to the prevalent fancies of the Gnostics (*cent.* iii, 11, c. 4). We notice Jahn's remark upon the *silence* of John himself in his gospel on the subject of possessions, although he introduces the *Jews* as speaking in the customary way respecting *dæmons* and *dæmoniacal* possessions, and although he often speaks of the sick who were healed by the Saviour; coupled with the fact that John wrote his gospel in Asia Minor, where *medical science* was very flourishing, and where it was generally known that the diseases attributed to *dæmons* were merely natural diseases (Jahn, *Archæol.* I, ii, 232, 477-480; see also Lomeirus, *De Vet. Gent. Lustra.*; Bekker, *Le Monde enchanté*; Van Dale, *De divinât. idol.* c. vi, p. 519 sq.; Annell, *Diss. ad loc. in Actis*, Upsal. 1758).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

III. *In the early Church.*—1. As Christians were supposed to be in constant conflict with the devil, they used not only prayer, but also *exorcism*, which was held to be a power given to the Church. Thus Tertullian (A. D.

220), speaking of the warfare of the Christian soldier (*De Corona Milit.* c. 11) with *dæmons*, says *exorcismis fugavit* (he routs them with exorcisms). So in his *Apologeticus* (c. 23) he says that the "evil spirit will confess himself to be a *dæmon* when commanded to speak by any Christian" (*Jussus a quolibet Christiano*). So also Origen, *cont. Celsum*, lib. vi, *ἰδιῶτα τὸ τοιοῦτον πᾶρτρουαι* (the common unlettered people do the same). "Oh, could you but hear," says Cyprian (*Ep.* 76), "and see those *dæmons* when they are tortured by us, and afflicted with spiritual chastisement and *vehal* anguish, and thus ejected from the bodies of the possessed (*obsessorum*), moaning and lamenting with human voice, through the power divine, as they feel the rods and stripes they confess the judgment to come. The exorcists rule with commanding right over the whole army of the insolent adversary. Oftentimes the devil promises to depart, but departs not; but when we come to baptism, then indeed we ought to be assured and confident, because the *dæmon* is then oppressed, and the man is consecrated to God and liberated." The invocation of Christ, attended by the sign of the cross, and pronounced by persons formally appointed to the office, was the method by which those stupendous effects were usually produced; and one among the many evils which proceeded from this absurd practice was an opinion, which gained some prevalence among the less enlightened converts, that the object of Christ's mission was to emancipate mankind from the yoke of their invisible enemy, and that the promised *redemption* was nothing more than a sensible liberation from the manifest influence of evil spirits" (*Waddington, Church History*, ch. xliii). The *Apostolical Constitutions*, viii, 26, says: "An exorcist is not appointed, for the prize pertaineth to voluntary goodness and the grace of God, through Christ, by the influence of the Holy Spirit; for he who hath received the gift of healing is declared by revelation from God, the grace that is in him being manifest unto all. But if there be need of him for a bishop, or presbyter, or deacon, he is appointed accordingly." Thus it appears (1) that the power of casting out devils was held to exist in the Church; (2) that as late as the third century it was not held to belong exclusively to the clergy, but to the whole Church, or at least to some among the laity. The use of exorcism seems to have been at first confined to the case of persons "possessed with devils," *ἐνεργούμενοι*, who were given into the care of persons set apart for the purpose (*Cyprian, Epist.* 75, 76). See *ENERGUMENS*. But Cyprian also speaks here of baptismal exorcism (see below).

2. *Exorcists.*—A special order of exorcists arose as early as the third century. Before that time, although, as has been seen, the power of exorcising was held to be a spiritual gift common to all classes in the Church, it yet appears to have been chiefly exercised by the clergy. On the date of the rise of the order of exorcists, and of their ordination and office, Bingham (*Orig. Eccles.* bk. iii, ch. iv) speaks as follows: "I take Bona's opinion to be the truest, that it came in upon the withdrawing (*Rerum Liturg.* lib. i, c. xxv, note. 17) of that extraordinary and miraculous power, which probably was by degrees, and not at the same time in all places. Cornelius (*ap. Euseb.* lib. vi, c. xliii), who lived in the third century, reckons exorcists among the inferior orders of the Church of Rome; yet the author of the *Constitutions*, who lived after him, says it was no certain order (*Constit. Apost.* lib. viii, c. xxvi), but God bestowed the gift of exorcising as a free grace upon whom he pleased; and therefore, consonant to that hypothesis, there is no rule among those *Constitutions* for giving any ordination to exorcists, as being appointed by God only, and not by the Church. But the credit of the *Constitutions* is not to be relied upon in this matter; for it is certain by this time exorcists were settled as an order in most parts of the Greek Church, as well as the Latin; which is evident from



the Council of Antioch, A.D. 341, in one of whose canons (*Conc. Antioch. c. x*) leave is given to the *chorepiscopi* to promote subdeacons, readers, and exorcists, which argues that those were then all standing orders of the Church. After this exorcists are frequently mentioned among the inferior orders by the writers of the fourth century, as in the Council of Laodicea (*Conc. Laodic. c. xxiv and xxvi*), Epiphanius (*Expos. Fid. note 21*), Paulinus (*Natal. iv, S. Felicis.*), Sulpicius Severus (*Vit. S. Martin. c. v*), and the Rescripts of Theodosius (*Cod. Theodos. lib. xii, tit. i, De Decurione Leg. 121*), and Gratian (*id. ib. lib. xvi, tit. ii, De Episc. Leg. 24*) in the Theodosian Code, where those emperors grant them the same immunities from civil offices as they do to the other orders of the clergy. Their ordination and office is thus described by the fourth Council of Carthage (*Conc. Carth. iv, c. vii: Exorcista quum ordinator, accipiat de manu episcopi libellum, in quo scripti sunt exorcismi, dicente sibi episcopo: Accipe et commenda memorie, et habeto potestatem imponendi manus super energumenum, sive baptizatum, sive catechumenum*): "When an exorcist is ordained, he shall receive at the hands of the bishop a book, wherein the forms of exorcising are written, the bishop saying, Receive thou these and commit them to memory, and have thou power to lay hands upon the energumens, whether they be baptized or only catechumens." These forms were certain prayers, together with adjurations in the name of Christ, commanding the unclean spirit to depart out of the possessed person, which may be collected from the words of Paulinus concerning the promotion of St. Felix to this office, where he says (*Natal. iv, S. Felicis. : Primis lector servivit in annis, inde gradum cepit, cui munus voce fidei adjurare malos, et sacris pellere verbis*), from a reader he arose to that degree whose office was to adjure evil spirits, and to drive them out by certain holy words. It does not appear that they were ordained to this office by any imposition of hands either in the Greek or Latin Church; but yet no one might pretend to exercise it either publicly or privately, in the church or in any house, without the appointment of the bishop, as the Council of Laodicea directs (*Conc. Laod. c. xxvi*); or at least the license of a *chorepiscopus*, who in that case was authorized (*Concil. Antiochen. cap. x*) by the bishop's deputation."

3. *Exorcism in Baptism.*—In the third century (at least after the Council of Carthage, A.D. 256) we find exorcism used in the catechumenate in preparation for baptism, and also as part of the ordinary ceremony of baptism. Riddle (*Christian Antiquities, bk. iv, ch. ii*) gives the following view of its origin: "Baptism, as the sacrament of the Holy Ghost, contributes to deliver men from the power of Satan and evil spirits; and hence it appears expedient and right at the reception of that rite to renounce the devil and his works. And when the number of candidates for baptism was multiplied from among the heathen, who are spoken of in Scripture as in a peculiar sense sinners (Gal. ii, 15), and who were regarded as being especially under the power of the prince of darkness, it seemed more particularly needful that admission into the Gospel Church—the kingdom of heaven—should be preceded by a formal abjuration of all heathen and superstitious practices or worship; in one word, by a renunciation of Satan. Such appears to be the most natural and simple account of the origin of exorcism at baptism in the Christian Church. Justin Martyr, the first uninspired writer who describes Christian baptism, knew nothing of this practice, although he was not unacquainted with the custom of exorcising evil spirits in the case of persons possessed. Tertullian, however, treats expressly of this matter, and says that the practice of renouncing the devil on occasion of baptism is founded not on Scripture, but on tradition (*De Corona Mil. c. iii*). Cyprian also treats of baptismal exorcism (*Ep. lxxvi, ad Magn.*). At first, indeed, this cere-

mony was confined to a renunciation of 'the devil and all his works' on the part of the person about to be baptized; and it was not until the fourth century that a form of abjuration by the officiating minister, commanding the evil spirit to depart from the new servant of Christ, was brought into use. And hence it is that some writers, making a distinction between the renunciation (*ἀπορρηγή*, *abrenuntiatio*) and exorcism (*ἐξορκισμός*), contend that the practice of exorcism was altogether unknown until the fourth, or, as others say, the seventh century. The fact, however, appears to be, that these customs are substantially one and the same, differing only in form. And the true state of the case with respect to baptismal exorcism appears to be as follows: 1. In the first century we find no trace of a renunciation of the devil in baptism. 2. In the second and third centuries this practice was in use, as appears from the testimonies of Tertullian and Cyprian, as well as of later writers who appeal to tradition. 3. In the fourth century the fathers speak of exorcism as not being highly expedient, inasmuch as, without it, children would not be free from the influence of evil spirits (Optat. Milev. *De Schism. Donat. lib. iv, c. vi*; Basil. M. *De Spiritu Sancto, c. xxxvii*; Gregor. Naz. *Orat. xl*). We find mention of baptismal exorcism also in the canons of the Council of Carthage held in the year 256, and those of the first Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381. The exorcists, who were concerned at first only with the energumens, or persons possessed, were afterwards called upon to assist at the baptism of all adults; but, as infant baptism gained ground, the duties of this office became superfluous, and they are very rarely mentioned in works posterior to the sixth century."

Cyril of Jerusalem († 386) gives a somewhat detailed account of the form of exorcism. The ceremonies used were: 1. Preliminary fasting, prayers, and genuflections. These, however, may be regarded as general preliminaries to baptism. 2. Imposition of hands upon the head of the candidate, who stood with his head bowed down in a submissive posture. 3. Putting off the shoes and clothing, with the exception of an under garment. 4. Facing the candidate to the west, which was the symbol of darkness, as the east was of light. In the Eastern Church he was required to thrust out his hand towards the west, as if in the act of pushing away an object in that direction. This was a token of his abhorrence of Satan and his works, and his determination to resist and repel them. 5. A renunciation of Satan and his works thus: 'I renounce Satan and his works, and his pomps and his services, and all things that are his.' This or a similar form was thrice repeated. 6. The exorcist then breathed upon the candidate either once or three times, and adjured the unclean spirit in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to come out of him. This form of adjuration seems not to have been in use until the fourth century; and these several formalities were apparently introduced gradually and at different times. The whole ceremony was at first confined to the renunciation of 'the devil and his works' on the part of the person about to be baptized (Coleman, *Christian Antiquities, ch. xiv, § 9*; Riddle. *l. c.*).

IV. *Roman Catholic Church.*—In the Roman Catholic Church exorcists constitute one of the four minor orders of the clergy—acolytes, exorcists, readers, porters (*Council of Trent, sess. xxiii, chap. ii, of Orders*). When initiating the exorcist the bishop gives him a book containing the exorcisms (or the Missal), and says, "*Accipe et commenda memorie, et habeto potestatem imponendi manus super energumenum, sive baptizatum sive catechumenum*" (Take this and commit it to memory, and have power to impose hands on persons possessed, be they baptized or catechumens). Every candidate for priests' orders in the Roman Church first receives the four lower orders, including that of exorcist. The process of exorcising water for baptism is

given under BAPTISM (vol. i, p. 650, col. 2). Children are regarded as belonging to the devil until baptized, and the priest or assisting exorcist blows out the evil spirit by the breath (*exsufflation*), and also breathes on the child again (*insufflation*), as a symbol of the gift of the Spirit. So the *Rituale*: "Sacerdos exsufflat ter in faciem catechumeni, semel dicens: Exi ab eo (ea), spiritus immunde, et da locum Spiritui Sancto Paraclyto. Hic in modum crucis halet in faciem ipsius dicit: Accipe Spiritum bonum per istam insufflationem, et Dei benedictionem. † Pax tibi." In cases where the priest is to practise exorcism on a person supposed to be "possessed of the devil," he is to prepare himself specially by prayer, fasting, confession, and mass. The ceremony may be performed in the church, or, if the sufferer be ill, at his house; but there must always be witnesses present. "Here, arrayed in robe, cope, and a blue stole, he first sprinkles the subject with holy water, and, kneeling down, prays the All Saints' litany, the Lord's prayer, and Psalm liii, *Deus in nomine tuo* (in our version Psalm liv); then two prayers in which, making the sign of the cross over the patient, he commands the evil spirit to depart, by the mysteries of the incarnation, the suffering and death, the resurrection and ascension of Christ, the sending of the Spirit, and the coming again to judgment. Thereupon follows the lesson from John i, *In principio erat Verbum*, with Mark xvi, 15-18, and Luke x, 17-19. Then he lays both hands upon the head of the exorcism, saying, 'Ecce crucem Domini: fugite partes adverse: viciit leo de tribu Juda,' and the prayer follows, with the proper formula of exorcism (*Exorcizo te, immunde spiritus*, etc.): 'I exorcise thee, unclean spirit, in the name of Jesus Christ; tremble, O Satan! thou enemy of the faith, thou foe of mankind, who hast brought death into the world, who hast deprived men of life, and hast rebelled against justice; thou seducer of mankind, thou root of all evil, thou source of avarice, discord, and envy', the priest meanwhile making three crosses, in the name of the Trinity, on the brow and breast of the possessed person. If the evil spirit does not depart, all these ceremonies must be repeated. In regard to the *exorcism of things*, the view of St. Paul, that every creature of God, used with thanksgiving, is good, stands true at all times. But in consequence of the curse, which the first sin brought upon all nature, the Church of Rome exorcises beforehand things designed for sacred use, such as the *water* and *salt* required for holy water. Beasts also, horses, fields, and fruits, are so treated, more frequently in the Greek Church than in the Roman' (Herzog, *Encyclopaedia*, Bombarger's transl., i, 255). When a house is infested with evil spirits the priest is sent for, who, on his arrival, sprinkles the place plentifully with holy water, repeats some prayers, and then pronounces the form of exorcism, whereupon, it is supposed, the devils depart. Should they again return the ceremony of exorcism is repeated, and again if necessary, until at length the Church proves itself victorious over the powers of hell (*Encycl. Metropolitana*; see also Jeremy Taylor, *Dissuasive from Popery*, § 9, for an account of the forms of exorcism; and the copious collection entitled *Thesaurus exorcismorum atque conjurationum terribilium, potentissimorum, efficacissimorum cum practica probatissima: quibus spiritus maligni, demones maleficeque omnia de corporibus humanis obsessis, tanquam flagellis fustibusque fugantur, expelluntur, doctrinis re-jertissimus atque uberrimus*, Coloniae, 1628, 8vo).

V. The Greek Church also continues the order of exorcists and the practice of exorcism. The exorcism of catechumens is designated *ἀφορκισμός*, and it is thrice administered in making a catechumen (see Eulogion, *cap. εἰχὴ εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι κατηχούμενον*). Exorcism is also practised upon the baptism of infants. The priest, having received the child at the church door, marks him with the sign of the cross on the forehead, then carries him to the font, where, before his

immersion, he is exorcised. The ancient forms are preserved with very little change in modern use. Three forms are employed, which may be found in Schmitt, *Morgenländ.-griech.-russische Kirche* (Mainz, 1826, p. 141). In Assemani, *Codex Liturg.* ii, 318 sq., may be found twenty-one forms for exorcising the devil and all evil spirits. In Metrophanis Critopuli *Confessio* (1661), cap. vii, *de Ecclesia*, is the statement that baptism must be performed with prayers and exorcisms (*μετὰ εὐχῶν καὶ ἔξορκισμῶν*); also (*ἔχορευεν δὲ ἔξορκισμὸν παρὰ τῶν ἀρχαίων πατέρων θανησιῶς συνθεμίονον*) "we have forms of exorcism admirably prepared by the ancient fathers;" and in cap. xi, *de Sacerdotio*, he states the duty of the exorcists to be "to exorcise the catechumens and catechize them" (see Kimmel, *Monum. Fid. Eccles. Orient.* (Jena, 1840, 8vo).

VI. In *Protestant Churches*.—Luther approved of exorcism. In his *Taufbüchlein* he preserved the spirit of the Roman Catholic form of renunciation of the devil. He did not consider it as essential, but as very useful to "remind the people earnestly of the power of sin and the devil." The immediate successors of Luther adopted his views, and they were generally diffused in Saxony, Würtemberg, and the other strongly Lutheran parts of Germany (Siegel, *Alterthümer*, ii, 64; Wiedenfeld, *De Exorcismi Origine*, etc., Marburg, 1824). In 1583 Heshusius wrote in favor of abolishing its use. Justus Menius, in a treatise *Vom Exorcismo*, 1590, advocated its retention. Calvin (*Instit.* iv, 12, 19), speaking of the "wax taper" and "exorcism" as used by the Romanists in baptism, says, "I am not ignorant of the ancient origin of this adventitious medley, yet it is lawful for me, and for all the faithful, to reject everything that men have presumed to add to the institution of Christ." In the Swedish Church, when the Augsburg Confession was proclaimed anew at the Council of Upsala, 1593, exorcism was retained, in its milder expressions, "as a free ceremony, on account of its utility as an admonition to the audience looking on at the baptism" (Ranke, *History of the Papacy*, i, 11, Austin's transl., Edinb. 1851, 2 vols. 8vo). Zuinglius agreed with Calvin in rejecting exorcism, and from the beginning the Reformed Church was disinclined to it. The question became a sort of test between Lutherans and Calvinists. In the Crypto-Calvinistic struggles the question of exorcism played a part, and one of the accusations against Nicolas Crell (q. v.) was that he "sought to extirpate exorcism from the Church, to its great injury (see Boehmer, *Jus. Eccl. Protest.* iii, 843). Among later Lutheran theologians, Gerhard, Quenstedt, and Hollaz place it among things indifferent; Baur, Baumgarten, and Reinhard urge its abolition. From Reinhard's time it has gradually become obsolete in the Lutheran Church. Since 1822 the "High" Lutherans have attempted to revive its use.

In the *Church of England*.—In the first liturgy of Edward VI, a form of exorcism at baptism is given. The priest, looking upon the children, was to say, "I command thee, unclean spirit, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, that thou come out and depart from these infants, whom our Lord Jesus Christ has vouchsafed to call to his holy baptism, to be made members of his body and of his holy congregation. Therefore, thou accursed spirit, remember thy sentence, remember thy judgment, remember the day to be at hand wherein thou shalt burn in fire everlasting, prepared for thee and thy angels; and presume not henceforth to exercise any tyranny towards these infants whom Christ hath bought with his precious blood, and, by his holy baptism, calleth to be of his flock." See BAPTISM. Ducer's remonstrance against the indiscriminate use of the form of exorcism, on the ground that it would be uncharitable to suppose that all were demoniacs who came to be baptized, was listened to by the Reformers; for in their revision of the *Prayer-book*, in the 5th and 6th of Edward VI, they de-

ceded on omitting it altogether. The seventy-second canon of the Church of England forbids any minister attempting to expel a devil or devils, under pain of the imputation of imposture, and cozenage, and deposition from the ministry, except he first obtains the license of the bishop of his diocese, had under his hand and seal (Wheatly, *On Common Prayer*, chap. vii, § 2). In the form of baptism used in the Church of England, the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the Protestant Episcopal Church, the question is put to the candidate, "Dost thou renounce the devil and all his works?" etc. This is a remnant of the old form of renunciation (connected with the exorcism at the baptism of catechumens), but of exorcism itself there is nothing in their formularies.

*Literature.*—See, besides the works already cited, Suicer, *Theaurus*, s. v. ἀφορισμός, ἔξορκισμός; Stolle, *De Origine Exorcismi in Baptismo*; Augusti, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, vii, 268 sq.; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.*, Bohu's ed., i, 435; ii, 110 sq.; Augusti, *Christl. Archaeologie*, ii, 427 sq.; iii, 402; Ferraris, *Promta Bibliotheca*, iii, 927 sq.; Kraft, *Ausführ. Hist. von Exorcismo* (Hamburg, 1750, 8vo); Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism*, bk. ii, ch. xv; Procter, *On Common Prayer*, p. 365.

**Exordium.** See HOMILETICS; SERMON.

**Expectancy** (Lat. *expectantia*, *expectiva*, *gratia expectativa*) in canon law, the name of a prospective claim to an ecclesiastical benefice which has not yet become vacant. At first the German emperors granted expectancies for the first place in every chapter that became vacant after their accession to the throne (*Jus prius precis*). After the eleventh century the popes granted expectancies at first in the shape of a request, and subsequently in the shape of an order. The expectancy was either for a definite benefice, or for any benefice of a certain class or chapter. The third Council of Lateran (1179), and later papal rescripts, forbade the expectancies, but the popes themselves continued to grant them. They were again restricted by the Council of Constance, and forbidden by the Council of Basel. The Council of Trent totally abolished them, except in cases of bishops and monastic superiors, to whom, in some specified cases, a coadjutor, with the right of succession, was given. In the Protestant state churches the princes have claimed the right to grant expectancies.—*Allgem. Real-Encykl.* i, 622; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* iv, 292. (A. J. S.)

**Expectation Week**, the time between Ascension Day and Whitsunday, the period during which the apostles tarried at Jerusalem in expectation of the fulfilment of the Master's promise as to the outpouring of the Comforter.—Procter, *On Common Prayer*, p. 289.

**Expediency**, fitness of means to ends. On expediency as the ground of morals, see Dwight, *Theology*, ser. xcix; Robert Hall, *Complete Works*, i, 96; ii, 295; *Lit. and Theol. Review*, iv, 358; Wayland, in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1843, p. 301; and the article ETHICS.

**Experience** (δοκιμή, Rom. v, 4, "proof," as elsewhere rendered), approval of integrity as the result of trial. "The three stages of ὑπομονή, endurance, δοκιμή, approval, and ἔλπις, hope, are considered by the apostle as proceeding from the sufferings; the first denoting the state of moral earnestness implied in patient and faithful endurance, the second that state of approval as genuine which thence results, and bears within it hope as its blossom" (Olshausen, *Comment.* in loc.).

**EXPERIENCE.** I. *In Philosophy.*—"Experience, in its strict sense, applies to what has occurred within a person's own knowledge. Experience, in this sense, of course relates to the past alone. Thus it is that a man knows by experience what sufferings he has undergone in some disease, or what height the tide reached at a certain time and place. More frequently the word is used to denote that judgment which is de-

rived from experience in the primary sense, by reasoning from that in combination with other data. Thus a man may assert, on the ground of experience, that he was cured of a disorder by such a medicine—that that medicine is generally beneficial in that disorder; that the tide may always be expected, under such circumstances, to rise to such a height. Strictly speaking, none of these can be known by experience, but are conclusions from experience. It is in this sense only that experience can be applied to the future, or, which comes to the same thing, to any general fact; as, e. g. when it is said that we know by experience that water exposed to a certain temperature will freeze" (Wheatly, *Logic*, app. i).

Locke (*Essay on Human Understand.* bk. ii, ch. i) assigns experience as the only and universal source of human knowledge. "Whence hath the mind all the materials of reason and knowledge? To this I answer, in one word, from experience; in that all our knowledge is founded, and from that ultimately derives itself. Our observation, employed either about external sensible objects, or about the internal operations of our minds, perceived and reflected on by ourselves, is that which supplies our understanding with all the materials of thinking. These are the fountains of knowledge from whence all the ideas we have, or can naturally have, do spring—that is, sensation and reflection." In opposition to this view, according to which all human knowledge is *à posteriori*, or the result of experience, it is contended that man has knowledge *à priori*—knowledge which experience neither does nor can give, and knowledge without which there could be no experience, inasmuch as all the generalizations of experience proceed and rest upon it. "No accumulation of experiments whatever can bring a general law home to the mind of man, because, if we rest upon experiments, our conclusion can never logically pass beyond the bounds of our premises; we can never infer more than we have proved; and all the past, which we have not seen, and the future, which we cannot see, is still left open, in which new experiences may arise to overturn the present theory. And yet the child will believe at once upon a single experiment, as having been once burned by fire. Why? Because a hand divine has implanted in him the tendency to generalize this rapidly. Because he does it by an instinct of which he can give no account, except that he is so formed by his Maker" (Sewell, *Christian Mor.* ch. xxiv). "We may have seen one circle and investigated its properties, but why, when our individual experience is so circumscribed, do we assume the same relations of all? Simply because the understanding has the conviction intuitively that similar objects will have similar properties; it does not acquire this idea by sensation or custom; the mind develops it by its own intrinsic force—it is a law of our faculties, ultimate and universal, from which all reasoning proceeds" (Dr. Mill, *Essays*, p. 337).—Fleming, *Vocabulary of Philosophy*, s. v.

II. *In Religion.*—(1.) Knowledge gained by trial or practice. "A man unacquainted with those spiritual changes in the mind which are mentioned in the Scripture can form no notion of them. He may have some idea of the possibility of the changes called the new birth, sanctification, etc., but he does not understand their nature; they are foolishness to him. Nothing is more common with unregenerate persons than to ridicule as enthusiastic religious experience. But if the constitution of human nature is considered, it will be seen that man has emotions as well as intellect. His passions are original parts of his mental constitution, and must be exercised in religion. They cannot be destroyed. However beautiful religion may be as a theory, its excellency and energy can only be displayed as experienced. Hence the Bible employs the analogous terms *tasting*, *feeling*, to indicate the internal enjoyment of a Christian. He has peace through

believing. He joys in God, through whom he has received the atonement. The love of God is shed abroad in his heart. He is conscious that he is a new creature" (Farrar, *Bibl. Dict.* s. v.). "That our experience is always absolutely pure in the present state cannot be expected; but if it be genuine, it will not fail, through the exercise of Christian diligence, to become more and more pure. The main point, therefore, is to guard well against mistaking the illusions of the imagination for the operation of divine truth on the conscience and the heart (1 Thess. ii, 13). See AFFECTIONS. (2.) The most valuable things are most apt to be counterfeited. But Christian experience may be considered as genuine, 1. When it accords with the revelation of God's mind and will, or what he has revealed in his word. Anything contrary to this, however pleasing, cannot be sound, or produced by divine agency. 2. When its tendency is to promote humility in us; that experience by which we learn our own weakness, and to subdue pride, must be good. 3. When it teaches us to hear with others, and to do them good. 4. When it operates so as to excite us to be ardent in our devotion, and sincere in our regard to God. A powerful experience of the divine favor will lead us to acknowledge the same, and to manifest our gratitude both by constant praise and genuine piety. (3.) Christian experience, however, may be abused. There are some good people who certainly have felt and enjoyed the power of religion, and yet have not always acted with prudence as to their experience. 1. Some boast of their experiences, or talk of them as if they were very extraordinary; whereas, were they acquainted with others, they would find it not so. That a man may make mention of his experience is no way improper, but often useful; but to hear persons always talking of themselves seems to indicate a spirit of pride, and that their experience cannot be very deep. 2. Another abuse of experience is dependence on it. We ought certainly to take encouragement from past circumstances if we can; but if we are so dependent on past experience as to preclude present exertions, or always expect to have exactly the same assistance in every state, trial, or ordinance, we shall be disappointed. God has wisely ordered it that, though he never will leave his people, yet he will suspend or bestow comfort in his own time; for this very reason, that we may rely on him, and not on the circumstance or ordinance. 3. It is an abuse of experience when introduced at improper times and before improper persons. It is true, we ought never to be ashamed of our profession; but to be always talking to irreligious people respecting experience, which they know nothing of, is, as our Saviour says, casting pearls before swine" (Buck, *Theol. Dict.* s. v.).—Buck, *Treatise on Experience*; Gurnall, *Christian Armor*; Edwards, *On the Affections*; Doddridge, *Rise and Progress*; Wesley, *Sermons*.

EXPERIENCE, Hume's argument from. See HUME; MIRACLE.

**Experience Meetings** are assemblies of religious persons, who meet for the purpose of relating their experience to each other. They are sometimes called covenant and conference meetings, and, in the Methodist Church, *class-meetings* (q. v.). "It has been doubted by some whether these meetings are of any great utility, and whether they do not, in some measure, force people to say more than is true, and puff up those with pride who are able to communicate their ideas with facility; but to this it has been answered, 1. That the abuse of a thing is no proof of the evil of it. 2. That the most eminent saints of old did not neglect this practice (Psa. lvi, 16; Mal. iii, 16). 3. That by a wise and prudent relation of experience the Christian is led to see that others have participated of the same joys and sorrows with himself; he is excited to love and serve God; and animated to perseverance in

duty by finding that others, of like passions with himself, are zealous, active, and diligent. 4. That the Scriptures seem to enjoin the frequent intercourse of Christians for the purpose of strengthening each other in religious services (Heb. x, 24, 25; Col. iii, 16; Matt. xviii, 20)" (Buck, *Theol. Dictionary*, s. v.). See CLASS-MEETINGS.

**Expiation, JEWISH DAY OF ANNUAL** (Lev. xvi, 1-34; comp. xxiii, 26, 29; Numb. xxix, 7-11), a solemn fast (Acts xxvii, 9; Philo, *Opp.* ii, 206, 296, 591; Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 16, 4) and holy day (יְוֹם הַכִּפּוּרִים, Lev. xvi, 31; xxiii, 32), held from the evening of the 9th till that of the 10th day of the 5th month, Tisri, five days before the feast of Tabernacles. The modern Mohammedan fast called "Ramadan," held during an entire (lunar) month, has sometimes been referred to as having its analogies; likewise the fast of Isis among the ancient Egyptians (Herod. iv, 186; comp. ii, 40), and the Hindu fast-day "Sandrajonon," etc. See FASTER.

**EXPIATION**, "a religious act, by which satisfaction or atonement is made for the commission of some crime, the guilt done away, and the obligation to punishment cancelled. The chief methods of expiation among the Jews were by sacrifices; and it is important always to recollect that the Levitical sacrifices were of an expiatory character; because as among the Jews sacrifices were unquestionably of divine original, and as the terms taken from them are found applied so frequently to Christ and to his sufferings in the New Testament, they serve to explain that peculiarity under which the apostles regarded the death of Christ, and afford additional proof that it was considered by them as a sacrifice of expiation, as the grand universal sin-offering for the whole world. For our Lord is announced by John as 'the Lamb of God;' and that not with reference to meekness or any other moral virtue, but with an accompanying phrase, which would communicate to a Jew the full sacrificial sense of the term employed, 'the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.' He is called 'our Passover, sacrificed for us.' He is said to have given 'himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God, for a sweet-smelling savor.' As a priest, it was necessary 'he should have somewhat to offer;' and he offered 'himself,' 'his own blood,' to which is ascribed the washing away of sin, and our eternal redemption. He is declared to have 'put away sin by the sacrifice of himself,' to have 'by himself purged our sins,' to have 'sanctified the people by his own blood,' to have 'offered to God one sacrifice for sins.' Add to these, and to innumerable other similar expressions and allusions, the argument of the apostle in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which, by proving at length that the sacrifice of Christ was superior in efficacy to the sacrifices of the law, he most unequivocally assumes that the death of Christ was a sacrifice and sin-offering; for without that it would no more have been capable of comparison with the sacrifices of the law, than the death of John the Baptist, St. Stephen, or St. James, all martyrs and sufferers for the truth, who had recently sealed their testimony with their blood. This very comparison, we may affirm, is utterly unaccountable and absurd on any hypothesis which denies the sacrifice of Christ; for what relation could his death have to the Levitical immolations and offerings if it had no sacrificial character? Nothing could, in fact, be more misleading, and even absurd, than to apply those terms which, both among Jews and Gentiles, were in use to express the various processes and means of atonement and peculiar propitiation, if the apostles and Christ himself did not intend to represent his death strictly as an expiation for sin—misleading, because such would be the natural and necessary inference from the terms themselves, which had acquired this as their established meaning; and absurd, because if, as Socinians say, they used them

metaphorically, there was not even an ideal resemblance between the figure and that which it was intended to illustrate. So totally irrelevant, indeed, will those terms appear to any notion entertained of the death of Christ which excludes its expiatory character, that to assume that our Lord and his apostles used them as metaphors is profanely to assume them to be such writers as would not in any other case be tolerated; writers wholly unacquainted with the common rules of language, and therefore wholly unfit to be teachers of others, and that not only in religion, but in things of inferior importance.

2. "The use of such terms, we have said, would not only be wholly absurd, but criminally misleading to the Gentiles, as well as to the Jews, who were first converted to Christianity. To them the notion of propitiatory offerings, offerings to avert the displeasure of the gods, and which expiated the crimes of offenders, was most familiar, and terms corresponding to it were in constant use. The bold denial of this by Dr. Priestly might well bring upon him the reproof of archbishop Magee, who, after establishing this point from the Greek and Latin writers, observes, 'So clearly does their language announce the notion of a propitiatory atonement, that if we would avoid an imputation on Dr. Priestly's fairness, we are driven, of necessity, to question the extent of his acquaintance with those writers.' The reader may consult the instances given by this writer in No. 5 of his 'Illustrations,' appended to his 'Discourses on the Atonement;' and also the tenth chapter of Grotius's *De Satisfactione*, whose learning has most amply illustrated and firmly settled this view of the heathen sacrifices. The use to be made of this in the argument is, that as the apostles found the very terms they used with reference to the nature and efficacy of the death of Christ fixed in an expiatory signification among the Greeks, they could not, in honesty, use them in a distant figurative sense, much less in a contrary one, without giving their readers due notice of their having invested them with a new import. From *ἄγος*, a *pollution*, an *impurity*, which was to be expiated by sacrifice, are derived *ἀγνίζω* and *ἀγιάζω*, which denote the act of expiation; *καθαίρω*, too, to *purify*, *cleanse*, is applied to the effect of expiation; and *ἱλάσκομαι* denotes the method of propitiating the gods by sacrifice. These, and other words of similar import, are used by the authors of the Septuagint, and by the evangelists and apostles; but they give no premonition of using them in any strange and altered sense; and when they apply them to the death of Christ, they must, therefore, be understood to use them in their received meaning. In like manner the Jews had their expiatory sacrifices, and the terms and phrases used in them are, in like manner, employed by the apostles to characterize the death of their Lord; and they would have been as guilty of misleading their Jewish as their Gentile readers had they employed them in a new sense, and without warning, which, unquestionably, they never gave.

3. "As to the expiatory nature of the sacrifices of the law, it is not required by the argument to show that *all* the Levitical offerings were of this character. There were also offerings for persons and for things prescribed for purification, which were identical; but even they grew out of the leading notion of expiatory sacrifice, and that legal purification which resulted from the forgiveness of sins. It is enough to prove that the grand and eminent sacrifices of the Jews were strictly expiatory, and that by them the offenders were released from punishment and death, for which ends they were appointed by the lawgiver. When we speak, too, of vicarious sacrifice, we do not mean either, on the one hand, such a substitution as that the victim should bear the same quantum of pain and suffering as the offender himself; or, on the other hand, that it was put in the place of the offender as a mere symbolical act, by which he confessed his desert of punish-

ment; but *substitution made by divine appointment*, by which the victim was exposed to sufferings and death instead of the offender, in virtue of which the offender himself was released. With this view, one can scarcely conceive why so able a writer as archbishop Magee should prefer to use the term 'vicarious import' rather than the simple and established term 'vicarious,' since the Antinomian notion of substitution may be otherwise sufficiently guarded against, and the phrase 'vicarious import' is certainly capable of being resolved into that figurative notion of mere symbolical action, which, however plausible, does in fact deprive the ancient sacrifices of their *typical*, and the oblation of Christ of its *real* efficacy. Vicarious acting is acting for another; vicarious suffering is suffering for another; but the nature and circumstances of that suffering in the case of Christ are to be determined by the doctrine of Scripture at large, and not wholly by the term itself, which is, however, useful for this purpose (and therefore to be preserved), that it indicates the sense in which those who use it understand the declaration of Scripture, 'Christ died for us,' so as that he died not merely for our *benefit*, but *in our stead*; in other words, that, but for his having died, those who believe in him would personally have suffered that death which is the penalty of every violation of the law of God.

4. "That sacrifices under the law were expiatory and vicarious admits of abundant proof. The chief objections made to this doctrine are, (1.) That under the law, in all capital cases, the offender, upon legal proof or conviction, was doomed to die, and that no sacrifice could exempt him from the penalty. (2.) That in all lower cases to which the law had not attached capital punishment, but pecuniary mulcts, or personal labor or servitude upon their non-payment, this penalty was to be strictly executed, and none could plead any privilege for exemption on account of sacrifice; and that when sacrifices were ordained with a pecuniary mulct, they are to be regarded in the light of *fine*, one part of which was paid to the state, the other to the Church. This was the mode of argument adopted by the author of *The Moral Philosopher*, and nothing of weight has been added to these objections since his day. Now much of this may be granted without any prejudice to the argument, and, indeed, is no more than the most orthodox writers on this subject have often remarked. The law under which the Jews were placed was at once, as to them, both a moral and a political law; and the lawgiver excepted certain offences from the benefit of pardon, because that would have been exemption from temporal death, which was the state penalty. He therefore would accept no atonement for such transgressions. Blasphemy, idolatry, murder, and adultery were the 'presumptuous sins' which were thus exempted; and the reason will be seen in the political relation of the people to God; for, in refusing to exempt them from punishment in this world, respect was had to the order and benefit of society. Running parallel, however, with this political application of the law to the Jews as subjects of the theocracy, we see the authority of the moral law kept over them as men and creatures; and if these 'presumptuous sins' of blasphemy and idolatry, of murder and adultery, and a few others, were the only capital crimes considered politically, they were not the only capital crimes considered morally; that is, there were other crimes which would have subjected the offender to death but for this provision of expiatory oblations. The true question, then, is whether such sacrifices were appointed by God, and accepted instead of the personal punishment or life of the offender, which otherwise would have been forfeited, as in the other cases; and, if so, if the life of animal sacrifices was accepted instead of the life of man, then the notion that 'they were mere mulcts and pecuniary penalties' falls to the ground, and the vicarious nature of most of the Levitical oblations is established. That other

offences besides those above mentioned were capital, that is, exposed the offender to death, is clear from this, that all offences against the law had this capital character. As death was the sanction of the commandment given to Adam, so any one who transgressed any part of the law of Moses became guilty of death; every man was 'accursed,' that is, devoted to die, who 'continued not in all things written in the book of the law.' 'The man only that doeth these things shall live by them' was the rule; and it was, therefore, to redeem the offenders from this penalty that sacrifices were appointed. So, with reference to the great day of expiation, we read, 'For on that day shall the priest make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that you may be clean from all your sins; and this shall be an everlasting statute unto you, to make an atonement for the children of Israel for all their sins once a year' (Lev. xvi, 30-34).

5. "To prove that this was the intention and effect of the annual sacrifices of the Jews, we need do little more than refer to Lev. xvii, 10, 11: 'I will set my face against that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people. For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul.' Here the blood which is said to make an atonement for the soul is the blood of the victims; and to make an atonement for the soul is the same as to be a ransom for the soul, as will appear by referring to Exod. xxx, 12-16; and to be a ransom for the soul is to avert death. 'They shall give every man a ransom for his soul unto the Lord, that there be no plague among them,' by which their lives might be suddenly taken away. The 'soul' is also here used obviously for the life; the blood, or the life of the victims in all sacrifices, was substituted for the life of man, to preserve him from death, and the victims were therefore vicarious.

6. "The Hebrew word *כִּפּוּר*, rendered *atonement*, signifying primarily *to cover, to overspread*, has been the subject of some evasive criticisms. It comes, however, in the secondary sense, to signify atonement or propitiation, because the effect of that is to cover, or, in Scripture meaning, to remit offences. The Septuagint also renders it by *ἱλαστικόν*, *to appease, to make propitious*. It is used, indeed, where the means of atonement are not of the sacrificial kind; but these instances equally serve to evince the Scripture sense of the term, in cases of transgression, to be that of reconciling the offended deity by averting his displeasure, so that when the atonement for sin is said to be made by sacrifice, no doubt can remain that the sacrifice was strictly a sacrifice of propitiation. Agreeably to this conclusion, we find it expressly declared, in the several cases of piacular oblations for transgression of the divine commands, that the sins for which atonement was made by those oblations should be forgiven.

7. "As the notion that the sacrifices of the law were not vicarious, but mere mulcts and fines, is overturned by the general appointment of the blood to be an atonement for the souls, the forfeited lives, of men, so also is it contradicted by particular instances. Let us refer to Lev. vi, 15, 16: 'If a soul commit a trespass, and sin through ignorance in the holy things of the Lord, he shall make amends for the harm that he hath done in the holy thing, and shall add a fifth part thereto, and shall give it to the priest.' Here, indeed, is the proper fine for the trespass; but it is added, 'He shall bring for his trespass unto the Lord a ram without blemish, and the priest shall make atonement for him with the ram of the trespass offering, and it shall be forgiven him.' Thus, then, so far from the sacrifice being the fine, the fine is distinguished from it, and with the ram only was the atonement made to the Lord for his trespass. Nor can the ceremonies with

which the trespass and sin offerings were accompanied agree with any notion but that of their vicarious character. The worshipper, conscious of his trespass, brought an animal, his own property, to the door of the tabernacle. This was not a eucharistical act; not a memorial of mercies received, but of sins committed. He laid his hands upon the head of the animal, the symbolical act of transferring punishment, then slew it with his own hand, and delivered it to the priest, who burned the fat and part of the animal upon the altar; and, having sprinkled part of the blood upon the altar, and in some cases upon the offerer himself, poured the rest at the bottom of the altar. And thus, we are told, 'The priest shall make an atonement for him as concerning his sin, and it shall be forgiven him.' So clearly is it made manifest by these actions, and by the description of their nature and end, that the animal bore the punishment of the offender, and that by this appointment he was reconciled to God, and obtained the forgiveness of his offences.

8. "An equally strong proof that the life of the animal sacrifice was accepted in the place of the life of man is afforded by the fact that atonement was required by the law to be made, by sin offerings and burnt offerings, for even bodily distempers and disorders. It is not necessary to the argument to explain the distinctions between these various oblations, nor yet to inquire into the reason for requiring propitiation to be made for corporal infirmities, which in many cases could not be avoided. They were, however, thus connected with sin as the cause of all these disorders; and God, who had placed his residence among the Israelites, insisted upon a perfect ceremonial purity, to impress upon them a sense of his moral purity, and the necessity of purification of mind. Whether these were the reasons, or some others not at all discoverable by us, all such unclean persons were liable to death, and were exempted from it only by animal sacrifices. This appears from the conclusion to all the Levitical directions concerning the ceremonial to be observed in all such cases: 'Thus shall ye separate the children of Israel from their uncleanness; that they die not in,' or by, 'their uncleanness, which they defile my tabernacle which is among them' (Lev. xv, 31). So that, by virtue of the sin offerings, the children of Israel were saved from a death which otherwise they would have suffered from their uncleanness, and that by substituting the life of the animal for the life of the offerer. Nor can it be urged that death is in these instances threatened only as the punishment of not observing these laws of purification; for the reason given in the passage just quoted shows that the threatening of death was not hypothetical upon their not bringing the prescribed purification, but is grounded upon the fact of 'defiling the tabernacle of the Lord which was among them,' which is supposed to be done by all uncleanness, as such, in the first instance.

9. "As a farther proof of the vicarious character of the principal sacrifices of the Mosaic economy we may instance those stately offered for the whole congregation. Every day were offered two lambs, one in the morning and the other in the evening, 'for a continual burnt offering.' To these daily victims were to be added weekly two other lambs for the burnt offering of every Sabbath. None of these could be considered in the light of fines for offences, since they were offered for no particular person, and must be considered, therefore, unless resolved into an unmeaning ceremony, piacular and vicarious. To pass over, however, the monthly sacrifices, and those offered at the great feasts, it is sufficient to fix upon those, so often alluded to in the Epistle to the Hebrews, offered on the solemn anniversary of expiation. On that day, to other prescribed sacrifices, were to be added another ram for a burnt offering, and another goat, the most eminent of the sacrifices for a sin offering, whose blood was to be carried by the high-priest into the inner sanctuary,

which was not done by the blood of any other victim, except the bullock, which was offered the same day as a sin offering for the family of Aaron. The circumstances of this ceremony, whereby atonement was to be made 'for all the sins' of the whole Jewish people, are so strikingly significant that they deserve a particular detail. On the day appointed for this general expiation the priest is commanded to offer a bullock and a goat as sin offerings, the one for himself and the other for the people; and, having sprinkled the blood of these in due form before the mercy seat, to lead forth a second goat, denominated 'the scape-goat;' and, after laying both his hands upon the head of the scape-goat, and confessing over him all the iniquities of the people, to put them upon the head of the goat, and to send the animal, thus bearing the sins of the people, away into the wilderness; in this manner expressing, by an action which cannot be misunderstood, that the atonement, which, it is affirmed, was to be effected by the sacrifice of the sin offering, consisted in removing from the people their iniquities by this translation of them to the animal. For it is to be remarked that the ceremony of the scape-goat is not a distinct one: it is a continuation of the process, and is evidently the concluding part and symbolical consummation of the sin offering; so that the transfer of the iniquities of the people upon the head of the scape-goat, and the bearing them away into the wilderness, manifestly imply that the atonement effected by the sacrifice of the sin offering consisted in the transfer and consequent removal of those iniquities.

10. "How, then, is this impressive and singular ceremonial to be explained? Shall we resort to the notion of mulets and fines? If so, then this and other stated sacrifices must be considered in the light of penal enactments. But this cannot agree with the appointment of such sacrifices annually in succeeding generations: 'This shall be a statute forever unto you.' The law appoints a certain day in the year for expiating the sins both of the high-priest himself and of the whole congregation, and that for all high-priests and all generations of the congregation. Now, could a law be enacted inflicting a certain penalty, at a certain time, upon a whole people, as well as upon their high-priest, thus presuming upon their actual transgression of it? The sacrifice was also for sins in general; and yet the penalty, if it were one, is not greater than individual persons were often obliged to undergo for single trespasses. Nothing, certainly, can be more absurd than this hypothesis. Shall we account for it by saying that sacrifices were offered for the benefit of the worshipper, but exclude the notion of expiation? But here we are obliged to confine the benefit to reconciliation and the taking away of sins, and that by the appointed means of the shedding of blood, and the presentation of blood in the holy place, accompanied by the expressive ceremony of imposition of hands upon the head of the victim; the import of which act is fixed, beyond all controversy, by the priests confessing over that victim the sins of all the people, and at the same time imprecating upon its head the vengeance due to them (Lev. xvi, 21). Shall we content ourselves with merely saying that this was a symbol? But the question remains, Of what was it the symbol? To determine this, let the several parts of the symbolic action be enumerated. Here is confession of sin; confession before God at the door of the tabernacle; the substitution of a victim; the figurative transfer of sins to that victim; the shedding of blood, which God appointed to make atonement for the soul; the carrying the blood into the holiest place, the very permission of which clearly marked the divine acceptance; the bearing away of iniquity; and the actual reconciliation of the people to God. If, then, this is symbolical, it has nothing very correspondent with it; it never had or can have anything correspondent to it but the sacrificial death of Jesus Christ, and the com-

munication of the benefits of his passion in the forgiveness of sins to those that believe in him, and in their reconciliation with God. Shall we, finally, say that those sacrifices had respect, not to God, to obtain pardon by expiation, but to the offerer, teaching him moral lessons, and calling forth moral dispositions? We answer that this hypothesis leaves many of the essential circumstances of the ceremonial wholly unaccounted for. The tabernacle and temple were erected for the residence of God by his own command. There it was his will to be approached, and to these sacred places the victims were required to be brought. Anywhere else they might as well have been offered, if they had had respect only to the offerer; but they were required to be brought to God, to be offered according to a prescribed ritual, and by an order of men appointed for that purpose. Now truly there is no reason why they should be offered in the sanctuary rather than in any other place, except that they were offered to the Inhabitant of the sanctuary; nor could they be offered in his presence without having respect to him. There were some victims whose blood, on the day of atonement, was to be carried into the inner sanctuary; but for what purpose can we suppose the blood to have been carried into the most secret place of the divine residence, except to obtain the favor of him in whose presence it was sprinkled? To this we may add that the reason given for these sacred services is not in any case a mere moral effect to be produced upon the minds of the worshippers; they were 'to make atonement,' that is, to avert God's displeasure, that the people might not 'die.'

11. "We may find, also, another more explicit illustration in the sacrifice of the passover. The sacrificial character of this offering is strongly marked; for it was an offering brought to the tabernacle; it was slain in the sanctuary, and the blood was sprinkled upon the altar by the priests. It derives its name from the passing over and sparing of the houses of the Israelites, on the door-posts of which the blood of the immolated lamb was sprinkled, when the first-born in the houses of the Egyptians were slain; and thus we have another instance of life being spared by the instituted means of animal sacrifice. Nor need we confine ourselves to particular instances. 'Almost all things,' says an apostle, who surely knew his subject, 'are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood there is no remission.' Thus, by their very law, and by constant usage, were the Jews familiarized to the notion of expiatory sacrifice, as well as by the history contained in their sacred books, especially in Genesis, which speaks of the vicarious sacrifices offered by the patriarchs; and in the book of Job, in which that patriarch is said to have offered sacrifices for the supposed sins of his sons; and where Eliphaz is commanded, by a divine oracle, to offer a burnt-offering for himself and his friends, 'lest God should deal with them after their folly.'

12. "On the sentiments of the uninspired Jewish writers on this point, the substitution of the life of the animal for that of the offerer, and, consequently, the expiatory nature of their sacrifices, Outram has given many quotations from their writings, which the reader may consult in his work on Sacrifices. Two or three only may be adduced by way of specimen. R. Levi ben-Gerson says, 'The imposition of the hands of the offerers was designed to indicate that their sins were removed from themselves and transferred to the animal.' Isaac ben-Arama; 'He transfers his sins from himself, and lays them upon the head of the victim.' R. Moses ben-Nachman says, with respect to a sinner offering a victim, 'It was just that his blood should be shed, and that his body should be burned; but the Creator, of his mercy, accepted the victim from him as his substitute and ransom, that the blood of the animal might be shed instead of his blood—that is, that the blood of the animal might be given for his life.'

13. "Full of these ideas of vicarious expiation, then, the apostles wrote and spoke, and the Jews of their time heard and read, the books of the New Testament. The Socinian pretence is, that the inspired penmen used the sacrificial terms which occur in their writings figuratively; but we not only reply, as before, that they could not do this honestly unless they had given notice of this new application of the established terms of the Jewish theology; but, if this be assumed, it leaves us wholly at a loss to discover what that really was which they intended to teach by these sacrificial terms and allusions. They are themselves utterly silent as to this point; and the varying theories of those who reject the doctrine of atonement, in fact, confess that their writings afford no solution of the difficulty. If, therefore, it is blasphemous to suppose, on the one hand, that inspired men should write on purpose to mislead, so, on the other, it is utterly inconceivable that, had they only been ordinary writers, they should construct a figurative language out of terms which had a definite and established sense, without giving any intimation at all that they employed them otherwise than in their received meaning, or telling us why they adopted them at all, and more especially when they knew that they must be interpreted, both by Jews and Greeks, in a sense which, if the Socinians are right, was in direct opposition to that which they intended to convey."—Watson, *Theol. Dictionary*, s. v.

Some modern writers deny the expiatory character of the Jewish sacrifices. So Bushnell (*Vicarious Sacrifice*, p. 425) asserts that no such thing as expiation is contained or supposed to be wrought out in the Scripture sacrifices. On this see *British Quarterly*, Oct. 1866, reprinted in the *Theol. Eclectic* (New Haven), iv, 397; and also an article on the *Expiatory Nature of the Atonement* (*Brit. Quarterly*, Oct. 1867; also in the *Theol. Eclectic*, v, 201 sq.). See the articles ATONEMENT; REDEMPTION; SACRIFICE.

**Exposition**, "the opening up and interpreting larger portions of Scripture in public discourses. In Scotland, where the practice has long obtained, and still extensively prevails, it is called *lecturing*. While the striking and insulated texts of Scripture, which furnish abundant matter for sermons, are calculated, when judiciously treated, to rouse and fix attention; and the discourses founded on them may be more useful to general hearers, especially the careless and unconverted, expository discourses furnish peculiar advantages as it regards the enlargement of the Christian's views of divine truth, and his consequent advancement in the ways of God. By judiciously expounding the Scriptures, a minister may hope to give a clearer exhibition of the great principles of religion in their mutual connections and diversified bearings than could otherwise be done. He will have a better opportunity of unfolding the true meaning of those parts of the Bible which are difficult—of bringing a vast variety of topics before his hearers, which may be of the utmost importance to them, but which he could not so conveniently have treated in preaching from detached texts—of exhibiting the doctrines and duties of Christianity in their relative positions—of successfully counteracting and arresting the progress of dangerous errors, and of storing the minds of his people with correct and influential views of divine things. (See *Dodbridge on Preaching*.) Such a mode of public instruction cannot but prove of great use to a minister's own mind, by rousing his energies, habituating him to close and accurate research, and saving him much of that indecision in the choice of texts which is so much lamented" (Buck, *Theolog. Dictionary*, s. v.). Dr. James W. Alexander was very earnest in advising expository preaching. "It is the most obvious and natural way of conveying to the hearers the import of the sacred volume. It is the very work (to interpret the Scriptures) for which the ministry was instituted." He advises exposition of whole chapters or books in

course, pleading for it not only the sanction of ancient usage, but also certain great advantages of the method both to the preacher and his hearers (*Thoughts on Preaching*, N. Y. 1867, 12mo, p. 272 sq.). See HOMILETICS.

**Expositions of Scripture.** See COMMENTARY.

**Exsuperius**, bishop of Toulouse in the end of the 4th and beginning of the 5th century, celebrated for the exercise of remarkable charity during a great famine. After having given away all his own property, he sold the sacred vessels of gold and silver to help the poor. Jerome compared him to the widow of Sarepta, and dedicated to him his *Commentary on Zechariah*. Pope Innocent addressed a decretal to him. He died about A. D. 417. See *Acta Sanctorum*, Sept. 28; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, x, 617, 825; A. Butler, *Lives of Saints*, September 28.

**Extempore Preaching.** See HOMILETICS.

**Extravagants** (*Extravagantes*), a name given to decretal epistles of the popes issued after Gratian's *Decretum*, and not contained in that work (see CANON LAW, vol. ii, p. 87, col. 2). They were therefore called *extra decretum vagantes*, or, briefly, *extravagantes*; and this name was still given to them after their insertion in the body of the canon law. For an account of the different collections of *extravagantes*, see CANON LAW.

**Extreme Unction**, one of the sacraments (the 5th) of the Roman Church, administered to sick persons in *extremis*, by anointing them with oil when death appears near. It dates from the 11th century, though the Roman Church, of course, seeks to trace it back to the apostolic age.

I. *Origin of the Practice.*—The Church of Rome appeals (see below) to Mark vi, 13, and James v, 14-16, as Scripture authority for extreme unction. In Mark we are told that the apostles "anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them." Clearly there is no trace of the "sacrament" here. The Council of Trent, in citing this passage, shrewdly says that it is "intimated" only in Mark, because, according to Rome, the apostles were not "priests" until the Last Supper. If, then, the passage in Mark teaches the *institution* of the sacrament, it would follow that others beside priests could administer it. Cardinal Cajetan, as cited by Catharinus, rejects this text as inapplicable to this sacrament; and Suarez (in part iii, dis-p. 39, § 1, n. 5) says that "when the apostles are said to anoint the sick and heal them (Mark vi, 13), this was not said in reference to the sacrament of unction, because their cures had not of themselves an immediate respect to the soul." As to the passage in James, it speaks of an anointing for "healing" by all the elders of the Church, who might or might not be laymen; it was "the prayer of faith that was to save the sick" (see, for a thorough discussion of this passage, Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism*, bk. ii, ch. xiv).

II. *The Ancient Greek Church.*—The ancient writers of the Greek Church use the passage of James only for exegetical, not for dogmatical purposes. Origen, in the second homily on Levit. iv, quotes the words of James when he speaks of the different ways which are given to the Christian for the remission of their sins. As the seventh way he mentions severe penance, in which he finds a compliance with the words of James: "If any be sick, let him call for the elders of the Church, and let them lay their hands on him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord," etc. The connection shows that Origen applies the words to mental and physical sickness, and the laying on of hands, which he adds to the apostolic words, points to a local use of anointment in Alexandria at the reconciliation of the *lapsi*. Chrysostom (*On the Priesthood*, iii, 196) quotes the words of James *only* as an argument that the priests have the power of remitting sins. John of Damascus, in speaking of the mysteries of the



Church, treats only of baptism and the Lord's Supper. The first certain testimony for the use of the anointment of the sick in the Greek Church is given by a Western writer about 798, Theodulf of Orleans.

III. *The Ancient Latin Church.*—In the Western Church, Irenæus (i, 21, 5) states that the Gnostics, and in particular the Heracleonites, poured upon dying members a mixture of water and oil, amidst an invocation of prayer, in order that their souls might become invisible and inaccessible to the hostile powers of the spiritual world. It is uncritical in the highest degree for Roman Catholic writers to infer from the existence of a Gnostic rite the existence of a similar rite in the orthodox Church. Tertullian and Cyprian, to whom we are indebted for so full information of the ecclesiastical usages of the Western Church, know nothing of extreme unction as a sacrament. This silence can not be explained by a reference to the *disciplina arcani*, as the latter exclusively embraced baptism and the Lord's Supper, and as even these topics, notwithstanding the *disciplina arcani*, are frequently and fully discussed by the ecclesiastical writers. Many of the latter mention the frequent use of oil as a peculiar charisma for miraculous cures. Thus it is related by Tertullian that the *pagan* Severus, father of the emperor Antoninus, was cured by the Christian Proclus by means of anointment. This certainly can have no reference to a sacrament for the use of *Christians*. (Many other examples of this use of oil may be found in Chemnitz, and in Binterim, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, vol. vi, pt. iii, p. 289.) Superstition developed this usage, and it occurred, according to the testimony of Chrysostom, that the lamps burning in the churches were plundered for the purpose of using the oil as a preservative against possible, and, as a miraculous remedy, against actual diseases. It is easy to comprehend how this medicinal and miraculous anointment could become the basis and the origin of a sacrament (see on this point Marheineke, *Symbolik*, i, 3, p. 258). The transition is visible in an epistle from the Roman bishop Innocent I to bishop Decentius, of Eugubium, written in 416. Innocent calls the anointment of the sick a "kind of sacrament" (*genus sacramenti*); and while he reserves to the bishops the right of preparing the sacred oil, he states that both priests *and laymen* may apply the oil (*quod ab episcopo confectum non solum sacerdotibus sed omnibus uti Christianis licet in sua aut in suorum necessitate unguendum*), which is entirely at variance with the present teaching of the Church of Rome, according to which the sacrament can be administered only by priests. From the beginning of the ninth century the anointment of the sick is frequently mentioned in the acts of the Councils. Theodulf of Orleans (798), and the first Council of Mentz (847), place it by the side of penance and the Eucharist, but preceding the two latter. The recovery of the sick is always regarded as the chief object. Its use appears to have been considered necessary only for sinners; for abbot Adalhard, of Corbie, was asked by the monks of the monastery whether he desired to be anointed with the sacred oil, as they were certain that he was free from sins. The conception of the anointment of the sick as an act of penance caused a discussion of the question whether it could be repeated. Ivo of Chartres, and Godfrey, abbot of Vendôme (about 1100), denied that the rite could be administered more than once, comparing it with the public penance; and it was a popular belief that a person recovering from sickness after receiving the anointment must not touch the ground with bare feet, and abstain from marital intercourse and the eating of meat. It was in the course of the 12th century that the names *sacramentum exunctum* and *extrema unctio* came first into use.

IV. *Extreme Unction as a Sacrament in the Church of Rome.*—A full dogmatical treatment of the anointment of the sick, according to the teaching gradually developed in the Church, was first given by Hugo of

St. Victor (*De Sacram. fidei lib. ii, p. xv*). Peter Lombardus assigned to it, in the series of the seven sacraments which he is the first to mention, the fifth place (*Sentent. lib. iv, diet. 23*). The scholastics, and, in particular, Thomas Aquinas, completed the scientific development of this doctrine, and the shape given to it by Thomas received the sanction of the Councils of Florence and of Trent.

The canons of Trent on this subject are: "Canon 1. If any shall say that extreme unction is not truly and properly a sacrament, instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, and declared by the blessed apostle James, but only a rite received from the fathers, or a human invention, let him be accursed. Canon 2. If any shall say that the holy anointing of the sick does not confer grace, nor remit sins, nor relieve the sick, but that it has ceased, as if it were formerly only the grace of healing, let him be accursed. Canon 3. If any shall say that the rite and usage of extreme unction, which the holy Roman Church observes, is contrary to the sentence of the blessed apostle James, and therefore should be changed, and may be despised by Christians without sin, let him be accursed. Canon 4. If any shall say that the presbyters of the Church, whom St. James directs to be called for the anointing of the sick, are not priests ordained by the bishops, but elders in age in any community, and that therefore the priest is not the only proper minister of extreme unction, let him be accursed" (*Concil. Trident. sess. xiv, c. i sq.*). The authority for this sacrament is stated by the Council (same session, c. i) as follows: "This sacred unction of the sick was instituted as a true and proper sacrament of the New Testament by Christ Jesus our Lord, being first intimated by Mark (vi, 13), and afterwards recommended and published to the faithful by James the apostle, brother of our Lord. 'Is any man,' saith he, 'sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man; and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him' (Jas. v, 14, 15). In which words, as the Church has learned by apostolical tradition, handed down from age to age, he teaches the matter, form, proper minister, and effect of this salutary sacrament. For the Church understands the matter of the sacrament to be the oil, blessed by the bishop; the unction most fitly representing the grace of the Holy Spirit, wherewith the soul of the sick man is invisibly anointed. The form is contained in the words of administration."

The ceremony must be performed by a priest. The oil must be olive oil consecrated by a bishop. "No other sort of oil can be the matter of this sacrament; and this its matter is most significant of its efficacy. Oil is very efficacious in soothing bodily pain, and this sacrament soothes and alleviates the pain and anguish of the soul. Oil also contributes to restore health and spirits, serves to give light, and refreshes fatigue; and these effects correspond with and are expressive of those produced, through the divine power, on the sick by the administration of this sacrament" (*Catechism of Trent*, Baltimore, 8vo, p. 206). The form of the ceremony is as follows: The priest, having dipped the thumb of his right hand in the holy oil, proceeds to mark the organs of the five senses of the patient with the sign of the cross; and after each application he wipes the part with a ball of cotton, for which purpose he brings with him seven balls already prepared. The order observed is this: the right eye is first anointed, then the left eye, the ears, and after them the nostrils (not the tip of the nose) are attended to in the same order, then the lips; after which the palms of the hands and soles of the feet receive the touch of the consecrated unguent. Men are also anointed in the reins, but this is dispensed with in the case of women. At each application the priest says, "*Per hanc sacram unctionem, et suam piissimam misericordiam indulget*

*tibi Deus quicquid peccasti, per visum,*” or “*auditum,*” “*olfactum,*” “*gustum,*” “*et tactum,*” as the case may be—“May God, by this holy anointing, and by his most pious mercy, pardon you the sins that you have committed by the eyes,” “ears,” “nose,” “taste,” and “touch.” “The anointing being ended, the priest rubs those of his fingers which have touched the oil with small pieces of bread, and then washes his hands. The crumbs of bread and the water are next thrown into the fire; and the pieces of cotton employed in the ceremony are carried into the church and burned, the ashes of which must be thrown into the *sacrarium.*” As to the *persons* to whom extreme unction is to be administered, the Catechism (*l. c.*) limits it “to those whose malady is such as to excite apprehensions of approaching dissolution. It is, however, a very grievous sin to defer the holy unction until, all hope of recovery now lost, life begins to ebb, and the sick person is fast verging into insensibility.” . . . “Extreme unction, then, can be administered only to the sick, and not to persons in health, although engaged in anything however dangerous, such as a perilous voyage, or the fatal dangers of battle. It cannot be administered even to persons condemned to death, and already ordered for execution. Its participation is also denied to insane persons, and to children incapable of committing sin, who, therefore, do not require to be purified from its stains, and also to those who labor under the awful visitation of madness, unless they give indications in their lucid intervals of a disposition to piety, and express a desire to be anointed. To persons insane from their birth this sacrament is not to be administered; but if a sick person, while in the possession of his faculties, expressed a wish to receive extreme unction, and afterwards becomes delirious, he is to be anointed.” . . . “The pastor will follow the uniform practice of the Catholic Church, and not administer extreme unction until the penitent has confessed and received the Eucharist.”

The effect of extreme unction is stated by the Council of Trent (sess. xiv, ch. ii) as follows: “The power and effect of this sacrament are explained in the words ‘and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him.’ For this power is the grace of the Holy Spirit, whose unction cleanses away sins, if any remain to be expiated, even the last traces of sin, and relieves and confirms the soul of the sick man, exciting in him strong confidence of the divine mercy: by which strengthened, he bears far better the inconveniences and pains of his disorder; resists more easily the temptations of the devil, who does, as it were, lie in wait at his heels; and sometimes obtains the restoration of his bodily health, if the same shall further the salvation of his soul.”

V. *The Greek Church.*—The Greek Church uses anointing with oil [see *EUCHELAION*] as one of its “mysteries,” but does not limit it to cases of supposed mortal illness. She counts it as the seventh of the sacraments, and regards it as instituted by Christ (Mark vi, 13), and introduced into practice by the Church (James v, 14). The oil may be consecrated by common priests, and is consecrated for every particular case. The anointment is generally performed by seven priests, but it may validly be performed by one. Those who are well enough go to church for the purpose of being anointed, after previously receiving absolution and the Eucharist. On the Thursday of the Passion Week in particular, many sufferers go to church for that purpose. The aim of the rite is to aid the recovery of the sick person, as is seen from the form of prayer used in applying the oil: “O holy Father, the physician of our souls and bodies, who didst send thy only begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, to heal all diseases, and to deliver us from death, heal this thy servant M. from the bodily infirmity under which he now labors, and raise him up by the grace of Christ” (Per-

ceval, *Roman Schism*; King, *Greek Church*). In the *Confession* of Metrophanes Critopulos (ed. by Kimmel, Jená, 1850), p. 152, it is further stated that, as many bodily diseases depend on sin, it is proper (*ἐηλοῖ*) that prayer should be offered at the same time for the remission of the sin for which the disease is a penalty. He adds that this *Euchelaion* is not extreme unction (*ὀκὶ ἰσχάτη χοίσιε*). It can be administered whenever a person is ill, and hence to the same person many times. For a description of this ceremony as performed in the Greek Church, see Schmidt, *Darstellung der griechisch-russischen Kirche* (Mentz, 1826, p. 220 sq.).

VI. *Extreme Unction and Protestantism.*—As the ancient Waldenses recognised the seven sacraments of the Roman Catholic Church, there is no doubt that they also accepted extreme unction. Wycliffe doubted many points of the doctrine of the Church of Rome concerning extreme unction, but was willing to regard it as a sacrament for the physical cure of the sick, provided the priests could obtain this effect by their prayer. Luther had no objection to the anointing of the sick if the priests prayed with them and exhorted them, but he denied the anointment to be a sacrament. Like Luther, all the other Protestant Churches reject extreme unction altogether. The 25th article of the Church of England puts it among the five so-called sacraments of Rome which “are not to be counted for sacraments of the Gospel.” Bishop Forbes (who represents the Romanizing tendency in the Church of England) calls “the unction of the sick the lost pleiad of the Anglican firmament,” and recommends its restoration (*On 39 Articles*, Art. xxv *ad fin.*). Among the High-Church Lutherans there are also some who urge the introduction of the anointing of the sick. On the general subject, see, besides the authors already cited, Siegel, *christl.-kirchl. Alterthümer*, iv, 119 sq.; Cramp, *Text-book of Popery*, ch. ix; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, bk. vii, ch. ii; Burnet, *On 39 Articles* (Art. xxv); Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* x, 551; and the article SACRAMENTS.

EYCK, HUBERT VAN. See PAINTING.

**Eye** (עַיַן, *á'yin*, from the idea of *flowing* [see below]; ὀφθαλμός). In most languages this important organ is used by figurative application, as the symbol of a large number of objects and ideas. In the East such applications of the word “eye” have always been uncommonly numerous, and they were so among the Hebrews. It may be serviceable to distinguish the following uses of the word, few of which are common among us except so far as they have become so through the translation of the Bible. (See Gesenius, *Heb. Lex.*; Wemys's *Symbol. Dict.*)

(1.) *A fountain.* This use of the word has already been indicated. See AIN. It probably originated from the eye being regarded as the fountain of tears.

(2.) *Color*, as in the phrase “and the eye (color) of the manna was as the eye (color) of bdellium” (Num. xi, 7). This originated, perhaps, in the eye being the part of the body which exhibits different colors in different persons.

(3.) *The surface*, as “the surface (eye) of the land” (Exod. x, 5, 15; Numb. xxii, 5, 11): the last is the passage which affords most sanction to the notion that עַיַן means in some places “face.” This is the sense which our own and other versions give to “eye to eye” (Num. xiv, 14, etc.), translated “face to face.” The phrases are indeed equivalent in meaning; but we are not thence to conclude that the Hebrews meant “face” when they said “eye,” but that they chose the opposition of the eyes, instead of that of the faces, to express the general meaning. Hence, therefore, we may object to the extension of the signification in such passages as 1 Sam. xvi, 12, where “beautiful eyes” (עַיַן יְפֵי) is rendered “fair countenance.”

(4.) It is also alleged that “between (or about) the

eyes" means the forehead, in Exod. xiii, 9, 16, and the forepart of the head, in Deut. vi, 8; but the passages are sufficiently intelligible if understood to denote what they literally express; and with reference to the last it may be remarked that there is hair about the eyes as well as on the head, the removal of which might well be interdicted as an act of lamentation.

(5.) In Cant. iv, 9, "eye" seems to be used poetical-ly for "look;" as is usual in most languages: "thou hast stolen my heart with one of thy looks" (eyes).

(6.) In Prov. xxiii, 31, the term "eye" is applied to the beads or bubbles of wine, when poured out, but our version preserves the sense of "color."

(7.) To these some other phrases, requiring notice and explanation, may be added:

"Before the eyes" of any one, meaning in his presence, or, as we should say, "before his face" (Gen. xxiii, 11, 18; Exod. iv, 30).

"In the eyes" of any one means what appears to be so or so in his individual judgment or opinion, and is equivalent to "seeming" or "appearing" (Gen. xix, 8; xxix, 20; 1 Sam. xii, 3).

"To set the eyes" upon any one is usually to regard him with favor (Gen. xlv, 21; Job xxiv, 23; Jer. xxxix, 12); but it occurs in a bad sense, as of looking with anger, in Amos ix, 8. But anger is more usually expressed by the contrary action of turning the eyes away.

As many of the passions, such as envy, pride, pity, desire, are expressed by the eye, so, in the scriptural style, they are often ascribed to that organ. Hence such phrases as "evil eye" (Matt. xx, 15), "bountiful eye" (Prov. xxii, 9), "haughty eyes" (Prov. vi, 17), "wanton eyes" (Isa. iii, 16), "eyes full of adultery" (2 Pet. ii, 14), "the lust of the eyes" (1 John ii, 16). This last phrase is applied by some to lasciviousness, by others to covetousness; but it is best to take the expression in the most extensive sense, as denoting a craving for the gay vanities of this life (comp. Ezek. xxiv, 25). In the same chapter of Ezekiel (ver. 16), "the desire of thy eyes" is put not for the prophet's wife directly, as often understood, but for whatever is one's greatest solace and delight, which in this case was the prophet's wife, but which in another case might have been something else.

Whether the Hebrews attached the same ideas to the expression "evil eye" (Prov. xxiii, 6; xxviii, 22) as is done by the Orientals at the present day is not easy to ascertain. It has been observed by Mr. Lane, and also by Mrs. Poole, that "nothing distresses an Egyptian parent more than that which in other countries is considered to convey a compliment—admiration of the child. If any one is seen to stare at so as to envy the offspring, the mother hastily snatches it away, to perform some superstitious rite, as a charm against the supposed evil eye." And Mr. Roberts says, among the Hindoos, the *kan-nuru*, "evil eye," of some people is believed to have a most baneful effect upon whatsoever it shall be fixed. Those who are reputed to have such eyes are always avoided, and none but near relations will invite them to a feast.

In Zech. iv, 10, the angels of the Lord are called "his eyes," as being the executioners of his judgments, and watching and attending for his glory. From some such association of ideas, the favorite ministers of state in the Persian monarchy were called "the king's eyes." So, in Numb. x, 31, "to be instead of eyes" is equivalent to being a prince, to rule and guide the people. This occurs also in the Greek poets, as in Pindar (*Olymp.* ii, 10), where "the eye of Sicilia" is given as a title to one of the chief men in Sicily,

showing his power. In like manner, in the same poet, "the eye of the army" stands for a good commander (*Olymp.* vi, 16).

To keep anything as the apple or pupil of the eye is to preserve it with particular care (Deut. xxxii, 10; Zech. ii, 8).

Eye-service is peculiar to slaves, who are governed by fear only, and is to be carefully guarded against by Christians, who ought to serve from a principle of duty and affection (Eph. vi, 6; Col. iii, 22).

The expression in Psalm cxxiii, 2, "As the eyes of servants look unto the hands of their masters," has suggested a number of curious illustrations from Oriental history and customs, tending to show that masters, especially when in the presence of others, are in the habit of communicating to their servants orders and intimations by certain motions of their hands, which, although scarcely noticeable by other persons present, are clearly understood and promptly acted upon by the attendants. This custom keeps them with their attention bent upon the hand of their master, watching its slightest motions. (See Kitto's *Daily Bible Illustra.* on Prov. vi, 13.)

The celebrated passage "Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, and considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye" (Matt. vii, 3), has occasioned much waste of explanation. It seems much better to understand it as a hyperbolic proverbial expression, than to contend that as *εὐκός* cannot literally mean "a beam," it must here signify something else, a disease, a thorn, etc. (see Doddridge and Campbell, in loc.). As a proverbial phrase, parallels have been produced abundantly from the Rabbins, from the fathers, and from the classics. See BLIND.

BLINDING THE EYES as a punishment or political disqualification was a heathen cruelty sometimes referred to in the Scriptures, and is found exhibited on the Assyrian monuments. The custom of putting out the eyes of captives especially was very common in the East (1 Sam. xi, 2). Thus Samson was deprived



Ancient Assyrian King blinding a Prisoner.

of sight by the Philistines (Judg. xvi, 21), and Zedekiah by the Chaldees (2 Kings xxv, 7). In 1820 Rae Wilson saw a number of individuals at Aere who were disfigured in various ways, by a hand amputated, an eye torn out, or a nose which had been split, or partly or totally cut off. In 1826 two emirs had their eyes burnt out, and their tongues in part cut off, by the prince of Mount Lebanon, on account of their having been concerned in some disturbances against his government. In some cases the Orientals deprive the criminal of the light of day by sealing up his eyes with some kind of adhesive plaster (Isa. xlv, 10). See PUNISHMENT.

"PAINTING THE EYES," or rather the eyelids, is more than once alluded to in Scripture, although this scarcely appears in the Authorized Version, as our translators, unaware of the custom, usually render "eye" by "face," although "eye" is still preserved in the margin. So Jezebel "painted her eyes," literally

"put her eyes in paint," before she showed herself publicly (2 Kings ix, 30). This action is forcibly expressed by Jeremiah (iv, 30), "Though thou rentest thine eyes with painting." Ezekiel (xxiii, 40) also represents this as a part of high dress: "For whom thou didst wash thyself, *paintedst thy eyes*, and deckedst thyself with ornaments." The custom is also, very possibly, alluded to in Prov. vi, 25: "Lust not after her beauty in thine heart, neither let her take thee *with her eyelids*." It certainly is the impression in Western Asia that this embellishment adds much to the languishing expression and seducement of the eyes, although Europeans find some difficulty in appreciating the beauty which the Orientals find in this adornment. (See Hartmann's *Hebræorum*, ii, 149 sq.)

The following description of the process is from Lane's *Modern Egyptians* (i, 41-43): "The eyes, with very few exceptions, are black, large, and of a long almond form, with long and beautiful lashes, and an exquisitely soft, bewitching expression: eyes more beautiful can hardly be conceived: their charming effect is much heightened by the concealment of the other features (however pleasing the latter may be), and is rendered still more striking by a practice universal among the females of the higher and middle classes, and very common among those of the lower orders, which is that of blackening the edge of the eyelids, both above and below the eyes, with a black pow-



Modern Egyptian Lady with painted Eyes. (The vessel for holding the paint, and the probe for applying it, are from the Monuments.)

der called *kohl*. This is a collyrium, commonly composed of the smoke-black which is produced by burning a kind of *libân*—an aromatic resin—a species of frankincense, used, I am told, in preference to the better kind of frankincense, as being cheaper and equally good for the purpose. Kohl is also prepared of the smoke-black produced from burning the shells of almonds. These two kinds, though believed to be beneficial to the eyes, are used merely for ornament; but there are several kinds used for their real or supposed medical properties, particularly the powder of several kinds of lead ore, to which are often added sarcocolla, long pepper, sugar-candy, fine dust of a Venetian sequin, and sometimes powdered pearls. Antimony, it is said, was formerly used for painting the edges of the eyelids. The kohl is applied with a small probe of wood, ivory, or silver, tapering towards the end, but blunt: this is moistened, sometimes with rose-water, then dipped in the powder and drawn along the edges of the eyelids: it is called *mirved*; and the glass vessel in which the kohl is kept, *mulekotal*. The custom of thus ornamenting the eyes prevailed among both sexes in Egypt in very ancient times: this is shown by the sculptures and paintings in the temples and tombs of this country; and kohl-vessels, with the probes, and



Ancient Egyptian Boxes or Bottles, holding the *Kohl* for staining the Eyelids. *a*. In the British Museum. The others are in the Museum of Alnwick Castle. *b*, *c*, is the Bodkin for applying the *Kohl*.

even with the remains of the black powder, have often been found in the ancient tombs. I have two in my possession. But, in many cases, the ancient mode of ornamenting with the kohl was a little different from the modern. I have, however, seen this ancient mode practised in the present day in the neighborhood of Cairo, though I only remember to have noticed it in two instances. The same custom existed among the Greek ladies, and among the Jewish women in early times."

Sir J. G. Wilkinson alludes to this passage in Mr. Lane's book, and admits that the lengthened form of the ancient Egyptian eye, represented in the paintings, was probably produced by this means. "Such," he adds, "is the effect described by Juvenal (*Sat.* ii, 93), Pliny (*Ep.* vi, 2), and other writers who notice the custom among the Romans. At Rome it was considered disgraceful for men to adopt it, as at present in [most parts of] the East, except medicinally; but, if we may judge from the similarity of the eyes of men and women in the paintings at Thebes, it appears to have been used by both sexes among the ancient Egyptians. Many of the kohl-bottles have been found in the tombs, together with the bodkin used for applying the moistened powder. They are of various materials, usually of stone, wood, or pottery; sometimes composed of two, sometimes of three or four separate cells, apparently containing each a mixture, differing slightly in its quality and hue from the other three. Many were simple round tubes, vases, or small boxes; some were ornamented with the figure of an ape or monster, supposed to assist in holding the bottle between his arms, while the lady dipped into it the pin with which she painted her eyes; and others were in imitation of a column made of stone, or rich porcelain of the choicest manufacture" (*Ancient Egyptians*, iii, 382).—Kitto, s. v. See PAINT.

**Eylert**, RÜHELMANN FRIEDRICH, was born at Hamm, in Prussian Westphalia, April 5, 1770. He studied theology at Halle, where he imbibed the moderate Rationalism of Niemyer. In 1794 he became a preacher in his native city; in 1806 court preacher at Potsdam, and after the death of Sack in 1817 he be-

came superintendent, being at the same time appointed minister of public instruction. In his later years his theology assumed a positively orthodox character. He died Feb. 3, 1852. While at court he was the friend and counsellor of king Frederick William III, over whom he exerted a great influence, especially in the matter of the Union and the Liturgy. See PRUSSIA, CHURCH OF. He was a prolific writer. The most important of his works are, *Betrachtungen ü. d. trustvollen Wahrheiten des Christenthums*, etc. (1804; 4th ed. 1834); — *Homilien ü. d. Parabeln Jesu* (1806; 2d ed. 1819); — *Predigten ü. Bedürfnisse unsers Herzens* (1805); — *Karakterzüge Friedrich Wilhelm's III* (1846-47). See *Neuer Nekrolog d. Deutschen* (1852).—Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 295.

**Eymeric**, NICOLAS, a Spanish inquisitor, was born about 1320 at Gerona. He entered the Dominican order in 1334, and was made inquisitor general of Aragon in 1336. His zeal was too great even for his superiors, and he was removed from his office for a time, but after some years he returned to it. He was noted especially for his fierce pursuit of the partisans of Raymond Lull (q. v.). His *Directorium Inquisitorum* has been often reprinted (Rome, 1578, 1589, 1597, fol.; Venice, 1591, 1607). He died Jan. 4, 1399.—Quétif et Echard, *Script. Ord. Præd.* i, 716; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xvi, 867. See INQUISITION.

**Eyre**, JOHN, a minister of the Church of England, was born at Bodmin, Cornwall, January, 1754. He had a good elementary education, and at fifteen was bound apprentice to a clothier. Before the termination of his apprenticeship he embraced a religious life, and on returning to his father's house he commenced holding public religious meetings. His father was offended at this, and drove him from his house. He was soon after admitted into lady Huntingdon's College at Trevecca, and in 1778 he was appointed minister to her chapel at Mulberry Gardens, London. In the same year he entered Emmanuel College, Oxford, and in December, 1779, he was made curate of Weston. In 1781 he became curate of St. Giles's, Reading, and in 1782 of St. Luke's, Chelsea. In 1785 he became pastor of the Episcopal chapel at Homerton, and opened a school there, which became very successful. He was very popular as a preacher, free from bigotry, and active in all schemes of benevolence. The *Evangelical Magazine* and the *London Missionary* were originated and for a time edited by him. From the profits of the *Evangelical Magazine* between twenty and thirty thousand pounds were paid out for the support of widows of ministers of various denominations. He was also one of the founders of the *London Missionary Society* (q. v.), of the scheme of "Village Itinerancy," and of the Hackney Seminary for theological training. After a life of earnest piety and usefulness, he died March 28, 1803.—Morison, *Missionary Fathers*, p. 9.

**Eyster**, MICHAEL, a minister of the Lutheran Church, was born in York County, Pa., May 16, 1814. He was principally educated at the institutions in Gettysburg, Pa., and was licensed to preach the Gospel in 1838. He labored in the ministry successively at Williamsburg, Greencastle, and Greensburg with great acceptance and success. He died Aug. 12, 1853. He was a man of rare promise, and, although comparatively young, had gained a strong hold upon the affections of the Church. In the pulpit his power over an audience was very great. He usually made a deep and an abiding impression. There was an originality and a freshness in his discourses not always found at the present day. (M. L. S.)

**Ez**. See GOAT.

**Ez'zar**, a less correct mode of Anglicizing (1 Chron. i, 38) the name EZER (q. v.).

**Ez'bai** [many *Ez'bai*, some *Ezba'î*] (Heb. *Ezbaif*, עֲזַבַּי, in pause עֲזַבַּי, signif. uncertain; Sept. Ἀζβί

v. Ἀζοβαί, Vulg. *Asbai*), the father of Naarai, which latter was one of David's thirty heroes (1 Chron. xi, 37). B.C. 1046. In the parallel list (2 Sam. xxiii, 35) the names are given "ΠΑΡΑΙΤΗ Ἀρβίτη," which Kennicott decides to be a corruption of the reading in Chronicles (*Dissertation*, p. 209).

**Ez'bon** (Heb. *Etsbon'*, עֲזַבֹּן, perhaps *working*), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. Θεσοβών, Vulg. *Esebon*.) The fourth son of the patriarch Gad (Gen. xlv, 16); called also (Numb. xxvi, 16) OZAI (q. v.). B.C. 1856.

2. (עֲזַבֹּן, Sept. Ἀσεβών v. r. Εσεβών, Vulg. *Esbon*.) The first-named of the sons (2 descendants) of Bela, the son of Benjamin, according to 1 Chron. vii, 7. It is singular, however, that while Ezbon is nowhere else mentioned among the sons of Bela, or Benjamin, he appears here in company with Ἰρί, Iri, which is, nevertheless, not a Benjamite family, according to the other lists, but is found in company with Ezbon among the Gadite families, both in Gen. xlv, 16 (Eri, Ἰρί, and Numb. xxvi, 16. Were these two Gadite families incorporated into Benjamin after the slaughter mentioned Judg. xx? Possibly they were from Jabesh-Gilead (comp. xxi, 12-14). See BECHER. 1 Chron. vii, 2 seems to fix the date of the census as in king David's time. B.C. cir. 1020.—Smith, s. v.

**Ezech'as** (Ἐζεκιᾶς), a mode of Anglicizing, in the Apocrypha, the name of two men.

1. The "son of Theocanus," and one of the two Israelitish leaders prominent in the reform under Ezra (1 Esdr. ix, 14); evidently the JAHAZIAH (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra x, 15).

2. One who is represented as having prayed for the chosen people in the time of Sennacherib (2 Esdr. vii, 40), obviously referring to king HEZEKIAH (q. v.)

**Ezezi'as** (Ἐζεκιᾶς), one of those who supported Ezra on the right while expounding the law (1 Esdr. ix, 43), corresponding to the HILKIAH (q. v.) of the parallel passage (Neh. viii, 4).

**Ezeki'as** (Ἐζεκιᾶς), a Grecized form (Ecclus. xlviii, 17, 22; xlix, 4; 2 Macc. xv, 22; Matt. i, 9, 10) of the name of king HEZEKIAH (q. v.).

**Eze'kiël** (Heb. *Yechezkel'*, יְחֶזְקֵאל, either meaning *Whom God will strengthen* or *God will prevail*), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. Ἐζεκιήλ.) The head of the twentieth "course" of priests under David (1 Chron. xxiv, 16, where the name is Anglicized JEHEZEKIEL [q. v.]).

2. (Ἰεζεκιήλ, Josephus Ἰεζεκιήλος, Ant. x, 5, 1.) One of the four greater prophets. See PROPHET.

1. There have been various fancies about his name: according to Abarbanel (*Prof. in Ezech.*), it implies "one who narrates the might of God to be displayed in the future," and some (as Villalpandus, *Prof. in Ezech.* p. x) see a play on the word in the expressions עֲזַבֵּי, and עֲזַבֵּי (iii, 7, 8, 9), whence the groundless conjecture of Sanctius (*Prolegom. in Ezech.* p. 2, n. 2) that the name was given him subsequently to the commencement of his career (Carpzov, *Introduct. ad Libr. Bibl. Vet. Testam.* ii, pt. iii, ch. v.).

2. He was the son of a priest named Buzi (i, 3), respecting whom fresh conjectures have been recorded, although nothing is known about him (as archbishop Newcome observes) beyond the fact that he must have given his son a careful and learned education. The Rabbis had a rule that every prophet in Scripture was also the son of a prophet, and hence (as R. David Kimchi in his Commentary) they absurdly identify Buzi with Jeremiah, who, they say, was so called because he was rejected and despised. Another tradition makes Ezekiel the servant of Jeremiah (Gregory Naz. *Or.* xlviii), and Jerome supposes that the prophets being contemporaries during a part of their mission


interchanged their prophecies, sending them respectively to Jerusalem and Chaldea for mutual confirmation and encouragement, that the Jews might hear, as it were, a strophe and antistrophe of warning and promise, "velut ac si duo cantores alter ad alterius vocem sese componerent" (Calvin, *Comment. ad Ezek.* i, 2). Although it was only towards the very close of Jeremiah's lengthened office that Ezekiel received his commission, yet these suppositions are easily accounted for by the internal harmony between the two prophets, in proof of which Hävernäck (*Introduct. to Ezek.*) quotes Ezek. xiii as compared with Jer. xxiii, 9 sq., and Ezek. xxxiv with Jer. xxxiii, etc. This inner resemblance is the more striking from the otherwise wide difference of character which separates the two prophets; for the elegiac tenderness of Jeremiah is the reflex of his gentle, calm, and introspective spirit, while Ezekiel, in that age when true prophets were so rare (Ezek. xii, 21; Lam. ii, 9), "comes forward with all abruptness and iron consistency. Has he to contend with a people of brazen front and unbending neck? He possesses on his own part an unbending nature, opposing the evil with an unflinching spirit of boldness, with words full of consuming fire" (Hävernäck, *Introl.*, transl. by Rev. F. W. Gotch in *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* i, 23).

3. Unlike his predecessor in the prophetic office, who gives us the amplest details of his personal history, Ezekiel rarely alludes to the facts of his own life, and we have to complete the imperfect picture by the colors of late and dubious tradition. He was taken captive from a place called Sarera (ἐκ γῆς Σαρρά, Isidor. *De Vit. et Ob. Sanct.* 39; Epiphani. *De Vit. et Mort. Prophet.* ix, ap. Carpzov) in the captivity (or transmigration, as Jerome more accurately prefers to render  $\text{גלות}$ , i, 2) of Jehoiachin (not Jehoiakim, as Josephus [*Ant.* x, 6, 3] states, probably by a slip of memory) with other distinguishing exiles (2 Kings xxiv, 15) eleven years before the destruction of Jerusalem. B. C. 598. Josephus (*l. c.*) says that this removal happened when he was a boy, and although we cannot consider the assertion to be refuted by Hävernäck's argument from the matured, vigorous, priestly character of his writings, and feel still less inclined to say that he had "undoubtedly" exercised for some considerable time the function of a priest, yet the statement is questionable, because it is improbable (as Hävernäck also points out) that Ezekiel long survived the twenty-seventh year of his exile (xxix, 17), so that, if Josephus be correct, he must have died very young. He was a member of a community of Jewish exiles who settled on the banks of the Chebar, a "river" or stream of Babylonia, which is sometimes taken to be the Khabour, but which the latest investigators suppose to be the Nahr Malcha, or royal canal of Nebuchadnezzar. See CHEBAR. The actual name of the spot where he resided was Tel-Abib ( $\text{תֵּל אַבִּיב}$ , Vulg. "acervus novarum frugum," Sept.  $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\theta\omicron\sigma\omicron\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\epsilon\sigma\iota\mu\eta\theta\omicron\nu\ \text{?}$ ), Syr. "the hill of grief"), a name which Jerome, as usual, allegorizes; it is thought by Michaelis to be the same as Thallaba in D'Anville's map (Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Geog.* ii, 188). It was by this river "in the land of the Chaldeans" that God's message first reached him (i, 2); the Chaldee version, however, interpolates the words "in the land [of Israel: and again a second time he spake to him in the land] of the Chaldeans," because the Jews had a notion that the Shechinah could not overshadow a prophet out of the Holy Land. Hence R. Jarchi thinks that chap. xvii was Ezekiel's first prophecy, and was uttered before the captivity, a view which he supports by the Hebrew idiom  $\text{הִיאָה עָלַי}$  (A. V. "came expressly") in i, 3. R. Kimchi, however, makes an exception to the rule in case the prophecy was inspired in some pure and quiet spot like a river's bank (comp. Psa. cxxxvii, 1). His call took place "in the fifth year of king Jehoiachin's captiv-

ity," B. C. 594 (i, 2), "in the thirtieth year, in the fourth month." The latter expression is very uncertain. Most commentators (see Poli *Synopsis*, in loc.) take it to mean the thirtieth year of his age (so Carpzov, *Appar. Crit.* p. 201; Fairbairn, *Dict. s. v.*, and others), the recognised period for assuming full priestly functions (Numb. iv, 23, 30). Origen, following this assumption, makes the prophet a type of Christ, to whom also "the heavens were opened" when he was baptized in Jordan. But, as Pradus argues, such a computation would be unusual, and would not be sufficiently important or well known as a mark of genuineness, and would require some more definite addition. Moreover, the statute referred to required an age of at least thirty full years. The Chaldee paraphrase by Jonah ben-Uzziel has "thirty years after Hilkiash, the high-priest, had found the book of the law in the sanctuary, in the vestibule under the porch, at midnight, after the setting of the moon, in the days of Josiah, etc., in the month Tammuz, in the fifth day of the month" (comp. 2 Kings xxii), i. e. the eighteenth of Josiah, or B. C. 623. This view is adopted by Jerome, Usher, Hävernäck, etc., and is, on the whole, the most probable, although it has been objected to its adoption that, had this been a recognised era, we should have found traces of it elsewhere, whereas even Ezekiel never refers to it again. But, whatever starting-point we adopt, this will still remain an isolated date in Ezekiel; and the example of Jeremiah, who computes the years of his prophetic ministrations from the reform in the days of Josiah (Jer. xxv, 3; comp. 2 Chron. xxiv, 3), warrants the supposition that his contemporary and parallel would note his own call from a similar religious epoch, the renewal of the pass-over in the same reign (2 Kings xxiii, 23). There are similar and more forcible objections to its being the thirtieth year from the jubilee, as Hitzig supposes, following many of the early commentators. It has been proposed by Scaliger (*De Emendatione Temporum*, Lugd. Bat. 1598, p. 374) that it was the thirtieth year from the new era of Nabopolassar, father of Nebuchadnezzar, who began to reign B. C. 625, an interpretation adopted by Eichhorn, Pradus, Rosenmüller, Henderson, etc. The use of this Chaldee epoch is the more appropriate as the prophet wrote in Babylonia, and he gives a Jewish chronology in ver. 2. Compare the notes of time in Dan. ii, 1; vii, 1; Ezra vii, 7; Neh. ii, 1; v, 14. But this would make the date in question B. C. 596 instead of 594. Moreover, as Nabopolassar was long since dead, the reckoning would doubtless have been by the years of the reigning monarch, as in the other passages cited. The decision of the question is the less important, because in all other places Ezekiel dates from the year of Jehoiachin's captivity (xxix, 17; xxx, 20, et passim). It appears that the call of Ezekiel to the prophetic office was connected with the communication of Jeremiah's predictions to Babylon (Jer. li, 59), which took place in the earlier part of the same year (Hävernäck, p. ix). We learn from an incidental allusion (xxiv, 18)—the only reference which he makes to his personal history—that he was married, and had a house (viii, 1) in his place of exile, and lost his wife by a sudden and unforeseen stroke. He lived in the highest consideration among his companions in exile, and their elders consulted him on all occasions (viii, 1; xi, 25; xiv, 1; xx, 1, etc.), because in his united office of priest and prophet he was a living witness to "them of the captivity" that God had not abandoned them (comp. Vitringa, *Synag. Tct.* p. 332). There seems to be little ground for Theodoret's supposition that he was a Nazarite. The last date he mentions is the twenty-seventh year of the captivity (xxix, 17), so that his mission extended over twenty-two years, during part of which period Daniel was probably living, and already famous (Ezek. xiv, 14; xxxviii, 3).

Tradition ascribes various miracles to him, as, for

instance, escaping from his enemies by walking dry-shod across the Chebar; feeding the furnished people with a miraculous draught of fishes, etc. He is said to have been murdered in Babylon by some Jewish prince (? ὁ ἠγοούμενος τοῦ λαοῦ, called in the Roman martyrology for vi Id. Apr. "judex populi," Carpzov. *Introd.* l. c.), whom he had convicted of idolatry; and to have been buried in a double tomb (σηπλάσιον ἐπιπλοῦν), the tomb of Shem and Arphaxad, on the banks of the Euphrates (Epiphanius. *De Vit. et Mort. Prophet.*). The tomb, said to have been built by Jehoiachin, was shown a few days' journey from Bagdad (Menasse ben-Israel, *De Resurrec. Mort.* p. 23), and was called "the abode of elegance" (habitaaculum elegantiae). A lamp was kept there continually burning, and the autograph copy of the prophecies was said to be there preserved. This tomb is mentioned by Pietro de la Valle, and fully described in the Itinerary of R. Benjamin of Tudela (Hottinger, *Theas. Phil.* II, i, 3; *Cippii Hebraici*, p. 82). His tomb is still pointed out in the vicinity of Babylon (Layard's *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 427), at a place called Keffil; and Mr. Loftus is inclined to ac-



Keffil and the Tomb of Ezekiel.

cept the tradition which assigns this as the resting-place of the prophet's remains (*Chaldea*, p. 35). The spire is the frustum of an elongated cone, tapering to a blunted top by a succession of steps, and peculiarly ornamented (*ib.*). A curious conjecture (discredited by Clemens Alexandrinus [*Strom.* i], but considered not impossible by Selden [*Synagoga de Diis Syr.* ii, 120], Meyer, and others) identifies him with "Nazarus the Assyrian," the teacher of Pythagoras. We need hardly mention the ridiculous suppositions that he is identical with Zoroaster, or with the Ἐσκιόλογος ὁ πῶν λουδαϊκῶν τραγωδιῶν ποιητής (Clem. Alexand. *Strom.* i; Euseb. *Prap. Evang.* ix, 28, 29), who wrote a treatise on the Exodus, called Ἐξαγωγή (Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* ii, 19). This Ezekiel lived B.C. 40 (Sixt. Sen. *Bibl. Sanct.* iv, 235), or later.

4. But, as Hävernick remarks, "by the side of the scattered data of his external life, those of his internal life appear so much the richer." We have already noticed his stern and inflexible energy of will and character; and we also observe a devoted adherence to the rites and ceremonies of his national religion. Ezekiel is no cosmopolite, but displays everywhere the peculiar tendencies of a Hebrew educated under Levitical training. The priestly bias is always visible, especially in chaps. viii-xi, xl-xlviii, and in iv, 13 sq.; xx, 12 sq.; xxii, 8, etc. It is strange of De Wette and Gesenius to attribute this to a "contracted spirituality," and of Ewald to see in it "a one-sided conception of antiquity which he obtained merely from books and traditions," and "a depression of spirit (!) enhanced by the long continuance of the banishment and bondage of the people" (Hävernick's *Introd.*). It was surely this very intensity of patriotic loyalty to a system whose partial suspension he both predicted and survived, which cheered the exiles with the confidence of his hopes in the future, and tended to preserve their decaying nationality. Mr. F. Newman is even more contemptuous than the German critics. "The writ-

ings of Ezekiel," he says (*Hebr. Monarchy*, p. 330, 2d ed.), "painfully show the growth of what is merely visionary, and an increasing value of hard sacerdotalism;" and he speaks of the "heavy materialism" of Ezekiel's Temple, with its priests, sacrifices, etc., as "tedious and unedifying as Leviticus itself." His own remark that Ezekiel's predictions "so kept alive in the minds of the next generation a belief in certain return from captivity, as to have tended exceedingly towards the result," is a sufficient refutation of such criticisms.

We may also note in Ezekiel the absorbing recognition of his high calling which enabled him cheerfully to endure any deprivation or misery (except indeed ceremonial pollution, from which he shrinks with characteristic loathing, iv, 14), if thereby he may give any warning or lesson to his people (iv; xxiv, 15, 16, etc.), whom he so ardently loved (ix, 8; xi, 13). On one occasion, and on one only, the feelings of the man burst, in one single expression, through the self-devotion of the prophet; and while even then his obedience is unwavering, yet the inexpressible depth of submissive pathos in the brief words which tell how it, one day "the desire of his eyes was taken from him" (xxiv, 15-18), shows what well-springs of the tenderest human emotion were concealed under his uncompromising opposition to every form of sin.—Smith, s. v. See Friderici, *Disputatio de Ezechiele* (Lips. 1719); Verpoorten, *De scriptis Ezechieis* (in his *Dissert.* p. 107); Alexander, *Hist. Ecclesias.* iii, 560; Kitto, *Jour. Sac. Lit.* i; Williams, *Characters of O. T.* p. 288.

EZEKIEL, BOOK OF. This, both in the Hebrew and Alexandrian canons, is placed next to the writings of Jeremiah.

I. *Order of Contents.*—The central point of Ezekiel's predictions is the destruction of Jerusalem. Previously to this catastrophe his chief object is to call to repentance those who were living in careless security; to warn them against indulging in blind confidence, that by the help of the Egyptians (Ezek. xvii, 15-17; comp. Jer. xxxvii, 7) the Babylonian yoke would be shaken off; and to assure them that the destruction of their city and Temple was inevitable and fast approaching. After this event his principal care is to console the captives by promises of future deliverance and return to their own land, and to encourage them by assurances of future blessings. His predictions against foreign nations stand between these two great divisions, and were for the most part uttered during the interval of suspense between the divine intimation that Nebuchadnezzar was besieging Jerusalem (chap. xxiv, 2) and the arrival of the news that he had taken it (ch. xxxiii, 21). The predictions are evidently arranged on a plan corresponding with these the chief subjects of them, and the time of their utterance is so frequently noted that there is little difficulty in ascertaining their chronological order. This order is followed throughout, except in the middle portion relating to foreign nations, where it is in some instances departed from to secure greater unity of subject (e. g. ch. xxix, 17). The want of exact chronological order in this portion of the book has led to various hypotheses respecting the manner in which the collection of the separate predictions was originally made. Jahn (*Introd.* p. 356) supposes that the predictions against foreign nations were placed in their present position by some transcriber in the order in which they happened to come into his hands, and that he through forgetfulness omitted chaps. xxxv, xxxviii, and xxxix. Eichhorn (*Einleit.* iii, 193) thinks it probable that the predictions were written on several greater or smaller rolls, which were put together in their present form without sufficient regard to chronological accuracy. Bertholdt (*Einleit.* iv, 1487, quoted by Hävernick) supposes that the collector of the whole book found two smaller collections already in existence (chaps. xxv-xxxii, and xxxiii, 21-xxxix), and that he arranged

the other predictions chronologically. All such hypotheses belong, as Hävernick remarks, to a former age of criticism.

The arrangement, by whomsoever made, is very evidently intentional, and it seems on many accounts most probable that it was made by Ezekiel himself. This is maintained by Hävernick on the following grounds: (1.) The arrangement proceeds throughout on a plan corresponding with the subjects of the predictions. In those against foreign nations chronological is united with material order, whilst in those which relate to Israel the order of time is strictly followed. (2.) The predictions stand in such connection with each other that every part has reference to what has preceded it. (3.) Historical notices are occasionally appended to the predictions, which would scarcely be done by a transcriber; e. g. the notice respecting himself in chaps. xi, xxiv, xxv, and the close of ch. xix, which Hävernick translates "This is a lamentation and was for a lamentation." The whole book is divided by Hävernick into nine sections, as follows:

1. Ezekiel's call to the prophetic office (ch. i-iii, 15).  
2. The general carrying out of the commission, in a series of symbolical representations and particular predictions foretelling the approaching destruction of Judah and Jerusalem (ch. iii, 16-vii).

3. The rejection of the people because of their idolatrous worship; a series of visions presented to the prophet a year and two months later than the former, in which he is shown the Temple polluted by the worship of Adonis, the consequent judgment on the inhabitants of Jerusalem and on the priests, and closing with promises of happier times and a purer worship (ch. viii-xi).

4. The sins of the people rebuked in detail; a series of reproofs and warnings directed especially against the particular errors and prejudices then prevalent amongst his contemporaries (ch. xii-xix).

5. The nature of the judgment, and the guilt which caused it; another series of warnings delivered about a year later, announcing the coming judgments to be yet nearer (ch. xx-xxiii).

6. The meaning of the now commencing punishment; predictions uttered two years and five months later, when Jerusalem was besieged, announcing to the captives that very day as the commencement of the siege (comp. 2 Kings xxv, 1), and assuring them of the complete overthrow of the city (ch. xxiv).

7. God's judgment denounced on seven heathen nations (Ammon, xxv, 1-7; Moab, 8-11; Edom, 12-14; the Philistines, 15-17; Tyre, xxvi-xxviii, 19; Sidon, 20-24; Egypt, xxix-xxxii).

8. After the destruction of Jerusalem a prophetic representation of the triumph of Israel and of the kingdom of God on earth (ch. xxxiii-xxxix).

9. The glorious consummation; a symbolic representation of Messianic times, and of the establishment and prosperity of the kingdom of God (ch. xl-xlvi). See § 3 below.

**II. *Genuineness and Completeness.***—According to Jewish tradition, doubts were entertained as to the canonicity of the book on the ground of its containing some apparent contradictions to the law, as well as because of the obscurity of many of its visions. These, however, were removed, it is said, by Rabbi Hananias, who wrote a commentary on the book, in which all these difficulties were satisfactorily solved (*Mischna*, ed. Surenhusius, *Præf. ad Part. iv.*; Carpzov, *Introd.* pt. iii, p. 215); but still, on account of their obscurity, the visions at the beginning and close of the book were forbidden to be read by those who were under thirty years of age (Carpzov, p. 212). Some Continental critics of the last century have impugned the canonicity of the last nine chapters, and have attributed them to some Samaritan or Hebrew who had returned in later times to the land of Judæa (Oeder, *Freie Untersuchung über einige Bücher des A. T.*, Hal. Sax. 1771; Vogel,

in his remarks on the above; and Corrodi, *Beleuchtung des Jüdisch. und Christl. Bibelkanons*, pt. i, p. 105, quoted by Rosenmüller, *Schol. in Ezech.* ad e. xl). These objections have been fully answered by Eichhorn (*Einführung*, iii, 203), Jahn (*Introd. in Lib. Sac. V. T.*, p. 356), and others. Jahn has also taken notice of and answered some objections raised by an anonymous writer in the *Monthly Magazine* (1798), to the canonicity of chaps. xxv-xxxii, xxxv, xxxvi, xxxviii, xxxix. A translation of Jahn's arguments will be found in Horne's *Introd.* iv, 222, old ed. These and similar objections have so little weight or probability that we shall content ourselves with quoting the general remark of Gesenius in reference to the whole of Ezekiel's writings: "This book belongs to that not very numerous class, which, from beginning to end, maintains, by means of favorite expressions and peculiar phrases, such a oneness of tone as by that circumstance alone to prevent any suspicion that separate portions of it are not genuine" (*Geschichte der Heb. Spr.* p. 35). The canonicity of the book of Ezekiel in general is satisfactorily established by Jewish and Christian authorities. There is, indeed, no explicit reference to it, or quotation from it, in the New Testament. Eichhorn (*Einführung*, p. 218) mentions the following passages as having apparently a reference to this book: Rom. ii, 24; comp. Ezek. xxxvi, 21; Rom. x, 5; Gal. iii, 12; comp. Ezek. xx, 11; 2 Pet. iii, 4; comp. Ezek. xii, 22; but none of these are quotations. The closing visions of Ezekiel are clearly referred to, though not quoted, in the last chapters of the Apocalypse. The prophet Ezekiel is distinctly referred to by the son of Sirach (*Eccles.* xlix, 8), and by Josephus (*Ant.* x, 5, 1; 6, 3; 7, 2; 8, 2). The book of Ezekiel is also mentioned as forming part of the canon in the catalogues of Melito (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* iv, 26), Origen (apud Euseb. l. c. vi, 25), Jerome (*Prologus Galeatus*), and the Talmud (Eichhorn, iii, 218; i, 126-137).

One of the passages of Josephus to which we have referred has occasioned much controversy and many conjectures, because he seems to affirm that Ezekiel had written two books of prophecies (*Ant.* x, 5, 1). According to the ordinary and, indeed, as it would seem, necessary interpretation of this passage, Ezekiel was the first who wrote two books respecting the Babylonian captivity. The question then arises, Has one of his books been lost, or are the two now joined into one? The former supposition has been maintained by some in order to account for certain professed quotations from the prophet Ezekiel of passages which are not found in his writings at present. Thus Clemens Romanus (1 *Ep. ad Cor.* c. 8) refers to such a passage, which is given more at length by Clemens Alexand. (*Pædagog.* i, 10). Thus, again, Tertullian (*De carne Christi*, c. 23, p. 394, ed. Semler) says, "Legimus quod Ezechielem de vacca illa quæ peperit et non peperit." Other instances may be seen in Fabricius (*Codex Pseudepigraphus V. T.*, 2d ed., p. 1118), and quoted from him by Carpzov (*Introd.* pt. iii, p. 208). Both these critics, however, agree that the most probable explanation of such references is that they were derived from Jewish tradition. The latter hypothesis, that our present book was originally two, the second containing the last nine chapters, has received the support of very many critics (see Le Moyne, *Varia Sacra*, ii, 332; Carpzov, *Introd.* p. 208). This view, however, is not without serious difficulties. There is no evidence that the book, as at present existing, was ever considered two; and the testimony of Josephus himself, that only twenty-two books were received as sacred (*Contr. Apion.* i, 8), appears quite opposed to such a supposition, since in whatever way the division of the Old Testament into twenty-two books is made there cannot be two out of the number left for Ezekiel. Eichhorn (*Einführung*, iii, 146) maintains that it is Jeremiah of whom Josephus speaks, a position to which we should at once assent if we could with him consider the words ὁς πῶτος αὐς



equivalent to ὁ δὲ πρῶτος. If this is what Josephus meant, we must suppose some corruption of his text. Becker omits the ὁ.

III. *Interpretation.*—The latter part of the book has always been regarded as very obscure. It will be seen, by the brief notices of the contents given above, that Hävernick considers the whole to relate to Messianic times. The predictions respecting Gog (chaps. xxxviii, xxxix) have been referred by some to Antiochus Epiphanes; by others to Cambyses, to the Chaldeans, the Scythians, the Turks, etc. Mr. Granville Penn has interpreted them of Napoleon and the French (*The Prophecy of Ezekiel concerning Gogoe, etc.*, 1815). See GOG. The description of the Temple (chaps. xl–xliii) has been thought by many to contain an account of what Solomon's Temple was; by others, of what the second Temple should be. (See Hävernick's *Commentar über Ezechiel*, Erlangen, 1843.) The best interpretation of these predictions is to be found in that of the similar ones of the Apocalypse. See TEMPLE.

We cannot now enter into the difficulties of these or other chapters (for which we must refer to some of the commentaries mentioned below); but we will enumerate, following Fairbairn, the four main lines of interpretation, viz., 1. The Historico-literal, adopted by Villalpandus, Grotius, Lowth, etc., who make them a prosaic description intended to preserve the memory of Solomon's Temple. 2. The Historico-ideal (of Eichhorn, Dathe, etc.), which reduces them "to a sort of vague and well-meaning announcement of future good." 3. The Jewish-carnal (of Lightfoot, Hoffman, etc.), which maintains that their outline was actually adopted by the exiles. 4. The Christian-spiritual (or Messianic), followed by Luther, Calvin, Cocceus, and most modern commentators, which makes them "a grand complicated symbol of the good God had in reserve for his Church." Rosenmüller, who disapproves alike of the literalism of Grotius, and the arbitrary, ambiguous allegorizing of others, remarks (*Schol.* in xxviii, 26) that it seems a useless task to attempt to refer these prophecies to distinct events, or to refer their poetical descriptions to naked fact. It is most safe to regard them, in accordance with the nature of allegorical representations and visions in general, as having a literal or material basis in the near past or future (i.e. recollections of Solomon's Temple, and prevision of hostile powers), which is made the vehicle of a higher and spiritual import setting forth the distant grandeur, glory, and triumph of the kingdom of God. See DOUBLE SENSE (OF PROPHECY).

IV. *Style.*—The depth of Ezekiel's matter, and the marvellous nature of his visions, make him occasionally obscure. Hence his prophecy was placed by the Jews among the  $\text{רֵזֵיזָה}$  (treasures), those portions of Scripture which (like the early part of Genesis, and the Canticles) were not allowed to be read till the age of thirty (Jerome, *Ep. ad Eustach.*; Origen, *Proem. homil. iv. in Cantic.*; Hottinger, *Theol. Phil.* ii, 1, 3). Hence Jerome compares the "inextricable error" of his writings to Virgil's labyrinth ("Oceanus Scripturam, mysteriorumque Dei labyrinthus"), and also to the Catacombs. The Jews classed him in the very highest rank of prophets. Gregory Naz. (*Or.* 23) bestows the loftiest encomiums upon him. Isidore (*De vit. et ob. Sanct.* 39) makes him a type of Christ from the title "Son of Man," but that is equally applied to Daniel (viii, 17). Other similar testimonies are quoted by Carpovz (*Introd.* ii, 193 sq.). The Sanhedrim is said to have hesitated long whether his book should form part of the canon, from the occasional obscurity, and from the supposed contradiction of xviii, 20 to Exod. xx, 5; xxxiv, 7; Jer. xxxii, 18. But, in point of fact, these apparent oppositions are the mere expression of truths complementary to each other, as Moses himself might have taught them (Deut. xxiv, 16). Although, generally speaking, comments on this

III.—F B

book were forbidden, a certain R. Nananias undertook to reconcile the supposed differences. (Spinoza, *Tract. Theol. Polit.* ii, 27, partly from these considerations, infers that the present book is made up of mere ἀποσπασματα, but his argument from its commencing with a  $\gamma$ , and from the expression in i, 3 above alluded to, hardly needs refutation.)

That Ezekiel was a poet of no mean order is acknowledged by almost all critics (Lowth, *De sacra Poësi Hebræorum*, ed. J. D. Michaelis, Göttingen, 1770, p. 431). Michaelis and Dathe are the only critics of any eminence (as far as we know) who think slightly of his poetical genius. The question is altogether one of taste, and has, we imagine, been decided by common consent against Michaelis. He remarks more truly that Ezekiel lived at a period when the Hebrew language was declining in purity, when the silver age was succeeding to the golden one. It is, indeed, to the matter rather than the language of Ezekiel that we are to look for evidence of poetic genius. His style is often simply didactic, and he abounds in peculiarities of expression, Aramaisms, and grammatical anomalies which, while they give individuality to his writings, plainly evince the decline of the language in which he wrote. An extended account of such peculiarities is given by Eichhorn (*Einleitung in das A. T.* iii, 196) and Gesenius (*Geschichte der Heb. Sprache u. Schrift*, p. 35). Among the most splendid passages are ch. i (called by the Rabbis  $\text{הַרְבֵּי הַקֹּדֶשׁ}$ ), the prophecy against Tyrus (ch. xxvi–xxviii), that against Assyria, "the noblest monument of Eastern history" (ch. xxxi), and ch. viii, the account of what he saw in the Temple porch,

"When, by the vision led,  
His eye surveyed the dark idolatries  
Of alienated Judah."—Milton, *Par. Lost*, l.

—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

V. *Commentaries.*—The following are special exegetical works on the entire book; the most important have an asterisk (\*) prefixed: Origen, *Commentarii*, etc. (in *Opera*, iii, 351 sq., 406); Ephraem Syrus, *Explanatio* (in *Opera*, v, 165); Gregory Nazianzen, *Significatio* (in *Opera Spuria*, i, 870); Jerome, *Commentarii*, etc. (in *Opera*, v); Theodoret, *Interpretatio* (in *Opera*, II, ii; also Rome, 1662, fol.); Gregory the Great, *Homilie* (in *Opera*, i, 1174); Raban, *Commentarii* (in *Opera*); Rupert, *In Ezech.* (in *Opera*, p. 489); Ecolampadius, *Commentarius* (Basil. 1534, 4to; 1543, 8vo; Argent. 1634, 4to); Strigel, *Scholæ* (Lips. 1539, 1564, 1575, 1579, 8vo); Calvin, *Praelectiones* (Geneva, 1565, 8vo, and since; in French, Genev. 1565, fol.; in English, Edinb. 1849–50, 2 vols. 8vo); Junius, *Commentaria* (Genev. 1609, fol.; 1610, 8vo); Maldonatus, *In Ezech.* (in his *Commentarii*, p. 542); Selnecker, *Auslegung* (Lips. 1567, 4to); Pinto, *Commentarius* (Salam. 1568, fol., and later); Lavater, *Commentarii* (Geneva, 1571, fol.); Serranus, *Commentarius* (Antw. 1572, 1607, fol.); Heilbrunner, *Questiones* (Laving. 1587, 8vo); Abraham ben-Mose, *Übersetzung* (Prag. 1602, 4to); \*Pradus and Villalpandus, *Explanaciones* (Romæ, 1605, 3 vols. fol.); Polan, *Commentaria* (Geneva, 1609, fol.; 1610, 8vo); à Lajode, *In Ezech.* (in his *Commentaria*); Sanctius, *Commentarius* (Lugd. 1612, 1619, fol.); Brandmüller, *Commentarius* (Basil. 1621, 4to); \*Greenhill, *Exposition* (London, 1645–67, 5 vols. 4to; also 1827, 1863, 8vo; in Dutch, Hague, 1732–6, 4 vols. 4to); Cocceus, *Commentarius* (Leyd. 1668, 4to; Amst. 1700, fol.); Hennisch, *Clavis* (Rotenburg, 1684; Lips. 1697, 4to); Petersen, *Zeugniss* (Freft. 1719, 4to); \*Lowth, *Commentary* (London, 1723, 4to); \*Starck, *Commentarius* (Freft. ad M. 1731, 4to); Vogel, *Weisagungen* (Hal. 1772, 8vo); Volbrunth, *Anmerk.* (Gött. 1787, 8vo); Newcome, *Explanation* (Dub. 1788, 8vo, and since); Venema, *Lectiones* (Leov. 1790, 4to); \*Horsley, *Notes* (in *Bib. Criticism*, ii, 65); Hancker, *Consideration* (in *Works*, ix, 719); \*Rosenmüller, *Scholæ* (Lpz. 8vo, 1808–10, 2 vols.; also

1826); Rhesa, *Observationes* (Regiom. 1819, 4to); Stern, *מגן עזרא*, etc. (Vienna, 1842, 8vo); \*Hävernick, *Commentar* (Erlangen, 1843, 8vo); \*Umbreit, *Commentar* (Hamb. 1843, 8vo); Macfarlan, *Version* (London, 1845, 8vo); \*Hitzig, *Erklärung* (in the *Kurtz. Exeget. Hdb.*, Lpz. 1847, 8vo); \*Fairbairn, *Exposition* (Edinb. 1851, 1855, 8vo); \*Henderson, *Commentary* (London, 1855, 8vo); Guthrie, *Discourses* (Edinb. 1856, 8vo); Shrewsbury, *Notes* (Manch. 1863, 8vo); Kliefoth, *Erklärung* (Rost. 1864-5, 8vo); \*Hengstenberg, *Erläuterung* (Berl. 1867 sq., 2 vols. 8vo); \*transl. Lond. 1869, 8vo); Cowles, *Notes* (New York, 1867, 12mo). See PROPHEETS.

**E'zel** occurs only in the name EBEN-EZEL (Heb. with the art. repeated, *ha-E'ben ha-E'zel*, *הַבֵּן הָעֶזֶל*, [in pause *בֵּן, A'zel*], the stone of the departure, perhaps i. q. *mile-stone*; Sept. *τὸ Ἐργάβ* [v. r. *ἔργον* and *ὁ λίθος*] *ἐκίνο*; Vulg. *lapis cui nomen est Ezel*; A. V. "the stone Ezel"), an old testimonial-stone in the neighborhood of Saul's residence, the scene of the parting of David and Jonathan when the former finally fled from the court (1 Sam. xx. 19). It seems to have derived its name from some early circumstance not recorded. At the second mention of the spot (ver. 41) the Heb. text (*בְּהַר הָעֶזֶל*; A. V. "out of a place toward the south," literally "from the slope of the south;" Sept. *ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀργάβ*, Vulg. *de loco qui vergebat ad austrum*) is, in the opinion of some critics, corrupt, as indicated by the Sept., which in both cases has *Ergab* or *Argab* (i. e. *בְּהַר אֶרְגָב*, *Argob'*, a heap of stones)—in ver. 19 for the Heb. *Eben*, "stone," and in ver. 41 for *han-negeb*, "the south." The sense in ver. 41 would then be as follows: "David arose from close to the stone heap"—close to which (the same preposition, *בְּ*, A. V. "by") it had been arranged beforehand that he should remain (ver. 19). Other interpreters, however, render simply "on the south side," a signification which sufficiently suits the circumstances. See also BETH-EZEL.

**E'zem** (Heb. *E'tsem*, *עֶזֶם*), a less incorrect mode (1 Chron. iv, 29) of Anglicized the name AZEM (q. v.), as elsewhere (Josh. xix, 3).

**Ezen.** See EZNITE.

**E'zer** (Heb. *E'tser*, *עֶזֶר*, *treasure*; Sept. *Ἀσάρ*, Vulg. *Ezer*), one of the sons of Seir, and native princes of Mount Hor (Gen. xxxvi, 21, 27, 30; 1 Chron. i, 42, 38, in which last verse the name is Anglicized "Ezar"). B. C. cir. 1927.

**E'ZER** (Heb. *E'zer*, *עֶזֶר*, *עֶזֶר* [in pause, *A'zer*, *עֶזֶר*], *help*), the name of five men. See also ROMAMTI-EZER; EBEN-EZER.

1. (Sept. *Ἐζέρο* v. r. *Ἀζέρο*, Vulg. *Ezer*.) A person named with Elead (q. v.) as a son (or descendant) of Ephraim, who was slain by the aboriginal inhabitants of Gath while engaged in a foray on their cattle (1 Chron. vii, 21). Ewald (*Gesch. Isr.* i, 490) assigns this occurrence to the pre-Egyptian period. B. C. ante 1658.

2. (Sept. *Ἐζέρο* v. r. *Γαζέρο*, Vulg. *Ezer*.) The father of Hushah, one of the posterity of Ilur, of the tribe of Judah (1 Chron. iv, 4). B. C. cir. 1658. In ver. 17 he appears to be called EZRA, but no such son occurs among the list of those there attributed to him.

3. (Sept. *Ἀζέρο* v. r. *Ἀζά*, Vulg. *Ezer*.) The first-named of the Gittite champions who repaired to David at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 9). B. C. 1054.

4. (Sept. *Ἀζέρο* v. r. *Ἀζούρο*, Vulg. *Azer*.) Son of Jeshua, and ruler of Mizpah, who repaired part of the city wall near the armory (Neh. iii, 19). B. C. 446.

5. (Sept. *Ἰεζούρο*, Vulg. *Ezer*.) One of the priests who made the circuit of the newly-finished walls of Jerusalem (Neh. xii, 42). B. C. 446.

**Ezeri'as** (ὁ Ἐζερίας v. r. *Ἐζορίας*, Vulg. *Azarias*), the son of Helchiah and father of Saraias, in the ances-

try of Esdras (1 Esdr. viii, 1); evidently the high-priest AZARIAH (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra vii, 1).

**Ezi'as** (ὁ Ἐζιάς v. r. ὁ Ὀζιάς, Vulg. *Azazel*), the son of Meremoth and father of Amarias in the same genealogy (1 Esdr. viii, 2); evidently the corresponding AZARIAH (q. v.) of the Hebrew list (Ezra vii, 3). Comp. AZIEL.

**E'zion-ge'ber** (Heb. *Etsyon'-Ge'ber*, *עֶזְיוֹן גְּבֵר* [in this form only at 1 Kings ix, 26; 2 Chron. viii, 17], i. q. *giant's back-bone*; Sept. *Γασιών* [in Deut. *Γασιών*] *Γάβερ* [in Chron. *Γαβέρ*], but in 1 Kings *Ἀσιών* *Γάβερ*; Vulg. *Asiongeber*) or E'ZION-GA'BER (being "in pause," Heb. *Etsyon'-Ga'ber*, *עֶזְיוֹן גְּבֵר* [in 1 Kings xx, 49; 2 Chron. xx, 36, fully *עֶזְיוֹן גְּבֵר*], so found also at Numb. xxxiii, 35, 36; Deut. ii, 8; but Anglicized "Ezion-geber" in 1 Kings xxii, 48 [49]), a very ancient city near Elath (q. v.), on the eastern arm of the Red Sea. Jonathan's *Targum*, following a false etymology, defines the name as i. q. "castle of the cock" (see Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* col. 384; Beck, *Chron. Chald. paraphr.* ii, 101). It is first mentioned in Numb. xxxiii, 35 as one of the stations where the Hebrews halted in their journeyings through the desert, being the last there named before they came to "the wilderness of Zin, which is Kadesh," and the point where they afterwards turned from the 'Arabah to Elath, towards "the wilderness of Moab" (Deut. ii, 8). See EXODE. From its harbor it was that Solomon (1 Kings ix, 26) sent the fleet which he had there built to the land of Ophir. See COMMERCE. Here also Jehoshaphat (1 Kings xxii, 47; 2 Chron. xx, 35) built a fleet "to go to Ophir;" but because he had joined himself with Ahaziah, "king of Israel, who did wickedly," "the ships were broken that they were not able to go to Tarshish," being probably destroyed on the rocks which lie in "jagged ranges on each side" (Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 84). Büsching (*Erdbeschr.* V, i, 620) erroneously locates it at *Shurm*, a port at the southern end of the gulf (*Geogr. Nub.* iii, 5). Wellsted (*Travels*, ii, 153) would find it in the modern *Dahab*, but this is the ancient Dizahab (q. v.); Laborde (*Commentaire Geogr.* p. 124) seeks it in the rocky island *el-Kurciyah*, which is hardly adequate in extent or position; and Rüppel (*Arab.* p. 252) locates it at the mouth of wady *Emrag*, i. e. *el-Murak*, which is liable to the same objection. Josephus (*Ant.* viii, 6, 4) says that Ezion-geber (*Ἀσσιγγάβαρος*) was also called *Berenice*, and that it lay not far from Elath. It is probably the same with the once-populous city *Asyñ* (Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 511). Robinson (*Biblical Researches*, i, 250) says, "No trace of Ezion-geber seems now to remain, unless it be in the name of a small wady with brackish water, *el-Ghudyan*, opening into el-'Arabah from the western mountain, some distance north of Akabah." It is doubtful, however, whether the sea ever extended so far up the 'Arabah as this. It was probably situated at the point where the Haj route strikes the 'Arabah at the north-west point of the gulf (Robinson, *ib.* i, 239). Yet the town may have given name to this the nearest spring, for *Ghudyan* in Arabic corresponds in all the essential letters to *Ezion* in Heb., which is identical with the later *Asyñ*. By comparing 1 Kings ix, 26, 27, with 2 Chron. viii, 17, 18, it is probable that timber was floated from Tyre to the nearest point on the Mediterranean coast, and then conveyed over land to the head of the Gulf of Akabah, where the ships seem to have been built; for there can hardly have been adequate forests in the neighborhood. Dr. Wilson noticed fragments of an old caravan route part way up the hill-side in this vicinity (*Lands of the Bible*, i, 284). See WILDERNESS OF THE WANDERING.

**Ez'nite** (Heb. in marg. *Etsni'*, *עֶזְנִי*, but in the text *עֶזְנו'*, i. e. *Etsno'*) is given in 2 Sam. xxiii, 8, in the Auth. Vers., as an epithet of Adino, præfect of Da-

vid's body-guard; and if considered as a gentle adj., must mean an inhabitant of *Ezen*, a place otherwise unknown. But of the words rendered "Adino the Eznite" (אֲדִינוֹ הָעִזְנִי, Sept. Ἀδινὸν ὁ Ἄσωναῖος; Vulg. quasi tenerrimus ligni vermiculus, as if understanding the latter term to be a form of אֲדִינוֹ, wood), Gesenius (*Heb. Lex.*) regards the former as a peculiar alliteration for אֲדִינוֹ, in the sense of "he brandished," from the root אֲדָנָה, to be pliant; and the latter as a rare word, אֲדִינוֹ, a spear (for which sense he finds analogy in the Arabic); and thus the whole phrase will be equivalent to that in the parallel passage (1 Chron. xi, 11), which otherwise we must here interpolate (with our translators) in order to make sense. That these words do not contain the name of a person is clear from the fact that Jashobeam is given in the parallel passage, and is capable of identification [see JASHOBEAM], and also from the enumeration, in which the two meritorious grades of three each, with the 30 warriors specially enumerated, require just this one special office to make up the number of 37 specified in the text as peculiarly distinguished. See DAVID. The passage in 2 Sam. is conceded to be less trustworthy than that in 1 Chron., even by Davidson, who vainly contends (*Sacred Hermeneutics*, p. 545) for Adino as a proper name. (See at length in Kennicott, *Dissertation*, i, 71-128; Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 994-5.) Compare ADINO.

**Ezob.** See HYRSOR.

**Ez'ra** (Heb. [except in No. 1] *Ezra'*, אֶזְרָא, the help, a Chaldee emphatic form of אֶזֶר, *Ezer*), the name of three or four men.

1. (1 Chron. iv, 17.) See EZRAII.

2. (Sept. Ἐζρα v. r. Ἐσθραῖς, Vulgate *Esdras*.) A leading priest among the first colonists to Jerusalem under Zerubbabel (Neh. xii, 1). B. C. 536. His son Meshullam was chief of his family in the time of the high-priest Joiakim (Neh. xii, 12). In the somewhat parallel list of Neh. x, 2-8, the name of the same person is written אֶזְרָא, AZARIAH, as it is probably in Ezra vii, 1.

3. (Sept. Ἐσθραῖς v. r. Ἐζρα, Josephus Ἐσθραῖς, Vulg. *Esdras*.) The celebrated Jewish scribe (סֵפֶרֶט) and priest (קֹהֵן), who, in the year B. C. 459, led the second expedition of Jews back from the Babylonian exile into Palestine, and the author of one of the canonical books of Scripture.

1. *Parentage.*—Ezra was a lineal descendant from Phinchas, the son of Aaron (Ezra vii, 1-5). He is stated to be the son of Seraiah, the son of Azariah; which Seraiah was slain at Riblah by order of Nebuchadnezzar, having been brought thither a captive by Nebuzaradan (2 Kings xxv, 18-21). See SERAIAH. But, as 130 years elapsed between the death of Seraiah and the departure of Ezra from Babylon, and we read that a grandson of Seraiah was the high-priest who accompanied Zerubbabel on the first return to Jerusalem, seventy years before Ezra returned thither, we may suppose that by the term *son* here, as in some other places, the relationship of great-grandson, or of a still more remote direct descendant, is intended. See FATHER. All that is really known of Ezra is contained in the last four chapters of the book of Ezra, and in Neh. viii and xii, 26. In addition to the information there given, that he was a "scribe," a "ready scribe of the law of Moses," "a scribe of the words of the commandments of the Lord and of his statutes to Israel," "a scribe of the law of the God of heaven," and "a priest," we are told by Josephus that he was high-priest of the Jews who were left in Babylon; that he was particularly conversant with the laws of Moses, and was held in universal esteem on account of his righteousness and virtue (*Ant.* xi, 5, 1).

2. *Scriptural History.*—The rebuilding of the Tem-

ple of Jerusalem, which had been decreed by Cyrus in the year B. C. 536, was, after much powerful and vexatious opposition, completed in the reign and by the permission of Darius Hystaspis, in the year B. C. 517.

The origin of Ezra's influence with the Persian king Artaxerxes Longimanus does not appear, but in the seventh year of his reign, B. C. 459, in spite of the unfavorable report which had been sent by Rehum and Shimshai, he obtained leave to go to Jerusalem, and to take with him a company of Israelites, together with priests, Levites, singers, porters, and Nethinim. Of these a list, amounting to 1754, is given in Ezra viii; and these, also, doubtless form a part of the full list of the returned captives contained in Neh. vii, and in duplicate in Ezra ii. Ezra and his companions were allowed to take with them a large free-will offering of gold and silver, and silver vessels, contributed not only by the Babylonian Jews, but by the king himself and his counsellors. These offerings were for the house of God, to beautify it, and for the purchase of bullocks, rams, and the other offerings required for the Temple-service. In addition to this, Ezra was empowered to draw upon the king's treasurers beyond the river for any further supplies he might require; and all priests, Levites, and other ministers of the Temple were exempted from taxation. Ezra had also authority given him to appoint magistrates and judges in Judaea, with power of life and death over all offenders. The reason of the interest for the worship of God at this time evinced by Artaxerxes appears to have been a fear of the divine displeasure, for we read in the conclusion of the decree to the treasurers beyond the river, "Whatsoever is commanded by the God of heaven, let it be diligently done for the house of the God of heaven; for why should there be wrath against the realm of the king and his sons?" We are also told (Ezra vii, 6) that the king granted Ezra all his request; and Josephus informs us that Ezra, being desirous of going to Jerusalem, requested the king to grant him recommendatory letters to the governor of Syria (*Ant.* xi, 5, 1). We may therefore suppose that the dread which Artaxerxes entertained of the divine judgments was the consequence of the exposition to him by Ezra of the history of the Jewish people. Some writers suppose that this favor shown to the Jews was consequent upon the marriage of Esther with Ahasuerus; but this could not be, even if we should grant, what is unlikely, that the Artaxerxes of the book of Ezra and the Ahasuerus of the book of Esther were the same person, because Ezra set out for Jerusalem in the first month in the seventh year of the reign of Artaxerxes, and Esther was not taken into the king's house until the tenth month in the seventh year of the reign of Ahasuerus, and did not declare her connection with the Jewish people, and obtain favor for them until after the plot of Haman, in the twelfth year of Ahasuerus. See AHASUERUS.

Ezra assembled the Jews who accompanied him on the banks of the river Ahava, where they halted three days in tents. Here Ezra proclaimed a fast, as an act of humiliation before God, and a season of prayer for divine direction and safe conduct; for, on setting out, he "was ashamed to require a band of soldiers and horsemen to help them against the enemy by the way," because he had asserted to the king that the hand of his God is upon all them that seek him for good. Ezra next committed the care of the treasures which he carried with him to twelve of the chief priests, assisted by ten of their brethren, appointing these to take charge of the treasures by the way, and deliver them safely in the house of the Lord at Jerusalem. On the twelfth day from their first setting out Ezra and his companions left the river Ahava, and arrived safely at Jerusalem in the fifth month, having been delivered from the hand of the enemy and of such as lay in wait by the way. Three days after their arrival the treasures were weighed and delivered

into the custody of some Levites. The returning exiles offered burnt-offerings to the Lord. They delivered also the king's commissions to the viceroys and governors, and gave needful help to the people and the ministers of the Temple.

Ezra's ample commission had been granted him at his own request (ver. 6), and it appears that his great design was to effect a religious reformation among the Palestinian Jews, and to bring them back to the observance of the law of Moses, from which they had grievously declined. His first care, accordingly, was to enforce a separation from their wives of all who had made heathen marriages, in which number were many priests and Levites, as well as other Israelites. For this an opportunity soon presented itself. When he had discharged the various trusts committed to him, the princes of the Jews came to him and complained that the Jewish people generally who had returned from the captivity, and also the priests and Levites, but especially the rulers and princes, had not kept themselves separate from the people of the land, but had done according to the abominations of the remnant of the nations whom their forefathers had driven out, and married their daughters, and allowed their children to intermarry with them. On this report Ezra evinced his deep affliction, according to the Jewish custom, by rending his mantle and tearing the hair of his head and beard. There gathered round him all those who still feared God, and dreaded his wrath for the transgression of those whom he had brought back from captivity. Having waited till the time of the evening sacrifice, Ezra rose up, and, having again rent his hair and his garments, made public prayer and confession of sin. The assembled people wept bitterly, and Shechaniab, one of the sons of Elam, came forward to propose a general covenant to put away the foreign wives and their children. Ezra then arose and administered an oath to the people that they would do accordingly. Proclamation was also made that all those who had returned from the captivity should within three days gather themselves together to Jerusalem, under pain of excommunication and forfeiture of their goods. The people assembled at the time appointed, trembling on account of their sin and of the heavy rain that fell. Ezra addressed them, declaring to them their sin, and exhorting them to amend their lives by dissolving their illegal connections. The people acknowledged the justice of his rebukes, and promised obedience. They then requested that, as the rain fell heavily, and the number of transgressors was great, he would appoint times at which they might severally come to be examined respecting this matter, accompanied by the judges and elders of every city. A commission was therefore formed, consisting of Ezra and some others, to investigate the extent of the evil. This investigation occupied three months. Josephus relates the affecting scene which occurred on the reading of the law by Ezra (*Ant.* xi, 5, 5). The account given by Josephus agrees with that of Nehemiah in all leading particulars, except that Josephus places the date and occasion in the reign of Xerxes (*Ant.* xi, 5, 1).

With the detailed account of this important transaction Ezra's autobiography ends abruptly, and we hear nothing more of him till, thirteen years afterwards, in the twentieth of Artaxerxes, we find him again at Jerusalem with Nehemiah the "Tirshatha." (*Ezra* vii, 11), and to carry thither "the silver and gold which the king and his counsellors had freely offered unto the God of Israel" (ver. 15), and as there is no trace whatever of his presence at Jerusalem between the eighth and the twentieth of Artaxerxes, it seems probable that after he had effected the above-named refor-

mation, and had appointed competent judges and magistrates, with authority to maintain it, he himself returned to the king of Persia. This is in itself what one would expect, and what is borne out by the parallel case of Nehemiah, and it also accounts for the abrupt termination of Ezra's narrative, and for that relapse of the Jews into their former irregularities which is apparent in the book of Nehemiah. Such a relapse, and such a state of affairs at Jerusalem in general, could scarcely have occurred if Ezra had continued there. Whether he returned to Jerusalem with Nehemiah, or separately, does not appear certainly, but as he is not mentioned in Nehemiah's narrative till after the completion of the wall (*Neh.* viii, 1), it is perhaps probable that he followed the latter some months later, having, perhaps, been sent for to aid him in his work. The functions he executed under Nehemiah's government were purely of a priestly and ecclesiastical character, such as reading and interpreting the law of Moses to the people during the eight days of the feast of Tabernacles, praying in the congregation, and assisting at the dedication of the wall, and in promoting the religious reformation so happily effected by the Tirshatha. But in such he filled the first place, being repeatedly coupled with Nehemiah the Tirshatha (*viii.* 9; *xii.* 26), while Eliashub the high-priest is not mentioned as taking any part in the reformation at all. In the sealing to the covenant described in *Neh.* x, Ezra perhaps sealed under the patronymic Seraiah or Azariah (*v.* 2). In *Neh.* viii we read that, on the occasion of the celebration of the feast of the seventh month, subsequently to Nehemiah's numbering the people, Ezra was requested to bring the book of the law of Moses; and that he read therein standing upon a pulpit of wood, which raised him above all the people. As Ezra is not mentioned after Nehemiah's departure for Babylon in the thirty-second of Artaxerxes, and as everything fell into confusion during Nehemiah's absence (*Neh.* xiii), it is not unlikely that Ezra may have again returned to Babylon before that year. See NEHEMIAH.

3. *Traditionary Acts.*—Josephus, who should be our next best authority after Scripture, evidently knew nothing about the time or the place of his death. He vaguely says, "He died an old man, and was buried in a magnificent manner at Jerusalem" (*Ant.* xi, 5, 5), and places his death in the high-priesthood of Joacim, and before the government of Nehemiah! According to some Jewish chroniclers, he died in the year in which Alexander came to Jerusalem, on the tenth day of the month Tebeth (that is, the lunation in December), in the same year in which took place the death of the prophets Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, and in which prophecy became extinct. According to other traditions, Ezra returned to Babylon and died there at the age of 120 years. The Talmudic statement is that he died at Zamzumu, a town on the Tigris, while on his road from Jerusalem to Susa, whither he was going to converse with Artaxerxes about the affairs of the Jews. Thus Benjamin of Tudela says of Nehar-Samorah (apparently Zamuza, otherwise Zamzumu): "The sepulchre of Ezra the priest and scribe is in this place, where he died on his journey from Jerusalem to King Artaxerxes" (*Travels*, i, 116). A tomb said to be his is shown on the Tigris, near its junction with the Euphrates (*Layard, Nin. and Bab.* p. 428, note). An interesting description of this tomb is given by Kitto (*Pict. Bible*, note at the end of Ezra).

As regards the traditional history of Ezra, it is extremely difficult to judge what portion of it has any historical foundation. The principal works ascribed to him by the Jews, and, on the strength of their testimony, by Christians also, are the following:

(1.) Some traditions assert that Ezra was, about A. M. 3113, the president of the *בְּנֵי שֵׁנַי הַגְּדוּלָה*, *Synagoga Magna*, and the father of all Mishnic doctors. See



Reputed Tomb of Ezra.

**SYNAGOGUE, GREAT.** In piety and meekness he was like Moses (*Yuchasin*, p. 13. See *Zemach David*). When he went from Babylon to Jerusalem, he took with him all persons whose descent was either illegitimate or unknown, so that the Jews left in Babylon should be נָקִי כֶסֶלֶת, *pure like flour* (*Kiddushin*, c. 4, 1, Gem.). Ezra is said to have introduced the present square Hebrew character, and, in conjunction with some other elders, to have made the Masora (q. v.), the punctuation, and accentuation of the whole Bible (*Abarbanel, Prefat. ad Nuchalah Aboth*; *Elias, Prefat. 3 Masor.*). Ezra is also said to have vigorously resisted the sect of the Sadducees, which sprang up in his days; and therefore to have put the words מֶן כִּלְבֵּם הַדְּוֹלָם עַד כִּלְבֵּם, *à seculo in seculum*, at the head of all prayers, as a symbol by which the orthodox could be distinguished (*Bab. Berachoth*, fol. 51). Since the people, during the Babylonian captivity or exile, had become accustomed to the Aramaic language, and scarcely understood Hebrew, Ezra established the office of turgoman, תְּרוּגְמָן, *turgoman*, or interpreter, who stood near the public reader in the synagogue, and translated every verse after it was read (*Megillah*, fol. 74). Hence he is usually regarded as the founder of the synagogue worship. See **SYNAGOGUE**. Ezra ordained that the year of jubilee should be reckoned from the seventh year after the rebuilding of the Temple (*Maimonides, Hal. Jubel*, cap. 10).

(2.) Ezra is considered to be the author of the canon, and worthy to have been the lawgiver, if Moses had not preceded him (*Bab. Sanhed.* c. ii, f. 21; comp. the art. **CANON**). He is even said to have rewritten the whole of the Old Testament from memory, the copies of which had perished by neglect. To him is also ascribed the authorship of the books of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and, some add, Esther; and, many of the Jews say, also of the books of Ezekiel, Daniel, and the twelve prophets; to which we may with more probability perhaps add the 119th Psalm. (See each book in its place.) Tischendorf has lately published (*Apocalypses Apocrypher*, Lips. 1866) an *editio princeps* of the Greek text of an "Apocalypsis Esdræ." See **REVELATIONS (SPURIOUS)**.

But we must abstain from recounting all the traditional amplifications of the doings of Ezra, since, if all were to be received, it would be difficult to say what he did not do, so strong has been the inclination to connect important facts with his person (comp. 2 Esdr. xiv; *Irenæus, adv. Hæres.* iii, 25; *Clem. Alexandr. Strom.* i, p. 142; *Augustin. De Mirabil. Script.* ii, 23; *Jerome, ad Hebr. l.* p. 212; *Buxtorf, Tiberias*, p. 88

sq.; *Bertholdt, Einleit.* i, 69 sq.; *De Wette, Einleit.* p. 17 sq.; *Sauer, Dissert. in canonem Vet. Test.* etc., Altorf, 1792; *Scnehdrin*, fol. xxi, 1; *Rau, De Synag. Magna*, p. 31, 89; *Hartmann, Verbindung des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, p. 114 sq.). Of most of the above acts of Ezra a full account is given in *Prideaux's Connexion*, i, 308-348, and 355-376; also in *Otho's Lex. Rabb.* p. 208 sq. A compendious account of the arguments by which most of these Jewish statements are proved to be fabulous is given in *Stehelin's Rabb. Literat.* p. 5-8; of which the chief are drawn from the silence of the sacred writers themselves, of the apocryphal books, and of Josephus—and it might be added, of Jerome—and from the fact that they may be traced to the author of the chapter in the Mishna called *Pirke Aboth*. Arabian fables about Ezra are mentioned in *Hottinger's Thes. Philol.* p. 113, and in *Herbelot, Bibl. Orientale*, p. 697, etc.—*Kitto*, s. v.; *Smith*, s. v.

**EZRA, BOOK OF.** This is manifestly a continuation of the books of Chronicles, as, indeed, it is called by *Hilary*, bishop of Poitiers, *Sermones dierum Esdræ* (*ap. Cosin's Canon of Script.* p. 51), and as was early conceded (*Huetius, Dem. Evang.* iv, 14, p. 341). See **CHRONICLES (BOOKS OF)**.

**I. Contents.**—The book of Ezra contains ἀπομνημονεύματα, *memorabilia*, or records of events occurring about the termination of the Babylonian exile. It contains accounts of the favors bestowed upon the Jews by the Persian kings; of the rebuilding of the Temple; of the mission of Ezra to Jerusalem, and his regulations and reforms. Such records forming the subject of the book of Ezra, we must not be surprised that its parts are not so intimately connected with each other as we might have expected if the author had set forth his intention to furnish a complete history of his times (see *Pemble, Persian Monarchy*, in his *Works*, Lond. 1635, p. 345). The events narrated in the book of Ezra are spread over the reigns of

	Years.	Months.
Cyrus.....	7	0
Cambyses.....	7	5
Magus, or Pseudo-Smerdis.....	0	7
Darius Hystaspis.....	36	0
Xerxes.....	19	5
Artabanus.....	0	7
Artaxerxes (in the eighth year of whose reign the records of Ezra cease).....	8	0
Total.....	79	0

The arrangement of the facts in the book of Ezra is chronological. The book may be divided into two portions. The first consists of chapters i-vi, and contains the history of the returning exiles and of their rebuilding of the Temple, and comprises the period from the first year of Cyrus, B.C. 536, to the sixth year of Darius Hystaspis, B.C. 515. The second portion contains the personal history of the migration of Ezra to Palestine, in the seventh year of Artaxerxes. This latter portion, embracing chapters vii-x, is an autobiography of Ezra during about twelve or thirteen months, in the seventh and eighth years of the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus.

**II. Plan.**—The course of events recorded in these ten chapters appears to be as follows: First, the decree of king Cyrus, putting an end to the Babylonish captivity, and instructing the returning Israelites to rebuild the Temple and restore the worship of Jehovah (ch. i). Second, the consequent proceedings of the people (ch. ii, iii). Third, the hindrances to which they were exposed by the jealousy of the Persian government, stimulated as this was by the hatred of the neighbors of the Jews, until Darius discovered the original decree of Cyrus, and confirmed and extended it, so that the Temple was fully rebuilt, and the worship restored according to the law (ch. iv, v, vi). Fourth, the mission of Ezra, who was both a priest and a scribe, and was empowered by king Artaxerxes not only to maintain the prescribed worship, but, greatly more than that, to restore the entire theocratic admin-

istration, only reserving the temporal supremacy of the Persian monarchy (ch. vii, viii). Lastly, the reconstruction of this theocratic state, which Ezra effected so completely that he carried the people with him in remodelling the family relations by the law against intermarriage with certain races (ch. ix, x).

III. *Unity*.—This is a complete narrative in itself; and there is no room for the hypothesis that Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, taken together, form one great historical work. The arguments for this hypothesis are of no weight in themselves for establishing the conclusion; but in so far as they are statements of fact, they are willingly put forward by us as circumstances worthy of consideration in themselves, and apart from the illogical purpose to which they have been applied. 1. The three books have a large number of words and phrases in common, which are not met with at all, or at least not frequently, in other parts of Scripture. This agrees well with their composition at a new epoch in the history of the Hebrew nation and its literature, by men who had been brought up in the land of Assyria or Babylonia, perhaps brought up together at the same Persian court, Ezra and Nehemiah being also most intimate friends and fellow-workers. The opinion is also probable that the Chronicles were compiled by Ezra, as well as the book to which his own name has been given. 2. There is a predilection for genealogical details running through all these books. This seems to have been characteristic of the age; and it was probably necessary, considering the efforts to restore the old arrangements as to the holding of property, the administration of government, and the preservation of ancient national feeling, all of which objects were likely to force genealogical questions upon the notice of men. 3. There is a similar prominence given to details about the priests and Levites. This is unavoidable in any treatment of the people of Israel, unless their character as the Church of God is to be overlooked. Especially, in whatever proportion there were difficulties felt as to the revival of the more political aspects of the theocracy, in that same proportion must the greater attention have been given to its ecclesiastical arrangements.

IV. *Authorship*.—A late ingenious writer (Rev. and Lord Hervey, in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v.) thus pronounces on this question: "Like the two books of Chronicles, it consists of the contemporary historical journals kept from time to time by the prophets, or other authorized persons, who were eye-witnesses for the most part of what they record, and whose several narratives were afterwards strung together, and either abridged or added to, as the case required, by a later hand. That later hand, in the book of Ezra, was doubtless Ezra's own, as appears by the last four chapters, as well as by other matter inserted in the previous chapters. While, therefore, in a certain sense, the whole book is Ezra's, as put together by him, yet strictly only the last four chapters are his original work. Nor will it be difficult to point out with tolerable certainty several of the writers of whose writings the first six chapters are composed." Accordingly, that writer, in imitation of many Rationalists, proceeds to dissect the book for this purpose. 1. Chap. i he assigns as being undoubtedly by Daniel, on account of the otherwise unaccountable silence of that prophet respecting the decree of Cyrus, and the phraseology of Ezra in referring to that event. 2. Chap. ii is assigned to Nehemiah, as being identical with Neh. vii. 3. Chap. iii, 2-vi (except iv, 6-23), he thinks belongs to Haggai, on account of certain coincidences of expression in that prophet. 4. Chap. iv, 6-23, he regards as a parenthetic addition made in the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus. 5. Chaps. vii-ix are unquestionably Ezra's own production. A still later critic (Dr. Davidson, in the new edit. of Kitt's *Cyclopaedia of Bibl. Lit.* s. v.) is even bolder in distributing various por-

tions to "the Chronist," as he designates the unknown interpolator after Ezra.

It is a sufficient refutation of all such attempts to note their extremely *subjective* character, depending chiefly upon the caprice or conjecture of the critic himself; for the peculiarities cited, when closely examined, are found to be too general and accidental to be relied upon as proofs of authorship, especially in view of the foregoing remarks respecting the scheme of the book. Moreover, if, as all admit, Ezra did incorporate older documents into his history (so even Moses does in the Pentateuch), yet, as he moulded them into a homogeneous narrative, this does not militate against his claim to be regarded as the proper author, and not simply *editor* of the book that bears his name. (See the *Einleitungen* of Hävernick and Keil.)

V. *Personality of the Writer*.—In the first six chapters the use of the third person predominates in the narrative, except in passages where, by *synecdoche*, occurs אֲנִי, Heb. אָנֹכִי, we said, or where the narrative contains abstracts from documents to which Ezra had access. In these abstracts the Aramaic or Chaldean language of the original documents has been preserved from ch. iv, 8 to vi, 18, and vii, 12-26. These portions exist in Kennicott's *Col.* p. 240, in a collateral Hebrew translation, reprinted in Kennicott's edition of the Hebrew Bible, and separately in *Chaldaeorum Danielis et Esrae capitulum interpretatio Hebraica* (Ludovicius Schulze, Halle, 1782, 8vo). An argument has been raised against the opinion that Ezra was the author of the whole book that bears his name from the use of the first person plural in the 4th verse of the 5th chapter, which would seem to imply that the narrator was present on the occasion described; but, setting aside other replies to this argument, it appears that the word *we* refers to Tatnai and his companions, and not at all to the Jews. Ezra speaks from ch. vii, 27, to ch. ix, 15, in the first person. "There is an essential difference between public events which a man recollects, though only as in a dream, to have heard of at the time when they occurred, and those which preceded his birth. The former we think of with reference to ourselves; the latter are foreign to us. The epoch and duration of the former we measure by our own life; the latter belong to a period for which our imagination has no scale. Life and definiteness are imparted to all that we hear or read with respect to the events of our own life" (Niebuhr, *On the Distinction between Annals and History*). These remarks, which Niebuhr made in reference to Tacitus, are in a great measure applicable also to Ezra. Instances of similar change of person are so frequent in ancient authors that rhetoricians have introduced it among the rhetorical figures under the name of *enallage personarum*. The prophetic writings of the Old Testament furnish examples of such *ἐναλλαγή*. For instance, Ezek. i, 1-3; Zech. i, 1; vi, 1; vii, 1, 4, 8; Jer. xx, 1 sq., comp. with v, 7 sq.; xxi, 1; xxviii, 1-5; xxxii, 1-8; Hos. i, 2-3; iii, 1. So also in Habakkuk, Daniel, etc. The frequency of this *ἐναλλαγή*, especially in the prophetic parts of the Old Testament, arises from either the more objective or more subjective tendency of the style, which of course varies in harmony with the contents of the chapter. (See Fromman, *Disq. qua Orientis regibus plurimum numero de se loqui non inusitatum fuisse, probabiliter ostenditur*, Cob. 1762.) We express our opinion that even Hävernick does not rightly set forth the truth of the matter when, in his *Einleitung*, he says that this *ἐναλλαγή* arose from Ezra's imitation of the prophetic usage, and when he approvingly quotes Schirmer's *Observationes exegeticae et criticae in librum Esrae*, ii, 8 (Vratisl. 1830). There was certainly as little imitation of the prophets in the *enallage personarum* of Ezra as there is imitation of the prophets if we change from the first to the third person in our own communications. *Ἐναλλαγή* never arises

from imitation, but only from the more subjective or more objective turn of our mind, and from that vivacity of style which renders it incumbent upon the reader rather than upon the writer to supply that **הַיְהוֹדוּת**, which, as in Jonah ii, 3, forms the transition from the use of the *third* to the adoption of the *first* person.

VI. *Date*.—The reckless assertions of some writers that this composition as a whole must be referred to a period about a century later than Ezra, or more, need not be noticed, because they have not even a pretence of argument in their favor. One writer, Zunz (*Die gottesdienstl. Vorträge der Juden*, 1832), has indeed alleged that there is some exaggeration about the sacred vessels said to have been restored by Cyrus; but his fellow-unbelievers have refused to agree with him, and have defended the historical credibility of the book throughout. Another critic, Bertheau, sees an evidence of the composition of ch. vi, 22 under the Greek successors of Alexander, because the king of Persia is called the king of *Assyria*; an argument which might have been left to its own weakness, even though we had been unable to give the parallels 2 Kings xxiii, 29; Lam. v, 6, as Keil has done.

On the contrary, critics who rely upon their internal arguments might have seen evidence in favor of its early composition in the fact that its chronology is clear and exact; while the accounts of Jewish affairs under the Persian monarchy, as given by Josephus from apocryphal writers and other sources unknown to us, present extreme confusion and some palpable mistakes. The book begins with the decree of Cyrus after he had taken Babylon, by which the Jews were sent home to Jerusalem and directed to rebuild the Temple, B.C. 536. It narrates the difficulties and hindrances before this was accomplished in the sixth year of Darius, the son of Hystaspes, about B.C. 516. It passes in silence over the rest of his reign, 31 years, and the whole of the reign of Xerxes, 21 years, proceeding directly to the work of Ezra, who received his commission in the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, B.C. 459. If the whole of the events narrated in the closing chapter took place almost immediately, as is understood, we believe, by all commentators, then the extreme length of time embraced in the narrative is not above 80 years; and the order is strictly chronological, though it is not continuous, but leaves a blank of almost sixty years. (See Hilgenfeld, *Ezra und Daniel, und ihre neueste Bearbeitungen*, Halle, 1863.)

VII. *Language*.—The book is written partly in Hebrew and partly in Chaldee. The Chaldee begins at iv, 8, and continues to the end of vi, 18. The letter or decree of Artaxerxes, vii, 12–26, is also given in the original Chaldee.

VIII. *Canonicity*.—There has never been any doubt about Ezra being canonical, although there is no quotation from it in the N. Test. Augustine styles Ezra "rather a writer of transactions than a prophet" (*De Civ. D. i.*, xviii, 36).

IX. *Apocryphal Additions*.—We have spoken thus far of the canonical book of Ezra; there are, however, four books that have received this name, viz. the book noticed above, the only one which was received into the Hebrew canon under that name, the book of Nehemiah, and the two apocryphal books of Esdras, concerning which last see *ESDRAS*.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.; Fairbairn, s. v.

X. *Commentaries*.—The following are special exegetical works on the entire book, the most important being denoted by an asterisk (\*): \*Aben Ezra, **פְּרָשִׁי** (in Buxtorf's Rabbinical Bible, Basle, 1618–19, fol.); Bede, *Expositio* (in *Works*, viii, 360); \*Rashi, **פְּרָשִׁי** (Naples, 1487, 4to; Venice, 1517, fol.; in Latin, under other books, Gotha, 1714, 4to); \*Kimchi, **פְּרָשִׁי** (in Bomberg's Rabbinical Bible, Ven. 1549, fol.); Simeon, **פְּרָשִׁי** (in his Bible, Venice, 1518, fol.);

Jachya, **פְּרָשִׁי** (Bologna, 1538, fol.); Jaabez, **פְּרָשִׁי** (Belvedere, n. d. fol.); Trapp, *Commentary* (London, 1656, fol.); De Oliva, *Commentarii* (Leyden, 1564, 4to; 1679, 2 vols. fol.); \*Strigel, *Commentarius* (Tigur. 1570, 1584, fol.); also *Scholia* (Lips. 1571); Wolpius, *Commentarii* (Tigur. 1584, fol.); Sanctius, *Commentarii* (Leyd. 1628, fol.); Lombard, *Commentarius* (Par. 1643, fol.); Jackson, *Explanation* (London, 1658, 4to); Lee, *Discourse* (London, 1722, 8vo); \*Rambach, *Note* (in Grotii ed. Clerici *Adnot. in Hagiogr.* ii); \*Schirmer, *Observationes* (Vratislav. 1817, 8vo; 1820, 4to); \*Keil, *Apolog. Vers.* etc. (Berl. 1833, 8vo); Kleinert, *Entstehung*, etc. (in the *Dörpt. Beitr.* i, 1–304; ii, 1–232); Jeitteles, **פְּרָשִׁי**, etc. (Vienna, 1835, 8vo); \*Bertheau, *Erlklär.* (in the *Kurt-gef. Exeg. Hdb.* Lpz. 1862, 8vo). See *OLD TESTAMENT*.

4. (Sept. Ἐζρα v. r. Ἐζραῶς, Vulg. *Esdras*.) One of the chief Israelites who formed the first division that made the circuit of the walls of Jerusalem when reconstructed (Neh. xii, 33). B.C. 446.

**Ezrah.** See *BAY-TREE*.

**Ez'rah** (Heb. *Ezrah'*, **עֶזְרָה**, *help*, another form of *Ezer* or *Ezra*; Sept. Ἐζρα, Vulg. *Ezra*, A. V. "Ezra"), a descendant of Judah (as if in the line of Caleb), and the father of several sons, although his own parentage is not given (1 Chron. iv, 17), unless he be identical with the *EZER* of ver. 4, whose son's name, however, does not correspond. B.C. ante 1618. See *MERED*. According to the author of the *Questiones in Paral.* Ezra is the same as Amram, and his sons Jether and Mered are Aaron and Moses; but this is out of the question. See also *EZRAHITE*.

**Ez'rahite** (Hebrew, with the article *ha-Ezrah'i'*, **הַיְהוּדֵי עֶזְרָה**, as if a patronym from *Ezrah*; Sept. ὁ Ζαροῖτης v. r. ὁ Ἐζραῖτης, Vulg. *Ezrahita*), a title attached to two persons—Ethan (1 Kings iv, 51; Ps. lxxxix, title) and Heman (Psa. lxxxviii, title). The word is naturally derivable from *Ezrah*, **עֶזְרָה**, or—which is almost the same—*Zerah*, **זֶרַח**; and accordingly in 1 Chron. ii, 6, Ethan and Heman are both given as sons of Zerah, the son of Judah. Another Ethan and another Heman are named as Levites and musicians in the lists of 1 Chron. vi and elsewhere.—Smith, s. v. In the passage first cited, "the Ezrahite," or, rather, *Ezrahite*, appears as a designation applied to Ethan, a man famous for his wisdom (1 Kings v, 11 [A. V. iv, 31]). See *ETHAN*. In the inscription of Psa. lxxxix, Ethan the Ezrahite is named as its author; and in the inscription of Psa. lxxxviii the same is said with respect to it of Heman the Ezrahite. This has led some to identify the Ethan and Heman, who were chief among the singers appointed by David (1 Chron. xv, 15). But we have no reason to believe that, whatever skill these men had in music, they were famed for surpassing wisdom; and the inscription in the Psalms is perhaps due to the mistake of some one in whose mind the passage in Kings had got mixed up with 1 Chron. ii, 6, where Ethan and Heman appear among the sons of Zerah of the tribe of Judah. As **זֶרַח** is the same as **זֶרַח** with the prosthetic *h*, it is not improbable that in this last passage it is the Ethan of Kings that is referred to; but we cannot with certainty pronounce this, as there is a want of accordance between the statement of the chronicler and that in Kings respecting the parentage of the other persons mentioned. It is not impossible, however, that the names "Heman, Calcol, and Dara" have been interpolated in the text of Chronicles from the passage in Kings, especially as the writer goes on to state only the descendants of Carmi or Zinuri and Ethan (ver. 7, 8). In this case Ethan, the son of Zerah, may be Ethan the Ezrahite; but there is no Heman the Ezrahite.—Kitto, s. v. A readier solution of the whole difficulty would be to

suppose that "Ezrahite" in the title to Psalm lxxxviii is merely an orthographical variety for IZARHITE (עֲזָרְיָהוּ; 1 Chron. xxvi, 23), a Levitical family to which the musical Heman certainly belonged (1 Chron. vi, 33-38); and that the epithet has crept into the title of Psalm lxxxix by assimilation of the names of Ethan and Heman so frequently associated together (these two Psalms being apparently closely related in

authorship, and perhaps originally joined together; see Delitzsch, *Commentar üb. den Psalter*, i, 653 sq.). See ZARHITE.

**Ez'ri** (Heb. *Ezri'*, עֲזָרִיָּה, *helpful*; Sept. Ἐσζήρι v. r. Ἐσζάι, Vulg. *Ezri*), son of Chelub, superintendent for king David of those "who did the work of the field for tillage of the ground" (1 Chron. xxvii, 26). B. C. 1014.

## F.

**Faber, Basil**, a learned German Protestant divine, was born at Sorau, in Lower Lusatia, about 1520, studied at Wittenberg under Melancthon, was rector of the gymnasium at Nordhausen, 1550-55, and afterwards of Quedlinburg, 1563-70. He opposed Melancthon's *Corpus Doctrinæ* and the Crypto-Calvinists, and in 1570 had to leave Quedlinburg on this account. He then taught at Erfurt till his death, 1576. His chief work is the *Thesaurus eruditiois scholasticæ* (Lips. 1571; last ed. Franct. 1749, 2 vols. fol.), a work which still commands consideration for its extensive and exact learning. He was also one of the writers of the Magdeburg Centuries (q. v.).

**Faber** (or **FABRI**), **Felix**, a Dominican monk and Oriental traveller, was born in Zurich, 1441-2, and was educated by the Dominicans at Basel. He early entered the Dominican order, and was made chief preacher in the cloister at Ulm, 1478. His studies were directed to the illustration of the Bible lands, and he made two journeys to the East, one in 1480 to Jerusalem, and one in 1483-4 to Palestine, Egypt, and Sinai. He died March 14, 1502. His principal writings are *Evagatorium in Terræ Sanctæ, Arabiæ et Ægypte peregrinationem* (republished Stuttg. 1843-9, 3 vols. 8vo):—*Historia Suerorum* (Franct. 1605; Ulm, 1727).—Quétif et Echarl, *Script. Ord. Præd.* vol. i; Herzog, *Real-Encyclopædie*, iv, 306.

**Faber, George Stanley**, D.D., an English divine and voluminous writer, was born Oct. 25, 1773, and was educated at the grammar-school of Heppenholtme, and at University College, Oxford, where he passed B.A. in 1792. In 1801, as Bampton lecturer, he preached before the University the discourses which he afterwards published under the title of *Hæc Mosaica*. In 1802 he became curate to his father at Calverley, Yorkshire; in 1805 he was made vicar of Stockton-upon-Tees; in 1811 vicar of Long-Newton, where he remained till 1831, when bishop Burgess presented him to a prebend in the cathedral of Salisbury. In 1832 he was made master of Sherburn Hospital, near Durham. "During his mastership he considerably increased the value of the estates of the hospital. He rebuilt the chapel, the house, and the offices, and greatly improved the grounds; he augmented the incomes of the incumbents of livings under his patronage, restored the chancels of their churches, and erected agricultural buildings on the farms. He died at his residence, Sherburn Hospital, Jan. 27, 1851." Dr. Faber's chief writings are on prophecy, and in them he seeks to show that the prophecies "are not applicable to the destinies of individuals, but to those of governments and nations." His most important writings are *Hæc Mosaica*, or *A Dissertation on the Credibility and Theology of the Pentateuch* (Bampton Lecture, London, 1801, 2 vols. 8vo; 2d ed. 1818, 2 vols. 8vo):—*A Dissertation on the Mysteries of the Cabyri, or the great Gods of Phœnicia, Samothrace, Egypt, Trous, Greece, Italy, and Crete* (Oxford, 1803, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Dissertation on the Prophecies that have been fulfilled, are now fulfilling, or will hereafter be fulfilled, relative to the great Period of 1260 Years* (London, 1806, 2 vols. 8vo; 3d ed. 1811-18, 3 vols. 8vo):—*A general and connected View of the Prophecies relating to the Conversion, Resto-*

*ration, Union, and future Glory of Judah and Israel* (London, 1808, 2 vols. 8vo):—*The Origin of Pagan Idolatry* (London, 1816, 3 vols. 4to):—*A Treatise on the Genius and Object of the Patriarchal, the Levitical, and the Christian Dispensation* (London, 1823, 2 vols. 8vo):—*The sacred Calendar of Prophecy* (London, 1828, 3 vols. 8vo; 1844, 3 vols. 12mo):—*Eight Dissertations on certain connected prophetic Passages of holy Scriptures bearing more or less upon the Promise of a mighty Deliverer* (London, 1845, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Treatise on the Holy Spirit* (London, 1813, 8vo):—*Difficulties of Infidelity* (London, 1824, 8vo; N. Y. 1854, 12mo):—*Difficulties of Romanism* (London, 1826, 8vo):—*On expiatory Sacrifice* (London, 1827, 8vo):—*Primitive Doctrine of Justification* (London, 1837, 8vo):—*Apostolicity of Trinitarianism* (London, 1832, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Primitive Doctrine of Election* (London, 1842, 2d ed. 8vo; Philad. 1842):—*Provincial Letters from the County Palatine of Durham, exhibiting the Nature and Tendency of the Principles put forth by the Writers of "Tracts for the Times," and their various Allies* (1842, 2 vols. 12mo):—*The many Mansions in the House of the Father scripturally discussed and practically considered* (1851, 8vo):—*Primitive Doctrine of Regeneration* (London, 1840, 8vo):—*The Vallenses and Albigenes* (London, 1838, 8vo):—*The Revival of the French Emperors anticipated from the Necessity of Prophecy* (London, 1853, 12mo; N. Y. 1859, 12mo).—*English Cyclopædia*; *Westleyan Magazine*, Nov. 1856.

**Faber** (FÈVRE, DE LA BODERIE), **Gui**, a French theologian, was born at Boderie, Normandy, Aug. 9, 1541. He became secretary of the duke of Alençon, and died in 1598. He was a good linguist, and took part in preparing the Antwerp Polyglot, for which he furnished the Syriac of the N. T. with a Latin translation. He also composed a Chaldaic and a Syriac Grammar, and a Syro-Chaldaic Lexicon, and edited the works of Severus, patriarch of Alexandria, on baptism and the Eucharist, in Syriac, with a Latin translation, and translated Marsil. Ficinus and other writers into French.—Herzog, *Real-Encyclopædie*, iv, 313; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxx, 342.

**Faber, Jacobus** (*Lefèvre Jacques*), doctor of the Sorbonne, and grand vicar of Bourges, was born at Coutances, became doctor of the Sorbonne in 1674, and died at Paris July 1, 1716. He wrote a number of pamphlets against the Protestants, as well as against Arnauld, Maimbourg, and Natalis Alexander; and also a defense of the Sorbonne against the Jesuits, for which he was for a time imprisoned in the Bastille.—Feller, *Dictionnaire Historique*, vii, 79; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxx, 343.

**Faber, Jacobus Stapulensis** (*Favre, or Le Fèvre d'Étaples Jacques*), an eminent scholar, one of the most zealous of his age for the revival of ancient learning, was born about 1450 (1455?) at Étaples, a village of Picardy. He was educated at the University of Paris, in which he studied mathematics, philosophy, and finally theology. He studied Greek with Hermonymus of Sparta at Paris. In 1492 he travelled into Italy, and studied Aristotle at Florence, Rome, and Venice; and on his return to Paris lectured on Aristotle's writings, and translated a number of them



into Latin. In 1507 he took up his abode in the Benedictine abbey of St. Germain des Près, with Briçonnet, the abbot, who was his pupil and intimate friend. Here he remained till 1520, engaged chiefly in Biblical studies, the first published fruit of which was his *Psalterium Quintuplex*, in five columns, *Gallicum, Romanum, Hebraicum, Vetus, Conciliatum* (Par. 1509, fol). He wrote also *Commentarius in Psalmos*, etc. (Paris, 1515);—*Commentarius in Epist. Catholicas* (Basil, 1527, fol.);—*Commentarius in Quat. Evang.* (Meld. 1522);—*De Tribus Magdalenis* (Par. 1531). He was suspected of Lutheranism, and the Parliament of Paris was about to proceed against him in 1521; but in 1523, Briçonnet, now bishop of Meaux, made him his general vicar, and he removed to Meaux. He was afterwards deprived of his doctors' degree, and compelled to retire to Guicune. Before this, at the request of the queen of Navarre, he had commenced a translation (from the Vulgate) of the N. T. into French, which appeared in 1523. This work was intended for common readers, and was soon widely scattered. "The effect of the dissemination of this version of the Word of God, which formed the basis for the subsequent translation of Robert Olivetanus, so important in the history of the progress of Protestantism in France, was at once visible. The copies were eagerly sought; the poor received the Gospel gratuitously when they could not even pay the small sum demanded, from the liberality of the good bishop. Briçonnet introduced the French Scriptures into the churches of Meaux, where the people listened to the lessons in an intelligible language and were delighted. An autograph letter, recently discovered among the rich treasures of the public library of Geneva, from Lefèvre to his absent pupil Farel, pictures to us the immediate results of the publication, and the glowing hopes of the reformer. He writes: 'Good God, with what joy do I exult when I perceive that the grace of the pure knowledge of Christ has already spread over a good part of Europe; and I hope that Christ is at length about to visit our France with this benediction. You can scarcely imagine with what ardor God is moving the minds of the simple in some places to embrace his Word since the books of the New Testament have been published in French; but you will justly lament that they have not been more widely scattered among the people. Some enemies have endeavored, under cover of the authority of the Parliament, to hinder the work; but our most generous king has become in this matter the defender of the cause of Christ, declaring it to be his will that his kingdom shall hear the word of God without impediment in that tongue which it understands. Now throughout our entire diocese, on feast-days and especially on Sunday, both the Epistle and the Gospel are read to the people in their native tongue, and the parish priest adds a word of exhortation to the Epistle or Gospel, or both at his own discretion' (Letter of Lefèvre, dated Meaux, July 6, 1524, in the *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français*, t. xi [1862], p. 212, 213)," cited by Baird, *Methodist Quarterly Review*, 1864, p. 442.

Faber was not fitted for the strife and storm of the times, and to secure quiet, he lived for several years as librarian to the palace at Blois, where he prepared a French translation (from the Vulgate) of the O. T., which appeared in Antwerp in 1528 (4 vols. 8vo). All his affinities, both from study and friendship, being with the Reformation, his last years were embittered by the persecutions suffered by his friends, though he never left the Roman Church. But he "well deserved the name of the forerunner of the Reformation; for in 1512, five years before Luther posted his theses on the doors of the cathedral at Wittenberg, he published his Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul, which clearly proclaimed the insufficiency of works, and the necessity of faith, as the ground of justification for the sinner. An affecting incident is told of his last hours.

While sitting at the royal table, a few days before his death, Lefèvre was observed to weep, whereupon queen Margaret complained of the sadness of one whose society she had sought for her own diversion, and asked the occasion of his sorrow. 'How can I minister to the joy of others, who am myself the greatest sinner upon earth?' was Lefèvre's mournful and unexpected response. Pressed to explain himself, the old man, after admitting that through a long life he had maintained exemplary morality of conduct, exclaimed in words frequently interrupted by sobs: 'How shall I be able to stand at God's tribunal, who have taught others the purity of the Gospel? Thousands have suffered and died in defence of the doctrine in which I instructed them; and I, unfaithful shepherd that I am, after reaching so advanced an age, when I ought to love nothing less than life, or rather to desire death, have basely avoided the martyr's crown, and betrayed the cause of my God!' The queen and the other persons who were present administered such consolation to the pious Lefèvre as they could find, and shortly afterwards he died, relying on the forgiveness of his Maker, leaving his library to his disciple, Gérard Roussel, and the rest of his scanty property to the poor. The truth of this story, which rests upon the authority of Hubert Thomas, counsellor of state and secretary of the elector palatine, has been discredited by Bayle in his Critical Dictionary, and after him by Tabaraud in the *Biographie Universelle*, and more lately by Haag, in his great work on French Protestant Biography. All rest their rejection of the story chiefly upon the entire silence of the Reformers, who might well be expected to notice so suggestive an occurrence, were it indeed authentic. But in this instance, as in so many others, it has been proved how unreliable are all such arguments. With singular good fortune, M. Jules Bonnet has recently discovered among the unexplored treasures of the Genevese public library a minute, in the handwriting of the reformer Farel, which demonstrates the truth of the circumstances described by Hubert Thomas. He writes: 'Our master, Jacques Lefèvre, of Étapes, when suffering from the disease by which he died, was for some days so greatly terrified by the judgment of God that he cried out that his fate was sealed, saying that he was eternally lost because he had not openly professed the truth of God. This complaint he continued to utter day and night. When Gérard Roussel admonished him to be of good courage and trust in Christ, he answered, "I am condemned; I have concealed the truth which I ought to have professed and openly borne witness to." It was a fearful sight to see so pious an old man so distressed in mind and so overwhelmed by so great a dread of the judgment of God. At length, however, freed from his fears, he began to entertain a good hope in Christ' (published for the first time in the *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français*, t. ix [1862], p. 214, 215).—Baird, in *Methodist Quarterly Review*, 1864, p. 41. He died at Nérac in 1536 (1537?). A full account of his writings may be found in the *Zeitschrift für histor. Theol.* (1852), parts i, ii. See also Graf, *Essai sur la vie et les écrits de Lefèvre d'Étapes* (Strasb. 1842); Hofer, *Nouv. Biograph. Générale*, xxx. 334 sq.; Haag, *La France Protestante*; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 310; Krug, *Handwörterbuch d. Philos.* ii, 2 sq.; Dupin, *Eccles. History*, 16th cent. p. 436.

**Faber, Johann** (named MALLEUS HERETICORUM from one of his books against Protestants), archbishop of Vienna, was born at Lentkirch, in Suabia, in 1478, and studied at Freiburg. He early entered the Dominican order. His talents secured him rapid advancement. In 1519 the bishop of Constance made him his vicar general, and in 1526 he was made confessor to Ferdinand (afterwards emperor). At first his literary associations made him friendly with Erasmus and Ecolampadius, and especially with Zwingle, and he opposed the sale of indulgences in Switzerland

strenuously. But about 1520 he went rapidly round to the other extreme of opinion, and in 1522 appeared his *Opus adversus nova quædam dogmata M. Lutheri*. After this he was an unwearied opponent of the Reformation in writings, colloquies, conferences, etc. His zeal was rewarded by the bishopric of Vienna, to which he was raised in 1531. He died in 1541. His principal writings are the *Malleus Hæreticorum* (1524, and Roma, 1569; a revision of the *Opus* above named), and sermons and controversial writings collected into 3 vols. fol. (Cologne, 1537-1541).—Dupin, *Eccles. Hist.* cent. xvi. p. 433; Kettner, *Diss. de I. Fabri Vita et Scriptis* (Lips. 1735, 4to); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* iv, 307; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xvi, 894.

**Faber, Johannes**, a Dominican monk and polemical writer, born at Heilbronn, 1504. His eloquence and learning gained him early distinction, and in 1534 he was made cathedral-preacher at Augsburg. He wrote largely against the Reformation. Among his writings are *Enchiridion Bibliorum* (Augsb. 1549, 4to);—*Fructus quibus discernuntur heretici* (Augsb. 1551, 4to);—*Quod fides esse possit sine charitate* (Augsb. 1548, 4to);—Joel's *Prophetie erklärt*:—*Testimonium Scripturæ et Patrum, Petrum Apostolum Romæ fuisse*, etc. See Echar, *Script. ord. Præd.* ii, 161; Wetzler und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 870.

**Faber, Johannes**, of Augsburg, a Dominican monk of the 16th century, confessor of the emperor Maximilian, and afterwards court-preacher of Charles V. Erasmus calls him "a mild, eloquent, and learned man." He at first wished mild counsels to be followed against Luther, and sympathized with Erasmus, but afterwards seems to have changed his views. He died about 1531.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xv, 894.

**Faber, Johann Ernst**, a distinguished German Orientalist, was born near Hildburghausen (Saxony), February, 1745. He prepared for the university in the gymnasium at Coburg, and studied under Walch, Heyne, and Michaelis at the University of Göttingen. In 1770 he was called to the chair of Oriental languages at the University of Kiel, and in 1772 to the same position at the University of Jena, where he died March 15 [April 14?], 1774. His most important works are, *Descriptio commentarii in septuaginta interpret.* (Götting. 1768-9, 2 vols. 4to);—*Dissertat. de animalibus quorum fit mentio Zephani*, ii, 14 (ibid. 1769, 4to; reprinted in the *Monuments scythes de la Palestine* by Cramer, Hamb. and Keil, 1777);—*Historia Marmæ inter Hebræos* (pars i, Kiel, 1770; pars ii, Jena, 1773);—*Programmata novum de Messia exactis 490 annis post exilium Judæorum Babilonicum nascituræ* ex Zach. iii, 8, 9, 10; repetitum vaticinium, spatio LXX, hebdomadum Dan. ix, 24 (ibid. [1771?] 1772, 4to);—*Jesus ex natalium opportunitate Messias* (Jena, 1772, 8vo);—*Archæologie der Hebræer*, vol. i (Halle, 1773, 8vo). Faber was also author of an Arabic Grammar and Chrestomathy, which he published at Jena in 1773.—Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* vi, 53; *Biog. Universelle*, xiv, 5; Kitto, *Cycl. of Bibl. Lit.* iii, 1; Doering, *Theol. Deutschlands*, i, 390. (J. H. W.)

**Faber, Johann Melchior**, was born Jan. 18, 1743, near Hildburghausen (Saxony), and was educated at the gymnasium of Coburg and at the University of Göttingen. In 1768 he was appointed professor of Hebrew and Greek at the gymnasium of Thorn (Prussia); in 1770 he was called to Coburg as professor of Greek and Rhetoric; and four years later (1774) he was made rector of the gymnasium at Ansbach. In 1795 he became church-counsellor (Kirchenrath). He died January 31, 1809. Most of his writings were published in the form of programmes. He was also a contributor to the *Repertorium für biblische und morgenländische Literatur*, and to Gabler's *Theologisches Journal*. The most important of his theological programmes are, *Programmata sex super libro Sapientie* (Ansbach, 1776-77, 4to; of which a second part, ibid. 1786-89, 4to);—*Observationes in Epistolam*

*Jacobi ex Syro* (ibid. 1771, 4to);—*De templorum apud Christianos antiquitate dubia* (ib. 1774, 4to);—*Litteras olim pro vocibus in numerantibus a scriptoribus V. T. esse adhibitas* (ibid. 1775, 4to);—*Unde origo doctrine de immortalitate animarum repetenda videatur* (ibid. 1773, 4to);—*In loca quedam Habacuci Prophete* (ibid. 1773, 4to);—*In Malachiam Prophetam* (ibid. 1779, 4to);—*Quo Eusebianæ de Jacobi, fratris Jesu, vita et morte narrationis partes quedam explicantur ac defenduntur* (ibid. 1793, 4to);—*Harmonia Maccabæorum* (pars i, ibid. 1794; pars ii, 1797, 4to).—Doering, *Theologen Deutschlands*, i, 395; Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit.* ii, 1. (J. H. W.)

**Faber, Petrus** (*Pierre Favre*), born in Saxony, 1506, was one of the nine original companions of Loyola in the establishment of the order of Jesuits. He was a zealous coadjutor of Loyola, and rendered great service to the interests of the new order by his missionary journeys into Italy, Spain and Germany. He died in 1546, on his way to the Council of Trent. His life, by Orlandini, was published at Rome, 1615, fol.; Lyons, 1617, 8vo.—Migne, *Dict. de Biographie*, ii, 156. See LOYOLA; JESUITS.

**Faber** (*Favre*), **Pierre François**, a Roman Catholic divine, was born about the opening of the 18th century, at St. Barthelemie, canton de Vand. He was priest at Laudun, in Lower Languedoc, when chosen by the bishop of Halicarnassus, François de la Baume, personal secretary and confessor on his visitation-tour to Cochín China. They reached Macao July 15, 1738, and were there, under the pretence of being entertained as visitors, kept as prisoners of the Jesuits some eight months. On their arrival in Cochín China in May, the bishop commenced his visitation work among the missionaries. The converted natives complained bitterly against certain missionaries who had excommunicated them under pretence of Jansenism, but really on account of their refusal to adhere to the heathen ceremonies and funeral sacrifices which the Jesuits allowed their Chinese converts to follow. The bishop took the side of the people, and was accused by the Jesuits before the mandarins as a disturber of the public peace, and he, as well as his secretary, narrowly escaped execution. The bishop appointed Favre his agent to visit the Southern provinces. The opposition with which both were met by the Jesuits shortly afterwards inclined the bishop to divide the country between the Jesuits, the French missionaries, and the Franciscans. The death of the bishop was hastened by sorrow and ill treatment as Faber has it, or by poison as one of the Franciscans reported to Rome. Faber attempted to assume the duties of his position as agent, but, finding that he could not act with success against the opposition of the Jesuits, he returned to Rome August 8, 1741, in order to report to the propaganda and to the pope. But even in Rome he found the Jesuits beforehand in undermining him by slander and every other means in their power, and the decree of the pope did not appear until Faber had almost abandoned the hope of ever receiving it. This decree (issued 1745) in the main sanctioned the acts of Faber and his predecessor. He gives a full account of the mission in *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses sur la visite apostolique de M. de la Baume, Evêque d'Halicarnasse, à la Cochinchine en 1740; où l'on voit les royaumes et les travaux de ce zélé Prélat, la conduite des Missionnaires Jésuites, et de quelques autres, avec de nouvelles observations*, etc. The work was condemned by the bishop at Lausanne, and was publicly burned at Freiburg. All copies that could be procured the Jesuits bought up, in order to prevent its circulation. An extract is given by Simler in his *Samml. a. u. n. Urkunden zur Beleuchtung der Kirchengesch.* i, 195-256.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* iv, 309.

**Faber Tanaquil**. See LEFEBVRE TANNEGUY.

**Faber the Oratorian**. See FABRE.

**Fabianus** (pope) is recorded as the 19th bishop

of Rome, from 236 to 250, but there is some dispute both as to his name and as to the time of his episcopate. In the Alexandrian Chronicle he is called Flavianus. Eusebius gives an account of certain wonders that happened on his election to the bishopric. "The faithful had assembled in a church for the purpose of the election, and several persons of consideration were proposed, without any thought of Fabianus, though he was present. Of a sudden, a white dove descended from above and alighted on his head. Then the faithful, recalling to their recollection that the Holy Spirit had manifested itself in a like form at the baptism of Jesus Christ, exclaimed that God had exhibited to them his will. Immediately Fabianus was proclaimed pope, and conducted to the episcopal see without other formality than the imposition of hands" (*Hist. Eccles.* vi, 29). From this fable the court of Rome derives support for its theory that the Holy Ghost always directs in the election of a pope. Cardinal Gusa says that "what happened in the election of Fabianus happens to every pope, though we do not see it with our natural eyes. In vain, electors, are all your intrigues; the person on whose head the heavenly dove perches will, in spite of them, be chosen" (*De Meth. Consistorii*, vii, 85). We have had strange illustrations of this in Borgia and others. Fabianus suffered martyrdom in Decius's persecution, A.D. 250. See *Acta Sanctorum*, Jan. 20; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, iii, 364; A. Butler, *Lives of Saints*, Jan. 20; Bower, *History of the Popes* (London, 1750), i, 47.

**Fable** (*μῦθος*, a *myth*), a legend or fictitious story, applied in the N. T. (1 Tim. i, 4; iv, 7; 2 Tim. iv, 4; Titus i, 14; 2 Pet. i, 16) to the Jewish traditions and speculations which were prevalent in the apostolic days, and were afterwards embodied in the Talmudical writings. (See Fleischnann's *Comment.* in 1 Tim. i, 4.)

1. Taking the words fable and parable, not in their strict etymological meaning, but in that which has been stamped upon them by current usage, looking, i. e. at the *Æsopie* fable as the type of the one, at the parables of the N. T. as the type of the other, we have to ask (*a.*) in what relation they stand to each other as instruments of moral teaching? (*b.*) what use is made in the Bible of this or of that form? That they have much in common is of course obvious enough. In both we find "statements of facts, which do not even pretend to be historical, used as vehicles for the exhibition of a general truth" (Neander, *Life of Christ*, Harper's ed. p. 67). Both differ from the *Mythus*, in the modern sense of that word, in being the result of a deliberate choice of such a mode of teaching, not the spontaneous, unconscious evolution of thought in some symbolic form. They take their place so far as species of the same genus. What are the characteristic marks by which one differs from the other, it is perhaps easier to feel than to define. Thus we have (comp. Trench, *On Parables*, p. 2) (i.) Lessing's statement that the fable takes the form of an actual narrative, while the parable assumes only that what is related might have happened; (ii.) Herder's, that the *différence* lies in the fable's dealing with brute or inanimate nature, in the parable's drawing its materials exclusively from human life; (iii.) Olshausen's (on Matt. xiii, 1), followed by Trench (*l. c.*), that it is to be found in the higher truths of which the parable is the vehicle. Perhaps the most satisfactory summing up of the chief distinctive features of each is to be found in the following extract from Neander (*l. c.*): "The parable is distinguished from the fable by this, that in the latter, qualities or acts of a higher class of beings may be attributed to a lower (e. g. those of men to brutes), while in the former the lower sphere is kept perfectly distinct from that which it seems to illustrate. The beings and powers thus introduced always follow the law of their nature, but their acts, according to this law, are used to figure those of a higher race. . . . The mere introduction of brutes as

personal agents in the fable is not sufficient to distinguish it from the parable which may make use of the same contrivance; as, for example, Christ employs the sheep in one of his parables. The great distinction here, also, lies in what has already been remarked; brutes introduced in the parable act according to the law of their nature, and the two spheres of nature and of the kingdom of God are carefully separated from each other. Hence the reciprocal relations of brutes to each other are not made use of, as these could furnish no appropriate image of the relation between man and the kingdom of God."

Of the fable as thus distinguished from the parable we have but two examples in the Bible: (1.) that of the trees choosing their king, addressed by Jotham to the men of Shechem (Judg. ix, 8-15); (2.) that of the cedar of Lebanon and the thistle, as the answer of Jehoash to the challenge of Amaziah (2 Kings xiv, 9). The narrative of Ezek. xvii, 1-10, though, in common with the fable, it brings before us the lower forms of creation as representatives of human characters and destinies, differs from it in the points above noticed, [1.] in not introducing them as having human attributes; [2.] in the higher prophetic character of the truths conveyed by it. The great eagle, the cedar of Lebanon, the spreading vine, are not grouped together as the agents in a fable, but are simply, like the bear, the leopard, and the lion in the visions of Daniel, symbols of the great monarchies of the world.

In the two instances referred to, the fable has more the character of the Greek *αἶνος*, or supernatural *tale* (Quintil. *Inst. Orat.* v, 11), than of the *μῦθος*, or *myth*; that is, it is less the fruit of a vivid imagination, sporting with the analogies between the worlds of nature and of men, than a covert reproof, making the sarcasm which it affects to hide all the sharper (Müller and Donaldson, *History of Greek Literature*, vol. i, c. xi). The appearance of the fable thus early in the history of Israel, and its entire absence from the direct teaching both of the O. and N. T., are, each of them in its way, significant. Taking the received chronology, the fable of Jotham was spoken about B.C. 1209. The Arabian traditions of Lokman do not assign to him an earlier date than that of David. The earliest Greek *αἶνος*, or proper fable, is that of Hesiod (*Op. et D.* v, 202), and the prose form of the fable does not meet us till we come (about B.C. 550) to Stesichorus and *Æsop*. The first example in the history of Rome is the apologue of Menenius Agrippa, B.C. 494, and its genuineness has been questioned on the ground that the fable could hardly at that time have found its way to Latium (Müller and Donaldson, *l. c.*). It may be noticed, too, that when collections of fables became familiar to the Greeks, they were looked upon as imported, not indigenous. The traditions that surround the name of *Æsop*, the absence of any evidence that he *wrote* fables, the traces of Eastern origin in those ascribed to him, leave him little more than the representative of a period when the forms of teaching, which had long been familiar to the more Eastern nations, were travelling westward, and were adopted eagerly by the Greeks. The collections themselves are described by titles that indicate a foreign origin. They are *Libyan* (Arist. *Rhet.* ii, 20), *Cyprian*, *Cilician*. All these facts lead to the conclusion that the Hebrew mind, gifted, as it was, in a special measure with the power of perceiving analogies in things apparently dissimilar, attained, at a very early stage of its growth, the power which does not appear in the history of other nations till a later period. Whatever antiquity may be ascribed to the fables in the comparatively later collection of the Pancha Tranta, the land of Canaan is, so far as we have any data to conclude from, the fatherland of fable. To conceive brutes or inanimate objects as representing human characteristics, to personify them as acting, speaking, reasoning, to draw lessons from them applicable to human life—this

must have been common among the Israelites in the time of the judges. The part assigned in the earliest records of the Bible to the impressions made by the brute creation on the mind of man when "the Lord God formed every beast of the field and every fowl of the air, and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them" (Gen. ii, 19), and the apparent symbolism of the serpent in the narrative of the Fall (Gen. iii, 1), are at once indications of teaching adapted to men in the possession of this power, and must have helped to develop it (Herder, *Geist der Ebräischen Poesie, Werke*, xxxiv, p. 16, ed. 1826). The large number of proverbs in which analogies of this kind are made the bases of a moral precept, and some of which (e. g. Prov. xxvi, 11; xxx, 15, 25-28) are of the nature of condensed fables, show that there was no decline of this power as the intellect of the people advanced. The absence of fables accordingly from the teaching of the O. T. must be ascribed to their want of fitness to be the media of the truths which that teaching was to convey. The points in which brutes or inanimate objects present analogies to man are chiefly those which belong to his lower nature, his pride, indolence, cunning, and the like, and the lessons derived from them accordingly do not rise higher than the prudential morality which aims at repressing such defects (comp. Trench, *On the Parables*, l. c.). Hence the fable, apart from the associations of a grotesque and ludicrous nature which gather round it; apart, too, from its presenting narratives which are "nec veræ nec verisimiles" (Cicero, *De Invent.* i, 19), is inadequate as the exponent of the higher truths which belong to man's spiritual life. It may serve to exhibit the relations between man and man; it fails to represent those between man and God. To do that is the office of the PARABLE, finding its outward framework in the dealings of men with each other, or in the world of nature as it is, not in any grotesque parody of nature, and exhibiting, in either case, real and not fanciful analogies. The fable seizes on that which man has in common with the creatures below him; the parable rests on the truths that man is made in the image of God, and that "all things are double one against another."

It is noticeable, as confirming this view of the office of the fable, that, though those of Æsop (so called) were known to the great philosopher of righteousness at Athens, though a metrical paraphrase of some of them was among the employments of his imprisonment (Plato, *Phædo*, p. 60, 61), they were not employed by him as illustrations, or channels of instruction. While Socrates shows an appreciation of the power of such fables to represent some of the phenomena of human life, he was not, he says, in this sense of the word, *μυθολογικός*. The myths, which appear in the *Gorgias*, the *Phædrus*, the *Phædo*, the *Republic*, are as unlike as possible to the Æsopic fables, are (to take his own account of them) *οὐ μῦθοι ἀλλὰ λόγοι*, true, though figurative, representations of spiritual realities, while the illustrations from the common facts of life which were so conspicuous in his ordinary teaching, though differing in being comparisons rather than narratives, come nearer to the parables of the Bible (compare the contrast between τὰ Σωκρατικά, as examples of the *παραβολή* and the *λόγοι Αἰσώπειοι*, Aristot. *Rhet.* ii, 20). It may be said, indeed, that the use of the fable as an instrument of teaching (apart from the embellishments of wit and fancy with which it is associated by such writers as Lessing and La Fontaine) belongs rather to childhood, and the child-like period of national life, than to a more advanced development. In the earlier stages of political change, as in the cases of Jotham, Stesichorus (Aristot. *Rhet.* l. c.), Menenius Agrippa, it is used as an element of persuasion or reproof. It ceases to appear in the higher eloquence of orators and statesmen. The special excellence of fables is that they are *δημιουργοί* (Aristot. *Rhet.* l. c.); that "ducere animos solent, præcipere rusticorum et

imperitorum" (Quintilian, *Instit. Orat.* l. c.).—Smith, s. v.

2. The *μῦθοι*, or "fables" of false teachers claiming to belong to the Christian Church, alluded to by writers of the N. T. in connection with "endless genealogies" (*γενεαλογίαι ἀπέραντοι*, 1 Tim. i, 4), or with disparaging epithets ("Jewish," *Ἰουδαῖοι*, Tit. i, 14; "old wives," *γραιῶντι*, 1 Tim. iv, 7; "cunningly devised," *σεσφωσμένοι*, 2 Pet. i, 16), do not appear to have had the character of fables, properly so called. As applied to them, the word takes its general meaning of anything false or unreal. Thus Paul exhorts Timothy and Titus (1 Tim. i, 4; iv, 7; Titus i, 14) to shun profane and Jewish fables, as having a tendency to seduce men from the truth. By these fables some understand the reveries of the Gnostics; but the fathers generally, and most modern commentators, interpret them of the vain traditions of the Jews. The great reservoir of Jewish tradition is the book, or rather the books, called the Talmud. At the time of the Christian era, the traditions, as they were called, of the law (by which was meant the decisions of the doctors on disputed points of the Mosaic code, and the extravagant fables with which they adorned their comments) had attained so great a bulk and so high a degree of veneration as quite to supersede the law itself in the common estimation. These traditions, which were supposed to have been handed down, some from the era of Moses, and some from a period far anterior, were, for the most part, mere directions for ridiculous ceremonies, questions of absurd casuistry, and fables which by their absurdity alone would have disgusted any other nation. Some of these fables and legends are too impious and blasphemous to be quoted, but we select a few specimens. Adam, of whose knowledge we can hardly form too high an idea, was said to be endowed with magic. "God," say the Talmudists, "gave him a precious jewel, the very sight of which would cure all diseases; this came afterwards into the possession of Abraham, but after his death, because, by reason of its exceeding brightness, it was likely to be worshipped, God hung it in the sun." Our first parents were, according to rabbinical tradition, of a gigantic stature; and this legend has been borrowed and improved by the Mohammedans. The transmigration of souls is much insisted on in the Talmud, and the soul of Adam is said to have passed successively into the bodies of Noah and David; it will also pass into the Messiah. This doctrine they took from the Egyptian mythology, and it is still more ancient than their residence in Egypt. Abraham was the person to whom, they say, it was first revealed, and he taught that the souls of men passed into women, beasts, birds, and even reptiles, rocks, and plants. The spirit of a man was punished by passing into a woman; and if the conduct of the man had been very atrocious, it took some reptile or inanimate form; and if a woman act righteously, she will, in another state, become a man. Thus the ass that carried Balaam, the ravens that fed Elijah, the whale that swallowed Jonah, are all supposed to have possessed reasonable, transmigrated souls. The Mishna says, "The two tables of stone were upwards of two tons weight, but the moment God's word and commandments were engraved thereon by the *shamir*, they became as light as a feather. When Moses left the mount and came within sight of the molten calf, and heard the multitude shouting, he was alarmed; so that when the rays of the molten calf, which were of gold, came in contact with the tables of stone, the letters thereon immediately flew away, and the tables of stone returned to their former weight, which was more than Moses could support, and therefore he threw them down, and they brake in pieces." It is also said that Moses was the richest man that ever was or ever will be. His riches consisted of diamonds, which he obtained possession of in the same way that every laborer gets rewarded, by be-

ing considered worthy of his hire. Moses never looked for any emolument from the Jews, and God therefore rewarded him in this manner. The two tables of stone were one solid mass of diamonds, and the chippings that came from the two tables were his own perquisites. But what was truly wonderful and astonishing, as the chippings flew off, they became regular and beautiful in their form. This circumstance gave the wicked Jews occasion to charge him with breaking the tackles purposely, in order that he might have the opportunity to obtain more chippings. It is said that Elijah the prophet is going about the world as an ambassador of God, and is everywhere present at one time, and is in his person a venerable old man, wearing a long beard. When Messiah shall appear, there will be a great feast, at which every Jew will be present. This feast will consist of fowl, of fish, and of flesh, which God created for the purpose at the beginning of the world. First, God provided a large fowl or bird, called Agal Loshder; also a large ox, called Shur Abur; and two large fish, called Leviathan. When God created these two great fish, male and female, being of such immense size, lest they should multiply, God slew the female, and buried it in salt, there to remain until it is wanted for this great feast. Then all the Jews that have been born, or that have existed since the creation of the world, will be restored to life. The table will be spread, and the provision placed upon it, and it is so ordained that each one will take his station according to his conduct in the present life. Moses will sit at the head of the table, and next to him Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and the prophets in rotation. Rabbi Simon says he was once sailing in the Great Sea, when he and the mariners espied a fish of such enormous size, that, although they had a fair wind, after they saw one eye of the fish, they sailed five days longer in a direct line before they reached the other eye of the same fish, which confirmed his belief in the report of the size of the leviathan. Much also is related concerning the size of the ox, which is said to be so immense that he eats up the whole of the grass that grows upon a thousand hills every day. The bird, also, is said to be of enormous size, and it is stated that one day this bird, in her flight, dropped an egg, which broke, and the yolk drowned fifty cities and villages (Stehelin, *Jewish Traditions*, passim). See TALMUD.

In the genuine fables and traditional narratives of remote antiquity, especially those of the ancient classics, many correspondencies with the Biblical history are found, such as intimate that these traditions were derived from this history. Of such a nature are the tales concerning a golden age of our race, an apostasy, a general flood, a future restoration. It may with safety be inferred from these traditions that the records in the book of Genesis concerning the apostasy, etc., are not philosophical myths; for, were they nothing more than the emanations of some Hebrew philosopher, how could they have been spread abroad among all nations? These popular traditions point us to the time when the human family were collected into one place, and afterwards separated into various branches. In this separation every tribe took with it the traditions that were common to all. See MYTHOLOGY.

**Fabre.** See FABER.

**Fabre, JEAN CLAUDE,** a French ecclesiastic and father of the Oratory, was born at Paris in 1668, and died there Oct. 22, 1753. In an edition of Richelet's *Dictionnaire* he inserted some passages which brought him under censure, and he was forced to quit the Oratorian order. He is chiefly known as the continuator of Fleury's *Histoire ecclésiastique*, of which he prepared vols. xxi-xxxv.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xvi, 923.

**Fabri, HONORÉ,** a learned Jesuit, was born at Bugey, in France, in 1607. He entered the novitiate of the order of Jesuits at Avignon in 1626, taught philoso-

phy and mathematics at the College of Lyons, and was subsequently called to Rome and appointed grand penitentiary. He was an indefatigable worker, and acquired great proficiency in almost every branch of learning, especially in natural sciences. He claimed to have taught the circulation of the blood before the publication of the celebrated work of Harvey on the subject. He died at Rome in 1688. He wrote several works in defense of the casuistic writers of his order against the attacks of the Jansenists: *Pithanophilus* (Rome, 1659);—*Notæ in Notas Wilhelmi Wendrockii ad Ludovici Montaltii Litteras* (Cologne, 1659);—*Ludovici Montaltii epistolares Libelli ad provinciale refutati* (Cologne, 1660);—*Apologeticus doctrinæ moralis societatis Jesu* (Lyons, 1670);—a summary of scholastic theology (*Summula theologica*, Lyons, 1699), and a large number of scientific, polemical, and other works. He bequeathed his MSS. to the establishment of the Jesuits at Lyons.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xvi, 945. (A. J. S.)

**Fabrica Ecclesiæ,** the name given in the Latin Church to a special fund for defraying the expenses for building and repairing the Church edifices of a particular congregation. As early as the 5th century it was customary that one portion of the property of a particular church should be set aside to this end. According to the rescripts of the Roman bishops Simplicius (475) and Gelasius (494), it was to be the fourth part of the whole property of the church, while in Spain one third was used. The Council of Frankfort in 794 declared that the holders of ecclesiastical benefices had the duty of keeping the church edifices in a proper condition, and this declaration was frequently confirmed by imperial and ecclesiastical laws. Charles the Bald in 846, besides confirming the same rule, ordered that all the serfs of the Church should work for repairing the churches at least twenty days every year. The parishioners generally were required to co-operate for keeping the Church edifices in proper order. There were, however, widely different usages in different localities. The Council of Trent (sessio xxi, cap. vii) established as a general principle that building and repairing expenses should be defrayed from the general revenue of the Church; in case these are not sufficient, all the patrons and others who have any kind of income from the church, and, if necessary, all the parishioners, are bound to co-operate to that end. This has since been the practice both in the Roman Catholic and in the Protestant state churches. The legislation of the first French empire (decree of 1809) charged the civil community with the duty of keeping the church edifices of all the recognised religions in good order. The civil laws of the European countries have many detailed provisions with regard to the subject, and in some points there is a wide difference.—Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* i, 737; Wetzler and Welte, iv, 876; Helfert, *Von d. Erbauung, Erhaltung u. Herstellung d. kirch. Gebäude* (Prague, 1834). (A. J. S.)

**Fabricius, Andreas,** a Roman Catholic divine, was born at Hodgege, a village of Liege, A.D. 1520. He studied at Ingolstadt, and became professor of philosophy at Louvain. The bishop of Augsburg sent him as his agent to Rome, where he remained six years under the pontificate of Pius IV. He was afterwards councillor to the duke of Bavaria, and provost of Ottingen, in Swabia, where he died in 1581. His principal work was *Harmonia Confessionis Augustiniana* (Cologne, 1573 and 1587, fol.). He wrote also a *Catechismus Romanus ex Decreto Concilii Tridentini*, with notes and illustrations (1570 and 1574, 8vo), and some Latin tragedies.—Hook, *Ecl. Biog.* v, 48; Migne, *Dict. de Biographie Chrétienne*, ii, 135.

**Fabricius, Christoph Gabriel,** a German divine, was born at Shackdorf, in Lusatia, May 18, 1682, and was educated at the University of Wittenberg. He served as pastor at Mulhoritz and other places in

Lusatia, and died June 12, 1757. He is noted especially for his bitter opposition to the modern Moravians. He wrote *Das entlaerte Herrnhuth* (Herrnhut unmasked, Wittenberg, 1743, 4to, and 1749, 8vo); *Entdeckte herrnhütische Satirerey* (1749, 8vo), in which he seeks to prove that Zinzendorf and the modern Moravians are not the successors of the Bohemian Brethren.—*Biog. Universelle*, xiv, 62.

**Fabricius, Franciscus**, a Dutch theologian, was born at Amsterdam April 10, 1663. He studied theology and the Oriental languages at the University of Leyden, at which he afterwards filled the chairs of theology and rhetoric. He died July 27, 1738. His chief works are, 1. *Christus unicum ac perpetuum fundamentum Ecclesie* (Leyden, 1717, 4to);—2. *De Sacerdotio Christi juxta Ordinem Melchisedec* (ib. 1720, 4to);—3. *Christologia Noachica et Abrahamica* (ib. 1733, 4to);—4. *De Fide Christiana Patriarcharum et Prophetarum* (ib. 4to);—5. *Orator Sacer* (ib. 1733, 4to), containing lectures on preaching.—*Migne, Dict. de Biographie Chrétienne*, ii, 136; *Biog. Universelle*, xiv, 61.

**Fabricius, Georgius**, a German philologist, was born at Chemnitz April 24, 1516, and after a liberal course of education travelled to Italy, and spent a long time at Rome, the fruit of which was his *Roma, antiquitatis Monumenta*, etc. (Basel, 1550 and 1557, 8vo). He was endowed with some poetical talent, and wrote numerous sacred poems in Latin verse—*Poematum Sacrorum lib. xvi* (Basel, 1560, 16mo). From 1553 to his death (July 13, 1571) he was director of the college at Meissen. His most important work is *Poetarum veterum ecclesiasticorum opera Christiana, thesaurus catholice et orthodoxe ecclesie* (Basel, 1564, 4to), a very valuable collection of early Christian hymns and poetry.—*Niceron, Mémoires*, xxxii, 31; *Hofer, Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xvi, 958.

**Fabricius, Johannes**, a German theologian, was born at Altorf Feb. 11, 1644. After a very diligent course of study in theology and philosophy at the University of Altorf, he journeyed through Germany and Italy from 1670 to 1677. On his return he became professor of theology at Altorf, where he remained twenty years. In 1697 he became professor at Helmstädt, where he died, Jan. 29, 1729. He bore a high reputation for scholarship, and for his minute acquaintance with the Romish controversy. His principal publications are, *Dissertatio de Altaribus* (Helmstädt, 1698, 4to);—*Amicitias theologice varii et selecti argumenti* (Helmst. 1699, 4to);—*Historia Biblioth. Fabricianæ* (Wolfenbüttel, 1717–24, 6 vols. 4to);—*Consideratio variorum controversiarum cum Atheis, Gentilibus. . . Pontificis et Reformatis* (1704; also 1715, confined to the controversies *inter Evangelicos et Catholicos*). He inherited the irenical tendencies of Calixtus (q. v.), and sought to show that the points of difference between Romanism and Protestantism are not so great as they are generally held to be; he even went so far as to believe that a Protestant might lawfully go over to the Romish Church.—*Hofer, Nouv. Biog. Gn.* xvi, 962; *Mosheim, Ch. Hist.* (N. Y. 1854), iii, 490.

**Fabricius, Johannes**, a German Orientalist, was born at Dantzie in 1608. After studying at several German universities, he completed his academical course at Leyden, where he studied Arabic and Persian under Golius. In 1635 he began to lecture on Oriental languages, and especially on Arabic, at Rostock. After travelling, for literary purposes, over nearly all Europe, he was made professor of Hebrew at Dantzie in 1642, and died there in 1653. Among his numerous publications are *Dissertatio Philologica de Nomine Jehoru* (Rostock, 1636, 4to);—*De Incarnatione λόγον, contra Socinianos* (Rostock, 1637, 4to);—*Specimen Arabicum* (1638, 4to);—*Testamentum Mohammedis latine ex Gabriëlis Sinaitæ versione* (Rostock, 1638, 4to).—J. A. Fabricius, *Centuria Fabriciorum*; *Hofer, Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xvi, 962.

**Fabricius, Johannes Albert**, "the most learned, most voluminous, and most useful of bibliographers," was born at Leipsic Nov. 11, 1668. He lost his parents at an early age, but was sent to study at Quedlinburg, where, by reading Barthius's *Adversaria*, he was inspired with an ardent love of letters. He went to Hamburg in 1693, and spent five years as librarian for J. F. Mayer, dividing his time between preaching and study, till he was chosen professor of rhetoric and philosophy in the gymnasium of that city. In 1719 the landgrave of Hesse-Cassel offered him the professorship of theology at Giessen, and the post of general superintendent of the churches of the Augsburg Confession; but the magistrates of Hamburg augmented his salary for the sake of keeping him, and of this he ever after retained so grateful a sense that no offers of preferment could tempt him to leave them. He died at Hamburg April 3, 1756, with the character of being one of the most learned of men. The list of his published writings exceeds 100 titles.

His principal works are, (1.) *Codex Pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti*, Gr. et Lat. collectus, et Animadversionibus illustratus (Hamb. 1713, 12mo; 2d ed. with a supplementary volume, ib. 1722–23, 12mo);—(2.) *Codex Apocryphus N. T.* (2d ed. Hamb. 1719, 3 vols. fol.); see APOCRYPHA OF N. T.;—(3.) *Observationes selecte in varia loca Nov. Test. variorum auctorum* (Hamb. 1712, small 8vo);—(4.) *Bibliotheca Antiquaria* (Hamb. 1713; 2d ed. 1760, 2 vols. 4to), containing notices of all writers on Hebrew, Greek, Roman, and Christian antiquities;—(5.) *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica* (Hamb. 1718, fol.), collecting the works of a number of Latin ecclesiastical writers;—(6.) *Bibliotheca Græca, sive notitia Script. Vet. Græcorum, quoruncunque monum. integ. aut. fragm. edita, extant* (Hamb. 1728, 14 vols. 4to). Of this invaluable collection a fourth and enlarged edition, edited by Harles, was commenced in 1790, of which 12 vols. had appeared up to 1811, extending to vol. xi, p. 544 of the former edition: an *Index* to the whole was published in 1838 (4to). (7.) Collection of authors on Christian Evidences, under the title *Delectus Argumentorum et Syllabus Scriptorum qui veritatem religionis Christianæ asseruerunt*, etc. (Hamb. 1725, 4to);—(8.) *Bibliotheca Latina* (Venice, 1728, 2 vols. 4to; re-edited by Ernesti, Lips. 1774, 3 vols. 8vo);—(9.) *Bibliotheca mediæ et infimæ Latinitatis* (best edit. Mansi's, Padua, 1754, 6 vols. 4to);—*Hydrotheologia*, written in German, and translated into French under the title *Théologie de l'Eau, ou Essai sur la Bonté, la Sagesse, et la Puissance de Dieu, manifestés dans la Création de l'Eau* (La Haye, 1741, 8vo);—*Conspectus Thesauri Litteraræ Italiæ* (1749, 8vo); or notices of the principal collections of the historians of Italy, as well as of other writers who have illustrated the antiquities, geography, etc., of that country, including the great works of Burmannus and Grævius, with an account of the Italian literary journals existing or which had existed before the time of Fabricius, of the Italian academies, and a catalogue of Italian bibliographers and biographers classed according to the particular towns which they have illustrated;—*Salutaris Lux Evangelii, sive Notitia Propagatorum per Orbem totum Christianorum Sacrorum: accedunt Epistole quadam ineditæ Juliani Imperatoris, Gregorij Hæbessini Theologia Æthiopicæ, necnon Index geographicus Episcopatum Orbis Christiani* (1731, 4to);—*Centifolium Luthericum, sive Notitia Literaria Scriptorum omnis generis de Martino Luthero, ejus Vita, Scriptis, et Reformatione Ecclesie editorum* (1730, 2 vols. 8vo);—*Centuria Fabriciorum Script. clarorum qui jam diem suam obierunt collecta* (1709, 2 vols. 8vo, with a continuation in 1727). The author has included in his list not only the authors whose name or surname was Fabricius, but also those whose names may be turned into the Latin Fabricius, such as Lefevre, Fabri, the German Schmidts, etc. Independently of the above and other minor works, Fabricius published editions of Sextus Empiricus, of the *Gallia Orientalis*

of father Colomiès, of the works of St. Hippolytus, and many others. For an account of his life and writings, see Reimar, *De vitu et Script. J. A. Fabricii comment.* (1737, 8vo).—*Biographie Universelle*, xiv, 54 sq.; *English Cyclopædia*, s. v.

**Fabricius, Johann Ludwig**, a Swiss divine, was born at Schaffhausen in 1632; studied at Utrecht and Paris, and in 1656 became pastor and professor, first of Greek, afterwards of theology, at Heidelberg. In 1664 he was made councillor to the elector palatine in ecclesiastical affairs. When Heidelberg was taken by the French in 1688, he retired to Schaffhausen, and afterwards to Frankfort. On his return to Heidelberg, when the castle and city were set on fire in the bombardment, he saved the archives of the city and university, and carried them to Frankfort, where he died in 1697. Among his writings are *Apologeticum pro Genere humano contra Calumniam Atheismi*.—*De Baptismo infantibus heterodoxorum confendo*.—*De Ludis Scenicis*.—*De baptismo pro muliere vel homine privatum administrato*—all gathered, with others, in an edition of his writings published by J. H. Heidegger (Zurich, 1698, 4to).—*Biog. Universelle*, xiv, 55.

**Fabricius, Lorenz**, a German divine, was born at Dantzig, 1555, and studied at various German universities, especially at Strasburg, in Hebrew, and at Wittemberg, where he became doctor of philosophy in 1587. In 1593 he was made professor of Hebrew at Wittemberg, in which office he remained until his death, April 28, 1629. He published *Oratio de Lingua Hebræa* (Wittemb. 1594).—*Partitomes Codicis Hebraei* (Wittemb. 1610, 4to).—*De Reliquiis Sanctis Syrarum Vocum in N. T.* (Wittemb. 1613, 4to).—*Metrica Hebræorum* (Wittemb. 8vo).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xiv, 959.

**Fabricius, Theodor**, a German divine and reformer, was born in Anholt (in Prussia) February 2, 1501, of very poor parents. He was apprenticed to a shoemaker, and could not begin to go to school until he was sixteen years old. His diligence and success attracted the attention of count Oswald of Bergen, who sent him to Cologne to study at the university. He afterwards went to Wittemberg, where he not only studied Hebrew thoroughly, but also imbibed from Luther and Melancthon the principles of the Reformation. His patron abandoned him; but, although he was reduced to great straits of poverty, he maintained his integrity and courage. Returning to Cologne, he taught Hebrew, but was soon driven away as a heretic. Philip of Hesse received him, and made him his almoner. In 1536 he became pastor at Allendorf. In 1540 he was imprisoned by the elector for preaching against polygamy. In 1543 he returned to Wittemberg as professor of Hebrew and of theology. His life, in many respects a stormy one, ended on the 15th of Oct. 1550. He published *Institutiones Grammaticæ in Linguam Sanctam* (Cologne, 1528, 1531, 4to).—*Tabule de verbis et nominibus Heb.* (Basel, 1545). There is a sketch of his life in Hase, *Biblioth. Bremensis*, pt. i. —*Biog. Universelle*, xiv, 46.

**Fabryc, GABRIEL**, a French archæologist, was born at Saint-Maximin, in the Provence, about 1725, entered the Dominican order, and became professor of theology at Rome, where he died in 1800. Among his writings are *Censuris theologi Diatribæ, quæ bibliographiæ antiquariæ et sacre criticæ capita aliquot illustrantur* (Rome, 1782, 8vo). He entered upon the study of Phœnician antiquities and literature, but did not live to complete his plans; the partial fruit of his labors appears in *De Phœnicæ Litteraturæ Fontibus* (Rome, 1803, 2 vols. 8vo). Perhaps his best work is *Des Titres primitifs de la Révelation, ou considérations critiques sur la pureté et l'intégrité du texte original des livres saints de l'ancien Testament* (Rome, 1772, 2 vols. 8vo), which is still of value in Biblical criticism.—*Biog. Universelle*, ii, 66.

**Facciolati (FACCIOLOTO), JACOPO**, was born at Torreglia, Italy, Jan. 4, 1682. He was educated in the college at Este, and afterwards in the seminary at Padua, where he became professor of theology and philosophy, and director of studies. "The seminary of Padua had then, as subsequently, a high reputation as a place for the study of Latin, and for the numerous and generally accurate editions of the classics and other school-books which have come from its press. Facciolati contributed to support this reputation by his labors. Among other works, he published improved editions of the *Lexicon* of Schrevelius, of the *Thesaurus Ciceronianus* of Nizolius, and of the vocabulary of seven languages, known by the name of *Lexicon Culepinum* (1731, 2 vols. fol.). In this last undertaking he was greatly assisted by his pupil, Egidio Forcellini, although he was not willing to acknowledge the obligation. It was in the course of his joint labors with Facciolati that Forcellini conceived the plan of a totally new Latin dictionary, which, after more than thirty years' assiduous application, he brought to light under the title of *Totius Latinitatis Lexicon* (Padua, 1771, 4 vols. fol.). This work has superseded all other Latin dictionaries. Forcellini, more generous than Facciolati, acknowledged in the title-page of his work that its production was in great measure due to the advice and instruction of his deceased master. The MS. of his *Lexicon*, in 12 vols. fol., is preserved in the library of the seminary." The best editions are (1) that of Furlanetto (Patav. 1827-32, 4 vols. 4to; ed. by Hertel and Voigtlander, Schneeberg, 1835-38, 4 vols. fol.; also by Giacchetto, 1839-45, 4 vols. 4to); (2) that of Bailey, with English renderings (1828, 2 vols. 4to). "In 1722, Facciolati, being appointed professor of logic in the University of Padua, delivered a series of introductory Latin discourses to the students of his class, which were received with considerable applause. His Latin epistles, as well as his *Orations*, or discourses, have been admired for the purity of their diction. The king of Portugal sent Facciolati a flattering invitation to Lisbon to take the direction of the public studies in his kingdom, but Facciolati declined the honor on account of his advanced age. He, however, wrote instructions for the reorganization of the scholastic establishments of that country, which had become necessary after the expulsion of the Jesuits." Facciolati died at Padua Aug. 25, 1769. Besides numerous works on philosophy, he published *Vita et Acta Jesu Christi secundum ultimam generationem, divinam ac humanam* (Padua, 1761, 24mo).—*Vitæ Theologica* (Padua, 1763).—*Vitæ et Acta Mariæ virginis* (Padua, 1764).—*English Cyclopædia*, s. v.; *Biog. Universelle*, xiv, 80.

**Face** (usually פָּנִים, *panim*, πρόσωπον), whatever of a thing is most exposed to view; hence the face of the country, ground, waters, sky, etc. In Scripture, this term is often used to denote *presence* in the general sense; and, when applied to the Almighty, denotes such a complete manifestation of the divine presence, by sound or sight, as was equivalent, in the vividness of the impression, to the seeing of a fellow-creature "face to face." The "face of God," therefore, denotes in Scripture anything or manner by which God is wont to manifest himself to man. Thus, when it is said that Adam and Eve hid themselves from "the face of Jehovah," we understand that they hid themselves from his presence, however manifested; for the term there used is the only proper word to denote presence in the Hebrew language. It was a very common and ancient opinion that our mortal frame could not survive the more sensible manifestations of the divine presence, or "see God face to face and live" (Gen. xxxii, 30). Hence, in this passage, the gratitude and astonishment of Jacob that he still lived after God had manifested himself to him more sensibly than by dreams and visions. This impression was confirmed

to Moses, who was told, "Thou canst not see my face: no man can see my face and live" (Exod. xxxiii, 20), which clearly signifies that no one can in this present state of being endure the view of that glory which belongs to him (1 Cor. xiii, 12; 1 John iii, 2; Rev. xxii, 4). The ancient heathen entertained the same notion, which is remarkably expressed in the celebrated mythological story of Semele, who, having prevailed on the reluctant Jove to appear to her in his heavenly splendor, was struck dead by the lightnings of his presence. It is to be borne in mind that God is usually represented to us in Scripture under a human form; and it is indeed difficult for even more spiritualized minds than those of the Hebrews to conceive of him apart from the form and attributes of the highest nature actually known to us. The Scriptures sanction this concession to the weakness of our intellect, and hence arise the anthropomorphic phrases which speak of the face, the eyes, the arm of God. The appearances of the angels in the Old-Testament times were generally in the human form (Judg. xiii, 6, etc.), and from this cause alone it would have been natural, in the imagination, to transfer the form of the messengers to him by whom they were sent.—Kitto, s. v. See ANTHROPOMORPHISM. The presence of Jehovah (Exod. xxxiii, 14, 15) and the "angel" (Exod. xxxiii, 20, 21) is Jehovah himself; but in Isa. lxiii, 9, the angel of his presence is opposed to Jehovah himself. The light of God's countenance is a token of his favor, and is there put synonymously with favor (Psa. xlv, 3; Dan. ix, 17). Thus, as in men, if the countenance be serene, it is a mark of good-will; if fiery or piercing, of anger or displeasure. "Face" also signifies anger, justice, and severity (Gen. xvi, 6, 8; Exod. ii, 15; Psa. lxxviii, 1; Rev. vi, 16). (See Wemyss, *Symbol. Dict.* s. v.)

The Jews prayed with their faces turned towards the Temple (1 Kings viii, 38, 44, 48), and those residing out of Jerusalem turned it towards that point of the heavens in which Jerusalem lay (Dan. vi, 10); thus the Mohammedans, when praying, always turn their faces towards Mecca. To bow down the face in the dust (Isa. xlix, 23) is a mark of the lowest humiliation and submission. See ATTITUDES.

The "bread of faces" is the show-bread which was always in the presence of God. See SHOW-BREAD.

**Faculties**, a term of the Roman Catholic Church law, designating certain rights as to ecclesiastical functions which an ecclesiastical superior confers upon subordinates. The most important faculties are those conferred by the popes upon bishops, especially with regard to dispensations. The first instances of such dispensations being given to foreign missionaries occur in the 13th century. Subsequently, especially since the 16th century, very extensive faculties were granted to the papal nuncios. As the Council of Trent reserved many dispensations which in former times had been granted by the bishops to the pope, and as many bishops regarded the jurisdiction exercised by the nuncios as injurious to their authority, they applied to the pope for special faculties with regard to a number of dispensations. These faculties were generally granted for a term of five years (*facultates quinquennales*). An effort made in the 18th century by some of the German archbishops to reassert their own authority in the cases covered by the papal faculties was unsuccessful [see EMS, CONGRESS OF], and the *facultates quinquennales* are still conferred upon the bishops by the pope. Besides this general class of faculties, which contains twenty different provisions, many special faculties are conferred upon bishops in particular cases. The bishops, in their turn, confer faculties upon the vicars-general, deans, and common priests of their dioceses, either delegating to them rights which properly belong to bishops, or subdelegating papal rights which they have been specially authorized to subdelegate.—Herzog, *Real-Ency-*

*klop.* iv, 315; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirch.-Lex.* iv, 879. (A. J. S.)

**Faculty**, in England, is a special privilege or dispensation granted by favor and indulgence to enable a person to do that which he is not permitted to do without it. There is a court of the Faculties, the chief officer of which is master of the Faculties, under the archbishop of Canterbury. It has power, by 25 Henry VIII, 21, to grant dispensations to marry, to hold two or more incompatible benefices, and the like; and in it are registered the certificates of peers to their chaplains to qualify them for pluralities and non-residence. The act gives authority to grant such dispensations "for any such matters, not being repugnant to the holy Scriptures and the laws of God, whereof before such dispensations, etc., had been accustomed to be had at the see of Rome. Up to the time of passing this act, the pope, notwithstanding the statutes which had been passed restraining his authority, continued to exercise his power, and to draw a considerable revenue for indulgences, etc. The sittings of the court have always been held at Doctors' Commons" (q. v.).—*Encyclopædia Metropolitana*, s. v.

**Faculty.** See UNIVERSITY.

**Facundus**, bishop of Hermiane, in Africa. He took part in the conference held at Constantinople in 547 by pope Vigilius (q. v.), to discuss the *trina capitula* [see CHAPTERS, THE THREE], and sustained the side of Theodore and Theodoret against the emperor's view. Vigilius demanded that he (with other opposing bishops) should sign the condemnation of Ibas, Theodore, and Theodoret. He refused absolutely, and bore with firmness the persecution and banishment which followed. He is supposed to have died about A.D. 553. His treatise *Pro defensione trium Capitulorum*, lib. xii, will be found in Sirmond, *Opera Varia*, ii, 297 (Venet. 1728, 5 vols. fol.); in *Bib. Max. Patr.* x; in D'Achery, *Spicilegium*, iii, 307, of the first edition, and in iii, 106, edit. of 1723; and in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, lxxvii, 527 sq. His *Contra Mociannum Libellus*, condemning Mociannus and Vigilius for their course with regard to the "Three Chapters," is also given in Migne (lxxvii, 853).

Neander says that the writings of Facundus "are characterized by qualities seldom to be met with in that age—a freedom of spirit unshackled by human fear, and a candid, thorough criticism, superior in many respects to the prejudices of the times. Nobly did he protest against the uncalled-for dogmatism which had ever been the source of so much mischief to the Greek Church, these useless disputes having in fact proceeded from no other cause. 'While,' he said, 'in all other arts and occupations, no one presumed to pass judgment on what he had never learned; in matters of theology, on the contrary, they who learned the least were the most arrogant and peremptory in their judgments. When the civil power overstepped its province, it might indeed plunge numbers in ruin by misleading them to deny the truth with their lips, but still it could never effect its object, for it could not instil into the minds of men other convictions than they had: its power reached only to what was outward, not to the soul.' He spoke with scorn of those bishops who accused themselves in pleading, in excuse of their behavior, the constraint under which they were placed; for it was not even the force of torture, but only the fear of the emperor's displeasure, which had brought them to yield (*Cont. Mociannum*, f. 595). 'As if,' said he, 'we had been ordained bishops for no other purpose than to be enriched by the presents of princes, and to sit with them among the high authorities of the state. But if, amidst the many cares of the state, through the deceitful arts of the wicked, of which there is never any lack; anything has been admitted by them which tended to injure the Church or to disturb its peace, as if it were not our duty to set before them the truth for their own benefit, and, if it be necessary,



to resist them with the authority of religion, and patiently endure their displeasure if we must incur it. If God should now raise up an Ambrose," said he, "there would not fail to be a Theodosius" (*Church History*, Torrey's, ii, 544). There is a remarkable passage in the *Defensio* showing that Facundus did not hold the Romanist doctrine as to the corporeal presence in the Eucharist: "Potest sacramentum adoptionis adoptio nuncupari, sicut sacramentum corporis et sanguinis ejus, quod est in pane et poculo consecrato, corpus ejus et sanguinem dicitur: non quod proprie corpus ejus sit panis, et poculum sanguis: sed quod in se mysterium corporis ejus et sanguinis contineat" ("The sacrament of adoption may be called adoption itself, as we term the sacrament of his body and blood, which is in the bread and the consecrated cup, his body and blood; not that the bread is properly his body and the cup his blood, but because they contain within them the mystery of his body and blood" (ix, 5, Migne, lxxvii, 762).—Neander, *Ch. History*, ii, 544; Neander, *History of Dogmas* (Ryland), i, 278; Cave, *Hist. Liter.* i, 520; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacrés* (Paris, 1862), xi, 285 sq.; Waterland, *Works* (Oxford), iv, 599, note.

**FADUS, CUSPIUS** (Græcized Κούσιος Φάδος, Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 11, 4), a Roman knight of the time of the emperor Claudius. After the death of king Agrippa, in A. D. 41, he was appointed by Claudius procurator of Judæa. During his administration peace was restored in the country, and the only disturbance was created by one Theudas (q. v.), who came forward with the claim of being a prophet. He and his followers were put to death by command of Fadus. He was succeeded in the administration of Judæa (A. D. cir. 46) by Tiberius Alexander (Josephus, *Ant.* xix, 9; xx, 5, 1; *War.* ii, 11, 5; Tacitus, *Hist.* v, 9; Zonaras, xii, 11; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* ii, 11).—Smith, *Dict. of Class. Lit.* s. v. See PROCURATOR.

**FAGIUS, PAULUS** (properly BÜCHELIN), was born at Rheinabern in 1504. His studies were pursued at Heidelberg and Strasburg, where he became a great proficient in Hebrew, and was led into close acquaintance with Capito, Hedio, Bucer, Zell, and other learned reformers. In 1537 he entered the ministry, and was pastor at Isny until 1543. Here he studied Hebrew thoroughly under Elias Levita (q. v.) and also established a Hebrew press. In 1541, when the plague began to rage in Isny, he publicly rebuked those of the wealthy classes who forsook the place without making provision for the relief of the poor, and himself visited the sick in person, and administered spiritual comfort to them day and night, and yet escaped. On the death of Capito at Strasburg, the senate called Fagius to succeed him as professor and pastor there (1544). In 1546, Frederick II, the elector palatine, intending a reformation in his churches, called him to Heidelberg, and made him professor there. He opposed the Interim (q. v.), and when it was introduced he was compelled to leave Strasburg. In 1548 he accepted the invitation of Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, and came to England. He was nominated by the archbishop to the professorship of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge. Before he went to Cambridge he resided with the archbishop at Lambeth, where he was associated with Bucer. His labors while there, in addition to the preparation necessary for his professional office, are thus described by Strype: "As it has been a great while the archbishop's desire that the Holy Bible should come abroad in the greatest exactness, and true agreement with the original text, so he laid this work upon these two learned men, viz. Fagius and Bucer. First, that they should give a clear, plain, and succinct interpretation of the Scripture, according to the propriety of the language; and, secondly, illustrate difficult and obscure places, and reconcile those that seemed repugnant to one another. And it was his will and his advice that to this end and purpose their public readings should tend. This

pius and good work, by the archbishop assigned to them, they most gladly and readily undertook. For their more regular carrying on this business, they allotted to each other, by consent, their distinct tasks, Fagius, because his talent lay in the Hebrew learning, was to undertake the Old Testament, and Bucer the New. The leisure they now enjoyed with the archbishop they spent in preparing their respective lectures. Fagius entered upon the evangelical prophet Esaias, and Bucer upon the Gospel of the evangelist John; and some chapters in each book were dispatched by them. But it was not long but both of them fell sick, which gave a very unhappy stop to their studies." He died at Cambridge Nov. 13, 1549. His body, along with Bucer's, was dug up and burnt in queen Mary's time. He wrote various books on Biblical and Hebrew literature, among which are *Metaphrasis et Enarratio Epist. Paul. ad Rom.* (Strasb. 1536, fol.):—*Sententiæ sapientum Hebræorum* (Isny, 1541, 4to):—*Annotationes in Targum* (Isny, 1546, fol.):—*Expositio literalis in IV priora Capita Genesios, cui accessit Textus Hebraicus et Paraphrasos Chaldaicæ collatio*, 4to (this and the last work reprinted in the *Critici Sacri*):—*Precesiones Hebraicæ, ex libello Hebraico excerptæ cui Nomen, Liber Fidei* (1542, 8vo):—*Tolius Hebraicus in Latinam translatus* (1542, 4to):—*Esa Syre Sententiæ Morales, cum succincto Commentario* (1542, 4to):—*Isagogæ in Linguam Hebraicam* (Constance, 1543, 4to).—Middleton, *Evang. Biography*, i, 260; Melchior Adam, *Vita theolog.* i, 99; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* v, 50.

**Fagnani, PROSPER**, an Italian writer on ecclesiastical law, was born in 1598. He was for fifteen years secretary of the Congregation for the Interpretation of the Council of Trent (*Congregatio Conc. Trid. Interpret.*), and subsequently professor of canon law at the Roman Academy. He was regarded as the ablest Roman jurist of his time, and was frequently consulted by the popes. Alexander VII charged him with compiling a commentary on the Decretals, which appeared in 3 vols. fol. at Rome in 1661 (reprinted at Cologne, 1676; Venice, 1697, and in many other editions). As Fagnani had been entirely blind from his forty-fourth year, he had to dictate the whole commentary to a clerk. He died at Rome in 1678.—Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirch.-Lex.* iv, 853. (A. J. S.)

**Fair** (properly פָּאָר, *gophik', kalós*). Travellers inform us that in hot countries the greatest difference imaginable subsists between the complexions of the women. Those of high condition seldom go abroad, and are ever accustomed to be shaded from the sun with the greatest attention, and their skin is consequently fair and beautiful. But women in the lower ranks of life, especially in the country, being, from the nature of their employments, more exposed to the scorching rays of the sun, are in their complexion remarkably tawny and swarthy. Under such circumstances, a high value would of course be set by the Eastern ladies upon the fairness of their complexions, as a distinguishing mark of their superior quality, no less than as an enhancement of their beauty. This notion appears to have obtained as early as the time of Abraham (Gen. xii, 11-13). Thus, also, how natural is the bride's self-abasing reflection in Cant. i, 5, 6, respecting her tawny complexion among the fair daughters of Jerusalem, who, as attendants on a royal marriage, were of the highest rank. Roberts observes, in reference to the daughters of Job being very fair (Job xlii, 15), "The word fair may sometimes refer to the form of the features as well as the color of the skin; but great value is attached to a woman of a light complexion. Hence our English females are greatly admired in the East, and instances have occurred where great exertions have been made to gain the hand of a fair daughter of Britain. The acmé of perfection in a Hindu lady is to be of the color of gold." (See Wemyss, *Symbol. Dict.* s. v.) See BEAUTY.

**Fairbanks**, ERASTUS, LL.D., governor of Vermont, was born at Brimfield, Mass., Oct. 28, 1792. He obtained such education as the district school afforded, and at seventeen himself taught a district school. From his youth he was diligent in self-culture. In 1812 he removed to St. Johnsbury, Vt., and in March, 1814, he united with the Congregational Church in that place. From this time to the end of his life the interests of religion and the Church were paramount to all others in his life and habits of thought. After various vicissitudes in trade, he began in 1830 the manufacture of the patent "platform scale," which is now in use all over the world, and from the sale of which he laid the foundation of a large fortune. The village of St. Johnsbury grew in population, wealth, and virtue, so as to have become a model place under his skillful guidance. "Drunkenness and disorder were things unknown; industry, intelligence, and thrift were universal." In 1828 he became a deacon of the Congregational Church. In 1836 he was elected a member of the State Legislature, in 1844 and 1848 presidential elector, and in 1852 and 1860 he was chosen governor of the State of Vermont. In the execution of his official duties he was conscientious and faithful, and acquired and retained, in an unusual degree, the confidence of all parties. During his second term of office the civil war broke out. "His firm having a great amount of property in the South which must be lost in case of war, it was for his pecuniary interest to keep peace. But this had no weight with him. Day and night he toiled raising troops, where, three months before, not even a knapsack was to be found, and sending regiment after regiment of the brave Green Mountain Boys forward to the seat of war." The Legislature conferred upon him almost unlimited power in the discharge of his duties, and placed at his sole disposal a million of dollars, and at the close of his official term in 1861 passed votes of approval of his labors, ability, and patriotic devotion. He never touched even the salary to which he was entitled. He was for many years a corporate member of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and both in this field and in that of home missions he devoted time, talents, and money freely to the cause of God. His personal literary culture was diligently carried on during his life, and in 1860 the University of Vermont conferred on him the degree of LL.D. He died Nov. 20, 1864. To trace the thirty-four years of his life from 1830 to his death "is to record the daily acts of a life devoted to every good and noble work. Rare must be the talent which could organize and direct such a business in the face of so many obstacles, in an inland town, remote from business centres, and guide it safely through all the financial embarrassments to which the country has been subject. But a fact far more rare and interesting is that, in the midst of so many cares, time abundant was always found, and means equally abundant, not only for aiding in every good work, but for leading in new benevolent movements, for which many, with far less to do, thought they could find no time." "His munificent contributions to benevolent purposes and objects were proverbial long before his death, and in connection with 'good words and works' the name of Erastus Fairbanks had, to the people of his state, come to be as familiar as household words. In public life he was honored and confided in as a capable, honest, and reliable man; and in the walks of social and private life he was esteemed as a kind neighbor, a sincere friend, and a Christian gentleman."—*Congregational Quarterly*, 1867, No. 1.

**Fair Havens** (*Καλοί Λιμένες*), a harbor in the island of Crete (Acts xxvii, 8), not mentioned in any other ancient writing. There seems no probability that it is, as most early commentators thought (see Biscoe, *On the Acts*, p. 347, ed. 1829), the *Καλή Ἀκρή*, or *Fair Beach*, of Steph. Byz. (see *Kuinöl, Comment.*

in loc.); for that is said to be a city, whereas Fair Havens is described as "a place near to which was a city called Lasæa." Moreover, Mr. Pashley found (*Travels in Crete*, ii, 57) a district called *Acte*; and it is most likely that *Καλή Ἀκρή* was situated there; but that district is in the west of the island, whereas Fair Havens was on the south. Its position is now quite certain. Though not mentioned by classical writers, it is still known by the old Greek name, as it was in the time of Rauwolf (who calls it *Calismene*), Pococke (ii, 250), and other early travellers mentioned by Mr. Smith (*Voy. and Shipwr. of St. Paul*, 2d ed., p. 80-82). LASÆA, too, has recently been most explicitly discovered. In fact, Fair Havens appears to have been practically its harbor. These places are situated four or five miles to the east of Cape Matala, which is the most conspicuous headland on the south coast of Crete, and immediately to the west of which the coast trends suddenly to the north. This last circumstance explains why the ship which conveyed Paul was brought to anchor in Fair Havens. In consequence of violent and continuing north-west winds she had been unable to hold on her course towards Italy from Cnidus (Acts xxvii, 7), and had ran down, by Salmone, under the lee of Crete. It was possible to reach Fair Havens; but beyond Cape Matala the difficulty would have recurred so long as the wind remained in the same quarter. A considerable delay took place (ver. 9), during which it is possible that Paul may have had opportunities of preaching the Gospel at Lasæa, or even at GORTYNA, where Jews resided (1 Macc. xv, 23), and which was not far distant; but all this is conjectural. A consultation took place, at which it was decided, against the apostle's advice, to make an attempt to reach a good harbor named PHENICE (ver. 12). However, the south wind, which sprang up afterwards (ver. 13), proved delusive; and the vessel was caught by a hurricane [see *ΕΡΥΚΛΥΔΩΝ*] on her way towards Phenice, and ultimately wrecked.—Smith, s. v. See *SHIPWRECK (of Paul)*. The name of the place is appropriate. It is shut in on the west by a bold headland, on the summit of which are the ruins of an ancient convent dedicated to St. Paul. On the south it is sheltered by two little islands; and between these and the shore is a safe anchorage. The roadstead, however, is open to the sea, and we can thus see the truth of Luke's statement that it was "inconspicuous to winter in" (*ἀνεπίστος πρὸς παρακλιμασίαν*, ver. 12; see Smith, p. 256; Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, ii, 320). See CRETE.

**Fairs** (יַרְבֵּי, *izzebonim*; Sept. ἀγορά, *Vulg. mundine, forum*), a word which occurs only in Ezek. xxvii, and there no less than seven times (ver. 12, 14, 16, 19, 22, 27, 33); in the last of these verses it is rendered "wares," and this appears to be the true meaning of the word throughout (so Fürst, *Heb. Handb.* s. v.; but Gesenius, *Heb. Lex.* s. v., thinks it means *traffic* in general, and also *gains*). It will be observed that the word stands in some sort of relation to יַמְרָבָּ, *maarab'*, throughout the whole of the chapter, the latter word also occurring seven times, and translated sometimes "market" (ver. 13, 17, 19), and elsewhere "merchandise" (ver. 9, 27, 33, 34). The words are used alternately, and represent the alternations of commercial business in which the merchants of Tyre were engaged. That the first of these words cannot signify "fairs" is evident from ver. 12; for the inhabitants of Tarsish did not visit Tyre, but *vice versa*. Let the reader substitute "paid" or "exchanged for thy wares" for "occupied in thy fairs," and the sense is much improved. The relation which this term bears to *maarab*, which properly means *barter*, appears to be pretty much the same as exists between exports and imports. The sense of *izzebon* (יַרְבֵּי, the presumed sing. form) thus becomes essentially that proposed by

Gousset (*Commentarii Ling. Hebr.* p. 594) and adopted by Hävernick (*Commentar.* p. 464), namely, *exchange*, or *equivalent*. The requirements of the Tyrians themselves, such as slaves (ver. 13), wheat (ver. 17), steel (ver. 19), were a matter of *naarab*; but where the business consisted in the exchange of Tyrian wares for foreign productions, it is specified in this form: "Tarshish paid for thy wares with silver, iron, tin, and lead" (see Hitzig, *Commentar.* in loc.). The use of the terms would probably have been more intelligible if the prophet had mentioned what the Tyrians gave in exchange: as it is, he only notices the one side of the bargain, viz. what the Tyrians received, whether they were buyers or sellers.—Smith, s. v. See COMMERCE. The natural sea-port of Western Asia, and the centre of the commerce of the East, was Tyre, or, rather, the ports of Phœnicia, for Tyre was but one of them. Phœnicia early grasped this commerce, and retained it until the rise of Alexander. Sidon first rose to opulence; and then Tyre, her "daughter," better situated for commerce, soon eclipsed her glory, and became the mart of the world. The enumeration of the articles of traffic in Ezek. xxvii shows that a large part of the commerce of Tyre was in articles of luxury, though it was the grand mart for all the trade of the Eastern and Western world. See TYRE.

Fairs, however, although not directly referred to by the above Heb. term, were doubtless anciently common, as now, in the East. Dr. Thomson (*Land and Book*, ii, 152 sq.) thus describes the scene at these Oriental mercantile gatherings: "On Monday of each week a great fair is held at the khans, when, for a few hours, the scene is very lively and picturesque. These gatherings afford an excellent opportunity to observe Syrian manners, customs, and costumes, and to become acquainted with the character and quality of her productions. Thousands of people assemble from all parts of the country either to sell, trade, or purchase. Cotton is brought in bales from Nablûs; barley, and wheat, and sesamum, and Indian corn from the Hûleh, the Hauran, and Esdracôn. From Gilead and Basban, and the surrounding districts, come horses and donkeys, cattle and flocks, with cheese, milk, oil, honey, and similar articles. Then there are miscellaneous articles, such as chickens and eggs, figs, raisins, apples, melons, grapes, and all sorts of fruits and vegetables in their season. The peddlers open their packages of tempting fabrics; the jeweller is there with his trinkets; the tailor with his ready-made garments; the shoemaker with his stock, from rough, hairy sandals to yellow and red morocco boots; the farrier is there with his tools, nails, and flat iron shoes, and drives a prosperous business for a few hours; and so does the saddler, with his coarse sacks and his gayly-tinted cloths. And thus it is with all the arts and occupations known to this people. The noise is incessant, and at a distance sounds like that 'of many waters.' Every man is crying his wares at the top of his voice, chickens cackle and squall, donkeys bray and fight, and the dogs bark. Every living thing adds somewhat to the many-toned and prodigious uproar. It is now a miscellaneous comedy in full operation, where every actor does his best, and is supremely gratified with his own performance. The people find many reasons for sustaining these antiquated and very curious gatherings. Every man, woman, and child has inherited the *itch* for trading, and, of course, all classes meet at this grand bourse to talk over the state of the markets, from the price of a cucumber to that of cotton, or of a five-thousand dollar horse from the Hauran. Again, every Arab is a politician, and groups gather around the outskirts of the crowd to discuss the doings of the 'allied powers,' the last firman from the sultan, or the new tax demanded by their own petty emir. Descending to more ordinary matters, these fairs are great places for gossip and scandal. Friends meet friends, and exchange the

news of weddings, births, and deaths, and all the multifarious incidents and accidents between those grand extremes of human life. In a word, these fairs supply the places of many of the appliances of more civilized society. They are the daily newspaper, for there is one for every day within a circuit of forty miles. They are the exchange and the *forwarding office*, and the political caucus, and the family gathering, and the grand festa and gala days, and underlying the whole is the ever-present idea and aim of making money." See BAZAAR.

**Faith** (Gr. πίστις, Lat. *fides*, *fiducia*) is essentially *trust*. The various uses of the word (both objective and subjective) may be summed up as follows: 1. An objective body of truth: "the faith;" designated by the schoolmen as *fides que creditur*, the faith which is believed. So the Augsburg Confession speaks of "our holy faith and Christian religion." (This sense does not occur in N. T.) 2. A rule of thought, the *fides pœnes quam creditur*: so the Roman Catholics say such a thing is "of faith" (not found in N. T.). 3. A personal quality, act, or habit of the individual man; the *fides qua creditur*; the faith by which we believe. This latter is either (I) the exercise of our natural gifts (*natural* faith), or (II) the exercise of natural gifts under the influence of the divine Spirit with regard to divine things, and especially with regard to the person and work of Christ (the gift of God). This latter is Christian faith, and it includes two elements: (1) the spiritual apprehension of the invisible and eternal (Heb. xi, 1), and, specifically, (2) trust in Christ as a personal Saviour; and, as such, in the Christian system, it is the necessary condition of salvation. It is the instrument or means by which the redemption of Christ is appropriated, and, so far as it is man's act, it is the act of the whole man, mind, affections, and will. It is "a saving grace whereby we receive and rest upon Christ alone for salvation, as he is freely offered to us in the Gospel."

I. *Natural Faith*.—All our knowledge presupposes faith. In this view Goethe said that he was a "believer in the five senses;" and Fichte, that "man apprehends all reality external to himself through faith alone, a faith that is born with him." In the article BELIEF (q. v.) it was shown that there is a foundation laid for the exercise of this principle in the primary laws of thought or self-consciousness—in the reason, not of the individual man, but of humanity. Psychologically, "faith is the faculty of grasping evidence, with a propensity to admit it when duly presented to the mind. Just as by sensation and perception we discern certain objects through the medium of the senses, and as by reason we discover some truths, or discern them upon their simple presentation (Chalmers, *Institutes of Theology*, bk. iii, ch. vi), without any other warranty than the voice within, so also by faith we discern other truths through the means of testimony or by the voice of authority. Attempts to analyze this quality of the human mind have been often made and as often failed. But still the fact remains that, according to the original constitution of our nature, we are able and disposed to yield to evidence in proportion to its nature and its strength (Hooker, *Eccles. Pol.* bk. ii, chap. vii, § 5); to assent to testimony concerning facts not present and manifest; and to submit to authority in the announcement or proposition of truths independently of any internal and direct perception of them by ourselves (Van Mildert, *Boyle Lect.* serm. xvi). In matters of common life, from childhood to old age, we continually act, and are compelled to act, upon this principle (Barrow, *On the Creed*, serm. iii; Hare, *Victory of Faith*, serm. iv). The child believes its parent or its nurse, and reposes in this belief; and under certain conditions, the man believes the records of past history, the testimony of eye-witnesses, and the affirmations of trustworthy persons capable of understanding that which they affirm. And it is not too

much to say that, apart from this principle and practice of belief, man, even in the full exercise of all his other intellectual powers, would be enveloped in such a cloud of ignorance on even the most ordinary subjects, that an arrest would be laid upon all the affairs of civilized life, and there must be an end of all social harmony and order. It is by this means that we obtain a certainty, not of sight, not of demonstration, not of direct and immediate intuition, but yet a real and efficient certainty in many matters of high practical importance concerning which we must otherwise be hopelessly ignorant and in the dark. This principle lies at the foundation of human affections and family ties, of agricultural and commercial activity, and of a large portion of our most valuable knowledge in science, and our highest attainments in art. Above all, it is thus that we obtain our knowledge of many things divine, and especially of relations subsisting between God and ourselves; an acquaintance with which, as we shall hereafter see, is of the utmost importance to us, while yet, independently of the exercise of faith, it is utterly beyond the reach of every man living" (Rogers, *Reason and Faith*; Riddle, *Bampton Lectures*, 1852, lect. i). Faith "is that operation of the soul in which we are convinced of the existence of what is not before us, of what is not under sense or any other directly cognitive power. It is certainly a native energy of the mind, quite as much as knowledge is, or conception is, or imagination is, or feeling is. Every human being entertains, and must entertain, faith of some kind. He who would insist on always having immediate knowledge must needs go out of the world, for he is unfit for this world, and yet he believes in no other. It is in consequence of possessing the general capacity that man is enabled to entertain specific forms of faith. By a native principle he is led to believe in that of which he can have no adequate conception—in the infinity of space and time, and, on evidence of his existence being presented, in the infinity of God. This enables him to rise to a faith in all those great religious verities which God has been pleased to reveal" (McCosh, *Intuitions of the Mind*, pt. iii, bk. ii, ch. v; see also pt. ii, bk. ii, ch. iv).

Guizot, *Mémoires et Études Morales* (transl. in *Journal of Sacred Literature*, xii, 430 sq.), has a thoughtful essay in which he distinguishes natural beliefs from faith as follows: "No one can doubt that the word faith has an especial meaning, which is not properly represented by belief, conviction, or certitude. Custom and universal opinion confirm this view. There are many simple and customary phrases in which the word faith could not be replaced by any other. Almost all languages have a specially appropriated word to express that which in English is expressed by faith, and which is essentially different from all analogous words. This word, then, corresponds to a state of the human soul; it expresses a moral fact which has rendered such a word necessary. We commonly understand by faith a certain belief of facts and dogmas—religious facts and dogmas. In fact, the word has no other sense when employing it absolutely and by itself—we speak of the *faith*. That is not, however, its unique, nor even its fundamental sense; it has one more extensive, and from which the religious sense is derived. We say, I have full *faith* in your words; this man has *faith* in himself, in his power, etc. This employment of the word in civil matters, so to speak, has become more frequent in our days; it is not, however, of modern invention; nor have religious ideas ever been an exclusive sphere, out of which the notions and the word *faith* were without application. It is, then, proved by the testimony of language and common opinion, first, that the word *faith* designates a certain interior state of him who believes, and not merely a certain kind of belief. Secondly, that it is, however, to a certain species of belief—religious belief—that it has been at first and most generally applied. Now

our *natural* beliefs germinate in the mind of man, without the co-operation of his reflection and his will. Our *scientific* beliefs, on the other hand, are the fruit of voluntary study. But *faith* partakes of, and at the same time differs from, natural and scientific beliefs. It is, like the latter, individual and particular; like the former, it is firm, complete, active, and sovereign. Considered in itself, and independent of all comparison with this or that analogous condition, faith is the full security of the man in the possession of his belief: a possession freed as much from labor as from doubt; in the midst of which every thought of the path by which it has been reached disappears, and leaves no other sentiment but that of the natural and pre-established harmony between the human mind and truth."

II. *Christian Faith*.—So far as faith is a voluntary act, quality, or habit of man, it is psychologically the same in the theological sense as in common life; the difference lies in the *objects* of the faith. In order to venerate or love a fellow-man, we must believe in his worthiness; so, for the fear and love of God, which are fundamental elements of the Christian life, faith must pre-exist. But this direction of the soul towards God does not spring from the *natural* working of the human mind; it is the gift of God (Eph. ii, 8), and is wrought in the heart by the Holy Spirit through the word of the Gospel and the free grace of Christ (Rom. x, 17; 1 Cor. i, 21). *Fides in verbo Evangelii recte agnoscimus* (Form. Concord. iii, 11). Not that the Holy Spirit endues the soul with any new faculty for the single purpose of receiving Gospel truth; but it quickens and directs an existing faculty, at the same time presenting to it an appropriate object. The true faith, thus excited, is an operation at once of the intellect, the heart, and the will. As said above, this faith, so far as it saves man in Christendom, is specifically trust in Christ as a personal Saviour. In further treating it, we give, (I.) The uses of the words *πίστις*, *faith*, and *πιστεύω*, *I believe*, in the Scriptures (condensed from Cremer, *Wörterbuch d. N. Test. Griechisch*, Gotha, 1866, 8vo). (II.) A history of the idea of faith in Christian theology up to the Reformation. (III.) The Protestant and Romanist doctrines of faith in contrast and comparison with each other. (IV.) Later Protestant statements of the doctrine.

(1.) *Use of the words Faith and believe in Scripture*.—*Πίστις*. 1. In profane Greek, *πίστις* means primarily *trust* or *confidence*, such as one man can have in another; more seldom *fidelity* or *fidelity* which one pledges or keeps; and also the *pledge of fidelity*, e. g. Sophocles, *O. C.* 1632; *δός μου χερσὶς σῆς πίστιν*. Examples of the primary meaning (*trust* or *confidence*) are: Herodotus, iii, 24; Sophocles, *O. Col.* 950; Xen. *Hier.* iv, 1. In the passive tense (*credit*) it is found e. g. Aristotle, *Eth.* x, 8. Parallel with the primary meaning (*trust* or *confidence*) stands that of *conviction*, e. g. *πίστιν ἔχειν τινός* (*to have faith in a thing*); but this conviction is based upon *trust*, and not upon knowledge: so that in this sense *ὁ πιστεύων* stands opposite to *εἰδώς*, and *πίστις* to *ἐπιστήμη* (comp. Plat. *Repub.* x, 601). In this sense *πίστις* is used (in the sphere of religion) of belief in the gods, and of acknowledgment of them, not based upon knowledge (comp. Plutarch, *Mor.* 756, B; Plato, *Legg.* 976, C, D; Eurip. *Med.* 413, 414). Rather characteristic is the fact that this faith is not designated as in the N. T. by the verb *πιστεύω*, but by *νομίζω* (Xen. *Mem.* I, i, 3).

This element of "acknowledgment," as distinct from *knowing* (*εἰδέναι*), is found also in the N. T. significations of the word as used by Paul and others; e. g. 2 Cor. v, 7, "For we walk by *faith* (*πίστει*), not by *sight*;" Heb. xi, 27, "By *faith* (*πίστει*) he forsook Egypt;" Heb. xi, 1, "Now *faith* (*πίστις*) is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen;" Rom. iv, 18, "Who against hope *believed* (*πίστευεν*) in hope;" John xx, 29, "Blessed (are) they

that have not seen and (yet) have believed" (πιστεύσαντες). But this opposition to "knowledge" or "sight" is not essential to the idea of faith, as is seen from John iv, 42; xi, 45; 1 Tim. iv, 3; Philem. 6, et al. In fact, the N. T. faith differs from the profane πίστις generally in that it is *not* a conviction held without reference to any ground or authority (compare 1 Pet. iii, 15; i, 21).

In the O. T. the word "faith" is comparatively seldom used; the relation of man to God and to his revelation is generally designated by some other term befitting the economy of the law, e. g. "doing God's will," "keeping the commandments," "remembering the Lord" (Exod. iii, 15), et al. Nevertheless, we do find (as one species of phrases among many to express this relation) terms denoting "trusting," "hoping," "waiting on the Lord" (בטח, הוסיף, קנה, ἐλπίζω, περιμένω, υπομένω, etc.). But in some of the most important passages of the Old-Test. history the word "faith" occurs; e. g. with regard to Abraham (Gen. xv, 6), "he believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness;" of the people of Israel (Exod. iv, 31; compare 1, 5, 8; xiv, 31); with regard to the possession of Canaan (Deut. ix, 23; comp. i, 32; Psa. lxxviii, 22, 32; cvi, 24); with regard to the covenant of the law (Exod. xix, 9). In view of these pregnant passages, we may say that the foundation laid for the N. T. in the Old is laid in "faith" (comp. 2 Chron. xx, 20; Isa. liii, 1; vii, 9; xxviii, 16; Jonah iii, 5). But *unbelief* is far oftener spoken of in the O. T. than *faith* (comp. Psa. xxvii, 13; 2 Kings xvii, 14; Psa. lxxviii, 22, 32; cvi, 24; Numb. xx, 12; Deut. ix, 23; Isa. vii, 9; liii, 1; Numb. xiv, 11; Psa. evi, 12; exix, 66). The verb used in all these passages is יָצַד, Hiph. of יָצַד, to *justen, build to make firm*. From the last of these significations follows that of *support, to rely upon, to trust* (Job xxxix, 11, 12; iv, 18; xv, 15); holding a thing for *certain and reliable* (1 Kings x, 7; 2 Chron. ix, 6; Lam. iv, 12; Jer. xl, 14; Deut. xxviii, 66; Job xxiv, 22). Used with relation to God, it denotes a cleaving to him, resting upon his strength, sure confidence in God, which gives fixedness and stability (2 Chron. xx, 20; Isa. vii, 9).

But there is apparently no corresponding noun to the verb יָצַד. For יִצְדָּה corresponds to the partic. in Kal and Niphal, יָצַד, יָצַדָּה, and denotes *steadfastness, stability* (as an objective quality; e. g. Isa. xxxiii, 6). In other passages it denotes the personal quality of *fidelity, faithfulness* (but not of *holding fast by faith*), e. g. 1 Chron. ix, 22; 2 Chron. xxxi, 18 (sense wrong in English version); 2 Kings xxii, 7; Jer. vii, 28. In these passages, where the word refers to man, the Sept. translates it πίστις; but where it refers to God it makes it ἀλήθεια, e. g. Psa. xxxiii, 4. Here it may be remarked that the reference to the יִצְדָּה (faithfulness of God) by Paul (Rom. iii, 2 sq.) helps us to fix his idea of faith as definitively *trust*. As a designation of the religious relation of man to God, יִצְדָּה, πίστις is only seldom used in the O. T. (see 1 Sam. xxvi, 23; Jer. v, 5). In these passages it denotes not simply *candor, honesty*, but rather *faithfulness, i. e. fidelity to the covenant* (comp. Jer. v, 3 with 1, 5, and Matt. xxiii, 23). But, after all, we have not yet found *our* idea of faith. But Habakkuk ii, 4 affords a passage in which is decidedly to be found the Pauline idea: יִצְדָּה יִצְדָּה יִצְדָּה יִצְדָּה יִצְדָּה (Sept. ὁ δὲ δικαίος ἐκ πίστεως μου ζήσεται). Apparently this passage was not understood by the Sept., which changed the suffix of the third person to that of the first, and referred it to the faithfulness and the reliability of God. But יִצְדָּה stands here with regard to the relation in which the just man, compared with the haughty Chaldean, holds himself to the divine promises; and it refers, therefore, not to the relation it-

self, but to the *quality of the relation*, as the Talmudic פִּיטְרָא דְּרַבִּי חֵלְדָּיָא denotes the *confiding faith* (compare Levy, *Chald. Wörterbuch*). Paul, in citing Hab. ii, 4, changes the order of the words from that in the Sept. to ὁ δὲ δικαίος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται (Rom. i, 17; comp. Delitzsch, *Habak.* p. 50-53; Keil, *Kleine Proph.* in loc.). So, then, we find laid in the O. T. the ground for the N.-T. doctrine of faith as *complete confidence, trust*; and this, too, combined with a conviction amounting to a recognition of the invisible (compare Heb. xi, 1).

Conviction combined with trust, as opposed to doubt, so far as the intellect is concerned, and as opposed to fear, so far as the heart is concerned—these appear, so far, to be the essential elements of faith (comp. Matt. xxi, 21; Jas. i, 6; Heb. x, 39; Mark iv, 40; Heb. vi, 12; Rev. xiii, 10).

2. We find πίστις seemingly used, especially in the Synoptical Gospels, with regard to the relation of individuals to the Lord, to designate *special acts of confidence* (Matt. viii, 10; ix, 2, 22; Luke, vii, 9, 50; viii, 48; xvii, 19, xviii, 42; Mark v, 34; x, 52; comp. Matt. xv, 28). But the Synoptists also use the word to denote (not simply special and single exertions of belief, but also) full trust in Christ, and in the divine revelation in him (Luke xviii, 8; comp. Matt. viii, 10; Luke viii, 25; Mark iv, 40; Luke xxii, 32; xvii, 5; Matt. xvii, 20; xxi, 21). Compared with this (and Paul points out the contrast emphatically), the O.-T. revelation was an education for faith (Gal. iii, 23-26: "But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster. For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus;" comp. Rom. xi, 32; Acts xvii, 31). But it is to be fully understood also that the epistle to the Hebrews makes faith the means of holding to the God of revelation, in the sphere of the *entire economy of redemption*—in the O. T. as well as the N. T. (Heb. xi). In the Acts faith seems to be used as more particularly characteristic of the sphere of the N.-T. revelation (Acts vi, 7; compare Rom. i, 5; xvi, 26; Acts xiii, 8; xvii, 31; Gal. i, 23). In Paul's epistles, while the O.-T. faith is clearly recognised (e. g. with reference to Abraham, and the citation of Hab. ii, 4), nevertheless, the prevailing O.-T. *unbelief* is especially emphasized (e. g. Rom. xi, 32); and the contrast between law and gospel (Gal. iii, 12 sq.) brings out clearly the chief element of N.-T. faith as unconditional trust.

The *promise*, as the correlate of the *Gospel*, is the N.-T. element of the O.-T. economy, and demands faith (Gal. iii, 22; compare iv, 21 sq.), but the absence of a σπέρμα ᾧ ἐπηγγέλτα (seed to whom the promise was made, Gal. iii, 19) made necessary the interposition of the law; not a νόμος πίστεως (law of faith), but ἔργων (of works), which, by manifesting sin, was an educator into faith (Rom. iii, 19; Gal. iii, 22, 23). This throws light upon the contrast of πίστις and ἔργα—χάρις and ὀφείλημα—or πίστις and νόμος (Gal. iii, 23; also Rom. iii, 27, 28; comp. iv, 2, 5; ix, 32; Gal. ii, 16; iii, 2, 5; comp. iii, 12; Eph. ii, 8; and in contrast to νόμος, Rom. iv, 13, 14, 16; ix, 30; Gal. iii, 11, 12, 23-25). This contrast, it will be observed, is only introduced by Paul in passages in which he is expressly pointing out the difference between the O.-T. economy of salvation and that of the N. T.

3. The following classification of the passages in which the word πίστις occurs will be found useful: (1.) It is used *with reference to an object*, Heb. vi, 1; 1 Thess. i, 8; Mark xi, 22; 2 Thess. ii, 13; Colos. ii, 12; Phil. i, 27; Acts xxiv, 24; xxvi, 18; Colos. ii, 5; Acts xx, 21; comp. Philem. 5; 1 Tim. iii, 13; Gal. iii, 26; Ephes. i, 15; 2 Tim. iii, 15; Rom. iii, 25; with the obj.-genit.,

Rom. iii, 22; Gal. ii, 16; iii, 22; Ephes. iii, 12; Phil. iii, 9; Gal. ii, 20; Acts iii, 16; Jas. ii, 1; Rev. ii, 13; xiv, 12; with Tit. i, 1, compare Rev. xvii, 14. (2) Without nearer definition, simply as *faith*, which adheres with full conviction and confidence to the N.-T. revelation of salvation, and makes this its foundation (support). Here is especially of importance the expression (Acts iii, 16), *the faith which is by him*, an expression which is used to point out the salvation arising from the mediation of Christ, through the *looking unto Jesus*, the author of faith (Heb. xii, 2). Under this class, besides the passages of the Synoptical Gospels already referred to, we mention Acts xv, 22; xvi, 5; Colos. i, 23; 1 Pet. v, 9; Rom. xiv, 1; iv, 19, 20; 1 Cor. xvi, 13; Rom. xi, 20; 2 Cor. i, 24; xiii, 5; 1 Tim. ii, 15; 2 Tim. iv, 7; 2 Cor. viii, 7; x, 15; 2 Thess. i, 3; Colos. ii, 7; 1 Tim. i, 19; Jas. ii, 1, 14, 18; Tit. i, 13; ii, 2; 2 Cor. v, 7; Rom. i, 17; Gal. iii, 11; Heb. x, 38 (comp. Gal. ii, 20); Acts xiii, 8; 2 Tim. ii, 18; 1 Tim. i, 19; iv, 1; v, 8, 12; vi, 10, 21; 2 Tim. iii, 8. Then the Pauline expressions *ἐκ πίστεως εἶναι, οἱ ἐκ π.* (they which are of *faith*; Gal. iii, 7, 9, 12, 22; Rom. iv, 16; iii, 26; comp. Heb. x, 39), *ἰσθῆναι πίστει* (we are of them that *believe*), are used of faith proper (compare Rom. xiv, 22, 23). The phrases *ἐκ πίστεως ἔκαστου, ἔκαστος*, make faith the necessary condition of justification (Rom. iii, 30; comp. Gal. iii, 14; Rom. v, 1; Gal. ii, 16; iii, 8; Rom. iv, 13; *ἐκ πίστεως*, ix, 30; x, 6; Phil. iii, 9; comp. Rom. i, 17; iv, 5, 9). The word *πίστις* is found joined to *ἀγάπη*, Ephes. vi, 23; 1 Thess. iii, 6; v, 8; 1 Tim. i, 14; iv, 12; vi, 11; 2 Tim. i, 5, 13; ii, 22; Gal. v, 6; 1 Cor. xiii, 13; Rev. ii, 19; with *ἁγίς, ὑπομονή*. 1 Cor. xiii, 13; 2 Thess. i, 4; Rev. xiii, 10. The word is also found Acts vi, 5, 8; xi, 24; xiv, 27; xv, 9; Rom. i, 8, 12; iii, 31; iv, 12; v, 2; x, 8, 17; xiii, 6; 1 Cor. ii, 5; xv, 14, 17; 2 Cor. i, 24; iv, 13; Gal. v, 5, 22; vi, 10; Ephes. iii, 17; iv, 5, 13; vi, 16; Phil. i, 25; i, 17; Col. i, 4; 1 Thess. i, 3; ii, 5, 7, 10; 2 Thess. iii, 2; 1 Tim. i, 2, 4; ii, 7; iii, 9; iv, 6; vi, 12; 2 Tim. i, 5; iii, 10; Tit. i, 1, 4; iii, 15; Philem. 6; Heb. x, 22; xiii, 7; Jas. i, 3, 6; ii, 5, 14, 17, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26; v, 15; 1 Pet. i, 5, 7, 9, 21; 2 Pet. i, 1, 5; Jude 3, 20.

That even in James, *confidence, trust* (and not mere *recognition*), is the essential element of faith, is manifested from the passage (v, 15), *ἡ ἐνυῖα τῆς πίστεως σώσει τὸν κάματον* (the *prayer of faith* shall save the sick). The *works of faith* are, according to James, such as show forth faith, and without which faith sinks into a mere recognition (Jas. ii, 19), as *dead faith* (*νεκρά*).

It must be noted that the word *πίστις* occurs in John's epistles only in one place, 1 John v, 4, and in his Apocalypse in four places (ii, 13, 19; xiii, 10; xiv, 12).

There remain a few passages in which *πίστις* apparently does not denote "trust" in salvation by Christ, as Rom. xii, 3 (comp. Alford, *in loc.*, and also Acts xvii, 31). 1 Cor. xiii, 2 is easily explained by comparison with Matt. xxi, 21; Luke xvii, 5, 6, and here will be best joined 1 Cor. xii, 9. In the signification *faithfulness, πίστις*, like the O. T. *אֱמוּנָה*, is spoken of God, Rom. iii, 3; of men, Matt. xxiii, 23; Tit. ii, 10. With the former passage compare Isa. v, 1 sq.

*Πιστέω*. General meaning: a. to trust, to depend upon, *τινί* e. g. *ταῖς προνομίαις θεῶν θεσφοταί*, Polyb. v, 62, 6; Sophoc. *Philoct.* 1369; Demosth. *Phil.* ii, 67, 9. With the dative of the person and the acc. of the thing, *π. τινί τι* = to intrust (confide) something to a person, Luke xvi, 11; John ii, 24; in the passive, *πιστεύομαι τι*, I am trusted with a thing; without obj.: I am trusted, Rom. iii, 2; 1 Cor. ix, 17; Gal. ii, 7; 1 Thess. ii, 4; 2 Thess. i, 10; 1 Tim. i, 11; Tit. i, 3. b. Very frequently *πισθεῖν τινί* denotes to trust a person, to give credence to, to accept statements (to be convinced of their truth); Soph. *El.* 886, *τῷ λόγῳ*. In

a broader sense, *πισθεῖν τινί τι*, to believe a person; e. g. Eur. *Hec.* 710, *λόγους ἐμοῖσι πιστεύονταί*; Xen. *Apol.* 15. Then *πισθεῖν τι*, to believe a thing, to recognize it (as true); e. g. Plat. *Gorg.* 524, A, *ἂ ἐγὼ ἀνηκούσως πιστέω ἀληθῆ εἶναι*; Aristot. *Analyt.* pr. 2, 23; also *πισθεῖν περί, ὑπὲρ τινος*, Plut. *Lyc.* 19, where *πισθεῖν* stands alone, to be inclined to believe, recognize a thing; while e. g. in John ix, 18, the specific aim is added: "But the Jews did not believe concerning him that he had been blind, and received his sight."

In the N. T. (in which *πισθεῖν* has regard to our conduct towards God and his revelation) all these constructions are found, as well as the combinations (unusual in the profane Greek) of *π. εἰς, ἐπί τινα, ἐπί τινα*, and also *πισθεῖν* standing alone. The question is whether the original signification is *confide, or accepting as true*.

(1.) We find *πισθεῖν* in the signification to believe, to take for true, and hence to be convinced, to recognize (accept); (a) with the acc. following, John xi, 26, *πιστεύεις τοῦτο*; comp. 25, 26; 1 John iv, 16; Acts xiii, 41; 1 Cor. xi, 18; 1 Tim. iii, 16 (comp. Matt. xxiv, 23, 26; Luke xxii, 67); John x, 25; (b) with the infinitive after it, Acts xv, 11 (*πιστεύομεν σωζήσθαι*); (c) with *ὅτι* after it, Matt. ix, 28; Mark xi, 23, 24; Acts ix, 26; Jas. ii, 19, *ὅ π. πιστεύεις ὅτι εἰς ὃ ζῶς ἴσταν*; compare Acts xxvii, 25; John iv, 21, *πιστέvé μοι, ὅτι ἔρχεται ὄρα*. This construction of *πισθεῖν ὅτι* is especially frequent in the writings of John, in St. Paul's meaning of it. It is also used by Paul in Rom. vi, 8; 1 Thess. iv, 14; but in Rom. x, 9, *ἐάν πισθέσθης ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ὅτι ὁ ζῶς πάντων ἠγγεῖται ἐκ νεκρῶν, σωθήσῃς*, the sense of *trust* predominates over that of *taking for true*. Compare also Heb. xi, 6, with xi, 1; iv, 3.

In John this construction with *ὅτι* is found in chap. iv, 21; viii, 24; x, 38; xi, 27 (compare vi, 69); xi, 42 (compare xvii, 3); xiii, 19; xiv, 10, 11; xvi, 27; (and have believed that I came out from God), xvi, 30; xvii, 8, 21; xx, 31; 1 John v, 1, 5 (comp. with v, 10). In these passages the sense of *πιστέω* is that of *assent, belief, recognition, conviction of truth*. This meaning is also predominant in the following passage: John iii, 12 (If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things) (comp. iii, 11). Note also the connection with *γινώσκω* (*to know*), vi, 69; x, 37, 38; xvii, 8; and note also the relation of Christ's works and of sight to faith, John iv, 48 (Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe); x, 37, 38; xiv, 11; vi, 36; xx, 8, 29 (compare xx, 25); i, 51; iv, 39-42.

Let us look now at the constructions *πισθεῖν τινί, εἰς τινα*. It is clear that *πισθεῖν τινί* of itself cannot signify to accept a person, but only to believe what he says, to trust his word; e. g. John ii, 22 (they believed the Scripture and the word which Jesus had said); v, 47; xii, 38 (comp. Luke i, 20; Acts xxiv, 14; xxvi, 27; 1 John iv, 1). In this sense also we understand John v, 46 (for had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me); viii, 31, 45, 46; x, 37 (comp. with x, 36); xiv, 11. Nevertheless, as it is the witness of Jesus himself that is in question, the acceptance of his words implies the acceptance of his person (John v, 46; comp. with v, 37-39). Connect with these the unique passage 1 John iii, 23: *αὕτη ἐστίν ἡ ἐντολή αὐτοῦ ἵνα πιστεύσωμεν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ*, "this is the commandment, that we should believe on the name of his son Jesus Christ" (elsewhere *εἰς τὸ ὄν.*, John i, 12; ii, 23; iii, 18; 1 John v, 13); comp. also John vi, 29; xvi, 3; 1 John v, 10 (He that believeth on [εἰς] the Son of God hath the witness in himself; he that believeth not God [τῷ θεῷ] hath made him a liar, because he believeth not [εἰς] the record that God gave of his Son). Here *πισθεῖν τῷ θεῷ*, to believe God, is to receive his testimony, *π. εἰς τὴν μαρτυρίαν*, and consequently to receive Him for whom the testimony is borne. Further comp. John v, 38 with 37, 24, 47, and 44. These passages show that John's idea of faith includes (1) accepting

the testimony of God, (2) accepting the testimony of Christ concerning himself, and therefore (3) accepting Christ himself. The construction *πιστεύειν εἰς* is found in John ii, 11; iii, 16, 18, 36; iv, 39; vi, 29, 40 (47); vii, 5, 31, 38, 39, 48; viii, 30; ix, 35, 36; x, 42; xi, 25, 26, 45, 48; xii, 11, 37, 42, 44, 46; xiv, i, 12; xvi, 9; xvii, 20; 1 John v, 13. The only passage in the writings of John in which another preposition occurs is John iii, 15, where Lachmann reads *ἐπ' αὐτόν*, Tischendorf *ἐν αὐτῷ*, instead of *εἰς αὐτόν*.

(2.) But the sense of *admitting, accepting as true*, thus far developed, is by no means the whole of John's idea of faith in Christ. It includes not only this, but also *adherence to Christ; cleaving to him*. See, for instance, the whole passage, John ix, 35-38, and comp. xi, 48; x, 26, 27; vi, 69; i, 12. Both these are evidently contained also in the *πιστεύειν τινί*, John vi, 30; comp. with vi, 29: *τί οὖν ποιῆς τὸ σημεῖον, ἵνα ἴωμεν καὶ πιστεύσωμέν σοι* (What sign showest thou, that we may see and believe in thee?); 29: *ἵνα πιστεύσῃτε εἰς ὃν ἄπιστευεν ὁ Ζῆσὺς* (that ye believe on him whom He hath sent). Compare especially also Matt. xxvii, 42; Mark xv, 32.

It is plain, now, that John's idea of faith includes the element of *cleaving to Christ* as well as of *accepting him*; and this cleaving to him includes the idea of *full trust* in Christ as Saviour, as illustrated in the important passage, John iii, 15: *ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐν αὐτῷ* (that whosoever believeth in him, not *εἰς αὐτόν*. Tischendorf *ἐν*, Lachmann *ἐπ' αὐτόν*). "Here is involved the anguish, in the believer, of the bite of the fiery serpent, and the earnest looking on him in whom sin is crucified with the inner eye of faith" (Alford, in loc.). In this full sense of the word John uses *πιστεύω* by itself (*to believe*) in i, 7, 51; iv, 41, 42, 48, 53; vi, 36, 64; ix, 38; x, 25, 26; xi, 15, 40; xii, 39, 47; xiv, 29; xvi, 31; xix, 35; xx, 31 (comp. iii, 12; vi, 69; xx, 8, 25, 29). And this faith is the condition of the gifts of life, light, and salvation; John x, 26, 27; iii, 12, 16, 18, 36; vi, 35, 40, 47; vii, 38; xi, 25, 26; xx, 31 (comp. v, 38); viii, 24; i, 12; xii, 36, 46 (comp. viii, 12 and xi, 40).

(3.) Paul's use of *πιστεύειν* also includes the idea of *intellectual conviction, recognition*; see the passages above cited under *πίστις*, and comp. also Rom. iv, 20 (strong *in fide*); i, 5; xvi, 26, and the relation of *πιστεύειν* to *κρῖναι* (Rom. x, 14, 16; 1 Cor. xv, 2, 11; Ephes. i, 13). But the sense of *trust in Christ as Saviour* is always predominant in Paul. The construction *πιστεύειν τινί*, *to trust, rely upon*, is found 2 Tim. i, 12 (I know *in whom I have believed, and am persuaded*); Tit. iii, 8; Rom. iv, 3; Gal. iii, 6; Rom. iv, 6; compare iv, 18. Instead of the dative we find *πιστεύειν ἐπὶ τινά*, Rom. iv, 5; *ἐπὶ τῶν ἑκαουσῶτα τὸν ἀσιβῆ* (*on him that justifieth the ungodly*), iv, 24. The *πιστεύειν εἰς* denotes always faith in Christ (Rom. x, 14; Gal. ii, 16; Phil. i, 29); likewise *ἐπὶ* with the dative, 1 Tim. i, 16; Rom. ix, 33. And *πιστεύειν* is used standing alone to designate the fullest *trust* of faith, Rom. i, 16; iii, 22; iv, 11, 18; x, 4, 10; xiii, 11; xv, 13; 1 Cor. i, 21; iii, 5; xiv, 22; 2 Cor. iv, 13; Gal. iii, 22; Ephes. i, 13, 19; 1 Thess. i, 7; ii, 10, 13; 2 Thess. i, 10.

In James ii, 19, *to believe* denotes intellectual assent, but in ver. 23 it denotes *trust* (see under *πίστις*). In Peter the two elements of assent and trust are conjoined (comp. 1 Pet. i, 8, with ii, 6, 7; i, 21).

In the Acts and Synoptical Gospels, the import of the word (whether assent or trust, or both conjoined) must be decided by the context.

The result of our examination is, that "faith" in the N. T. includes three elements, each and all necessary to the full meaning of the word, while one or another of them may become prominent according to the connection, viz. (1) full intellectual acceptance of the revelation of salvation; (2) adherence to the truth and to the person of Christ thus accepted; (3) absolute and

exclusive trust in the redeeming work of Christ for salvation. In no one of the writers of the New Testament is any one of these three elements wanting.

(1.) *Early History of the Doctrine of Faith*.—1. In the early Church, the Pauline doctrine of faith as a condition of justification was universally maintained. But the Eastern thinkers did not give much attention to faith in a doctrinal way, and its true meaning was not prominently developed, nor was the distinction between faith and works (as conditions) sharply drawn. During the Apologetic period (from A. D. 100 to A. D. 250), while attention was "principally directed to theoretical knowledge, faith was for the most part considered as historico-dogmatic faith in its relation to *γνώσις*. This gave rise to the opinion that knowledge in divine things justifies, while ignorance condemns. Minucius Felix († 208), 35: *Imperitū Deī sufficit ad penam, notitia prodest ad veniam*. Theophilus of Antioch († 181) also knows of a *filēs historica* alone, upon which he makes salvation to depend, i, 14: *Ἀπόδειξεν οὖν λαβῶν τῶν γινομένων καὶ προαναπεφωτημένων, οὐκ ἀπιστῶ, ἀλλὰ πιστέω περὶ ἀρχῶν Ζεῦ, ᾧ ἔν βοῦλει καὶ σὺ ὑποτάγητι, πιστεύων αὐτῷ, μὴ ἔν ἄπιστῆσθα, πιστῶν ἄνωμεος τότε ἐν αἰωνίου τιμωρίας*. But, though it was reserved for men of later times to investigate more profoundly the idea of justifying faith in the Pauline sense, yet correct views on this subject were not entirely wanting during this period." Clement of Rome († 100) says in a Pauline spirit, "Called by the will of God in Christ, we can be justified, not by ourselves, not by our own wisdom and piety, but only by faith, by which God has justified all in all ages. But shall we on this account cease from doing good, and give up charity? No, we shall labor with unwearied zeal as God, who has called us, always works, and rejoices in his works" (1 *Ep. ad Cor.* c. 32, 33). Irenæus († 202) contrasts the new joyful obedience which ensues on the forgiveness of sins with the legal stand-point. "The law which was given to bondmen formed men's souls by outward corporal work, for it coerced men by a curse to obey the commandments, in order that they might learn to obey God. But the Word, the Logos who frees the soul, and through it the body, teaches a voluntary surrender. Hence the fetters of the law must be taken off, and man accustoms himself to the free obedience of love. The obedience of freedom must be of a higher kind; we are not allowed to go back to our earlier stand-point; for he has not set us free in order that we may leave him; this no one can do who has sincerely confessed him. No one can obtain the blessings of salvation out of communion with the Lord; and the more we obtain from him, so much the more must we love him; and the more we love him, so much greater glory shall we receive from him" (Irenæus, *Har.* bk. iv, chap. xiii, 1, 23; Neander, *History of Dogmas*, Ryland, p. 216). Tertullian (220) adv. Marc. v, 3: *Ex fidei libertate justificatur homo, non ex legis servitute, quia iustus ex fide vivit*. According to Clement of Alexandria († 218), *faith* is not only the key to the knowledge of God (*Coh.* p. 9), but by it we are also made the children of God (*ib.* p. 23). Clement accurately distinguishes between theoretical and practical unbelief, and understands by the latter the want of susceptibility of divine impressions, a carnal mind which would have everything in a tangible shape (*Strom.* ii, 4, p. 436). Origen (A. D. 250) in *Num. Hom.* xxvi (Opp. iii, p. 369): *Impossibile est salvari sine fide; Comm. in Ep. ad Rom.* (Opp. iv, p. 517): *Etiam si opera quis habeat ex lege, tamen, quia non sunt cœlicata supra fundamentum fidei, quævis videantur esse bona, tamen operatore suum justificare non possunt, quod eis dedit fides, quæ est signaculum eorum, quæ justificatur a Deo* (Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, § 70; comp. also § 34). Apollinaris († 385) on John vi, 27, says: "The eternally enduring food, by which we are sealed by the Father and assimilated to Christ, is the faith which makes alive;"

and on ver. 28, "Faith both justifies and sanctifies without human works, seeing that it contains within itself the noblest energy, and is not slothful or inactive" (Dorner, *Person of Christ*, Edinb. transl., div. i, vol. ii. p. 389). Hilary († 368): "By faith we become, not merely in a moral way, but essentially, one with Him" (*Ibid.*, p. 118).

2. The Latins, more earnest on the practical than on the theoretical side, seem to have had deeper notions of faith (see Tertullian, cited above). But the minds of theologians were turned almost wholly to the doctrines of sin, grace, and free will (Pelagian controversy), and not to the appropriation of redemption by faith. The relations of faith to knowledge were set forth clearly and strongly, however, in the maxim *Fides præcedit intellectum*, first announced by Origen, and adopted by Augustine (Epist. cxx, 3; ed. Migne, ii, 453, cited by Shedd, *History of Doctrines*, i, 162). Compare also Augustine, *De Utilitate Credendi*, c. x-xiii, where he shows the natural analogies for faith; e. g. that friendship among men, filial piety, etc., are grounded on faith. He makes a distinction between *fides quæ* and *fides quæ creditur* (*De Trin.* xiii, 2); and uses the phrase *fides Catholica* in the objective sense, to denote the body of doctrine "necessary to a Christian" (*De temp. serm.* 53; and *adv. Jud.* c. xix). Augustine, says Melancthon, did not set forth fully Paul's doctrine, though he came nearer to it than the Scholastics (*Letter to Brentius*, opp. ed. Bretschneider, ii, 502).

3. In the scholastic period the idea of the kingdom of God degenerated into that of an ecclesiastical theocracy, and the outward side of the religious life (penance and good works) was prominent. Nevertheless, the great doctrinal truths of Christianity were carefully studied, and the aim of the greatest thinkers (e. g. Anselm) was to show that faith can be verified to the intellect as truth, while, at the same time, it is the necessary condition of science, as well as of salvation. "First of all," he says, "faith must purify the heart: we must humble ourselves, and become as little children. He who believes not cannot experience; he who has not experienced cannot understand. Nothing can be done till the soul rises on the wings of faith to God" (*De Fide Trinitat.* c. ii). The great Greek theologian, John of Damascus (8th century), who may be considered as beginning the period of scholastic theology, defined faith as consisting of two things: 1. belief in the truth of revealed doctrines, the *πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς* (the faith which cometh by hearing, Rom. x, 17); 2. firm confidence in the promises of God, the faith which is "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen" (Heb. xi, 1). The first of these, he says, is the work of our own minds; the second is the gift of the Spirit (*De Fide Orthod.* iv, 10). "Anselm comprises the whole doctrine of faith and morals in the question, how man appropriates redemption to himself. He says, 'The mere idea does not make faith, although this cannot exist without an object; in order to true faith the right tendency of the will must be added, which grace imparts' (*De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio*, c. vi). He distinguishes (*Monologium*, p. 72; compare p. 75) between *credere Deum*, *Christum*, and *credere in Deum*, *in Christum*; the former denotes a mere outward faith which only retains the form; the latter denotes the true, living faith, which lays hold of communion with God (*credendo tendere in dirinum essentiam*); the former is valueless and dead; the latter contains the power of love, and testifies its power and its life by love. The faith which is connected with love cannot be inoperative; it proves its vitality by so operating. Hugo of St. Victor develops the general idea of faith in connection with the religious nature of man. Faith marks the manner in which invisible blessings dwell within our souls (*quodam modo in nobis subsistunt*), the real vital communion with God, his true existence in the human

soul. For divine things cannot be apprehended by us through the senses, the understanding, or the imagination, since they have nothing analogous to all these, but are exalted above all images. The only vehicle of their appropriation is faith. Two elements meet in it—the tendency of the disposition, and the matter of cognition. This latter is the object of faith, but its essence consists in the tendency of the disposition; and although this is never altogether without the former, yet it constitutes the value of faith. Bernard agrees with Hugo in his view of the nature of faith: 'even now,' he says, 'many who believe with confidence have only scanty knowledge; thus many in the O. T. retained firm faith in God, and received salvation by this faith, although they knew not when and how salvation would come to them.' Abelard's expressions are also important (*Sentent.* c. iv). 'Faith,' he says, 'always refers to the invisible, never to the visible. But how is this? when Christ said to Thomas, "Because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed." What Thomas saw before him was one thing, what he believed was another. He confessed the man whom he saw to be the Lord, in whom he believed. He saw the flesh, but he believed in the God veiled in the flesh'" (Neander, *Church History*, Torrey, iv, 375). "Not merely Abelard, but also most of the other schoolmen, understood by *Justificatio per fidem* not objective justification, but a subjective character of the disposition, which proceeds from faith, the true inward sanctification in love which arises out of faith. Bernard, on the other hand, was led by his experience to a more objective view: 'No one is without sin (*Sermo on Solomon's Song*, 23, § 15); for all righteousness it is enough for me that he is gracious to me who has redeemed me. Christ is not merely righteous (*Jb.* 22, § 8), but righteousness itself.' The scholastic doctrine on this point received a fixed form through Peter Lombard (*Sentent.* iii, dist. 28). He makes a threefold distinction in faith: *Deum credere*, *Deo credere*, and *in Deum* or *Christum credere*. The two first amount merely to holding a thing to be true, but the last is the faith by which we enter into communion with God. With such a faith love is necessarily connected, and this faith alone is justifying. Love is the effect of this faith, and the ground of the whole Christian life. Applying to faith the Aristotelian distinction between the form as the formative principle (*εἶδος, forma*), and the inorganic material determined by it (*ἕλη, materiam*), Peter distinguishes faith as the *qualitas mentis informis*, the mere material of faith, and the *files formata*, when the vivifying power of love is added to it, which forms and determines it. The *files formata* is a true virtue, and this faith, working by love, alone justifies" (Neander, *History of Dogmas*, Ryland, p. 522 sq.).

The Scholastics generally recognised the distinction (hinted by Augustine) between objective and subjective faith (*fides quæ creditur* and *fides quæ creditur*), and also distinguished between developed (*explicita*) and undeveloped (*implicita*) faith (Aquinas, *Summa*, ii, qu. 1, art. 7). But in all the scholastic period, the prevalence of the sacerdotal theory of religion hindered, if it did not absolutely prevent, a just apprehension of the nature of faith, and naturally developed the theory of the merit of good works. Peter Lombard, indeed, says that good works are those only that spring from the love of God, which love itself is the fruit of faith (*opus fidei*; *Sentent.* lib. iii, dist. 23, 1); but the "views of Thomas Aquinas were not quite so scriptural; thus (*Summ.* pt. ii, 2, qu. 4, art. 7) he speaks of faith itself as a virtue, though he assigns to it the first and highest place among all virtues." He defines faith to be "an act of the intellect assenting to divine truth in virtue of the operation of the Spirit of God upon the will" (*Summa*, ii, 2, 1, 4), and reckons faith among the theological virtues, which he distinguishes from the ethical (Neander, *Wiss. Abhandlung.* ed. Jacobi, 1851, p. 42). "Such notions, however, led more and more to do



revival of Pelagianism, till the forerunners of the Reformation returned to the simpler truths of the Gospel" (Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, § 186). According to Aquinas, the faith by which we are cleared from sin is not the *fidis informis*, which can coexist with sin; but is the *fidis formata per charitatem* (faith informed by love). In justification there is a *motus charitatis* as well as a *motus fidei* (*Summa*, pt. iii, qu. 44, art. 1). This statement contains the germ of the later Roman Catholic doctrine (see other passages in Möhler, *Synbolism*, N. Y. 1844, p. 205; comp. Beck, *Dogmengeschichte*, 1864, p. 365). Its doctrine (as that of the period generally) is that justification is "not an objective act, but something subjective, making man internally righteous by the communication of the divine life in fellowship with Christ. For the attainment of *justificatio*, moreover, faith can only be the first step; it was not sufficient for justification, but love must be added; and the *gratia justificans* was first given in the *fides formata*, making man internally righteous. Since this external idea of faith required that for effecting justification something must be added from without, the additional aid of the Church here was demanded" (Neander, *Dogmas*, p. 661). See JUSTIFICATION.

4. John Wessel († 1489) was a precursor of the Reformation in his views on faith, as well as on many other points. None of the theologians of the Scholastic age expressed the principle of faith so fully in the Pauline spirit as Wessel. He considers it "not a mere taking for granted of historical facts, but the devotion of the whole mind to fellowship with God through Christ; it is the basis of the whole higher life; not merely in the relations of man to man, but also in the relations of man to God" (Ullmann, *Reformers before the E. formation*, Edinb. 1855, ii, 468).

Practically, at the dawn of the Reformation (and for ages before), Christian people were taught by their pastors that the pardon of sin was to be secured, not by faith in the merits of Christ, but by penitential observances and good works, followed by priestly absolution; and faith itself was generally held to be simply the reception of the teaching of the Church. In practice, faith was transformed into credulity.

(III.) *The Protestant and Roman Catholic Doctrines of Faith compared.*—*The Protestant Doctrine.*—The central point of the Reformation, in a doctrinal point of view, was justification by faith. Its development will be treated in our article JUSTIFICATION; we can here only briefly give the distinction between the Protestant and Roman Catholic doctrines of faith: 1. that of the Reformers; 2. that of the Roman Catholic Church.

1. *The Reformers.*—The Reformers, in opposition to the Scholastic doctrine of justification as a subjective work (the *making just*), brought out prominently the objective idea of justification (as a work done for us by Christ). "On the other side, correspondingly, they regarded faith as subjective, and as the principle of the transformation of the whole inner life" (Neander, *Dogmas*, ii, 662). The prominent position of faith in the theology of the Reformers was a fundamental part of the change that was taking place, at the time, in the general religious views of Christendom. "The mind was not satisfied with an objective and outward salvation, however valid and reliable it might be. It desired a consciousness of being saved; it craved an experience of salvation. The Protestant mind could not rest in the Church, neither could it pretend to rest in an atonement that was unappropriated. The objective work of Christ on Calvary must become the subjective experience and rejoicing of the soul itself. While, however, the principle and act of faith occupies such a prominent place in the soteriology of the Reformation, we should not fail to notice that it is never represented as a *procuring cause* of justification; it is only the instrumental cause. Protestantism was exceedingly careful to distinguish justification from legal righteousness on the one hand, and from sanctification by grace on

the other. It could not, consequently, concede to any species of human agency, however excellent, a peculiar and atoning efficacy. Hence we find none of that supplementary or perfecting of the work of Christ by the work of the creature which is found in the papal soteriology. And this applies to the highest acts, the act of faith itself. Faith itself, though the gift and the work of God, does not justify, speaking accurately, but merely accepts that which does justify" (Shedd, *History of Doctrines*, ii, 337-8). Luther was led to the true Pauline doctrine of faith by his profound conviction of the desperate condition of humanity, not simply from its sense of finiteness (which could only have led him to faith as a realization of the invisible and eternal), but also and chiefly from the crushing sense of personal guilt on account of sin. He regards faith not merely as a mere attribute, but, "so to speak, as a substantial and divine thing, so far as it cleaves to God, and God is in it. Faith is in the state of the *unio mystica*, union with God; and yet it is, at the same time, man's true existence." It is no mere intellectual act, but a giving up of the whole man to trust in Christ; and conversely, a penetration of the whole man by the life of Christ. "Faith makes new creatures of us. My holiness and righteousness do not spring from myself; they arise alone out of Christ, in whom I am rooted by faith" (Dorner, *Person of Christ*, ii, 58, 64). In the *Preface to the Epistle to the Romans*, Luther says: "Faith alone justifies, and it alone fulfills the law; for faith, through the merits of Christ, obtains the Holy Spirit. And then, at length, from the faith thus efficaciously working and living in the heart, freely (*fluunt*) proceed those works which are truly good. . . . But faith is an energy in the heart; at once so efficacious, lively, breathing, and powerful as to be incapable of remaining inactive, but bursts forth into operation. Neither does he who has faith (*moratur*) demur about the question whether good works have been commanded or not; but even though there were no law, feeling the motions of this living impulse putting forth and exerting itself in his heart, he is spontaneously borne onward to work, and at no time does he cease to perform such actions as are truly pious and Christian. Faith, then, is a constant *fulcra*, a trust in the mercy of God toward us; a trust living and efficaciously working in the heart, by which we cast ourselves entirely on God, and commit ourselves to him; by which, *ceteris freti*, having an assured reliance, we feel no hesitation about enduring death a thousand times." "Luther laid the greatest stress at all times on the assurance of salvation, and of the divine truth of Christianity. The ground certainty, on which all other certainty depends, is with him the justification of the sinner for Christ's sake apprehended by faith; of which it is only the objective statement to say that to him the fundamental certainty is Christ as the Redeemer, through surrender to whom faith has full satisfaction, and knows that it stands in the truth" (Dorner, *Geschichte d. Prot. Theol.*, München, 1867, p. 224). "To believe those things to be true which are preached of Christ is not sufficient to constitute thee a Christian; but thou must not doubt that thou art of the number of them unto whom all the benefits of Christ are given and exhibited, which he that believes must plainly confess, that he is holy, godly, righteous, the Son of God, and certain of salvation, and that by no merit of his own, but by the mere mercy of God poured forth upon him for Christ's sake" (Luther, *Serm. on Gal. i*, 4-7, in Fish, *Masterpieces of Pulpit Eloquence*, i, 462).

Zwingle held that faith, in the sense of the appropriation by man, through grace, of the redemptive work of Christ, is the only means or instrument of salvation. It was one of his grounds of objection to the Roman and Lutheran doctrines of the Eucharist that these doctrines detract from the glory of faith by representing it as insufficient for salvation (Dorner, *Person of Christ*, div. ii, vol. ii, p. 116). Melancthon, in

a letter to Brentius, May, 1551, says: "Faith alone (*sola*) justifies, not because it is the root (*radix*), as you write, but because it *lays hold of Christ*, on whose account we are accepted. It is not love, the fulfilling of the law, which justifies, but faith alone, not because it is a perfection *in us*, but only because it lays hold on Christ" (edit. Bretschneider, Hal. Sax. 1835, ii, 501). Calvin (*Institutes*, bk. iii, chap. xi) treats of faith at large, and distinguishes it from "a common assent to the evangelical history," and refutes the nugatory distinction made by the schools between *fides formata* and *fides informis*. "The disputes of the schools concerning faith, by simply styling God the object of it, rather mislead miserable souls by a vain speculation than direct them to the proper mark. For, since God, 'dwelleth in the light which no man can approach unto,' there is a necessity for the interposition of Christ as the medium of access to him." "This evil, then, as well as innumerable others, must be imputed to the schoolmen, who have, as it were, concealed Christ by drawing a veil over him; whereas, unless our views be immediately and steadily directed to him, we shall always be wandering through labyrinths without end. They not only, by their obscure definitions, diminish, and almost annihilate, all the importance of faith, but have fabricated the notion of implicit faith, a term with which they have honored the grossest ignorance, and most perniciously deluded the miserable multitude." "Is this faith—to understand nothing, but obediently to submit our understanding to the Church? Faith consists not in ignorance, but in knowledge; and that not only of God, but also of the divine will. . . . For faith consists of a knowledge of God and of Christ, not in reverence to the Church. . . . In short, no man is truly a believer unless he be firmly persuaded that God is a propitious and benevolent Father to him, and promise himself everything from his goodness; unless he depend on the promises of divine benevolence to him, and feel an undoubted expectation of salvation. He is no believer, I say, who does not rely on the security of his salvation, and confidently triumph over the devil and death" (Calvin, *Institutes*, bk. iii, ch. ii).

The passages from the several Confessions will be given more fully in the art. JUSTIFICATION; we cite here a few. *Augsburg Confession*.—"Men are justified freely for Christ's sake through faith when they believe that they are received into favor, and their sins are remitted for Christ's sake; this faith doth God impute for righteousness upon him" (Art. iv). The nature of *saving faith* is set forth in Art. xx: "It is to be observed here that a mere historical belief, such as wicked men and devils have, is not here meant, who also believe in the history of the sufferings of Christ, and in his resurrection from the dead; but that genuine faith is here meant which causeth us to believe that we can obtain grace and forgiveness of sins through Christ, and which giveth us the confidence that through Christ we have a merciful God, which also gives us the assurance to know God, to call upon him, and to have him always in remembrance, so that the believer is not without God, as are the Gentiles" (compare the *Apology for the Confession*, art. ii, iii). *Heidelberg Catechism*.—(Qu. 21. "What is true faith? Ans. It is not only a certain knowledge whereby I hold for truth all that God has revealed to us in his word, but also a hearty trust, which the Holy Ghost works in me by the Gospel, that not only to others, but to me also, forgiveness of sins, everlasting righteousness, and salvation are freely given by God, merely of grace, only for the sake of Christ's merit." *Remonstrants' Confession* (xi, 1).—"Faith in Christ is a firm assent (*assensus*) of the mind to the word of God, joined with true trust (*fideliter*) in Christ, so that we not only faithfully receive Christ's doctrine as true and divine, but rest wholly on Christ himself for salvation." *Westminster Confession* (10, 14).—

"Faith, thus receiving and resting on Christ and his righteousness, is the alone instrument of justification; yet it . . . is no dead faith, but worketh by love. By this faith a Christian believeth to be true whatsoever is revealed in the word . . . but the principal acts of saving faith are accepting, receiving, and resting upon Christ alone for justification, sanctification, and eternal life, by virtue of the covenant of grace. This faith is different in degrees, weak or strong; may be often and many ways assailed and weakened, but gets the victory, growing up in many to the attainment of a full assurance through Christ." In all the Confessions, both Lutheran and Reformed, faith is held to be a laying hold on Christ, by whom we are saved (and not by our own works, or by any work of sanctification done in us).

2. *Roman Catholic Doctrine*.—The Augsburg Confession (Art. xx) speaks of the long desuetude of the doctrine of faith in the Church, and the substitution of childish and needless works (fasts, pilgrimages, etc.), as the great cause of its corruption, and furnishing the chief occasion for the reformation of doctrine. "Our adversaries now," they say (A.D. 1530), "do not preach concerning these unprofitable works as they were wont; moreover, they have now learned to make mention of faith, about which, in former times, entire silence was observed. They now teach that we are not justified before God by works alone, but join faith in Christ thereto, and say faith and works justify us before God; which doctrine imparts more consolation than mere confidence in good works." This was the chief theological dispute of the Reformation, and was also the main topic of theological discussion at the Council of Trent (1545-63). A few of the divines there (the archbishop of Sienna, the bishop of Cava, and others) held that faith alone justifies; but this ancient doctrine was too inconsistent with the sacerdotal system to find favor with the majority. "Great pains were taken to discuss thoroughly the assertion that 'man is justified by faith,' and to affix some determinate meaning to that expression; but the task was not easy. Some busied themselves in searching for the different senses in which the word 'faith' is used in Scripture, which they made to amount to fifteen, but knew not in which it is employed when applied to justification. At length, after much disputing, it was agreed that faith is the belief of all things which God has revealed, or the Church has commanded to be believed. It was distinguished into two sorts: the one said to exist even in sinners, and which was termed *unformed, barren, and dead*; the other peculiar to the just, and working by charity, and thence called *formed, efficacious, and living faith*. Still, as father Paul observes, 'they touched not the principal point of the difficulty, which was to ascertain whether a man is justified *before* he works righteousness, or whether he is justified *by* his works of righteousness" (Cramp, *Text-book of Popery*, ch. vii).

The decision of the Council is as follows (sess. vi, c. viii): "When the apostle says that man is justified 'by faith,' and 'freely,' these words are to be understood in that sense in which the Catholic Church hath always held and explained them, namely, that we are said to be justified 'by faith' because faith is the beginning of human salvation, the foundation and root of all justification, without which it is impossible to please God, and come into the fellowship of his children; and that we are said to be justified 'freely,' because nothing which precedes justification, whether faith or works, can deserve the grace thereof." Here two things are to be noted: (1.) That the Roman idea of faith in general is that of the acceptance of the body of doctrine taught by the Church: "La foi nécessaire pour la justification est la foi Catholique d'après laquelle nous croyons ce que Dieu a révélé à son église" (Drioux, note to his edit. of Aquinas's *Summa*, vi, 600); thus substantially making the intellect alone

the seat of faith, as Bellarmine expressly puts it in his contrast between the Protestant and the Roman ideas of faith: "hæretici fidem *fiduciam* esse definiunt; Catholici *fidem in intellectu sedem habere volunt*" (*De Justif.* i, 4). How thoroughly *external* a thing this faith may become in practice is evinced by the fact that the recitation of a creed, in Romanist language, is called an "act of faith" (Bergier, *Dict. de Théologie*, iii, 54). (2.) That, accordingly, the Council of Trent makes faith only the "beginning of human salvation" (*salutis humanæ incitium*), and "the root of all justification" (*radix omnium justificationis*). If faith is simply an intellectual act, it is fitly described as only the "beginning" of justification, and not its instrument. So Möhler, in commenting on this passage, expressly says that "Roman Catholics consider faith as the reunion with God in Christ especially by means of the faculty of knowledge, illuminated and strengthened by grace" (*Symbolism*, N. Y. 1844, p. 204). In the same vein is the definition given by the Catechism of Trent, viz. that the "faith necessary to salvation is that *faith* by which we yield our entire assent to whatever has been revealed by almighty God" (Baltimore edit. p. 19). It is plain that the notion of faith, as Protestants hold it, and as they believe that Paul held it, is totally wanting in the Roman doctrine. Naturally, too, with this conception of faith, the Romanists deny that faith alone justifies, affirming, in the way of the Scholastics (see above), that faith must be informed by charity, as the germ of new obedience, a gift bestowed first in baptism, and renewed by confession and absolution. So J. H. Newman (*Difficulties of Anglicanism*, cited by Hare, *Contest with Rome*, p. 113) declares that Roman "Catholics hold that faith and love, faith and obedience, faith and works, are simply separable, and ordinarily separated in fact; that faith does not imply love, obedience, or works; that the firmest faith, so as to move mountains, may exist without love—that is, true faith, as truly faith in the strict sense of the word as the faith of a martyr or a doctor." On this Hare remarks: "This belief is not faith. To many persons, indeed, it may appear that this is little more than a dispute about words; that we use the word *faith* in one sense, and the Romanist in another, and that it is not worth while to argue about the matter. But when we call to mind how great are the power and the blessings promised to faith by the Gospel, it surely is a question of the highest moment whether that power and those blessings belong to a lifeless, inert, inanimate notion, or to a living, energetic principle. This is the great controversy between Romanism and Protestantism. Their stay is the *opus operatum*, ours *fides operans*—faith, the gift of God, apprehending him through Christ, renewing the whole man, and becoming the living spring of his feelings, and thoughts, and actions" (*Contest with Rome*, note 1). A letter of Bunsen's in 1840 illustrates the Roman idea of faith, as it had taken root in the mind of J. H. Newman before he went over to Rome. A pastor in Antwerp (named Spörlein) was troubled about episcopal ordination, and came to England for light. He was invited to breakfast at Newman's, and found him and a number of his friends ready to hear him. "He unburdened his heart to them, and they gave their decision—the verdict of a Newmanic jury on a case of conscience, viz. that 'Pastor Spörlein, as a Continental Christian, was subject to the authority of the bishop of Antwerp.' He objected that by that bishop he would be excommunicated as a heretic. 'Of course; but you will conform to his decision.' 'How can I do that,' exclaimed Spörlein, 'without aljuring my faith?' 'But your faith is heresy.' 'How? Do you mean that I am to embrace the errors of Rome, and to aljure the faith of the Gospel?' 'There is no faith but that of the Church.' 'But my faith is in Christ crucified.' 'You are mistaken; you are not saved by Christ, but by the Church'" (*Memoir of Bunsen*, by his Widow, London, 1868, i, 614).

(IV.) *Later Protestantism*.—1. Whatever minor differences may have arisen in Protestant theology as to faith, all evangelical theologians agree in the following points: 1. That saving faith not only recognises the supernatural, but also accepts and trusts *absolutely* on Jesus Christ, the Son of God, as Saviour; 2. that this saving power is the gift of God; 3. that it invariably brings forth good works; 4. that the faith which appropriates the merits of Christ must be a living faith; 5. that it is not the faith, nor the vitality of the faith, which justifies and saves man, but it is the *object* of the faith, i. e. the merits of Christ the Redeemer, and therefore that it is an error to attach a saving quality to any merely subjective faith. The earlier Reformers and Confessions made *assurance* an essential part of saving faith, but this doctrine was not long held. See ASSURANCE; JUSTIFICATION.

2. *Divisions of Faith*.—Faith is divided by the theologians into *fides historica* and *fides salvifica* (historical faith and saving faith). The former is intellectual knowledge and belief of the Christian doctrine; the latter a genuine appropriation of the merits of Christ unto salvation. True faith embraces both. The *parts* of faith, in theological language, are three: *a. Notitia* (act of the intellect), knowledge, instruction in the facts and doctrines of Christianity (Rom. x, 14). *b. Assensus* (act of the will), assent to the doctrine, or reception of it as true and credible. *c. Fiducia* (act of the heart), trust or confidence in the divine word. "True and saving faith in Christ consists both of assent and trust; but this is not a blind and superstitious trust in the sacrifice of Christ, like that of the heathens in their sacrifices, nor the presumptuous trust of wicked and impenitent men, who depend on Christ to save them in their sins, but such a trust as is exercised according to the authority and direction of the word of God; so that to *know* the Gospel in its leading principles, and to have a cordial of *belief* in it, is necessary to that mere specific act of faith which is called *reliance*, or, in systematic language, *fiducial assent*" (Watson, *Institutes*, ii, 243).

3. *Faith in Christ; justifying Faith*.—*Faith as Condition of Salvation*.—(a.) Though the entire revelation of God is set forth, in one sense, as the object of faith (Luke xxiv, 25, 26; Heb. xi), yet Christ, the incarnate Son of God, the dying and risen Redeemer, is *κατ' ἔξοχον*, the object of faith (Gal. ii, 16; John xvii, 21). In the evangelical churches, justifying faith is understood to be exercised specifically in Christ, as by his death making expiation and satisfaction for the sinner's guilt, or (to put the same idea in another light) in God's covenant with mankind in Christ, as offering them pardon for the sake of Christ's death; and this faith is yet viewed *merely* as a condition of justification. (b.) "What faith is it, then, through which we are saved? It may be answered, first, in general, it is a faith in Christ; Christ, and God through Christ, are the proper objects of it. Herein, therefore, it is sufficiently, absolutely distinguished from the faith either of ancient or modern heathens. And from the faith of a devil it is fully distinguished by this—it is not barely a speculative, rational thing, a cold, lifeless assent, a train of ideas in the head, but also a disposition of the heart. For thus saith the Scripture, 'With the heart man believeth unto righteousness.' And, 'If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe with thy heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.' It acknowledges his death as the only sufficient means of redeeming man from death eternal, and his resurrection as the restoration of us all to life and immortality; inasmuch as he 'was delivered for our sins, and rose again for our justification.' Christian faith is, then not only an assent to the whole Gospel of Christ, but also a full reliance on the blood of Christ; a trust in the merits of his life, death, and resurrection; a recumbency upon him as our atonement and our life, as given for

us, and living in us. It is a sure confidence which a man hath in God that through the merits of Christ his sins are forgiven, and he reconciled to the favor of God; and in consequence thereof, a closing with him, and cleaving to him, as our 'wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption,' or, in one word, our salvation" (Wesley, *Serm. on Justification*). (c.) Faith is not meritoriously, but instrumentally, the condition of our pardon. "If Christ had not merited, God had not promised; if God had not promised, justification had never followed on this faith: so that the indissoluble connection of faith and justification is from God's institution, whereby he hath bound himself to give the benefit upon performance of the condition. Yet there is an aptitude in faith to be made a condition; for no other act can receive Christ as a priest propitiating and pleading the propitiation, and the promise of God for his sake to give the benefit. As receiving Christ and his gracious promise in this manner, it acknowledgeth man's guilt, and so man renounceth all righteousness in himself, and honoreth God the Father, and Christ the Son as the only Redeemer. It glorifies God's mercy and free grace in the highest degree. It acknowledgeth on earth, as it will be perpetually acknowledged in heaven, that the whole salvation of sinful man, from the beginning to the last degree thereof, whereof there shall be no end, is from God's freest love, Christ's merit and intercession, his own gracious promise, and the power of his own Holy Spirit" (Lawson). Wesley, speaking of faith as the condition of our justification, says, "We mean this much, that it is the only thing without which no one is justified; the only thing that is immediately, indispensably, absolutely requisite in order to pardon. As, on the one hand, though a man should have everything else, without faith, yet he cannot be justified; so, on the other, though he be supposed to want everything else, yet if he hath faith he cannot but be justified. For suppose a sinner of any kind or degree, in a full sense of his total ungodliness, of his total inability to think, speak, or do good—suppose, I say, this sinner, helpless and hopeless, casts himself wholly on the mercy of God in Christ (which, indeed, he cannot do but by the grace of God), who will affirm that any more is required before that sinner can be justified?" (Wesley, *Sermon on Justification*; Neander, *Planting and Training*, ii, 123 sq.). "Faith, as it is mere belief, may be produced by rational evidence. But when that is attained, the work of grace in the heart is nowhere said in Scripture to be carried on by the natural operation of these credited truths. The contrary fact, that men often credit them and remain uninfluenced by them, is obvious. When a different state of mind ensues, it is ascribed to the quickening influence of the Spirit, an influence which may be ordinarily resisted. By that influence men are 'pricked in their heart;' and the heart is prepared to feel the dread impression which is conveyed by the manifestation of man's perishing state, not merely in the doctrine of the word, but as it stands in the Spirit's application to the heart and conscience. But, though this was previously credited, and is still credited; and though its import and meaning are now more fully perceived as the perishing condition of the awakened man is more clearly discovered, the faith of alliance does not therefore follow. A person in these circumstances is not to be likened to a man drowning, who will instinctively seize the rope as soon as it is thrown out to him. There is a perverse disposition in man to seek salvation in his own way, and to stand on terms with his Saviour. There is a reluctance to trust wholly in his atonement, and to be saved by grace. There is a sin of unbelief, an evil heart of unbelief, a repugnance to the committal of the soul to Christ, which the influence of grace, not merely knowledge of the opposite truth and duty, must conquer. Even when this is subdued, and man is made willing to be saved in the appointed way, a

want of power is felt, not to credit the truth of the sacrifice of Christ, or its merits, or its sufficiency, but a want of power to trust wholly, and with confidence, in it, as to the issue. It is then that, like the disciples, and all good men in all ages, every man in these circumstances prays for faith; for this power to trust personally, and for himself, in the atonement made for his sins. Thus he recognises Christ as 'the Author and Finisher of faith,' and faith as the gift of God, though his own duty: thus there is in the mind an entire renunciation of self on the one hand, and a seeking of all from Christ on the other, which cannot but be followed by the gift of faith, and by the joy which springs, not from mere sentiment, but from the attestation of the Spirit to our acceptance with God. Then the Holy Spirit is given, not only as the Comforter, but as the Sanctifier. It is in this way, too, that faith saves us to the end, by connecting us with the exerted influence and power of God, through Christ. 'The life that I live in the flesh, I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.' These are views which will, it is true, be a stumbling-stone and a rock of offence to the philosophers of this world. But there is no remedy in concession. Still this will stand, 'Whosoever receiveth not the kingdom of God as a little child shall in no wise enter therein'" (Watson, *Works*, London, 1835, vii, 224).

Pye Smith (*First Lines of Christian Theology*, bk. v, ch. v, § 3) defines the specific act of saving faith to be that act of the mind which directly and necessarily arises from the principle of faith, which is the proper and characteristic exertion of that principle, and in which the real nature, design, and tendency of genuine faith is made apparent. This act or exercise is expressed in Scripture by the terms "coming to Christ—looking to him—receiving him—eating the flesh of the Son of Man, and drinking his blood—trusting in him, and being fully persuaded of his truth and faithfulness." It is that which our old and excellent divines usually denoted by the phrase (perhaps too familiar, but very expressive and easily understood) *closing with Christ*. President Edwards expresses it thus: "The whole act of acceptance, or closing of the soul or heart with Christ" (*Works*, viii, 546). "Faith is an assured resting of the soul upon God's promises of mercy in Jesus Christ for pardon of sins here and glory hereafter" (Dr. Owen's *Catechism*).

4. It has been said (above) that Protestant theologians are substantially agreed as to the nature of saving faith. But there is a class of divines in the Church of England (the so-called sacramental or Romanizing party) who seem to have gone back wholly to the scholastic doctrine of faith, if not, indeed, to that of Rome. One of the best writers of this school is bishop Forbes, of Brechin, who, in treating on Art. xi of the Church of England, asserts that the faith by which we are justified is not the *fiducia* of Luther, but is "that beginning and root of the Christian life whereby we willingly believe, etc.," thus adopting the very phraseology of Trent in framing his definition of faith. So, also, he adopts Bellarmine's statement that "love is the vivifying principle of the faith which impetrates justification." While he admits that the fathers often affirm that we are justified by faith alone, he adds that "they never intended, by the word alone, to exclude all works of faith and grace from the causes of justification and eternal salvation" (*Explanation of the 39 Articles*, London, 1867, i, 177 sq.). These views are not Protestant; yet bishop Forbes, and the set of theologians who agree with him in going back to Romish doctrine, still belong to a Church which calls itself Protestant. In happy contrast, we cite another divine of the same Church, Dr. O'Brien, who, in his excellent treatise on *Justification by Faith* (Lond. 2d ed. 1863), after a clear statement of the nature of Christian faith as "trust in Christ; an entire and unreserved confidence in the

efficacy of what Christ has done and suffered for us, a full reliance upon him and his work," protests against the error that, "in justification, faith is accounted to us for righteousness because it is in itself a right principle, and one which naturally tends to produce obedience to divine precepts;" and he shows that, "while it is the fit instrument of our justification, and the seminal principle of holy obedience, it is, notwithstanding, the instrument of our justification, essentially and properly, because it unites us to the Lord Jesus Christ, so that we have an interest in all that he has done and suffered. God having, in his infinite wisdom and mercy, appointed that we should be pardoned and accepted for the sufferings and for the merits of another, seems most fitly to have appointed, too, that our voluntary acceptance of this his mode of freely forgiving and receiving us, by putting our trust in him through whom these blessings are to be bestowed upon us, should necessarily precede our full participation of all the benefits of this gracious scheme, and that nothing else should. . . . If for our justification it be essential, and sufficient, that we be united to Christ—one with Christ—*found in Christ*—does not the act whereby we take him for our defence against that wrath which we feel that we have earned—whereby, abjuring all self-dependence, we cast ourselves upon God's free mercies in the Redeemer, with a full sense of our guilt and our danger, but in a full reliance upon the efficacy of all that he has wrought and endured; does not this act, whereby we cleave to him, and, as far as in us lies, become one with him, seem the fit act whereunto to annex the full enjoyment of all those inestimable benefits which, however dearly purchased they were by him who bought them, were designed to be, with respect to us upon whom they are bestowed, emphatically free? With less than this, our part in the procedure would not have been, what it was manifestly designed to be, intelligent and voluntary; with more, it might seem to be meritorious. Whereas *faith* unites all the advantages that we ought to look for in the instrument whereby we were to lay hold on the blessings thus freely offered to us: it makes us voluntary recipients of them, and yet does not seem to leave, even to the deceitfulness of our own deceitful hearts, the power of ascribing to ourselves any meritorious share in procuring them" (p. 119-121).

The relation of faith to works, and the question of the apparent difference between the doctrine of Paul and that of James on this point, will be treated in our article *WORKS*. We only remark here that the Protestant theology (as has been abundantly shown in the extracts already given) holds that true faith always manifests itself by love and good works (see *Augsburg Confession, Apology*, c. iii.); any other faith is mere belief, or what St. James calls "dead faith." The minor differences among Protestants as to the nature of faith depend chiefly upon differences as to the nature of justification. See *JUSTIFICATION*.

See, besides the works already cited, Edwards, *Works* (N. Y. edit., 4 vols. 8vo), i, 110; ii, 601 sq.; iv, 64 sq.; Waterland, *Works* (Oxf. 1843), vi, 23-29; Pearson, *On the Creed*, art. i.; Wardlaw, *Systematic Theology* (Edinb. 1857, 3 vols. 8vo), ii, 728 sq.; Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics* (Edinb. 1866, 8vo), p. 37, 308 sq.; Knapp, *Christian Theology*, § 121 sq.; Browne, *On 39 Articles* (N. Y. 1865), p. 308 sq.; Burnet, *On 39 Articles*, art. xi; Nitzsch, *Christliche Lehre*, § 143; Monsell, *Religion of Redemption* (Lond. 1867, 8vo), p. 219 sq.; Böhmner, *Christl. Dogmatik* (Breslau, 1840), i, 4; ii, 259 sq.; Perrone (Rom. C.), *Prælectiones Theologicæ* (ed. Migne, 2 vols.), ii, 1414 sq.; Möhler (R. C.), *Symbolism* (N. Y. 1844), bk. i, ch. iii, § 15, 16; Buchanan, *On Justification* (Edinb. 1867, 8vo), p. 364 sq.; Hare, *Victory of Faith* (reviewed in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1860, art. ii); Lepsius, *Paulin. Rechtfertigungslehre* (Leips. 1853, 8vo), p. 94 sq.; Usteri, *Paulin. Lehrbegriff* (Zür. 1824, 8vo); Ritschl, *Attkathol. Kirche* (Leips. 1857, 8vo), p. 82 sq.;

Schulz, *Die Christliche Lehre v. Glauben* (Leips. 1824, 8vo); Cobb, *Philosophy of Faith* (Nashville); Neander, *Katholicismus u. Protestantismus* (Berlin, 1863, 8vo), p. 131-146; Hase, *Protestant. Polemik* (Leips. 1865, 8vo), p. 242 sq.; Baur, *Katholicismus und Protestantismus* (Tübingen, 1886, 8vo), p. 259-264; Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism*, book i, chap. ii; Baur, *Dogmengeschichte* (Leips. 1867, 3 vols. 8vo), iii, 200 sq.; Cunningham, *Historical Theology*, chap. xxi; Beck, *Dogmengeschichte* (Tübingen, 1864, 8vo), p. 364-369. See also *JUSTIFICATION*; *SANCTIFICATION*.

FAITH, ACT OF. See *AUTO DA FÉ*.

FAITH, ARTICLES OF. See *ARTICLES*, and *FUNDAMENTAL*.

FAITH AND WORKS. See *WORKS*.

FAITH, CONFESSIONS OF. See *CONFESSIONS OF FAITH*.

FAITH, FUNDAMENTAL ARTICLES OF. See *FUNDAMENTAL*.

FAITH, RULE OF. I. *Regula Fidei*.—In the early Church the summary of doctrines taught to catechumens, and to which they were required to give their assent before baptism, was called in Greek πίστις, the *faith*; ὁρος πίστεως, the *limit or determination of the faith*; ἐκδοσις πίστεως, *exposition of the faith*; κανὼν, *rule*; and in Latin, *Regula fidei*, rule of faith. This term was afterwards applied to the Apostles' Creed. See *CREED*, *APOSTLES'*; *REGULA FIDEI*.

II. From the ancient usage, the phrase has been adopted (not very aptly) in modern theology to denote (1) the true source of our knowledge of Christian truth: and (2) the criterion or standard of Christian doctrine. Protestants find this rule in the Scriptures alone; the Greek and Roman churches, and some Anglicans, find it not only in Scripture, but also in the Church, as the authorized (inspired) interpreter of Scripture, whose interpretations are embodied in tradition. The supreme authority, according to the Romanists, lies in tradition, and in the pope as its living expounder. Some of the mystics and the Quakers make the "inner light" the supreme rule: thus Robert Barclay says that the highest source of knowledge—divine revelation and illumination—is something internal, trustworthy, and self-evident, which commands reason to accept it by the indwelling evidence. The Rationalists make reason the final arbiter, and the mind of man the measure of truth.

(1.) *The Protestant Doctrine*.—1. One of the chief doctrinal elements of the Reformation was the *sufficiency* of Scripture for faith and salvation. Wickliffe, indeed, anticipated the Reformation in asserting the authority of Scripture. "When we truly believe in Christ," he says, "the authority of Holy Writ is greater for us than that of any other writing." He makes the acknowledgment of the divine word to spring from the immediate relation of the soul to Christ, while Rome puts the Church between the soul and Christ. Luther also rejected all mediation between the soul and Christ, "Yet, before he had consciously developed the principle that the holy Scriptures must be the highest source of knowledge, his doctrine had already been formed upon it, and unconsciously he was guided by the principle to admit nothing which was at variance with the Scriptures. Controversy first brought him to carry out this principle with scientific clearness." It was, however, first "scientifically stated by Melancthon on the occasion of the Leipsig disputation, in which Eck attacked a statement made by that reformer in one of his letters, which thus acquired notoriety. He says that it is a duty to abide by the pure and simple meaning of Holy Writ, as, indeed, heavenly truths are always the simplest; this meaning is to be found by comparing Holy Writ with itself. On this account we study Holy Writ, in order to pass judgment on all human opinions by it as a universal touchstone" (*Cont. Eekium Defensio, Melancthonii Opera*, ed. Bretschnei-

der, i, 113, cited by Neander, *History of Dogmas*, [Ryland], p. 623). Both tradition and the apocryphal books were rejected by the Reformers. While the material principle of Protestantism is justification by faith, its formal principle (*principium cognoscendi*, knowledge-principle, or principle of cognition) is that the word of God, given in the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments, "is the pure and proper source, as well as the only certain measure of all saving truth" (Schaff, *Principle of Protestantism*, Chambersburg, 1845, p. 70).

2. The chief *Protestant Confessions* agree as to the rule of faith. The *Augsburg Confession* repudiates the traditions of the Church of Rome as to penances, fasts, etc. (art. xv), discrimina ciborum, etc. (part ii, art. v); and see especially *Apologia Confess.* cap. viii, p. 206; *De traditionibus humanis in Ecclesia*; and *Prof. ad Conf. August.* p. 6, "We offer our confession . . . drawn from the sacred Scriptures and the pure word of God." The *Formula Concordiæ*, Epit. i, 1, is more definite: "Credimus, confitemur et docemus unicam regulam et normam, secundum quam omnia dogmata, omnesque doctores æstimari et judicari oporteat, nullam omnino aliam esse quam prophetica et apostolica scripta cum veteris tum novi Testamenti, sicut scriptum est Psa. cxix, 105; Gal. i, 8." "Reliqua vero sive patrum sive neotericorum scripta, quocumque veniant nomine, sacris literis nequaquam sunt equiparanda, sed universa illis ita subjicienda sunt, ut alia ratione non recipiantur, nisi testium loco, qui doceant, quod etiam post apostolorum tempora et in quibus partibus orbis doctrina illa prophetarum et apostolorum sincerior conservata sit." "Cætera autem symbola et alia scripta, quorum paulo ante mentionem fecimus, non obtinent auctoritatem judicis; hæc etiam dignitas solis sacris literis debetur, sed dumtaxat pro religione nostra testimonium dicunt, etc." (We believe, confess, and teach that the one rule and criterion by which all doctrines and teaching are to be tested is Scripture . . . all other writings, whether ancient or modern; all symbols, creeds, etc., are of use [not as of equal authority, but only] as witnesses of the preservation of the revealed doctrines, and testimonies for our religion, etc.). *Conf. Gall.* art. v: "It is not lawful to oppose either antiquity, custom, multitude, man's wisdom and judgment, or edicts, or any decrees, or councils, or visions, or miracles, unto this holy Scripture, but rather that all things ought to be examined and tried by the rule and square thereof. Wherefore we do for this cause also allow those three creeds, namely, the Apostles', the Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds, because they are agreeable to the written word of God." *Conf. Helvet.* ii, 1: "In controversies of religion on matters of faith, we cannot admit any other judge than God himself, pronouncing by the holy Scripture what is true, what is false, what is to be followed, or what to be avoided. So we do not rest but in the judgment of spiritual men drawn from the Word of God." *Conf. Belgic.* art. vii: "We believe also that the holy Scriptures doth most perfectly contain all the will of God, and that in it all things are abundantly taught whatsoever is necessary to be believed of man to attain salvation." *Westminster Confession*, art. i: "The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man's salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture; unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit or traditions of men. Nevertheless, we acknowledge the inward illumination of the Spirit of God to be necessary for the saving understanding of such things as are revealed in the word," etc. "All things in Scripture are not alike plain in themselves, nor alike clear unto all; yet those things which are necessary to be known, believed, and observed for salvation are so clearly propounded and opened in some place of Scripture or

other, that not only the learned, but the unlearned, in a due use of the ordinary means, may attain unto a sufficient understanding of them." *Church of England*, art. vi (vth of the Methodist Episcopal Church): "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith." So the Creeds (art. viii) are commended to reception and belief only because they may be proved by certain "warrants of holy Scripture;" works of supererogation (xiv) are rejected as contradicted by the word of Christ; things ordained even by general councils are affirmed (xxi) to have neither strength nor authority unless it be declared that they "be taken out of holy Scripture;" purgatory, pardons, image worship, relics, saintly invocation (xxii), and transubstantiation (xxviii) are rejected as grounded "upon no warrant of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God."

(II.) *The Romanist Doctrine*.—The Council of Trent (sess. iv, April 8, 1546, *On the Canon*) declares that the "Gospel promised before by the prophets in the sacred Scriptures was first orally published by our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who afterwards commanded it to be preached by his apostles to every creature, as the source of all saving truth and discipline; and that this truth and discipline are contained both in written books and in unwritten traditions, which have come down to us, either received by the apostles from the lip of Christ himself, or transmitted by the hands of the same apostles, under the dictation of the Holy Spirit;" and names as canonical all the books of the O. T. and the Apocrypha, according to the Vulgate edition; declaring that the Council "doth receive and reverence, with equal piety and veneration, all the books, as well of the Old as of the New Testament, the same God being the author of both—and also the aforesaid traditions, pertaining both to faith and manners, whether received from Christ himself or dictated by the Holy Spirit, and preserved in the Catholic Church by continual succession." The *Catechism of the Council of Trent* declares (*Preface*) that "all the doctrines of Christianity in which the faithful are to be instructed are derived from the Word of God, which includes Scriptures and tradition." These statements are not so decided as those of later Roman theologians, but they were nevertheless received at the time as ordaining a new rule of faith in the Church. Bernard Gilpin († 1583) had, it is said, been hesitating about accepting Protestantism, but the publication of the decree of Trent decided him: "While he was distracted with these things, the rule of faith changed by the Council of Trent astonished him. For he observed that not only the ancient divines, but even the modern ones, Lombard, Scotus, and Aquinas, all confessed that the rule of faith was solely to be drawn from Scripture, whereas he found, according to the Council of Trent, that it might as well be drawn from human traditions. . . . The Church of Rome kept the rule of faith entire till it was changed by the Council of Trent. From that time he thought it a point of duty to forsake her communion, that the true Church, thus called out, might follow the Word of God" (*Life of Bernard Gilpin*, p. 69, Glasgow, 1824, cited by Cramp, *Text-book of Popery*, ch. iii). Bellarmine († 1621), perhaps the greatest of Roman theologians, sets forth the Roman theory more fully in his treatise *De Verbo Dei*. He divides it into the written and the unwritten word. The written word includes the Scriptures of the O. and N. T.; the unwritten is tradition, i. e. 1. *divine* tradition, including doctrines communicated by Christ himself to the apostles, and taught by them, but not recorded; 2. *apostolical* tradition, doctrines taught by the apostles, but not recorded in their writings; 3. *ecclesiastical* tradition, including ancient customs and usages handed down in the Church. The necessity for these tra-

ditions he maintains on the express ground of the *insufficiency* of Scripture as a rule of faith and life (*asserimus in Scripturis non contineri expresse totam doctrinam necessariam sive de fide sive de moribus, De Verbo Dei, iv, 3*). The substance of these passages is, that in the rule of faith tradition is an authority independent of Scripture, and in all respects equal to it in binding force. Möhler (*Symbolism, § 38*) attempts to refine the Roman doctrine, but, in fact, disguises it under an ideal theory of his own, intended to be adapted to "the spirit of the age," or else inspired by it. But the substance of the Roman doctrine remains, in spite of his skill, in his statement that "it is the Church in which alone man arrives at the true understanding of Holy Writ." One of the latest and most skilful advocates of the Roman view is archbishop Manning, who, in his *Grounds of Faith* (London, 1852, 8vo), maintains that "universal tradition is the supreme interpreter of Scripture," and that this tradition is maintained *only* in the Church of Rome, of which the pope is the head and exponent. Dr. Schaff sums up the vices of the Romanist theory of the rule of faith as follows: "The distinction between the divine and the human is unsettled by it. This pantheistic feature runs through the whole system, culminating in the respect shown towards the pope as lawfully holding and exercising the threefold office of Christ himself. Too much is allowed, again, to human agency in the formation of the sacred Scriptures, by limiting the inspiration of the Holy Ghost to mere assistance and guidance (*assistentia et directio*). Still farther, the Latin translation of Jerome, a work of course proceeding from a particular Church position, and reflecting its image, is not only placed on a par with the original text, but in actual use preferred to it altogether (Belarmine, *De Verbo Dei, ii, 10*). In the fourth place, the charge of darkness and ambiguity is brought against the Scriptures, whence tradition is held to be necessary for their interpretation, and it is counselled that the laity should not read them except in cases of special qualification, of which the bishop is to be the judge. In short, the whole tendency of the Roman Catholic Church has for its object to subordinate the Bible to tradition, and then to make itself the infallible judge of truth, with power to determine at pleasure what is God's word and the doctrine of the Church, and to anathematize everything that may go beyond its past decisions, even though, as in the case of the Reformation and Jansenism, it should be an actual deepening of the Christian consciousness itself" (*Principle of Protestantism, p. 74*).

(III.) *The new Anglican Doctrine.*—The so-called Tractarian party in the Church of England adopted, almost at its first beginning in Oxford, in substance, the Romanist theory of the rule of faith; so, e. g. "Tracts for the Times" (No. 70): "Catholic tradition teaches revealed truth, Scripture proves it: Scripture is the document of faith, tradition the witness of it: Scripture and tradition, taken together, are the joint rule of faith." The truth was, that the men comprising this new party had already embraced several of the Romanist doctrines, and, not finding any warrant for them in Scripture, sought it in tradition. Thus Keble (*Sermon on Tradition*) asserts that without tradition it would be impossible to demonstrate the doctrine of the "real presence," that of the "clergy as a distinct order," and that "consecration by apostolical authority is essential to the Eucharist" (see further in Goode, *Divine Rule of Faith and Practice, ii, 18 sq.*). Some of these writers soon began to decry Protestantism as a failure, and the Reformation as a schism; and the next step was to assert that the Scriptures are both defective and obscure, and that many doctrines necessary to faith are not in Scripture at all, but must be learned from tradition, which is "partly the interpretation and partly the supplement of Scripture" (see an able article in the *Princeton Rev.* 1842, p.

598 sq.). Dr. Arnold remarks (*Edinb. Rev.* April, 1843), that, according to the Tractarian theory, "the Scriptures are *not* the sole or a perfect rule of faith; they are to be *supplemented* by tradition; they furnish at best but the germ of an imperfectly developed Christianity, which is to be found full blown and perfect somewhere (no one can tell where) in the third, or fourth, or fifth, or sixth century, or some century still later; and the fathers have much to tell us of undoubted apostolical authority, which the apostles themselves have failed to tell. Infinite are the disputes which such a theory instantly gives rise to. In essence and principle it in no wise differs from that of Rome (for it affirms both a *written* and an *unwritten word*); it differs only in the pleasant and gratuitously perplexing addition that it is impossible to assign the period within which the circle of Catholic verities may be supposed complete—the period when the slowly developed Church system became ripe, but had not yet become rotten. The unity of faith which is thus sought is farther off than ever, for the materials of discord are enlarged a thousand fold. 1. There is the dispute as to whether there be any such authoritative rule of faith at all, and this alone promises to be an endless controversy. 2. Even if we were to admit the possible existence of such a rule, the uncertainty in its application would preclude the possibility of its being of any use. 3. Even if men in general are told that they need not inquire for themselves, but just receive what their 'authorized guides' choose to tell them, private judgment is still pressed with insuperable difficulties; for, alas! we find that the 'authorized guides' themselves, in the exercise of *their* private judgment, have arrived at very different conclusions as to what is Catholic verity and what is not. It is very easy for Mr. Newman to talk in magniloquent phrase of that much abused abstraction, the 'Church,' and to represent his system of 'Church principles' as one and complete in every age. But when we inquire *which* is that Church, *what* are the doctrines it has delivered as the complete circle of verity, and who are its infallible interpreters, we find those whom these authorized guides proclaim *equally* authorized at endless variance—Romanists, Greeks, and Anglicans differing in judgment from each other and from themselves. In a word, we find the 'Church' is just Mr. Newman or Dr. Pusey—not unbecomingly disguised in the habiliments of a somewhat antiquated lady, and uttering their 'private judgments' as veritable oracles. What can one of these 'guides' say to 'a brother guide' who declares, 'I adopt your principles, and it appears to me and many others that, on the same grounds on which you contend for the apostolical succession—that is, on the authority of the ancient Church—I must contend for the celibacy of the clergy?' Or to another, who declares, 'On our common principles I think there is good reason to admit the invocation of saints, the worship of images, the doctrine of the efficacy of holy relics, the monastic institute, to be of apostolical origin?' Or to another, 'It appears to me that the doctrine of purgatory is but a *development* of the doctrine which justifies prayers for the dead?'" Dr. Arnold was right in his view of the tendency of the Tractarian doctrine: J. H. Newman and many others went logically to Rome, while Dr. Pusey illogically remained in the Church of England to corrupt it. And now, 1869, the Romanizing party in that Church bids defiance to both "Protestant tradition" and the state law.

III. It is one of the charges brought by Romanists against Protestantism that it has violently separated itself from the historical life of Christianity by its denial of tradition. But the charge is unfounded. Protestantism is the continuation of the *true* life of Christianity, reformed from the errors of Rome, among which errors was the exaltation of tradition to a level with Scripture as an *authority*. No such view of tradition can be found either in Scripture or in the early

Church writers. According to the Protestant view, the Greek and Roman doctrine of the rule of faith takes away Christ, and puts an ecclesiastical corporation in his place. But Protestantism does not deny the value of tradition in transmitting Christian doctrine: its value is inestimable. But it is not authoritative or final; it is a servant, not a master. In fact, the question of the rule of faith is closely connected with that of the true idea of the Church, or, indeed, identical with it in the last analysis. So, at the fourth session of the Council of Trent, when the question of Scripture and tradition came up for discussion, Vincent Lanesl, one of the members of the council, a Franciscan, "thought it would be preferable to treat of the Church in the first instance, because Scripture derived its authority from the Church. He added that if it were once established that all Christians are bound to obey the Church, everything else would be easy, and that this was the only argument that would refute the heretics." While Protestantism leads to Christ through the Scriptures, and through Christ to the Church, Rome pretends to lead through the Church to Christ and the Scriptures; the authority of the Protestant doctrine being its conformity with revealed truth, that of the Roman Catholic system the assumed infallibility of the Church. *In causis spiritualibus necessario admittentibus a'ignis supremis julx controversiarum* (in spiritual things there must needs be some final and supreme judge to decide controverted questions) is the old postulate of those who contend for a visible Church endowed with God's own infallibility. Grant them their postulate, in their own sense of it, and the whole theory of "Church principles," as the modern successors of Hildebrand complacently name their dogmas, will inevitably follow. On the other hand, let it be settled that the Scriptures, and the Scriptures alone, constitute the true rule of Christian faith and practice, and we shall have done forever with the juggling priestcraft which has so long disgraced Christianity, and which finds its only hope of support in ecclesiastical tradition. The question is a vital one. It is not a mere matter of detail, about which men can differ at pleasure; it is the Rubicon which separates Protestantism from Popery. It involves "a choice between the Gospel of Christ as declared by himself and his apostles, and that deadly apostasy which Paul in his lifetime saw threatening—nay, the effects of which, during his captivity, had nearly supplanted his own gospel in the Asiatic churches, and which he declares would come speedily with a fearful power of lying wonders" (Stanley, *Life of Arnold*, ii, 110). The Church of God, according to the Protestant, is built upon the "foundation of the prophets and the apostles, Christ himself being the chief corner-stone;" according to the traditionist, upon the sands of antiquity as well. From the beginning men have made the word of God of none effect through their traditions. See BIBLE, USE OF; FATHERS; INFALLIBILITY; PROTESTANTISM; ROMANISM; and especially TRADITION.

*Literature.*—Besides the authors already named in the course of this article, see Wiener, *Comp. Darstellung*, 1866, p. 27; Nitzsch, *System d. christl. Lehre*, § 36-39; Daillé, *Right Use of the Fathers* (Philada. 1842, 12mo); Elliott, *Disunion of Romanism*, bk. i, chap. i and iii; Jeremy Taylor, *Dissuasive from Popery* (Heber's ed.), x, 283 sq.; Chemnitz, *Examen Concilii Tridentini*; Chillingworth, *Religion of Protestants* (Philadel. 1838), 8vo; Marsh, *Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome* (Cambridge, 1814, 8vo); Stillingfleet, *Protestant Grounds of Faith* (Works, Lond. 1709, vols. iv, v, and vi); Knapp, *Christian Theol.* § vii; Goode, *Divine Rule of Faith and Practice* (2d ed. Lond. 1853, 3 vols. 8vo); Peck, *App'at from Tradition to Scripture* (New York, 1844, 12mo, reviewed by McClintock in the *Biblical Repository*, Jan. 1846, art. 2); *Ellinb. Review*, April, 1843; Lightfoot, *Works*, vi, 51; Rosenmüller, *De Orig. Theology*, cap. xi, § 35; Holden, *Authority of*

*Tradition* (Phil. 1841); Hawkins, *Dissert. on Tradition* (Oxf. 1819, 8vo); Burnet, *On 39 Articles*; Browne, *On 39 Articles*; Forbes, *On 39 Articles* (each on art. vi).

**FAITH AND REASON.** Religion and science express in the abstract and in the concrete the two opposite poles of human knowledge, between which there must always be discrepancy, and has usually been discord. In all ages in which there has been any notable activity of intelligence there has been a controversy, more or less violent, between the claims of religious authority and the pretensions of human reason. The acrimony of the strife has been increased, and the importance of appeasing it has been augmented by every extension of the domain of precise, coherent, systematic reasoning. Every creed accepted by a cultivated and speculative community has been in turn assailed by a spirit of speculative scrutiny, which has gradually encroached upon the sacred domain, and has ultimately denied all validity to doctrines not established by the processes of ratiocination, or discovered and confirmed by direct observation and experiment. The primeval theology of the Hindoos, the capricious and graceful fantasies of the Greek mythology, the stern solemnity of the Roman Fasti, the arbitrary credulities of Islamism, have all experienced this phase of hostility, as well as Christianity, in the various periods and forms of its dissemination. But never has this war been more deadly in mode or in menace than in this current age, when the foundations of revealed truth are undermined by insidious approaches, and when science erects its multitudinous batteries against all the ramparts of the Christian faith.

In other times, attempts, more or less unsuccessful, have been made to restore natural amity between these embittered adversaries. The Euhemerism of the Greeks was an effort to explain the legendary superstitions of Greece so as to render them acceptable to the enlightened doubts of Hellenic philosophy. See EUHEMERUS. A second and more elaborate plan for the maintenance of the expiring reverence for the divinities of the pagan world was hazarded by the Neoplatonists. See NEO-PLATONISM. Both experiments signally failed. In a much later period, with wholly dissimilar weapons, and with much vaster interests at stake, the illustrious Leibnitz undertook to reconcile religion and reason in a treatise equally remarkable for the classical elegance of its style, and for the vigor and profundity of its argumentation. It was negative in its character, and only offered a compromise. Such was also the complexion of the admirable work of bishop Butler on the *Analogy of Natural and Revealed Religion*. In consequence, these luminous essays only interpose as landmarks in the midst of the waves between the hardy scepticism of the beginning and the revolutionary atheism of the close of the 18th century. The war has become more determined, even though it may have gradually lost much of its earlier bitterness. Extremists on both sides now declare that there is an implacable antagonism between faith and science. Ministers of religion may be found denouncing the procedures and conclusions of science as "enmity with God," and as incompatible with revealed truth; as if the laws of the creation could be at variance with the declarations of the Creator. Adepts in scientific research, on the other hand, proclaim the deceptiveness and inanity of all religious doctrine as contradictory to the clearly ascertained processes of the universe; as if the phenomena of matter could contravert the constitution of the human mind, and the ineradicable instincts, appetencies, and requirements of the human heart.

Yet, even in this apparently hopeless state of discord, renewed endeavors have been made to bring the great adversaries into harmonious union. The most recent and the most notable of these is that of Herbert Spencer, which is plausible in its pretensions, but most delusive in its results. It is singularly insidious in



design and in execution. It betrays with a kiss, and deals a mortal stab while inquiring, "How is it with thee, my brother?" It recognises the universality, the indestructibility, the necessity of religious belief, admits the impossibility of ignoring or dispelling the attributes of a Supreme Being, and yet attenuates everything thus admitted till it sublimates these conceptions into a vaporous phenomenalism, a misty hallucination of the human mind under the perennial hypochondria of a morbid fantasy. No suspension of arms has been obtained, because each party hopes for a decisive victory. But the prolongation and exacerbation of this strife are most disastrous, not merely to the legitimate authority of religion, but to the equally legitimate demands of science. One portion of the Christian community is repelled from the prompt acceptance and the zealous encouragement of the discoveries of science by the apprehension that the bulwarks of revealed religion may be surrendered to an unsparing foe. Another portion rejects the teachings of the Church and of the Christian creed from disgust at an unreasoning and unreasonable opposition to science. A third party, intermediate between the two, extends a hand to both; surrenders whatever rationalism questions, and professes to retain in a changed sense all that is essential in the dogmas of religion. Meanwhile, those of vicious inclinations find an excuse for the indulgence of their passions and the rejection of moral restraints in an intelligent repudiation or in a doubtful acknowledgment of religion; while the multitude, careless and stolid, pursues its private ambitions or personal whims without regard to the obligations of this life, without concern for that great hereafter which occupies no place in its thoughts. The conciliation of faith and science thus becomes more urgent than in any former time, and its urgency is increased by the difficulty of accomplishing it in the midst of contentions between reciprocally repellant combatants, armed on the one side with the thunders of the Almighty, the promises of heaven, and the terrors of hell, and on the other with the dazzling panoply of modern investigation, and with weapons wreathed with the laurels of a century of scientific achievements.

The re-establishment of fraternal union between two so widely alienated disputants must be an arduous and always a somewhat doubtful task. "*Quis concordabit tantum contrarietatem?*" A mere truce will answer no good purpose. It would simply convert a running sore into a purulent condition of the whole system. The conciliation, to be efficient, must rest on an essential harmony of principles, on a recognised dissimilarity of aims and applications. Even then the agreement may be liable to occasional rupture from reciprocal jealousies; but room must be allowed for partial dissent, as in these high questions no more can be expected than an unsteady *conquiescence—discordia concors*. Whether even this agreement is attainable must be uncertain till it has been attained; it may be reserved for that blessed expansion of our discernment when we shall no longer "see as through a glass darkly." But, in the mean time, there is a high obligation resting upon those who would repudiate neither the sanctifying influences of a holy life, nor the illumination of secular learning, to seek out the grounds of reconciliation, and to renew the marriage of the liberal arts with theology. This seems to be the appropriate duty and the peculiar aspiration of the present age, and the imperfect or delusive efforts made in this direction indicate the latent consciousness that it is so. The instinctive *nisus*, often grievously misdirected, always precedes the solution of the great enigmas of humanity. Before any reasonable hope, however, of a satisfactory result can be entertained, it is necessary to ascertain the conditions of the problem, and to discover among the obvious and multitudinous discrepancies whether there is any essential identity between the opposing forces. If there is, there may be a pros-

pect of final accordance; if there is not, the antipathies are ineradicable and immedicable.

The conditions under which the question presents itself are thus, the determination of the nature of the contending parties; the detection of any agreement in their intrinsic character; and the discernment of the causes of their opposition and diverse procedure. It becomes expedient, therefore, to ascertain the peculiar character and functions of faith and science respectively. This cannot be accomplished by any mode of mere logical division and definition, because faith resides in our spiritual susceptibilities, and is incapable of verbal circumscription; and because science admits of no immutable boundaries, but "grows forever and forever." But the character of each may be sufficiently described to permit the contradistinction of the two, to exhibit their contrasts, and to disclose any harmony that may exist between them.

Science is precise, definite, systematic knowledge, attained and co-ordinated by the application of human reasoning to admitted facts or observed phenomena. The conclusions of science are reached and are connected together by the discovery of the general principles which regulate the occurrence of the phenomena and reveal the conditions of their occurrence. These principles are established by the employment of the two processes of deduction and induction; and science is the determination by the arts of reasoning of such knowledge as is apprehensible by the logical faculties of the human mind. The conclusions attained are more or less firmly believed according to the sufficiency or insufficiency of the reasoning; but, when firmly established, are believed on the strength of the evidence, and cannot be doubted except by remembering the finite power and comprehension, and consequent fallibility of the reasoning mind itself. This limitation, though properly—nay, inevitably overlooked in the constitution and acceptance of scientific truth, cannot be safely disregarded in the estimation of the validity and certainty of scientific procedure.

Faith is something more than rational belief—something more firm and assured than scientific or philosophic conviction. Conviction is produced by the strength of the arguments adduced—by the influence of the demonstration or other evidence on the understanding. Faith goes far beyond this, both in the assurance conveyed, and in the disproportion between the testimony and what is accepted on that testimony. "Seeing is believing," but he who "walks by faith" "walks not by sight." We believe in the results of science; we have faith in the truths of revelation. We believe that the earth is round; we have faith in the existence of God, and in the immortality of the soul. Conviction questions and scrutinizes; faith confides, and does not cavil. The belief which is founded upon reasoning ponders the arguments propounded, the evidence presented; faith is itself "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." This distinction may not be acceptable to persons of loose habits of thought, who employ words without discriminating their delicate shades of meaning; but it seems to be required by more than one passage of the New Testament, and is fully sustained by the most acute, profound, and sagacious of the schoolmen, Thomas Aquinas (*Summa Theologiae*, 2, a, qu. ii, art. x; qu. iv, art. i). It is of the essence of faith to transcend the logical evidence, to accept more than is contained in any logical premises, and to hold the tenet thus retained with a more earnest tenacity than any demonstration or generalization can produce. Not that faith is independent of evidence or testimony; but the cogency of such proof is not intrinsic or indisputable in itself, but is derived from its acceptance, and from the submissive adherence of the recipient. It is "the Spirit of truth" which "will guide you into all truth." This exposition may seem applicable only to religious faith, or to faith in supernatural truth; but it is with

faith of this kind that the controversy on the part of science is maintained. It is therefore in this domain that the essence of faith is to be specially considered. Nevertheless, a little reflection and examination will show that all faith possesses the same general characteristics. The faith which we repose in another similarly transcends, and usually precedes the evidence; the faith which we hold in regard to the regular order of nature is manifested without thought of the arguments by which that order is proved; the faith which we entertain in the necessity and generally beneficent action of government is wholly irrespective of our opinions in relation to its particular measures. See FAITH.

Thus widely contrasted, then, are the characteristics of faith and science. The former is out of all proportion to the proof addressed to the reasoning faculties; the other is strictly limited by the proof. The one is an adhesion of our whole spiritual nature, undoubting, and unvisited by any anxious concern; the other is simply the acquiescence of the understanding, which may be dispelled by further discoveries. The one may be resisted, the other cannot be denied; the one is of voluntary acceptance, the other of compulsory belief. The being of God may be denied; the validity of a demonstration of Euclid cannot be gainsaid, if the terms and the logical process are apprehended.

But, though these things be thus disparate in their ordinary and in their ultimate manifestations, they are identical in their foundations and in their point of departure. It has been stated already that scientific reasoning proceeds by way of deduction or of induction. Deduction, however, proceeds from premises which are either established by induction, or are received without demonstration; and induction requires general principles, not reached by induction, to render induction possible. First principles admit of neither definition nor proof. The conception of order, the admission of the uniformity of natural laws, are not inductions. Supposing, however, that those things which are confirmed by science, and receive their expansion and development from science, are reached by scientific reasoning, still the conceptions of mind, matter, and similar primordial phenomena with which science deals are intuitive, and are accepted by an unreasoning, though rational faith. They are only perplexed and weakened by argumentation on the subject. The contrasted conceptions of mind and matter are universally recognised as contrasted, even by those who deny the reality of matter, and represent it as a mere image or phantasm of the mind; and by those who deny the distinct character of mind, and profess to regard it as nothing more than a modification or efflorescence of matter. The distinction is admitted, although the distinctness of essence or of substance be denied. So pressing is the intuitive consciousness of the contrast that recent votaries of science, who would cashier the whole realm of faith, are compelled by an unavowed and unsuspected instinct to disembody and to evaporate, as well as despiritualize, the whole universe, which they pretend to explain by ascribing a purely apparent existence to facts and to the evolution of facts—a merely phenomenal validity to demonstrated changes and the laws of change. They make shadows chase shadows in a spectral world for the entertainment of shadowy observers. In this manner they convert the material and the intelligible universe into an impalpable phantasmagoria; they render it a reflection upon the clouds, a giant of the Broken, an intricate dance of fantastic unrealities. But the ghosts which they evoke from the dissipated forms of being are as intractable and as hostile to the spirits and bodies which they have attempted to annihilate. Faith, the same in kind, though greater in degree, is required for the admission of such *idols* of mind and matter, and nothing is gained for their own purposes by embracing the cloud instead of the goddess.

The true doctrine with respect to the foundations of scientific procedure is laid down by Aristotle in the close of the *Posterior Analytics*. "It is evident," says he, "that, as demonstration is not the beginning of demonstration, so neither is science the first principle of science." Nearly six centuries later, Proclus similarly declares in his *Theological Institutes* that "intuition is the principle and first cause of knowledge." After the lapse of more than twelve hundred years, the Sage of Verulam reasserted the same position in a somewhat different form in *The Fable of Cupid*, and again in the *Novum Organum* (1 *Aph.* lxxvi). Thus the founder of science, the most extreme of Transcendentalists, and the restorer of inductive philosophy, concur in recognising that science is not self-sustaining, but is dependent upon principles beyond the sphere of science. Their declarations, too, are no isolated testimonies, but are merely echoes of the convictions of philosophers of the most divergent schools (Plato, *Timæus*, ch. i; Aristotle, *Met.* iii, 4; x, 5, 6; Theophrastus, *Met.* v; Alex. Aphrodisiensis, *Schol.* in *Aristot.* ed. Brandis, p. 525, 527, 592, 605, 653; Asclepiades, *Ibid.* p. 599; Ammonius, *Ibid.* p. 519; Des Cartes, *Med.* ii; Spinoza, *De la Réforme de l'Entendement*, *Œuvres*, ii, 281, ed. Saisset.; Leibnitz, *Opera*, i, p. cxlv, clxi, ed. Dutens). A remarkable testimony to the same effect was recently (Ang. 1868) given by Prof. Tyndall in his introductory address before the Mathematical Section of the British Association.

It is not simply a metaphysical axiom, but an obvious truism, that there can be neither definition nor demonstration of first principles—of those fundamental and primary facts upon which not merely all knowledge, but all possibility of knowledge depends. Life is consciousness, not a conclusion of the reason. Personal identity admits neither proof nor denial. Mind escapes from the formulas of scientific knowledge; matter cannot be seized or established by them. The theory of Boscovich may be invalid, but it cannot be disproved. Thus the very foundations of scientific knowledge rest upon faith, and upon faith only—upon faith in primitive facts—faith in the testimony of the senses—faith in our intellectual apprehensions. Accordingly, the faith which is supposed to make unreasonable demands in requiring the acceptance of theological truths is equally, though not in an equal degree, required for scientific speculation. Science cannot commence its speculations without humbly receiving dogmas communicated and held by faith; it cannot advance a single step without implicit acquiescence in their truth, and without their necessary, though latent support. On all sides we are encompassed by mystery. Religion and science thus spring from a common root. They address themselves in the first instance to a common characteristic of the intelligence. In both, faith must precede knowledge; and in either, the celebrated maxim of St. Augustine finds its application: "*Credo, ut intelligam.*" They are twin sisters, sustained by a common life, nourished by a common sustenance, illumined by the radiance proceeding from a common fountain of light. Both require τὸ θιον ἄρχη ὅμοια τὰ θεία προλαμβάνον; and both may turn to the Father of Lights and exclaim, "*Angelorum esca nutritiis populum tuum, et paratum panem de celo praestitisti illis sine labore, omne delectamentum in se habentem et omnis saporis suavitatem.*"

But, though religion and science are intimately united in the cradle by participation in faith and in the works of faith, their development follows along widely divergent lines. Religion proceeds on its sacred mission accompanied, supported, and guided by faith throughout the whole journey, and calls in the aid of reason only to remove the obstacles and impediments occasioned by the weakness or scepticism of the finite intelligence. Science, like the prodigal son, leaves his father's house to wander in strange lands and among strange scenes, and too often forgets the

innocence, the purity, and the heavenly illumination of his paternal home. But still the first lessons of faith—"the vision splendid" of his youth—attend his course, return to his memory, recall his origin, and silently reclaim him to his early home.

"Perchance he may return with others there,  
When he has purged his guilt."

Science thus reposes on faith, upon principles of the same generic character as those which furnish the substance of religion; but it requires them only as premises which are soon left out and forgotten in its strictly ratiocinative development. It is willingly oblivious of the fact that "there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in our philosophy." Religion receives these and the like principles of faith as its commencement, beginning, and end. Science commences where religion leaves off, but it is ushered into its career by faith.

These brief and undeveloped views may perhaps indicate the means of securing a valid conciliation of faith and reason, of religion and science, and of establishing the limits of their respective spheres, and the characteristics of their respective procedures. Interpreted as they have been here explained, their contrasts and functions remain distinctly marked, but they cease to be antagonistic, and have neither reason nor excuse for enmity.—Compare Shedd, *History of Doctrines*, i, 154 sq.; Chlebus, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1846, p. 905 sq.; *Edinburgh Review*, Oct. 1849, art. i; Westcott, *Study of the Gospels*, p. 393; M'Cosh, *Intuitions of the Mind*, bk. ii, ch. i, and pt. iii, bk. ii, ch. v; Miles, *Philosophical Theology* (Charleston, 1850, 8vo). (G. F. H.)

**Faith of Jesus, Society of the** (or **FATHERS OF THE FAITH**), an ecclesiastical order in the Church of Rome, founded by Paccanari, a Tyrolese enthusiast, and formerly a soldier of the pope, under the patronage of the archduchess Mariana. The intention of Paccanari was to give to the Church a substitute for the order of the Jesuits, which had been suppressed by Clement XIV. The foundation of the society was laid by Paccanari and twelve companions in 1798 at a villa near Spoleto, which a nobleman had offered to them for that purpose. The rule adopted by Paccanari was almost identical with that of the Jesuits. Pope Pius VI, who was at that time kept a prisoner by the government of France in a monastery near Florence, and whom Paccanari visited, encouraged the new society, and recommended to it the pupils of the Propaganda whom the government of the Roman republic had expelled from their college. In 1799, Paccanari, while on a visit to Rome, was arrested, together with his companions, but they were soon set at liberty on the condition that they should leave the Roman territory. In the same year the "Society of the Sacred Heart," a society which had been established in 1794 by some ex-Jesuits for the purpose of reviving the order of the Jesuits under a different name, united, in consequence of an express order of the pope, with the Fathers of the Faith, and recognised Paccanari as their superior. The latter, who up to this time had been a layman, now received minor orders at the hands of the papal nuncio in Vienna, and in 1800 was ordained priest. The society, which had already taken charge of several missions in Africa, established houses in Bavaria, Italy, France, England, and Holland, and in 1804 numbered about eighty members. Pope Pius VII was, however, not favorable to them. Some of the members joined the Jesuits, who had been restored in Russia and (in 1804) in Naples, while others repudiated the authority of Paccanari, and placed themselves under the direct authority of the diocesan bishops. Paccanari himself was summoned before an ecclesiastical court, and sentenced to life-long imprisonment. The second invasion of Rome by the French restored to him his liberty, but the society was wholly dissolved in 1814, when its last members joined the order of the Jesuits, who in that year were restored for

the whole Church.—Henrion-Fehr, *Gesch. der Mönchsorden*, ii, 62. (A. J. S.)

**Faithful.** (1.) A title given in Scripture to Christians (1 Cor. iv, 17; Ephes. vi, 21, et al.). (2.) The term *πιστοί*, the *faithful* (FIDELES), was the general and favorite name in the early Church to denote baptized persons. By this name they were distinguished, on the one hand, from the *ἀπιστοί*, such as were not Christians; and, on the other, from the catechumens.—Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. i, ch. iii, iv; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, bk. ii, ch. v.

**Fakir** (also spelled **FAQUIR**). This word, derived from the Arabic *fakr* (poverty), is used by the Arabs to designate those mendicant orders called by the Persians and Turks *dervishes*. By Europeans it is commonly used to denote certain Hindoo sects noted for asceticism and austerities. For a brief account of the Mohammedan Fakirs, see the article **DERVISH**. We mention here, in addition, only a sect of them styled *Calenders*, from the name of their founder, Santone Kalendarer, described by Knolles (*History of the Turks*) as Epicureans, whose motto is, "This day is ours, tomorrow is his who may live to enjoy it," and in whose view the tavern is as holy as the mosque, and God as well pleased with their debaucheries, i. e. "liberal use of his creatures," as with the austerities of others (see D'Herbelot, s. v. *Calender*).

1. *History*.—We find no religious devotees of this kind among the Mohammedans earlier than the 13th century after Christ, though the origin of Hindoo fakirism is by some writers referred back to Sakyamuni. See **BUDDHISM**. But a satisfactory explanation of the origin of fakirism may be found in that perverted human tendency which in all ages has sought to earn the favor of God and the praise of men through abstraction of the soul and chastenings of the flesh, and has been too prone to accord to such acts undue homage and sanctity. Nowhere has this tendency been more marked than among the imaginative and superstitious peoples of the East. The account which Strabo, on the authority of Megasthenes, Aristobulus, and others, has given us of the Gymnosophists, especially that class called by him *Garmes*, and by others *Sarmani* or *Samanai*, shows that ascetics, very similar in modes of life, doctrines, and practices to the Fakirs of modern India, were found there at the time of Alexander's conquests. This conclusion is strengthened by the descriptions of Quintus Curtius, Arrian, Plutarch, Pliny, Clemens Alexandrinus, and other ancient authors, when treating of the philosophers of India. It seems not a merely speculative view which assumes that the *naked philosophers*, so celebrated in ancient times, were, in an ethical sense at least, the progenitors of the modern Fakirs (see Heeren, *Asiatic Nations*, ii, 242, note).

Among the mendicant devotees who abounded in India at the date of the Mohammedan conquests we find the Fakirs mentioned as prominent in the veneration of the people, and exercising an almost unlimited influence over them; and frequent mention is made of these fanatics and their strange practices by the travellers who have described India since the period named. D'Herbelot estimated that there was in India 800,000 Mohammedan and 1,200,000 idolatrous Fakirs, while the number of both sorts is now estimated at over 1,000,000. Fakirism, with other forms of superstitious fanaticism, seems to be rapidly losing ground under the influences and agencies which, since the prevalence of British rule, have been diffusing the light of the purer doctrines of the Gospel through India.

2. *Sects or Fraternities*.—They are divided into sects or orders, each differing from the others more or less in dress, habits, etc. Owing perhaps to the lack of organization and the number of their fraternities, the accounts of travellers and other authorities in this re-

spect seem conflicting and fragmentary. Without attempting any precise classification, we may group them under two heads: 1. Those living in *communities*, either in convents, as Western monks, or wandering about in troops, sometimes amounting to thousands. 2. Those living *singly*, as hermits or as vagabond mendicants, passing from place to place, practising the arts and tricks of their order, and receiving from the credulous superstition of the people the entertainment and alms provided at public expense in the villages for persons of their class.

"The Fakirs of India," says Zimmermann (*Vonder Einsamkeit*, ii, 107), "have a sect which is called the Illuminated, or those who are united with God. The Illuminated have overcome the world, live in some secluded garden, like hermits, so deeply sunk in contemplation that they look for whole hours at one spot, insensible to all outward objects. But then, as they state, with indescribable delight they perceive God as a pure white light. For some days before they live on nothing but bread and water, sink into deep silence, look upward for some time with fixed gaze, turn their eyes in deep concentration of the soul to the point of the nose, and now the white light appears" (Ennemoser, i, 205-6).

The Fakirs, or Yogees, of the Senessee tribe travel over Hindostan, living on the charity of the other Hindoos, generally entirely naked, and "most of them robust, handsome men. They admit proselytes from the other tribes, especially youths of bright parts, and take great pains to instruct them in their mysteries." Collected in large bodies, and armed, they make pilgrimages to sacred places, laying the country under contribution. Led on by an old woman named Bostimia, who pretended to possess the gift of enchantment, one of their hosts, 20,000 strong, defeated an army of Aurungzebe, and for a time, through the influence of superstitious fears, paralyzing his powers of resistance, spread terror and dismay through his court and capital. Niebuhr, the traveller, speaks of the Bargais and the Gussains, two orders of Fakirs, as travelling armed, and in troops of thousands. The *Iconographic Encyclopedia* (iv, 232) names three classes of Hindoo ascetics, viz. *Sanashis* or *Sanassi*, *Vishnavins*, and *Penitents*.

3. *Peculiar Doctrines and Austerities*.—The profession of poverty constitutes a fundamental principle of fakirism, as the name itself indicates. One author says "the quality which God most loves in his creatures is poverty;" and tradition reports Mohammed as saying to his servant Belal, "See to it that you appear before God poor and not rich, for the poor have the chief places in his mansion." Another fundamental principle is the virtue of self-torture, penances, and seclusion of spirit as means for the attainment of sanctity. The Fakir, says Hassan al Basri, is like a dog in ten things: he is always hungry; has no fixed abode; watches during the night; leaves no heritage when he dies; does not abandon his master, though ill treated; chooses the lowest place; yields his place to whomsoever wishes it; returns to him who has beaten him, when a crust of bread is offered; keeps quiet while others eat, and follows his master without thinking of returning to the place he has left. The variety and character of their penances and mortifications of the flesh display no little ingenuity of conception, and demand great powers of endurance in performance. Some go naked, or wear only filthy rags, suffering the heat of the sun, the storms of rain, and the cold of the night in the open air, sleeping on cow-dung or other ordure, "delighting in nastiness and a holy obscenity with a great show of sanctity," with hair uncut, and body and face besmeared with ashes, looking more like devils than men. One has kept his arms in one position until they shrivelled up; another has kept his hands clasped together until the nails grew through the flesh. Some have buried themselves up to their

chins in pits, and thus remained for days; others have imprisoned themselves for life in iron cages; one has had his cheeks and tongue pierced with a sharp iron, kept in its place by another passing under the chin; another would drag along a heavy chain, one link of which passed through the tenderest part of the body, the penis; one bears on his neck a heavy yoke, with heavy weights in his hands; another lies down on a bed of iron spikes; one suspends himself head downwards over a fire until his scalp is burned to the bone; another traverses long distances by rolling on the ground, receiving his food and drink from the hands of the people; one makes the singular vow to perform a long journey by rolling himself along as a sort of cart-wheel: having for this purpose fastened his wrists and ankles together, and caused a tire, made of chopped straw, mud, and cows' dung, to be laid along the ridge of his back-bone, with a bamboo-stick passed through the angle made by his knees and elbows for an axle, he rolls himself to the first village on his route, where he is received with demonstrations of joyous respect, and conducted to the tank or well for ablution. Ascertaining what house of the village promises the best cheer, thither he repairs, and there remains until the supplies fail. He then repeats the process of preparation, and journeys to another place. Some fakirs have combined traffic with their religious pilgrimages, and by the exchange of valuable, yet easily transported articles, carried in their belts and clothing, have made great gains in the pelf of the world which they so much affect to despise. The lives of some, perhaps, comport with the spirit of sanctity and self-denial professed, but most of them are in secret addicted to gross vices, and whenever favorable opportunity offers, the pride and cruelty of their hearts display themselves.

4. *Literature*.—Stralio, § 712-19; Arrianus, *Indica*, cap. xii; Quintus Curtius, lib. viii, cap. ix; Plutarch, *Vita Alexandri*; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* lib. vii, cap. ii; Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata*, lib. i, 305 d.; Bohlen, *Das Alte Indien*; Coleman, *Mythology of the Hindus*; Dufl, *India and Indian Missions*; Ward, *Hist. Literat. Mythology, etc. of the Hindus*; *Iconographic Encyclopedia*, iv, 12-13 (N. York, 1851); D'Herbelot, *Bibliothèque Orientale*, s. v. Fakir and Calender; Ennemoser, *History of Magic*, i, 205-10 (Bohn's ed. 1854); *Indic. Pictorial, Descriptive, and Historical*, p. 73, 115-119, 430 (Bohn's Illust. Library); Ruffner, *The Fathers of the Desert*, i, 23-51. For pictorial illustrations, see *Harpur's Weekly* for 1857, p. 540, and *Iconographic Encyclopedia*, Plates to *Mythology and Religious Rites*, pl. 2, fig. 20, and pl. 3, fig. 10, 11, and 12. (J. W. M.)

Falaguera, SIEEM TOBIAS BEN-JOSEPH BEN, a Spanish Jew of great learning, and a philosopher of the school of Maimonides, was born about 1228. Besides a work on *The Relation of Religion and Philosophy*, he wrote, in 1263, *היבבקות, the Inquirer* (printed at Amsterdam, 1779). Later he wrote *הפושט, Psychology* (Amst. 1835), in which he follows the Arabic school of Aristotle's disciples; *שלושה המעשרים, Ethics*; and in 1280 a work on the philosophical parts of Moreh, *גוררה המורה* (printed at Pressburg, 1837). We mention also *בינהה קנאיה*, a work written in 1290 in defence of Maimonides.—Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenthums u. seiner Sekten*, iii, 27. (J. H. W.)

Falashas (*Black Jews*), a large and peculiar race inhabiting the province of Semen, on the shores of the Tzana Sea, near Gondar and the mountainous regions of northern Abyssinia. The word *Falasha* means *exile*, and sufficiently indicates that they were not natives of the soil. They have a skin more or less dark, without possessing, however, the negro type, and speak both the dominant language of the country—the Amharic, and a dialect of the Aagaon language. They possess the whole of the Jewish Canon (O. T. Canon) in the Gueez language (a sister language of the He-

brew, Arabic, and Aramæan dialects, and from which the Amharic is derived), together with the apocryphal books accepted by the Abyssinian Church. Their priests, who live round the inclosures of the temple (which are situated near the edge of the Falasha villages, and have more the appearance of the ancient sanctuary than the modern synagogue), observe the laws of purity with rigor, prepare their own food, and keep aloof from the world. They are principally engaged in the education of youth, making the Bible and the traditional practices the basis of their instruction. The Falashas deviate from Jewish usages in many respects. Thus the fringed praying-scarf (talet, q. v.), the phylacteries (q. v.), are not used in their devotions. They retain the usage of offering sacrifices, but rather as commemorative ceremonies than as real sacrifices; the most common is the offering for the repose of the dead. No sacrifices can be offered on the Sabbath or on the day of atonement. The Falashas, with all other Jewish sects, hope for a return to the sacred city, Jerusalem. While polygamy is not forbidden by law, it is nevertheless censured. They have a special hatred of slave-dealers, yet slavery is tolerated among them; they instruct the slaves in the law of Moses, and manumit them on conversion. They are a very industrious race, and have the reputation of being good farmers. They are also able warriors (many fought under king Theodore in the late Abyssinian war), but are averse to commerce, which they consider an obstacle to fidelity and rigor in religious observances. The Falashas were formerly governed by an independent prince, whose residence was in the fastness of Aimba Gideon, and it is only since 1800, after the extinction of the race of their original masters, that they have passed under the domination of the princes of Tigré. They claim that their ancestors settled in Abyssinia as early as the time of Solomon, but it is likely that they came much later. The knowledge of Hebrew they have lost. In 1867, the central committee of the Jewish *Alliance Universelle*, which has its seat in Paris, sent M. Leon Halévy to Abyssinia to make a tour of exploration among the Falashas, and report on what might be done for their education, with a special view to counteracting the influence of the Christian missionaries who had been sent out from India. After his return, M. Halévy made, in July, 1868, a very interesting report on the Falashas, and announced the publication of an "Essay on the Falashah," which will undoubtedly be the first thorough work on the subject. He brought with him a young Falashah, who will be educated in France.—Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, vi, 79; *Israélite*, vol. xv, No. 21 and 25. (J. H. W.)

**Falcandus**, Hugo, a distinguished historian, lived in the 12th century. According to the Benedictine authors of the work *L'Art de Vérifier les Dates*, he was a native of France (his original name being Fulcandus or Foucault); accompanied his patron Stephen de la Perche, archbishop of Palermo, and grand-uncle of king William II, to Sicily, and finally became abbot of St. Denys, at Paris. Gibbon is of opinion that he was a native of Sicily. His celebrated work, *Historia Sicula*, which procured for him the surname of the Sicilian Tacitus, was published in 1189 or 1190, and is of great importance for the Church history of that period.—Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirch.-Lex.* iv, 885. (A. J. S.)

**Falcon**, a bird of the hawk tribe, anciently trained to assist in hunting, and still used in the East for the same purpose. Dr. Thomson (*Land and Book*, i, 309 sq.) thus speaks of the practice in Palestine: "The beg at the castle of Tibnin, which we are now approaching, always keeps several of these large falcons on their perches in his grand reception-hall, where they are tended with the utmost care. I have been out on the mountains to see them hunt, and it is a most exciting scene. The emirs sit on their horses,



Large Falcon.

holding the birds on their wrists, and the woods are filled with their retainers, beating about and shouting, to start up and drive toward them the poor partridges. When near enough, the falcon is launched from the hand, and swoops down upon his victim like an eagle hastening to the prey. After he has struck his quarry, the falcon flies a short distance, and lights on the ground, amid the redoubled shouts of the sportsmen. The keeper darts forward, secures both, cuts the throat of the partridge, and allows his captor to suck its blood. This is his reward. Notwithstanding the exhilaration of the sport, I could never endure the falcon himself. There is something almost satanic in his eye, and in the ferocity with which he drinks the warm life-blood of his innocent victim. I once saw some men of Tortosa catching the Syrian quail with a small hawk. This was done on foot, each sportsman carrying his bird on the right wrist, and beating the bushes with a stick held in his left hand. These quails are less than the American; are migratory, coming here in early spring, and passing on to the north. They hide under the bushes, and will not rise on the wing unless forced to do so by a dog, or by the hunter himself. I was surprised to see how quickly and surely the little hawk seized his game. His reward also was merely the blood of the bird. I do not know whether or not the Jews in ancient days were acquainted with falconry, but David complains that Saul hunted for his blood as one doth hunt for a partridge in the mountains (1 Sam. xxvi, 20); and this hunting of the same bird on these mountains, and giving their blood to the hawk, reminds one of the sad complaint of the persecuted son of Jesse. In the neighborhood of Aleppo the smaller falcon is taught to assist the sportsman to capture the gazelle. Neither horse nor greyhound can overtake these fleet creatures on the open desert, and therefore the Arabs have taught the hawk to fasten on their forehead, and blind them by incessant flapping of their wings. Bewildered and terrified, they leap about at random, and are easily captured. They are also trained to attack the bustard in the same region. This bird is about as large as a turkey, and highly prized by the lovers of game; but, as they keep on the vast level plains, where there is nothing to screen the cautious hunter, it is almost impossible to get within gunshot of them. When they rise in the air, the little falcon flies up from beneath and fastens on one of their wings, and then both come whirling over and over to the ground, when the hunter quickly seizes the bustard, and delivers his brave bird from a position not particularly safe or comfortable. They will even bring down the largest eagle in the

same way; but in this desperate game they are sometimes torn to pieces by the insulted majesty of the feathered kingdom." See **HAWK**.



Small Falcon.

**Falconer**, THOMAS, A.M., a Church of England divine, was born at Bath in 1771; was made fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in 1794, and died in 1839. He published *The Resurrection of our Saviour* (1798):—*Eight Discourses on the alleged Dissonances in the Gospels*, in reply to Evanson (q. v.) (Bampton Lecture, Oxf. 1811, 8vo):—*The Case of Eusebius of Casarea* (Lond. 1822, 8vo); and other critical and historical writings.

**Faldistorium** or **Fald-stool**, a stool folding like a camp-stool, formerly used in the enthronization of bishops, and in coronations, both for sitting and kneeling. In modern times the name is (improperly) given to a small stool at which, in some English churches, the Litany is read. In those churches in which it is used it is generally placed in the middle of the choir, near the steps of the communion-table. The name is probably from *fulden*, *plieare*, and *stoul*, *sedes*.—*Maskell, Monum. Rituala*, iii, 86; *Siegel, Alterthümer*, ii, 453.

**Falkner**, THOMAS, a missionary Jesuit, the son of an eminent surgeon at Manchester, England, was born at Manchester about 1710, and was bred to his father's profession. He visited Buenos Ayres, and falling ill there, was nursed by the Jesuits, and under the influence of their kindness was led to abandon the Presbyterian Church in which he had been brought up, to enter the Roman Church, and to join the order of Jesuits. He devoted himself to missionary labors, in which his medical skill was of great use. He spent forty years in this service in various parts of South America. After the suppression of the order he returned to England, where he died January 30, 1784. He wrote a *Description of Patagonia* (London, 1774, 4to):—*Botanical and other Observations in America* (4 vols. fol.).—Migne, *Dict. de Biog. Christ.* s. v.

**Fall of Man**, a phrase which "does not occur in Scripture, but is probably taken from the book of Wisdom, chap. x, 1. It is a convenient term to express the fact of the revolt of our first parents from God, and the consequent sin and misery in which they and their posterity were involved."

I. *Scriptural Account of the Fall*.—(1.) The Mosaic account is (Gen. ii, iii), that a garden having been planted by the Creator for the use of man, he was placed in it to dress it and to keep it: that in this garden two trees were specially distinguished, one as the tree of life, the other as the tree of knowledge of good and evil; that Adam was put under the following probation by his Maker (Gen. ii, 16, 17): "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the

knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die;" that the serpent, who was more subtil than any beast of the field, tempted the woman to eat, by insinuating that death would be the consequence, and by assuring her that her eyes and those of her husband should be opened, and that they should be "as gods, knowing good and evil;" that the woman took of the fruit, gave of it to her husband, who also ate; and that for this act of disobedience they were expelled from the garden, made subject to death, and laid under various maledictions.

(2.) Whether this account be a literal history or not, has been matter of great discussion, not merely between Christians and unbelievers, but also among Christian interpreters. One theory is that the passage is an allegory, signifying the origin of sin in the abuse of free-will, under which the appetites of man were allowed to obtain supremacy over his higher powers. Another (later) view makes the narration mythical. The general current of Christian interpretation has held the passage to be historical, and has interpreted it literally. Philo Judeus († c. 40), speaking of the account of Paradise, says: "These accounts seem to me to be symbolical; not mere fabulous inventions like those of the poets and sophists, but rather types shadowing forth allegorical truth according to some mystical explanation." So he makes the serpent the symbol of pleasure, etc. (*On the Creation of the World*, Bohn's translation, London, 1854, p. 46 sq.).

Among the early Church writers, Clement considers the narrative of the Fall partly as fact and partly as allegory (*Strom.* v, 11, p. 689, 90), and, following Philo, makes the serpent the image of voluptuousness. Origen regards the account as allegorical (*De princ.* iv, 16; *contra Cels.* iv, 40; comp. also Origen, *Fragm. in Gen.* ad loc.). Irenæus held the passage to be historical; so also Tertullian, *adv. Jullianos*, ii, 184; *De virg. vel.* 11; *adv. Marc.* ii, 2. "He insists upon the literal interpretation of the particulars of the narrative, as they succeeded each other in order of time (*De resurr. carn.* 61: Adam ante nomina animalibus enunciat, quam de arbore decerpit; ante etiam prophetavit, quam voravit). The Gnostics made it allegorical or mythical. On the Gnostic (Basiliidian) doctrine of the Fall (*σύγκρισις ἀρχαίων*), compare Clem. *Strom.* ii, 20, p. 488; Gieseler, *Stud. u. Kritiken* (1830), p. 336. The author of the Clementine Homilies goes so far in idealizing Adam, as to convert the historical person into a purely mythical being (like the Adam-Cadmon of the Cabalists), while he represents Eve as far inferior to him. Hence Adam could not trespass, but sin makes its first appearance in *Cain*; Baur, *Gnosis*, p. 339" (*Hagenbach, History of Doctrines*, § 61). Among the later fathers, and in the scholastic period, the account was generally held to be historical. Augustine (*De Civitate Dei*, xiii, 21) asserts the historical verity of the narration, but adds that true spiritual and typical meanings are contained in it; e. g. Paradise is the Church, the tree of knowledge is the type of free-will, etc.

The theologians of the Reformation followed the Scholastics in adhering to the literal interpretation, but differ in the exposition of several parts of the narrative; e. g. the serpent is held by some to be a natural serpent; by others, Satan in the guise of a serpent, etc. Calvin (*Commentary on Genesis* iii) speaks as follows: "It appears, perhaps, scarcely consonant with reason that the serpent only should be here brought forward, all mention of Satan being suppressed. I acknowledge, indeed, that from this place alone nothing more can be collected than that men were deceived by the serpent. But the testimonies of Scripture are sufficiently numerous in which it is plainly asserted that the serpent was only the mouth of the devil; for not the serpent, but the devil, is declared to be 'the father of lies,' the fabricator of imposture, and the author of death. The question, how-

ever, is not yet solved why Moses has kept back the name of Satan. I willingly subscribe to the opinion of those who maintain that the Holy Spirit then purposely used obscure figures, because it was fitting that full and clear light should be reserved for the kingdom of Christ. In the mean time the prophets prove that they were well acquainted with the meaning of Moses when, in different places, they cast the blame of our ruin upon the devil. We have elsewhere said that Moses, by a homely and uncultivated style, accommodates what he delivers to the capacity of the people, and for the best reason; for not only had he to instruct an untaught race of men, but the existing age of the Church was so puerile that it was unable to receive any higher instruction. There is, therefore, nothing absurd in the supposition that they whom, for the time, we know and confess to have been but as infants, were fed with milk. Or (if another comparison be more acceptable) Moses is by no means to be blamed if he, considering the office of schoolmaster as imposed upon him, insists on the rudiments suitable to children. They who have an aversion to this simplicity must of necessity condemn the whole economy of God in governing the Church." A similar view is given by Kurtz, *Bible and Astronomy* (Phila. 1861), p. 174 sq. The modern extreme Rationalists generally interpret the narrative as mythical. Eichhorn (*Urgeschichte*) finds truth in it in the form of poetry, that is, he makes it a myth; so Gabler, Paulus, and others. Kant, Schelling, and other recent German philosophers and interpreters make it a "speculative myth." Von Bohlen (*On Genesis* iii) follows Rosenmüller in supposing that the narrator had the Zendavesta in view. Julius Müller gives up the historical character of the narrative. "If now," he says, "we turn to the narrative in the book of Genesis, we shall find that not sin, but physical suffering and death, are there connected with Adam's fall. This fact, and the lesson that man's ruin originated in himself, are the great truths which are to be gathered from the story, which must be regarded as fundamentally true, although the story is in the form of a fable. That it is not to be taken literally is plain from Scripture, for the story in Genesis speaks of the serpent as the agent in the temptation of Eve. St. Paul speaks of the same temptation as coming from Satan. It is usual to assume that the serpent was the mere instrument of Satan, but there is nothing to lead us to this view in the words of the narrative. St. Paul, by interpolating this into the narrative, shows us that it is not to be taken as literally true. We find in John viii, 44, 'the devil was a murderer from the beginning,' an allusion to the ruin of man by the temptation. If this be so, it is a plain reference to Satan as the cause of man's bodily death. To bring in the idea of spiritual death seems less appropriate, for our Lord was rebuking the murderous intentions of the Jews. It was through conduct like that of the devil that they showed themselves his children" (*Doctrine of Sin*, Edinb. 1868, p. 78, 79).

The more recent German interpreters of the better class (e. g. Hävernick, Delitzsch, Keil, etc.) admit the historical character of the account, but there are, of course, various theories among them as to its interpretation. Martensen (*Christian Dogmatics*, § 79) interprets the Mosaic account as a combination of history and sacred symbolism, a figurative representation of an actual event. Lange (*On Genesis*, Amst. edit. p. 243), speaking of the narrative, says: "Like the Biblical histories everywhere, and especially the primitive traditions of Genesis, it is a historical fact, to be taken in a religious-ideal, that is, a symbolical form. It is just as little a mere allegory. It is just as little a bare, naked fact, as the speaking of the serpent is a literal speaking, or as the tree of life, in itself regarded, is a plant whose eating imparted imperishable life. That sin began with the beginning of the race, that the first sin had its origin in a forbidden en-

joyment of nature, and not in the Cainitic fratricide or similar crimes, that the origin of human sin points back to the beginning of the human race, that the woman was ever more seducible than the man, that along with sin came in the tendency to sin, consciousness of guilt, alienation from God, and evil in general—all these are affirmations of the religious historical consciousness which demand the historicalness of our tradition, and would point back to some such fact, even though it were not written in Genesis."

The interpretations of the *serpent* have been very variant. Eusebius (*Prap. Evang.* i, 10) says that Moses calls the evil spirit (*πονηρός δαίμων*) by the name of "serpent," as he is "full of poison and malice." Adam Clarke (*Commentary on Genesis*, ch. iii) interprets the word *nachash* (rendered "serpent") to mean "a creature of the ape or orang-outang kind." His notes on the whole passage afford a very curious specimen of exegesis. We cite Lange (*Genesis*, Amer. edit. p. 228) as follows: "True it is that the serpent appears as the probable author of this temptation, but such probability is weakened by what is said in i, 25 and ii, 20. 'The serpent was a good creation of God, though different, as originally created, from what it afterwards became' (Delitzsch). As a type, the serpent is just as well the figure of health and renovation as of death, since every year it changes its skin, and ejects, moreover, its venom. This double peculiarity and double character, as *ἀγαθοδαίμων* and *κακοδαίμων*, is indicated not only in language, but also in myths, in sculpture, and in modes of worship. In this relation, however, we must distinguish two diverging views of the ancient peoples. To the Egyptian reverence for the serpent stands in opposition the abhorrence for it among the Israelites [see SERPENT], Greeks, Persians, and Germans." "That Satan made use of the serpent, and that a serpent was somehow employed, is likely; the language of Jehovah subsequently, while it was literally true of the instrument, being in a higher sense true of the agent, the one being made the emblem of the other (Gen. iii, 14). Was the language here entirely symbolical and figurative, having nothing in it literal whatever? This does not seem likely. Why should such an allusion have been employed at all to describe the outcast and degraded condition of a fallen angel, had there been nothing whatever giving the serpent any connection with the temptation and the fall? Is it not more reasonable to consider both as blended, the literal and the symbolical? (Gen. iii, 4; 2 Cor. xi, 3; Rev. xii, 9; xx, 2; Gen. iii, 15; Col. ii, 15; Rom. xvi, 20; 1 John iii, 8; John viii, 44). Conjectures, too, have arisen out of the terms in which the serpent was addressed: 'Upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life.' 'The serpent, perhaps,' says Gill, 'formerly moved in a more erect posture, but was doomed to lick the dust.' 'Probably his original residence and food,' guesses another, 'were in the trees, but now he is degraded to the earth.' That sentence evidently, whatever might be its literal application to the serpent, was emblematically meant of Satan himself. 'Plainly figurative,' says Dwight, 'to express a state of peculiar degradation and suffering' (Wardlaw, *Systematic Theology*, p. 85-7). Watson defends the historical character of the narrative (*Institutes*, pt. ii, ch. xviii), as also does Holden, *Dissertation on the Fall* (Lond. 1823, 8vo). Conyers Middleton (*Essay on the Allegorical and Literal Interpretation of the Fall*, Works, 1775, ii, 437) maintains the allegorical view. Comp. Pve Smith, *First Lines of Theology*, bk. iv, ch. ii.

A writer in the *Journal of Sacred Literature* (i, 351 sq.) seeks to show that the common opinion that the serpent was the instrument of the tempter is untenable, on the ground that the Scripture does not state that the serpent was an instrument; and that the literal application of the words of the narrative to a serpent as the instrument of Satan appears to be incon-

sistent with the present relation of the serpent to other animals, and also with the testimony of geology as to fossil remains, etc. He maintains that under the name serpent Satan is meant, as there are "probable grounds for the conclusion that *the serpent* was, during the earliest ages, the name of the Evil One, reflecting the conception of him that then prevailed." Bishop Newton (*Dissert. on Creation and Fall*, 1st edit.) takes a similar view, viz. that Satan is spoken of in the passage under the "well-known" symbol or hieroglyphic of the serpent, which was a proper emblem, he holds, of the deceiver of mankind, as in popular estimation it was held to be the most cunning and insidious of animals. Sherlock (*Use and Intent of Prophecy*, diss. iii) refers to the "common usage of Eastern countries, which was, to clothe history in parables and similitudes;" and remarks that "it seems not improbable that for this reason the history of the fall was put into the dress in which we now find it. The serpent was remarkable for an insidious cunning, and therefore stood as a proper emblem of a deceiver; and yet, being one of the lowest of God's creatures, the emblem gave no suspicion of any power concerned that might pretend to rival the Creator." What was the particular nature of the sin of our first parents it is not an easy matter to determine. Bishop Newton remarks (l. c.) that "eating forbidden fruit is nothing more than a continuation of the same hieroglyphic characters wherein the history of the fall was recorded before the use of letters. It was plainly the violation of a divine prohibition; it was indulging an unlawful appetite; it was aspiring after forbidden knowledge, and pretending to be wise above their condition. So much may be safely asserted in general; we bewilder and lose ourselves in search of more particulars." In a later edition of this dissertation (*Works*, i, 91), bishop Newton modified the statement above given, and gave his adherence to the view that a real serpent was concerned in the fall (see Quarry, *On Genesis* ix). Martensen (*Christian Dogmatics*, § 103) passes by the question whether the "serpent was led by an evil spirit, or whether an evil spirit assumed the form of the serpent;" but he adds, "if we abide by the original narration, we may say that the serpent is the allegorical designation for the criminal principle which opposed itself to man in temptation." Dörtenbach (in Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* xv, 209, art. Sünde) maintains that the serpent was a real serpent, the tree a real tree, etc. Quarry gives a copious dissertation on Paradise and the Fall in his *Genesis and its Authorship* (London, 1866, 8vo). The aim of this writer is to withdraw the scriptural statements "altogether from the range of physical interpretation." He cites a remark of Hengstenberg's (*Christologie*, th. i, abt. i, p. 26, ed. 1829), to the effect that if the serpent be symbolical, the whole history is symbolical, as, in a connected passage like this, unity of interpretation must prevail; and it is not allowable to follow at one moment the symbolical, and at the next moment the literal interpretation. Admitting the truth of this, Quarry states that, nevertheless, the narrative may be, as a whole, not simply an apologue illustrating true principles, but a true history of great facts represented symbolically. He interprets the tree of life (Compare Rev. ii, 7; xxii, 2, 14), and the eating the fruit of the tree of knowledge, as mystical; the former denoting the promise of eternal life conditioned on man's obedience, the latter denoting the act of disobedience and its moral consequences, consciousness of guilt and shame. He maintains that the supposition of a real serpent is untenable, as there is no ground for the belief that Satan can possess at will any living creature, or work such a miracle as to make a serpent speak. "A natural serpent is literally spoken of, but this natural serpent is only the symbol of the real tempter; otherwise the innocent animal receives all the punishment, while the really guilty tempter escapes." The

real sin itself must have arisen at some point at which "natural appetite passed into that stage of its progress when, as St. James says, lust has conceived, and at which the sin thus conceived has quickened into mental transgression. This point, lost in the mystery which envelops every beginning of existence, mental or material, of thought, act, or substance, was the real fall, and is better represented by the mystical symbol of the participation of forbidden fruit than by a historical narrative that should only specify the overt act in words to be taken in their literal acceptation." After answering Hengstenberg's objections to the symbolical interpretation (especially the objections drawn from those passages of the N. T. in which the history of the fall is taken as actual history, 2 Cor. xi, 3; 1 Tim. ii, 13, 14; Rom. v, 12), he concludes with the general statement that "enough of the historical facts are patent to suffice for all the moral and religious uses of such a narrative, the creation and the fall being unquestionable verities;" but "nothing is told merely to gratify curiosity; the details that could only serve this end are withdrawn behind the veil of a mystical mode of representation" (p. 155). See also Knapp, *Christian Theology*, § 75.

*Heathen Traditions.*—There are many heathen traditions concerning the creation and the fall, some of which have marked points of resemblance to the Bible account. In some mythologies the serpent is an object of worship, while in others "mythology represents that reptile as trampled under the feet of a mighty deliverer. In a coin of Antoninus Pius Hercules is represented as plucking apples from a tree round the trunk of which a serpent is entwined." Among the Goths, the Persians, and the Hindoos, traditions of a serpent of various kinds are found. Stillingfleet ingeniously observes that from this origin has come the use of serpents to so great an extent in divination, Satan appearing 'ambitious to have the world think that the knowledge of good and evil was to come by the serpent still.' The Hebrew word for serpent signifies at the same time *to divine*, and the Greek word *ὄφιν εἶσθαι* has the same derivation from *ὄφιν*, a serpent; 'thus we see how careful the devil was to advance his honor in the world under that form wherein he had deceived mankind into so much folly and misery.' (Wardlaw, *Systematic Theology*, ii, 85 sq.). It has been the fashion to deny that the traditions of the various peoples, analogous to the Mosaic account, are at all confirmations of that account. But the harmony of these traditions has never been rationally explained apart from the theory that regards them as springing from common reminiscences of an actual occurrence. Auberlen remarks that "these oldest traditions of the human race confirm the historical credibility of the Mosaic narrative, down to its details, just as much as they do the inner purity and elevation of them, compared with the myths of heathenism. In regard to this latter view, it is especially seen how Israel alone, along with the fact, retains the deep, divine idea of it. The heathen, while they preserve with great fidelity the outward circumstances, clothe them in fantastic and national vesture. The difference is the same in kind as that between the canonical and apocryphal gospels." He cites also Herder, concerning the narration in Genesis, as follows: "Its sound has gone out into all the earth, and its very words into all lands! Whence is it that the remotest nations have their knowledge of it? How comes it that they built on it religions and mythologies; that it is, in fact, the simplest foundation of all their arts, institutions, and sciences? If from it things may be made plain and clear as sunlight that are as chaos and dark as night when it is denied, or when men prate of their hypotheses; if from this a whole antiquity may be reduced to order, and a line of light be drawn through the most confused events of the early history of nations—light which, like that in Correggio's pic-



ture, shines from the cradle of the race—what then have ye to say, ye manufacturers of myths, ye who would profane the revelation of God?" (Herder, *alt. Urkunde der Menschengeschlechts*; Werke, Carlsruhe, 1827, v, 187; vi, 4).

II. *Doctrinal Import of the Narrative.*—Whatever views are held as to the nature of the narrative in Gen. ii, iii, all who believe it to be a record of divine revelation find in it the following points of doctrine: 1. That God, after creating man, placed him in a state of probation; 2. that the test of his probation was obedience to the divine law; 3. that the temptation to disobedience came from an evil power outside of man; 4. that the temptation appealed both to the intellect and to the senses, leading first to unbelief in God, secondly to putting "self" in place of God, and thereby to the beginning of evil lust; 5. that in the exercise of free will man yielded and sinned; 6. that the consequences of the sin were knowledge of good and evil, separation from God, and death, the curse lighting upon man and upon nature also. Auberlen, referring to the three constituents of the first sin named above, viz. unbelief, self-love, and lust, remarks as follows: "That these three parts of the idea of sin are not accidental, but substantially express it and exhaust it, is shown not only in the fact that all sin that comes before us in life may be referred to them, but also in the fact that they correspond to the three fundamental elements of man's being and consciousness—spirit, soul, body—the God-consciousness, self-consciousness, and world-consciousness. These have all become corrupted and perverted. They have become, respectively, alienation from God, selfishness, love of the world. The first and highest element of human nature—the spiritual—is negated, obscured, made powerless; the two others—the lower—are pushed into extreme but unhealthy prominence and activity. Man has become physical and fleshly. Unbelief is the negative, the union of self-seeking and the lust of the senses is the positive element in the idea of sin. Man no longer wishes for God; he is bent on having the creature in both ways, the mental and natural, the subjective and objective; he will have his own Ego and the world too. According to Gen. iii, 5, 6, the selfishness is, as it were, the soul; sensuousness, the body of sin: the first is the deep, invisible root; the second, the external manifestation. The Ego, separated from God, seeks in the world the elements on which it lives. Genesis thus comprehends the various opposing theories of men on the nature of sin, the theory of selfishness, which in recent times is represented by Julius Müller, and that of the senses by Schleiermacher and Rothe. It leads both ethical theories back to a religious basis, and in that matter modern thought has a great deal to learn" (*Divine Revelation*, Edinb. 1867, p. 184).

The theological question of the connection between the sin of Adam and that of the whole human race will be treated under the articles *IMPUTATION*; *SIN*. For the specific loss of man by the fall, in the theological sense, involving the difference between the Roman Catholic anthropology and the Protestant, see *IMAGE OF GOD*; *JUSTIFICATION*; *SIN*. In this place we give the views of various writers as to the general doctrinal significance of the narrative.

Lange (*On Genesis*, Am. ed., p. 73 sq.) remarks that "the significance of Paradise is this, that it declares the original ideal state of the earth and the human race, the unity of the particular and the general, the unity of spirit and nature, the unity of spiritual innocence and the physical harmony of nature, the unity of the fall and the disturbance of nature; lastly, the unity of the facts and their symbolical meaning, which both the barely literal and mythical explanations of the record rend asunder. . . . The tree of knowledge of good and evil existed in some one form, but with it all nature is in some measure designated as a test.

But the serpent, as the organ of that temptation, is not only the type of temptation and of sin, but, as originally a worm, the type of its brutality, its degradation, and its subjection. The record of the actual fall stands there as an eternal judgment upon the theoretical, the human, view of moral evil, especially upon the errors of Dualism and Manicheism, Pelagianism and Pantheism. Hence arise the numerous and strong objections which the most diverse systems in old and modern times have raised against this record. The earthly origin of evil out of the abuse of freedom offends dualism, which derives it from an evil deity, from dark matter, or from the supremacy of sense. Although the serpent sustains the doctrine that, prior to the fall of man, sin had existed in a sphere on the other side, working through dæmoniac agency upon this (for the serpent was not created evil, Gen. i, 25; generally not even fitted for evil, and can only be regarded, therefore, as the organ of a far different evil power), yet the visible picture of the fall in this sphere is a certain sign that the fall in that sphere could only have risen through the abuse of the freedom of the creature. But if we observe the progress of sin from the first sin of Eve to the fratricide of Cain; if we view the opposition between Cain and Abel, and the intimation of the moral freedom of Cain himself, so the Augustinian view, raising original sin to absolute original death, receives its illumination and its just limits. But how every Pelagian view of life falls before this record, as it brings into prominence the causal connection between the sin of the spirit world and that of man, between the sin of the woman and the man, between the sin of our first parents, and their own sinfulness, and the sinfulness of their posterity! If we take into view the stages of the development of evil in the genesis of the first sin, how limited and vapid appears the modern view, which regards the senses as the prime starting-point of evil! But when Pantheism asserts the necessity of sin, or rather of the fall, as the necessary transition of men from the state of pure innocence to that of conscious freedom, the simple remark that the ingenuousness of Adam would have been carried directly on in the proper way if he had stood the test, just as Christ through his sinlessness has reached the knowledge of the true distinction between good and evil, and has actually shown that sin, notwithstanding its inweaving with human nature, does not belong to its very being, clearly refutes the assertion. But how clear is the explanation of evil, of punishment, and of judgment, as it meets us in this account! that the natural evil does not belong to the moral, but, notwithstanding its inward connection with it, is still the divine counteracting force against it; that punishment is to redeem and purify; that from the very acme of the judgment breaks forth the promise and salvation. These truths, which are far above every high anti-Christian view of the world, make it apparent that the first judgment of God, as a type of the world-redeeming judgment of God, has found its completion in the death of Christ upon the cross." "The deceptive promise of the serpent was fulfilled: man's eyes were opened (ch. iii, 7), but he saw only his misery and nakedness. He was now brought to know good and evil, but with the painful consciousness of having trifled with and lost the one, and of being sunk in the depths of woe by the other. He had become as a god; he had boldly cast off all allegiance to the one God, and assumed sovereignty over himself. He had constituted himself a God, no longer the representative of God; he had become his own master, free as God; but this likeness to God brought not with it the happiness which pertains to the divine Being, but was fraught with the deepest misery and woe" (Kurtz, *Bible and Astronomy*, p. 171). Müller, after affirming that "there is really nothing in the narrative of the fall obliging us to consider that event as the primary beginning of sin, in the strict sense of the word," adds

“that neither ‘the image of God,’ wherein man was created, nor God’s pronouncing everything ‘very good,’ prevents our believing that the fall was only the outward manifestation of a perversion of the will preceding the empirical life of man—the outgo of an evil already present *in potentia*, which might, indeed, by a persevering effort, have been crushed, but which forms the basis of an original moral depravity in human nature. The endeavor of the tempter was to bring out to view, and into action, this hidden evil” (*Doctrine of Sin*, Edinb. 1868, ii, 385). This view of Müller’s rests upon his theory of a sin of man in some pre-existent state, which he calls a “self-determination of the transcendental freedom before our individual existence.” Rothe, on the other hand (*Ethik*, ii, 180), places the essence of sin chiefly in the necessity of matter. “The passage through sin, in his opinion, is a metaphysical necessity. He conceives of our first parents not as mature at their creation, but destined to spiritual development; consequently their material part, in the absence of training, must gain the upper hand; and imperceptibly, and without blame, they found themselves, by their development, in sin. Hence evil lies in the divine world-plan, not merely as something permitted; it lies unavoidably in the creature, on account of his origin—in the fact of his *coming into existence* in contradistinction from God; but as creature-evil has been ordained in the plan of the world, so also has its destruction, as it may come to light. Rothe (p. 204) openly declares that the ‘effort to separate evil from all connection with the divine causality must ever remain an idle undertaking;’ although even he himself, in a measure startled at this result, imagines himself to hold the causation of human sin entirely apart from God. He says: ‘The divine production of evil is at the same time its absolute destruction. Within the sphere of redemption the necessity of sinning is not entirely removed, but is conceived of as constantly vanishing.’”

In opposition to Müller and Rothe, as well as to all who presuppose evil as fundamental and its development as necessary, Pastor Kinck wrote an able article, *Von dem Ursprung des Bösen*, in the *Theol. Studien u. Kritiken* for 1852 (p. 651 sq.; translated by Dr. Nadal in the *Methodist Quarterly*, October, 1853), from which we make the following extract. After stating that it matters not, for this discussion, whether the Scripture narrative be literal or figurative, he states its substantial import as follows: “God caused the tree of life and the tree of knowledge of good and evil to grow up in the midst of the garden, and commanded man, ‘Of the tree of knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat; for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.’ This tree of knowledge, as planted by God, is not yet evil, but contains in itself the *choice between good and evil*—the innate possibility of sinning, which possibility is bound up with the very conception of a free being, whose liberty is not the divine necessity, but lies outside of it. It is a tree of divine commands and prohibitions—objectively conceived, the object of knowledge; or, subjectively, the possibility of transgressing the command, the object of free choice. Alongside of this stands the tree of life; and both are united to prove that the mere possibility of evil, which is involved in the creation of man, is not yet anything evil or death-bringing. Only with the realization of the possibility does opposition to the tree of life arise, i. e. the true life is forfeited, and death, curse, and destruction appear in its place. The tree of life, which the *living* God had planted for man, and his expressed will not to eat of the tree of knowledge, presuppose the possibility of not transgressing, because God could neither require anything impossible of man, nor involve him inextricably in the meshes of a scheme which would certainly exclude him from the tree of life. The origin of evil from absolute good must forever remain inconceivable; not so with relative good.

If we hold fast to this difference, the objection of Rothe will not hold: ‘The religious-moral perfection of the first parents of our race would exclude all psychological possibility of the fall.’ But this possibility is explained by the *creation* of man, who, as it were, stands out of God; not holy and perfect like God, and yet not a mere creature like the beast: he is not under and in the law of necessity, but possesses the likeness of God and freedom. The perfection of a creature is not divine, not absolute. The want of such perfection in a creature casts no shadow upon the Creator. According to the doctrines of Emanation and Pantheism, which mix God and the world, the fall cannot be explained, but only according to the doctrines of God and of the creation. When, then, by the creation, God set free beings out of himself, then the possible departure from God was given, and the question, ‘Wherefore did not God hinder the evil that he foresaw?’ is entirely inadmissible. God does not prevent evil, because by so doing, contrary to his own will, he would injure and destroy the province of freedom (the divine image). Thus our Saviour did not hinder the murderous blows of his enemies, while at the same time he did not will or excuse them. In like manner, God was Lord over the parents of our race and over the serpent; but if he by his own will restrained his highest power, and left free play-room to free created beings, and still retains the government, he is not therefore destitute of power, but only consistent, and worthy to be adored. Man should rather complain of himself, but give thanks to God that he has endowed him with such prerogatives, and glorify him with soul and body, which are God’s. There was no necessity at all to sin; that complaint can only be established on the ground that, as Rothe teaches, evil *inevitably* developed itself. Besides, from the beginning of the world God had provided for the human race, whose fall he foresaw, the most perfect means of grace and gifts, in order to make that injury abundantly good, and to lead back the fallen ones to himself and his kingdom. Indeed, as all evil, so also must the sin of our first parents redound to the praise of the merciful God, because by it was conditioned the mission of the second Adam as the Redeemer of the world. But the *possibility* of the fall without blame to the Creator being admitted, another question arises: Through what incitement did it become a *reality*? Even to this question the Scriptures give a satisfactory answer: it took place through outward prompting—through evil spiritual influence, which was already existing in creation. Upon the basis of a created but still spiritual existence, the possibility of being moved and poisoned by an influence at enmity with God must be admitted. The inexperience of our first parents, who were not isolated in the new world, corresponded exactly with the subtlety of Satan in the form of a serpent. The kingdom of Satan, as a spiritual power, and the peccability of the first pair, whose pure self-determination was ensnared and obscured through that power, furnish a satisfactory explanation of the fall. The fall itself was certainly a free self-determination, otherwise no blame could attach to it; but not altogether so: both the decision and the guilt were shared by the devil, as the murderer from the beginning: it was a co-operation of human freedom with the temptation of the evil principle itself. But, according to the Scripture account, the temptation of our first parents was gradual, and the motives to the fall are thus psychologically clear. First of all, the serpent raised a doubt concerning the divine prohibition and the ruinous consequences of sin: ‘Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?’ ‘Ye shall not surely die.’ Then he awakened pride, inducing man to overleap his appointed condition to become like God, and to use his freedom arbitrarily, and according to his own pleasure: ‘God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof then your eyes shall be opened, and

ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.' After this preparation came the thought that the tree was good for food, pleasant to look upon, and to be desired to make one wise. The sensual desire would now naturally start up, and the woman seduced became the seducer. The powers of the soul were corrupted before the actual sin took place; the faculty of knowledge by doubt and unbelief toward God, the faculty of desire through unbounded striving and proud excess, as the Grecian fable of Prometheus represents it; and, finally, the faculty of feeling, through sensual longing, which propensity the religion of the Greeks sets forth by Epimetheus and Pandora. Thus did the possibility of the fall, which rests upon the freedom of the creature, pass over into reality under evil outward influences. The conversation between Eve and the serpent shows how accessible she was; the woman, as the weaker part, is first approached and misled, and not till then the man, and even then only through her; as also the apostle Paul expresses it (1 Tim. ii, 14), the woman was first in the transgression. Rothe, indeed (p. 221), thinks that the assumption of a satanical temptation does not at all help the difficulty, because that assumption always presupposes a real susceptibility of being tempted, a sinful predisposition, a minimum of sin. But the possibility of being tempted to sin is not yet sin; with Rothe that predisposition is rather something already existing. It is certainly much more worthy of God to conceive of his creatures as pure and good—they first determining themselves to evil, and the enemy active therein. If even the Son of God could be tempted without injury to his sinlessness, much more the first Adam, whose personality and divine resemblance were specifically lower. If, in fine, we compare the scriptural theory, thus understood, with the modern philosophical explanations of the fall, the result will be that the former will be found to contain incomparably more truth and wisdom than the latter; although Rothe (p. 221) is of the opinion that the Biblical account of the fall can no longer be maintained, and that the fall cannot be explained from the Mosaic stand-point. Only the Bible (and perhaps, agreeing with it, the mythology of antiquity) tells us of a man created in the image of God, in a paradisaical state of innocence; and, in accordance with this fact, shows how this state was interrupted and perverted into one of guilt. Dr. Julius Müller, on the contrary, although Paradise has still a place in his system, places Adam in it as already a sinner. In the same way Rothe presupposes what he ought to show, since he assumes evil as original and necessary in the development of the world. We cannot see, either according to Müller or Rothe, whence it could properly come into the natural world. Rothe, with his presupposition, is obliged to assume one of two things: either he must dualistically establish an evil principle in matter, and deny the pure creation of God, or he must ascribe the origin of sin, not to the perverted will, but to God himself: in both cases he has a Manichean life-view of sentient beings. Sin with him is not a free act of man, proceeding out of the heart and will; it springs from the overmatching power of material nature subduing his personality with inevitable necessity (p. 226). 'The origin of evil from pure good must forever remain inconceivable' (p. 222); thus he establishes an impure material creation. Is anything explained by this means? Whence comes, then, impurity into the material creation before all acts of the will? Is not the question more easily explained by the abuse of freedom than by metaphysics; more easily through the devil and man than by the act of the Creator? The fall, according to the doctrine of the Church, says Rothe (p. 220), was a blunder in the work of the earthly creation, as it were, at the beginning. In order to avoid this, either an evil principle must have been co-operative in the creation, or else God himself must have ruined his own work at its

commencement. Shall we call this escaping the blunder made at the beginning? Is it not rather increasing it, and carrying it over into the region of the perfect and the holy? The latter of these two opinions, strictly taken, is that of Rothe, since he assumes matter as created by God, and from matter deduces sin. But the positions, Matter was created by God, and Matter is the opposite of God, and hence the origin of sin, contradict each other."

*Literature.*—Besides the books already cited in this article, see Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*; Neander, *History of Dogmas*; Shedd, *History of Christian Doctrine* (all under *Anthropology*); Hase, *Evang.-Protest. Dogmatik*, Lips. 1860, § 71-73; Fletcher, *Appeal to Matter of Fact and Common Sense*; Döderlein, *Inst. Theol. Christ.* § 178; Fairbairn, *Typology of Scripture*, i, 240 sq.; Riebers, *Schöpfungsgeschichte* (Leips. 1854, 8vo); Middleton, *Essay on the Creation and Fall of Man, Works* (1755, 5 vols.), iii, 437 sq.; Zeller, *Die älteste Theodicee* (Jena, 1803, 8vo); Coleridge, *Aids to Reflection*, Intr. 66; Cunningham, *Historical Theology*, vol. i, ch. xix; Delitzsch, *Biblical Psychology* (Edinb. 1867), p. 147 sq.; Monsell, *The Religion of Redemption* (Lond. 1867), p. 20 sq.; *Meth. Quar. Review*, Oct. 1867, art. vii. On the effects of the fall on nature, see NATURE.

**Fallow-deer** (צִיָּבָה, *yachmar'*; Sept. βούβαλος [but ζορκός in 1 Kings], Vulg. *bubalus*), mentioned among the beasts that may be eaten in Deut. xiv, 5, and among the provisions for Solomon's table in 1 Kings iv, 23 [Heb. v, 3]. There are three animals of the *Cervidae* family with which different writers have identified it. See ZOOLOGY.

1. Most commentators (following Bochart, *Hieroz.* i, 910; ii, 260) regard it as properly translated in our version, deriving the word from צִיָּבָה, *chamar'*, in the sense of *being red*, and thus referring it to a species of deer of a reddish color; probably the *Cervus dama* of Linnaeus, originally a native of Barbary, where it is still found wild. It is stated to be found very generally dispersed over Western and Southern Asia, and is said to have been introduced into England from Norway (see *Penny Cyclopædia*, s. v. Deer). It is smaller than the stag (*Cervus elaphus*), having horns or branches serrated on the inside, which it sheds annually. The color in winter is a darkish brown, but in summer bay, spotted with white. The fallow-deer




Common Fallow-deer.

(*Cervus dama*) is deemed by most authorities to be undoubtedly a native of Asia; indeed, Persia seems to be its proper country. Hasselquist (*Trav.* p. 211) noticed this deer in Mount Tabor. Oedmann (*Vern.*

*Samml.* i, 178) likewise believes that the *yachmür* is best denoted by the *Cervus dama*. The female is called in the Talmud נִיבִיזָה, and is identified by Lewysohn with the German *Damhirsch*. It is, however, difficult to suppose that Jerusalem could have received any appreciable amount of flesh-meat from such a source, remote as it is from a forest country. See DEER.

2. Kitto (*Pict. Bibl. Deut. l. c.*) says, "The *yachmür* of the Hebrews is without doubt erroneously identified with the fallow-deer, which does not exist in Asia," and refers the name to the *Oryx leucoryx*, citing Niebuhr as authority for stating that this animal is known among the Eastern Arabs by the name of *yachmür*. This is the opinion which we have adopted, from Hamilton Smith, who is the best modern authority on such questions. See ANTELOPE.

3. Still others, on the authority of the Septuagint rendering in Deuteronomy, regard the term as denoting "the *Antelope bubalus* (Pallas); the *βούβαλος* of the Greeks (see Herod. iv, 192; Aristotle, *Hist. Anim.* iii, 6, ed. Schneider, and *De Part. Anim.* iii, 2, 11, edit. Bekker; Oppian, *Cyn.* ii, 300). From the different descriptions of the *yachmür* as given by Arabian writers, and cited by Bochart (*Hieroz.* ii, 281 sq.), it would also seem that this is the animal designated; though Damir's remarks in some respects are fabulous, and he represents the *yachmür* as having deciduous horns, which will not apply to any antelope. Still Cazuis, according to Rosenmüller, identifies the *yachmür*



*Antelope Bubalus.*

with the *bekker el-wash* ('wild cow'), which is the modern name in North Africa for the *Antelope bubalus* (see Shaw's *Travels*, p. 242, and Suppl. p. 75, fol.; Buffon, *Hist. Natur.* xii, 294). The term *bubalus* evidently points to some animal having the general appearance of an ox. Pliny (*N. H.* viii, 15) tells us that the common people, in their ignorance, sometimes gave this name to the *Bison* (*Auroch*) and the *Urus*. He adds, the animal properly so called is produced in Africa, and bears a resemblance to the calf and the stag; a middle position between the cervine and bovine ruminants that corresponds to the external appearance of the animal in question. The *bekker el-wash* appears to be depicted in the Egyptian monuments [see CHIASE], where it is represented as being hunted for the sake of its flesh, which Shaw tells us (Suppl. p. 75) is very sweet and nourishing, much preferable to that of the red deer (see Wilkinson's *Anc. Egypt.* i, 223, figs. 3, 4, and p. 225, fig. 19). This animal, which is about the size of a stag, is common in North Africa, and lives in herds" (Smith, s. v.). See WILD OX.

Fallow ground (נִיבִיזָה), broken up with the

plough), a field (especially of sward) just ploughed (figuratively, Jer. iv, 3; Hos. x, 12; literally, "tilage" Prov. xiii, 23). See AGRICULTURE.

**Fallow year.** Among the Hebrews every seventh year was a sabbath of rest to the land. The commencement of this year was on the first day of the seventh month, *Tisri*=October. There was neither sowing nor reaping; the vines and the olives were not pruned; there was no gathering of fruits; for all spontaneous productions were left to the poor, the traveller, and the wild beast (Lev. xxv, 1-7; Deut. xv, 1-10). The sabbatical year was instituted in order that the land might be improved, and that the Hebrews might be taught economy and foresight, and also invited to exercise a large degree of trust in the providence of Jehovah their king. During this year they could fish, hunt, take care of their bees and flocks, repair their buildings, manufacture furniture and cloths, and carry on commerce. Delts, on account of there being no income from the soil, were not collected (Deut. xv, 9; xxxi, 10-13). Nor were servants manumitted on this year, but at the end of the sixth year of their service (Exod. xxi, 2; Deut. xv, 12; Jer. xxxiv, 14). The Hebrews remained longer in the tabernacle or temple this year, during which the whole Mosaic law was read, in order to be instructed in religious and moral duties, the history of their nation, and the wonderful works and blessings of God (Deut. xxxi, 10-13). When Jehovah gave the Hebrews this remarkable institute, in order to guard them against the apprehension of famine, he promised, on the condition of their obedience, so great plenty in every sixth harvest that it alone would suffice for three years (Lev. xxv, 20-22). However, through the avarice of the Hebrews, this seventh year's rest, as Moses had apprehended (Lev. xxvi, 34, 35), was for a long time utterly neglected (2 Chron. xxxvi, 21); for in all the history of the Hebrew kings there is no mention of the sabbatical year, nor of the year of jubilee. The period when this wise and advantageous law fell into disuse may probably be understood from the prediction of Moses in Lev. xxvi, 33, 34, 43; comp. with 2 Chron. xxxvi, 21; Jer. xxv, 11. Thus was it foretold that the Hebrews, for the violation of this law, should go into captivity: "To fulfil the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah, until the land had paid off her sabbaths: for as long as she lay desolate she kept sabbath, to fulfil threescore and ten years." Here it is taken for granted that seventy sabbatical years, including the jubilee years which succeeded every seventh sabbatical year, had been neglected by the unfaithful people. The Hebrews were frequently weary of the law; and at different periods during the commonwealth they appear to have utterly neglected the fallow or sabbatical years. Hence it appears that the captivity of the Hebrews and the desolation of their country was an act of retributive Providence, brought upon them for this very reason, that the land might pay off those sabbatical years of rest, of which the Hebrews had deprived it, in neglecting the statute of Jehovah their king (Lev. xxvi, 43). After the exile the fallow or sabbatical year appears to have been more scrupulously observed, as we learn from Josephus (*Ant.* xi, 11, 8). See JUBILEE.

**False Prophet** (ψευδοπροφήτης, a *pseudo-prophet*), i. e. one falsely professing to come as a prophet or ambassador from God, a false teacher (Matt. vii, 15; xxiv, 11, 24, etc.; comp. *Test. xii Patr.* p. 614; Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 13, 1; x, 7, 3; *War.* vi, 5, 2). See PROPHECY. In Rev. xvi, 13, the term is distinctively used, "the false prophet," with reference to the mythological system of paganism, the second "beast" (q. v.), supporting the first or secular power of Rome; allegorically interpreted of the impostor Mohammed (Matthews, *De pseudoprophetismo Hebræorum*, L. B. 1859, 8vo).

**Fama clamōsa** (*general bad report*), in the Scot-

tish ecclesiastical law, is a ground of action before a presbytery or synod against a minister or member of the Church, founded on common report, and not a charge by accusation. If the rumor, or *fama clamosa*, be general and hurtful, the court can investigate it without any accuser, for the vindication of the character of the Church and of the court, and with a view to the preservation of good morals in the community. See Hill, *Church Practice*, p. 49.

#### Familia Charitātis. See FAMILISTS.

**Familiars of the Inquisition**, officers of that tribunal whose function it is to apprehend accused or suspected persons and convey them to prison. They belong to the family of the inquisitor, and are therefore called *familiars*. The office was formerly held in high honor, and men of noble family often held it, especially in Spain. Innocent III granted large indulgences to familiars. The same plenary indulgence is granted by the pope to each exercise of this office as was granted by the Lateran Council to those who secured the Holy Land. "When several persons are to be taken up at the same time, these familiars are commanded to order matters that they may know nothing of one another's being apprehended; and it is related that a father and his three sons and three daughters, who lived together in the same house, were carried prisoners to the Inquisition without knowing anything of one another's being there till seven years afterwards," when those that were alive were released by an *Auto da Fé*. See INQUISITION.

**Familiar Spirit** (כִּזְז, *ob*, a leathern bottle or water-skin, Job xxxii, 19; hence, the conjurer, being regarded as the vessel containing the inspiring demon), a  *necromancer*, or sorcerer who professes to call up the dead by means of incantations, to answer questions (Deut. xviii, 11; 2 Kings xxi, 6; 2 Chron. xxxiii, 6; Lev. xix, 31; xx, 6; 1 Sam. xxviii, 3, 9; Isa. viii, 19; xix, 3). Put also specially for the *python* (Acts xvi, 16) or divining-spirit, by the aid of which such jugglers were supposed to conjure (Lev. xx, 27; 1 Sam. xxviii, 7, 8), and for the *shade* or departed spirit thus evoked (Isa. xxix, 4). See DIVINATION. The term is rendered by the Septuagint ἐγγαστριμβος, "a ventriloquist," but is rather a wizard who asked counsel of his familiar, and gave the responses received from him to others—the name being applied in reference to the spirit or demon that animated the person, and inflated the belly so that it protuberated like the side of a bottle. Or it was applied to the magician, because he was supposed to be inflated by the spirit (δαίμων-ολιπτός), like the ancient Εὐρυκλείς (ἐν ἀλλοτρίᾳ γαστρὶ ἐνέει, Ar. *Vesp.* 1017, *malum spiritum per ventrem nature excipiebat; Schol.* in Ar. *Plut.*). The *ob* of the Hebrews was thus precisely the same as the *python* of the Greeks (Plutarch, *De def. Or.* 414; Cicero, *De div.* i, 19), and was used not only to designate the performer, but the spirit itself, πνεῦμα Πύθωνος, which possessed him (see Levit. xx, 27; 1 Sam. xxviii, 8; also Acts xvi, 16). A more specific denomination of this last term was the *necromancer* (literally *seeker of the dead*, כִּזְזֵי מֵתִים, Deut. xviii, 10; comp. לִזְזֵי מֵתִים, חֲכָמֵי מֵתִים, one who, by frequenting tombs, by inspecting corpses, or, more frequently, by help of the *ob*, like the witch of Endor, pretended to evoke the dead, and bring secrets from the invisible world (Gen. xli, 8; Exod. vii, 11; Lev. xix, 26; Deut. xviii, 10-12). Compare the כִּזְזֵי, *whisperers* ("charmers"), of Isa. xix, 3. But Shuckford, who denies that the Jews in early ages believed in spirits, makes it mean "consulters of dead idols" (*Connect.* ii, 395). These ventriloquists "peeped and muttered" (compare *τροιζειν*, Homer, *Il.* xxiii, 101; "sneak and gibber," Shaksp. *Jul. Cesar*) from the earth to imitate the voice of the revealing "familiar" (Isa. xxix, 4, etc.; 1 Sam. xxviii, 8; Lev. xx, 27; compare *σπρονόματις*, Soph. *Frag.*). Of this

class was the witch of Endor (Josephus, *Ant.* vi, 14, 2), in whose case *intended* imposture may have been overruled into genuine necromancy (Eccles. xlv, 20). On this wide subject, see Chrysostom ad 1 Cor. xii; Tertullian, *adv. Marc.* iv, 25; *De Anima*, p. 57; Augustine, *De doctr. Christ.* § 33; Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* i, 16, and the commentators on *Æn.* vi; *Critici Sacri*, vi, 331; Le Moyne, *Var. Sacr.* p. 993 sq.; Selden, *De Diis Syr.* i, 2; and, above all, Böttcher, *De Inferis*, p. 101-121, where the research displayed is marvellous. Those who sought inspiration, either from the demons or the spirits of the dead, haunted tombs and caverns (Isa. lxx, 4), and invited the unclean communications by voluntary fasts (Maimon. *De Idol.* ix, 15; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* ad Matt. x, 1). That the supposed *ψυχομαρτία* was often effected by ventriloquism and illusion is certain; for a specimen of this even in modern times, see the *Life of Benvenuto Cellini*. Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See NECROMANCER.

Closely connected with this form of divination are the two following: (1.) כִּזְזֵי, *che'ber*, a *spell* or enchantment, by means of a cabalistic arrangement of certain words and implements (Deut. xviii, 11; Isa. xlvii, 9, 12), spoken also of serpent-charming (Psa. lviii, 6). See CHARMING; ENCHANTMENT. (2.) Sorcery (either *wizard*, כִּזְזֵי, *knowing* one, Lev. xix, 31; xx, 6; Deut. xviii, 11; 1 Sam. xxviii, 3, 9; spoken also of the imp or spirit of divination by which they were supposed to be attended, Lev. xx, 27; or some form of כִּזְזֵי, *kashaph'*, to act the *witch*, literally by magic incantations, 2 Chron. xxiii, 6; Exod. vii, 11; Deut. xviii, 10; Dan. ii, 2, etc.), which signifies practising divination by means of the black art, with an implied collusion with evil spirits; applied usually to pretending to reveal secrets, to discover things lost, find hidden treasure, and interpret dreams. See WIZARD.

**Familists, Familia Charitātis, Family of Love**, a sect founded in the 16th century by Henry Nicholas, a native of Münster, in Westphalia, who, after residing for some time in Holland, went to England in the latter part of the reign of Edward VI, and there established (1552) his *familia charitatis*, or *Huis des Liefde* (Strype's *Cranmer*, ii, 410). His doctrines have often been confounded with those of David Joris [see JORIS], which they resemble in many respects, and generally with those of the Anabaptists. His followers, however, published a *Confession of Faith* in 1575 (given in Strype, *Annals*, ii, 577), and soon after an *Apology*, in which they attempt to prove the identity of their doctrines with those of the evangelical Confessions. The characteristic feature of this sect was a tendency to mystic contemplation, and the belief that, through love, man could become absolutely absorbed in and identified with God, in a subjective sense. Nicholas represented himself as the apostle of this "service of Love," and it is said went so far as to claim superiority over Christ, on the ground that Moses only preached hope, Christ faith, but he preached love. The sect was accused of denying the divinity of Christ, and of even rejecting the divinity of God himself, in its higher attributes, by maintaining that man would, in this life, become identified with God. They, on the contrary, maintained in their *Apology* their belief in the three general Christian creeds, and particularly in the satisfaction rendered by Christ, while they merely claimed to emulate the state of life exhibited by him. As they looked upon themselves as perfect, they could not acknowledge the need of forgiveness, and stated in their *Apology* that they tried with all the heart to believe and keep the commandments, leaving the rest to God, as the power of so doing could only come from him. They distinguished themselves from the Anabaptists by their recognition of infant baptism, and by their indifference as to the external part of the established worship, which the Anabaptists assailed with es-

pecial violence. Nicholas, who at first kept proselyting quietly, came out more boldly during the reign of Elizabeth, and announced himself as a prophet appointed by the Lord, and anointed by the Holy Spirit. He is said to have been an uneducated man, yet appears to have succeeded in gaining the ear of several theologians and persons of high rank. In 1580 Elizabeth issued a proclamation against the sect, and directed an inquiry to be made into their practices. They seem to have attracted considerable attention at that period, and accusations of all kinds were brought forward against them. Their books were ordered to be burnt in October, 1580. In 1604 they presented a petition to James I, to clear themselves from the imputations laid against them. From this time their numbers diminished, but they were not extinct even as late as 1645. King James I, in his *Barlaamov* *ōpōp*, calls them *infamem anabaptistarum sectam, que familia amoris vocatur*. A person named Etherington was made to recant as a Familist in 1627; but he does not appear to have held precisely the same doctrine as the older Familists. See a curious book by J. R. (John Rogers), entitled *The Displaying of an horrible Sect naming themselves the Family of Love* (Lond. 1579); and Knewstub, *Confutation of monstrous and horrible Heresies taught by H. N.* etc. (Lond. 1579); Mosheim, *Church History*, c. xvi, § iii, pt. ii, § 25; Collier, *Eccles. Hist. of England*, vi, 609; vii, 311; Hardwick, *Reformation*, chap. v.

**Family.** The idea of the family (*oikos*), in Greece, was that of the nucleus of society, or of the state. "Aristotle speaks of it as the foundation of the state, and quotes Hesiod to the effect that the original family consisted of the wife and the laboring ox, which held, as he says, to the poor the position of the slave (*Polit.* i, 1). The complete Greek family, then, consisted of the man, and his wife, and his slave; the two latter, Aristotle says, never having been confounded in the same class by the Greeks, as by the barbarians (*ib.*). In this form, the family was recognised as the model of the monarchy, the earliest, as well as the simplest, form of government. When, by the birth and growth of children, and the death of the father, the original family is broken up into several, the heads of which stand to each other in a co-ordinate rather than a strictly subordinate position, we have in these the prototypes of the more advanced forms of government. Each brother, by becoming the head of a separate family, becomes a member of an aristocracy, or the embodiment of a portion of the sovereign power, as it exists in the separate elements of which a constitutional or a democratic government is composed. But at Rome the idea of the family was still more closely entwined with that of life in the state, and the natural power of the father was taken as the basis not only of the whole political, but of the whole social organization of the people. Among the Romans, as with the Greeks, the family included the slave as well as the wife, and ultimately the children, a fact which, indeed, is indicated by the etymology of the word, which belongs to the same root as *famulus*, a slave. In its widest sense, the *familia* included even the inanimate possessions of the citizen, who, as the head of a house, was his own master (*sui juris*); and Gaius (ii, 102) uses it as synonymous with *patrimonium*. In general, however, it was confined to persons—the wife, children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren, if such there were, and slaves of a full-blown Roman citizen. Sometimes, too, it signified all those who had sprung from a common stock, and would have been members of the family, and under the potestas of a common ancestor, had he been alive. In this sense, of course, the slaves belonging to the different members of the family were not included in it. It was a family, in short, in the sense in which we speak of 'the royal family,' etc., with this difference, that it was possible for an individual to quit it, and to pass into another by adoption. Sometimes, again, the word

was used with reference to slaves exclusively, and, analogically, to a sect of philosophers, or a body of gladiators." See Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*.

The *Christian* family, on the contrary, is a communion resting on an ethico-religious foundation, and forming the closest of all human relationships. It is a copy of the highest and most perfect union, that of the Church with Christ its head. Christianity, considered as the true (ideal) family, wherein Christ's power begets, through the Word and the Spirit, children of faith unto God, who mutually aid each other with their several spiritual gifts, is imaged in the natural family; imperfectly, indeed, since the life of the Christian family is yet a life in the flesh (Gal. ii, 20); yet truly, because its bond of union is spiritual, being the spirit of Christ. The basis of the Christian family is Christian marriage, or monogamy, the exclusive union of one man to one woman. The deepest ground of this union, and its true aim, without which *Christian* marriage and family are impossible, is the consciousness of unity in Christ, or in the love of God in Christ, the source of individual sympathy, as well as of brotherly and universal love. Marriage has, in common with Christian *friendship*, the bond of tender sentiments; but the former is an *exclusive* bond between two persons of different sexes, whose personality is *complemented*, so to speak, by each other. It is therefore a lifelong relation, while friendship may be only temporary. See MARRIAGE.

Two persons thus joined in marriage lay the foundation of a Christian family; indeed, they constitute a family, though yet incomplete and undeveloped. It awaits its completion in the birth of children. In proportion, however, as the married couple live in a state of holiness, so are the natural desires for issue and their gratification made subservient to the divinely ordered end of the marriage, and accompanied by a sense of dependence on the will and blessing of God. And in order duly to attain this higher end of the family, it is necessary that, keeping the merely carnal passions subordinate, both husband and wife should endeavor to subserve each other's moral and spiritual completeness; and also that they should, when children are born, faithfully help each other in training them properly, by the combination of their particular dispositions, the father's sternness being tempered with the mother's gentleness, and the mother's tenderness energized by the father's authority. The children should see the unity between the father and the mother, in their unity of aim, though manifested according to their different dispositions. Early baptism should be followed by careful religious training. In this the mother has a certain priority, inasmuch as, aside from giving her children birth, she is also first in giving them the bodily and spiritual care they require. Yet even in this early period she derives assistance from the husband, who, as the head of the family, counsels, strengthens, and assists her. In after years their relative shares in the education of the children become more equalized, the sons coming, however, more under the influence of the father, while the daughters remain more under the mother's. Those who wish theirs to be a real Christian family must from the first inculcate on their children (aside from the habit of absolute, unquestioning obedience to the parental authority as divinely instituted) the true ground of obedience, as laid in obedience to God, springing from love to God. "The order in which the love of the child graduates is from the stage of instinctive love to natural affection, and from this to the love of its heavenly Parent. Desirous as the parents may be to lead its affections up at once to the Creator, the previous stages of the path must first be passed through. For a while the maternal care is the only Providence it knows; and the father's experience is to it a world of grand enterprise, and of power unlimited. In vain it strives to

climb the height of his knowledge—his virtual omniscience; nor can it conceive of a diviner guarantee than his promise. To see its parents bend in worship, and to hear them speak with holy awe of their Father in heaven, is itself solemn and suggestive as a ladder set up from earth to heaven. The wise discipline, too, which leads the parent kindly to repress its selfish desires, and constantly to aim at its moral welfare, invariably begets in return the highest order of filial love and confidence; evincing the power of the child to discriminate between instinctive and moral affection, and preparing it to embrace that heavenly Parent of whom the earthly is but an imperfect representation. And let the parents remark that, from the moment they begin to point their child to God as an object of reverence and love, they are pursuing the certain course for augmenting its moral affection for themselves; while its intelligent love for them is a valuable means and a pledge for its ascending to the love of God" (Harris, *Patriarchy, or the Family*, p. 352). This divine liberty, based on fear and love, far from diminishing the respectful love of the children for their parents, will exalt and purify it, and bring it to its highest degree of perfection; it will make it become part of their religion, and whenever a collision may occur between the parental wishes and the will of God, it will lead the children, while obeying the latter, to cherish all possible reverence and respect for the former. By this personal development of their spiritual life the sons and daughters will become *friends* to their parents; a higher kind of trust, such as is felt in one's equals, is thus reached, without diminishing the respect which is the duty of the child and the right of the parents. This is the true graduation of the Christian family life, in which the elder children become helps to the parents for the education of the younger, while at the same time they become more thoroughly fitted to fulfil their own duties as heads of families in after life. Where the blessing of children has been denied, it can in some measure, though not completely, find a substitute in the adoption of orphans or other children, and then the duties towards these are the same as towards one's own.

The Christian family includes also what heathen Rome called the family in a subordinate sense—the *servants*. Their position, wherever the principles of Christian humanity prevail, is not one of slavery, but is a free moral relation, entered into by the consent of both parties, and giving each peculiar rights and duties. The Christian, penetrated with the spirit of his Master, will not lose sight of the fact that this spirit inclined Him much more to serve others than to have them serve Him, and he will not be satisfied by rewarding his servants with wages only, but with all the spiritual blessings of which the family is the proper sphere. They should take part in the family worship, and even an active part, as in reading, singing, praying. The more they come to take part in the life of the family, in its interests, its joys, its griefs, and receive from it the sympathy and help they require, either for the body or the mind, the more does the general family lead a really Christian life.

The entire life of the Christian family is a continuous act of worship in the more extended sense of the word, and must gradually become more and more so, since all its actions are done in the name of Christ and for the glory of God. This thoroughly Christian conduct is, however, sustained and strengthened by the *family worship* in the proper sense, in which the family, as such, seeks for strength in the Word and in the Spirit of God. The more perfectly this family worship is organized, the more will it resemble public worship, consisting, like it, in the reading and expounding of Scripture, singing, and prayer. The leader in the religious exercises of the family should be the father, as priestly head of the house. This, however, is not to exclude the co-operation of the

mother, children, and other members of the family; their participation, on the contrary, adds much to the interest of the service, and makes it an admirable supplement to public worship, as in the family the feeling of trust in each other and of self-dependence add much to liberty in prayer. This constitutes the true hearth of the family, the centre around which all meet again, from whence they derive light and warmth, and whose genial influences will be felt through life. From the bosom of such a family the spirit of Christianity goes out with its healthful influence into the Church, the school, the state, and even the whole world.

See generally the writers on moral philosophy and Christian ethics, and especially Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie* iv, 318; Rothe, *Theolog. Ethik*, iii, 605; Schaff, *Apostolical Age*, § 111; Harris, *Patriarchy, or the Family* (Lond. 1855, 8vo); Anderson, *Genius and Design of the Domestic Constitution* (Edinb. 1826, 8vo); Thiersch, *Ueber christliches Familienleben* (4th ed. Frankf. 1859; translated into several languages).

**Family, Holy.** One of the most favorite themes of Christian art, from its earliest period in the Catacombs, has been the presentation of scenes from the infancy and childhood of the Saviour. The name "holy family" is given especially to those paintings and sculptures in which the parents, Joseph and Mary, are worshipping the infant Saviour, or are holding him up for the adoration of spectators. In a wider sense, it is also applied to the birth of the Saviour, the adoration of the magi, of the shepherds, and of the mythical three kings, to the flight into Egypt, the finding of Christ in the Temple disputing with the doctors, and all other scenes from the childhood of Christ that are drawn from the gospels. Accessory figures of angels, saints, and of persons contemporary with Christ or with the artist, and sometimes of the artist or the donor of the painting to the church, are often added. (G. F. C.)

**Family of Love.** See FAMILISTS.

**Family prayer.** See FAMILY; PRAYER; WORSHIP.

**Famine** (properly *רָעָב*, *raab'*, *λιμός*, *hunger*, whether of individuals or of nations). "In the whole of Syria and Arabia, the fruits of the earth must ever be dependent on rain; the watersheds having few large springs, and the small rivers not being sufficient for the irrigation of even the level lands. If, therefore, the heavy rains of November and December fail, the sustenance of the people is cut off in the parching drought of harvest-time, when the country is almost devoid of moisture. Further, the pastoral tribes rely on the scanty herbage of the desert-plains and valleys for their flocks and herds; for the desert is interspersed in spring-time with spontaneous vegetation, which is the product of the preceding rain-fall, and fails almost totally without it. It is therefore not difficult to conceive the frequent occurrence and severity of famines in ancient times, when the scattered population, rather of a pastoral than an agricultural country, was dependent on natural phenomena which, however regular in their season, occasionally failed, and with them the sustenance of man and beast.

"Egypt, again, owes all its fertility—a fertility that gained for it the striking comparison with the 'garden of the Lord'—to its mighty river, whose annual rise inundates nearly the whole land, and renders its cultivation an easy certainty. But this very bounty of nature has not unfrequently exposed the country to the opposite extreme of drought. With scarcely any rain, and that only on the Mediterranean coast, and with wells only supplied by filtration from the river through a nitrous soil, a failure in the rise of the Nile almost certainly entails a degree of scarcity, although if followed by cool weather, and if only the occurrence of a single year, the labor of the people may in a great

measure avert the calamity. The causes of dearth and famine in Egypt are occasioned by defective inundation, preceded, and accompanied, and followed by prevalent easterly and southerly winds. Both these winds dry up the earth, and the latter, keeping back the rain-clouds from the north, are perhaps the chief cause of the defective inundation, as they are also by their accelerating the current of the river—the northerly winds producing the contrary effects. Famines in Egypt and Palestine seem to be affected by drought extending from northern Syria, through the meridian of Egypt, as far as the highlands of Abyssinia.

“It may be said of the ancient world generally that it was subject to periodical returns of dearth, often amounting in particular districts to famine, greatly beyond what is usually experienced in modern times. Various causes of a merely natural and economical kind contributed to this, apart from strictly moral considerations. Among these causes may more especially be mentioned the imperfect knowledge of agriculture which prevailed, in consequence of which men had few resources to stimulate, or in unfavorable seasons and localities to aid, the productive powers of nature; the defective means of transit, rendering it often impossible to relieve the wants of one region, even when plenty existed at no great distance in another; the despotic governments, which to so great an extent checked the free development of human energy and skill; and the frequent wars and desolations, in a great degree also the result of those despotic governments, which both interrupted the labors of the field and afterwards wasted its fruits. Depending, as every returning harvest does, upon the meeting of many conditions in the soil and climate, which necessarily vary from season to season, it was inevitable that times of scarcity should be ever and anon occurring in particular regions of the world; and from the disadvantages now referred to, under which the world in more remote times labored, it was equally inevitable that such times should often result in all the horrors of famine” (Smith, s. v.).

The Scriptures record several famines in Palestine and the neighboring countries. The first occurs in Gen. xii, 10, which is described as so grievous as to compel Abraham to quit Canaan for Egypt (Gen. xxvi, 1). Another occurred in the days of Isaac, which was the cause of his removal from Canaan to Gerar (Gen. xxvi, 17). The most remarkable one was that of seven years in Egypt, while Joseph was governor. It was distinguished for its duration, extent, and severity, particularly as Egypt is one of the countries least subject to such a calamity, by reason of its general fertility. The ordinary cause of famine in Egypt is connected with the annual overflow of the Nile. But it would appear that more than local causes were in operation in the case noticed in Gen. xli, 30, for it is said that “the famine was sore in all lands,” that “the famine was over all the face of the earth.” By the foresight and wisdom of Joseph, however, provision had been made in Egypt during the seven preceding years of plenty, so that the people of other parts sought and received supplies in Egypt—“all countries came into Egypt to buy corn.” Among other lands, Canaan suffered from the famine, which was the immediate occasion of Jacob sending his sons down into Egypt, and of the settlement in that land of the descendants of Abraham; an event of the highest consequence in the sequel, and serving to illustrate the benignity and wisdom of divine Providence in bringing there a band of shepherds to prepare and qualify them for becoming ultimately the founders of the Hebrew nation.

The fruitfulness of Egypt depends upon the inundations of the Nile; but these are occasioned by the tropical rains which fall upon the Abyssinian mountains. These rains depend upon climatic laws of wide extent and great regularity. Yet there is scarcely a land on the earth in which famine has raged so often and so

terribly as in Egypt, or a land that so very much needs the measures which Joseph adopted for the preservation of the people. The swelling of the Nile a few feet above or below what is necessary proves alike destructive. Particular instances of famine which history has handed down to us are truly horrible, and the accounts of them are worthy of notice also, inasmuch as they present the services of Joseph in behalf of Egypt in their true light. Abdollatif relates thus: “In the year 596 (A.D. 1199), the height of the flood was small almost without example. The consequence was a terrible famine, accompanied by indescribable enormities. Parents consumed their children; human flesh was, in fact, a very common article of food; they contrived various ways of preparing it. They spoke of it and heard it spoken of as an indifferent affair. Men-catching became a regular business. The greater part of the population were swept away by death. In the following year, also, the inundation did not reach the proper height, and only the lowlands were overflowed. Also much of that which was inundated could not be sown for want of laborers and seed; much was destroyed by worms which devoured the seed-corn; also of the seed which escaped this destruction, a great part produced only meagre shoots which perished.” (See the account of this famine translated in the *Am. Bibl. Repos.* 1822, p. 659 sq.) Compare with this account the “thin ears and blasted with the east wind” (Gen. xli, 6). “Of the horrors in this second year’s famine, the year of the Flight, 597 (A.D. 1200), Abdollatif, who was an eye-witness, likewise gives a most interesting account, stating that the people throughout the country were driven to the last extremities, eating offal, and even their own dead, and mentions, as an instance of the dire straits to which they were driven, that persons who were burnt alive for eating human flesh were themselves, thus ready roasted, eaten by others. Multitudes fled the country, only to perish in the desert-rot to Palestine.

“But the most remarkable famine was that of the reign of the Fâtîmi Khalîfeh, El-Mustansîr billâh, which is the only instance on record of one of seven years’ duration in Egypt since the time of Joseph (A. H. 457–464, A. D. 1064–1071). This famine exceeded in severity all others of modern times, and was aggravated by the anarchy which then ravaged the country. Vehement drought and pestilence (says Es-Suyûtî, in his *Isbn el-Mohâdarah*, MS.) continued for seven consecutive years, so that they [the people] ate corpses, and animals that died of themselves; the cattle perished; a dog was sold for 5 dinârs, and a cat for 3 dinârs . . . and an ardebb (about 5 bushels) of wheat for 100 dinârs, and then it failed altogether. He adds that all the horses of the Khalîfeh, save three, perished, and gives numerous instances of the straits to which the wretched inhabitants were driven, and of the organized bands of kidnappers who infested Cairo, and caught passengers in the streets by ropes furnished with hooks and let down from the houses. This account is confirmed by El-Makrizî (in his *Khât*; Quatremère has translated the account of this famine in the life of El-Mustansîr, contained in his *Mémoires Géographiques et Historiques sur l’Égypte*), from whom we further learn that the family, and even the women of the Khalîfeh fled, by the way of Syria, on foot, to escape the peril that threatened all ranks of the population. The whole narrative is worthy of attention, since it contains a parallel to the duration of the famine of Joseph, and at the same time enables us to form an idea of the character of famines in the East. The famine of Samaria resembled it in many particulars; and that very briefly recorded in 2 Kings viii, 1, 2, affords another instance of one of seven years: ‘Then spake Elisha unto the woman whose son he had restored to life, saying, Arise, and go thou and thy household, and sojourn wheresoever thou canst sojourn: for the Lord hath called for a famine; and it shall also



come upon the land seven years. And the woman arose, and did after the saying of the man of God: and she went with her household, and sojourned in the land of the Philistines seven years." Bunsen (*Egypt's Place*, etc., ii, 334) quotes the record of a famine in the reign of Sesertesen I, which he supposes to be that of Joseph; but it must be observed that the instance in point is expressly stated not to have extended over the whole land, and is at least equally likely, apart from chronological reasons, to have been that of Abraham.

"In Arabia, famines are of frequent occurrence. The Arabs, in such cases, when they could not afford to slaughter their camels, used to bleed them and drink the blood, or mix it with the shorn fur, making a kind of black pudding. They ate also various plants and grains, which at other times were not used as articles of food. Thus the tribe of Hanifeh were taunted with having in a famine eaten their god, which consisted of a dish of dates mashed up with clarified butter and a preparation of dried curds of milk (*Sihâh*, MS.," (Smith, s. v.).

Famine is likewise a natural result, in the East, when caterpillars, locusts, or other insects destroy the produce of the earth. The prophet Joel compares locusts to a numerous and terrible army ravaging the land (ch. i). Famine was also an effect of God's anger (2 Kings viii, 1, 2). The prophets frequently threaten Israel with the sword of famine, or with war and famine, evils that frequently go together. Amos threatens another sort of famine: "I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord" (Amos viii, 11). In ancient times, owing to the imperfect modes of warfare in use, besieged cities were more frequently reduced by famine than by any other means, and the persons shut up were often reduced to the necessity of devouring not only unclean animals, but also human flesh (compare Dent. xxviii, 22-42; 2 Sam. xxi, 1; 2 Kings vi, 25-28; xxv, 3; Jer. xiv, 15; xix, 9; xlii, 17; Ezek. v, 10-12, 16; vi, 12; vii, 15).

The famine predicted by Agabus (Acts xi, 28) was the same with that which is related by Josephus (*Ant.* xx, 2, 6) as having taken place in the fourth year of Claudius, and affected especially the province of Judæa. (See Kuhnöl, *Comment. proleg.*) See DEARTH.

**FAN** (פָּנֵה, *mizreh*, πῦρον), a *winnnowing-shovel*, with which grain was thrown up against the wind, in order to cleanse it from the broken straw and chaff (Isa. xxx, 24; Jer. xv, 7; Matt. iii, 12; Luke iii, 17). See AGRICULTURE. At the present day, in Syria, the instrument used is a large wooden fork. (See Robinson's *Researches*, ii, 277, 371; Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s. v. Pala). Both kinds of instruments are delineated on the Egyptian monuments (Wilkinson, ii, 40-46). See WINNOWER.

**Fanaticism.** (1.) The ancients primarily gave the name of *fanatici* to those who uttered oracular announcements, or exhibited wild antics and gestures under the (supposed) inspiration of some divinity whose temples (*fiava*) they frequented. The heathen *vates*, who pretended to prophesy under the guidance of an indwelling spirit (*aijwov*), was called by the Greek writers *ἑνθεος*, and by the Latins *fanaticus* (see Suidas, s. v. *ἑνθεος*; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* xvi, v, 4). Thence the name was transferred to persons actuated by a frantic zeal in religion.

(2.) The word is sometimes improperly used to stigmatize such Christians as are "zealously affected in a good thing" (Gal. iv, 18). Its only legitimate application is to such as add to enthusiasm and zeal for the cause which they believe to be the cause of truth a hatred of those who are opposed to them, whether in politics, philosophy, or religion. Isaac Taylor, speaking of religious fanaticism, remarks that, "after rejecting from account that opprobrious sense of the word

fanaticism which the virulent calumniator of religion and of the religious assigns to it, it will be found, as we believe, that the elementary idea attaching to the term in its manifold application is that of *jeñtious fervor* in religion, rendered turbulent, morose, or raucorous by junction with some one or more of the unsocial emotions. Or, if a definition as brief as possible were demanded, we should say that fanaticism is enthusiasm inflamed by hatred." He classifies the chief varieties of fanaticism "under four designations, of which the first will comprehend all instances wherein malignant religious sentiments turn inward upon the unhappy subject of them; to the second class will belong that more virulent sort of fanaticism which looks abroad for its victims; the third embraces the combination of intemperate religious zeal with military sentiments, or with national pride and the love of power; to the fourth class must be reserved all instances of the more intellectual kind, and which stand connected with opinion and dogma. Our first sort, then, is austere, the second cruel, the third ambitious, and the fourth factious. Or, for the purpose of fixing a characteristic mark upon each of our classes as above named, let it be permitted us to entitle them as follows—namely, the *first*, the fanaticism of the scourge, or of personal infliction; the *second*, the fanaticism of the brand, or of immolation and cruelty; the *third*, the fanaticism of the banner, or of ambition and conquest; and the *fourth*, the fanaticism of the symbol, or of creeds, dogmatism, and ecclesiastical virulence" (*Fanaticism*, New York, 1834, 12mo, p. 62).


The fanatic begins by rejecting the light of reason to abandon himself to the dictates of his fancy. He generally adopts some single and exclusive idea, which destroys the proper balance of his mind. This absorbing idea may have a germ of truth in it, but the fanatic will not recognise it, if in another form, in others: he cannot admit that truth which has taken a certain shape for him may have taken another in the eye of his neighbor without ceasing to be the truth. He thus becomes exclusive, malevolent, and prone to persecution. The hatred of blood relations is more intense and fierce than that between strangers, and so the fanatic is all the more fierce and tyrannical against others in proportion as their views approach his own, without being identically the same. He will undergo any suffering rather than abate one jot of his claims, or retreat one step for the sake of charity and union. He prefers darkness to light, the letter to the spirit, hatred to love, the wildness of passion to the calmness of inquiry. Fanaticism may show itself in all the relations of life, but its special field is found in politics and religion; and it becomes most dangerous when the two are combined. Being entirely one-sided, it is yet liable to go in the most opposite directions, and then goes all lengths. Thus we have in politics fanatics of peace, who want peace at any cost, and under all circumstances; fanatics of unrest, who believe only in the overthrow of existing institutions; fanatics of progress, who think anything good if it is only new; and fanatics of the past, or conservatives, who wish to hold fast whatever is, no matter how bad it is; fanatics of liberty, who, however, require others to view liberty in the same light as they do, or else deny it to them; and fanatics of despotism, who would wish all hearts to beat in unison, like so many well-regulated clocks. We find cosmopolitan fanatics, who glory in reviving their own country, and patriotic fanatics, who consider all other nations but their own as barbarians; and heathens; fanatics of rationalism, who consider every opponent a blockhead, and fanatics of orthodoxy, who think the pope requires only might to make him perfect, and who pray for the re-establishment of the Inquisition and the stake. Fanaticism has left especially sad records of its excesses in the religious history of the world, not only among the heathen in India, the Moslems and the Jews, but also among Chris-

tians. It caused the bloody encounters of the monks of Constantinople at the time of the controversy between the Eutychians and the Nestorians. It evened out the quarrels of the Montanists and the Donatists. It persecuted the Jews in the Middle Ages. It organized the Inquisition, developed the method of the *cogite intrare* (Luke xiv, 23), and invented a new sense for the words in Tit. iii, 10 (hæreticum de vita!); it instigated the crusade against the Albigenses, who, when they were indiscriminately massacred, were comforted with the assurance that "the Lord would know his own;" it aimed the dagger in the hands of Ravallac against the breast of his king; it inspired the *Te Deum* of Gregory XIII as a thanksgiving for the massacre of St. Bartholomew's. In the Protestant world we find fanaticism in the Anabaptists of Münster, in the Crypto-calvinistic troubles, and in the wars of the Cavaliers and Roundheads of England (Beck, in Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 327 sq.). "Fanaticism is the most incurable of all mental diseases, because in all its forms—religious, philosophical, or political—it is distinguished by a sort of mad contempt for experience, which alone can correct errors of practical judgments" (Mackintosh, *Works*, London, 1851, ii, 671). See also Stillingfleet, *Works*, v, 19, 92, 130; Fletcher, *Works* (N. Y. ed.), iv, 233 sq.

**Fanino** or **Fannio**, FAVENTINO, a native of Faenza, in Italy, one of the first martyrs of the Reformation in Italy. The Scriptures in Italian (probably Bruccioli's version, 1532) fell into his hands, and he soon began to speak of the truth to his neighbors. When the ecclesiastical authorities heard of his course they arrested and imprisoned him. His wife and family came to him with entreaties and tears when first apprehended, and he yielded to their persuasions to gain his release from prison by recantation. Under the bitter reproaches of conscience he soon determined to confess Christ openly, and he went publicly through Romagna preaching the Reformed doctrines. He was arrested at Bagna Cavallo, and condemned to the stake. He was removed to Ferrara, where, for eighteen months, persuasion, promises, and tortures were used in vain to induce him to recant. Soon after the accession of pope Julius III a brief was issued for the execution of Fanino. He embraced the messenger, saying, "I accept death joyfully for Christ's sake." Being urged to recant for the sake of his wife and children, whom he was about to leave without a protector, he replied, "I have recommended them to the care of the best of guardians." "What guardian?" "Jesus Christ! I think I could not commit them to the care of a better." He was ironed, and led out to execution; and on the way, being reproached by his enemies for his cheerfulness, when Christ was exceeding sorrowful at the approach of death, he answered, "Christ sustained all manner of pangs and conflicts with death and hell on our account, and by his sufferings freed those who really believe in him from the fear of them." He was strangled at dawn, and his body was burned at noon, in September, 1550.—Young, *Life of Aonio Palærio* (1860, ii, 111); McCrie, *Reformation in Italy*, ch. v.

**Fannio.** See FANINO.

**Fan-tracery Vaulting**, "a kind of vaulting used chiefly in late perpendicular work, in which all the ribs that rise from the springing of the vault have the same curve, and diverge equally in every direction, producing an effect something like that of the bones of a fan. This kind of vaulting admits of considerable variety in the subordinate parts, but the general effect



of the leading features is more nearly uniform. It is very frequently used over tombs, chantry chapels, and other small erections, and fine examples on a larger scale exist at Henry the Seventh's Chapel; St. George's Chapel, Windsor; King's College Chapel, Cambridge, etc., in England.—Parker, *Concise Glossary of Architecture*, s. v.

**Farel**, GUILLAUME, one of the boldest pioneers of the Reformation in Switzerland and France, was born near Gap, in Dauphiny, in 1489. He studied at Paris with great success, and was for some time teacher in the college of cardinal Le Moine, to which post he was recommended by Lefèvre d'Étaples. See FABER STAPULENSIS. At this period of his life he had no personal religious convictions; but yet, while devoured with a love of letters, he was zealous in the service of the Roman Catholic Church. But he was led, under the influence of Lefèvre, to the study of the Scriptures. About 1521 he went to Meaux, at the invitation of Lefèvre, and the bishop (Brignonet, q. v.) gave him authority to preach. His mind was now fixed substantially in the Reformed doctrine, and he preached, perhaps, with more zeal than discretion; and in 1523, Brignonet, now becoming timid, sent away the ardent young preacher. He soon found it best to retire to Switzerland. At Basel, Feb. 15, 1524, he sustained publicly thirteen theses on the chief points in controversy (*Thematæ quadam Latine et Germanice propositæ*, Basel, 1528). During his few months' stay at Basel he visited some of the Swiss cities, and made friends of Myconius, Haller, and Zwingle. At Basel, Œcolampadius was his warm friend, admiring his zeal and energy, but, at the same time, not unaware of his lack of discretion. Farel was soon involved in a dispute with Erasmus, whose "trimming" tendency was just the opposite of his own ardent and decided nature. He compared Erasmus to Balaam; but the scholar soon proved too strong for the young reformer, who was compelled to leave Basel. In one of his later letters, Erasmus says of him (*Epist.* p. 798, ed. Lond.): "You have in your neighborhood the new evangelist Farel, than whom I never saw a man more false, more virulent, more seditious." But the abuse of Erasmus could not, in the long run, injure Farel. Towards the end of March, 1524, Farel went to Strasburg, where he made the friendship of Bucer and Capito. Under the direction of Œcolampadius, he went to serve a newly-formed society at Montbéliard. Here he preached successfully, but yet with great violence. Once, on a procession day, he pulled out of the priest's hand the image of St. Anthony, and threw it from a bridge into the river; he narrowly escaped being torn to pieces by the mob. His friends became alarmed, and Œcolampadius censured him for his imprudence (see *Correspondance des Réformateurs*, Paris, 1866, i, 265). Leaving Montbéliard in the spring of 1525, he spent a short time at Basel, and the next year partly in Alsace and partly in Switzerland. In 1527 he went to Aigle, and in 1528, when Berne became Protestant, he extended his labors to all the territory connected with Berne. Under his labors, Aigle and Bex became Protestant in 1528-9; Morat and Neufchâtel in 1530; Orbe in 1531. His labors during these years were not only vast, but perilous; but the government of Berne gave him strong and steady support. In 1531 he was sent as a deputation (with A. Saunier) to the Waldensian Synod at Angrogne. He always retained great influence among the Waldensers.

In 1532, on his return from the Waldensian meeting, he came to Geneva, then full of religious strife. His first preaching was private, but it was too successful to be kept secret; and he was summoned before the episcopal council, at the time trembling for its authority, and therefore the more likely to be severe. The meeting with the council was a scene of bitter recriminations, and when Farel was leaving it a gun was fired at him. He coolly remarked, "Your shots

do not terrify me." But he was forced to quit Geneva for the time, and sent Fiomont and Olivetan to continue the work there. In 1533 he returned to Geneva, where the Reformation was gaining ground. Farel's situation here was full of trial and peril, but his courage and devotion admirably fitted him for his task. The triumph came Aug. 27, 1535, when the city council, by an edict, formally proclaimed the adhesion of Geneva to the Reformation. Farel was full of toil and anxiety in organizing the Reformed discipline and worship, in which he was assisted especially by Viret (q. v.). In 1536, Calvin stopped at Geneva to visit the Reformers. Farel urged him to stay, and, on Calvin's refusal, thus addressed him: "I declare, in the name of God, that if you do not assist us in this work of the Lord, the Lord will punish you for following your own interest rather than his call." Calvin, struck with this denunciation, submitted, and was appointed preacher and professor. See CALVIN. From that time on Farel's labors were closely united with those of Calvin. The confession of faith drawn up by Farel, with Calvin's counsel, was approved by the people in July, 1537. The same year the Council of Geneva conferred on Farel the honor of a Burgess of the city, in token of their respect and gratitude. But the popular will was not prepared for the severe discipline of the Reformers, and in a short time the people, under the direction of a faction, met in a public assembly and expelled Farel and Calvin from the place (April, 1538). Farel went to Neufchâtel, where the Church was in a state of disorder, in consequence of the troubles occasioned by the severity of the Reformed discipline. He dealt with offenders severely; even a lady of noble birth did not escape. She had left her husband; Farel urged her to return to him, and on her refusal rebuked the scandal and its authors publicly from the pulpit. A great strife arose, and the people were on the point of expelling Farel; but at last his energy overcame the factions party, and the council by vote, in 1542, proclaimed his triumph. In that year he returned to Geneva, and went thence to Metz, to organize the Reformed Church. He preached first in the Dominican cemetery, amid the ringing of the convent bells purposely to drown his voice. Thousands afterwards flocked to hear him. Once, when a Franciscan was preaching Mariolatry, Farel contradicted him, and nearly fell a victim to the fury of the mob, especially of the women. On Oct. 2, 1542, the city council forbade his preaching in the city, and he retired to the neighboring town of Montigny, and afterwards to Gorze, where the count of Furstenberg took him and his friends under his protection. On March 25, 1543, an armed band fell upon the evangelists while celebrating the Easter communion. Many were killed and wounded; among the latter was Farel, who took refuge in the castle. He escaped in disguise, and went to Strasburg, where he remained a few months. He then visited his old friends in Neufchâtel and Geneva. Here he approved the execution of Servetus (q. v.). In 1557 he was sent, with Beza, to the Protestant princes of Germany, to implore their aid for the Waldenses, and on his return he went to preach the Reformation among the Jura Mountains. At sixty-nine he married a young wife, very much to Calvin's disgust, who spoke of him under the circumstances as *our poor brother* (pôvre frère). In 1560 he visited his native Dauphny, established a Reformed Church at Grenoble, and passed several months at Gap, preaching against Rome with all the vehemence of his youth. On Nov. 24, 1561, he was thrown into prison, but was rescued by his friends, who took him from the rampart in a basket. In 1561 he paid a visit to the dying Calvin, and then passed some months with his old flock at Metz. He returned to Neufchâtel worn out with fatigue, and died there Sept. 13, 1565.

Farel was an ardent, impulsive man, a missionary rather than an organizer, an iconoclast rather than a

theologian. His gifts admirably supplemented those of Calvin. Beza (*Life of Calvin*) says of Farel that in his preaching "he excelled in a certain sublimity, so that none could hear his thunders without trembling." Among his writings are *Sommaire; brève déclaration d'aillieurs lieux fort nécessaires a un chacun Chrétien*, etc. (many editions; reprinted in 1865, along with *Du vray usage*: see below);—*De Oratione Dominica* (1524, 8vo), afterwards in French, enlarged (Genev. 1543, 12mo);—*Traité du Purgatoire* (1543, 12mo);—*La Gloire de l'Esprit* (against Libertines; Genev. 1550);—*Du vray usage de la croix de J. C.* (Genev. 1560, 8vo; new ed., with other letters and writings of Farel, Neufchâtel, 1865, 8vo);—*Traité de la Cène* (1555). There are several lives of Farel: Ancillon, *Vie de Guill. Farel* (Amst. 1691); Kirchofer, *Leben Farel's* (Zurich, 1833, 2 vols.); translated, Kirchofer's *Life of Farel* (Lond. 1837, sm. 8vo); Blackburn, *Life of Farel* (Phila. Presb. Board). See also Schmidt, *Études sur Farel* (Strasb. 1834); Haag, *La France Protestante*, vol. iv.; Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, s. v.; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xvii, 103; *Correspondence des Réformateurs dans les Pays de langue Française* (Paris, 1866, tom. i).

**Farfa**, one of the three most celebrated Italian monasteries of the Middle Ages (Montecassino, Nonantola, and Farfa), situated on the little river Farfa, in Central Italy. It was in existence before the invasion of the Langobardians, by whom it was destroyed, together with a number of other monasteries. It was re-established in 681 by the priest Thomas of Maurienna, who, on his return from the Holy Land, came to Farfa. It soon became celebrated, and received numerous presents and privileges from popes and kings. The monastery was so strongly fortified that abbot Peter, at the close of the 9th century, was able for nine years to resist a siege by the Saracens, though he was finally compelled to depart with the monks and the treasures of the monastery. Having remained abandoned and desolate for 48 years, it was re-established about the middle of the 10th century by king Hugo, but it afterwards became the seat of frightful disorders. Several abbots were assassinated and poisoned; and the monks, without restraint and disguise, defied all the laws of the Church and the state. At the beginning of the 11th century a stop was put to these disorders, and the reformation of Clugny was carried through at Farfa. Since then the history of the monastery presents no points of special interest. A work of considerable importance for the history of Italy, called after the monastery, *Chronicon Farfense*, was compiled at the close of the 11th century by Gregory, a monk and librarian of Farfa (died 1100). After many vicissitudes, the monastery is still in existence.—Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 904. (A. J. S.)

**Farindon**, ANTHONY, an eminent divine of the Church of England, was born at Sunning, in Berkshire, England, in 1596; was admitted scholar of Trinity College, in Oxford, in 1612, and was elected fellow in 1617. He took his M.A. degree in 1620, and, entering into holy orders, he became a tutor in his college. In 1624, being then B.D., he was called to be vicar of Bray, in Berkshire, and soon was made divinity-reader in the king's chapel at Windsor. During the Civil War he was ejected for conformity to the Church of England, and was reduced to such extremities as to be very near starving. Sir John Robinson, alderman of London, and some of the parishioners of Milk Street, London, invited him to be pastor of St. Mary Magdalen there, "which invitation he gladly accepted, and preached to the great liking of the royal party. In the year 1657 he published a folio volume of these sermons, and dedicated them to his kind patron Robinson, 'as a witness or manifesto,' says he to him, 'of my deep apprehension of your many noble favors, and great charity to me and mine, when the sharpness of the weather and the roughness of the times had blown

all from us, and well-nigh left us naked." He died at his house in Milk Street in September, 1658. Three posthumous volumes of his sermons (folio) were published (1658-1673) in 1663, a second folio volume of his sermons containing forty, and a third in 1673 containing fifty. He also left in manuscript several memorials of the life of Hales (q. v.) of Eton, his intimate friend. A new edition of his *Sermons, with a Life of the Author* by F. Jackson, appeared in London in 1849 (3 vols. 8vo). They afford a "fine specimen of sterling English, and of rich and varied cloquence." See Wood, *Atheue Oxonienses*; Hook, *Ecclesiastical Biography*, v, 57; Jackson, *Life of Fariudon*, prefixed to the new edition of his sermons.

**Fariissol or Peritzol**, ABRAHAM BEN-MORDECAI, a French Rabbi, distinguished alike in geography, polemics, and exegesis, was born at Avignon about the middle of the 15th century. In 1472 he went to Ferrara as minister to a Jewish congregation, and while there gave most of his time and attention to the study of the sacred writings. He published in 1500 a commentary on the Pentateuch, entitled פְּרִיִּשׁ שֵׁנִי (the flower of lilies), which, according to De Rossi, was begun in 1468. Next followed an apologetic and polemic work, מִגְן אַבְרָהָם (the shield of Abraham), consisting of three parts, of which the first is an apology for Judaism, the second an attack on Mohammedanism, and the third against Christianity. About 1517 he published a scholarly commentary on Job, אֲבוֹתֵינוּ בְּלִי אֲרִיב, printed in the Venetian Rabbinical Bible (1517, fol.), and in the Amsterdam Rabbinical Bible (edited by Frankfurter, 1727-1728). In 1524 he published his famous cosmography, אֲרִיבֵי הָעוֹלָם, Itinera Mundi (Venice, 1587, 8vo, very rare; reprinted Offenbach, 1720; and again with a Latin translation and elaborate notes by the English Orientalist, Thomas Hyde, Oxford, 1691). In this last-named work Fariissol describes the abodes of the ten tribes, the Sambation [Eldad], and the garden of Eden, which he places in the mountains of Nubia (ch. xviii and xxx). A year later Fariissol completed a Commentary on the book of Ecclesiastes, פְּרִיִּשׁ סֵפֶר, which has, however, never been printed. He died about the end of 1528, shortly after his return to Avignon.—Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums u. s. Sekten*, iii, 122; Etheridge, *Introd. to Heb. Liter.*, p. 453; Hoefler, *Nouv. Etog. Générale*, xxxix, 614; Kitto, *Cyclopædia*, ii, 4; Fürst, *Bib. Jud.* i, 276. (J. H. W.)

**Farm** (ἀγρός, elsewhere usually rendered "field"), a plot of arable land (Matt. xxii, 5). Moses, following the example of the Egyptians, made agriculture the basis of the Hebrew state. He accordingly apportioned to every Hebrew a certain quantity of land, and gave him the right of tilling it himself, and of transmitting it to his heirs (Num. xxvi, 33-54). This equal distribution of the soil was the basis of the Hebrew agrarian law. As in Egypt the lands all belonged to the king, and the husbandmen were not the proprietors of the fields which they cultivated, but farmers or tenants who were obliged to give to the king one fifth of their produce (Gen. xlvii, 20-25), just so Moses represents Jehovah as the sole possessor of the soil of the Promised Land, in which he was about to place the Hebrews by his special providence; and this land they held independent of all temporal superiors, by direct tenure from Jehovah their king (Lev. xxv, 23). Moses further enacted that for the land the Hebrews should pay a kind of quit-rent to Jehovah, the sovereign proprietor, in the form of a tenth or tithe of the produce, which was assigned to the priesthood. The condition of military service was also attached to the land, as it appears that every freeholder was obliged to attend the general muster of the national army, and (with few exceptions, Deut. xx, 5-9)

to serve in it, at his own expense, as long as the occasion required. The Hebrews appear to have acquired in Egypt considerable knowledge of agriculture; but the physical circumstances of the land of Canaan were in many respects essentially different, as it was not a land rarely refreshed with rain as Egypt (Deut. xi, 10-15). The Hebrews, notwithstanding the richness of the soil, endeavored to increase its fertility in various ways. In order to avert the aridity which the summer droughts occasioned, they watered the soil by means of aqueducts communicating with the brooks, and thereby imparted to their fields a garden-like verdure (Psa. i, 3; lxxv, 10; Prov. xxi, 1; Isa. xxxii, 2, 20). In the hilly part of the country terrace cultivation was practised, so that the hills otherwise barren were rendered fertile (Deut. xi, 11; Psa. lxxii, 16; civ, 10; Isa. xxx, 25). With the use of manure the Hebrews were undoubtedly acquainted: and that the soil might not be exhausted, it was ordered that every seventh and every fiftieth year the whole land should lie fallow. The dung, the carcasses, and the blood of animals were used to enrich the soil (2 Kings ix, 37; Psa. lxxiii, 10; viii, 2; Jer. ix, 22). Salt, either by itself, or mixed in the dunghill in order to promote putrefaction, is specially mentioned as a compost (Matt. v, 13; Luke xiv, 34, 35). The soil was enriched, also, by means of ashes, to which the straw, stubble, husks of corn, brambles, grass, etc., that overspread the land during the fallow or sabbatical year, were reduced by fire. The burning over the surface of the land had also the good effect of destroying the seeds of noxious herbs (Prov. xxiv, 31; Isa. xxx, 25). The soil of Palestine is very fruitful, if the dews of spring, and the rains of autumn and winter are not withheld. "Nevertheless," observes Hengstenberg, "it is to be considered that the Canaan of which Moses speaks is in a manner an ideal land. It was never what it might have been, since the bond of allegiance, in consequence of which God had promised to give the land its rain in its season, was always far from being perfectly complied with." Among the Hebrews the occupation of the husbandman was held in high honor, and even distinguished men disdained not to put their hands to the plough (1 Sam. xi, 5-7; 1 Kings xix, 19; 2 Chron. xxvi, 10). The esteem in which agriculture was held diminished as luxury increased, but it never wholly ceased; even after the exile, when many of the Jews had become merchants and mechanics, the esteem and honor attached to this occupation still continued, especially under the dynasty of the Persians, who were agriculturists from religious motives. See LAND.

In ancient Egypt, the peasants or husbandmen, like the modern *fellahs* of the same country, seem to have formed a distinct class, if not caste, of society (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* ii, 1, 2). The government did not interfere directly with the peasants respecting the nature of the produce they intended to cultivate, and the vexations of later times were unknown under the Pharaohs. They were thought to have the best opportunities of obtaining, from actual observation, an accurate knowledge on all subjects connected with husbandry; and, as Diodorus observes, "being from their infancy brought up to agricultural pursuits, they far excelled the husbandmen of other countries, and had become acquainted with the capabilities of the land, the mode of irrigation, the exact season for sowing and reaping, as well as all the most useful secrets connected with the harvest, which they had derived from their ancestors, and had improved by their own experience." "They rented," says the same historian, "the arable lands belonging to the kings, the priests, and the military class, for a small sum, and employed their whole time in the tillage of their farms;" and the laborers who cultivated land for the rich peasant, or other landed proprietors, were superintended by the steward or owner of the estate, who had authority over them, and

the power of condemning delinquents to the bastinado. This is shown by the paintings of the tombs, which frequently represent a person of consequence inspecting the tillage of the field, either seated in a chariot, walking, or leaning on his staff, accompanied by a fa-



Ancient Egyptian Farming.

Fig. 1, the overseer; 2, his chariot, in charge of a driver; 6, breaking up the ground; 4, 5, sowing; 3, ploughing in.

vorite dog. To one officer were intrusted the affairs of the house, answering to "the ruler," "overseer," or "steward of Joseph's house" (Gen. xxxix, 5; xliii, 16, 19; xlv, 1); others "superintended the granaries," the vineyard (comp. Matt. xx, 8), or the culture of the fields; and the extent of their duties, or the number of those employed, depended on the quantity of land, or the will of its owner.

At the present day the lower orders in Egypt, with the exception of a very small proportion, chiefly residing in the large towns, consist of fellâhin (or agriculturists). Most of those in the great towns, and a few in the smaller towns and some of the villages, are petty tradesmen or artificers, or obtain their livelihood as servants, or by various labors. In all cases their earnings are very small; barely sufficient, in general, and sometimes insufficient, to supply them and their families with the cheapest necessaries of life. Their food chiefly consists of bread (made of millet or of maize), milk, new cheese, eggs, small salted fish, cucumbers and melons, and gourds of a great variety of kinds, onions and leeks, beans, chick-peas, lupins, the fruit of the black egg-plant, lentils, etc., dates (both fresh and dried), and pickles. Most of the vegetables they eat in a crude state. When the maize (or Indian corn) is nearly ripe, many ears of it are plucked, and toasted or baked, and eaten thus by the peasants. Rice is too dear to be an article of common food for the fellâhin, and flesh-meat they very seldom taste. It is surprising to observe how simple and poor is the diet of the Egyptian peasantry, and yet how robust and healthy most of them are, and how severe is the labor which they can undergo (see Lane, *Mol. Egypt.* ch. vii).

Dr. Thomson thus describes the modern lower class of farmers in Palestine (*Land and Book*, i, 531 sq.): "These farmers about us belong to el-Mughhar, and their land extends to the declivity immediately above Gennesaret, a distance of at least eight miles from their village. Our farmers would think it hard to travel so far before they began the day's work, and so would these if they had it to do every day; but they drive their oxen before them, carry bed, bedding, and board, plow, yoke, and seed on their donkeys, and expect to remain out in the open country until their task is accomplished. The mildness of the climate enables them to do so without inconvenience or injury. How very different from the habits of Western farmers! These men carry no cooking apparatus, and, we should think, no provisions. They, however, have a quantity of their thin, tough bread, a few olives, and perhaps a little cheese in that leathern bag which hangs from their shoulders—the 'scrip' of the New Testament—and with this they are contented. When hungry, they sit by the fountain or the brook, and eat; if weary or sleepy, they throw around them their loose 'aba, and lie down on the ground as contentedly as the ox himself. At night they retire to a cave, sheltering rock, or shady tree, kindle a fire of thorn-bushes, heat over their stale bread, and, if they have shot a bird or caught a fish, they broil it on the coals, and thus dinner and supper in one are achieved with the least possible trouble. But their great luxury is smoking, and the whole evening is whiled away in

whiffing tobacco and bandying the rude jokes of the light-hearted peasant. Such a life need not be disagreeable, nor is it necessarily a severe drudgery in this delightful climate. The only thing they dread is an incursion of wild Arabs from beyond the lake, and to meet them they are all armed as if going forth to war." See AGRICULTURE.

**Farmer, HUGH**, a learned Independent minister, was born in 1714, near Shrewsbury, England. He studied under Doddridge, and gained his entire esteem and approbation. On leaving Northampton, he became assistant to Mr. David Some. His services, however, proving acceptable to the Dissenters in the neighborhood of Walthamstow, a place of worship was soon built, and for many years he continued there. In 1761 he became afternoon lecturer at Salters' Hall, and soon after Tuesday lecturer at the "Merchants' lecture." As he declined in years, he gradually relinquished his engagements as a preacher. In 1772 he resigned the afternoon lecture at Salters' Hall, and eight years after he gave up the Tuesday morning sermon; but he did not leave his church at Walthamstow till a few years later, when he gave up pulpit exercises entirely. He died Feb. 5, 1787. He published *A Dissertation on Miracles* (London, 1771, 8vo); *An Inquiry into the Nature and Design of Christ's Temptation in the Wilderness* (London, 1776, 8vo, 3d ed.); and *An Essay on the Demoniacs of the New Testament* (London, 1775, 8vo), in which he endeavored to prove that these were not cases of real possession, but of persons afflicted with epilepsy or madness. "This publication was answered by the late Mr. Fell, one of the tutors of Homerton Academy; and a controversy ensued, in which much acrimony of temper was discovered on both sides. Mr. Farmer was rather of a high spirit and hasty temper; but, abating these defects, he was a most estimable man," though he allowed himself larger liberty in speculation than was common in that age. Thus he interprets the temptation of Christ as a vision, and demoniacal possession as a disease. See DEMONIACS. A clause in his will directed his manuscripts to be burned; among them was a treatise on Balaam, and a revised edition of his essay on miracles. See Dodson, *Memoirs of Farmer* (London, 1805, 8vo); Jones, *Christian Biography*, p. 145.

**Farnworth, ELLIS**, an English divine, was born in the parish of Bonsall, Derbyshire, England, of which his father was rector, pursued his studies first at Chesterfield School, then at Eton, and then at Jesus College, Cambridge. In 1763 he was presented to the rectory of Carsington, in his native county, where he died in 1763. His works, which are all translations, are: 1. *Life of Pope Sextus V*, from the Italian of Gregorio Leti, with Preface, etc. (London, 1754, fol., and Dublin, 1778, 8vo);—2. *A short History of the Israelites*, from abbé Fleury's *Les Mœurs des Israélites* (Lond. 1756, 8vo; new edition by Adam Clarke, Lond. 1805, 12mo; republished N. Y. in 16mo);—3. *The History of the Civil Wars of France*, from the Italian of Davila (1757, 2 vols. 4to);—4. *The Works of Machiavel*, translated, with Notes, Anecdotes, and Life (1761, 2 vols. 4to, and 1775, 4 vols. 8vo), a work not appreciated during the life of the translator, but now commanding a high price (Disraeli, *Calamities of Authors*, Lond. and N. Y. 1859, p. 84). See Rose, *New Gen. Biog. Dict.*, and Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, s. v. (J. W. M.)

**Farnovius** (STANISLAUS FARNOUSKI or FARNUSIUS), one of the principal Antitrinitarians of Poland, was a pupil of Peter Gonesius (q. v.). After siding for some time with the Socinians, he became in 1567 a violent champion of the right wing of Unitarianism, teaching, in the true Arian sense, the subjection of the Son to the Father, without, however, denying the pre-


existence of the supernatural part of his nature. The followers of his system are called Farnovians or Farnesians. Farnovius vigorously attacked the Socinian wing which maintained that Christ was essentially a man, but is to be worshipped as God since his ascension. He found it difficult, however, to retain the half-way position he had taken, and in the course of events most of his followers joined the main body of the Unitarians, especially when Socinus became the chief of that party. His own school vanished at his death, about 1614. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* iv, 331; Zeltner, *Hist. Crypto-Socinismi*, i, 1201; Bock, *Hist. Antitrinitariorum*; O. Fock, *Socinianismus*, i, 155 sq.; Mosheim, *Church History*, iii, 242; Trechsel, *Die protest. Antitrinitarier*, vols. i and ii.

**Faroë Islands.** See DENMARK.

**Farrant, RICHARD**, an eminent composer of music, and regarded as one of the fathers of Church music in England, was born in the early part of the 16th century, and died about 1585. His name appears on the list of gentlemen of the chapel to Edward VI in 1564, and he was afterwards organist and master of the choristers of St. George's Chapel, Windsor. His "compositions for the Church, simple as they seem, are so solemn, so devout, so tender, and affecting, that they may challenge comparison with the sacred music of any age or country" (*Pictorial Hist.*). Many of his pieces are found in the collections of Boyce and Barnard. The best are, "Hide not thou thy face," "Call to remembrance," and "Lord, for thy tender mercy's sake." — Rose, *New Gen. Biog. Dict.*; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*; *Pictorial Hist. of England*, iii, 562 (Chambers's ed.). (J. W. M.)

**Farthing** is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. for two Roman coins of different values. See MONEY.

1. The *assarius* (Græcized ἀσσάριον, Matt. x, 29; Luke xii, 6), properly a small *as*, *assarium*, but in the time of our Lord used as the Gr. equivalent of the Lat. *as*. In the texts cited it is put (like our term "a copper") for any trifling amount. The Vulg. in Matt. x, 29 renders it by *as*, and in Luke xii, 6, puts *dipondius* for two *assaria*, the *dipondius* or *dupondus* us being equal to two *ases*. The ἀσσάριον is therefore either the Roman *as*, or the more common equivalent in Palestine in the Græco-Roman series, or perhaps both. The ren-



*Assarion of Chloris.*

dering of the Vulg. in Luke xii, 6 makes it probable that a single coin is intended by two *assaria*, and this opinion is strengthened by the occurrence, on coins of Chloris, struck during the imperial period, but without the heads of emperors, and therefore of the Greek autonomous class, of the words ACCAPION, ACCAPIA ΔΥΟ, ACCAPIA ΤΡΙΑ. The *half assarion* of the same island has also been found, yet it is of the same size as the full *assarion* (Akerman, *Nunismatic Illustrations of the New Testament*, p. 7).


The proper *as* was a copper coin, the Roman unit of value for small sums, equal to a tenth of the *denarius* or *drachma*, i. e. 1½ cents (Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s. v. *As*). See PENNY.

2. The *quadrans* (Græcized κοδράντης, Matt. v, 26; Mark xii, 42), the



Roman *As*.

λεπτόν, was originally a very small Greek copper coin,



Roman *Quadrans*.

seven of which with the Athenians went to the χαλκοίς, or bronze piece. The copper currency of Palestine, in the reign of Tiberius, was partly of Roman coins, partly of Græco-Roman (technically *Greek Imperial*). In the former class there was no common piece smaller than the *as*, equivalent to the ἀσσάριον of the N. T. (above), but in the latter there were two common smaller pieces, the one apparently the quarter of the ἀσσάριον, and the other its eighth, though the irregularity with which they were struck makes it difficult to pronounce with certainty; the former piece was doubtless called the κοδράντης, or *quadrans*, and the latter the λεπτόν, or *lepton*. See MITE.

**Fascination.** See CHARM.

**Fassari, VINCENT**, a Sicilian theologian, was born in Palermo in 1599, and died in the same city in 1663. He became a Jesuit in 1614, and taught successively belles-lettres, philosophy, theology, and the Scriptures. Of his religious and philosophical works, the most important are *Disputat. ones philosophicæ de quantitate, ejusque Compositione, Essentia*, etc. (Palermo, 1644, fol.); and *Immaculata Deiparæ Conceptio theologica Commisâa trutinæ* (Lyons, 1666, fol.). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*; Mongitore, *Bibliotheca Sicula*; *Bibliothèque des Ecrivains de la Compagnie de Jesus*. (J. W. M.)

**Fassoni, LIBERATO**, an Italian theologian, was born about A. D. 1700, and died at Rome in 1767. He was professor of theology in the college of his order at Rome. We have from him *De Leibnitiano Rat. Princ.* (Sinigaglia, 1754, fol.); — *De Græca Sacrarum Litterarum editione a LXX interpretibus* (Urbino, 1754, fol.); — *De Piorum in sinu Abræhe beatitudine ante Christi mortem* (Rome, 1760, 4to). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*. (J. W. M.)

**Fast** (properly, פָּסַח, *tsum*, strictly, to keep the mouth shut; νηστεῖω, strictly, not to eat). In the early ages of the world, when the spontaneous productions of nature and the spoils of the chase formed man's chief aliment, fasting from time to time was compulsory, in consequence of the uncertainty of obtaining food when wanted. It would be easy for superstitious ignorance to interpret this compulsion into an expression of the divine will, and so to sanction the observance of fasting as a religious duty. The transition would be the easier at a time and in countries when the office of physician was united in the same person with that of priest; for in hot climates occasional abstinence is not without its advantages on the health; and an abstinence which the state of the body required, but which the appetite shunned or refused, the authority of the priest and the sanctions of religion



would exact at once with ease and certainty. In the earlier stages of civilization no idea is more prevalent and operative than that the Deity is propitiated by voluntary sufferings on the part of his creatures. Hence ensued all kinds of bodily mortifications, and even the sacrifice of life itself. Nay, "the fruit of the body"—the dear pledges of mutual affection, the best earthly gift from the heavenly Father—children, were sacrificed in expiation of "the sin of the soul." Human enjoyments were held to be displeasing in the sight of God. The notion that the gods were jealous of man's happiness runs through the entire texture of Greek and Roman mythology; and the development of this falsehood, as presented in Greek tragedy, has given birth to some of the finest productions of the human mind. But what more pleasurable than food to man, especially to the semi-barbarian? The denial of such a pleasure must then be well-pleasing to the Divinity, the rather because, on occasions of family bereavement, of national disaster, or any great calamity, the appetite is naturally affected under the influence of grief, and is made to loathe the food which in its ordinary condition it finds most grateful. A connection between sorrow and fasting would thus be established which would carry with it a sort of divine sanction in being natural and inevitable in its origin. Accordingly, abstinence, which seemed imposed by Providence, if not in expiation of guilt, yet as an accompaniment of sorrow, easily became regarded as a religious duty when voluntarily prolonged or assumed, and grew to be considered as an efficacious means for appeasing the divine wrath, and restoring prosperity and peace. "Climate, the habits of a people, and their creed, gave it at different periods different characteristics; but it may be pronounced to have been a recognised institution with all the more civilized nations, especially those of Asia, throughout all historic times. We find it in high estimation among the ancient Parsees of Irania. It formed a prominent feature in the ceremonies of the mysteries of Mithras; and found its way, together with these, over Armenia, Cappadocia, Pontus, and Asia Minor, to Palestine, and northward to the wilds of Scythia. The ancient Chinese and Hindus, and principally the latter, in accordance with their primeval view—which they held in common with the Parsees—of heaven and hell, salvation and damnation, of the transmigration of the soul, and of the body as the temporary prison of a fallen spirit, carried fasting to an unnatural excess. Although the Vedas attach little importance to the excruciation of the body, yet the Pavaka, by the due observance of which the Hindu believer is purified from all his sins, requires, among other things, an uninterrupted fast for the space of twelve days. Egypt seems to have had few or no compulsory general fasts; but it is established beyond doubt that for the initiation into the mysteries of Isis and Osiris, temporary abstinence was rigorously enforced. In Siam, all solemn acts are preceded by a period of fasting, the seasons of the new and full moon being especially consecrated to this rite. In Java, where abstinence from the flesh of oxen is part of the religion of all, Buddhists and worshippers of Brahma alike, the manner and times of the observance vary according to the religion of the individual. Again, in Tibet, the Dalai-lamaites and Bogdo-lamaites hold this law in common. That Greece observed and gave a high place to occasional fast-days—such as the third day of the festival of the Eleusinian mysteries, and that, for instance, those who came to consult the oracle of Trophonius had to abstain from food for twenty-four hours—is well known. It need hardly be added that the Romans did not omit so important an element of the festivals and ceremonies which they adopted from their neighbors, though with them the periods of fasting were of less frequent recurrence" (Chambers, *Encyclopædia*, s. v.). The Mohammedans fast (till sunset) during the

whole of their ninth (lunar) month Ramadan (see D'Herbelot, *Bibl. Or.* s. v.). (On this religious observance among pagan nations, consult Meiners, *Gesch. der Relig.* ii, 139; Lakemacher, *Antiq. Græc. Sacr.* p. 626; Wachsmuth, *Hellen. Alterthum.* ii, 237; Böttiger, *Kunstmythol.* i, 132.) See ASCETICISM.

1. *Jewish Fasting.*—The word פָּסַח (פְּסָחָה, *ḥejuni-um*) is not found in the Pentateuch, but it often occurs in the historical books and the prophets (2 Sam. xii, 16; 1 Kings xxi, 9-12; Ezra viii, 21; Psal. lxi, 10; Isa. lviii, 5; Joel i, 14; ii, 15; Zech. viii, 19, etc.). In the law the only term used to denote the religious observance of fasting is the more significant one, נָחַם אֶת-רוּחַ (נָחַם אֶת-רוּחַ) (נָחַם אֶת-רוּחַ; *affligere animam*), "afflicting the soul" (Lev. xvi, 29-31; xxiii, 27; Numb. xxx, 13). The word נָחַם אֶת-רוּחַ, i. e. *affliction*, which occurs Ezra ix, 5, where it is rendered in A. V. "heaviness," is commonly used to denote fasting in the Talmud, and is the title of one of its treatises.

The sacrifice of the personal will, which gives to fasting all its value, is expressed in the old term used in the law, *afflicting the soul*. The faithful son of Israel realized the blessing of "chastening his soul with fasting" (Psal. lxi, 10). But the frequent admonitions and stern denunciations of the prophets may show us how prone the Jews were in their formal fasts to lose the idea of a spiritual discipline, and to regard them as being in themselves a means of winning favor from God, or, in a still worse spirit, to make a parade of them in order to appear religious before men (Isa. lviii, 3; Zech. vii, 5, 6; Mal. iii, 14; comp. Matt. vi, 16).

The Jewish fasts were observed with various degrees of strictness. Sometimes there was entire abstinence from food (Esth. iv, 16, etc.). On other occasions there appears to have been only a restriction to a very plain diet (Dan. x, 3). Rules are given in the Talmud (both in *Yoma* and *Taanith*) as to the mode in which fasting is to be observed on particular occasions. The fast of the day, according to Josephus (*Ant.* iii, 19, 3), was considered to terminate at sunset, and St. Jerome speaks of the fasting Jew as anxiously waiting for the rising of the stars. Fasts were not observed on the sabbaths, the new moons, the great festivals, or the feasts of Purim and Dedication (Judith viii, 6; *Taanith*, ii, 10).

Those who fasted frequently dressed in sackcloth or rent their clothes, put ashes on their head and went barefoot (1 Kings xxi, 27; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 13, 8; Neh. ix, 1; Psal. xxxv, 13). The rabbinical directions for the ceremonies to be observed in public fasts, and the prayers to be used in them, may be seen in *Taanith*, ii, 1-4 (see the *Col. Talm.*, *Taanith*, c. *vers.*, et *notis* De Lundii, Traj. ad Rh. 1694, 8vo). Consult also Maimonides, *Jud. Hal-Chetzka, Hillelith Taanith*, i, 315 sq.; Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebraicæ* on Luke xviii, 12; Schöttgen, *Horæ Hebraicæ* on Luke xviii, 12; Reland, *Antiquitates Sacre Veterum Hebræorum* (1717), p. 538 sq.; Bloch, in Geiger's *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theol.* iv, 205 sq.; Fink, in Ersch und Gruber's *Encyclopædie*, s. v. Fasten; Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums und seiner Secten* (Leipzig, 1857), i, 184 sq.; Bauer, *Gottesd. Verf.* i, 348 sq.; Otho, *Lex. Rab.* p. 233 sq.

1. The sole fast required by Moses was on the great day of annual atonement. This observance seems always to have retained some prominence as "the fast" (Acts xxvii, 9). But what the observance of the enjoined duty involved we are nowhere expressly informed, and can approximate to a knowledge of precise details only so far as later practices among the Jews may be considered as affording a faithful picture of this divinely-sanctioned ordinance. In these remarks the opinion is implied that "the fast," whatever importance it may have subsequently acquired, was orig-

inally only an incident, not to say an accident, in the great solemnity of the annual atonement. See ATONEMENT, DAY OF.

There is no mention of any other periodical fast in the O. T., except in Zech. vii, 1-7; viii, 19. From these passages it appears that the Jews, during their captivity, observed four annual fasts in the fourth, fifth, seventh, and tenth months. When the building of the second Temple had commenced, those who remained in Babylon sent a message to the priests at Jerusalem to inquire whether the observance of the fast in the fifth month should not be discontinued. The prophet takes the occasion to rebuke the Jews for the spirit in which they had observed the fast of the seventh month as well as that of the fifth (vii, 5-6); and afterwards (viii, 19), giving the subject an evangelical turn, he declares that the whole of the four fasts shall be turned to "joy and gladness, and cheerful feasts." Zechariah simply distinguishes the fasts by the months in which they were observed; but the Mishna (*Taanith*, iv, 6) and St. Jerome (*in Zachariam* viii) give statements of certain historical events which they were intended to commemorate:

(1.) The fast of the fourth month.—Kept on the 17th of Tammuz, to commemorate the making of the golden calf by the Jews, the breaking of the tables of the law by Moses (Exod. xxiv; comp. xxxiii, 3), the failure of the daily sacrifice for want of cattle during the siege, and the storming of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar (Jer. lii).

(2.) The fast of the fifth month.—Kept on the 9th of Ab, to commemorate the decree that those who had left Egypt should not enter Canaan (Num. xiv, 27, etc.); the Temple burnt by Nebuchadnezzar, and again by Titus; and the ploughing up of the site of the Temple, with the capture of Bether, in which a vast number of Jews from Jerusalem had taken refuge in the time of Hadrian (comp. *Jost, Gesch. d. Israeliten*, iii, 240).

(3.) The fast of the seventh month.—Commemorating the complete sack of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, and the death of Gedaliah (2 Kings xxv), on the 3d of Tisri (comp. *Seder Olam Rabba*, c. xxvi).

(4.) The fast of the tenth month.—On the 10th of Tebeth, to commemorate the receiving by Ezekiel and the other captives in Babylon of the news of the destruction of Jerusalem (Ezek. xxxiii, 21; compare 2 Kings xxv, 1).

These four fasts have been Christianized, and tradition tells us that their transfer into the Christian Church was made by the Roman bishop Callistus (flour. A. D. 223). To deprive them, however, of their Jewish appearance, the whole year was divided into four seasons (*quatuor tempora*), and a fast was appointed for one week of each season (compare Herzog, *Encyclopädie*, iii, 336).

(5.) The fast of Esther.—Additional to the above; kept on the 13th of Adar (Esth. iv, 16). See ESTHER (FAST OF).

Some other events mentioned in the Mishna are omitted as unimportant. Of those here stated several could have had nothing to do with the fasts in the time of the prophet. It would seem most probable, from the mode in which he has grouped them together, that the original purpose of all four was to commemorate the circumstances connected with the commencement of the captivity, and that the other events were subsequently associated with them on the ground of some real or fancied coincidence of the time of occurrence. As regards the fast of the fifth month, at least, it can hardly be doubted that the captive Jews applied it exclusively to the destruction of the Temple, and that St. Jerome was right in regarding as the reason of their request to be released from its observance the fact that it had no longer any purpose after the new Temple was begun. As this fast (as well as the three others) is still retained in the Jewish calendar, we must

infer either that the priests did not agree with the Babylonian Jews, or that the fast, having been discontinued for a time, was renewed after the destruction of the Temple by Titus.

The number of annual fasts in the present Jewish calendar has been multiplied to twenty-eight, a list of which is given by Reland (*Antiq.* p. 274). See CALNDAR.

2. Public fasts were occasionally proclaimed to express national humiliation on account of sin or misfortune, and to supplicate divine favor in regard to some great undertaking or threatened danger. In the case of public danger, the proclamation appears to have been accompanied with the blowing of trumpets (Joel ii, 1-15; comp. *Taanith*, i, 6). The following instances are recorded of strictly national fasts: Samuel gathered "all Israel" to Mizpeh and proclaimed a fast, performing at the same time what seems to have been a rite symbolical of purification, when the people confessed their sin in having worshipped Baalim and Ash-taroath (1 Sam. vii, 6); Jehoshaphat appointed one "throughout all Judah" when he was preparing for war against Moab and Ammon (2 Chron. xx, 3); in the reign of Jehoakim, one was proclaimed for "all the people in Jerusalem, and all who came thither out of the cities of Judah," when the prophecy of Jeremiah was publicly read by Baruch (Jer. xxxvi, 6-10; comp. Baruch i, 5); three days after the feast of Tabernacles, when the second Temple was completed, "the children of Israel assembled with fasting, and with sackclothes and earth upon them," to hear the law read, and to confess their sins (Neh. ix, 1). There are references to general fasts in the prophets (Joel i, 14; ii, 15; Isa. lviii), and two are noticed in the books of the Maccabees (1 Macc. iii, 46-47; 2 Macc. xiii, 10-12).

There are a considerable number of instances of cities and bodies of men observing fasts on occasions in which they were especially concerned. In the days of Phinehas, the grandson of Aaron, when the men of Judah had been defeated by those of Benjamin, they fasted in making preparation for another battle (Judg. xx, 26). David and his men fasted for a day on account of the death of Saul (2 Sam. i, 12), and the men of Jabesh Gilead fasted seven days on Saul's burial (1 Sam. xxxi, 13). Jezebel, in the name of Ahab, appointed a fast for the inhabitants of Jezreel, to render more striking, as it would seem, the punishment about to be inflicted on Naboth (1 Kings xxi, 9-12). Ezra proclaimed a fast for his companions at the river of Ahava, when he was seeking for God's help and guidance in the work he was about to undertake (Ezra viii, 21-23). Esther, when she was going to intercede with Ahasuerus, commanded the Jews of Shushan neither to eat nor drink for three days (Esth. iv, 16). A fast of great strictness is recorded in the Scriptures as having been proclaimed by the heathen king of Nineveh to avert the destruction threatened by Jehovah (Jonah ii, 5-9).

Public fasts expressly on account of unseasonable weather and of famine may perhaps be traced in the first and second chapters of Joel. In later times they assumed great importance, and form the main subject of the treatise *Taanith* in the Mishna. The Sanhedrim ordered general fasts when the nation was threatened with any great evil, such as drought or famine (Josephus, *Life*, § 56; *Taanith*, i, 5), as was usual with the Romans in their supplications (Livy, iii, 7; x, 23).

3. Private occasional fasts are recognised in one passage of the law (Numb. xxx, 13). The instances given of individuals fasting under the influence of grief, vexation, or anxiety are numerous (1 Sam. i, 7; xx, 34; 2 Sam. iii, 35; xii, 16; 1 Kings xxi, 27; Ezra x, 6; Neh. i, 4; Dan. x, 3). The fasts of forty days of Moses (Exod. xxiv, 18; xxxiv, 28; Dent. ix, 18) and of Elijah (1 Kings xix, 8), are, of course, to be regarded as special acts of spiritual discipline, faint though wonderful shadows of that fast in the wilder-



ness of Judæa, in which all true fasting finds its meaning (Matt. iv, 1, 2).

After the exile private fasts became very frequent (Lightfoot, p. 318), awaiting the call of no special occasion, but entering as a regular part of the current religious worship (Sueton. *Aug.* 76; Tacit. *Hist.* v, 4, 3). In Judith viii, 6 we read that Judith fasted all the days of her widowhood, "save the eves of the sabbaths, and the sabbaths, and the eves of the new moons, and the new moons, and the feasts and the solemn days of the house of Israel." In Tobit xii prayer is declared to be good with fasting; see also Luke ii, 37; Matt. ix, 14. The parable of the Pharisee and Publican (Luke xviii, 9; comp. Matt. ix, 14) shows how much the Pharisees were given to voluntary and private fasts—"I fast twice a week." The first was on the fifth day of the week, on which Moses ascended to the top of Mount Sinai; the second was on the second day, on which he came down (*Tawith*, ii, 9; *Hieros. Megillah*, 75, 1). This bi-weekly fasting has also been adopted in the Christian Church; but Monday and Thursday were changed to Wednesday and Friday (*feria quarta et sexta*), as commemorative of the betrayal and crucifixion of Christ. Of a similar semi-occasional character was the *First-born sons' fast* (פְּסַחֵי בְּנֵי מִצְרַיִם), on the day preceding the feast of Passover, in commemoration of the fact that while God on that occasion smote all the first-born of the Egyptians, he spared those of the house of Israel (comp. Exod. xii, 29, etc.; *Sopherim*, xxi, 3). See **FIRST-BORN**. The Essenes and the Therapeutæ also were much given to such observances (Philo, *Vit. Contempl.* p. 613; Euseb. *Prop. Evam.* ix, 3). Fasts were considered a useful exercise in preparing the mind for special religious impressions; as in Dan. x, 2 sq. (see also Acts xiii, 3; xiv, 23). From Matt. xvii, 21: "Howbeit this kind (of demons) goeth not out but by prayer and fasting," it would appear that the practice under consideration was considered in the days of Christ to act in certain special cases as an exorcism.

Fasting (as stated above) was accompanied by the ordinary signs of grief among the Israelites, as may be seen in 1 Macc. iii, 47. The abstinence was either partial or total. In the case of the latter fast was entirely foregone, but this ordinarily took place only in fasts of short duration; and abstinence from food in Eastern climes is more easy and less detrimental (if not in some cases positively useful) than keeping from food would be with us in these cold, damp Northern regions (Esth. iv, 16). In the case of partial abstinence the time was longer, the denial in degree less. When Daniel (x, 2) was "mourning three full weeks," he ate no "pleasant bread, neither came flesh nor wine in his mouth." There does not appear to have been any fixed and recognised periods during which these fasts endured. From one day to forty days fasts were observed. The latter period appears to have been regarded with feelings of peculiar sanctity, owing, doubtless, to the above instances in Jewish history. There are monographs, entitled *De jejuniis Hebræorum*, by Opitz (Kil. 1680), Peringer (Holm. 1684), and Lund (Aboe, 1696).

II. *In New Testament.*—We have already seen how qualified the sanction was which Moses gave to the observance of fasting as a religious duty. In the same spirit which actuated him, the prophets bore testimony against the lamentable abuses to which the practice was turned in the lapse of time and with the increase of social corruption (Isa. lviii, 4 sq.; Jer. xiv, 12; Zech. vii, 5). Continuing the same species of influence and perfecting that spirituality in religion which Moses began, our Lord rebuked the Pharisees sternly for their outward and hypocritical pretences in the fasts which they observed (Matt. vi, 16 sq.), and actually abstained from appointing any fast whatever as a part of his own religion. In Matt. ix, 14, the question

of the reason of this avoidance is expressly put—"Why do we (the disciples of John) and the Pharisees fast oft, but thy disciples fast not?" The answer shows the voluntary character of fasting in the Christian Church—"Can the children of the bridechamber fast?" It is true that a period is alluded to when these children "shall fast;" but the general scope of the passage, taken in connection with the fact that Christ's disciples fasted not, and with the other fact, that while John (Matt. xi, 18, 19) "came neither eating nor drinking," the Son of man "came eating and drinking," clearly shows that our Lord, as he did not positively enjoin religious fasting, so by the assertion that a time would come when, being deprived of the (personal presence of the) bridegroom, his disciples would fast, meant to intimate the approach of a period of general mourning, and employed the term "fast" derivatively to signify rather sorrow of mind than any corporeal self-denial (Neander, *Leben Jesu*, p. 231, 305). In his sermon on the mount, however (Matt. vi, 17), while correcting the self-righteous austerity of Pharisaic fasting, he clearly allows the practice itself, but leaves the frequency, extent, and occasion of its performance to the private conscience and circumstances of each individual.

That the early Christians observed the ordinary fasts which the public practice of their day sanctioned is clear from more than one passage in the New-Testament Scriptures (Acts xiii, 2; xiv, 23; 2 Cor. vi, 5); but in this they probably did nothing more than yield obedience, as in general they thought themselves bound to do, to the law of their fathers so long as the Mosaic institutions remained entire. Although the great body of the Christian Church held themselves free from all ritual and ceremonial observances when God in his providence had brought Judaism to a termination in the rasure of the holy city and the closing of the Temple, yet the practice of fasting thus originated might easily and unobservedly have been transmitted from year to year and from age to age, and that the rather because so large a portion of the disciples being Jews (to say nothing of the influence of the Ebionites in the primitive Church), thousands must have been accustomed to fasting from the earliest days of their existence, either in their own practice, or the practice of their fathers, relatives, and associates (comp. Cor. vii, 5).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See **FASTING**.

*Literature.*—Ciacconius, *De jejuniis apud antiquos* (Rom. 1599); Tiegenhorn, *Descriptio jejuniarum* (Jen. 1607); Drexel, *De j-junio* (Antw. 1637); Dallæus, *De jejuniis et Quadragesima* (Dauentr. 1654); Ortløb, *De ritu jejuniarum* (Viteb. 1656); Lochner, *De jejuniis contra pontificios* (Rost. 1656); Launoy, *De ciorum delectu in jejuniis* (Par. 1663); Funke, *De jejuniis* (Altenb. 1663); Nicolai, *De jejuniis Christianis* (Par. 1667); Sommer, *De jejuniarum natura* (Jen. 1670); Sagittarius, *De jejuniis veterum* (Jen. 1672); Varenius, *Jejunium Christianum* (Rost. 1684); Salden, *De jejuniis* (in *Otia theol.* [Amst. 1684], p. 658 sq.); Thomasin, *Traité des jeûnes* (Paris, 1690); Hooper, *Discourse concerning Lent* (Lond. 1696); Ortløb, *De jejuniis Mosis quadragesimali* (Lips. 1701); Andry, *Le régime de carême* (Par. 1710); Pfanner, *De jejuniis Christianorum* (in *Obs. suc.* ii, 324-520); Mabilon, *Jeune de l'Épiphânie* (in *Œuvres posth.* i, 431 sq.); Hildebrand, *De jejuniis* (Helmst. 1719); Böhmer, *De jure circa jejunantes* (Hal. 1722); Schütz, *De quat. temporum jejunis* (Wenig. 1725); Volland, *De jejuniis Sabbaticis* (Rost. 1724); Muratori, *De quat. temporum jejunis* (in *Anecd.* ii, 246 sq.); Bernhold, *De jejunio partiali* (Aldt. 1725); Waleh, *De jejunio quadragesimali* (Jena, 1727); Bernhold, *De jejunio spiritali* (Altorf. 1736); Carpzov, *De jejunis Sabbaticis* (Rost. 1741); à Seelen, *De jejunis Sabbaticis* (Rost. 1741-2); Becker, *De jejunis vett. Christianorum* (Leucop. 1742); Ehrlich, *De Quadragesima jejunio* (Lips. 1744); Kiesling, *De zerophagiu ap. Judæos et Christianos* (Lips. 1746); Seidel, *De Hieronymo, jejunii suasore* (Lond. 1747); Schickedanz,

*De jejuniis Sabbatico* (Servest. 1768); Körner, *Jejunium Christo propitium* (Lips. 1776); Anon. *Gesch. der Fastenanstalten* (Vien. 1787); Anon. *Apologie du jeune* (Par. and Genev. 1790); Van Falckenhausen, *Ueb. d. 40täg. Fastengebet* (Augsburg, 1809); Braun, *Werth d. Fastens* (Vien. 1830); Morin, *Jeune chez les anciens* (in *Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscr.* iv, 29 sq.). On fasting in the Christian Church, see **FASTING**.

**Fastidius**, PRISCUS, an English writer, and, according to some authorities, bishop of London in the 5th century. He is proved by Holstenius to be the author of a treatise found in Augustine's works, vol. ix, and published by Holstenius (Rome, 1663) under the title *De Vita Christiana et Viduitate*. Its precepts are good and practical, but Tillemont (*Mém.* xv, 16) considers it as tending to Pelagianism, inasmuch as it reduces Christianity to love of God and our neighbors, including good works. It is given, with prolegomena, in Galland, *Bib. Vet. Patr.* t. ix, and is reprinted in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* i, 377 sq.—Clarke, *Succession of Sac. Lit.* ii, 152; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i, 401.

**FASTING IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.** In the article **FAST** we have given an account of Jewish fasting, and also of the notices of fasting in the N. T. We confine ourselves in this article to a history of fasting in the Christian Church.

1. *Early Church.*—Fasting and abstinence have been practised in the Christian Church from the beginning [see **ABSTINENCE**] as means of self-discipline. Where the ascetic spirit has prevailed, fasting has been used as a means of mortification and penance. See **ASCETICISM**; **MORTIFICATION**; **PENANCE**. In the N. T. fasting appears either (1) as a token of sorrow or repentance, or (2) as a means of preparation for and aid in the discharge of spiritual duties (e. g. prayer, etc.). It was free from superstition; and the N. T. nowhere makes fasting, of itself, a means of grace. But the ascetic tendency in the early Church led to reliance on fasting, etc., as not only helps to, but substitutes for, the inward and spiritual life. The theory which placed the origin and seat of sin in the body [see **SIN**] also tended to give value to the practice of fasting. It came at last to be considered as an effectual means of securing forgiveness of sin. The earliest notices of fasting in the Christian writers are in a better vein. "The days of holy consecration, of penitence and prayer, which individual Christians appointed for their own use, were oftentimes also a sort of fast-days. That they might be less disturbed by sense while their minds were intent on holy things, they were accustomed on such days to confine their bodily wants within stricter limits than usual, or else to fast entirely; where we must take into consideration the peculiar nature of that hot climate in which Christianity first began to spread. Whatever they saved by their abstinence on these days was appropriated to the maintenance of the poor brethren" (Neander, *Church History*, Torrey's, ii, 274).

We cite some of the *Apostolical Fathers*. Hermas (1st century), *Shepherd* (*Simil.* v, ch. iii): "This fasting is very good, provided that the commandments of the Lord be observed. Observe as follows the fasting you intend to keep. First of all, refrain both from speaking and from hearing what is wrong; and cleanse thy heart from all pollution, from all revengeful feelings, and from all covetousness; and on the day thou fastest content thyself with bread, vegetables, and water, and thank God for these. But reckon up what thy meal on this day would have cost thee, and give the amount to some widow, or orphan, or to the poor. Happy for thee if, with thy children and whole household, thou observest these things." (See also *Simil.* v, ch. i.) The *Epistle of Barnabas* declares that the Jewish fasts are not true fasts, nor acceptable unto God, and cites Isa. lviii, 4-9, as giving the true fast "which God hath chosen." The *Epistle of Polycarp*

(2d century) exhorts Christians "to return to the word handed down from the beginning, watching unto prayer, and persevering in fasting" (ch. vii). Justin Martyr († 165) also cites Isa. lviii as giving the "true fast," and applies it to practical life. He speaks, however, of fasting being joined with prayer in the administration of baptism (*Dial. c. Tryph.* ch. xv). Irenæus († 200) speaks of the fast before Easter, and says, "Not only is the dispute respecting the day, but also respecting the manner of fasting. For some think they ought to fast only one day, some two, some more days; some compute their day as consisting of forty hours night and day; and this diversity existing among those that observe it is not a matter that has just sprung up in our times, but long ago among those before us, who perhaps, not having ruled with sufficient strictness, established the practice that arose from their simplicity and inexperience. And yet with all, these maintained peace, and we have maintained peace with one another; and the very difference in our fasting establishes the unanimity in our faith" (Eusebius, *Ch. History*, v, 24). Clement of Alexandria († 220?) notices the fact that many kinds of pagan worship required celibacy and abstinence from meat and wine in their priests; that there were rigid ascetics among the Indians, namely, the Samaneans, and hence argued that usages which may exist also in other religions, and even be combined with superstition, cannot, in themselves considered, be peculiarly Christian. He then adds: "Paul declares that the kingdom of heaven consists not in meat and drink, neither therefore in abstaining from wine and flesh, but in righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. As humility is shown, not by the castigation of the body, but by gentleness of disposition, so also abstinence is a virtue of the soul, consisting not in that which is without, but in that which is within the man. Abstinence has reference not to some one thing alone, not merely to pleasure, but it is abstinence also to despise money, to tame the tongue, and to obtain by reason the dominion over sin" (*Strom.* lib. iii). Clement also speaks of weekly fasts as the usage of the Church. It appears to be clear that weekly fasts were observed in the Church before the end of the 2d century, but that they were not enforced as essential means of grace. The Montanists were rigorous to excess with regard to fasting. "Besides the usual fasts, they observed special *perychagia* (*aridus vietus*), as they were called; seasons of two weeks for eating only dry, or, properly, uncooked food, bread, salt, and water. The Church refused to sanction these excesses as a general rule, but allowed ascetics to carry fasting even to extremes. A confessor in Lyons, for example, lived on bread and water alone, but forsook that austerity when reminded that he gave offence to other Christians by so despising the gifts of God" (Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* i, § 90). Tertullian († c. 220), in his *De Jejuniis*, complains of the little attention paid by the Catholic Church to the practice of fasting, thereby showing that liberty of judgment was exercised with regard to it. Origen speaks of Wednesday and Fridays in the Church at Alexandria as fast-days, on the ground that our Lord was betrayed on a Wednesday and crucified on a Friday (*Hom. x on Leviticus*).

By the 6th century fasting ceased to be a voluntary exercise; for by the second Council of Orleans, A.D. 541, it was decreed that any one neglecting to observe the stated times of abstinence should be treated as an offender against the laws of the Church. In the 8th century it was regarded as meritorious, and the breach of the observance subjected the offender to the penalty of excommunication. In later times, some persons who ate flesh during prescribed seasons of abstinence were punished with the loss of their teeth. These severities were, however, subsequently relaxed, and permission was given to use all kinds of food, except flesh,

eggs, cheese, and wine. Afterwards flesh only was prohibited, eggs, cheese, and wine being allowed; an indulgence which was censured by the Greek Church, and led to a quarrel between it and the Western. The following fasts generally obtained: 1. *Lent*, the annual fast of forty days before Easter. At first the duration of this fast was forty hours; in the time of Gregory I it was thirty-six days; but afterwards, either by Gregory I or Gregory II (8th century), in imitation of the fasts of Moses, Elias, and our Saviour, it was extended to forty days. See LENT; QUADRAGESIMA. 2. *Quarterly fasts*, which cannot be traced beyond the 5th century, though Bellarmin asserts that they dated from the apostles' time. 3. *A fast of three days before the festival of the Ascension*, introduced by Mameucus of Vienne (5th century). In some places it was not celebrated till after Whitsuntide. It was called *jejunium rogationum*, or *jejunium litaniarum*, the feast of rogations or litanies (hence rogation-days), on account of certain litanies sung on those days (Bingham, bk. xxi, c. ii, § 8). 4. *Monthly fasts*, a day in every month, except July and August, being selected. 5. *Fasts before festivals*, instead of the ancient vigils, which were abolished in the 5th century. 6. *Weekly fasts*, on Wednesdays and Fridays, entitled *stationes*, from the practice of soldiers keeping guard, which was called *statio* by the Romans. 7. There were also occasional fasts, appointed by ecclesiastical authority, in times of great danger, emergency, or distress (Tertull. *De Jejun.* c. 13). "The custom of the Church at the end of the 4th century may be collected from the following passage of Epiphanius: 'In the whole Christian Church, the following fast-days throughout the year are regularly observed. On Wednesdays and Fridays we fast until the ninth hour (i. e. three o'clock in the afternoon), except during the interval of fifty days between Easter and Whitsuntide, in which it is usual neither to kneel nor fast at all. Besides this, there is no fasting on the Epiphany or Nativity, if those days should fall on a Wednesday or Friday. But those persons who especially devote themselves to religious exercises (the monks) fast also at other times when they please, except on Sundays and during the fifty days between Easter and Whitsuntide. It is also the practice of the Church to observe the forty days' fast before the sacred week. But on Sundays there is no fasting, even during the last-mentioned period (compare *Doctr. de fide*). But even at this late date there was no universal agreement in the practice of the Church in this matter, neither had fasts been established by law. The custom, so far as it existed, had been silently introduced into the Church, and its observance was altogether voluntary. This fasting consisted, at first, in abstinence from food until three o'clock in the afternoon. A custom was afterwards introduced, probably by the Montanists, affecting the kind of food to be taken, which was limited to bread, salt, and water' (Siegel, *Alterthümer*, ii, 77, translated by Coleman, *Antient Christianity*, p. 445).

11. *Roman and Greek Churches*.—The Church of Rome prescribes the times and character of fasts by law (*Concil. Trident.* session xxv, *De delect. ciborum*). "Moreover, the holy council exhorts all pastors, and beseeches them by the most holy coming of our Lord and Saviour, that as good soldiers of Jesus Christ they assiduously recommend to all the faithful the observance of all the institutions of the holy Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all churches, and of the decrees of this and other oecumenical councils; and that they use all diligence to promote obedience to all their commands, and especially to those which relate to the mortification of the flesh, as the choice of meats and fasts." The Church commands fasts, and disobedience to her commands is sin. "See *Abstract of the Douay Catechism* (p. 44): 'Slighting or neglecting the precepts of the Church, and living in habits of breaking the fasts commanded, or of eating meat on Satur-

days, or other days of abstinence, without just dispensation, were sins which excluded from the benefits of the jubilee, unless confessed and forsaken in the same manner as drunkenness, swearing, and debauchery' (*Instructions and Directions*, etc., p. xxiv). But a papal dispensation changes the nature of things; the Spaniard who has paid the pope for a *flesh bull* may feast even in Lent; while his neighbor, who has neglected or declined to purchase the privilege, cannot eat an egg or drink a spoonful of milk during that period without committing mortal sin" (Cramp, *Text-book of Popery*, chap. xiv). Among the "satisfactory" works of "penance" in the Roman Church, fasting goes along with prayer and almsgiving (Dens, *Theologia*, vi, *De Satisf.* 176). The Church distinguishes between days of fasting and of abstinence. On the former but one meal, and that not of flesh, is tasted during twenty-four hours; on the latter, flesh only is abstained from. The following is the distribution of Church fasts as given in bishop Challoner's *Garden of the Soul*: 1. The forty days of Lent. 2. The Ember Days, being the Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday of the first week in Lent, of Whitsun Week, of the third week in September, and of the third week in Advent. 3. The Wednesdays and Fridays of the four weeks in Advent. 4. The vigils or eves of Whitsuntide, of the feasts of St. Peter and St. Paul, of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, of All Saints, and of Christmas Day. When any fasting day falls upon a Sunday, it is to be observed on the Saturday before. *Abstinence Days*.—1. The Sundays in Lent. 2. The three Rogation Days, being the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday before Ascension Day. 3. St. Mark, April 25, unless it falls in Easter Week. 4. The Fridays and Saturdays out of Lent, and the Ember Weeks, or such as happen to be vigils; but should Christmas Day fall upon a Friday or Saturday, it is not of abstinence. In the *Practical Catechism upon the Sundays, Feasts, and Fasts*, the reason assigned for observing St. Mark's Day as a day of abstinence is, that his disciples, the first Christians of Alexandria, under his own conduct were eminent for their mortification; moreover, that St. Gregory the Great, the apostle of England, first set it apart in memory of the cessation of a mortality in his time at Rome. All Fridays and Saturdays, except those which fall between Dec. 25 and Feb. 2, are days of *Abstinence*; but in the United States there is a dispensation of Saturdays for twenty years from 1840. The *Fasting* days are, every day in Lent except Sunday; the Ember Days; the vigils of Pentecost, Assumption, All Saints, and Christmas.

In the Greek Church fasting is kept with great severity. There are four principal fasts. That of Lent, commencing according to the old style; one, beginning in the week after Whitsuntide, and ending on June 29, so that it varies in length, and is called the Fast of the holy Apostles; one, for a fortnight before the Assumption of the Virgin (August 15), which is observed even to the prohibition of oil, except on the day of the Transfiguration (August 6), on which day both oil and fish may be eaten; and one forty days before Christmas.

III. *Protestant Churches*.—In these, fasting is not made imperative as a term of membership in the Church, but is generally recommended as a Christian duty, especially under circumstances of national or individual affliction.

1. *Church of England*.—"In the reign of queen Elizabeth there was a royal ordinance for fasting; not, however, so much with a religious view as for the encouragement of the fisheries. The Church has only so far recognised the custom in its ecclesiastical law as to retain the fast-days and prayers, but has prescribed no regulation of diet. Abstinence from food is not, therefore, the duty which it enjoins on its members, but whatever each finds to be best adapted for self-discipline, and most suitable under his circum-

stances for a repentant spirit. Mention is made of abstinence in the 'Collect for the first Sunday in Lent;' but it is not the abstaining from food, or particular kinds of food, but such abstinence as shall subdue the flesh to the spirit, i. e. the abstaining *habitually* from excess" (Eden). No legal distinction is drawn between fasting and abstinence; so Wheatley, (*On Common Prayer*, ch. v, § 4): "In the Church of Rome, fasting and abstinence admit of a distinction, and different days are appointed for each of them. But I do not find that the Church of England makes any difference between them. It is true, in the title of the table of vigils, etc., she mentions 'fasts and days of abstinence' separately; but when she comes to enumerate the particulars, she calls them all 'days of fasting or abstinence,' without distinguishing the one from the other. Nor does she anywhere point out to us what food is proper for such times or seasons, or seem to place any part of religion in abstaining from any particular kinds of meat. It is true, by a statute still in force, flesh is prohibited on fast-days; but this is declared to be for a political reason, viz. for the increase of cattle, and for the encouragement of fishery and navigation. Not but that the statute allows that abstinence is serviceable to virtue, and helps to subdue the body to the mind; but the distinction of clean and unclean meats determined, it says, with the Mosaic law; and therefore it sets forth that days and meats are in themselves all of the same nature and quality as to moral consideration, one not having any inherent holiness above the other. And for this reason it is that our Church, as I have said, nowhere makes any difference in the kinds of meat; but, as far as she determines, she seems to recommend an entire abstinence from all manner of food till the time of fasting be over; declaring in her homilies that fasting (by the decree of the six hundred and thirty fathers, assembled at the Council of Chalcedon, which was one of the four first general councils, who grounded their determination upon the sacred Scriptures, and long-continued usage or practice both of the prophets and other godly persons before the coming of Christ; and also of the apostles and other devout men in the New Testament) is a withholding of meat, drink, and all natural food from the body for the determined time of fasting." The fixed days appointed by the Church of England for fasting and abstinence are the following: 1. The forty days of Lent. 2. The Ember Days at the four seasons, being the Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday after the first Sunday in Lent, the feast of Pentecost, September 14, and December 13. 3. The three Rogation Days, being the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday before Holy Thursday, or the Ascension of our Lord. 4. All the Fridays in the year except Christmas Day. These days are mentioned in 2 and 3 Edward VI, c. 19, and in 5 Elizabeth, c. 5; and by 12 Charles II, c. 14, January 30 is ordained to be a day of fasting and repentance for the "martyrdom" of Charles I. But an act passed in 1859, the 22 Victoria, repeals all enactments requiring special Church service to be observed on January 30, May 29, November 5, and October 23. Other days of fasting are occasionally appointed by royal proclamation (*Encyclopædia Metropolitana*, s. v.).

2. *Lutheran Church.*—Luther by no means rejected or discountenanced fasting, but discarded the idea that it could be meritorious (*Comm. on Matt.* vi, 16). The *Augsburg Confession* (art. xxvi) repudiates "diversity of meats" and other traditions; but adds, "The charge, however, that we forbid the mortification of our sinful propensities, as Jovian asserts, is groundless. For our writers have always given instruction concerning the cross which it is the duty of Christians to bear. We moreover teach that it is the duty of every man, by fasting and other exercises, to avoid giving any occasion to sin, but not to merit grace by such works. But this watchfulness over our body is to be observed

always, not on particular days only. On this subject Christ says, Take heed to yourselves lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting (Luke xxi, 34). Again, The devils are not cast out but by fasting and prayer (Matt. xvii, 21). And Paul says, I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection (1 Cor. ix, 27). By which he wishes to intimate that this bodily discipline is not designed to merit grace, but to keep the body in a suitable condition for the several duties of our calling. We do not, therefore, object to fasting itself, but to the fact that it is represented as a necessary duty, and that specific days have been fixed for its performance."

3. *Calvin.*—The views of Calvin on fasting have been very generally adopted in the Reformed churches: "Therefore let us say something of fasting, because many, for want of knowing its usefulness, undervalue its necessity, and some reject it as almost superfluous; while, on the other hand, where the use of it is not well understood, it easily degenerates into superstition. Holy and legitimate fasting is directed to three ends, for we practise it either as a restraint on the flesh, to preserve it from licentiousness, or as a preparation for prayers or pious meditations, or as a testimony of our humiliation in the presence of God, when we are desirous of confessing our guilt before him. The first is not often contemplated in public fasting, because all men have not the same constitution or health of body; therefore it is rather more applicable to private fasting. The second end is common to both, such preparation for prayer being necessary to the whole Church, as well as to every one of the faithful in particular. The same may be said of the third, for it will sometimes happen that God will afflict a whole nation with war, pestilence, or some other calamity; under such a common scourge, it behoves all the people to make a confession of their guilt. When the hand of the Lord chastises an individual, he ought to make a similar confession, either alone or with his family. It is true that this acknowledgment lies principally in the disposition of the heart; but when the heart is affected as it ought to be, it can scarcely avoid breaking out into the external expression, and most especially when it promotes the general edification, in order that all, by a public confession of their sin, may unitedly acknowledge the justice of God, and may mutually animate each other by the influence of example. Wherefore fasting, as it is a sign of humiliation, is of more frequent use in public than among individuals in private, though it is common to both, as we have already observed. With regard to the discipline, therefore, of which we are now treating, whenever supplications are to be presented to God on any important occasion, it would be right to enjoin the union of fasting with prayer. Thus, when the faithful at Antioch 'laid their hands on Paul and Barnabas,' the better to recommend their very important ministry to God, they 'fasted' as well as 'prayed.' So, also, when Paul and Barnabas afterwards 'ordained elders in every church,' they used to 'pray with fasting.' In this kind of fasting their only object was that they might be more lively and unembarrassed in prayer. And we find by experience that after a full meal the mind does not aspire towards God so as to be able to enter on prayer, and to continue in it with seriousness and ardor of affection. So we are to understand what Luke says of Anna, that 'she served God with fastings and prayers.' For he does not place the worship of God in fasting, but signifies that by such means that holy woman habituated herself to a constancy in prayer. Such was the fasting of Nehemiah, when he prayed to God with more than common fervor for the deliverance of his people. For this cause Paul declares it to be expedient for the faithful to practise a temporary abstinence from lawful enjoyments, that they may be more at liberty to 'give themselves to fasting and prayer;' for by connecting fasting with

prayer, as an assistance to it, he signifies that fasting is of no importance in itself any further than as it is directed to this end. Besides, from the direction which he gives in that place to husbands and wives, to 'render to each other 'due benevolence,' it is clear that he is not speaking of daily prayers, but of such as require peculiar earnestness of attention. That there may be no mistake respecting the term, let us define what fasting is; for we do not understand it to denote mere temperance and abstinence in eating and drinking, but something more. The life of the faithful, indeed, ought to be so regulated by frugality and sobriety as to exhibit, as far as possible, the appearance of a perpetual fast. But besides this, there is another temporary fast, when we retrace anything from our customary mode of living, either for a day or for any certain time, and prescribe to ourselves a more than commonly rigid and severe abstinence from food. This restriction consists in three things—in time, in quality, and in quantity of food. By time I mean that we should perform, while fasting, those exercises on account of which fasts are instituted. As, for example, if any one fast for solemn prayer, he should not break his fast till he has attended to it. The quality consists in an entire abstinence from dainties, and content with simpler and humbler fare, that our appetite may not be stimulated by delicacies. The rule of quantity is that we eat more sparingly and slightly than usual, only for necessity, and not for pleasure. But it is necessary for us, above all things, to be particularly on our guard against the approaches of superstition, which has heretofore been a great source of injury to the Church. For it were far better that fasting should be entirely disused, than that the practice should be diligently observed, and at the same time corrupted with false and pernicious opinions, into which the world is constantly falling, unless it be prevented by the greatest fidelity and prudence of the pastors. The first caution necessary, and which they should be constantly urging, is that suggested by Joel: 'Rend your heart, and not your garments;' that is, they should admonish the people that God sets no value on fasting unless it be accompanied by a corresponding disposition of heart, a real displeasure against sin, sincere self-abhorrence, true humiliation, and unfeigned grief arising from a fear of God; and that fasting is of no use on any other account than as an additional and subordinate assistance to these things; for nothing is more abominable to God than when men attempt to impose upon him by the presentation of signs and external appearances instead of purity of heart. Therefore he severely reprobates this hypocrisy in the Jews, who imagined they had satisfied God merely by having fasted, while they cherished impious and impure thoughts in their hearts. 'Is it such a fast, saith the Lord, that I have chosen?' The fasting of hypocrites, therefore, is not only superfluous and useless fatigue, but the greatest abomination. Allied to this is another evil, which requires the most vigilant caution, lest it be considered as a meritorious act, or a species of divine service. For as it is a thing indifferent in itself, and possesses no other value than it derives from those ends to which it ought to be directed, it is most pernicious superstition to confound it with works commanded by God, and necessary in themselves, without reference to any other object. Such was formerly the folly of the Manicheans, in the refutation of whom Augustine most clearly shows that fasting is to be held in no other estimation than on account of those ends which I here mention, and that it receives no approbation from God unless it be practised for their sake. The third error is not so impious indeed, yet is pregnant with danger, to enforce it with extreme rigor as one of the principal duties, and to extol it with extravagant encomiums, so that men imagine themselves to have performed a work of peculiar excellence when they have fasted. In this respect I dare not wholly excuse the ancient

fathers from having sown some seeds of superstition, and given occasion to the tyranny which afterwards arose. Their writings contain some sound and judicious sentiments on the subject of fasting, but they also contain extravagant praises, which elevate it to a rank among the principal virtues. And the superstitious observance of Lent had at that time generally prevailed, because the common people considered themselves as performing an eminent act of obedience to God, and the pastors commended it as a holy imitation of Christ; whereas it is plain that Christ fasted, not to set an example to others, but in order that by such an introduction to the preaching of the Gospel, he might prove the doctrine not to be a human invention, but a revelation from heaven" (Calvin, *Institutes*, bk. iv, ch. xii, § 15-20). The *Westminster Confession* declares that "solemn fastings" are, "in their times and seasons," to be used in a holy and religious manner (xxi, v); and the *Westminster Catechism* makes "religious fasting" one of the duties required in the second commandment (quest. 109).

In *Scotland* there is generally a yearly fast "appointed by the kirk-session of the Established Church of the parish, or by concurrence of kirk-sessions in towns, but generally by use and wont fixed as to their date. The fast-day is always some day of the week preceding the *Communion Sunday*, or Sunday set apart in the Presbyterian churches for the Lord's Supper. It is usually appointed as a day for 'fasting, humiliation, and prayer.' Business is generally suspended, shops shut as on a Sunday, and churches opened for public worship. By an act of Parliament passed not many years since, factories are prohibited from carrying on work on the parish fast-day; but, in consequence of the ecclesiastical divisions in Scotland, it has become more common than it once was for agricultural and other kinds of work to be carried on" (Chambers, *Encyclopædia*, s. v.).

*America*.—The New England Puritans rejected the ancient ecclesiastical fast-days. The Pilgrim fathers observed "seasons of fasting and prayer" before sailing from Europe, and after their arrival in America. They admitted the right and duty of the civil rulers to set apart days for fasting and prayer. This right has been recognised, and the duty observed, in most states of the American Union. During the Civil War (1861-5) the President of the United States appointed days of national fasting, which were generally observed by all the churches. The *Methodist Episcopal Church* enjoins "fasting, or abstinence," upon the people in the "General Rules" (*Discipline*, pt. i, ch. i, § 3); advises weekly fasts to her clergy (pt. ii, ch. ii, § 3); and directs that "a fast be held in every society on the Friday preceding every quarterly meeting" (pt. ii, ch. ii, § 17). The Presbyterian Church adopts the doctrine of the Westminster Confession on fasting (see above); makes "public solemn fasting" one of the ordinances established by Christ in the Church (*Form of Government*, ch. vii); ordains a fast-day in the congregation before an ordination (ch. xv), and declares that while "there is no day under the Gospel commanded to be kept holy except the Lord's day, which is the Christian Sabbath, nevertheless, to observe days of fasting and thanksgiving, as the extraordinary dispensations of divine Providence may direct, we judge both scriptural and rational. Fasts and thanksgivings may be observed by individual Christians or families in private; by particular congregations; by a number of congregations contiguous to each other; by the congregations under the care of a presbytery or of a synod; or by all the congregations of our Church. It must be left to the judgment and discretion of every Christian and family to determine when it is proper to observe a private fast or thanksgiving, and to the church-sessions to determine for particular congregations, and to the presbyteries or synods to determine for larger districts. When it is deemed ex-

pedient that a fast or thanksgiving should be general, the call for them must be judged of by the Synod or General Assembly. And if at any time the civil power should think it proper to appoint a fast or thanksgiving, it is the duty of the ministers and people of our communion, as we live under a Christian government, to pay all due respect to the same" (*Directory for Worship*, ch. xiv).

Besides the writers heretofore quoted, consult Tillotson, *Sermons* (serm. 39); Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. xxi, chap. i-iii; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity*, p. 552 sq.; Bishop Morris, in *Meth. Quart. Review*, 1849, 205 sq.; Augusti, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, x, 311 sq.; Suicer, *Thesaurus*, s. v.  $\nu\eta\sigma\tau\iota\alpha$ ; Ducange, *Glossarium*, s. v. Jejunium; Ferraris, *Promta Bibliotheca*, iv, 867 sq. (ed. Migne); Wesley, *Sermons*, i, 245.

Fat for receiving wine; an old orthography for VAT (q. v.).

Fat (prop.  $\text{כֶּחֶלֶב}$ , *ché'leb*). [For the use of the word as a verb, see FATTED FOWL.] The Hebrews distinguished between the suet, or pure fat of an animal ( $\text{שֶׁמֶן}$ ), and the fat which was intermixed with the lean ( $\text{שֶׁמֶן זָךְ}$ , *oily pieces*, Neh. viii, 10). Certain restrictions were imposed upon them in reference to the former: some parts of the suet, viz. about the stomach, the entrails, the kidneys, and the tail of a sheep, which grows to an excessive size in many Eastern countries, and is a special delicacy, were forbidden to be eaten in the case of animals offered to Jehovah in sacrifice (Lev. iii, 3, 9, 17; vii, 3, 23). The ground of the prohibition was that the fat was the richest part of the animal, and therefore belonged to him (iii, 16). It has been supposed that other reasons were superadded, as that the use of fat was unwholesome in the hot climate of Palestine (Maimonides, *Mora Nebochim*, pt. iii, ch. xlviii). There appears, however, to be no ground for such an assumption (Bähr, *Symbol.* ii, 382). The presentation of the fat as the richest part of the animal was agreeable to the dictates of natural feeling, and to the analogy in dedicating the first-born and first-fruits to God. This was also the ordinary practice even of heathen nations, as instanced in the Homeric descriptions of sacrifices (*Il.* i, 460; ii, 423; *Od.* iii, 457), and in the customs of the Egyptians (Herod. ii, 47), and Persians (Strabo, xv, 732). Accordingly, Abel, who brought the first animal sacrifice, not only presented to the Lord "the firstlings of his flock," but "the fat thereof," which, by virtue of its being the best part, was as much the firstling of the animal itself as the animal was the firstling of the flock (Gen. iv, 4); or if the word here means the *fattest* of his flock, the same idea is essentially implied. Indeed, the term *cheleb* is itself significant of the feeling on which the regulation was based, for it sometimes describes the *best* of any production (Gen. xlv, 18; Numb. xviii, 12; Psa. lxxxi, 16; cxlvii, 14; compare 2 Sam. i, 22; Judg. iii, 29; Isa. x, 16). With regard to the other parts of the fat of sacrifices or the fat of other animals, it might be consumed, with the exception of those dying either by a violent or a natural death (Lev. vii, 24), which might still be used in any other way. The burning of the fat of sacrifices was particularly specified in each kind of offering, whether a peace offering (Lev. iii, 9), consecration offering (viii, 25), sin offering (iv, 8), trespass offering (vii, 3), or redemption offering (Numb. xviii, 17). The Hebrews fully appreciated the luxury of well-fatted meat, and had their stall-fed oxen and calves (1 Kings iv, 23; Jer. xlvi, 21; Luke xv, 23). This was, however, not a usual practice; and even at this day in the East, domestic cattle seldom undergo any preparatory feeding or fattening before being killed. Hence there is little fat in the carcase except that belonging to the parts specified in the prohibition, which is all more or less of the nature of suet. See FOOD.

The parts of the fat or suet of the victims which belong to God, and are especially to be appropriated to the altar, are given in Exod. xxix, 13-22, and Lev. iii, 3-5, as follows: 1. The fat which covers the entrails ( $\text{כֶּחֶלֶב הַכִּבְדִּים הַשְּׂמֵרָה}$ ) = *ἐπιπλοῦς*, as Josephus rightly has it (*Ant.* iii, 9, 2); the *omentum*, which is only to be found in man and mammals, and is very fat in ruminants (comp. Aristot. *Hist. Anim.* i, 16; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xi, 80). 2. The fat which accumulates around entrails ( $\text{כֶּחֶלֶב הַכִּבְדִּים}$ ), and is easily separated therefrom, i. e. the reticular adhering to the colon. 3. The two kidneys, with the fat on them, at the internal muscles of the loins ( $\text{כֶּחֶלֶב הַכִּבְדִּים}$ ), as the most fat accumulates near the kidneys (Deut. xxxii, 14; Isa. xxxiv, 6), and to such an extent in sheep that they sometimes die of it (*οἱ νεφοὶ μάλιστα τῶν σπλάγγων ἔχονσι πικρὴν, Aristot. De Part. Anim.* iii, 9, and *Hist. Anim.* iii, 16; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xi, 81). 4. The  $\text{כֶּחֶלֶב הַיֶּרֶךְ}$ , *yothe'rath*, which is taken by the Sept. and Josephus (*Ant.* iii, 9, 2) to mean *ὁ λοβὸς τοῦ ἡπατος*, the *greater lobe of the liver*, similarly the Syriac and Chaldee ( $\text{כֶּחֶלֶב הַיֶּרֶךְ}$ ); and is explained by the Talmud (*Chulin*, xlix, 6), Rashi, Kimchi, Solomon ben-Melech, etc., as  $\text{שֶׁמֶן הַיֶּרֶךְ} = \tau\rho\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\zeta\alpha$ , whereby the Greeks, according to Hippocrates, understood the greater and thickest of the five segments of the liver (Bähr, *Symbol.* ii, 254). This meaning of  $\text{כֶּחֶלֶב הַיֶּרֶךְ}$  is ably defended by Bochart (*Hieroz.* lib. ii, c. xlv), and followed by Le Clerc, J. D. Rosenmüller, Kalisch (on Exod. xxix, 13), and others. But the Vulgate, Luther, Tyndale, the Bishops' Bible, the Geneva Bible, the A. V., P'seator, De Wette, Knobel, Fürst, etc., take it to denote *omentum minus*, which is preferable, for the lobes have no accumulation of fat. 5. The tail ( $\text{כֶּחֶלֶב הַזָּנָב}$ , *ayah'*, A. V. "rump") of a sheep (Lev. vii, 3), which, in a certain species (*ovis laticaudata*), contains a great quantity of fat. It is for this reason that the eating of fat is forbidden (Lev. iii, 17). It affords a delicate marrowy substance much used in *pillais* and other messes which require to be lubricated by animal juices. The Rabbinical Jews maintain that the prohibition of it is restricted to the sacrifices, while the Karaite Jews regard the eating of the tail as absolutely forbidden.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See SHEEP.

One of the metaphorical senses of "fat" (in the Hebrew) is noticed above. By a natural figure, "fat" is occasionally put in Scripture for a dull and torpid state of mind, as if the heart were covered with thick fat, and therefore insensible (Psa. xvii, 10). See OIL.

**Fatalism**, the doctrine of an inevitable necessity, implying an omnipotent and arbitrary superior power. It is derived from the Latin *fatum* ("what is spoken or decreed," passive participle of *fari*). The Greeks expressed it also by the passive participle *ἡμορμένη*; but their words *μοῖρα* (*Destiny, the Goddess of Fate*) and *ἄστα* (*decree, destiny, goddess who dispenses fate*) have an active meaning.

I. In Homer, *Moira* has a twofold force; it is sometimes considered as superior to Zeus, then again as inferior to him; a twofold force which Nägelsbach correctly expounds (after Delbrück and Creuzer) by saying that in Homer the monarchical will of Zeus does not appear as directly opposed to the contrary efforts of the other gods. Yet the human mind has a monotheistic tendency even among the heathen, and therefore seeks to give to the heavens one supreme ruler, and to unite all the gods into one exclusive unity. On the other hand, however, this unity is inert and dead, and this leads Homer to identify it with the highest, the living god—with the "total will" of the other gods. The gradual development of Greek philosophy led to the thought of representing the supreme ruling power by *Moira*: so we find it in Herodotus, i, 91, *τὴν περὶ*

*μῆνῃ μοῖραν ἀδυνατὰ ἴσθιν ἀποφυγεῖν καὶ θεῶν.* This agency of Fate was afterwards made to apply to the regulation of the outward life of men, and the conception of Fate as the ruling power of the universe became deeper and more spiritual: so Anaxagoras recognizes *Νοῦς*, the spirit, as ruler of the world; and Plato does the same, especially in *Philebus* (31, 4, *ἐν τῇ τοῦ Διὸς φύσει βασιλικὴν μὲν ψυχὴν, βασιλικὴν δὲ νοῦν ἐγγίγνεσθαι*). This same tendency towards a spiritualization of Fate is found in the tragic authors, especially in Sophocles, who has happily expressed these views in his *Œdipus Coloneus*, 266, 267 (edition Schneidewin): *ἐπεὶ τὰ γ' ἔργα μοι πεποιθότε' ἴσθι μάλλον ἢ δευρακότα* (for my actions are rather to be called my destiny's than my own). But this fate does not exclude guilt on the part of man, for the curse rested from the first on individual sin, as is shown especially in the revelation of fearful guilt in the *Œdipus Rex*, and the possibility of pardon in the *Coloneus*. The Greek tragedy is based on this very antagonism between individual being and the supreme world-power. After Sophocles, the two notions of the word *Μοῖρα* were separated, and each was gradually brought out more distinctly. From Euripides down to the Epicureans a tendency prevailed to make the power of fate subservient to human caprice, and to make it subordinate to *Τύχη* (chance), which plays an important part in Thucydides. Blind chance was made to rule the earth. The Epicureans proclaimed their gods the "essence of pure inactive self-indulgence, indifferent to the condition of mankind and the world," so that, the gods no longer interfering in human affairs, it became matter of indifference whether they were worshipped or not. On the other hand, Stoicism maintained that to live according to the laws of nature, i. e. to resign one's self to the necessary course of things, is the true wisdom of life. In this point, as in others, the views of the Stoics and the Epicureans were directly opposed to each other [see EPICUREAN PHILOSOPHY], yet in their results they arrived at the same point, viz. that against the *inechetable fatum*, whether the result of separate accidental chances or of the general law of nature, there is nothing to be done. The *Moira*, acting according to higher laws incomprehensible to humanity, is thus confounded with blind destiny.

11. The conception of fate which underlies all theories of fatalism is as follows: (1.) Destiny is a dead, blind power; (2.) human liberty is completely and irresistibly controlled by destiny. Under this twofold aspect, fatalism finds its most complete realization in Mohammedanism; but it has also been defended on scientific grounds within the sphere of Christendom. The doctrine of absolute predestination, in its hidden *absolutum decretum* (see Luther, *De servo arbitrio*, and Ullmann, *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1847, i, 2), resembles the heathen conception of fate. In its relation to spiritual and eternal life, fatalism is generally based on (1) the pantheistic view of the world, which swallows up individual freedom and responsibility, so that (as by Spinoza) all our thoughts and actions are represented as but the thoughts and actions of God manifested through us. This leads naturally to (2) the determinism of deism, which considers the world as so ruled by the immutable laws of nature that individual life and actions are but cogs of one of the wheels of the universal machinery; and to modern materialism, according to which thought is but a natural secretion of the brain.

The Christian idea of God is directly opposed to all fatalism, whether pagan or modern materialistic. In Christian thought, God is not blind chance, dead fate, or a dark, unknown force of nature; but God is spirit, a living God, a personal Being, who is love and the Father of love. And this living and personal God has endowed man with his own image, and therefore with freedom, in the exercise of which endowment man is to become himself a participant in the fulfilment of

the divine decrees, a "co-worker" with God, and, as such, not only capable of aiding in the spread and consummation of the kingdom (or royal sway) of God upon the earth, but also bound to aid in it.—Herzog, *Real-Encyclopædie*, iv, 340 sq. (from which this article is chiefly a translation); Cudworth, *Intellectual System of the Universe*, bk. i, chap. i; Hamilton, *Discussions in Philosophy*; Werner, *Geschichte der apolog. Literatur* (Schaffhausen, 1867). See MATERIALISM.

**Father** (פֶּתֶר, a primitive word, but following the analogy of פֶּתֶחַ, to show kindness, Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, p. 6-8; Chaldee, ܦܬܪܐ, πατήρ). Compare SON.

1. This word, besides its obvious and primary sense, bears in Scripture a number of other applications, most of which have, through the use of the Bible, become more or less common in all Christian countries (see Gesenius's *Heb.* and Robinson's *Greek Lex.*).

(1.) *Father* is applied to any ancestor near or remote, or to ancestors ("fathers") in general. The progenitor or founder, or patriarch of a tribe or nation was also pre-eminently its father, as Abraham of the Jews. Examples of this abound. See, for instance, Deut. i, 11; 1 Kings viii, 11; Matt. iii, 9; xxiii, 30; Mark xi, 10; Luke i, 32, 73; vi, 23, 23; John vii, 22, etc. So of the founder or rebuilder of a city (1 Chron. ii, 50-52, etc.).

(2.) *Father* is also applied as a title of respect to any head, chief, ruler, or elder, and especially to kings, prophets, and priests (Judg. xvii, 10; xviii, 19; 1 Sam. x, 12; 2 Kings ii, 12; v, 13; vi, 21; xiii, 14; Prov. iv, 1; Matt. xxiii, 9; Acts vii, 2; xxii, 1; 1 Cor. iv, 15, etc.). Also of protector or guardian (Job xxix, 16; Psa. lxxviii, 5; Deut. xxxii, 6). Hence of seniors, especially of Church fathers. See *below*.

(3.) The author, source, or beginner of anything is also called the father of the same, or of those who follow him. Thus Jabal is called "the father of those who dwell in tents, and have cattle;" and Jubal "the father of all such as handle the harp and the organ" (Gen. iv, 21, 22; comp. Job xxxviii, 28; John viii, 44; Rom. iv, 12). In the Talmud the term father is used to indicate the chief; e. g. the principal of certain works are termed "fathers." Objects whose contact causes pollution are called "fathers" of defilement (Mishna, *Shabb.* vii, 2, vol. ii, p. 29; *Pesach*, i, 6, vol. ii, p. 137, Surenh.). This use of *father* is exceedingly common in the East to this day, especially as applied in the formation of proper names, in which also the most curious Hebrew examples of this usage occur. See *AB-*.

(4.) As an extension of all the foregoing senses, the term father is very often applied to God himself (Gen. xlv, 19, 20; Exod. iv, 22; Deut. xxxii, 6; 2 Sam. vii, 14; Psa. lxxxix, 27, 28; Isa. lxiii, 16; lxiv, 8). Indeed, the analogy of language would point to this, seeing that in the Old Testament, and in all the Syro-Arabian dialects, the originator of anything is constantly called its father. Without doubt, however, God is in a more especial manner, even as by covenant, the Father of the Jews (Jer. xxxi, 9; Isa. lxiii, 16; lxiv, 8; John viii, 41; v, 45; 2 Cor. vi, 18); and also of Christians, or, rather, of all pious and believing persons, who are called "sons of God" (John i, 12; Rom. viii, 16, etc.). Thus Jesus, in speaking to his disciples, calls God their Father (Matt. vi, 4, 8, 15, 18; x, 20, 29; xiii, 43, etc.). The apostles also, for themselves and other Christians, call him "Father" (Rom. i, 7; 1 Cor. i, 3; 2 Cor. i, 2; Gal. i, 4; and many other places). See *ABBA*.

2. The position and authority of the father as the head of the family is expressly assumed and sanctioned in Scripture, as a likeness of that of the Almighty over his creatures, an authority—as Philo remarks—intermediate between human and divine (Philo, *περί γονέων τμήσε*, § 1). It lies, of course, at the root of that so-called patriarchal government (Gen. iii, 16: 1

Gen. xi, 3), which was introductory to the more definite systems that followed, and that in part, but not wholly, superseded it. When, therefore, the name of "father of nations" (אֲבִי הָעַמִּים) was given to Abram, he was thereby held up not only as the ancestor, but as the example of those who should come after him (Gen. xviii, 18, 19; Rom. iv, 17). The father's blessing was regarded as conferring special benefit, but his malediction special injury, on those upon whom it fell (Gen. ix, 25, 27; xxvii, 27-40; xlviii, 15, 20; xlix); and so also the sin of a parent was held to affect, in certain cases, the welfare of his descendants (2 Kings, v, 27), though the law forbade the punishment of the son for his father's transgression (Deut. xxiv, 16; 2 Kings xiv, 6; Ezek. xviii, 20). The command to honor parents is noticed by the apostle Paul as the only one of the Decalogue which bore a distinct promise (Exod. xx, 12; Ephes. vi, 2), and direproof towards them was condemned by the law as one of the worst of crimes (Exod. xxi, 15, 17; 1 Tim. i, 9; comp. Virgil, *Æn.* vi, 609; Aristoph. *Ran.* 274-773). Instances of legal enactment in support of parental authority are found in Exod. xxii, 17; Numb. xxx, 3, 5; xii, 14; Deut. xxi, 18, 21; Lev. xx, 9; xxi, 9; xxii, 12; and the spirit of the law in this direction may be seen in Prov. xiii, 1; xv, 5; xvii, 25; xix, 13; xx, 20; xxviii, 24; xxx, 17; Isa. xlv, 10; Mal. i, 6. The father, however, had not the power of death over his child under the Mosaic law (Deut. xxi, 18-21; Philo, *l. c.*).

From the patriarchal spirit also the principle of respect to age and authority in general appears to be derived. Thus Jacob is described as blessing Pharaoh (Gen. xlvii, 7, 10; comp. Lev. xix, 32; Prov. xvi, 31; Philo, *l. c.* § 6).

The authority of a father was thus very great in patriarchal times; and although the law of Moses required the parent to bring his cause of complaint to the public tribunals (Deut. xxi, 18-21), all the more real powers of parental character were not only left unimpaired, but were made in a great degree the basis of the judicial polity which that law established. The children, and even the grandchildren, continued under the roof of the father and grandfather; they labored on his account, and were the most submissive of his servants. The property of the soil, the power of judgment, the civil rights, belonged to him only, and his sons were merely his instruments and assistants. If a family be compared to a body, then the father was the head, and the sons the members, moving at his will and in his service. There were exceptions, doubtless, but this was the rule, and, with some modifications, it is still the rule throughout the East.

Filial duty and obedience were, indeed, in the eyes of the Jewish legislator, of such high importance that great care was taken that the paternal authority should not be weakened by the withdrawal of a power so liable to fatal and barbarous abuse as that of capital punishment. Any outrage against a parent—a blow, a curse, or incorrigible profligacy—was made a capital crime (Exod. xxi, 15, 17; Lev. xx, 9). If the offence was public, it was taken up by the witnesses as a crime against Jehovah, and the culprit was brought before the magistrates, whether the parent consented or not; and if the offence was hidden within the paternal walls, it devolved on the parents to denounce him and to require his punishment.

It is a beautiful circumstance in the law of Moses that this filial respect is exacted for the mother as well as for the father. The threats and promises of the legislator distinguish not the one from the other; and the fifth commandment associates the father and mother in a precisely equal claim to honor from their children (see Collier, *Espirit de la Législation Mosaique*, ii, 69, 122-129). Comp. WOMAN.

Among Mohammedans parental authority has great weight during the time of pupillage. The son is not

allowed to eat, scarcely to sit, in his father's presence. Disobedience to parents is reckoned one of the most heinous of crimes (Burckhardt, *Notes on Bed.* i, 355; Lane, *Mod. Eg.* i, 84; Atkinson, *Travels in Siberia*, p. 559).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

**Father (GOD THE)** was usually represented in early Christian art by a hand, which was usually extended through a cloud. The principal subjects in which God the Father is represented by a hand are the scenes from the creation: Moses receiving the law, Moses at the burning bush, the sacrifice of Abraham, and the baptism of Christ. The hand is often given as holding out wreaths or crowns to saints and martyrs at their death, or their ascension to Paradise. As early as the fifth century, God the Father is represented as an old man. This symbol predominated during the later Middle Ages, and is the one now universally adopted by Christian artists. The figures of God in the creation by M. Angelo and Raphael, in the Sistine chapel and in the Vatican, are among the grandest conceptions in all art. God the Father is also represented as an old man in the representations of the Trinity (q. v.).—Martigny, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités Chrétiennes*, 1865. (G. F. C.)

**Father-in-law:** 1. חַמ, *cham* (from חָתָן, to join in affinity; see MOTHER-IN-LAW), Gen. xxxviii, 13, 25; 1 Sam. iv, 19, 21. 2. חָתָן, *chothen'* (participle of חָתַן, to marry), one marrying a daughter, Exod. iii, 1; iv, 18; xviii, 1-27; Num. x, 29; Judg. i, 16; iv, 11; xix, 4, 7, 9. 3. *πατερός* (strictly one related by marriage, like No. 1), John xviii, 13. See AFFINITY.

**Father's Brother**, דוד, *dod* (strictly one beloved, a friend, as in Isa. v, 1), an *uncle* (q. v.), Num. xxxvi, 11; 2 Kings xxiv, 17; fem. FATHER'S SISTER, דודא, *dodah'*, Exod. vi, 20, an *aunt* (q. v.).

**Fathers of the Church** (*Patres Ecclesie*), a name applied to certain ancient Christian writers, who have preserved in their writings, to a certain extent, the history, doctrines, and traditions of the early Church. The use of the name "father" for this purpose originated in the Oriental habit of styling the relation of teacher and pupil that of "father" and "son." So Alexander the Great called Aristotle his "father," Elisha calls Elijah his "father" (2 Kings ii, 12); the pupils of the prophets were called "sons of the prophets." At an early period in the Christian Church, this title was given to preachers and teachers; and later, the title "father" (*papa*, pope) was given to bishops especially.

The Greek Church closes the list of the "fathers," properly so called, with John of Damascus († 754), the Latin Church with Gregory the Great († 604). The use of the word "fathers" is by Protestants "limited to the more distinguished teachers of the first five or six centuries, excepting, of course, the apostles, who stand far above them all as the inspired organs of the Holy Ghost. It applies, therefore, to the period of the oecumenical formation of doctrines, before the separation of Eastern and Western Christendom" (Schaff, *Church History*, i, 454). The Roman theologians make the following qualities the criterion of a "Church father," viz. antiquity, orthodoxy, sanctity of life, and the approval of the Church (Fessler, *Institutiones Patrologie*, i, 26). Accordingly, the Roman Church denies the title fathers to such men as Origen, Tertullian, Lactantius, Eusebius, etc., because their writings are not held to be in all respects orthodox; they are designated, not as *patres*, but as *scriptores ecclesiastici* (ecclesiastical writers). At a later period, the title *doctores ecclesie* (doctors of the Church) was given to writers supposed to have the qualities cited above as constituting the criterion of "a father," substituting *eminens eruditio for antiquitas*. A decree of pope Boniface (A. D. 1298) assigns the title *magni ecclesie doctores* to the four Latin fathers Ambrose, Au-



gustine, Jerome, and Gregory the Great. Among the Greeks, the title *doctores ecclesie* was given to Athanasius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, and Chrysostom, and the Latins recognise them as such. To a few great men among the scholastics the same title was given, with an additional epithet to designate some special intellectual quality in gift; thus, in the 12th and 13th centuries, the following doctors of the Church were thus honored: Thomas Aquinas, Angelicus; Johannes Bonaventura, Seraphicus; Johannes Duns Scotus, Subtilis; Raimundus Lullius, Illuminatus; Alanus de Insulis (de l'Isle), Universalis; Durandus de S. Pourçain, Resolutissimus; Gregorius de Rimini, Authenticus; Johannes Taulerus, Illuminatus; Johannes Gersonus, Christianissimus; Alexander Haales, Irrefragabilis; Roger Bacon, Admirabilis; William Oecam, Singularis. Since 1839, Bernard of Clairvaux has been included among the "doctors," and, since 1852, Hilary of Poitiers. Chronologically, the fathers are divided into three classes, the apostolical, the anti-Nicene, and post-Nicene.

I. The *Apostolical Fathers* are those Christian writers (of whom any remains are now extant) who are supposed to have been contemporary with one or more of the apostles, that is to say, who lived and wrote before A. D. 120. There are five names usually given as those of the apostolical fathers, i. e. there are five men who lived during the age of the apostles, and who did converse, or might have conversed with them, to whom writings still extant have been ascribed, viz. Barnabas, Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Hermas. The following works are generally counted to these writers: 1. The epistle of Barnabas [see BARNABAS]; 2. Two epistles of Clement, bishop of Rome, to the Corinthians [see CLEMENT OF ROME]; 3. Several epistles of Ignatius, bishop of Antioch [see IGNATIUS]; 4. An epistle of Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, to the Philippians [see POLYCARP]; 5. The epistle (of an unknown author) to Diognetus [see DIOGNETUS]; 6. The book entitled *Pastor Hermas* [see HERMAS]. Certain fragments of Papias are also commonly included among the apostolical fathers. See PAPIAS. Of the writings attributed to these fathers, some at least are of doubtful genuineness (on this point, see the individual titles referred to). See the article APOSTOLICAL FATHERS, vol. i, p. 815.

II. The *Anti-Nicene Fathers* are those whose writings date before the Council of Nicea, A. D. 325. The chief among them are (lists from Eadie, *Riddle*, Alzo.): Justin Martyr, born probably about A. D. 100; left Palestine 132; presented his first *Apology* to Antoninus about (140 or) 148; wrote his second *Apology* in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, probably about 162-4; has left a variety of other works, and a *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*; suffered martyrdom at Rome about 165.

Hermias wrote his work, *Derision of the Heathen Philosophers*, probably about 170.

Dionysius of Corinth wrote some epistles; all lost except a very few fragments; fl. 170.

Hegesippus, originally a Jew, wrote *History of the Church*, of which only a few fragments survive, about 175.

Tatian wrote an *Oration against the Greeks*, which has been preserved; died probably about 176.

Athenagoras wrote an *Apology for the Christians*, and also on the resurrection, both of which have been translated into English, 176.

Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, wrote his work on religion to Autolytus about 180; died 181.

Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, Gaul, in the latter part of the second century (became bishop about A. D. 177), wrote his work *Against Heresies*, or *A Refutation and Subversion of Knowledge falsely so called*, between A. D. 182 and 188; died about A. D. 202.

Minucius Felix wrote his *Octavius*, or defence of Christianity, about 208.

Clement of Alexandria succeeded Pantænus in the catechetical school of that city 188 or 199; quitted Alexandria 202; died about 217.

Tertullian became a Montanist about the year 200; his *Apology* was composed (198 or) 205; his work against Marcion, 207; has left a great variety of tracts on the vices and customs of his age—as on the theatre, the dress of females, idolatry, second marriages, the soldier's crown, and on flight in persecution, etc.; died about 240.

Hippolytus, bishop of Portus Romanus, wrote, besides many other pieces, *Philosophoumena*, newly discovered; died about 230.

Origen, born 185; head of the catechetical school at Alexandria 204; went to Rome, and returned to Alexandria, 215; went to Cæsarea, in Palestine, 215; ordained at Cæsarea, and afterwards settled there, about 230; retired to Cappadocia 235; returned to Cæsarea 239; a laborious scholar and critic; compiled a *Hexapla*, or Polyglot Bible; wrote commentaries on Scripture, some of which survive; a treatise on prayer; and a defence against Celsus; thrown into prison 250; died 254.

Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, 248; fled from Carthage 250; returned 251; banished 257; author of epistles, addresses, and tracts; advocate of Episcopacy; suffered martyrdom 258.

Dionysius, surnamed the Great, bishop of Alexandria, a scholar of Origen, 247 or 248; died 265.

Gregory (Thaumaturgus), bishop of Neocæsarea, flourished 245; composed a creed, an oration in praise of Origen, and a paraphrase on Ecclesiastes; died about 270.

Victorinus wrote scholia on the Apocalypse; died 303. Arnobius wrote his treatise of seven books *Against the Gentiles* about 305; died probably about 325.

Lactantius finished his *Institutes* about 320; wrote also on *The Death of Persecutors*, and on *The Wrath of God*; composed a symposium or banquet, and an itinerary, both in verse; died 325.

For the literature, see each of these titles in its alphabetical place. The greater part of this period, down at least to the death of Origen, A. D. 254, may be called the apologetic period of the early Church, and many of the writers of that time belong to the class of apologists (q. v.). The last half of the period was one of construction of doctrines and of polemical discussion of them within the Church. Strife against pagans and pagan philosophy on the one hand, and against Judaic Doctem and Gnosticism on the other, characterizes the whole period (see Neander, *History of Dogmas*, Ryland's translation, i, 33 sq.). "While the so-called apostolical fathers (with few exceptions) were distinguished by a direct practico-ascetical rather than a definite doctrinal activity, the philosophizing tendency allied to Hellenism was in some measure represented by the apologists Justin Martyr, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus of Antioch, and Minucius Felix in the West. On the contrary, Irenæus, as well as Tertullian, and his disciple Cyprian, firmly adhered to the positive dogmatic theology of the Church, the former in a milder and more considerate, the latter in a strict and sometimes gloomy manner. Clement and Origen, both belonging to the Alexandrian school, chiefly developed the speculative aspect of theology. But these contrasts are only relative; for we find, e. g. that Justin Martyr manifests both a leaning towards Hellenism, and a strong Judaizing tendency: that the idealism and criticism of Origen are now and then accompanied with a surprising adherence to the letter; and that Tertullian, notwithstanding his anti-Gnostic tendency, evidently strives after philosophical ideas. It was the characteristic feature of the apologetic period, that the whole system of Christianity as a religious-moral fact was considered and defended rather than particular doctrines. Still, certain doctrines become more prominent, while others receive less atten-

tion. Investigations of a theological and christological nature are certainly more numerous than those of an anthropological character. On this account the doctrine of human liberty is made more conspicuous in this period than later writers approved. Next to theology and christology, eschatology engaged most the attention of Christians at that time, and was more fully developed in the struggle with millenarianism on the one side, and with the scepticism of Grecian philosophers on the other" (Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, § 26, 27). A valuable literary history of the ante-Nicene fathers is furnished by Donaldson, *Critical History of Christian Literature and Doctrine, from the death of the Apostles to the Nicene Council* (Lond. 1864, 3 vols. 8vo), a work which shows industry and ability, but is not remarkable for true critical judgment. Dr. Buchanan remarks that "Donaldson argues on the erroneous principle that the teaching of the earlier fathers may be applied as a test, if not of the truth of certain doctrines, at least of their necessity and importance as articles of faith. 'If the early writers were heterodox on the Trinity—if they knew nothing of a satisfaction of divine justice, but spoke only in a vague way of the matter—if they wavered in regard to original sin, some denying it entirely, and others expressing themselves with great uncertainty—if their testimony to the inspiration of the New Testament is unsatisfactory and inconclusive, where was Christianity in those days? Did it really sleep for three long centuries? . . . Or may not the evangelical school be wrong in asserting that it is necessary for a man to believe in original sin, the Trinity, the atonement, and similar dogmas, before he can be a Christian?' (vol. i, p. 64). Dr. Donaldson's work—considered as a 'Critical History of Christian Literature' in the first three centuries—is highly valuable, and exhibits the results of ripe scholarship, and extensive reading and research; but considered as a 'Critical History of Christian Doctrine,' it is far from being a safe guide. His interpretation of many passages in the writings of the fathers is, to say the least, highly questionable, and at direct variance with that of such writers as Bull, and Waterland, and Faber. But, even were it more certain than it is, and did it afford proof that their writings were less in accordance with Scripture than we believe them to have been, we should still fall back on the cardinal principle that they are to be tested by the only infallible standard, the inspired Word of God. 'To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this Word, there is no light in them.' We should then be constrained to say of them, as the prophet said of ancient Israel, 'They have forsaken the word of the Lord, and what wisdom is in them?' but we should have no difficulty in answering the question, Where was Christianity then? for it existed then, as it exists still, in 'the Word of God, the Gospel of our salvation'; and it was neither dead nor asleep, but alive and active in the Church of the Catacombs" (Buchanan, *Doctrine of Justification*, Edinb. 1867, p. 431).

III. *Post-Nicene*.—The principal post-Nicene fathers are as follows:

Eusebius (Pamphili), born about A.D. 270; bishop of Caesarea, in Palestine, 315; was a learned and laborious writer; wrote, besides many other things, the *Evangelical Preparation*, in fifteen books; *Evangelical Demonstration*, in twenty books—the half of which is lost—but both works belong to Apologetics (q. v.); an *Ecclesiastical History*, in ten books; died 340.

Julius Firmicus Maternus, who wrote on the error of profane religions; flourished about 340.

Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, born 305; banished to Phrygia 356; wrote on the Trinity, on councils, against the Arians, with a commentary on the Psalms and Matthew; died 366.

Athanasius, born at Alexandria about 296; present as deacon at the Council of Nicæa 325; bishop of Al-

exandria 326; fled to Rome 341; returned to Alexandria 346; fled to the deserts of Egypt 356; wrote a discourse against the Gentiles, on the Incarnation; against the Arians, on the Incarnation; against Apollinaris, etc.; died 373.

Basil, surnamed the Great, born 329; bishop of Caesarea, in Cappadocia, 370; wrote homilies, expositions, panegyrics, *Hexæmeron*, and letters; died 379.

Ephraim the Syrian, deacon of Edessa; published a variety of commentaries, polemical treatise, and smaller works; died about 379.

Cyril of Jerusalem, born 315; bishop of Jerusalem 350; wrote catechetical discourses; died 386.

Gregory of Nazianzus, born 328; ordained deacon 361; bishop of Suziama 372; bishop of Constantinople 381; wrote discourses, poems, and letters; died about 390.

Gregory of Nyssa, born 351; bishop of Nyssa 372; wrote a *Hexæmeron*, life of Moses, on prayer, along with orations, panegyrics, tracts, and letters; died about 395.

Ambrose, born 340; archbishop of Milan 374; published annotations on Scripture, discourses, and miscellaneous treatises; died about 397.

Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis, born about 330; wrote a *Panarium*, or a treatise on heresies, etc.; died 403.

Chrysostom, born at Antioch about 344; ordained presbyter in that church 386; bishop of Constantinople 398; deprived and restored 403; banished 404; was a most eloquent preacher and voluminous writer; wrote many commentaries, homilies, orations, with several controversial pieces; died 407.

Ruffinus, presbyter of Aquileia, engaged in controversy with Jerome 394; published a great many Latin translations, as well as original works; died 410.

Jerome, born 331; in Rome 363; ordained presbyter about 378; translated or revised the Latin *Vulgate*; wrote commentaries on most of the books of Scripture, controversial tracts, an *Onomasticon*, and lives and works of preceding ecclesiastical writers; died 420.

Theodorus, bishop of Mopsuestia, in Cilicia, about 392; wrote commentaries, in which he expounded the grammatical sense; but only a few brief fragments remain; died about 428.

Augustine, born 354; baptized 387; ordained presbyter at Hippo 391; coadjutor of Valerius, Bishop of Hippo, 395; began his work, *De Civitate Dei*, 402; published Confessions; engaged in controversy with the Pelagians, Donatists, and Manichæans; composed a great variety of tracts bearing on systematic theology and prevalent errors; wrote his *Retractations*, or reviews of his own work, 426; died 430.

Cyril of Alexandria, bishop of Alexandria 513; an ambitious and turbulent defender of orthodoxy; wrote on the Pentateuch, on adoration in spirit, some commentaries on portions of the Old and New Testaments, on the Trinity, against the emperor Julian, and against Nestorius; died 444.

Vincent of Lerins (Vincenotius Lirinensis) wrote his *Commonitorium*, or admonition against profane novelties of heretics, 434; died about 448.

Isidore of Pelusium; wrote tracts on Scripture, on doctrines, on discipline, and on monachism; died 449.

Sedulius, poet, and Scotsman by birth, wrote several hymns, and a *Carmen Paschale*, in verse; flourished about 449.

Theodoret, born 386 (or 393); bishop of Cyrus, in Syria, 423; deprived 449; restored 451; wrote questions on Scripture, commentaries, and a Church history, extending from 325 to 429; a religious history, and an epitome of heretical fables; died 456.

Petrus Chrysologus; wrote a letter to Eutyches and some sermons; died about 456.

Leo I, surnamed the Great, to whom are ascribed let-

ters and sermons; wrote on morals, on the pastorate, and left also homilies, dialogues, and letters; died 461.

Vigilius, bishop of Thapsus; wrote against the heresies of Arius, Nestorius, and on the Trinity; flourished about 480.

Boethius, author of the *Consolation of Philosophy*; put to death 525.

Procopius of Gaza, a commentator on Scripture; flourished about 525.

Aretas, a commentator on the Apocalypse; flourished about 549.

Evagrius, wrote a *Church History*; died 594.

Gregory, bishop of Tours; died 596.

Gregory I, surnamed the Great, bishop of Rome 590; died 604.

Joannes Moschus, monk, died 620.

Isidore of Seville, died 636.

Bede, the *Venerable*, died 735.

John of Damascus, *Dogmatic Theology*, c. 775.

See each of the above names in its alphabetical place in this Cyclopaedia.

IV. *Use and Authority of the Fathers in Theology.*—On this subject there are three opinions: (a.) The Roman and Puseyite view, which puts the "consent of the fathers" (embodying tradition) into the rule of faith, along with Scripture. See FAITH, RULE OF. (b.) That of the High-Church writers, who, though they acknowledge the Scriptures as the only rule of faith, yet appeal to the fathers as the proper expositors of Scripture doctrine, and denounce as arrogant and presumptuous those who attempt to oppose modern opinions to what is held to be the sentiment of Christian antiquity. (c.) The Protestant view, according to which the fathers are to be treated, like other theological writers, with the deference and respect to which their learning and their virtues may entitle them. "In reading the fathers we must always bear in mind that the Scriptures are the only rule of faith, and that we have no right to insist upon the reception, as an article of faith, of any doctrine which is not to be found clearly revealed in Scripture, or which is not deducible from Scripture. Still, the judgment of antiquity on disputed points may be useful; and while we should not put these writers into the position of judges, they may be regarded as competent witnesses. They are also the historians of the Church, and report its customs in successive ages; we must, therefore, have recourse to their writings for information on matters of ecclesiastical antiquity, just as we refer to the writings of heathen orators, historians, and poets for information with respect to Roman or Grecian antiquities" (Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 56).

1. The scholastic theology (q. v.) began with comments upon citations from the fathers, considered as authoritative (*sententiae*). When the Reformation began, the Roman divines found themselves driven anew to the fathers for authority for the doctrines and practices which Luther and his coadjutors showed to be without foundation in Scripture. More loudly than even the scholastics did the controvertists of this period proclaim the authority of patristic tradition in settling questions of faith. We have here a clear polemical reason for the view taken of the fathers in Roman theology (see it stated in Alzog, *Patrologie*, § 3; and compare the articles FAITH, RULE OF; TRADITION). Not unnaturally, then, have the Roman theologians been the most diligent workers in this field of Christian literature. But, on the other hand, the Roman theory that questions of doctrine can only be settled by councils (or by pope and council), has not been without effect in leading Roman writers to depreciate the early writers, or, at least, to see their defects clearly. So Petavius, whose *Opus De Theologicis Dogmatibus* (Paris, 1644-50; new edit. vol. i, Rome, 1857, fol.) is a store-house of patristical learning, points out the theological errors of Athenagoras, Tertullian, and

others, with great clearness. So also J. H. Newman, in the Introduction to his *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (p. 12-15, N. Y. edit.), dwells upon the "incompleteness" and even of the "errors" of the ante-Nicene theology, even in the hands of such fathers as Irenaeus, Gregory, and Cyprian. This whole Introduction may be considered as an argument against the so-called Tractarian view of the authority of the fathers, and especially against the validity and practicability of the much-vaunted *dictum* of Vincentius Lirinensis (q. v.), *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus traditum est*. All the recent Roman writers who adopt the theory of "development" (q. v.) write in the same vein.

2. The Protestant theologians have, until a late period at least, been divided into two wings on this question of the "right use of the fathers." One of these wings may be represented by Milton († 1674) and by Daillé († 1670). Milton, in his tract on *Prelatical Episcopacy*, speaks, in his strong way, of those who, "not content with the plentiful and wholesome fountains of Scripture, seek to themselves teachers, and cannot think any doubt resolved until they run to that undigested heap and fry of authors which they call antiquity. Whatever time, or the heedless hand of blind chance, hath drawn down from of old to this present in her huge drag-net, whether fish or sea-weed, shells or shrubs, unpicked, unchosen, those are the fathers." But yet, he adds, in another part of the same tract, "He that thinks it the part of a well-learned man to have read diligently the ancient stories of the Church, and to be no stranger in the volumes of the fathers, shall have all judicious men consenting with him; not hereby to control and new-fangle the Scriptures, God forbid! but to mark how corruption and apostasy crept in by degrees, and to gather up, wherever we find the remaining sparks of original truth, wherewith to stop the mouths of our adversaries, and to bridle them with their own curb who willingly pass by that which is orthodox in them, and studiously cull out that which is commentitious and best for their turns; not weighing the fathers in the balance of Scripture, but Scripture in the balance of the fathers. If we, therefore, making first the Gospel our rule and oracle, shall take the good which we light on in the fathers, and set it to oppose the evil which other men seek from them, in this way of skirmish we shall easily master all superstition and false doctrine; but if we turn this our discreet and wary usage of them into a blind devotion towards them, and whatsoever we find written by them, we both forsake our own grounds and reasons which led us at first to part from Rome, that is, to hold the Scriptures against all antiquity; we remove our cause into our adversaries' own court, and take up there those cast principles which will soon cause us to solder up with them again, inasmuch as, believing antiquity for itself in any one point, we bring an engagement upon ourselves of assenting to all that it charges upon us." Milton, it is plain, was writing against the Anglican admirers of antiquity as much as against the Roman Catholics.

Daillé wrote a treatise, *De Vero Usu Patrum* (1636; Am. ed. *The Right Use of the Fathers*, Philadel. 1842, 12mo), which formed an epoch in the history of opinion on this subject. Warburton, in his *Introduction to Julian*, speaks of the work, its occasion and issues, as follows: "When the great defection was made from the Church of Rome back again to the Church of Christ, the Reformed, though they shook off the tyranny of the pope, could not disengage themselves from the unbounded authority of the fathers, but carried that prejudice with them, as they did some others of a worse complexion, into the Protestant religion. For in sacred matters, as novelty is suspicious and antiquity venerable, they thought it for their credit to have the fathers on their side. They seemed neither to consider antiquity in general as a thing relative,

nor Christian antiquity as a thing positive; either of which would have shown them that the fathers themselves were modern compared to that authority on which the Reformation was founded, and that the Gospel was that true antiquity on which all its followers should repose themselves. The consequence of which unhappy error was that, in the long appeal to reason between Protestants and Papists, both of them going on a common principle of the decisive authority of the fathers, enabled the latter to support their credit against all the evidence of common sense and sacred Scripture. At length an excellent writer of the *Reformed* [Daillé], observing that the controversy was likely to be endless; for, though the gross corruptions of Popery were certainly later than the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, to which the appeal was usually made, yet the seeds of them being sown, and beginning to pullulate, it was but too plain there was hold enough for a skilful debater to draw the fathers to his own side, and make them water the sprouts they had been planting: observing this, I say, he wisely projected to shift the ground, and force the disputants to vary their method both of attack and defence. In order to this, he composed a discourse of the *True Use of the Fathers*, in which, with uncommon learning and strength of argument, he showed that the fathers were incompetent deciders of the controversies now on foot, since the points in question were not formed into articles till long after the ages in which they lived. This was bringing the fathers from the bench to the table, degrading them from the rank of judges into the class of simple evidence; in which, too, they were not to speak, like *Irish* evidence, in every cause where they were wanted, but only to such matters as were agreed to be within their knowledge. Had this learned critic stopped here, his book had been free from blame; but, at the same time, his purpose had in all likelihood proved very ineffectual, for the obliquity of old prejudices is not to be set straight by reducing it to that line of right which barely restores it to integrity. He went much farther; and by showing occasionally that they were absurd interpreters of Holy Writ, that they were bad reasoners in morals and very loose evidence in facts, he seemed willing to have his readers infer that, even though they had been masters of the subject, yet these other defects would have rendered them very unqualified deciders. However, the work of this famous foreigner had great consequences, and especially with us here at home. The more learned among the nobility (which at that time was of the republic of letters) were the first who emancipated themselves from the general prejudice. It brought the excellent lord Falkland to think moderately of the fathers, and to turn his theological inquiries into a more useful channel; and his great rival in arts, the famous lord Digby, found it of such use to him in his defence of the Reformation against his cousin Sir Kenelm that he has even epitomized it in his fine letter on that subject. But what it has chiefly to boast of is that it gave birth to the two best defenses ever written on the two best subjects, *religion and liberty*—I mean Mr. Chillingworth's *Religion of Protestants*, and Dr. Jeremy Taylor's *Liberty of Prophesying*. In a word, it may be truly said to be the store-house from whence all who have since written popularly on the character of the fathers have derived their materials" (cited in *Preface* to the Philadelphia edition of Daillé).

3. The other Protestant wing consists of the early writers after the Reformation who sought in the fathers to find weapons against Rome, and of their successors, especially in the Church of England, who have favored what are called High-Church views. Among Continental writers, Scultetus (*Medulla Theologie Patrum Synoptica*, Frankfort, 1598; Heidelb. 1613; Frankfort, 1634) sought to show that the ante-Nicene fathers had been corrupted and misinterpreted by Roman writers, and that Protestant doctrines were nearer to the an-

cient than the Roman Catholic doctrines. The Anglican divines, from an early period of the Reformation, made great use of the fathers in the controversy with Rome. Moreover, they found, or believed that they found, the fathers very serviceable in their warfare for episcopacy. Patristic studies became fashionable in the Church; the great names of Bull, Waterland, Usher, Andrews, and many others, show a list of patristical scholars hardly excelled in the Roman schools. Usher set great store upon the study of the fathers, not simply on polemical, but also on scientific grounds. Dr. Parr says of him: "Indeed, he had so great an esteem of the ancient authors for the acquiring any solid learning, whether sacred or profane, that his advice to young students, either in divinity or antiquity, was, not to spend too much time in epitomes, but to set themselves to read the ancient authors themselves; as, to begin with the fathers, and to read them according to the ages in which they lived (which was the method he had taken himself), and, together with them, carefully to peruse the Church historians that treated of that age in which those fathers lived, by which means the student would be better able to perceive the reason and meaning of divers passages in their writings (which otherwise would be obscure) when he knew the original and growth of those heresies and heterodox opinions against which they wrote, and may also better judge what doctrines, ceremonies, and opinions prevailed in the Church in every age, and by what means introduced." Bull and Waterland made great use of the fathers in their discussions of the Trinity. Waterland writes against Daillé's charges of obscurity in the fathers (*Works*, Oxford, 6 vols. 8vo); he also wrote on the use and value of ecclesiastical antiquity in general (iii, 601-655), and made a reply to Barbeyrac's *Morale des Pères de l'Église* (Amst. 1728). The great dissenting scholar, Dr. Lardner, applied the fathers in an apologetical way, with rare learning and skill, in his *Credibility of the Gospel History* (latest edition, in his *Works*, 10 vols. 8vo, London, 1827). He gives brief but painstaking notices of the history and literature of each of the writers cited, and his work is to this day one of the most useful introductions to the study of the writings of antiquity.

There was much controversy in the 18th century about the fathers, generally polemical, and inspired rather by the controversial spirit than by the love of truth. So Priestley attacked the fathers in his *Corruptions of Christianity* (1782). Bishop Horsley replied to him; and a voluminous issue of tracts followed from both parties (see Horsley, *Tracts in controversy with Dr. Priestley on the belief of the first Ages with regard to our Lord's Divinity* (3d ed. Dundee, 1812). Middleton's *Free Inquiry into the miraculous Powers attributed to the Early Church* (*Works*, 1755, vol. i) also gave rise to a copious controversy. John Wesley, in reply to it, says that "Middleton seeks to prove that all the primitive fathers were fools or knaves, and most of them both one and the other." He vindicates the ante-Nicene fathers from Middleton's charge that they held to all the chief "corruptions of Popery." In his summing up he says of the early fathers, "I allow that some of these had not strong natural sense, that few of them had much learning, and none the assistances which our age enjoys in some respects above all that went before. Hence I doubt not but whoever will be at the pains of reading over their writings for that poor end will find many mistakes, many weak suppositions, and many ill-drawn conclusions. And yet I exceedingly reverence them, as well as their writings, and esteem them very highly in love. I reverence them because they were Christians; and I reverence their writings because they describe true genuine Christianity, and direct us to the strongest evidence of the Christian doctrine" (*Works*, N. Y. ed., v, 705-761).

4. A new impulse was given to the study of the fa-

thers in England by the so-called Catholic revival in that Church in the first half of the 19th century. The old reverence for their authority, and even more, a blind following of their guidance, seemed to take possession of the leaders of that movement. One of its best fruits was the publication of the *Library of the Fathers* (see below). The movement gave rise, as is well known, to a bitter controversy, reopening the whole question of the character of the fathers, their trustworthiness as witnesses, their authority as teachers, and the general utility of studying their writings. We cite a few specimens:

Coleridge, in his *Notes on Hacket*, especially on his *Sermons*, remarks: "Let any competent judge read Hacket's life of archbishop Williams, and then these sermons, and so measure the stultifying, nugifying effect of a blind and uncritical study of the fathers, and the exclusive prepossession in favor of their authority in the minds of many of our Church dignitaries in the reign of Charles I" (*Works*, Harpers' ed. N. Y., v, 128).

Dr. Arnold, of Rugby, who was a hearty hater of the Tractarian movement, writes on the authority of the fathers as follows: "In fact, it would greatly help to clear this question if we understand what we mean by allowing or denying the authority of the so-called fathers. The term *authority* is ambiguous, and, according to the sense in which I use it, I should either acknowledge it or deny it. The writers of the first four or of the first seven centuries have authority just as the scholiasts and ancient commentators have; some of them, and in some points, are of weight singly; the agreement of many of them has much weight; the agreement of almost all of them would have great weight. In this sense I acknowledge their authority, and it would be against all sound principles of criticism to deny it. But if by authority is meant a *decisive* authority, a judgment which may not be questioned, then the claim of authority in such a case, for any man or set of men, is either a folly or a revelation. Such an authority is not human, but divine: if any man pretends to possess it, let him show God's clear warrant for his pretension, or he must be regarded as a deceiver or a madman. But it may be said that an authority not to be questioned was conferred by the Roman law on the opinions of a certain number of great lawyers: if a judge believed that their interpretation of the law was erroneous, he yet was not at liberty to follow his own private judgment in departing from it. Why may not the same thing be allowed in the Church? or why may not the interpretations of Cyprian, or Athanasius, or Augustine, or Chrysostom be as decisive, with respect to the true sense of the Scriptures, as those of Gaius, Paulus, Modestinus, Ulpian, and Papinian were acknowledged to be with respect to the sense of the Roman law? The answer is, that the emperor's edict could absolve the judge from following his own convictions about the sense of the law, because it gave to the authorized interpretation the force of law. The text, as the judge interpreted it, was a law repealed; the comment of the great lawyers was now a law in its room. As a mere literary composition, he might interpret it rightly, and Gaius or Papinian might be wrong; but if his interpretation was ever so right grammatically or critically, yet legally it was nothing to the purpose; Gaius's interpretation had superseded it, and was now the law which he was bound to obey. But in the Church, the only point to be aimed at is the discovery of the true meaning of the text of the divine law; no human power can invest the comment with equal authority. The emperor said, and might say to his judges, "You need not consider what was the meaning of the decemvirs when they wrote the Twelve Tables, or of Aquilius when he drew up the Aquilian law. The law for you is not what the decemvirs may have meant, but what their interpreters meant; the decemvirs' meaning, if it was their meaning, is no longer the law of Rome." But

who dare say to a Christian, "You need not consider what was the meaning of our Lord and his apostles; the law for you now is the meaning of Cyprian, or Ambrose, or Chrysostom; that meaning has superseded the meaning of Christ." A Christian must find out Christ's meaning, and believe that he has found it, or else he must still seek for it. It is a matter, not of outward submission, but of inward faith; and if in our inward mind we are persuaded that the interpreter has mistaken our Lord's meaning, how can we by possibility adopt that interpretation in faith?" (*Miscellaneous Works*, N. Y. 1845, p. 274).

Archdeacon Hare (in his notes to the *Mission of the Comforter*) seeks to show that even the greatest of the fathers were inferior, in their understanding of Scripture, to the great divines of the Reformation. "There is much truth," he says, "though perhaps not without some exaggeration of phrase, in what Coleridge says (*Remains*, iii, 276) with reference to Luther, Melancthon, and Calvin, that 'the least of them was not inferior to Augustine, and worth a brigade of the Cyprians, Firmilians, and the like.' Surely there is nothing surprising in this. The marvel, the contradiction to the whole course of history would be if this were not the case, unless we suppose that the special illumination which was granted to the apostles was bestowed on the chief teachers of Christianity down to the last of the fathers, was then withdrawn, and has been withheld ever since. But for such a limitation and restriction of the gifts of the Spirit no ground can be discovered, either in Scripture or in the nature of man; nor does the history of the Church present any facts to support it. . . . It is next to a moral impossibility that men living in the decrepitude of the ancient world, under the relaxing and palsying influences of the Roman and Byzantine empires, when all intellectual and moral life was fast waning away, and the grand and stirring ideas and aims which had drawn forth the energies of the classical nations in their prime had been superseded by rhetorical tumor and allegorical and grammatical trifling, should have mounted to such a pitch of intellectual power as to be beyond the reach of the noblest minds in the age when all the faculties of the new world were bursting into life, and when one region of power after another was laid open to man, and called him to rise up and take possession of it. . . . There is no antecedent improbability that a theologian in the sixteenth century should be quite as wise and as sound an expounder of theological truth as one in the fourth or fifth. Though the earlier divines may have had certain special advantages, the advantages enjoyed by those in the later period were far greater and more important; and if they had peculiar temptations to lead them astray, so had the others. The epoch at which a man lives does not afford us a criterion for judging of the truth of what he says, except so far as his testimony may be appealed to concerning facts; in other respects the value of his writings must be determined on different grounds by candid and intelligent criticism. Nor is such criticism less needful with regard to the fathers than to any other body of writers. . . . To those who study the fathers critically and discerningly they still yield grains of precious gold in abundance, as we see in the excellent exegetical writings of Mr. Trench. But the superstitious and idolatrous are ever fond of displaying their dotage by picking out as the special objects of their complacency not that which is really valuable—other men might approve of that—but that which in itself is worthless, nay, mawkishly silly or wildly absurd. . . . And with what exactitude is the training of some of our patrolers who are lapsing into Romanism here described! The issue, indeed, so far as we are at present acquainted with it, has been mainly in one direction—towards Rome. This is not because the fathers of the first four or five centuries are favorable to the errors and corruptions of Rome,

The contest on this point has been waged again and again, and the victory, in the main, has always been on our side. But the very habit of looking with prostrate minds to outward human authority, and that, too, authority so remote from the special wants and yearnings of our age, and incapable of speaking to us with that intelligent fellow-feeling which elicits the responsive activity of our own spirits—to authority, therefore, which can only speak imperatively, except to the few whose understandings are mature enough to consult it critically, and to distinguish the true from the erroneous, the relevant from the irrelevant—tends to breed an imbecile tone of judgment which is incapable of standing alone, and will not be content with the helps wherewith God has supplied us, but craves restlessly for some absolute authority whereby it may be enabled to walk in leading-strings all its life long. Such minds, when one prop after another gives way under them, as they find out that no father can be appealed to as an absolute authority, least of all on the particular questions which agitate our times the most, will try to save themselves from falling into infidelity by catching desperately hold of infallibility. And how long will this bear them up?" (Hare, *Vindication of Luther*, p. 76-82).

5. But some of the opponents of an undue reverence for the fathers have not been wanting in just appreciation of their historical value. Dr. W. L. Alexander (*Anglo-Catholicism not Apostolical*, Edinb. 1843, 8vo) gives the following caution against under-estimating the importance and value of the fathers: "There has been among Protestants a great deal of foolish talking and much jesting that is anything but convenient upon this subject. Men who have never read a page of the fathers, and who could not read one were they to try, have deemed themselves at liberty to speak in terms of scoffing and supercilious contempt of these venerable luminaries of the early Church. Because Clement of Rome believed in the existence of the phoenix, and because Justin Martyr thought the sons of God who are said in Genesis to have intermarried with the daughters of men were angels, who for the loves of earth were willing to forego the joys of heaven; and because legends and old wives' fables enow are found in almost all the fathers, it has been deemed wise to reject, despise, and ridicule the whole body of their writings. The least reflection will suffice to show the unsoundness of such an inference. What should we say of one who, because lord Bacon held many opinions which modern science has proved to be false, should treat the *Novum Organum* with contempt? or of one who should deem himself entitled to scoff at Richard Baxter because in his *Saints' Rest* that able and excellent man tries to prove the existence of Satan by quoting instances of his apparitions, and of his power over witches? There is no man, however good or great, that can get quite beyond the errors and credulities of his age. It becomes us, therefore, in dealing with the writings of a former generation, to take care that, in rejecting the bad, we do not also despise the good; and especially that we be not found availing ourselves of advantages which have reached us through the medium of these writings, while we ignorantly and ungratefully dishonor the memory of those by whom these writings were penned." In the height of the so-called Tractarian controversy in England, Isaac Taylor wrote his *Ancient Christianity and the Doctrines of the Oxford Tracts* (Lond. 1839, 2 vols. 8vo; 2d ed. 1844; reprint of vol. I, Phila. 1840, 12mo) for the purpose of laying "open the real condition, moral, spiritual, and ecclesiastical, of the ancient Church;" and the chief aim and tendency of the book is to lessen the authority of the fathers, especially of those of the ante-Nicene period. Yet even he devotes a chapter to show the dependence of the modern Church upon the ancient, and to depreciate a "setting at naught" of patristical learning.

"It is not, we may be sure, those who possess much of this indispensable learning that in any such way set it at naught; and it is an acknowledged rule in all walks of science and literature that the scoffs and captious objections of the ignorant need not be seriously replied to—know what you are speaking of, and then condemn it." Now the mere fact of applying *any* comprehensive terms, either of admiration or contempt, to a body and series of writers, stretching through seven hundred or a thousand years, and these writers natives as they were of distant countries, some of them simple and rude, while others were erudite and accomplished, may be taken as a proof of heedlessness, regarding the matter in hand, sufficient to excuse a silent disregard of the objection it involves. These 'fathers,' thus grouped as a little band by the objectors, were some of them men of as brilliant genius as any age has produced; some commanding a flowing and vigorous eloquence, some an extensive erudition, some conversant with the great world, some whose meditations had been ripened by years of seclusion, some of them the only historians of the times in which they lived, some the chiefs of the philosophy of their age; and if we are to speak of the whole as a series or body of writers, they are the men who, during a long era of deepening barbarism, still held the lamp of knowledge and learning, and, in fact, afford us almost all that we can now know, intimately, of the condition of the nations surrounding the Mediterranean, from the extinction of the classic fire to the time of its rekindling in the fourteenth century. The Church was the ark of all things that had life during a deluge of seven hundred years. Such is the group which is often conveniently dismissed with a concise phrase of contempt by some! It may be suspected that very many of the delighted admirers of the *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* are little aware of the extent of Gibbon's obligations to—the fathers. Were it possible to draw off from that seductive work the entire materials derived by the indefatigable author from the ecclesiastical compartment of his library, it is no small proportion of the splendor, the accuracy, the correct drawing, the vivid coloring, which are its charm and praise, that would be found wanting. Well would it have been if some of the professed champions and historians of Christianity had been as thoroughly conversant with the remains of Christian antiquity as was its most dangerous assailant. The ignorance of which we are here complaining has once endangered our faith as Christians, and it is now endangering our faith as Protestants. Nearly of the same quality, and usually advanced by the same parties, is the portentous insinuation, or the bold and appalling averment, that there was little or no genuine Christianity in the world from the times of Justin Martyr to those of Wickliffe, or of Luther! and the inference from this assumption is that we are far more likely to be led astray than edified by looking into the literature of this vast territory of religious darkness. I must leave it to those who entertain any such sombre belief as this to reply, in the best manner they are able, those fiery darts of infidelity which will not fail to be hurled at Christianity itself as often as the opinion is professed. Such persons, too, must expound as they can our Lord's parting promise to his servants. Notions of this sort, and there are many of like kind, all take their rise from some narrow and sectarian hypothesis concerning Christianity. We do not, perhaps, find, during certain cycles of the Church's history, that style or dialect which, by an intimate association of ideas, has combined itself with our religious sentiments, and therefore it is to us and our peculiar feelings as if Christianity itself had actually not been extant at such times. If these are our feelings, it is well that we get rid of them with all speed. Christianity is absolute truth, bearing with various effect, from age to age, upon our distorted and discolored human nature,

but never so powerfully pervading the foreign substance it enters as to undergo no deflections itself, or to take no stains; and as its influence varies, from age to age, in intensity, as well as in the particular direction it may take, so does it exhibit, from age to age, great variations of form and hue. But the men of any one age indulge too much the overweening temper that attaches always to human nature when they say to themselves, *our* Christianity is absolute Christianity, but that of such or such an age was a mere shadow of it. All mystification apart, as well as its superstitions and overweening deference to antiquity, nothing can be more simple than the facts on which rests the legitimate use and value of the ancient documents of Christianity, considered as the repositories of those practices and opinions which, obscurely or ambiguously alluded to in the canonical writings, are found, drawn forth, and illustrated in the records of the times immediately succeeding. These records contain at once a testimony in behalf of the capital articles of our faith and an exposition of minor sentiments and ecclesiastical usages, neither of which can be surrendered without some serious loss and damage" (Taylor, *Ancient Christianity*, 8vo ed. p. 66-71).

6. The more recent tendency among the theologians of Germany, England, and America is to study the fathers more thoroughly than ever, but to study them in a scientific way, for historical rather than polemical and dogmatical ends: or, where dogmatic interests are involved, to use the fathers historically, and not as authorities. The terms Patristics and Patrology have come into use to designate the history and literature of the fathers on the one hand [see PATRISTICS], and their theology on the other [see PATROLOGY]. These branches have not yet taken fully scientific shape, but they are on the way to it (see the references below).

IV. *Collective Editions of the Fathers.*—1. The first great collection was that of De la Bigne, who formed the idea of a collection of the fathers with a view of opposing the doctrines of the French Protestants. This scheme met with the approbation of his superiors in the Sorbonne, and the first eight volumes appeared at Paris in 1575, and the 9th in 1579. It is entitled *Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum et Antiquorum Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latine*, and it contained about 200 writers. The 2d edit., somewhat improved, was published at Paris in 1589, 9 vols. fol. The 3d edit. (Paris, 1609, 11 vols. fol.) has the addition of an *Auctuarium*. In these editions the writers are classed according to subjects. The 4th edit., or rather a new work by the professors of Cologne, has the writers arranged in chronological order. It was printed at Cologne in 1608, in 14 vols. fol., to which in 1622 a supplement in one vol. was added. The 5th edit. (or 4th of De la Bigne) was published at Paris in 1624, in 10 vols. fol., with the addition of an *Auctuarium Græco-Latinum* compiled by Le Duc (the Jesuit *Fronto Ducessus*), and in 1629 a *Supplementum Latinum* in two vols. was added. The 6th edit. (or 5th of De la Bigne), printed at Paris in 1634, in 17 vols. fol., contains the preceding, with the *Auctuarium* and *Supplementum* incorporated. The 7th edit. in 1654 is merely a reprint of the last. 2. In 1677 appeared at Lyons (27 vols. fol.) the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, which generally and deservedly bears the name of *Bibliotheca Maxima Patrum Lugdunensis*. It contains nearly all the writers found in the preceding works, together with many others (*Latin* only), chronologically arranged. 3. After this gigantic undertaking, no similar work appeared until that of André Galland was published, under the title of *Bibliotheca veterum Patrum antiquorumque Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum postremi Lugdunensi multo locupletior atque accuratior*, in 14 vols. fol. (Venice, 1766-1781). The Greek texts are given, with Latin versions. Galland omits many authors given in the *Bibl. Mar.*, but adds also 180 not given in it. 4. The most complete edition of both Greek and Latin fathers is that of Migne, *Patrologiæ*

*Cursus Completus, seu Bibliotheca Universalis, integra, etc., Omnium SS. Patrum, Doctorum, Scriptorumque Ecclesiasticorum* (Paris, 1844-1867). This immense collection includes all the Latin writers from the apostolical age down to the time of Innocent III (A. D. 1216), and the Greeks down to the time of the Council of Florence (A. D. 1439). In most cases the Benedictine texts are followed. Ample indexes are given, both alphabetical and analytical, of the Latin fathers; those for the Greek, unfortunately, were not all finished when Migne's establishment was burned down in 1868. The Latin fathers fill, with the indexes, two hundred and twenty-two volumes imperial octavo. The Greek writers (with Latin versions) take up one hundred and sixty-seven volumes of the same size. The Latin version of the Greek fathers is also published separately in eighty-four volumes. For purposes of reference, there can be no question that this is the most convenient series of the fathers and ecclesiastical writers ever published. Complaints are made of many of the volumes (and justly) that sufficient care has not been taken with the editing; and it is further charged that, in some cases, the old literary policy of the Church of Rome, of modifying, omitting, and even garbling, for polemical purposes, has been followed by Migne. For the study of special authors there are, certainly, editions to be had more accurate and trustworthy than Migne's; and no student who desires to be thorough in critical study would ever be satisfied without comparison of various editions. But with all drawbacks, the fact remains that the *Cursus Completus Patrologiæ* is an indispensable necessity to every large theological or historical library.

*Incomplete Collections and Translations.*—Among these we cite, 1. A useful abridgment or analysis, in alphabetical order, viz. *Bib. Mar. Patrum in Epitomen redacta* (Augsb. 1719, 2 vols. fol.); 2. Combefis, *Græco-Lat. Patrum Bibliothecæ Novum Auctuarium* (7618); also his *Bibliothecæ Græcorum Patrum Auctuarium Novissimum* (2 parts, 1672); 3. Canisius, *Antiquæ Lectioes seu varia veter. monumenta* (Ingolstadt, 1602), enlarged by Basnage (Amst. 1672, 4 vols. fol.); 4. Montfaucon, *Collectio Nova Patrum et Script. Græcorum* (Paris, 1706, 2 vols. fol.); 5. D'Achery, *Spicilegium sive collectio vet. aliquot Scriptorum* (Paris, 1655-77, 13 vols.); Par. 1723, 3 vols. fol.); 6. Grabe, *Spicilegium SS. Patrum ut et hæretic. seculi post Christ. I-III* (2d edit. Oxon. 1714, 2 vols. 8vo); 7. Martène et Durand, *Amplissima collectio vet. script. et monument. hist.* (Paris, 1724-33, 9 vols. fol.); 8. Routh, *Scriptorium Ecclesiasticorum Opusculum* (2d edit. Oxford, 1840, 2 vols. 8vo); 9. Routh, *Reliquiæ Sacrae, sive auctorum fere jam desperatorum 2 et 3 sæculi, accedunt synodi et epist. canon. Nicæni.* (Oxf. 1846 8, 5 vols. 8vo); 10. Angelo Mai, *Script. vet. nova collectio* (Romæ, 1825-38, 10 vols. 4to); 11. Mai, *Spicilegium Romanum* (Romæ, 1839-44, 10 vols. 8vo); 12. Mai, *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca* (Rom. 1852, 7 vols. 4to); 13. Pitra, *Spicilegium Solesmense* (Par. 1852 sq., 4 vols. 8vo); 14. (*Oxford Selection*), *Bib. Patr. Eccl. Catholice, qui ante orientis et occidentis schisma floruerunt*; delecta Presbyterorum quorundam Oxoniensium (Oxf. 8vo, 1838, and following years—still issuing); 15. (*Oxford translation*), *Library of the Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church anterior to the division of the East and West* (translated by members of the English Church; edited by E. B. Pusey, J. Keble, C. Marriott, Oxford, 8vo, 1839, and following years; 40 vols. issued); 16. *Bibliotheca Patrum concionatoria, hoc est, anni totius, evangelia, festa dominica, etc., homilias atque sermonibus adornata SS. Patr. et script. eccles. qui tredecim prior. sæc. flor.*, Opera, et studio F. Francisci Combefis; editio castigata, etc.; ed. A. Goulet et Ludovic. Pere (Paris, 1852 sq.; to form 30 vols. large 8vo); 17. (*Hand Editions*), Oberthür, *Opera Patrum Græcorum, Græc et Lat.* (Wircch. 1777-92, 10 vols. 8vo); *Ibid. Op. Patrum Latinorum* (1780-91); Richter, *Bibliotheca Selecta Patrum Græcorum* (Lips. 1826 et seq.; Josephus, Philo, Clemens); Thilo, *Patrum*

*Græcorum Dogmatica* (Leipz. 1853-4, 2 vols. 8vo, Athanasius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen); Gersdorf, *Patrum Eccles. Lat. selecta Bibliotheca* (Lips. 1838, 13 vols. 12mo, Clemens Rom., Cyprian, Tertullian, Ambrose, Lactantius, Arnobius, Minucius Felix; a very correct and convenient edition); *Corpus Scriptor. Eccles. Latinorum* (edited under the direction of the Academy of Vienna, 1866, and continuing); *Corpus Apologetarum secundæ sæculi* (ed. Otto, Jena, 1847, 8 vols. issued); *Corpus Hæresiologicalum* (ed. Oehler, Berlin, 1856-65, 5 vols. 8vo); 18. (*German Translation*), *Sämml. Werke der Kirchenväter ins Deutsche übersetzt*. (edit. Ziegler and Waitzmann, Kempten, 1831-1854; 19 vols. publ. up to 1854); 19. *The Ante-Nicene Christian Library; translations of the Ante-Nicene Fathers*, edited by Roberts and Donaldson, an admirably conceived and executed work. Up to this date (January, 1869) the following have been issued: Vol. i, *The Apostolic Fathers*, translated by Rev. Dr. Roberts, Dr. Donaldson, and Rev. F. Crombie; vol. ii, *The Writings of Justin Martyr and Athenagoras*, translated by Rev. Marcus Dods, A.M., Rev. George Reith, A.M., and Rev. B. P. Pratten; vol. iii, *The Writings of Tatian and Theophilus, and the Clementine Recognitions*, translated by B. P. Pratten, Rev. Marcus Dods, A.M., and Rev. T. Smith, D.D.; vol. iv, *The Writings of Clement of Alexandria*, translated by Rev. W. Wilson, M.A.; vol. v, *The Writings of Irenæus*, translated by Rev. A. Roberts and Rev. W. H. Rambaut; vol. vi, *The Refutation of all Heresies by Hippolytus*, translated by Rev. J. H. Macmahon, M.A.; with Fragments from his Commentaries on various Books of Scripture, translated by Rev. S. D. F. Salmond; vol. vii, *The Fire Books of Tertullian against Marcion*, translated by Peter Holmes, D.D.; vol. viii, *The Writings of Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage*, vol. i, containing the Epistles and some of the Treatises, translated by Rev. E. Wallis, Ph. D.; vol. ix, *Irenæus*, vol. ii, translated by Rev. H. Roberts and Rev. W. H. Rambaut; vol. x, *The Writings of Origen*, translated by Rev. F. Crombie, M.A. For editions of the fathers separately, see the individual names in their alphabetical places.

11. *Works on the Fathers; their literary history, their use, authority, etc.*—1. Jerome († 420), *De Viris Illustribus s. catalogus Scriptor. Eccles.* (Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* xxiii, 602 sq., many editions and recensions: the work is the basis of Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica*, Hamburg, 1718, fol.); 2. Photius († 890), Βιβλιοθήκη. *Bibliotheca* (Migne, *Patrol. Græc.* vols. ciii, civ), containing sketches of 280 pagan and Christian writers; 3. Bellarmine, *Liber de Scriptor. Ecclesiasticis* (Rom. 1613, and often); 4. Cave, *Scriptorum Eccles. Historia Literaria*, ad sæc. xiv (2 parts, Lond. 1688-98; Genev. 1705, 1720; Basel, 1741; Oxford [continued by Wharton], 1740-43, 2 vols. fol.); 5. Dupin, *Nouv. Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques* (Paris, 1686-1698, 47 vols. 8vo; Anst. 1693-1715, 19 vols. 4to; Latin version, Paris, 1692 sq., 3 vols. 4to [up to Augustine]; English version, including 17th century, Lond. 1693-1707, 17 vols. bound in 7 or 8; Dublin, 1722-24, 3 vols. fol. [without the 17th century]; see DUPIN); 6. Ceillier, *Histoire Générale des Auteurs Sacrés et ecclésiastiques* (Par. 1729-63, 23 vols. 4to; new edition, revised with additions, Paris, 1860-1865, 15 vols. imp. 8vo; see CEILLIER); 7. Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique* (Par. 1693, 16 vols.); 8. Oudin, *Commentarius de Scriptor. Eccles. antiquis*, professing to fill up the gaps left by Cave, Dupin, etc. (Lips. 1722, 3 vols. fol.); 9. Le Nourry, *Apparatus Criticus ad Bihl. Max. Patr.* (Paris, 1703-15, 2 vols. fol.); 10. Tricalet, *Bibliothèque portative des pères de l'église* (Paris, 1757-62, 9 vols. 8vo); 11. Sprenger, *Thesaurus rei patristicæ* (Wirceb. 1782-91, 3 vols. 4to); 12. Lumpfer, *Hist. theologico-Critica de vita scriptis, etc.*, SS. *Patrum* (Aug. Vind. 1783-99, 13 vols. 8vo); 13. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Græca*, etc. (Hamb. 1708-28, 14 vols.; ed. by Harless, 1790 to 1812, 12 vols. including Index); Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Eccl-*

*siastica* (mentioned above); Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Latina* (see FABRICIUS); 14. Walch, *Bibliotheca Patristica* (Jena, 1770; new ed. by Danz, Jena, 1834, 8vo); 15. (*Introductions to Patristics and Patrology*), Wilhelm (l. Cath.), *Patrologia ad usus academ.* (Freib. 1775); Engelhardt, *Leitfaden zu Vorlesungen üb. die Patristik* (Erlangen, 1823); Goldwitzer (R. C.), *Bibliographie d. Kirchen-Väter* (Nürnberg, 1833-4, 2 vols. 8vo, not of much value); Locherer (R. C.), *Lehrbuch der Patrologie* (Mainz, 1837, 8vo); Permaneder (R. C.), *Patrologia generalis, specialis* (Landshut, 1841-43, 2 vols. 8vo); Möhler (R. C.), *Patrologie*, ed. by Reithmayr (Regensburg, 1840; only first vol. finished, covering first three centuries); Fessler (R. C.), *Institutiones Patrol.*, up to Gregory the Great (1850-51, 2 vols. 8vo); Alzog (R. C.), *Grundriss d. Patrologie* (Freib. 1866, 8vo); Donaldson, *Critical History of Christian Literature*, etc. (mentioned above, Lond. 1864, 3 vols. 8vo); 16. (*On the Use of the Fathers*), Nat. Bonaventura (R. C.), *Traité de la lecture des Pères* (Paris, 1688-97); also in Latin, *De opt. meth. legend. ecclesiæ. Patr.* (August. Vind. 1756, 8vo); Daillé (see above), *Right Use of the Fathers* (Phil. 1842, 12mo); Goode, *Divine Rule of Faith*, etc. (Lond. 1853, 3 vols.; Phila. 2 vols.); Peck, *Appeal from Tradition* (N. York, 1844); and other works cited under FATIO, RULE OF (q. v.); also Campbell, *Prelim. Diss. to Four Gospels* (diss. iv); Milton, *Prelatical Episcopacy* (*Prose Works*, vol. i); Conybeare, *Examination of the Ante-Nicene Fathers* (Bampton Lect. 1839); Taylor, *Ancient Christianity* (Lond. 2 vols. 8vo); Hare, *Indication of Luther*; Blunt, *Right Use of the Early Fathers*, against Daillé and others (Lond. 1857, 8vo); Schaff, *Church History*, i, 453 sq.; Moses Stuart, in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, i, 125 sq.; *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, 1867, 2, 356; 1867, 4, 760; F. Nitzsch, in *Jahrbücher f. deutsche Theologie*, x, 37 sq.; Schwann, *Dogmengeschichte der patrist. Zeit.* (Münster, 1867, 8vo); Hübler, *Die Philosophie d. Kirchenväter* (München, 1867, 8vo); *Levestre, Dictionnaire de Patrologie* (Paris, 5 vols. 8vo). Brief sketches of the lives of the fathers may be found in Hook, *Ecclesiastical Biography* (8 vols. 12mo, Lond. 1845-52); Evans, *Biography of the Early Church* (2d edit. Lond. 1859, 2 vols. 18mo); copious biographies of them in Böhringer, *Kirchengeschichte in Biographien* (Zürich, 9 parts, 1842-58).

**Fathom** (ὄργυον), a nautical measure of six (Greek) feet in length (strictly 6·81 Engl. feet); properly (as the word implies) the space which one can cover by extending the arms laterally (Acts xxvii, 28). See MEASURE.

**Fatio de Duillers**, NICOLAS, a learned mathematician and an eccentric religious enthusiast, was born at Basle, in Switzerland, Feb. 16, 1664, and died in the county of Worcester, England, in 1753. He was educated in Geneva, visited and spent some time in Paris and the Hague, but finally chose England for his home. He early showed great ability in the exact sciences, and at the age of eighteen propounded a new theory of the earth and of the rings of Saturn in a letter to Cassini, to whose theory of zodiacal light he in 1685 gave new developments. He made several useful and curious applications of science to practical life, one of which was a new method of determining the speed of a vessel. In the controversy regarding the discovery of the differential calculus he was an earnest supporter of the claims of Newton. Later in life he adopted extravagant views on religious subjects, was an ardent champion of the prophets of the Cevennes, and claimed for himself inspiration and the gift of prophecy and miracles. Neither the ridicule which Shaftesbury, in his letter on enthusiasm, aimed at him, nor his public exposure with two other persons on the pillory in London (Sept. 1707) "for abetting and favoring Elias Marion in his wicked and counterfeited prophecies," had the effect to cure him of his enthusiasm. He even went to Asia in the hope of




converting the world, but, not meeting with success, returned to England again, and spent his time in retirement, pursuing his scientific labors, but still cherishing his extravagant religious opinions. Many scientific works from his pen are extant, but his writings in favor of the prophets of the Cevennes are now unknown.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biographie Générale*, xvii, 138. (J. W. M.)

**Fatling.** 1. מֵרִי, *meri*, a fattened animal, especially bullock ("calf") for slaughter, 2 Sam. vi, 13; Isa. xi, 6; Ezek. xxxix, 18. 2. מֵאֵח, *me'ach*, a marrowy sheep (q. v.), especially of the fat-tailed variety (Psa. lxxvi, 15). 3. Improperly for מִשְׁחֶכֶת, *mishkeh*, the second in rank, i. e. of inferior quality, 1 Sam. xv, 9. 4. (Corresponding with No. 1), *αἰσῆσις*, *corn fed*, i. e. stalled, fat, Matt. xxii, 4. See FAT.

**Fatou, NICHOLAS**, a French mystic writer, born at Arras in 1644, died at St. Omer in 1694, took the vows of the Dominican order in the convent at Arras, and subsequently entered that at St. Omer. We have from him: 1. *Le Paradis terrestre du Saint Rosaire de l'auguste Vierge, mère de Dieu*, etc., in 4 vols., of which only one vol. appeared (St. Omer et Lille, 1692, 12mo).—2. A treatise on the famous miracle of the holy candle, entitled *Discours sur les Prodiges du Saint Cierge*, etc., of which the first edition, quite rare, St. Omer, 1693; the second and third, Arras, 1696, sm. 8vo, and 1744, 12mo.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.*

**Fatted FOWL** (פֶּרֶרְבָּרִים אֲבוּסִים, *barburim' abusim'*, Sept. ἀβουσιων ἐκλεκτων στρωτα, Vulg. *aves altiles*) are included in 1 Kings iv, 23 [v, 3], among the daily provisions for Solomon's table. Gesenius (*Thes. Heb.* p. 246) prefers to translate this "fatted geese,"



An ancient Egyptian Poultryer's Shop, showing the feeding and plucking of Geese.

referring the word to the root פָּרַר, "to be pure," because of the pure whiteness of the bird. He gives reasons for believing that the same word in the cognate languages included also the meaning of *swan* (comp. Bochart, *Hieroz.* ii, 127). Michaelis (*Supplen.* p. 226) less aptly interprets *field animals* (from the Chald. פֶּר, a *field*). Whether domestic poultry was much raised by the Hebrews has been a matter of dispute; but no good reason can be assigned why they should not in this respect have been as well supplied as their neighbors the Egyptians, who gave great attention to them. See HEN. As it is pretty generally conceded that some kind of *bird* is intended by the *barbur* here designated, none can in this particular compete with the dung-hill fowl; and the *fattening* implies their domestication, while the fact of their *daily* consumption at the royal table argues their extensive cultivation and common use. *Geese*, however, may very probably be intended, as they were an esteemed article of food anciently, especially among the

Egyptians, whose monuments abound with illustrations of their rearing and culinary application. See FOWL.

**Faucher, Denis**, a French theologian, was born at Arles, A.D. 1487, and died at the abbey of Lerins in 1562. In 1508 he entered the Benedictine order at the convent of Polinore, near Mantua, and in 1515 was sent to the monastery of Lerins, of which he in advanced years became prior. His works are found in Vincent Barralle's (of Salerno) *Chronologia Sanctorum et Aliorum virorum illustrium ac Abbatum Sacre insule Lerinensis* (Lyon, 1613, 4to).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.*


**Faucher, Jean**, a French Protestant preacher and controversialist, died at Nîmes in 1628. He was minister at Uzès, when he was sent in 1611 by the Protestant churches of Lower Languedoc as deputy to the Assembly at Sommières, and in 1615 to that at Grenoble. When this latter assembly was in the following year transferred to Nîmes, Faucher was chosen pastor and professor of theology in that city. He, however, followed the assembly to Rochelle, and did not return to Nîmes until 1617, after the conclusion of a peace. He was a man of great energy of character, and agreed in opinion with those Huguenots who hoped by force of arms to secure liberty of conscience, if not the triumph of the Protestant cause in France. He persistently advocated a policy in consonance with such views in the assembly from 1615 to 1617, as indeed also in that convoked by the duke of Rohan in August, 1622, to agree upon terms of peace with the king, declaring that to open their cities to him would prove the sacrifice of their liberties. Only two works from his pen are known, viz., *Exorcismes divins, ou propositions Chrétiennes pour chasser les demons et les esprits abuseurs qui troublent les royaumes* (Nîmes, 1626, sm. 8vo), and *Zacharie, ou la Sainteté du Mariage et particulièrement du Mariage des ecclésiastiques, contre l'usage des sous-introduites et autres impuretés des consciences castrées* (Nîmes, 1627, sm. 8vo).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.*; Haag, *La France protestante*. (J. W. M.)

**Fauchet, CLAUDE**, commonly known as the abbé Fauchet, and a prominent Girondist in the French Revolution, was born at Dornes, in the department of Nièvre, Sept. 22, 1744, and was guillotined at Paris Oct. 31, 1793. After his ordination he became one of the priests of St. Roch, at Paris. When scarcely 30 years of age he delivered a panegyric on St. Louis before the French Academy, and was soon thereafter appointed grand vicar to the archbishop of Bourges; then one of the court preachers, and abbot of Montfort-Lacarre in Brittany. In a sermon delivered in 1788 at the *fête de la Rosière* at Sarènes, he manifested so strongly his sympathy with the revolutionary tendency that his name was stricken from the list of court preachers. Thenceforth an outspoken and zealous champion of the new political doctrines, he was active in the popular meetings in Paris, a participant in the movements against the Bastille, was named a member of the *Commune de Paris*, and assisted in the reorganization of the Church by composing the treatise entitled *Religion Nationale*, and was one of the editors of the *Bouche de Fer* (Iron Mouth). In 1791 he was made constitutional bishop of Calvados, from which department he was chosen a deputy to the Assembly and the Convention, where, though a zealous Republican, he opposed the extreme measures taken in regard to the king and the Church, supporting by his pen in the *Journal des Amis* the positions maintained by him in the Legislature. He consequently incur-

red the hatred of the Jacobins, and was included in the list of 21 Girondists proscribed by that party; was accused of federalism and complicity in the crime of Charlotte Corday, though the only ground on which this last charge was based was the accidental fact that Corday, coming to Paris an entire stranger, had applied to him, as the bishop of her province, for an introduction to the tribunes. He was, however, adjudged guilty, and executed with his fellow-Girondist deputies. The statements as to his repentance and recantation of Republican doctrines in prison, made by the abbé Lothringer (letter in vol. iv of *Annales Catholiques*), and of his venality by De Molleville (*Mémoires*, ii, 355-6), rest upon too questionable grounds to be accepted as true. In addition to the discourses and writings above mentioned, he published funeral orations in honor of the duke of Orleans, the archbishop of Bourges, and the abbé de l'Épée; a eulogium of Franklin, three discourses on liberty, and one on the agreement of religion and liberty, a treatise in favor of the agrarian law, and a portion of the text of the *Tableau de la Revolution*.—Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xvii, 163-5; Lamartine, *History of the Girondists*; Jarry (l'abbé Valmérón), *L'Abbé Fauchet peint par lui-même*, etc. (Jersey, 1791); *Vie de l'Abbé Fauchet* (Paris, 1791); Alison, *History of Europe*. (J. W. M.)

**Faucher**, MICHEL LE, a French Protestant divine of great talent as a preacher, was successively minister at Montpellier, Charenton, and Paris. He died in 1657. It is related of him that on one occasion he preached so forcibly against duels that maréchal De la Force, who heard him, remarked to some officers in the audience that, should a challenge be sent to him, he would decline it. He wrote, *Sermons sur les onze premiers chapitres des Actes des Apôtres* (Gen. 1664, 4 vols. 12mo).—*Traité de l'action de l'orateur, ou de la prononciation et du geste* (Par. 1657, 12mo).—*Sermon, Rom. vi, 23: The wages of sin and the reward of grace* (translated in Coblin's *French Preacher*).—*Traité sur l'Eucharistie* (Gen. 1635), etc.—Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, s. v.

**Fauchion**, i. e. FALCHION, is the rendering (Judith xiii, 6; xvi, 9) of the Greek ἀκνάκις (which the Romans also Latinized *acinaces*), a Persian term for the short sword, usually represented as a straight, thick poniard on the Persepolitan figures (see Smith,



Ancient Persian Sword.

*Diet. of Class. Ant.* s. v. *Acinaces*), and therefore appropriately employed in the apocryphal account of the decapitation of Holofernes by the Hebrewess. See **SWORD**.

**Faukelius**, HERMANNUS, was born at Bruges about the year 1560. His parents were warmly attached to the Protestant cause. At twenty we find him in a theological seminary at Ghent. Here he enjoyed the instructions of able professors, among whom

was Danaus (q. v.). After leaving Ghent, where he distinguished himself as a student, he spent a short time at the University of Leyden. In 1585 he was called to serve a Protestant church at Cologne, where he labored for fourteen years amid many discouragements. On June 27, 1599, he was installed over the Reformed church in Middelburg, the chief city of Zealand, where he spent the remainder of his life. He had great reputation as a preacher. His learning was profound, his exhortations earnest and impressive, and his deportment exemplary. In ecclesiastical affairs he acted a conspicuous part. He was member and assessor of the Provincial Synod held at Tholen in 1602, and was delegated in 1607 to the *Conventus pragmativus* at the Hague, where his opposition to the Arminian tendency was strongly exhibited. He assured the Convention that the churches of Zealand desired no revision of the Catechism and Confession. In 1616 the task was assigned to him, in conjunction with Buceus and Walaeus, to make known to the scholars and to universities in other lands the condition of ecclesiastical affairs in Holland. At the organization of the Synod of Dort he was chosen one of the assessors of that famous body. At its forty-third session he was selected as one of the deputation sent to the Hague to report the proceedings of synod to the States General. During its thirteenth session he was appointed one of the translators of the New Testament. For this work he was eminently fitted. Of this he had given previous evidence in his translation of the N. T., published in 1617 at Middelburg, entitled, *Het Nieuwe Testament onses Heeren Jesu Christi, uit den griekselken overghet, neerstelick nu overseen na de beste oversettingen, ende van veel druckfouten ghesuyvert; met nieuwe sommatien ende afleefelingen der eyttelen, midtsgaders annotatien aam den Rand tot verclaringhe van den text*. In his knowledge of the Hebrew he is said to have surpassed most of his contemporaries. The historical books of the O. T. were translated by him, and neatly written out in two folio volumes, which are still preserved in the vestry of the Reformed church in Middelburg. Other important labors were also assigned him by the Synod. He was appointed one of a committee to compare the Latin, Dutch, and French copies of the Confession, in order to obtain as accurate a copy as possible. He was also a member of the committee appointed to draft articles on the five disputed points known as the *Canons of the Synod of Dort*. See **DORT**. He was also requested to prepare two catechetical works. *Het Kort begrip der Christelijke Religie* (Compendium of the Christian Religion) is due to his pen. This may still be found in company with the Heidelberg Catechism, Confession of Faith, etc., in the book of praise used by the Reformed Church in this country. He published a work on the Anabaptists in 1621. After his death, an exposition of the 45th Psalm, and a volume of sermons on the incarnation, circumcision, death, and resurrection of the Lord Jesus were issued. Various other important tracts, besides those already mentioned, were discharged by him with exemplary zeal. We find nothing alleged against him, even by Brandt, save his strenuous opposition to the Remonstrants; and even in this matter he is not charged with anything inconsistent with the dignity of his position. If he lacked in Christian charity and forbearance, it was a fault in which he does not seem to have shared more deeply than most of his contemporaries. He died May 9, 1625, and was buried under the old church in Middelburg. See **GLAUSIUS**, *Godgeleerd Nederland*, I Deel, blz. 455 en verv; G. Brandt, *Historie der Reformatie, en andere kercklijke Geschiednissen in en omtrent de Nederlanden*, III Deel, blz. 27, 53, 226, 227, 233, 544, 627, 645, 648. (J. P. W.)

**Faunt**, ARTHUR, or LAURENCE, ARTHUR, an English Jesuit, was born at Foston, Leicestershire, in 1544, and died at Unna, in Lithuania, in 1591. He was educated at Merton College, Oxford, and thence went

successively to the Jesuits' College at Louvain, to Paris, Munich, and Rome, where he was appointed divinity reader in the English Jesuits' College. He wrote several theological treatises, for an account of which, see Watts, *Bib. Brit.*—Rose, *New Gen. Biog. Dict.*; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*.

**Faure, Charles**, a French Roman Catholic theologian, born at Luciennes, near Paris, in 1594; died Nov. 4, 1644. He was the first superior-general of the regular canons of the Congregation of France, and devoted his life to the reform of the religious orders. He is the author of several religious works, among which is the *Dictionnaire des Novices* (Paris, 1711, 4to).—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*.

**Faure, François**, a French prelate, born Nov. 8, 1612; died May 11, 1687. He entered the Franciscan order at the age of seventeen, and rose to the highest positions therein; was appointed sub-preceptor of Louis XIV, and finally bishop of Amiens. We have from him a condemnation of the *Lettres Provinciales*; an *Ordonnance contre le Nouveau Testament de Mons* (1673); a *Pan'gyrique de Louis XIV* (Paris, 1680, 4to); an *Oraison funèbre de la reine Anne d'Autriche* (died 1666); and an *Oraison funèbre de Henriëtte-Marie de France, reine de la Grande-Bretagne* (Paris, 1670, 4to).—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*.

**Faust, Dr.**, according to tradition, a celebrated dealer in the black art. (The following account, chiefly translated from Pterer, *Universal-Lexikon*, is taken from Chambers, *Encyclopædia*, s. v.) He was born probably about A. D. 1480, at Knittlingen (or Kundlingen), in Würtemberg, or, as some say, at Roda, near Weinaar. He is said to have studied magic at Cracow. "After having spent a rich inheritance left him by his uncle, Faust is alleged to have made use of his 'power' to raise or conjure up the devil, with whom he entered into a contract for twenty-four years, obtaining during that time his fill of earthly pleasure, but at its termination surrendering body and soul into the hands of the great enemy. The devil gave him an attendant spirit or demon, called Mephistopheles, though other names are given him by the later traditionists, with whom he travelled about, enjoying life in all its forms, and astonishing people by working wonders, till he was finally carried off by the Evil One, who appeared in terrible guise between twelve and one o'clock at night, at the village of Rimlich, near Wittenberg, though several other places lay claim to that very questionable honor. Some have doubted, considering the monstrously mythical form in which his career has come down to us, whether such an individual as Faust ever existed; but it is now generally believed that there was a basis of fact, on which tradition has built its grotesque superstructure. Gorres, indeed, asserts that one George Sabellicus, who disappeared about the year 1517, is the real Faust; but Philip Melancthon—the man of all the reformers whose word in regard to a matter of fact would most readily be trusted—says that he had himself conversed with Dr. Faustus. Conrad Gesner (1561) is equally positive; and Luther, in his *Table Talk*, speaks of Dr. Faust as a man lost beyond all hope. The opinion that prevails, and which is reckoned to be intrinsically the more probable, is that some man of this name, possessed of varied knowledge, may possibly have practised jugglery (for the wandering savans of the Middle Ages had all a touch of the quack about them), and thus have been taken by the ignorant people for a dealer in the black art, and one who maintained a secret and intimate relation with evil spirits. His widely diffused celebrity not only occasioned the wonders worked by other so-called necromancers of an earlier age—Albertus Magnus, Simon Magus, and Paracelsus—to be attributed to him, but likewise many ancient tales and legends of a marvellous character were gradually transferred to him, till he finally appears as the very

hero of magicians. But while, on the one hand, the narrative of Faust's marvels afforded amusement to the people, on the other they were made use of for instruction by the clergy, who pointed out, in the frightful fate of Faust, the danger of tampering with the 'black art,' and the abominableness of a life sunk in sensuality and vice. The myth of Faust has received a manifold literary treatment. First come the *Volksbücher* (or people's books), which record Faust's enterprises and feats. The oldest of these now known appeared at Frankfort in 1588. Then came an 'improved' edition of the same, by Widmann, entitled *Wahrhaftige Historien von denen grätlichen Sünden Dr. Joh. Faust's* (True History of the Horrible Crimes of Dr. John Faust, Hamb. 3 vols. 1599); and in 1695, a work was published at Nürnberg by Pfitzer, based upon that of Widmann. The oldest of these books was translated into all the civilized languages of Europe. Impostors also published books of magic under the name of Faust, such as *Faust's grosser und gewaltiger Höllezwang* (Faust's Great and Potent Book of Spells), *Faust's Mirakelkunst* (Faust's Art of Performing Miracles), and *Dreifache Höllezwang* (The Threefold Book of Spells). These wretched productions are filled throughout with meaningless scrawls and figures, interspersed with texts from the Bible scandalously misapplied; but in the belief of the vulgar, they were supposed capable, when properly understood, of accomplishing prodigies. That the poetical art should in due time have seized on a subject affording so much material for the fancy to work upon was inevitable, and consequently German literature abounds in elegies, pantomimes, tragedies, and comedies on Faust. Since the end of the 17th century, the *Puppenspiel* (Puppet-show) of Dr. Faust (published at Leipsic in 1850) has been one of the most popular pieces in Germany. It forms the transition from the rude magic tales concerning Faust to the later philosophic conception of the Faust-myth, which has become the most perfect poetical expression of the eternal strife between good and evil in the soul of man. The first writer who treated the story of Faust dramatically was the English writer Christopher Marlowe, about the year 1600 (German translation by W. Müller, Berlin, 1818); but the grandest work on the subject is Goethe's *Faust*, the first part of which appeared under the title of *Dr. Faust, ein Trauerspiel* (Leip. 1790), and afterwards in a remodelled form, under the title of *Faust, eine Tragödie* (Tübingen, 1808). The second part was published after the author's death, at Stuttgart, in 1833. Besides Goethe's drama may be mentioned Lessing's masterly fragment, *Faust und die Sieben Geister* (Faust and the Seven Spirits), G. F. L. Müller's *Dr. Faust's Leben* (Dr. Faust's Life, Mannh. 1778), and Klinger's *Faust's Leben, Thaten, und Höllefahrt* (Faust's Life, Doings, and Descent into Hell; Petersburg and Leip. 1791). The plastic art has also found a fit subject in Faust. In Auerbach's cellar at Leipsic, where Faust is said to have performed many of his feats, are two rude daubs of the year 1525, representing Faust and Mephistopheles riding out of the cellar on a wine-barrel. Rembrandt and Christoph von Sichein have also illustrated the story of Faust, and, in modern times, Cornelius and Retzsch have done the same. See Peter, *Die Literatur der Faustsage* (The Literature of the Faust Myth), 2d edit. Leip. 1851."

**Fausta**, FLAVIA MAXIMIANA, daughter of the emperor Maximianus Herculius and Eutropia, was the second wife of Constantine the Great, to whom she bore three sons, Constantinus, Constantius, and Constans, and two daughters, Constantina and Helena. She was born about A. D. 289, was married in 307, and put to death in 326, if the general opinion in regard to her end be correct. She gained great influence over the mind of her husband by her devotion in revealing to him a plot, formed by her own father, to assassinate him, though with filial tenderness she covenanted

the life of her parent, who was notwithstanding put to death. This confidence and affection, as is alleged by some, she abused so as to instigate the death of Crispus, Constantine's son by his first wife Minervina, a youth of rare promise and great popularity, because, as some say, he stood in the way of her own sons, or, according to others, of his refusal to reciprocate her illicit love. Helena, the mother of the emperor, however, avenged the fate of her grandson, and Fausta, whose perfidy and infidelity were made known, was suffocated in a hot bath. Other accounts, however, hold Fausta innocent of the death of Crispus, which, together with her own and that of the Cæsar Licinius, is attributed to the cruel suspiciousness of Constantine, engendered by success—that *insolentia rerum secularum*, as Eutropius styles it, which perverted his nature and led to deeds of cruelty. The vague and contradictory statements in regard to her conduct, and to the time, cause, and manner of her death, leave the whole matter in doubt. In one account she is made to survive the death of her son Constantine, who was slain three years after his father's death, and in another is represented as the "most pious of queens." Her conversion to Christianity is also a matter of doubt, though she probably followed her husband in that respect.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, s. v.; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, ii, 162-3 (N. Y. Harpers', 1852, 6 vols. 12mo); Tillemont, *Hist. des Emp.* vol. iv, art. lxii, p. 224, and *Notes sur Constantin*, xvii; Eckhel, *Doctrina Nummorum*, viii, 98; Eutropius, x, 6; Lactantius, *De Morte Persecut.* 27; Julian, *Orat.* i; Zosimus, ii, 10, 29; Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccles.* ii, 4. (J. W. M.)

**Faustinus**, bishop of Lyons, lived in the second part of the third century. He became bishop about the year 250, and distinguished himself by his zeal for the faith, and the ardor with which he attacked Marcianus, bishop of Arles, the only Gallic bishop who had embraced Novatianism. Unable to accomplish anything by himself, he made sure of the aid of the bishops of the Narbonnaise, and wrote to the pope, Stephen, to obtain the deposition of Marcianus. The pope hesitated, and Faustinus, in order to hasten matters, wrote to Cyprian, bishop of Carthage. The two letters which he wrote no longer exist, but they form the material of the sixty-seventh letter of Cyprian to pope Stephen, which gives a curious picture of the Gallic Church at that period. Marcianus persisted in his schism, and the result of the affair is uncertain, but it is probable that he was deposed, since his name is not found in the list of the bishops of Arles.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xvii, 199.

**Faustinus**, a priest of the sect of the Luciferians (q. v.) in the fourth century. He shared in the persecution they experienced, but was set free by the intervention of the emperor Theodosius, to whom he presented a petition praying for protection to be extended to himself and others who associated with him; this the emperor granted, and Damasus's papal persecutions were stayed. He wrote a treatise, *De Trinitate sive de Fide contra Arianos* (Concerning the Faith, against the Arians). The discourse is dedicated to the empress Flacilla, and divided into seven chapters. He begins by stating the heresies of the Arians, and then combats them from Scripture. In chap. ii he proves that the word *Son* belongs to our Saviour, but leaves untouched the question whether the word applies to him as God or *man*, taking for granted the former; in chap. iii he shows the omnipotence and perpetual endurance of Christ; explains in chap. iv John xiv, 28; in chap. v, the qualifications implied in Acts ii, 36 are pointed out as belonging only to God; and chap. vi is a short dissertation on the Holy Spirit. He wrote also *Fides Theodosio imp. oblata* (according to Mabillon, about A. D. 380)—*Libellus Precum*, a petition addressed to the emperors Valentinian and Theodosius, relating and requesting to be freed from the persecutions which he,

Marcellinus, and others were suffering in consequence of being Luciferians. A short account of this sect is prefixed by Faustinus to the petition. His remains will be found in Galland, *Bib. Max. Patr.* vii, 441, and in Migne, *Patrol. Cours.* xiii, 38 sq.—Clarke, *Success. Sac. Lit.*; Lardner, *Works*, iv, 250.

**Faustinus**, who lived towards the close of the sixth century after Christ, was appointed bishop of Dax, France, by authority of Gondwald, who, claiming to be a natural son of Clothaire I, aspired to the throne of Aquitaine, but was vanquished, betrayed, and slain. Faustinus was then deposed by a council held at Macon, which, curiously enough, also condemned the bishops who had ordained him to provide for him in turn, and pay him 100 solidi annually.—Gregory of Tours, *Epitome historie Francorum*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Gén.* (J. W. M.)

**Faustus, Dr.** See FAUST, Dr.

**Faustus Reiensis or Rhegiensis** (of Rhegium, or Reil, in Provence), so called from the diocese over which he presided, a pious and self-sacrificing prelate, although doctrinally he favored Semi-Pelagianism. He was born in Britain about the beginning of the fifth century, and became a monk of Lerins. When Maximus was made bishop of Rhegium, Faustus succeeded him in his abbacy of Lerins, and succeeded him again as bishop on his death, A. D. 454. He was present at the council held under Hilary at Rome, 462, and returned in 484 to his diocese, where he died about 485. He wrote (1) *De Gratia Dei et humane mentis libero arbitrio* (On Grace and Free-will) (*Bib. Max. Patr.* viii). In this treatise he opposes absolute predestination, but admits original sin and the necessity of grace to assist man's nature, but denies that grace is confined in its saving influences to a few, or that original sin is entirely destructive of every good, so as to leave man "a mass of corruption." He also shows that God's foreknowledge does not affect the salvation or condemnation of any, and interprets the various texts of Scripture which refer to the matter. (2) *Professio Fidei* (A Confession of Faith) (*Bib. Max. Patr.* viii), directed against the doctrines of predestination and fate, addressed to Leontius, bishop of Arles. This is a recapitulation of his treatise *De Gratia*. (3) *Epistola ad Lucidum Presbyterum*, against the Predestinarians of the monastery of Adrumetum. Lucidus was convinced by this letter, and subscribed to the points condemned in it (Mansi, *Concil.* vii, 1007). This and other *Epistole*, to Ruricius and others, are in *Cassii Lect. Antiq.* i, 352 (Antw. 1725, fol.), and in the *Biblioth. Max. Patr.* viii; also several *Sermons*. The treatise *De Gratia* is also in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* Iviii, 775 sq., together with the *Epistole* and *Sermons*. Angelo Mai, in his *Spicilegium Romanum*, gives three discourses of Faustus never before printed. Neander gives the following judicious statement of the doctrines of Faustus: "Although Faustus adopted the Semi-Pelagian mode of exposition with regard to the relation of the free-will to grace, yet he unfolded this scheme in a way peculiar to himself. If he did not express himself so distinctly as to satisfy the acute and clear-headed theologian, yet we see presented in him, in a beautiful manner, such a harmonious tendency of Christian feeling, keeping aloof from all partial and exaggerated views, as prevented him from giving undue prominence either to the work of redemption, so as to infringe on that of the creation, or to the work of creation, so as to infringe on that of the redemption. 'As the same Being,' says he, 'is both Creator and Redeemer, so one and the same Being is to be adored both in the work of creation and of redemption.' Among the attributes which, as expressing the image of God, could not be destroyed in human nature, he reckons pre-eminently the free-will. But even before the fall the free-will was insufficient without the aid of grace, and still less can it at present,

since sin has entered, suffice by its own strength for the attainment of salvation. It has now lost its original power, yet it is not in itself destroyed; it is not altogether shut out from the divine gifts, but only it must strive once more to obtain them by intense efforts and the divine assistance. Like the author of the work *De vocatione gentium*, he makes a distinction between general grace (*gratia generalis*), a term by which he designates the religioso-moral capability which God has furnished to man's nature, and which, too, has not been wholly supplanted by sin, as well as the universal inward revelation of God by means of this universal religioso-moral sense; between general grace so understood, and special grace, by which he means all that was first bestowed on mankind through Christianity. But the relation of these two kinds of grace to each other is defined by him quite otherwise than it is in the work above mentioned. Although, as a general thing, the grace of redemption, and in many cases, also, the calling, is antecedent to all human merit, still the operation of that special grace in man is dependent on the manner in which he has used that general grace; and in many cases the striving and seeking of the man which proceeds from the former, the self-active bent of the free-will, is antecedent to that which is imparted to the man by this special grace; a thing which Faustus endeavors to show by examples similar to those which the Semi-Pelagians had been accustomed to adduce since the time of Cassian. He denominates the imperishable germ of good in human nature a spark of fire implanted within by the divine hand, which, cherished by man, with the assistance of divine grace, would become operative. He recognises, therefore, a preparatory development of the religious and moral nature even among the heathen, and converts those who are unwilling to allow that, by a faithful use of that general grace, the heathen might have attained to the true service of God. From this it might also be inferred that Faustus was an opponent of the doctrine which taught that all the heathen would be unconditionally condemned; and that it was his opinion that the worthy among them would still be led, after the present life, to faith in the Saviour, and thereby to salvation; but on these points he does not express himself more distinctly. There is much good sense in the remarks of Faustus where he compares the two extremes in the mode of apprehending the relation of grace to free-will with the two extremes in the mode of apprehending the doctrine concerning the person of Christ. As in the doctrine concerning Christ's person some gave undue prominence to the divine, others to the human element, and, as the result of so doing, were led into errors which, on opposite sides, injured the doctrine of redemption, so he says it was also with the doctrine concerning human nature. Faustus deserves notice also on account of his dispute concerning the corporeality of the soul. He affirmed, as others before him had already done (e. g. Hilary of Poitiers, *On Matt.* v, 8, and even Didymus, in his work *De Trinitate*, bk. ii, ch. 4: 'Οἱ ἄγγελοι πνεύματα, καθὸ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἄσώματα, σώματα ἐπουράνια διὰ τὸ ἀπέριφον ἀπέχειν τοῦ ἀκρίστου πνεύματος), that God alone is a pure spirit; in the essential nature of finitude is grounded limitation as by time (a beginning of existence), so also by space; and hence all creatures are corporeal beings, the higher spirits as well as souls. He was led by his controversies with the Arians of the German tribes, who were then spreading themselves in these countries, to unfold these views still farther; for he supposed he could demonstrate that if equality of essence with the Father was not ascribed to the Logos, it would be necessary to regard him as a corporeal being. He found an opponent who surpassed him in philosophical spirit in the presbyter Claudianus Mamertus of Vienna, a man on whom the speculative spirit of Augustine had exerted a great influence. He wrote

against Faustus his work *De statu animæ*" (Neander, *Church History*, Torrey, ii, 645).—Clarke, *Succession of Sac. Lit.* ii, 255; Neander, *History of Dogmas*, Ryland, ii, 383; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. v, pt. ii, ch. v, § 26, n. 55; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacrés* (Paris, 1861), x, 420-426. See SEMI-PELAGIANS; MASSILIANS.

**Faustus, Socinus.** See SOCINUS.

**Faustus, St. (d'Againe)**, was born about A.D. 460, but the date of his death is unknown. He became a monk in the convent of Agaune, in Valois, and in 505 went to Paris with Severinus, his abbot, who was called thither by Clovis I to employ his medical skill in treating him for a chronic fever. On his return journey Severinus died, and Faustus, who had remained in France, was commissioned by Childbert to write his life. This work is commendable for its simplicity, exactness, and scant mention of miracles as wrought by its subject, in an age whose literature is replete with such marvels. The best edition is that by Mabillon in the *Acta Sanctorum Ord. Sancti Benedicti* (Paris, 1668-1710, 9 vols. fol.; reprinted at Venice, 1733, 9 vols. fol.). The *Acta Sanctorum* assigns the 11th of February to St. Faustus d'Againe.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xvii, 202. (J. W. M.)

**Faustus, St. (de Glanfeuil)**, was one of the Benedictine monks who came with St. Maurus to France, A.D. 543, and assisted in founding the first monastery of his order in that country at Glanfeuil (Glanafolium), in Anjou. In 585, after the death of Maurus, he returned to Italy, and became an inmate of the monastery of Lateran at Rome, where, at the instance of his brother monks, he wrote a life of St. Maurus, and presented it to pope Boniface IV, who approved it about 607. Faustus died some time after this (on a 15th of February, according to the Bollandists), and was buried in the monastery of Lateran. His life of St. Maurus reflects the spirit of the age, a credulous faith in the marvellous, and abounds in uninteresting and prolix details. Surius (*Vite Sanctorum*, etc.), Du Breul (*Supplém. Antig.* etc.), and Mabillon (*Acta Sancti Benedicti*) have edited it.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xvii, 202-3. (J. W. M.)

**Faustus, THE MANICHEAN**, a prominent bishop of the Manichæans, was a native of Mileve, in Numidia. Our knowledge of him is almost exclusively derived from the writings of Augustine. When beginning to doubt the truth of the Manichæan doctrines which he had adopted during his stay at Carthage, Augustine was referred by his Manichæan teachers whom he consulted, and who were unable to solve his doubts, to Faustus, as the ablest man of the sect. Augustine did not, however, find in Faustus what he had expected; his knowledge was by no means so extensive and so profound as the Manichæans generally believed. Of Latin literature he had only read some orations of Cicero, a part of Seneca's works, a few poets, and the Latin works of Manichæan authors. He confessed an entire ignorance of natural sciences. He was, however, possessed of a great readiness of speech and dexterity in argument. Faustus subsequently wrote a work against the doctrines of the Christian Church and in defence of the Manichæans, in which the objections of his sect to the Scriptures, and in particular to the Old Testament, are presented with some keenness and wit. Augustine, induced by his friends, wrote against Faustus his work *Contra Faustum Manicheum Libri xxxii* (compiled about 400; sent to Jerome 404), in which nearly the whole of the work of Faustus is quoted. Augustine relates of him that he led a life of luxurious ease, regarded himself as the Incarnate Wisdom, was for a time exiled for his Manichæan opinions to an island, but subsequently released. The work of Augustine against Faustus is in the 8th volume of his works in the Maurine and Migne editions. See AUGUSTINE, MANICHEANS.—Herzog,

*Real-Encyclop.* iv, 342; Wetzler u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 927. (A. J. S.)

**Favor.** See GRACE.

**Favre.** See FABER.

**Fawcett, Benjamin**, an English dissenting minister, was born at Sleaford, Lincolnshire, in 1715, and died in 1780. He was a pupil of Dr. Doddridge at Northampton, and preached first at Taunton, and then at Kidderminster, where he was pastor of a congregation of Dissenters for 55 years. He was a strict economist of time, and attributed his uninterrupted good health to his temperate mode of life and the habit of early rising. His works are, *Sermons* (1756-80), an abridgment of Baxter's *Saints' Everlasting Rest*, and *Religious Melancholy* (1780, 8vo).—Rose, *New Gen. Biog. Dict.*; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*.

**Fawcett, John, D.D.**, an eminent Baptist minister, was born in Yorkshire Jan. 6, 1739, joined a Baptist church in 1758, and was ordained minister at Wainsgate in 1764. Here he opened an academy, at which many ministers were educated, among them Ward of Serampore. He was a self-taught, but well-informed man: in theology he was a moderate Calvinist. He died July 25, 1819. He published *The Sick Man's Friend* (1774);—*Hymns* (Leeds, 1781, 12mo);—*Essay on Anger* (Leeds, 1787, 12mo);—*Devotional Family Bible* (1807-11, 2 vols. 4to).—Jones, *Christian Biography*, s. v.; Jamieson, *Cyclop. of Biography*, p. 194.

**Fawcett, Joseph**, minister of an Independent church at Walthamstow, died 1804. He was a very popular preacher, and published *Sermons delivered at the Old Jewry* (Lond. 1795, 2 vols. 8vo).

**Fawkes, Guy** ("properly Guido"), the head of the conspiracy known by the name of the Gunpowder Plot, was born of a Protestant family in Yorkshire in the year 1570. He became a Roman Catholic at an early age, and served in the Spanish army in the Netherlands. Inspired with fanatical zeal for his new religion, on his return to England he entered into a plot with several Catholic gentlemen for blowing up the king, his ministers, and the members of both houses at the opening of Parliament, November 5, 1605. Guy Fawkes was taken with the burning match in his hand, tried, and, after being put to the torture, was publicly executed January 31, 1606. In remembrance of this event, in most English towns, but particularly in London, a grotesque figure, stuffed with straw, is carried about the streets on the 5th of November, and finally committed to the flames. A political and religious signification was again imparted to this custom by what was called 'the papal aggression' in the year 1850, when the figure of cardinal Wiseman (q. v.) was substituted for that of Guy Fawkes.—Chambers, *Encyclopædia*, s. v. See GUNPOWDER PLOT.

**Faydit, Pierre**, a priest of the French Oratory, was born at Riom, in the Auvergne, in the first half of the 17th century. He was in 1671 excluded from the Oratory for having published, in spite of the prohibition of his superiors, from the Cartesian point of view, a work *On the Human Mind (De Mente Humana)*. While pope Innocent XI was quarrelling with the French government, Faydit, in a sermon on St. Polycarp, preached against the pope, whose conduct he compared with that of pope Victor toward the Asiatic bishops. The view expressed in these sermons he refuted himself in another sermon published at Liege; but in 1687 he again published at Maastricht an extract from his first sermon, with proofs for the facts quoted in it. In consequence of an *Essay on the Trinity*, in which he seemed to favor Tritheism, he was imprisoned in 1696 at St. Lazarus. Subsequently he was ordered to withdraw to his native city, where he continued to compile quarrelsome works, attacking with ridiculous arguments some of the best works of his age, such as Fénelon's *Télémaque* and Tillémont's *Mé-*

*moires Ecclesiastiques*. He died in 1709.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xvi, 229. (A. J. S.)

**Fear of God.** I. *Old Testament.*—There is no mention in the Scriptures of the sentiment of fear in the relations between man and God before the fall of Adam. After the transgression, Adam says, "I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid" (Gen. iii, 10). Fear of God (יְרֵאָה לַיהוָה) stands thus in close connection with conscience, and with the fact of actual or possible sin. We are probably justified in inferring from the narrative in Genesis that the sentiment of fear, in relation to God, is one of the consequences of Adam's sin. Since the Fall, fear is a natural and proper feeling on the part of dependent man with regard to the infinite God whom he has offended. Dependence alone, without the consciousness of sin, or of sinful tendencies and possibilities, would not engender fear. In sinful beings, however, fear is useful and necessary as a preventive and safeguard against transgression. As such it is enjoined in the O. T. especially. (Compare Exod. i, 17; Deut. vi, 2; Prov. iii, 7; xiv, 2.) So in O. T. we find practical piety generally described as the fear of God: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge" (Prov. i, 7); Job xxviii, 8, "Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom, and to depart from evil is understanding;" "The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring forever" (Psa. xix, 9). Fear, thus coming to be almost, if not quite, synonymous with piety, did not (under the old covenant) exclude filial and even cheerful trust in God, and delight in his law and in his worship; the Psalms abound in illustrations of this. Under this covenant, too, the law of love prevailed (Deut. vi, 5, "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might"). The promise of a new covenant, also, added the grace of hope to the experience of O. T. believers (Jer. xxxi, 31-34). But a fear which is conjoined with love and hope is not a slavish fear, but rather filial fear, veneration (compare Deut. xxxii, 6; Hosea xi, 1; Isa. i, 2; lxiii, 16; lxiv, 8). Nevertheless, the sense of the filial relation to God through Christ, such as appears in the N. T., was wanting in the old covenant, and fear was, perhaps, under that covenant, the prevailing element in the consciousness of believers, so far as their relation to God was concerned.

II. In the sphere of the N. T., the fear of God, in the sense of slavish or untrusting dread, is completely dispelled. True, in the economy of salvation through Christ fear finds a useful place as a preventive of negligence and carelessness in religion, and as an inducement to penitence (2 Cor. v, 11; vii, 1; Phil. ii, 12; Eph. v, 21; Heb. xii, 28, 29), and is enforced in this sense by Christ himself (Matt. x, 28). But as Christian experience deepens, and the soul is consecrated to God, the sense of fear vanishes, and love takes its place (Rom. viii, 15; 2 Tim. i, 7; 1 John iv, 18). On the other hand, where there is nothing more than the form of Christian life, without its inward power, the old Jewish and even pagan fear springs up. So the Romish Church does not admit a free and direct approach to God, but demands the intercession of saints, etc., and makes of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, in which Christians are lovingly to surround his table, a tremendous and fearful mystery. In Protestant theology, on the contrary, the fear to approach God is considered as a consequence of the Fall, and free access to him is held to be an essential element of true Christian life. Edwards, in his *Treatise on Religious Affections*, remarks as follows on the relations of fear and sin: "For so hath God contrived and constituted things, in his dispensations towards his own people, that when their love decays, and the exercises of it fail or become weak, fear should arise; for then they need it to restrain them from sin, and to excite them to care for the good of their souls, and so to stir them

up to watchfulness and diligence in religion; but God hath so ordered that, when love rises and is in vigorous exercise, then fear should vanish and be driven away; for then they need it not, having a higher and more excellent principle in exercise to restrain them from sin, and stir them up to their duty. There are no other principles which human nature is under the influence of that will ever make men conscientious but one of these two, *fear or love*; and therefore, if one of these should not prevail as the other decays, God's people, when fallen into dead and carnal frames, when love is asleep, would be lamentably exposed indeed; and therefore God has wisely ordained that these two opposite principles of love and fear should rise and fall like the two opposite scales of a balance; when one rises, the other sinks. Love is the spirit of adoption, or the childlike principle; if that slumbers, men fall under fear, which is the spirit of bondage, or the servile principle; and so on the contrary. And if it be so that love, or the spirit of adoption, be carried to a great height, it quite drives away all fear, and gives full assurance; agreeable to that of the apostle, 1 John iv, 18, "There is no fear in love, but perfect love casts out fear." These two opposite principles of love and holy love bring hope and fear into the hearts of God's children in proportion as they prevail, that is, when left to their own natural influence, without something adventitious or accidental intervening, as the distemper of melancholy, doctrinal ignorance, prejudices of education, wrong instruction, false principles, peculiar temptations, etc. Fear is cast out by the Spirit of God no other way than by the prevailing of love: nor is it ever maintained by his Spirit but when love is asleep" (Edwards, *Works*, N. Y. edit., iii, 56). See, on the different dispensations of grace, Fletcher, *Works*, iii, 175 sq; Stowell, *On Nehemiah*, lect. 1; Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, v, 280, from which part of this article is a modified translation.

**Feast** (properly מִשְׁתֵּה, *mishteh*, δὲσῆ, when a hospitable entertainment; and צֶדָה, *chay*, ἐσπρή, when a religious festival). To what an early date the practices of hospitality are referable may be seen in Gen. xix, 3, where we find Lot inviting the two angels—"Turn in, I pray you, into your servant's house and tarry all night, and wash your feet; and he pressed upon them greatly, and they entered into his house; and he made them a feast;" which was obviously of an impromptu nature, since it is added, "and did bake unleavened bread, and they did eat" (Judg. vi, 19). It was usual not only thus to receive persons with choice viands, but also to dismiss them in a similar manner; accordingly Laban, when he had overtaken the fleeing Jacob, complains (Gen. xxxi, 27), "Wherefore didst thou steal away from me and didst not tell me, that I might have sent thee away with mirth, and with songs, and with tabret, and with harp?" See also 2 Sam. iii, 20; 2 Kings vi, 23; Job viii, 20; 1 Mace. xvi, 15. This practice explains the reason why the prodigal, on his return, was welcomed by a feast (Luke xv, 23). Occasions of domestic joy were hailed with feasting; thus, in Gen. xxi, 8, Abraham "made a great feast the same day that Isaac was weaned." Birthdays were thus celebrated (Gen. xl, 20): "Pharaoh, on his birthday, made a feast unto all his servants" (Job i, 4; Matt. xiv, 6; compare Herod. i, 133). Marriage-feasts were also common. Samson (Judg. xiv, 10) on such an occasion "made a feast," and it is added, "for so used the young men to do." So Laban, when he gave his daughter Leah to Jacob (Gen. xxix, 22), "gathered together all the men of the place, and made a feast." These festive occasions seem originally to have answered the important purpose of serving as evidence and attestation of the events which they celebrated, on which account relatives and neighbors were invited to be present (Ruth iv, 10; John ii, 1). Those processes in rural occupations by which the di-

vine bounties are gathered into the hands of man have in all ages been made seasons of festivity; accordingly, in 2 Sam. xiii, 23, Absalom invites all the king's sons, and even David himself, to a sheep-shearing feast, on which occasion the guests became "merry with wine" (1 Sam. xxv, 2 sq.). The vintage was also celebrated with festive eating and drinking (Judg. ix, 27). Feasting at funerals existed among the Jews (2 Sam. iii, 33). In Jer. xvi, 7, among other funeral customs, mention is made of "the cup of consolation, to drink for their father or their mother," which brings to mind the indulgence in spirituous liquors to which our ancestors were given at interments, and which has not yet entirely disappeared in Lancashire, nor probably in Ireland (Carleton's *Irish Peasantry; England in the Nineteenth Century*, vol. ii). To what an extent expense was sometimes carried on these occasions may be learned from Josephus (*War*, iv, 1, 1), who, having remarked that Archelaus "mourned for his father seven days, and had given a very expensive funeral feast to the multitude," states, "which custom is the occasion of poverty to many of the Jews;" adding, "because they are forced to feast the multitude; for if any one omits it he is not esteemed a holy person." See ENTERTAINMENT.

As among heathen nations, so also among the Hebrews, feasting made a part of the observances which took place on occasion of animal sacrifices. In Deut. xii, 6, 7, after the Israelites are enjoined to bring to the place chosen of God their burnt offerings, tithes, heave offerings, vows, free-will offerings, and the firstlings of their herds and flocks, they are told, "There shall ye eat before the Lord your God, and ye shall rejoice in all ye put your hand unto, ye and your households, wherein the Lord thy God hath blessed thee" (1 Sam. ix, 19; xvi, 3, 5; 2 Sam. vi, 19). These sacrificial meals were enjoyed in connection with peace offerings, whether eucharistic or votive. The kidneys, and all the inward fat, and the tail of the lamb, were burnt with the sacrifice; the breast and right shoulder fell to the priest, and the rest was to be eaten by the offerer and his friends, on the same day if the offering were eucharistic, on that and the next day if it were votive (Lev. iii, 1-17; vii, 11-21; 29-36; xix, 5-8; xx, 29, 30). To the feast at the second tithe of the produce of the land, which was to be made every year, and eaten at the annual festivals before Jehovah, not only friends, but strangers, widows, orphans, and Levites were to be invited, as well as the slaves. If the tabernacle was so distant as to make it inconvenient to carry thither the tithe, it was to be turned into money, which was to be spent in providing feasts at the place at which the festivals were held (Deut. xiv, 22-27; xii, 14; Tobit i, 6). Charitable entertainments were also provided, at the end of three years, from the tithe of the increase. The Levite, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow were to be present (Deut. xii, 17-19; xiv, 28, 29; xxvi, 12-15). At the feast of Pentecost the command is very express (Deut. xvi, 11), "Thou shalt rejoice before the Lord thy God, thou, and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy man-servant, and thy maid-servant, and the Levite that is within thy gates, and the stranger, and the fatherless, and the widow that are among you." Accordingly, Tobit (ii, 1, 2) affirms, "Now when I was come home again, in the feast of Pentecost, when I saw abundance of meat, I said to my son, go and bring what poor man soever thou shalt find out of our brethren, who is mindful of the Lord." The Israelites were forbidden to partake of food offered in sacrifice to idols (Exod. xxxiv, 15), lest they should be thereby enticed into idolatry, or appear to give a sanction to idolatrous observances (1 Cor. x, 28).—Kitto, s. v. See ALISGEMA.

For further particulars as to social entertainments, see BANQUET; and as to sacred occasions, see FESTIVAL.

**Feasts, or Festivals,** in the Christian Church, certain days set apart for the more particular remembrance of the prominent transactions connected with our Lord in his redemption of mankind, and also for the commemoration of the labors and sufferings of his apostles.

1. *History and Theory of their Observance.*—(1.) "Some Protestants object to the observance of these feasts on the ground that such observance is contrary to the injunction of the apostle Paul (Col. ii, 16), forgetting that in this passage the apostle alludes exclusively to Jewish feasts; others object to all such festivals as being popish, forgetting that they have been observed from the earliest ages of the Church. If a Church has power to ordain rites and ceremonies which are not contrary to Scripture, she has the power to set apart certain days in commemoration of the most important events and persons connected with the first promulgation of the Gospel to sinners" (Eden). (2.) Festival days were hallowed in the Church long before the rise of the papacy. At first the religious festivals of the Church were observed voluntarily, and never by formal obligation; but in the 4th century various decrees of councils were passed, enjoining the observance of them as a duty. The number of festivals was originally small, consisting, besides Sunday, of Easter, Pentecost, and Ascension, and to these the Epiphany and Christmas were added at a later period. "The end designed by the observance of these festivals was to call to mind the benefits of the Christian dispensation, to excite Christians to holy living, to offer thanks for providential mercies, and to aid in the cultivation of Christian graces. The discourses which were delivered on these occasions always referred to the most important topics of the Christian religion. Even the Lord's day, according to Eusebius, was said to have had a threefold origin, emblematic of the sacred Trinity—the creation of the world, the resurrection of Christ, and the effusion of the Holy Spirit" (Bingham, bk. xx, ch. iv.; Neander, *Church History*, i, 301). "The primitive Church were not careful to prescribe a specific time or place for the celebration of their religious festivals. The apostles and their immediate successors proceeded on the principle that these should be observed at stated times, which might still be varied as circumstances should direct. These seasons were regarded as *sacred*, not for any peculiar sanctity belonging to the day or hour in which they were solemnized, in itself considered, but merely as being set apart from a common to a religious use. Some, however, have maintained that these festive days should be observed as *holy time*" (Coleman, *Christian Antiquities*, ch. xxi). After the 4th century festivals were so greatly multiplied in the Church that later times bear no resemblance in this respect to the first ages. "Many causes contributed to this multiplication of festivals, among which may be mentioned as the chief, 1. The commemorations of martyrs and confessors already introduced, which led to the establishment of numerous festivals in honor of saints, and to the superstitious use of relics, invocations, pilgrimages, and the like; 2. The errors of some sects respecting existing festivals, to correct which the Catholic Church introduced new observances; 3. Several laws of Constantine relating to the celebration of Easter, the religious observance of Friday in every week, and the feasts of martyrs; 4. The celebration of Christmas, which was introduced in the 4th century, led the way to the establishment of other festivals in connection with itself, such as those in honor of the Virgin Mary. 5. The propensity of many Christians to partake in the celebration of heathen festivals and in Jewish observances had become a serious evil in the Church during the third and fourth centuries. In Homilies and decrees of councils of that date we find earnest protests against the amalgamation of Christian worship with Jewish and heathen rites, and a description of

the dangers which threatened Christianity from this practice, which had begun to gain ground (see Chrysostom, *Hom.* 1, 6, 52, and elsewhere: *Conc. Laod.* c. 29, 37, 39; *Conc. Illiber.* c. 49, 50). This perverse attachment to forms and ceremonies altogether foreign to the Christian religion appears to have been a leading cause of the multiplication of festivals within the Church. The original simplicity of Christian worship had become unsatisfactory to the multitude, and it was deemed necessary to give splendor and external attraction to the religion of the Gospel by the establishment of new festivals, or by converting Jewish and heathen ceremonies into Christian solemnities. It was thought that this might be done with safety, inasmuch as there was no longer occasion to fear that the people would return to Judaism or heathenism. And accordingly, in the time of Gregory the Great, many observances were adopted into the course of Christian worship from the Jewish and heathen ritual, without fear of those evil consequences which were formerly apprehended from such a combination. See Gregor. M. *R. g.* ix, Ep. 71; Theodoret, *De Mart.* i, viii" (Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 648). (3.) Those who vindicate the observance of festivals in the Church maintain that "this sanctification or setting apart of festival days is a token of that thankfulness, and a part of that public honor which we owe to God for his admirable benefits; and these days or feasts set apart are of excellent use, being, as Hooker observes, the, 1. Splendor and outward dignity of our religion; 2. Forceful witnesses of ancient truth; 3. Provocations to the exercise of all piety; 4. Shadows of our endless felicity in heaven; 5. Records teaching the facts of Christianity in the most obvious way. The Church begins her ecclesiastical year with the Sundays in Advent, to remind us of the coming of Christ in the flesh. After these, we are brought to contemplate the mystery of the incarnation; and so, step by step, we follow the Church through all the events of our Saviour's pilgrimage to his ascension into heaven. In all this the grand object is to keep Christ perpetually before us, to make him and his doctrine the chief object in all our varied services. Every Sunday has its peculiar character, and has reference to some act or scene in the life of our Lord, or the redemption achieved by him, or the mystery of mercy carried on by the blessed Trinity. Thus every year brings the whole Gospel history to view; and it will be found, as a general rule, that the appointed portions of Scripture in each day's service are mutually illustrative; the New Testament casting light on the Old, prophecy being admirably brought in contact with its accomplishment, so that no plan could be devised for a more profitable course of Scripture reading than that presented by the Church on her holy days" (Sparrow, *Rationale of the Common Prayer*).

II. *Number and Classes of Feasts.*—(1.) Besides the days observed by the whole Church as memorials of the acts of Christ's life and death, other festivals were also introduced commemorative of the apostles and martyrs. Bingham states that these may be traced up to the 2d century (*Orig. Eccl.* xx, 7), and Mosheim agrees with him (cent. i, pt. ii, chap. iv, § 4). It is to be observed that while Christmas is celebrated as the *birthday* of Christ, the martyrs' festivals were held on the days of their *deaths*—still, however, called *birthdays (natalis)*, as on these days they were transferred to endless life. On the number of these festivals in the early Church, and the modes in which they were observed, see Bingham (*l. c.*; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* i, 360 sq.).

(2.) The *Roman Catholic Church* has retained all the early festivals, with the later ones of the apostles and martyrs, and has added largely to the number. She retains the right to enact festival days, and to fix the mode of their observance. The following list embraces the feasts of the American calendar:

*Movable Feasts and Holydays.*—Feast of the Holy



Name of Jesus; Septuagesima Sunday; Ash Wednesday; Office of the Passion of our Lord; Office of the Most Sacred Crown; Office of the Spear and Nails; Office of the Five Wounds; Office of the Most Precious Blood; Sorrows of the B. V. Mary; Easter Day; Patronage of St. Joseph; Ascension of our Lord; Whit Sunday; Trinity Sunday; Corpus Christi; Feast of the Sacred Heart of Jesus; Feast of the Most Precious Blood of our Lord; Feast of the Holy Name of Mary; Feast of the Seven Dolours of B. V. M.; Feast of the Holy Rosary; Feast of the Maternity of B. V. M.; Feast of the Patronage of B. V. M.; Sundays after Pentecost; First Sunday of Advent.

*Immovable Feasts and Saints' Days.*—Abdon and Sennen, MM., July 30; Ægidius, Ab., Sept. 1; Agatha, V. M., Feb. 5; Agnes, V. M., Jan. 21; Alexius, C., July 17; All Saints, Nov. 1; All Saints, Octave of, Nov. 8; All Souls, Nov. 2; Aloysius Gonzaga, C., June 21; Alphonsus Liguori, B. C., Aug. 2; Ambrose, B. C. D., Dec. 7; Anacletus, Pope, M., July 13; Andrew, Apostle, Nov. 30; Andrew Avellino, C., Nov. 10; Andrew Corsini, B. C., Feb. 4; Anicetus, Pope, M., April 17; Ann, Mother of B. V. M., July 26; Anselm, B. C. D., April 21; Anthony, Ab., Jan. 17; Anthony of Padua, C., June 13; Antoninus, B. C., May 10; Apollinaris, B. M., July 23; Apollonia, V. M., Feb. 9; Athanasius, B. C. D., May 2; Augustine, B. C. D., Aug. 28; Barnabas, Apostle, June 11; Bartholomew, Apostle, April 24; Basil, B. C. D., June 14; Benedict, Ab. C., Mar. 21; Bernard, Ab. D., Aug. 20; Bernardinus, C., May 20; Bibiana, V. M., Dec. 2; Blase, B. M., Feb. 3; Bonaventure, B. C. D., July 14; Boniface, M., May 14; Bridget, Widow, Oct. 8; Bruno, C., Oct. 6; Cajetan, C., Aug. 7; Callistus, Pope, M., Oct. 14; Camillus de Lellis, C., July 18; Canute, M., Jan. 19; Casimir, C., Mar. 4; Catharine, V. M., Nov. 25; Catharine of Sienna, V., April 30; Cecilia, V. M., Nov. 22; Chas. Borromeo, B. C., Nov. 4; Christmas Day, Dec. 25; Chrysanthus and Daria, Oct. 25; Circumcision of our Lord, Jan. 1; Clare, V., Aug. 12; Clement, Pope, M., Nov. 23; Cletus and Marcel, PP. MM., April 26; Cornelius and Cyprian, MM., Sept. 16; Cosmas and Damian, MM., Sept. 27; Cyprian and Justina, MM., Sept. 26; Cyriacus, etc. MM., Aug. 8; Damasus, Pope, C., Dec. 11; Didacus, C., Nov. 13; Dionysius, etc. MM., Oct. 9; Dominic, C., Aug. 4; Dorothy, V. M., Feb. 6; Edward, King, C., Oct. 13; Elizabeth, Widow, July 8; Elizabeth of Hungary, Widow, Nov. 19; Epiphany of our Lord, Jan. 6; Epiphany, Octave of, Jan. 13; Eusebius, B. M., Dec. 16; Eustachius, etc. MM., Sept. 20; Evaristus, Pope, M., Oct. 26; Exaltation of the Holy Cross, Sept. 14; Fabian and Sebastian, MM., Jan. 20; Faustinus and Jovita, MM., Feb. 15; Felix, P. M., Mar. 30; Felix of Valois, C., Nov. 20; Fidelis, M., April 24; Finding of the Holy Cross, May 3; Frances, Widow, Mar. 9; Francis of Assisium, C., Oct. 4; Francis, Stigmas of, Sept. 17; Francis Borgia, C., Oct. 10; Francis Caracciolo, C., June 4; Francis of Paula, C., April 4; Francis of Sales, B. C., Jan. 29; Francis Xavier, C., Dec. 3; Gabriel, Archangel, Mar. 18; George, M., April 23; Gertrude, V., Nov. 15; Gregory the Great, P. C. D., Mar. 12; Gregory Nazianzen, B. C. D., May 9; Gregory Thaumaturgus, B. C., Nov. 17; Gregory VII, P. C., May 25; Guardian Angels, Oct. 2; Hedwigis, Widow, Oct. 17; Henry, Emperor, C., July 15; Hermenegild, M., April 13; Hilaron, Ab., Oct. 21; Hilary, B. C., Jan. 14; Hyacinth, C., Aug. 16; Ignatius, B. M., Feb. 1; Ignatius of Loyola, C., July 31; Innocents, Holy, Dec. 28; Innocents, Holy, Octave of, Jan. 4; Irenæus, B. M., June 28; Isidore, B. C. D., April 4; James, Apostle, July 25; Jane Frances de Chantal, Aug. 21; Januarius, etc. MM., Sept. 19; Jerome, C. D., Sept. 30; Jerome Æmilian, C., July 20; John, Apostle and Evangelist, Dec. 27; John, Octave of, Jan. 3; John before Lat. Gate, May 6; John the Baptist, Beheading of, Aug. 29; John the Baptist, Nativity of, June 24; John the Baptist, Oc-

tave of, July 1; John Cantius, C., Oct. 20; John Chrysostom, B. C. D., Jan. 27; John of the Cross, C., Nov. 24; John of God, C., Mar. 8; John Lateran, Dedication of, Nov. 9; John A. S. Facundo, C., June 12; John Francis Regis, C., June 18; John of Matha, C., Feb. 8; John Guibert, A. C., July 12; John Nepomucen, M., May 22; John and Paul, MM., June 26; Joseph, C., Spouse of B. V. M., Mar. 19; Joseph Calasanctius, C., Aug. 27; Joseph Cupertino, C., Sept. 18; Juliana Falconieri, V., June 19; Lady of Mercy, Our Blessed, Sept. 24; Lady ad Nives, Our, Aug. 5; Laurence, M., Aug. 10; Laurence, Octave of, Aug. 17; Laurence Justinian, B. C., Sept. 5; Leo the Great, P. C. D., April 11; Leo, Pope, C., July 7; Lewis, King, C., Aug. 25; Linus, Pope, M., Sept. 23; Lucy, V. M., Dec. 13; Luke, Evangelist, Oct. 18; Magdalen, Mary, Pen, July 22; Magdalen of Pazzi, V., May 27; Marcellinus, etc. MM., June 2; Marcellus, P. M., Jan. 16; Marcus, etc. MM., June 18; Margaret, Queen, Widow, June 10; Mark, Evangelist, April 25; Mark, Pope, C., Oct. 7; Martha, V., July 29; Martin, B. C., Nov. 11; Martin, Pope, M., Nov. 12; Martina, V. M., Jan. 30; Martyrs, Forty, Mar. 10; Mary, B. V. of Mt. Carmel, July 16; Mary, B. V., Annunciation of, Mar. 25; Mary, B. V., Assumption of, Aug. 15; Mary, B. V., Octave of, Aug. 22; Mary, B. V., Conception of, Dec. 8; Mary, B. V., Octave of, Dec. 15; Mary, B. V., Espousals of, Jan. 23; Mary, B. V., Expected Deliverance of, Dec. 18; Mary, B. V., Help of Christ, May 24; Mary, B. V., Nativity of, Sept. 8; Mary, B. V., Octave of, Sept. 15; Mary, B. V., Presentation of, Nov. 21; Mary, B. V., Purification of, Feb. 2; Mary, B. V., Visitation of, July 2; Mathias, Apostle, Feb. 24; Matthias, Apostle, leap year, Feb. 25; Matthew, Apostle and Evangelist, Sept. 21; Michael, Archangel, Dedication of the Church of, Sept. 29; Michael, Apparition of, May 8; Monica, Widow, May 4; Nazarius, etc. MM., July 28; Nereus, etc. MM., May 12; Nicholas of Tolent., C., Sept. 10; Nicholas of Myra, B. C., Dec. 6; Norbert, B. C., June 6; Pantaleon, M., July 27; Paschal Baylon, C., May 17; Patrick, B. C., Mar. 17; Paul, Conversion of, Jan. 25; Paul, Commemoration of, June 30; Paul, First Hermit, C., Jan. 15; Paulinus, B. C., June 22; Peter's Chains, Aug. 1; Peter's Chair at Antioch, Feb. 22; Peter's Chair at Rome, Jan. 18; Peter, Martyr, April 29; Peter of Alcantara, C., Oct. 19; Peter Celestinus, P. C., May 19; Peter Chrysologus, B. C. D., Dec. 4; Peter Damian, B. C. D., Feb. 23; Peter Nolasco, C., Jan. 31; Peter and Paul, Apostles, June 29; Peter and Paul, Octave of, July 6; Peter and Paul, Dedication of the Church of, Nov. 18; Philip Beniti, C., Aug. 23; Philip Neri, C., May 26; Philip and James, Apostles, May 1; Pius V, Pope, C., May 5; Pius, Pope, M., July 11; Placidus, etc. MM., Oct. 5; Polycarp, B. M., Jan. 26; Praxedes, V., July 21; Primus and Felicianus, MM., June 9; Raphael, Arch., Oct. 24; Raymund of Pennafort, Jan. 29; Raymund of Nonnatus, C., Aug. 31; Remigius, B. C., Oct. 1; Romuald, Ab., Feb. 7; Rose of Lina, V., Aug. 30; Sabbas, Ab., Dec. 5; Saviour's Church, Dedication of the, Nov. 9; Scholastica, V., Feb. 10; Seven Brothers, MM., July 10; Silvester, Pope, C., Dec. 21; Silverius, Pope, M., June 20; Simeon, B. M., Feb. 18; Simon and Jude, Apostles, Oct. 28; Soter and Caius, PP. MM., April 22; Stanislaus Kostka, C., Nov. 14; Stanislaus, B. M., May 7; Stephen, Protomartyr, Dec. 26; Stephen, Octave of, Jan. 2; Stephen, Finding of Relics of, Aug. 3; Stephen, Pope, M., Aug. 2; Stephen, King, C., Sept. 2; Theresa, V., Oct. 15; Thomas, Ap., Dec. 21; Thomas of Aquin, C. D., Mar. 7; Thomas of Canterbury, B. M., Dec. 29; Thomas of Villanova, B. C., Sept. 22; Tiburtius, etc. MM., April 14; Timothy, B. M., Jan. 24; Transfiguration of our Lord, Aug. 6; Ubaldus, B. C., May 16; Valentine, M., Feb. 14; Venantius, M., May 18; Vincent of Paul, C., July 19; Vincent Ferrier, C., April 5; Vincent and Anastasius, MM., Jan. 22; Vitalis, M., April 28; Vitus, Modestus, etc. MM., June 15; Wenceslaus, M.,

Sept. 28; William, Ab. C., June 25; Zephyrinus, Pope, M., Aug. 26.

(3.) The Church of England retains the following; the history will be found under the particular name of each festival.

*Movable Feasts and Holy Days.*—Advent; Septuagesima; Sexagesima; Quinquagesima; Ash Wednesday; Quadragesima, and the four following Sundays; Palm Sunday; Maundy Thursday; Good Friday; Easter Eve (*Sabbatum Majum*); Easter Day; Sundays after Easter; Ascension Day; Whit Sunday; Trinity Sunday.

*Immovable Feasts and Holy Days.*—Jan. 1, the Circumcision of our Lord; Jan. 6, the Epiphany; Jan. 25, the Conversion of St. Paul; Feb. 2, the Presentation of Christ in the Temple, or the Purification of the Virgin; Feb. 24, St. Matthias's Day; March 25, the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary; April 25, St. Mark's Day; May 1, St. Philip and St. James's Day; June 11, St. Barnabas the Apostle; June 24, St. John the Baptist's Day; June 29, St. Peter and St. Paul's Day; July 25, St. James the Apostle; Aug. 24, St. Bartholomew the Apostle; Sept. 21, St. Matthew the Apostle; Sept. 29, St. Michael and all Angels; Oct. 18, St. Luke the Evangelist; Oct. 28, St. Simon and St. Jude, Apostles; Nov. 1, All Saints' Day; Nov. 30, St. Andrew's Day; Dec. 21, St. Thomas the Apostle; Dec. 25, Nativity of our Lord; Dec. 26, St. Stephen's Day; Dec. 27, St. John the Evangelist; Dec. 28, the Innocents' Day.

See, besides the works already cited, Zyliegan, *die alte und neue Feste aller Christl. Confessionen* (Dantzig, 1825, 8vo); Augusti, *Christl. Archæologie*, i, 469 sq.; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity exemplified*, ch. xxvi; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. xx, ch. iv; Butler, *Feasts and Fasts of the Catholic Church* (N. Y. 1856, 12mo); Nelson, *Festivals and Fasts of the Church of England*; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, bk. v, ch. i; Barrow, *Sermons* (serm. 77); *Bibliotheca Sacra*, iv, 650; Neander, *Planting and Training*, i, 158; Lewis, *Bible, Missal, and Breviary* (Edinb. 1853), ch. i; Schaff, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, i, 128, 372; Lamson, *Church of the first three Centuries*, p. 321 sq.; Siegel, *Christl.-Kirchl. Alterthümer*, ii, 81, and references there.

**Feast of Asses**, a ridiculous festival of the Roman Catholic Church, celebrated in Rouen and some other cities of France, to commemorate the flight into Egypt. It was not uniformly observed, but the following were generally among the ceremonies, especially at Beauvais. A young woman with a child in her arms was made to ride on an ass. Followed by the bishop and clergy, she was conducted to the church, and a sermon was preached, in which the high qualities of the animal that enabled the Virgin and child to escape from Herod were lauded. During the ceremony, a ludicrous composition, half Latin, half French, was sung with great vociferation, in praise of the ass, of which the last stanza may serve as a specimen:

"Amen dicas asine  
Jam satur de granine  
Amen, amen itera  
Aspernare vetera.  
Hez va! Hez va! Hez va! Hez!  
Bialx sire asuez, car allez,  
Belle bouche eur chantez."

In Rouen it was celebrated about Christmas; in other places, as, for instance, at Beauvais, on the 14th of June. Several popes, papal legates, and bishops endeavored to suppress it, but it maintained itself until the 15th century, when Nicholas de Clemangis, by his work *De novis celebratibus non instituendis*, and especially the Council of Basle by a decree, caused the suppression of this and a number of similar festivals.—Ducange, s. v. *Festum Asinorum*; Moreri, s. v. *Pête*; Schröckh, *Kirchen-Geschichte*, vol. xxviii; Wetzler u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iv, 710.

**Feast of Charity, or Love.** See *AGAPE*; *LOVE-FAEST*.

**Feast of Fools**, a festival celebrated during the Middle Ages in many countries of Europe, especially in France, with grotesque ceremonies. It was an imitation of the *Saturnalia*, and, like that festival, was celebrated in December. The chief celebration fell on New Year's or Innocents' Day; but the feast continued from Christmas to the last Sunday of Epiphany. At first only the young boys of the choir and young sacristans played the principal parts in it, but afterwards all the inferior servants of the Church were engaged, the bishop and the superior clergymen, with the canons, forming the audience. The young people who played the chief parts chose from their own number a bishop or archbishop of fools, as he was called, and consecrated him, in the principal church of the place, with many absurd ceremonies. This mock-bishop then took the seat usually occupied by the bishop, and caused high mass to be said. During the performance, the others who took part in the play, dressed in masks and different disguises, engaged in indecent songs and dances, and practised all kinds of follies. It fell into disuse in the 15th century, but some of its features yet remain in the Carnival (q. v.).—Tilliot, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la fête des fous* (Lausanne, 1751); Schröckh, *Kirchengeschichte*, xxviii, 271; xxxii, 55; Siegel, *Christl.-Kirchl. Alterthümer*, iv, 115. See *BOY-BISHOP*.

**Feather.** 1. נִצָּף or נִצָּף, *notsah'* (from נִצָּץ, to fly), a *pinion* or wing-feather, Ezek. xvii, 3, 7 (falsely "ostrich" in Job xxxix, 13; but it means the excrement of the crop in Lev. i, 16). 2. עֲבָרָה, *ebrah'* (fem. of עָבַר, Isa. xl, 21, which has the same meaning), likewise a *pinion* or wing-feather, Psa. lxxviii, 13; xci, 4 (inexactly "wing," Deut. xxxii, 11; Job xxxix, 13). 3. Incorrectly for חֲסִידָה, *chasidah'*, Job xxxix, 13, the *stork*, as elsewhere rendered. See *WING*.

**Feathering, or Foliation**, an arrangement of small arcs, separated by projecting points or cusps, to ornament the inside of larger arches, or triangular or circular openings in Gothic architecture. Feathering was first introduced at the close of the early English style, and continued till the supplanting of the Gothic by the Renaissance architecture. When smaller arcs are added to ornament these small arcs, the feathering is said to be double. It is also sometimes made triple in the latest decadence of the Gothic architecture.—Parker, *Glossary of Architecture*.

**Feathers' Tavern Association**, a society of Englishmen, clergymen and laymen, formed to secure a reformation of the English liturgy in the latter part of the 18th century. The name is derived from the "Feathers' Tavern," in London, where their meetings were held. The number of clergymen in the body was nearly 300. Gilbert Wakefield (q. v.) was a leading spirit in the association. "They signed a petition requesting the excision of the damnable clauses in the Athanasian Creed, and the relief of their consciences in the matter of subscription; and with this, no doubt, many of them would have been satisfied. But the laity went much further. In the war of pamphlets which this affair created, some of them spoke of the Reformation, the doctrine of the Trinity, and the Thirty-nine Articles with ridicule. When the matter was debated in the House of Commons, the doctrines of the Church of England were treated with contempt. 'I would gladly exchange all the Thirty-nine Articles,' said one of the speakers, 'for a fortieth, of which the subject should be the peace of the Church.' The doctrine of the Trinity was denounced by one of the writers of the association as 'an imposition—a deception of a much later date than Athanasius—a deception, too, on which an article of faith is rested.' The whole system of Christian doctrine, as taught by the Church of England, was assailed. The same writer affirms, with a degree of effrontery that might

well rouse the indignation of the clergy, 'that certain parts in the public service and doctrine of the Church are acknowledged by every clergyman of learning and candor to be unscriptural and unfounded; no man of sense and learning can maintain them' (*Hints submitted to the Association*, etc., etc., by a Layman, 1789). Bishop Horsley answered with force, but with the unbecoming asperity which defaces all his controversial writings." The society was not long-lived, and, for many years after, any voice raised in the Church of England in favor of liturgical revision was silenced by the mention of "the Feathers' Tavern."—Marsden, *Churches and Sects*, i, 314; Baxter, *Church History of England* (London, 1849), p. 668.

**Featly, DANIEL, D.D.**, a learned divine, was born at Charlton, near Oxford, in 1582. His father was cook at Corpus Christi College, where the son received his education. In 1610, Sir Thomas Edmunds, ambassador of king James to France, chose him as his chaplain at Paris, where he spent three years, and did great honor to the English nation and the Protestant cause. After his return he became successively rector of Northill in Cornwall, of Lambeth in Surrey, and of All-hallows in London. This last he soon changed for Acton in Middlesex, and then became provost of Chelsea College. In 1626 he published his *Ancilla Pietatis*, or "The Handmaid to Private Devotion," which went through many editions. In 1643 he was appointed one of the assembly of divines, and was a witness against archbishop Laud. Heylin said of him that he always was a Calvinist in his heart, but he never showed it openly till then. But the Parliamentary party soon took offence at him, and he was thrown into prison, where he remained six months, and where he chiefly composed his celebrated answer to the Jesuit's challenge published under the name of *Roma Ruens*. Nearly at the same time he wrote a book against the Baptists, called *The Dipper Dipt*. His sufferings in prison brought on the dropsy, of which he died April 1, 1645. Among his many writings (a list of which may be found in Wood's *Athenæ Oxonienses*) are *Clavis Mystica*, a key opening divers mysterious texts of Scripture, in 70 sermons (London, 1636, fol.) :—*Hexædexium*, or six cordials against the terrors of death (London, 1637, fol.)—Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* v, 59; Middleton, *Biog. Evangel.* vol. iii; Neal, *History of the Puritans*, Harper's edit., i, 473; ii, 20 sq.

**Febronius.** See HONTHEIM.

**Fecht, JOHANN**, a German theologian, was born at Salzburg December 26, 1636, and studied at several German universities, especially Tübingen and Heidelberg. In 1666 he became pastor of Langendenzlingen, and court preacher at Durlach in 1668. He afterwards became professor of theology at Rostock, where he died May 5, 1716. He was a voluminous writer, delighted in controversy, and was especially bitter against the Pietists. Among his publications are, *Lectiæ Theologicæ* (Rostock, 1722):—*Compendium Universæ Theologiæ* (Leips. 1741):—*Apparatus ad suppl. hist. eccles. sæc. xvi.* Gass calls him a "most learned and fruitful divine, and much read, long after his death."—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xvii, 246; Gass, *Geschichte der Prot. Dogmatik* (Berlin, 1862, iii, 148).

**Feder, JOHANN MICHAEL**, a Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Oellingen, near Würzburg, in Bavaria. In 1785 he was appointed extraordinary, and in 1786 ordinary professor at the university. From 1804 to 1811 he was first librarian of the university library. He died in 1824. Feder was one of the most prolific writers in the Roman Catholic Church of Germany, though none of his works are of special importance. They are chiefly translations from the Greek (Chrysostom, Cyril, Theodoret), Latin (works of Cicero, Cornelius Nepos, Vincent of Lerin), and French. He revised the translation of the Bible by

Braun, and contributed to a number of the Roman Catholic periodicals of Germany. A complete list of his publications is given in the *Theaurus librorum rei catholice* (Wurz. 1818).—Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 344; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 928. (A. J. S.)

**Federal Theology** (Lat. *foedus*, a compact; adj. *fœderalis*), a method of stating divine truth, according to which all the doctrines of religion are arranged under the heads of certain covenants God has made with men. We set forth (I.) the doctrine, as stated by its advocates; (II.) its history.

I. *Doctrine.*—The fundamental idea of the system is that man has always stood towards God in the relation of a covenant, though a covenant of a peculiar character. The ordinary idea of a covenant, which is that of a mutual compact between one or more parties, each bound to render some benefit to the other, is obviously excluded by the nature of the case. Where God and man are the parties, the benefits must be all on one side and the obligations on the other. The relationship must be determined and be imposed upon man by God in his right of a sovereign ruler. And yet it is something more than a mere law or promise. It involves, indeed, a law which man has no right to disobey; but superadded to this is a promise of benefits vastly disproportioned to the merit of obedience, a limitation of the time and circumstances of the probation on which all is made to depend, and the representation of many by some one as their natural head. There is even a virtual implication of mutual consent and obligations, for on the one hand God graciously binds himself to the performance of certain engagements with the view of securing results that shall manifest his glory; and man freely consents when, with this understanding, he enters upon a course of obedience. Such a promise on God's part, suspended upon the performance of a condition on man's, is a covenant. The advocates of this system have usually made but two such covenants: viz. 1, that of nature or of works; and, 2, that of grace. These have been successive in their revelation to man, since the former was an arrangement before the Fall, and the latter was not made known until after that event; and yet the latter must have been agreed upon before all worlds, whereas the former could not have been formed until the creation of man; and some contend that those who refuse their consent to the covenant of grace must necessarily remain, even now, under the obligations and penalties of the covenant of works. In both we have the same contracting parties, God and man; the same blessing to be attained, eternal life; and the same requirement of perfect obedience; but they differ, inasmuch as the covenant of grace is a dispensation of mercy to sinners, is through a divine Mediator, and secures the blessings of eternal life without the possibility of a failure.

1. *The covenant of nature, or of works*, is nowhere spoken of under that name, but is supposed to be more than once alluded to in the Scriptures. Some have thought they had discovered an express mention of it in Hos. vi, 7: "They, like Adam, have transgressed the covenant;" (compare Job xxxi, 33; Psa. lxxxii, 7). The apostle often speaks of the law of works in contrast with the law of faith, of the two covenants (Gal. iv, 24), and not unfrequently of an old and a new covenant. It is not denied that by these expressions he usually meant the Mosaic or Sinaitic dispensation, in distinction from the evangelical; but it is thought that such a dispensation could be designated a covenant of works only because it was a republication of a moral law to be a rule of conduct, but not a covenant of life, for a particular nation. The contrast and resemblance which Paul also draws between the first and the second Adam (Rom. v, 12-21; 1 Cor. xv, 45) would seem to have no meaning without the understanding of a covenant with our great

progenitor. All the essentials of a covenant, too, are discoverable in the constitution under which Adam was placed by his Maker. Not only was he, as a moral being, under obligation to conform to the law written upon his heart, and to obey the positive precept given to test his confidence in God, but eternal life was promised him on condition of his obedience. He was constituted the representative of his race, and a limited period was assigned him in which the destiny of all was to be decided. That this is a true statement of the case was inferred from that which actually followed the transgression of our first parents, and must have been more or less clearly known to them. To such an arrangement those who had been created in the image of God could do no otherwise than yield a cheerful assent, inasmuch as far higher blessings were proposed by it than by any merely legal relation. We have reason to suppose, also, that their powers were quite ample for the performance of the condition. Many have thought that before the Fall they were endowed with such supernatural gifts as secured to them the possession of their original righteousness; but, as nothing is said of these in the sacred history, and as they appeared to many inconsistent with the possibility of man's fall, most writers contend that the divine image consisted wholly in the knowledge and moral excellence which Adam had within himself. That he would have secured eternal life for himself and his descendants had he continued faithful for a prescribed period is inferred from the fact that he fell for himself and them; and we have no reason to think that a benevolent God would have made the penalty more extensive in its influence than the promise. The penalty for disobedience was death, corporeal, spiritual, and eternal, for each of these necessarily followed a forfeiture of a divine life. The seal by which this covenant was ratified and signified was at least the tree of life, but a sacramental character has been attributed to almost everything mentioned in the scriptural account of Paradise.

After an indefinite period this covenant was violated on man's part. This result was not the effect of any action on God's part either positive or privative, but in the exercise of man's own freedom. No intellectual knowledge, or upright purposes, or pure affections could give the creature absolute immutability; and hence, with the highest and best gifts, man "being left to the freedom of his own will, fell from the estate in which he was created." The friends of the federal system allege that this was the only proper period of man's probation, since only then was his destiny dependent upon a contingency. Ever since that event, if any are saved it must be by an unconditional grant through Jesus Christ. The whole race sinned in Adam and fell with him, not because of any confusion of personal or moral identity, not because of any transference of character from one man to another, but simply because all were represented in him. As a representative, he was in no sense numerically one and the same with those he represents, for no one can represent himself. He simply acted in behalf of them, as a parent, or guardian, or agent often does. There was a reason on account of which he was thus chosen to act in their stead. This was the unity of their nature with his, and his peculiar position as the natural head of the race; but their representation was something additional to all that. A natural head of a family might be so situated that many consequences might flow to them from his action, and yet he might not stand as their covenant or legal representative. Adam stood in our place, not directly, because he was our natural head, but because God chose him to stand thus. The natural relation might have been, and doubtless was, the reason for his being chosen to such an office, but the legal or covenant unity was constituted by the divine designation and choice. The consequence was that all mankind, descending from him

by ordinary generation, were henceforth to be treated as guilty and fallen creatures. Only his first sin was thus imputed to them because the original covenant was broken by that alone, and Adam must afterwards have stood as a single person, and not as a public representative. Personally he lost the moral image of God, communion with God, corporeal life, a place in Paradise, and the hope of a blessed immortality. His posterity fell under the imputation of his guilt, were destitute of original righteousness, and became corrupt in their whole nature. As a method sanctioned by God for attaining eternal life, the covenant of works was henceforth abolished and forbidden, and yet all men are under obligation to obey the law, and on their own disobedience they must endure its penalty, unless they are redeemed by Jesus Christ. God has encouraged no expectation of salvation by an obedience to the law, for, even if such an obedience were possible, no one has ever realized it, and God has provided no promises for a merely hypothetical case. If, therefore, no other scheme had been proposed to man, each individual of our race had lain under the penalty of a broken covenant, which subjected him to a hopeless abandonment by his Maker, to all the evils of a dying state in this world, to final death itself, and to an everlasting banishment from God in the world to come. Not that each person was judicially condemned to all these evils exclusively on account of the first sin, but such were the consequences which would certainly follow that act. It is conceded that in the last day none will be condemned for any but their own personal sin, and yet it is contended that in the first sin all are rendered liable to both the sinfulness and the misery of the present state.

2. *The covenant of grace* is that glorious scheme of wisdom and goodness by which eternal life and salvation have been provided for men in a way of free grace and mercy. It is sometimes distinguished from the covenant of redemption, inasmuch as the latter phrase may be confined to the arrangement in eternity between the persons of the Trinity, and the former to the engagement into which God enters in time with believers. On the other hand, some have contended that the covenant of redemption is that stricter arrangement according to which believers are delivered from all sin, while that of grace is that wider one according to which a sufficient atonement was provided for all men. It has, however, been most common to speak of all God's arrangements for the salvation of men as under a single covenant, which, however, may have various modes of dispensation. One may conceive of the whole race as fallen, and then of a scheme of mercy which provides first a door of mercy sufficiently open for all mankind to enter, and finally a system of means which should secure the actual salvation of a limited number; or he may conceive of the eye of God being fixed first upon a limited number of our fallen race, and for their sake alone providing an atonement sufficient indeed for all men, but designed and efficient for the salvation of only a definite number. The latter was the aspect in which the covenant of grace has usually been presented by its advocates. They have supposed that God originally anticipated the temporary character of the covenant of works, and determined upon another arrangement, by which a portion of mankind might be saved from the ruins of the apostasy. Why he did not include the whole or a larger portion of mankind within the scope of his saving mercy, they prefer to leave out of discussion as an unapproachable mystery. That he had sufficient reasons without implying a want of benevolence they assert without hesitation, but they think it best never to attempt a definition of them. Negatively they contend that the favored ones could have had no pre-eminence in natural goodness, since many of them confessed themselves to be the chief of sinners. The effort to find a sufficient reason in the anticipated circumstances

of men has usually proved so confusing to the finite intellect, that most thinkers have concluded to leave the origin of discriminating grace where the Scriptures have left it, in the mere good pleasure (*beneplicitum*) of God. As we read of some who were chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, it has been inferred that there must have been in eternity an agreement or covenant between the persons of the sacred Trinity, according to which a seed was given to the Son to serve him, and that he became their surety to satisfy the claims of justice upon them, to give them a title to eternal life, and to bring them to everlasting glory. The Father (who in this transaction is usually regarded as personating the Deity as such) engaged to spare his beloved Son, to furnish him with all suitable endowments and preparations for his work, to support him in it, to deliver into his hands all power in heaven and on earth, to pardon and accept all who should come unto God by him, and to confer upon him a glorious reward forever and ever. The Holy Spirit, who must also be looked upon as having a part in this covenant, also engaged to become the efficient agent in the regeneration, sanctification, and glorification of the holy seed. Without ascribing to this transaction the technicalities of a human compact, and conceding that the whole mode of viewing it is anthropomorphic, it is contended that something equivalent to this, and amounting to such a mutual understanding, must have existed in the sacred Trinity. An equal love towards men is supposed to have existed in each of the divine persons. But as man was under condemnation, and could not therefore act for himself, the Son of God acted in behalf of all of whom he was to be the spiritual head. To constitute a natural ground for this headship, he was to become a man, uniting divinity in one person with humanity. He thus became a new federal head for his spiritual seed, similar to that which Adam had sustained to his natural descendants. In this relation he was to act in all he did as their representative. He was to share with them in the actual curse which the first sin had brought on the human race, not shrinking even from death in its most terrific form. Though this endurance was not the same with that which they would have endured in its spiritual results or in eternal duration, it was supposed to be infinite in value on account of the infinite dignity of his person. It was indeed sufficient in objective worth to expiate for any amount of sin in any number of worlds. It has actually conferred innumerable benefits upon all men. Pardon and salvation is offered to every one who hears the Gospel; time, opportunity, and some means of grace are afforded to all, and sufficient is done to leave those inexcusable who deny the Lord that bought them. But confessedly all are not made partakers of salvation, and only a portion of men were eternally given to Christ by the Father. Obviously it was not left to an uncertainty whether his work would be in vain or not. A seed was secured to him by covenant, and it was with an ultimate reference to these that he entered upon his work. Adapted to all, and sufficient for all as his work may be, it must have been specially designed to effect the salvation only of the covenant people. Of these alone can he be regarded as the proper head and representative, since they alone are ingrafted into him by a living and active faith. To them alone is his perfect righteousness imputed, as if he had suffered and obeyed in their stead. By his sufferings he has satisfied for their guilt, and by his perfect obedience to the law he has obtained for them a title to eternal life. He thus becomes their surety, not merely to make them inherently holy, but to perform what is required of them. He satisfies in this way both the penalty and the precept of the broken covenant. That covenant required obedience only for a limited period, and he has fulfilled the law during the time allotted him by the Father. The whole person of the Redeemer in both natures was subject to

the law, and as such an obedience (at least in this special form of it) was not obligatory, but voluntary on his part, it became available for an infinite righteousness.

Such was the covenant of grace as formed in eternity. To this must be added its actual administration in time. Of course the only administrator of it was the Son of God himself, the mediator between God and man. He has power over all flesh, in order to give eternal life to as many as had been given him. He it was who represented the divine Ruler in all those dispensations of mercy of which the sacred history informs us. Although at different periods of human history the outward forms of religion have been changed, the covenant of grace, which lay at the basis of them all, was always the same. Salvation has in all cases been by Christ, even where the subjects of it knew little or nothing respecting him. None have ever been saved by the law of works, and none have had their hopes bounded by promises of an earthly home. The antediluvians, the patriarchs, Job and his friends, the Israelites in Egypt and under the Mosaic dispensation, looked for forgiveness under certain prescribed conditions, and for a city beyond the present world whose builder and maker is God. The only difference between them was that salvation was presented with greater obscurity, under more symbolical forms, with narrower restrictions to families and nations, and with less enlarged measures of the divine Spirit at some periods than at others. Ordinarily there have been reckoned but two principal economies or dispensations, viz. that under the Old and that under the New Testament. Although the same word in the original languages of the Bible is applied to all covenants between God and man, the advocates of the federal system have translated them differently when applied on the one hand to the great covenants of nature and of grace, and on the other to the different economies under the covenant of grace. Availing themselves of the double meaning, especially of the Greek word (*διαθήκη*), they have usually designated these latter economies by the name of testaments, to indicate that they were that peculiar kind of arrangements which acquire validity only after the decease of him who makes them. Though the Redeemer had not, in fact, died before the earlier dispensation, he was looked upon as slain from the foundation of the world, and the dispensations of mercy were even then constituted in anticipation of his death. Hence, when speaking of the communication of benefits to men, no mutual conditions are implied, but Jesus Christ is said to bequeath them by testament. The death of the testator is indispensable to render the grant valid, and to make the promises sure (Heb. ix, 16-17). Conditions, in the proper sense of the word, on the part of God's people, are not required, but benefits are supposed to be bestowed absolutely, by free donation, and by an irrevocable will. Men are indeed to believe, to be holy, and to persevere faithfully unto the end, but all this is supposed to be secured by the free grace of God in Christ.

The Christian dispensation is the ultimate form in which the covenant of grace will be administered; for, since all national restrictions have been removed, and the Holy Spirit is given in his plenitude, no other is conceivable. Jesus Christ will continue to administer it until the whole world shall be subdued unto him. Finally, the present economy of things shall cease, the dead shall be raised, the living shall be changed, every human being shall be judged at Christ's bar for sins, not only against God as a moral ruler, but against himself as the mediatorial king, and sentence shall be passed upon each according to his works. Christ will claim the right to do this even with respect to such as are not under his spiritual headship, inasmuch as they too are in one sense purchased by him (2 Pet. ii, 1), and hence power over all flesh has been given him by the Father (John xvii, 2). Then, having obtained full pos-

session of his kingdom, he will present it to the Father as the economical representative of the Godhead, either in token of the completeness of his work, or as indicating the close of his mediatorship. But, whether he denits his peculiar office (1 Cor. xv, 28), or only brings his mediatorial kingdom into some new relation, he will then complete the scheme of the covenant of grace, and receive his eternally betrothed Church into an everlasting union with himself.

II. *History.*—The words rendered covenant are frequently used in the original Scriptures in application to God's dealings with his creatures. The Hebrew בְּרִית signifies undoubtedly in its primary meaning a mutual compact (Robinson's Gesenius's *Lexicon*), and yet it is not infrequently applied to transactions in which such an idea in its strictness is impossible (Gen. ix, 9-18; Jer. xxxiii, 20-21). With a true sense of its usage and idea, if not strictly according to its etymological signification, the LXX have translated this word by the Greek *διαθήκη*, the generic meaning of which is a disposition or arrangement, and lapses into the idea of a mutual compact or testament only when the author or authors of it happened to be mutual stipulators or testators. But neither in the Septuagint nor in the New Testament is the word ever applied to the relation in which man stood before the Fall, but always to some transaction or dispensation under the covenant of grace (Hos. vi, 7, with this signification, is doubtful). Nor has any clear instance of such an application of the word to man's primeval state been found in any theological writer before the commencement of the 17th century. (See, however, Bede on Gen. xvii, 14.) Certainly no one had attempted to arrange all the materials of a systematic theology under the general heads of divine covenants. And yet there was an obvious tendency in that direction among the Reformed churches of the Calvinistic school. These had become familiar with the word in relation to Christ and his people, and with all the principles involved in a covenant with Adam. They had seen that Adam's original position was not that of a mere subject of law, but that promises had been made to him with a condition, and that the whole race were represented on a limited probation in him. It is generally conceded that the federal system had its origin with Kloppenburg, a professor of theology at Franeker (died in 1652). The first, however, who had the genius and boldness to give definiteness and completeness to the system was John Koch (Cocceius), a pupil of his, and a successor in the same chair. In his *Summa doctrinae de fœdere et testamento Dei* (1648), and still further in his more enlarged *Summa Theologiae* (2d edit. 1665), he comprises all the doctrines of the Christian religion under the two great categories of the covenants of nature and of grace. The method he pursued has gained for him the appellation of "the Father of Biblical Theology;" and, laying aside the practice usual with his predecessors, of viewing divine truth in its subjective form, either as logically constructed by a human mind, or as it was supposed to lie in the divine mind around the great central doctrine of predestination, he professed to come to the Scriptures, reverently to read them, and derive his system from the inspired historical arrangement. The events of human history were regarded in their anthropological aspect as well as related to the divine efficiency. The final cause of salvation he can indeed find nowhere else than in the divine mind, and he has no occasion to impinge against the highest style of contemporary orthodoxy, and yet he succeeded in giving to theology a more practical character. Although under all dispensations he conceived of man as receptive, and God alone as communicative, he still represented man as coming under an obligation to perform certain duties which were looked upon as a virtual condition of the divine promises. This fidelity to the scriptural repre-

sentation compelled him to develop his system according to the successive periods of the sacred history (Ebrard, *Dogmen*, § 40; D. Schenkel, *Christ.-Dogmen*, § 129, note).

As often occurs when great changes are introduced in formal statements of truth, this system was as bitterly opposed as if it had been an essential error. Other principles, on which the author was more vulnerable, were introduced into the controversy; but the main features of his system soon obtained a remarkable degree of acceptance in all the Reformed churches of France, Switzerland, Holland, Scotland, and among the English Puritans. The orthodox Roman Catholics have always regarded it with aversion, and the Jansenists oppose the whole conception of a covenant with Adam as an innovation upon Augustinism, and needless to explain the natural effects of the first sin (Father Paul's *Hist. of the Council of Trent*, p. 177-201; Jansenius, *August*, ii, 208-11). The Lutheran divines have in general rejected it on account of the prominence it still gave to the doctrine of predestination, and because, when the word covenant was divested of the idea of a mutual compact, it offered no advantages over the words which had long been in use (Thomassin, *Christi Person und Werk*, § 28). The Arminians of Holland were partially conciliated by those juridical considerations by which the advocates of the system defended it, and many of them accepted of it with some important modifications. The object of these was to limit the direct consequences of Adam's sin to a privation of original righteousness, or the loss of those aids of the divine spirit on which they made the original moral image to depend, to temporal evils, and to bodily death, together with such a deprivation of our mental and moral state as renders us incapable of obedience, and so to extend the benefits of Christ's death that he should not only be regarded as dying for all men alike, but as actually restoring to them such supernatural aids as, if properly used, would enable them to lay hold upon the great salvation (Nichol's *Calvinism and Arminianism* in Watson's *Theol. Instit.* ii, 45). Notwithstanding the objections raised against the federal system, its principles were carried still further forward with fearless and logical consistency by Francis Burmann, a pupil of Koch, and a professor in the University of Utrecht. In his *Synopsis of Theology, and especially of the Economy of the Covenants* (1671), he endeavored to show that all the details of the covenant of nature were fairly to be inferred from the idea of the divine image in man in connection with what we know of the divine goodness, since that goodness would of course desire to bring man into the highest communion with itself, and would not be satisfied with the prescriptions of a mere natural justice. The difficulties, however, with which the system was pressed by its opponents were sought to be removed by Hermann Witsius, a successor and former pupil of Burmann in the theological chair of the University of Utrecht. In his *Economy of the Covenants*, the first edition of which appeared in 1685, some important distinctions maintained by his predecessors were given up (as, e. g. that between the *πάρεσις* of the Old and the *ἀφεισις* of the New Testament, as shown in Rom. iii, 25, 26, and the three dispensations or economies of the covenant of grace); a minute parallel is drawn between the two covenants by the introduction of four sacraments into Paradise (the tree of life, the tree of knowledge, the Sabbath, and Paradise itself); and a sacramental character is given to a multitude of things under the economy before the law (the coats of skins, the ark, the rainbow, etc. bk. ii, chap. viii, § 10; bk. iv, chap. vii). In 1688 a further attempt was made to complete the federal system by Melchior Leydecker, another professor in Utrecht, who, though not in the strictest sense a Federalist, professedly wrote under its spirit and tendency. In his *Seven Books upon the Truth of the Christian Religion*, he endeavors to trace the econ-

omy of the covenant of grace to the several Persons of the sacred Trinity, by showing that the Father reveals himself, especially in the Old Testament, as the universal Ruler maintaining the cause of justice; the Son, especially during his life on earth, as the Mediator dispensing mercy; and the Holy Ghost, especially since the day of Pentecost, as the Comforter exercising divine and saving power. This arbitrary assignment of the divine attributes, however, has never been acceptable. Though the Heidelberg Catechism was composed before the federal theory was distinctly broached, most of the great commentaries which have been written upon it were written by Federalists. The maturest fruit of that system may be seen in the writings of Solomon van Til (Tilenus), a professor in Dort and Leyden, whose Compend (*Compend of Nat. and Ier. Theol.* Leyden, 1704, and *Compend of Theology*, Berne, 1703) were the organic union of the three great tendencies of Scholasticism, Federalism, and Cartesianism, and have obtained general acceptance in the schools of Holland; and in those of F. A. Lampe, the pastor of several influential congregations and a professor in Utrecht (1720-27), whose doctrinal and practical works in the German vernacular have had the honor of reconciling Pietism to the orthodox Church, and have sometimes had a popularity scarcely inferior to the authorized Catechism of the national Church. It does not appear that the Federal system has at any time found universal acceptance in the Reformed churches. It has never been either condemned or sanctioned by the public synod, and such has been the balance of parties that, by right of long-established custom, one Federalist must be appointed in each of the universities of Holland (Ebrard, *Christ. Dogm.* § 41).

A modification both of the Scholastic and Federal theology made its appearance among the Protestants of France. The rival theological schools of Saumur and Montauban zealously adopted the federal system. But John Cameron, a Scotchman, who at different times was a professor in both institutions [see CAMERON], and his pupils, Moïse Amyraut (Amyraldus) and Joshua de la Place (Placeus), who were associated as professors at Saumur (1633-64), proposed, and for many years maintained, a peculiar system, which attempted to reconcile it with the doctrine of a universal redemption. See AMYRAUT and LA PLACE. The result was a crude syncretism of an ideal or hypothetical Universalism with a rigid and real Particularism. Amyraut maintained that there were three instead of two general covenants with man—the *natural*, with a positive prohibition and a promise of a blessed life in Paradise; a *legal*, promising the land of Canaan on condition of a life of faith; and the *gracious*, promising eternal life on the condition of faith in Christ. La Place also drew a distinction between a mediate and an immediate imputation, according to which Adam's sin might be imputed to his posterity, either mediately, on account of a previously recognised inherent depravity in them; or it might be imputed to them immediately, simply on account of their federal representation in Adam. This whole system was strenuously opposed by the elder Spanheim, of Geneva and Leyden; J. H. Heidegger, of Zurich; and Francis Turretin, of Geneva. At the two last national synods ever held in France (Charenton, in 1615, and Loudun, in 1659) the authors successfully defended themselves from the charge of heresy, and maintained that their views were only a more distinct statement of doctrines which had been universally held by the orthodox Church since primitive times, and especially by Augustine and Calvin; but a statement of opinions imputed to them (incorrectly, as they maintained) was condemned at a synod at Charenton (1642), and the *Formula Consensus Helvetica* was composed principally by Heidegger (1675), and was adopted and sent forth to guard the churches against such views. Al-

though this is one of the most scientific and highly esteemed of the Calvinistic confessions, and is the only one among the Continental confessions which is constructed expressly upon the basis of the federal system, its authority has never been acknowledged in France, and it was received by only five of the Swiss cantons (and there mainly through the support of the civil magistrates), and finally lost all public sanction within fifty years from its promulgation (Ebrard's *Christ. Dogm.* § 43; L. Noack's *Christ. Dogmengesch.* § 74; Sheld's *Hist. of Chr. Doct.* ii, 412).

In the British Islands, and especially in those churches which adhere to the confession of faith put forth by the Synod of Westminster (1643-8), we have the stronghold of the federal system. The representatives of the English Church at the Synod of Dort (1618-19), and especially bishop Davenant, had maintained a system similar to that of Amyraut, and a large party in that Church have always held views based upon the federal theology. Even Jeremy Taylor maintained it (1654), with some Arminian, and even Pelagian modifications, in one of his treatises (*On Repentance*, ch. i, § 1). The celebrated Richard Baxter, though he "subscribed to the Synod of Dort without any exception, limitation, or exposition of any word," was an ardent admirer of the federal theology, as qualified by Amyraut (Preface to *The Saints' Rest*, 1650; *Cath. Theol.* 1675; *Univ. Redemp.* 1657; Orme's *Life of Baxter*, vol. ii, ch. ii). The assembly of divines at Westminster was, in fact, contemporary with the first publication of Koch's principal work on the covenants (1648), and deserves a credit, perhaps, equal to his for the origination and precise statement of the doctrine. The national Scotch Church, with its affiliated branches in Scotland and Ireland, has always upheld the system in its utmost consistency and extremest form. The United Presbyterian Church alone is said to maintain it, with some modifications connected with the theory of a general atonement (Wardlaw, *On the Extent of the Atonement*, § 13-15). Among the orthodox dissenters of England it has also been accepted, and found some of its most able defenders. The Wesleyans of England and America claim that they are enabled, by their peculiar modifications of it, to "carry through the system with greater consistency than the Calvinists themselves, inasmuch as they more easily account for certain good dispositions and occasional religious inclinations in those who never give evidence of actual conversion." By their doctrine of a general redemption, they maintain that in spite of the loss of the supernatural aids through the Fall, and the consequent incapacity of unassisted man to have such good dispositions, there is given to every one, through Christ, those gracious influences which, if not resisted, would lead on to a saving conversion (Watson's *Theol. Instit.* ii, 48-52; Porter's *Comp. of Methodism*, pt. ii, ch. iv). The reason that these gracious influences are not resisted they can only refer to the doctrine of free-will, and from the nature of the case they can give no further account of it. The orthodox Congregationalists and the New-school Presbyterians of the United States usually object to the phrase "*universal redemption*" as used by the Amyraldists of France, the Baxterians of England, and the Arminians generally, inasmuch as the word redemption properly signifies more than what is obtained simply by the expiatory work of Christ, and includes an entire deliverance from sin. They therefore use the word atonement to signify the objective or expiatory work of Christ, and contend that this is *for* sin, and *for* all men, while redemption implies the salvation of men, and must, of course, be confined to such as shall be saved (Dr. W. R. Weeks, in Parks's *Collections on the Atonement*, p. 579). Such an atonement is not merely hypothetical, but really opens the door of salvation to all men, who are supposed, even since the Fall, to possess all those faculties and powers which render them responsible for

a compliance with the terms of salvation. And yet, so certain are all men to use their powers, and the best external means of grace, to their perdition, that no reason can be assigned for the repentance and faith of any but the covenant of grace formed in Christ before the world was (Dwight's *Theol. ser.* xliii; Barnes, *On the Atonement*, chap. ix; *Presb. Quart. Rev.* iii, 218-252, 630-648). Other classes of Presbyterians and Calvinistic Baptists in this country use the word redemption, and even atonement, in the sense of an entire deliverance from sin; and they, of course, confine its application to the elect. They speak in the largest terms of the sufficiency of the work of Christ for the pardon of all sin, but regard it as limited in the purpose and design of God to such as are effectually called of the Spirit, and are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation (*Princeton Theol. Essays*, vol. v, viii, and xiv; A. Fuller's *Gospel*, etc., in *Works*, i, 312-340, vol. i, artt. viii and xiv).

III. *Literature*.—On the general system and history: Turretin's *Inst. Theol. Elench.* loc. viii and xii; Hill's *Lect. in Divinity*, bk. v, ch. v; Dick's *Lect. on Theol.* lect. xlviii; Witsius, *Econ. of the Cov.* 3 vols.; Buck's, Smith's, and Kitto's *Dictionaries*, art. Covenants; Herzog's *Real-Encykl.* arts. Cocceius, Burmann, Witsius, and Voetius; Erbrand's *Chr. Dogm.* § 37-44; Vincent's and Fisher's *Catechisms*; Hagenbach's *Hist. of Doctr.* § 224; *New Englander*, xxvii, 469-516; *Bibl. Repert.* for 1868; L. Noack's *Chr. Dogmengesch.* § 74; Knapp's *Christ. Theol.* § 76, 113; Hopkins's *System*, i, 240-250; *Mercersburg Review*, x, 63; Kelly, *On the Covenants*; *Jahrb. Deutsch. Theolog.* x, 209; Fletcher's *Works*, i, 452; Gass, *Protest. Theol.* ii, 276, 318; Isaac Watts's *Kein and Recovery*, p. 324-347; Bidgley's *Body of Divinity*, p. 11; Dr. E. A. Park's *Discourses and Treatises* by Edwards, Smallley, Maxey, Emmons, Griffin, Burge, and Weeks, on the Atonement; Neander, *Dogmengesch.* per. iii, bk. ii, c-f; Max Goebel, *Gesch. d. chr. Lebens*, etc., vol. ii, A, § 7-10, p. 153; Cunningham's *Hist. Theol.* ch. xxv; Schweitzer, *Ref. Dogm.* p. 103 sq. (C. P. W.)

Feejee Islands. See FIJI.

**Feeling.** The relation of feeling to religion is a subject of importance both from a religious and philosophical point of view. It has been viewed in very different ways, and has led to long and animated controversies.

In Greek, the word αἰσθησις denoted every kind of perception, sensuous and spiritual, mediate and immediate; consequently, also what we call feeling. Plato referred to a sensuous spiritual feeling, though he did not call it by this name; for, according to him, the understanding (νοῦς) communes with the affections (ἐπιθυμητικόν), and the seat of this communion is the liver, from which proceed the power of divination (μαντεία) and enthusiasm (ἐνθουσιασμός). Connected with this view is the opinion of Plato, that virtue cannot be taught, and that what is substantially good breaks forth in the soul as an immediate light.

The extensive usage of the Latin word *sensus* embraces also the natural moral feeling, *sensus communis*, *sensus hominum*.

In the Septuagint the word αἰσθησις frequently occurs, and is generally rendered by "knowledge" or "wisdom," as Prov. i, 7; xii, 25. In the New Testament it occurs only once, Phil. i, 9, where it is coupled with ἐπιγνωσις (English version: and this I pray that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and in all judgment).

The psychological meaning of the words αἰσθησις and *sensus* in the Greek and Latin fathers is not fully settled, but in general they use them to denote a knowledge, or insight obtained by means of feeling. Origen (*contra Celsum*, i, 48) speaks of a "divine insight" (ζῆλια αἰσθησις) of the soul by means of which enlightened men perceive supernatural things just as

others perceive natural objects by means of their senses. Clement (*Stromat.* iv, p. 333, ed. Potter) ascribes to the scientific man a συναίσθησις, a faculty of inventing and understanding, analogous to the faculty of taste possessed by the sculptor, and the sense of hearing possessed by the musician. To denote a feeling accompanying the will, the Latin fathers used the word κίνησις. Among the Latin fathers, Tertullian (*De anima*, chap. ii) spoke of a *publicus sensus* which leads the soul to a knowledge of God. Augustin introduced the expression *inner sense* (*interior scensus*), which became of great importance in the writings of the mystics. The common expressions in the mystics to denote subjective and objective feeling are *sensus*, *sentimentum*, *affectus*, *gustus*. *Affectus* always embraces a practical impulse. *Gustus*, which is identified with *sensus*, does not exclude the practical impulse, but properly denotes feeling viewed in its relation to its own contents, and therefore designated as a *modus cognoscendi*, a kind of cognition. The immediateness of this *sensus*, which words cannot fully express, is therefore, in the opinion of the mystics, greatly superior to an intellectual insight. Mystic theology, according to Gerson, because it rests on feeling, is widely different from all other sciences. Thomas Aquinas regards not only mystical theology, but theology and faith in general, as founded in the *pia affectio* (pious or religious feeling), because faith supposes a movement of the will towards the first truth and the highest good which produces assent (*Summa Theol.* ii, 2, 9, 4, 5).

The mystical writers of Germany in the Middle Ages, writing on practical more than speculative subjects, spoke of feeling in particular as a subjective consciousness, and demanded its renunciation. The spiritual man, they urged, should emancipate himself from all emotion, and sever his connection with everything created, that God might become present to him, and eternity might be felt by him and tasted. The objective feeling of the supernatural God appears to these writers as the final result of the renunciation of the subjective feeling of personal and individual existence.

Luther warned against a reliance upon "feeling" instead of clinging to the "word." At the same time, however, he demands that the soul feel the call of the Lord, and the "spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba, father" (Rom. viii, 15), he defines as a feeling of the fatherly love of God. The testimony of the Holy Ghost he finds in the religious experience, and this experience he identifies with the religious feeling. Similar are the views of the other reformers and the early writers of the Reformed churches.

A greater stress was laid on feeling as an element of religion by the Pietists, who regarded its very inexpressibility as an argument for its truth. The same was done by the Moravians, who reduced religion to the feeling of truth. Opposition to the Pietists made most of the later dogmatic writers of the Lutheran Church suspicious of feeling as an element of religion; but some recognised its importance, as M. Pfaff (*Instit. Theol. and Moral.*), who did not hesitate to apply (like the society of Friends) to the "spiritual feeling" (*sensus* or *gustus spiritualis*) the expression "spiritual light" (*humen spirituale*).

About the middle of the 18th century arose the system of Utilitarianism. Bread and butter were now more valuable than metaphysics. In the same proportion as confidence in the truth of *thought* vanished, confidence in the objective contents of feeling was also weakened. But gradually philosophy prepared the way for a more correct appreciation of feeling. Until Wolf, philosophy had only recognised two faculties of the soul, intellect and will (or desire). Tenens added feeling as "the inner sense for the pleasant and the unpleasant." Kant, also, in his *Kritik der Urtheilskraft*, reduced all faculties of the soul to three, one of which was the *Gefühl der Lust und Unlust* (feel-



ing of the pleasant and unpleasant). Kant also called attention to the fact that in æsthetics the beautiful and sublime is felt, and the infinite is seen in the finite appearance. Here, therefore, an objective feeling was found. This idea of Kant's æsthetics was further developed by Fries, who based upon feeling an æsthetic-religious system which taught that the highest ideas must be divined by faith. Jacobi taught an immediate faculty of the divine, which he first called the faculty of faith; later, of reason; finally—adopting the terms of Fries—of feeling.

These philosophical speculations greatly influenced the various systems of Rationalism. After the times of Wolf, only a few, as Röhrl, adhered to an exclusive intellectualism. Most of the important representatives of Rationalism accept the theories of Fries and Jacobi. Thus Wegscheider refers chiefly to the philosophical works of the disciples of Jacobi—Gerlach, Bouterweck, and Salat. And Gabler, one of the keenest of the early Rationalists, defines religion as a "feeling of dependence upon the infinite."

Among the adherents of Supranaturalism, Bretschneider and Reinhard recognised only a subjective feeling, but De Wette introduced the theory of Fries into systematic theology. Unlike Fries, however, in whose system there still was some obscurity as regards the relation of feeling and will to religion, De Wette based religion altogether on feeling or an æsthetic view of the world, in which all difference between religion and art disappeared.

The system of Jacobi and of Spinoza, together with the spirit prevailing among the Moravians, worked together to produce the new doctrine of feeling which constituted the basis of the theology of Schleiermacher, and which still influences most theological systems of modern times. For Schleiermacher, religion is "the feeling of absolute dependence;" that to which our reflection traces our individual existence is called God; and thus, in feeling, God is given to us in an original manner. See SCHLEIERMACHER. This theory of feeling was defended and keenly developed by Twisten, and in particular by Nitzsch. Hegel severely attacked the views of Schleiermacher, but his own views considerably changed with the gradual development of his system. See Tholuck, in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*, iv, 703. (A. J. S.)

**Feet.** See FOOT.

**Feith**, RUDOLPH, was born at Zwolle Feb. 7, 1753. He received a careful Christian training. At fifteen he entered the University of Leyden. In 1781 he competed with Lannoy in celebrating De Ruyter. His epic received the gold, and his lyric the silver medal. As a poet, he enjoyed a high reputation through life. He excelled chiefly as a didactic poet, though he also tried his hand at lyric and dramatic poetry. His lyric on Immortality (*De Onsterfelijkheid*) is beautiful and sublime. His didactic poem on the Grave (*Het Graf*) is his longest, and is regarded as one of his best productions, abounding in the beautiful, the striking, and the sublime. His poetic writings are very numerous; and he also wrote several volumes of prose. He was appointed one of a commission to prepare a book of hymns for the use of the Reformed Church in Holland. This duty he discharged with great zeal and fidelity. To this collection he contributed himself a large number of beautiful and appropriate hymns, most of them original, and a few translated from the German. Though a layman, he was a successful cultivator of theology. Two essays or treatises of his on important questions received the premium from Teyler's Theological Society, and another was crowned by the Hague Society. He died February 8, 1824, at his villa near Zwolle. See Siegenbeek's *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Letterkunde* (Haarlem, 1826); Hofdijk's *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Letterkunde*, bl. 415 en verv. (Amsterd. 1864);

Glasius, *Godgeleerd Nederland*, blz. 460 en verv.; *Geschiedenis der Christelijke Kerk in Nederland door B. ter Haar*, W. Moll, E. P. Swealve, etc., ii Deel, blz. 593 en verv. (Amsterd. 1860); *Evangelische Gezangen*, introduced in 1807. (J. P. W.)

**Felgenhauer**, PAUL, a Protestant theologian and mystic, was the son of a Lutheran clergyman in Bohemia. He was born at Putschwitz, in Bohemia, in 1620. He studied medicine at the University of Wittenberg, but soon after returning to his native country appeared (1620) in public as a writer on theological subjects. In his *Chronology* he maintained that Christ was born in the year 4235 after the creation of the world, and as the world was not to last more than 6000 years, it ought to come to an end in A.D. 1765. As, however, the time was to be shortened on account of the elect, he assumed that the end of the world would occur before that year, although he claimed no special revelations on the subject. In his *Zeitspiegel* he denounced the corruption of the Church and of the Lutheran clergy. The persecution of Protestantism in Bohemia compelled him to leave his country. He first (1623) went to Amsterdam, where he published a number of mystic and alchemic writings, the theological views of which may be reduced to Sabellianism and Monophysitism, resting on a pantheistic and cabalistic basis. The large circulation of some of his works alarmed the Lutheran clergy, and many wrote against him. Not satisfied with this, the clergy of Hamburg, Lubeck, and Lüneburg requested the ministry at Amsterdam to arrest the circulation of the works of Felgenhauer, and the spreading of his views, if necessary, by force. From 1635 to 1639 he lived at Bederkesa, near Bremen, where he held meetings of his adherents. Expelled from Bremen, he returned to Holland, where he, however, soon left again for Northern Germany. In 1657 he was arrested by order of the governments of Zelle and Hanover, and imprisoned at Syke. The efforts of several Lutheran clergymen to convert him to the Lutheran creed failed. About 1659 he lived in Hamburg. The year of his death is not known. A complete list of his works (forty-six in number) is given in Adelung, *Gesch. der menschl. Narrheit*, iv, 400.—Herzog, *Real-Encycl.* iii, 348; Arnold, *Kirch.-u. Ketzerhistorie*, vol. iii, ch. v. (A. J. S.)

**Felibien**, JACQUES, a Roman Catholic divine, was born at Chartres in 1636, and distinguished himself in youth by success in study, especially of the Scripture. In 1668 he became pastor at Vineuil; in 1669, canon of Chartres; in 1695, archdeacon of Vendome. He died at Chartres Nov. 23, 1716. Besides various practical works, he wrote *Le Symbole des Apôtres expliqué par l'écriture Sainte* (Blois, 1696, 12mo).—*Comment. in Oseam* (Chartres, 1702, 4to).—*Pentateuchus Historicus ex fonte Hebraico*, etc. (Chartres, 1703, 4to). This book gave rise to much clamor, and Felibien was obliged to suppress various passages in which he was supposed to have departed from the orthodox interpretations. Moreover, as it had been printed with the permission only of the bishop, and without that of the royal censor, the book was suppressed by the government, and all the printed copies confiscated.—Hofer, *Now. Biog. Générale*, xvii, 274.

**Felicissimus**, the author of a schism in the Church of Carthage in the 3d century, was appointed deacon in Carthage by the presbyter Novatus, without a previous understanding with Cyprian, who, a short time before, had been elected bishop. Cyprian declared his appointment to be an encroachment upon his episcopal prerogatives, but did not depose him. During the Decian persecution Cyprian was for some time absent from Carthage, and some of the presbyters, who claimed greater rights than Cyprian was willing to concede to them, began to readmit the *lapsi* to the communion of the Church in consequence of the *libelli pacis* given by the martyrs, without having an under-

standing on the subject with Cyprian. The latter reproached the presbyters with too great laxity, and sent a commission to Carthage which was to investigate the conduct of the *lapsi*, and to regulate the support which the treasury of the Church granted in certain cases. Felicissimus denounced the conduct of Cyprian as an encroachment upon his rights as deacon, among which belonged, in the Church of Africa, the administration of the treasury of the Church; and he even went so far as to exclude from the communion of his church those who should appear before the episcopal commission. He was joined in his opposition by five presbyters and a number of confessors, and his church became the centre of all the *lapsi* who wished to have their cases decided before the return of Cyprian. After the return of Cyprian to Carthage in 251, a synod regulated the affair of the *lapsi*, and excluded Felicissimus and the presbyters acting with him from the Church. Felicissimus, however, not only persisted in his opposition, but his party, strengthened by the accession of several African bishops, elected Fortunatus, one of the five presbyters siding with Felicissimus, bishop of Carthage, and sent Felicissimus himself to Rome—where, in the mean while, the Novatian controversy had broken out—for the purpose of gaining the Roman bishop Cornelius over to their side. The mission was, however, unsuccessful, and the schism of Felicissimus seems soon after to have become extinct.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* iv, 349; Schaff, *Church History.* (A. J. S.)

**Felicitas**, a saint of the Roman calendar, supposed to have suffered martyrdom A.D. 161. According to the legend, she was a woman of high birth, who embraced Christianity and brought up her seven sons in the faith. She was denounced to Marcus Aurelius, who ordered an inquiry. The prefect ordered her to sacrifice to the gods; she refused, as did her children. After vain efforts to break their constancy, the prefect reported the case anew to the emperor, who ordered a trial before special judges. The lady and her children were all put to death. The story is plainly of comparatively modern invention. Felicitas is commemorated in the Church of Rome Nov. 13, and her seven sons July 16. The bones of two of her sons are said to be preserved in Germany!—Bolland, *Acta Sanctor.* July 10; Butler, *Lives of Saints*, July 10.

**Felicitas**, an African slave who suffered martyrdom at Carthage along with Perpetua (q. v.), in the time of Severus, A.D. 202. They are both said by Basnage to have been Montanists, but cardinal Orsi seems to have disproved this in his *Dissert. Apol. pro SS. Perpetua et Felicitate*. They were arrested at Carthage while still catechumens, and were baptized in prison. All efforts were tried in vain to induce them to abandon their faith; they were condemned to be thrown to the wild beasts at a festival in honor of the anniversary of Geta's nomination (*Annales Cesaris*). After this judgment they were remanded to prison to await the fatal day. For the account of Perpetua, see PERPETUA. "As to Felicitas, on her return to the dungeon she was seized with the pains of labor. The jailer said to her, 'If thy present sufferings are so great, what wilt thou do when thou art thrown to the wild beasts? This thou didst not consider when thou refusedst to sacrifice.' She answered, 'I now suffer myself all that I suffer; but then there will be another who shall suffer for me, because I also will suffer for him.' A custom which had come down from the times of human sacrifices, under the bloody Baal-worship of the Carthaginians, still prevailed, of dressing those criminals who were condemned to die by wild beasts in priestly raiment. It was therefore proposed, in the present case, that the men should be clothed as the priests of Saturn, and the women as the priestesses of Ceres. Nobly did their free, Christian spirit protest against such a proceeding. 'We have come here,'

said they, 'of our own will, that we may not suffer our freedom to be taken from us. We have given up our lives that we may not be forced to such abominations.' The pagans themselves acknowledged the justice of their demand, and yielded. After they had been torn by the wild beasts, and were about to receive the merciful stroke which was to end their sufferings, they took leave of each other for the last time with the mutual kiss of Christian love." Felicitas is commemorated in the Church of Rome March 7.—Neander, *Ch. Hist.* Torrey, i, 123; Butler, *Lives of Saints*, March 7.

**Felix** (*happy*, Græcied Φηλαξ, Acts xxiii-xxiv; in Tacitus, *Hist.* v, 9, called ANTONIUS FELIX; in Suidas, CLAUDIUS FELIX; in Josephus and Acts, simply FELIX; so also in Tacitus, *Ann.* xii, 54), the Roman procurator of Judæa, before whom Paul so "reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come," that the judge trembled, saying, "Go thy way for this time; when I have a convenient season I will call for thee" (Acts xxiv, 25; see Abicht, *De Claudio Felice*, Viteb. 1752; Eckhard, *Pauli oratio ad Felicem*, Isen. 1779). The context states that Felix had expected a bribe from Paul; and, in order to procure this bribe, he appears to have had several interviews with the apostle. The depravity which such an expectation implies is in agreement with the idea which the historical fragments preserved respecting Felix would lead the student to form of the man.

The year in which Felix entered on his office cannot be strictly determined. He was appointed by the emperor Claudius, whose freedman he was, on the banishment of Ventidius Cumanus, probably A.D. 53. Tacitus (*Ann.* xii, 54) states that Felix and Cumanus were joint procurators, Cumanus having Galilee, and Felix Samaria. In this account Tacitus is directly at issue with Josephus (*Ant.* xx, 6, 2), and is generally supposed to be in error; but his account is very circumstantial, and by adopting it we should gain greater justification for the expression of Paul (Acts xxiv, 10) that Felix had been judge of the nation "for many years." Those words, however, must not even thus be closely pressed; for Cumanus himself only went to Judæa in the eighth year of Claudius (Josephus, *Ant.* xx, 5, 2). From the words of Josephus (*Ant.* xx, 7, 1), it appears that his appointment took place before the twelfth year of the emperor Claudius. Eusebius fixes the time of his actually undertaking his duties in the eleventh year of that monarch. The question is fully discussed under CHRONOLOGY, vol. ii, 311, 312.

Felix was a remarkable instance of the elevation to distinguished station of persons born and bred in the lowest condition. Originally a slave, he rose to little less than kingly power. For some unknown, but probably not very creditable services, he was manumitted by Claudius Cæsar (Sueton. *Claudius*, 28; Tacitus, *Hist.* v, 9), on which account he is said to have taken the prænomén of Claudius. In Tacitus, however (*l. c.*), he is surnamed Antonius, probably because he was also a freedman of Antonia, the emperor's mother. Felix was the brother of Claudius's powerful freedman Pallas (Josephus, *War*, ii, 12, 8; *Ant.* xx, 7, 1); and it was to the circumstance of Pallas's influence surviving his master's death (Tacitus, *Ann.* xiv, 65) that Felix was retained in his procuratorship by Nero. In speaking of Pallas in conjunction with another freedman, namely, Narcissus, the imperial private secretary, Suetonius (*Claudius*, 28) says that the emperor was eager in heaping upon them the highest honors that a subject could enjoy, and suffered them to carry on a system of plunder and gain to such an extent that, on complaining of the poverty of his exchequer, some one had the boldness to remark that he would abound in wealth if he were taken into partnership by his two favorite freedmen.

The character which the ancients have left of Felix is of a very dark complexion. Suetonius speaks of the military honors which the emperor loaded him

with, and specifies his appointment as governor of the province of Judæa (*Claudius*, 28), adding an innuendo, which loses nothing by its brevity, namely, that he was the husband of three queens or royal ladies ("trium reginarum maritum"). Tacitus, in his *History* (v, 9), declares that, during his governorship in Judæa, he indulged in all kinds of cruelty and lust, exercising regal power with the disposition of a slave; and, in his *Annals* (xii, 54), he represents Felix as considering himself licensed to commit any crime, relying on the influence which he possessed at court. The country was ready for rebellion, and the unsuitable remedies which Felix applied served only to inflame the passions and to incite to crime. The contempt which he and Cumanus (who, according to Tacitus, governed Galilee while Felix ruled Samaria; but see Josephus, *Ant. xx*, 7, 1) excited in the minds of the people, encouraged them to give free scope to the passions which arose from the old enmity between the Jews and Samaritans, while the two wily and base procurators were enriched by booty as if it had been spoils of war. This so far was a pleasant game to these men, but in the prosecution of it Roman soldiers lost their lives, and but for the intervention of Quadratus, governor of Syria, a rebellion would have been inevitable. A court-martial was held to inquire into the causes of this disaffection, when Felix, one of the accused, was seen by the injured Jews among the judges, and even seated on the judgment-seat, placed there by the president Quadratus expressly to outface and deter the accusers and witnesses. Josephus (*Ant. xx*, 8, 5) reports that under Felix the affairs of the country grew worse and worse. The land was filled with robbers and impostors who deluded the multitude. Felix used his power to repress these disorders to little purpose, since his own example gave no sanction to justice. Thus, having got one Dineas, leader of a band of assassins, into his hands by a promise of impunity, he sent him to Rome to receive his punishment. Having a grudge against Jonathan, the high-priest, who had expostulated with him on his misuse, he made use of Doras, an intimate friend of Jonathan, in order to get him assassinated by a gang of villains, who joined the crowds that were going up to the Temple worship—a crime which led subsequently to countless evils, by the encouragement which it gave to the Sicarii, or leagued assassins of the day, to whose excesses Josephus ascribes, under Providence, the overthrow of the Jewish state. Among other crimes, some of these villains misled the people under the promise of performing miracles, and were punished by Felix. An Egyptian impostor, who escaped himself, was the occasion of the loss of life to four hundred followers, and of the loss of liberty to two hundred more, thus severely dealt with by Felix (Josephus, *Ant. xx*, 8, 6; *War*, ii, 13, 5; comp. Acts xxi, 38). A serious misunderstanding having arisen between the Jewish and the Syrian inhabitants of Cæsarea, Felix employed his troops, and slew and plundered till prevailed on to desist. His cruelty in this affair brought on him, after he was superseded by Festus, an accusation at Rome, which, however, he was enabled to render nugatory by the influence which his brother Pallas had, and exercised to the utmost, with the emperor Nero. Josephus, in his *Life* (§ 3), reports that, "at the time when Felix was procurator of Judæa, there were certain priests of my acquaintance, and very excellent persons they were, whom, on a small and trifling occasion, he had put into bonds and sent to Rome to plead their cause before Caesar." At the end of a two years' term Porcius Festus was appointed to supersede Felix, who, on his return to Rome, was accused by the Jews in Cæsarea, as above noticed (*Ant. xx*, 8, 9). This was in A.D. 55 (not in the year 60, as Anzer, *De temporibus in Act. Apost. ratione*, p. 100; Wieseler, *Chronologie der Apostelgeschichte*, p. 66-82).

While in his office, being inflamed by a passion for

the beautiful Drusilla, a daughter of king Herod Agrippa, who was married to Azizus, king of Emesa, he employed one Simon, a magician, to use his arts in order to persuade her to forsake her husband and marry him, promising that if she would comply with his suit he would make her a happy woman. Drusilla, partly impelled by a desire to avoid the envy of her sister Berenice, was prevailed on to transgress the laws of her forefathers, and consented to a union with Felix. In this marriage a son was born, who was named Agrippa: both mother and son perished in an eruption of Mount Vesuvius, which took place in the days of Titus Caesar (Josephus, *Ant. xx*, 7, 2). With this adulteress was Felix seated when Paul reasoned before the judge, as already stated (Acts xxiv, 24). Another Drusilla is mentioned by Tacitus as being the wife (the first wife) of Felix. This woman was niece of Cleopatra and Antony. See DRUSILLA. By this marriage Felix was connected with Claudius. Of his third wife nothing is known. (See Salden, *De Felice et Drusilla*, Amst. 1684).

Paul, being apprehended in Jerusalem, was sent by a letter from Claudius Lysias to Felix at Cæsarea, where he was at first confined in Herod's judgment-hall till his accusers came. They arrived. Tertullus appeared as their spokesman, and had the audacity, in order to conciliate the good-will of Felix, to express gratitude on the part of the Jews, "seeing that by thee we enjoy great quietness, and that very worthy deeds are done unto this nation by thy providence" (Acts xxiii, xxiv). Paul pleaded his cause in a worthy speech; and Felix, consigning the apostle to the custody of a centurion, ordered that he should have such liberty as the circumstances admitted, with permission that his acquaintance might see him and minister to his wants. This imprisonment the apostle suffered for a short period (not two years, as ordinarily supposed, that expression having reference to Felix's whole term of sole office), being left bound when Felix gave place to Festus (q. v.), as that unjust judge "was willing," not to do what was right, but "to show the Jews a pleasure" (Walch, *De Felice procuratore*, Jena, 1747; also in his *Dissert. in Act. iii*, 29; Smith's *Dictionary of Class. Biog.* s. v.).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

**Felix**, MARTYR, and his companion Regula, were, according to tradition, the first Christian missionaries in the city of Zurich, which, before the Reformation, venerated them as patrons, and still has their names in the town seals. They are said to have been executed by order of the emperor Maximian. Nothing certain is known about their history.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* iv, 351. (A. J. S.)

**Felix** OF NOLA was a native and presbyter of Nola. After his property had been confiscated during the persecution of Decius, he supported himself by cultivating a garden and some rented land. According to a legend, he concealed himself during the persecution in the fissures of an old building, and a spider saved him from the search of the messengers by drawing her web over him. His sufferings and alleged miracles were celebrated by Paulinus, bishop of Nola, and many pilgrims visited his grave.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* iv, 355. (A. J. S.)

**Felix** THE MANICHEAN was a contemporary of Augustine. He was an elder or elect of the Manicheans, and had gone to Hippo to gain converts for his sect. Augustine had a discussion with him in the church of Hippo in the presence of the congregation which lasted two days. The proceedings were taken down by notaries, and are still extant (vol. viii of the Benedictine edition of Augustine's works: *De actis cum Felice Manicheo*, libri ii). On the day before the disputation, Felix declared his readiness to be burned with his books if anything wrong could be found in them; but during the disputation he is reported to have been

timid, weak, evasive, and it was thought that he wished to flee. Before the disputation began, his books were taken from him, and placed under the public seal. Felix undertook to prove that Mani was the Paraclete who had been promised by Christ, and he used as an argument the information given by Mani on the construction of the world, on which nothing could be found in Paul and the writings of the other apostles. Augustine replied that the Paraclete had the mission to teach the truths of religion, but not to expound mathematics. The result of the disputation was that Felix declared himself refuted, and publicly renounced and cursed Mani. The protocol of the disputation was signed by both Augustine and Felix. Posidius, in the *Life of Augustine*, also states that Felix, after the third meeting, acknowledged his error, and accepted the faith of the Church.—Herzog, *Real-Encycl.* iv, 350. (A. J. S.)

**Felix** (*Pratensis*), an eminent Jewish scholar of the 16th century, was born in Prato, Tuscany. He was the son of a rabbi, who taught him the Oriental languages. He travelled in Italy after the death of his father, and, becoming convinced of the truth of Christianity, was baptized, and shortly after entered the order of St. Augustine. The date of his profession of Christianity is uncertain, but it probably took place before 1506. He translated the Psalms into Latin, dedicating the work to Leo X, and received authority from the pope to translate the other books of the Old Testament. He revised the text of the two first Hebrew editions of the Bible published by Bomberg, carefully correcting the proofs himself. He died in 1557. His works are, 1. *Psalterium ex hebraeo ad verbum ferè tractatum adjectis notationibus* (Venice, 1515, 4to) (this version has been inserted in the *Psalterium Septuaginta* (Lyons, 1530, 8vo);—2. *Biblia sacra hebraea, cum utraque mazorá et targum, item cum Commentariis rabbinorum; curá et studio Felicis Pratensis, cum profectione latina Leonis X nuncupatá* (Venice, 1518, 4 vols. fol.). There are said to be versions of Job and other books of the Bible by Felix, but they have never been published.—*Biographie Universelle*, xiv, 273. (J. H. W.)

**Felix**, bishop of Urgel (Urgelis), in Spain, 9th century. Of his early life little is known. He became bishop of Urgel in 791. Elipandus of Toledo, who had been his pupil, consulted him as to the doctrine of the person of Christ, with regard to which he seems to have already embraced the so-called *Adoptian* doctrine. See **ELIPANDUS**. "The answer of Felix was that Christ, with respect to his divine nature, was truly and properly the Son of God, begotten of the Father, and hence he was the true God, together with the Father and the Holy Spirit, in the unity of the Godhead. But that, with respect to his humanity, Christ was the Son of God by adoption, born of the Virgin by the will of the Father, and thus he was nominally God. Hence, according to the opponents of the Felicians, it followed that there was a twofold Sonship in Christ, and that he must consist of two persons. The opinion of Felix was considered by the orthodox as nothing more than a development of the Nestorian heresy. The doctrine of Felix was adopted by Elipandus, who, being the primate of Spain, propagated it through the different provinces of Spain, while Felix himself contributed to spread it throughout Narbonne and other parts of Gaul" (Carwithen, *Church History*, p. 179). It appears to be clear that Felix had read some of the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia (q. v.), in which a similar doctrine is taught. Felix seems, moreover, to have engaged in controversy with the Mohammedans, and, according to Alcuin, he wrote a *Dialogue* against them; and it is not unlikely that he was led to the Adoptian view by his desire to render the doctrine of the Incarnation less offensive to the Mohammedans. Alcuin (q. v.) entered into controversy with Felix, and we learn from him a large part of what is known

about the controversy (Alcuin, *Opera*, ii, 760 sq.). Neander gives the following statement: "Felix distinguished between how far Christ was the Son of God and God according to nature (*natura, genere*), and how far he was so by virtue of grace, by an act of the divine will (*gratia, voluntate*), by the divine choice and good pleasure (*electione, placito*); and the name Son of God was given to him only in consequence of connection with God (*nuncupative*); and hence the expressions for this distinction, *secundum naturam* and *secundum adoptionem*. Felix appealed to the fact that, though the name of Son by adoption (*ὁ υἱοθετίας*) is not applied in the Bible to Christ, yet there are other designations which express the same idea. He adduces John x, 34, when Jesus disputed with the Jews (*κατ' ἀνθρώπων*), and referred to the passage in the Old Testament, in which men are called *Elohim*, where Christ placed himself as a man in the category of those who were called 'gods' *nuncupative*, and not in a strict sense. Then as to the passage, 'None is good save one, that is God,' from this it appears that as man he was not to be called good in the same sense as God, and that only the divine nature in him was the source of goodness. He would allow an interchange of the divine and human predicates only in the same manner as Theodore; it could not be made without limitation, but the different senses must be observed according as they were attributed to the divine or human natures. He charged his opponents with so confounding the two natures by their doctrine of the *singularitas persone* that they left no distinction between the *suscipiens* and the *susceptum*. Expressions that were then in common use, such as *God was born, and died*, never occur in Scripture, which also never says that the Son of God, but that the Son of man was given for us. On the latter point Alcuin could easily have confuted Felix by other passages, but both were wrong in not distinguishing the various Biblical applications of the term Son of God from the Church use of it, and in taking the idea everywhere in a Church sense. Like Theodore, Felix asserted Agnoëtism of Christ. It is also a point of resemblance between them that both sought for an analogy between the union of the man Christ with the divine Being and the relation of believers to God. Felix says that Christ in an improper sense (*nuncupative*) was called the Son of God conjointly with all who are not God according to their nature, but by the grace of God in Christ have been taken into communion with God (*deificati*). In this order also the Son of God is, in respect of his humanity, both according to nature and grace. He maintained that, as far as Christ as man is reckoned among the sons of God, all believers are his members; considered according to his divine nature, believers are the temple in which he dwells. He did not wish by that to deny the specific difference between Christ and believers; whatever resemblance existed between them belonged to him in a far higher sense; he was united to God by generation, and was the medium of the communion of the rest with God. Felix also perfectly agreed with Theodore in the thought that the communion with God into which Christ was received as a man might be represented as a revelation of the divine being according to the measure of the various stages of the development of his human nature, and thus supposed various degrees of it up to the highest revelation after the glorification of Christ. It might be peculiarly offensive that he should compare the baptism of Christ with the regeneration of believers; but he certainly did not mean to say that Christ thus became partaker of communion with the divine nature, but only to point out an analogy so far, as baptism marked a distinct stage in Christ's life, after which the operation of the divine life in him was peculiarly conspicuous. It is therefore evident that the doctrine of Felix was altogether that of Theodore, excepting that the latter could express himself more freely in an

age when the doctrines of the Church were less rigorously defined, while Felix was obliged to use a terminology which was opposed to his own system. The great importance of the antagonism in which he stood to the Church doctrine is likewise manifest; it included not merely Christology, but also Anthropology; for the doctrine of the revelation of the Divine Being in Christ, conditioned by various stages of development, was connected with one of special importance—the principle of free self-determination. It is uncertain how far Felix consciously developed his principles; but there is no question that these were throughout contradictory to the prevalent Augustinian doctrine. As Felix lived in the Frankish territory, the Frankish Church was drawn into the controversy. In A.D. 792, Charlemagne convoked an assembly at Ratishon, at which Felix appeared, and was induced to recant. He was then sent to Rome, where he made similar explanations (Alcuin *adv. Elipandum*, i, c. 16; Mansi, *Concil.* xiii, 1031). But, on being permitted to return home, he repented of the steps he had taken, took refuge in Saracenic Spain, and again promulgated his doctrine. Alcuin, who had been summoned to take a part in the controversy, endeavored to win him over by a friendly epistle; but Felix regarded the subject of the controversy as too important, and thus it was carried on in his writings (Alcuin *libellus adv. Haresin Felicis*, *Opp. Alc.* i, pars ii, 759). The Spanish bishops interceded for Felix with the emperor, and applied for a new investigation (Alcuin, *Opera*, ii, 567). In consequence, Charles called a second synod at Frankfort-on-the-Maine in A.D. 794, which again decided against Felix (*Mansi*, xiii, 863); and since the Adoptianists had spread themselves even as far as France, the emperor sent a commission of three persons into those parts in order to oppose them. Felix came with them, and was prevailed upon to appear before the synod at Aix-la-Chapelle (Aix), A.D. 799. After Alcuin had disputed with him for a long time, Felix declared himself to be convinced. He made a recantation in Spain; yet he was not altogether trusted, and was placed under the oversight of Leidrad, bishop of Lyons. He could not at once give up a dogmatic tendency which was so deeply rooted; he still was always inclined to Agnœtism, and after his death a series of questions was found which showed that he firmly adhered to his fundamental views" (*Hist. of Dogmas*, tr. by Ryland, p. 44 sq.). Felix was deposed A.D. 799, and died about A.D. 818. His writings, whether in apology or retraction of his views, remain only in fragments; but his *Profession of Faith*, made at Aix-la-Chapelle in 799, is given in Alcuin *Opera* (Paris, 1617, fol.), in Mansi, *Concil.* xiii, 1035; in Labbe, *Concil.* p. 1171. See Dupin, *Eccles. Writers*, cent. viii; Neander, *Ch. History*, iii, 156, 158; Mosheim, *Ch. History*, cent. viii, ch. v, § 3; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, § 179; Dorner, *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, Edinb. transl. div. ii, vol. i, 248 sq. See ADOPTIANS; CHRISTOLOGY.

**Felix I**, bishop of Rome. According to the *Acta Sanctorum*, he succeeded Dionysius in 269, and died in 274. He was declared a "martyr" by the Council of Ephesus on "account of his sufferings for Christ," but he did not die by violence. There is extant a letter of his against the Sabellians and Paul of Samosata. Other writings, not believed to be his, are to be found in Migne, *Patrolog. Lat.* vol. v, and in Galland, *Bibl. Ant.* iii, 542.—Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vii, 30; Baronius, *Annales*, p. 272-275; Bower, *History of the Popes*, i, 78.

**Felix II**, Anti-pope, was placed in the episcopal chair of Rome A.D. 355, by the Arian emperor Constantius, in place of Liberius (q. v.), who was exiled by the emperor. The clergy refused to acknowledge Felix, and Constantius recalled Liberius to hold the see conjointly with Felix; but when the decree was read in the circus, the people rejected it with the cry,

"One God, one Christ, one bishop." But Sozomen says that Felix was an adherent of the Nicene faith, and a "blameless" man. Nevertheless, Felix had to retire from Rome, and is said to have died A.D. 365; but the accounts vary very much. His name is found in the Roman Martyrology, July 29; but Baronius decides against his claims (*Annal.* A.D. 357). Nevertheless, Gregory XIII confirmed his sainthood in 1582.—Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* iv, 11; Tillemont, *Mém. pour Servir*, etc., vol. vi; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, vol. xvii; Bower, *History of the Popes*, i, 134. See LIBERIIUS.

**Felix III (II?)** was elected successor of Simplicianus A.D. 483, under the influence of the Gothic emperor Odoacer. He and Acacius, bishop of Constantinople, mutually excommunicated each other, and thus gave occasion to the first schism between the Greek and Latin churches. He died Feb. 24 or 25, 492. He is commemorated by the Roman Church as a saint (Feb. 25).—Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. v, pt. ii, ch. v, § 18, 21; Bower, *History of the Popes*, ii, 193 sq. See MONOPHYSITES.

**Felix (III or) IV**, Pope, succeeded John I A.D. 526, by the influence of the Arian emperor Theodoric. Little is known of him, but that little is creditable. He died 530.—Baronius, *Annal.* cent. vi; Dupin, *Eccles. Writers*, cent. vi.

**Felix V**, AMADEUS (of Savoy), Pope or Anti-pope, was born Sept. 4, 1383. He succeeded his father, Amadeus VII, in the earldom of Savoy, which the emperor Sigismund raised into a duchy. In his eighteenth year he was married to Maria of Burgundy, and in those times of bloody excess was accounted a wise and just prince. He participated through an envoy in the Council of Constance, and in 1422 shared in the crusade against the Hussites. His naturally strong religious tendencies having been strengthened by his wife's death, he built a hermitage at Ripaille, on Lake Lemán, in 1434, and retired to it with the intention of spending the rest of his days in retirement. After the councils of Pisa and Constance had deposed Eugenius IV, another was assembled at Basle, and Amadeus was elected pope. He accepted the nomination, adopted the title of Felix V, and as such entered Rome June 24, 1440. Finally he made terms with Nicolas V, Eugenius IV's successor, and, having thus ended the schism, Felix V retired to his hermitage at Ripaille, with the rank of cardinal-legate and permanent vicar-general of the papal see in Savoy, Basle, Strasburg, etc. He died at Geneva January 7, 1451. See Guichenon, *Histoire générale de la roy. maison de Savoie* (1660); Æn. Sylvii *Commentar. de gestis Concil.* (Basle, 1577). See BASLE, COUNCIL OF.

**Fell, John**, D.D., bishop of Oxford, a learned theologian, was born at Longworth, in Berks, June 23, 1625, and graduated M.A. in 1643. As a devoted friend of the Stuarts, for whom he had been in arms, he was deprived of his studentship in Christ Church by the parliamentary visitors, and during the Protectorate he continued in obscurity. After the Restoration he obtained a stall at Chichester, whence he was preferred to a more valuable one at Christ Church, and soon after became dean of Christ Church. In 1666 he became vice-chancellor of the university, and in 1676 bishop of Oxford, retaining his deanery. He was a great benefactor to the university, and as a prelate was distinguished by learning and munificence; but his conduct in the matter of John Locke's illegal removal from his studentship in Christ Church is a great stain upon his memory (see *Edinburgh Review*, 1829, l, 16). Among his writings are a Latin translation of Wood's *History and Antiquities of Oxford* (2 vols. fol.):—*A Life of Dr. Hammond* (1660, prefixed to *Hammond's Works*):—*St. Clement's Two Epistles to the Corinthians* (Oxford, 1669, 12mo, Gr. and Lat.):—*Artis Logice Compendium*:—*Epistle of Barna-*

*bas* (Oxford, 1685, 12mo):—*Cypriani Opera* (Oxford, 1677):—also Athenagoras, Hermes, and Justin's *Apologia*:—*Novi Testamenti Libri Omnes; accesserunt Parallela Script. loc. necnon variae lectiones*, etc. (London, 1675; Leips. 1697, and again, edited by A. H. Francke, 1702; Oxford, ed. by Gregory, fol. 1703; Oxford, ed. by Jacobson, 1852, 8vo):—*Paraphrase and Annotations upon all the Epistles of St. Paul* (Lond. 1675, 8vo; but from the edition of 1708 it appears that this book was the work of A. Woodhead, R. Allestree, and O. Walker, "corrected and improved" by Fell). His edition of the N. T. gave a new impulse to critical science, which he farther aided by the assistance he furnished, in money and otherwise, to the critical labors of John Mill (q. v.). Indeed, bishop Fell is said to have devoted his "whole substance" to works of piety and charity. He died July 10, 1686.—Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* v, 74; Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses; Biog. Britannica*, s. v.

**Fell, John**, an English Independent minister, was born at Cockermouth, 1735, and became pastor at Thaxted, Essex. His early opportunities were not great, but by his talents and industry he became a very respectable scholar. He was made tutor in the ancient languages in the Dissenters' seminary at Homerton. He is said to have "been dismissed from his office there for reading newspapers on Sunday." His friends got him an annuity of £100, and he was "asked to deliver lectures on the Evidences at the Scots' Church, London Wall." He had only delivered four when he died, Sept. 6, 1797. He published (in controversy with Dr. Hugh Farmer, q. v.) *Demoniacs, an Inquiry into the Heathen and Scripture Doctrine of Demons* (London, 1779, 8vo):—*The Idolatry of Greece and Rome distinguished from that of other Heathen Nations* (Lond. 1785, 8vo). After his death Dr. Hunter published his *Lectures on the Ev' d nces* (Lond. 1798, 8vo).—Bogue and Bennett, *Hist. of Dissenters*, ii, 518; Kitto, *Cyclopædia*, s. v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, i, 1125.

**Fellenberg, Philippe-Emanuel de**, a philanthropist and earnest laborer in the cause of education, was born at Berne, Switzerland, June 27, 1771. His father, who was a member of the government of Berne, laid the foundation of his intellectual culture, but he received his moral bent and self-sacrificing spirit from his mother, a great granddaughter of the Dutch admiral Van Tromp. After some time spent at the University of Tübingen in the study of civil law, he devoted himself especially to politics and philosophy. "In order to acquaint himself with the moral state of his countrymen, he spent much of his time in traveling through Switzerland, France, and Germany, usually on foot, with his knapsack on his back, residing in the villages and farm-houses, mingling in the labors and occupations, and partaking of the rude lodging and fare of the peasants and mechanics, and often extending his journey to the adjacent countries." On his return to Berne in 1798 he rendered important service as "commandant of the quarter" in the revolutionary troubles. In 1799 he purchased the estate called *Hofwyl*, two leagues from Berne, and founded there, successively, a school of agriculture, a manufactory of agricultural implements, schools for the poor, for the better classes, and a normal school. He devoted the remainder of his life to education with great success, but not without opposition. He died Nov. 21, 1844. See Vericourt, *Rapport sur les Instituts de Hofwyl*; Haam, *Fellenberg's Leben und Wirken* (Berne, 1845); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xvii, 307.

**Feller, Francis Xavier**, a Flemish Jesuit, was born at Brussels Aug. 18, 1735, entered the order of Jesuits in 1754, and died May 23, 1802. He was a very learned and voluminous writer, his publications amounting to 120 volumes. Among them are *Reply to Febronius* [see HONTHEIM], 1771:—*Observat. Philos. sur le Système de Newton* (3d edit. Liege, 1778):—*Cate-*

*chisme Philosophique*—Evidences of Christianity (5th edit. Lyons, 1819, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Dictionnaire-historique* (Liege, 1818, 8 vols.; 7th ed. Paris, 1829, 17 vols. 8vo):—*Cours de Morale Chrétienne* (Paris, 1825, 5 vols. 8vo).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xvii, 309.

**Felloes** (פֶּלְאוֹס, *chishshlukim'*, joinings, 1 Kings vii, 33) probably denotes rather the *spokes* that connect the rim with the hub of a wheel, being a kindred term with that used to denote the *coupling-rods* of the tabernacle (Exod. xxvii, 10). See CHARIOT.

**Fellow**, besides its contemptuous use (as a rendering of פֶּלְאוֹס, a man, etc.), and its frequent employment (usually as a rendering of פֶּלְאוֹס, a friend or equal), in the sense of *companion*, stands in one remarkable passage (Zech. xiii, 7) as the rendering of פֶּלְאוֹס, *amith'*, society, in the phrase פֶּלְאוֹס יְהוָה, *man of my association*, i. e. *my associate*; corresponding with פֶּלְאוֹס, *my shepherd* in the parallel member, and referred to himself by our Saviour (Matt. xxvi, 31) as the great Pastor and Sacrifice for his people; not so much in the sense of simple equality of nature with the Father, as of copartnership with him in the great work of caring for and redeeming mankind. See NEIGHBOR.

**Fellow of a College.** See FELLOWSHIP.

**Fellowes, Robert**, was born in Norfolk, England, in 1770; studied at St. Mary's Hall, Oxford, took holy orders in 1795, and died in 1847. His theological speculations gradually led him to reject the doctrines of the Established Church, and to adopt the opinions found in his *Religion of the Universe*, published in London in 1836. He was an intimate friend of Dr. Parr and baron Masères, the latter of whom left him the greater part of his large fortune, to be dispensed in literary and benevolent enterprises. He was for some time editor of the *London Critical Review*. He was an early advocate of the establishment of the University of London, of which he was a liberal benefactor. Among his works are *Christian Philosophy* (1798, 2d ed. 1799, 8vo):—*Supplement to do.*:—*Religion without Cant* (1801, 8vo):—*Guide to Immortality* (1804, 3 vols. 8vo):—*Manual of Piety* (1807, 8vo):—*A Body of Theology* (1807, 2 vols. 8vo).—Appleton, *Cyclopædia*, s. v.; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 584.

**Fellowship** in a college, a station of privilege and emolument enjoyed by one who is elected a member of any of those endowed societies which in the English universities are called colleges. The person so elected shares the benefits of the foundation in common with the other members, and from such participation derives the name of fellow, the Latin name for which in the statutes of most of the colleges is *socius*. See UNIVERSITY. In Oxford and Cambridge "the fellowships were either constituted by the original founders of the colleges to which they belong, or they have been since endowed. In almost all cases their holders must have taken at least the first degree of bachelor of arts or student in the civil law. One of the greatest changes introduced by the commissioners under the University Act of 1854 was the throwing open of the fellowships to all members of the university of requisite standing, by removing the old restrictions by which many of them were confined to founder's kin, or to the inhabitants of certain dioceses, arch-deaconries, or other districts. Fellowships vary greatly in value. Some of the best at Oxford, in good years, are said to reach £700 or even £800, whilst there are others which do not amount to £100, and many at Cambridge which fall short of that sum. Being paid out of the college revenues which arise from land, they also vary from year to year, though from this arrangement, on the other hand, their general value with reference to the value of commodities is preserved nearly unchangeable, which would not be the case if they consisted of a fixed payment in money. The

senior fellowships are the most lucrative, a system of promotion being established among their holders; but they all confer on their holders the privilege of occupying apartments in the college, and generally, in addition, certain perquisites as to meals or commons. Many fellowships are tenable for life, but in general they are forfeited should the holder attain to certain preferments in the Church or at the bar, and sometimes in the case of his succeeding to property above a certain amount. In general, also, they are forfeited by marriage, though this disability may now be removed by a special vote of the college, permitting the fellow to retain his fellowship notwithstanding his marriage. With the single exception of Downing College, Cambridge, in which the graduates of both universities are eligible, the fellowships are confined to the graduates of the university to which they belong" (Chambers, *Encyclopaedia*, s. v.).

**Fellowship** (κοινωνία), "joint interest, or the having one common stock. The fellowship of the saints is twofold: 1. With God (1 John i, 3; 1 Cor. i, 9; 1 Cor. xiii, 14); 2. With one another (1 John i, 7). Fellowship with God consists in knowledge of his will (Job xxii, 21; John xvii, 3); agreement in design (Amos iii, 2); mutual affection (Rom. viii, 38, 39); enjoyment of his presence (Psa. iv, 6); conformity to his image (1 John ii, 6; 1 John i, 6); participation of his felicity (1 John i, 3, 4; Eph. iii, 14-21; 2 Cor. xiii, 14). Fellowship of the saints may be considered as a fellowship of duties (Rom. xii, 6; 1 Cor. xii, 1; 1 Thess. v, 17, 18; James v, 16); of ordinances (Heb. x, 24; Acts ii, 46); of graces, love, joy, etc. (Heb. x, 24; Mal. iii, 16; 2 Cor. viii, 4); of interest spiritual, and sometimes temporal (Rom. xii, 4, 13; Heb. xiii, 16); of sufferings (Rom. xv, 1, 2; Gal. vi, 1, 2; Rom. xii, 15); of eternal glory (Rev. vii, 9)."—Buck, *Theol. Dictionary*, s. v. See COMMUNION.

**Feltham**, OWEN, an English writer of the reign of James I, who was a native of Suffolk, lived many years in the earl of Thomond's family, and died about 1678. The work by which he is remembered is *Resolves, Divine, Political, and Moral*, which has passed through many editions, and is still reprinted.

**Felton**, HENRY, D.D., a learned English divine, was born at London in 1679, and was educated at Westminster school, the Charter House, and Edmund Hall, Oxford. In 1711 he became rector of Whitewell, Derbyshire, and was finally appointed principal of St. Edmund's Hall in 1722. He died in 1740. His principal works are, *A Dissertation on reading the Classics* (Lond. 3d ed. 1723, 12mo):—*The Common People taught to defend their Communion with the Church of England* (Oxf. 1727, 8vo):—*The Christian Faith asserted against Deists, Arians, and Socinians* (Oxf. 1732, 8vo):—*The Resurrection of the same numerical Body asserted* (London, 1733, 3d ed. 8vo):—*Sermons on the Creation, Fall, and Redemption of Man*, etc. (Lond. 1748, 8vo):—*Nineteen Sermons*, 1748 (posthumous).—Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, s. v.; Rose, *New Gen. Biog. Dict.* s. v.

**Female ECCLESIASTIC.** (For monographs, see Volboding, *Index*, p. 164.) See MINISTRY; DEACONESS; AGAPETE.

**Fence** (Psa. lxii, 3), גִּדְרֵי, *gader'*, a wall (q. v.) rather than hedge (as elsewhere generally rendered). The Hebrews use two terms to denote a fence of different kinds: גִּדְרֵי, *gader'*, or גִּדְרֵיהֶם, *gederal'*, and גִּבְעוֹתֵיהֶם, *mesukah'*. According to Vitringa, the latter denotes the outer thorny fence of the vineyard, and the former the inner wall of stones surrounding it. The chief use of the former was to keep off men, and of the latter to keep off beasts, not only from gardens, vineyards, etc., but also from the flocks at night (see Prov. xv, 19; xxiv, 31). See HEDGE. From this root the Phenicians called any enclosed place *gaddir*, and particularly gave this name to their settlement in


the south-western coast of Spain, which the Greeks from them called Γάδρα, the Romans *Gades*, and the moderns *Cadiz*. See GEDERAH. In Ezek. xiii, 5; xxii, 30, *gader'* appears to denote the fortifications of a city; and in Psa. lxii, 3, the wicked are compared to a tottering fence and bowing wall; i. e. their destruction comes suddenly upon them. Fenced cities (see below) were such as were fortified.—Calmet, s. v. See AGRICULTURE.

**Fenced City** (מְצוּרָה, *metzurah'*, *intrenched*; 2 Chron. xi, 10, 23; xii, 4; xiv, 6; xxi, 3; rendered "stronghold," 2 Chron. xi, 11; "fort," Isa. xxix, 3; "munition," ii, 1. מִבְּצָר, *mibtsar'*, a fortress, is also sometimes rendered "fenced" in connection with צִיָּר, a city, Numb. xxxii, 17, 36; Josh. x, 20; xix, 35; 1 Sam. vi, 18; 2 Kings iii, 19; x, 2; xvii, 9; xviii, 8; 2 Chron. xvii, 19; Jer. v, 17; Dan. xi, 15; elsewhere "stronghold," etc.). The broad distinction between a city and a village in Biblical language consisted in the possession of walls. See CITY. The city had walls, the village was unwall, or had only a watchman's tower (מִצְדָּה, *mitsdoh*, *turris custodum*; comp. Gesen. *Thes.* p. 267), to which the villagers resorted in times of danger. A threefold distinction is thus obtained: 1. cities; 2. unwall villages; 3. villages with castles or towers (1 Chron. xxvii, 25). The district east of the Jordan, forming the kingdoms of Moab and Bashan, is said to have abounded from very early times in castles and fortresses, such as were built by Uzziah to protect the cattle, and to repel the inroads of the neighboring tribes, besides unwall towns (Ammian. Marc. xiv, 9; Dent. iii, 5; 2 Chron. xxvi, 10). Of these many remains are thought by Mr. Porter to exist at the present day (*Damascus*, ii, 197). The dangers to which unwall villages are exposed from the marauding tribes of the desert, and also the fortifications by which the inhabitants sometimes protect themselves, are illustrated by Sir J. Malcolm (*Sketches of Persia*, c. xiv, p. 148) and Frazer (*Persia*, p. 379, 380; comp. Judg. v, 7). Villages in the Hauran are sometimes enclosed by a wall, or, rather, the houses, being joined together, form a defence against Arab robbers, and the entrance is closed by a gate (Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 212). See GATE.

A further characteristic of a city as a fortified place is found in the use of the word בָּנֵה, *build*, and also *fortify*; so that to "build" a city appears to be sometimes the same thing as to fortify it (comp. Gen. viii, 20, and 2 Chron. xvi, 6, with 2 Chron. xi, 5-10, and 1 Kings xv, 17). See WALL.

The fortifications of the cities of Palestine, thus regularly "fenced," consisted of one or more walls crowned with battlemented parapets, מְצֻרֹת, having towers at regular intervals (2 Chron. xxxii, 5; Jer. xxxi, 38), on which in later times engines of war were placed, and watch was kept by day and night in time of war (2 Chron. xxvi, 9, 15; Judg. ix, 45; 2 Kings ix, 17). Along the oldest of the three walls of Jerusalem there were ninety towers, in the second fourteen, and in the third sixty (Josephus, *War*, v, 4, 2). One such tower, that of Hananeel, is repeatedly mentioned (Jer. xxxi, 38; Zech. xiv, 10), as also others (Neh. iii, 1, 11, 27). The gateways of fortified towns were also fortified and closed with strong doors (Neh. ii, 8; iii, 3, 6, etc.; Judg. xvi, 2, 3; 1 Sam. xxiii, 7; 2 Sam. xviii, 24, 33; 2 Chron. xiv, 7; 1 Macc. xiii, 33; xv, 39). In advance of the wall there appears to have been sometimes an outwork (חֲבֵל, *proteichisma*), in A. Vers. "ditch" (1 Kings xxi, 23; 2 Sam. xx, 15; Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 454), which was perhaps either a palisade or wall lining the ditch, or a wall raised midway within the ditch itself. Both of these methods of strengthening fortified places, by hindering the near approach of machines, were usual in earlier Egyptian fortifications (Wilkinson,


*Anc. Eg.* i, 401), but, would generally be of less use in the hill forts of Palestine than in Egypt. In many towns there was a keep or citadel for a last resource to the defenders. Those remaining in the Hauran and Leja are square. Such existed at Shechem and Thebez (*Judg.* ix, 46, 51; viii, 17; 2 Kings ix, 17), and the great forts or towers of Psephizus, Hippicus, and especially Antonia, served a similar purpose, as well as that of overawing the town at Jerusalem. These forts were well furnished with cisterns (*Acts* xxi, 34; 2 Macc. v, 5; Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 4, 3; *War.* i, 5, 4; v, 4, 2; vi, 2, 1). At the time of the entrance of Israel into Canaan there were many fenced cities existing, which first caused great alarm to the exploring party of searchers (*Numb.* xiii, 28), and afterwards gave much trouble to the people in subduing them. Many of these were refortified, or, as it is expressed, rebuilt by the Hebrews (*Numb.* xxxii, 17, 34-42; *Dent.* iii, 4, 5; *Josh.* xi, 12, 13; *Judg.* i, 27-33), and many, especially those on the sea-coast, remained for a long time in the possession of their inhabitants, who were enabled to preserve them by means of their strength in chariots (*Josh.* xiii, 3, 6; xvii, 16; *Judg.* i, 19; 2 Kings xviii, 8; 2 Chron. xxvi, 6). The strength of Jerusalem was shown by the fact that that city, or at least the citadel, or "stronghold of Zion," remained in the possession of the Jebusites until the time of David (2 Sam. v, 6, 7; 1 Chron. xi, 5). Among the kings of Israel and Judah several are mentioned as fortifiers or "builders" of cities, e. g. Solomon (1 Kings ix, 17-19; 2 Chron. viii, 4-6), Jeroboam I (1 Kings xii, 25), Rehoboam (2 Chron. xi, 5, 12), Baasha (1 Kings xv, 17), Omri (1 Kings xvi, 24), Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxxii, 5), Asa (2 Chron. xiv, 6, 7), Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xvii, 12) but especially Uzziah (2 Kings xiv, 22; 2 Chron. xxvi, 2, 9, 15); and in the reign of Ahab the town of Jericho was rebuilt and fortified by a private individual, Hiel of Bethel (1 Kings xvi, 34). Herod the Great was conspicuous in fortifying strong positions, as Masada, Machaerus, Herodium, besides his great works at Jerusalem (Josephus, *War.* vii, 6, 1, 2; 8, 3; i, 21, 10; *Ant.* xiv, 13, 9). See **FORT**.



The so-called Golden Gate of Jerusalem, showing supposed Remains of the old Jewish Wall.


But the fortified places of Palestine served only in a few instances to check effectually the progress of an invading force, though many instances of determined and protracted resistance are on record, as of Samaria for three years (2 Kings xviii, 10), Jerusalem (2 Kings xxv, 3) for four months, and in later times of Jotapata, Gamala, Machaerus, Masada, and, above all, Jerusalem itself, the strength of whose defences drew forth the admiration of the conqueror Titus (Josephus, *War.* iii, 6; iv, 1 and 9; vii, 6, 2-4 and 8; Robinson, i, 232). See **FORTRESS**.

The earlier Egyptian fortifications consisted usually of a quadrangular and sometimes double wall of sun-dried brick, fifteen feet thick, and often fifty feet in height, with square towers at intervals, of the same



Slab from ancient Thebes, representing a Phalanx of the Kheta (Cananites) drawn up as a *corps de r eserve*, with the fortified town (fig. 1), surrounded by double Ditches, over which are Bridges (figs. 2 and 3).

height as the walls, both crowned with a parapet, and a round-headed battlement in shape like a shield. A second lower wall with towers at the entrance was added, distant thirteen or twenty feet from the main wall, and sometimes another was made of seventy or one hundred feet in length, projecting at right angles from the main wall, to enable the defenders to annoy the assailants in flank. The ditch was sometimes fortified by a sort of tennail in the ditch itself, or a ravelin on its edge. In later times the practice of fortifying towns was laid aside, and the large temples, with their enclosures, were made to serve the purpose of forts (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* i, 408, 409, abridgm.).



Slab from Kouyunjik, representing a double-walled city, with arched gateway and inclined approaches leading to them from the outer walls. Within are warriors and horses; outside the fortifications is a narrow stream or canal, planted on both sides with trees, and flowing into a broad river, on which are large boats, holding several persons, and a raft of skins, bearing a man fishing, and two others seated before a pot or caldron. Along the banks, and apparently washed by the stream, is a wall with equidistant towers and battlements.



The fortifications of Nineveh, Babylon, Ecbatana, and of Tyre and Sidon are all mentioned either in the canonical books or the Apocrypha. In the sculptures of Nineveh representations are found of walled towns, of which one is thought to represent Tyre, and all illustrate the mode of fortification adopted both by the Assyrians and their enemies (Jer. li, 30-32, 58; Amos i, 10; Zech. ix, 3; Ezek. xxvii, 11; Nah. iii, 14; Tobit i, 17; xiv, 14, 15; Judith i, 1, 4; Layard, *Nin.* ii, 275, 279, 388, 395; *Nin.* and *Bab.* p. 231, 358; *Mon. of Nin.* pt. ii, pl. 39, 43).—Smith, s. v. See FORTIFICATION.

**Fencing the Tables**, a special address in the ministrations of the Lord's Supper among the Scotch Presbyterians. It is a lecture from the minister just before the distribution of the elements, pointing out the character of those who have and of those who have not a right to come to the Lord's table. It was formerly called "debarings," because in it the ministry debarred from the sacrament those who were not supposed to be worthy.

**Fénelon**, FRANÇOIS DE SALIGNAC DE LA MOTHE, the most venerated name in the modern history of the Roman Catholic Church, was born Aug. 6, 1651, at the castle of Fénelon, in Perigord. He was a younger son of the marquis of Fénelon. He was carefully trained at home up to twelve years of age, when he was sent to the University of Cahors, and afterwards to the College of Plessis at Paris. His mind was very early turned towards the Church; he preached his first sermon at fifteen. His theological studies were continued at the Seminary of St. Sulpice, then under the charge of the abbé Tronson, from whom he is believed to have imbibed the views of sanctity and of "disinterested love" which were so strongly brought out in his later life. He was ordained in 1675, and for three years was one of the priests of the parish of St. Sulpice. Before his ordination he was strongly inclined to a foreign mission in the Levant or in Canada, but was kept back, it is said, by his uncle. The *Correspondance Littéraire* (July 25, 1863) gives a letter (from the archives of the French Ministry of Marine) in Colbert's handwriting, date of 1675, to Frontenac, governor of Canada, in which Louis XIV says, "I have blamed the action of abbé Fénelon, and have ordered him not to return to Canada. But I ought to say to you that it was difficult to institute a criminal process against him, or to oblige the priests of the Seminary of St. Sulpice, at Montreal, to testify against him; and it was necessary to remit the case to his bishop or the grand vicar to punish him by ecclesiastical penalties, or to arrest him and send him back to France by the first ship." According to this, Fénelon was actually in Canada (*Am. Pres. Review*, July, 1863). About the year 1678 he was appointed superior of the "*Nouvelles Catholiques*," a society formed to educate and proselyte the children of Protestants. In this office he wrote his first work, *De l'éducation des filles*, which has been translated into English. He now became intimate with Bossuet, and under his guidance wrote *Réfutation du Système de Malebranche sur la nature et la grâce*; and also a treatise entitled *Du Ministère des Pasteurs*, in which heretics are attacked, though with moderation. Louis XIV, then about to revoke the edict of Nantes, employed Fénelon on a special mission to the Protestants of Poitou. He accepted the charge on the condition that no means of conversion were to be used but persuasion. In 1689 he was intrusted with the education of the young duke of Burgundy. For his royal pupil he wrote *Télémaque*. After five years' service, he was elevated to the archbishopric of Cambrai in 1694. He had previously become intimate with Madame Guyon (q. v.), and his relations with her, and the complications which grew out of them, embittered more or less his whole after life.

This interesting history deserves to be recounted somewhat in detail. For the special history of Quiet-

ism, see the article under that title. Suffice it here to say, that the particular form of it taught by Madame Guyon began to spread widely, and to alarm the leading clergy of the Church of France. Bossuet was soon vigorously enlisted against her. He conducted the controversy against Madame Guyon with his usual skill. He, together with the bishop of Chartres and abbé Tronson, were appointed commissioners to inquire into the doctrines advanced by Madame Guyon. The conferences between the parties lasted for six months. Bossuet was little conversant at this time with mystical theology, and at his request Fénelon provided him with extracts from the chief of the mystical writers. The commissioners assembled at Issy, a retired country house belonging to the congregation of St. Sulpice. They drew up thirty articles, in which certain alterations were made by Fénelon, by whom four were added. There was no mention in them of Madame Guyon or her doctrines, but they were supposed to express the doctrines of the established Church of France on the principal subjects in dispute. Their conclusion amounts to little more than this, that spiritualism, or an aim at the very highest devotional feeling and communion with God, is not necessary to all, and is liable to abuse. Madame Guyon immediately expressed her acquiescence in the articles of Issy. The whole question seemed now to be set at rest. Fénelon, having been nominated before these transactions to the archbishopric of Cambrai, was duly consecrated, Bossuet, bishop of Meaux, officiating, at his own earnest request. But Quietism continued to gain ground, and, to stop its progress, Bossuet published his *Instruction sur les états de l'oraison*, for which he sought the approbation of the new archbishop; but Fénelon refused on the ground that the book absolutely denied the possibility of a pure disinterested love of God, and that its censures of Madame Guyon were too severe. Thus began the bitter controversy between these two distinguished prelates, which for a long time disturbed the peace of the Church of France. Fénelon published his *Explication des maximes des saints sur la vie intérieure*, but not before it was carefully examined by the cardinal de Noailles and abbé Tronson, two of the committee at Issy, and by M. Piro, a theologian of eminence attached to Bossuet. These pronounced the *Maximes* to be a golden work. But no sooner was it published than an uproar was raised against it. In this controversy Louis XIV and Madame de Maintenon took part against Fénelon. Bossuet had the support of the court, and made vigorous use of all the weapons at his command. Fénelon defended himself with spirit. An appeal was made to Rome. Bossuet artfully brought his influence with Louis to bear upon the court of Rome, and insinuated that Fénelon was, in his own diocese, considered a heretic, and that, as soon as Rome should speak, Cambrai, and all the Low Countries, would rise against him. The pope (Innocent XII) proceeded cautiously, and delayed his decision. In the mean time the friends of Fénelon were persecuted by the court, and he himself was suspended from his office of preceptor to the royal dukes; but never, amidst all the indignities he suffered, did he lose the pious serenity of his mind. "Yet but a little while," he says in one of his letters, "and the deceitful dream of this life will be over. We shall meet in the kingdom of truth, where there is no error, no division, no scandal; we shall breathe the pure love of God; he will communicate to us his everlasting peace. In the mean while let us suffer; let us be trodden under foot; let us not refuse disgrace. Jesus Christ was disgraced for us; may our disgrace tend to his glory." At length the pope appointed a congregation of cardinals, who met twelve times without coming to any resolution; he then appointed a new congregation of cardinals, who met fifty-two times, and extracted from Fénelon's work several propositions, which they re-

ported to the pope as censurable. Meantime Louis XIV was urging the pope to condemn Fénelon, although the pope himself was unwilling to come to a final decision. It was difficult to censure Fénelon without censuring some writers of acknowledged orthodoxy. Holy, too, as Fénelon was, it was considered that to submit to a decision against him was an act of such heroic humility that it could scarcely be expected, and that a schism might be caused equal to that of the Reformation. The pope inclined to issue a brief, stating the doctrine of the Church, and calling upon each party to abstain from future discussions. But even a pope may stand in awe of worldly consequences. Louis XIV, urged on by Bossuet, insisted upon the condemnation of Fénelon, and the pope at last (March 12, 1699) issued a brief, by which twenty-three propositions were extracted from Fénelon's work and condemned, "though the expressions used in the condemnation of them were so gentle, that it is evident that if the pope had feared God as much as he feared the French king, Fénelon would have escaped all censure. By this course, the friends of Fénelon were soothed and his adversaries mortified; and their mortification was increased by an expression of the pope, which was soon in every one's mouth, that Fénelon was in fault for too great love of God; his enemies equally in fault for too little love of their neighbor" (Bausset, *Hist. de Fénelon*, ii, 220).

The controversy had been going on in France during the time occupied by the investigation at Rome. Bossuet published a succession of pamphlets. Several of the bishops who had espoused the side of Bossuet issued pastorals in the same sense. Fénelon defended himself vigorously against them all in several publications, explanatory as well of his principles as of the personal imputations in which some of his adversaries did not scruple to indulge. The last blow against the ancient friendship of the great rivals was struck by Bossuet in his celebrated *Relation sur le Quietisme*. Fénelon was wounded to the heart. The copy of Bossuet's pamphlet which first came into his hands is still preserved in the British Museum, and the margin is literally filled with remarks, annotations, replies, denials, and rejoinders, in the singularly delicate and beautiful handwriting of the indignant archbishop. The copy now in the British Museum is most probably one which, as we learn from his correspondence, he sent to his agent at Rome, and on the margin of which he corrected, for the guidance of his friend, the many false and exaggerated charges of his great antagonist. The substance of these replies he gave to the public in a most masterly defence, written, printed, and published within little more than a fortnight from the appearance of Bossuet's *Relation*" (Chambers, *Encyclopædia*, s. v.).

When the papal brief arrived, Fénelon submitted at once, and ordered all copies of the book that were in circulation to be brought that he might burn them with his own hand. He read the brief from his own pulpit, and addressed a pastoral to the people of his diocese, in which he said, "Our holy father has condemned my book, entitled *Maxims of Saints*, and has condemned in a particular manner twenty-three propositions extracted from it. We adhere to his brief, and condemn the book and the propositions simply, absolutely, and without a shadow of reserve." He even presented to the cathedral a piece of gold plate, on which is a picture engraved representing the angel of truth trampling on several erroneous books, among which is his *Maximes*. This submission appears to us Protestants to have been at once weak and ostentatious, but in the Roman Catholic Church it is one of Fénelon's highest titles to glory. Bossuet's conduct is variously represented: according to one account he was really touched by the conduct of Fénelon, and desired to be completely reconciled to him; according to others, he retained at heart his bitter feeling, and kept

up the same spirit in the mind of the king. About this time Fénelon sent a complete and corrected copy of *Télémaque* to the duke of Burgundy. The copyist, it seems, made a duplicate, and printed it at Paris, without the knowledge of Fénelon. The book was immediately suppressed by order of the king, but was printed again in Holland in 1699, spread throughout Europe, and was translated into almost every tongue. By the courtiers of Louis XIV *Télémaque* was regarded as a satire upon that monarch and his satellites, Sesostris being supposed to represent the king; Calypso, Madame de Montespan; Protesilaus, Louvois; and Eucharis, Mademoiselle de Fontanges. This scandal shut Fénelon out of the court of Louis XIV for the rest of his life. He was ordered to remain within his diocese, and was forbidden all intercourse with his pupil, the duke of Burgundy. But the displeasure of the court did not diminish the reputation of Fénelon either in France or in Europe generally. He devoted the remainder of his life to diligent care of his diocese, and to literary labors. He founded a seminary at Cambrai, to which he gave his personal attention. During the War of the Succession his diocese was often the scene of military operations, and he did his best to assuage the horrors of war. He brought together into his palace the wretched inhabitants of the country whom the war had driven from their homes, and took care of them, and fed them at his own table. Seeing one day that one of these peasants ate nothing, he asked him the reason of his abstinence. "Alas! my lord," said the poor man, "in making my escape from my cottage I had not time to bring off my cow, which was the support of my family. The enemy will drive her away, and I shall never find another so good." Fénelon, availing himself of his privilege of safe-conduct, immediately set out, accompanied by a single servant, and drove the cow back himself to the peasant. "This," said cardinal Maury, "is perhaps the finest act of Fénelon's life." He adds, "Alas! for the man who reads it without being affected." Another anecdote, showing his tenderness to the poor, is thus related of him. A literary man, whose library was destroyed by fire, has been deservedly admired for saying, "I should have profited but little by my books if they had not taught me how to bear the loss of them." The remark of Fénelon, who lost his in a similar way, is still more simple and touching: "I would much rather they were burned than the cottage of a poor peasant." In 1709, the duke of Marlborough, by express commands, exempted his lands from pillage, while that general himself and his allies showed the aged prelate every mark of courtesy.

In the Jansenist disputes Fénelon wrote against Jansenius, and expressed himself very strongly, though at first charitably, against Quesnel and Pascal. See JANSENISM; PORT ROYAL. He wrote a *Mémoire* demanding a judgment from the pope to settle the controversy by a dogmatic decision, to which all must submit. This *Mémoire* was laid before the pope (Clement XI), and his bull *Inœnam Dœmni* shows evident traces of its influence. He also wrote a treatise, *De Summi Pontificis Auctoritate* (in his *Œuvres*, Versailles, 1820, tom. ii), in which he yielded more to the papal claims than became him as a Gallican bishop. Denying the direct temporal power of the pope, he admits a *potestas directoria*, equivalent to what is called the indirect temporal power. See POPE, TEMPORAL POWER OF.

In his personal habits Fénelon was temperate almost to abstemiousness, took no repose except a few hours daily in the exercises of walking or riding, while the rest of his time was devoted to social intercourse with his friends, to visiting the poor, and other pastoral functions. The most of his revenues were devoted to benevolent uses. He died at Cambrai Jan. 7, 1715.

We cite a passage from Dr. Channing on the character and writings of Fénelon: "His works have the

great charm of coming fresh from the soul. He wrote from experience, and hence, though he often speaks a language which must seem almost a foreign one to men of the world, yet he always speaks in a tone of reality. That he has excesses we mean not to deny, but they are of a kind which we regard with more than indulgence, almost with admiration. Common fanaticism we cannot away with, for it is essentially vulgar, the working of animal passions, sometimes of sexual love, and oftener of earthly ambition. But when a pure mind errs by aspiring after disinterestedness and purity not granted to our present infant state, we almost reverence its errors; and still more, we recognise in them an essential truth. They only anticipate and claim too speedily the good for which man was made. They are the misapprehensions of the inspired prophet, who hopes to see in his own day what he was appointed to promise to remoter ages. Fénelon saw far into the human heart, and especially into the lurkings of self-love. He looked with a piercing eye through the disguises of sin. But he knew sin, not, as most men do, by bitter experience of its power, so much as by his knowledge and experience of virtue. Deformity was revealed to him by his refined perceptions and intense love of moral beauty. The light, which he carried with him into the dark corners of the human heart, and by which he laid open its most hidden guilt, was that of celestial goodness. Hence, though the severest of censors, he is the most pitying. Not a tone of asperity escapes him. He looks on human error with an angel's tenderness, with tears which an angel might shed, and thus reconciles and binds us to our race at the very moment of revealing its corruptions" (*Christian Examiner*, vi, 7).

*Literature.*—The writings of Fénelon are too numerous to be mentioned in detail. They are classified as follows in the Versailles edition of his works (1820, 22 vols. 8vo): *Metaphysical and Theological Writings*, vols. i-iii; *The Quietistic Controversy, and Discussions thereon with Bossuet*, vols. iv-ix; writings on *Jansenism*, vols. x-xvi; *Education of Girls, Sermons, Religious Meditations*, vols. xvii, xviii; *Fables, Dialogues, smaller writings*, vol. xix; *Télémaque*, vol. xx; *Diálogos on Eloquence, Correspondence, Lives of Ancient Philosophers*, vols. xxi, xxii. There are many collective editions of the writings of Fénelon, of which the most complete is that of Lebel, commenced at Versailles 1820-24, in 22 vols. 8vo., with 11 vols. additional of *Correspondance* (Paris, 1827-29), and 1 vol. of *Tables et Index* (Paris, 1830), making 34 vols. in all. The next best (in some respects the best) is that of the abbé Gosselin (Paris and Besançon, 1851-52, 10 vols. imp. 8vo), with a copious literary history of Fénelon. Of editions of his *select* works, the best are that of Périsset (Paris, 1842, 4 vols. large 8vo); that of Dufour, the first volume of which is a *Vie de Fénelon* (Paris, 1826, 12 vols. 8vo); and that of Lefevre, with *Vie* by Aimé Martin (Paris, 1835; and by Didot, 1838, 3 vols. large 8vo). Of his separate writings the editions are too numerous to be mentioned here. Many of his writings have been translated into English; among them are, *On the Education of Daughters* (Lond. 1703; Albany, 1806); *Dialogues on Eloquence* (Lond. 1808; Boston, 1832); *Demonstration of the Existence of God* (Lond. 1749, 12mo); *Spiritual Works*, translated by Houghton, with *Life* (Dublin, 1771, 2 vols. 8vo); *Télémaque* (many editions; best by Hawkesworth, Lond. 2 vols. 12mo, 1808); *Lives of the Anc. Philosophers*, with *Life of Fénelon*, by Cormach (N. Y. 1841, 12mo); *Selections from the Writings of Fénelon, with a Memoir of his Life* by Mrs. Follen (Boston, 1829; new ed. 1859, 12mo). Of *Lives* of Fénelon, besides those already cited in connection with editions of his works, we name Ramsay, *Vie de Fénelon* (Paris, 1725, 12mo); Querbeuf, *Vie de F.* (Paris, 1787); Bausset, *Hist. de Fénelon* (Par. 1817, 31 ed., 4 vols. 8vo); Mudford, *Life of F.* (transl. from Bausset, Lond. 1810, 2 vols. 8vo); Butler, *Life of Fénelon*

(abridged from Bausset, Lond. 1810, 8vo); Tabaranl, *Suppl. aux histoires de Bossuet et de Fénelon* (Paris, 1822, 8vo). See also Mackintosh, *Ethical Philosophy* (Philadelphia, 1832, 8vo), p. 96 sq.; *Quarterly Review* (Lond.), x, 409; *Princeton Review*, April, 1853, art. i; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xvii, 319 sq.; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* v, 78 sq.; Matter, *Le Mysticisme en France au Temps de Fénelon* (Par. 1864); Sainte Beuve, *Nouv. Luidis* (Par. 1864), ii, 113 sq.; *Revue Chrétienne*, 1863, 513 sq.; *Methodist Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1866; *Zeitschrift f. d. hist. Theologie*, 1869, 239.

**Fenestella**, the niche at the side of an altar, containing the piscina (q. v.) or water-drain, into which was poured the water in which the priest washed his hands, and that with which the chalice was rinsed at the celebration of the mass. There is frequently a shelf above the water-drain, on which could be placed certain vessels which were required at the altar. A second niche, at the side of the fenestella, sometimes held the credence-table. In England the fenestella is almost universally at the south side of the altar. (G. F. C.)

**Fenner**, WILLIAM, B.D., an English Puritan, was born in 1600, and was educated at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge. He was appointed rector of Rochford, Essex, in 1629, and died about 1640. He was a very popular preacher, and his works, which have become very scarce, are written in a plain, earnest, and impressive style. The principal are, *A Treatise of the Affections; or the Soul's Pulse* (Lond. 1641, 8vo);—*The Sacrifice of the Faithful; or the Nature, Property, and Efficacy of zealous Prayer* (Lond. 1648, sm. 8vo);—*The spiritual Man's Directory, guiding to true Blessedness in his three main Duties* (Lond. 1649, sm. 8vo), collected, with other writings, in his *Works* (Lond. 1658, 1 vol. in 2, fol.).—Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, s. v.

**Fereter** usually indicates the portable shrine in which the relics of saints are carried about in procession; it is also applied to the fixed shrines or tombs in which the bodies or relics of saints are deposited. (G. F. C.)

**Feretry**, the inclosure or chapel of a church in which the fereter is placed. (G. F. C.)

**Ferguson**, Adam, a Scotch philosopher, was born in 1724 at Logierait, Perthshire. He studied at St. Andrew's and at Edinburgh with a view to the Christian ministry. On being ordained, he was appointed chaplain to the 42d regiment, in which he remained till 1757, when he retired, and was appointed keeper of the advocates' library of Edinburgh. In 1759 he was made professor of natural philosophy in the college of that city, and in 1764 he was appointed to the chair of moral philosophy, a branch of science to which he had more particularly applied himself. In 1767 he published *Essay on the History of Civil Society*; in 1776, *Remarks on a Pamphlet of Dr. Price, entitled Observations on the Nature of Civil Liberty*. "In 1778 he was appointed secretary to the commissioners who were sent to America in order to try to effect a reconciliation with the mother country, an office in which Ferguson took a clearer view of the state of the question, and of the temper of the American people, than was common at that time with Englishmen. On his return in 1779 he resumed the duties of his professorship, and in 1783 he published *History of the Progress and the Termination of the Roman Republic* (3 vols. 4to)." In 1784 he resigned his professorship. "In 1792 he published *Principles of Moral and Political Science*, being chiefly a retrospect of lectures on ethics and politics, delivered in the College of Edinburgh (2 vols. 4to). Another work of Dr. Ferguson on the same subject, though a more elementary one, the *Institutes of Moral Philosophy*, which he first published in 1769, has been translated into the French and German languages, and often reprinted." He died at St. An-

drew's, February 22, 1816.—Chambers, *Encyclopædia*, s. v.

**Ferguson, James**, minister of Kilwinning, Scotland, a preacher and commentator of some eminence. Little is known of his life; he died about 1670. He published *Brief Exposition of Philipians and Colossians* (1656);—*Brief Exposition of Galatians and Ephesians* (1659); and after his death appeared his *Brief Exposition of 1 and 2 Thessalonians* (1674). Orme (*Biblioth. Biblica*) says that these "expositions are uncommonly sensible." They have been republished in one volume (London, 1841, large 8vo).

**Ferguson, Samuel D.**, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in the city of New York in 1798, but removed with his parents at an early age to Delaware County, where he was converted at fourteen. He entered the New York Conference in 1819, and died in New York, December 30, 1855. He was a highly influential and useful minister, and an able presiding elder. He was three times a delegate to the General Conference, in 1832, 1836, and 1844. He served some time as agent for the Troy Conference Seminary, and spent four years with eminent success as superintendent of the Leake and Watts Orphan House, New York.—*Minutes of Conferences*, vi, 64.

**Ferloni, Severus Antonius**, a Roman ecclesiastic, born in the States of the Church in 1740. He employed himself for thirty years on a *History of the Variations in the Discipline of the Church*, which was to form 30 vols., and was on the point of completion when the French army entered Rome in 1798. His papers were destroyed and his labor lost. Ferloni was soon after engaged on the side of Napoleon, wrote homilies in his favor, and was made theologian to the privy council of the viceroy at Milan. Among other things he wrote a treatise *De Auctoritate Ecclesie*, maintaining French views, but the censors would not allow it to appear. He died at Milan, 1813.—Migne, *Biographie Chrét.* s. v.

**Ferne** (or *Fairholme*), **Charles**, a Scotch divine, was born in Edinburgh, and was educated at the university there, where he became M.A. in 1587. In 1593 he was made one of the regents of the university. He afterwards became minister at Fraserburgh, and (1600) principal of the college there; he died at Fraserburgh in 1617. He wrote a *Logical Analysis of the Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, which was published under the care of Dr. Adamson in 1671, and has been republished by the Wodrow Society (Edinburgh, 1850, 8vo). In the preface to this edition, Dr. W. L. Alexander gives the work high praise, even saying, "So sagacious, exact, and perspicuous a commentary on the Romans I had not before had the good fortune to peruse."

**Ferment.** See LEAVEN; WINE.

**Fermentarians** (*Fermentarii*), a name given to the Greek Church by the Latins, because the former use *leavened bread* in the Eucharist; the Greeks calling the Latins *Azymites* (q. v.). The word *fermentum* was used, even in the Latin Church, at an early period, to designate the Eucharist, showing that then fermented bread was used.—Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. xv, ch. ii, § 5.

**Fernand** (**Phernandus**, **Ferdinand**, or **Ferrand**), a Belgian monk and reformer, was born at Bruges in 1450. He either lost his sight in childhood or was born blind, which, however, did not prevent him from studying philosophy, theology, rhetoric, poetry, and music. He pursued these studies in Paris, and was appointed by Charles VIII to the chair of belles-lettres in the University of Paris. It is possible that he may also have occupied the chair of theology. In 1490 he entered the order of the Benedictines, and soon after, by special dispensation from the pope, he was allowed, in spite of his blindness, to take deacon's orders, and began to preach. He died in 1496. His blindness did not prevent him from writing many

books, among which are *Epistolæ Caroli Phernandi, Brugensis* (Paris, no date, 4to);—*De Animi Tranquillitate libri duo* (Paris, 1512);—*Speculum monasticæ discipline Patris Benedicti Magni*, etc. (Par. 1515, fol.);—*Elegiæ de Contemptu Mundi*; *Odarum in laudem Christi Libri* (Paris, 1815).—Hoefler, *Novæ Biog. Génér.* rate, xvii, 455.

**Ferne, Henry, D.D.**, bishop of Chester, was born at York in 1602, and was educated at St. Mary's Hall, Oxford, and at Trinity College, Cambridge, of which he became a fellow. He was made chaplain to the bishop of Durham, and was successively presented to the livings of Masham, of Medburn, and to the archdeaconry of Leicester. He took his doctor's degree in 1642, and espoused the cause of Charles I, who made him his chaplain. On the Restoration Charles II gave him the mastership of Trinity College, and he was twice chosen vice-chancellor. He was made bishop of Chester in 1660, died in 1661, and was buried in Westminster Abbey. He published four tracts against the rebellion, 1642-43; two sermons, 1644-49; and five treatises in defense of the Church of England against Romanism and Presbyterianism, 1647-60. He is said to have aided Walton in the Polyglot Bible.—Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, v, 89.

**Ferrand, Louis**, a French Orientalist. He was born at Toulon October 3, 1645, and was educated in his native city and at Lyons, where he studied Hebrew and other Oriental languages. At twenty he went to Paris, and soon after to Mayence, to undertake a translation of the Hebrew Bible. This project not succeeding, he returned to France, studied law, and was received as advocate in the Parliament of Paris. He, however, occupied himself much less with his new profession than with controversial writings, and works on the history of the East. He died Mar. 11, 1699. His works are, *Conspectus seu Synopsis libri hebraici qui inscribitur: Annales Regum Franciæ et regum domus Othomanicæ* (Paris, 1670, 8vo);—*Réflexions sur la Religion Chrétienne, contenant les prophéties de Jacob et de David sur la venue du Messie*, etc. (Paris, 1679, 2 vols. 12mo);—*Liber Psalmorum, cum argumentis, paraphrasi et annotationibus* (Paris, 1683, 4to);—*Traité de l'Église, contre les hérétiques et principalement contre les calvinistes* (Paris, 1685, 12mo);—*Réponse à l'Apologie pour la Réformation, pour les réformateurs et pour les réformés* (Paris, 1685, 12mo);—*Psaumes de David en latin et en français selon la Vulgate* (Paris, 1686, 12mo);—*Lettre à M<sup>r</sup>. l'évêque de Beauvais sur le Monachisme de saint Augustin* (Journal des Savants);—*Discours où l'on fait voir que saint Augustin a été moine* (Paris, 1689, 12mo);—*Summa Biblica seu dissertationes prolegomenicæ de Sacra Scriptura* (Paris, 1689, 12mo).—Hoefler, *Novæ Biog. Générale*, xvii, 488.

**Ferrandus Fulgentius.** See FULGENTIUS FERRANDUS.

**Ferrar, Nicholas**, a clergyman of the Church of England, eminent for piety, was born in London in 1592, and was carefully trained at home both in religion and letters. At fourteen he entered the University of Cambridge, and was eminently distinguished there by his abilities and learning, so that his tutor used to say of him, "May God keep him in a right mind! for if he should turn schismatic or heretic, he would make work for all the world." In 1612 he went abroad, studied at Leipsic and Padua, and, after visiting Rome, returned to England in 1618, and soon after became actively engaged in the affairs of a great company for colonizing Virginia, in America, of which he was chosen deputy governor. In 1624 he was elected to Parliament, where he was highly distinguished for eloquence and ability, but soon decided to quit public life and devote himself to a religious life. In the Church of Rome he would have been a monk, and he came as near to it as possible for a Protestant. He purchased in 1612 the manor of Little Gidding, in

Huntingdonshire, and organized in the mansion a religious community of some forty persons, male and female, including his mother. In 1626 he was ordained deacon by Laud (then bishop of St. David's). He now "signed a vow, that since God had heard his most humble petitions, and delivered him out of many dangers, and in many desperate calamities had extended his mercy to him, he would therefore now give himself up continually to serve God to the utmost of his power in the office of a deacon, into which office he had that morning been regularly ordained; that he had long ago seen enough of the manners and of the vanities of the world, and that he did hold them all in so low esteem that he was resolved to spend the remainder of his life in mortifications, in devotion and charity, and in a constant preparation for death." Benefices of great value were offered him, but he refused, saying that his fixed determination was to rise no higher in the Church than the place and office which he now possessed, and which he had undertaken only with the view to be legally authorized to give spiritual assistance, according to his abilities, to his family and others with whom he might be concerned; and that, as to temporal affairs, he had now parted with all his worldly estate, and divided it among his family. Ferrar allotted one room in his house as an oratory for the devotions of the whole family, besides two separate oratories for the men and women at night. His own lodgings were so contrived that he could conveniently see that everything was conducted with decency and order. He established a school close to the house, and provided masters for the free instruction of the children. He was diligent in catechizing the children of the neighborhood; and every Sunday, after service, these children, more than one hundred in number, were hospitably entertained. After evening service, all went into the oratory, when select portions of the Psalms were repeated. After this they were at liberty till eight o'clock, when the bell again summoned them to the oratory, where they sang a hymn to the organ and went to prayers, and then all retired. On the first Sunday in every month they received the communion. On week-days they rose at four, at five went to prayers, at six said the Psalms of the hour; then they sang a hymn, repeated some passages of Scripture, and at half past six went to church. "At seven they said the Psalms of the hour, sang a hymn, and went to breakfast. At ten they went to church to litany; at eleven to dinner, during which Scripture and pious books were read aloud. They went to evening prayers in the church at four, after which came supper and recreations till eight, at which time they prayed in their oratory. During the night there was a continual vigil or watching, in which several of the men and women, in their respective oratories, repeated the whole Psalter, together with prayers for the life of the king and his sons, from nine at night till one in the morning. The time of this watch being ended, they awoke Nicholas Ferrar, who constantly rose at one o'clock, and betook himself to religious meditation, according to these words, 'At midnight will I rise and give thanks.' Ferrar himself lay upon a skin stretched on the floor, arrayed in a loose frieze gown, and he watched in the oratory or the church three nights in the week. King Charles I held Nicholas Ferrar in great reverence, and came more than once to visit this religious society; and, having perused the Harmony of the Gospels which they had compiled, he was so much pleased with it that he requested them to prepare a copy for his own peculiar use." He died in 1637. Ferrar translated and published (though without his own name) the *CX Considerations* of Valdes (1638). — Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, v, 108; Peckard, *Life of Ferrar*, in Wordsworth, *Eccles. Biography*, iv, 111; Palmer, *Church History*, 184 sq. See VALDES, JUAN.

**Ferrar, Robert**, bishop of St. David's, a martyr

of the reign of queen Mary, was born at Halifax, Yorkshire, and was educated at Oxford, where he became B.D. and a regular canon of the order of St. Augustine. The duke of Somerset, lord protector in the reign of Edward VI, was his patron, and employed him in carrying on the Reformation. He was one of the committee nominated to compile the English liturgy. The zeal of Ferrar, who was consecrated bishop in 1547 (under Edward VI), soon procured him many enemies among the Papists, and after the fall of his eminent patron he was, under a false charge, committed to prison some time before the death of the king. On the accession of Mary he was tried on the new charge of *heresy* as a Protestant, degraded from his ecclesiastical functions, and, in company with Hooper, Bradford, Rogers, Saunders, and others, delivered over to the secular power for punishment. A little before this good bishop suffered, a young gentleman who visited him lamented the severity of the kind of death he was about to undergo. Ferrar replied, "If you see me once to stir while I suffer the pains of burning, then give no credit to those doctrines for which I die." By the grace of God he was enabled to make good this assertion, for he never moved until he was struck down in the flames by a blow on his head. He was burned at Caermarthen, in Wales, March 30, 1555.—Middleton, *Evangelical Biography*, i, 346; Burnet, *Hist. of Reformation* (4 vols.), ii, 347 sq.; Fox, *Book of Martyrs*; Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, v, 96.

**Ferrara, Council of** (*Concilium Ferrariense*), falsely styled œcumenical. Eugene VI having published a bull Sept. 18, 1437, for the transfer of the Council of Basle (q. v.) to Ferrara, a few bishops and abbots assembled Jan. 8, 1438, viz. cardinal Julian, who presided, five archbishops, eighteen bishops, ten abbots, and some generals of the monastic orders; of these bishops only four had left the Council of Basle, which continued its sitting, justly regarding the pope's bull as illegal, and passing sentence of suspension on him Jan. 24, 1438. Charles VII, indeed, forbade any of his subjects to attend at Ferrara. On Jan. 10 the first sitting was held, in which the translation of the council from Basle was pronounced to be canonical, and therefore the œcumenical Council of Ferrara lawfully assembled. Pope Eugene presided in the second session, March 15, at the head of seventy-two bishops, and promulgated a decree against the fathers at Basle. The Greek emperor, John Manuel Paleologus, and the patriarch of Constantinople, Joseph II, arrived Feb. 9 at Venice, and were received with great pomp, together with Mark, archbishop of Ephesus; twenty-one other prelates (among whom was Isidore, a Russian bishop, and Bessarion of Nicaea), and other ecclesiastics, amounting in all to seven hundred persons. Before holding the first session with the Greeks, a scheme was drawn up of the different questions to be debated: 1. The procession of the Holy Spirit; 2. the addition "*filioque*" to the creed; 3. purgatory, and the intermediate state; 4. the use of unleavened bread in the holy Eucharist; 5. the authority of the Roman see and the primacy of the pope. These questions were debated in thirteen sessions, up to the sixteenth, Jan. 10, 1439, when it was proposed to transfer the council from Ferrara to Florence, and, this being agreed to, publication was made of the change.—Labbe, *Concil.* xiii, 1-222, 825-1061; Landon, *Manual of Councils*, p. 242; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. xv, pt. ii, ch. ii, § 13; Mansi, t. xxix, xxxi; Ffoulkes, *Christendom's Divisions*, Lond. 1867, pt. ii, ch. vii. See FLORENCE, COUNCIL OF.

**Ferrara (RENATA), Duchesse de**, celebrated for her virtues and for her attachment to the Reformation, the daughter of Louis XII and Anne of Bretagne, was born at Blois Oct. 25, 1510. In 1527 she was married to Hercule d'Este, duke of Ferrara and Modena. She is said to have been very learned, excelling in mathe-

matics, especially in astronomy. Her husband died in 1559, and the next year she left Italy on account of her religion, and returned to France, where she was permitted to profess the Protestant faith. She resided at Montargis, and there gave protection to as many as were persecuted till she was forced to desist. During the civil war in France she fed and maintained in her castle a great number of Protestants who had fled to her for refuge. She interceded strongly for the prince of Condé when he was imprisoned at Orleans in the time of the young king Francis, but was afterwards displeased with him, because neither she nor her ministers approved of the Protestants taking up arms. She died at Montargis June 12, 1575, in full profession of the Reformed faith, though the Jesuit Le Laboureux seeks to show that she abjured her religion.—Bayle, *Dictionary*, ed. Des Maizeaux (Lond. 1736), iii, 30.

**Ferrari, FRANCESCO BERNARDINO**, an Italian archæologist, was born at Milan in 1576. Entering the Congregation of St. Ambrose, he studied philosophy and divinity, as well as the Latin and Greek languages, and was admitted doctor. Borromeo, archbishop of Milan, appointed him to travel into various parts of Europe to purchase the best books and MSS. to form a library at Milan. Ferrari passed over part of Italy and Spain, and collected a great number of books, which laid the foundation of the famous Ambrosian Library. About 1638 he was appointed director of the College of the Nobles, lately erected at Padua, which office he discharged two years, and then, on account of indisposition, returned to Milan. He died at Milan Feb. 3, 1663. Among his writings are, *De Antiquo Eccles. Epistolarum Genere libri tres* (Milan, 1613);—*De Ritu Sacrarum Ecclesie Catholice concionum libri tres* (Milan, 1620; Utrecht, 1692, cum præfatione Joannis Georgii Grævii);—*De Veterum acclamationibus et plursu libri septem* (Milan, 1627; also in vol. vi of Grævius's *Thesaur. Antiq. Rom.*). His writings are full of learning; he is very judicious in his conjectures, and exact in his quotations.—Du Pin, *Bibl. des Auteurs Ecclés.* xvii, 109 (Amst. 1711).

**Ferraris, LUCIUS**, an Italian divine, author of a large encyclopedic work, entitled *Promta bibliotheca canonica, juridica, moralis, theologica, necnon ascetica, polemica, rubricata, historica* (edit. noviss. Venetæ, 1782, 10 vols. 4to). A new edition, revised and enlarged, was published by Migne (Paris, 1866, 8 vols. royal 8vo).


**Ferrer, Bonifácio**, brother of St. Vincent Ferrer, and prior of the Carthusian monastery of Portaceli, in Valencia. He translated the whole Scriptures into the Valencian or Catalanian dialect. This translation, which was printed at Valencia in 1478, although it was the work of a Roman Catholic author, and had undergone the examination and correction of the inquisitor James Borrell, had scarcely made its appearance when it was suppressed by the Inquisition, and consigned to the flames. He died in the year 1417.—McCrie, *Reformation in Spain*, ch. v.

**Ferrer, Rafaél**, a Spanish missionary, was born at Valencia. Having entered the order of the Jesuits, he devoted himself to the preaching of the Gospel in the deserts bordering on the Amazon River. It was, in particular, the ferocious and numerous nation of the Cofanes, which had never yet seen a missionary, and which, divided into twenty tribes, occupied a territory about sixty miles from Quito, to which he devoted his labors. The Cofanes had never been subjected to Spanish rule, and had recently destroyed the town of Ecija and a number of villages. In 1603, after fourteen months of labor, Ferrer succeeded in organizing the mission of *San Paulo y San Pedro de los Cofanes*. In 1604 two other villages swelled the number of the converted population to 6500. In 1605 Ferrer followed the course of the Aguatico, penetrated into the

Napo, and altogether, in the course of two years and a half, travelled more than 1000 miles, and acquired a better acquaintance with the savage nations in the vicinity of the Amazon than any man of that time. In 1608 he returned to the Cofanes. He then prepared a Grammar of the language of the Cofanes, and translated for them the Catechism. He next undertook a journey to Quito, to induce the authorities to establish new missions. His petition having been granted, he again returned to the Cofanes, when his earnest sermons against polygamy cost him his life in 1611, one of the chiefs whom he had compelled to give up his concubines precipitating him from a steep rock.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xvii, 535. (A. J. S.)

**Ferrer or Ferrier, Vincentius** (St.), a Dominican monk, was born in Valencia Jan. 23, 1357. He entered the order in 1374, and in 1380 he went to the University of Barcelona, where he spent two years. In 1384 he was made doctor at Lerida. In 1395 he was called to Avignon by pope Benedict XIII as master of the palace, and here he conceived the idea of devoting his life to the healing of the schism in the papacy which then threatened the destruction of the Roman Church. He carried out this idea by declaring for Martin V, and by striving for a reunion in many writings, and by vast labors and travels in Spain, France, Italy, and the British Islands. He died at Vannes, in Brittany, April 5, 1419, and was canonized by pope Calixtus in 1455. His writings are said to be poor in thought and language.—Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. xv, pt. ii, ch. ii, n. 75; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, April 5.

**Ferret**, evidently a conjectural rendering for *anakh' (אֲנַחַךְ, a sighing; Sept. μυγάλη, Vulg. mygale)*, one of the unclean creeping things mentioned in Lev. xi, 30. The Rabbinical writers seem to have identified this animal with the hedgehog (see Lewysohn, *Zool. des Talmuds*, § 129, 134). The Sept. and Vulg. refer to an animal which, according to Aristotle (*Hist. Anim.* viii, 24), is the *Mus araneus*, or shrew-mouse; but the associated names render it more probable that the animal referred to in Leviticus was a reptile of the lizard tribe (so Bochart and Gesenius), deriving its name from the mournful cry, or wail, which some lizards utter, especially those of the Gecko family. The *Lacerta gecko* (otherwise called "fan-foot" lizard; *Gecko ululatus*, the *Ptyodactylus* of Hasselquist) is perhaps the animal intended. "The geckos are small



The Gecko.

lizards, usually somewhat clumsy in form, stealthy and cat-like in their actions, secreting themselves in holes and crevices by day, and at night coming forth to prey upon nocturnal insects. The form of the eye indicates their season of activity, for the pupil, which is capable of great expansion and contraction, closes to a vertical line. The animals crawl with ease and confidence on perpendicular walls, and even on the under sides of ceilings, beams, and the like, provided these have a somewhat roughened surface. This curious power, the rapidity with which they disappear in some crevice when alarmed, and their sombre and lu-

rid hues, their association with night, their loud and harsh croak, their slow and stealthy pace, and especially a certain sinister expression of countenance, produced by the large globular eye, unprotected by an eyelid and divided by its linear pupil, have combined to give to these reptiles in all countries a popular reputation for malignity and venom, and they are generally much dreaded. This reputation, however, appears to be wholly groundless; and the story told by Hasselquist of a man who would lay hold of the reptile, and whose hand instantly became covered with red pustules, inflamed and itching, must be received with suspicion. Still more incredible is another account by the same naturalist, to the effect that he saw at Cairo two women and a girl at the point of death from having eaten some cheese over which a gecko had crawled! The most interesting point in the economy of these curious lizards is the structure of their feet, by which they are enabled to defy the laws of gravity. The feet are nearly equal, short, stout, and terminated by five toes, differing little in length, which radiate as if from a centre, so as to form two thirds of a circle. The under surface of the toes is, in most of the genera, much widened, and furnished with small plates or laminae, overlapping each other in a regular manner, which varies in different genera and species. The toes are frequently united by a membrane at their base. The claws are pointed, hooked, and kept constantly sharp, by an apparatus by which they are capable of retraction, like those of the cat. It is by means of the singular lamellated structure of the under surface of the toes that these reptiles, or at least many of them, are enabled to cling to vertical or even inverted surfaces, as house-flies do. The mode in which this is effected we do not thoroughly understand; but we may conjecture that it is by the raising of these imbricated plates by muscular action, so as to form a vacuum beneath the sole, when the pressure of the external air causes the toe to adhere firmly to the surface. The similarity of the structure to that of the coronal sucker in the remora suggests this explanation. A familiar illustration of the principle is seen in the leathern suckers which children make, which adhere so firmly that large stones are lifted by them" (Fairbairn, s. v.). See LIZARD.



Under Surface of the Feet of the Gecko.

**Ferrier, JEREMY**, a French Protestant minister, was born about 1560, became professor of theology at Nîmes, and is remarkable for having become a Papist, even after having maintained in a public disputation in 1602 that "pope Clement the VIIIth was properly the Antichrist." The Parliament of Toulouse having ordered his arrest, it became necessary for Henry IV to intervene to save him from the results of his temerity. In gratitude for this, Ferrier favored the restrictive measures adopted by the court against the Protestants. For this he was suspected by his Protestant friends, and was forbidden to preach by the Synod of Privas in 1612. He did not, however, change his religion till a popular tumult arose against him, in which his house was plundered, and himself so near being murdered, that, for the sake of escaping, he was obliged to lie three days concealed in a tomb. He then became a Roman Catholic, and removed to Paris, where he was subsequently made counsellor of state by Louis

XIII. He died Sept. 26, 1626. He wrote a treatise, *De l'Antichrist et de ses marques, contre les ennemis de l'Eglise catholique* (Paris, 1615).—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xvii, 550; Bayle, *Dictionary* (London, 1736), iii, 39.

**Ferry, Paul**, a French Protestant divine, was born at Metz Feb. 24, 1591, and was educated at the Seminary of Montauban. He became pastor at Metz in 1612, and held that position during sixty years. He was one of the most eloquent men in the province, and by his powers of mind, his activity, and his prudence, he gained the esteem of the most influential men of his time, and early obtained great influence over Roman Catholics as well as Protestants. Being troubled by the divisions which existed among the Protestants, and hoping to do something towards removing them, he held a correspondence on the subject with Duraeus [see DURY], the great "pacifiator." Dury even came to Metz in 1662 to discuss the subject. Nothing substantial came of it; but Ferry carried his love of conciliation so far that he even regarded as possible the reunion of Protestants and Romanists; at all events, it is certain that he had on this subject a long correspondence with Bossuet. It occurred in this way. Ferry had published in 1654 a *Catéchisme général de la Réformation*, in which he showed that the Reformation was a necessary reaction against the corruption of the Church. Bossuet, at that time canon and archdeacon of Metz, wrote a refutation of this little work. The discussion led to a mutual esteem between the disputants; and when, in 1667, the project of the reunion of Protestants and Roman Catholics was considered by the government, Ferry was consulted, and entered into correspondence with Bossuet on the subject. This correspondence is printed in vol. xxiv of the *Œuvres de Bossuet* (edition of Versailles). It has been proved almost beyond doubt that Ferry was one of the ministers gained over by the cardinal Richelieu to agitate in favor of the reunion of the two religions, and that he received a pension of five hundred crowns for so doing. The receipt of Ferry for this sum is said to be shown in the Imperial Library of Paris. Ferry died at Metz July 28, 1669. He left a large number of writings, most of which remain in MS. Those which are published are, besides a volume of poetry, *Scholastici orthodoxi Specimen, hoc est Salutis nostrae methodus analytica, ex ip[s]is Scholasticorum veterum & recentiorum intimis juxta normam Scripturarum adornata et instructa* (Geneva, 1616, 8vo; 2d ed. Leyden, 1630, 8vo):—*Le dernier Désespoir de la Tradition contre l'écriture* (Sedan, 1618, 8vo):—*Réfutation des Calomnies semées nouvellement contre certain endroit d'un livre publié il y a plusieurs années et intitulé: Le dernier Désespoir*, etc. (Sedan, 1624, 8vo):—*Remarques d'historie sur le "Discours de la vie et de la mort de St. Serier," mépris par le Sieur de Ramberville* (1624, 8vo):—*Vindicie pro Scholasticis orthodoxis adversus Leon. Perinium, Jesuit., in quibus agitur de predestinatione et annexis, de gratia et libero arbitrio, de causis peccati et justificatione* (Leyden, 1630, 8vo):—*Quatre Sermons prononcés en divers lieux et sur différents sujets* (La Ferté-au-Col, 1646, 12mo):—*Lettre aux ministres de Genève*, vol. ii of the *Bibliothèque Anglaise*.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xvii, 563; Bayle, *Dictionary* (Lond. 1736), iii, 33; Haag, *La France Protestante*; Floquet, *Études sur la vie de Bossuet* (Par. 1855, 3 vols. 8vo), vol. i; *London Rev.* July, 1856, p. 409 sq.

**Ferri, Paul**. See FERRY.


**Ferry-boat** (פֶּרִי־בֵּרֶה, *abarab'*, passage; Sept. διάβασις), a vessel for crossing a stream (2 Sam. xix, 18). The Syriac and Vulg. refer this word to the men mentioned in the above text, and accordingly Boothroyd renders the passage, "And these went over Jordan before the king, and performed the service of bringing over the king's household," which, as some of the Rabbins understand, was accomplished by carry-

ing over on their backs the women and children who could not conveniently ford the river. This, however, is not in accordance with the construction of the original (which, moreover, has the article emphatically *הַפֶּרֶךְ הַיָּמִינִי*, and *THE ferry[-boat] crossed*). Some suppose (so Josephus, *Ant.* vii, 11, 2) that there was a bridge of boats employed on this occasion, and others that a ferry-boat of some kind was used for this purpose (see Kitto, *Pict. Bible*, note in loc.). It is probable that a raft, or float, was constructed; if not, some kind of boat, for the use of these must have been known to the Hebrews, as we find vessels apparently of this description delineated among the paintings of ships on the Egyptian monuments. Floats of various



Ancient Egyptian Ferry-boat for Funerals.

kinds, buoyed up by inflated bladders, calabashes, wicker-work, and even earthen or metallic vessels, have been used from the earliest ages on the Nile (*Isa.* xviii, 2) and Tigris, for transporting passengers or goods; and modern travellers frequently allude to similar modes of conveyance at the present day among the Arabs. See *FLOAT*. Similar scenes are depicted upon the Assyrian monuments (*Layard's Nineveh*, i, 276). See *BOAT*.



Ancient Assyrian Monarch preparing to cross a River.

**Ferus**, JOHANNES (originally WILD), a Franciscan monk and cathedral preacher at Mentz, lived in the 16th century. He published a large number of sermons and Biblical commentaries. Of the latter several were put on the Roman Index. Ferus clings to the literal meaning of the Scriptures, and avoids allegorical interpretations. He recommends the reading of the Scriptures, and refutes the objection that the Scriptures are obscure. He complains of the prevalence of a Pharisaic spirit in the Roman Catholic Church, since there was in it a great deal of outward ceremonial, but little truth. He preached that repentance does not consist in outward works, such as fasting, praying, and giving alms, but that it begins, on the one hand, with the announcement of the divine law, the consciousness of one's sinfulness, and the fear of the judgment of God, and, on the other hand, with the announcement of the grace of God, and with confidence in the divine promise. Ferus thought that popes, emperors, councils, and the diets could do nothing so long as the Church was full of errors and her doctrines corrupt. He died in 1554.—*Herzog, Real-Encyclop.* xvi, 141. (A. J. S.)

**Fesch**, JOSEPH, a French cardinal, was born in Ajaccio, Corsica, Jan. 3, 1763. His father's second wife was the mother of Lætitia Bonaparte. He studied at the College of Aix, in Provence, entered the

Church, and was archdeacon and provost of the chapter of Ajaccio when the revolution broke out. The Bonaparte family being exiled from Corsica in 1793 for their opposition to Paoli and his British allies, Fesch followed them to Toulon, where his circumstances compelled him to enter the commissariat of the army. In 1795 he was appointed to the commissariat of the Army of Italy, just placed under the command of his nephew, Napoleon Bonaparte. After the 18th Brumaire he resumed his ecclesiastical functions, and was actively engaged in the negotiations concerning the Concordat of July 15, 1801. Napoleon made him archbishop of Lyons, and Fesch took possession of that see Aug. 15, 1802. Six months later he was created cardinal of St. Laurent in *Lucina*. In 1804 he was appointed ambassador to Rome, and was accompanied in this mission by Châteaubriand, who thus began his diplomatic career. He subsequently decided Pius VII to come to Paris to crown the emperor. Napoleon appointed him high almoner, commander of the Legion of Honor, and senator. Fesch paid great attention to the interests of his diocese, and established a high theological school. During the difficulties between Napoleon and the pope he showed much consideration for the latter, declining in 1809 the archbishopric of Paris, which was offered him by the emperor, and even rejecting the petitions of the chapter that he would at least administer the diocese. In 1811 Napoleon called a council to settle his difficulties with Pius VII, and appointed Fesch its president, in which capacity he seems not to have acted according to the views of the emperor, for he was sent back to his diocese. A letter of his addressed to the pope, then at Fontainebleau,

caused him to be deprived of his stipend. He introduced into France the order of the "Brethren of the Christian Schools," founded at Lyons a college of home missions, and was instrumental in procuring the recall of the Jesuits. When Napoleon I was sent to Elba, Fesch withdrew to Rome, where he was well received by Pius VII. During the "hundred days" he returned to France and into his archbishopric. After the battle of Waterloo he re-

tired to Rome, declining, however, to resign his office as archbishop of Lyons. He died May 13, 1839. See *Biog. du Clergé contemporain; L'Ami de la Religion; L'Abbé Lyonnet, le Cardinal Fesch, fragments biographiques* (Lyons, 1841, 2 vols. 8vo); *Le Vêtu sur le cardinal Fesch* (Lyons, 1842, 8vo); *Thiers, Hist. du Consulat et de l'Empire*, t. xiii; *Hofer, Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xvii, 572.

**Fessler**, IGNAZ AURELIUS, a Hungarian historian, was born at Czörendorf, Lower Hungary, in July, 1756. He became a Capuchin in 1773, and in 1784 or 1786 was appointed professor of Oriental languages and hermeneutics in the University of Lemberg. He afterwards joined the freemasons, and withdrew from the Capuchins. In 1787 the representation of a tragedy of his, entitled *Sidney*, which was denounced as impious, obliged him to retire to Silesia; here he became tutor to prince Carolath's sons. In 1791 Fessler became a Protestant. After remaining a long time in Berlin he went to Russia, and became professor of Oriental languages in the Academy of St. Alexander Newski, but was afterwards accused of atheism, and lost his situation. After being for a while a member of the Legislative Assembly, he went in 1817 to Screepta, the head-quarters of the Moravians in Russia. In 1820 he became superintendent of the evangelical community at Saratof, and in 1833 general superin-



tendent of the Lutheran congregation at Petersburg, where he died Dec. 15, 1839. His principal works are, *Marc-Aurel*, a historical novel (Bresl. 1790-92, 3 vols.); — *Matthias Corvinus* (Bresl. 1793); — *Aristides u. Themistokles* (Berlin, 1792 and 1818, 3d ed.); — *Attila* (Breslau, 1794); — *Gesch. d. Ungarn*, etc. (Lpz. 1812-25); — *Rückblicke a. meine 70 jaehrige Pilgerschaft* (Breslau, 1826); — *Hoefler*, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* (Paris, 1857).

**Festival** (properly פֶּסַח, *chag, iopri*, "feast"), RELIGIOUS, OF THE ISRAELITES (compare Lev. xxiii). These were occasions of public religious observances, recurring at certain set and somewhat distant intervals. In a certain sense, indeed, each day was such an occasion, for at the daily service two lambs of the first year were to be offered at the door of the tabernacle; one in the morning, the other in the evening, a continual burnt-offering. With each lamb was to be offered one tenth of an ephah of flour, mingled with one fourth of a hin of fresh oil, for a meat-offering, and one fourth of a hin of wine for a drink-offering. Frankincense was to be placed on the meat-offering, a handful of which, with the frankincense, was to be burnt, and the remainder was to be eaten by the priest in the holy place, without leaven. The priests were to offer daily the tenth of an ephah of fine flour, half in the morning and half in the evening, for themselves. The high-priest was to dress the lamps in the tabernacle every morning, and light them every evening; and at the same time burn incense on the altar of incense. The people provided oil for the lamps which were to burn from evening to morning: the ashes were removed by a priest, dressed in his linen garment and his linen drawers, and then carried by him out of the camp in his common dress. Great stress was laid on the regular observance of these requirements (Numb. xxviii, 1-8; Exod. xxix, 38-42; Lev. vi, 8-23; Exod. xxx, 7-9; xxvii, 20; Lev. xxiv, 1-4; Numb. viii, 2). See DAILY SACRIFICE.

So, likewise, there was a weekly, a monthly, and a yearly festival, as will presently appear. At the *New-moon* festival, in the beginning of the month, in addition to the daily sacrifice, two heifers, one ram, and seven lambs of the first year were to be offered as burnt-offerings, with three tenths of an ephah of flour, mingled with oil, for each heifer; two tenths of an ephah of flour, mingled with oil, for the ram; and one tenth of an ephah of flour, mingled with oil, for every lamb; and a drink-offering of half of a hin of wine for a heifer, one third of a hin for the ram, and one fourth of a hin for every lamb. One kid of the goats was also to be offered as a sin-offering (Numb. x, 10; xxviii, 11-15). See NEW MOON.

**I. Pre-exilian Festivals.**—The religious times ordained in the law fall under three heads: 1. Those formally connected with the institution of the Sabbath. These were the following:

(1.) *The weekly Sabbath itself.*—On this day two lambs of the first year, without blemish, were to be offered for a burnt-offering, morning and evening, with two tenths of an ephah of flour, mingled with oil, for a meat-offering, and one half of a hin of wine for a drink-offering, thus doubling the offering for ordinary days. Twelve cakes of fine flour were to be placed every Sabbath upon the table in the tabernacle, in two piles, and pure frankincense laid on the uppermost of each pile. These were to be furnished by the people; two were offered to Jehovah, the rest were eaten by the priests in the holy place (Exod. xxxi, 12; Lev. xxiii, 1; xxvi, 2; Exod. xix, 3-30; xx, 8-11; xxiii, 12; Deut. v, 12-15; Lev. xxiii, 3; xxiv, 5-9; Numb. xv, 55; xxviii, 9). See SABBATH.

(2.) *The seventh New Moon, or Feast of Trumpets.*—The first day of the seventh month was to be a Sabbath, a holy convocation, accompanied by the blowing of trumpets. In addition to the daily and monthly sacrifices, one ram and seven lambs were to be offered

as burnt-offerings, with their respective meat-offerings, as at the usual New-moon festival (Numb. xxviii, 11-15; xxix, 1-6; Lev. xxiii, 23-25). See TRUMPETS, FEAST OF.

The other septenary festivals were: (3.) *The Sabbatical Year* (q. v.), and (4.) *The Year of Jubilee* (q. v.).

2. The great feasts (פֶּסָחִים, *set times*; in the Talmud, פֶּסָחִים, *pilgrimage feasts*) are: the Passover; the feast of Pentecost, of Weeks, of Wheat-harvest, or of the First-fruits; the feast of Tabernacles, or of Ingathering. In the arrangement of these festivals likewise a sabbatical order remarkably prevails (compare *Midrash Rabba* on Lev. xxiii, 24), and serves to furnish a strong proof that the whole system of the festivals of the Jewish law was the product of one mind. Pentecost occurs seven weeks after the Passover; the Passover and the feast of Tabernacles last seven days each; the days of Holy Convocation are seven in the year—two at the Passover, one at Pentecost, one at the feast of Trumpets, one on the Day of Atonement, and two at the feast of Tabernacles; the feast of Tabernacles, as well as the Day of Atonement, falls in the seventh month of the sacred year; and, lastly, the cycle of annual feasts occupies seven months, from Nisan to Tisri. See SEVEN.

On each of these occasions every male Israelite was commanded "to appear before the Lord," that is, to attend in the court of the tabernacle or the Temple, and to make his offering with a joyful heart (Deut. xxvii, 7; Neh. viii, 9-12; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* xi, 5, 5). The attendance of women was voluntary, but the zealous often went up to the Passover. Thus Mary attended it (Luke ii, 41), and Hannah (1 Sam. i, 7; ii, 19). As might be supposed, there was a stricter obligation regarding the Passover than the other feasts, and hence there was an express provision to enable those who, by unavoidable circumstances or legal impurity, had been prevented from attending at the proper time, to observe the feast on the same day of the succeeding month (Numb. ix, 10-11). None were to come empty-handed, but every one was to give according as Jehovah had blessed him; and there before Jehovah was every one to rejoice with his family, the Levite, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow (Exod. xxxiii, 14-17; xxxiv, 22-24; Deut. xvi, 16, 17). On all the days of Holy Convocation there was to be an entire suspension of ordinary labor of all kinds (Exod. xii, 16; Lev. xvi, 29; xxiii, 21, 24, 25, 35). But on the intervening days of the longer festivals work might be carried on. The law always speaks of the days of Holy Convocation as Sabbaths. But the Mishna makes a distinction, and states in detail what acts may be performed on the former, which are unlawful on the Sabbath, in the treatise *Yom Tob*; while in *Mod Katan* it lays down strange and burdensome conditions in reference to the intermediate days. See CONVOCATION, HOLY.

Brown has spoken (*Antiquities of the Jews*, i, 522) of the defenceless state in which the country lay when all the males were gathered together at Jerusalem. What was to prevent an enemy from devastating the land, and slaying women and children? He refers the protection of the country to the express interposition of God, citing "the promise," as found in Exod. xxxiv, 23, 24. He adds, "During the whole period between Moses and Christ we never read of an enemy invading the land at the time of the three festivals. The first instance on record was thirty-three years after they had withdrawn from themselves the divine protection by imbruing their hands in the Saviour's blood, when Cestius, the Roman general, slew fifty of the people of Lydda, while all the rest had gone up to the Feast of Tabernacles, A. D. 66" (Josephus, *War*, ii, 19). The objection, however, which this writer thus meets is founded on the assumption that the law was strictly, uniformly, and lastingly obeyed. But the re-

quirement that all males should appear three times a year before Jehovah is not without some practical difficulty. During the sojourn in the wilderness its observance would not only be easy, but highly useful in preventing the dispersion of individuals or numbers from the main body—an influence the more needful, because many persons would doubtless stray from time to time in search of pasture. In subsequent and more settled times it must have been a serious inconvenience for all the males of the nation to leave their families unprotected and their business neglected for so many days every year as would be necessary in going to and from Jerusalem. It is true that the seasons of the festivals were well fixed and distributed for the convenience of an agricultural people. Yet to have to visit Jerusalem thrice in seven months was a serious thing, especially in later times, when Israelites were scattered far abroad. Even if the expense was, as many think [see *ASSESSMENT*], a small consideration, yet the interruption to domestic life and the pursuits of business must have been very great; nor would it be an exaggeration to say that the observance was an impossibility to the Jews, for instance, who were in Babylon, Egypt, Italy, Macedonia, Asia Minor, etc. How far the law was rigorously enforced or strictly obeyed at any time after the settlement in Palestine, it would not be easy to say. Palfrey (*Lectures on the Jewish Scrip.* i, 199) supposes that "a man might well be said to have virtually executed this duty who appeared before the Lord (not in person, but) with his offering, sent by the hand of a friend, as a suitor is said in our common speech to appear in a court of justice when he is represented there by his attorney;" a conjecture which, to our mind, savors too much of modern ideas and usages. That some relaxation took place, at least in "the latter days," appears from John vii, 8, in which more or less of what is voluntary is obviously connected in the mind and practice of our Lord with "the feast," though it must be allowed that the passage is an evidence of the general observance, not to say the universal obligation, in his days, of at least the feast of Tabernacles. If, however, there was in practice some abatement from the strict requirements of the law, yet obviously time enough was saved from labor by the strong hand of religion to secure to the laborer a degree of most desirable and enviable rest. Not, indeed, that all the days set apart were emancipated from labor. At the feast of Tabernacles, for instance, labor is interdicted only on the first and the last day. So, on other occasions, business and pleasure were pursued in connection with religious observances. But if all males appeared before Jehovah even only once a year, they must, in going and returning, as well as in being present at the festival, have spent no small portion of time in abstinence from their ordinary pursuits, and could not have failed to derive singular advantages alike to their bodies and their minds. The rest and recreation would be the more pleasant, salutary, and beneficial, because of the joyous nature of the religious services in which they were, for the greater part, engaged. These solemn festivals were not only commemorations of great national events, but they were occasions for the reunion of friends, for the enjoyment of hospitality, and for the interchange of kindness. The feasts which accompanied the sacrifices opened the heart of the entire family to joy, and gave a welcome which bore a religious sanction even to the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow (Michaelis, *Mos. Recht*, art. 199). On these solemn occasions food came partly from hospitality (a splendid instance of which may be found in 2 Chron. xxxv, 7-9), partly from the feasts which accompanied the sacrifices in the Temple, and partly also from provision expressly made by the travellers themselves. It appears that the pilgrims to Mecca carry with them every kind of food that they need except flesh, which they procure in the city itself. Lodging, too, was af-

forded by friends, or found in tents erected for the purpose in and around Jerusalem. See *HOSPITALITY*.

Besides their religious purpose, the great festivals must have had an important bearing on the maintenance of a feeling of national unity. This may be traced in the apprehensions of Jeroboam (1 Kings xii, 26, 27), and in the attempt at reformation by Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxx, 1), as well as in the necessity which, in later times, was felt by the Roman government of mustering a considerable military force at Jerusalem during the festivals (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 9, 3; xvii, 10, 2; compare Matt. xxvi, 5; Luke xiii, 1). Another effect of these festivals Michaelis has found in the furtherance of internal commerce. They would give rise to something resembling our modern fairs. Among the Mohammedans similar festivals have had this effect. In Article 199 the same learned writer treats of the important influence which the festivals had on the Calendar, and the correction of its errors. See *YEAR*.

The agricultural significance of the three great festivals is clearly set forth in the account of the Jewish sacred year contained in Lev. xxiii. The prominence which, not only in that chapter, but elsewhere, is given to this significance, in the names by which Pentecost and Tabernacles are often called, and also by the offering of "the first-fruits of wheat-harvest" at Pentecost (Exod. xxxiv, 22), and of "the first of the first-fruits" at the Passover (Exod. xxiii, 19; xxxiv, 26), might easily suggest that the origin of the feasts was patriarchal (Ewald, *Alterthümer*, p. 385), and that the historical associations with which Moses endowed them were grafted upon their primitive meaning. It is perhaps, however, a difficulty in the way of this view that we should rather look for the institution of agricultural festivals among an agricultural than a pastoral people, such as the Israelites and their ancestors were before the settlement in the land of promise. The times of the festivals were evidently ordained in wisdom, so as to interfere as little as possible with the industry of the people. The Passover was held just before the work of harvest commenced, Pentecost at the conclusion of the corn-harvest and before the vintage, the feast of Tabernacles after all the fruits of the ground were gathered in. In winter, when travelling was difficult, there were no festivals. See *SEASONS*.

(1.) The first of these three great festivals, that of Unleavened Bread, called also the Passover, was kept in the month Abib, in commemoration of the rescue of the Israelites by Jehovah out of Egypt, which took place in that month. The ceremonies that were connected with it will be detailed under the head *PASSOVER*. Every one who was ritually clean, and not on a journey, and yet omitted to keep the Passover, was to be cut off from the people. Any one who was disabled for the observance, either by uncleanness or being on a journey, was to keep the Passover on the fourteenth day of the next month. In order to make the season more remarkable, it was ordained that henceforward the month in which it took place should be reckoned the first of the national religious year (Exod. xii, 2). From this time, accordingly, the year began in the month Abib, or Nisan (March—April), while the civil year continued to be reckoned from Tisri (September—October) (Exod. xii, 2, 14, 27, 43-49; Lev. xxiii, 5; Numb. xxviii, 16; Deut. xvi, 1-7). The Passover lasted one week, including two Sabbaths (De Wette, *Archæolog.* p. 214). The first day and the last were holy, that is, devoted to the observances in the public temple, and to rest from all labor (Exod. xii, 16; Lev. xxiii, 6; Numb. xxviii, 18; Deut. xvi, 8). The modern Jews observe the 15th and 16th, and the 20th and 21st-days of Nisan, as holy days in connection with this festival. See *NISAN*.

On the day after the Sabbath, on the feast of Passover, a sheaf of the first-fruits of the barley harvest was to be brought to the priest to be waved before Je-

hovah, accompanied by a burnt-offering. Till this sheaf was presented, neither bread nor parched corn, nor full ripe ears of the harvest, could be eaten (Exod. xii, 15-20; xiii, 6-10; Lev. xxiii, 6-8; Deut. xvi, 2-8; Numb. xxviii, 17-25). See HARVEST.

(2.) The feast of Pentecost or of Weeks was kept to Jehovah at the end of seven weeks from that day of the festival of Unleavened Bread, on which the sheaf was presented. On the morrow after the seventh complete week, or on the fiftieth day, two wave loaves were presented as first-fruits of the wheat-harvest, together with a burnt-offering, a sin-offering, and a peace-offering, etc. The day was a holy convocation, in which no servile work was done. The festival lasted but one day. The Jews of the present day, however, hold it during two successive days. It is said to have been designed to commemorate the giving of the law on Mount Sinai (Deut. xvi, 9-11; Lev. xiii, 15-21; Numb. xxviii, 26-31; xv, 17-21). See PENTECOST.

(3.) The feast of Ingathering or of Tabernacles began on the fifteenth day of the seventh month, and continued eight days, the first and last being Sabbaths. During the feast all native Israelites dwelt in booths made of the shoots of beautiful trees, palm branches, boughs of thick-leaved trees, and of the willows of the brook, when they rejoiced with their families, with the Levite, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow, before Jehovah. Various offerings were made. At the end of every seven years, in the year of release, at the feast of Tabernacles, the law was required to be read by the priests in the hearing of all the Israelites (Deut. xvi, 13-15; xxxi, 10-13; Lev. xxiii, 39-43, 43-46; Numb. xxix, 12-38, 40). The feast of Tabernacles was appointed partly to be an occasion of annual thanksgiving after the ingathering of the harvest (Exod. xxxiv, 22; Lev. xxiii, 39; Deut. xvi, 13), and partly to remind the Israelites that their fathers had lived in tents in the wilderness (Lev. xxiii, 40-43). This feast took place in the end of the year, September or October. The modern Jews observe it for seven successive days, the first two and the last two of which are holy days. See TABERNACLES, FEAST OF.

(4.) The festival of *New Year's Day* (*Rosh hash-Shannah* in the Talmud) is held by modern Jews for two days at the beginning of Tisri. See TRUMPETS, FEAST OF.

3. The tenth day of the seventh month was the *Day of Atonement*—a day of abstinence, a day of holy convocation, in which all were to afflict themselves. Special offerings were made (Lev. xxiii, 26-32; xvi, 1, 34; Numb. xxix, 7-11; Exod. xxx, 10). See ATONEMENT, DAY OF.

II. *Additional Post-exilian Festivals.*—1. The term "the festival of the Basket" (*εορτή Κεράλλου*) is applied by Philo (*Opp.* v, 51) to the offering of the first-fruits described in Deut. xxvi, 1-11, and occurring on the 16th of the first month (Nisan). See FIRST-FRUITS.

2. The *Festival of Acra*, which was instituted by Simon Maccabæus, B.C. 141, to be celebrated on the 23d of the second month (Ijar), in commemoration of the capture and purifying of Acra (q. v.), and the expulsion of the Hellenists from Jerusalem (1 Macc. xiii, 50-52). See MACCABEES.

3. The *Festival of Wood-carrying*, as it was called (*εορτή τῶν ξυλοφοριῶν*), is mentioned by Josephus (*War.* ii, 17, 6) and the Mishna (*Taanith*, iv, 5). What appears to have been its origin is found in Neh. x, 34. It was celebrated on the 15th (21st) of the fifth month (Ab). See XYLOPHORIA.

4. The *Festival of Water-drawing* (*מִיּוֹת הַבַּיִת*), which was held on the 22d of the seventh month (Tisri), the last day of the feast of Tabernacles (comp. John vii, 37; Mishna, *Succa*, iv, 9; v, 1-3; see Frey, *De aquæ libatione in festo tabernaculorum*, Altorf, 1744). See SILOAM.

5. The *Festival of Dedication* was appointed by Judas Maccabæus on occasion of the purification of the Temple and reconstruction of the altar after they had been polluted by Antiochus Epiphanes. The hatred of this monarch towards the Jews had been manifested in various ways: he forbade their children to be circumcised, restrained them in the exercise of their religion, killed many who disobeyed his mandates, burnt the books of the law, set up idolatry, carried off the altar of incense, the shew-bread table, and the golden candlestick, with the other vessels and treasures of the Temple, and went to such extremes as to sacrifice a sow upon the altar of burnt-offerings, build a heathen altar on the top of that sacred pile, and with broth of swine's flesh to sprinkle the courts and the Temple (1 Macc. i; 2 Macc. v; Pridæaux, *sub* A.C. 167-8, 170). The new dedication took place on the 25th day of the ninth month, called Kislev, in the year before Christ 170. This would be in December. The day was chosen as being that on which Antiochus, three years before, had polluted the altar by heathen sacrifices. The joy of the Israelites must have been great on the occasion, and well may they have prolonged the observance of it for eight days. A general illumination formed a part of the festival, when it obtained the name of the feast of Lights. In John x, 22 this festival is alluded to when our Lord is said to have been present at the feast of Dedication. The historian marks the time by stating "it was winter." (Compare 1 Macc. iv, 52-59; Mishna, *Taanith*, ii, 10; *Moed Katon*, iii, 9; Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 7, 7; *Ap.* ii, 39.) See DEDICATION, FEAST OF.

6. The *Festival of Nicanor*, to commemorate the defeat by Judas Maccabæus of the Greeks when the Jews "smote off Nicanor's head and his right hand which he stretched out so proudly," caused "the people to rejoice greatly, and they kept that day a day of great gladness; moreover, they ordained to keep yearly this day, being the thirteenth day of Adar"—the twelfth month (1 Macc. vii, 47; Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 10, 5; *Taanith*, xii; Talm. Jerus. *Taanith*, ii, 13; Josippon ben-Gorion, iii, 22, p. 244, ed. Breith.). See NICANOR.

7. The *Festival of Purim* or of Lots originated in the gratitude of the Jews in escaping the plot of Haman designed for their destruction. It took its name from the lots which were cast before Haman by the astrologers, who knew his hatred against Mordecai and his wish to destroy his family and nation (Ester iii, 7; ix, 2, 5). The feast was suggested by Esther and Mordecai, and was celebrated on the 13th, 14th, and 15th days of the twelfth month (Adar). The 13th was a fast, being the day on which the Jews were to have been destroyed; and the 14th and 15th were a feast held in commemoration of their deliverance (see 2 Macc. xv, 36). The fast is called the Fast of Esther, and the feast still holds the name of Purim. Pridæaux (*Connex.*) styles it the bacchanalia of the Jews. See PURIM.

The slaughter of Holofernes by the hand of Judith, the consequent defeat of the Assyrians, and the liberation of the Jews, were commemorated by the institution of a festival (Judith xiv, xv). See HOLOFERNES. Some other minor festivals may be found noticed in Brown's *Antiquities*, i, 586, and in Simon's *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, art. "Fêtes."—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See CALENDAR, JEWISII.

*Literature.*—Josephus, *Ant.* ii-iii, xiii-xvii; *War.* ii, 3, 1, and many other places; Philo, *De Septenario et Festivis diebus* (Περὶ ἑπτῆς ἑβδομήτης, *Op.* vol. v, p. 21, edit. Tauch.); the Mishna, *Tracts respecting the Festivals*, or *סדר ביירות*; especially the Talmudical tract *Chagiga* (Mishna, ii, 12), *sive de trib. festis solenn. c. vers. et Bartenoræ comment.* (edit. Ludovici, Lips. 1696, 1712); also Hottinger, *De trina comparitione Israel. coram Domino* (Marb. 1707); Otho, *Lex Rabb.* p. 288; Johnston, *De fistis Hebræor. et Græcor.* (Vratisl. 1660; Jen.

1670); Meyer, *De tempor. et festis dieb. Hebraeor.* (Amst. 1724; also in Ugolini *Thesaur.* i); Credner, *Joel*, p. 213 sq.; Baur, in the *Tabing. Zeitschr.* 1832, iii, 125 sq.; George, *Die alte jud. Feste* (Berlin, 1835); Fairbairn, *Typology*, ii, 403 sq.; Meusel, *Biblioth. histor.* I, ii, 168 sq.; Hospinianus, *De fest. diebus Judaeor. Graecor. etc.* (Zur. 1592); P'riem, *De festiv. Hebraeor.* (Bamb. 1765); Seligmann, *Dats jud. Ceremoniell bei Festen* (Hamburg, 1722); Spencer, *De Legibus Hebraeorum Ritualibus et eorum rationibus* (Cantabrigie, 1727); Bähr, *Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus* (Heidelberg, 1839), ii, 525 sq.; Ewald, *Die Alterthümer des Volkes Israel* (Göttingen, 1854), p. 379 sq.; *De Feriarum Hebraearum origine ac ratione* (Göttinge, 1841); Creuzer, *Symbol.* ii, 597; Saalschütz, *Archäologie der Hebräer* (Königsb. 1855), p. 207 sq.; Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (Nordhausen, 1857), ii, 106 sq.; Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums* (Leipzig, 1857), i, 158 sq.; Raphall, *Festivals of the Lord* (Lond. 1839); Hupfeld, *De festis Heb. ex legibus Mosaiscis* (Hal. 1865). See SACRIFICE.

**Festivals in the Christian Church.** See FEASTS.

**Fes'tus** (*festal*), PORCIUS (Græcized Πόρκιος Φη-στος), the successor of Felix as procurator of Judea (Acts xxiv, 27; Joseph. *Ant.* xx, 8, 9; *War.* ii, 14, 1), sent by Nero, probably in the autumn of A.D. 55. See FELIX. A few weeks after Festus reached his province he heard the cause of the apostle Paul, who had been left a prisoner by Felix, in the presence of Herod Agrippa II. and Bernice his sister. Not finding any thing in the apostle worthy of death or of bonds, and being confirmed in this view by his guests, he would have set him free had it not been that Paul had himself previously (Acts xxv, 11, 12) appealed to Cæsar. In consequence, Festus sent him to Rome. See PAUL. Judea was in the same disturbed state during the procuratorship of Festus, which had prevailed through that of his predecessor. Sicarii, robbers, and magicians were put down with a strong hand (*Ant.* xx, 8, 10). Festus had a difference with the Jews at Jerusalem about a high wall which they had built to prevent Agrippa seeing from his palace into the court of the Temple. As this also hid the view of the Temple from the Roman guard appointed to watch it during the festivals, the procurator took strongly the side of Agrippa, but permitted the Jews to send to Rome for the decision of the emperor. He, being influenced by Poppæa, who was a proselyte (Joseph. *Ant.* xx, 8, 11), decided in favor of the Jews. Festus probably died in the summer of A.D. 62, and was succeeded by Albinus (Joseph. *War.* xx, 9, 1). The chronological questions concerning his entrance on the province and his death are too intricate and difficult to be entered on here, but will be found fully discussed by Anger, *De temporum in Act. Apost. ratione*, p. 99 sq.; and Wieseler, *Chronologie der Apostelgeschichte*, p. 89-99. See also CHRONOLOGY. Josephus implies (*War.* ii, 14, 1) that Festus was a just as well as an active magistrate.—Smith, s. v.


**Fetichism** or **Fetishism**, a term recently introduced to denote the lowest forms of human worship, "in which the shapeless stone, the meanest reptile, or any object however worthless or insignificant, is consecrated by a vague and mysterious reverence" (Milman). It is derived from *Feticco*, a term borrowed from the Portuguese *fétisso*, and used by the negroes of Senegal to denote an instrument of witchcraft. It was first brought into use in Europe by De Bosses, in his *Du Culte des Dieux Fétiches* (Dijon, 1760). Fetichism is practised in Greenland, Africa, Australia, and Liberia. The fetiches in use in Africa are either *natural* (as a tiger, serpent, etc.) or *artificial* (as skins or claws of beasts, stones, etc.). Sometimes a single fetich is made the object of worship for a whole tribe, e. g. the *tiger* in Dahomey, the *serpent* by the Whydahs. The negroes of Benin make a fetich of their own shadows. But, besides these, each individual almost has his own

particular fetich or fetiches. Any object may become one by the merest accident; e. g. by having been the subject of a dream. When any one has a fetich supposed to possess extraordinary powers of injuring others, no efforts are spared to get it from the owner. Collections of them are highly prized, and a traveller on the coast of Guinea saw as many as 20,000 fetiches in the possession of one negro. Sometimes they are purely imaginary, and are fantastic forms, such as are never found in nature, and generally contrived for the purpose of producing fear. At Cape Coast there is a public guardian fetich, supreme in power and dignity. This is a rock which projects into the sea from the bottom of the cliff on which the castle is built. To this rock annual sacrifices are presented, and the responses given through the priests are rewarded by the blinded devotees.

With regard to the religious relation between the fetiches and their worshippers, we find that, although undoubtedly sinking often to the rank of mere instruments of sorcery in practice, fetiches are yet essentially idols. They receive, every morning and evening, offerings of spices, milk, tobacco, etc., and are always approached with marks of respect and of fear. They are resorted to for protection against lightning, beasts of prey, murder, etc. They also serve to protect property, to attest oaths, and the negroes have even a vague idea that after death they will have to render an account to their fetiches. Yet the moral hold of the fetich over its worshipper is, after all, very weak; the object of worship is discarded or broken as soon as its efficacy is distrusted.

Substantially, fetichism is a rude form of pantheism. Its root is to be found in the fear generated in the rude nature of the savage by the unknown forces of the universe.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* iv, 395; Scholten, *Geschichte der Relig. und Philosophie* (Elberfeld, 1868); Lecky, *Rationalism*, i, 208 sq.; Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, ii, 127.

**Fetter** (פֶּתֶל, *zek*, bond or chain in general, only in the plur. Job xxxvi, 8, elsewhere "chains," Psa. cxlix, 8; Isa. xlv, 14; Nah. iii, 10; כְּבָבִים, *ke'bal*, sing. perhaps the link joining the fetter, Psa. cv, 18; plur. and of iron, cxlix, 8;



Ancient Assyrian Handcuffs and Fetters for Captives.



Ancient Egyptian Captive handcuffed.

נְשֵׁתַי, *necho'seth*, *braces*, in the dual, the appropriate term, Lam. iii, 7; Judg. xvi, 21; 2 Sam. iii, 34; 2 Kings xxv, 7; Jer. xxxix, 7; lii, 11; πῆδη, implying that they were for the feet, in the plur., Mark v, 4; Luke viii, 29; Eccles. vi, 24, 29; xxi, 19), shackles or chains for binding prisoners, whether by the wrists or ankles. The Philistines bound Samson with fetters of copper (Judg. xvi, 21). Manasseh and Zedekiah, kings of Judah, were

bound with fetters by the Chaldeans and carried to Babylon (2 Chron. xxxiii, 11; 2 Kings xxv, 7). Manacles for the feet and hands are represented on the Assyrian monuments (Layard, *Nineveh*, ii, 376; Kitto, *Daily Bible Illustrations*, ii, 437). See CHAIN. One mode of securing prisoners among the Egyptians, as depicted on the monuments, was to enclose their hands in an elongated fetter of wood, made of two opposite segments, nailed together at each end, such as are used for a similar purpose in Egypt at the present day (Wilkinson, *Ancient Egyptians*, i, 410, abridgm.).

#### Feudal System. See FIEF.

**Feuguières.** GUILLAUME, was born at Rouen. In his native place he became minister of the Reformed Church. In 1578, at the recommendation of prince William the First, he was appointed first professor of theology in the recently founded University of Leyden. His influence was of decided advantage to the new institution, but his connection with it was of short continuance. In 1579 he resigned his professorship, in order to accept the pressing invitation of his former charge to again become their pastor. There he spent the remainder of his days, and died in 1613 at an advanced age. He wrote several works in Latin, of which we deem the following most worthy of mention: *G. Feuguerii prophetice et apostolice, i. e. totius divine et canonice scripturæ thesaurus, in locos communes rerum, dogmatum suis divinis exemplis illustratorum, et phrasion scripturæ familiarium, ordine alphabetico Augustini Marlbrati adversarius* (Lond. 1574; reprinted at Berne in 1601, and at Geneva in 1624. A compendium of it was published at Geneva in 1613):—*Novum Testamentum latine, ex versione et cum annotationibus Th. Beze, p. n. c. etiam additis ex Joachimi Camerarii notationibus, studio Petri Loselerii Villerii, theolog. prof. s. s. Genevensis, et nunc postremo G. F. opera* (Lond. 1587). See B. Glasius, *Godgeleerd Nederland*, Deel i, blz. 464 en verv.; also Soermans, *Acad. Regist.* bl. 32; Paquot, i, frag. 178. (J. P. W.)

**Feuillants** (*Feuillants, Congregatio beate Mariæ Fulviensis*), a reformed congregation of the Cistercians (q. v.). Their founder, Jean de la Barrière, of the family of the Vicomtes de Turennes, was born at St. Cère in 1544, and finished his education at the University of Paris. In 1562, when only 18 years of age, he received the Cistercian abbey of Notre Dame de Feuillants in commendam, and three years later took possession of it. After having received the income of the abbey for eleven months, he entered the order himself. His efforts to restore a stricter monastic discipline met with the unanimous opposition of the members of the abbey, and he was even in danger of being assassinated. He was charged at the chapter general held at Cîteaux with introducing innovations, but his defence made so deep an impression that many of the assembled monks placed themselves under his spiritual guidance, and enabled him to carry through a thorough reformation in his abbey. La Barrière and his friends now suffered a great deal of persecution from the old Cistercians; but their reformation was, in 1586 and 1587, approved by the pope, though they remained subject, with regard to such points as were not at variance with their new discipline, to the abbot of Cîteaux. Other abbeys were authorized to adopt the reformation of Feuillants, and pope Sixtus V gave them the house of San Vito at Rome, to which, after a time, was added the house of St. Pudentiana, and somewhat later a beautiful monastery. In 1588 Henry III gave them a monastery in Paris. During the civil war La Barrière remained loyal to Henry III, whose funeral sermon he preached at Berdeaux, but many members of the order became ardent partisans of the Ligue. One of them, Bernard de Montgaillard, became celebrated under the name of "The Little Feuillant." By these partisans of the Ligue, La Barrière was denounced as a traitor to the interests of the Catholic Church. At a

chapter held in 1592, under the presidency of the Dominican monk Alexander De Francis, subsequently bishop of Forlì, he was deposed from his position, forbidden to say mass, and required to report himself once every month to the Inquisition. A revision of the trial by cardinal Baronius led, however, to the acquittal of La Barrière. Pope Clement VIII fully dissolved the connection of the new congregation with Cîteaux, placed them under the immediate jurisdiction of the papal see, and commissioned six of the members with framing new statutes. These new statutes provided for the mitigation of some of the rules, the rigor of which, it was reported, had caused the death of fourteen members, and they received the sanction of the Church in 1595. The congregation now spread in France and Italy, and at its head in France was an abbot elected for three years. As discipline again began to slacken, pope Urban VIII in 1630 divided the congregation into two—the French, called after Notre Dame de Feuillants, and the Italians, the members of



A member of the French Congregation of Feuillants.

Member of the Italian Congregation of Feuillants or Reformed Bernardines.

which were called reformed Bernardines. At the head of each was henceforth a general. Subsequently considerable alterations were made in the statutes of each (of the French in 1634, of the Italian in 1667). Among the most celebrated members of the two congregations belong cardinal Bona and Cosmus Roger. Joseph Meratius wrote their history (*Cistercii reforescentis seu Congregationum Cistercio-Monasticarum B. M. Fulviensis in Gallia et reformatorum S. Bernardi in Italia chronologica historia*, Turin, 1690).

The first convent of nuns according to the reformed rule of Feuillants was organized in 1588 at Montesquieu. It was subsequently transferred to Toulouse. The chapters general held in 1595 and 1598 forbade the establishment of new convents, but in 1662 the wife of king Louis XIII succeeded in establishing one in Paris. According to a bull of Clement VIII of 1606, these nuns were subject to all the rules of the congregation of the Feuillants.



Nun of the Congregation of Feuillants.

It seems that the congregation has become entirely extinct in consequence of the French Revolution.—Helyot, *Ordres Religieux*, ed. Migne, s. v.; Henrion-

Fehr, *Mönchsorden*, i, 159; Wetzler u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iv, 61. (A. J. S.)

**Fever**, the rendering, in the A. V., of the Hebrew  $\text{קדחת}$ , *kaddach'ath* (Deut. xxviii, 22), and the Greek  $\text{πυρετός}$  (Mat. viii, 14; Mark i, 30; Luke iv, 38; John iv, 52; Acts xxviii, 8). Both the Hebrew and Greek words are derived from the association of burning heat, which is the usual symptom of a febrile attack; the former coming from the verb  $\text{קדח}$ , *to burn*, the latter from  $\text{πύρ}$ , *fire* (comp. Aram.  $\text{ܩܕܚܐ}$  from  $\text{ܩܕܚ}$ ; Goth. *brinno*, from *brinnan*, to burn; Lat. *febris*, and our own *fever*, from *fervere*). In Lev. xxvi, 16, the A. V. renders  $\text{קדחת}$  by "burning ague," but the rendering *fever* seems better, as it is not necessarily the intermittent type of the disease which is thus designated. In all Eastern climates febrile diseases are common, and in Syria and Palestine they are among the commonest and severest afflictions under which the inhabitants suffer (Russell's *Aleppo*, bk. v, ch. iii). They are especially prevalent in the vicinity of Capernaum (Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 547). The fever under which Peter's wife's mother suffered is called by Luke  $\text{πυρετις μέγας}$ , "a great fever," and this has been regarded as having reference to the ancient scientific distribution of fevers into the great and the less (Galen, *De diff. febr.*; see Wetstein, in loc.), and as an instance of Luke's professional exactitude in describing disease. His use of  $\text{πυρετοί}$  in the plural in describing the disease under which the father of Publius labored (Acts xxviii, 8) has also been adduced as an instance of the same kind, inasmuch as that disease was, from its being conjoined with dysentery, not a continuous, but an intermittent fever. To this much importance cannot be attached, though it is probable that Luke, as a physician, would naturally use the technical language of his profession in speaking of disease. In Deut. xxviii, 22, besides  $\text{קדחת}$ , two diseases of the same class are mentioned,  $\text{דלקת}$ , *dalle'keth*, a burning (A. V. "inflammation"), and  $\text{חַרְחָר}$ , *charchur'*, intense parching (A. V. "extreme burning"). The Sept. renders the former of these by  $\text{πίρος}$ , *shivering*, and the latter by  $\text{ἐπιθυσμός}$ , a word which is used by the Greek writers on medicine to designate "quodvis Naturæ irritamentum, quo sollicitata natura ad obundas motiones excitatur" (Foes, *Oecon. Hippoc.*). The former is probably the ague, a disease of frequent occurrence in the East; and the latter probably dysentery, or some species of inflammatory fever. The Syriac version renders it by *burning*, which favors the latter suggestion. Rosenmüller inclines to the opinion that it is the *catarrhus suffocans*, but this is without probability. There is no ground for supposing it to be erysipelas. Fever constantly accompanies the bloody flux or dysentery (Acts xxviii, 8; compare De Mandel-lo, *Travels*, ed. 1669, p. 65). Fevers of an inflammatory character are mentioned (Burekhardt, *Arab.* i, 446) as common at Mecca, and putrid ones at Jeddah. Intermittent fever and dysentery, the latter often fatal, are ordinary Arabian diseases. For the former, though often fatal to strangers, the natives care little, but much dread a relapse. These fevers sometimes occasion most troublesome swellings in the stomach and legs (ii, 290-291).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See DISEASE.

**Few**, IGNATIUS A., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church. He was born in Columbia County, Georgia, April, 1791. About the year 1804 he was sent North to be under the care of his uncle, then residing in New York, for the benefits of a Northern education. He was prepared for college by a Mr. Traphagen, at Bergen, N. J., and afterwards went to Princeton, but, instead of entering the regular college course, he preferred devoting himself to such accomplishments as music and French, drawing and fencing. After remaining at Princeton some time he went to the city

of New York, and after prosecuting his studies there a short time he returned to Georgia. He commenced the study of law, but after his marriage, which took place in 1811, he gave up his legal pursuits, and settled down into the life of a planter, from which he was only aroused by an appointment as colonel of a regiment to repair to Savannah in 1815. At the end of the war he returned to his studies with such intensity as to lead to the neglect of his business and the loss of his property. In the year 1823 he removed to Augusta, and engaged in the practice of the law with flattering success, but in 1824 he was attacked with hemorrhage of the lungs, and from that time was unable to attend to the duties of his profession, and never afterwards fully regained his health. At this period of his life a great change in his character took place. Heretofore he had been inclined to one or other of the forms of scepticism, but Fletcher's *Appeal to Matter of Fact and Common Sense* falling in his way, his scepticism was dissipated, and his heart opened to the influence of Christianity. In 1828 he was admitted on trial in the South Carolina Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. "Notwithstanding he was always an invalid from the time he entered the ministry, he performed a great amount of labor, and filled some of the most important places in the gift of his denomination. He was the projector, and for a time the president, of Emory College, at Oxford, Ga., and rendered important service to the cause of education and sound morals." The degree of LL.D. was conferred upon Mr. Few by the Wesleyan University in 1838. Dr. Few's last public act was the drawing up of the report on the division of the Methodist Church, which was adopted by the Georgia Conference in 1845. The excitement produced by this effort was too much for his strength, and, though he partially rallied and lingered during the greater part of the year, his debilitated constitution sank at last, and he died in great peace at Athens, Ga., Nov. 21, 1845, and was buried in Oxford, the seat of Emory College. He left a widow, but no children.—Sprague, *Annals*, vii, 739.

**Fiacre**, SAINT, an Irish hermit, who died at Breuil (Erie), in France, about 670. He was originally called in France Fèvre, and, according to some writers, the name Fiacre was given to him about five or six hundred years after his death. Little is known about his life. According to some writers, he descended from an illustrious Irish family; according to others, he was the son of a king of Scotland. He came to France with some companions while still very young, cultivated a tract of land, and built cells for himself and his companions, and an asylum for foreigners. An Irish or Scotch nobleman, by the name of Chillen, induced him to preach in the neighboring provinces, and his sermons are said to have had great results. He was buried in his oratory at Breuil, and subsequently an oratory was erected on the spot. His relics became quite celebrated, as a number of miracles were ascribed to them; as, for instance, by queen Ann, wife of Louis XIII. In the former province of Artois, where he is the object of a particular veneration, he is commemorated on the 13th of November. He is also the patron of the gardeners, who commemorate him on the 6th of August. A class of four-wheeled French carriages, which became common in the 17th century, are said by some to have been named after him, as the inventor had on his sign the words *A Saint Fiacre*; but others explain the origin of the word differently. Some writers make mention of a letter written by Fiacre to his sister Syra, and containing some exhortations.—Hofer, *Nouvelle Biographie Générale*, xvi, 614. (A. J. S.)

**Fichte**, JOHANN GOTTLIEB, a German philosopher, was born May 19, 1762, at the village of Rammenau, near Bischofswerda, in Lusatia. The baron Milletz, struck with the promise of the boy, assumed

the charge of his education. At thirteen he was placed in the gymnasium of Schulpforte, and while there he imbibed (from reading Lessing) a spirit of free inquiry which animated his whole intellectual life. At eighteen he entered the University of Jena as a student of theology, and while there he seems to have adopted the philosophy and theology of Spinoza. But the sense of "personality" soon lifted him out of that abyss. The death of baron Miltetz threw him on his own resources, and privation added strength to his character. For a while he was tutor in a family at Zurich, and in 1790 he went to Leipzig, where he suffered greatly from poverty. "I have nothing," he writes, "excepting courage left." Kant's *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* (the Criticism of Pure Reason) wrought a revolution in his mode of thinking, and freed his mind entirely from the remains of Determinism. "I now heartily believe in the freedom of man, and am well convinced that it is only on this supposition that duty, virtue, and morality is so much as possible. . . . It is now evident to me that the doctrine of the necessity of all human actions is the source of a great part of the immorality of the so-called higher classes" (*Letter to Achelis*, 1790). In 1791 he went to Warsaw to fill a place as private tutor, but soon threw it up in disgust, and on his way home stopped at Königsberg to visit Kant (June, 1791). Not finding at first a very cordial reception, he wrote, between July 13 and Aug. 18, his *Kritik aller Offenbarung* (Criticism of all possible Revelation), and laid it before Kant, as an introduction of "his mind" to that philosopher. Kant was, indeed, conciliated; but yet, when Fichte soon after asked for a small loan to help him forward, Kant refused. The book appeared in the spring of 1792, and attracted universal attention. It was everywhere ascribed to Kant, who was compelled to name Fichte as the author, in order to disclaim it completely for himself. The work seeks to determine the necessary conditions under which revelation must be given by God to man, and to lay down the criteria by which every professed revelation must be tested. In October, 1792, Fichte was married, and took up his abode with his father-in-law (Rahn) at Zurich, where he spent several months. Here he published a work on the French Revolution (1793, 2 vols.), in which he advocated the modern principle that no political constitution can be unchangeable; and that the best constitution is that which carries in itself the principle of progress, and provides a method for its own change and improvement. He was charged with Jacobinism and democracy on account of this work. In 1794 he became professor of philosophy at Jena, as successor of Reinhold. His lectures awakened great enthusiasm among the students. Part of them were published under the title *Die Bestimmung des Gelehrten* (transl. by W. Smith, *The Vocation of the Scholar*, London, 1847, 12mo). In 1795 he published *Wissenschaftslehre* (Doctrine of Knowledge), and in 1798 his *Sittenlehre* (Doctrine of Ethics). The freedom and novelty of the doctrines taught in these lectures, together with the fact that he delivered many of them on Sunday (see below), brought upon him a charge of atheism, which he vigorously repelled in his *Appellation gegen die Anklage des Atheismus*. Nevertheless, he was compelled to resign his chair in 1799. He went to Berlin and delivered private lectures, which were very popular; and in 1800 he published his *Bestimmung des Menschen* (transl. by Mrs. Sinnott under the title *The Destination of Man*, Lond. 1846, 12mo). In 1805 he held the chair of philosophy at Erlangen for a few months. Between 1805 and 1807 he published lectures, *Ueber das Wesen des Gelehrten* (transl. by W. Smith under the title *The Nature of the Scholar and its Manifestations*, Lond. 1854, 12mo); lectures delivered at Berlin on *Grundzüge des gegenwärtigen Zeitalters* (transl. by W. Smith, *The Characteristics of the present Age*, London, 1847, 12mo); and *Anweisung zum seligen Leben, oder die Religionslehre*, the most impor-

tant of his later writings, as giving what he considered to be the ethical and religious results of his philosophy (translated by W. Smith, *The Way towards the blessed Life, or the Doctrine of Religion*, London, 1849, 12mo). Returning to Berlin in 1807, he published *Reden an die Deutsche Nation* (Addresses to the German People), which awakened great political enthusiasm. On the restoration of peace he was called by the king to aid in reorganizing the University of Berlin, and in 1810 he was made rector of the university, which then included among its faculty Schleiermacher, Neander, De Wette, Von Humboldt, and other brilliant names. During the subjection of Germany to Napoleon, much of Fichte's time and thoughts were given to politics; his patriotism was pure, fervent, and self-sacrificing. After the great battles of 1813, the hospitals were filled with wounded men, and his wife was an assiduous and devoted nurse. She was seized with typhoid fever early in 1814, and her husband imbibed the infection from her; she recovered, but he died, Jan. 27, 1814. His son, Immanuel Hermann (born in 1797), inherited his father's aptitudes to a certain extent, has edited his works, and has also vindicated him from the charge of atheism and irreligion. Besides the works of J. G. Fichte already mentioned, we name *Grundlage des Natur-Rechts* (Jena, 1767-9, 2 parts):—*Die Thatachen des Bewusstseyns* (Stuttgart, 1817). The following were edited by his son after his death: *Nachgelassene Werke* (Bonn, 1834, 3 vols.):—*Religions-philosophische Schriften* (Berlin, 1847):—*Populärphilos. Schriften* (Berlin, 1807, 7 vols.):—*Briefwechsel mit Schelling* (Stuttgart, 1856):—*J. G. Fichte's Sämmtliche Werke* (Berlin, 1845 sq. 8 vols.).

We can give only a summary view of the attempts of Fichte to found a complete philosophy. Historically he stands between Kant and Hegel, and forms the point of transition from the one to the other. "The end which Fichte proposes to himself in his *Wissenschaftslehre* is to give to science a true, that is to say, an absolute principle, reposing only upon itself, and leaving a basis to all the rest. Here the idealism of Kant is accepted in all its rigor. There is no longer any arbitrarily supposed objective element, even as a simple phenomenon. All is severally deduced from the subject, the sole term of knowledge admitted by idealism. Fichte's problem is just this: to bring out philosophy whole and entire from the *Ego*; and this bold reasoner proposes to give his deduction a more than mathematical exactitude. Algebra rests upon the law of identity, which is thus expressed:  $A=A$ . Fichte maintains that this law implies another, the only one which a philosopher is entitled to admit without proof, and also the only one which he requires:  $Me=Me$ . When you say  $A=A$ , you intend to affirm nothing upon the existence of  $A$ . You only affirm that if  $A$  is  $A$ ,  $A$  can be nothing else than  $A$ . The proposition  $A=A$  is therefore, says Fichte, absolute only in its *form*, and not in its *matter* or contents. I know not if  $A$  exists practically and materially or not; but it matters not. I am formally certain that *given*  $A$ ,  $A$  cannot differ from  $A$ , and that there is necessary relation between these two terms. It is by the analysis of this relation that Fichte undertakes to prove the existence of *Ego*. In the proposition  $A=A$ , he argues, the first  $A$  is not considered under the same point of view as the second. The first  $A$ , as we have seen, is laid down conditionally, the second absolutely. What reduces these two terms to unity, puts them in a certain relation, judges, affirms, and constitutes this relation? Evidently the *Ego*. Take away the *Ego*, and you take away the relation, the two terms, the proposition  $A=A$ . Above it, then, there is a higher and more immediate truth. The principle of identity is only absolute in *form*; the principle  $Me=Me$  is absolute both in *form* and matter; it alone is *truly absolute*. I need not follow Fichte in the course of his deduction, the most subtle and artificial which can be

conceived. It is enough for me to know that he pushed to the utmost the strange idea of deducing a vast system of philosophy from this one principle, the *Ego*. The *Ego* alone is the principle, explaining, laying down, creating itself. I know not whether I should wonder more at the excess of extravagance to which the human mind may be carried, or at the amazing richness of its resources. By Kant it was condemned to be ignorant of the universe and of God, locked up in the prison of the *Ego*. Let him alone. This one reserved point will give him back all the rest. From the furthest limits of skepticism he will even pass to the most absolute dogmatism. But a little while ago he doubted of everything. Now he vaunts, not merely that he *knows* Nature, but that he *creates* her. Nay, he vaunts that he creates God. Such are the very expressions, at once absurd and logical, of Fichte. He draws nature and God from the *Ego*. The *Ego* implies the *Non-Ego*. It limits itself. It is only itself by opposing to itself another which is not itself. It poses itself only by opposing its contrary. It is itself the link of this opposition, the synthesis of this antinomy. In fact, if the *Ego* only exists for itself, the faculty of self-limitation which it possesses implies that, in itself, it is infinite and illimitable. Beyond the divisible and *relative Ego*, opposed to the *Non-Ego*, there is, therefore, an *absolute Ego*, comprising nature and man. This absolute *Ego* is God. Here, then, is thought in possession of its three essential objects; here are man, nature, and God, in their necessary relation, members of one identical thought, with three terms, at once separated and reconciled; here is a philosophy worthy of the name; a rigorous, demonstrated, homogeneous science, starting from one great principle to follow out and to exhaust all its consequences.

"Such, in its general principle, is the metaphysics of Fichte. His morality is a logical, though perhaps unforeseen consequence of this. It is founded upon the *Ego*, whose eminent characteristic is liberty. To preserve one's own liberty, one's *Ego* is duty; to respect the *Ego*, the liberty of others, is another not less sacred duty which becomes the foundation of right. Hence the noble stoicism of Fichte, and that passion for liberty, which were in such perfect harmony with the masculine strength of his character and the generous part which he played in the political affairs of Germany. But the importance of the system of Fichte does not lie here. I find his greatness and originality in the extraordinary metaphysics so justly and boldly called by himself subjective absolute idealism. It has this singular feature, that in pushing the scepticism of Kant to its extremest consequences, it prepares the way for the dogmatism of Schelling and of Hegel. Not only does it prepare the way for, but even begins and contains this dogmatism. Fichte openly aspires to absolute science. He explains all things—man, nature, and God. He leads German philosophy, if I may venture to say so, from the subjective to the objective by the subjective itself. From absolute scepticism he flings it into an enormous dogmatism. Setting out from a teaching so timid that it scarcely ventures to affirm one actual being, it is the prelude of that ambitious philosophy which embraces in its enormous frameworks the history of man and that of nature, and pretends to an unmeasured, unreserved, and universal explanation of all things" (Saisset, *Modern Pantheism*, Edinb. 1863, ii, 2 sq.).

On the relations of Fichte's life and works to theology and to the Christian Church, we make the following extracts from Hagenbach, *German Rationalism* (transl. by Gage and Stuckenberg, N. Y. 1865): "It would certainly be doing Fichte injustice to interpret his system to mean that he wished to make himself, J. G. Fichte, God. We might say with more propriety that Fichte, like Spinoza, denied the existence of God only in order to conceive him more spiritually;

stripping off all associations of created things from the idea of the Creator, lest he should be dragged down into the sphere of the finite. The human mind is too apt to think of God in an anthropomorphic manner. Fichte was a teacher of academic youth. At his feet sat many who were destined to proclaim to Christian congregations the God of the Gospel; a God who is only Creator if there are creatures of his creation, who has called a world into being, not as a visionary world, but as an actual and real one; a world in which sin, misery, and affliction appear but too real, from which the mere *imagination* that they do not exist cannot save us, but which can only be removed by a higher reality, a divine fact, by God's act of love, as it appears historically in the redemption through Christ. If now the ground were taken from under the feet of those destined to proclaim such a doctrine, if nothing religious remained for them but their miserable *Ego*, of which they were not even as fully and energetically conscious as Fichte of his, must not many just scruples have arisen in the minds of those, too, who were not accustomed to restrain the freedom of investigation hastily? Hence Fichte was charged with no less an error than atheism, and to this day the learned are not agreed whether this oft-abused term may be applied to Fichte's system as represented in his *Wissenschaftslehre*. To this must be added, as Fichte himself remarks, that his democracy was as much a thorn in the eyes of his opponents as his atheism. The fact that he disregarded all established customs offended many. He chose Sunday for delivering moral lectures to the students. In this the Consistory of Weimar, of which at that time Herder was a member, thought they recognised the secret intention of gradually undermining public worship, although Fichte protested solemnly against this, and appealed to the example of Gellert, whose moral lectures had also been delivered on Sunday, and why not then the philosophical lecture-room? The dispute about reading lectures on Sunday was, however, only the prelude to a fiercer contest. Fichte published a work *On the Grounds of our Faith in the Divine Government of the World*, in which the moral order of the world was denoted as God, and the assertion was made that we need and can conceive of no other God. 'The existence of this God cannot be doubted; it is the most certain of all things, and the ground of all other certainty; but the idea of God as a particular substance is impossible and contradictory. It is proper to say this candidly to strike down the prating of the schools, so that the true religion of doing right cheerfully may be elevated.' Many pious minds, of course, took offence at these expressions. Although Fichte might be satisfied with this moral order of the world, *the Christian's faith in God*, a faith, too, in 'doing right cheerfully,' but at the same time in a real God, could by no means be content with this philosophical theory. This faith would not, however, have been destroyed by this theory, even if no interdiction had been issued against it. Such an interdiction appeared. The book in which Fichte advocated the theory of the divine order of the world was attacked in the electorate of Saxony, and from this place the attention of the court at Weimar was called to the dangers of Fichte's doctrine, 'as one not only openly hostile to the Christian, but even to natural religion.' . . . It is remarkable in the case of Fichte that, after he had removed himself farthest from the common Christian feeling, he was led nearer and nearer it again. . . . After Fichte had called attention to the deep importance of faith, in the book *Die Bestimmung des Menschen*; after he had pointed out the importance of Christianity 'as the only true religion' in the history, and the great importance of the Christian state, in the *Grundzüge des gegenwärtigen Zeitalters*, he attempted, especially in his *Anweisungen zum selbigen Leben, oder Religionshere*, to prove the agreement of his philosophy of that time with the principles



of Christianity, which he regarded in a light entirely different from Kant. Kant and the Rationalists placed the essence of Christianity chiefly in morality and the fulfilment of the moral law, and, in accordance with this, esteemed and used with a special predilection those passages in Scripture in which the various moral precepts are drawn in distinct outlines, as, for instance, the Sermon on the Mount, and several parables of Jesus in the first three gospels (while they had no taste for John, who appeared to them a mystic); Fichte, on the other hand, threw himself on the fourth gospel, and regarded it as the only true source of the genuine doctrine of Christ; he, of course, did this in a one-sided manner, and with a denial of the other truths of Scripture, which belong fully as much to the totality of Christian doctrine and history as the gospel of John. . . . The person of Jesus had with him a signification entirely different from that of the Rationalists. He does not behold in him the teacher of morality, nor simply the moral example. No; exactly that oneness with God, as Christ expresses it in the gospel of John, exactly that *real unity with the Father* which the Rationalists desired to remove as a metaphysical formula of no use to morality, was to him the heart and the star of the Gospel. On this account he held himself so closely to John and his doctrine of the Logos having become flesh, in which he beheld the fullness of all religious knowledge. We should, however, make a great mistake if from this we concluded that Fichte agreed with the old orthodox doctrine in reference to Christ. What this doctrine regarded as a historical fact, which had occurred once, that Fichte regarded as a fact eternally repeating itself, as occurring in every religious man. Christ was not the *Saviour* to him in the old sense; he was only the representative of that which is continually occurring still. 'The eternal Word becomes flesh at all times, in every one, without exception, who understands, in a living manner, his oneness with God, and who really yields his entire individual life to the divine life in living . . . quite in the same manner as in Christ Jesus.' . . . In the house of the distinguished philosopher, each day, without exception, was closed with proper and solemn evening devotions, in which the domestics were also accustomed to take a part. After several verses had been sung from a choral-book, accompanied with the clavichord, the father of the family would make some remarks on some passage of the New Testament, most frequently on his favorite gospel of John. In these discourses he was less concerned about moral applications and rules of life than about freeing the mind from the distraction and vanity of the common affairs of life, and elevating the spirit to the eternal." Dörner regards Fichte as closing what he calls the period of "reflection" in philosophy by his theory of absolute subjective idealism; and holds the later form of Fichte's teaching to be Spinozistic, as denying the idea of a self-conscious God distinct from the world (*Person of Christ*, Edinb. transl., div. ii, vol. iii, 93 sq.).

*Literature.*—Besides the works already mentioned, see J. H. Fichte, *J. G. Fichte's Leben* (Sulzbach, 1820); J. H. Fichte, *Karakteristik d. neuesten Philosophie* (Sulzbach, 1841); Erdmann, *Entwickelung d. deutschen Speculation seit Kant* (vol. i); W. Smith, *Memoir of J. G. Fichte* (Lond. 1848, 2d ed. 12mo); *Christian Examiner*, May, 1841, p. 192 sq.; *Foreign Quart. Rev.* Oct. 1845; *Living Age*, vi, 162; xxx, 193; Tenenbaum, *Manuel Hist. Phil.* (ed. Bohn), § 400-415; Morell, *Mod. Philosophy*, ch. v, § 2; Lewes, *History of Philosophy* (Lond. 1867, 3d ed.), ii, 490 sq.; Krug, *Allg. Handwörterbuch d. philos. Wissenschaften*, ii, 21 sq.; Saintes, *History of Rationalism*, bk. ii, ch. xiii; Schwegler, *Hist. of Philosophy*, transl. by Seelye, § 41; Lasson, *J. G. Fichte im Verhältnis zu Kirche und Staat* (Berl. 1863); Kahnis, *German Protestantism*, bk. i, ch. iv; M'Cosh, *Intuitions* (see Index); Mills, in *Christian Examiner*, July, 1866. Fichte's *Wissenschaftslehre* has recently been admirably

bly translated by A. E. Kroeger, under the title *The Science of Knowledge* (Philadelphia, 1868, 12mo).

**FICINUS, MARSIILIUS** (*Marsiglio Ficino*)—the principal restorer of the Platonic philosophy, and the most enthusiastic of its modern advocates—was born at Florence Oct. 18, 1433, and died at his villa of Careggi, in the neighborhood, Oct. 1, 1499. He was the son of the chief physician of Cosmo di Medici, and was designed for the same profession; but his youthful intelligence attracted the great Florentine, and induced his selection as the prospective head of the projected Medicæan Academy. During the sessions of the Council of Florence, the conversations of Gemistus Pletho had inspired Cosmo with profound admiration for the Platonic doctrine, and with a desire to disseminate it in Tuscany. The excessive refinements and logomachies of the later schoolmen had discredited the system of Aristotle; the disturbance and alarms preceding the capture of Constantinople had driven many educated Greeks into Italy, and introduced the works and the followers of Plato and the Neo-Platonists; and the acrimonious controversy of Pletho and Gennadius attracted attention to the sublime reveries and eloquent expositions of the Platonic school.

Marsilius Ficinus devoted himself with ardor to the acquisition and illustration of the Platonic doctrines, and was abundantly supplied by the Medici with MSS., and with the other requirements for the successful prosecution of his task. At the age of 23 he presented to his patron a synopsis of the tenets of the academy, but was recommended to suppress it, as his knowledge was obtained at second-hand, and he had not yet attained an adequate acquaintance with the Greek language. Ficinus continued his studies, and devoted his whole life to the translation and interpretation of the academic texts, inclining strongly to the views of the later Platonists. He rendered into Latin the whole works of Plato and of Plotinus, and parts of the writings of Proclus, Porphyry, Iamblichus, etc. The translation of Plotinus was undertaken at the suggestion of Pico di Mirandola, and was published in 1492. His whole heart seems to have been thrown into this labor of love. In part he transforms himself into Plotinus; in a greater degree he constrains Plotinus to give utterance to his own preconceptions. To each chapter of the work is prefixed a copious summary, which presents rather Ficino's scheme of transcendentalism than an accurate abbreviation of the text. It, however, affords something like an intelligible and coherent exposition, in place of the dark, oracular, and loosely-connected pantheism of his author, which baffled even the penetration of Longinus. The intricacy, the opacity, and the mysticism of the doctrine expounded, and the ruggedness of its original exposition, are not relieved by any literary graces on the part of the summarist and translator. His style is inconceivably harsh, angular, and obscure; yet it is impossible to withhold admiration from the vigor, and skill, and grasp with which he compels the reluctant Latin to lend itself to the demands of the subject—to twist, and wind, and adapt itself to the sinuosities of the most plastic of all languages, applied to the most perplexed and attenuated of all speculations—and to interpret a style and a system totally foreign to the air of Latium. Lucretius apologized in the Golden Age for the stubbornness of his native tongue in the treatment of the simple and perspicuous doctrines of Epicurus; and a much more wonderful power is exhibited by Ficinus in constraining the dead and stiffened tongue of Rome to conform itself to all the convolutions of Greek thought and fantasy in their most bewildering license. Nor is it just to leave unnoticed the frequency with which Ficinus catches and reflects the splendors of his original, and reproduces the magnificences of their expression.

Attempts had often been made, and were renewed in the 15th century, to conciliate the teachings of Ple-

to and Aristotle, and the evident aim of Ficinus was to impose upon Plato and the Neo-Platonists a significance which might identify, or at least harmonize, their doctrines with the Christian creed. It was a preposterous revival of a design fruitlessly attempted at Alexandria in the age of Origen and his successors. Pantheism is wholly antipathetic to Christianity, whether presented as Neo-Platonism, as Spinozism, or as German transcendentalism. But it was a natural effort in that era of confusion and hopeful anticipation which witnessed the Renaissance. Moreover, the doctrines of Plotinus himself are manifestly moulded and modified by the contemporaneous influences of Christianity; and it is a curious taste to detect the Christian impress which marks so much of his abstruse metaphysics, especially in the closing books of the last *Enchiridion*. It is scarcely possible to read the concluding *capitulum*, or summary, without feeling that the hallucination of Ficinus was an honest as well as an earnest delusion; and that, if he misrepresented both Plato and the Alexandrian school by Christianizing their doctrine, he did not suffer himself to be seduced from a recognition of the personality of the Supreme Being, or into any position consciously at variance with the Christian creed.

Ficinus was liberally maintained throughout his life by his generous patrons of the house of the Medici, retaining their favor for three generations—*μετὰ δὲ τριτάτοιςιν ἀνασσειν*. He was equally countenanced by Cosmo, Pietro, and Lorenzo. He took holy orders in the forty-third year of his age, having, according to some accounts, had his thoughts earnestly directed to religion by the preaching of the celebrated Savonarola.

He was placed in charge of two churches in Florence by Lorenzo di Medici, and promoted to a canonry in the cathedral by the future pope Leo X. Lorenzo made him a present of the villa of Careggi, where he died, seven years after the death of the donor, and five years after the expulsion of his patrons from Florence. His constitution was always very feeble, his health uncertain, and his temperament melancholy. His frail body—for he scarcely attained half the ordinary stature of man—required constant care and nursing, and it is surprising that he was not worn out by continual study long before reaching his climacteric. His character was singularly pure and amiable; his attachments were strong and enduring; his tastes simple, and his desires moderate. He refused to profit by his powerful connections to enrich either himself or his family. He partook largely of the popular superstitions of the time, which were accordant with the later Platonism which he professed; and is said to have reappeared after death to his friend Michele Mercati, according to promise, to assure him of the immortality of the soul.

The Medicean Academy was extinguished by the invasion of Charles VIII.; but Ficinus had disseminated his influence and renown through the chair of philosophy in the University of Florence, to which he had been appointed by the Cardinal di Medici, afterwards Leo X. Here he acquired many distinguished pupils and friends, among them Giovanni Pico di Mirandola, Cavalcanto, Politian, etc. Enthusiasts came from the depths of Germany to profit by his instructions. Reuchlin regarded him with reverence, and among other illustrious admirers he numbered Matthias Corvinus, the accomplished king of Hungary, and pope Sixtus IV.

The numerous productions of Ficinus are enumerated by Moreri, and a more correct list is given in the *Bibliographie Universelle*. A life of him was written by Domenico Mellini, but it was never published, and it disappeared. Another life, composed by Giovanni Corsi in 1506, was published by Bandini (Pisa, 1771). The best account of the philosophy of Ficinus is given by Böhle, *Geschichte der Philosophie*; but the following authorities may be consulted: Schellhorn, *Amanitatis Lit.* tom. i.; Nicéron, *Mém. des Hommes Illustres*; Negri,

*Ist. Scritt. Fiorentini*; J. A. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Med. et Inf. Lat.* lib. vi. p. 496-7; Morhofius, *Polyhistor*. II, i, vii, § 15; Tiraboschi, *Storia della Lett. Ital.* tom. vi, lib. ii, c. ii, § xix-xxi; Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Phil.* per. iii, pt. i, lib. i, c. ii, § iii; Roscoe, *Life of Lorenzo di Medici*; Hallam, *Hist. Lit.* i, ch. iii, § 85-7, 115. (G. F. H.)

**Fiddes**, RICHARD, a clergyman of the Church of England, and author of several works marked by industry and research rather than talent, was born at Hunmanby, Yorkshire, in 1671. He took his bachelor's degree at University College, Oxford, in 1693. He was made rector of Halsham in 1694, but, losing his health, he devoted himself to authorship. Among his works are, *A Body of Divinity* (London, 1718-20, 2 vols. fol.);—*Fifty-two practical Discourses* (London, 1714, 3 vols. 8vo);—*Life of Cardinal Wolsey* (London, 1724, fol.);—*General Treatise on Morality* (London, 1724, 8vo). He died at Putney in 1725. Knight, in his *Life of Erasmus* (Introd. p. 15 sq.), accuses Fiddes of being at heart a Romanist. Knight accounts for Fiddes's speaking irreverently of Erasmus "probably because he had by his writings favored the Reformation. Dr. Fiddes censures the Reformation; and, to give it the more home strokes, goes to the very root of it, and does all he can to evince the unjustifiable grounds it proceeded upon, ridicules the instruments of it, and would insinuate that there was a change made for the worse, and therefore palliates some of the most absurd doctrines of the Church of Rome, which were happily thrown off at the Reformation." He afterwards goes further, asserting, among other particulars, that Fiddes had "most partially, and indeed scandalously, reflected upon the opening of the Reformation, laying on the grossest colors to hide the deformities of Popery." He then proceeds "to give the true rise and occasion of writing his *Life of Wolsey*," which he declares to have been at the solicitation of the late bishop Atterbury, on occasion of the dispute in which he was then engaged with archbishop Wake.—*New General Biog.* Dict. v, § 323.

**Fidejussores**, sureties, a title borrowed from the Roman law, and employed by Augustine to represent the office of sponsor. Baptism at an early period was considered in the light of a contract; and as many of the leaders in the early Church had, before their conversion, been engaged in the interpretation or administration of law, it was natural for them to use a term which they had been accustomed to employ in civil transactions. See SPONSORS.

**Fideles**. See FAITHFUL.

**Fidélis**, St., properly MARCUS ROY, was born at Sigmaringen in 1577. He studied law, and in 1604-10 visited the principal cities of Europe, but on his return he quitted his profession, and entered the order of the Capuchins under the name of Fidélis. After studying theology in the convents of Constance and Frauenfeld, he was ordained, and in 1621 obtained charge of Feldkirch, in Vorarlberg, Tyrol. Here he labored with great success, trying to re-establish the sway of the Roman Church among the Grisons. When Austria afterwards attempted to put down Protestantism by force of arms, Fidélis was sent by the pope as a member of the Propaganda, and the ruffian general Baldiron, with his dragoons, travelled from town to town exterminating those who refused to obey. But the peasants rose, defeated Baldiron, and only spared his life upon his taking the oath not to bear arms against them any more. The promise was soon broken; but the peasants rose again, and during the insurrection, Fidélis, having fallen into the hands of a party of peasants, was put to death, April 24, 1622. He was canonized by Clement XIII.—Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 403.

**Fidelium Missa**, *Mass of the Faithful*. Under the *Arcani Disciplina* (q. v.) the catechumens were not permitted to partake of the Lord's Supper with the

faithful (q. v.): they were allowed to join with them in worship only until the offertory. Then the deacon gave a signal to the catechumens to leave the church, saying *Ite, missa est*, "Depart, the assembly is dismissed." Hence arose the twofold *missa*, namely, the *missa catechumenorum* and the *missa fidelium*; the former meaning that portion of the public worship which was performed before the dismissal of the catechumens, and the latter that portion which was continued until the communicants went away.—Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. xiii, ch. i, § 3; bk. xv, ch. i, § 1; Far-*rar, Dictionary*, s. v. See MASS.

**Fief, Feod, Feud; Feudalism; Feudal System.** These terms relate to the peculiar organization of society in Western Europe during the Middle Ages, and specifically to institutions affecting real estate more profoundly than it has ever been affected by any others—institutions whose influence is still manifest in the language, doctrines, and procedure of law throughout Christendom.

A fief, feod, feud, or fee is an estate—and, primarily, an estate in land—held of a superior on condition of the faithful discharge of prescribed services, chiefly military. Feudalism denotes the essential character of the organization founded on the basis of such estates, and is frequently employed in a concrete sense to signify the organization itself and its accompaniments. The Feudal System is the name given to this organization, or to that body of institutions, political and social, established upon the military tenure of land which characterized the rising kingdoms of modern Europe. In the period of its incipient growth, in its maturity, and in its decline, the feudal system, like all other political arrangements, assumed diverse aspects, and assimilated to itself other coincident tendencies, but its identity may be discerned through all its manifold transformations. Its existence has been distributed by Sir Thomas Craig into four periods: I. From the barbarian invasions of the Roman empire to the reunion of the Frank monarchy under Dagobert I in 628; II. To the restoration of the Western empire in the person of Charlemagne in 800; III. To the accession of the Capetian dynasty in France, and of the Franconian line in Germany; IV. From the commencement of the 11th century to the gradual extinction of the polity at different times and in different degrees, in different countries. This division has not been universally accepted, and is open to many objections, but it may be of service. The culminating era of feudalism may be assigned to the times of the first crusade, and to the early ages of chivalry which constituted its bloom and expedited its decay.

An examination of the principles and phenomena of the feudal system will furnish all necessary information in regard to the other terms included in this title, so far as these illustrate the religious, moral, and social aspect of Europe during the period over which feudalism extends.

Under the feudal system the whole order of society rested directly on the tenure of land by military service. Territorial possessions were granted by the suzerain, or supreme lord, in consideration of prompt and gratuitous service in war, and participation in his deliberative and judicial courts. Lands were held of the principal lords, or tenants *in capite*, by the lesser barons, by similar obligations. By the like service, lands were held by vassors, knights, and squires. Even the lowest tenure of all, the peculiarly English tenure of socage, frank and villein, was of an analogous character, and secured the cultivation of the lord's domain, and the maintenance of himself, his family, and his retainers, in war and in peace. The system was strictly military in its nature—a uniform organization from the crown to the lowest landholder, establishing a regularly appointed army in scattered strongholds through every part of the country, to insure the support of the whole body politic in arms for the repression of do-

mestic insurrection and the repulsion of foreign attack.

Though such was the feudal system in its definite constitution, it did not, of course, begin in this closely articulated and rigorous form. It assumes much of this aspect even in the Lombard occupancy of Northern Italy in the 6th century; and its general outline may be imperfectly distinguished in the Ostrogothic kingdom of Theodoric (Sartorius, *Peuples d'Italie sous les Goths*, v, 61). But it had a simpler commencement, and both expanded and modified itself with the changing necessities of successive generations. It is in its rudimentary types, however, that its essential principles, and its singular adaptation to urgent contemporary needs, can be best detected. Inattention to its humbler beginnings has occasioned numerous controversies with regard to its origin, and rendered the information accessible on the subject often perplexed, contradictory, and uninteresting.

The vital germ of feudalism is contained in the act of homage—*hominagium, hominatum, hominagium, hominatium, hominatum*, etc.—the solemn formula by which a dependent professed himself *the man*, and faithful adherent of a superior, originally of his own selection, and always theoretically so ("Integrum et perfectum in se continet fidelitatem," *Libri Feudorum* ii, vii). The liegeman knelt down, placed his hands between the hands of his intended chief, and took upon himself the obligation of absolute *fidelity* in certain prescribed relations, so long as his superior performed the corresponding duties of protection and support. The contract was sealed with a kiss, and confirmed with the sanctions of religion (Galbert, *Vie de Charles-le-Bon, de Flandres*, ch. xii; Guizot, *Mém. pour servir*, etc., viii, 339-40). The profession of *fidelity* was ultimately expressed by the following declaration in the presence of the baronial court: "*Devenio homo vester de tenemento quod de vobis teneo, et fidem vobis portabo contra omnes gentes, salva fide debita Domino Regi et hereditibus suis*" (Bracton, ii, xxxv, 8; *Libb. Feud.* ii, x). With this declaration should certainly be compared the statement of Procopius in regard to the ancient usage under the Roman empire (*De Bello Vandal.* ii, xviii, vol. i, p. 491).

Homage, then, was the pledge of true and loyal service to a superior—liege faith and liege obedience—given in consideration of defence and maintenance promised by the baron (*man, par excellence* "baronem *ingenitum*," a free man. *Lex Satic.* xxxi; see Du Cange, *Gloss. Med. et Inf. Latin.* tit. *Baro*, who omits in his classical authorities for the word, Petron. *Satyr.* liii). One man voluntarily became the man of another, and that other became the chief, leader, adviser, patron, and protector of his homager. The vassal originally had, and long retained, the right of formally renouncing the reciprocal obligations contracted by the process of *diffidatio*, or defiance. By carrying this relation of perfect trust and faithful dependence through all gradations of society till it reached the head of the tribe or nation, the whole fiefal hierarchy was constructed, and all the members of the associated body were linked together in strict military union and subordination.

The principal object of this close correlation of the constituents of society was to maintain the population in a constant state of preparation for war, "with its captains over tens, and its captains over fifties, and its captains over hundreds, and its captains over thousands." For this purpose the lord granted to his liegeman a definite quantity of land, to be held on condition of rendering a definite amount of service in the wars and other affairs of his chief. In this way, every man within the feudal circle was professed the *faithful* follower of some lord—except the chief lord of all—the suzerain; and every piece of land was held *in fee* of some feudal superior. Hence arose the doctrine that the eminent domain of the whole realm belonged to the king, and that all honor, authority, and ownership of

the soil descended from him. Hence, too, the maxim of the English law, *nulla terra sine domino*—no estate in land without its lord. But these deductions were not drawn by the companions of Ataulph the Visigoth, of Clovis the Frank, or of Alboin the Lombard.

The principle of homage and the principle of the military tenure of land are not necessarily, though they are usually connected. They have existed separately, but they coalesced in the Middle Ages, and engendered by their conjunction what is so familiar under the name of the Feudal System.

When society was disintegrated by internal discord, misery, and both civil and foreign war; when it was constantly assailed by new hordes of barbarians; when life and property, the fruits of industry and tranquillity, were continually imperilled by the hazards of the times, the weakness of the government, and the exactions of imperial officials; when there was no longer any *faith* between man and man, any honesty of dealing, any security or protection against violent or insidious attacks (all which phenomena characterized the declining age of the Western empire and the ensuing centuries, Lactant. *Div. Inst.* vii, xv; Salvian. *De Gubernat. Dei*, iv, v-vi, et *passim*), the social ties which bind men together snapped like flax in the fire, and the social organism rotted into incoherent atoms, which were totally deprived of old mutual attractions, and of capacity for continued combination in the ancient forms. In order that men might live together—and together they must live in order to live at all in such times—it was necessary to provide mutual support against aggression, and to establish entire fidelity at least between individual men, so that conjoint resistance might be obtained by reliance on reciprocal support. These wants were satisfied by the feudal relation, which, commencing with the elements of society, reunited them, separately man to man, under pledges of mutual trust, fidelity, and dependence. It provided also for the defence of the soil and the fruits of the soil, nearly the sole productions of such disordered times, by resisting any attack upon the community or its members (Salvian. *Ibid.* v, viii). Feudalism thus supplied the means of reconstructing society from its very foundations, and of restoring coherence and some degree of security to distracted and dissociated populations. Of course, the scheme was cradled in weakness and imperfection, and grew, through many changes of feature and fluctuations of fortune, into perfect symmetry of form. Of course, long and anxious generations were required to permit the confluence and full development of arrangements at first local and obscure. And of course, too, the scheme expanded and became more systematic among an intrusive band of foreign warriors, settled in the midst of a larger and more intelligent population, and menaced from without by new intruders, and it developed itself still further and more predominantly as new necessities, new temptations, and new opportunities arose.

This organization of society, with the corresponding tenure of land, is so essential to the maintenance of any degree of social order or public safety in certain conditions of society, that it has presented itself, in some form or other, in analogous circumstances, in widely separated ages and countries. So frequent and so striking is this recurrence, that it suggested to Sir Walter Scott in 1789 an essay, in which he undertook to prove that the feudal system "proceeds upon principles common to all nations when placed in a certain situation." Sir Walter was delighted in his old age by finding this view illustrated and enforced in colonel Tod's *History of Rajahstan* (Lockhart, *Life of Scott*, ch. vi). It contains a considerable amount of truth, but is far from expressing the whole truth.

There are distinct indications of something very like feudalism in ancient Egypt. Approximations to it are found in the early history of China, India, and Persia. Analogies of the same sort may be discovered among

the Jews in their early occupation of the Holy Land. They may be suspected in the Spartan constitution; they are very evident in the institutions of Macedonia. The principles of feudalism are involved in Plato's ideal state (*De Legg.*). The relation of patron and client at Rome was essentially feudal. A semi-feudal organization was adopted by the Saracens in Spain, and exhibited by the Timariots, or mounted militia, among the Ottoman Turks. It may still be detected among the warlike tribes of Afghanistan, and among the Mongolian tributaries of the Chinese empire. Humboldt recognised it among the Guanches of Teneriffe, and among some of the South-Sea Islanders (*Personal Narrative*, ch. ii). Other instances might be noted. All show how some arrangement of the kind is inspired or necessitated by appropriate social requirements; they explain the facility with which feudalism was adopted, and its vitality when adopted; but they do not interpret its special forms in mediæval Europe, nor supply any testimony to the historical origin of the feudal system.

In regard to this origin a wide divergence of opinion has existed. Montesquieu, Guizot, and the generality of recent writers refer feudalism to the voluntary followers and companions—*comites*—of the Germanic chieftains, who invaded the Roman empire in the 5th and succeeding centuries; but it was never found among these Northern races in their original abodes. Some juridical antiquaries of the 16th century traced it to the *patronatus* and *clientele* of ancient Rome; but these resembled much more nearly the clans of the Scotch Highlands and the septa of Ireland. The better opinion appears to be that the principles and general framework of the system were of later Roman origin, whatever modifications and developments they may have received in the Teutonic kingdoms. This is the view espoused by Franciscus Balduinus (*ad Leges Romulæ*, apud Heineccii *Jurispr. Rom. et Att.* i, 50), the profound but inconstant jurist of the 16th century. It was entertained by his rival, the greater jurist Cujacius, and favored by Camden in his *Britannia*, and by Du Cange in his wondrous *Latin Glossary*. It has been reaffirmed, with suitable rectifications, by Sir Francis Palgrave, Lehuéron, Ozanam, and a few recent students of mediæval archaeology. This view does not conflict with the distinct acknowledgment of Teutonic influences in animating, sustaining, and moulding the fœdal elements.

It is impossible to introduce here either the arguments or the evidences by which this conclusion may be confirmed; but it is scarcely necessary to do more than examine the titles *Beneficiarius*, *Englytenis*, *Militis Limitanei*, *Lati*, *Coloni*, *Adscriptitii*, *Inquilini*, in the *Corpus Juris Civilis*, and the same titles, with the addition of *Commendatio*, *Feudum*, and its derivatives, in Du Cange, in order to be assured of its substantial correctness. It may be expedient to corroborate this position by citing the earliest distinct notice in a Latin author of such an organization: "*Sola, que de hostibus capta sunt, limitaneis ducibus et militibus donavit, ita ut eorum ita essent, si heredes illorum militarent, nec unquam ad privatos pertinerent; illi, ceteris attentis eos militarent, si etiam sua rura defendere vellent*" (Lampriid. *Alex. Severus*, c. lviii; *Cod. Theod.* vii, xv, ii; *Novell. Theod.* xxxiv; *Cod. Just.* xi, lx [lix], 3; Böcking, *Notit. Dign.* i, 292; ii, 168\*). To this may be added a significant exposition of the manner in which like arrangements sprung up in the interior of the Roman empire. . . . "Tradunt se ad tenendum protogendunque majoribus, dedititios se divitum faciunt, et quasi in jus eorum ditonenque transcendunt: nec tamen grave hoc aut indignum arbitror, immo potius gratulari hanc potentium magnitudinem quibus se pauperes debent; si patrocinia ista non vellent, si quod se humiles d'cunt defendere, humanitati tribuerent, non cupiditati" (Salvianus, *De Gubernat. Dei*, v, viii). The class technically designated *dedititii* ulti-

mately merged into serfdom, it is true, but only by Justinian's edict of 530 (*Cod. vii, v*); and the term is plainly metaphorical in Salavian.

Wherever the Teutonic hordes passed the frontiers of the Roman empire, they found the presence or the memory of the *Milites Limitanei*, whose constitution, traceable beyond the reign of Augustus, accorded with all the essential characteristics of undeveloped feudalism. These military borderers were, indeed, of kindred blood and race, and when they were supplanted or overlaid by new tribes, the institutions were retained, which had been designed as a protection against incursion. This was only the observance of the habitual policy of the barbarians in regard to the Roman civilization.

As has been already observed, the feudal scheme, like all other imperial forms, was contracted or extended, weakened or strengthened, according to the changes of fortune and social condition which checkered the agitated and anxious periods attending the overthrow of the Western empire. At times it was as much disguised and obscured, as largely recompounded with Teutonic associations, as was the ever-subsisting Roman jurisprudence during the same ages. But it survived in spirit and in outline, ready always to multiply its ramifications, and to attain such proportions as contemporaneous necessities might induce. It is thus that its existence and operation so frequently elude regard during the earlier centuries of its growth, and that its origin is so often referred to the late era when it became predominant and universal as the sole corrective of returning anarchy under the feeble successors of Charlemagne.

It is impracticable, within the space at command, to recount and explain the successive transformations of feudalism which culminated in the perfect type of the feudal system in the 9th, 10th, and 11th centuries. Its development accompanied and was due to the progressive dissolution and increasing inaptitude of the complex administrative organization of imperial Rome. A distinction of ages and a contradistinction of institutions have been suspected in the succession of the terms *munera*, *beneficia*, and *feuda*; and feudalism has been restricted to the period when the last of these designations prevailed. *Munera* is supposed to represent estates at will; *beneficia*, estates for life; and *feuda*, estates of inheritance. It has been assumed that feudalism could not properly be said to exist until benefices became hereditary. But the essence of feudalism does not reside in the duration of the estate, but in the nature, and especially in the obligation of the tenure. Moreover, the contrasted terms may be in some measure concurrent with, but they do not denote, such diversities of duration. *Munera* is a generic term applied to all honors, dignities, offices, and donations. There was no such clear line of demarcation, in meaning or in time, as Montesquien and others imagine, between estates for life and estates heritable. Such precision was entirely foreign to the habits and the dispositions of those troubled but practical ages. Life estates were conceded in Germany as late as 1378. The commencement of hereditary feuds is often referred to Hugh Capet, in 947. Montesquien assigns it to the reign of Charles the Bald, in 877. But such tenures are found under Louis le Debonnaire in 814; and in the form of *beneficia* they were customary under the Roman empire. Estates in perpetuity are mentioned under the name of *beneficia* as early as 759 (Ratpert, *Causa S. Galli*, § 2, *apud* Pertz, *Mon. Germ. Hist.* ii, 63; comp. S. Anskarii *Vita S. Willehadi*, § 8; *Ibid.* p. 382). But, in order to ascribe a purely Germanic origin to feuds, *beneficia* and *feuda* have been represented as diverse institutions. They are used as convertible terms throughout the *Book of Feuds*. "*Feudum idem cum beneficio*," says Du Cange (s. v., p. 258, col. 1). King Alfonso the Wise of Castile, declares in *Las Siete Partidas*: "*Feudo es bene-*

*fechio que da el señor a algun home, porque se torna su vasallo, et le fece homenage de serle leal. E tomo este nombre de fe que debe siempre guardar el vasallo al señor.*"

The term *feudum* is a barbarous, and probably hybrid compound, whose first employment Illallam assigns to a constitution of Robert I of France in 1008, though it is found in a constitution, of somewhat doubtful authenticity, of Charles the Fat, in 884. Were there no fiefs antecedent to the introduction of this name? If there were, then *beneficia* are fiefs. If there were not, then fiefs are the same things as *beneficia*. The confusion has proceeded from the fantastic derivation of *Feod*, from the supposed Teutonic word *Fe*, represented by the Anglo-Saxon *Fea*, *Froh*, *fee*, and the Scandinavian *od*, *odh*, property. Unfortunately, feudalism was a late and very partial innovation among both Anglo-Saxons and Scandinavians, while the term *Feudum* springs up along the Rhine; and the Anglo-Saxon *Froh* is congenuous to the Latin *pecus*—*pecoris*—if not borrowed from it. The *fe* in *Fe-od*, the Spanish and Provençal *fe*, the modern French *foi*, the Scotch *fen*, are apparently nothing but contractions of the Latin *fide* or Italian *fide*. "*Feudum, credo, a fide, quia vox ex Italia in Germaniam venit. Et ante seculum xii feuda in Germania et apud omnes Francos beneficia appellabantur*" (Leibnitz, *Collect. Etymolog. Opp.* ed. Dutens, tom. vi, pt. ii, p. 58, 59). "*Nulla autem investitura debet ei fieri, qui fidelitatem fovere recusat, quam a fidelitate feudum dicatur vel a fide*" (*Libb. Feud.* ii, iii, 3; compare vii). This derivation of the term *Feod* is singularly corroborated by the use of the word "*truage*" in Sir Thomas Malory's *Morte d'Arthur*: "And thus Sir Marhans every day sent unto king Marke for to pay the *truage* which was behind of seven years, or else to find a knight to fight with him for the *truage*" (pt. ii, ch. iv, *Romance of Sir Tristrem*).

It is indubitable that feudal tenures long existed in the midst of Roman *fundis* and *possessionses*, and of Germanic allodial estates; it is also unquestionable that these were gradually absorbed or transmuted into feudal tenements, for the conversion of allodial into feudal holdings is illustrated by ample documentary evidence; and it is also certain that this feudalization of the land was not completed till the times when the word *feuda* comes into use. But this will not justify the juridical distinctions which have been proposed, nor sanction the alleged derivation of *Feod*, nor sustain the Germanic origination of the tenure. The designation of *Feod* may well have been devised as a counterpart to *alodh*; but the generally received etymology of *alodh* is very unreliable, and strong arguments may be adduced for referring it to the same source as the common English word *lot*. This question, however, cannot be examined here. (Compare Kemble, *The Saxons in England*, bk. i, ch. iv, vol. i, p. 90, 91, with Procopius, *De Bell. Vandal.* i, v, in regard to the κλιποι βασιλικων.)

In the 10th and 11th centuries the feudal system acquired its widest extension, assumed its full, symmetrical form, and engrossed nearly all the functions of government, judicature, police, war, and industrial organization. It constrained and overshadowed the attenuated framework of the Roman administrative constitution (which, however, coexisted with it), and adapted itself to it by making the king the feudal suzerain of the nation—the emperor, the supreme temporal head of Christendom. Everything accepted a feudal complexion and a feudal structure—"nothing but did sniffer a sea-change." The process of government, the public revenue, the offices of state, the modes of jurisdiction, the command in war, the ecclesiastical constitution, the municipal arrangements, the guilds and corporations of arts and trades, the occupations of rural, mining, and other industry, were all feudalized. Everything rested on homage, fealty, and the military tenure of land, or was assimilated to the forms springing from that basis. As in the Russian empire, all

office or authority is invested with a military character and designation, so everything under the feudal system adopted a feudal type. To this cause we must attribute the ecclesiastical baronies which arose during the period, and also the priestly warriors, the fighting abbots, and the knightly bishops, who inspire such surprise and disgust during the Middle Ages. The Roman Church, with the pope at its head, was the spiritual empire, rivalling and co-ordinate with the secular empire of Germany, and contending for a loftier supremacy. The ecclesiastical organization became baronial and feudal throughout all its provinces and dioceses, as the counterpart and counterpoise of the feudal kingdoms, and duchies, and counties, under the acknowledged but disregarded suzerainty of the holy Roman empire. No other scheme, no idea inconsistent with the prevailing scheme, could be entertained among populations saturated with feudalism, and environed with its universal atmosphere. How thoroughly the Church had accepted the general feudalization is shown by an allocution of pope Innocent II to the Lateran Council, April 20, 1139: "The pontifical throne is the source of all ecclesiastical authority and dignity; so that every such office or dignity is to be received at the hands of the Roman pontiff as a *feoff of the Holy See, without which enjoyment no such office can be lawfully exercised or enjoyed*" (quoted by Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri*, bk. xii, ch. i).

By this process, infinitely diversified, though ever essentially the same, society was slowly reconstructed and re-edified through long generations of anarchy, wretchedness, and foreign peril from new swarms of ruthless assailants. The elements and forces of a new civilization were thus collected and harmonized, and were recombined into a uniform and coherent system on the simple basis of fidelity between man and man. Ancient paganism had died out, and universal scepticism had supervened before the new religious faith which was to regenerate the world had been accepted by minds still largely tainted with heathenism. All human trust had been betrayed and dissipated; all social ligaments had been corroded or ruptured; all dependence upon government, law, and public force had been deceived and outraged; and yet—consentaneously with the introduction of a new religious creed, and of fresh races to maintain that creed (*Salvian, De Gubernat. Dei; Augustine, Civitas Dei*)—the seeds of a renovated social union were sprouting in the dust and ashes of the dissolving empire, and grew up in the midst of violence and disorder:

"Per damna, per cales, ab ipso  
Ducit opes animamque ferro."

This new growth, from its earliest development, protected life and property, rendered industry possible once more, sustained or revived languishing hope, defended the shattered relics of the old civilization from the ruin of interminable swarms of ever-increasing barbarians, disciplined communities in habits of obedience and order, renewed the culture of the soil, reorganized the nations, and inaugurated a new series of the ages by introducing loyal faith between lord and vassal, and the honorable protection of the weak by the powerful. The political renovation thus ran parallel with the spiritual transmutation, deriving life and encouragement from it even when resisting its influence, and confirming its dominion even while contaminating its morality by the infection of worldly interests and passions. Though the feudal order never realized in practice the ideal which its function suggests—what human institution has ever done this?—though sore blemishes at all times stained its actual manifestations, yet the strong but rare eulogies bestowed upon it are fully justified by the inestimable services which it rendered to the nations during the millennial agony of humanity. High, indeed, must be the merits which provoke a concert of praise from such antipodes as Montesquieu and De Maistre, and

make the former proclaim his conviction that "the feudal system was the best-constituted government that ever existed upon earth;" and the latter declare that "feudalism was the most perfect institution that the universe has seen." The crinations which have been so bitterly, and not altogether unjustly, directed against the feudal spirit, are applicable to its decline, when it had rendered its incomparable service to mankind, and had become an embarrassment and a tyranny amid the enlarging industry, the augmented intelligence, and the ampler aspirations which its long duration had cherished and trained.

Montesquieu boasted of closing his discussion of feudalism where others commenced, yet he mistook or overlooked its true antecedents and characteristics. From this notice nearly everything has been excluded which is repeated in familiar or accessible authors; nor has the associated topic of serfs and serfdom been noticed, as it presents an occasion for extended and independent consideration.

From Blackstone, Robertson, Hallam, etc., may be learned the habitual organization of nations during the maturity of the feudal system. From authors of a like character may be pleasantly ascertained the romantic and other aspects of those memorable developments of feudalism, the Crusades and Chivalry—"a gilded halo hovering round decay." From similar sources may be drawn all needful information in regard to the various species of feuds or fees, and to what are called feudal incidents. These incidents attached to every fief, and consisted of, 1. Reliefs; 2. Fines on alienation; 3. Escheats; 4. Aids; 5. Wardship; 6. Marriage (Hallam, *Hist. Middle Ages*, ch. ii, pt. i; Blackstone, *Comm.* bk. ii, ch. v; Robert (du Var), *Hist. de la Classe Ouvrière*, liv. iv, ch. vi; liv. v, ch. i-iv). These *servitia*, or burdens, varied somewhat at different times and in different countries; they were incidental rather than essential to feudalism, and most of them accompanied the early Roman *clientela*. Their exposition, therefore, is not indispensable in a summary appreciation of the general characteristics and operation of the feudal system.

*Authorities.*—To give a list of authorities for such topics as Fief, Feudalism, Feudal System, would require the enumeration of volumes sufficient for an extensive library. It may suffice to note here some of the principal works connected with the subject, a few of which have been already referred to, and most of which have never been seen by the writer:—*Codex Theodosianus* (ed. Gothofredus); *Corpus Juris Civilis* (ed. Gothofredus); *Basilica* (ed. Hembach); *Baluzii Capitularia*—a more complete and satisfactory edition is found in Pertz, *Monumenta Hist. Germ.*; *Libri Feudorum*, cum commentatione J. Cujacii; Foncher, *Assizes de Jerusalem*; Bengnot, *Assizes de Jerusalem* (very instructive extracts from this text are given in Cantu, *Hist. Universelle*, vol. ix, append. A); Lespeyres, *Entstehung u. älteste Bearbeitung der Libb. Feudorum*; Marculfi *Formularie*; Beaumanoir, *Coustumes de Beauvoisis*; Honard, *Coutumes Anglo-Normandes*; Loysel, *Institutions Coutumières*; Alteserra, *Origines Feudorum*; Caravita, *Praelectiones Feodales*; Cragius, *De Feudis*; Dalrymple, *History of Feudal Property*; Boehmer, *Principia Juris Feudorum*; Salvaing, *L'Usage des Fiefs*; Brussel, *Usage Général des Fiefs*; Jenichen, *Thesaurus Juris Feudalis*; Turzole, *Traité de la Seigneurie Féodale Universelle*; Guyot, *Des Fiefs*; *Institutions Féodales*; Winspeare, *Abusi Feudali*; Gebauer, *Origines Feodi*; Le Févre, *De l'Origine des Fiefs*; De Gaillardon, *Scènes de la Vie Féodale au XIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle*; Galland, *Traité du Franc-Alléu*; La Boulaye, *Hist. du Droit Foncier en Occident*; Lehuérou, *Institutions Mirroringiennes et Carolingiennes*; Böcking, *Notitia Dignitatum Utriusque Imperii*; Meyer, *Esprit, Origine, et Progrès des Institutions Judiciaires*; Allen, *On the Royal Prerogative*; Spence, *Inquiry into the Origin of the Laws and Institutions of Modern Europe*; *Equitable Jurisprudence of the Court of Chancery*, vol. i;

Savigny, *Hist. du Droit Romain*; Mortreuil, *Hist. du Droit Byzantin*; Du Cange, *Glossarium Med. et Inf. Latinitatis*; Du Bos, *Hist. Crit. de la Monarchie Française*; Boulainvilliers, *Mem. Hist. sur l'Etat de France*; Mably, *Observations sur l'Histoire de France*; Made-moiselle De Lézardière, *Théorie des lois politiques de la Monarchie Française*; Montlosier, *De la Monarchie Française*; Montesquieu, *Esprit des Lois*, liv. xxx, xxxi; Guizot, *Hist. de la Civilisation en Europe*; *Hist. de la Gr. en France*; Ozanam, *La Civilisation ou Cinquième Siècle*; *Etudes Germaniques*; Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England*; Robertson, *Life of the Emperor Charles V*; Lyttelton, *History of Henry II, King of England*; Hallam, *History of the Middle Ages*; and *Supplement*; Kemble, *The Saxons in England*; Palgrave, *The English Commonwealth*; *Hist. of Normandy and England*; St. Palaye, *Histoire de la Chevalerie*; St. Marie, *Diss. Hist. sur la Chevalerie*. (G. F. II.)

**Field** (usually שָׂדֵה, *sadeh'* [poetic שָׂדֵי, *saday'*], ἄγρος; but occasionally שְׂדֵי, *s'rets*, land [Chald. ܒܪ, *bar*, open country], χώρα; חוּץ, *chuts*, out-doors; חֵלְקֵה, *chelk'h'*, a portion or plot, χωρίον; שְׂדֵי, *shelemah'*, a cultivated field, according to Gesenius and Fürst from the context, in the plur. Deut. xxxii, 32; 2 Kings xxiii, 4; Isa. xvi, 8; Jer. xxxi, 40; IIab. iii, 17; also שָׂדֵי, *shad'eb'*, an arable field, in the plur. Jer. xxxix, 10). The Hebrew *sadeh* is not adequately represented by our "field;" the two words agree in describing cultivated land, but they differ in point of extent, the *sadeh* being specifically applied to what is unenclosed, while the opposite notion of enclosure is involved in the word *field* (compare DESERT). The essence of the Hebrew word has been variously taken to lie in each of these notions, Gesenius (*Thesaurus*, p. 1321) giving it the sense of freedom, Stanley (*Palest.* p. 481) that of smoothness, comparing *arum* from *arare*. On the one hand *sadeh* is applied to any cultivated ground, whether pasture (Gen. xxix, 2; xxxi, 4; xxxiv, 7; Exod. ix, 3), tillage (Gen. xxxvii, 7; xlvii, 24; Ruth ii, 2, 3; Job xxiv, 6; Jer. xxvi, 18; Mic. iii, 12), woodland (1 Sam. xiv, 25; A. V. "ground"; Psa. cxxxii, 6), or mountain-top (Judg. ix, 32, 36; 2 Sam. i, 21); and in some instances in marked opposition to the neighboring wilderness, as in the instance of Jacob settling in the field of Shechem (Gen. xxxiii, 19), the field of Moab (Gen. xxxvi, 35; Numb. xxi, 20, A. V. "country"; Ruth i, 1), and the vale of Siddim, i. e. of the cultivated fields, which formed the oasis of the Pentapolis (Gen. xiv, 3, 8), though a different sense has been given to the name (by Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 1321). On the other hand, the *sadeh* is frequently contrasted with what is enclosed, whether a vineyard (Exod. xxii, 5; Lev. xxv, 3, 4; Numb. xvi, 14; xx, 17; compare Numb. xxii, 23, "the ass went into the field," with ver. 24, "a path of the vineyards, a wall being on this side and a wall on that side"), a garden (the very name of which, גַּן, implies enclosure), or a walled town (Deut. xxviii, 3, 16): unvalled villages or scattered houses ranked in the eye of the law as fields (Lev. xxv, 31), and hence the expression εἰς τοὺς ἀγρούς = houses in the fields (Vulg. in villas; Mark vi, 36, 36). In many passages the term implies what is remote from a house (Gen. iv, 8; xxiv, 63; Deut. xxii, 25) or settled habitation, as in the case of Esau (Gen. xxv, 27; the Sept., however, refers it to his character, ἀγροικος); this is more fully expressed by שְׂדֵי הַבָּיִת, "the open field" (Lev. xiv, 7, 53; xvii, 5; Numb. xix, 16; 2 Sam. xi, 11), with which is naturally coupled the notion of exposure and desertion (Jer. ix, 22; Ezek. xvi, 5; xxxii, 4; xxxiii, 27; xxxix, 5). See MEADOW.

The separate plots of ground were marked off by stones, which might easily be removed (Deut. xix, 14; xxvii, 17; comp. Job xxiv, 2; Prov. xxii, 28; xxxiii, 10); the absence of fences rendered the fields

liable to damage from straying cattle (Exod. xxii, 5) or fire (ver. 6; 2 Sam. xiv, 30); hence the necessity of constantly watching flocks and herds, the people so employed being in the present day named *Natur* (Wortabst, *Syria*, i, 293). A certain amount of protection was gained by sowing the tallest and strongest of the grain crops on the outside: "spelt" appears to have been most commonly used for this purpose (Isa. xxviii, 25, as in the margin). From the absence of enclosures, cultivated land of any size might be termed a field, whether it were a piece of ground of limited area (Gen. xxiii, 13, 17; Isa. v, 8), a man's whole inheritance (Lev. xxvii, 16 sq.; Ruth iv, 5; Jer. xxxii, 9, 25; Prov. xxvii, 26; xxxi, 16), the *ager publicus* of a town (Gen. xli, 48; Neh. xii, 29), as distinct, however, from the ground immediately adjacent to the walls of the Levitical cities, which was called שְׂדֵי הַבְּרִיחַ (A. V. "suburbs"), and was deemed an appendage of the town itself (Josh. xxi, 11, 12), or, lastly, the territory of a people (Gen. xiv, 7; xxxii, 3; xxxvi, 35; Numb. xxi, 20; Ruth i, 6; iv, 3; 1 Sam. vi, 1; xxvii, 7, 11). In 1 Sam. xxvii, 5, "a town in the field" (Auth. Vers. "country") was a provincial town as distinct from the royal city. A plot of ground separated from a larger one was termed שְׂדֵי הַבְּרִיחַ (Gen. xxxiii, 19; Ruth ii, 3; 1 Chron. xi, 13), or simply שְׂדֵי הַבְּרִיחַ (2 Sam. xiv, 30; xxiii, 12; comp. 2 Sam. xix, 29). Fields occasionally received names after remarkable events, as Helkath-Hazzurim, the *field of the strong men*, or possibly of swords (2 Sam. ii, 16), or from the use to which they may have been applied (2 Kings xviii, 17; Isa. vii, 3; Matt. xxvii, 7). See LAND.

It should be observed that the expressions "fruitful field" (Isa. x, 18; xxix, 17; xxxii, 15, 16) and "plentiful field" (Isa. xvi, 10; Jer. xlviii, 35) are not connected with *sadeh*, but with *karmel*, meaning a park or well-kept wood, as distinct from a wilder ess or a forest. The same term occurs in 2 Kings xix, 23, and Isa. xxxvii, 24 (A. Vers. "Carmel"); Isa. x, 18 ("forest," and Jer. iv, 26 ("fruitful place"). See CARMEL. Distinct from this is the expression in Ezek. xvii, 5, שְׂדֵי הַבְּרִיחַ (A. V. "fruitful field"), which means a field suited for planting suckers.—Smith, s. v. See AGRICULTURE.

**Field, David Dudley**, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born in East Guilford, Conn., May 20, 1781, prepared for college under Dr. John Elliott, of Guilford, and graduated at Yale in 1802. After studying theology under Dr. Backus, he was licensed to preach in 1803, and was installed pastor at East Haddam in 1804. He filled this charge with great diligence and success until 1818, and in 1819 accepted a call to Stockbridge, Mass. After eighteen years' pastoral service at Stockbridge, he was called in 1837 to his old parish at Haddam. In 1848 he travelled in Europe. In 1851 he gave up his charge at Haddam, and spent the remainder of his life in quiet retirement at Stockbridge, where he died April 15, 1867. Dr. Field was a man of strong character. His mental powers were vigorous and comprehensive; his culture was at once thorough and varied. His duties as preacher and pastor were always filled with conscientious care; and his long pastorates, with the unusual ease of his return to his first charge after an absence of thirty-three years, sufficiently attest the confidence and affection of his parishioners. Of his ten children, six sons are now living, and all eminent as professional men; among them are Cyrus W. Field, the "father" of the Atlantic Telegraph, and Dr. H. M. Field, editor of *The New York Evangelist*. Besides a number of occasional sermons, Dr. Field published *History of Middlesex:—History of Berkshire:—Genealogy of the Braintree Family*.—Appleton's *Annual Cyclop.* 1867, p. 301.

**Field, Richard**, D.D., one of the best of the High-

Church writers of the Church of England, was born at Hampstead, Hertfordshire, in 1561, and was educated at Magdalen Hall, Oxford, where he lectured for seven years on logic and philosophy, and gained the reputation of a learned preacher and an acute disputant. He was afterwards reader of divinity at Lincoln's Inn, London, and rector of Burghleas in Hampshire. Here he refused the offer of St. Andrew's, in Holborn, London, a much more valuable living, that he might serve God and pursue his studies in a more retired situation. In 1598 queen Elizabeth made him one of her chaplains, and he formed a warm friendship with Richard Hooker, a man of kindred spirit. In 1604 he was made canon of Windsor, and in 1609 dean of Gloucester. "He was esteemed a perfect oracle in ecclesiastical learning. Divines, even of the first order, scarce ever went to him without loading themselves with questions. Fuller calls him 'that learned divine, whose memory smelleth like a field which the Lord hath blessed.' When king James heard him preach the first time, he said, 'This is a Field for God to dwell in.' His majesty retained so good an opinion of him that he designed to raise him to the bishopric of Oxford; but God was pleased, as Mr. Wood remarks, to prefer him for a better place, for, on the 21st of November, 1616, he died, leaving behind him a character equally great and amiable. His reputation rests securely on his great work, *The Book of the Church*, which was originally issued in 1606, and with a fifth book added in 1810. A new edition, printed for the "Ecl. Hist. Society," appeared at Cambridge, 1847-52 (4 vols. 8vo).—Hook, *Ecl. Biog.* v, 116; Middleton, *Ecl. Biog.* ii, 374.

**Field-preaching**, or preaching in the open air, "a plan adopted by reformers in every age, in order to propagate more extensively and effectually their peculiar sentiments among the great masses of the people. Christ and his apostles not only availed themselves of the privileges which the synagogues afforded of making known the 'Gospel of the Kingdom' to those who assembled therein from Sabbath to Sabbath, they also proclaimed the doctrines and precepts of the new dispensation on the highways and hedges, on the seashore and on the barren glade, on the mountain's side and in the streets of the teeming city. Wherever men were found, and under whatever circumstances they were placed, if their ears could be reached, there the voice of the first teachers of Christianity was heard, warning sinners of coming danger, and pointing out the only way of escape—the only medium of access unto God. So was it, too, with other reformers, whose labors our limits forbid our noticing, as we desire to add a few words on the field-preaching of Whitefield and Wesley. The practice was commenced by the former, and that without any misgivings as to the 'irregularity' of such a strange proceeding; whereas the latter, though a man of more highly cultivated intellect, and who, on that account, ought to have risen superior to the prejudices of his order, was, with much reluctance, induced to follow in the course so heroically opened up by the eloquent Whitefield. But having once commenced, there was no drawing back; he had taken to the field, and no man's face or frown should cause him to retire. John Wesley was not a man of a weak and shrinking spirit, as his whole life testifies; but he was a man who proved himself on all occasions to be a good soldier of Jesus Christ. When Whitefield was refused the pulpits of the London and Bristol churches, and after he had been threatened by the chancellor of the diocese of the latter place with suspension and excommunication if he persisted in preaching in his diocese without a license, he resolved in his mind whether it might not be his duty to preach in the open air. Indeed, he had thought of this before he was refused permission to preach in the pulpits of the establishment, when he saw that thousands who sought to hear him could not gain admittance into the churches. He mentioned his thoughts to some friends, who

pronounced the idea to be a mad one; but now, he believed that in Bristol his duty in this respect was no longer doubtful. Moreover, many persons said to him, 'What need of going abroad? Have we not Indians enough at home? If you have a mind to convert Indians, there are colliers enough at Kingswood.' To these, therefore, he determined to preach the message of reconciliation. The colliers at Kingswood were without any means of religious instruction; they had no church in which to worship, no minister to teach them the duties of religion, or to pray with them; hence they were notorious for their brutality and wickedness, and in times of excitement were a terror to all around them. On February 17, 1739, Whitefield proceeded to Rose Green, Kingswood (his first field-pulpit), where he preached to as many as the novelty of the scene collected, which were about 200. 'The ice being now broke'—to use his own observation on this first open-air sermon—he determined to persevere in the same course. Accordingly, he visited Kingswood frequently, and every time he went there the number of his hearers increased; for, besides the colliers, thousands of all ranks flocked from Bristol and the neighborhood, and the congregation was sometimes computed at 20,000. With gladness and eagerness many of these despised outcasts, who had never been in a church in their lives, received the instruction of this eminent follower of him who '*went about doing good.*' 'The first discovery,' says he, 'of their being affected was to see the white gutters made by their tears, which plentifully fell down their black cheeks, as they came out of their coal-pits. . . . Sometimes, when 20,000 people were before me, I had not, in my own apprehension, a word to say, either to God (in prayer) or to them (by preaching). . . . The open firmament above me, the prospect of the adjacent fields, with the sight of thousands and thousands, some in coaches, some on horseback, and some on the trees, and at times all affected and drenched in tears together, to which sometimes was added the solemnity of the approaching evening, was almost too much for, and quite overcame me.' Whitefield was then requested to preach in a bowling-green in the city, and he complied. Many of the audience sneered to see a stripling with a gown mount a table on unconsecrated ground; for field-preaching, since common enough in England, was then unknown, and therefore obloquy was poured upon it. His engagements so increased that he sought the help of Mr. Wesley. Without delay Mr. Wesley proceeded to Bristol, and on his arrival was invited to preach in the open air. 'I could scarce reconcile myself at first,' says he, 'to this strange way of preaching in the fields, of which he (Whitefield) set me the example on the Sunday, having been all my life, till very lately, so tenacious of every point relating to decency and order that I should have thought the saving of souls a sin if it had not been done in a church.' However, on the following day, Mr. Wesley preached from a little eminence in an open ground adjoining the city to about 5000 people. In the days of Whitefield and the Wesleys field-preaching was not unfrequently attended with danger. Though they often met with a kind reception from the multitudes, yet at other times they experienced the rudest and most determined opposition, and often their lives were in imminent peril from the violence of an ignorant, depraved, and excited populace. In his *Earnest Appeal*, Mr. Wesley asks, 'Who is there among you, brethren, that is willing (examine your own hearts) even to save souls from death at this price? Would not you let a thousand souls perish rather than you would be the instrument of rescuing them thus? I do not speak now with regard to conscience, but to the inconveniences that must accompany it. Can you sustain them if you would? Can you bear the summer sun to beat upon your naked head? Can you suffer the wintry rain or wind, from whatever quarter it blows? Are



you able to stand in the open air, without any covering or defence, when God casteth abroad his snow like wool, or scattereth his hoar frost like ashes? And yet these are some of the smallest inconveniences which accompany field-preaching. Far beyond all these are the contradiction of sinners, the scoffs both of the great vulgar and the small; contempt and reproach of every kind; often more than verbal affronts—stupid, brutal violence, sometimes to the hazard of health, or limbs, or life. Brethren, do you envy us this honor? What, I pray you, would buy you to be a field-preacher? When Mr. Wesley had been accustomed to field-preaching for more than twenty years, he made the following remarks: 'One hour in Moorfields might convince any impartial man of the expediency of field-preaching. What building, except St. Paul's church, could contain such a congregation? and if it would, what human voice could have reached them there? By repeated observations, I find I can command thrice the number in the open air that I can under a roof. And who can say the time for field-preaching is over, while, 1. Greater numbers than ever attend; 2. The converting as well as the convincing power of God is eminently present with them?' One extract more, and this article must close. Mr. Wesley thus describes these open-air services: 'I cannot say I have ever seen a more awful sight than when, on Rose Green or the top of Hannan Mount, some thousands of people were calmly joined together in solemn waiting upon God, while

““They stood, and under open air adored  
The God who made both air, earth, heaven, and sky.””

And whether they were listening to his word with attention still as night, or were lifting up their voice in praise as the sound of many waters, many a time have I been constrained to say in my heart, "How dreadful is this place!" This, also, "is no other than the house of God! this is the gate of heaven!"' (See *Memoirs of Wesley*, by Coke, Southey, and Watson; also Jackson's *Centenary of Wesleyan Methodism*.) Having now once adopted this mode of imparting instruction to the neglected classes of the community, Mr. Wesley never abandoned it to the end of his life; and in a short time his brother Charles followed his example in the same self-denying labor of love, being urged thereto by the indefatigable Whitefield. Mr. Charles Wesley's first field-sermon was preached at Moorfields on June 24, 1739, his congregation amounting to about 1000, and in the evening of the same day he preached to multitudes on Kennington Common. A few weeks afterwards he preached to about 10,000 people in Moorfields; and for several years he followed with equal steps both his brother and Mr. Whitefield in laborious zeal and public usefulness. It is not to be supposed that Mr. Wesley had not preached in the open air till the time he was induced by Mr. Whitefield to do so at Bristol. He had done so in Georgia before Mr. Whitefield was ordained, but he had no intention of resuming the practice in England until compelled to do so by the necessities of the case. He says, "Wherever I was now desired to preach (in churches), salvation by faith was my only theme. . . . Things were in this posture when I was told I must preach no more in this, and this, and another church; the reason was usually added without reserve, "Because you preach such doctrine." . . . After a time I determined to do the same thing in England which I had often done in a warmer climate—to preach in the open air.' 'Be pleased to observe,' he adds, '1. That I was forbidden to preach in any church "for preaching such doctrine." 2. That I had no desire nor design to preach in the open air till after the prohibition. 3. That when I did, as it was no matter of choice, so neither of premeditation. There was no scheme at all previously formed which was to be supported thereby. 4. Field-preaching was therefore a sudden expedient—a thing submitted to rather than chosen; and therefore sub-

mitted to because I thought preaching even thus better than not preaching at all.' Field-preaching, or, as it was called, tent-preaching, that is, preaching from a tent, was common in Scotland on summer sacramental occasions up till a very recent period. The practice still survives in some parts of the Highlands. Thousands from neighboring parishes used to assemble on the brae or in the quiet hollow, and listen to the word of life. But unhallowed scenes sometimes occurred, of which Burns's *Holy Fair* is an exaggerated picture; and such gatherings have been discontinued. Of late, however, field-preaching has been resorted to for a different purpose—that of evangelization—so that the masses may be reached which have given up attendance at the house of God. Everywhere the result seems to be satisfactory, and the practice is every year more and more extensively followed in Great Britain."—Eadie, *Ecol. Cyclop.* s. v. See CAMP-MEETING.

**Fifth-monarchy-men**, a sect of Millenarians which sprung up in the time of Cromwell, and held that the millennial reign of Christ on earth, styled by them the fifth great monarchy, reckoned in succession with the Assyrian, Persian, Grecian, and Roman ones, was then to begin. Under the lead of Thomas Venner, a wine-cooper, they formed a plot to inaugurate their kingdom of the saints on April 9th, 1657, but were foiled by the vigilance of Thurloe, the secretary of state, and a number of the conspirators, arrested with arms in their hands, were sent to the Tower, though the penalty of the law, death, was not inflicted on any of them. On the 6th of January, 1661, some fifty or sixty of these madmen, led by the same Venner, rose in insurrection, if we may term it such, against the government of Charles II, proclaimed "king Jesus," attacked the police force, and, after concealing themselves for two days in Caen Wood, near Hliligate, returned to encounter the train-bands, insanely believing that neither bullet nor steel could harm them. Most of them, refusing quarter, were slain outright; but Venner and sixteen others were taken, tried, and executed.—Knight, *Popular Hist. of England*, iv, 206, 251; *Pictorial Hist. of England*, iii, 421, 679 (Chambers's ed.); Burnet, *Hist. of His Own Times*, vol. i, bk. ii; Baxter, *Hist. of the Church of England*, p. 606, 611; Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans* (London), iv, 186. (J. W. M.)

**Fig**, The usual Hebrew word for this is תְּמָרָה (*te'mah'*, of uncertain etymology), which is universally translated *fig* (N. T. *σίκκιον*) and *fig-tree* (N. T. *σικκίη*) in both ancient and modern versions, and no doubt correctly so. It has from the earliest times been a highly esteemed fruit in the East, and its present as well as ancient Arabic name is *tin*. When figs are spoken of as distinguished from the fig-tree, the masc. plur. form תְּמָרִים is used (see Jer. viii, 13). The other words rendered *fig* in the Auth. Vers. are: *פַּג* (*pag*, "green fig," Cant. ii, 13; *δωριζος*, "untimely fig," Rev. vi, 13), a designation of the late fig, which, being unripe at the proper time for gathering, frequently hangs on the tree over winter (comp. also the name BETH-PHAGE); and *בִּכְרִיָּה* (*bikkurah'*, "first ripe," Isa. xxviii, 4; Jer. xxiv, 2; Mic. vii, 1; Hos. ix, 10), which denotes the early or spring fig, still called *boccore* in Mauritania, and in Spanish *abocora* (Shaw, *Travels*, p. 370, fol.). See also SYCAMORE.

The fig is mentioned in so many passages of Scripture that our space will not allow us to enumerate them, but they are detailed by Celsius (*Hierobot.* ii, 368). The first notice of it, however, occurs in Gen. iii, 7, where Adam and Eve are described as sewing fig-leaves together to make themselves aprons. The common fig-leaf is not so well suited, from its lobed nature, for this purpose; but the practice of sewing or pinning leaves together is very common in the East even in the present day, and baskets, dishes, and un-

brellas are made of leaves so pinned or sewn together. Hence some have supposed the *Ficus Indica* to be the tree there referred to, but this is unlikely and unnecessary. The fig-tree is enumerated (Deut. viii, 8) as one of the valuable products of Palestine, "a land of wheat, and barley, and vines, and fig-trees, and pome-



The Fig (*Ficus Carica*).

granates." The spies who were sent from the wilderness of Paran brought back from the brook of Eshcol clusters of grapes, pomegranates, and figs. Mount Olivet was famous for its fig-trees in ancient times, and they are still found there (see Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 187, 421, 422). The fig-tree is referred to as one of the signs of prosperity (1 Kings iv, 25). Hence "to sit under one's own vine and one's own fig-tree" became a proverbial expression among the Jews to denote peace and prosperity (Mic. iv, 4; Zech. iii, 10). The failure of this fruit is likewise noted as a sign of affliction (Psa. cv, 33). The very frequent references which are made in the Old Testament to the fig and other fruit-trees are in consequence of fruits forming a much more important article of diet in the warm and dry countries of the East than they can ever do in the cold and moist regions of the North (see Judith x, 5; comp. Mishna, *Shebi'ith*, iv, 7). Figs are also used medicinally; and we have a notice in 2 Kings xx, 7, of their employment as a poultice (comp. Pliny, xxiii, 62; Dioscor. i, 184). In the historical books of the Old Testament mention is made of cakes of figs, used as articles of food, and compressed into that form for the sake of keeping them (*σχάδες, carica*, Lucian, *Vit. Auct.* 19; Martial, xiii, 28). Such a cake was called *הַבְּרֵכָה* (Talmud, *בבב, טניל, בבב, Mishna, Terumoth*, iv, 8), or more fully *הַבְּרֵכָה הַרְבֵּעִי*, on account of its shape, from the root *הַבְּרֵכָה*, to make round (see 1 Sam. xxx, 12; Jer. xxiv, 2 sq.). Hence, or rather from the Syrian *דבבל*, the first letter being dropped, came the Gr. word *παλάθη* (see Wesseling, *ad. Diol. Sic.* xvii, 67). Athenæus (xi, p. 500, ed. Casaub.) makes express mention of the *παλάθη Συριακή*. Jerome, on Ezek. vi, describes the *παλάθη* as a mass of figs and rich dates, formed into the shape of bricks or tiles, and compressed in order that they may keep. Such cakes hardened so as to need cutting with an axe. The fig is still extensively cultivated in the East, and in a dried state, strung upon cords, it forms an extensive article of commerce from Persia to India. The fig-tree, though now successfully cultivated in a great part of Europe, even as far north as the southern parts of

England, is yet a native of the East, and probably of the Persian region, where it is most extensively cultivated. The climate there is such that the tree must necessarily be able to bear some degree of cold, and thus be fitted to travel northwards, and ripen its fruit where there is a sufficient amount and continuance of summer heat. It has a smooth stem, which is seldom quite straight, and is covered with a gray bark; the leaves are of the shape of a heart, with three or five lobes, and are indented; the upper side is rough, the lower is covered with fine hair. The fruit makes its appearance before the leaves, but not before the flowers or blossom, which lies concealed within a hollow, fleshy receptacle (Hogg, *Vegetable Kingdom*, p. 676). The fertilization of the blossoms is often assisted by an artificial process called *caprification* (Pliny, xx, 21; Tournefort, ii, 52; Russel, *Alippo*, i, 168; Hasselquist, p. 221). See the *Penny Cyclopædia*, s. v.



Fig-tree (*Ficus Carica*).

**FIG-TREE, CURSED.** Few passages in the Gospels have given occasion to so much perplexity as that of Mark xi, 13, where the evangelist relates the circumstance of our Lord's cursing the fig-tree near Bethany: "And seeing a fig-tree afar off having leaves, he came, if haply he might find anything thereon: and when he came to it he found nothing but leaves, for the time of figs was not yet." The apparent unreasonableness of seeking fruit at a time when none could naturally be expected, and the consequent injustice of the sentence pronounced upon the tree, has been made the ground of grave impeachment of the Gospel record, and of our Saviour's character itself.

The fig-tree (*Ficus Carica*) in Palestine produces fruit at two, or even three different periods of the year: first, there is the *bikkurah*, or "early-ripe fig" (*πρόδρομος, praeoos*, Pliny, xv, 19; xvi, 49; Macrobi. *Sat.* ii, 16), frequently mentioned in the O. T. (see Mic. vii, 1; Isa. xxviii, 4; Hos. ix, 10), which ripens on an average towards the end of June, though in favorable places of soil or temperature the figs may ripen a little earlier, while under less favorable circumstances they may not be matured till the middle of July (Buhle, *Calendar Econ.* p. 15). The *bikkurah* drops off the tree as soon as ripe; hence the allusion in Nab. iii, 12, when shaken they "even fall into the mouth of the eater." Shaw (*Trav.* i, 264, 8vo ed.) aptly compares the Spanish name *breba* for this early fruit, "quasi breve," as continuing only for a short time. About the time of the ripening of the *bikkurim* the *kermis* or summer fig begins to be formed; these rarely ripen before August (Buhle, *ut sup.* p. 41), when another crop, called "the winter fig," appears. Shaw describes this kind as being of a much longer shape and darker

complexion than the *kermis*, hanging and ripening on the tree even after the leaves are shed, and, provided the winter proves mild and temperate, as gathered as a delicious morsel in the spring (see Miss Bremer's *Travels in the Holy Land*, i, 195; compare Pliny, *N. H.* xvi, 26, 27). Thus, especially in sheltered situations (e. g. the plain of Gennesareth, Josephus, *War*, iii, 10, 8), fresh figs might be had at almost all seasons of the year (compare Strabo, xi, 508; Columella, *Arbor.* 21).

The attempts to explain the above-quoted passage in Mark are numerous, and for the most part very unsatisfactory; passing over, therefore, the ingenious though objectionable reading proposed by Dan. Heinsius (*Exercit. Sac.* ed. 1639, p. 116) of *οὐ γὰρ ἦν, καρπὸς σίκων*—"where he was, it was the season for figs"—and merely mentioning another proposal to read that clause of the evangelist's remark as a question, "for was it not the season of figs?" and the no less unsatisfactory rendering of Hammond (*Annot. ad St. Mark*), "it was not a good season for figs," we come to the interpretations which, though not perhaps of recent origin, we find in modern works.

The explanation which has found favor with most writers is that which understands the words *καρπὸς σίκων* to mean "the fig-harvest;" the *γὰρ* in this case is referred, not to the clause immediately preceding, "he found nothing but leaves," but to the more remote one, "he came if haply he might find anything thereon;" for a similar *trajectio* it is usual to refer to Mark xvi, 3, 4; and the sense of the whole passage would then be as follows: "And seeing a fig-tree afar off having leaves, he came if perchance he might find any fruit on it (and he ought to have found some), for the time of gathering it had not yet arrived, but when he came he found nothing but leaves." (See the notes in the Greek Testaments of Burton, TroLope, Bloomfield, Webster, and Wilkinson; Macknight, *Harm. of the Gospels*, ii, 591, note, 1809; Elsley's *Annot.* ad l. c., etc.) A forcible objection to this explanation will be found in the fact that at the time implied, viz. the end of March or the beginning of April, no figs at all eatable would be found on the trees: the *bikkurim* seldom ripen in Palestine before the end of June, and at the time of the Passover, the fruit, to use Shaw's expression, would be "hard, and no bigger than common plums," corresponding in this state to the *puggim* (פֻּגִים) of Cant. ii, 13, wholly unfit for food in an unprepared state; and it is but reasonable to infer that our Lord expected to find something more palatable than these small, sour things upon a tree which by its show of foliage bespoke, though falsely, a corresponding show of good fruit, for it is important to remember that *the fruit comes before the leaves*. Again, if *καρπὸς* denotes the "fig-harvest," we must suppose that, although the fruit might not have been ripe, the season was not very far distant, and that the figs in consequence must have been considerably more matured than these hard *puggim*; but is it probable that Mark would have thought it necessary to state that it was not yet the season for gathering figs in March, when they could not have been fit to gather before June at the earliest? It would be better to understand the *γὰρ* here in an adversative-illative sense = *although*.

There is another way of seeking to get over the difficulty by supposing that the tree in question was not of the ordinary kind. Celsius (*Hierob.* ii, 385) says there is a peculiar fig-tree known to the Jews by the name of *Benoth-shuach* (בְּנֵי תֵּיטֵי), which produces *grossuli*, "small unripe figs" (*puggim*) every year, but only good fruit every third year; and that our Lord came to this tree at a time when the ordinary annual *grossuli* only were produced! We are ignorant as to what tree the *Benoth-shuach* may denote, but it is obvious that the apparent *unreasonableness* remains as it was. As to the tree which Whitley (*Commentary in*

*Mark*, l. c.) identifies with the one in question, that it was that kind which Theophrastus (*Hist. Plant.* iv, 2, § 4) calls *αἰφώλλον*, "evergreen," it is enough to observe that this is no fig at all, but the carob or locust tree (*Ceratonia siliqua*). Dr. Thomson, however, speaks of a large green-colored fig that ripens in May on Lebanon, and probably much earlier in milder positions (*Land and Book*, i, 538).

But, after all, where is the *unreasonableness* of the whole transaction? It has been stated above that the fruit of the fig-tree appears before the leaves (see Hackett, *Illust. of Scripture*, p. 133); consequently, if the tree produced leaves, it should also have had some figs as well. As to what natural causes had operated to effect so unusual a thing as for a fig-tree to have leaves in March, it is unimportant to inquire; but the stepping out of the way with the possible chance (*εἰ ἄρα, si forte*, "under the circumstances," see Winer, *Gram. of N. Test. Diction.* p. 465, Masson's transl.) of finding eatable fruit on a fig-tree in leaf at the end of March, would probably be repeated by any observant modern traveller in Palestine. The whole question turns on the *pretensions* of the tree; had it not proclaimed by its foliage its superiority over other fig-trees, and thus proudly exhibited its *precoiousness*; had our Lord at that season of the year visited any of the other fig-trees upon which no leaves had as yet appeared with the prospect of finding fruit, then the case would be altered, and the unreasonableness and injustice real. The words of Mark, therefore, are to be understood in the sense which the order of the words naturally suggests. The evangelist gives the reason why no fruit was found on the tree, viz. "because it was not the time for fruit;" we are left to infer the reason why it *ought to have had* fruit if it were true to its pretensions; and it must be remembered that this miracle had a typical design (see the *Christ. Annotator*, i, 228), to show how God would deal with the Jews, who, professing, like this precocious fig-tree, "to be first," should be "last" in his favor, seeing that no fruit was produced in their lives, but only, as Wordsworth well expresses it, "the rustling leaves of a religious profession, the barren traditions of the Pharisees, the ostentatious display of the law, and vain exuberance of words without the good fruit of works" (comp. Ezek. xvii, 24). So Trench (*Notes on the Miracles*, p. 438) concludes: "All the explanations which go to prove that, according to the natural order of things in a climate like that of Palestine, there might have been, even at this early time of the year, figs on that tree, either winter figs which had survived till spring, or the early figs of spring themselves—all these, ingenious as they often are, yet seem to me beside the matter. For, without entering further into the question whether they prove their point or not, they shatter upon that *οὐ γὰρ ἦν καρπὸς σίκων* of Mark, from which it is plain that no such calculation of probabilities brought the Lord thither, but those abnormal leaves which he had a right to count would have been accompanied with abnormal fruit."—Smith, s. v.

Monographs on this fig-tree cursed by the Saviour have been written in Latin by Flensburg (Hafn. 1775), Gösigen (Lips. 1697), Hofmann (Jena, 1670), Iken (Bremen, 1741), Juster (Abo, 1724), Muler (Hafnia, 1739), Schmidt (Viteb. 1701), Majus (in *Obs. sacr.* p. 71 sq.), Simonis (Fr. ad V. 1689), Withon (in *Opusc.* p. 159 sq.), Witsius (Lugd. Bat. 1709); in German by Pagendarm (Wolfenb. 1755), Ebeling (in *Hamb. gel. Briefwechsel*, 1750, p. 513 sq.), Stosch (in Rathlef's *Theol.-g.* 1754, p. 27 sq.), Kunze (in the *Studien u. Krit.* 1841, iii, 702). See Jesus.

**Fight** (מִלְחָמָה, *milchamah'*, Deut. ii, 32; 1 Kings xx, 26; 2 Chron. xxvi, 11; xxxii, 2, *war* or *battle*, as usually rendered; or מִרְכָּבָה, *marak'ah'*, 1 Sam. xvii, 20, *battle-array*, as often rendered; in other passages some form of the verbs מָלַח, נָלַח, etc.; Gr. πόλε

*μῆρ*, war, as usually rendered, or *μαχὴ*; also *ἀγῶν*, etc.). The Israelites began their existence as a nation with an aggressive campaign, in the sequel of which nevertheless they were from time to time compelled to occupy a defensive position throughout the entire period of the Judges (q. v.). This consisted, however, for the most part, of tumultuary and disconnected skirmishes. Regular engagements first occurred under (Saul and) David; and the frequent hostile collisions of disciplined Hebrew generals in the civil and foreign commotions of subsequent periods must have greatly stimulated military training. The opening of a campaign (generally in spring, 2 Sam. xi, 1; Josephus, *Ant.* vii, 6, 3; Harmer, ii, 283), as well as of single engagements, although not prefaced by regular diplomatic communications or a declaration of war (but see Judg. xi, 12 sq.; 1 Kings xx, 2 sq.; 2 Kings xiv, 8; Josephus, *Ant.* iv, 8, 41), was preceded in important and deliberate cases by an interrogation of the Urim (q. v.) and Thummim (Judg. xx, 27 sq.; 1 Sam. xiv, 37; xxiii, 2; xxviii, 6; xx, 8) or a prophet (1 Kings xxii, 6 sq.; 2 Chron. xviii, 4 sq.; 2 Kings xix, 2 sq.), in like manner as the Greeks consulted oracles before beginning a contest, and even took seers with them to the field (see Wachsmuth, *Hellen. Alterth.* iii, 390, 411). A peculiar species of divination prior to an attack is mentioned (Ezek. xxi, 20 sq.) with regard to the Chaldeans (see LOT), like the *extispicium* of the Romans (Cicero, *Divin.* i, 16; ii, 12 sq.). See SOOTHSAVER. In solemn instances, while the army stood in sight of the enemy, an offering was brought (1 Sam. vii, 9; xiii, 9 sq.), and a priest (Deut. xx, 2 sq.), who always appears to have accompanied the prince to the field (2 Chron. xiii, 12, 14; comp. Num. x, 9; a specially selected and anointed functionary of this kind, like a modern field-chaplain [Mill, *De sacerdote castronsi veter. Hebr.* Utr. 1728], is mentioned in the Mishna, *Sotah*, viii, 1, by the name of *הַכֹּהֵן הַמְּבַרֵךְ*; see Reland, *Antiq. Sacr.* ii, 3, 2; Otho, *Lex. Rab.* p. 89; Van Alphen, in Oelrich's *Collectio*, ii, 515 sq.; Tatii *Diss. de sacerdote castr. Hebr.*, and Ugolini *Diss. de sacer. castr.* [both in Ugolini *Thesaur.* xii]; Thorschmiel, *De sacerdote ad bell. uncto*, Torg. 1737; Kretzschmar, *De uncto bell.*, Dresd. 1738; although not mentioned in the O.-T. books; comp. Deyling, *Observ.* ii, 298; Lakemacher, *Observ. Philol.* iii, 236 sq.), or the commander himself, delivered a hortatory oration (2 Chron. xx, 20). Then followed by a trumpet blast the signal for the conflict (Numb. xiii, 12; 1 Macc. xvi, 8), and the struggle began amid terrific battle-cries (*הַבְּרָחָה*, 1 Sam. xvii, 52; Isa. xlii, 13; Amos i, 14; Jer. i, 42; Ezek. xxi, 22; as among almost all ancient nations; see especially Homer, *Il.* ii, 144 sq., 394 sq.; iii, 2 sq.; iv, 452 sq.; Curt. iii, 10, 1; Tacit. *Germ.* iii, a; Doughtai *Analect.* i, 74 sq.; Potter, *Greek Antiq.* ii, 174 sq.). The battle-array (*הַמַּחֲרָה* or *הַמַּחֲרָה*, 1 Sam. iv, 2; xxii, 8, 20, etc.; comp. *מַחֲרָה*, Judg. xx, 30; 1 Sam. xvii, 21) appears to have been a simple ranging of the troops in line; and even in the Maccabean period, when the Jews had acquired some of the strategic art of the Greek Syrians, their leaders seem to have rested in their simple tactics, gaining advantage over the martial skill of the enemy chiefly by their patriotic valor. Scientific marshallings and exact military lists are mentioned in 1 Macc. vii, 26 sq.; ix, 11; comp. ver. 45 (see Joseph. *Ant.* xiii, 12, 5); x, 77 sq.; xii, 28. The foreign troops of the later Jewish kings were manoeuvred according to Greek and Roman tactics (comp. Joseph. *Ant.* xiii, 12, 5). For stratagems of the Jews during their final war, see Josephus, *War*, iii, 7, 13, 14, 20, 28. Nevertheless we can early trace a division of the army into three corps, probably with a view to charge the enemy in the centre and upon both flanks (Judg. vii, 16, 19; 1 Sam. xi, 11; 2 Sam. xviii, 2; comp. 1 Macc. v,

33; so four divisions, 2 Macc. viii, 22: the expression *wings* of the army was already known, comp. *כַּנְפֵי צְבָא*, Isa. viii, 8; *כַּנְפֵי צְבָא*, Ezek. xii, 14, 17; xxxviii, 6, etc.; see Gesenius, *Comment. zu Jes.* i, 335, and *Thesaur.* p. 229). The field was probably fought man against man. The extended arms of the combatants appear to have been bare ("exserti lacerti, humeri," etc. Sil. Ital. xii, 715; Lucan, ii, 543; Statius, *Theb.* i, 413, etc.), the military mantle having no armlets (comp. Ezek. iv, 7; Isa. lii, 10; so Doughtai *Analect.* i, 257 sq.). Great prowess, especially bodily dexterity and agility (for attack and pursuit), was a main qualification for the soldier or officer (2 Sam. i, 23; ii, 18; 1 Chron. xii, 8; Hab. iii, 19; the "swift of foot" of the Homeric heroes). Signals for retreat or desisting from pursuit of the enemy were sounded on the trumpet (*הַבְּרָחָה*, 2 Sam. ii, 28; xviii, 16; xx, 22). Single combat (q. v.) between two champions, which decided the battle (like the Horatii and Curiatii of Livy, i, 24), is the well-known one between David and Goliath (1 Sam. xvii); another example occurs 2 Sam. ii, 14 sq. Sometimes peculiar stratagems were resorted to in the fight (comp. 2 Kings vii, 12 sq.; see Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* iii, 233 sq.), especially the surprise (Judg. vii, 16 sq.), the ambuscade (*מַחְסֵי*, Josh. viii, 2, 12; Judg. xx, 36; 1 Sam. xv, 5), and surrounding (2 Sam. v, 23). Informants and spies (*מַחְסֵי*, *κατάσκοποι*) were also employed (Josh. ii, vi, xxii; Judg. vii, 10 sq.; 1 Sam. xxvi, 4; 1 Macc. v, 38; xii, 26). Distinguished acts of individual valor were often secured by an appointed prize (Josh. xv, 16; Judg. i, 12; 1 Sam. xvii, 25 sq.; xviii, 25 sq.; 1 Chron. xi, 6). With the design of insuring a successful issue in battle, the sanctuary (ark of the covenant) was sometimes carried into the field (1 Sam. iv, 4 sq.; comp. 2 Sam. v, 21). We have no sufficient accounts as to the disposition of the Hebrew camp aside from the Mosaic arrangement (Numb. ii); although from 1 Sam. xvii, 20; xxvi, 5, it appears to have had a circular form, like that of the Arabs (also the Bedouins, Arvieux, iii, 214) and ancient Greeks (Xenoph. *Rep. Laccd.* xii, 1), and we may understand the term *מַחְסֵי* (Auth. Vers. "trench") to refer to the bulwark of vehicles and beasts of burden, or (with Thenius) the circumvallation of the encampment (q. v.). The camps were usually guarded by carefully-posted sentinels (Judg. vii, 19; 1 Macc. xii, 27), and during the action a garrison remained in them or among the baggage (1 Sam. xxx, 24). Vanquished enemies were in general treated very severely: the captured generals and princes were put to death (Josh. x, 24; Judg. vii, 25); not unfrequently they were cut to pieces alive or beheaded when dead (2 Macc. xv, 30; 1 Sam. xvii, 54; comp. Herodot. vii, 77; Joseph. *War*, i, 17, 2); all warriors were stripped (1 Sam. xxxi, 8; 2 Macc. viii, 27), and the living captives either carried into slavery (Numb. xxxi, 26 sq.; Deut. xx, 14; some mitigation, however, being shown in the case of females, Deut. xxi, 11 sq.) or put to death (Judg. ix, 45), sometimes in a cruel manner (2 Sam. xii, 31; 2 Chron. xxiii, 12; comp. Judg. viii, 7), or even mutilated (Judg. i, 6 sq.; 1 Sam. xi, 2), although these cases of extreme severity are evidently peculiar and exceptional. As in all ancient warfare, the gentler sex and tender age were not always spared amid the ruthless fury of vengeance: there are notices of women violated or dismembered of their unborn infants, and of children dashed in pieces against stones and the corners of streets (2 Kings xv, 16; comp. 2 Kings viii, 12; Isa. xiii, 16; Amos i, 13; Hos. x, 14; xiv, 1; Nah. iii, 10; 2 Macc. v, 13; see Schultens, *Monument. histor. Arab.* p. 125; Wachsmuth, *Hellen. Alterthümer*, iii, 425); although these occur chiefly in connection with heathen countries (comp. Josephus, *Apion*, ii, 29). Captured horses were hamstringed (2 Sam. viii, 4; Josh. xi, 6, 9). But

see **BOOTY**. Conquered cities were occasionally burnt or demolished (Judg. ix, 45; 1 Macc. v, 28, 52; x, 84); at least heathen sanctuaries were destroyed (1 Macc. v, 68; x, 84) or carried away (Isa. xlvi, 1; see Gesenius, *Comment.* in loc.). The open country itself was laid waste (Judg. vi, 4; 1 Chron. xx, 1; 2 Kings iii, 19, 25; comp. Judith ii, 17; Herodot. i, 17). Sometimes the conquerors contented themselves with pulling down the fortifications and carrying away the treasures (2 Kings xiv, 14; comp. 1 Kings xiv, 26; 2 Kings xxiv, 13), demanded hostages (2 Kings xv, 14), and exacted contributions (2 Kings xviii, 14; see Isa. xxxiii, 18); garrisons were also left in charge (2 Sam. viii, 6, 14). But a more absolute war of extermination was waged by the Hebrew people against the Canaanites on the esode into Palestine. See **ACCURSED**. Victory was celebrated with joyful shouts, songs, and dances (Judg. v; 1 Sam. xviii, 6 sq.; 2 Sam. xxii; Judith xvi, 2, 24; 1 Macc. iv, 24); trophies were also set up (1 Sam. xv, 12; 2 Sam. viii, 13; but see Thenius, ad loc.). As permanent memorials of good fortune in war, captured weapons or pieces of armor were deposited in the sanctuary (1 Sam. xxi, 9; see xxxi, 10; 2 Kings xi, 10; 1 Chron. x, 10; comp. Homer, *Il.* vii, 83; Virg. *Æn.* vii, 183 sq.; Justin, ix, 7; Lucan, i, 240; Tacit. *Annal.* i, 59, 2). For military exploits, individuals were honored with presents or a promotion (1 Sam. xviii, 25 sq. [comp. Rosellini, *Monum. Stor.* iv, 74]; 2 Sam. xviii, 11), and David had a sort of honorary legion (2 Sam. xxiii, 8). Herod the Great once rewarded all his soldiers for a hard-earned victory with money (Joseph. *Ant.* xiv, 15, 4). Leaders who fell were honored by the army with military mourning (2 Sam. iii, 31), and their weapons were placed in their grave (Ezek. xxxii, 27; comp. Doughty *Anal.* ut sup.), as in that case the burial (with the tumultuary pomp of war, Amos ii, 2) of the remains was a cardinal duty of the army and its commander (1 Kings xi, 15). The scrupulousness of the later Jews respecting the observance of the Sabbath (q. v.) sometimes gave the enemy an advantage over them. See generally Lydiî *Spatuqna de re mi'itari*, c. notis Van Til (Dordæi, 1638; also in Ugolini *Thes.* xxvii). Kausler's *Wörterb. der Schlachten aller Völker* (vol. i, Ulm, 1825) is of little value for Hebrew archaeology.—Winer, i, 680. Compare **BATTLE**. On 1 Cor. ix, 26, see **GAMES**.

**Figure** stands in the Auth. Vers. as the representative of the following words in the original:  $\text{כָּרָת}$ , *se'mel*, Dent. iv, 16, i. e. an *idol*, as elsewhere rendered;  $\text{מִקְלָאֵת}$ , *mikla'ath*, 1 Kings vi, 29, a *carving*, as elsewhere rendered; but usually, in a metaphorical sense,  $\text{תְּבַרִיחַ}$ , *tabnâh'*, Isa. xliv, 13, *likeness* or *pattern*, as elsewhere rendered; to which correspond in the N. T.  $\tauύπος$ , Acts vii, 43; Rom. v, 14, a *type*;  $\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\tau\upsilon\pi\omicron\varsigma$ , Heb. ix, 24, 1 Pet. iii, 21, an *antitype*; and  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\beta\omicron\lambda\eta$ , Heb. ix, 9; xi, 19, a *parable*, as elsewhere rendered. See **TYPE**; **PARABLE**.

**Fiji Islands**, a group of islands in Polynesia, situated 340 miles north-west of the Friendly Islands, between lat. 15° 30' and 19° 30', and long. 177° and 178° West. It comprises 225 islands, of which 95 are inhabited. The others are occasionally resorted to by natives for the purpose of fishing, and taking the *bêche-de-mer*, or sea-slug. Two are large islands, stretching north-east and south-west nearly throughout the whole extent of the group, and are supposed to be each about 300 miles in circumference. The group comprises seven districts, and is under as many principal chiefs. All the minor chiefs on the different islands are more or less connected or subject to one of these. The area of the whole group is estimated at 8033 sq. miles, and the population at from 200,000 to 300,000. The white population is about 600, among whom are 40 Americans. The people are divided into a number of tribes,

independent of and often hostile to each other. In each tribe great and marked distinction of rank exist. The classes which are readily distinguished are as follows: 1. kings; 2. chiefs; 3. warriors; 4. the king's messengers (*matanivanua*, literally "eyes of the lands"); 5. slaves (*kaisi*). Mbau, the metropolis and imperial city, is situated on a small island, about two miles in circumference. It contains nearly one thousand inhabitants.

War is a constant occupation of the natives, and engrosses most of their time and thought. In 1809 they became acquainted with the use of fire-arms. The crew of a brig which had been wrecked on the reef off Nairai, in order to preserve their lives, joined the Mbau people, instructed them in the use of the musket, and assisted them in their wars. Next to war, agriculture is the most general occupation of this people. They have a great number of esculent fruits and roots, which they cultivate in addition to many spontaneous productions of the soil.

Of the religion of the natives, the following account is given in Newcomb, *Cyclopædia of Missions*: "The pantheon of the Fijians contains many deities. 'Many of the natives,' says Mr. Hunt, in his Memoirs of Mr. Cross, 'believe in the existence of a deity called *Ovê*, who is considered the maker of all men; yet different parts of the group ascribe their origin to other gods. A certain female deity is said to have created the Vewa people; and yet if a child is born malformed it is attributed to an oversight of *Ovê*.' The god most generally known next to *Ovê* is *Ndengei*. He is worshipped in the form of a large serpent, alleged to dwell in a district under the authority of Mbau, which is called *Nakauvandra*, and is situated near the western end of Viti-Levu. To this deity they believe that the spirit goes immediately after death for purification, or to receive sentence. All spirits, however, are not believed to be permitted to reach the judgment-seat of *Ndengei*; for, upon the road, it is supposed that an enormous giant, armed with a large axe, stands constantly on the watch. With this weapon he endeavors to wound all who attempt to pass him. Those who are wounded dare not present themselves to *Ndengei*, and are obliged to wander about in the mountains. Whether the spirit be wounded or not depends not upon the conduct in life; but they ascribe an escape from a blow to good luck. They have four classes of gods besides their malicious deities. The occasions on which the priests are required to officiate are usually the following: to implore good crops of yams and taro; on going to battle; for propitious voyages; for rain; for storms, to drive boats and ships ashore, in order that the natives may plunder them; and for the destruction of their enemies. Their belief in a future state, guided by no just notions of religious or moral obligation, is the source of many abhorrent practices, among which are the custom of putting their parents to death when they are advanced in years, suicide, the immolation of wives at the funeral of their husbands, and human sacrifices."

The islands were discovered in 1643 by Tasman, partly rediscovered in 1773 by Cook, visited in 1789 and 1792 by Bligh, but accurate information about them was for the first time obtained through the expeditions of Dumont d'Urville (1827) and Wilkes (1840). The history of the Christianization of the Fiji Islands began in 1855. In October of that year, the Rev. Wm. Cross and D. Cargill, Wesleyan missionaries from England, proceeded from Vavau, one of the Friendly Islands, to Lakemba, one of the Fiji Islands. It is but a small island, being only about 22 miles in circumference, and did not contain above 1000 inhabitants. The chief, to whom their object was explained, appeared friendly, gave them a piece of land on which to live, and built a temporary dwelling for each of their families. In a few months the missionaries baptized a number of the natives, some of whom had previously

obtained a knowledge of Christianity in the Friendly Islands. The chief, being only a tributary chief, appeared unwilling to take any step in favor of Christianity until he knew the minds of the more powerful chiefs of Fiji, and even threatened and persecuted the converts. In the course of a few years, the missionaries, with the aid of native teachers and preachers, some of whom came from the Vavau Islands, introduced the Gospel into various other islands of the Fiji group besides Lakenba, as Rewa, Vewa, Bua, Nandy, and some others of minor importance. They were favorably received by a number of the chiefs and the people, in some instances, however, from motives of a secular character. In 1845 and the following year there was a great religious movement in the islands of Vewa, which extended also to other islands, and resulted in large additions to the Christian churches. Among the most remarkable fruits of the movement was the conversion of a chief whose name was Varin, and who had long acted as the human butcher of Seru, being called the Napoleon of Fiji.

In 1854, the chief king of the islands, king Thakombau, who occupied several of the smaller islands and the eastern coast of Viti-Levu, together with his tribe, embraced Christianity. Since this time the prosperity of the islands has rapidly increased, and they are now partially civilized. A number of whites have settled on the island, and have developed to a considerable extent the natural resources of the soil. A great part of the territory of Thakombau is now mapped off into cotton and sugar plantations, most of the planters being Australians. There is also in the island of Levuka, now the head-quarters of the king and his seat of government, a flourishing little town called Ovalau, which has a hotel and a number of stores, all of them kept by whites. There is a British consul also stationed in this island, and in 1868 an agent of the American government was sent there from Sidney. About the same time that king Thakombau embraced Christianity, the crews of two American whalers were murdered by his subjects. The American government preferred a claim for compensation, and it was ultimately agreed that \$45,000 should be paid by the Fijians in reparation for the outrage committed. The king, finding it difficult to raise the sum agreed upon, offered in 1858 his entire territory to the English government, by which it was, however, declined. In 1868 the king's prime minister, C. H. Hare (an Englishman), proposed that the American government should not only take possession of the three islands which had been mortgaged to it, but that it should also purchase all the other islands of the group. As the government of the United States was disinclined to buy the islands, an offer was accepted from a company in Melbourne, the Fiji Trading and Banking Company, which undertook to pay the amount due to the U. States, and in return received very extensive rights and privileges.

Christianity is now the predominant religion in the Fiji Islands. In the *Wesleyan Methodist Calendar* for 1869, the statistics of the mission are reported as follows: circuits, 9; chapels, 453; other preaching-places, 339; missionaries and assistant missionaries, 58; subordinate paid and unpaid agents, 4051; members, 17,836; on trial for membership, 4609; scholars in schools, 35,617; attendants on public worship, 109,088. The Christianization of the whole group makes rapid progress. One heathen island was visited in 1867 for the first time. In the same year the Rev. Mr. Baker, a Wesleyan missionary, also a native assistant missionary, a native catechist, and six native students, were murdered by the people in the interior of Viti-Levu. See Newcomb, *Cyclopedia of Missions*, p. 720; Brown's *History of Missions*, vol. i; J. Hunt's *Life of Mr. Cross*; Walter Lawry, *Missions in Tonga and Fiji*; G. R. Rowe, *Life of John Hunt*; T. Williams and James C. Ivert, *Fiji and the Fijians* (London, 2d edit. 1863, 2 vols.). (A. J. S.)

**File** is the incorrect rendering in the Eng. Bible of the expression פִּימָה פִּימָה (petsirah' pim, found only in 1 Sam. xiii, 21), which literally signifies a *notching of the mouth or edge of tools*, i. e. bluntness or dullness of the agricultural instruments, in consequence of the want of smiths to sharpen them by welding out the point.

**Filiation** (OF SON OF GOD). The state of relationship in which the Second Person of the Godhead stands to the First, as the *Son of the Father*. See CHRISTOLOGY; FATHER; SON OF GOD; SONSHIP; TRINITY.

**Filioque Controversy**, a historical question as to the introduction of the words *kai ek tou viou* (*filioque*, and from the Son) into the Nicene Creed, to denote the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son as well as from the Father. The Western churches admit the *filioque*; the Eastern deny it; and this is the chief doctrinal point of division between the Greek and Latin churches.

1. The original Nicene Creed (A.D. 325), it is admitted on all hands, does not contain the *filioque*. The simple statement there made is, "we believe also in the Holy Ghost" (*kai eis to Pneuma to agion*). See CREED, vol. ii, p. 562. The Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed (A.D. 381) adds the phrase *to ek tou patros ekporomeuon*, who proceedeth from the Father; but says nothing about "the Son" (CREED, vol. ii, p. 562). The Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) made certain modifications of the language of the creed [see CHALCEDON, vol. ii, p. 196], but left the passage relating to the Holy Ghost unchanged. Nor has any change on this point ever been authorized by any general council recognised as such either by the Eastern or Western churches. To this day the creed is recited and used throughout the East in the original form. But the Roman Church, and also the Reformed churches, used it with the words "and from the Son." The historical question is, When and how did this interpolation take place?

2. It was said under CREED (vol. ii, p. 563) that this addition of *filioque* first appeared in the acts of a synod at Braga, in Spain, A.D. 412 (A.D. 411; Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* x, 4, 16), but the records of that synod are now acknowledged, even by the Latins, to be spurious (Hefele, *Concilien-geschichte*, ii, 91). In 446, Turibius, bishop of Astorga, addressed a letter to Leo the Great complaining of the Priscillianist heresy in Spain. Leo ordered a council of all Spain, but the troubles of the time (the Goths controlling much of the country) made this impossible; and two synods were held, one in Toledo, the other in Galicia (A.D. 447; Mansi, vi, 491). At Toledo, nineteen bishops were present; and here, and by these nineteen Spanish bishops, the words *filioque* were first used of the procession of the Holy Ghost in a creed (Hefele, *Concilien-geschichte*, ii, 289). But the words were not added here to the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed. This was first done at the third Council of Toledo (A.D. 589), held by order of king Reccaredus, on the occasion of his abjuring Arianism (Hefele, iii, 44). At this council, and by order of Reccaredus, an anathema was declared against all who should deny the procession from "the Son also" (*filioque*). It is doubtful, however, whether the reverend fathers really knew what was the original form of the creed, as they issued a canon at the same time ordering the creed to be recited "according to the form of the Oriental churches." But the General Council of Constantinople (A.D. 681) paid no attention to this obscure Spanish innovation, and promulgated the creed in its original form, as also did the seventh General Council at Nicea, A.D. 787. But the habit of using the creed with the *filioque* had now grown up in the West, and was favored by Charlemagne. In 809 two Western monks from the court of Charlemagne were at Mount Olivet, and there used this new

Western form, for which they were accused of heresy by the Easterns. Charlemagne hated the East heartily, drew up a refutation of the Eastern doctrine, and summoned a council at Aix-la-Chapelle (809), which sanctioned the *filioque*, and sent deputies to Leo III to obtain his confirmation of their decision. Leo refused to add the *filioque* to the creed, and even had the creed itself, in its original form, engraved on two silver shields (in Greek and Latin), which he hung up in St. Paul's Church as a testimony to his unwillingness to break his oath of allegiance to the general councils by adding to the creed. At the same time, he gave his sanction to the doctrine of the *filioque* as scriptural and sound. In the latter part of the century the troubles with Photius (q. v.) renewed the controversy between East and West; and the Council of Constantinople (A.D. 879), which was attended by 380 bishops, anathematized all who add the *filioque*. No pope had as yet formally authorized the addition, and yet it was coming into general use in the West, under the authority, especially, of pope Nicholas I (Neale, *Eastern Church*, p. 1155 sq.; Mansi, xv, 255). Finally, Rome did add the *filioque* to the creed, but in no public or open way; "no decretal, encyclical or synodical, announcing her adhesion. The thing was done in a corner, and, but for a curious liturgical writer of the Western empire, who went to see his sovereign, Henry II, crowned at Rome, A.D. 1014, by pope Benedict VIII, nobody could have guessed when it occurred. Berno therefore records what he witnessed with his own eyes and ears; and being engaged himself in a work on the Mass, he would naturally be very particular in his inquiries when he came to Rome, of all places, how things were done there. Now his account is that 'up to that time the Romans,' that is, the Church of Rome generally, 'had in no wise chanted the creed after the gospel; but that the lord emperor Henry would not desist till, with the approval of all, he had persuaded the apostolic lord Benedict to let it be chanted at high mass.' Thus Recard inaugurated the addition, Charlemagne patronized it, and Henry II got it adopted by the popes themselves. When this had been done, the pontifical oath was changed. Later popes, of course, shrank from imprecating a judgment upon themselves, according to the terms of their oath, in case they failed to keep the decrees of the general councils enumerated in it, '*usque ad uerum apicem*,' when they felt they had notoriously failed to do so by the creed. That clause was accordingly struck out. For the last 1000 years the Roman communion has been committed to the use of a creed which is not that of the Church, but of the Crown! I do not say, therefore, to the use of a creed which is heterodox. On the theological question involved in it I would wish to speak with becoming reverence; but thus much is certain, that the addition which forms its distinguishing feature was made and had been in use many centuries before any pope judged it allowable, much less necessary; many centuries before theologians in the West had agreed among themselves whether the terms 'mission' and 'procession' were distinguishable. Doubtless it has since found able defenders; but among them there are scarce two who give the same account of it, historically or doctrinally, and some of them are neither consistent with each other nor with themselves. Others, in arguing for it against the Easterns, have grievously misstated facts, and numberless passages have been adduced in support of it from the fathers, either wholly spurious or interpolated. I know of no parallel to it in this respect in any religious controversy before or since. If the Athanasian Creed was not expressly coined for this controversy, it was employed in this controversy first as a polemical weapon" (Foulkes, *Letter to Archbishop Manning*, London, 1868).

For the renewal of the question, with a view to union between the Greeks and Latins at the Council

of Florence, see FLORENCE. The great English divines, Pearson and Waterland, while adhering to the doctrine of the West, condemn the interpolation of the creed. So Pearson remarks: "Thus did the Oriental Church accuse the Occidental for adding *filioque* to the creed, contrary to a general council, which had prohibited all additions, and that without the least pretence of the authority of another council; and so the schism between the Latin and the Greek Church began and was continued, never to be ended until those words, *kai ek tou viov*, or *filioque*, are taken out of the creed" (*Exposition of the Creed*, art. viii, Oxford, 1820, ii, 394).

The commissioners for a review of the English Prayer-book, 1689, expressed in a note their opinion that something should be done to satisfy the Greek Church. At a later period the non-juring prelates made proposals to the Greeks, stating that in the clause *filioque* nothing more is meant than "from the Father by the Son;" to which the Greek patriarch and Synod of Constantinople replied (April 12, 1718): "We receive no other rule or creed than that which was set forth by the first and second holy General Council, in which it was decreed that the Holy Ghost proceeds 'from the Father.' Therefore we receive none who add the least syllable (and the most perfect word would fall far short), either by way of insertion, commentary, or explication to this holy creed, or who take anything from it. For the holy fathers at that time anathematize all such as shall either take from or add to it any word or syllable. If any one has formerly inserted any word, let it be struck out, and let the creed be unaltered as it was at first written, and is to this day, after so many years, read and believed by us. Now, concerning this point, we thus believe that there is a *twofold processio* of the Holy Spirit: the one natural, eternal, and before time, according to which the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone; and of which it is both written in the creed, and the Lord has said, 'the Comforter, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which PROCEEDETH FROM THE FATHER' (John xv, 26). The other procession is temporal and deputative, according to which the Holy Spirit is externally sent forth, derived, proceeds, and flows from both the Father and the Son for the sanctification of the creature. As to his temporal and outward procession, we agree that he proceeds, comes, or is sent by the Son, or through the Son's mediation, and from the Son, in this sense of an outward procession, for the sanctification of the creature. But this *πρόσβσις*, or mission, we do not call procession, lest we should be as unhappy as the Papists, who, because of the limited dialect of the Latin language, which is unable to express the *πρόσβσις*, or mission, by one word, and the *εκπόρευσις*, or procession, by another, have called them both processions, which afterwards grew into error, and made them take the eternal procession for that *πρόσβσις* which was *in time*" (*Amer. Quart. Church Rev.*, April, 1868, p. 93).

The historical question is very thoroughly discussed by the Rev. E. S. Foulkes (a convert from the Anglican to the Roman Church) in several recent works of his, especially in *A Historical Account of the Addition of the Words Filioque to the Creed* (Lond. 1867). Mr. Foulkes states that he has no objection to the doctrine of the double procession in the abstract, but he objects to its "embodiment in the creed in a word of four syllables, foisted in without authority, retained there without authority, in a place that was never designed for it, in a proposition set apart for the declaration of another truth" (p. 31). Moreover, he objects to the clause because it binds to the acceptance of a proposition which has two meanings: "the sense in which the Holy Ghost is said to proceed from the Son not being in every way coextensive with the sense in which he is said to proceed from the Father." And he expresses his conviction that this clause has a good deal to do

with the Socinianism and Unitarianism so long rife in the West. Mr. Foulkes notices that in the East, where the *filioque* is not adopted, "there is positively no such thing known as Unitarianism among baptized Christians;" and it happened to himself once to meet with this reply from a literary friend with whom he had been discussing the clause—"I find my escape from it in Unitarianism."

3. For the theological question involved, see HOLY GHOST, PROCESSION. Suffice it here to say, that while the Latins are inexcusable, according to their own canon law, for their addition of the *filioque* to the creed, they are still correct as to the doctrine. Their deeper anthropological investigations naturally developed the doctrine of the mission of the Holy Ghost by the Son. Palmer (*Dissertations on Subjects relating to the Eastern Communion*, Lond. 1853, 8vo, p. 103 sq.) gives the following summary of the controversy: "I. That when the expression of the Holy Ghost proceeding 'also from the Son' was first noticed and objected against by the Greeks, the Latins explained it away or dissembled it, instead of openly insisting on it as truth. Again, II. That when, at length, they had all received it themselves, the Latins attempted to force it into the creed, and to impose it on the Church at large by overbearing violence, not by an œcumenical council. Again, III. That in seeking to impose it upon the Easterns, the Latins generally have rested it upon manifestly false grounds, as upon the ground of unbroken and explicit tradition. Again, IV. That a vast multitude of passages, formerly alleged by the Latins, both from Greek and Latin fathers, have been proved either to be interpolations altogether, or to have been corrupted. Lastly, V. That some of the texts most insisted on by the Latins at the Council of Florence, and shown afterwards, by Zuernikaff, to have been corrupted, have, since Zaernikoff wrote, been surrendered, even by Latin editors; so that the Greek cause, as respects the critical examination of passages, has gained materially in strength since the Council of Florence. But to reject a doctrine not revealed in Scripture, nor handed down by unbroken tradition from the beginning, but 'dug out' or developed by a part of the Church in later ages, and violently thrust upon the rest on false grounds, can never be heresy. If, indeed, it were confessed to be a novelty and a development, and sufficiently shown to be, notwithstanding, a legitimate and necessary development, there might be a greater responsibility in rejecting it. On the other side, very many of the Greeks assert, not only that the Latin doctrine is false in itself, but also that it is a heresy, and that the Latins are heretics for maintaining it. But against this view it is fair to object, I. That those heretical consequences which seem to flow from the assertion of the procession from the Son as well as from the Father, and on account of which the doctrine itself is said to be heresy, are clearly rejected and condemned as heresies by the Latins, no less than by the Greeks; which would seem to reduce the Latin error, if it be an error, to a mere misconception and misuse of words. II. That all heresies spring from evil motives; but the motive which prompted the assertion of this doctrine is commonly admitted, even by the Greeks, to have been good, namely, the desire to maintain, against the Arians and other heretics, the co-equality of the Son with the Father. III. That the Greeks have repeatedly and all along offered to unite and communicate with the Latins, winking at all other faults if only the form of the creed were restored, which they could not have done if the doctrine of the procession from the Son had been held to be heresy in itself. IV. That until not only some or many passages, but all those passages in St. Augustine and other Latin fathers which assert the procession from the Son, have been shown to be corrupt or interpolated, or, in sense, to mean no more than they were stated to mean in the explanation given at Rome to Maximus the

martyr in the 7th century, the Latins, even if they be in error, cannot be called heretics for adhering to a doctrine seemingly taught and bequeathed to them by great saints, who are venerated as such by the Eastern Church, no less than by their own. 'We conclude, then, that so long as the "*Filioque*" is not interpolated into the creed without the consent of a council, the question of the doctrine in itself is still open and pending; and that neither are the Greeks heretics if they deny it, nor the Latins if they assert it, so long as they both desire that the subject may be fairly and religiously decided by an œcumenical council.'

*Literature.*—Besides the works already mentioned, see J. G. Walsh, *Hist. Cont. Græc. Lætinorumque* (Jen. 1751, 8vo); J. G. Voss, *De Tribus Symbolis*, diss. iii.; Neale, *Eastern Church, Introduct.*; Waterland, *Works* (Oxford, 1843), iii, 201, 437; Pearson, *On the Creed*, art. viii.; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, § 169; Neander, *Church History*, Torrey's transl., iii, 224, 553 sq.; Schaff, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, § 131; Gieseler, *Church Hist.* § 13, 41; *Hist. of the Council of Florence*, transl. by Popoff and J. M. Neale (Lond. 1861, 12mo); Neale, *Voices from the East* (London, 1859), p. 69 sq.; Harvey, *History of the Creeds*, p. 452 sq.; Hardwick, *Middle Age*, p. 61, n. 4; Browne, *Exposition of the Articles*, p. 114 sq.; Procter, *On Common Prayer*, p. 234; Heurtley, *Harmonia Symbolica*, p. 121; *Christian Remembrancer*, July, 1855, p. 69 sq.; Foulkes, *Christendon's Divisions*, i. 59 sq.; ii, 67, 551 sq.; *Westminster Rev.* Jan. 1868, p. 111; *American Quarterly Church Review*, April, 1868, art. v. See FLORENCE, COUNCIL OF; GREEK CHURCH; HOLY GHOST; PROCESSION.


FILLAN, ST. "Two Scoto-Irish saints of the name of Fillan appear in the Church calendars, and have left their mark on the topography of Scotland and Ireland. (1.) ST. FILLAN, or Faolan, surnamed the Lep-er, had his yearly festival on the 20th of June. His chief church in Scotland was at the east end of Loch Erne, in Perthshire, where 'St. Fillan's Well' was long believed to have supernatural powers of healing. A seat in the rock of Dumfillan still keeps the name of 'St. Fillan's Chair;' and two cavities beside it are said to have been hollowed by St. Fillan's knees in prayer. His Irish church is at Ballyheyland (anciently called Killhelan or Kill Faclain), in the barony of Cullenagh, in Queen's County. (2.) ST. FILLAN, the abbot, the son of St. Kentigerna of Inchealeoch, in Loch Lomond, lived in the 8th century, and had his yearly festival on the 7th or 9th of January. His church in Ireland was at Chlain Maosena, in Fartullach, in the county of Westmeath. His chief church in Scotland was in Perthshire, in the upper part of Glendochart, which takes from him the name of Strathfillan. Here a well-endowed priory, dedicated in his honor, was repaired or rebuilt in the beginning of the 14th century. King Robert Bruce made a grant of money to the work, in gratitude, probably, for the miraculous encouragement which he was said to have received on the eve of Bannockburn from a relic of the saint—one of his arm-bones enclosed in a silver case. Another relic of St. Fillan's—the silver head of his crosier or pastoral staff—has been preserved to our time. It is called the 'Coygerach' or 'Quigrich,' and appears in record as early as the year 1428, when it was in the hereditary keeping of a family named Jore or Dewar, who were believed to have been its keepers from the time of king Robert Bruce. They had half a boll of meal yearly from every parishioner of Glendochart who held a merk land, and smaller quantities from smaller tenants; and they were bound, in return, to follow the stolen cattle of the parishioners wherever their traces could be found within the realm of Scotland. The Quigrich, besides its virtues in the detection of theft, was venerated also for its miraculous powers of healing. In 1487, the right of keeping it was confirmed to Malice Doire or Dewar by king James III in a charter, which was presented for registration among the public records of Scotland



so lately as the year 1734. Sixty years later, the Quigrich still commanded reverence; but its healing virtues were now only tried on cattle, and its once opulent keepers had fallen to the rank of farm-laborers. It was publicly exhibited in Edinburgh in the year 1818, before being carried to Canada, where it now is, in the hands of a descendant of its old custodians, a farmer named Alexander Dewar. He puts such a value on the relic that he has hitherto refused to part with it for less than £100 sterling, or 1000 acres of Canadian land. It has been recently figured and described by Dr. Daniel Wilson in a paper in the *Canadian Journal*, No. xxiv, reprinted in a pamphlet, with the title of *The Quigrich, or Crosier of St. Fillan* (Toronto, 1859); and in the *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, vol. iii, pt. ii, p. 233, plate xxvi (Edinb. 1861). A linn in the river Fillan or Dochart, in Strathfillan, was long believed to work wonderful cures on insane persons, who were immersed in the stream at sunset, and left bound hand and foot till sunrise in the ruins of the neighboring church of St. Fillan. A hand-bell, which bore the name of St. Fillan, was also believed to work miracles" (Chambers, *Encyclopaedia*, s. v.

**Fillet** is an erroneous translation in the A. V. of two Heb. words:  $\text{צַחְצְחִים}$ , *chashukim'*, *joinings* (comp. Exod. xxxviii, 17, 28; xxvii, 17), the poles or rods which served to join together the tops of the columns around the court of the tabernacle (q. v.), and from which the curtains were suspended (Exod. xxvii, 10, 11; xxxvi, 38; xxxviii, 10, 11, 12, 17, 19).  $\text{צִוּת}$ , *chut*, a *thread* (as elsewhere rendered), a measuring-line 12 cubits long for the circumference of the pillars of copper in Solomon's Temple (Jer. lii, 21). See COLUMN; GARLAND.

**Fillet**, a small flat face or band in classical architecture, used to separate mouldings; in Gothic architecture, a flat band on a curved moulding, used to decorate a shaft on a larger moulding. When on the front of a large moulding, it is called its keel; on the sides, it is called a wing. In the cut, *a a* are examples of fillets.



Fillets.

**Fin** ( $\text{סַנְאִי}$ , *senappi'*, of uncertain etymol.), the fin of a fish (q. v.), a distinctive mark of such as might be eaten under the Mosaic law (Lev. xi, 9, 10, 12; Deut. xiv, 9, 10). See CLEAN.

**Final Perseverance.** See PERSEVERANCE.


**Fine** or *mulet* for damages (q. v.). In some instances, by the Mosaic law, the amount of a fine, or of an indemnification that was to be made, was determined by the person who had been injured; in other instances it was fixed by the judge, and in others was defined by the law (Exod. xxi, 19-36; Deut. xxii, 19, 29). Twofold, fourfold, and even fivefold restitution of things stolen, and restitution of property unjustly retained, with twenty per cent. over and above, was required. Thus, if a man killed a beast, he was to make it good, beast for beast. This ordinance, observes Michaelis (*Laws of Moses*, art. 160), appears only incidentally in Lev. xxiv, 18, among criminal laws. If an ox pushed or gored another man's servant to death, his owner was bound to pay for the servant thirty shekels of silver (Exod. xxi, 32). In the case of one man's ox pushing or goring another's to death, it would have been a very intricate point to ascertain which of the two had been to blame for the quarrel, and therefore both owners were obliged to bear the loss. The living ox was sold, and the price, together with the dead one, equally divided between them (Exod. xxi, 35). If, however, the ox had previously been notorious for pushing, and the owner had not

taken care to confine him, this made a difference; for then, to the man whose ox had been pushed, he was obliged to give another, and the dead ox he got himself (Exod. xxi, 36). If a man dug a pit and did not cover it, or let an old pit belonging to him remain open, and another man's beast fell into it, the owner of the pit was obliged to pay for the beast, and had it for the payment (Exod. xxi, 33, 34). When a fire was kindled in the fields, and did any damage, he who kindled it was obliged to make the damage good (Exod. xxii, 6). See PUNISHMENT.

**Finer** ( $\text{צַרְפָּטָא}$ , *tsoreph'*), a gold and silver worker (Prov. xxv, 4). See REFINER. In Judg. xvii, 4, our version renders the word "founder;" in Isa. xli, 7, "goldsmith." It refers especially to the melting of fine metal. See FURNACE. The Egyptians carried the working of metals to a very extraordinary degree of perfection, as their various articles of jewellery preserved in our museums evince; and there is no doubt the Hebrews derived their knowledge of these arts from this source, though there is at the same time reference to their being known before the Flood (Gen. xiv, 19-22). See METAL.

**Finger** ( $\text{אֶצְבָּע}$ , *etsba'*,  $\text{δάκτυλος}$ ), besides its ordinary meaning, is used in Scripture to denote the special and immediate agency of any one. See ARM. The Egyptian magicians, terrified by the numerous plagues inflicted upon their country, at length said, "This is the finger of God," i. e. this is done by the power of God himself (Exod. viii, 19). Moses gave the tables of the law written by the finger (personal direction) of God to the Hebrews (Exod. xxxi, 18). The heavens are said to be the work of God's fingers, i. e. his power (Psa. viii, 3). Christ cast out devils with the finger or power of God (Luke xi, 20). "To put forth the finger" is a bantering, insulting gesture (Isa. lviii, 9). Some take this for a menacing gesture, as Nicanor stretched out his hand against the Temple, threatening to burn it (2 Macc. xiv, 33). "Four fingers thick" occurs as a measure in Jer. lii, 21. See RING.

**Finial**, the cluster of foliage that is frequently used to ornament the top of pinnacles, canopies, pediments, etc., in Gothic architecture. The term is also often used as synonymous with the pinnacle of a spire, roof, or canopy. (G. F. C.)



Finials (Chambers).

1, from Bishop Bridport's Monument, Salisbury Cathedral, 2, York Minster; 3, Maulbronn, Germany; 4, Crew Hall, Cheshire; 5, Augsburg.

**Finning-pot** ( $\text{מַצְרֵפֶת}$ , *matsreph'*), a crucible or melting-pot (Prov. xvii, 3; xxvii, 21). See METALLURGY. The use of these for reducing gold was familiar to the ancient Egyptians. "Much cannot, of course, be expected from the objects found in the excavated

tombs to illustrate the means employed in smelting the ore, or to disclose any of the secrets they possessed in metallurgy; and little is given in the paintings beyond the use of the blow-pipe, the forceps, and the mode of concentrating heat by raising cheeks of metal round three sides of the fire in which the crucibles were placed. See FURNACE. Of the latter, indeed, there



Furnace.—An Egyptian blowing the Fire for melting Gold (Wilkinson).

is no indication in these subjects, unless it be in the accompanying woodcut; but their use is readily suggested, and some which have been found in Egypt are preserved in the museum of Berlin. They are nearly five inches in diameter at the mouth, and about the same in depth, and present the ordinary form and appearance of those used at the present day" (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* abridgm. ii, 138). See HANDICRAFT.

**Finland**, when first mentioned in history, was inhabited by savage tribes belonging to the Finnish nations, which by piracy and frequent inroads became especially formidable to the Swedes. The latter subjugated with difficulty and only for a short time the coast of Finland, while the republic of Novgorod extended its rule over the southern branches of the Finns. The frequent robberies of the pagan Suomi induced king Eric of Sweden to conquer them, and compel them to adopt Christianity. Accompanied by bishop Henry, of Upsala, an Englishman, he landed in 1157 on the south-western coast, and at first met with but little resistance. The first church was built at Rendamecki, near the town of Abo, the foundation of which had likewise been laid by Eric. When Eric returned to Sweden, bishop Henry remained in the country, but the progress of Christianity was very slow, as the Finns had yielded only to compulsion; the missionaries had a very imperfect knowledge of the language, and the poverty of the language presented the greatest obstacles to an adequate designation of the new Christian ideas. While outwardly professing Christianity, most of the converts remained secretly addicted to their old pagan ideas, or at least mixed up Christian doctrines with pagan mythology. Bishop Henry baptized a large number, established an episcopal see at Rendamecki, and finally lost his life (1160) in consequence of his zeal in enforcing Church discipline. After the complete triumph of Christianity, the Finns venerated him as their apostle and patron saint. He was commemorated on the 19th of January and the 18th of June; his picture, exhibiting his full episcopal ornament, with an axe by his side and the murderer at his feet, was hung up in every church, and many miracles were ascribed to his relics (see HENRY, apostle of the Finns). His successor, Rudolphus, was carried off by the Courlanders and killed. The progress of Christianity was considerably delayed by the opposition of the Russians to the advance of the Swedes, on whom the existence of the feeble Christian Church was wholly dependent. In 1198, Abo was burned by the Russians, and the fourth bishop, also an Englishman, had to seek a refuge upon the island of Gothland. In 1249, the brother of the king of Sweden, Birger Magnusson, the first yarl of the kingdom, landed on the southern coast of Aestbothnia, routed the tribe of the Tavasti, established the fortress of Tavastehus, subsequently called Tavastehus, built several churches, and compelled the inhabitants to accept Christianity and to pay taxes to the bishop. These taxes the fifth bishop, Bero, of his own accord, ceded to the king. Another great Swedish expedition was undertaken in 1293 by Thorkel Knutson, the guardian of the minor king, Birger II. The pope not only sanctioned this expedition, but granted to the knights and warriors who took part in

it the same indulgences as to the Crusaders. Thorkel landed with a large fleet, overpowered the inhabitants, and established the fortress of Wiborg. Bishop Peter, of Westeras, announced Christianity to the tribes which were still pagans, and the Swedish arms left to the natives only the choice between Christianity and slavery. Thus Christianity was gradually forced upon the whole nation, with the exception of a few remote districts where paganism continued to maintain itself. Though planted and spread by force, Christianity finally rooted itself in the minds of the people by means of schools and churches. The episcopal see at Abo attained considerable celebrity. The number of churches was largely increased, the cathedral school of Abo was numerously attended, and gradually six monasteries were established. The Reformation met in Finland with comparatively little resistance, and soon the Lutheran Church superseded Roman Catholicism altogether. In consequence of the wars between Sweden and Russia in the 18th and the beginning of the 19th centuries, Finland was lost to Sweden and gained by the emperor of Russia. In 1721, at the peace of Nystadt, Russia received the towns of Wilorg and Keyholm; in 1743, at the peace of Abo, a territory of about 4800 square miles, with the fortresses of Nyslott, Frederiksham, and Savolax; and in 1809, at the peace of Frederiksham, the whole of Finland. Emperor Alexander I reunited Wiborg, which for some time had constituted a Russian province, with Finland, which retains its old Constitution, its Swedish laws, and Lutheran religion. Finland is, in point of administration, wholly separated from Russia Proper; the highest authority is the imperial senate for Finland, consisting of 16 natives, under the presidency of a governor general. The diet, as formerly in Sweden, consists of four estates, nobility, clergy, burghers, and peasants.

The population of Finland in 1865 amounted to 1,840,957, of whom 41,760 were connected with the Greek Church, which has 17 churches and 2 monasteries. The Roman Catholics have a church in Wiborg and in Helsingfors. Nearly the whole remainder, a population of about 1,500,000, belongs to the Lutheran Church. The organization of the Lutheran Church of Finland is in every respect similar to that of the Lutheran Church of Sweden. Liturgies, hymn-book, catechism, and other Church books, are substantially the same as in Sweden. The Church has one archbishopric, of Abo (the archbishop resides at Helsingfors), and two bishoprics, of Borgio and Kuopio, the latter of recent origin. The number of parishes in 1867 was 214. Most of the congregations have, besides the pastor, a chaplain, also a church council. The churches are generally well attended. In most of the churches, especially in the country, the sermons are preached in the Finnish language; in others, both Finnish and Swedish are used; and in some, Swedish exclusively. The highest literary institution is the University of Helsingfors (until 1847 at Abo). It has among the faculties one of Lutheran theology, about 45 professors, and 600 students. There is also at Helsingfors a theological seminary. Finland has 6 gymnasias, 13 secondary and 33 primary schools, 3 female institutions, and a number of schools for special purposes. At the higher institutions instruction is generally given in Swedish; but the use of the Finnish language is advancing at the expense of the Swedish, and this movement is greatly encouraged by the Russian government. An Evangelical Society was established in 1817; there are also several Bible Societies.—Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, iv, 70; Wiggers, *Kirchl. Statistik*, ii, 423; Rühls, *Finland u. seine Bevolner* (Leipz. 1808). (A. J. S.)

**Finley, James Bradley**, one of the most distinguished and useful pioneers of Methodism in Ohio, was the son of the Rev. R. W. Finley, and was born in North Carolina, July 1, 1781. He received a good

education from his father. In 1801 he married, and settled in what is now Highland County, Ohio. In 1802, while returning from a camp-meeting in Kentucky, he was converted. He at once felt called to preach, but refused to obey, lost all religion, and lived for seven years a worse sinner than before. At the end of this time he was again converted, and immediately began to persuade his wicked neighbors to seek God, and soon formed a large society. In 1809 he entered the Western Conference, travelled with great success for six years, and was in 1816-21 presiding elder on Steubenville, Ohio, and Lebanon Districts. Through the labors of John Stewart, the colored preacher, and Between-the-Logs, a converted chief, a great revival had begun among the Wyandotte Indians at Upper Sandusky. Thither Finley was sent in 1821, and spent six years of labor, suffering, and glorious success among the Indians. After his removal he still had supervision of the mission, and from 1829 to 1845 served the Church as preacher or presiding elder in the principal cities of Southern Ohio. He served as chaplain of the Ohio Penitentiary, at Columbus, from 1845 to 1849, when his health failed, and he was made supernummate. He was afterward appointed to Clinton Street, Cincinnati (from him named Finley Chapel). His last appointment was that of Conference missionary. He was thus forty-five years a laborious and successful minister. He was eight times a delegate to the General Conference. He died Sept. 6, 1856, in Cincinnati. Both in character and labors he was an extraordinary man. His zeal, his indomitable courage, which the Indian chiefs both respected and feared, his sympathy and his integrity, gave him a dominant control over men of all professions and conditions. His eloquence in the pulpit, especially at camp-meetings, often brought down thousands almost at a stroke, and wherever he went conversions were multiplied. He published an *Autobiography* (Cincinnati, 1854, 12mo):—*Wyandotte Mission* (12mo):—*Sketches of Western Methodism* (Cincinnati, 1857, 12mo):—*Life among the Indians* (Cincinnati, 1857, 12mo):—*Memorials of Prison Life* (Cincinnati, 1860, 12mo).—*Minutes of Conferences*, vi, 441; *Autobiography of J. B. Finley* (Cincinnati, 1854); Stevens, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, vol. iv.

**Finley, John P.**, a Methodist Episcopal minister and professor of languages in Augusta College, Kentucky, was born in South Carolina in June, 1783, and though early removed by his parents to the West, "through their exertions and his own he obtained a classical education." From 1810 to 1822 he taught in schools and academies in Ohio, and preached also with zeal and success. In 1822 he was elected to the chair of languages in Augusta College, and the same year entered the itinerancy, and in both labored zealously and usefully until his death in May, 1825.—*Minutes of Conferences*, i, 505. (G. L. T.)

**Finley, Robert, D.D.**, a Presbyterian minister, and president of the University of Georgia, was born at Princeton, N. J., in 1772, and graduated at Princeton College in 1787. From 1793 to 1795 he was a tutor in the college, and a trustee from 1807 to 1817, when he resigned. He was the minister of a Presbyterian church at Baskingridge, N. J., from June, 1797, till 1817. In 1816 he became greatly interested in the welfare of the free blacks, and formed a plan of sending them to Africa. He was thus the founder of the American Colonization Society. He was chosen president of Athens College, Ga., and went there in 1817, but died Oct. 3d of that year.—Sprague, *Annals*, iv, 126.

**Finley, Robert Smith**, a Presbyterian minister, was born at Basking Ridge, New Jersey, May 9, 1804, and was educated at Princeton College. He studied law, and was admitted to the bar at Cincinnati; but in 1833 he determined to enter the ministry, and spent

a short time at Lane Seminary. In 1835 he was licensed by the Presbytery of Mississippi, and was ordained in 1842. His first charge was Pine Grove, La.; and for some time he was missionary among the slaves near Natchez. For six years he edited, at St. Louis, the *Liberian Advocate*, devoted to African colonization, in which cause he was greatly interested through life. In 1850 he became pastor of the Presbyterian church at Metuchen, N. J., and in 1858 principal of the Presbyterian Female Institute at Talladega, Ala., where he died July 2, 1860.—Wilson, *Presbyterian Almanac*, 1861, p. 85.

**Finley, Robert W.**, a distinguished Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Bucks County, Pa., June 9, 1750. He was converted at seventeen. Soon after he entered Princeton College, N. J., where he spent seven years in general and theological studies. In 1774 he was licensed to preach in the Presbyterian Church, and was sent as a missionary to Georgia and the Carolinas. Here he was a patriot as well as a preacher, and was often with general Marion in his expeditions, and incurred much enmity and risk of life from the Tories. In 1784 he went to Hampshire County, then in New Virginia, where he preached two years. In 1788 he emigrated to Kentucky, and eventually opened a school for students in divinity, and a number of his pupils were distinguished in subsequent life. In 1795 he went with general Massie to explore the Scioto country, then in the Northwest Territory, and in May, 1796, he settled on the Scioto, below Chillicothe. In 1808 he connected himself with the Methodist Church, and in 1811 or 1812 joined the Ohio Conference as a travelling preacher. For many years he labored with great success, and received hundreds into the Church. When almost eighty and supernummate, he mounted his horse, with his books and clothes, and set off as a missionary to Saut St. Marie, and there formed a circuit and appointed a camp-meeting. He died at Germantown, Ohio, Dec. 8, 1840.—*Minutes of Conferences*, iii, 239. (G. L. T.)

**Finley, Samuel, D.D.**, a Presbyterian minister and president of New Jersey College, was born in County Armagh, Ireland, and came to America in 1734. On his arrival at Philadelphia he renewed his studies preparatory to the ministry, and was licensed in 1740. He labored long and successfully in West Jersey, in Deerfield, Greenwich, and Cape May, and supplied the church in Philadelphia for a time. He was ordained by the Presbytery of New Brunswick in 1742, and in 1744 he accepted a call from Nottingham, Maryland, where he continued for nearly seventeen years, and where he kept an academy of great reputation. In 1761 he was called to the presidency of New Jersey College, and removed to Princeton, and soon after was honored with the degree of D.D. from Glasgow. He died July 17, 1766. He published a sermon entitled *Christ triumphing and Satan raging*, 1741:—*A Refutation of a Sermon on the Doctrine of Convictions*, 1743:—*Satan stripped of his angelic Robes*, 1743:—*A charitable Plea for the Speechless*, 1747:—*A Vindication of the preceding*, 1748:—*A Sermon—The Curse of Meroz, etc.*, 1757:—*A Sermon on the Death of President Davies*, 1761.—Sprague, *Annals*, iii, 96.

**Finnan**, an Irish ecclesiastic whom Oswin, king of Northumberland, called to the abbacy of Lindisfarne, and to superintend the churches in his kingdom. The Venerable Bede says, "He was a man of fierce and rough nature, but very successful in ministerial labors. He baptized Peada, king of the Middle Angles, and sent four priests to instruct his subjects in Christianity." He also consecrated Ceadmon, who afterwards became a very prominent bishop among the East Angles, and baptized Siegebirt their king, together with great numbers of the common people. He was very active in promoting the temporal as well as the spiritual interest of the Church. During his

superintendency, Bede says "he erected a church on the island of Lindisfarne fit for an episcopal see, which, nevertheless, he built after the manner of the Scots [Irish], not of stone, but of sawn oak, and covered it with thatch" (*Eccles. Hist.* lib. iii. c. xxv). Years afterwards, when the British clergy took possession of these churches in Northumberland, Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, required this church to be reconsecrated, and dedicated to the patronage of St. Peter. Finnan, having for ten years superintended the abbacy of Lindisfarne and the churches of Northumberland under the simple title of "bishop," died A. D. 661. He left a treatise entitled *Pro Veteri Paschali Ritu*, regarding the Irish and Oriental time of keeping Easter as the old and true time, and that of Rome as of recent date. See Bede's *Eccles. Hist.*; *Illust. Men of Ireland*, vol. i. (D. D.)

**Finns**, "geographically the name of the inhabitants of Finland, but in ethnology that of a considerable branch of the Ugrian race, dwelling for the most part in Finland, though with some representatives in Sweden and Norway as well. The Ugrians have been classed among the nations said to have a Mongolian origin. Dr. Latham places them among the 'Tauranic Altaic Mongolids,' and divides them into Ugrians of the East and Ugrians of the West. The Western Ugrians consist of Lapps, Finns, Permians, and other nations or tribes in the north and north-west of Russia, and of the Magyars in Hungary. The Magyars are the most numerous, and next after these come the Finns, comprising about 2,000,000 of individuals. All the other tribes of Western Ugrians do not together comprise so many. The Finns, in common with the other Ugrians, are of the Mongolian type. The Finns, from having been originally a nomadic race, have for many centuries been stationary and civilized. Long before the arrival of the German and Slavic nations in the north of Europe, the Ugrians, or *Oyres* (for the name, so common in fiction, is really of historic origin), possessed it, and were gradually pushed further north and east by the new invaders. Both Finns and Lapps, there is good reason to believe, originally extended much further south than they do at present, occupying, perhaps, the whole of Sweden and Norway. 'The Finns,' says Prichard, 'were in the time of Tacitus as savage as the Lapps; but the former, during the succeeding ages, became so far civilized as to exchange a nomadic life for one of agricultural pursuits, while the Lapps have ever continued to be barbarous nomades, as well as the Siberian tribes of the same race—namely, the Woguls and Ostiaks. The Finns, as well as their brethren the Beornmahs, or Finns of the White Sea, had probably undergone this change long before the time when they were visited by Othar, the guest of Alfred. When the Finns were conquered by the Swedes, they had long been a settled people, but one of curious, and singular, and isolated character.'—Chambers, *Cyclopaedia*, s. v. See FINLAND.

**Fintanus or Fintan**, the founder of the monastery of Rheinau (q. v.), in the canton of Zurich. He descended from a noble family in the province of Leinster, Ireland. In a war between two chieftains, one chieftain killed Fintan's brother, and, fearing that Fintan would avenge the brother's death, caused him insidiously to be carried off by the Normans. Having changed his master several times within a few days, Fintan was to be taken to Scotland, but escaped when the vessel landed at one of the Orkney Islands. He had to spend three days on this uninhabited island, after which he swam, miraculously supported, to Scotland. He remained for two years with a bishop who had studied in Ireland; then, in compliance with a vow, he journeyed, through Gallia, Alemannia, and Lombardy, to Rome. After his return he first went to the monastery of Pfäfers, and from there to Rheinau, where he completed, conjointly with Wolfen, a scion of the

house of the Welfs, the monastery which the grandfather and father of Wolfen had begun. After working at Rheinau for five years as a priest, he entered the monastery in 851, remained there five years, and thereupon became a hermit, leading for 22 years, from 856 to 878, the year of his death, a life of extreme asceticism. Thus he came to be venerated as a saint, even during his lifetime, throughout the whole region. When his friend Wolfen, who in the mean time had become abbot of Rheinau, returned from Rome with the relics of St. Blasius, Fintan took a portion of them to a cell in the Black Forest, which subsequently was called St. Blasien.—Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* xix, 491. (A. J. S.)

**Fir** (*קברן*, the name of an extensive family of coniferous evergreens; see *Penny Cyclopaedia*, s. v. *Abies*) is the uniform rendering in the Auth. Vers. of *קברן*, *berosh'* (from its being cut into planks, Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 246), which frequently occurs (2 Sam. vi, 5; 1 Kings v, 8, 10; vi, 15, 34; ix, 11; 2 Kings ix, 23; 2 Chron. ii, 8; iii, 5; Psa. civ, 17; Isa. xiv, 8; xxxvii, 24; xli, 19; lv, 13; lx, 13; Ezek. xxvii, 5; xxxi, 8; Hos. xiv, 8; Nah. ii, 3; Zech. xi, 2), and *קברן*, *beroth'*, which is said to be only the Aramæan form of the same word (in Cant. i, 17). In most of the passages the terms rendered cedar and fir in the Auth. Vers. are mentioned together. *Berosh* is translated variously in the Sept. *πίτυς*, *πίσκη*, *κνάρισσος*, and (Ezek. xxvii, 5) *κίερος*; in Isa. xiv, 8, *ξύλα Αιβάνου*; in the Vulg. chiefly *abies*, *cypressus*. It was a lofty tree (Isa. lv, 13), growing on Lebanon (Isa. xxxvii, 24), and of an ornamental figure (Isa. lx, 13). The passages from which any special account of its use can be derived are, 1. Of musical instruments (2 Sam. vi, 5); 2. Of doors (1 Kings vi, 34); 3. Of gilded ceilings (2 Chron. iii, 5); 4. Boards or decks of ships (Ezek. xxvii, 5), or planks for flooring (1 Kings vi, 15). Rosenmüller says, "In most of the passages where the Hebrew word occurs, it is by the oldest Greek and the Syriac translators rendered *cypressus*." Celsius, on the contrary, is of opinion that *berosh* indicates the cedar of Lebanon, and that *erez*, which is usually considered to have that meaning, is the common pine (*Pinus sylvestris*), apparently because he conceives *berosh* to be changed from *sherbin*, the Arabic name of pine. J. E. Falter, as quoted by Rosenmüller, conjectures that the Hebrew name *berosh* included three different trees which resemble each other, viz. the evergreen cypress, the thyme, and the savine. The last, or *Juniperus sabina*, is so like the cypress that the ancients often called it by that name, and the moderns have noticed the resemblance, especially as to the leaves. "Hence, even among the Greeks, both trees bore the old Eastern names of *berosh*, *beroth*, *brutha*, or *brathy'* (Rosenmüller, *Bot. of the Bible*, transl. p. 200). The word *berosh* or *beroth* is slightly varied in the Syriac and Chaldee versions, being written *berutha* in the former, and *berath* in the latter. All these are closely allied to *bruta*, a name of the *sarvine* plant, which is the *βαύρα*, *βραβέρν*, and *βαράβωρε* of the Greeks, and which the Arabs have converted into *buras* and *burat*. By them it is applied to a species of juniper, which they call *abihl* and *aris* or *oris*. It appears that many of these terms must be considered generic rather than specific in the modern sense, when so much care is bestowed on the accurate discrimination of one species from another. Thus *arus*, applied by the Arabs to a juniper, indicates a pine-tree in Scripture, whether we follow the common acceptance and consider it the cedar, or adopt the opinion of Celsius, that the *Pinus sylvestris* is indicated. So *burat* may have been applied by the Arabs, etc. not only to the savine and other species of juniper, but also to plants, such as the cypress, which resemble these. In many of those cases, therefore, where we are unable to discover any absolute identity or similarity of name, we must be guided by the nature of

the trees, the uses to which they were applied, and the situations in which they are said to have been found. Thus, as we find *erez* and *berosh* so constantly associated in Scripture, the former may indicate the cedar with the wild pine-tree, while the latter may comprehend the juniper and cypress tribe. See CEDAR; CYPRESS; JUNIPER. All these were extensively used for architecture, and are at this day found in Lebanon (Balfour, *Trees of Scripture*, p. 11; Thenius on 1 Kings vi, 34; Saalschütz, *Hebr. Arch.* i, 280, note 4; Miller, *Gardener's Dict.* s. v. Cupressus; Stephens, *Thest. Ling. Gr.* s. v. *πίεκη*; Belon, *Obs.* c. 110, p. 165; Loudon, *Arboretum*, iv, 2163).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. In Hos. xiv, 8, the "stone-pine" (*Pinus pinea*), which has a cone containing an edible nut, seems to be intended (Kitto, *Pict. Bible*, in loc.), although Henderson (*Comment.* in loc.) thinks that a fruitless tree is there referred to by way of contrast. See TREE.

**Fire** (properly *עֵשׂ, esh, פִּיֶּקֶת*). On the origin of fire, see Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* i, 94. The applications of fire in Scripture are susceptible of the following classification:

I. *Religious*.—1. That which consumed the burnt sacrifice and the incense-offering, beginning with the sacrifice of Noah (Gen. viii, 20), and continued in the ever-burning fire on the altar, first kindled from heaven (Lev. vi, 9, 13; ix, 24), and rekindled at the dedication of Solomon's Temple (2 Chron. vii, 1, 3). See SACRIFICE.

"Fire from heaven," "fire of the Lord," usually denotes lightning in the Old Testament; but, when connected with sacrifices, the "fire of the Lord" is often to be understood as the fire of the altar, and sometimes the holocaust itself (Exod. xxix, 18; Lev. i, 9; ii, 3; iii, 5, 9; Numb. xxviii, 6; 1 Sam. ii, 28; Isa. xx, 16; Mal. i, 10). See LIGHTNING.

The perpetual fire on the altar was to be replenished with wood every morning (Lev. vi, 12; comp. Isa. xxxi, 9). According to the Gemara, it was divided into three parts, one for burning the victims, one for incense, and one for supply of the other portions (Lev. vi, 15; see Reland, *Antiq. Hebr.* i, 4, 8, p. 26; and ix, 10, p. 98). Fire for sacred purposes obtained elsewhere than from the altar was called "strange fire," and for use of such Nadab and Abihu were punished with death by fire from God (Lev. x, 1, 2; Numb. iii, 4; xxvi, 61). See ALTAR.

2. Parallel with this application of fire is to be noted the similar use for sacrificial purposes, and the respect paid to it, or to the heavenly bodies as symbols of deity (see below), which prevailed among so many nations of antiquity, and of which the traces are not even now extinct: e. g. the Sabeian and Magian systems of worship, and their alleged connection with Abraham (Spencer, *De Leg. Hebr.* ii, 1, 2); the occasional relapse of the Jews themselves into sun- or its corrupted form of fire-worship (Isa. xxvii, 9; compare Gesenius, s. v. *שֶׁמֶשׁ, Theaur.* p. 489; see Dent. xvii, 3; Jer. viii, 2; Ezek. viii, 16; Zeph. i, 5; 2 Kings xvii, 16; xxi, 3; xxiii, 5, 10, 11, 13; comp. Jahn, *Bibl. Arch.* c. vi, § 405, 408); the worship or deification of heavenly bodies or of fire, prevailing to some extent, as among the Persians, so also even in Egypt (Herod. iii, 16; see Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* i, 328, abridgm.); the sacred fire of the Greeks and Romans (Thucyd. i, 24; ii, 15; Cicero, *De Leg.* ii, 8, 12; Livy, xxviii, 12; Dionys. ii, 67; Plutarch, *Numa*, 9, i, 263, ed. Reiske); the ancient forms and usages of worship, differing from each other in some important respects, but to some extent similar in principle, of Mexico and Peru (Prescott, *Mexico*, i, 60, 64; *Peru*, i, 101); and, lastly, the theory of the so-called Guebres of Persia, and the Parsees of Bombay. (Frazer, *Persia*, c. iv, p. 141, 162, 164; Sir R. Porter, *Travels*, ii, 50, 424; Chardin, *Voyages*, ii, 310; iv, 258; viii, 367 sq.; Niebuhr, *Travels*, ii, 36, 37; Mandelslo, *Travels*, b. i, p. 76; Gibbon, *Hist.* c. viii, i, 335, ed. Smith;

Benj. of Tudela, *Early Trav.* p. 114, 116; Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 156.) See IDOLATRY. On the heathen practice of children "passing through the fire," see MOLOCH.

3. In the case of the spoil taken from the Midianites, such articles as could bear it were purified by fire as well as in the water appointed for the purpose (Numb. xxxi, 23). The victims slain for sin-offerings were afterwards consumed by fire outside the camp (Lev. iv, 12, 21; vi, 30; xvi, 27; Heb. xiii, 11). The Nazarite who had completed his vow, marked its completion by shaving his head and casting the hair into the fire on the altar on which the peace-offerings were sacrificed (Numb. vi, 18).

II. *Domestic*.—Besides for cooking, baking, and roasting purposes [see BREAD, FOOD, etc.], fire is often required in Palestine for warmth (Jer. xxxvi, 22; Mark xiv, 54; John xviii, 18; see Harmer, *Obs.* i, 125; Raitner, p. 79). For this purpose a hearth with a chimney is sometimes constructed, on which either lighted wood or pans of charcoal are placed (Harmer, i, 405). In Persia, a hole made in the floor is sometimes filled with charcoal, on which a sort of table is set covered with a carpet; and the company, placing their feet under the carpet, draw it over themselves (Olearius, *Travels*, p. 294; Chardin, *Voyages*, viii, 190). Rooms in Egypt are warmed, when necessary, with pans of charcoal, as there are no fireplaces except in the kitchens (Lane, *Mod. Eg.* i, 41; *Eng. in Eg.* ii, 11). See COAL; FEEL.

On the Sabbath, the law forbade any fire to be kindled even for culinary purposes (Exod. xxxv, 3; Numb. xv, 32). As the primary design of this law appears to have been to prevent the proper privileges of the Sabbath day from being lost to any one through the care and time required in cooking victuals (Exod. xvi, 23), it is doubted whether the use of fire for warmth on the Sabbath day was included in this interdiction. In practice, it would appear that the fire was never lighted or kept up for cooking on the Sabbath day, and that consequently there were no fires in the houses during the Sabbaths of the greater part of the year; but it may be collected that in winter fires for warming apartments were kept up from the previous day. Michaelis is very much mistaken with respect to the climate of Palestine in supposing that the inhabitants could, without much discomfort, dispense with fires for warmth during winter (*Mosäisches Recht*, iv, 195). To this general prohibition the Jews added various refinements; e. g. that on the eve of the Sabbath no one might read with a light, though passages to be read on the Sabbath by children in schools might be looked out by the teacher. If a Gentile lighted a lamp, a Jew might use it, but not if it had been lighted for the use of the Jew. If a festival day fell on the Sabbath eve no cooking was to be done (*Mishna, Shabb.* i, 3; xvi, 8, vol. ii, p. 4, 56; *Moed Katan*, ii, vol. ii, p. 287, ed. Surenhus). The modern Jews, although there is no cooking in their houses, have fires on the Sabbath day, which are attended to by a Christian servant; or a charwoman is hired to attend to the fires of several houses, which she visits repeatedly during the day. See SABBATH.

III. *Statutory Regulation*.—The dryness of the land in the hot season in Syria of course increases the liability to accident from fire (Judg. ix, 15). The law therefore ordered that any one kindling a fire which caused damage to corn in a field should make restitution (Exod. xxii, 6; comp. Judg. xv, 4, 5; 2 Sam. xiv, 30; see Mishna, *Maccoth*, vi, 5, 6; vol. iv, 48, Surenhus.; Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 496, 622). This law was calculated to teach caution in the use of fire to the herdsmen in the fields, who were the parties most concerned. And it is to be remembered that the herdsmen were generally substantial persons, and had their assistant shepherds, for whose imprudence they were made responsible. Still no inference is to be drawn

from this law with regard to fires breaking out in towns, the circumstances being so very different. See DAMAGES.

IV. *Penal.*—Punishment of death by fire was awarded by the law only in the cases of incest with a mother-in-law, and of unchastity on the part of a daughter of a priest (Lev. xx. 14; xxi. 9). In the former case both the parties, in the latter the woman only, was to suffer. This sentence appears to have been a relaxation of the original practice in such cases (Gen. xxxviii. 24). Among other nations, burning alive appears to have been no uncommon mode, if not of judicial punishment, at least of vengeance upon captives; and in a modified form was not unknown in war among the Jews themselves (2 Sam. xii. 31; Jer. xxix. 22; Dan. iii. 20). In certain cases the bodies of executed criminals and of infamous persons were subsequently burnt (Josh. vii. 25; 2 Kings xxiii. 16). See PUNISHMENT.

V. *Military.*—In time of war towns were often destroyed by fire. This, as a war usage, belongs to all times and nations; but among the Hebrews there were some particular notions connected with it, as an act of strong abhorrence, or of devotedness to abiding desolation. See ACCURSED. The principal instances historically commemorated are the destruction by fire of Jericho (Josh. vi. 24); Ai (Josh. viii. 19); Hazor (Josh. xi. 11); Laish (Judg. xviii. 27); the towns of the Benjamites (Judg. xx. 48); Ziklag, by the Amalekites (1 Sam. xxx. 1); Jazer, by Pharaoh (1 Kings ix. 16); and the Temple and palaces of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar (2 Kings xxv. 9). Even the war-chariots of the Canaanites were burnt by the Israelites (Josh. vi. 24; viii. 28; xi. 6, 9, 13), probably on the principle of precluding the possibility of recovery by the enemy of instruments of strength for which they had themselves no use. The frequency with which towns were fired in ancient warfare is shown by the very numerous threats by the prophets that the towns of Israel should be burned by their foreign enemies. Some great towns, not of Israel, are particularly named; and it would be an interesting task to trace, as far as the materials exist, the fulfilment of these prophecies in those more marked examples. Among the places thus threatened we find Damascus (Isa. xliii. 12, 13), Gaza, Tyre, Teman (Amos i. 7, 10, 11). The temples and idols of a conquered town or people were very often burnt by the victors (Isa. liii. 12, 13). The Jews were expressly ordered to destroy the idols of the heathen nations, and especially any city of their own relapsed into idolatry (Exod. xxxii. 20; 2 Kings x. 26; Deut. vii. 5; xii. 3; xiii. 16). One of the expedients of war in sieges was to set fire to the gate of the besieged place (Judg. ix. 49, 52). See SIEGE.

In battle, torches were often carried by the soldiers, which explains the use of torches in the attack of Gideon upon the camp of the Midianites (Judg. vii. 6). This military use of torches was very general among ancient nations, and is alluded to by many of their writers (Statius, *Theb.* iv. 5, 7; Stobæus, *Serm.* p. 194; Michaelis, in *Symbol. Liter. Bremens.* iii. 254). See TORCH.

Signal fires on the tops of mountains were also anciently common as a telegraphic mode of conveying intelligence both in civil and military matters (Judith vii. 5). See BEACON.

VI. *Funeral.*—Incense was sometimes burnt in honor of the dead, especially royal personages, as is mentioned specially in the cases of Asa and Zedekiah, and negatively in that of Jehoram (2 Chron. xvi. 14; xxi. 19; Jer. xxxiv. 5). See FUNERAL.

VII. *Metalurgic.*—The use of fire in reducing and refining metals was well known to the Hebrews at the time of the Exodus (Exod. xxxii. 24; xxxv. 32; xxxvii. 2, 6, 17; xxxviii. 2, 8; Numb. xvi. 38, 39).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See HANDICRAFT.

VIII. *Figurative Senses.*—1. Fire is in the Scriptures considered as a symbol of Jehovah's presence (see

Mehner, *De Deo in igne*, Dresd. n. d.) and the instrument of his power, in the way either of approval or of destruction (Exod. xiv. 19; Numb. xi. 1, 3; Judg. xiii. 20; 1 Kings xviii. 38; 2 Kings i. 10, 12; ii. 11; vi. 17; comp. Isa. li. 6; lxxvi. 15, 24; Joel ii. 30; Mal. iii. 2, 3; iv. 1; 2 Pet. iii. 10; Rev. xx. 14, 15; see Reland, *Ant. Sacr.* i. 8, p. 26; Jennings, *Jewish Ant.* ii. 1, p. 301; Josephus, *Ant.* iii. 8, 6; viii. 4, 4). Thus he appeared in this element at the burning bush and on Mount Sinai (Exod. iii. 2; xix. 18). He showed himself to Isaiah, Ezekiel, and John in the midst of fire (Isa. vi. 4; Ezek. i. 4; Rev. i. 14), and it is said that he will so appear at his second coming (2 Thess. i. 8). The people of Israel wandered through the desert, guided by the Lord under the form of a pillar of fire [see PILLAR] (Exod. xiii. 21); and Daniel, relating his vision, in which he saw the Ancient of days, says, "A fiery stream issued and came forth before him" (vii. 10). God may be compared to fire, not only by reason of his glorious brightness, but also on account of his anger against sin, which consumes those against whom it is kindled, as fire does stubble (Deut. xxxii. 22; Isa. x. 17; Ezek. xxi. 3; Heb. xii. 29). Coals of fire proceeding from God's mouth denote his anger (Psa. cxvii. 8). His word also is compared to fire (Jer. xxiii. 29). Thus, in Jer. v. 14, "Behold, I will make my words in thy mouth fire, and this people wood, and it shall devour them." See FLAME.

2. Hence the destructive energies of this element and the torment which it inflicts rendered it a fit symbol of (1) whatever does damage and consumes (Prov. xvi. 27; Isa. ix. 18); (2) of severe trials, vexations, and misfortunes (Zech. xii. 9; Luke xii. 49 [see the dissertations on this text by Scharhan (*Obs. Sacr.* p. 127-146), Ellrod (Erlang. 1774)]; 1 Cor. iii. 13, 15 [see the dissertations on this text by Lichtenstein (Helmst. 1771), Georgi (Viteb. 1748)]; 1 Pet. i. 7); (3) of the punishments beyond the grave (Matt. v. 22; Mark ix. 44; Rev. xiv. 10; xxi. 8). See HELL.

3. Fire or flame is also used in a metaphorical sense to express excited feeling and divine inspiration (Psa. xxxix. 3; Jer. xx. 9). Thus the influences of the Holy Ghost are compared to fire (Matt. iii. 11), and the descent of the Holy Spirit was denoted by the appearance of lambent flames, or tongues of fire (Acts ii. 3). See TONGUE. The angels of God also are represented under the emblem of fire (Psa. civ. 4). These are the more benign applications of the figure, in the sense of warmth, activity, and illumination (see Wemyss's *Symbol. Diet.*). Compare LIGHT.

FIRE-BAPTISM. The expression "baptize with fire" (Matt. iii. 11; Luke iii. 16) is understood by most modern interpreters to be synonymous with *baptism by the Holy Spirit*, e. g. on the day of Pentecost (see Arthur, *Tongue of Fire*, passim, Lond. 1856, N. Y. 1857). Olshausen (*Comment.* ad loc., Am. ed. i. 269) regards "fire" here as put in contrast with the opposite element "water," i. e. the spiritual as distinct from the material baptism. So also Alford (*Greek Test.* ad loc. Matt.), who remarks that "to separate off *πῦρ*. 'Ay. as belonging to one set of persons, and *πῦρ* as belonging to another, when both are united in *ἵνα*, is harsh and confused." Yet so Origen early understood the passage, and in this Neander, De Wette, Meyer, and many other expositors coincide. Dr. Robinson observes that "the *wheat* are evidently those who receive Christ as the Messiah, and embrace his doctrines; these he will baptize with the Holy Ghost, i. e. he will impart to them spiritual gifts, the teachings and consolations of the Holy Spirit; while the *chaff* are as evidently those who reject Christ and his doctrines, and live in sin; these he will baptize with *fire* unquenchable" (in Calmet, s. v. Baptism). There are monographs on this subject by Iken (*Dissert.* p. 300-316), Mieg (*Misc. Duisb.* i. 205 sq., 602 sq.), Oslander (Tubingen, 1755), Schmid (Lips. 1706), Ribow (Gött. 1744), Zeibich (Ger. 1781). Compare BAPTISM WITH FIRE.

**Firebrand** (פֶּתֶל, *ud*, a *poker* or burnt end of a stick, Isa. vii, 4; Amos iv, 11; "brand," Zech. iii, 2; פֶּתֶל, *lappid*, Judg. xv, 4, a *lamp* or torch [as often elsewhere], i. e. flambeau; פֶּתֶל, *zek*, only in the plur., burning *darts*, i. e. arrows [q. v.] fitted with combustibles, Prov. xxvi, 18; comp. Eph. vi, 16). In Judg. xv, 4, it is said, "And Samson went and caught three hundred foxes [jackals], and took firebrands, and turned tail to tail, and put a firebrand in the midst between two tails." A firebrand in such a position, if sufficiently ignited to kindle a blaze in the shocks of corn, would soon have burnt itself free from the tails of the foxes, or have been extinguished by being drawn over the ground. A torch or flambeau, on the other hand, made of resinous wood or artificial materials, being more tenacious of flame, would have answered a far better purpose, and such is the legitimate import of the original. His "turning them tail to tail" was apparently intended to prevent them making too rapid a retreat to their holes, or, indeed, from going to their holes at all. They were probably not so tied that they should pull in different directions, but that they might run deviously and slowly, side by side, and so do the more effectual execution. Had he put a torch to the tail of each, the creature, naturally terrified at fire, would instantly have betaken itself to its hole, or some place of retreat, and thus the design of Samson would have been wholly frustrated. But by tying two of them together by the tail they would frequently thwart each other in running, and thus cause the greater devastation. Similar conflagrations produced by animals, particularly by foxes, were well known to the Greeks and Romans. Thus Lycophron (*Alexandra*, 344) makes Cassandra represent Ulysses as a cunning and mischievous man, the "man for many wiles renowned" of Homer, and styles him, very properly, *λαμπούρις*, *fire-tail*, a name for the fox (*Æsch. Fragm.* 386). The Romans, also, at their feast in honor of Ceres, the patron goddess of grain, offered in sacrifice animals injurious to corn-fields, and therefore introduced into the circus, on this occasion, foxes with firebrands so fastened to them as to burn them: a retaliation, as Ovid seems to explain it, of the injuries done to the corn by foxes so furnished (*P'asti*, iv, 681, 707, 711). In Leland's *Collectanea*, there is an engraving representing a Roman brick found twenty-eight feet below a pavement in London, about the year 1675, on which is exhibited, in basso-relievo, the figure of a man driving into a field of corn two foxes with a fire fastened to their tails, which many have supposed to refer to the feat of Samson, or at least to be a memento of the Roman usage just mentioned. Richardson, in his *Dissertation on the Eastern Nations*, speaking of the great festival of fire celebrated by the ancient Persians on the shortest night of the year, says, "Among other ceremonies common on this occasion, there was one which, whether it originated in superstition or caprice, seems to have been singularly cruel. The kings and great men used to set fire to large bunches of dry combustibles, fastened around wild beasts and birds, which being let loose, the air and earth appeared one great illumination; and as these terrified creatures naturally fled to the woods for shelter, it is easy to conceive that the conflagrations which would often happen must have been peculiarly destructive." See Fox.

**Firepan** (מִצְבֵּי, *machtah'*, from מִצְבֵּי, to take up coals of fire, etc.; Sept. *πυρρίον*, Vulg. *ignium receptaculum*), one of the vessels of the Temple service (Exod. xxvii, 3; xxxviii, 3; 2 Kings xxv, 15; Jer. lii, 19); elsewhere rendered "snuff-dish" (Exod. xxv, 38; xxxvii, 23; Numb. iv, 9; Sept. *ἐπαρσστήρ*, *ἐπαρσστήρις*, *ὑπόζευμα*, Vulg. *emunctorium*) and "censer" (Lev. x, 1; xvi, 12; Numb. xvi, 6 sq.; 2 Chron. iv, 22; Sept. *θυσιαστήριον*, Vulg. *thuribulum*). These appear, however, not to have been two or three forms of utensils, but essentially the same kind of article, probably i. q.

a metallic *cinder-basin*, of different sizes, for at least two uses: one, like a chafing-dish, to carry live coals for the purpose of burning incense; another, like a snuffer-dish, used in trimming the lamps, in order to (carry the snuffers and) convey away the snuff. See CENSER.

**Fire-worship.** For an account of the fire-worshippers of modern times, the reader is referred to the article PARSEES. We attempt here only a brief sketch of the origin and extent of pyrolatry among ancient nations. Under varying conceptions, as the symbol of purity, or of the divine presence and power, or as one of the constituent elements, or as typifying the destructive principle in nature, fire was early and among many nations an object of religious worship. If we attach any credit to the statements of the reputed Sanchoniathon, Usous, whose name reminds us of the Biblical Uz, the son of Aram, was the first to introduce the worship of fire. The violence of the winds at Tyre, by rubbing the branches of trees together, caused this element to manifest its presence, and Usous thereupon erected rude altars to fire and wind, and made libations thereon of the blood of animals captured in the chase.

The prevalence of pyrolatry among the Canaanites is frequently referred to in the Scriptures, and the people of God are solemnly and repeatedly warned against forsaking his worship to join in the abominations which belonged to the worship of Molech, the fire-god of these people (Lev. xviii, 21; xx, 2-5; Deut. xii, 31; 1 Kings xi, 7; 2 Kings xvi, 3; xxxiii, 10, 13; 2 Chron. xxviii, 3; Psa. cvi, 37, 38; Jer. vii, 31; xix, 5, 6; xxx, 35; Ezek. xvi, 20, 21; xxxiii, 37); yet, despite the denunciations of divine wrath and punishment, the Israelites sometimes apostatized to this worship, and caused their seed to pass through or be burnt in the fire to Molech. Solomon and Ahaz were notable instances of such apostasy, and from the terms employed to describe the conduct of the latter, "and burnt his children in the fire after the abominations of the heathen whom the Lord had cast out before the children of Israel" (2 Chron. xxviii, 3), we learn that the worship of Molech in the time of Ahaz was the same as in that of the old Canaanites. For the ceremonies of this worship, see MOLECH.

"Adrammelech, the fire-god of Sepharvaim; Chemosh, the fire-god of Moab; Uroal, Dusares, Sair, and Thyadrites, of the Edomites and neighboring Arab tribes, and the Greek Dionysus, were worshipped under the symbol of a rising flame of fire, which was imitated in the stone pillars erected in their honor" (*Movers, Phönizier*, i, c. 9). Among the ancient Persians and Medes fire-worship was practised in very early times by their religious teachers, the Magi, though pyra- or fire-temples probably date no further back than Zoroaster. Herodotus states (iii, 16) that the Persians regarded fire as a god, and sacrificed to it, as also to the heavenly bodies, and the other terrestrial elements (i, 131), using the tops of mountains or hills, for they had no temples or altars for the worship of their deities. Strabo, in agreement with Herodotus, states (§ 732) that they worshipped on high places, had no images or altars, and called the heavens Zeus; that they made sacrifices, especially (*ἑλαφρόντων*) to fire and water, placing dry wood without the bark, and putting fat upon it, then kindling the fire from beneath, not blowing it with the breath, but fanning it, for they esteemed it worthy of death to defile this sacred element by blowing the breath or placing a corpse or excrement upon it. In speaking of Cappadocia (§ 733), he, moreover, tells us that there were many magi there, called fire-worshippers (*πύραθοι*), and also pyra- or fire-temples, in which the sacred fire was kept perpetually burning by the Magi. Fire-temples also were found in Persia and other places. The chief men of Persia went to feed the sacred fires with precious oils and rich aromatics, styled by them fire-

banquets (*epule ignis*). For the ceremonies of worship in connection with these fire-temples, see MAGI and PARSEES.

Fire-worship was practised also among the Carthaginians, Scythians, the ancient Germans, and the ancient inhabitants of the British Isles, and we find traces of it also in the Mexican and Peruvian worship (Prescott, *Mexico*, i, 60, 64; *Peru*, i, 101). Diodorus Siculus states (xx, 14) that the Carthaginians, when hard pressed by Agathocles, attributing their reverses to the anger of their ancestral divinities, whose worship they had neglected, sacrificed 200 of the noblest children (to which number 300 were added by voluntary offerings) to Chronos or Saturn, whose brazen statue was so constructed that a child placed in its arms rolled into a pit of fire. This deity was therefore evidently the same as the Molech of their Tyrian ancestors. The Hindoos worshipped Agni, the god of fire, and in their mythology fire was the symbol of Siva, the destroyer, a conception of this element seemingly in accord with that of the ancient Egyptians (Herod. iii, 16).

The sacred fire was carefully watched in the temple of Vesta, at Rome, by virgins consecrated to this special service (*Virginesque Vestales in urbe custodiunt ignem foci publici sempiternum*, Cic. *De Leg.* ii, 8), and the extinction of this fire was regarded as a fearful omen, portending great disaster to the state, so that the unhappy Vestal who careless or ill luck was the occasion of such a misfortune atoned therefor by a severe and degrading punishment (Liv. xxviii, 11). The ancient Greeks paid worship to the same divinity in Hestia, reckoned one of the twelve great gods, and symbolized by the fire which burns upon the hearth, a deity admitted to the penetralia of domestic life.

We find the worship of the heavenly bodies frequently mentioned in connection with that of the gods of fire, and the former was doubtless older, as it was the higher form of worship (Dent. xvii, 3; 2 Kings xvii, 16, 17; xxi, 3; xxiii, 5, 11; Isa. xxvii, 9; Jer. vii, 2; Ezek. viii, 16; Zeph. i, 5; Herodotus, *l. c.*; Strabo, *l. c.*). There appears, therefore, to have been some connection between them. According to the Greek legends, it was Prometheus, the fire-bearer, who, purloining the ethereal and beneficent element from the sun, the high divinity of the Sabeian worship, conveyed it by stealth to earth as a gift to men, braving therefor and incurring thereby the anger of Zeus, the Greek form of the name by which, according to Herodotus and Strabo, the circuit of the heavens was called by the Magi, and probably the same as Mithra. May we not find symbolized in this Promethean legend the connection and the conflict between sun-worship and fire-worship, Sabeianism and Magism? For an abstract of the relation of the Mithraic worship and the original doctrines of the Zend-Avesta, with references to works of modern writers on this subject, see De Guignaut's translation of Creuzer's *Rel. de l'Antiquité*, notes viii, ix, to bk. ii, vol. i, pt. ii, p. 728.—Smith, *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v. Molech and Fire; *Auct. Univ. Hist.* (Lond. 1747, 21 vols. 8vo; see index in vol. xx); Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of Rom. Empire* (N. Y. 1852, 6 vols. 12mo), i, 226-238; Smith, *Gentile Nations* (N. Y.); Stoddard, *Introd. Univ. Hist.*, p. 228-9, 301; Hyde, *De Relig. vet. Persarum* (Oxon. 1700, 4to); Creuzer, *Religion de l'Antiquité*; Anquetil du Perron, *Zend-Avesta*, etc. (improved in German translation by discussions of Kleuker); Richter, *Älteste Religionen des Orients.* (J. W. M.)

**Firkin** (*μετρητής*, a measurer, occurs only in John ii, 6), a *metretēs*, i. e. the Attic AMPHORA, a measure for liquids, equivalent to the Hebrew BATH, and containing about 8½ gallons (Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s. v. Metretes). See METROLOGY.

**Firmament**, a term introduced into our language from the Vulgate, which gives *firmamentum* as the equivalent of the *σφραῖμα* of the Sept. and the *rakia* of

(רָקִיעַ) of the Hebrew text (Gen. i, 6); more fully רָקִיעַ הַשָּׁמַיִם, *firmament of the heavens*, Gen. i, 14, 15, 17). See HEAVEN.

1. The Hebrew term is generally regarded as expressive of simple *expansion*, and is so rendered in the margin of the A. V. (l. c.); but the true idea of the word is a complex one, taking in the *mode* by which the expansion is effected, and consequently implying the *nature of the material* expanded. The verb רָקַע, *rakā'*, means to expand by *beating*, whether by the hand, the foot, or any instrument. It is especially used, however, of beating out metals into thin plates (Exod. xxxix, 3; Numb. xvi, 39), and hence the substantive רָקִיעַ, "broad plates" of metal (Numb. xvi, 38). It is thus applied to the flattened surface of the solid earth (Isa. xlii, 5; xlv, 24; Psa. cxxxvi, 6), and it is in this sense that the term is applied to the heaven in Job xxxvii, 18, "Hast thou spread (rather *hammered*) out the sky which is strong, and as a molten looking-glass"—the mirrors to which he refers being made of metal. The sense of *solidity*, therefore, is combined with the ideas of *expansion* and *tenuity* in the term *rakia*. Saalschütz (*Archæol.* ii, 67) conceives that the idea of solidity is inconsistent with Gen. ii, 6, which implies, according to him, the passage of the mist through the *rakia*; he therefore gives it the sense of pure *expansion*—it is the large and lofty room in which the winds, etc. have their abode. But it should be observed that Gen. ii, 6 implies the very reverse. If the mist had penetrated the *rakia* it would have descended in the form of rain: the mist, however, was formed under the *rakia*, and resembled a heavy dew—a mode of fructifying the earth which, from its regularity and quietude, was more appropriate to a state of innocence than rain, the occasional violence of which associated it with the idea of divine vengeance. But the same idea of *solidity* runs through all the references to the *rakia*. In Exod. xxiv, 10, it is poetically represented as a solid floor, "a paved work of a sapphire stone;" nor is the image much weakened if we regard the word רָקִיעַ as applying to the *transparency* of the stone rather than to the *paring* as in the A. V., either sense being admissible. So again, in Ezek. i, 22-26, the "firmament" is the floor on which the throne of the Most High is placed. That the *rakia* should be transparent, as implied in the comparisons with the sapphire (Exod. l. c.) and with crystal (Ezek. l. c.; comp. Rev. iv, 6), is by no means inconsistent with its solidity. Further, the office of the *rakia* in the economy of the world demanded *strength* and *substance*. It was to serve as a division between the waters above and the waters below (Gen. i, 7). In order to enter into this description we must carry our ideas back to the time when the earth was a chaotic mass overspread with water, in which the material elements of the heavens were intermingled. The first step, therefore, in the work of orderly arrangement was to separate the elements of heaven and earth, and to fix a floor of partition between the waters of the heaven and the waters of the earth; and accordingly the *rakia* was created to support the upper reservoir (Psa. cxlviii, 4; comp. Psa. civ, 3, where Jehovah is represented as "building his chambers of water," not simply "in water," as the A. Vers.; the prep. *ב* signifying the *material* out of which the beams and joists were made), itself being supported at the edge or rim of the earth's disk by the mountains (2 Sam. xxii, 8; Job xxvi, 11). In keeping with this view the *rakia* was provided with "windows" (Gen. vii, 11; Isa. xxiv, 18; Mal. iii, 10) and "doors" (Psa. lxxviii, 23), through which the rain and the snow might descend. A secondary purpose which the *rakia* served was to support the heavenly bodies, sun, moon, and stars (Gen. i, 14), in which they were fixed as nails, and from which, consequently, they might be said figuratively to drop off (Isa. xiv, 12; xxxiv, 4;



Matt. xxiv, 29). In all these particulars we recognise the same view as was entertained by the Greeks, and, to a certain extent, by the Latins. The former applied to the heaven such epithets as "brazen" (χάλκεον, Homer, *Iliad*, xvii, 425; Pind. *Pyth.* x, 42; *Nem.* vi, 6; πολύχαλκον, *Il.* v, 504; *Od.* iii, 2) and "iron" (σίδηρον, *Od.* xv, 328; xvii, 565)—epithets also used in the Scriptures (Lev. xxvi, 19)—and that this was not merely poetical embellishment appears from the views promulgated by their philosophers, Empedocles, who described the heavens as *σπερμίονον* and *κρυσταλλοειδής*, composed of air glaciated by fire (Plutarch, *Plac. Phil.* ii, 11; Stobæus, *Eclóg. Phys.* i, 24; Diog. Laertius, viii, 77; Lactant. *De Opif. D. i.*, c. 17; comp. Karsten, *Phil. Gr. Veter. Operum Reliquiæ*, ii, 422); and Artemidorus, who taught that "summa cæli ora solidissima est, in modum tecti durata" (Seneca, *Quest.* vii, 13). The same idea is expressed in the *cælo affixa sidera* of the Latins (Pliny ii, 39; xviii, 57). Plato also, in his *Timæus*, makes mention of the visible heaven under the notion of *τάσις* (from *τείνω*, to extend), not unlike the Hebrew derivation. If it be objected to the Mosaic account that the view embodied in the word *rakia* does not harmonize with strict philosophical truth, the answer to such an objection is, that the writer describes things as they appear rather than as they are. But, in truth, the same absence of philosophic truth may be traced throughout all the terms applied to this subject, and the objection is levelled rather against the principles of language than anything else. Examine the Latin *cælum* (κόλιον), the "hollow place" or cave scooped out of solid space ("cavernæ cæli," Lucret. iv, 172; compare Pott, *Etymol. Forschungen*, i, 23, 27); our own "heaven," i. e. what is *heaved up*; the Greek *οὐρανός*, similarly significant of height (Pott, *Etym. Forsch.* i, 123); or the German "himmel," from *heimeln*, to cover—the "roof" which constitutes the "heim" or abode of man: in each there is a large amount of philosophical error. Correctly speaking, of course, the atmosphere is the true *rakia* by which the clouds are supported, and undefined space is the abode of the celestial bodies. There certainly appears an inconsistency in treating the *rakia* as the support both of the clouds and of the stars, for it could not have escaped observation that the clouds were below the stars; but perhaps this may be referred to the same feeling which is expressed in the *cælum ruit* of the Latins, the downfall of the *rakia* in stormy weather. Although the *rakia* and the *shamayim* ("heavens") are treated as identical in Gen. i, 8, yet it was more correct to recognise a distinction between them, as implied in the expression "firmament of the heavens" (Gen. i, 11), the former being the upheaving power and the latter the upheaved body—the former the line of demarcation between heaven and earth, the latter the *strata* or stories into which the heaven was divided. See COSMOGONY.

2. Hence it is easy to conceive how the Gr. translators came to render the Heb. term in question by *σπερμίονον*, a word which is commonly used to designate some compact solid, such as the basis of a pillar, or a pillar itself, and which is used elsewhere by the Sept. as equivalent to the Heb. רֹכֶן, a rock (Psa. xviii, 2), and by Symmachus and Theodotion as the rendering of the Heb. מַטֵּה, a staff. Basil. (*Hexæm.* Hom. 3) explains the term as not intended to describe what is naturally hard, and solid, and weighty, which belongs rather to the earth; but says that because the nature of the object above it is fine and thin, and not perceptible by sense, it is called *σπερμίονον*, by a comparison between things of extreme rarity and such as can be perceived by sense (*συγκρίσει τῶν λεπτοτάτων καὶ τῇ αἰσθησῇ καταληπτῶν*). It is not very clear what his meaning here is, but probably he intended that as a solid extension would be properly called a *σπερμίονον*, so this mass of light and vapory substances might by analogy receive this name. Others have suggested

that this term was employed to indicate that the רֹכֶן is the "universitas τῶν λεπτομερῶν in regionem superam conglobata et firmata," along with the idea that this "nihil habet uspiam inanitatis, sed omnia sui generis naturæ plena" (Fuller, *Miscel. Sac.* bk. i, c. vi). Fuller thinks also that the Sept. selected *σπερμίονον* rather than *πέτασμα* or *περιπέτασμα* in order to convey the idea of *depth* as well as superficial expansion. The general opinion, however, is, that the Sept. adopted this term rather than one exactly equivalent to the original, because it conveys what was the Hebrew belief concerning the upper atmosphere or visible heavens, which they regarded as a solid expanse encircling the earth, although the true state of the case was probably not unknown to them (Job xxxvi, 27, 28). Others, nevertheless, think that the waters above the *rakia* are merely the clouds, which need no solid support (Delitzsch, *Comment.* on Gen. i, 6; Kurz, *Bible and Astronomy*, in *Hist. of the Old Covenant*, i, 30).

3. With some old astronomers the *firmament* is the orb of the fixed stars, or the highest of all the heavens. But in Scripture and in common language it is used for the middle regions, the space or expanse appearing like an arch immediately above us in the heavens. Many of the ancients, and of the moderns also, account the firmament a fluid substance; but those who gave it the name of "firmament" must have regarded it as solid. In the Ptolemaic astronomy, the *firmament* is called the eighth heaven or sphere, with respect to the seven spheres of the planets, which it surrounds. It is supposed to have two motions—a diurnal motion imparted to it by the *primum mobile*, from east to west, about the poles of the ecliptic, and another opposite motion from west to east, which last is completed, according to Tycho, in 25,412 years; according to Ptolemy, in 36,000; and according to Copernicus, in 25,800; in which time the fixed stars return to the same points in which they were at the beginning. This period is called the *Platonic*, or *Great Year*.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See ASTRONOMY.

**Firmicus, JULIUS MATERNUS**, a Christian writer of the 4th century, of whom little is known. There was an astrologer of the same name and time, who wrote *Matheseos lib. viii.* There was a bishop of Milan of the same name, who flourished at the same time, but probably not the same person. He wrote a book, *De Errore Profanarum Religionum*, which he dedicated to Constantius and Constans; and from this it appears he was bred up in heathenism, and afterwards converted to the Christian faith. He is not mentioned by any ancient writer; and there is no direct evidence that he held any sacred office in the Christian Church. From internal evidence, it appears certain that the treatise was written between A.D. 343 and 350. An analysis of it is given by Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacrés* (Par. 1865), iv, 310 sq. The object of the treatise is to trace the history of the pagan faith, and to demonstrate the falsehood of its various forms. It adopts and applies the theory of Euhemerus (q. v.). It was first printed by Matt. Flacius (Strasburg, 1562); the latest separate edition is that of Munter (Copenhagen, 1826, 8vo), with prolegomena and notes. It may be found also in *Bib. Max. Patrol.* iv, 164; Galland, *Bib. Patrol.* v, 23; and Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* vol. xii.

**Firmilian, Sr.**, bishop of Caesarea, in Cappadocia, was an intimate friend both of Origen (Euseb. vi, 27) and Cyprian, with the latter of whom he took part in the controversy relative to the necessity of rebaptizing those who had been baptized by heretics. On this subject he wrote an *Epistle to St. Cyprian*, which was undoubtedly written in Greek, though the epistle extant in St. Cyprian's works is in Latin; it is generally allowed to have been translated by Cyprian himself. It is very valuable in disproving the authority of the bishop of Rome as *pope* in the 3d century. This epistle, which is a very long one, is the sixty-fifth among

those of St. Cyprian, and may be found in Oberthür's edition of Cyprian (i, 254); also in Routh, *Script. Eccl. Opuscula* (Oxon. 1840, i, 227); and in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* vol. iii. Baronius places the death of Firmilian A. D. 272.—Clarke, *Succession of Sacred Literature*, i, 172; Cave, *Hist. Liter.* (Geneva, 1720), i, 78; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacrés* (Paris, 1865), ii, 435 sq.

**Firmin**, THOMAS, an English Unitarian, noted for public benefactions and charities, was born at Ipswich, in Suffolk, June, 1632. His parents were Puritans, very reputable and substantial people, and at a proper age put out their son to an apprenticeship in London. His master was an Arminian, a hearer of Mr. John Goodwin, to whose sermons young Firmin resorting, "exchanged," as we are told, "the harsh opinions of Calvin, in which he had been educated, for those more reasonable ones of Arminius and the Remonstrants." He was led to certain opinions not agreeable to the orthodox faith, for instance, that "the unity of God is a unity of person as well as of nature, and that the Holy Spirit is indeed a person, but not God." He settled in business in Lombard Street, and became intimate with Whicheote, Wilkins, Tillotson, etc.; so particularly with the last that, when obliged to be out of town, at Canterbury, perhaps, where he was dean, he left to Mr. Firmin the provision of preachers for his Tuesday's lecture at St. Laurence. Queen Mary heard of his usefulness, and that he was heterodox in the articles of the Trinity, the divinity of our Saviour, and the atonement. She spoke to Tillotson, therefore, to set him right in those weighty and necessary points, who answered that he had often endeavored it, but that Mr. Firmin had now so long imbibed the Socinian doctrine as not to be capable of renouncing it. However, his grace, for he was then archbishop, published his sermons, formerly preached at St. Laurence's, concerning those questions, and sent Mr. Firmin one of the first copies from the press, who, not convinced, caused a respectful answer to be drawn up and published, with this title, *Considerations on the Explications and Defences of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, himself giving a copy to his grace. The plague in 1665, and the fire in 1666, furnished him with a variety of objects of charity. He went on with his trade in Lombard Street till 1676, at which time his biographer supposes him to have been worth £9000, though he had disposed of incredible sums in charities. This year he erected his warehouse in Little Britain for the employment of the poor in the linen manufacture, on which Tillotson spoke honorably in his funeral sermon on Mr. Gouge in 1681. In 1680 and 1681 came over the French Protestants, who furnished new work for Mr. Firmin's zeal and charity, and in 1682 he set up a linen manufacture for them at Ipswich. During the last twenty years of his life he was one of the governors of Christ-church Hospital in London, to which he procured many considerable donations. In April, 1693, he became a governor of St. Thomas's Hospital in Southwark; and, indeed, there was hardly any public trust or charity in which he either was not or might not have been concerned. He was buried, according to his desire, in the cloisters of Christ-church Hospital, and there is placed in the wall near his grave an inscription in terms of the highest panegyric. His *Life* was published in 1698, and again by Cornish, 1780, 12mo.—*New Gen. Biog. Dict.* s. v.; Wesley, *Works* (N. Y.), ii, 574.

**First-born** (בְּרִיָּה, בְּרִיָּה, from בָּרָא, to ripen early; Sept. and N. T. πρωτότοκος, Vulg. *primogenitus*), applied equally to animals and human beings. Among the Hebrews the first-born son had many privileges, to be entitled to which it was not only required that a man should be the first child of his mother, but that he should be, at the same time, the first son of his father (Deut. xxi, 15-17). The eldest son received a double portion of the father's inheritance (Deut. xxi,

17), but not of the mother's (Mishna, *Bekoroth*, viii, 9). If the father had married two wives, of whom he preferred one to the other, he was forbidden to give precedence to the son of the one if the child of the other were the first-born (Deut. xxi, 15, 16). In the case of levirate marriage, the son of the next brother succeeded to his uncle's vacant inheritance (Deut. xxv, 5, 6). Under the monarchy, the eldest son usually, but not always, as appears in the case of Solomon, succeeded his father in the kingdom (1 Kings i, 30; ii, 22). That some rights of primogeniture existed in very early times is plain, but it is not so clear in what they consisted. They have been classed as (a.) authority over the rest of the family; (b.) priesthood; (c.) a double portion of the inheritance. The birthright of Esau and of Reuben, set aside by authority or forfeited by misconduct, prove a general privilege as well as quasi-sacredness of primogeniture (Gen. xxv, 23, 31, 34; xlix, 3; 1 Chron. v, 1; Heb. xii, 16), and a precedence which obviously existed, and is alluded to in various passages (as Psa. lxxxix, 27; Job xviii, 13; Rom. viii, 29; Colos. i, 15; Heb. xii, 23); but the story of Esau's rejection tends to show the supreme and sacred authority of the parent irrevocable even by himself, rather than inherent right existing in the eldest son, which was evidently not inalienable (Gen. xxvii, 29, 33, 36; Grotius, Calmet, Patrick, Knöbel, on Gen. xxv). See Hottinger, *De primogenitis* (Marb. 1711); Schröder, *De rect. Hebr. et primogenitis* (Marb. 1741); Fabricius, *Bibliogr. Antiq.* p. 892; Gerdes, *De variis locis in quibus primogenitorum mentio occurrit* (Duisb. 1730); Frischmuth, *De primogenitura* (Jen. 1649). See BIRTHRIGHT.

The expression "first-born" is not always to be understood literally; it is sometimes taken for the prime, most excellent, most distinguished of things. Thus "Jesus Christ" is "the first-born of every creature, the first-begotten, or first-born from the dead;" begotten of the Father before any creature was produced; the first who rose from the dead by his own power (see *Jour. Sac. Lit.* Apr. 1861). Wisdom says that she came out of the mouth of the Most High before he had produced any creature (Prov. viii, 22; Eccles. xxiv, 3; Isa. xiv, 30). "The first-born of the poor" signifies the most miserable of the poor (Job xviii, 13); "the first-born of death," the most terrible of deaths (see Wemyss, *Symbol. Dict.*). The "Church of the first-born" (Heb. xii, 23) signifies the Church of the redeemed—those who have become peculiarly the Lord's, and through the blood of the everlasting covenant, applied to their consciences, are consecrated to him for evermore, in accordance with the custom of consecration described below (see Schöttgen, *Hor. Hebr.* i, 922).

**DESTRUCTION OF THE FIRST-BORN.** This was the tenth and last plague inflicted on the Egyptians (Exod. xi, 1-8; xii, 29, 30). We learn from Herodotus (ii, 85) that it was the custom of the Egyptians to rush from the house into the street, to bewail the dead with loud and bitter outcries; and every member of the family united in these expressions of sorrow. How great must their terror and grief have been when "at midnight Jehovah smote all the first-born in the land of Egypt." Hengstenberg remarks (*Egypt and the Books of Moses*) that "the phrase 'all the first-born' must not be pressed too far. The whole tenor of the narrative is opposed to such a proceeding, and particularly the declaration, 'There was no house where there was not one dead;' since in every house there was not a first-born. It must not be inferred that none of the first-born remained alive in the land, or that none besides the first-born died. That the Egyptians were swept off by an epidemic is indeed probable, and much more than probable, from Exod. ix, 15. What the Lord there says, he had long been able to do, that he now really does; since the reasons here given in ver. 16, which until now have prevented him from proceeding to this last resource, have now ceased; since, in short, he has by a series of acts sufficiently unfold-

ed his omnipotence and grace." See PLAGUES OF EGYPT.

**FIRST-BORN, SANCTIFICATION AND REDEMPTION OF** (פְּרִי־הַבְּיָרֵךְ, קִרְוֵי־בְּיָרֵךְ). Males of human beings and animals were strictly enjoined to perpetuate the remembrance of the death of Egypt's first-born, whereby the liberty of the Israelites was secured, and of the preservation of Israel's first-born. Compare Exod. xii, 2, 11-15.

1. *Sanctification of the First-born, its significance, etc.*—The fact that the first-born of Egypt were selected to be smitten down for the hard-heartedness of Pharaoh, and that their death was regarded as the greatest calamity, shows of itself that a peculiar sanctity had already been attached to the first-born of both man and cattle. The cause of this is easily traced in the Scriptures. The power of procreation was declared by God himself to be a special blessing (Gen. i, 22, 28; ix, 1; xvii, 16; xxix, 31), and was granted as a reward to those who were well pleasing in his sight (Gen. xv, 4; Psa. cxxviii, 4). This was fully appreciated by the Jews; for the possession of children, especially of the male sex, was esteemed the climax of social happiness (Gen. xvi, 2; xxix, 31; Deut. vii, 13, 14; Psa. cxxviii, 3, 4), and the absence of them was considered a *reproach* (קִרְוֵי־בְּיָרֵךְ), since it implied divine displeasure (Gen. xxx, 23), and no other earthly blessing could compensate for it (Gen. xvi, 1-5). Moreover, the first-born of newly-married young people (קִרְוֵי־בְּיָרֵךְ, Psa. cxxvii, 4) were believed to represent the prime of human vigor (פְּרִי־הַבְּיָרֵךְ), being born before the strength of the father began to diminish (Gen. xlix, 3; Deut. xxi, 17; Psa. lxxxviii, 51; cv, 36). It was therefore natural that the first instalment of God's blessing, and the prime of man's strength, should be regarded with peculiar affection, and have special sanctity attached to him, and that by virtue of the claim which God has to what is most loved and held sacred by us, and gratitude on the part of man, the first-born males, both of man and animals, should be consecrated to the Giver of all good things; the one as a priest, representing the family to which he belonged (Exod. xix, 22, 24), and the other as a sacrifice (Gen. iv, 4), just as the fat of sacrifices was devoted to God because it was regarded as the prime part of the animal. See FAT. This explains the fact why the plague of the first-born of the Egyptians was so terribly felt; it was the destruction of the objects most dear and sacred to them, whilst the first-born of the Hebrews, i. e. their priests and sacrifices, were spared. Moreover, it shows the import of the consecration enjoined in Exod. xiii, 1. Hitherto it was optional with the Hebrews whether they would devote the first-born to the Lord, but now God, by virtue of having so signally interposed for their deliverance, *claims the public consecration of the first-born of man as his priests, and of the first-born of animals as sacrifices.*

2. *Origin of the Redemption of the First-born.*—This devotion of the first-born was believed to indicate a priesthood belonging to the eldest sons of families, which being set aside in the case of Reuben, was transferred to the tribe of Levi. This priesthood is said to have lasted till the completion of the tabernacle (Jahn, *Bibl. Arch.* x, § 165, 387; Selden, *De Syn.* c. 16; Mishna, *Zebuchim*, xiv, 4, vol. v, 58; comp. Ezek. xxiv, 5). After the building of the tabernacle and the introduction of the extensive sacrificial service, which required a special priestly order, as well as a separate staff of servants, who could *exclusively* devote themselves to the ministry of the sanctuary, the offices of the first-born were superseded by those of the Levites (Numb. iii, 11-13), and it was ordained that the first-born of the other tribes, as well as the first-born of the animals which could not be sacrificed, should henceforth be redeemed (ib. xviii, 15).

3. *Redemption of the First-born of Man.*—The redemption of a child is to take place when it is a month old, when the father is to give to the priest five silver shekels of the sanctuary, i. e. about three dollars as the maximum. If it died before the expiration of 90 days, the Jewish doctors held the father excused, but liable to the payment if it outlived that time (Exod. xiii, 12-15; xxii, 29; Numb. viii, 17; Lev. xxvii, 6; Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* on Luke ii, 22; Philo, *De Pr. Sacerd.* i, ii, 233; Mangey). If the child was sickly, or appeared otherwise to be inferior to children generally, the priest could estimate it at less than this sum (Numb. iii, 46, etc.; xviii, 16). The priest had to come to the house of the infant, as the mother could not appear with it in the Temple because her days of purification, according to the law (Lev. xii, 2, 4), were not as yet accomplished. No bargaining was allowed, but if the priest saw that the parents were poor, he could, if he chose, return the money when the ceremony was over. When the mother's days of purification were accomplished, and she could appear in the Temple, she then brought the child to the priest to be presented publicly to the Lord (Luke ii, 22). The Jews still observe this law of redemption. When the first-born male is thirty days old, the parents invite to their house their friends and a priest (קִרְוֵי־בְּיָרֵךְ) to a meal for the following day. The priest, having invoked God's blessing upon the repast, and offered some introductory prayers, etc., looks at the child and the price of redemption presented before him, and asks the father which he would rather have, the money or the first-born child. Upon the father's reply that he would rather pay the price of redemption, the priest takes the money, swings it round the head of the infant in token of his vicarious authority, saying, "This is for the first-born, this is in lieu of it, this redeems it; and let this son be spared for life, for the law of God, and for the fear of Heaven. May it please Thee, that, as he was spared for redemption, so he may be spared for the Law, for matrimony, and for good works. Amen." The priest lays his hand upon the child's head and blesses it, as follows: "The Lord make thee as Ephraim and Manasseh!" etc. It is to this that the apostle Peter refers when he says, "Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold," etc. (1 Peter i, 18). When the first-born son is thirteen years of age, he fasts the day before the feast of Passover, in commemoration of the sparing of the first-born of the Hebrews in Egypt. See FASTER.

4. *Redemption of the First-born of clean Animals.*—The male first-born of animals (קִרְוֵי־בְּיָרֵךְ; Sept. *ἀναβοῶντων μῆτρων*; Vulg. *quod aperit vulvam*) was also devoted to God (Exod. xiii, 2, 12, 13; xxii, 29; xxxiv, 19, 20; Philo, *l. c.*, and *quis rerum die. hæres.* 24, i, 489, Mang.). The first-born of every clean animal (i. e., ox, sheep, goat, etc.), from eight days to twelve months old, had to be taken to Jerusalem every year (Deut. xii, 6, etc.), and delivered to the priest, who offered it as a sacrifice to Jehovah, sprinkled its blood upon the altar, burned the fat, and ate the flesh (Exod. xiii, 13; xxii, 30; xxxiv, 20; Numb. xviii, 15-17; Neh. x, 36). In the mean time the animal was not to be used for any work, for it belonged to the Lord (Deut. xv, 19); but if it had any blemish it was not to be sacrificed, but eaten up at home (ib. xv, 21, 22). Various refinements on the subject of blemishes are to be found in Mishna, *Bekoroth*. (See *Mab.* i, 8. By "firstlings," Deut. xiv, 23, compared with Numb. xviii, 17, are meant tithe animals: see Reland, *Antiq.* iii, 10, p. 327; Jahn, *Bibl. Arch.* § 387). If, however, the man whose cattle had first-born lived at too great a distance from Jerusalem to carry them thither, he was commanded to sell them, and take the money to the sanctuary (Deut. xiv, 24, 25).

5. *Redemption of the First-born of unclean Animals.*—The first-born of unclean animals, not being allowed

to be offered as sacrifices, were either to be redeemed according to the valuation of the priest, with the addition of one fifth of the value, and then remain with their owner, or be sold, and the price given to the priests (Lev. xxvii, 11-13, 27). The first-born of an ass was to be redeemed with a lamb, or, if not redeemed, put to death (Exod. xiii, 13; xxxiv, 20; Numb. xviii, 15). Commentators hold that the first-born of dogs were killed, because they were unclean; and that nothing was given for them to the priests, because there was no trade or commerce in them. See Dent. xxiii, 18.

6. *Literature*.—Josephus, *Ant.* iv, 4, 4; Mishna, *Bechoroth*; Maimonides, *Mishna Torá*, iii, 241; *Hilchoth Bechoroth*; Ibn Ezra's comments on the passages cited in this article; Calmet, on Numb. xviii; *The Hebrew Prayer-Book*, by Knöplfmacher (Vienna, 1859), entitled *Derech Ha-Chajim*, p. 407; *Der Israelitische Volkslehrer*, vii, 41 sq.; ix, 138 sq., 212 sq., 248 sq.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

**First Day of the Week.** See LORD'S DAY.

**First-fruit** (in the sing. רֵשִׁית, *reshith'*, beginning; in the plur. בִּקְרֻרִים, *bikkurim'*, first-ripe fruits; Sept. *πρωτογεννηματα*, ἀπαρχή, ἀπαίσιμα; Vulgate *primitia*, *primitiva*, *frugum initia*; comp. תְּרוּמָה, *terumah*, oblation; A. V. "heave-offering," etc.). The same natural feeling which at first led man out of gratitude to consecrate to the Giver of all good things the first-born of both man and animals, and the prime parts of sacrifices, because they were regarded as the first instalments of his blessings, and which afterwards led to the legalizing of these offerings, also gave rise to the offering of the first-fruits and to its becoming law. This was done publicly by the nation at each of the three great yearly festivals, and also by individuals without limitation of time. No ordinance appears to have been more distinctly recognised than this, so that the use of the term in the way of illustration carried to it a full significance even in N.-T. times (Prov. iii, 9; Tob. i, 6; 1 Macc. iii, 49; Rom. viii, 23; xi, 16; James i, 18; Rev. xiv, 4).

1. *Character and Classification of the First-fruits*.—(1.) On the morrow after the Passover Sabbath, i. e. on the 16th of Nisan, a sheaf of new corn was to be brought to the priest, and waved before the altar, in acknowledgment of the gift of fruitfulness (Lev. xxiii, 5, 6, 10, 12; ii, 12). Josephus tells us that the sheaf was of barley, and that, until this ceremony had been performed, no harvest work was to be begun (*Ant.* iii, 10, 5). See PASSOVER.

(2.) At the expiration of seven weeks from this time, i. e. at the feast of Pentecost, an oblation was to be made of two loaves of leavened bread made from the new flour, which were to be waved in like manner with the Passover sheaf (Exod. xxxiv, 22; Lev. xxiii, 15, 17; Numb. xxvii, 26). See PENTECOST.

(3.) The feast of ingathering, i. e. the feast of Tabernacles in the 7th month, was itself an acknowledgment of the fruits of the harvest (Exod. xxiii, 16; xxxiv, 22; Lev. xxiii, 39). See TABERNACLES.

Besides these stated occasions, the law also required every individual to consecrate to the Lord a part of the first-fruit of the land (comp. Exod. xxii, 29; xxiii, 19; xxxiv, 26; Numb. xv, 20, 21; xviii, 12, 13; Deut. xviii, 4; xxvi, 2-11). The first-fruits to be offered are restricted by Jewish tradition to the seven chief productions of Palestine, viz. wheat, barley, grapes, figs, pomegranates, olives, and honey, mentioned in Deut. viii, 8 in praise of the land (comp. Mishna, *Bikurim*, i, 3; *Berachoth*, 35, a; Maimonides, *Jod Ha-Chezaka*, *Hilchoth Bikurim*, ii, 2), to which perhaps may be added dates (Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 219; Mishna, *Bikurim*, i, 3; Hasselquist, *Travels*, p. 417); but the law appears to have contemplated produce of all sorts, and to have been so understood by Nehemiah (Deut. xxvi, 2; Neh. x, 35, 37). By the Talmudists they are divided into

two classes: 1. *The actual produce of the soil, the raw material, such as corn, fruits, etc., which are denominated* רֵשִׁית, *πρωτογεννηματα*, *primitiva*; and, 2. *Preparations of the produce, as oil, flour, wine, etc., which are called* תְּרוּמָה, *ἀπαρχαι*, *primitia* (comp. Midrash *Rabba*, the Chaldee Paraphrases of Onkelos and Jonathan ben-Uziel, and Rashi on Exod. xxii, 29). (Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 1276; Augustine, *Quæst. in Hept.* iv, 32, vol. iii, p. 732; Spencer, *De Leg. Hebr.* iii, 9, p. 713; Reland, *Antiq.* iii, 7; Philo, *De Pr. Sacerd.* i [ii, 233, Mang.]; *De Sacrific. Abel. et Cain*, 21 [i, 177, M.]; *De Monarchia*, ii, 3 [ii, 224, Mang.]

2. *Quantity and Time of Offering*.—Of the public offerings of first-fruits, the law defined no place from which the Passover sheaf should be chosen, but the Jewish custom, so far as it is represented by the Mishna, prescribed that the wave-sheaf or sheaves should be taken from the neighborhood of Jerusalem (*Terumoth*, x, 2). Deputies from the Sanhedrim went out on the eve of the festival, and tied the growing stalks in bunches. In the evening of the festival day the sheaf was cut with all possible publicity, and carried to the Temple. It was there threshed, and an omer of grain, after being winnowed, was bruised and roasted: after it had been mixed with oil and frankincense laid upon it, the priest waved the offering in all directions. A handful was thrown on the altar-fire, and the rest belonged to the priests, to be eaten by those who were free from ceremonial defilement. After this the harvest might be carried on. After the destruction of the Temple all this was discontinued, on the principle, as it seems, that the house of God was exclusively the place for oblation (Lev. ii, 14; x, 14; xxiii, 13; Numb. xviii, 11; Mishna, *Terum.* v, 6; x, 4, 5; *Shekalim*, viii, 8; Josephus, *Ant.* iii, 10, 5; Philo, *De proem. sac.* i [ii, 233, Mang.]; Reland, *Antiq.* iii, 7, 3; iv, 3, 8).

The offering made at the feast of Pentecost was a thanksgiving for the conclusion of wheat harvest. It consisted of two loaves (according to Josephus one loaf) of new flour baked with leaven, which were waved by the priest as at the Passover. The size of the loaves is fixed by the Mishna at seven palms long and four wide, with horns of four fingers length. No private offerings of first-fruits were allowed before this public oblation of the two loaves (Lev. xxiii, 15, 20; Mishna, *Terum.* x, 6; xi, 4; Josephus, *Ant.* iii, 10, 6; Reland, *Antiq.* iv, 4, 5).

The quantity of private first-fruits to be consecrated to the Lord has neither been fixed by the law nor by tradition; it was left entirely to the generosity of the people. "Yet," says Maimonides, "it is implied that a sixtieth part is to be consecrated, and he who wishes to devote all the first-fruits of his field may do so" (*Hilchoth Bikurim*, ii, 17). The way in which a proprietor fixed which first-fruit he should offer was this, as the Mishna tells us, "when he went into his field and saw a fig ripening, or a bunch of grapes, or a pomegranate, he tied a rush about it, and said, 'Lo, this is first-fruit'" (*Bikurim*, iii). All the first-fruits thus devoted to the Lord had to be delivered at Jerusalem before the feasts of Pentecost and Dedication (Exod. xxiii, 16; Lev. xxiii, 16, 17; *Bikurim*, i, 36); any offering brought after this time was not received.

3. *Manner in which these Offerings were taken to Jerusalem*.—The first-fruits of the land were to be brought in a basket to the holy place of God's choice, and there presented to the priest, who was to set the basket down before the altar. The offerer was then, in words of which the outline, if not the whole form was prescribed, to recite the story of Jacob's descent into Egypt, and the deliverance therefrom of his posterity, and to acknowledge the blessings with which God had visited him (Deut. xxvi, 2-11). The law that every one should take up the first-fruits to Jerusalem was soon found impracticable, since even the most pious Israel-

ite found it very difficult, in addition to his appearing at the three great festivals, to have to go to the Temple with every newly-ripened fruit. Nor was it found convenient for every one to go up with his first-fruits separately. Hence the custom arose, that when the first-fruits were ripe, all the inhabitants of one district who were ready to deliver them assembled together in the principal town of that locality where their representative lived, with a basket containing the ripe fruits of the seven several kinds, arranged in the following manner: "The barley was put lowermost, the wheat over it, the olives above that, the dates over them, the pomegranates over the dates, and the figs were put uppermost in the basket, leaves being put between every kind to separate it from the other, and clusters of grapes were laid upon the figs to form the outside of the basket" (Maimonides, *Hilchoth Bikurim*, iii, 7; *Tosifia Bikurim*, ii). With this basket all the pilgrims (or at least a company of twenty-four persons) staid up all night in the open market-place, because they were afraid to go into houses to sleep lest any inmate of them should die, and thus cause pollution. Early in the morning the representative of the district, who was the official (בְּרֵאשִׁית) and *ex officio* the leader of the imposing procession, summoned them with the words of the prophet Jeremiah, "Arise, and let us go up to Zion, to the house of Jehovah our God" (xxxii, 6). The whole company were then ready to start. We cannot do better than give literally the description which the Mishna and the Talmud give of this imposing procession: An ox [destined for a peace-offering] went before them with gilded horns and an olive crown upon its head, and a piper who played before them, whilst the air rang with the song of the people, "I was glad when they said unto me, Let us go into the house of the Lord" (Psa. cxxii, 1). On approaching Jerusalem a messenger was sent forward to announce their arrival, and the first-fruits were tastefully arranged. The officiating priest, the Levites, and the treasurers went out to meet them, the number of officials who went out being in accordance with the largeness of the party that arrived, and conducted them into the holy city, singing, as they entered, "Our feet stand within thy gates, O Jerusalem" (Psa. cxxii, 2), whilst all the workmen [who plied their craft] in the streets of Jerusalem stood up before them and welcomed them, saying, "Brethren of such and such a place, peace be with you." The piper continued to play before them till the procession came to the mount of the Temple. Here every one, even the king, took his own basket upon his shoulders, and went forward till they all came to the court of the Temple, singing, "Praise ye the Lord, praise God in his sanctuary," etc. [through the whole of Psalm c] ; whereupon the Levites sang, "I will extol thee, O Lord! because thou hast lifted me up, and hast not made my foes to rejoice over me" (Psa. xxx). Then the pigeons which were hung about the baskets were taken for burnt-offerings, and the pilgrims gave to the priests what they brought in their hands. With the baskets still upon their shoulders every one repeated, "I profess this day unto the Lord thy God," etc., till he came to the words, "A wandering Syrian was my father" (i. e. from Deut. xxvi, 3-5), when he took the basket off his shoulders and laid hold of it by its brim; the priest then put his hands under it and waved it, whilst the offerer continued to recite from the words "A wandering Syrian," where he had left off, to the end of the section (i. e. to Deut. xxvi, 10), then put the basket by the side of the altar, threw himself down on his face, and afterwards departed (Mishna, *Bikurim*, iii, 2-6; *Jerusalem Bikurim*, 65; Maimonides, *Hilchoth Bikurim*, iv, 16, 17). These first-fruits then became the property of the priests who officiated during that week. The baskets of the rich were of gold or silver, those of the poor of peeled willow. The baskets of the latter kind were presented to the priests, who waved the offerings at the S.W. corner of

the altar: the more valuable baskets were returned to the owners (*Bik.* iii, 6, 8). After passing the night at Jerusalem, the pilgrims returned on the following day to their homes (Deut. xvi, 7; *Terum.* ii, 4). It is mentioned that king Agrippa bore his part in this highly picturesque national ceremony by carrying his basket like the rest to the Temple (*Bik.* iii, 4). Among other by-laws were the following: 1. He who ate his first-fruits elsewhere than in Jerusalem, and without the proper form, was liable to punishment (*Maccoth.* iii, 3, vol. iv, 284, Surenh.). 2. Women, slaves, deaf and dumb persons, and some others, were exempt from the verbal oblation before the priest, which was not generally used after the feast of Tabernacles (*Bik.* i, 5, 6).

4. *Exemption from the Offering or the connected Service.*—Those who simply possessed the trees and not the land were exempted from the offering of first-fruits, for they could not say "the land which thou hast given me" (Maimonides, *Hilchoth Bikurim*, ii, 13). Those, too, who lived beyond the Jordan could not bring first-fruits in the proper sense of the libation, inasmuch as they could not say the words of the service, from "the land that floweth with milk and honey" (Deut. xxvi, 15; compare Mishna, *Bikurim*, i, 10). A proselyte, again, though he could bring the offering, from "the land that floweth with milk and honey" (Deut. xxvi, 3), "I am come to the country which the Lord sware unto our fathers to give us" (*Bikurim*, i, 4). Stewards, servants, slaves, women, sexless persons, and hermaphrodites were also not allowed to recite the service, though they could offer the libation, because they could not use the words, "I have brought the first-fruits of the land which thou, O Lord, hast given me" (Deut. xxvi, 10), they having originally had no share in the land (*Bikurim*, i, 5).

5. *Offering of the prepared Produce.*—In this, too, the quantity to be offered was left to the generosity of the people. But it was understood, says Maimonides, that "a liberal man will give a fortieth part of his first-fruits; one who is neither liberal nor illiberal will give a fiftieth part, and a covetous man will give a sixtieth" (*Hilchoth Teruma*, iii, 2). They had to be presented even from the produce of Jewish fields in foreign countries, and were not allowed to be taken from the portion intended for tithes, nor from the corners left for the poor (*Teruma*, i, 5; iii, 7), and were not required to be delivered in the Temple, but might be given to the nearest priest (*ib.* iv, 3; *Bikurim*, ii, 2). They consisted of wine, wool, bread, oil, date-honey, onions, cucumbers (*Terum.* ii, 5, 6; *Numb.* xv, 19, 21; Deut. xviii, 4). The measuring-basket was to be thrice estimated during the season (*ib.* iv, 3). He who ate or drank his offering by mistake was bound to add one fifth, and present it to the priest (Lev. v, 16; xxii, 14), who was forbidden to remit the penalty (*Terum.* vi, 1, 5). The offerings were to be eaten or used only by those who were clean from ceremonial defilement (*Numb.* xviii, 11; Deut. xviii, 4).

6. *The First-fruit of the Dough.*—Besides the offering of the first-fruits themselves, the Israelites were also required to give to the Lord a cake made of the first corn that was threshed, winnowed, and ground (*Numb.* xv, 18-21). Tradition restricts this to wheat, barley, casmin, or rye, fox-ear (barley), and oats (*Chab.* i, 1; Maimonides, *Bikurim*, vi, 1), of which a twenty-fourth part had to be given, but the baker who made it for sale had to give a forty-eighth part (Maimonides, *Hilchoth Bikurim*, v, 2, 3). This was the perquisite of the priest, and it is to this that the apostle refers in Rom. xi, 16.

7. *First-fruits of Fruit-trees.*—According to the law, the fruits of every newly-planted tree were not to be eaten or sold, or used in any way for the first three years, but considered "uncircumcised" or unclean. In the fourth year, however, the first-fruits were to be consecrated to the Lord, or, as the traditional explana-

tion is, eaten in Jerusalem, and in the fifth year became available to the owner (Lev. xix, 23-25). The three years, according to Rabbinic law, began with the first of *Tisri*, if the tree was planted before the sixteenth of *Ab*. The reason of this is that the fruits of those three years were considered imperfect; such imperfect fruit could not, therefore, be offered to God; and as man was not allowed to partake of the produce before he consecrated the first instalment of God's blessings to the giver of all good things, the planter had to wait till the fifth year (comp. Josephus, *Ant. iv*, 8, 19; and *Aben Ezra* on Lev. xix, 23). The law may also have had the ulterior object of excluding from use crude, immature, and therefore unwholesome fruits. Michaelis (iii, 267-8), indeed, finds a benefit to the trees themselves in this regulation: "The economical object of the law is very striking. Every gardener will teach us not to let fruit-trees bear in their earliest years, but to pluck off the blossoms; and for this reason, that they will thus thrive the better, and bear more abundantly afterwards, since, if we may not taste the fruit the first three years, we shall be the more disposed to pinch off the blossoms, and the son will learn to do this of his father. The very expression 'to regard them as uncircumcised' suggests the propriety of pinching them off; I do not say *cutting* them off, because it is generally the hand, and not a knife, that is employed in the operation." The trees found growing by the Jews at the conquest were treated as exempt from this rule (*Mishna, Orlah, i*, 2). See *FRUIT*.

8. *Historical Notices*.—The corruption of the nation after the time of Solomon gave rise to neglect in these as well as in other ordinances of the law, and restoration of them was among the reforms brought about by Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxxi, 5, 11). Nehemiah also, at the return from captivity, took pains to reorganize the offerings of first-fruits of both kinds, and to appoint places to receive them (*Neh. x*, 35, 37; xii, 44). Perversion or alienation of them is reprobated, as care in observing is enlorged by the prophets, and specially mentioned in the sketch of the restoration of the Temple and Temple-service made by Ezekiel (*Exod.* xx, 40; xliv, 30; xlviii, 14; Mal. iii, 8).

An offering of first-fruits is mentioned as an acceptable to the prophet Elisha (2 Kings iv, 42).

Offerings of first-fruits were sent to Jerusalem by Jews living in foreign countries (Josephus, *Ant. xvi*, 6, 7).

Offerings of first-fruits were also customary in heathen systems of worship (Homer, *Il. ix*, 529; *Odys. iii*, 44; Eurip. *Orest.* 96; *Phon.* 1523; Callim. *in Ceres.* 19; Theoc. vii, 31; *Stat. Theb.* ii, 742; Aristoph. *Ran.* 1272; Pausan. i, 43, 4; ix, 19, 4; Long, *Pastor.* ii, 2 and 22; Diol. Siculus, i, 14; Plutarch, *Isid.* 66; Pliny, xviii, 2; iv, 6; Calpurn. *Ecl.* iv, 122; Ovid, *Mel.* viii, 273; x, 431; *Fast.* ii, 519; Tibul. i, 1, 13; Spanheim, *ad Callim. Del.* 283; Porphyry, *De Abst.* ii, 56, 32; Epictet. 38; etc.). See Patrick, *On Deut.* xxvi; Spencer, *De Leg. Hebr.* iii, 9, *De Primitiarum Origine*; Leslie, *On Tithe*, in *Works*, vol. ii; Douglai *Analect.* i, 89; Lakemacher, *Ant. Gr.* p. 402; Munter, *Relig. der Karthog.* p. 54.

9. *Figurative Allusions*.—In the New Testament, the "first-fruits" are emblematical of abundance and excellence, and also the earnest or sample of a full harvest at hand. Paul says (*Rom.* viii, 23), Christians "have the first-fruits of the Spirit," i. e. the first gifts of the Spirit, the earnest, the pledge of future and still higher gifts. (See the monographs on this text by Gruner [Hal. 1767], Anon. [Gott. 1767], Müller [*Satura Obs. Philol.* p. 120], Keil [Lips. 1869].) Christ is called "the first-fruits of them that slept," i. e. the first who rose from the dead (1 Cor. xv, 20, 23; xvi, 15; *Rom.* xi, 16; James i, 18; Rev. xiv, 4).

10. *Literature*.—*Mishna, Bikurim, Teruma, Chala, and Orla*; Maimonides, *Jod Ha-Chezaka, Hillotho Bikurim*, iii, 121; Lewis, *Antiq. of the Hebrew Republic*, i, 145, etc. (Lond. 1724); Saalschütz, *Mosaische Recht*, p. 343 sq., 416 sq., 433 sq.; Herzfeld, *Geschichte d. Volkes Israel*, ii, 128 sq.; Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums*, i, 172 sq.; Carpov, *Appar.* p. 611 sq.; Bauer, *Gottesd. Verf.* i, 251 sq.; Gruner, *De primitiarum oblatione* (Lugd. B. 1739; also in Ugolino, xvii).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See OFFERING.

1. True Christians are called 'a kind of first-fruits of God's creatures (James i, 18), as being specially consecrated to him.' 2. The communications of God's grace on earth, as an earnest of future glory, are also so called (*Rom.* viii, 23), and for the same reason, the resurrection of Christ, as 'the pledge of the resurrection of the just' (1 Cor. iv, 20). 3. In an ecclesiastical sense, this term is applied to the first year's produce of benefices, which the pope demanded of foreigners to whom he gave benefices of the Church of England. Henry VIII rescued this payment from the pope, but annexed it to the crown. Queen Anne, however, gave them back to the Church for the augmentation of small livings" (Eden). See ANNATES. The *valor beneficiorum*, commonly called the value in the King's Books, was made at the same time as the statute 26 Henry VIII, c. 3, by which these payments were transferred to the crown. A former valuation had been made, 20 Edward I, which still exists in the exchequer. By this statute and one subsequent, 1 Elizabeth IV, every spiritual person admitted to a benefice must pay his first-fruits within three months after induction, in proper proportion: if he does not live half a year, or be ousted before the expiration of the first year, only one quarter is required; if he lives the year, or be ousted before eighteen months, one half; if a year and a half, three quarters; if two years, the whole. Archbishops and bishops have four years allowed them, and shall pay one quarter every year, if they live so long on the see. Other dignitaries pay as rectors and vicars. By several statutes of Anne, all livings under £50 per annum are discharged of the payment of first-fruits and tenths. The following notice of the valuation in the King's Books, and the former payments to the pope as *primicia*, is taken from Godwin's work, *De Præsulibus Angl.* The florin was 4s. 6d., the ducat 8s. English:

	King's Books.	To the Pope.
Canterbury.....	£2682 19 2	10,000 florins.
For a pall.....		5,000 "
London.....	1000 0 0	3,000 "
Winchester.....	2573 18 1½	12.0.0 ducats.
Ely.....	2134 18 6½	7,000 "
Lincoln.....	828 14 9½	5,000 "
Litchfield and Coventry.....	559 17 3½	1,733 "
Salisbury.....	1385 5 0	4,500 "
Bath and Wells.....	533 1 3	450 florins.
Exeter.....	500 0 0	6,000 ducats.
Norwich.....	834 11 1½	5,000 "
Worcester.....	929 13 3	2,000 florins.
Hereford.....	768 11 0½	2,000 "
Chichester.....	677 1 3	323 ducats.
Rochester.....	558 4 9½	1,300 florins.
Oxford.....	381 11 0½	
Gloucester.....	315 7 1	
Peterborough.....	414 19 8½	
Bristol.....	294 11 0½	
St. David's.....	426 2 1	1,500 florins.
Landaff.....	154 14 2	700 "
Bangor.....	131 16 3	126 "
St. Asaph.....	187 11 8	126 "
York.....	1610 0 0	10,000 ducats.
For a pall.....		5,000 "
Durham.....	1821 1 3	9,000 "
Carlisle.....	531 4 9½	1,000 "
Chester.....	420 1 8	

It will be observed that the bishoprics of Oxford, Gloucester, Peterborough, Bristol, and Chester, as creations or revivals by Henry VIII, are not included in the above catalogue as paying to the pope.—Eadie, *Eccle. Cyclop.* s. v.; Bingham, *Orig. Eccle.* bk. v, ch. vi, § 4.

**Fish** (אֵיִשׁ, *dag*, so called from its great fecundity; Gr.

יצְהוּץ, Gen. ix, 2; Numb. xi, 22; Jonah ii, 1, 10; Matt. vii, 10; xiv, 17; xv, 34; Luke v, 6; John xxi, 6, 8, 11). The Hebrews recognised fish as one of the great divisions of the animal kingdom, and, as such, give them a place in the account of the creation (Gen. i, 21, 28; where, however, they are included under the general terms יְרֵבִיבִים, *she'rets*, *swarm*, and רֵמֵשׁ, *rome'seth*, *creeping thing*, i. e. destitute of legs; and as distinguished from the larger inhabitants of the deep, דַּגִּים, *tanninim*), as well as in other passages where an exhaustive description of living creatures is intended (Gen. ix, 2; Exod. xx, 4; Deut. iv, 18; 1 Kings iv, 33). They do not, however, appear to have acquired any intimate knowledge of this branch of natural history. Although they were acquainted with some of the names given by the Egyptians to the different species (for Josephus, *War*, iii, 10, 8, compares one found in the Sea of Galilee to the *coracinus*), they did not adopt a similar method of distinguishing them; nor was any classification attempted beyond the broad divisions of clean and unclean, great and small. The former was established by the Mosaic law (Lev. xi, 9, 10), which pronounced unclean such fish as were devoid of fins and scales: these were and are regarded as unwholesome food in Egypt (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt*, iii, 58, 59), so much so that one of the laws of El-Ilakim prohibited the sale, or even the capture of them (Lane, *Modern Egyptians*, i, 136, note; De Sacy, *Chrestomathie Arabe*, 2d ed. i, 98). This distinction is referred to in the terms *σαρούα* (*esui non idonea*, Schleusner's *Lex.* s. v.; Trench, *On Parables*, p. 137) and *καλά* (Matt. xiii, 48). This law of Moses may have given rise to some casuistry, as many fishes have scales, which, though imperceptible when first caught, are very apparent after the skin is in the least dried. Maimonides, with less reason, sees in the Levitical distinctions of *fins* and *scales* among fishes "marks whereby the more noble and excellent species might be distinguished from those that were inferior" (Townley's *More Nevochim*, p. 305). In no ordinance of the laws of Moses do we find *fishes* prescribed as religious offerings. In this respect, as well as many others, these laws were opposed to the heathen rituals, which appointed fish-offerings to various deities. Besides the *bipi lotus*, the *oxyrhincus*, the *phrygus* (*eel*, "from its unwholesome qualities not eaten by the ancient Egyptians," Wilkinson, v, 251), *latas*, and *maotes* were held sacred in various parts of ancient Egypt (Clem. Alex., Plutarch, Strabo, Athenæus, and the authorities referred to by Sir G. Wilkinson, v, 125). In the *Ordi-nances of Menu*, ch. v (on *Diet, Purification*, etc.), secs. 15, 16, "the twice-born man is commanded diligently to abstain from *fish*; yet the two fishes called *pathina* (sheat-fish, *Silurus pelorius*) and *rohita* (rohi-fish, *Cyprinus denticulatus*) may be eaten by the guests, when offered at a repast in honor of the gods or manes; and so may the *rajiva* (a large fish, *Cyprianus Niloticus*), the *sihatunda*, and the *susalca* (probably shrimps and prawns) of every species" (Sir W. Jones's *Laws of Menu*, by Haughton, p. 146). Similarly in the heathen observances of other nations; thus "Apu [query, *Anchovy*] Veneri erat sacra; Concha [perhaps *Pearl-oyster*] Veneri stat; Mullus Diane; pisces omnes Neptuno: Thuanus Neptuno." (Beyer, *Adit. ad Seldeni Syntag. de Diis Syriis*; Ugolini *Theaur.* xxxiii, 338. Vossius, in Hoffmanni *Lexicon*, iii, 771, has a much longer list of fourteen fishes, "a veteribus pro Diis habiti." Consecrated fishes were kept in reservoirs, with rings of gold, or silver, or brass attached to them. So Sir J. Chardin in Harmer, iii, 58.) It was perhaps as an image of fecundity that the fish was selected as an object of idolatry: the worship of it was widely spread, from Egypt (Wilkinson, iii, 58) to Assyria (Layard, *Nineveh*, ii, 467), and even India (Baur, *Mythologie*, ii, 58). Among the Philistines, Dagon (= *little fish*) was represented by a figure half man and half

fish (1 Sam. v, 4). On this account the worship of fish is expressly prohibited (Deut. iv, 18). See DAGON. The form of a fish (*Notius Poseidon*) was, from remote ages, a type of protective dominion, which the symbolizing spirit of the ancients caused to pass into Christianity, as appears from Eusebius (*Life of Constantine*) and St. Augustine (*De Civitate Dei*). On the walls of the oldest catacombs of Rome the representation of the ΙΧΘΥΣ is frequently discernible, and always interpreted as an emblem of the Saviour.

Taking fishes in the scientific sense of "oviparous, vertebrated, cold-blooded animals, breathing water by means of gills or *branchie*, and generally provided with fins," none are mentioned by name throughout the O. T. and N. T.; but, regarded in the popular and inexact sense of aquatic animals, inhabitants more or less of the water, we meet with eleven instances which require some notice here. 1. That well-known batrachian reptile, the frog (צְבָרָדִים, *tsopardé'û*), which emerges from a fish-like infancy, breathing by gills instead of lungs, and respiring water instead of air, is often mentioned in Exod. viii, but only in two passages else, Psa. lxxviii, 45, and cv, 30. See FROG. 2. The annelid *horse-leech*, whose name occurs only once, Prov. xxx, 15 (רֵמֵשׁ, *alukah*). "It would appear that the blood-sucking quality of this useful little animal is a direct and exclusive ordination of Providence for man's advantage. That blood is not the natural food of the animal is probable from the fact that, in the streams and pools which they inhabit, not one in a hundred could, in the common course of things, ever indulge such an appetite; and even when received into the stomach, it does not appear to be digested; for, though it will remain there for weeks without coagulating or becoming putrid, yet the animal usually dies unless the blood be vomited through the mouth" (Gosse's *Zool.* ii, 374). Of course it is the smaller species, the *Hirudo medicinalis*, that is here referred to. But the larger species, the *Hæmopsis sanguisuga*, or "horse-leech," has a still greater voracity for blood. Bochart (*Hieroz.* ii, 796-802) and Schultens (Prov. in loc.) give another turn to Prov. xxx, 15, by identifying רֵמֵשׁ with the Arabic *aluk*, and making *fate* or *destiny*, instead of the *horse-leech*, the insatiable exacter. The ancient versions, however, must be deemed to outweigh their learned speculations; added to which the Arabic *alukat*, the Syriac *aluka*, and the Chaldee and Talmudic רֵמֵשׁ, or רֵמֵשׁ, all designate the *leech*, which is as abundant in the East as it ever was in our Western countries. The blood-appetite of this animal made it suitable to point a proverb: Horace says, *Non missura cutem, nisi plena cruoris, hirudo* (De Arte Poet. 476). With this comp. Plautus, *Epidicus*, ii, 2, 4, 5; and Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. i, epist. 13. See HORSE-LEECH. 3. The testaceous mollusk (*Ostrea marina*, Gesenius, *Theas.* p. 1263), called by the Hebrews רֵמֵשׁ, *argamenu'*; by Avicenna, *Alargawean*; by Galen, *Θαλασσία φοφύρα*, is the *Murex trunculus* of zoology, from which the renowned Tyrian dye used to be obtained. This shell-fish (and not the "purple" extracted from it) is with good reason supposed by Gesenius to be referred to in Cant. vii, 5: *The tresses of thine head are like the wreathed shell of the purple-fish*: reminding us of the ancient head-dresses of the Athenians, described by Thucydides, i, 6, 3 (comp. the conical head-tuft of the Roman *Tutulus* [Varro, *De Ling. Lat.* vii, 3, 90], and Virgil's *Crines nodantur in aurum*). A second reference to this shell-fish probably occurs in Ezek. xxvii, 7. The Tyrians seem to have imported some *murexes* from the Peloponnesus (the same as "Elishah" according to Heeren, *Researches, Asiatic Nations* [Oxford, trans.], i, 361); and Gesenius supposes that these, the material out of which the celebrated dye was procured, are referred to by the prophet in his enumeration of the Tyrian merchandise. That

these fishes were supplied from the coast of Greece we learn from Horace, *Od.* ii, 18, 7 (*Laconice purpure*); from Pausanias, iii, 21, 6; and from Pliny, ix, 36. See PURPLE. 4. The other word used by Ezekiel in this passage, תֵּלֶלֶת, *tele'leth*, is described by Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 1503, as "a species of shell-fish (*Conchylium, Helix vandina* [*concha*]), found cleaving to the rocks in the Mediterranean Sea, covered with a violet shell (Forsk., *Descript. animal.* p. 127), from which was procured a dark-blue dye." In the many other passages where these two words occur, they undoubtedly designate either the colors or the material dyed in them. The phrase "treasures hid in the sand" (Dent. xxxii, 19) is supposed to refer to the abundance of the rich dyes afforded by the תֵּלֶלֶת and other testaceous animals found in the sand, on the Phœnician coast, assigned to Zebulon and Issachar (Targum of Jonathan b. Uziel, Walton, iv, 387, and Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 1503). See BLUE. 5. The תַּמִּי' (*plur.* תַּמִּיִּם or תַּמִּיִּת) must be carefully distinguished from תַּמִּי, *tamim'*, the plural of the unused word תַּמִּי, a *jackal*, according to Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 1138. "The sea-monsters," which are described by Jeremiah (Lament. iv, 3) as "suckling their young," used to be regarded as the mammiferous whales or other large *cetacea* (Calmet by Taylor, "Fragments" on *Natural History*, No. xxvi). They are by Gesenius (*l. c.*) supposed to be rather תַּמִּי, *jackals*; this is the reading of some of the MSS. (Kennicott, ii, 546), and Gesenius accepts the Masoretic text as an Aramaic form of it. In Ezek. xxix, 3, and xxxii, 2, the textual reading תַּמִּי, which is represented usually as an anomalous singular noun, should no doubt be תַּמִּי, the regular singular, which may well bear (what the other word could not) the suitable sense of *crocodile*; the MS. authority in favor of the latter word is overwhelming (Kennicott, ii, 212). For a description of the תַּמִּי, see WHALE. 6. תַּבְּחִי, *Behemoth'* (q. v.). 7. לֵוִיָּתָן, *Leviathan*. See CROCODILE. 8. "The great fish," גִּבְרִי' גָּדוֹל, of Jonah i, 17 (גִּבְרִי' in ii, 1), was probably some species of shark, such as the *Zypræna mælieus*, or the *Carcharias vulgaris* (the white shark), therefore strictly a fish. Of the same kind of huge fish, ἀθροιστάγοι, does Amos speak in prophecy, ix, 3, "I will command the serpent from the bottom of the sea, and he shall bite them" (Bochart, *Hieroz.* i, c. 40, l. 40). The difficulty that in the Sept. of Jonah, and in the Greek Testament (Matt. xii, 40), κήτος is the word by which the fish is designated, is removed by the fact that this Greek term does not specifically indicate whales only, as the objection supposes, but any of the larger inhabitants of the deep. (Wesseling's Herodot. *Fragm. de Incremento Nilæ*, p. 789, as quoted in Valpy's *Stephani Thes.* s. v. κήτος; here "piscis," as well as "bellue quælibet ingentes, veluti crocodilus et hippopotamus," are included.) Accordingly κήτος stands in the Sept., *passim*, for תַּבְּחִי, as well as for תַּמִּי (see Schleusner, *Lex. Y. T.* s. v. κήτος). Admiral Smyth, in the chapter on Ichthyology, in his *Mediterranean*, p. 196, says the white shark has been called "*Jona piscis*" from its transcendent claim "to have been the *great fish* that swallowed the prophet, since he can readily engulf a man whole." For more on the subject of this fish, see Kitto, *Bibl. Illustr.* vi, 399-404, and JONAH. 9. Of Tobit's fish, O. F. Fritzsche, in his commentary on the passage (Tobit vi, *passim*) enumerates nine or ten speculations by different writers. According to Bochart and Helvigius, the *Silurus* has the best claim. This the former describes as "being very large, of great strength and boldness, and ever ready to attack other animals, even men, an inhabitant of the rivers Euphrates and Tigris." C. H. Smith, in the first edition of Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, combats Bochart's conclusions,

and suggests "the *Sisar* of the Indus, a crocodile, probably of the genus *Gavial*, which grows to a great size, is eaten, and has a gall bladder, still used to cure obstinate wounds and defluctions." Glaire suggests the *sturgeon*, but this is more suitable to Northern rivers. Pennant mentions the capture of one in the Esk weighing 464 pounds (*British Zoology*, iii, 127). See more in Bochart, *Hieroz.* v, 14; Glaire, *Introduction de l'Ancien. et du N. T.* ii, 91 [ed. 3], Paris, 1862, and TORR. 10. If Dr. French and Mr. Skinner, in their *Translation of the Psalms*, are right in rendering Psa. civ, 26, "There swimmeth the *nautilus* and the *whale*," etc. (as if the sacred writer meant to indicate a *small*, though conspicuous, as well as a *large* aquatic animal, as equally the object of God's care), we have in the תַּמִּיִּם, *amiyoth'*, A. V. "ships," an unexpected addition to our Scripture nomenclature of fishes, in what lord Byron calls—

"The tender Nautilus who steers his prow,  
The sea-born sailor of his shell canoe,  
The ocean Mab, the fairy of the sea."—*The Island*.

In their note the translators say, "*The Nautilus*.—This little creature floats at pleasure upon the surface of the sea. Its shell resembles the *hull of a ship*, whence it has its name." Mr. Thrupp accepts the new rendering as having "much apparent probability" (*Introduction to the Psalms*, ii, 178). Another recent expositor of the Psalms, J. Olshausen (*Exeg. Handb.* p. 402), remarks that "the introduction of *ships* amongst the living creatures of the sea has always presented an obstacle" to the understanding of the sentence. The paper nautilus (*Argonauta*) frequents the Mediterranean. The verb תַּמִּי, *proceed, walk*, very well describes the stately progress of the nautilus as it floats upon the wave. We may add that it gives greater fitness to the 27th verse, which at present is hardly compatible with the 25th and 26th, owing to the intrusion of the clause, *there go the ships*. Replace this by the *nautilus*, and the coherence of the 27th verse with the two preceding is complete in all its terms. 11. Our last specific fish is rather suggested than named in Ezek. xxix, 4, where the prophet twice mentions "the fish of the rivers which cleave to the scales" [of the crocodile]. This description seems to identify this fish with the *Echeneis remora*, so remarkable for the adhesive or sucking disc which covers the upper part of the head, and enables it to adhere to the body of another fish, or to the bottom of a vessel. (Its fabulous powers of being able even to arrest a vessel in her course are recorded by Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xxxii, 1; it is mentioned by Aristotle, *Hist. Anim.* ii, 14, ἡ ἐχένη τῶν ἰσθίων, ὁ καλοῦσι τῶν ἐχένην. It is also mentioned by Forskal as seen at Gidda, and by Hasselquist at Alexandria). The *lump-sucker* (*Cyclopterus lumpus*) is furnished with ventral fins which unite beneath the body and form a concave disc, by which the fish can with ease adhere to stones or other bodies. Either in the *remora*, with its adhesive apparatus *above*, or in the *lump-sucker* with a similar appendage *below*, or in both, we have in all probability the prophet's fishes which cleave to the monster of the Nile.

The species of fishes known to the Hebrews, or at least to those who dwelt on the coast, were probably very numerous, because the usual current of the Mediterranean sets in, with a great depth of water, at the Straits of Gibraltar, and passes eastward on the African side until the shoals of the delta of the Nile begin to turn it towards the north; it continues in that direction along the Syrian shores, and falls into a broken course only when turning westward on the Cyprian and Cretan coasts. Every spring, with the sun's return towards the north, innumerable troops of littoral species, having passed the winter in the offings of Western Africa, return northward for spawning, or are impelled in that direction by other unknown laws. A small part only ascend along the Atlantic coast of



Spain and Portugal towards the British Channel, while the main bodies pass into the Mediterranean, follow the general current, and do not break into more scattered families until they have swept round the shores of Palestine. Lists of species of the fish frequenting various parts of the Mediterranean may be found in Risso (*Ichthyol. de Nice*), who describes 315 species he had observed at Nice; and in Adm. Smyth's *Mediterranean*, where in the chapter on *Ichthyology* he gives a list of about 300 fishes haunting the waters of Sicily, besides 240 *crustacea*, *testacea*, and *mollusks*. Admiral Smyth remarks generally of the Mediterranean fish, that, "though mostly handsomer than British fishes, they are, for the most part, not to be compared with them in flavor" (p. 192-209). Professor E. Forbes (in his *Report on Aegean Invertebrata*) divides that part of the East Mediterranean, in which for many years he conducted his inquiries, into eight regions of *depth*, each characterized by its peculiar fauna. "Certain species," he says, "in each are found in no other; several are found in one region which do not range into the next above, whilst they extend to that below, or *vice versa*. Certain species have their maximum of development in each zone, being most prolific in individuals at that zone in which is their maximum, and of which they may be regarded as especially characteristic. Mingled with these true natives are stragglers, owing their presence to the secondary influences which modify distribution." The Syrian waters are probably not less prolific. The coasts of Tyre and Sidon would produce at least as great a number. The name of the latter place, indeed, is derived from the Phœnician word *fish* (see Gesenius, s. v. צִדֹן, *Sidon*: the modern name has the same meaning, *Saida*; Abulfar. *Syria*, p. 93. See *SDON*), and it is the oldest fishing establishment for commercial purposes known in history. The Hebrews had a less perfect acquaintance with the species found in the *Red Sea*, whither, to a certain extent, the majority of fishes found in the Indian Ocean resort. Besides these, in Egypt they had anciently eaten those of the Nile (for the fish of the Nile, see Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, ii, 119-121, and, more fully, Wilkinson's *Ancient Egyptians*, iii, 58; v, 248-251); subsequently, those of the lake of Tiberias and of the rivers falling into the Jordan (Von Raumer, *Palästina*, p. 105, after Hasselquist, mentions the *Sparus Galileus*, a sort of bream, the *silurus* and *mugil*; and Reuchlin, in *Herzog*, after Dr. Barth, adds the *Labrus Niloticus* as inhabiting this lake, which Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 375, represents as abounding in fish of all kinds [comp. John xxi, 11, with Matt. xiv, 17 and xv, 34]. From the earliest times—so said the Rabbinical legends—this lake had been so renowned in this respect [see Reland, p. 260, who quotes the *Baba Bathra* of the Babylonian Gemara], that one of the ten fundamental laws laid down by Joshua was, that any one might fish with a hook in the Sea of Galilee [see Lightfoot, *Tal. Ezerit.* on Matt. iv, 8]. Two of the villages on the banks derived their name from their fisheries, the west and the east *Bethsaida*, "house of fish" [compare the modern name of Sidon just mentioned]. The numerous streams which flow into the Jordan are also described by Stanley as full of fish, especially the Jabbok, p. 323; and they may have been acquainted with species of other lakes, of the *Orontes*, and even of the *Euphrates*. The supply, however, of this article of food, which the Jewish people appear to have consumed largely, came chiefly from the *Mediterranean*. From Neh. xiii, 16, we learn that the Phœnicians of Tyre actually resided in Jerusalem as dealers in fish, which must have led to an exchange of that commodity for corn and cattle. They must have previously salted it (in which form it is termed כִּלְיָה in the Talmud; Lightfoot on Matt. xiv, 17): the existence of a regular fish-market is implied in the notice of the fish-gate, which was probably contiguous to it (2 Chron. xxxiii,

14; Neh. iii, 3; xii, 39; Zeph. i, 10). In addition to these sources, the reservoirs formed in the neighborhood of towns may have been stocked with fish (2 Sam. ii, 13; iv, 12; Isa. vii, 3; xxii, 9, 11; Cant. vii, 4, where, however, "fish" is interpolated in the A.V.). See *FOOD*. The most nutritious and common of the fishes which must have filled the Jewish markets were genera of *Percade* (perch tribes); *Sciænide* (much resembling the perches); and particularly the great tribe of the *Scomberide* (mackerel, with its numerous genera and still more abundant species, frequenting the Mediterranean in prodigious numbers, and mostly excellent for the table; but being often without perceptible scales, they may have been of questionable use to the Hebrews. All the species resort to the deep seas, and foremost of them is the genus *Thynnus*, our tunny, a fish often mentioned with honor by the ancients, from Aristotle downward; a specimen taken near Greenock in 1831 was nine feet in length. Its flesh is highly prized, and from its great solidity it partakes much of the character of meat. Although repeatedly taken on the English coast, it is really a native of the Mediterranean, where it abounds, not only in Sicilian waters, but, in three or four species, in the Levant. The following complete the catalogue: the *Mugilide* family (the sea mullets, *mugiles*, being valuable in every part of the Mediterranean), the *Labride* (or *Wrasse* of Pennant), and *Cyprinide* (carps, particularly abundant in the fresh waters of Asia); after these may be ranged the genus *Mormyrus*, of which the species, amounting to six or seven, are almost exclusively tenants of the Nile and the lake of Tiberias, and held among the most palatable fish which the fresh waters produce. Cat or sheat-fish (*Siluride*) are a family of numerous genera, all of which, except the *Loricaria*, are destitute of a scaly covering, and were consequently unclean to the Hebrews; though several of them were held by the ancient Gentile nations and by some of the modern in high estimation, such as the blackfish, probably the shilbeh (*Silurus Shilbe Niloticus*) of the Nile, and others. Of salmon (*Salmonide*), the *Myletes dentex* or *Hasselquisti* belongs to the most edible fishes of the Egyptian river; there were also *Clupeide* (herrings) and the *Gadide* (or cod), these last being present about Tyre; *Pleuronectes* (or flatfish) are found off the Egyptian coasts, and eel-shaped genera are bred abundantly in the lakes of the Delta. A comparison of this list with the enumeration of the ancient Egyptian fish given by Strabo (xvii, 823), or by Sir G. Wilkinson in his *Ancient Egyptians* (iii, 58), will show us that some of the fish which have to the present day preserved their excellent character as wholesome food (such as some species of the *Percade* [e. g. the "gisher"], and the *Labride* [e. g. the "bulti"], and the *Cyprinide* [e. g. the "bemi"; "the carpe is a dayntous fische," wrote old Leonard Maschal in 1514, when he introduced the fish into England]), were the identical diet which the children of Israel "remembered" so invidiously at Taborah, when they ungratefully loathed the manna (Numb. xi, 5). Finally, there are the cartilaginous orders, where we find the file-fish (genus *Balistes*), having a species (*B. vetula*) in the waters of the Nile; and true chondropterygians, containing the sharks, numerous in genera and species, both in the Mediterranean and Red Sea. We notice only *Carcharias Lamia*, the white or raging shark, often found of enormous size off Alexandria, and always attended by several pilot-fish (*Naucrates*), and the saw-fish (*Pristis antiqorum*), most dreaded by the pearl-fishers in the Persian Gulf, and which has been seen in the Red Sea pursuing its prey even into the surf, with such force and velocity that, on one occasion, half of a fish cut asunder by the saw flew on shore at the feet of an officer while employed in the surveying service. On rays we shall only add that most of the genera are represented by species in either sea, and in particular the sting rays (*Trigon*) and electric rays (*Torpedo*),

with which we close our general review of the class, although many interesting remarks might be subjoined, all tending to clear up existing misconceptions respecting fishes in general—such as that cetaceans, or the whale tribe, belong to them; and the misapplication of the term when tortoises and oysters are denominated fish; for the error is general, and the Arabs even include lizards in the appellation. See ZOOLOGY.

ἰχθύων ἄγονος ἔστιν). This epithet ἄγονος is applied to the Dead Sea itself by Josephus, *War*, v, 4 (see Bochart, *Hieroz.* i, 40).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See DEAD SEA.

FISH IN CHRISTIAN SYMBOLISM. Of all the symbols used by the early Christians, none was more widely used than that of the fish. It was employed as a metaphor in the writings of the fathers of the Church,



Ancient Egyptians curing Fish. Fig. 1, splits them open, *a*, and removes the entrails, as at *b*, *b*; 2, takes out the backbone, *d*, and salts them from the pot, *c*; 3 and 4, bring them in whole, *e*, *f*, *g*.

The extreme value of fish as an article of food [when cooked, or otherwise prepared as a relish, *ὀψάσιον*, lit. *sauce*] (our Lord seems to recognise this as sharing with bread the claim to be considered as a prime necessary of life, see Matt. vii, 9, 10) imparted to the destruction of fish the character of a divine judgment (see Isa. i, 2; Hosea iv, 3; Zeph. i, 3; compare with Exod. vii, 18, 21; Psa. cv, 29; and Isa. xix, 8). This would especially be the case in Egypt, where the abundance of fish in the Nile, and the lakes and canals (Strabo, xvii, p. 823; Diod. i, 36, 43, 52; Herod. ii, 23, 149), rendered it one of the staple commodities of food (Numb. xi, 5; comp. Wilkinson, iii, 62). How fish is destroyed, largely in the way of God's judgment, is stated by Dr. E. Pococke on Hosea iv, 3, where he collects many conjectures of the learned, to which may be added the more obvious cause of death by disease, such as the case mentioned by Welsted (*Travels in Arabia*, i, 310) of the destruction of vast quantities of the fish of Oman by an epidemic, which recurred nearly every five years. St. John (*Travels in Valley of the Nile*, ii, 246) describes a vast destruction of fish from cold. Aristotle (*Hist. Anim.* viii, 19) mentions certain symptoms of disease among fish as known to skillful fishermen; but he denies that epidemics such as affect men and cattle fall upon them. In the next section he mentions the *mullein plant* (*verbascum*, *πλόμοε*) as poisonous to fresh-water and other fish. Certain waters are well known to be fatal to life. The instance of the Dead Sea, the very contrast of the other Jordan lakes so full of life, is well described by Schwarz (*Descriptive Geography of Palestine*, p. 41–45), and by Stanley (*Sinai and Palestine*, p. 290–294), and more fully by De Saunay (*Dead Sea*, passim). Contrast the present condition of this Sea of Death with the vitality which is predicted of it in the vision of Ezekiel (xlvi, 9, 10). Its healed waters and renovated fish “exceeding many,” and “the fishers which shall stand on it from Engedi even unto Eneglaim,” and “the places on its coast to spread forth nets”—all these features are in vivid opposition to the present condition of “the Asphaltic lake.” Of like remarkable import is 2 Esdr. v, 7, where the writer, among the signs of the times to come, predicts, “The Sodomitic sea shall cast out fish.” For ancient testimonies of the death which reigns over this lake, see St. Jerome on Ezekiel, lib. xiv; Tacitus, *Hist.* v, 6; Diod. Sic. ii, 48, and xix, 98; and the Nubian Geographer, iii, 5, as quoted by Bochart, *Hieroz.* i, 40. But there are other waters equally fatal to fish life, though less known, such as the lake called *Canonidan* (Avicenna, i, q. ἄγονος, without life), in Armenia, and that which Ælian (*Hist. Animal.* iii, 38) mentions (ἡ δὲ ἐν Φνεῖν λίμνη

and was graven or painted as a secret sign upon monuments of all kinds. We do not speak, of course, of the fish introduced into arabesque ornamentation, or into the scenes drawn from the New Testament, nor of those cases where it was used upon tombs to indicate the calling of the deceased, but of those cases where it was used independently, and manifestly in a purely symbolical sense. Numberless examples are extant of its being thus used on tombstones, rings, seals, and amulets. It manifestly had two significations, sometimes referring to Christ, and sometimes to the Christian Church.

I. Referring to Christ, it was in familiar use as early as the 2d century. Its significance was drawn from the fact that the letters of the acrostic ἰχθύς, the Greek word for fish, form the initials of the acrostic Ἰησοῦς, Χριστός, Θεοῦ, Υἱός, Σωτήρ (*Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour*). The complete acrostic is found upon but one monument, a tombstone. It is explained in the writings of St. Augustine. Sometimes the entire word was used; in other cases there were but parts of it. The figure of a fish was very frequently cut or painted to represent the Saviour. Fishes of glass or of bronze were often hung upon the necks of believers as amulets. Seals and rings often had other symbols also, as the anchor, the cross, and the A Ω. The fish was especially used for baptismal fonts and on the walls of baptisteries. A ship resting on a fish was used to indicate that Christ supports the Church.

II. The fish represents the Christian in all artistic presentations of those parables where the apostles are spoken of as fishers of men. The fish, attached to a hook and line, with or without a fisherman, always refers to the Christian, as do those representations of a number of fishes on pavements of churches, and on those tombstones where funeral inscriptions, as *in pace*, are added. Often two fishes are given, one on each side of an anchor or a cross. Many interpretations are given of this, the best established being the one that considers them as referring to the Jews and Gentiles, though much weight is attached to the interpretation which considers the two fishes to allude to the two covenants, the Jewish and the Christian. The baptisteries were therefore sometimes called *piscinæ*. Tertullian speaks of Christians as accustomed to please themselves with the name *pisciculi*, “fishes,” to denote that they were born again into Christ's religion by water. He says, *Nos pisciculi secundum ἰχθύον, nostrum Jesum Christum, in aquâ nascimur* (*De Bapt.* ch. i).


The use of the fish as a symbol ceased almost entirely with the death of Constantine the Great, though examples are found of it as late as the 5th or 6th century.—Rossi, *De Christianis Monumentis* IXΘΥΝ *er-*

*hibentibus* (Par. 1855); Martigny, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités Chrétiennes* (Paris, 1865); Piper, *Die christliche Kunst*; Becker, *Die Darstellung Jesu Christi unter dem Bilde des Fisches* (Breslau, 1866, 8vo); Didron, *Christian Iconography*, i. 344; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. i, ch. i, § 2. (G. F. C.)

**FISHING** (אִיִּשׁ, *dig*; ἀλιεύειν). The copious supply of fish in the waters of Palestine encouraged the art or avocation of fishery, to which frequent allusions are made in the Bible: in the O. T. these allusions are of a metaphorical character, descriptive either of the conversion (Jer. xvi, 16; Ezek. xlvii, 10) or of the destruction (Ezek. xxix, 3 sq.; Eccl. ix, 12; Amos iv, 2; Hab. i, 14) of the enemies of God. In the N. T. the allusions are of a historical character for the most part (see Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 79), though the metaphorical application is still maintained in Matt. xiii, 47 sq. It was from the fishing-nets that Jesus called his earliest disciples to "become fishers of men" (Mark i, 16-20); it was from a fishing-boat that he rebuked the winds and the waves (Matt. viii, 26); it was from a fishing-boat that he delivered his wondrous series of prophetic parables of the kingdom of heaven (Matt. xiii); it was to a fishing-boat that he walked on the sea, and from it that Peter walked to him (Matt. xiv, 24-32); it was with fish (doubtless dried) as well as with bread that he twice miraculously fed the multitude (Matt. xiv, 19; xv, 36); it was from the mouth of a fish, taken with a hook, that the tribute-stater was paid (Matt. xvi, 27); it was "a piece of broiled fish" that he ate before his disciples on the day that he rose from the dead (Luke xxiv, 42, 43); and yet again, before he ascended, he filled their net with "great fishes, an hundred and fifty and three," while he himself prepared a "fire of coals," and "laid fish thereon," on which then he and they dined (John xxi, 1-14).


The most prevalent method of catching fish in use among the Hebrews was by *nets* of various kinds and sizes. Four of these are mentioned: two in Hab. i, 15, 16, חֶרֶם (che' rem, Sept. ἀμφίβληστρον: no doubt in v, 16 this word and σαγήνη have been by some means transposed; verse 17 compared with verse 15 makes this evident), the *casting-net*, Matt. iv, 18 (δίκτυον), and Mark i, 16; and מִקְמֶתֶת (mikmeteth, Sept. σαγήνη), the *drag-net*, a larger kind (see Matt. xiii, 48), requiring the use of a boat: the latter was probably most used on the Sea of Galilee, as the number of boats kept on it was very considerable (Josephus, *War*, iii, 10, 9). The third occurs Eccl. ix, 12, מִצְדוּחַ (mits'uduh, Sept. ἀμφίβληστρον), a *casting-net*. The fourth, רֶשֶׁת (re'sheth, Sept. πᾶγίς), a *fowler's net* as well as a *fisher's*. In Psa. xxxv, 7, 8, the רֶשֶׁת, net, is used with פִּתּוּל, a *pit* ("they have hid for me their net in a pit"): the allusion would seem to be to that mode of winter-fishing which Aristotle describes as practised by the Phœnicians (*Hist. Animal.* viii, 20). Net-fishing is still used on the lake of Tiberias (Dr. Pococke, *Descrip. of the East*, ii, 69). See NET. This mode of fishing prevailed in Palestine, and is a prominent feature of the piscatorial associations in the Gospel history to the very last (see John xxi, 6, 8, 11). It is certainly less characteristic of *Egyptian* fishing, of which we have frequent mention in the O. T. See **ANGLING**. The instruments therein employed were the חֶקֶה (chakkah, Sept. ἀγκίστρον, comp. Matt. xvii, 27), *angling-hook*, for smaller fish; Isa. xix, 8; Hab. i, 15. These hooks were (for disguise) made to resemble *thorns* (on the principle of the fly-fishing instruments, though not in the same manner; for the Egyptians, neither anciently nor now, seem to have put winged insects on their hooks to attract their prey; Wilkinson, iii, 54), and were thence called כִּרְרוֹת, *s'roth'*, Amos iv, 2 ("from their resemblance to thorns," Gesenius, *Lex. s. v.*); and (in the case of the larger

sort) זְבִיִּים, *sukkah'*, A. V. "barbed iron;" Job xli, 7 [xli, 31]. Another name for these *thorn-like* instruments was רִיבֵי, *istinnoth'*, Amos iv, 2 (a generic word, judging from the Sept., ὄπλα). רִיחַ, *cho'ach*, was either a hook or a ring put through the nostrils of fish to let them down again alive into the water (Gesenius), or (it may be) a *crook* by which fishes were suspended to long poles, and carried home after being caught (such as is shown in plate 344 [from a tomb near the Pyramids] in Wilkinson, iii, 56). The word is used in Job xli, 2 [xli, 26] with רִיבֵיִם, *agnon'*, a *cord of rushes* (σχοῖνον). Rosenmüller, ad loc., applies these two words to the binding of larger fish to the bank of the river until wanted, after they are captured, and quotes Bruce for instances of such a practice in modern Egyptian fishing. The rod was occasionally dispensed with (Wilkinson, iii, 53), and is not mentioned in the Bible: ground-bait alone was used, fly-fishing being unknown. Though we have so many terms for the *hook*, it is doubtful whether any have come down to us denoting the *line*; and אֲנָמֵן, אֲנָמֵן, though the most nearly connected with piscatorial employment, hardly express our notion of a line for *angling* (see Gesenius, s. v.); while פְּרִיֵת, פְּרִיֵת (thread, twine) are never used in Scripture for fishing purposes. See HOOK. The large fish-spear or *harpoon* used for destroying the crocodile and hippopotamus was called צַבְצַל הַגֵּרִים (Job xli, 7 [xli, 31]; comp. with Wilkinson, iii, 72, 73). צַבְצַל means a *cymbal* or any clang-



Ancient Egyptian spearing Fish.

ing instrument, and this seems to have led to the belief of fishes being attracted and caught by musical sounds; stories of such, including Arion and the dolphin, are collected by Schelhorn in his *Dissertatio de Jobi* (Ugolini *Thesaur.* xxix, 329). "The Egyptian fishermen used the net; it was of a long form, like the common drag-net, with wooden floats on the upper and leads on the lower side; though sometimes let down from a boat, those who pulled it generally stood on the shore and landed the fish on a shelving bank" (Wilkinson, ii, 21). This net is mentioned in Isa. xix, 8, under the name מִקְמֶתֶת. It is, however, doubtful whether this be anything more than a frame, somewhat between a basket and a net, resembling the *landing-net* represented in Wilkinson, iii, 55. The Mishna (vi, 76, 116) describes it by the word אֲכוּן, *akun'*, *nassa*, *corbis piscatoria*, a basket. Maillet (*Epist.* ix) expressly says that "*nets for fishing are not used in Egypt.*" If this be so, the usage has much altered since the times which Wilkinson has described. Frames for fishing, attached to stakes driven into the bottom, were prohibited in the lake of Tiberias, "because they are an impediment to boats" (Talmudic Gloss, quoted by Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebr.* on Matt. iv, 18). No such prohibition existed in Egypt, where wicker-traps, now as anciently, are placed at the mouths of canals, by which means a great quantity of fish is caught (Rawlinson, *Herod.* ii, 232, note). The custom of drying fish is frequently represented in the sculptures of Upper and Lower Egypt (p. 127, note). There was a caste of fishermen; and allusion to the artificial reservoirs and fish-ponds of Egypt occurs in the Prophe-



Ancient Egyptians fishing with the Net and drying Fish in the rigging of the Boat. A kite sits upon the mast waiting for the entrails of the fish.

ets (Isa. xix, 8-10). Fishing pavilions, apparently built on the margin of artificial lakes, also appear in the Assyrian sculptures (Layard's *Nineveh*, i, 55). Ac-



Ancient Assyrian fishing in a Lake with a Line, without a Rod, and carrying a rush Basket on his Shoulders.

cording to Aristotle (*Hist. Anim.* viii, 19), comp. with Luke v, 5, *the night* was the best time for fishing operations: "before sunrise and after sunset."—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.; Fairbairn, s. v.

**Fisher** (פִּיֶּשֶׁר, *davrag'*, Jer. xvi, 16 [marg.]; Ezek. xlvii, 10; or פִּיֶּשֶׁר, *davrag'*, Isa. xix, 8; Jer. xvi, 16 [text]; Gr. ἄλιος, *seaman* or sailor, hence fisherman, as rendered Luke v, 2), a term used, besides its literal import [see FISHING, above], in the phrase "fishers of men" (Matt. xix, 1; Mark i, 17), as applied by our Saviour to the apostles (q. v.) in calling them to their office; and in a like typical manner, but in an unfavorable sense, the word occurs Jer. xvi, 16. The application of the figure is obvious (see Wemyss, *Symbolical Diet.* s. v.). On the "fisher's coat" (ἑπενδύτης, John xxi, 7), see COAT.

**Fisher, Edward**, an English Protestant theologian, was born in 1597, and was educated at Oxford, where he became a gentleman commoner in 1627. He taught a school at Caermarthen, in Wales, and died in Ireland. He was a strong Calvinist. His *Marrow of Modern Divinity*, published in 1644, excited a vigorous controversy when republished in Scotland by Hogg (1718, 8vo). It went through numerous editions (12th ed. Lond. 1726, with notes by Thomas Boston, 2 vols. 8vo). Fisher also wrote *Appeal to the Conscience* (Oxford, 1644, 8vo):—*Fest of Asses* (1644, 4to):—*Caveat to the Sabbatarians* (1650, 4to).—Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, s. v.; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, ed. Smith, ii, 431. See MARROW CONTROVERSY.

**Fisher, John**, bishop of Rochester, was born at Beverly, in Yorkshire, in 1459. He was educated at Michael House, Cambridge, of which house he became master in 1495; and being appointed confessor to Margaret, countess of Richmond, mother of Henry VII, he

induced her to found St. John's and Christ's colleges. He was made divinity-professor in Cambridge, 1502, and bishop of Rochester, 1504. He was a great benefactor to the University of Cambridge. He opposed the Lutheran reformation, and was supposed by some to be the real writer of Henry VIII's book against Luther; and on Luther's replying, he wrote a *Defence of the King of England's Assertion of the Catholic Faith*. He continued in high favor with Henry VIII till he opposed the king's divorce, and to his honest views on this point he adhered unflinchingly. He remained unmolested till 1534, when he refused to take the oath of allegiance, and was committed to the Tower. He was attainted by Parliament November 3, 1534, and his bishopric was declared void January 2, 1535. He would probably have been permitted to remain quietly in prison during the rest of his life had not Paul III, by making him, in May, 1535, cardinal-priest of St. Vitalis, angered the king, who issued orders that no person should be permitted to bring the hat into his dominions. Lord Cromwell, being sent to examine the bishop, asked him, "My lord of Rochester, what would you say if the pope should send you a cardinal's hat; would you accept of it?" The bishop replied, "Sir, I know myself to be so far unworthy any such dignity, that I think of nothing less: but if any such thing should happen, assure yourself that I should improve that favor to the best advantage that I could, in assisting the Holy Catholic Church of Christ, and in that respect I would receive it upon my knees." When this answer was brought to the king by secretary Cromwell, Henry said in a great passion, "Yea, is he yet so lusty? Well, let the pope send him a hat when he will, Mother of God, he shall wear it on his shoulders then, for I will leave him never a head to set it on." Fisher was convicted of high treason, and beheaded on Tower Hill, June 22, 1535. His *Life* by Bailely is published with those of *More* and *Roper* (Dublin, 1835, 7th edit.). There is also a *Life* by Lewis (Lond. 1862, 2 vols. 8vo). His polemical and miscellaneous writings will be found in the edition *Opera J. Fisherique hæc hactenus inveniri potuerint omnia* (Wurtzb. 1597, fol.). "The character of Fisher is remarkable for firmness. In his steady maintenance of the fallen cause of queen Catharine, undaunted by the anger of the vindictive king, this quality peculiarly shone forth; and still more with regard to the oath of supremacy, refusal to take which was certain to call forth severe punishment, and in all probability death. Fisher was immovable, not being convinced that he was in the wrong; his fearless firmness allowed him to maintain an open profession that he was in the right. He was a learned and devout man, and his conduct fully proved his sincerity."—Dupin, *Eccles. Hist.* cent. xvi, p. 412; Burnet, *Hist. Reform.* ii, 248, 567 sq.; Hook, *Ecl. Biography*, v, 132.

**Fisher, Jonathan**, a Congregational minister, was born Oct. 7, 1768, at New Braintree, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College, 1792, entered the ministry Oct. 1793, and was installed pastor at Blue Hill,

Me., July 13, 1796, where he labored until Oct. 24, 1837, and died Sept. 22, 1847. He published a volume of *Miscellaneous Poems; Scripture Animals*; and a sermon.—Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 341.

**Fisher, Richard Adams**, a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in Berks Co., Pa., Oct. 25, 1805. Having finished his preparatory studies under his own pastor, Rev. F. Herman, Jr., he began the study of theology with Rev. Dr. Herman; was licensed and ordained in 1826. He took charge of the German Reformed congregation in Sunbury, Pa., together with several affiliated churches, in 1827, and continued in this field of labor till 1854, when failing health compelled him to resign. Recovering somewhat, he labored a short time in Lyken's Valley, Dauphin Co., Pa., where he died Jan. 27, 1857. Mr. Fisher had a good mind, was a logical and instructive preacher, a genial and kind friend, and was greatly beloved throughout the church in which he labored. He preached well in both the German and English languages. (H. H.)

**Fisher-Ring or Fisherman's Ring.** See ANULUS.

**Fish-Gate** (פֶּתַח הַדִּיגִים, *sha' ar haad-digim'*, gate of the fishes; Sept. ἡ πύλη ἢ ἐχθρική, in Neh. ἡ πύλη ἐχθρὰ, in Zeph. πύλη ἀποικιστῶν; Vulg. *porta piscium*), the name of one of the gates of Jerusalem (2 Chron. xxxiii, 14; Neh. iii, 3; xii, 39; Zeph. i, 10); probably on the east side, just north of the Temple enclosure (Strong's *Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels*, Appendix, i, p. 18), although Bartlett (*City of Great King*, p. 153) locates it on the west side of the Temple, supposing it to have been near the mediæval "piscina" (p. 301); a very unsuitable position, as it doubtless derived its name from the fact that fish (q. v.) from the lake of Tiberias (or perhaps from the Mediterranean) were brought to the city by that route, or that they were sold there (Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 1054, who identifies it with the present gate of St. Stephen). See JERUSALEM.

**Fish-hook** (in the plur. סִירוֹת דִּיגִים, *thorns* [as often rendered] of fishing; Sept. at random λίβηται ἔμπροσθ, Vulg. equally so *olle ferentes*, both taking the term in the sense of *pots*, contrary to the synonymous סִירוֹת, "hooks," of the other hemistich), used figuratively of an instrument of control (Amos iv, 2), after the analogy of animals which were tamed by putting hooks and rings in their noses (comp. Isa. xxxvii, 29; Ezek. xxxix, 4; Job xl, 26; see Oedmann, *Samm.* v, 5). Others, as Döderlein (in loc.), prefer to retain the simple meaning of *thorns*, as referring to pastoral customs. See FISHING.

**Fish-pool** (בְּרֵכַת, *berekah'*, a pool, as often elsewhere), a pond or reservoir in general; presumed by our translators at Cant. vii, 4 to be intended for fish (q. v.), such as we know were anciently constructed for the purpose of pleasure angling. See FISHING (above).

**Fish-spear** (זֶבֶל דִּיגִים, lit. a *prong of fishes*; Sept. and Vulgate vaguely *πλοία ἀλωίσωσ, gurgustium piscium*), a harpoon or trident for spearing fish (Job xli, 2 [in the Heb. xi, 31]). See FISHING.

**Fisk, Ezra, D.D.**, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Shelburne, Mass., Jan. 10, 1785, graduated at Williams College in 1809, and was licensed in 1810. After preaching for some months, he was ordained as an evangelist, and labored chiefly among destitute congregations of Georgia; after which he engaged as missionary in Philadelphia. In 1813 he was chosen pastor of the Presbyterian church in Goshen, N. Y., where he continued for upwards of twenty years. He became a trustee of Williams College in 1823, and a director of the Theological Seminary at Princeton in 1825. He retired to Georgia in 1832 for his health,

and was appointed the following year professor of ecclesiastical history and Church government in the Western Theological Seminary, and moderator of the General Assembly. He removed to Philadelphia, and died Dec. 5, 1833. He published *An Oration delivered before the Society of Alumni of Williams College* (1825):—*A Lecture on the Inability of Sinners* (Phila, 1832):—*A Firewell Sermon* (1833):—*Articles on Mental Science*, in *Church Advocate* (1832).—Sprague, *Annals*, iv, 457.

**Fisk, Pliny**, a Congregational minister and missionary, was born at Shelburne, Mass., June 24, 1792. He graduated at Middlebury College in 1814, studied theology at Andover, entered the ministry in January, 1814, and preached for a time in Wilmington, Vt. Having determined to be a missionary, he was, with Mr. Levi Parsons, appointed by the American Board of Missions to the Palestine mission in September, 1818, and spent the winter travelling through the South, raising money for the missionary cause. With his colleague, he sailed from Boston for Smyrna, Nov. 3, 1819, and arrived at their port Jan. 15, 1820. The two missionaries spent some time in Scio to study modern Greek, then visited the "seven churches" in Asia Minor, and finally settled in Smyrna. Early in 1822 Mr. Fisk accompanied Mr. Parsons to Egypt, where the latter died, Feb. 10. His successor, the Rev. J. King, met Mr. Fisk at Malta, and in April, 1823, they went, together with Mr. Wolff, by way of Egypt and the desert, to Judea. After visiting Jerusalem and Beyrout, they visited the principal cities in Northern Syria to "spy out the land," and spent some part of 1824 at Damascus and Aleppo studying Arabic. In May, 1825, he joined the mission already established at Beyrout, and died there on the 23d of October following. See Bond, *Life of Pliny Fisk* (Boston, 1828, 12mo).—*American Miss. Memorial*, p. 254; Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 622.

**Fisk, Samuel.** See FISKE, SAMUEL.

**Fisk, Wilbur**, first president of the Wesleyan University, was born in Brattleboro, Vt., August 31, 1792. His parents were of the old Puritan stock, and he was trained in habits of virtue and religion, especially by his mother. In 1809 he went to the Grammar School at Peacham, and in 1812 to the University of Vermont, where he passed A.B. in 1815. In 1818 he entered the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and soon became remarkable for piety and success in his ministry. His talents as a preacher were of a very high order; indeed, he has hardly been surpassed in this respect in the American pulpit. His health was feeble, however, from the beginning, and his unwearied labors in the itinerant ministry were too great for him. In 1823 he was made presiding elder of the Vermont district, and in 1824 was chosen delegate to the Vermont Conference, a rare distinction for so young a man. From this time onward his life was devoted to the cause of Christian education in the Methodist Episcopal Church. When he entered the ministry in 1818 "there was not a single literary institution of any note under the patronage of the Church. A few years later, in 1824, he was appointed agent to collect funds for one which had been established in Newmarket, N. H.; but he declined the service because, as he said, it was not established on a permanent basis. Still he was anxious that one should be established, and through his efforts, with others, the academy at Wilbraham was commenced, and he was appointed its principal in 1826. The spirit which was thus aroused soon demanded an institution of a higher grade. The Northern and Eastern Conferences united to found the Wesleyan University at Middletown, and Dr. Fisk naturally, and without a rival, was chosen its president in 1830. The part he had already taken in awaking the people to the subject, his devotion to it, and his abilities, made him more than ever a leader in the cause of education in the Church. Stu-

dents gathered to the institution from every part of the nation, and many soon went forth from it who, by his recommendation, became presidents, professors, and teachers in the rapidly multiplying colleges and seminaries under the patronage of the Church throughout the United States. His heart was in this work. He believed, too, that he was where Providence designed him to be. And when, in 1863, he was elected bishop, he declined the office, for he said, 'If my health would allow me to perform the work of the episcopacy I dare not accept it, for I believe I can do more for the cause of Christ where I am than I could do as a bishop.' Who shall say that his decision was not only honest, but wise; that his duties as an educator of the young, and the part he took in awaking the people to the great value of general education, were less important than the work of any bishop?" (*Centenary Memories, in The Methodist, N. Y.*) In 1828 he had been elected bishop of the Canada Conference, but declined the office. In 1829 he received the degree of D.D. from Brown University, and in the same year was elected president of Lagrange College, Alabama, and also professor in the University of Alabama, both which offices he declined. For many years his life was an incessant struggle with pulmonary disease, and in 1835-6 he travelled in Europe for the benefit of his health. He died at Middletown, Feb. 22, 1838. Among his writings are, *The Calvinistic Controversy* (N. Y. 18mo); —*Travels in Europe* (N. Y. 1838, 8vo); —*Sermons and Lectures on Universalism:—Reply to Pierpoint on the Atonement*, and other tracts and sermons.

Dr. Fisk was a saintly man, of the type of Fénelon, and endowed with some of Fénelon's best moral and mental traits—clearness and logical force; flexibility and adroitness in controversy; with earnest love of truth and goodness for the animating spirit of all his life and thought. As a preacher, few surpassed him in eloquence, none in fervor. As a teacher, he had that highest of all qualities, the power to kindle the enthusiasm of his pupils. Take him for all in all, he was a man of rare symmetry of character, moral and intellectual, of whom all whom he knew would be more willing to say, "Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright," than of any man of his time who held so high a place. Dr. Stevens describes him as follows: "Wilbur Fisk's person bespoke his character. It was of good size, and remarkable for its symmetry. His features were beautifully harmonious, the contour strongly resembling the better Roman outline, though lacking its most peculiar distinction, the *nasus aquilinus*. His eye was nicely defined, and, when excited, beamed with a peculiarly benign and conciliatory expression. His complexion was bilious, and added to the diseased indication of his somewhat attenuated features. His head was a model, not of great, but of well-proportioned development. It had the height of the Roman brow, though none of the breadth of the Greek. There is a bust of him extant, but it is not to be looked at by any who would not mar in their memories the beautiful and benign image of his earlier manhood by the disfigurements of disease and suffering. His voice was peculiarly flexible and sonorous; a catarrhal disease affected it, but just enough, during most of his life, to improve its tone to a soft orotund, without a trace of nasal defect. Few men could indicate the moral emotions more effectually by mere tones. It was especially expressive in pathetic passages. His pulpit manner was marked in the introduction of the sermon by dignity, but dignity without ceremony or pretension. As he advanced into the exposition and argument of his discourse (and there were both in most of his sermons), he became more emphatic, especially as brilliant though brief illustrations ever and anon gleamed upon his logic. By the time he had reached the peroration his utterance became rapid, his thoughts were incandescent, the music of his voice rang out in thrilling tones, and sometimes even quivered with

trills of pathos. No imaginative excitement prevailed in the audience as under Maffitt's eloquence, no tumultuous wonder as under Bascom's, none of Cookman's impetuous passion, or Olin's overwhelming power, but a subduing, almost tranquil spell of genial feeling, expressed often by tears or half-suppressed ejaculations; something of the kindly effect of Summerfield combined with a higher intellectual impression. Fisk lived for many years in the faith and exemplification of Paul's sublime doctrine of Christian perfection. He prized that great tenet as one of the most important distinctions of Christianity. His own experience respecting it was marked by signal circumstances, and from the day he practically adopted it till he triumphed over death, its impress was radiant on his daily life. With John Wesley, he deemed this important truth—promulgated, in any very express form, almost solely by Methodism in these days—to be one of the most solemn responsibilities of his Church, the most potent element in the experimental divinity of the Scriptures" (*Methodist Quarterly Review*, July, 1852, p. 446). See Holdich, *Life of Wilbur Fisk* (N. Y. 1840, 8vo); *Methodist Quarterly*, 1842, p. 579; Sherman, *New-England Divines*, p. 238; M'Clintock, *Lives of Methodist Ministers* (N. Y. 8vo); sketch of Fisk by the Rev. O. H. Tiffany, D.D.); Sprague, *Annals*, vii, 576; Stevens, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church*; *Christian Review*, July 9, 1868; *Zion's Herald*, vii, 400 sq. See also NEW ENGLAND THEOLOGY.

**Fiske, John, D.D.**, a Congregational minister, was born Oct. 26, 1770, in Warwick, Mass. He graduated at Dartmouth College, 1791; entered the ministry May 6, 1794; and was ordained pastor in New Braintree Oct. 26, 1796, where he remained until his death, Mar. 15, 1855. Dr. Fiske assisted largely in the founding of Amherst College. He published a *Spelling-book* (1807), and two sermons.—Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 367.

**Fiske, Nathan Welby**, an eminent Congregational minister, was born April 17, 1798, at Weston, Mass. He graduated at Dartmouth College 1817; was chosen tutor 1818, in which position he remained two years, and then entered the Theological Seminary at Andover. In Nov. 1823, he went to Savannah, and preached among the seamen and others not belonging to any church. He was chosen professor of languages in Amherst Collegiate Institution (afterwards Amherst College), 1824. A few years after, he was transferred to the chair of intellectual and moral philosophy, which he held until his death. In 1846, on account of ill health, he sailed (Nov. 5) for Palestine, and died in Jerusalem May 27, 1847. Mr. Fiske published a translation of Eschenburg's *Manual of Classical Literature* (1856), which went through three editions, and was stereotyped for the fourth ed. (1843). A volume of his *Sermons* was published in 1850, and also *Memoirs of N. W. Fiske, with Selections from his Sermons and other Writings*, by Heman Humphrey, D.D. (Amherst, 1850). The *New Englander* (Feb. 1850, p. 70) speaks of his sermons as follows: "They are eminently suggestive. Some of them, like that on 'the analysis of conscience,' are fine specimens of philosophical analysis. Some, like that on 'the wonderfulness of man's mental constitution,' and that on 'the fearfulness of man's mental constitution,' lead the reader over a track almost untrodden by sermonizers, and yet presenting grounds for most powerful appeals. No thinking mind can fail to be enriched by the attentive reading of these discourses. They belong in many respects to the class of bishop Butler's sermons; yet with the bishop's strong reasoning and clear analysis of principles, they have much more of the direct and powerful application of the truth to the conscience, and are more imbued with the very essence of the doctrines of the cross."

**Fiske, Samuel**, a Congregational minister, was born in Shelburne, Mass., July 23, 1828, and was edu-

cated at Amherst College, where he graduated in 1848. After two years spent in teaching, he studied theology at Andover until 1852, when he became tutor at Amherst, where he remained until 1855, when he sailed for Europe and the East. His letters describing this journey were collected under the title of *Mr. Dunn Brown's Experiences in foreign Parts* (Boston, 1857, 12mo), and abound with wit, humor, and graphic power. In 1857 he was ordained pastor of the Congregational church at Madison, Conn., where he was remarkably useful and successful. During the Civil War his patriotism led him to join the army; and failing to secure a chaplaincy, he entered the service as private, but soon rose to be captain. While in service he wrote *Mr. Dunn Brown's Experiences in the Army* (Boston, 1866, 12mo). Made prisoner at Chancellorsville, he spent some time in Libby prison, Richmond. He fell in the first battle of the Wilderness, May 6, 1864. His Christian life in the army was kept up as at home, and he was more than a chaplain could be to his men. "He was a Christian officer, illustrating in camp, and on the march, and in battle the noblest Christian character. He decidedly rebuked all the vices of the army; he gently soothed the sick and wounded, prayed with the dying and over the dead. Touching memories of him have been recalled in our hospitals at the mention of his name. 'Oh,' said one in Washington, 'he is the man who put his arm around me so kindly, and begged me to promise him that I would never utter another oath, and I never have.' Said another; 'Captain Fiske—oh yes; he helped me off the field after that dreadful battle, gave me his blanket, and spoke kind words of cheer that helped to keep me alive.' Multitudes could testify of his fidelity to them. It was his daily duty to care both for the bodies and the souls of all about him."—*New Englander*, January, 1866, art. iv; *Congregational Quarterly*, 1866, art. i.

**Fistulæ, pipes or reeds** used in the administration of the wine in the Eucharist from the 8th century to the 12th. The deacon held the cup in his own hand, a small reed or pipe was introduced into the wine, and the communicant drew up the wine into his mouth through this pipe. The object was to prevent the possibility of spilling any of the wine.

**Fitch, EBENEZER, D.D.**, a Presbyterian minister, and president of Williams College, Mass., was born in Norwich Sept. 26, 1756, and graduated in Yale in 1777. After teaching for some time in Hanover, N. Y., he became tutor in Yale, and remained there till 1783, when he formed a mercantile connection, which proving disastrous, he returned to his former office, to which was added that of librarian. He was licensed to preach in 1787, and in 1791 became preceptor of the academy in Williamstown, Mass., of which, with the title of Williams College, he was appointed president in 1793. He resigned in 1815, and was installed pastor of the Presbyterian church, West Bloomfield, N. Y., which he resigned in 1828, after a zealous and efficient ministry. He died March 21, 1833. He published *A Baccalaureate Discourse*, 1799.—Sprague, *Annals*, iii, 511.

**Fitches** (i. e. VETCHES or chick-pea), the incorrect rendering, in the Auth. Vers., of two Heb. words. See BOTANY.

1. כֶּסֶחַ (*ke' tsach*, something strewn), which occurs only in Isa. xxviii, 25, 27, where especial reference is made to the mode of threshing it; not with "a threshing instrument," כֶּסֶחַ יָדָאֵן (קָדָאֵן), but "with a staff" (כֶּסֶחַ יָדָאֵן), because the heavy-armed cylinders of the former implement would have crushed it. Although *ketsach*, in Chaldee כֶּסֶחַ (Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* col. 2101), is always acknowledged to denote some seed, yet interpreters have had great difficulty in determining the particular kind intended, some translating it *peas*, others, as Luther and the English version, *vetches*, but without any proof. Meibomius considers it to

be the *white poppy*, and others a *black seed*. This last interpretation has the most numerous, as well as the oldest authorities in its support. Of these a few are in favor of the black poppy-seed, but the majority of a black seed common in Egypt, etc. (Celsius, *Herobot.* ii, 70). The Sept. translates it *μελάνθιον*, the Vulg. *gith* (perhaps from the Heb. גִּית, coriander; see Plautus, *Rud.* v, 3, 39), and Tremellius *melanthium*, while the Arabic has *shinez*. All these mean the same thing, namely, a very black-colored and aromatic seed, "*fennel-flower*" or "*black cumin*," still cultivated and in daily employment as a condiment in the East. Thus Pliny (xx, 17, 71), "*Gith*, from the Greeks, others call *melanthion*, and still others *melanspermon*. The best is that of the most pungent smell, and blackest." By Dioscorides (iii, 93), or the ancient author who is supposed to have added the synonyms, we are informed that *μελάνθιον* was also called the "wild black poppy," that the seed was black, acrid, and aromatic, and that it was added to bread or cakes. Pliny also says, "The seed of the melanthium or melanspermon makes an excellent confection in the loaves" (xix, 8). *Melanthium* is universally recognised by botanists to be the *Nigella*. Thus Bauhin Pinax, "*Nigella*, from the black color of the seed, is commonly called *μελάνθιον*." The *shinez* of the Arabs is, moreover, the same plant or seed, which is usually called "black cumin." So one kind of cumin is said by Dioscorides to have seeds like those of *melanthion* or *nigella*. It was commonly cultivated in Egypt, and P. Alpinus mentions it as "Suneg Egyptiis." The Arabs, besides *shinez*, also call it *hub-al-souda*, and the Persians *seah dana*, both words signifying *black seed*. One species, named *Nigella Indica* by Dr. Roxburgh, is called *kala jira* in India, that is, black zira or cumin, of the family of Ranunculaceæ. "*Nigella sativa* is alone cultivated in India, as in most Eastern countries, and continues in the present day, as in the most ancient times, to be used both as a condiment and as a medicine" (*Illustr. Himal. Bot.* p. 46). If we consider that this appears to have always been one of the cultivated grains of the East, and compare the character of *nigella* with the passages in which *ketsach* is mentioned, we shall find that the former is applicable to them all. Indeed, Rabbi Obadiah de Bartenora states that the barbarous or vulgar name of the *ketsach* was *nielle*, that is, *nigella*. The *Nigella sativa* is a gar-



*Nigella Sativa.*

den plant, which commonly attains the height of an ell, with narrow leaves, like the leaves of *fennel*, a blue flower, out of which is formed, on the very top of the plant, an oblong muricate capsule, the interior of which is, by means of thin membranes, separated into compartments containing a seed of a very black color not unlike the poppy, but of a pleasant smell, and a sharp taste not unlike pepper. The various species of *nigella* are herbaceous (several of them being indig-

enous in Europe, others cultivated in most parts of Asia), with their leaves deeply cut and linear, their flowers terminal, most of them having under the calyx leafy involucre which often half surround the flower. The fruit is composed of five or six capsules, which are compressed, oblong, pointed, sometimes said to be hornlike, united below, and divided into several cells, and enclosing numerous angular, scabrous, black-colored seeds. From the nature of the capsules, it is evident that, when they are ripe, the seeds might easily be shaken out by moderate blows of a stick, as is related to have been the case with the *ketsach* of the text. See TUBESHING.

Besides the *N. sativa*, there is another species, the *N. arvensis*, which may be included under the term *ketsach*; but the seeds of this last-named plant are less aromatic than the other. They are annual plants belonging to the natural order *Ranunculaceæ*, and sub-order *Uelleborææ*. The *nigella* forms a singular exception among the family to which it belongs, inasmuch as they are terrible poisons, while the *nigella* produces seeds that are not only wholesome and aromatic, but are in great reputation for their medicinal qualities. See AROMATICS.

2. In Ezek. iv, 9, "fitches" are mentioned among the materials of the bread the prophet was bidden to make, but there it represents the Heb. word כִּסְסִים, *kusse' meth*. This word is incorrectly translated in A. V. "rye" (q. v.) in Exod. ix, 32, and Isa. xxviii, 25; but in the latter place, as in Ezek. iv, 9, we have the marginal reading "spelt," which is the true rendering of the word. The root of כִּסְסִים is סָסַם, to shear, and the species of corn to which it gives a name is the *Triticum spelta* of Linnæus—in Greek ζῆα; in Latin *far* and *ador*. "Spelt" has a four-leaved blunted calix, small blossoms, with little awns, and a smooth, slender ear (as it were shorn), the grains of which sit so firmly in the husks that they must be freed from them by peculiar devices; it grows about as high as barley, and is extensively cultivated in the southern countries of Europe, in Egypt, Arabia, and Palestine, in more than one species. The Sept. translate it by ἄλρα, in Pliny *arinea*, which corresponds with the French *riguet*; and Herodotus (ii, 36) observes that it was used by the Egyptians for baking bread" (Kalisch on Exod. ix, 32).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See CEREALS.

**Five-mile Act, or Oxford Act**, an act of the British Parliament, passed in 1665, which imposed an oath on all nonconformists, binding them at no time to endeavor any alteration of the government in either Church or State; and ordering that nonconforming ministers should neither live in, nor come within *five miles* (except in crossing the road) of any borough, city, or corporate town, or within five miles of any parish, town, or place in which they had been, since the Act of Oblivion, parson, vicar, or lecturer, under a penalty of forty pounds, or six months' imprisonment, and being rendered incapable of teaching any school, or taking any boarders to be taught or instructed.—Baxter, *Church History of England*, ii, 632; Neal, *History of the Puritans* (Harpers' ed.), ii, 255.

**Five Points**, the five doctrines controverted between the Calvinists and Arminians, viz. predestination, extent of the atonement, grace, free-will, and final perseverance. The *quinquarticular controversy* in England was a dispute which arose at Cambridge in 1594 respecting the above points. In 1626 two fruitless conferences were held on these points; and in 1630 bishop Davenant preached at court on these disputed matters, and thereby gave great offence to Charles I. The next year the controversy was revived at Oxford and in Ireland, of which archbishop Usher was then primate. The king issued certain injunctions concerning the bounds within which these points might be discussed. See ARMINIANISM; CALVINISM; DORT.

**Flaccus**, CAIUS NORBANUS (Græcized Γάιος Νόρβανος Φλάκκος, Josephus, *Ant.* xvi, 6, 6), son of a somewhat notable consular Roman of the same name (see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Biogr.* s. v.), was consul with Octavianus in A.D. 51 (Tacitus, *Ann.* i, 54; Sueton. *Vit.* 3). While proconsul of Asia Minor, he promulgated the emperor's decrees to the provincial magistrates in favor of the Jews (Joseph. *Ant.* xvi, 6, 3-6); and when præses of Syria he befriended Herod Agrippa till influenced by Aristobulus (*ib.* xviii, 6, 2-3).

**Flacians**, a name given to those who adhered, in the controversies among the German reformers, to Matthias Flacius (q. v.).

**Flacius** (*Flach*), MATTHIAS, also called ILLYRICUS from his native country, an eminent Lutheran reformer, was born at Albouna, in Illyria, about 1520. At sixteen he proposed entering a convent, but Baldo Lupetino, the provincial of the Franciscans, who had imbibed Protestant tendencies, advised him to study theology in the universities of Germany. Accordingly he went to Basle in 1539, to Tübingen in 1540, and in 1541 to Wittenberg, where he gave private lessons in Greek and Hebrew. In his travels he became acquainted with Grynaeus, Leonard Fuchs, Eber, and finally with Luther himself, whose zealous disciple he soon became. He was after a while appointed professor of O.-T. literature at Wittenberg, but, driven away by the issue of the Smalcaldic War in 1547, he went to Brunswick. Recalled by prince Maurice, he came back, but, having opposed Melancthon's *Leipsic Interim* [see ADIAPHORA and INTERIM], he went to Hamburg, and thence to Magdeburg, whence he published several writings against the *Interim*, though in other points, especially in the Osiandrian controversy, he sided with Melancthon. He was also for several years engaged in theological controversies with Major, Strigel, Schwenkfeld, etc. See SYNERGISTIC CONTROVERSY. About the same time he projected the *Magdeburg Centuries* [see CENTURIES], of which great work he was the life and soul. In 1557 he was made professor of the newly-organized University of Jena, which became the stronghold of strict Lutheranism, and where he was chiefly instrumental in the drawing up of the *Sächsische Confutationsschrift*, to enforce Lutheran views. It, however, proved injurious both to the university and to himself, as it led the duke to establish a censorship, to which Flacius and his colleagues were unwilling to submit, and were dismissed in 1561. He had made himself especially odious by the rash statement (in his discussion with Strigel at Weimar, 1560) that original sin is the very substance of man in his fallen state. He was accused, therefore, of Manicheism. After spending five years in Regensburg, he accepted a call to Antwerp, and from thence to Frankfort and Strasburg. Obligated to leave the latter city on account of his opinions, he returned to Frankfort, where he died in the hospital in 1575.

The career of Flacius was, on the whole, a stormy and unhappy one. But, after all the abuse that has been heaped upon him, it cannot be denied that he was a consistent upholder of the doctrines which he learned originally from Luther. The writers in the Reformed interest have generally treated him too severely; an unfavorable view of him is given by Planck, *Geschichte des Protestant. Lehrbegriffs*. The best account of him is to be found in Preger, *Matthias Flacius Illyricus u. seine Zeit* (Erlangen, 1859-61, 2 vols.), from a notice of which, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* (1862, p. 226), we make the following extracts: "If it was right for a sincere follower of Luther to espouse the cause of his deceased friend and teacher, and to show by the severest logic that the Lutheran Church was, under Melancthon's guidance, drifting away from its moorings, then Flacius is to be exonerated from the charge of uncharitableness, and his plea must be allowed, that the unhappy division was not chargeable



to him who defended the old Wittenberg theology, but rather to him who introduced innovations. We say nothing now about the truth of the one or the other view; we only remark that Flacius was the undoubted champion of the genuine theology of Saxony, as taught by Luther. We cannot, therefore, uphold Luther and condemn Flacius. In theology we cannot say that what Luther, as the first reformer, had a right to teach, Flacius, his inferior in authority, had not a right to maintain against so great a man as Melancthon; for the theologian swears allegiance not to men, but to principles. Flacius could justly reply to all who thus reproached him, that if Melancthon was great, truth was greater. . . . But how stands the matter as it affects the intellectual and moral character of the two chief combatants? Flacius clearly had Luther's great authority on his side, and that was enough for him. Melancthon saw that the Genevan and Strasburg theologians entertained clearer and more scriptural views of the subject than Luther and the party of Flacius. With him the authority of Luther was not final. According to Flacius, all questions of theology and church usages were to be decided by the authority of the Bible and of Luther. According to Melancthon, they were to be decided by the authority of the Bible and of reason. Both were sincere and deeply in earnest. Both make out their points by irresistible logic. Schmidt, in the new Life of Melancthon just published by him, vindicates Melancthon's character in this controversy triumphantly. Preger has done the same for Flacius. Flacius shows more firmness and tenacity, Melancthon more conciliation and forbearance. The former had such a reverence for truth, or for what seemed to be truth, that he forgot the respect due to a great and good man. He was mercilessly but conscientiously contentious. The latter was so amiable and fond of peace that he would for the sake of it yield what he might have maintained. He was never a polemic, except by necessity. . . . It is a somewhat remarkable fact that Flacius was incessantly persecuted, and often driven from place to place for teaching exactly what Luther taught. He was evidently a tenacious man, and born to be a polemic; but, notwithstanding his bad name for disputatiousness, he was far less violent and abusive in his language than his opponents, and more measured and unimpassioned than Luther. It was the sharpness of his logic, and the unsparring severity with which he exposed to the light of day any deviation from Luther, that so galled his opponents. They charged him, and perhaps not unjustly, with assuming to be the guardian of the Church. He did, indeed, endeavor to persuade princes and magistrates to watch over the purity of Christian doctrine, and confessed that he called every man to account, no matter what his rank or position was, who either openly or secretly attempted to destroy what Luther had built up. At the same time, he affirmed that he did it as a faithful son of the Church, doing only what every one was bound to do, namely, to guard its purity with all the power and skill he possessed. He furthermore maintained that, as the pupil and friend of Luther, he owed it to his memory to defend him and his doctrines against all assaults, even though they were made at Wittenberg itself, and by no less a man than Melancthon. He was undoubtedly governed by conscientious motives, however he may have erred both in matters of doctrine and of expediency; but when he trusted in princes to preserve the orthodoxy of the Church, he found, to his grief, that he trusted to a broken reed. Though unfortunate in his life, and a wanderer and fugitive in his old age, and apparently unsuccessful in the chief aim of his life, still he ranks third among the men of his age in his influence upon the doctrines of the old Lutheran Church. He has, indeed, been long almost forgotten, except as an ecclesiastical historian." The chief writings of Flacius are *Omnia Scripta Latina contra adiphoristicas fraudes edita* (Magde-

burg, 1550, 8vo):—*Osiandri de Justificatione Refutatio* (Franf. 1552, 4to):—*Catalogus Testium Veritatis*, etc. (Bâle, 1556; Franf. 1674, 4to):—*Unan. Prim. Ecclesie consensus de non scrutando divinæ generationis Filii Dei modo* (Bâle, 1660, 8vo):—*Historia certaminum de primatu Papæ* (Bâle, 1554, 8vo):—*Clavis Scripture Sacre* (Bâle, 1567, 4to; Jena, 1675, fol.; a valuable Biblical and hermeneutical dictionary). See, besides the works already noticed, Twisten, *M. Flacius Illyricus* (Berlin, 1844); Adami, *Vita Theolog. Germ.*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xvii, 808; Herzog, *Real-Encyclopædie*, iv, 410 sq.; Heppé, *Die confess. Entwicklung der altprotest. Kirche Deutschlands* (Marburg, 1854); *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1855, 648; Schmidt, in *Zeitschrift f. d. histor. Theologie*, 1849; Dörner, *Geschichte d. prot. Theologie* (München, 1867, 8vo), 361-374; Gieseler, *Ch. History*, ed. Smith, vol. iv, § 87; and the articles ADI-PHORISTIC CONTROVERSIES; SYNERGISTIC CONTROVERSIES.

**Flag** (as the name of a plant) stands in the Auth. Vers. as the representative in part of two Heb. words. See BOTANY.

1. *Achu'* (אָחַי; Sept. Græcizes ἄχι, ἄχει, βούτρομον; Vulg. *locus palustris, carectum*), a word, according to Jerome (*Comment. in Isa. xix. 7*), of Egyptian origin, and denoting "any green and coarse herbage, such as rushes and reeds, which grows in marshy places" (comp. Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.*, p. 67). In Job viii, 11, it is asked, "Can the *achu* ("flag") grow without water?" It seems probable that some specific plant is here denoted, as Celsius has endeavored to prove (*Hierob. i*, 342), for the *achu* is mentioned with the *gome* or "papyrus." See the treatise of Haploch, *De papyro*, etc. (Coburg, 1772; with the *Additament. ib.* 1777). The word occurs once again in Gen. xli, 2, 18, where it is said that the seven well-favored kine came up out of the river and fed in an *achu* ("meadow"). Now it is generally well known that most of the plants which grow in water, as well as many of those which grow in its vicinity, are not well suited as food for cattle; some being very watery, others very coarse in texture, and some possessed of acrid and even poisonous properties. None, therefore, of the *Alge* can be intended, nor any species of *Bulmus*, or "flowering rush" (as might be inferred from one rendering of the Sept.). The different kinds of *Juncus*, or rush, though abounding in such situations, are not suited for pasturage, and, in fact, are avoided by cattle. So are the majority of the *Cyperaceæ*, or sedge tribe; and also the numerous species of *Carex*, which grow in moist situations, yet yield a very coarse grass, which is scarcely if ever touched by cattle. A few species of *Cyperus* serve as pasturage, and the roots of some of them are esculent and aromatic; but these must be dug up before cattle can feed on them. Some species of *Scirpus*, or club-rush, however, serve as food for cattle: *S. cespitosus*, for instance, is the principal food of cattle and sheep in the highlands of Scotland from the beginning of March till the end of May. Varieties of *S. maritimus*, found in different countries, and a few of the numerous kinds of *Cyperaceæ* common in Indian pastures, as *Cyperus dubius* and *hexastachyus*, are also eaten by cattle. Therefore, if any specific plant is intended, as seems implied in what goes before, it is perhaps one of the edible species of *scirpus* or *cyperus*, perhaps *C. esculentus*, which, however, has distinct Arabic names; or it may be a true grass; some species of *panicum*, for instance, which form excellent pasture in warm countries, and several of which grow luxuriantly in the neighborhood of water. But it is well known to all acquainted with warm countries subject to excessive drought that the only pasturage to which cattle can resort is a green strip of different grasses, with some sedges, which runs along the banks of rivers or of pieces of water, varying more or less in breadth according to the height of the bank, that is,



*Cyperus Esculentus.*

the distance of water from the surface. Cattle emerging from rivers, which they may often be seen doing in hot countries, would naturally go to such green herbage as intimated in this passage of Genesis, and which, as indicated in Job xviii, 2, could not grow without water in a warm, dry country and climate. Kitto (*Pict. Bib.* on Genesis, l. c.) identifies this sedge with the *μαλαθαία* of Theophrastus (*Hist. Plant.* iv, 8, 12), which plant was much eaten by sheep and cattle. There is, however, much doubt as to what the *malinathalla* denotes, as Schneider has shown. Theodotion, in Job viii, 11, has *ἀχι*; and *ἄχι* occurs in the Sept. (Isa. xix, 7) also as the representative of *אֲחִי* (A. V. "paper reeds"), which word is explained by Gesenius, naked places without trees—the grassy places on the banks of the Nile. The same Greek word is used by the son of Sirach, Eccles. xi, 16 (*ἄχι* or *ἄχαι*, for the copies vary). As no similar name is known to be applied to any plant or plants in Hebrew, endeavors have been made to find a similar one so applied in the cognate languages (see Jablonski, *Opusc.* i, 45; ii, 159, ed. Te-Water), and, as quoted by Dr. Harris (*Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, s. v.), the learned Cappellon says, "We have no radix for *אֲחִי*, unless we derive it, as Schultens does (*Comment. in Job*, l. c.), from the Arabic *achi*, to bind or join together." Hence it has been inferred that it might be some one of the grasses or sedges employed in former times, as some still are, for making ropes. But there is probably some other Arabic root which has not yet been ascertained, or which may have become obsolete; for there are numerous words in the Arabic language having reference to greenness, all of which have *akh* as a common element. Thus *akhyas*, thickets, dark groves, places full of reeds or flags, in which animals take shelter; *akhevas*, putting forth leaves; so *akhzivar*, greenness, verdure; *akchishub*, abounding in grass. These may be connected with *kah*, a common term for grass in Northern India, derived from the Persian, whence amber is called *kah-robehy*, grass-attracter.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See REED.

2. *Suph.* (סֹפֶר, Sept. *Ḥoc*, Vulg. *carectum*, *pelagus*) occurs frequently in the O. T. in connection with *yam*, "sea," to denote the "Red Sea" (q. v.). The term here appears to be used in a very wide sense to denote "weeds of any kind." The *yam-suph*, therefore, is the "sea of weeds," and perhaps, as Stanley (*S. and P.* p. 6, note) observes, *suph* "may be applied to any aqueous vegetation," which would include the arborescent coral growths for which this sea is celebrated, as well as the different algae which grow at the bottom: see Pliny (*H. N.* xiii, 25) and Shaw (*Travels*, p. 387, fol. 1738), who speaks of a "variety of *algæ* and *fuci* that grow within its channel, and at low water are left in great quantities upon the sea-shore" (see also p. 384). The word *suph* in Jonah ii, 5, translated "weeds" by

the A. V., has, there can be no doubt, reference to "sea-weed," and more especially to the long, ribbon-like fronds of the *Laminaria*, or the entangled masses of *Fuci*. In Exod. ii, 3, 5, however, where we read that Moses was laid "in the *suph*, A. V. 'flags,' by the river's brink," it is probable that "reeds" or "rushes," etc., are denoted, as Rab. Salomon explains it, "a place thick with reeds." (See Celsius, *Hierob.* ii, 66.) The *yam-suph* in the Coptic version (as in Exod. x, 19; xiii, 18; Psa. cvi, 7, 9, 22) is rendered "the *Sari-sea*." The word *sari* is the old Egyptian for a sedge of some kind. Jablonski (*Opusc.* i, 266) gives *Juncus* as its rendering, and compares a passage in Theophrastus (*Hist. Plant.* iv, 8, § 2, 5) which thus describes the *sari*: "The *sari* grows in water about marshes and those watery places which the river after its return to its bed leaves behind it; it has a hard and closely-twisted root, from which spring the *suria* (stalks) so-called." Pliny (*H. N.* xiii, 23) thus speaks of this plant: "The *sari*, which grows about the Nile, is a shrubby kind of plant (?), commonly being about two cubits high, and as thick as a man's thumb; it has the panicle (*coma*) of the papyrus, and is similarly eaten; the root, on account of its hardness, is used in blacksmiths' shops instead of charcoal." Sprengel (*Hist. Herb.* i, 78) identifies the *sari* of Theophrastus with the *Cyperus fastigiatus*, Linn.; but the description is too vague to serve as a sufficient basis for identification. There can be little doubt that *suph* is sometimes used in a general sense like our English "weeds." It cannot be restricted to denote *algæ*, as Celsius has endeavored to show, because none of the proper *algæ* are found in the Nile. Lady Calcott (*Script. Herb.* p. 158) thinks the *Zostera marina* ("grass-wrack") may be intended, but there is nothing in favor of such an opinion. The *suph* of Isa. xix, 6, where it is mentioned with the *kaneh*, appears to be used in a more restricted sense to denote some species of "reed" or "tall grass." There are various kinds of *Cyperaceæ* and tall *Graminaceæ*, such as *Arundo* and *Saccharum*, in Egypt.—Smith, s. v. See WEED.

Flag (as a military term) is represented generally in Heb. by *לָבַד*, *dé'gel*, such being those borne by the Israelitish camp during their march through the wilderness. Each three tribes had a banner of this description (Numb. i, 52; ii, 2 sq.; x, 14 sq.), of the color and form of which the Rabbins have many legendary stories (see Jonathan on Numb. ii; comp. Carpzov, *Appar.* p. 667 sq.). The tribe of Judah (together with Issachar and Zebulun) bore as a device a young lion (compare Gen. xlix, 9); the tribe of Reuben (with Simeon and Gad), a man (according to Jonathan, a stag, instead of the bullock, as a memento of the golden calf, Gen. xlix, 6); Ephraim (with Manasseh and Benjamin), a steer (boys, according to Jonathan); Dan (with Asher and Naphtali), an eagle (according to Jonathan, a cerastes; comp. Gen. xlix, 17), on their tribal standard. How the *field-ensigns* of the several families, which in those passages are called *לָבַד*, *signs*, differed from these *לָבַד*, is not clearly defined. The assertion of colored pennants (Harmer, i, 478) is not sustained by proof. On the pretended motto upon the banner of the Maccabees, see MACCABEES. *סָרָס*, *ves*, which is often taken for a banner, is a military signal raised upon a mountain as a telegraphic notice (Isa. v, 26; xiii, 2; xxiii, 3; xxx, 17; lxii, 10, etc.; comp. Cicero, *Attic.* x, 17; Macrobius, *Satur.* i, 16), and may have usually consisted of a high pole with a streamer flying from its summit. Others regard it rather as a beacon fire (*πυρρός*, *φωκρός*; comp. Curtius, v, 2, 7; vii, 7, 5, 13). See generally Faber, ii, 462 sq.; Jahn, II, ii, 462 sq.; Celsius, *De Vexillis Hebr.* (Upsal. 1727). To the Roman standards, *aquile* (Josephus, *War.* iii, 62; comp. Hiermann, *ad Lucian. conscrib. hist.* p. 185), an allusion apparently occurs in Matt. xxiv, 28. (On the Egyptian ensigns, see Wilkinson, i, 294; Rosel-

lini, II, iii, 230.) The Persians under Cyrus bore the same symbol (Xenoph. *Cyrop.* vii, i, 4; but Ezek. xvii, 3 is not in point, being a reference to Chaldean usages). See generally Lydii *Synt. Sacr. de re milit.* iii, 7.—Wiener, i, 362. Compare BANNER.

**Flagellants** (Lat. *flagellare*, to scourge), a name given to certain fanatical sects from the 12th to the 15th century, who used the scourge as a means of purification. See DISCIPLINE OF THE LASH. They were also called *cruciferi*, *crucifratres*, because they held it their duty, as they said, to copy the sufferings of Christ; and *acephali*, because of their separation from the Roman Church authority. Their excesses were only the natural development of certain features of the Roman discipline [see PENANCE; PENITENTIAL DISCIPLINE]; especially of the belief, springing from the system of indulgences, that the mercy of God could be propitiated by self-inflicted punishments. It is said that the first society of Flagellants appeared in Padua in the beginning of the 12th century. Amid the contests between the Guelphs and Ghibellines, cruelty and rapine were followed by remorse; and about 1260 public associations sprang up for the purpose of discipline, under the name of Flagellantes. In an edict of the marquis of Este and the people of Ferrara for their suppression, they are termed *Le Compagnie de' Rattuti*, and *Soldatis Scopre sive Flagitationis*. Muratori has given a plate of the thongs which they employed against themselves (*Antiq. Ital. med. ævi*, vi, 463). Self-scourging was practised in the open streets, and little regard was paid to decency. A hermit named Rainier, of Perugia, is named as the founder of the sect, and his success was wonderful. Vast bodies of men, girded with ropes, marched in procession, with songs and prayer, through the cities, and from one city to another, calling on the people to repent. All hostilities ceased. The momentary impression produced by these movements was profound, but it did not last long. From Italy the contagion passed over the Alps; large bodies wandered over Carniola, Austria, and even as far as Poland. In a few years they disappeared. Under the alarm of the great plague of the following century the Flagellants revived again. The plague reached Italy in 1347, and carried off throughout Europe millions of persons: 1,200,000 in Germany, where, in 1349, the Flagellants "arose afresh, with increased enthusiasm. They wandered through several provinces, whipping themselves, and propagating the most extravagant doctrines, namely, that flagellation was of equal virtue with the sacraments; that the forgiveness of all sins was to be obtained by it, exclusive of the merits of Christ; that the old law of Christ was soon to be abolished, and that a new law, enjoining the baptism of blood, to be administered by whipping, was to be substituted in its place. Clement VI issued a bull against them (Oct. 20, 1349), and in many places their leaders were burned. They are again mentioned in the beginning of the 15th century as venting yet stranger and more mystical tenets in Thuringia and Lower Saxony. They rejected every branch of external worship, entertained some wild notions respecting the evil spirit, and held that the person who believes what is contained in the Apostles' Creed, repeats frequently the Lord's Prayer and the Ave Maria, and at certain times lashes his body severely as a voluntary punishment for the transgressions he has committed, shall obtain eternal salvation. The infection spread rapidly, and occasioned much disorder; for, by travelling in such numbers, they gave rise to seditious disturbances and to very many excesses. The shameful exposure of their persons, and their extortion of alms, rendered them so obnoxious to the higher clergy and to the more respectable classes, that several princes in Germany and Italy endeavored to suppress their irregularities, and the kings of Poland and Bohemia expelled them from their territories. A numerous list of these fanatics who were condemned to the

flames is preserved by the German ecclesiastical historians. At Sangerhausen, in the year 1414, no fewer than ninety-one were burned" (*Encyc. Metrop.* s. v.). In the year 1399 a society of this character, the White Brethren (Bianchi), descended from the Alps into Italy, and were everywhere enthusiastically welcomed both by the clergy and the populace; but no sooner had they reached the papal territory than their leader was put to death, and the whole array dispersed. After this processions of Flagellants were led through Italy, Spain, and the south of France by the Dominican Vincentius Ferrentius, who may perhaps have been the secret instigator of the White Brethren. But such processions having been condemned at the Council of Constance, he also discontinued them (Gieseler, § 120). Gieseler gives extracts from the trial at Sangerhausen, 1414, with many of their articles of doctrine (*Church History*, § 120). See Boileau, *Histoire des Flagellans* (Paris, 1700, 12mo); Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. xiii, pt. ii, ch. iii; cent. xiv, pt. ii, ch. v; cent. xv, pt. ii, ch. v; Förstemann, *Die christ. Geisslergesellschaften* (Halle, 1828); Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 726 sq.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* (Torrey's), v, 512.

**Flagellation.** See SCOURGE.


**Flagon**, a word employed in the A. V. to render two distinct Hebrew terms.

1. *Ashishah*, אִשִּׁיחַ (2 Sam. vi, 19; 1 Chron. xvi, 3; Cant. ii, 5; Hos. iii, 1). The real meaning of this word, according to the conclusions of Gesenius (*Thest. Heb.* p. 166), is a *cake* of pressed raisins (q. v.), such as are a common refreshment in the East, especially for travellers. See CAKE. He derives it from a root signifying to *compress*, and this is confirmed by the renderings of the Sept. (*λάγανον*, ἀροῖτήν, πύμακα) and of the Vulgate (*simila*, but in Hos. *vinacia*, in Cant. *jores*, where the Sept. has *μύρα*), and also by the indications of the Targum Pseudojon. and the Mishna (*Nedarim*, 6, § 10). In the passage in Hosea there is probably a reference to a practice of offering such cakes before the false deities. The rendering of the A. V. is perhaps to be traced to Luther, who in the first two of the above passages has *ein Nüssel Wein*, and in the last *Kanne Wein*; but primarily to the interpretations of modern Jews (e. g. Gemara, *Baba B'bra*, and Targum on Chronicles), grounded on a false etymology (see Michaelis, quoted by Gesenius, and the observations of the latter, as above). It will be observed that in the first two passages the words "of wine" are interpolated, and that in the last "of wine" should be "of grapes." See FRUIT.

2. *Ne'bel*, נֶבֶל (Isa. xxii, 24), which is commonly used for a bottle (q. v.) or vessel, originally probably a skin, but in later times a piece of pottery (Isa. xxx, 14). But it also frequently occurs (Psa. lvii, 9, etc.) with the force of a musical instrument (A. V. generally "psaltery," but sometimes "viol"), a meaning which is adopted by the Targum, and the Arabic and Vulgate (*musicus*), and Luther, and given in the margin of the A. V. The text, however, seems to have aimed to follow the rendering of the Sept. (confusedly *ἰπυκομάκρονοι*), and with this agree Gesenius (*Comment.* in loc.) and Fürst (*Hebr. Handb.* s. v.), as being agreeable to the parallel *בַּכּוּפִּים*, *bowls* ("cups," Vulg. *cratera*).—Smith, s. v. See MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS; PITCHER.

**Flake** is the rendering in the A. V. at Job xli, 15 ("the *flakes* of his [i. e. Leviathan's] flesh are joined together," חֲבֵטֵי הָאֵרֶץ, *have chung*, i. e. are rigid), for חֲבֵטֵי הָאֵרֶץ, *mappal'*, something *pendulous* (elsewhere only Amos viii, 6, for *refuse* of grain, as that which falls away in winnowing, i. e. chaff), referring to the *develaps* or flabby parts on the belly of the crocodile (q. v.), which are firmly attached to the body, instead of loosely hanging as in the ox.

**Flamboyant** (Fr. *flambeau* = a torch), "a term applied by the antiquaries of France to the style of architecture which was contemporary in that country with the Perpendicular of England, from the flame-like wavings of its tracery. It ought perhaps to be regarded as a vitiated Decorated rather than a distinct style, though some of its characteristics are peculiar, and it seldom possesses the purity or boldness of earlier ages; in rich works the intricacy and redundancy of the ornaments are sometimes truly surprising. One of the most striking and universal features is the waving arrangement of the tracery of the windows, panels, etc."—Parker, *Glossary of Architecture*, s. v.



ST. OULIN, ROUEN.

**Flame** (prop.  $\text{לָהָב}$ , *lu' hab*,  $\phi\lambda\omicron\gamma$ ), the incandescent vapor of fire, with which latter term it is usually found connected in the Bible. The only thing respecting fire which calls for explanation here is its symbolical use. In this we may distinguish a lower and a higher sense: a lower, when the reference is simply to the burning heat of the element, in which respect any vehement affection, such as anger, indignation, shame, love, is wont to be spoken of as a fire in the bosom of the individual affected (Psa. xxxix, 3; Jer. xx, 9); and a higher, which is also by much the more common one in Scripture, when it is regarded as imaging the more distinctive properties of the divine nature. In this symbolical use of fire the reference is to its powerful, penetrating agency, and the terrible melting, seemingly resistless, effects it is capable of producing. So viewed, fire, especially a "flame  $\text{לָהָב}$  of fire" (Exod. iii, 2), is the chosen symbol of the holiness of God, which manifests itself in a consuming hatred of sin, and can endure nothing in its presence but what is in accordance with the pure and good. There is considerable variety in the application of the symbol, but the passages are all explicable by a reference to this fundamental idea. God, for example, is called "a consuming fire" (Heb. xii, 29; comp.  $\text{אֵשׁ מְדֹבְרֵת}$ , an intense flame); to dwell with him is to dwell "with devouring fire" (Isa. xxxiii, 14); as manifested even in the glorified Redeemer, "his eyes are like a flame of fire" (Rev. ii, 18); his aspect when coming for judgment is as if a fire went before him, or a scorching flame compassed him about (Psa. xcvi, 3; 2 Thess. i, 8)—in these, and many similar representations occurring in Scripture, it is the relation of God to sin that is more especially in view, and the searching, intense, all-consuming operation of his holiness in regard to it. They who are themselves conformed to this holiness have nothing to fear from it; they can dwell amid its light and glory as in their proper element; like Moses, can enter the flame-enwrapping cloud of the divine presence, and abide in it unscathed, though it appear in the eyes of others "like devouring fire on the top of the mount" (Exod. xxiv, 17, 18). Hence we can easily explain why in Old-Testament times the appearance of fire, and in particular the pillar of fire (enveloped in a cloud, as if to shade and restrain its excessive brightness and power), was taken as the appropriate form of the divine presence and glory; for in those times, which were more peculiarly the times of the law, it was the holiness of God that came most prominent-

ly into view; it was this which had in every form to be pressed most urgently upon the consciences of men, as a counteractive to the polluting influences of idolatry, and of essential moment to a proper apprehension of the covenant. But in the new, as well as in the old, when the same form of representation is employed, it is the same aspect of the divine character that is meant to be exhibited. Thus, at the commencement of the Gospel era, when John the Baptist came forth announcing the advent of the Lord, he spoke of him as coming to baptize with fire as well as with the Spirit, not less to burn up the chaff with fire unquenchable than to gather in the wheat into his garner (Matt. iii, 11, 12). The language is substantially that of an Old-Testament prophet (Mal. iii, 2; iv, 1); and it points, not, as is often represented, to the enlightening, purifying, love-encending agency of Christ, but to the severe and retributive effects of his appearance. He was to be set for judgment as well as for mercy; for mercy indeed first, but to those who rejected the mercy, and hardened themselves in sin, also for judgment. To be baptized with the Spirit of light, holiness, and love, is what should ever follow on a due submission to his authority; but a baptism with fire—the fire of divine wrath here (John iii, 36), growing into fire unquenchable hereafter—should be the inevitable portion of such as set themselves in rebellion against him.

It is true that fire in its symbolical use is also spoken of as purifying—the emblem of a healing process effected upon the spiritual natures of persons in covenant with God. We read, not merely of fire, but of refiner's fire, and of a spirit of burning purging away the dross and impurity of Jerusalem (Mal. iii, 2; Isa. iv, 4). Still it is a work of severity and judgment that is indicated; yet its sphere is, not the unbelieving and corrupt world, but the mixed community of the Lord's people, with many false members to be purged out, and the individual believer himself with an old man of corruption in his members to be mortified and cast off. The Spirit of holiness has a work of judgment to execute also there; and with respect to that it might doubtless be said that Christ baptizes each one of his people with fire. But in the discourse of the Baptist the reference is rather to different classes of persons than to different kinds of operation in the same person; he points to the partakers of grace on the one side, and to the children of apostasy and perdition on the other. Nor is the reference materially different in the emblem of tongues, like as of fire, which sat on the apostles at Pentecost, and in the fire that is said to go out of the mouth of the symbolical witnesses of the Apocalypse (Acts ii, 3; Rev. xi, 5). In both cases the fire indicated the power of holiness to be connected with the ministrations of Christ's chosen witnesses—a power that should, as it were, burn up the corruptions of the world, consume the enmity of men's hearts, and prove a resistless weapon against the power and malice of the adversary.—Fairbairn, s. v. Compare FIRE.

**Flamen**, according to Varro and Festus, from *flamen*, the band of white wool wrapped about the cap, was the title given to members of a college of Roman priests devoted severally to the service of a particular deity. "*Divisque aliis Sacerdotes, omnibus Pontifices, singulis Flamines sunt,*" says Cicero (*De Leg. ii*, 8). Each received his distinctive name from that of the god to whose service he was devoted—"horum singuli cognomen habent ab eo deo quod sacra faciunt" (Varro, *De Ling. Lat.* v, 84). There were two classes of flamens, (1.) those styled *flamines majores*, and always patricians, viz. the fl. dialis, martialis, and quirinalis, instituted by Numa, according to Livy (i, 20), to take charge of those religious services which had hitherto been functions of the kingly office; and (2.) the *flamines minores*, who might be, and usually were plebeians, about twelve in number, and instituted at various times.

The flamens were in the earlier times nominated by the Comitia Curiata (in the case of the dialis three being designated), but after the enactment of the *Lex Domitia* (B.C. 104) they were named by the Comitia Tributa, and when thus nominated were received (*capiti*) and inaugurated by the pontifex maximus, who always claimed paramount authority over them. The office was for life, but forfeitable for a breach of duty, or on the occurrence of some accident of ill omen while engaged in priestly functions. Their official dress was the apex, a sort of close-fitting cap, the *læna*, *χλαῖνα*, a thick woollen cloak (see Smith, *Diet. Antiq.* s. v.), and a laurel wreath. The highest in rank and honor was the flamen dialis, or priest of Jupiter, who must be the son of parents united in marriage by the ceremony of *confarreatio* (which rule probably applied to all the *maiores*), and who was himself married by the same form to his wife, officially styled flaminica, whose aid was so indispensable to him in the performance of his priestly offices that, in the event of her death, he was forced to resign, since the flamen dialis could not marry again. He was subject to many restrictions—among others, was forbidden to leave the city for a single night (though this rule was somewhat modified by Augustus and Tiberius), or to sleep out of his bed for three consecutive nights; to touch or mount a horse, or look upon an army drawn up outside of the *pomerium*; nor could he take an oath, hence he could not be a consul or governor of a province, and was, it would appear, *summo jure*, excluded from all civil offices, and made *Jove aeternum sacerdotem* (Liv. i, 20). Furthermore, he could not wear a ring *nisi perrio et casso*, whatever that may mean, or go out without his proper head-dress, or allow a knot in his attire, touch flour, leaven, leavened bread, a dead body, a dog, a she-goat, ivy, beans, or raw flesh. Similar restrictions followed the actions of the flaminica. On the other hand, the flamen dialis enjoyed peculiar privileges, viz. exemption from parental control, an ex officio seat in the senate, a licitor, the right to use the *sella curulis* and the *toga pretexta*, the seat next below the *rex sacrificulus* at banquets, and the right of sanctuary for his house. His distinctive dress was the *albugalerus* (see Hope's *Costumes*, pl. 266). Of the *flamen martialis*, or priest of Mars, and the *flumen quirinalis*, or priest of Quirinus, less frequent mention is made, and of the *flamines minores* but little is known beyond the names. The municipal towns also had flamens, and after it became a custom to deify the emperors, flamens were appointed, both in Rome and the provinces, to attend to their worship.—Smith, *Diet. Greek and Roman Antiq.* s. v.; Ramsay, *Man. Rom. Antiq.* s. v.; Livy, i, 20; v, 52; Epit. xix, xxvii, 8; xxix, 38; xxx, 26; xxxi, 50; xxxvii, 51; Tacitus, *Ann.* iii, 58, 71; iv, 16; Plutarch, *Numa*, 7, and *Quest. Rom.* p. 114, 118, 119, 164–170 (ed. Reiske); Festus, s. v. *Maximæ dignationes et majores Amnes*; Aulus Gellius, x, 15, etc. (J. W. M.)

**Flamingians.** See MENNONITES.

**Flank**, פֶּסֶל, *ke'sel*, the *loin* of an animal (Job xiv, 27, where fatness is noted as a sign of self-pampering); elsewhere in the plur. for the internal muscles of the loins near the kidneys, to which the fat adheres, Gr. *ἰσάα* (Lev. iii, 4, 10, 15; iv, 9; vii, 4); hence the viscera in general, metaphorically for the inmost feelings ("loins," Psa. xxxviii, 8). See REINS.

**Flash of lightning** (Ezek. i, 14). See LIGHTNING.

**Flatt**, a name borne by several theological writers of Germany. I. JOHANN JAKOB, born at Balingen in 1724, studied theology at Tübingen, and became tutor in that university in 1749. He was successively appointed deacon of Leonberg in 1753, of Tübingen in 1757, of St. Leonard's Church at Stuttgart in 1759, pastor in the latter city in 1781, court preacher in 1783, counsellor of the Consistory in 1784, and abbot

of Herrenalb in 1791. He died Sept. 16, 1792. His principal works are: *Meletemata philosophico-theologica ad materias gravissimas (de imputatione peccati Adami: cæci: — De vicaria Christi satisfactione: — De humane Christi nature omnipresentia* [Tüb. 1759]); — *Untersuchung, v. d. Sünde wider d. Heiligen Geist* (Lpz. 1770).

II. JOHANN FRIEDRICH, son of the foregoing, was born at Tübingen Feb. 20, 1759, became professor of theology in the university of his native city in 1798, and died Nov. 24, 1821. His principal writings are: *Versuche theolog.-kritisch-philosophischen Inhalts* (Lpz. 1785); — *Beiträge z. Bestimmung, etc. d. Causalität* (Lpz. 1788); — *Briefe ü. d. moralischen Erkenntnisgründe der Religion* (Tüb. 1789); — *Vorlesungen ü. christliche Moral*, herausgeg. v. Steudel (Tüb. 1823); — *Opuscula Academica*, herausgeg. v. Stüsskind (Tüb. 1826); — *Magazin für christliche Dogmatik u. Moral* (Tüb. 1796–1810). Hoffmann and Kling have also published his *Vorlesungen ü. d. Briefe a. d. Römer* (Tübing. 1825); — *a. d. Korinther* (1827); — *a. d. Galater und Epheser* (1828); — *a. d. Philipper, Kolosser, Thessalonicher u. Philemon* (1829); — *a. d. Timotheus u. Titus* (1831).—Doering, *Gelehrte Theologen Deutschlands*, i, 408.

III. KARL CHRISTIAN, brother of the preceding, was born at Stuttgart in 1772. He became in 1812 high counsellor of the Consistory and prebendary of Stuttgart, counsellor of the university in 1813, prelate in 1822, and general superintendent at Ulm in 1828. He resigned his office in 1842, and died in 1843. He wrote, in connection with Storr, *Lehrbuch d. christl. Dogmatik* (2d ed., 1813, 2 vols.; transl. by Schmucker, Storr and Flatt's *Biblical Theology*, Andover, 2d ed., 1836); and published, in connection with Ewald, the *Zeitschrift z. Nahrung christlichen Sinnes* (1815–1819, 3 vols.).—Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, s. v.

**Flattich**, JOHANN FRIEDRICH, a German theologian and educator, was born in 1713 at Beyhingen, near Ludwigsburg. After studying theology at Tübingen, he became in succession preacher of the garrison of Hohenasberg (1742), pastor of Metterzimmern (1747), and pastor at Münchening (1760). At the latter place he died in 1797. Flattich wrote a number of works and essays on education, as *Hausregeln, Vom Ehestand, Unterschiedliche Gedanken, Von der Aufzucht der Kinder*. Most of his works are collected in *Leiderhose, Leben und Schriften des J. F. Flattich* (3d edit. Heidelberg, 1856). He also enjoyed the reputation of being one of the most successful educators in Southern Germany, and was on intimate terms with many of the prominent men of that period. See Palmer, in Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* xix, 493; Völter, in Schmid, *Encyclop. für das Erziehungs- und Unterrichts-wesen*, ii, 382. (A. J. S.)

**Flavel**, JOHN, a nonconformist divine and writer of practical works, was born in Worestershire, England, in 1627. He was in early life religiously educated by his father, and completed his public education at Oxford. Having devoted himself to the Gospel ministry, he was settled at Deptford in 1650 as curate to Mr. Walpole, and on his death succeeded to the rectory. In 1655 he accepted a unanimous and pressing call to remove to Dartmouth, where he received a much smaller stipend, but had a larger field of usefulness. In 1662 he was ejected from his living for nonconformity; he did not, however, forsake his flock, but seized every opportunity of ministering to their spiritual necessities. His colleague dying soon after, the whole care devolved on him. On the execution of the Oxford Act he was compelled to remove five miles from Dartmouth, to Slapton, where he was out of the reach of legal disturbance, and where many of his former flock, in spite of the severity of the laws, resorted to him, and he at times stole into the town to visit them. Once, while preaching in a wood, he was just entering on his discourse, when the soldiers suddenly rushed in and dispersed the conventicle. Sev-

eral of the fugitives were apprehended and fined; but the remainder, rallying after the effects of their first surprise had subsided, conveyed Mr. Flavel to a more retired spot, where he resumed his sermon. In 1687, when James II dispensed with the penal laws, Mr. Flavel came forth from obscurity, and renewed his self-sacrificing labors. He took a lively interest in the proposed union between the Presbyterian and Independent churches, which was effected in 1691, and, like many a good man in those days, fondly anticipated from that consummation a season of ecclesiastical peace and concord which never arrived. He died in 1691, leaving behind him the name of a most faithful minister. Flavel's writings are valued more for their pungent and practical earnestness than for any other qualities. His *Whole Works* were published in London in 1820 (6 vols. 8vo). The American Tract Society publishes, in cheap form, his *Fountain of Life, Method of Grace, Christ knocking at the Door, On keeping the Heart, and Touchstone of Sincerity*.—Jamieson, *Religious Biography*, s. v.; Jones, *Christian Biography*, s. v.; Bogue and Bennett, *History of Dissenters*, i, 340.

**Flaviānus**, patriarch of Antioch, was born of one of the best families in that city in the early part of the 4th century. Even while a layman he was an earnest opponent of Arianism. Theodoret (who gives a full account of Flavian) says that he, associated with another lay monk, Diodorus, "by night and day exhorted all men to be zealous in religion." He says also that "they were the first to devise the choir, and to teach them to sing the Psalms of David responsively" (*Hist. Eccles.* ii, 24). His zeal did not diminish after his ordination as priest by Meletius (q. v.), about A. D. 365 (?). When Meletius was banished from his see by Valens, Flavian remained to serve the churches in Antioch. But the Eustathian (q. v.) bishop Paulinus contested the right of Meletius, and the churches were divided. On the death of Meletius, A. D. 381, Flavian was elected to succeed him, although (according to the accusation of Paulinus) he had bound himself by oath not to accept the office while the Eustathian bishop survived. The dispute was a fierce one; but at last, when Evagrius, successor of Paulinus, died, 390, Flavian was acknowledged by both the Eastern and Western churches. He was held in great respect: Chrysostom, who was his pupil, speaks very highly of him. He died A. D. 404. He treated the Messalians severely [see MESSALIANS].—Socrates, *Hist. Ecc.* bk. v, ch. xxiv; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* viii, 24; Theodoret, *Hist. Ecc.* ii, 24; Cave, *Hist. Litt.*; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacrés* (Paris, 1860), vi, 310. See EUSTATHIUS; MELETIUS.

**Flavianus** of CONSTANTINOPLE was chosen bishop of that city, as successor to Proclus, A. D. 446 or 447. The emperor Theodosius was set against him from the beginning of his episcopate. Eutyches and his friends were very strong at court, but at a *Home Synod* at which Flavian presided (A. D. 448) at Constantinople, Eusebius of Dorylaum presented a formal complaint against Eutyches. Flavian, knowing the danger of attacking persons so powerful in court influence, at first sought to quiet the matter; but, as Eutyches was stubborn, the trial was had, and ended in his condemnation for heresy. The emperor was greatly offended, and, under the advice of Dioscurus, summoned a council at Ephesus (the Robber Council), at which Dioscurus presided, and where the most violent courses were pursued. Flavian was not only deposed, but so brutally beaten by the Egyptian attendants of Dioscurus that he died three days after (A. D. 449). The Council of Chalcedon named him martyr, and his name is to be found in the Roman martyrology, Feb. 18. See Evagrius, *Hist. Ecc.* i, 8; Neander, *Church History*, ii, 506 sq.; and arts. EUTYCHES; EUTYCHANISIS; EPIESUS, ROBBER COUNCIL OF; EUSEBIUS OF DORYLEUM.

**Flavigny**, VALERIAN DE, a French Hebrew schol-

ar, was born at Villers-en-Prayères, near Laon, about the commencement of the 17th century; was made doctor of the Sorbonne in 1628, and in 1630 professor of Hebrew at the College of France. Flavigny was master of several Oriental languages, and was considered one of the best critics of the Bible text of his time. He was engaged in a controversy with Abraham Echellensis (q. v.) and Gabriel Sionita with regard to the correctness of the polyglot of Le Jay, which was finally decided against him by a committee of the Sorbonne. He condemned the Copernican system as heretical in his *Expostulatio adversus thesim*, etc. (Paris, 1666, 12mo). He died April 29, 1674. Flavigny's writings on the text of the Bible are, *Epistole iv de incoenti Bibliorum opere septemlingui* (1636);—*Epistole duce in quibus de ingenti Bibliorum opere quod nuper Lutetia Parisiorum prodit ac ei prefata prefatione*, etc. (1646);—*Epistola iii<sup>a</sup> in qua de libello Ruth Syriaco, quem Abr. Echellensis insertum esse voluit ingenti Bibliorum operi*, etc. (1647);—*Epistola adversus Abr. Echellensem de libello Ruth, simulque sacrosancta veritas hebraica strenue defenditur atque propugnatur* (1648);—*Disquisitio theologica, an, ut habet Capellanus, nonnulla sancte Scripturæ testimonia alio modo proferantur a rabbinis quam nunc leguntur in voluminibus hebraicis* . . . (1666). Flavigny published also a dissertation against the propositions of Louis of Clèves on the episcopacy and priesthood. He was also editor of the works of Guillaume de Saint-Amour, a divine of the 13th century.—Dupin, *Bibliothèque des Aut. ecclésiastiques*, xviii, 99; Hofer, *Nouv. Biographie Générale*, xvii, 864; *Biographie Universelle*, xv, 27.

**Flax**, פִּשְׁתָּהּ, *pishtah'* (Exod. ix, 31; Isa. xlii, 3; "tow," xliii, 17); and פִּשְׁתֵּל, *pishtel'* (rendered "flax" or "linen"); Greek λίνον. As regards the latter of these two Heb. terms, there is probably only one passage where it stands for the plant in its undressed state (Josh. ii, 6). Eliminating all the places where the words are used for the article manufactured in the *thread*, the *piece*, or the *made-up garment* (q. v. severally), we reduce them to two: Exod. ix, 31, certain, and Josh. ii, 6, disputed. In the former the flax of the Egyptians is recorded to have been damaged by the plague of hail. The word פִּשְׁתֵּל, there rendered "boll," is retained by Onkelos; but is rendered in the Sept. σπερματίζον, and in the Vulg. *folliculos germinabat*. Rosenmüller renders it "the globe or knob of ripening flax" (*Schol.* ad loc.). Gesenius makes it the *calix* or *corolla*; refers to the Mishna, where it is used for the calix of the hyssop, and describes this explanation as one of long standing among the more learned Rabbins (*Thees.* p. 261). See BOLLED. As the departure of the Israelites took place in the spring, this passage has reference no doubt to the practice adopted in Egypt, as well as in India, of sowing grain partly in the months of September and October, and partly in spring, so that the wheat might easily be in blade at the same time that the barley and flax were more advanced. From the numerous references to flax and linen, there is no doubt that the plant was extensively cultivated, not only in Egypt, but also in Palestine. Ritter (*Erdkunde*, ii, 916; compare his *Vorhalle*, etc., p. 45-48) renders it probable that the cultivation of flax for the purpose of the manufacture of linen was by no means confined to these countries, but that, originating in India, it spread over the whole continent of Asia at a very early period of antiquity. For the culture of flax, low alluvial lands which have received deposits left by the overflowing of rivers are deemed the most favorable situations. To this circumstance Egypt must have been indebted for the superiority of her flax, so famous in the ancient world, and which gave to her more elaborate manufactures the subtlety of the most exquisite muslin, well meriting the epithet "woven air." Herodotus mentions (iii, 47) as laid up in a temple at Lindus, in Rhodes, a linen corslet which

had belonged to Amasis, king of Egypt, each thread of which was composed of 360 strands or filaments. In length and in fineness of fibre no country could compete with the flax which produced the "fine linen of Egypt," and which made the Delta "the great linen market of the ancient world" (Kalisch). By annihilating this crop, the seventh plague inflicted a terrible calamity. It destroyed what, next to corn, formed the staple of the country, and would only find its modern parallel in the visitation which should cut off a cotton harvest in America. That it was grown in Palestine even before the conquest of that country by the Israelites appears from Josh. ii, 6, the second of the two passages mentioned above. There is, however, some difference of opinion about the meaning of the words פְּתִיחֵי הַיַּיִץ (Sept. *λινοκαλίμη*, Vulg. *stipulae lini*, and so A. V. "stalks of flax"); Josephus speaks of *λίνου ἀγκυλίδες*, armfuls or bundles of flax; but Arab. Vers. "stalks of cotton." Gesenius, however, and Rosenmüller are in favor of the rendering "stalks of flax." If this be correct, the place involves an allusion to the custom of drying the flax-stalks by exposing them to the heat of the sun upon the flat roofs of houses; and so expressly in Josephus (*Ant.* v, i, 2). See STALK.


rendering of Lev. xiii, 47 (*ματίω στριπνίνω*), and Judg. xv, 14 (*στριπνίον*; comp. Isa. i, 31). In several other passages, as Lev. xiii, 48, 52, 59; Deut. xxii, 11; Jer. xiii, 1; Ezek. xl, 3; xlv, 17, 18, we find it mentioned as forming different articles of clothing, as girdles, cords, and bands. In Prov. xxxi, 13, the careful housewife "seeketh wool and flax, and worketh it willingly with her hands." The words of Isaiah (xlii, 3), "A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench," are evidently referred to in Matt. xii, 20, where *λίνον* is used as the name of flax, and as the equivalent of *pishtak*. But there can be no doubt of this word being correctly understood, as it has been well investigated by several authors. (Celsius, *Hierobot.* ii, 283; Yates, *Textinum Antiquorum*, p. 253). See COTTON.

Few plants are at once so lovely and so useful as the slender, upright herb, with taper leaves and large blue-purple flowers, from which are fashioned alike the coarsest canvas and the most ethereal cambric or lawn—the sail of the ship and the fairy-looking scarf which can be packed into a filbert shell. It was of linen, in part at least, that the hangings of the tabernacle were constructed, white, blue, and crimson, with cherubim inwoven; and it was of linen that the vestments of Aaron were fashioned. When arrayed in all his glory, Solomon could put on nothing more costly than the finest linen of Egypt; and describing "the marriage of the Lamb," the seer of Patmos represents the bride as "arrayed in fine linen, clean and white; for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints." As to Egypt, we have proof in the mummy-cloth being made of linen, and also in the representations of the flax cultivation in the paintings of the Grotto of El-Kab, which represent the whole process with the utmost clearness; and numerous testimonies might be adduced from ancient authors of the esteem in which the linen of Egypt was held (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* iii, 133). From these pictures, preserved at Beni Hassan, it would seem that the Egyptian treatment of the flax-plant was essentially the same as that which was pursued till quite lately by ourselves, which even now is only modified by machinery, and which is thus described by Pliny: "The stalks are immersed in water warmed by the heat of the sun, and are kept down by weights placed upon them, for nothing is lighter than flax. The membrane or rind becoming loose is a sign of their being sufficiently macerated. They are then taken out, and repeatedly turned over in the sun until perfectly dried, and afterwards beaten by mallets on stone slabs. The tow which is nearest the rind is inferior to the inner fibres, and is fit only for the wicks of lamps. It is combed out with iron hooks until all the rind is removed. The inner part is of a finer and



Flax (*Linum Usitatissimum*).

In later times this drying was done in ovens. There is a decided reference to the raw material in the Sept.



Ancient Egyptians preparing the Flax, beating it, and making it into Twine and Cloth.

a, steps leading up to the top of the pits, b b, where the flax was steeped; c c, the flax taken by fig. 3 to dry, previous to beating; d, the stalks fresh cut.

Fig. 1 brings water in earthen pots; 2 pours it over the stalks; 4 and 5 are engaged in beating them with mallets, e e; 6, pounding the coarser parts; 7 and 8, striding the tow, after it is made into yarn, on a stone; 9; 9 and 10, twisting the yarn into a rope; 4; 11 and 12 show that a piece of cloth, i, has been made of the yarn 13, a superintendent.

winter quality. After it is made into yarn, it is polished by striking it frequently on a hard stone, moistened with water; and when woven into cloth it is again beaten with clubs, being always improved in proportion as it is beaten" (*Hist. Nat.* xix, 1). The various processes employed in preparing the flax for manufacture into cloth are indicated in Scripture. 1. The drying process (see above). 2. The peeling of the stalks and separation of the fibres (the name of flax itself being derivable either, as Parkhurst, from פֶּשֶׁתִּים, *pashat'*, to strip, peel, or as Gesenius, from פֶּשֶׁשׁ, *pashash'*, to separate into parts). 3. The hackling (Isa. xix, 9; Sept. λίνον τὸ σχιστόν; see Gesenius, *Lex. s. v.* פֶּשֶׁשׁ; and for the combs used in the process, comp. Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* iii, 140). The flax, however, was not always dressed before weaving (see *Eclus.* xl, 4, where ὀμόλωρον is mentioned as a species of clothing worn by the poor). That the use of the coarser fibres was known to the Hebrews may be inferred from the mention of tow (פֶּשֶׁתִּים) in *Judg.* xvi, 9; *Isa.* i, 31. That flax was anciently one of the most important crops in Palestine appears from *Hos.* ii, 5, 9; that it continued to be grown and manufactured into linen in N. Palestine down to the Middle Ages we have the testimony of numerous Talmudists and Rabbins. At present it does not seem to be so much cultivated there as the cotton-plant. For the flax of ancient Egypt, see *Herodot.* ii, 37, 105; *Cels.* ii, p. 285 sq.; *Heeren, Ideen.* ii, 2, p. 368 sq. For that of modern Egypt, see *Hasselquist, Journey.* p. 500; *Olivier, Voyage.* iii, 297; *Girard's Observations in Descript. de l'Egypte.* xvii, 98; *Paul Lucas, Voyages.* ii, 47.—*Kitto, s. v.*; *Smith, s. v.*; *Fairbairn, s. v.* See LINEN.

Flea (פֶּשֶׁתִּים, *parosh'*, from its leaping; a name found in the Arab. equivalent: see *Bochart*, iii, 474, ed. *Rosenm.*) occurs only 1 *Sam.* xxiv, 14 [15]; *xxvi*, 20, where David thus addresses his persecutor Saul at the cave of Adullam: "After whom is the king of Israel come out? after whom dost thou pursue?—after a flea;" "The king of Israel is come out to seek a flea!" In both these passages our translation omits the force of the word פֶּשֶׁתִּים, which is found in the Hebrew of each; thus, "to pursue after, to seek one or a single flea" (*Sept.* ψάλλος *εἰς*, *Vulg.* *pulex unus*). David's allusion to the flea displays great address. It is an appeal founded upon the immense disparity between Saul, as the king of Israel, and himself as the poor contemptible object of the monarch's laborious pursuit. Hunting a flea is a comparison in other ancient writings (*Homer, Il.* x, 378; *Aristoph. Nub.* i, 2; iii, 1) for much labor expended to secure a worthless result. This insect, in the East, is often used as a popular emblem for insignificance (*Roberts, Oriental Illustrations*, p. 178). An Arabian author thus describes this troublesome insect: "A black, nimble, extenuated, hunch-backed animal, which, being sensible when any one looks on it, jumps incessantly, now on one side, now on the other, till it gets out of sight." The flea belongs to the Linnean order *aptera* (*Latreille, siphonaptera*; *Kirby, aphanaoptera*). For a description of itself and congeners, see the *Penny Cyclopædia*, s. v. *Pulex*. Owing to the habits of the lower orders, fleas abound so profusely in Syria (see *Thomson, Land and Book*, ii, 94), especially during the spring, in the streets and dusty bazaars, that persons of condition always change their long dresses on returning home. There is a popular saying in Palestine that "the king of the fleas keeps his court at Tiberias," though many other places in that region might dispute the distinction



Common Flea (*Pulex Irritans*), magnified.

with that town (*Kitto, Physical History of Palestine*, p. 421).

**Flechner, ESPRIT**, a celebrated French orator and prelate, was born June 10, 1622, at Pernes, near Avignon. After studying in the college of the "Fathers of the Christian Doctrine," he went to Paris, and soon became known by a Latin poem on the famous carousal given by Louis XIV in 1662. His sermons and funeral orations soon raised him to such a pitch of reputation that the duke of Montausier recommended him to fill the office of reader to the dauphin. In 1673 he was chosen a member of the Academy, and in 1682 he was appointed almoner to the dauphiness. In 1685 he obtained the bishopric of Lavaur. When the monarch gave it to him, he said, "Do not be surprised that I have been so tardy in rewarding your merit; I was loth to be deprived of the pleasure of hearing you preach." In 1687 he was removed to the bishopric of Nismes. The Protestants of his neighborhood suffered greatly from the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, but Flechner administered his office so mildly and tenderly that he gained the love of even the Protestants. He died in February, 1710; and when Fénelon heard of his death, he cried out, "We have lost our master!" His *panegyric on Turenne* is considered his masterpiece of eloquence. Among his writings are, *Les Panegyriques des Saints* (Paris, 1697, 2 vols. 12mo); *Oraisons Funèbres* (4to); *Histoire de l'Empereur Theodoce le Grand* (Paris, 1679, 4to, and often 12mo); *Vie du Card. Ximenes* (2 vols. 12mo). They may all be found in the collection of his works, *Œuvres complètes, recues sur les manuscrits de l'auteur*, etc. (Nismes, 1782, 10 vols. 8vo).—*Biog. Universelle*, xv, 35.

**Fléchière, DE LA.** See FLETCHER, JOHN.

**Fledgling** would be a proper rendering for גִּזְיָה, *gozal'* (so called from its peeping; the Arab. and Syr. use essentially the same word in the sense of *nestling*), a "young" bird, e. g. of the dove [squab], or pigeon (*Gen.* xv, 9), or eagle [eaglet] (*Deut.* xxxii, 11. The Greek corresponding term is νεοσσός ("young" pigeon, *Luke* ii, 24). See BIRD.

**Fleece** (צֶמֶד, *gez*, so called from *shearing*, *Deut.* xviii, 4; *Job* xxxi, 20; or צֶמֶדִים, the fem. form, *Judg.* vi, 37, 39, 40), the wool of a sheep, whether on the back of the animal, or shorn off, or attached to the flayed skin, which last appears to have been the case in the passage last cited. The threshing-floor of Gideon appears to have been an open uncovered space, upon which the dews of heaven fell without interruption. See THRESHING-FLOOR. The miracle of Gideon's fleece consists in the dew having fallen one time upon the fleece, without any on the floor, and that at another time the fleece remained dry while the ground was wet with it. See GIDEON. It may appear a little improbable to us who inhabit northern climates, where the dews are inconsiderable, how Gideon's fleece in one night should contract such a quantity of water that, when he came to wring it, a bowl-full was produced; but *Kitto* observes (*Pict. Bible*, note ad loc.), "We remember, while travelling in Western Asia, to have found all the baggage, which had been left in the open air, so wet, when we came forth from the tent in the morning, that it seemed to have been exposed to heavy rain, and we could with difficulty believe that no rain had fallen. So also, when sleeping in the open air, the sheep-skin cloak which served for a covering has been found in the morning scarcely less wet than if it had been immersed in water." See DEW.

**Fleetwood, WILLIAM**, bishop of Ely, and one of the most eloquent preachers of his time, was born January, 1656, in the Tower of London, and was educated at Eton and King's College, Cambridge. After having held the preferments of rector of St. Austin's and canon of Windsor, he was made bishop of St. Asaph in 1706, and was translated to Ely in 1714. He died at



Tottenham, Middlesex, Aug. 4, 1723. In politics he held liberal views. His principal works are, *An Essay on Miracles* (1701, 8vo);—*Inscriptionum Antiquarum Sylloge* (1691, 8vo);—*Chronicon Pretiosum, or an Account of English Money* (1707);—*Method of Devotion, translated from Jurieu* (1692; of which the 27th edition appeared in 1750);—*The Judgment of the Church of England concerning Lay Baptism* (1712);—*The Life and Miracles of St. Winifred* (1713). His sermons, etc., are gathered in *A complete Collection of the Sermons, Tracts, etc., of Bp. Fleetwood* (London, 1737, fol.); and there is a new edition of his *Whole Works* from the University Press (Oxford, 1854, 3 vols. 8vo).—*New Gen. Biog. Dict.* v, 373; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, p. 604.

**Fleming, Robert, sen.**, an eminent Scotch divine, was born at Yester in 1630. He studied philosophy at the University of Edinburgh, and divinity at St. Andrew's, under Rutherford. His first pastoral charge was at Cambuslang, in Clydesdale. He was one of four hundred ministers ejected by the Glasgow Act after the restoration of Charles II. He was imprisoned in the Tolbooth of Edinburgh, but was liberated in 1673, and went to Holland, where he succeeded Mr. Brown as pastor of the Scots congregation at Rotterdam. He died July 15, 1694, leaving behind him several works, of which the most remarkable is *The fulfilling of the Scriptures*, complete in three parts: 1. Providence; 2. in the word; 3. in the Church (Lond. 1726, 5th ed. fol.), with memoir of the author by D. Burgess.—Middleton, *Biog. Evang.* iv, 69.

**Fleming, Robert, jun.**, son of the above, was born at Cambuslang, and was educated at Leyden and Utrecht. In 1692 he became minister of the Scottish church at Leyden. In 1694 he succeeded his father at Rotterdam, and in 1698 became minister at Lothbury, London, where he died in 1716. He wrote a remarkable *Discourse on the Rise and Fall of the Papacy*, the predictions of which have received a singular fulfillment. In this sermon, published in 1701, Fleming ventures his opinion that the French monarchy would be humbled in 1794, that the period of the fifth vial extended from 1794 to 1848, and that in the last-mentioned year the papacy would receive its most signal blow, and that it would be followed by the destruction of the Turk. The sermon was reprinted in 1848. He published also *Christology, a Discourse concerning Christ* (Lond. 1705-8, 3 vols. 8vo), in which he maintains the eternal pre-existence of the human soul of Christ.—Jamieson, *Religious Biography*, p. 200; Dörner, *Person of Christ*, Edinb. transl., div. ii, vol. ii, p. 329.

**Fleming, Thornton**, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Williamsburg, Va., Oct., 1764; was converted at about twenty; entered the itinerant ministry in 1788. He was set off with the Pittsburg Conference from the Baltimore Conference in 1825, superannuated in 1834, and died at Elizabethtown, Pa., in 1846. He was fifty-eight years in the ministry, fifteen of which he was presiding elder. He possessed rare endowments as a man and a minister, and was widely useful in his life and labors.—*Minutes of Conferences*, iv, 139; Stevens, *Hist. of the Methodist Episcopal Church*.

**Flemingians or Flamingians.** See MENNONITES.

**Flemming, Paul**, a German poet and hymn maker, was born October 15, 1609, at Hartenstein, in Schönburg, and studied medicine at Leipsic. In 1633 he accompanied the embassy sent by the duke of Holstein to Russia, and in 1635 was attached to an embassy to Persia. He returned in 1639, and died in Hamburg April 2, 1640. His *Geistliche und weltliche Poemata* (Jena, 1642) contain many love songs, and also sacred poems; among them the beautiful hymn *In allen un-*

*seren Thaten*, a translation of which is given in Miss Winkworth's *Lyra Germanica*, second series, p. 149. His life, with his select poems, was published by Schwab (Stuttgart, 1820). See Knapp, *Evangelischer Liederschatz* (Stuttg. 1837), and Müller, in the *Bibliothek deutscher Dichter des 17 Jahrhunderts* (Lpz. 1822, 3 vols.).—Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, s. v.

**Flentes**, προκλαιοντες, mourners or weepers, candidates for penance in the early Church. Their station was in the church porch, where they lay prostrate, begging the prayers of the faithful as they went in, and desiring to be admitted to do public penance in the church. See PENITENTS.

**Flesh.** בָּשָׂר, *basar'* [Chal. בְּשָׂר, *besar'*] (so called from its plump freshness), σαρκίς, terms of extensive application in the O. and N. T. (see Gesenius, *Heb. Lex.*; Robinson, *N. T. Lexicon*; Wemyss, *Clavis Symbolica*). They are applied generally to the whole animal creation, whether man or beast; or to all beings whose material substance is flesh (Gen. vi, 13, 17, 19; vii, 15, 16, 21; viii, 17); and to the flesh of cattle, meat, as used for food (Exod. xvi, 12; Lev. vii, 19; Numb. xi, 4, 13). See FOOD. Specialty: 1. All flesh, i. e. all men, the human race, mankind (Gen. vi, 12; Psa. vi, 2; exlv, 21; Isa. xl, 5, 6; Luke iii, 6; John xvii, 2; Acts ii, 17; 1 Pet. i, 24; Matt. xxiv, 22; Rom. iii, 20; Gal. ii, 16); 2. "Flesh," or the body, as distinguished from "soul" or "spirit" (Job xiv, 22; xix, 26; Prov. xiv, 30; Isa. x, 18; John vi, 52; 1 Cor. v, 5; 2 Cor. iv, 11; vii, 1; Colos. ii, 5; 1 Pet. iv, 6); so also "flesh and blood" [see BLOOD] as a periphrasis for the whole animal nature or man (Heb. ii, 14); 3. Human nature, man (Gen. ii, 23, 24; Matt. xix, 5, 6; 1 Cor. vi, 16; Ephes. v, 29-31); spoken also of the incarnation of Christ (John i, 14; vi, 51; Rom. i, 3; Ephes. ii, 15; Colos. i, 22; 1 Tim. iii, 16; Heb. v, 7; x, 20; 1 Pet. iii, 18; 1 John iv, 2, 3; 2 John 7); 4. As the medium of external or natural generation, and of consequent kindred relationship (Gen. xxix, 14; xxxvii, 27; Judg. ix, 2; 2 Sam. v, 1; xix, 13; John i, 13; Rom. ix, 8; Heb. ii, 11-14; xii, 9); of one's countrymen (Rom. ix, 3; xi, 14; Acts ii, 30; Gal. iv, 23); also of any other person, a fellow-mortal (Isa. lviii, 7); 5. "Flesh" is also used as a modest general term for the secret parts (Gen. xvii, 11; Exod. xxviii, 42; Lev. xv, 2, 3, 7, 16, 19; Ezek. xxiii, 20; 2 Pet. ii, 10; Jude 7); in Prov. v, 11, the "flesh" of the intemperate is described as being consumed by infamous diseases; 6. Spoken of circumcision in the flesh, the external rite (Gen. xvii, 11; Rom. ii, 28; 2 Cor. xi, 18; Gal. iii, 3; Ephes. ii, 11); 7. Spoken figuratively of human nature as opposed to the Spirit of God (Gen. vi, 3; Job x, 4; Isa. xxxi, 3; Psa. lvi, 4; Jer. xvii, 5; Matt. xvi, 17; 2 Cor. x, 4; Gal. i, 16); the unregenerate nature, the seat of carnal appetites and desires (*Meth. Quart. Rev.* April, 1861, p. 240 sq.), whether physical or moral (Rom. vii, 5; viii, 1, 4, 5, 8; Gal. v, 16, 17; Ephes. ii, 3); and as implying weakness, frailty, imperfection, both physical and moral (Psa. lxxviii, 39; Matt. xxvi, 41; Mark xiv, 38; John iii, 6; Rom. vi, 19; 1 Cor. xv, 50; 2 Cor. x, 3; Ephes. vi, 12).

Other terms occasionally rendered "flesh" in the O. T. are שֶׁמֶר', *sheer'* (from a similar idea of *fulness*), Psa. lxxiii, 26; lxxviii, 20, 27; Prov. xi, 17; Jer. li, 35; Mic. iii, 2, 3 (elsewhere "food," "body," "kin"), which has more especial reference to the *muscle* or physical element, as food or a bodily constituent (see Weller, *Erklärung d. zwei hebr. Wörter. בָּשָׂר und שֶׁמֶר'*, Lpz. 1757); also תְּבַחָה, *tibchah*, a slaughtered carcase (1 Sam. xxv, 11; "slaughterer," i. e. slaughter-house, Psa. xlv, 22; Jer. xii, 3); and לֶחֶם, *lechem*, food (Zeph. i, 17; "eating," Job xx, 23).

2. עֶשְׂפָר' (*eshpar'*), an obscure Heb. word, found only in 2 Sam. vi, 19; 1 Chron. xvi, 3. The Sept. appears to understand by the term some peculiar sort

of bread (*ἰσχαρίτης, ἄρτοκοπιτικός* v. r. *ἀρτοκοπικός*), and the Auth. Vers., following the Vulg. (*assatura bubule carnis, pars assæ carnis bubule*, apparently with the absurd derivation from *ῥῆ, fire*, and *ῥῆ, a bullock*), renders it "a good piece of (roasted) flesh." But there can be little doubt that it was a certain measure of wine or drink (for *ῥῆ* with *ῥ* prosthetic), a measure, cup. An approach to the truth was made by L. de Dieu, who, following the same etymology, understands a portion of the sacrifice measured out (Gesenius, *Heb. Lex.* s. v.) See MEAT.

**FLESH.** The word flesh (*ἄρῶν, σάρξ*) is used both in the O. and N. T. with a variety of meanings, physical, metaphysical, and ethical, the latter occurring especially in the writings of St. Paul.

I. *Old Testament.*—In the O. T. it designates (1.) a particular part or parts of the body of man and of animals (Gen. ii, 21; xli, 2; Job x, 11; Psa. cii, 6); (2.) in a more extended sense, the whole body (Psa. xvi, 9; lxxxiv, 2) in contradistinction from the heart (*לב*) or soul (*נפש*)—the body, that is, as possessed of a soul or spirit (Lev. xvii, 11; Job xii, 10). Hence it is also applied (3.) to all living things having flesh (Gen. vi, 13), and particularly to man and humanity as a whole, which is designated as "all flesh" (Gen. vi, 12). It is often connected (4.) with the ideas of mutability, of degeneracy, and of weakness, which are the natural defects of the flesh proper. It is thus represented as the counterpart of the divine strength, as the opposite of God or of the Spirit, as in 2 Chron. xxxii, 8, "With him is an arm of flesh, but with us is the Lord our God to help us" (see also Isa. xxxi, 3; Psa. lxxxviii, 39). To this we can also add Gen. vi, 3, the only passage in the O. T. in which the word approaches to an ethical sense, yet without actually acquiring it. The peculiar softness of the flesh is also (5.) the basis of the expression "heart of flesh" (*לב*) as opposed to "heart of stone" (Ezek. xi, 19). (6.) The expression "my flesh" (oftener "my flesh and bone"), to indicate relationship (Judg. ix, 2; Isa. lviii, 7), evidently refers to the physical and corporeal connection between persons sprung from a common father. In all these cases the O. T. only uses the word flesh in the physical and metaphysical senses.

II. *New Testament.*—These senses of the word "flesh" are also found in the N. T. (1.) As a name for the body, the exterior appearance of humanity, it easily passes on also to denote *external phenomena* in general, as opposed to what is inner and spiritual. So, when Christ says to the Jews, "I judge not after the flesh," he means "the flesh is the rule by which you judge" (John vii, 15; compare also Phil. iii, 3; 2 Cor. v, 16). In Rom. iv, 1, the ethical sense appears. The word "flesh" here denotes man's incapacity for good apart from divine aid. This impotence, both practical and spiritual, is also expressed in other passages, as in Rom. vi, 19; Matt. xvi, 17; and in Matt. xxvi, 41, where the lower, earthly, and sensual element in humanity, as opposed to the "spirit," is, as such, incapable of bearing trial and temptation. The root of this weakness is *sin dwelling in the flesh* (Rom. vii, 18; xvii, 20), by which man is divided within himself as well as separated from God, inasmuch as he has, on the one side, the self-conscious spirit (*νοῦς*), which submits to the divine law, and takes pleasure in this obedience, desiring all that is commanded, and avoiding all that is forbidden; and, on the other hand, the *flesh*, which, being inhabited by sin, seeks only for the lower satisfactions, thus inclining to evil rather than good, and opposed to the divine law (see Rom. vii, 7-25; viii, 3). The "sinful flesh" (*σάρξ ἀμαρτίας*) hinders the efficacy of the divine law, so that, although it (the law) gains the assent of the "inner man," it is not fulfilled, because of this tendency of the flesh towards what is forbidden. Hence the "being 'n the flesh" means, in fact, such ac-

tivity of the sinful passions (*παθήματα ἀμαρτῶν*) of the organism (*ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν*) as results in death (Rom. vii, 5; viii, 8, 9). To live and act "according to the flesh" is to live and act sinfully; the "carnal mind is enmity against God" (Rom. viii, 4, 5, 7, 12). The "wisdom according to the flesh" is a mistaken, Godless wisdom (1 Cor. i, 26). All efforts, boasts, etc., having the flesh for object or for motive (*βουλεύεσθαι σαρπηύεσθαι, κενύεσθαι κατὰ σάρκα*, 2 Cor. i, 17; x, 2; xi, 18), are foreign to the life of the true Christian. The *lusts, desires, and works of the flesh* are sinful, and opposed to holy, divine impulses and actions (Gal. v, 16; Eph. ii, 3). To crucify the flesh and the works of the flesh is the great object of the Christian, which he attains through the power of the spirit of Christ which dwells in him (Gal. v, 25; Rom. viii, 13). The fleshly mind is the mistaken mind, leading away from Christ to pride, and consequently to error (Col. ii, 18, 19). Finally, to act according to the flesh is called to "be sold under sin" (Rom. vii, 12; comp. 1 John ii, 16; Rom. viii, 3).

But "flesh" does not always denote sinfulness (see Rom. i, 3; ix, 5; 1 Tim. iii, 16; John i, 14). The flesh, in Christ, was not sinful; God sent him only "in the likeness of sinful flesh" (*ἐν ὁμοιωματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας*, Rom. viii, 3). This sinless flesh, as the organ of the Word of life, contains the divine life, which is communicated to men also living in the flesh, to redeem them from the death of sin, and to make them partakers of everlasting life (John vi, 51).


We see, then, that the meaning of the word flesh was, on the one hand, gradually extended from a physical to a metaphysical, and finally to an ethical sense. In the ethical use in the N. T., moreover, of the term "flesh," we do not find the idea of *essential sin* as lying in the flesh. Flesh in itself is neither bad nor sinful. It is the living body, the casket of the soul, containing within itself the interior and exterior organism of the senses, which, by its union with the spirit, conceives ideas, sensations, desires, and contains the so-called faculties of the soul with their divers functions. In the normal state, its whole activity is governed by the spirit, and in so far as the latter remains in unison with God from whom it proceeds, it is in turn governed by him. But sin, which disturbs this unison of the spirit with God, alters also the power of the spirit over the body. The *ego* oversteps the bounds of the divine life, moves no longer in harmony with the divine spirit, and, being no longer supported by the divine power, gradually becomes earthly and worldly, and all its functions partake of this character. The spirit endeavors, it is true, to bring the flesh under subjection to the higher laws, but does not succeed. It may, under the form of conscience, succeed in regaining some ground, but not in bringing back the state of abnegation and of detachment from the world. It is only through an immediate action on the part of God that the original relation of the flesh to the spirit is restored, the lost power regained, and the flesh brought back to its normal condition (*And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth*, John i, 14).

The original source of sin in man is neither to be found in the spirit, the organ of God's revelation within us, nor in the flesh, which is in turn the physical organ of the spirit. According to Scripture, it is the *heart*, the centre of our personality, in which all the influences, both godly and ungodly, meet—in which the choice between them is made. If the heart then gives entrance to sin, permits any doubt of God's truth, any mistrust of his love and kindness, and thus lowers him to put *self* in his place (Gen. iii), the union between God and man ceases; the inner man loses his energy to govern the *σάρξ*; the flesh starts up in opposition to the divine commands in its feelings and its desires. It asserts its independence. Self is made the centre. Hence hatred, strife, desire for worldly superiority,

creating envy, and giving rise to all the "lusts of the flesh." That both selfishness and sensualism have their seat in the *σάρξ*, and that the actions of men are guided by one or the other, is clearly shown in the enumeration given by the apostle of the works of the flesh (Gal. v, 19), which are clearly the effects of selfishness and of sinful passions; and that the word *flesh*, as used by Paul, is intended to signify both, is proved by the apostle's warning (Gal. v, 13) not to use Christian liberty for "an occasion to the flesh," i. e. to satisfy the desires of the flesh, adding to it the recommendation "*but by love serve one another.*" Whichever of the two is then especially alluded to when the Scriptures, and especially St. Paul, speak of the nature, the life, or the works of the flesh, the context will show. Sometimes both are equally active, sometimes the one only to the exclusion of the other. This is the only way in which we can arrive at a true appreciation of the meaning in each case. Those interpreters who, in view of the substitution of *σάρξ* for *σώμα* and *μέλη*, consider it as meaning exclusively the bodily, sinful side of human nature, fall into the errors of the Manichæans. See Tholuck, *Erneute Untersuchung ü. sārξ als Quelle d. Sünde* (Theol. Stud. u. Kritiken, 1855, 3); Stirm, *i. d. Tub. Zeitschr.* 1834 (ü. d. n. t. Anthropol.); Neander, *Planting and Training*, vol. ii; Kling, in Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, from which this article is condensed; Campbell, *On Four Gospels*, diss. i, § 2.

**Flesh and blood.** An expression employed by our Lord to denote (after an Oriental figure) "his Spirit," represented by his flesh and blood, as these again are by the sacramental bread and wine (Eden). See EUCHARIST.

**Flesh-hook** (מַזְלֵג, *mazleg'*, and מִזְלָגָה, *mizlagah*), an instrument used in the sacrificial services (1 Sam. ii, 13, 14; Exod. xxvii, 3; xxxviii, 3; Numb. iv, 14; 1 Chron. xxviii, 17; 2 Chron. iv, 16), probably a many-pronged fork, bent backward to draw away a flesh. The priests required such an instrument that, if the flesh burnt too quickly, they might draw it out, and again throw it into the flame or upon the coals. The implement in 1 Sam. ii, 13, 14 (where the



Ancient Etruscan sacrificial Flesh-hook.

first or masc. form of the above Heb. term is used), is stated to have been three-tined, and was apparently the ordinary fork with prongs for culinary purposes, such as was familiar likewise to the Greeks and Romans (κράταρα; see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s. v. Harpago).

**Flesh-pot** (סִיר הַבָּסָר, *sir hab-basar'*, *pot of the flesh*, Exod. xvi, 3), probably a bronze vessel, standing on three legs, appropriated for culinary purposes among the Egyptians, such as we frequently see represented in the paintings of the tombs, with a fire lighted beneath it. See Por.



Ancient Egyptian Flesh-pot.

**Fletcher, Alexander, D.D.**, was born at the Bridge of Teith, Scotland, in 1787. He studied divinity in the University of Glasgow, and succeeded his

father as minister of the secession church at the Bridge of Teith in 1807. In 1808 he came to London to supply the Presbyterian chapel in Miles's Lane, and his popularity soon became so great that a spacious building (Albion Chapel, Moorfields) was erected for him. Some indiscretion in a love affair caused him to be cut off from the Presbyterian Church, but did not injure his moral character. A great chapel in Finsbury Circus was built for him, where he preached for many years as an Independent, but both he and his church were finally admitted into the Presbyterian body. The University of Glasgow made him D.D. During thirty years of service he was one of the most popular dissenting ministers of London, especially for his Sunday-school addresses and sermons. He published a number of works, chiefly for children and youth, among them, *Scripture Sacred History* (16mo);—*Scripture Natural History* (16mo);—*The Christian Conqueror* (12mo);—*Guide to Family Devotions* (4to);—*Sermons for Children* (3 vols. 18mo);—*Warning to Evil Speakers* (12mo);—*Sabbath Remembrancer* (12mo);—*Sabbath-school Preacher* (12mo). It is computed that 70,000 copies of his *Guide to Family Devotions* were sold before his death. He died at his residence in Clapton, Sept. 30, 1860.—*The Christian World*, Oct. 5, 1860.

**Fletcher, John (FLÉCHIERE, JOHN W. DE LA)**, an early Methodist and saintly minister of the Church of England, was born Sept. 12, 1729, at Nyon, Vaud, of a distinguished family. He was educated at Geneva, where he studied profoundly both in philology and philosophy. At an early period he was, to a certain extent, master of the French, German, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages. His parents intended him for the ministry, but he preferred the sword, and at twenty he entered the service of Portugal as captain. Peace returning, he went to England, and became tutor in the family of T. Hill, Esq., Shropshire. About 1755 he joined the Methodist society, and in 1757 he took orders in the Church of England. Through the influence of Rowland Hill, he received, three years after, a presentation to the living of Dunham, worth £400 a year; but, finding that in this place there was "too much time and too little labor," he, with characteristic zeal and disinterestedness, accepted Madeley in preference, as, though the income was just the half of the other, it afforded a more extensive sphere of usefulness. This was a situation for which, by his energy of character and varied accomplishments, he was peculiarly adapted. The fact is, he was such a parish priest that it is surprising he was tolerated at all within the pale of the Church of England; he belonged more to the Methodists than to the Establishment, and he was too apostolical for those who are fondest of talking about apostolical succession. The country gentlemen resisted him for reproving some of their barbarous sports and pastimes, and even many of the clergy looked on him with an evil eye, as disturbing the quiet of their lifeless routine. Opposition was shown to him in many quarters by refusals of admissions into houses—by placards posted on the doors of his chapel—and in a variety of other forms. But, unmoved by slander and undaunted by menaces, he pursued the onward tenor of his way, and did his Master's work according to the dictates of his conscience, whether men would hear or whether they would forbear. With incessant preaching he combined the most diligent pastoral labors. He went from house to house, sympathizing with the afflicted, helping the poor, ministering to the sick, and admonishing the vicious. His liberality to the poor is said, by his successor in the parish, to have been scarcely credible. He led a life of severe abstinence that he might feed the hungry; he clothed himself in cheap attire that he might clothe the naked; he sometimes unfurnished his house that he might supply suffering families with nec-

essary articles. Thus devoted to his holy office, he soon changed the tide of opposition which had raged against him, and won the reverence and admiration of his people, and many looked upon their homes as consecrated by his visits. In the summer of 1769 Mr. Fletcher visited France, Italy, and Switzerland. Towards the close of the summer he returned to England, when, at the request of Lady Huntingdon, he became president of her seminary for educating young men for the ministry at Trevecca, in Wales. In 1770 he went there to reside, but shortly afterwards resigned, on account of some difference with Lady Huntingdon. Benson describes Fletcher at Trevecca in glowing terms: "The reader," he says, "will pardon me if he thinks I exceed; my heart kindles while I write. Here it was that I saw, shall I say, an angel in human flesh? I should not far exceed the truth if I said so. But here I saw a descendant of fallen Adam so fully raised above the ruins of the fall, that though by the body he was tied down to earth, yet was his whole conversation in heaven; yet was his life from day to day hid with Christ in God. Prayer, praise, love, and zeal, all ardent, elevated above what one would think attainable in this state of frailty, were the elements in which he continually lived. Languages, arts, sciences, grammar, rhetoric, logic, even divinity itself, as it is called, were all laid aside when he appeared in the school-room among the students. And they seldom hearkened long before they were all in tears, and every heart caught fire from the flame that burned in his soul." On leaving Trevecca he resumed his missionary and pastoral labors, making Madeley his centre. But his health failed, and again he was obliged to visit Switzerland. He derived great benefit from the change of climate, and, soon after his return to England in 1781, he married. Mr. Fletcher had for many years seen, with regret and pain, the neglected condition of poor children, and he opened a school-room for them in Madeley Wood, which was the last public work in which he was employed. On the 14th of August, 1785, he expired, in sure and certain hope of a joyful resurrection. In his life the primitive excellence of apostolical Christianity was emulated and illustrated; and if any man, since the apostolic time, has deserved the title of *saint*, it is Fletcher. "For a time he fell into asceticism, living on vegetables and bread, and devoting two whole nights each week to meditation and prayer, errors which he afterwards acknowledged. He received Wesley's doctrine of Perfection, and not only wrote in its defense, but exemplified it through a life of purity, charity, and labor, which was as faultless, perhaps, as was ever lived by mortal man. Southey says: 'No age or country has ever produced a man of more fervent piety or more perfect charity; no Church has ever possessed a more apostolical minister' (*Life of Wesley*, ch. xxv). His preaching is described as greatly effective. He spoke the English language not only with correctness, but with eloquence. There was, says Gilpin, who heard him often, an energy in his discourse which was irresistible; to hear him without admiration was impossible. Powerful as are his writings, his preaching was mightier; 'his living word soared with an eagle's flight; he basked in the sun, carried his young ones on his wings, and seized the prey for his Master.' He was Wesley's most ardent coadjutor among the clergy; his counsellor, his fellow-traveler at times in his evangelical itinerancy, an attendant at his Conferences, the champion of his theological views, and, above all, a saintly example of the life and power of Christianity as taught by Methodism, read and known, admired and loved by Methodists throughout the world. Madeley, his vicarage, is familiar and dear to them next to Epworth itself" (Stevens, *Methodism*, i, 367, 422). He was eminent, also, as a controversial writer, for point, directness, acuteness, and logical skill. He wrote largely upon the Calvinistic controversy, against Top-

lady and others; and his writings, especially his *Checks to Antinomianism*, are essential to the thorough study of that controversy. "Written as detached pamphlets, and abounding in contemporary and personal references, the *Checks* could not possibly have the consistence and compactness of a thorough treatise on the difficult questions of the great 'Quinquarticular Controversy.' But they comprehend, nevertheless, nearly every important thesis of the subject. Its highest philosophical questions—theories of the freedom of the will, prescience, fatalism—are elaborately discussed by them, as in the *Remarks on Top-lady's Scheme of Necessity*, and the *Answer to Top-lady's Vindication of Decrees*. The scriptural argument is thorough; and exegetical expositions are given in detail, as in the *Discussion of the ninth Chapter to the Romans*, and the *View of St. Paul's Doctrine of the first Chapter to the Ephesians*. No writer has better balanced the apparently contradictory passages of Scripture on the question. The popular argument has never, perhaps, been more effectively drawn out. No polemical works of a former age are so extensively circulated as these *Checks*. They are read more to-day than they were during the excitement of the controversy. They control the opinions of the largest and most effective body of evangelical clergymen on the earth. They are staples in every Methodist publishing-house. Every Methodist preacher is supposed to read them as an indispensable part of his theological studies, and they are found at all points of the globe whither Methodist preachers have borne the cross. They have been more influential in the denomination than Wesley's own controversial writings on the subject; for he was content to pursue his itinerant work, replying but briefly to the Hills, and leaving the contest to Fletcher" (Stevens, *History of Methodism*, ii, 53-55). His *Appeal to Matter of Fact and Common Sense* is an admirable, and, in some respects, novel treatise on the doctrine of universal depravity. Mr. Fletcher's English style is a marvel of purity and precision, considering that he acquired the language after twenty. His writings have been collected in several editions in England, and also in America, under the title, *The Works of the Rev. John Fletcher* (New York, Methodist Book Concern, 4 vols. 8vo). For his life, see Gilpin's account, prefixed to Fletcher's *Portrait of St. Paul*; and Benson's *Life of the Rev. J. W. de la Flèche* (New York, 1833, 12mo). See also Stevens, *History of Methodism*, vols. i and ii; Jones, *Christian Biography*; *New York Review*, i, 76.

**Fletcher, Joseph, D.D.**, an Independent minister, was born at Chester in 1784. He entered Hoxton Academy in 1803, and the University of Glasgow in the following year. In 1807 he became minister of the Independent chapel at Blackburn, being at the same time engaged as theological tutor in an academy, and in 1823 he accepted a call as minister at Stepney. He died in 1813. His principal writings were edited by the Rev. Joseph Fletcher, jun., under the title of *Select Works and Memoirs* (London, 1846, 3 vols. 8vo), including the Memoir, vol. i; essays on Romanism and Puseyism, vol. ii; Sermons, vol. iii. There appeared separately, *A Discourse* (Rom. viii, 3) on *Spirituality of Mind* (London, 1824, 2d. ed. 8vo);—*A Discourse* (1 John ii, 18) on *the Prophecies concerning Antichrist* (London, 1825, 8vo);—*Discourse* (Jude 21), *the Christian's Hope of Mercy* (London, 1832, 8vo).—Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, s. v.

**Fleury, Claude**, an eminent French historian and divine, was born in Paris Dec. 6, 1640. He was educated as an advocate at the College of Clermont, and became a counsellor of the Parliament of Paris in 1658, but subsequently took orders, and, acquiring a great reputation for learning, he was appointed in 1674 preceptor to the princess of Conti, and afterwards associated with Fénelon in educating the young dukes

of Burgundy, Anjou, and Berri. He was made member of the Academy in 1696, and in 1707 obtained from Louis XIV the priory of Argenteuil, where he resided till 1716, when he left it to become confessor to Louis XV. He died July 14, 1723, greatly respected for his learning and his virtues. His reputation rests chiefly upon his *Church History*, in twenty volumes, the first of which was published in 1691, and the last in 1722, ending with the year 1414. This work, as Fleury says in the preface, was meant to be rather a popular history than one of research and erudition; but yet it is a clear and generally fair account of the progress of Christianity, and evinces a large amount of the proper talent of the historian. It is written from the Gallican stand-point. "Fleury writes diffusely and in the spirit of a monk, but with taste and skill, in mild temper and strong love for the Church and Christianity, and with a view always to edify as well as to instruct. He follows the order of time, though not slavishly, prefacing some of his volumes with general characteristics. He also defends antiquity and the Gallican ecclesiastical constitution, without, however, surrendering at all the credit of the Church, its general tradition, or the necessity of the pope as its head. His principal concern is with doctrine, discipline, and practical piety" (Schaff, *Apost. Church*, § 26). Fleury, as a writer of Church history, is not at all in favor with Ultramontanists; a specimen of their feeling towards him is given by the *Univers* (Paris) for July 8, 1856, which calls him "the worthless and hateful Fleury, so ardent and furious in his calumnies and spite against the pope!" His *Church History* was continued by Fabri, but feebly, down to A. D. 1598. The last edition is *Histoire Ecclésiastique avec continuation par Fabri et Gouget* (Paris, 1769-74, 36 vols.; indexes, 4 vols.; in all, 40 vols. 12mo). A very good recent edition is that of Didier (Paris, 1840, 6 vols. 8vo). A translation by Herbert, up to the 9th century, was published in London (1727, 5 vols. 4to); and a partial translation by Rev. J. H. Newman appeared in 1842-44 (3 vols. 8vo). The *Abrégé de l'Histoire Ecclésiastique de Fleury*, published at Berne in 1776, is ascribed to Frederick the Great. His other writings were very numerous; the most important are, *Mœurs des Chrétiens* (Paris, 1682);—*Mœurs des Israélites* (Paris, 1681), which was translated and published, with additions, by Dr. Adam Clarke (Manchester, 1805; New York, 1836);—*Institution du droit ecclésiastique* (Paris, 1771, 2 vols. 12mo);—*Discours sur les libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane*. His minor works are collected in Martin's edition of *Œuvres de l'abbé Fleury* (1837, imp. 8vo), to which is prefixed a life of Fleury. Jortin translated his *Discourse on Eccles. History* from 600 to 1100 (see Jortin, *Remarks on Ecclesiastical History*, Lond. 1773, v, 72 sq.). See also Dupin, *Ecclesiast. Writers*, cent. xvii; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xvii, 916; Dowling, *On the Study of Ecclesiastical History*, ch. iii.

**FLIEDNER, THEODOR**, a German philanthropist, was born at Eppstein, Rhenish Prussia, in 1798, where his father was pastor. His early education was conducted by his father, and he entered the ministry with some misgiving, rather doubting his fitness, and choosing rather the function of teacher. But in 1820 a call to the pastorate of the little village community of Kaiserswerth, a small town on the Rhine, opened his way, and he diffidently began his work in the place now forever associated with his name, and which became, under his hand, the centre of an influence approaching that of Wesley himself, whose power of endurance, faith, and incessant labor Fliedner rivalled. The inhabitants of Kaiserswerth were chiefly supported by a large manufactory, which failed in 1822. Fliedner devoted himself to the work of helping his flock instead of being supported by them. "Never did a man begin to ask for help with a heavier heart, nor with worse success, till a brother pastor at Elberfeld took him home to dinner, and told him that the three requi-

sites for his work were 'patience, impudence, and a ready tongue.' The receipt, to which Fliedner added much prayer and much faith, proved so successful that he was spoken of before his death as the most accomplished beggar ever known in Germany. England, America, and many distant regions learned to pour their contributions into his wallet, and often his worst necessities were relieved by what seemed almost miraculous unsolicited gifts, which exactly answered the demands upon him." In 1823 he visited England on a begging excursion, and there became acquainted with Elizabeth Fry and with her benevolent movements. See FRY, ELIZABETH. On his return he examined the prisons of his neighborhood, and found them in a wretched state. "The convicts were crammed together in narrow, dirty cells, often in damp cellars without light or air; boys who had fallen into crime from thoughtlessness were mixed up with hoary, cunning sinners; young girls with the most corrupt old women. There was absolutely no classification; even accused persons waiting for trial, who might soon be released again as innocent, were placed with criminals who might be undergoing a lengthened term of imprisonment. There was as good as no supervision at all; as long as the jailers allowed no one to escape, they had fulfilled their duty." For more than two years Fliedner tried to bridge the gulf which lay between this criminal class and the rest of the community in his own person, visiting, teaching, reorganizing, and in 1826 he founded the first German society for improving prison discipline. "Seeking a matron for the female wards at Dusseldorf, he found his wife, whose parents refused to let her take the position first offered to her, but approved her acceptance of the young pastor himself, although the second involved all the duties of the first. In 1833 he took a poor creature released from prison into a summer-house in his garden, and so practically started a scheme which had for some time been in his mind, to provide a refuge for such women as desired to reform on the expiration of their sentences. A friend of Mrs. Fliedner's came to take charge of this minute beginning, and assumed the title of deaconess. The summer-house gave way to a house, the deaconess got companions, and the establishment grew. Then the thought of founding an order of deaconesses for the care of the sick poor dawned upon him. He bought a house in 1836, having no money, but a vast amount of faith. The same may be said of all his subsequent enlargements of his borders. His hospital was started with one table, some broken chairs, a few worn knives and two-pronged forks, worm-eaten bedsteads, seven sheets, and four severe cases of illness. The effort soon flourished under royal favor." In 1838 Fliedner first sent deaconesses from his establishment to work in other places; they spread, fresh mother-houses multiplied, till now there are 129 stations. (For statistics, see DEACONESSES, vol. ii, p. 709.) In 1849 he visited America, and travelled widely. He founded a "house" at Pittsburg, Pennsylvania. "In the course of his life Fliedner established at Kaiserswerth schools, training colleges for middle-class school-mistresses as well as for governesses, a lunatic asylum, a boy's school, and a training college for schoolmasters. The hospital, the asylum, the schools, are all utilized for the training of deaconesses, whom Fliedner frequently taught himself by the example of his wonderful gifts for interesting the young. Comical stories might be told of his doings in his infant-schools, where he would fall prostrate by way of illustration of the story of Goliath, distribute bread and honey to fix the excellence of the heavenly manna on the children's minds, or suddenly send a boy under the table to vivify his tale of the fall of a traveller over a precipice. His labors lasted till his death. He died at Kaiserswerth, Oct. 4, 1864, worn out by journeys in Germany, France, Great Britain, and America, which had brought on disease of the lungs.

To the very last day of his life, he continued, in spite of painful weakness, to exhort those near him to a religious and earnest life, took keen interest in the details of daily work going on around him, and died a day or two after taking the communion with his whole establishment and family, including two sons, whose entrance into the Church he specially rejoiced to see." Fliedner published (after 1836) annual reports of his institution, and a monthly periodical called *Der Armen- und Krankenfreund*. He also wrote a work, in four volumes, on the martyrs of the Evangelical Church, *Buch der Märtyrer und anderer Glaubenszeugen der evangel. Kirche von den Aposteln bis auf unsere Zeit*, 1852-1860, 4 vols.—*London Quarterly Review*, April, 1868, p. 247; *Spectator*, April 11, 1868; Winkworth, *Life of Pastor Fliedner* (Lond. 1867); Appleton, *Am. Cyclop.* (1864), p. 377.

**Flies.** See FLY.

**Flinn, ANDREW, D.D.**, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Maryland in 1773, graduated at the University of North Carolina in 1799, and was licensed to preach by Orange Presbytery in 1800. In 1803 he became pastor of the Presbyterian church at Fayetteville, and in 1811 he was installed pastor of a new church, expressly organized for him, in Charleston, S. C. Here he gained a brilliant and solid reputation, which was soon widely diffused throughout the country. He was "one of the most impressive and attractive preachers of his day." He died Feb. 24, 1820. He printed a few occasional sermons.—*Sprague, Annals*, iv, 276.

**Flint** (חַלְמִישׁ, *challamish'*, from its smoothness, *Ps.* cxiv, 8; *Isa.* i, 7; "rock," *Job* xxviii, 9; frequently with the accompaniment חֲבֵר, a rock, *Deut.* viii, 15; xxxii, 13; once for צַר itself, *Ezek.* iii, 9; "sharp stone," *Exod.* iv, 25), any hard stone, especially of a silicious character, as quartz or granite; but in mineralogical science it is applied only to silicious nodules. In the three passages first cited above the reference is to God's bringing water and oil out of the naturally barren rocks of the wilderness for the sake of his people. In *Isaiah* the word is used metaphorically to signify the firmness of the prophet in resistance to his persecutors. So also in *Isa.* v, 28 we have *like flint*, in reference to the hoofs of horses. In *1 Macc.* x, 73, κόχλαξ is translated *flint*, and in *Wisd.* xi, 4 the expression ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτόμου is adopted from *Deut.* viii, 15 (*Sept.*). See **ROCK**. Flints abound in nearly all the plains and valleys through which the Hebrews marched during the forty years of wandering. In the northward desert, low hills of chalk occur, as well as frequent tracts of chalky soil, for the most part overspread with flints. In the western desert Burckhardt saw some large pieces of flint perfectly oval, three to four feet in length, and about a foot and a half in breadth. This desert presents to the traveller's view its immense expanse of dreary country, covered with black flints, with here and there some hilly chains rising from the plain. See **DESERT**.

**Flint, ABEL, D.D.**, a Congregational minister, was born Nov., 1765, at Windham, Conn. He graduated at Yale in 1785, and in 1786 was elected tutor in Brown University, where he remained until 1790, and on April 20, 1791, was installed pastor of the Second Church, Hartford. He was chosen secretary of the Connecticut Missionary Society at its organization, June, 1798, and held the

office for twenty-four years. In January, 1824, he was dismissed from his pastoral charge on account of his failing health, and died March 7, 1825. Dr. Flint published *A Treatise on Surveying*, and several occasional discourses. He assisted in compiling *The Hartford Selection of Hymns*, and was also assistant editor of the *Connecticut Evangelical Magazine* for seven years.—*Sprague, Annals*, ii, 273.

**Float** (only in the plur. דְּבֵרוֹת, *doberoth'*, *drifts*, *1 Kings* v, 9; דְּבֵרוֹת, *rhapsodoth'*, of uncertain derivation, *2 Chron.* ii, 15; *Sept.* in both passages *σχεδία*, as also in *1 Esdr.* v, 55), a raft for conveying bulky substances by water. Two methods of conveying wood in floats appear to have been practised in ancient times. The first was by pushing single trunks of trees into the water, and suffering them to be carried along by the stream: this was commonly adopted with regard to firewood. The other was ranging a number of planks close to each other in regular order, binding them together, and steering them down the current: this was probably the most ancient practice. The earliest ships, or boats, were nothing more than rafts, or a collection of deals and planks bound together. They were called *σχεδία* by the Greeks, and *rates* by the Romans. The ancients ventured out to sea with them on piratical expeditions, as well as to carry on commerce; and after the invention of ships they were still retained for the transportation of soldiers (*Scheffer, De Milit. Nav. Vet.*). Solomon, it appears from the above passages, entered into a contract with Hiram, king of Tyre, by which the latter was to cause cedars for the use of the Temple to be cut down on the western side of Mount Lebanon, above Tripolis, and to be floated to Jaffa. At present no streams run from Lebanon to Jerusalem, and the Jordan, the only river in Palestine that could bear floats, is at a considerable distance from the cedar forest. The wood, therefore, must have been brought along the coast by sea to Jaffa. The Assyrian monuments represent men



Ancient Assyrian Floats.

crossing rivers on inflated skins [see **FERRY**] and in basket-boats, precisely as described by ancient authors (*Herod.* i, 194); and in the same region transportation and travelling is still largely carried on by means of floats, some of them open rafts, and others with an awning or cabin. See **NAVIGATION**.



Modern Assyrian Kellek, or Raft.

**Flock** (usually and properly  $\text{צֹדֵן}$ , *e'der*,  $\text{ποιμήνη}$  [or dimin.  $\text{ποιμνιον}$ , a "little flock," like  $\text{צֹאֵן}$ , *chasipt'*, 1 Kings xx, 27]; occasionally  $\text{מִקְנֵה}$ , *mikneh'*, cattle, as generally rendered; frequently  $\text{צֹאֵן}$ , *sheep* collectively, as commonly rendered; also  $\text{מַרְיָה}$ , *marith'*, Jer. x, 21, *pasture*, as elsewhere rendered; and  $\text{אַשְׁתְּרוֹת}$ , *ashteroth'* [q. v.], Dent. vii, 13; xxxviii, 4, 18, 51, i. e. *Venuses*, ewes for breeding). See FOLD; PASTURAGE; SHEEP.

**Flock**, the correlative term to "pastor." "The way in which this term, or the language which implies it, invariably occurs in Scripture (1 Pet. v, 2; John xxi, 15), points out to the people that they are not properly the minister's flock (which would exalt him into the mediator between them and God), but Christ's."—Eden, *Church Dictionary*, s. v.

**Floardoard** (*Floardardus* or *Froardardus*) OF RHEIMS, a French chronicler, was born at Epernay in 894, and became canon of Rheims. He was persecuted by count Heribert for opposing the raising of his unqualified son Hugo to the archbishopric of Rheims, and was imprisoned for several months. After the death of the count, Hugo the son did justice to Floardoard. He died March 28, 966. He wrote *Chronica* or *Annales*, a chronicle of France from 919 to 966, published by Pithou (Paris, 1588). He also wrote a *Historia Ecclesie Remensis*, in four books, giving an account of the prelates who had presided over its affairs (printed by Colvener, Douay, 1617). Both these works, as far as extant, are given in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 135, together with the *Opuscula Metrica* of Floardoard, including his *Triumphus Christi*, a sort of Church History in verse.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xvii, 936; Clarke, *Succession of Sacred Literature*, ii, 565.

**Floh**, JACOB HENDRIK, was born in the year 1758, at Crefeld. He studied theology in the Baptist seminary in Amsterdam. He was invited in 1783 to take charge of the Baptist church at Enschedé. Here he labored between forty and fifty years. He was a man of extensive knowledge and of a ready wit, and was indefatigable in his labors. He contributed greatly to promote the cause of education in the section of the country where he was located. Several valuable essays were written by him on the subject of education. One, on the *Best Theory of Punishments and Rewards in Schools*, received the prize from the Maatschappij tot nut van 't algemeen. Several works on other subjects were written by him. One, on the *Indissoluble Connection between Virtue and true Happiness*, was crowned by the same society. Another, on a kindred subject, we deem worthy of mention here: *National Happiness cannot Exist without national Virtue*. For a few years Floh allowed himself to be drawn aside from his ministerial vocation to engage in political life. In 1796 he was chosen representative of the people in the National Convention at the Hague. In 1798 he was chosen secretary of the first chamber of the representative body of the Batavian people. He acquitted himself in these positions with great credit. His theological views were Latitudinarian. His principal works are, *Proeve eener bereideneerde verklaring der geschiedenis van 's Heilands verzoeking in de woestijn*, Deventer, 1790; *Iets over bedestonden*, 1817. His attack on the Heidelberg Catechism, as teaching, in the answer to the fifth question, a doctrine dangerous to the state, made in the National Assembly at the Hague, was regarded as highly injudicious, and excited great indignation. It elicited a triumphant reply from the pen of Ewaldus Kist, one of the most highly esteemed ministers of the Reformed Church. Floh attempted no reply. It was thought that he was himself convinced by the moderate and judicious reply of Kist. We may add in honor of Floh that this attack of his was regarded as an exception to his otherwise impartial conduct as a public representative. He died at Enschedé in March,

1830. See B. Glasius, *Godgeleerd Nederland*, i Deel, blz. 467 en verv.; Ypey en Dermont's *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk*, iv Deel, blz. 206 en verv. (Breda, 1827). (J. P. W.)

**Flohr**, GEORGE DANIEL, a minister of the Lutheran Church, was a native of Germany, born in 1759. He died in Wytheville, Va., in 1826. He studied medicine in Paris, and was one of the throng that witnessed the execution of Louis XVI. The accidental but tragical death of an individual in the crowd standing near him, part of whose mangled body was thrown upon his person, most deeply affected him, and so operated upon his mind as to lead him to change all his purposes and plans for the future. This was the turning-point in his character. A train of serious thought was awakened which resulted in his conversion, and subsequent consecration to the work of the ministry. Soon after he came to America, and pursued the study of theology under the direction of the Rev. William Carpenter, Madison County, Va. After his licensure to preach the Gospel, he engaged in successful missionary service in south-western Virginia, but subsequently took charge of several congregations in Wythe County, among whom he faithfully labored till his death. Mr. Flohr exercised an extraordinary influence not only upon the members of his church, but upon all classes of society. When difficulties occurred in the community they were always referred to him for adjustment, and from his decision scarcely any one ever thought of an appeal. The basis of this influence was the unlimited confidence which every one had in his personal worth and Christian integrity. So far as his professional engagements allowed, Mr. Flohr was devoted to study. His acquaintance with the German and French was extensive and thorough, and his attainments in Latin and Greek considerable. The only work of his ever published was a posthumous volume of sermons. (M. L. S.)

**Flood** (the rendering of several Heb. words [see RAIN], but especially of  $\text{מַבּוּל}$ , *mabbul'*,  $\text{κατακλυσμός}$ ), an event related in the book of Genesis (ch. vii and viii), by which, according to the usual interpretation of the description, the whole world was overwhelmed and every terrestrial creature destroyed, with the exception of one human family and the representatives of each species of animal, supernaturally preserved in an ark, constructed by divine appointment for the purpose. See ARK.

1. The successive stages of its progress were in order and at intervals as follows. In the 600th year of his life, Noah was commanded to enter the ark, taking with him his wife, and his three sons with their wives. One week afterwards, on the 17th day of the 2d month (answering nearly to our November), there began a forty-days' rain, and the fountains of the great deep were broken up, so that its waters rose over the land until all the high hills under the whole heavens were covered. Fifteen cubits (twenty-seven feet) upward did the waters prevail (rise). On the 17th day of the 7th month (about April), or 150 days after the deluge began, the ark rested on the mountains of Ararat, or Armenia, the waters having begun to abate. They continued to decrease till the 1st day of the 10th month (July), when the tops of the mountains were visible. Forty days after this, Noah sent forth a raven from the ark, which never returned. He next (apparently after seven days) sent forth a dove, which came back. Seven days afterwards he dispatched the dove again to ascertain the state of the earth, and in the evening she returned with an olive-leaf in her mouth. After an interval of seven days the dove was sent forth a third time, and returned no more. On the first day of the 1st month of the new year (Sept.—Oct.) the waters were dried from off the earth, and on the 27th day of the 2d month (Nov.) Noah came out of the ark, built an altar, and offered sacrifice. See NOAH.

2. The truth of the Mosaic history of the deluge is confirmed by the tradition of it which universally obtained. A tradition of the deluge, in many respects accurately coinciding with the Mosaic account, has been preserved almost universally among the ancient nations. It is a very remarkable fact concerning the deluge that the memory of almost all nations begins with the history of it, even of those nations which were unknown until they were discovered by enterprising voyagers and travellers; and that traditions of the deluge were kept up in all the rites and ceremonies of the Gentile world; and it is observable that, the farther we go back, the more vivid the traces appear, especially in those countries which were nearest to the scene of action. Such narratives have formed part of the rude belief of the Egyptians, Chaldeans, Greeks, Scythians, and Celtic tribes. They have also been discovered among the Peruvians and Mexicans, the aborigines of Cuba, North America, and the South-Sea Islands. See ARARAT.

3. The account furnished by the sacred historian is circumstantially distinct, and the whole is expressly ascribed to divine agency: but in several of the lesser particulars secondary causes, as rain, "the opening of the windows of heaven" (vii, 11), and the "breaking up of the fountains of the great deep," are mentioned, and again the effect of wind in drying up the waters (viii, 1). It is chiefly to be remarked that the whole event is represented as both commencing and terminating in the most gradual and quiet manner, without anything at all resembling the catastrophes and convulsions often pictured in vulgar imagination as accompanying it. When the waters subsided, so little was the surface of the earth changed that the *vegetation* continued *uninjured*; the olive-trees remained from which the dove brought its token. We allude particularly to these circumstances in the narrative as being those which bear most upon the probable *nature* and extent of the event, which it is our main object in the present article to examine, according to the tenor of what little evidence can be collected on the subject, whether from the terms of the narrative, or from other sources of information which may be opened to us by the researches of science. See Cockburn, *Inquiry into the Truth and Certainty of the Mosaic Deluge* (London, 1756).

The evidence which geology may disclose, and which can in any degree bear on our present subject, must, from the nature of the case, be confined to indications of superficial action attributable to the agency of water, subsequent to the latest period of the regular geological formations, and corresponding in character to a temporary inundation of a *quiet* and tranquil nature, of a depth sufficient to cover the highest mountains, and, lastly (as indeed this condition implies), extending over the whole globe; or, if these conditions should not be fulfilled, then indications of at least something approaching to this, or with which the terms of the description may be fairly understood and interpreted to correspond. (See Prof. Hitchcock, on "The Historical and Geological Deluges compared," in the *Bib. Repos.* January, 1837; April, 1837; April, 1838; also Brown's translation of "twelve dissertations" [on the Flood] out of Le Clerc [Commentary, i, 66-70, 1710] on Genesis, London, 1696.) Of those geological facts which seem to bear at all upon such an inquiry, the first, perhaps, which strikes us is the occurrence of what was formerly all included under the common name of *diluvium*, but which more modern research has separated into many distinct classes. The general term may, however, not inaptly describe superficial accumulations, whether of soil, sand, gravel, or loose aggregations of larger blocks, which are found to prevail over large tracts of the earth's surface, and are manifestly superinduced over the deposits of different ages, with which they have no connection. An examination of the contents of this accumulated detritus soon

showed the diversified nature of the fragments of which it is composed in different localities. The general result, as bearing on our present subject, is obviously this: the traces of currents, and the like, which the surface of the earth does exhibit, and which *might* be ascribed to diluvial action of some kind, are certainly not the results of *one universal* simultaneous submergence, but of *many distinct*, local, aqueous forces, for the most part continued in action for long periods, and of a kind precisely analogous to such agency as is now at work. While, further, many parts of the existing surface show no traces of such operations; and the phenomena of the volcanic districts prove distinctly that during the enormous periods which have elapsed since the craters were active, no deluge could possibly have passed over them without removing all those lighter portions of their exuvia which have evidently remained wholly untouched since they were ejected. Upon the whole, it is thus apparent that we have no evidence whatever of any great aqueous revolution at any comparatively recent period having affected the earth's surface over any considerable tract: changes, doubtless, may have been produced on a small scale in isolated districts. The phenomena presented by caves containing bones, as at Kirkdale and other localities, are not of a kind forming any breach in the continuity of the analogies by which all the changes in the surface are more and more seen to have been carried on. But a recent simultaneous influx of water covering the globe, and ascending above the level of the mountains, must have left indisputable traces of its influence, which not only is *not* the case, but against which we have seen *positive* facts standing out. Such traces must especially be expected to be found in the masses of *human remains* which such a deluge must have imbedded in the strata of soil and detritus, if these were formed by that event. Now it is quite notorious that no bed indisputably attributable to diluvial action has ever been found containing a single bone or tooth of the human species. We must therefore contend that *no evidence has yet been adduced* of any deposit which can be identified with the Noachian deluge. See GEOLOGY.

Apart from the testimonies of geology, there are other sciences which must be interrogated on such a subject. These are, chiefly, terrestrial physics, to assign the possibility of a supply of water to stand all over the globe five miles in depth *above* the level of the ordinary sea; natural history, to count the myriads of species of living creatures to be preserved and continued in the ark; mechanics, to construct such a vessel; with some others not less necessary to the case. But we have no space to enter more minutely on such points: the reader will find them most clearly and candidly stated in Dr. Pye Smith's *Geology and Scripture*, etc., p. 130, 2d edit. See ARK.

Let us now glance at the nature and possible solutions of the difficulty thus presented. We believe only two main solutions have been attempted. One is that proposed by Dr. Pye Smith (*ib.* p. 294), who expressly contends that there is no real contradiction between these facts and the description in the Mosaic record, *when the latter is correctly interpreted*. This more correct interpretation then refers, in the first instance, to the proper import of the Scripture terms commonly taken to imply the *universality* of the deluge. These the author shows, by a large comparison of similar passages, are only to be understood as expressing a *great extent*; often, indeed, the very same phrase is applied to a very limited region or country, as in Gen. xli, 56; Deut. ii, 25; Acts ii, 5, etc. Thus, so far as these expressions are concerned, the description may apply to a local deluge. Next, the destruction of the whole existing human race does not by any means imply this universality, since, by ingenious considerations as to the multiplication of mankind at the alleged era of the deluge, the author has shown that they



probably had not extended beyond a comparatively limited district of the East. A local destruction of animal life would also allow of such a reduction of the numbers to be included in the ark as might obviate objections on that score; and here again the Oriental idiom may save the necessity of the *literal* supposition of every actual species being included. This is a consideration of very great importance when we take into account the countless varieties of animated beings for which the ark itself made no provision, such as reptiles, insects, and even fishes, which could not exist in the brackish waters, even if they survived the collisions of the flood. The other difficulties above alluded to, arising from kindred sciences, such as the lack of water, the effect of so large an accession of water upon the temperature and upon the rotation of the earth, the unfitness of such a place as the ark for the long confinement of so many animals, the actual existence of trees in different parts of the world older than the deluge, and the impossibility of preserving even vegetable life for so long a time under water, are all likewise obviated by the supposition of a local deluge. Again, the difficulties in the way of the descent of so many animals from so lofty, bleak, and craggy a mountain as Ararat, and their dissemination thence over all the world, are obviated in this way, by supposing that it was on one of its lower eminences that the ark grounded, as it floated by the force of the southerly irruption towards the great mountain barriers of Armenia. Lastly, this author suggests considerations tending to fix the region which may have been the scene of the actual inundation described by Moses in about that part of Western Asia where there is a large district now considerably depressed below the level of the sea (see the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1867, p. 465); this might have been submerged by the joint action of rain, and an elevation of the bed of the Persian and Indian Seas. Finally, he quotes the opinions of several approved divines in confirmation of such a view, especially as bearing upon all the essential religious instruction which the narrative is calculated to convey.

The only other mode of viewing the subject is that which, accepting the letter of the scriptural narrative, makes the deluge strictly universal; and allowing (as they *must* be allowed) all the difficulties, not to say contradictions, in a natural sense, involved in it, accounts for them all by *supernatural* agency. In fact, the terms of the narrative, strictly taken, may perhaps be understood throughout as representing the whole event, from beginning to end, as entirely of a miraculous nature. If so, it may be said, there is an end to all difficulties or question, since there are no limits to omnipotence, and one miracle is not greater than another. In a word, if we suppose the flood to have been miraculously produced, and all the difficulties thus overcome, we must also suppose that it was not only miraculously terminated also, but every trace and mark of it supernaturally effaced and destroyed. Now, considering the immense amount of supernatural agency thus rendered necessary, this hypothesis has appeared to some quite untenable. Dr. Pyle Smith, in particular (whom no one will suspect of any leaning to scepticism), enlarges on the difficulty (p. 157, and note), and offers some excellent remarks on the general question of miracles (p. 84-85); and there can be no doubt that, however plausible may be the assertion that all miracles are alike, yet the idea of supernatural agency to so enormous an amount as in the present instance is, to many minds at least, very staggering, if not wholly inadmissible. In fact, in stretching the argument to such an extent, it must be borne in mind that we may be trenching upon difficulties in another quarter, and not sufficiently regarding the force of the evidence on which *any* miracles are supported. See MIRACLE.

If we look to the actual tenor of the whole narrative as delivered by Moses (Gen. viii and ix), we shall ob-

serve that the manifest *immediate* purport of it is the same as that of the rest of the early portion of his history, viz. as forming part of the *introduction* to THE LAW. Thus we find, in the first instance, the narrative dwelling on the distinction of clean and unclean beasts (vii, 2); afterwards on the covenant with Noah; the promise of future enjoyment of the earth and its fruits; the prohibition of eating blood; the punishment of murder (ix, 4, etc.); all constituting, in fact, some of the *rudiments* out of which the Mosaic law was framed, and which were thus brought before the Israelites as forming an anticipatory sanction for it. Regarded in a Christian light, the narrative is important solely in respect to the applications made of it in the New Testament, and these are only of the following kind: it is referred to as a warning of Christ's coming (Matt. xxiv, 38; Luke xvii, 27); as an assurance of judgment on sin (2 Pet. ii, 5); and of God's long-suffering; while the ark is made a type of baptism and Christian salvation (1 Pet. iii, 20); and, lastly, Noah is set forth as an example of faith (Heb. xi, 7). In these applications no reference is made to the physical nature of the event, nor even to its literal universality. They are all allusions, not to the event abstractedly, but only in the way of *argument with the parties addressed* in support of *other* truths; an appeal to the Old Testament addressed to those who already believed in it—in the first of the instances cited, to the Jews—in the others, to *Jewish* converts to Christianity (compare 1 Pet. i, 1, and 2 Pet. iii, 1). Indeed, if the terms "earth" (אֶרֶץ) and "heavens" (שָׁמַיִם) be referred in the Mosaic narrative itself to the visible extent of *land* and superincumbent arch of *sky* (as they often signify), all direct statement of the universality of the deluge over the surface of the globe will at once disappear. That it was coextensive with the spread of the human race at the time is indeed demanded by the conditions of the sacred history [see ANTEDILUVIANS]; but there is no evidence that the population before the flood was either so extensive or so widely disseminated as many have imagined, calculating upon the inapposite rate of modern increase and later usages. On the contrary, it appears that even after the deluge the inhabitants were still so greatly inclined to cluster around one native centre that the catastrophe of Babel was requisite in order to induce a fulfilment of the divine behest that mankind should "fill the earth." Undoubtedly, if read from the present advanced stage of the world's history, it would be impossible to understand the language otherwise than of an absolute universality; for, now that every region of the world is known, and known to be more or less occupied by man and beast, it must have been in the strictest sense a world-embracing catastrophe which could be described as enveloping in a watery shroud every hill under the whole heaven, and destroying every living thing that moved on the face of the earth. But here it must be remembered, the sacred narrative dates from the comparative infancy of the world, when but a limited portion of it was peopled or known; and it is always one of the most natural, as well as most fertile sources of error, respecting the interpretation of such early records, that one is apt to overlook the change of circumstances, and contemplate what is written from a modern point of view. Hence the embarrassments so often felt, and the misjudgments sometimes actually pronounced, respecting those parts of Scripture which speak of the movements of the heavenly bodies in language suited to the *apparent*, but at variance, as has now been ascertained, with the *real* phenomena. In such cases it is forgotten that the Bible was not intended to teach the truths of physical science, or point the way to discoveries in the merely natural sphere. Of things in these departments of knowledge it uses the language of common life. So, whatever in the scriptural account of the deluge touches on geographi-

cal limits or matters strictly physical, ought to be taken with the qualifications inseparable from the bounded horizon of men's views and relations at the time. Accordingly, there were not wanting theological writers who, long before any geological fact, or well-ascertained fact of any sort in physical science, had appeared to shake men's faith in a strictly universal deluge, actually put the interpretation now suggested as competent upon the narrative of the deluge. Thus Poole, who flourished in the middle of the 17th century, says in his *Synopsis* on Gen. vii, 19: "It is not to be supposed that the entire globe of the earth was covered with water. Where was the need of overwhelming those regions in which there were no human beings? It would be highly unreasonable to suppose that mankind had so increased before the deluge as to have penetrated to all the corners of the earth. It is, indeed, not probable that they had extended beyond the limits of Syria and Mesopotamia. It would be absurd to affirm that the effects of the punishment inflicted upon men alone applied to places in which there were no men." Hence he concludes that "if not so much as the hundredth part of the globe was overspread with water, still the deluge would be universal, because the extirpation took effect upon all the part of the world which was inhabited." In like manner Stillingfleet, a writer of the same period, in his *Origines Sacre* (bk. iii, ch. iv.), states that "he cannot see any urgent necessity from the Scripture to assert that the flood did spread over all the surface of the earth. The flood was universal as to mankind; but from thence follows no necessity at all of asserting the universality of it as to the globe of the earth, unless it be sufficiently proved that the whole earth was peopled before the flood—which I despair of ever seeing proved." Indeed, this view dates much farther back than the comparatively recent time when these authors lived; for while bishop Patrick himself took the other and commoner view, we find him thus noting in his commentary on Gen. vii, 19: "There were those anciently (i. e. in the earlier ages), and they have their successors now, who imagined the flood was not universal—ἀλλ' ἐν ᾧ οἱ τῶρε ἀνθρώποι ᾤκουν—but only there where men then dwelt; as the author of the *Questiones ad Orthodoxos* tells us, Quest. 34." It is certain, therefore, that this is not a question between scientific naturalists on the one side, and men of simple faith in Scripture on the other. Apart from the cultivation or the discoveries of science, we have two classes of interpreters of Scripture, one of which find no reason to believe in more than a restricted universality, while the other press the language to its farthest possible extent—take it, not as descriptive of God's judgment upon the earth, in so far merely as it was occupied by men, but with reference to the globe at large, and to an event in its natural history. See Offerhaus, *De diluvio Noëico* (Franck, 1694); Hardt, *Historia diluvii Noachi* (Helmst. 1728); Diecke, *Ueber die Sündfluth* (St. Gall, 1861); Rendell, *History of the Flood* (Lond. 1851, 1864).—Kitto, s. v.; Fairbairn, s. v. Compare DELUGE.

**Floor** (ἵστῖς, *go' ren*; ἄλων), prop. a level or open area (as the "place" or square around the gates of Oriental cities, 1 Kings xxii, 10; 2 Chron. xviii, 9); hence usually the spot, well-beaten and smooth, on which grain is trodden out by cattle in the East, i. e. the "barn-floor" or "threshing-floor." See THRESHING. For the floor of rooms, see HOUSE; for that of court-yards, see PAVEMENT.

**Flore**, ORDER OF (*Floriacenses, Florenses, or Florianses*), a monastic order of the Roman Catholic Church, was founded, in 1189, by Joachim de Celico (generally called Joachim of Floris), who resigned his position of abbot of the Cistercian monastery of Corazzo in order to withdraw with some companions into the desert of Flora. Soon a monastery arose there, the statutes of

which were sanctioned in 1196 by pope Celestine III. Gradually the statutes were adopted by several monasteries in Naples and the two Calabrias; but, as the founder was suspected of heresy, the order had repeatedly to suffer persecution. In 1470 began the rule of commendatory abbots, which led to a rapid degeneration. In 1505 most of the monasteries connected with the order joined the Cistercians, while a few others were incorporated with the Carthusians and Dominicans. At the close of the 16th century no more monasteries of the order seem to have been in existence. There were also a few convents of nuns following the rule of Flore. The order differed but little from the Cistercians.—Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, iv, 102. (A. J. S.)

**Florence, Council of** (transferred from Ferrara in 1439). The circumstances under which the Council of Ferrara was called by Eugenius IV are stated under BASLE, COUNCIL OF; FERRARA, COUNCIL OF. The plea for the transfer of the council from Ferrara to Florence was the prevalence of the plague in Ferrara; but this must be pronounced a blind, as the plague had prevailed for months, and was nearly over when the transfer took place. "Are we, then, free to surmise that the true reason was kept a profound secret after all, and was, really, that the Latins were getting thoroughly the worst of it on the point of adding to the creed, and that attention was to be diverted from the subject by a change of scene and improved fare?" (Foulkes, *Christendom's Divisions*, ii, 346). "It is clear that the Greek bishops were only led to consent to obey the pope and go from Ferrara to Florence by the promise that their allowance for expenses, which had been withheld for several months, should be promptly paid" (Popoff, *History of the Council of Florence*, edited by Neale, Lond. 1861, ch. vi).

The bull transferring the council to Florence was read in the cathedral of Ferrara, Jan. 10, 1439; on Feb. 9 the pope and bishops entered Florence; the emperor, John Palæologus, arrived on the 15th. The aim of the council was (in continuation of that at Ferrara) to restore union between the churches of the East and the West. Eugenius IV desired this greatly, in order to confound his enemies at the Council of Basle, who were still in session, and who soon afterwards deposed him (June 25, 1439; see BASLE); while the emperor John Palæologus sought to gain the aid of the West in his wars with the Turks. The chief topic of discussion was the addition of the *filioque* to the creed [see FILIOQUE]; but the Latins succeeded in taking up the doctrinal question of the procession of the Holy Ghost instead of the historical one of the additions to the creed. The cardinal Julian chiefly represented the Latin side, and Mark of Ephesus was the strongest disputant on the side of the Greeks. Bessarion, of the Greek side, was won over to the Latin by promises of rewards from the pope. See BESSARIION.

At the first session, Feb. 26, 1439, Joseph, patriarch of Constantinople, was absent on account of illness. He died before the close of this council. Cardinal Julian proposed a discussion of the means of union; the emperor reminded him that the dispute on the *filioque* was not ended. At the end of the sitting, he held a private meeting of the Greeks to consider terms of union, but nothing came of it. In the second session (March 2) a beginning was made in discussing the doctrine of the procession, the Latin side being ably represented by Johannes de Monte Nigro, provincial of the Dominicans in Lombardy. The discussion was continued in several sessions up to the ninth (March 25). The Greeks succeeded best in the scriptural argument, and also showed that many of the passages from Epiphanius, Basil, and Augustine, cited by the Latins, had been corrupted. After the session of Mar. 17, the emperor prohibited Mark of Ephesus and Anthony of Heraclea, the two strongest advocates on the

Greek side, from taking further part in the discussions. The emperor was bent on union at any price. At the end of the session of March 24, the pope sent word to the patriarch that the Greeks must either express their assent to the Roman view, or return home by Easter, April 5. From this time the emperor vacillated: on the one side was his conscience, and also the fear that the whole East would brand him as a traitor to orthodoxy; on the other hand was his desire for the aid of the West in maintaining his falling empire. Policy triumphed. Moreover, the Greeks were far from home, and without money, and they received nothing on account of the allowance promised them by the pope from the time of their arrival in Florence until May 22. The emperor summoned a meeting of the Greek bishops, March 30, in the apartment of the invalid patriarch Joseph, and other such meetings followed. The discussions were stormy. Dositheus of Jerusalem declared that he would rather die than be false to the creed and "Latinize." Mark declared that the Latins were not only schismatics, but heretics. It was finally agreed that a committee of twenty should be appointed, ten from each side, to lay down the doctrine of the procession in a form that might be accepted by both sides. "After many unsuccessful endeavors, they drew up a profession of faith upon the subject of the procession of the Holy Spirit, in which they declared as follows: 'That the Holy Spirit is from all eternity from the Father and of the Son; that he from all eternity proceedeth from both, as from one only principle, and by one only *spiratio*; that by this way of speaking it is signified that the Son also is, as the Greeks express it, the *cause*, or, as the Latins, the *principle* of the subsistence of the Holy Spirit equally with the Father. Also we declare that what some of the holy fathers have said of the procession of the Holy Spirit *from* (ex) the Father *by* (per) the Son is to be taken in such a sense as that the Son is, as well as the Father, and conjointly with him, the cause or principle of the Holy Spirit; and since all that the Father hath he hath, in begetting him, communicated to his only begotten Son, the paternity alone excepted; so it is from the Father from all eternity that the Son hath received this also, that the Holy Spirit proceedeth from the Son as well as from the Father.' In the same decree the council declared that it was lawful to consecrate unleavened bread as well as that which had been leavened; and upon the subject of purgatory, that the souls of those who die truly penitent in the love of God, before bringing forth fruit meet for repentance, are purified after death by the pains of purgatory, and that they derive comfort in those pains from the prayers of the faithful on earth, as also by the sacrifice of the mass, alms, and other works of piety. Concerning the primacy of the pope, they confessed the pope to be the sovereign pontiff and vicar of Jesus Christ, the head of the whole Church, and the father and teacher of all Christians, and the governor of the Church of God, according to the sacred canons and acts of the oecumenical councils, *saving the privileges and rights of the Eastern patriarchs.*

After various conferences, the decree of union was drawn up in due order, in Greek and in Latin; it was then read and signed by the pope, and by eighteen cardinals, by the Latin patriarchs of Jerusalem and Grenada, and the two episcopal ambassadors of the duke of Burgundy, eight archbishops, forty-seven bishops (who were almost all Italians), four generals of monastic orders, and forty-one abbots. On the Greek side, it was signed by the emperor John Paleologus, by the vicars of the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem (the patriarch of Constantinople had lately died), and by several metropolitans. This decree was published on the 6th of July, 1439, after which the Greeks, to the number of thirty, left Florence, and arrived at Constantinople, February 1, 1440. The union thus formed was of very short duration. See GREEK

CHURCH. After their departure, the council continued its sittings; and in the next session, held September 4th, the fathers at Basle were declared to be heretics and schismatics. In the second, November 22d, a very long decree was made upon the subject of the union of the Armenians with the Roman Church. This decree runs in the name of the pope only. In the third, Mar. 23, 1440, the anti-pope Amadeus, whom the council at Basle had elected pope (Felix V), was declared to be a heretic and schismatic, and all his followers guilty of high treason; a promise of pardon being held out to those who should submit within fifty days. In the fourth session, 4th of February, 1441, a decree for the reunion of the Jacobites of Ethiopia with the Roman Church was published, signed by the pope and eight cardinals. Andrew, the deputy of John XI, the patriarch of Alexandria, received it in the name of the Ethiopian Jacobites. In the fifth session, 26th of April, 1442, the pope's proposal to transfer the council to Rome was agreed to, but only two sessions were held there, in which decrees for the union of the Syrians, Chaldeans, and Maronites with the see of Rome were drawn up" (Landon, *Manual of Councils*, s. v). On the return home of the Greeks, they found no welcome: Mark of Ephesus was held up as the true representative of orthodoxy, and the signers to the union were denounced as recreants. Most of those who had signed their names recanted, saying, "Alas! we have been seduced by distress, by fraud, and by the hopes and fears of a transitory life. The hand that has signed the union should be cut off, and the tongue that has pronounced the Latin creed deserves to be torn from the root."

*Literature.*—For the acts of the council (on the Latin side), see Hor. Justinianus, *Acta Concilii Florentini* (Rom. 1638, 3 parts fol.); Mansi, *Concilia*, v, ix; Labbe et Cossart, *Concil.* xiii, 223, 510, 1034; Harduin, *Concil.* ix. The acts are summed up in Semler, *Selecta Historiæ Eccles.* capit. iii, 140 sq. On the Greek side we have Sylvester Sguroplous (often written Syropoulos), *Ἀπομνημονεύματα, Vera Hist. unionis non vere inter Græcos et Latinos, s. Concilii Florent. narratio*; Gr. et Lat., ed. Rob. Creighton (Hague, 1660, fol.); in reply to which, Leo Allatius wrote *Exercit. in R. Creightonii apparatus*, etc. (Romæ, 1674, 1665, 4to). See also Schröckh, *Kirchengeschichte*, xxxiv, 388 sq.; Ffoulkes, *Christendom's Divisions* (Lond. 1867), ii, 332 sq.; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, bk. xiii, ch. xiv; Hefele, in *Tübing. Quartal-Schrift*, 1847, 183 sq.; Grier, *Epitome of Councils* (Dublin, 1827, 8vo), ch. xxvi; *The History of the Council of Florence translated by Basil Popoff*, ed. by J. M. Neale (Lond. 1861, 12mo); Cunningham, *Historical Theology*, i, 468 sq.; Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism*, bk. iii, ch. iii.

**Florentius Radewins**, successor of Gerhard Groot as director of the Brethren of the Common Life (q. v.), was born at Leerdam in 1350. He became M.A. at the University of Prague, and on his return to Holland came under the influence of Gerhard, and became his close friend, and a leader among the Brethren. He died A.D. 1400. His life was written by Thomas à Kempis (*Vita Florentii*, in *Opera Omnia*, ed. 1635, vol. iii). See Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation*, ii, 82 sq. See BRETUREN.

**Florian**. 1. A martyr (saint in the Roman Catholic Church), was the son of Christian parents of Celia, and served in the Roman army at the time of the emperor Dioclesian. When the prefect Aquilinus went to Loreh to search for Christians, Florian voluntarily confessed his faith and was drowned in the Enns. A pious matron, Valeria, in pursuance of a vision, had his corpse buried at the place where subsequently the monastery of St. Florian was erected. Later, his relics were taken to Rome, and in 1183 pope Lucius III sent them to king Casimir, of Poland, and bishop Gedeon, of Cracow. Thus he became the patron saint

of Poland. He is commemorated on the 4th of March. As he is particularly invoked by those in danger of fire, he is represented in Christian art with a vessel extinguishing flames.

2. One of the most celebrated Augustinian monasteries of Austria. It was erected over the grave of St. Florian (see FLORIAN, 1) in the 6th century, and built anew in 1713.—Stülz, *Gesch. des regulären Chorherren-Stiftes St. Florian* (Linz, 1835). (A. J. S.)

**Florida**, a diocese of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States coextensive with the state of the same name. It was organized in 1838. The first bishop was Francis Huger Rutledge, D.D., a native of South Carolina, consecrated in 1851; died at Tallahassee Nov. 4, 1866. He was succeeded by John Freeman Young, consecrated July 25, 1867. From 1862 to 1865 Florida belonged to the "General Council of the Confederate States of America." In 1868 the diocese counted 16 clergymen, 14 parishes, and 738 communicants. (A. J. S.)

**Florinians**, a sect in the 2d century who inclined to the views of the Valentinians. They were so named from Florinus, a Roman presbyter who was deposed by Eleutherius. His views are only to be gathered from a letter of Irenæus and from a passage in Eusebius (v, 20). It appears that Florinus at first pushed monarchianism so far as to make God the author of evil; and afterwards, on the other extreme, in connection with the peculiar dogmas of Valentinus, Florinus maintained that light and darkness were two eternal principles from which all the good and evil respectively in the universe had proceeded.—Neander, *Ch. Hist.* i, 680; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* i, 408. See VALENTINIANS.

**Floris**, JOACHIM OF. See JOACHIM.

**Florus**, **Drepanius** (commonly called FLORUS DIACONUS or MAGISTER), a deacon of the Church of Lyons in the 9th century, noted especially for the share he took in the disputes with Gottschale and Johannus Scotus, and also between Agobard and Amalarius. Against the former he wrote (A.D. 852) *Liber de Predestinatione contra Joh. Scoti erron. definitiones*. He asserts a twofold predestination, or, rather, predestination under a twofold aspect: a gratuitous predestination of the elect to grace and glory, and a predestination of the reprobate to damnation for their sins, which they commit by their own free will; and maintains that, though our free will can choose that which is good, yet it never would choose, or do it, if it were not assisted by the grace of Jesus Christ. And to explain this, he makes use of the comparison of a sick man, of whom we may say that he may recover his health, although he hath need of physic to restore it; or of a dead man, that he may be raised, but by the divine power. In like manner, saith he, the free will being distempered, and dead, by the sin of the first man, may be revived, but not by its own virtue, but by the grace and power of God, who hath pity on it, which Florus understands not only of that grace which is necessary for actions, but of that also which is necessary to seek conversion by prayer, and begin to do well. "While he censured Scotus on account of his abuse of the worldly sciences, he did not suffer himself to be so far misled by the zeal of the polemic as to discard them as useless in themselves to theology; but he had the discretion to distinguish the right use of them, in investigating truth, from that abuse. He only demanded that everything should be tried by the test of the sacred Scriptures. But, at the same time, he declared that, in order rightly to understand and apply Scripture truth, it was not enough to study the letter alone, but that the inward illumination of a Christian temper was also required. The holy Scriptures themselves could not be rightly understood and profitably read unless faith in Christ first existed in the heart of the reader, so that the truth might be

rightly apprehended by means of that, or unless faith in Christ was truly sought, and found in them by the light which cometh from above." This, and his tract *De Actione Missarum*, and *De electionibus Episcoporum*, may be found in *Bib. Max. Patr.* tom. xv; the *Opusc. ad. Amalarium* in *Martene et Durand*, collect. ix, p. 577. He compiled, chiefly from Augustine, a *Comm. in Omnes Pauli Epistolas*, which was published as Beda's until Mabillon showed it to be Florus's. All his extant writings are given in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* cxix, 1-423.—Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. ix, pt. ii, ch. ii, n. 45; Hook, *Ecol. Biog.* v, 153; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, tom. v; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* (Torrey), iii, 489; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacrés* (Paris, 1862), xii, 478 sq.

**Florus**, **Gessius** (Grecized Γέσιος Φλώρος by Josephus), sometimes with the prænomén *Festus* or *Cestius*, a native of Clazomenæ, appointed procurator of Judea, A.D. 64, in place of Albinus, by Nero, through the influence of his wife Cleopatra with Poppæa, the empress. His rule was marked with such unprecedented rapine and violence as to drive the Jews into their final rebellion (Tacit. *Hist.* v, 10), a result apparently intended by him in order to cover his own enormities (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 1, 6; xx, 11, 1; *War.* ii, 14). He took a bribe at Cæsarea from the Jews for protecting them in their synagogue worship, and then abandoned them to the fury of the Greeks, imprisoning those who came to supplicate his promised protection. He massacred and impaled Jewish citizens of rank at pleasure, and publicly derided their efforts to secure the intervention of Cestius Gallus, proconsul of Syria, in their favor. His term ended with the Jewish insurrection, A.D. 65, in which he was superseded by Vespasian, or perhaps perished (Josephus, *Life*, 6; *Ant.* xiv, 9, 2; xx, 9, 5; *War.* ii, 15; Suetonius, *Vesp.* iv; Orosius, vii, 9; Sulpic. Sev. *Sacr. Hist.* ii, 42; Eusebius, *Chron.* lxxvi).—Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s. v. See GOVERNOR.

**Flote**. See FLOAT.

**Flour** stands in the Auth. Vers. as the representative of the following Heb. words: כֶּמֶח (ke'mach, literally *marrow* [see FAT], Judg. vi, 19; 1 Sam. i, 24; xxvii, 24; 2 Sam. xvii, 28, *meal*, as it is elsewhere rendered), סוֹלֶת (so'leth, from *stripping off* the hull, the finest and purest part of the meal, usually rendered "fine flour," Sept. and N. Test. *σπιρίδις*, Rev. xviii, 18), and בַּטֶּשֶׁק (batsek', from its *swelling* in rising, 2 Sam. xiii, 18, *dough* as it is elsewhere rendered). See MEAL.

In early times corn was often eaten whole without any preparation at all (Deut. xxiii, 25), and the custom was not entirely disused in the time of our Saviour (Matt. xii, 1). Parching it afterwards became so general that the words which properly mean parched were also used for corn or meal (Ruth ii, 14; 2 Sam. xvii, 28). See PARCHED CORN. Mortars were used in the time of Moses for bruising corn, as was also the mill (Numb. xi, 8). See MORTAR. Fine meal, that is, corn or grain ground or beaten fine, is spoken of as far back as the time of Abraham (Gen. xviii, 6). At first, barley alone was ground, but afterwards wheat, as only the poor used barley. Barley-bread appears to have been more suitable in the warm climate of the East than in a colder climate. See BREAD. On the second day, however, it becomes insipid and rough to the palate, as is likewise the case with wheaten bread; hence the necessity of baking every day, and hence also the daily grinding at the mills about evening alluded to by the prophet Jeremiah (xxv, 10). See MILL. The flour, being mingled with water, was reduced to a solid mass in a sort of wooden tray or kneading-trough (q. v.); this, after remaining a little time, was kneaded, some leaven being also added to it (Exod. xii, 34). See LEAVEN. In case it was necessary to prepare the bread very hastily, the leaven

was left out (Gen. xviii, 6; xix, 3). The cakes, when made, were round, and nine or ten inches in diameter, and often not thicker than a knife.—Jahn, *Archæol.* § 137-140. See CAKE. Fine flour was especially offered by the poor as a sin-offering (Lev. v, 11-13), and in connection with other sacrifices in general (Numb. xv, 3-12; xxviii, 7-29). See OFFERING.

**Flower** (usually some form of the kindred roots פָּרַח and פָּרַח, to *glitter*, and hence to *blossom*; Sept. and N. T. ἀνθος), a generic term, not designating any particular species. Flowers grow in great variety and abundance in Palestine, and from the month of January to May the groves and meadows are adorned with the blossoms of different species of wild plants. Travellers have noticed different species of anemone, ranunculus, crocus, tulip, narcissus, hyacinth, lily, violet, aster, pink, iris, asphodel, daffodil, crowfoot, wind-flower, willow-herb, hyssop, dragon-wort, periwinkle, squill, the spiked veronica, white clover, and a flower resembling the hollyhock, and several others, which, by their variety and multitude, perfume the air, and yield a very lovely prospect. The rose of Sharon, which is not properly a rose, but a cistus, white or red, grows abundantly; also the rose of Jericho, though not properly so, grows spontaneously, particularly near the Dead Sea and the Jordan. The celebrated henna plant abounds in several places. With the jasmine, as well as with the vine, the people ornament the alleys and the arbors of their gardens. Burckhardt noticed the pretty red flower of the nomen plant, which abounds in all the valleys of Sinai, and is also seen among the most barren granitic rocks of the mountains (see Tyas, *Flowers of Holy Land*, Lond. n. l.). See PALESTINE.

Flowers in the Bible are not treated from a scientific point of view. Very few species are mentioned; and, although their beauty is once or twice alluded to in descriptive passages (sometimes under the general term "grass," Matt. vi, 38; Cant. ii, 12; v, 13), they are seldom introduced, except in the single pathetic analogy which they afford to the transitory life and glory of mankind (Job xiv, 2; Psa. ciii, 15; Isa. xxviii, 1; xl, 6; Jas. i, 10; 1 Pet. i, 24). See BOTANY. The ancient Egyptians were exceedingly fond of flowers, and they are often represented on the monuments (see Wilkinson, i, 19, 37, 57, 78, 141, 257, etc.). Gardens (פָּרַח, פָּרַח, פָּרַח, παράδεισος) were in use among Orientals from the earliest times (Gen. xiii, 10; Deut. xi, 12, etc.); but, although they were planted with flowers and fragrant herbs (Cant. vi, 2; iv, 16), often chosen for their beauty and rarity (Isa. xvii, 10), yet they appear to have been chiefly cultivated for useful and culinary purposes (Jer. xxix, 5; Cant. vi, 11; iv, 13; Deut. viii, 8, etc.). See GARDEN.

**Flower** (פָּרַח, *pe'rach*, a bud, Isa. xviii, 5; Numb. xvii, 8, as just *bursting* open into a blossom, Isa. v, 24; Nah. i, 4) is used to describe the floral ornaments of the golden candelabrum (Exod. xxv, 31 sq.; xxxvii, 17; 1 Kings vii, 26), and also the artificial lily-ornaments around the edge of the great laver (1 Kings vii, 26; 2 Chron. iv, 5) in the tabernacle and Temple. See CANDLESTICK, GOLDEN; BRAZEN SEA.

**Flowers** (פָּרַח, *niddah'*, uncleanness, as often elsewhere rendered) stands in Lev. xv, 21, 33, for the menstrual discharge of females.

**Flowers.** (1.) It was an ancient practice to strew flowers on graves. Jerome bestows the following commendation on Pammachius: "While other husbands throw thorns, lilies, violets, roses, and purple flowers upon the graves of their wives, our Pammachius waters the bones and holy ashes of his wife with the balsam of alms. With these perfumes and odors he solaces the ashes of the dead that lie at rest" (*Epist.* 26). (2.) The practice of decorating churches with flowers is very common in the Roman, and some of

the Protestant churches of the Continent, and exists in various parts of England. It probably arose out of a desire to "honor the first-fruits" of nature's most beautiful productions, and may therefore be retained among things in themselves indifferent. The modern Ritualists, however, carry this, as other things, to excess.—Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. xxiii, chap. iii, § 20; Walcot, *Sacred Archaeology*, p. 280; Barrett, *Flowers and Festivals, or Directions for the Floral Decoration of Churches* (London, 1868).

**Floy, JAMES, D.D.**, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in the city of New York Aug. 20, 1806. He received his academical education at Columbia College, New York, but left college before graduating, and went to London, where he was for some time a student of botany and horticulture at the Royal Botanical Gardens. Returning to New York, he became a clerk in the Methodist Publishing House. In 1831 he joined the Bowery Village (now Seventh Street) Methodist Episcopal Church, and for some time acted as teacher and superintendent of a Sunday-school for colored persons under the care of that church. He was also appointed a class-leader; was licensed to preach in February, 1833; was received into the travelling ministry as a probationer at the New York Conference of 1835, and appointed to Riverhead, Long Island, N. Y. His subsequent appointments were: 1836-37, Hempstead Circuit; 1837-39, Harlem Mission. He was an earnest abolitionist at a time when abolitionism cost a man something; and in 1838 he was censured by his Conference for attending an abolition Convention. He lived to see his principles triumph both in Church and State. At the Conference for 1839 he was ordained elder, and appointed to Kortright Circuit, Delaware County, N. Y., but, on account of the illness of his wife, he was released from the appointment. From 1840 to 1842 he was at Washington-street Church, Brooklyn; 1842-44, Danbury, Conn.; 1844-46, Madison Street, New York; 1847-48, Middletown, Conn.; 1848-50, New Haven, Conn.; 1850-52, Madison Street, New York, second time; 1852-54, Twenty-seventh Street, New York; 1854-56, presiding elder of New York District; 1856-60, editor of National Magazine and Secretary of the Tract Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church; 1861-63, Seventh Street, New York; 1863, Beekman Hill, New York. Three times his Conference elected him a delegate to the General Conference. His appointments during the twenty-four years of his pastoral life strongly indicate the high appreciation that was held of his merits; and it is believed that he never failed to leave any charge better than when he came to it. He also took a lively interest in the general affairs of the Church; was diligent in his attendance on the sessions of his Conference, where his influence was always potent. As assistant secretary and secretary, he kept the Conference journals fourteen years. In 1848 he received the degree of D.D. from the Wesleyan University. As a preacher, he was clear, direct, and earnest; eminently evangelical in doctrine; in exhortation, pungent and effective; elevated in matter, and rigidly correct in style and manner. His death was sudden. On the evening of Oct. 14, 1863, in his study, with only a son with him, he was seized with apoplexy, and expired almost instantly. Dr. Floy was a man of powerful personal character, and of vigorous as well as acute intellect. His critical faculty was largely developed; his personal culture was careful and thorough; his English style was pure and clear to a rare degree. For twenty years he was a contributor to the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, and some of the best articles in that journal are from his pen. He was devoted to Sunday-schools, and wrote several books for the use of the schools, among them *Harry Budd*, a very successful juvenile tale. One of his most important labors was the editing of the *Methodist Hymn-book*, a task assigned to a committee, of which Dr. Floy was the

most active member, by the General Conference of 1849. The Hymn-book now in use owes its comprehensiveness and general excellence largely to Dr. Floyd. He edited the posthumous works of Dr. Olin (q. v.). After his death appeared his *Old Testament Characters delineated and illustrated* (N. York, 12mo).—*Occasional Sermons, Reviews, and Essays* (N. Y. 12mo).—Curry, in *Methodist Quarterly Review*, January, 1864, article vi; Woodruff, in *The Ladies Repository*, July, 1865, art. i; *Minutes of the Annual Conferences*, 1864, p. 88.

**Floyd, JOHN**, an English Jesuit, was born in Cambridgeshire. He became a Jesuit on the Continent in 1593, and returned to England as a missionary. He was afterwards banished, and was employed by his superiors to teach polite literature and divinity at St. Omer and Louvain. The time of his death is not known. He was involved in controversies with Chillingworth, Antonius de Dominis, Crashaw, Sir Edward Hobby, and other Protestants, in which he assumed the names of *Daniel à Jesu*, *Hermannus Lamelius*, and *Annosus Fidelis Verimontanus*. Under these names he wrote *Synopsis Apostasie M. A. de Dominis* (Antwerp, 1617, 8vo):—*Detectio Hypocrisis M. A. de Dominis* (1619, 8vo):—*The Church Conquerant over human Wit*, against Chillingworth (St. Omer, 1631, 4to):—*The Total Sum*, against the same (1639, 4to):—*Answer to William Crashaw* (1612, 4to):—*A Treatise of Purgatory*, in answer to Sir Edward Hobby (1613).—*Alegambe, De Script. Frat. Jesu*; Hook, *Eccl. Biog.* v, 154.

**Fludd, ROBERT** (Latin, *DE FLUCTIBUS*), an English physician and theosophist, was born at Millgate, in Kent, in 1574. He was educated at Oxford, and afterwards travelled on the Continent, where he became a Rosicrucian (q. v.). Returning to England, he became M.D., and practised in London, devoting himself also to the study of the natural sciences, in which he showed rare aptitudes. He was also a zealous student of the occult sciences. He died at London Sept. 8, 1637. He was a man of real genius. Kepler and Gassendi thought it worth while to write against him. Fludd's works were published in Latin at Oppenheim, 1617-33, 6 vols. folio. His *Mosaical Philosophy, grounded upon the essential Truth or eternal Sapience* (Lond. 1659, fol.), is translated from the Latin text. See Rich, *Biog. Dictionary*; Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Philosophiæ*; Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*. See THEOSOPHY.

**Flüe, NIKOLAUS VON DER**, also known under the name of *Brother Klaus*, was born at Flüeli, in the canton of Unterwalden, Switzerland, March 21, 1417. He was religiously educated, and was early distinguished for his asceticism, while, at the same time, he neglected none of his social duties. He served in the army with distinction, and afterwards was nineteen years councillor of state and judge. His countrymen would have appointed him to the highest offices, but he declined, and, resigning even his function of judge, he left his family Oct. 16, 1467, barefooted, bareheaded, and coarsely clad, to withdraw from the world entirely, and live in the wilderness. He settled among the Alps, where he is said to have lived for twenty years without touching any food except the consecrated wafer brought to him by the priest. The people erected a chapel for him, and he gained great renown. After 1477 he began preaching in the chapel. In 1481 he suddenly appeared at a diet of the eight cantons, which at that time composed the Swiss Confederation, held at Slanz, and by an effective address averted the threatening disruption of the Confederation. He died March 21, 1487. He was canonized in 1669 by Clement IX.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* iv, 431; Piper, *Evang. Kalender*, 1851; Goldlin von Tiefenau, *Geist und Leben des heil. Bruders Klaus* (2d edit. Lucerne, 1808); Businger, *Bruder Klaus in sein Zeitalter* (Lucerne, 1827); Schneller, *Ueber Nicolaus von der Flüe* (Einsied. 1852). There are also biographies by

Wysing, Weissenbach, Herzog, Widmer, Geiger, and G. Göres.

**Flute** (מַשְׁרוּקָה, *mashrokitha'*, from its hissing or whistling sound; Theodot. σὺφιάξ, a *pipe*), a musical instrument, mentioned among others (Dan. iii, 5, 7, 10, 15) as used at the worship of the golden image which Nebuchadnezzar had set up. (Comp. the αὐλός of 1 Esdr. v, 2, as a Persian instrument.) According to the author of *Shilte-Haggiborim*, this instrument was sometimes made of a great number of pipes—a statement which, if correct, would make its name the Chaldee for the musical instrument called in Hebrew מַשְׁרָף, *ugab'*, and erroneously rendered in the A. V. "organ."—Smith, s. v. See PIPE.


There is notice taken in the Gospels of players on the flute (*αὐλητής*, "minstrel"), who were collected at funerals (Matt. ix, 23, 24). The Rabbins say that it was not allowable to have less than two players on the flute at the funeral of persons of the meanest condition, besides a professional woman hired to lament; and Josephus relates that, a false report of his death being spread at Jerusalem, several persons hired players on the flute by way of preparation for his funeral. In the Old Testament, however, we see nothing like it. The Jews probably borrowed the custom from the Romans. When it was an old woman who died they used trumpets, but flutes when a young woman was to be buried.—Calmet, s. v. See FUNERAL.

Flutes, or rather *flageolets*, were very early in use in ancient Egypt, where they were of various forms and lengths, both single and double, with different numbers of holes, and used by players of both sexes.



Ancient Egyptian Flutes.

So also among the Greeks and Romans these instruments were common (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* i, 126 sq., abridgm.; Kitto, *Pictorial Bible*, note on Dan. iii, 10).



Ancient Roman Double Flutes.


They are likewise frequent in the modern East (Lane's *Egyptians*, ii, 82). See MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS.




Modern Egyptian Nay or Flute.

**Flutes or Flutings**, curved channels cut perpendicularly in the shafts of columns of classical architecture. In the Doric order the column has twenty flutes, separated by a sharp edge. In the Ionic, Corinthian, and Composite there are twenty-four, sepa-

rated by a small fillet. Spiral flutes occur in some classical, and in early Romanesque architecture. Flutes also occur, but rarely, in pillars and pilasters of Gothic buildings. (G. F. C.)



Doric.



Ionic.

**Flux, BLOODY** (*δυσεντερία*, Acts xxviii, 8), the same as our *dysentery*, which in the East is, though sometimes sporadic, generally epidemic (as in the case of the Asiatic cholera), and then assumes its worst form. It is always attended with fever (q. v.), frequently in an intermittent form, the presence of which Luke, with professional accuracy, intimates by the plural (*πυρετοί*) in the above case of Publius. A sharp gnawing and burning sensation seizes the bowels, which give off in purging much slimy matter and purulent discharge. When blood flows it is said to be less dangerous than without it (Schmidt, *Bibl. Medic.* c. xiv, p. 503-507). King Jehoram's disease is thought by Dr. Mead to have been a chronic dysentery, and the "bowels falling out" the *prolapsus ani*, known sometimes to ensue (2 Chron. xxi, 15, 19).—Smith, s. v. See DISEASE.

**Fly** is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of two Heb. words. (Egli has a curious article on the name of the butterfly among the Hebrews, in the *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theologie*, Jena, 1864, i.) See ANT; BEE; FLEA; GNAT; HORNET; LICE; LOCUST; SCORPION, etc.

1. *Zebub'* (זְבֻבִי; Sept. *μῦια*, Vulg. *musca*) occurs only in two passages (comp. Wisd. xvi, 9; xix, 10), namely, Eccles. x, 1, "Dead *zebum* cause the ointment of the apothecary to send forth a stinking savor," and in Isa. vii, 18, where it is said, "The Lord shall hiss for the *zebug* that is in the uttermost part of the rivers of Egypt." The Heb. name, it is probable, is a generic one for any insect, but the etymology is a matter of doubt (see Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 401; *Heb. and Chald. Lex.* s. v.; and Fürst, *Heb. Concord.* s. v.). The word *zebug*, fly, enters as an element into the name originally appropriated to an idol worshipped at Ekron, Baalzebug (2 Kings i, 2); but, according to the English version and the Vulgate, in the time of our Lord applied to the prince of *dæmons*, interchangeable with "Satan" (Matt. xii, 24, 26, 27). This "lord of flies" corresponds to the *Ζεὺς ἀπόμυιας* of the Greeks and Romans, as if a defender from flies (see Kitto, *Pict. Bible*, note on 2 Kings i, 2). The Greek in the New Testament reads Beelzebul (*Βεελ-ζεβοὺλ*, which is said to mean "lord of dung" instead of "lord of flies," and has been considered as one of those contemptuous puns which the Jews were in the habit of making by slight changes of letters. There might be a peculiar sting in this particular case, from the circumstance that flies are chiefly bred in dunghills, and many species do greatly congregate thither; hence the deity in question, being confessedly a "lord of flies," must *ipso facto* be a "dungy lord." One of the names by which "idols" are expressed in the Old Testament is זְבֻבִים, *gillulim'*, which has the closest affinity with זְבֻבִים, *ge'el*, dung. The margin of the English Bible, indeed, gives "dungy gods" as the rendering of this word in Deut. xxix, 17. See BEELZEBUL.



Silver Coin of Aradus, with a figure of a Fly.

chiefly of the family *Muscivora*, getting into vessels of ointment or other substances; even in this country we know what an intolerable annoyance the house-flies are in a hot summer when they abound, crawling everywhere and into everything; but in the East the nuisance is tenfold greater. There the common house-flies (*Musca domestica*) swarm in immense numbers; and though they inflict no physical injury, yet, from their continual settling on the face, they are inexpressibly annoying (Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* IV, ii, 420 sq.; Kussel, *Aleppo*, ii, 123 sq.; Tavernier, i, 74; compare Prosp. Alp. *Descr. Egypt.* iv, 3, p. 207). In Egypt the peasants are so subject to a virulent kind of ophthalmia that almost every second person is said to be affected with it, and multitudes are blind of either one or both eyes. The complaint is greatly augmented by the constant presence of the flies, which congregate around the diseased eyes, attracted by the moisture which exudes; and so useless is it to drive them away, that the miserable people submit to the infliction, and little children are seen with their eyes margined with rows of black flies, of whose presence they appear unconscious, though presenting a most painful sight to Europeans (Lorent. p. 25, 48; compare Forskal, *Descr. Anim.* p. 85; Rosenmüller, in Bochart's *Hierez.* iii, 342). The "ointment of the apothecary," composed of substances perhaps peculiarly attractive to these impudent intruders, would be likely to become choked up with their entangled bodies, which, corrupting, would be the more offensive for their contrast with the expected odor. Thus would little follies render despicable him who had a reputation for wisdom. The man is the ointment, his reputation the perfume, his little folly the dead fly, his disgrace the stinking savor. See UNGUENT.

In the other passage, the *zebug* from the rivers of Egypt has by some writers, as by Oedmann (*Vermisch. Samm.* vi, 79), been identified with the *zimb* of which Bruce (*Trav.* v, 190) gives a description, and which is evidently some species of *Tabanus*. Sir G. Wilkinson has given some account (*Transac. of the Entomological Soc.* ii, p. 183) of an injurious fly under the name of *altheab*, a term almost identical with *zebug*. It would not do to press too much upon this point when it is considered that Egypt abounds with noxious insects; but it must be allowed that there is some reason for this identification; and though, as was stated above, *zebug* is probably a generic name for any flies, in this passage of Isaiah it may be used to denote some very troublesome and injurious fly, *κατ' ἰξοχῆν*. "The *altheab* is a long gray fly which comes out about the rise of the Nile, and is like the *cleg* of the north of England; it abounds in calm hot weather, and is often met with in June and July, both in the desert and on the Nile." This insect is very injurious to camels, and causes their death if the disease which it generates is neglected; it attacks both man and beast. The phrase hissing, or, rather, *histing*, for the fly (Isa. vii, 18) is explained in the article BEE.

2. *Arob'* (אַרֹב; Sept. *κνῆμυια*, Vulg. *omne genus muscarum, musce diversi generis, musca gravissima*; but in *Psa. canomyia*; A. V. "swarms of flies," "divers sorts of flies"), the name of the insect or insects which God sent to punish Pharaoh (Exod. viii, 21-31; see *Psa.* lxxviii, 45; cv, 31). The question as to what particular insect is denoted by *arob*, or whether any one species is to be understood by it, has long been a matter of dispute. The scriptural details are as follows: the *arob* filled the houses of the Egyptians, they covered the ground, they lighted on the people, the land was laid waste on their account. From the expression in ver. 31, "there remained not one," some writers have concluded that the Heb. word points to some definite species; we do not think, however, that much stress ought to be laid upon this argument; if the *arob* be taken to denote "swarms," as the A. V.

renders it, the "not one remaining" may surely have for its antecedent an individual fly understood in the collective "swarms." The Sept. explain *arob* by *κνρόμια*, i. e. "dog-fly;" it is not very clear what insect is meant by the Greek term, which is frequent in Homer, who often uses it as an abusive epithet. Thus he represents Mars as applying the epithet to Minerva for instigating the gods to quarrel (*Il.* xxi, 394). It is also referred to as an insect by Elian, who, in describing the *myops*, *tabanus*, or horse-fly, says it is similar to what is called the *κνρόμια* (*Hist. Anim.* iv, 51). Philo, in his *Life of Moses* (i, 23, p. 401, ed. Mangey), expressly describes it as a biting insidious creature, which comes like a dart, with great noise, and, rushing with great impetuosity on the skin, sticks to it most tenaciously. It seems likely that Jerome, in translating Exodus, derived the word from *מִצְרָה*, "to mingle," and understood by it a mixture of noxious creatures, as did Josephus, Aquila, and all the ancient translators. The diversity of Jerome's renderings in Exodus, however, betokens his uncertainty, and in the Psalms he has adopted that of the Septuagint. More modern writers, reasoning on other senses of the Hebrew word, which are somewhat numerous, have proposed several different insects. Thus one of the meanings of *מִצְרָה* is "to darken," and Mouffet observes that the name *cynomyia* agrees with no kind of flies better than with those black, large, compressed flies which boldly beset cattle, and not only obtain ichor, as other flies, but also suck out blood from beneath, and occasion great pain. He observes that they have no proboscis, but, instead of it, have double sets of teeth, like wasps, which they infix deeply in the skin; and adds that they greatly infest the ears of dogs (*Theat. Insect.* xi). Pliny describes an insect of this kind (*Hist. Nat.* xi, 40); so also Columella (vii, 13). (See Pliny by Grandsagne and Cuvier, Parisii, 1828, ii, 461, note.) But the ancient naturalists generally describe the *cynomyia* as a sort of whame-fly (*Tabanus*), which might include both senses, for this genus is most impudently pertinacious in its assaults, spares neither man nor

son to restrict the *arob* to any one family. "Of insects," says Sonnini (*Trav.* iii, 199), "the most troublesome in Egypt are flies; both man and beast are cruelly tormented with them. No idea can be formed of their obstinate rapacity. It is in vain to drive them away; they return again in the self-same moment, and their perseverance wearies out the most patient spirit." The *arob* may include various species of *Culicidae* (gnats), such as the musquito, if it is necessary to interpret the "devouring" nature of the *arob* (in *Psa.* lxxviii, 45) in a strictly literal sense; though the expression used by the Psalmist is not inapplicable to the flies, which even to this day in Egypt may be regarded as a "plague," and which are the great instrument of spreading the well-known ophthalmia, this being conveyed from one individual to another by these dreadful pests; or the literal meaning of the *arob* "devouring" the Egyptians may be understood in its fullest sense of the *Muscidae* if we suppose that the people may have been punished by the larvae gaining admittance into the bodies, as into the stomach, frontal sinus, and intestines, and so occasioning in a hot climate many instances of death (see, for cases of *Myasis* produced by *Dipterous larvae*, *Transactions of Entomol. Soc.* ii, 266-269). See GNAT.

The identification of the *arob* with the cockroach (*Blatta Orientalis*), which Oedmann (*Vern. Sam.* pt. ii, c. 7) suggests, and which Kirby (*Bridgw. Treat.* ii, 357) adopts, has nothing at all to recommend it, and is purely gratuitous, as Mr. Hope proved in 1837 in a paper on this subject in the *Trans. Ent. Soc.* ii, 179-183. The error of calling the cockroach a beetle, and the confusion which has been made between it and the sacred beetle of Egypt (*Ateuchus sacer*), has recently been repeated by M. Kalisch (*Hist. and Crit. Comment.* Exod. l. c.). The cockroach, as Mr. Hope remarks, is a nocturnal insect, and prowls about for food at night; "but what reason have we to believe that the fly attacked the Egyptians by night and not by day?" The miracle involved in the plague of flies consisted, partly at least, in the creature being brought against the Egyptians in so great an abundance during winter. Possibly, however, the better rendering of the Hebrew would be beetles. (See Wibel's treatise, *Ueber der Arob*, in the "*Frühaufgeseene Früchte*," 1738, p. 244.)—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.; Fairbairn, s. v. See BETLE.

**Flying buttress**, in Gothic architecture, a buttress extended above the wall of the side aisles, or other outer wall, and connected with the wall of the clerestory, or of a tower, by a portion of an arch, to afford lateral support.

**Fo, Foë** (or *Fu*), the Chinese name for Buddha (the first syllable of *Fo-l'a* or *Fu-l'a*—Buddha). See Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, ii, 74, 84, 95; and the articles **BUDDHISM**; **CHINA** (ii, 249); **FU-HE**; **LAMAISM**.

**Foal** (רִפְיָה, *a'yir*, or simply רִפְיָה, the son of an ass, *Zech.* ix, 9, as *νιός* in *Matt.* xxi, 5), an ass's colt (*Gen.* xxxii, 15; *xlix*, 11). See **ASS**; **COLT**.

**Foam** occurs as a translation of *קִפְיָה* (*ke'feseh*, something broken): in *Ios.* x, 7, "As for Samaria, her king is cut off as the foam upon the water," after the *Vulg. spuma*. The Sept. doubtless gives the correct sense, *φρίγγανον*, a dry twig or splinter. Horsley (*Comment.* in loc.) renders "bubble."

"Foam" is the true meaning of *ἀφρός*, *froth* (*Luke* ix, 39; with its derivatives in *Mark* ix, 18, 20; *Jude* 13).

**Fodder** (לֶחֶם, *bellil*, *Job* vi, 5; *xxiv*, 6; *Isa.* xxx, 24). In the second passage in *Job* this word is rendered in our version "corn;" the margin gives "mingled corn or dredge;" in that of *Isaiah* it is rendered "provender." The word properly signifies a mixture, a *medley*. Gesenius (*Heb. Lex.*) says, "The two latter passages are most clearly understood by a reference



*Tabanus Alpivus.*

beast, gorges itself to bursting with blood, infusing an irritating venom at the same time, and occurs, in suitable localities even in our own climate, in immense numbers. If the *arob* was composed of one or more species of *Tabanidae*, miraculously augmented in numbers, and preternaturally induced to penetrate into the houses, such a visitation would be a plague of no slight intensity, even supposing their blood-thirstiness and pertinacity, individually considered, to be of no higher standard than we are accustomed to see. It is not improbable that one of the *Hippoboscidae*, perhaps *H. equina*, Linn., is the *κνρόμια* of Elian (*N. A.* iv, 51), though Homer may have used the compound term to denote extreme impudence, implied by the shamelessness of the dog and the teasing impertinence of the common fly (*Musca*). As the *arob* are said to have filled the houses of the Egyptians, it seems not improbable that common flies (*Muscidae*) are more especially intended, and that the compound *κνρόμια* denotes the grievous nature of the plague, though we see no rea-



to the Roman *farrago* (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.*), consisting of barley or oats, mixed with vetches and beans, which were sown and reaped together."

**Foggini**, PIETRO FRANCESCO, an Italian archæologist, was born in 1713 at Florence, devoted himself to the Church, and was made doctor at Pisa. In 1741 he published *De primis Florentinorum Apostolis*, and an edition of Virgil (Florence, 4to). In 1742 Foggini accepted an invitation from Bottari, second librarian of the Vatican, to come to Rome, where Benedict XIV gave him a place in the pontifical academy of history, and made him sub-librarian at the Vatican. In 1775 he succeeded Bottari as librarian. He died at Rome May 31, 1783. He devoted great part of his life to the study of the MSS. of the Vatican; and published, besides the works already mentioned, Epiphanius, *De XII gemmis*, etc. (Rome, 1743, 4to):—Epiphanius Salomo, *Comment. in Cant.* (Rome, 1750, 4to):—*Appendix Historiæ Byzantiæ* (Rome, 1777).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xviii, 35.

**Fo-hi**. See FUN-HE.


**Fold** (properly גִּדְרָה, *gederah'*, a place walled in, Numb. xxxii, 16, 24, 36; ἀλι, a court-yard, John x, 1, 16; also מִקְלָה, *miklah'*, a place shut up, Hab. iii, 17; Psa. l, 9; lxxviii, 70; whereas דֹּבֵר, *dober'*, Isa. v, 17; Mic. ii, 12; and נֶאֱכָה, *neveh'*, 2 Sam. vii, 8; 1 Chron. xvii, 7; Isa. lxxv, 10; Jer. xxiii, 3; Ezek. xxv, 5; xxxiv, 14, signify pasture, and ποιμνῆ, John x, 16, the flock itself), a small enclosure for flocks to rest together (Isa. xiii, 20). It appears that, before the shearing, the sheep were collected together into an uncovered enclosure (ἀλι), surrounded by a wall (John x, 11, 16). The object of this is that the wool may be rendered finer by the sweating and evaporation which necessarily result from the flock being thus crowded together. These are the sheepfolds mentioned in Numb. xxx, 16; xxv, 36; 2 Sam. vii, 8; Zeph. ii, 6, etc. No other kind than this are used in the East (Jahn, *Archæol.* § 46). See PASTURAGE. Such an enclosure, open above, was often made of hurdles, in which, during the summer months, the flocks are kept by night or at noon. They were usually divided into two parts for the different kinds of flocks, i. e. sheep and goats (Judg. v, 16). See FLOCK. The gentlemen forming the Scotch Mission of Inquiry to the Jews in 1839, when at Eshtaol, observed, "Many large flocks of sheep and goats were coming into the village, and we followed the footsteps of the flocks in order to see where they were lodged all night. We found the dwellings to be merely cottages of mud, with a door, and sometimes also a window, into a court-yard. In this yard the flocks were lying down, while the villagers were spreading their mats to rest within. Small mud walls formed frail partitions to keep separate the larger and smaller cattle, for oxen, horses, and camels were in some of these enclosures." In the East it is common for shepherds to make use of ruined edifices to shelter their flocks from the heat of the middle of the day and from the dangers of the night. Thus it was prophesied of the cities of Ammon, Aroer, and Judæa that they should be couching-places for flocks (Ezek. xxv, 5; Isa. xvii, 2; xxxii, 14). But Babylon was to be visited with a far greater desolation, and to become unfit even for such a purpose (Isa. xiii, 19). The peculiar expression in Psa. lxxviii, 13, "Though ye have lien among the pots," or, according to J. D. Michaelis, "drinking-troughs" or "water-troughs," would be better rendered, "Though ye have lien among the folds." See POT. To lie among the folds, says Gesenius, seems to be spoken proverbially of shepherds and husbandmen living in leisure and quiet. In John x, 16, the Jews and Gentiles are represented under the image of two different flocks enclosed in different folds. See SHEEP.

**Follen**, CHARLES THEODORE CHRISTIAN, LL.D., III.—Q q

a Unitarian minister, was born at Romrod, Hesse-Darmstadt, September 4, 1796. He was educated at the Gymnasium and University of Giessen, which last he entered in 1813. After the battle of Leipsic he entered the army as a volunteer against the domination of Napoleon. In 1815 he returned to the university, and received his degree of doctor of laws in 1817. In 1819 he lectured on the Pandects and the Roman law in Jena; but he had incurred the hatred of the government for his advocacy of freedom, and in 1820 he retired to Switzerland. In 1821 he was appointed lecturer at the University of Basle, but in 1824 the governments of Russia, Prussia, and Austria demanded his surrender as a political prisoner. He was advised to depart, and, after various adventures and escapes, reached New-York January 12, 1825. He was soon after appointed professor of German at Harvard, and in 1828 was made professor of Church History in the theological school at Cambridge. He engaged at an early period with all his heart in the American anti-slavery movement, a course which alienated some of his friends, and hindered his advancement. He finally became pastor of a Unitarian church in East Lexington, Mass. On the night of Jan. 13, 1840, he perished in the burning of the steamer Lexington in Long Island Sound. He was a thorough scholar, and a man of the purest principles, and of courageous devotion to them. His writings were published after his death by his widow, under the title, *The Works of Charles Follen, with a Memoir of his Life* (Bost. 1841, 5 vols. 12mo).—*Christian Examiner*, 1842, p. 33; Sprague, *Unitar. Pulpit*, p. 588.

**Folly**. See FOOT.


**Font** (baptismal), the vessel containing the water for baptism. It was for some time the custom to baptize in or near flowing streams of water. Then baptisteries were erected outside of churches. Properly speaking, the baptistery was the building in which baptism was performed; and the vessel in which it was performed was called in Greek κολυμβηθρα, in Latin *psicina*. At a later period the vessel for baptism was placed in the church, and called *fons*, font or fountain. Fonts finally came to be generally made as



Font, Swaton, Lincolnshire, 1310 (Chambers).

vases of stone, elevated three or four feet from the floor, supported by a stone standard, and usually placed before the altar. They were frequently lined with silver, lead, or brass, and were usually adorned with ornamental work in the same style as the church edifice, or with bas-reliefs of scriptural scenes. In form, the early fonts were sometimes round, and sometimes built in the shape of a cross or of a tombstone (Rom. vii). At first fonts were covered simply with a lid. These were later enlarged into high and highly-ornamented pinnacles or spires.—Bingham, *Orig. Eccles. bk.*

viii, chap. vii; Parker, *Glossary of Architecture*, s. v.; Martigny, *Dictionnaire des antiquités Chrétiennes*.



Font, St. Mildred's, Canterbury (Parker).

**Fonseca, PEDRO DA**, a Jesuit and metaphysician, was born at Cortizada, Portugal, 1528. He entered the order in 1548, and in a few years was made professor of philosophy at Coimbra, and afterwards professor of theology at Evora. He obtained the name of the "Portuguese Aristotle." He stood high in the favor of king Philip II and of pope Gregory XIII. He died Nov. 4, 1599. He was the first who publicly taught the doctrine relative to the divine prescience known as *scientia media*, and which was discussed long and furiously between the adherents of Molina (who was a pupil of Fonseca) and the Dominicans. See PRESCIENCE. Among his works are *Commentarii in Aristotelem* (4 vols., often reprinted):—*Institutiones Dialecticæ* (Lisbon, 1564):—*De concord. providentiæ et gratiæ Dei cum libero arbit. hom.* (Lisb. 1588).—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xviii, 81.

**Fonte Avellana**, ORDER OF, a monastic order of the Roman Catholic Church. The name is derived from the desert of Fonte Avellana, near Faenza, where the first monastery of the order was established in 1001 by Ludolf, subsequently bishop of Eugubio. The best known member of this order is the abbot Peter Damiani (q. v.), under whom it made considerable progress. Little is known of its subsequent history, except that it greatly degenerated. In 1570, cardinal Jules de la Rovère, who had been appointed by pope Pius V abbot *in commendam* of the abbey of Fonte Avellana, caused the monks to unite with the Camaldulenses.—Helyot; Migne, *Dict. des Ordres Religieux*, s. v. Font-Avellane. (A. J. S.)

**Fontein, PIETER**, was born in 1708. He enjoyed the instructions of the celebrated Tiberius Hemsterhuis and Albert Schultens. His taste for the literature of antiquity was developed under their able tuition. His first charge was a Baptist congregation in Rotterdam, to which he was called in 1732. Here he labored seven years. From this field of labor he was

transferred to a similar one in Amsterdam, where he remained till his death, which occurred in 1788 or 1789. The literary taste acquired in early life he continued to cultivate. He became an uncommon proficient in Greek and Roman literature. He edited the *Characteres Ethicæ* of Theophrastus according to a Florentine MS. He was on terms of friendly intercourse with the most eminent scholars of the age. His library, containing the best editions of the Greek and Roman classics, and enriched with the stores of patristic, theological, and philosophical literature, was bequeathed to the Baptist church in Amsterdam. By this bequest, which served for the foundation of the valuable library of the Baptists in that city, he conferred a great and lasting benefit on the cause of theological education. See Glasius, *Godgeleerd Nederland*, i Deel, blz. 470; also Blaupot ten Cate, *Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in Holland enz.* ii Deel, blz. 156 verv.; S. Muller, *Geschiedenis van het onderwijs in de theologie by de Nederl. Doopsgezinden*, blz. 70. (J. P. W.)

**Fontenay, PIERRE CLAUDE**, a Jesuit, was born at Paris in 1683. He became rector of the college at Orleans, but was recalled to Paris to continue Longueval's *Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane*, of which he wrote vols. ix, x. He died at La Flèche, Oct. 15, 1742.—Migne, *Dict. de Biog. Chrétienne*, s. v.

**Fontévrault**, ORDER OF (*Ordo Frontis Ebraldii*), a monastic order of the Roman Catholic Church, founded at the close of the 11th century by Robert of Arbrissel [see ARBRISSEL], who in the forest of Craon united a number of hermits under the rule of St. Augustine. The number of members rapidly increased, and Arbrissel had to establish several convents for men and women. The latter were divided into three different establishments, namely, 1 (*Le Grand Montier*), for virgins and widows; 2 (*St. Lazarus*), for lepers and other sick people; 3 (*St. Magdalen*), for fallen women who wished to reform. The whole order



Monk of Fontévrault.

Monk of Fontévrault.

was devoted to the glorification of the Virgin Mary, and the men of the order were placed under the supreme jurisdiction of the abbot of Fontévrault, who became the general of the whole order. Here, a relative of the duke of Bretagne, was the first abbot; Petronella, baroness of Chemillé, her assistant. The order was confirmed by pope Paschal II (in 1106, and again in 1113). After the death of the founder, the number of convents gradually rose to about sixty, all of which, with the exception of a few in Spain and England, were in France. The history of the order presents no facts of importance; it soon degenerated to an even higher degree than the majority of the mediæval orders. Attempts to reform it were made by the abbesses Maria of Bretagne (1477), Renate of Bourbon

(1507), and Antoinette of Orleans (1571 to 1608), but they had no lasting results. The whole order perished during the French Revolution; the last abbess, Julie Sophie Charlotte de Pardaillan, died in Paris in 1799. No attempt has since been made to revive it.—Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iv, 109; Helyot (ed. Migne), *Ordres Religieux*, s. v.; Honoré Niquet, *Hist. de l'Ordre de Font.* (Angres, 1586). (A. J. S.)

**Food** (represented by several Heb. and Gr. words [especially some derivative of the verb  $\text{אָכַל}$ , *akal*, to eat], which are variously rendered in the A. V.). Compare VICTUALS.

**I. Materials.**—The original grant of the Creator made over to man the use of the vegetable world for food (Gen. i, 29), with the exception of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (Gen. ii, 17), and, as some hold, also, the tree of life (iii, 22). So long as man continued in Paradise, he doubtless restricted his choice of food within the limits thus defined; but whether, as is commonly stated, we are to regard this as characteristic of the entire period between the creation of Adam and the grant of animal food to Noah after the flood (Gen. ix, iii), admits of doubt. It is doing no violence to the passage last cited to view it rather in the light of an ordinance intended to regulate a practice already in use, than as containing the first permission of that practice; and when we consider that man is, by his original constitution, omnivorous, that there are special adaptations in his frame, as made by God, for the use of animal food, that from the beginning he was acquainted with the use of fire, that from the beginning there was a distinction known to him between clean and unclean animals (Gen. vii, 2, 8), corresponding apparently to a distinction between animals good for food and animals not so, and that the pastoral was as early as the agricultural occupation among men, it seems more probable than otherwise that the use of animal food was not unknown to the antediluvians. Perhaps some fierce or cruel custom connected with the use of raw flesh, such as Bruce found in his day among the Abyssinians, and such as Moses glances at (Exod. xii, 9), may have prevailed among the more barbarous and ferocious of the antediluvians; and it may have been in order to check this that the communication recorded in Gen. ix, 2-5, was made to Noah. It is not, however, to be overlooked that, in the traditions of antiquity, the early age of the world was represented as one in which men did not use animal food (Diod. Sic. i, 43; ii, 38; Ovid, *Metam.* i, 101 sq.; xv, 96 sq.; *Fast.* iv., 395 sq.).

In the Patriarchal age the food of the ancestors of the Hebrews comprised the flesh of animals both tame and wild, as well as the cereals. We read of their using not only cakes of fine meal, but also milk and butter, and the flesh of the calf, the kid, and game taken by hunting (Gen. xviii, 6-8; xxvii, 3, 4). They used also leguminous food, and a preparation of lentiles seems to have been a customary and favorite dish with them (Gen. xxv, 34). They made use also of honey (either honey of bees or sirup of grapes), spices, nuts, and almonds (Gen. xliii, 11).

During their residence in Egypt the Israelites shared in the abundance of that land; there they "sat by the flesh-pots, and did eat bread to the full" (Exod. xvi, 3); and amid the privations of the wilderness they remembered with regret and murmuring "the fish which they did eat in Egypt freely (the abundance of fish in Egypt is attested by Diod. Sic. i, 34, 36; and Ælian, *De Nat. Anim.* x, 43), the cucumbers and the melons, and the leeks, and the onions, and the garlic" (Numb. xi, 5). These vegetable products have always formed an important part of the food of the people of Egypt; and the abundant use also of animal food by them is sufficiently attested by the monuments (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* ii, 367-374).

In their passage through the wilderness, the want

of the ordinary materials of food was miraculously supplied to the Israelites by the manna. As it was of importance that their flocks and herds should not be wholly consumed or even greatly reduced before their entering on the promised land, they seem to have been placed under restrictions in the use of animal food, though this was not forbidden (Lev. xvii, 3 sq.); and when their longing for this food broke out into rebellious murmurs, a supply was sent to them by means of large flocks of a species of partridge very much in use in the East (Exod. xvi, 11-13; Numb. xi, 31; comp. Diod. Sic. i, 60).

When they reached the promised land, "the land flowing with milk and honey," abundance of all kinds of food awaited the favored people. The rich pastures of Palestine enabled them to rear and maintain large flocks and herds; game of various kinds was abundant in the more mountainous and uninhabited districts; fish was largely supplied by the rivers and inland seas, and seems to have been used to a considerable extent (2 Chron. xxxiii, 14; Neh. iii, 3; Matt. vii, 10; xiv, 17; xv, 34; Luke xxiv, 42; John xxi, 6-14), so that the destruction of it was represented as a special judgment from God (Isa. i, 2; Hos. iv, 3; Zeph. i, 3). See FISH. In the Mosaic code express regulations are laid down as to the kinds of animals that may be used in food (Lev. xi; Deut. xiv). Those expressly permitted are, of *beasts*, the ox, the sheep, the goat, the hart, the roebuck, the fallow-deer, the wild goat, the pygarg, the wild ox, the chamois, and, in general, every beast that parteth the hoof and cleaveth the cleft into two claws [that is, where the hoof is completely parted, and each part is separately cased in bone], and cleweth the cud; of *fish*, all that have scales and fins; of *fowls*, all clean birds, that is, all except the carnivorous and piscivorous birds; of *insects*, the locust, the bald locust, the beetle, and the grasshopper. Whether the Hebrews attended to the rearing of gallinaceous fowls remains a matter of doubt. See COCK.

Besides animals declared to be unclean, the Israelites were forbidden to use as food anything which had been consecrated to idols (Exod. xxxiv, 15); animals which had died of disease or been torn by wild beasts (Exod. xxii, 31; Lev. xxii, 8; comp. Ezek. iv, 14), and certain parts of animals, viz. the blood (Lev. xxvii, 10; xix, 26; Deut. xii, 16-23), the fat covering the intestines, the kidneys, and the fat covering them, the fat of any part of the ox, or sheep, or goat, especially the fat tail of certain sheep (Exod. xxix, 13-22; Lev. iii, 4-9, 10; ix, 19). They were also forbidden to use any food or liquids occupying a vessel into which the dead body of any unclean beast had fallen, as well as all food and liquids which had stood uncovered in the apartment of a dead or dying person (Numb. xix, 15). The eating of a kid boiled in the milk or fat of its mother was also prohibited (Exod. xxiii, 19; xxxiv, 26; Deut. xiv, 21). These restrictions rested chiefly, doubtless, on religious and theocratic grounds [see FAT], but for some of them reasons of a sanitary kind may also have existed. It belonged to the essence of the theocratic system that the people should be constantly surrounded by what reminded them of their separation to Jehovah, and the need of keeping themselves free from all that would level or lower the distinction between them and the nations around them. For this reason specific restrictions were laid upon their diet, which were not attended to by other nations, nor were always insisted on in the case of strangers dwelling within their bounds (Deut. xiv, 21). This does not, however, preclude our admitting that reasons of a social or political kind may also have conspired to render these restrictions desirable. In warm climates the importance of avoiding contagion rendered the utmost caution necessary in handling whatever may have been exposed to the influence of a corpse; and it is well known that the use of adipose matter in

food requires, in such climates, to be restricted within narrow limits. The peculiar prohibition of a kid boiled in its mother's milk was ordained probably for the purpose of avoiding conformity to some idolatrous usage, or for the purpose generally of encouraging humane feelings on the part of the Israelites towards their domesticated animals (Spencer, *De Legg. Hebr.* *Rituall.* bk. ii, ch. viii; Michaelis, *Mos. Recht.* iv, 200). See CLEAN.

Subject to these restrictions, the Israelites were free to use for food all the produce of their fertile and favored land. "Thou shalt bestow thy money," said God to them, "for whatsoever thy soul lusteth after, for oxen, or for sheep, or for wine, or for strong drink, and thou shalt eat thereof before the Lord thy God, and thou shalt rejoice, thou and thy household" (Deut. xiv, 26). In the enumeration of blessings conferred by God on Israel, we find "honey out of the rock, and oil out of the flinty rock, butter of kine, and milk of sheep, with fat of lambs, and rams of the breed of Bashan, and goats, with the fat of kidneys of wheat," specified as among his free gifts to his people (Deut. xxxii, 13, 14). Though allowed this wide range, however, of animal food, the Hebrews do not seem in ordinary life to have availed themselves of it. The usual food of the people appears to have consisted of milk and its preparations, honey, bread, and vegetables of various sorts; and only at the royal table was animal food in daily use (1 Kings iv, 23; Neh. v, 18). The animals commonly used for food were *cabees* (Gen. xviii, 7; 1 Sam. xxviii, 24; Amos vi, 4): these were fattened for the purpose, and hence were called *fattlings*, or *fatted calves* (*μασχάς σιτηρός*, Luke xv, 23; *σιτιστάς*, Matt. xxii, 4); *lumbs*, 2 Sam. xii, 4; Amos vi, 4); *sheep* (1 Sam. xiv, 34; xxv, 18; 1 Kings iv, 23); *oxen* stall-fed, or from the pastures (1 Kings i, 9; iv, 23; 2 Chron. xviii, 2; Matt. xxii, 4); *fatted cattle* (*שׂוֹמֵרֵי*, a particular kind of the bovine genus peculiar to Bashan, supposed by some to be a species of buffalo or ure-ox, but not to be confounded with the fattening or fatted calf above mentioned, 2 Sam. vi, 13; 1 Kings i, 9; Amos v, 22; Ezek. xxxix, 18); *kids* (1 Sam. xvi, 20); and various kinds of game, such as the *ayil*, the *tsébi*, and the *gachmur* (1 Kings v, 3 [iv, 23, A. V.]). The articles brought by Abigail to David were bread, sheep, parched [roasted] corn, raisins, and figs (1 Sam. xxv, 18); when Ziba met David on his flight from Absalom he brought to him bread, raisins, and summer fruits (2 Sam. xvi, 1); and the present of Barzillai to the king consisted of wheat, barley, flour, roasted corn, beans, lentils, honey, butter, sheep, and cheese (2 Sam. xvii, 28). We may presume from this that these formed the principal articles of food among the Jews at this time. Besides raisins or grapes dried in the sun, they used grapes pressed into cakes (*שֵׁמֶרֶט*); they had also fig-cakes (*שֵׁמֶרֶט*). On special occasions they probably indulged in more costly viands; in times of famine they resorted even to very vile food; in seasons of affliction they abstained from all delicacies, and even sometimes from all food; and to prisoners the food allowed seems to have been only bread and water (1 Kings xxii, 27; Jer. xxxvii, 21).

Besides the vegetables above mentioned, the Jews were acquainted with the melon, the cucumber, the mallow, the leek, the onion, garlic, and bitter herbs. In Job vi, 6, mention is made of *שֵׁמֶרֶט*, which Gesenius would translate *purslain-stone*, or *purslain-broth*—something extremely insipid (*Thesaur.* p. 480). The reasons he gives for this are not without force, but cannot be held conclusive. The A. V. "white of an egg," follows the Rabbinical interpretation, which Rosenmüller, Ewald, etc., also approve; Lee (ad verb.) and Fürst prefer understanding it of the whey of curdled milk; Rénan translates it *le jus de la mauve*.

The *drinks* of the Hebrews were, besides water, which was their ordinary beverage, milk, wine, and

*שֵׁמֶרֶט*, which in the A. V. is rendered *strong drink*. To give the water a stronger relish, they probably sometimes dissolved a portion of fig-cake in it, according to the fashion of the Arabs at the present day (Niebuhr, *Arab.* p. 57). The wines used were of various sorts, and sometimes their effect was strengthened by mingling different kinds together, or by the mixture with them of drugs (Psa. lxxv, 9; Prov. ix, 23, 30; Isa. v, 22). A species of delicacy seems to have been furnished by "spiced wines," that is, wines flavored by aromatic herbs, or perhaps simply by the juice of the pomegranate (Cant. viii, 2). No mention is made in Scripture of the mixing of water with wine for the purpose of drinking it; the reference in Isa. i, 22 being to the adulteration of wine by fraudulent dealers; but the habit was so common in ancient times (comp. *Odys.* i, 110; ix, 208 sq.; Hippocrates, *De Morb.* iii, 30; Lucian, *Asin.* vii; Plin. *II. Nat.* xxiii, 22) that we can hardly doubt that it was known also among the Hebrews. See WINE. Vinegar, *שֵׁמֶרֶט*, was also used by them as a means of quenching thirst (Ruth ii, 14; Num. vi, 3); mixed with oil, this is still a favorite in the East, and mixed with water, it was drunk by the Roman soldiers and poor under the name of *posca* (Pliny, *II. Nat.* xix, 29; xxii, 58; Plantus, *Mil. Glor.* iii, 2, 23). See DRINK.

The Hebrews made use of condiments to heighten the flavor of their dishes, as well as of spices to increase the effect of their wines. Besides the general condiment salt, they used cumin, dill, mint, coriander, rue, mustard, and the seeds of an herb to which they gave the name of *שֵׁמֶרֶט*, "fitches." Sometimes their made dishes were so richly flavored that the nature of the meat used could not be discovered (Gen. xxvii, 9, 25). Besides myrrh, with which they flavored their wines, the Hebrews used various odoriferous products; but whether they used any of these with food is uncertain. See AROMATICS.

II. *Methods of Preparation.*—The early acquaintance of the race with the use of fire renders it probable that from the beginning men used some process of cooking in the preparation of their food, except in the case of such products as are more agreeable to the palate in a crude than in a concocted state. The cereals were sometimes eaten raw (Lev. xxiii, 11; Deut. xxiii, 25; 2 Kings iv, 42; Matt. xii, 1); but from an early period it was customary to roast the grains, and so prepare them for food (Lev. ii, 14; comp. Robinson, *Bib. Res.* ii, 394). This received the name of *שֵׁמֶרֶט* (more fully *שֵׁמֶרֶט* *שֵׁמֶרֶט* *שֵׁמֶרֶט*) and *שֵׁמֶרֶט*, A. V. "parched corn;" and was eaten either dry or formed into a sort of porridge, perhaps something after the manner of the *pilaw* in the East at the present day. This was not peculiar to the Hebrews; even as late as the time of Virgil roasting was a recognised method of preparing corn for use (*Georg.* i, 267), though this may have been only preparatory to bruising it (comp. Servius on *Æn.* i, 179; Pliny, *II. N.* xviii, 18, 23). For the preparation and kinds of bread in use among the Hebrews, see BREAD and MILL.

Vegetables were cooked by boiling, and seem to have been made into a pottage (*שֵׁמֶרֶט*, the Niph. part. of *בָּרַב*, to boil, Gen. xxv, 50, 34; 2 Kings iv, 38, 39), probably strengthened by the addition of some oily substance, such as butter or fat, or by having bones and gristles boiled down with them, as is still customary in the East (Shaw, *Travels*, p. 125, cited by Jahn, *Archæol.* I, ii, 190).

When animal food was to be used, the animal was killed in such a way as to allow all the blood to leave the carcase, in order scrupulously to observe the prohibition, Exod. xxii, 31. Among the modern Jews, this is accomplished by cutting the throat of the animal quite through, and then suspending the carcase so as to allow all the blood to run out; the entrails with

the fat are removed, the nerves and veins extracted, and strict search is made lest any drop of blood should be allowed to remain in any part (Buxtorf, *Syn. Jud.* ch. xxvii). The flesh, thus prepared for cooking, was commonly boiled in water (עֲבָדָה, Piel of עָבַד), probably also sometimes in milk, as is still the case among the Arabs. Before being put into the pot, the flesh, freed from the skin, appears to have been cut into small pieces, or perhaps this was done during the process of cooking (Mic. iii, 3; comp. Hitzig, ad loc.). The broth and the flesh were served up separately (Judg. vi, 15), and both were eaten with bread. Salt was used to season the food; spices were also occasionally introduced, and highly flavored dishes were sometimes prepared (Ezek. xxiv, 10; Gen. xxvii, 4; Prov. xxiii, 3). For boiling, the pot or caldron was used; and the fuel was commonly wood, especially thorns (Eccles. vii, 6; Psa. lviii, 9; Isa. xliv, 16; Ezek. xxiv, 10), sometimes the dried excrement of animals (Ezek. iv, 15), a species of fuel still much used in the East (Irby and Mangles's *Travels*, p. 172; Rae Wilson's *Travels*, ii, 156; Hue's *Travels*, passim). Food was also prepared by *roasting* (רָאָה). This was regarded as the more luxurious mode of preparation, and was resorted to chiefly on festive occasions. The paschal lamb was to be roasted whole (Exod. xii, 4, 6), but it does not appear that this was the usual method of roasting flesh; it is more probable that the ancient Hebrews, like the modern Arabs, roasted their meat in small portions by means of short spits of wood or metal placed near the fire, and turned as the process of cooking required (comp. *Odys.* iii, 461-2, etc.; *Il.* i, 465, etc.). Birds were roasted whole on such a spit. The Persians roast lambs and calves entire by placing them in an oven (Tavernier, i, 269; Chardin, iii, 88), and this may also have prevailed among the Hebrews. Among the poor, locusts were eaten roasted, as is still common among the Arabs, whose method of cooking them is as follows: the feet and wings having been plucked off, and the entrails taken out, the body is salted, and then roasted by means of a wooden spit, on which a row of bodies similarly prepared are strung. Fish were usually broiled (Luke xxiv, 42; John xxi, 9), but it would seem that they were sometimes cured, or at least brought into a state in which they could be used without farther cooking (Matt. xiv, 17, 19; xv, 34, 36). In either case they were eaten with bread.

In primitive times the mistress of the house presided over the cooking of the food, as the master of the house charged himself with the slaughtering of the animals required (Gen. xviii, 6, 8; Judg. vi, 19; comp. *Il.* xxiv, 622, and *Odys.* ii, 300). Among the Egyptians, servants who were professional cooks took charge of preparing the food (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* ii, 382 sq.); and in later times among the Hebrews similar functionaries were employed, both male and female (עֲבָדָה, 1 Sam. ix, 23, 24; עֲבָדָה, 1 Sam. viii, 13). The culinary utensils were עֲבָדָה, a deep pan (Numb. xi, 8; Judg. vi, 19; 1 Sam. ii, 14); עֲבָדָה, a basin or pan (Exod. xxx, 18; 1 Sam. ii, 14; עֲבָדָה, עֲבָדָה, סָפֶה, עֲבָדָה, an iron pan; עֲבָדָה, a frying-pan (Lev. ii, 5-7; vii, 9); עֲבָדָה, pans (1 Chron. ix, 31); עֲבָדָה, a fork or flesh-hook with which flesh was drawn from the pot (1 Sam. ii, 13, 14), and perhaps the flesh separated from the bones in the pot (Mich. iii, 3); עֲבָדָה, a word of doubtful significance, rendered by the Septuagint ὀπίσθε (Lev. xi, 34), by the Syr. *place of pots*, by Gesenius *range for pots*, by Fürst *hearth* for cooking, consisting of two rows of stones meeting at an angle, by Rosemüller a place in the hearth under which was fire, and on the surface of which were orifices, over which pots were placed, and by Knobel an earthenware stew-pan (Ravius, *De re cibaria vet. Heb.* Traj. ad Rhen. 1768; Pareau, *Antiq.*

*Hebr.* p. 388 sq.; Jahn, *Archäologie*, I, ii, 167 sq.; Wilkinson, *Anc. Egyptians*, ii, chap. 5-7).—Kitto, s. v. See *COOK*.

**Food, Spiritual**, "an expression found in two places in the 'Order for the Holy Communion' in the English Church service, to signify the sustenance which the soul receives from the sacrifice of the flesh and blood, that is, the offering up of the life of the Son of man ('for the blood,' says Moses, 'is the life') to atone for the sins of the world, and to redeem us from everlasting death. Some have maintained from those words of our Lord, 'This is my body,' that the literal, material flesh and blood of Christ are, in some sense, received in the communion; while others see clearly that the Church of England, at least, has taken special pains to guard against and exclude such a notion, both in the above passages, and by the language of the 88th Article of Religion. The opponents of the 'material' view contend also that literal flesh and blood 'cannot be *spiritually* received,' or 'refresh the soul.'"—Eelen, *Churchman's Dict.* s. v. See *TRANSUBSTANTIATION*.

**Fool** (represented by several Hebrew and Greek words, especially עֲבָדָה, *nabal*, ἄφρων). The "fool" of Scripture is not an idiot, but an absurd person; not one who does not reason at all, but one who reasons wrong; also any one whose conduct is not regulated by the dictates of reason and religion (Psa. xiv, 1). Foolishness, therefore, is not a negative condition, but a condition of wrong action in the intellectual or sentient being, or in both (2 Sam. xiii, 12, 13; Psa. xxxviii, 5). In the book of Proverbs, however, "foolishness" appears to be sometimes used for lack of understanding, although more generally for perverseness of will. The phrase "Thou fool" (Matt. v, 22) implies not only angry temper, by which such severe language is prompted, but a scornful, contemptuous feeling, utterly inconsistent with the love and meekness which characterize disciples of Christ, and of course exposing the individual who is under its influence to eternal punishment. See *WISDOM*.

**Fools, Feast of.** See *FEAST OF FOOLS*.

**Foot** (properly עֲבָדָה, *re'gel*, πῶς). Of the various senses in which the word "foot" is used in Scripture, the following are the most remarkable. Such phrases as the "slipping" of the foot, the "stumbling" of the foot, "from head to foot" (to express the entire body), and "footsteps" (to express tendencies, as when we say of one that he walks in another's footsteps), require no explanation, being common to most languages.

The extreme modesty of the Hebrew language, which has perhaps seldom been sufficiently appreciated, dictated the use of the word "feet" to express the parts and the acts which it is not allowed to name. Hence such phrases as the "hair of the feet," the "water of the feet," "between the feet," "to open the feet," "to cover the feet," all of which are sufficiently intelligible, except perhaps the last, which certainly does not mean "going to sleep," as some interpreters suggest, but "to dismiss the refuse of nature."

"To be under any one's feet" denotes the subordination of a subject to his sovereign, or of a servant to his master (Psa. viii, 6; comp. Heb. ii, 8; 1 Cor. xv, 26); and was doubtless derived from the symbolical action of conquerors, who set their feet upon the neck or body of the chiefs whom they had vanquished, in token of their triumph. This custom is expressly mentioned in Scripture (Josh. x, 23), and is figured on the monuments of Egypt, Persia, and Rome. See *TRUMPH*.

In like manner, "to be at any one's feet" is used for being at the service of any one, following him, or willingly receiving his instructions (Judg. iv, 10). The last passage, in which Paul is described as being brought up "at the feet of Gamaliel," will appear still clearer if we understand that, as the Jewish writers

allege, pupils actually did sit on the floor before, and therefore at the feet of, the doctors of the law, who themselves were raised on an elevated seat. See DISCIPLE.

"Lameness of feet" generally denotes affliction or calamity, as in Psa. xxxv, 15; xxxviii, 18; Jer. xx, 10; Mich. iv, 6, 7; Zech. iii, 9. See LAME.

"To set one's foot" in a place signifies to take possession of it, as in Deut. i, 26; xi, 34, and elsewhere.

"To water with the feet" (Deut. xi, 10) implies that the soil was watered with as much ease as a garden, in which the small channels for irrigation may be tamed, etc., with the foot. See GARDEN.

An elegant phrase, borrowed from the feet, occurs in Gal. ii, 14, where Paul says, "When I saw that they walked not uprightly," *οὐκ ὀρθοποδοῦντες*, literally, "not with a straight foot," or "did not foot it straightly."

Nakedness of feet expressed mourning (Ezek. xxiv, 17). This must mean appearing abroad with naked feet, for there is reason to think that the Jews never used their sandals or shoes within doors. The modern Orientals consider it disrespectful to enter a room without taking off the outer covering of their feet. It is with them equivalent to uncovering the head among Europeans. The practice of feet-washing implies a similar usage among the Hebrews. See ABLUTION; WASHING. Uncovering the feet was also a mark of adoration. Moses put off his sandals to approach the burning bush where the presence of God was manifested (Exod. iii, 5). Among the modern Orientals it would be regarded as the height of profanation to enter a place of worship with covered feet. The Egyptian priests officiated barefoot; and most commentators are of opinion that the Aaronite priests served with bare feet in the tabernacle, as, according to all the Jewish writers, they afterwards did in the Temple, and as the frequent washings of their feet enjoined by the law seem to imply. See SANDALS.

The passage, "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth glad tidings, that publisheth peace" (Isa. lii, 7), appears to signify that, although the feet of messengers and travellers are usually rendered disagreeable by the soil and dust of the way, yet the feet of these blessed messengers seemed, notwithstanding, even beautiful, on account of the glad tidings which they bore (see Wemyss, *Symbol. Dict.* s. v.).—Kitto, s. v.

**Foot**, JOSEPH IVES, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, and president of Washington College, Tenn., was born at Watertown, Conn., Nov. 17, 1796, and graduated at Union College in 1821. Having passed through the usual theological course at Andover, he was licensed in 1824, and ordained as an evangelist, when he went to South Carolina, and labored successfully for some months. Returning to New England, he preached for some time at Boston, and at a later period was called to the Congregational church at West Brookfield, Mass. From this charge he obtained a dismission in 1831 on account of ill health, and in 1833 accepted a call from Salina, N. Y., where he continued for two years, and then accepted a call to Cortlandt. Here he opposed with much ability the system of perfectionism then prevalent, on which he wrote an able article in the *Literary and Theological Review* (1834). In 1837 he removed to Westport, Conn., and while there he joined the Presbyterian Church, with which he remained connected during his life. In 1839 he accepted a call to the Presbyterian church of Knoxville, Tenn. He was connected with the Presbyteries of Bedford and Geneva, and with the Old-school Church, and while at Knoxville was elected to the presidency of Washington College. He was on his way to be inaugurated as president of the college when he was killed by a fall from his horse, April 20, 1840. He published *The prominent Trait in Teachers of false Religion* (1828);—*A historical Discourse* (1828);—*Ser-*

*mons on Intemperance* (1828);—*Three Sermons on Perfectionism* (1834). A *Memoir*, with a selection from his MS. sermons, was published by his brother (1841, 8vo).—Sprague, *Annals*, iv, 669.

**Foot, Kissing of the Pope's.** The kissing of the feet of rulers was an Oriental mode of testifying reverence or subjection. It was also done in the West to some, at least, of the Roman emperors: Dioclesian is said to have had gans fastened to his shoes, that the honor of kissing his feet might be more willingly paid. It was introduced as a sign of reverence for the pope of Rome at some date not precisely known. In defence of this practice, the Roman writers adduce an early usage of the sort in favor of all bishops; but it was kissing of the hand, not of the foot, that seems to have been the usage (Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. ii, ch. ix). The first example of an emperor kissing the pope's foot is that of Justin with the foot of pope John I, A.D. 525. It is now practised (1) after the election of a new pope, when all the cardinals kiss his foot; (2) on the election of a new cardinal, when he kisses the pope's foot, formally, in sign of homage and submission; (3) at public audiences of the pope, when persons presented kiss his foot. Protestants are not required to perform this homage when presented. A crucifix is fastened to the slipper, that the act of adoration may be interpreted as paid to Christ in the person of his so-called vicar.

**Footman**, a word employed in the A. V. in two senses. See RUNNER. 1. Generally, to distinguish those of the people or of the fighting-men who went on foot from those who were on animals or in chariots. The Hebrew word for this is רַגְלִי, *ragli*, from *regel*, a foot. The Sept. commonly expresses it by *πεζοι*, or occasionally *τάγματα*. It is a military term, designating the infantry of an army (1 Sam. iv, 10; xv, 4; 2 Sam. x, 6; Jer. xii, 5), or those simply who journeyed on foot, whether soldiers or not (Exod. xii, 37; Numb. xi, 21). In the latter case the word perhaps indicates the *male* portion of the company, those who walked while the females *rode*, like the Arabic *rajul*, a *man*. Sometimes it is joined with אָדָם, a *man* (Judg. xx, 2). See ARMY; RIDER.

2. The word occurs in a more special sense (in 1 Sam. xxii, 17) as the translation of a different term, *rats*, part. of רָצַח, to *run*. This passage affords the first mention of the existence of a body of swift runners in attendance on the king, though such a thing had been foretold by Samuel (1 Sam. viii, 11). This body appears to have been afterwards kept up, and to have been distinct from the body-guard—the six hundred and the thirty—who were originated by David (see 1 Kings xiv, 27, 28; 2 Chron. xii, 10, 11; 2 Kings xi, 4, 6, 11, 13, 19). In each of these cases the word is rendered "guard;" but the translators were evidently aware of its signification, for they have put the word "runners" in the margin in two instances (1 Kings xiv, 27; 2 Kings xi, 19). This, indeed, was the force of the term "footman" at the time the A. V. was made, as is plain not only from the references just quoted, but, among others, from the title of a well-known tract of Bunyan's, *The heavenly Footman, or a Description of the Man that gets to Heaven*, on 1 Cor. ix, 24 (the apostle Paul's figure of the race). The same Heb. word is also used elsewhere to denote the royal or praetorian guard (2 Sam. xv, 1; 1 Kings i, 5; 2 Kings x, 25). Whether they were the same as the *Peletites* is doubtful. The word likewise occurs (Job ix, 25) of any swift messenger, hence a weaver's *shuttle* (Job vii, 6), and also of the couriers of the Persian king (Esth. iii, 13, 15; viii, 14). Swift running was evidently a valued accomplishment of a perfect warrior—a *gibbor*, as the Hebrew word is—among the Israelites. There are constant allusions to this in the Bible, though obscured in the A. V. from the transla-

tors not recognising the technical sense of the word *gibbor*. Among others, see Psa. xix, 5; Job xvi, 14; Joel ii, 7, where "strong man," "giant," and "mighty man" are all *gibbor*. David was famed for his powers of arms; they are so mentioned as to seem characteristic of him (1 Sam. xvii, 22, 48, 51; xx, 6), and he makes them a special subject of thanksgiving to God (2 Sam. xxii, 30; Psa. xviii, 29). The cases of Cush and Ahimaa (2 Sam. xviii) will occur to every one. It is not impossible that the former—"the Ethiopian," as his name most likely is—had some peculiar mode of running. See CUSHI. Asahel also was "swift on his feet," and the Gadite heroes who came across to David in his difficulties were "swift as the roes upon the mountains;" but in neither of these last cases is the word rats employed. The word probably derives its modern sense from the custom of domestic servants running by the side of the carriage of their master.—Smith, s. v.; Kitto, s. v. See GUARD.

**Footsteps** (generally פְּעָמַי, *pa'am*, a tread; but spec. אֲכֵב', *akeb'*, Psa. lvi, 6; lxxvii, 19; lxxxix, 51; Cant. i, 8, the *heel*, as elsewhere rendered). On the meaning of this term in Psa. xvii, 5, 11, Mr. Roberts says, among the Hindus, "a man who has the people watching him, to find out a cause for accusation against him to the king, or to great men, says, Yes, they are around my legs and my feet; their eyes are always open; they are ever watching my *suaadu*, 'steps;' that is, they are looking for the impress or footsteps in the earth." For this purpose, the eyes of the enemies of David were "bowing down to the earth."

**Footstool** (spec. כִּסֵּא, *ke'esh*, something trodden upon; Sept. ἰσοπέδιον v. r. ἰσοπέδιον, Vulg. *scabellum*, 2 Chron. ix, 18). Where sitting is referred to in Scripture, it is frequently spoken of as a posture of more than ordinary state, and means sitting on a throne, for which a footstool was necessary, both in order that the person might ascend to it, and for supporting the legs when he was placed in it (2 Chron. ix, 18). The divine glory which resided symbolically in the holy place, between the cherubim above the ark of the covenant, is supposed to use the ark as a footstool (1 Chron. xxviii, 2; Psa. xcix, 5; cxxxii, 7). So the earth is called God's footstool by the same expressive figure which represents heaven as his throne (Psa. cx, 1; Isa. lxvi, 1; Matt. v, 35). We find, on the paintings in the tombs of Egypt, as well as on the Assyrian monuments, frequent representations of their kings sitting on a throne or chair of state, with a footstool. See THRONE. The common manner of sitting in the East is upon a mat or carpet spread upon the ground or floor, with the legs crossed. Many of the Turks, however, through European intercourse, attempt to sit upon chairs. See DIVAN.

**Foot-washing.** The custom of washing the feet held, in ancient times, a place among the duties of hospitality, being regarded as a mark of respect to the guest, and a token of humble and affectionate attention on the part of the entertainer. It had its origin in circumstances for the most part peculiar to the East. In general, in warm Oriental climes, cleanliness is of the highest consequence, particularly as a safeguard against the leprosy. The East knows nothing of the factitious distinctions which prevail among us between sanitary regulations and religious duties; but the one, as much as the other, are considered a part of that great system of obligations under which man lies towards God. What, therefore, the health demands, religion is at hand to sanction. Cleanliness is, in consequence, not next to godliness, but a part of godliness itself. As in this Oriental view may be found the origin and reason of much of what the Mosaic law lays down touching clean and unclean, so the practice of feet-washing in particular, which considerations of purity and personal propriety recommended,

hospitality adopted and religion sanctioned. In temperate climes bathing is far too much neglected; but in the East the heat of the atmosphere and the dryness of the soil would render the ablation of the body peculiarly desirable, and make feet-washing no less grateful than salutary to the weary traveller. The foot, too, was less protected than with us. In the earliest ages it probably had no covering, and the sandal worn in later times was little else than the sole of our shoe bound under the foot. Even this defence, however, was ordinarily laid aside on entering a house, in which the inmates were either barefoot or wore nothing but slippers. See SUEE.

The washing of the feet is among the most ancient, as well as the most obligatory, of the rites of Eastern hospitality. From Gen. xviii, 4; xix, 2, it appears to have existed as early as the days of the patriarch Abraham. In Gen. xxiv, 32, also, "Abraham's servant" is provided with water to wash his feet, and the men's feet that were with him. The same custom is mentioned in Judg. xix, 21. From 1 Sam. xxv, 41, it appears that the rite was sometimes performed by servants and sons, as their appropriate duty, regarded as of an humble character. Hence, in addition to its being a token of affectionate regard, it was a sign of humility. Vessels of no great value appear to have been ordinarily kept and appropriated to the purpose. These vessels would gain nothing in estimation from the lowly, if not mean office for which they were employed. Hence, probably, the explanation of Psa. lx, 8, "Moab is my wash-pot." Slaves, moreover, were commonly employed in washing the feet of guests. The passage, then, in effect, declares the Moabites to be the meanest of God's instruments. See WASH-POT.

The most remarkable instance of this custom is found in the 13th chapter of John's Gospel, where our Saviour is represented as washing the feet of his disciples, with whom he had taken supper. Minute particulars are given in the sacred narrative, which should be carefully studied, as presenting a true Oriental picture. From ver. 12 sq., it is clear that the act was of a symbolical nature, designed to teach, *à fortiori*, brotherly humility and good-will. If the master had performed for his scholars an act at once so lowly yet so needful, how much more were the disciples themselves bound to consider any Christian service whatever as a duty which each was to perform for the other. The principle involved in the particular act is, that love dignifies any service; that all high and proud thoughts are no less unchristian than selfish; and that the sole ground of honor in the Church of Christ is meek, gentle, and self-forgetting benevolence. It was specially customary in the days of our Lord to wash before eating (Matt. xv, 2; Luke xi, 38). This was also the practice with the ancient Greeks, as it may be seen in *Iliad*, x, 577. From Martial (*Epig.* iii, 50, 3, "Deposui soles"), we see it was usual to lay aside the shoes, lest they should soil the linen. The usage is still found among the Orientals (Niebuhr, i, 54; Shaw, p. 202). But Jesus did not pay a scrupulous regard to the practice, and hence drew blame upon himself from the Pharisees (Luke xi, 38). In this our Lord was probably influenced by the superstitious abuses and foolish misinterpretations connected with washing before meat. For the same reason he may purposely have postponed the act of washing his disciples' feet till after supper, lest, while he was teaching a new lesson of humility, he might add a sanction to current and baneful errors. See ABLETON. The union of affectionate attention and lowly service is found indicated by feet-washing in 1 Tim. v, 10, where, among the signs of the widows that were to be honored—supported, that is, at the expense of the Church—this is given, if any one "have washed the saints' feet."—Kitto, s. v. Washing. See WASHING OF HANDS AND FEET.

**FOOT-WASHING IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.** The use of sandals among the Eastern nations in-

instead of shoes, as well as the heat of the climate, gave rise to frequent ablutions, and especially of the feet. It became a duty of hospitality, and a mark of respect towards strangers. Abraham offered water to the three angels (Gen. xviii, 4) to wash their feet; Lot did the same to the two angels who visited him (Gen. xix, 2); Abigail to the messengers of David (1 Sam. xxv, 41). The Pharisee Simon gave Jesus no water for his feet (Luke vii, 44), and Mary Magdalene therefore washed his feet with tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head. At the last supper Christ washed the feet of his disciples (John xiii, 4). This was at once a symbol and an example: a symbol, as it was meant to teach them (1) that those only whose sins were washed away by him, the Lamb of God, could have part with him hereafter; and (2) that such as had once been thus purified in the blood of the Lamb "needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit" (John xiii, 10). The act thus performed by Christ at the institution of the Supper suggests to believers at every communion this lesson of humility. It is also an example of humility, patience, forbearance, and charity, and particularly of assistance in helping each other to purification from sin.

In the early post-apostolic times, the command "ye also ought to wash one another's feet" came to be observed not only after the spirit, but also after the letter. Augustine speaks (Ep. 118, *ad Januarium*) of this practice, as also of the doubts entertained in his times as to the proper day when the ceremony ought to be performed. The Synod of Toledo, 694 (ch. iii) stated that it should take place on the anniversary of the day when Christ performed it—the Thursday, 14th of Nisan. In the Greek Church, foot-washing came to be even considered as a sacrament. In the Roman Catholic Church, Bernard de Clairvaux strongly recommends it as *sacramentum remissionis peccatorum quotidianorum*. Yet it did not become a general, public practice in either Church. It was mostly observed at the installation of princes and bishops in the Middle Ages. In the Greek convents, however, and at the Russian court, it is yet observed with great solemnity (Leo Alat. *De dom. et heb. grec.* 21). In the papal court, in those of Vienna, Munich, Madrid, Lisbon, and in the cathedrals and convents of the Roman Catholic Church, the command is also literally carried out to this day, the pope, emperor, kings, etc., washing the feet of twelve persons, generally poor old men, who receive a small gratuity on the occasion. In Rome, the twelve representatives of the apostles are seated in the Clementine Chapel, dressed in tunics of white woollen cloth, and the pope, attired in the same plain manner, sprinkles a few drops on the right foot of each, then wipes and kisses it. At the beginning of the ceremony the antiphony *Mandatum novum do vobis* is sung, from whence the ceremony of the *Pedilavium* is also called *Mandatum*. After this a repast takes place, at which the pope, assisted by his cabinet, serve the twelve (thirteen) apostles, who, at the close, are permitted to take away the white tunics, the towels with which their feet have been wiped, and a small piece of money.

Luther opposed "this hypocritical foot-washing," in which the superior washes the feet of his inferior, who, the ceremony over, will have to act all the more humbly towards him, while Christ had made it an emblem of true humility and abnegation, and raised thereby the position of those whose feet he washed. "We have nothing to do," said he, "with foot-washing with water, otherwise it is not only the feet of the twelve, but those of everybody we should wash. People would be much more benefited if a general bath were at once ordered, and the whole body washed. If you wish to wash your neighbor's feet, see that your heart is really humble, and help every one in becoming better."

The Church of England at first carried out the letter of the command; but, instead of it, there are now assembled in Whitehall every year as many poor men and women as the sovereign has reigned years; to each of these are given clothes, food, and as many pieces of money as the sovereign counts years. The Anabaptists continued the practice of foot-washing, which, in consideration of the passages John xiii, 14; 1 Tim. v, 10, they considered as a sacrament instituted and recommended by Christ (see the *Confessio* of the United Baptists, or Mennonites, of 1660). The Lutheran Upper Consistory of Dresden condemned in 1718 twelve Lutheran citizens of Weida to public penance for having permitted duke Moritz Wilhelm to wash their feet. As the Moravians revived the old love-feasts, they also revived the practice, yet without strictly enforcing it. It used to be performed not only by the leaders towards their followers, but also by the latter among themselves, while they sang a hymn explanatory of the symbol, in which it was called "the lesser baptism." The Mennonites (q. v.) and the River Brethren (q. v.) still practise foot-washing. The Church of God (q. v.) regards foot-washing as a positive ordinance of perpetual standing in the Church, the same as baptism and the Lord's Supper.—Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 630. (J. N. P.)

**Forbes, Rt. Hon. Duncan**, one of the most eminent lawyers of Scotland, was born at Banchrew or Culloden in 1685. He was educated at the University of Edinburgh, and afterwards spent some time at the universities in Leyden, Utrecht, and Paris. In 1717 he became solicitor-general, and in 1742 lord-president of the court of session. In the Rebellion of 1745 he espoused the Hanoverian cause, and it is said that the ingratitude of the government so chagrined him that he fell a victim to fever produced by it. President Forbes cultivated the study of Hebrew and Biblical criticism. He was a follower of the English philosopher and theological writer John Hutcheson. In his work, *Thoughts on Religion, natural and revealed* (Edinb. 1735-43, 8vo), translated into French by father Houbigant, he lays down the doctrine that a system of natural science as well as religion could be drawn from the books of the O. T. if interpreted according to the radical import or root of the language. Forbes published also *Reflections on the Sources of Incredulity with regard to Religion* (Edinb. 1750, 2 vols. 12mo, or 1 vol. 12mo):—*Letters to a Bishop concerning some important Discoveries in Philosophy and Theology* (Lond. 1735, 4to; also translated into French by father Houbigant). The entire works of Forbes, with a biographical sketch, were published by J. Bannatyne (Edinb. 1816, 8vo; 2 vols. 12mo). Bishop Warburton calls him the greatest man that ever Scotland produced, both as a judge, a patriot, and a Christian.—*Encyclop. Brit.* ix, 771; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 611. (J. H. W.)

**Forbes, Eli, D.D.**, a Congregational minister, was born at Westborough, Mass., Oct. 1726; graduated at Harvard College, 1751; and in 1752 became pastor of the church at Brookfield, Mass. In 1762 he went on a mission among the Oneida Indians. In 1776 he was installed as pastor at Gloucester, having left his former parish on account of a false charge of Toryism. He died Dec. 15, 1804. He published *The Family Book* (1801, 12mo), and a number of occasional sermons.—Sprague, *Annals*, i, 493.

**Forbes, John** (of Corse), son of Patrick Forbes, was born May 2, 1593. After studying at Heidelberg and Sedan, he was appointed professor of divinity in King's College, Aberdeen, in 1619. In the great struggle in Scotland between Presbyterianism and prelacy, he favored Episcopacy, but sought to be a peacemaker, publishing *Trenicium Amatoribus Veritatis et Pacis in Ecclesia Scotiana* (Aberdeen, 1629). In 1638 he published *A peaceable Warning to the Subjects in Scotland*. Refusing to sign the Solemn League and Covenant, he was



deprived of his benefice in 1640. His case was one of peculiar hardship, for he had made over part of his own private property to be attached to the professorship which he held, and he lost this property on being dismissed from his office. In 1642 he went to Holland, married there, and remained three years. Returning to Scotland, he spent the remainder of his life on his estate at Corse, and died April 20, 1648. His reputation chiefly rests upon his great work *Instructiones Historico-Theologicæ de doctrinâ Christianâ et vario rerum statu, ortisque erroribus et controversiis* (Amst. 1645, fol.; Geneva, 1680, fol.; abridged by Arnold Montanus (Amst. 1663, 8vo). His collected works were published under the title *Joannis Forbesii à Corse Opera Omnia, inter quæ plurima posthuma*, with *vita* by Dr. Garden (Amst. 1702-3, 2 vols. fol.). His *Instructiones* is still a valuable work; its design was to show, in opposition to Bellarmine, the doctrinal agreement between the Reformers and the earlier fathers, and it formed a precursor of the modern works on the History of Doctrines. Bishop Burnet (Preface to *Life of Bedell*) says that Forbes of Corse was a man "of much more extensive learning than his father (Patrick Forbes), in which, perhaps, he was excelled by none of that age. Those who shall read his book of Historical and Theological Institutions will not dispute this title with him; for it is so excellent a work, that, if he had been left in quiet, in the retirement he had chosen, to apply himself to his studies, and could have finished it by a second volume, it would, perhaps, have been the most valuable treatise of divinity that has yet appeared in the world." Baur names Forbes and Petavius as the two great writers of the 17th century on History of Doctrines.—*Encycl. Britannica*, ix, 776; Nieéron, *Mémoires pour servir*, etc., t. xlii; Donaldson, *History of Christian Literature*, i, 66.

**Forbes, Patrick**, bishop of Aberdeen, was born of a noble family in Aberdeenshire in 1564, and became "laird of Corse" and baron of O'Neil. He was educated at Aberdeen and St. Andrew's. "For a good space," says bishop Keith, "he refused to enter into holy orders; but at last, when he was forty-eight years old, viz. anno 1612, he was prevailed upon—a very singular accident having intervened, which made him then yield, namely, the earnest obtestation of a religious minister in the neighborhood, who, in a fit of melancholy, had stabbed himself, but survived to lament his error." He became pastor of Keith, in Morayshire, where he remained until 1618, when he was elected bishop of Aberdeen, on the recommendation of the king. He died March 28, 1635. "He was wont to visit his diocese in a very singular retinue, scarce any person hearing of him until he came into the church on the Lord's day; and according as he perceived the respective ministers to behave themselves, he gave his instructions to them." He wrote *Commentaria in Apocalypsin, cum Appendice* (Amst. 1646, 4to); translated, *An exquisite Commentary on the Revelation* (London, 1613, 4to); a treatise entitled *Exercitationes de Verbo Dei*; and a *Dissertatio de Versionibus vernaculis*. He was a great benefactor to Aberdeen University, of which he was chancellor, and he revived the professorships of law, physic, and divinity.—Keith, *Historical Catal. of Scottish Bishops* (Edinb. 1824, 8vo); Burnet, *History of our own Times*; Hook, *Ecl. Biog.* v, 157.

**Forbes, William**, bishop of Edinburgh, was born at Aberdeen, 1585, and was educated at Marischal College. About the age of twenty he went abroad and studied at the German universities, especially Helmstädt and Heidelberg. He returned after five years, and was offered the chair of Hebrew at Oxford; but he declined it, and became minister first at Alford, next at Monimusk, and afterwards at Aberdeen. About 1617 he was chosen principal of Marischal College in that city, and about 1619 he accepted a pastorate in Edinburgh. When Charles I was in Scotland in 1633 he

heard Forbes preach, and said that he had found a man who deserved to have a see erected for him. His patent from the king, to be the first bishop of Edinburgh, bears date the 26th of January, 1634, and he died April 1 in the same year. He wrote *Considerationes modestæ et pacificæ controversiarum de justificatione, purgatorio, invocatione sanctorum*, which was published posthumously (Lond. 1658, 8vo; reprinted, with an English version, in the *Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*, Oxford, 1850-56, 2 vols. 8vo). This work is a storehouse of learning on the subject, but does not maintain the Protestant doctrine of justification. It embodied a proposal for an accommodation between the Protestant Episcopal churches and the Church of Rome, the only result of which would have been to make episcopacy regarded with more suspicion in Scotland than it was. Some other polemical works of his which had raised high expectations were lost. Burnet, characterizing his eloquence, says that "he preached with a zeal and vehemence that made him forget all the measures of time—two or three hours was no extraordinary thing for him" (*English Cyclopædia*).—Hook, *Ecl. Biog.* v, 158; *Encyclopedia Britannica*, ix, 777.

**Forcellini**, EGIDIO, an Italian lexicographer, was born Aug. 26, 1688, at Fener, a village near Padua. As his family was poor, it was only towards manhood that he was able to begin the regular course of study in the seminary at Padua. His industry and success in studying Latin gained the confidence of Facciolati (q. v.), who associated him with his labors, especially in preparing the *Totius Latinitatis Lexicon, consilio et cura Jac. Facciolati, opera et stud. E. J. Forcellini Lucubratum* (Padua, 1771). The excellence of this great work is largely attributed to Forcellini. He died April 4, 1768. See FACCIOLATI.

**Forces** (spec. כֹּחַ, *chû'yl*, strength, especially in a military point of view; hence, also, *army, fortification*, etc.), in one phrase, "forces of the Gentiles" (Isa. lx, 5, 11), seems to be used in its widest sense (see Alexander, ad loc.) to denote (as the context implies) not only the subjugation of the heathen, but also the consecration of their wealth (Gen. xxxiv, 29, where the same Heb. word occurs). The כֹּחַ הַמַּלְאָכִים, or *god of strongholds*, of Dan. xi, 38, is probably Mars, or rather Jupiter (Olympius or Capitolinus), whom Antiochus (q. v.) specially honored. See DANIEL.

**Ford** (פֹּרְדִים, *maabar'*, and פֹּרְדִים, *mabarah'*, a pass), a shallow place in a stream where it may easily be crossed on foot or by wading (Gen. xxxii, 23; Josh. ii, 2; Judg. iii, 28; xii, 5, 6; Isa. xvi, 2). See RIVER. The Heb. word is also used both in the singular and in the plural with reference to the mountain pass at Michnah, between Seneh and Bozez (1 Sam. xiv, 4, and Isa. x, 29). Mention is repeatedly made of the fords of Jordan (Josh. ii, 7; Judg. iii, 28; xii, 5, 6; A. V. "passages"). These were evidently in ancient times few in number, and well known, though now the Jordan is fordable in hundreds of places (Smith's *Dict. of Classical Geogr.* s. v. *Palæstina*, p. 521). See JORDAN. Of these, that named Bethabara (q. v.) was probably the most noted. Mention is also made of the ford of the Jabbok (Gen. xxxii, 22), and the fords of Arnon (Isa. xvi, 2). See ARNON. The fords of the Euphrates (Jer. li, 32) were probably the bridges across that river built by Nitocris, as the Euphrates was not fordable at Babylon (Hitzig, *Ezæet. Heb.* ad loc.).—Kitto, s. v. See EUPHRATES.

**Ford**, JOSHUA EDWARDS, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ogdensburg Aug. 3, 1825, graduated at Williams College in 1844, and studied theology at Union Theological Seminary, New York. In 1847 he entered the missionary work in Syria, under the auspices of the American Board. His first station was Aleppo. He was afterwards transferred to Beirut, and subsequently to Sidon. Invited by the Turkish Missions Aid Society, he spent some months in England

in 1861, advocating the claims of the Syrian Mission. In 1865 he returned to America on account of illness in his family, and labored earnestly in behalf of his mission; but his exertions enfeebled him, and he died of pneumonia at Geneseo, N. Y., April 3, 1866. While in the East he obtained a thorough knowledge of Arabic, and could use it in preaching. He rendered useful service in editing Arabic books for the press, and wrote a book in that language on "Fasting and Prayer." He also used the Turkish language.—Wilson, *Presbyterian Historical Almanac*, 1867, p. 289.

**Fordyce, David**, brother of James, was born in 1711 at Aberdeen. In 1742 he was appointed professor of moral philosophy in Marischal College. He perished by shipwreck in 1751. He wrote *Dialogues concerning Education*:—*Theodorus, a Dialogue on the Art of Preaching* (Lond. 1755, 3d ed. 12mo):—*Elements of Moral Philosophy* (Lond. 1769, 4th ed. 12mo).

**Fordyce, James, D.D.**, a Scotch divine, was born in 1720 at Aberdeen, was educated at Marischal College, and was successively minister at Brechin and Alloa, in Scotland, and at Monkwell Street, London. In 1782 he relinquished the pastoral office, and retired first to Hampshire and afterwards to Bath, where he died, Oct. 1, 1796. He wrote *Sermons to Young Women* (London, 9th ed. 1778, 2 vols. 12mo):—*Addresses to Young Men* (Lond. 1777, 2 vols. 12mo):—*Addresses to the Duty* (London, 1785, sm. 8vo); and several single sermons, which were very popular.—Jones, *Christian Biography*, s. v.

**Forehead** (מִצְחָה, *me'tsach*, from an obsolete root signif. to shine, Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 815; μέτωπον). The practice of veiling the face in public for women of the higher classes, especially married women, in the East, sufficiently stigmatizes with reproach the unveiled face of women of bad character (Gen. xxv, 65; Jer. iii, 3; Niebuhr, *Trav.* i, 132, 149, 150; Shaw, *Travels*, p. 228, 240; Hasselquist, *Travels*, p. 58; Buckingham, *Arab Tribes*, p. 312; Lane, *Mod. Eg.* i, 72, 77, 225-248; Burckhardt, *Travels*, i, 233). An especial force is thus given to the term "hard of forehead" as descriptive of audacity in general (Ezek. iii, 7, 8, 9; compare Juvenal, *Sat.* xiv, 242—"Ejectum atritâ de fronte ruborem"). See VEIL.

The custom among many Oriental nations both of coloring the face and forehead, and of impressing on



Oriental Marks in the Forehead.

the body marks indicative of devotion to some special deity or religious sect is mentioned by various writers (Burckhardt, *Notes on Bed.* i, 51; Niebuhr, *Trav.* ii, 57; Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* ii, 342; Lane, *Modern Eg.* i, 66). Sometimes it extends to serious inflictions. See CUTTINGS IN THE FLESH. It is doubtless alluded to in

Rev. (xiii, 16, 17; xiv, 9; xvii, 5; xx, 4), and in the opposite direction by Ezekiel (ix, 4, 5, 6), and in Rev. (vii, 3; ix, 4; xiv, 1; xxii, 4). The mark mentioned by Ezekiel with approval has been supposed by some to be the figure of the cross, said to be denoted by the word here used, "צ", in the ancient Shemitic language (Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 1495; Spencer, *De Leg. Hebr.* ii, 20; iii, 403, 413). See MARK (ON THE PERSON).

It may have been by way of contradiction to heathen practice that the high-priest wore on the front of his mitre the golden plate inscribed "Holiness to the Lord" (Exod. xxviii, 36; xxxix, 30; Spencer, *l. c.*). See MITRE.

The "jewels for the forehead" mentioned by Ezekiel (xvi, 12), and in the margin of the A. V., Gen. xxiv, 22, were in all probability nose-rings (Isa. iii, 21; Lane, *Mod. Egypt.* iii, 225, 226; Harmer, *Observ.* iv, 311, 312; Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 870). The Persian and also Egyptian women wear jewels and strings of coins across their foreheads (Olearius, *Travels*, p. 317; Lane, *Mod. Eg.* ii, 228).—Smith, s. v. See NOSE-JEWEL.

For the use of frontlets between the eyes, see FRONTLET, and for the symptoms of leprosy apparent in the forehead, LEPROSY. For baldness in the forehead, see BALD.

**Foreigner** (נָכְרִי, *nokri'*, Deut. xv, 3; Obađiah 11, a *stranger*, as elsewhere rendered; תּוֹשָׁב, *toshab'*, Exod. xii, 45, a *sojourner*, as usually rendered; πάροικος, lit. a *neighbor*, Eph. ii, 19, elsewhere "stranger" or "sojourner"), a resident in a country not native to him, i. e. in the Jewish sense a Gentile. See ALIEN. Such non-Israelites (גֵּרִים, Josephus ἀλλοτριόχωροι, *Ant.* iii, 12, 3) as resided among the Hebrews were by the Mosaic law not only commended in general to the sympathy and humanity of the citizens (Exod. xxii, 21; xxiii, 9; Lev. xix, 33, 34; Dent. x, 18 sq.; comp. Jer. vii, 6; Ezek. xxii, 7; Zech. vii, 10; Mal. iii, 5; see Josephus, *Apion*, ii, 28), but were also entitled to certain privileges belonging to the poor, namely, to participation in the festivals and decennial feasts (Dent. xiv, 28 sq.; xvi, 10 sq.; xxvi, 11 sq.; Tobit i, 7), to gleanings in the vineyards and fields (Lev. xix, 10; xxiii, 52; Dent. xxiv, 19 sq.), and to the harvest in the year of jubilee (Lev. xxv, 6); prescriptions which found a definite point of support in Oriental hospitality. Before the courts they had equal rights with the native-born residents (Exod. xii, 49; Lev. xxiv, 22; Numb. xv, 15 sq.; Dent. i, 16; xxiv, 17; xxvii, 19), and the cities of refuge were appointed for them likewise in case of unintentional homicide (Numb. xxxv, 15). On the other hand, they also were not allowed to perform anything which was an abomination according to the Hebrew law (Exod. xx, 10; Lev. xvii, 10; xviii, 26; xx, 2; xxiv, 16; Dent. v, 14; Ezek. xiv, 7); yet they were exempted from the prohibition of using the flesh of animals that died of themselves (Dent. xiv, 21; but there are also other distinctions between this passage and Lev. xvii, 15. See CARCASS). Foreign slaves must be circumcised, but were then entitled to eat the passover (Gen. xvii, 12 sq.; Exod. xii, 44). It was lawful to take interest from foreigners for loaned capital (Dent. xxiii, 20). See DEBT. Under certain restrictions, when they submitted to circumcision, they became naturalized, and received the prerogatives of Jewish citizenship; Edomites and Egyptians in the third generation (Dent. xxiii, 7 sq.; comp. Theodoret, *Quæst.* in *Deut.* 26), others after a longer time. Only Ammonites, Moabites, castrated persons, and the offspring of public harlots were altogether excluded from this privilege (Dent. xxiii, 1 sq.; comp. Neh. xiii, 1). Foreigners accordingly appear in the royal service (1 Sam. xxi, 7; xxii, 9; 2 Sam. xi, 3, 6, etc.). See GIT-TITE. Later fanaticism, however, sought to expel all foreigners from the country (Neh. xiii, 3; on the contrary, Ezek. xlvii, 22), or impose the hard condition

of circumcision (Josephus, *Life*, 23). See generally Michaelis, *Mos. Recht*, ii, 443 sq.; Jahn, I, ii, 346 sq. The legal treatment of foreigners was in the earlier ages the more humane, as originally at Rome (Adam, *Rom. Ant.* i, 145) and at Athens. See PROSELYTE.

**Foreiro**, FRANCIS (*Forerius Franciscus*), a Portuguese Dominican monk, was born at Lisbon in 1523, and, entering early into the Dominican order, was sent by John III to study theology in the University of Paris. On his return to Lisbon he was charged with the education of the young prince Antonio, and was appointed preacher to the king. Among the Portuguese at the Council of Trent he held the first place. He offered to preach before the council in any language. The council sent him on a mission to Pius IV, who made Foreiro confessor to his nephew, cardinal Charles Borromeo. He was employed to reform the Breviary and the Roman Missal, and to aid in the preparation of the "Catechism of the Council of Trent." On his return to Portugal he was chosen prior of the Dominican convent at Lisbon in 1568. He died January 10, 1587. His principal work is *Isaie Propheta vetus et nova ex Hebraico Versio, cum Commentario*, etc. (Venice, 1563, fol.), inserted in the fifth volume of the *Critici Sacri*.—Echard et Quétié, *Script. Ord. Præd.* ii, 261; Hook, *Eccles. Biogr.* v, 161; Hofer, *Nouv. Lüggr. Générale*, xviii, 170.

**Foreknowledge.** See PRESCIENCE.

**Fore-Ordination.** See PREDESTINATION.

**Forer**, LAURENT, a Jesuit, born in Switzerland, 1580, was professor of philosophy in many colleges of his order; then chancellor of the University of Dillingen, and finally rector of the Jesuits' College at Lucerne. He died in 1659, leaving 44 works, a list of which may be found in Sotwell, *Bibliographie de la Société de Jésus*. Among them is *Symbolum Catholicum, Lutheranum, Calvinianum cum Apostolico collatum* (Dillingen, 1622, 4to).—Migne, *Dict. de Biog. Chrétienne*, s. v.

**Forerunner** is the literal meaning of *πρόδρομος* (Heb. vi, 20), a *precursor*, one who not only goes before to a particular place, to lead or prepare the way, but who makes arrangements for those that follow. In this sense it is usually applied to John the Baptist, as the harbinger of Christ. But in the above text (the only one where it occurs in Scripture) it is spoken of Jesus, the high-priest of the new dispensation, as entering before his followers into the heavenly sanctuary, and making expiation of perpetual efficacy for sinners (comp. John xiv, 2).

**Foreship** (*πρόρα*, the  *prow*, Acts xxvii, 50, 41), the bow or stem of a vessel. See SHIP.

**Foreskin** (*פְּרִיָּה*, *orlah*), a native term for this special rite; Greek *ἀκροβυστία*; both used in their literal and metaphorical meaning), the prepuce or projecting fold of skin in the distinctive member of the male sex, which was removed in circumcision, so as to leave the *glans penis* artificially uncovered. This well-known symbolical rite was instituted by Jehovah for the consecration of all the male Israelites—originally descendants of Abraham (and in that case on the eighth day after birth, Gen. xxi, 4; Lev. xii, 3; Luke i, 59; ii, 21; see Philo, iii, 5; Josephus, *Ant.* i, 12, 2; yet compare Exod. iv, 25, with ii, 12, and the Mishna, *Shabb.* xix, 5, where in certain cases the ceremony is deferred till the ninth or twelfth day: the Sabbath, however, did not cause a postponement, John vii, 22 sq.; compare Wetstein, i, 887; but delicate children might be circumcised after weaning, Mishna, *l. c.*), and in later times "Proselytes of Righteousness" (Exod. xii, 48; comp. Judith xiv, 10; see Tacit. *Hist.* v, 5, 3), as a ratification of their title to the theocratic citizenship. (Whether circumcision among the Egyptians stood in connection with Phallus worship [Tuch, *Gen.* p. 34] is not determined, but its use among the Israelites is rather against such a supposition. Baur [*Tüb.*

*Zeitschr.* 1832, i, 104 sq.] refers it to the idea of separation from heathendom, which is consistent with the entire system of Mosaism [comp. the Mishna, *Nedar.* iii, 11.] House-born (heathen) slaves were also to undergo the operation (Gen. xvii, 12), as a sign of participation in the covenant with Jehovah. (But children born of a heathen father and an Israelitish mother must not be circumcised, according to *Yebam.* iv, 2; yet comp. Acts xvi, 3.) Every Israelite (Joseph. *Ant.* xii, 5, 4), generally the father of the house (Gen. xvii, 23; but, in cases of exigency, also women; see Buxtorf, *Synagog. Jud.* p. 90; comp. Exod. iv, 25; not heathens, however; yet see *Abodu Sara*, ed. Edzard, ii, 40 sq. In adults a physician was required, Joseph. *Ant.* xx, 2, 5. In case two sons by the same mother died of the operation, the [later] rabbins allowed the circumcision of the third son to be delayed till he was full grown; Maimonides, *III. Mith.* i, 18), should perform the rite, and they employed for the purpose a sharp knife (Quanat, *De cultris circumcisoris et sces-pitii Hebr.* Regiom. 1714; also in Ugolino *Thesaurus*, xxii), earlier an edged stone or stone knife (Exod. iv, 25; Josh. v, 2 sq.; comp. Herod. ii, 86; see Douglæi *Analect.* i, 59; Abicht, *De cultris saxis*, etc. Lips. 1712; also in Hasse *Thesaur.* i, 497 sq.; and Gedæi *Diss. de instrumentis circumcis.* Lips. 1698; also in the *Nov. thesaurus philol.* i, 263 sq.; and in Ugolino, xxii), as the Galli or priests of Cybele castrated themselves with a shell ("Samia testa," Pliny, xxxv, 46; comp. Catull. lxiii, 5; Martial, iii, 8; see Arnobius, *adv. Gent.* v, 16), under the idea that healing was thereby promoted. The Christians of Abyssinia also performed the operation with stone knives (Ludolf, *Hist. Aethiop.* iii, 1, 21). Modern Jews use for this purpose steel knives, and the operation is thus described by Otho (*Ler. Rabb.* p. 133): "The circumcizer applies a rod to the organ, and draws the prepuce forward over it as far as possible; then with a forceps he seizes a part of it, and cuts it off with a razor. He next seizes the prepuce with his two thumbs, and rolls it back till the whole *glans* is exposed, after which he sucks out the blood (Mishna, *Shabb.* xix, 2) till the blood comes from the remoter parts of the body, and finally he applies a plaster to the wound." (Comp. Thevenot, *Trar.* i, 58; Chelius, *Handb. d. Chirurg.* II, i, 50; Wolfers, in Henke, *Zeitschr. f. Staatsarzn.* 1825, i, 205 sq.; also in the *Encycl. Wörterb. d. medic. Wissenschaft.* v, 256 sq.) On Arab circumcision, see Arvieux, iii, 146. That so severe and painful an operation (comp. Targ. Jonath. on Gen. xxii, 1) could not well be performed on an infant less than eight days old is evident. The practice of *female* circumcision, or excision, referred to by several ancient and modern writers, as practiced by certain nations, may have consisted in removing the anterior flap of skin which in some actual specimens of Hottentots or Bushwomen has been found to cover the female genitals, apparently wholly distinct from the vaginal membrane (see the *Penay Cyclopadia*, s. v. Circumcision). As circumcision was a symbol of purification, the prepuce was a type of corruption; hence the phrase "foreskin of the heart" (Deut. x, 16; Jer. iv, 10), to designate a carnal or heathenish state (Rom. ii, 29; compare Philo, ii, 258). See URCIRCUMCISION. The part removed by circumcision thus naturally became one of the harshest terms of opprobrium (1 Sam. xvii, 26, 26; comp. Ludolf, *Comment. in Hist. Aeth.* p. 274), like *verpus* among the Romans (Martial, vii, 82, 6). It was sometimes brought as a trophy of slain Gentiles (1 Sam. xviii, 25; 2 Sam. iii, 14), like scalps by the North American savages. Paul, on the other hand, uses the ironical term "concision" (Phil. iii, 2) to stigmatize the extreme attachment of a Judaizing party to this ordinance.—Winer, 156. See CIRCUMCISION.

**FORESKINS, HILL OF**, a place near Gilgal, so called from the circumcision of the Israelites at that spot before entering Canaan (Josh. v, 3). See GIBEAH-HA-ARALOTH.

**Forest** is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of three distinct Heb. words. See TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS.

1. Usually and most properly יָבֵשׁ, *ya'ar*, or יָבֵשׁ, *ya'rah* (once rendered "wood," Deut. xix, 5), signifying a dense woods from its *redundancy* or *luxuriance*, such as is seen in the growth of forest-trees, and in use restricted (with the exception of 1 Sam. xiv, 26, and Cant. v, 1, in which it refers to honey) to an abundance of trees. It is the name given to all the great primeval forests of Syria, where the stately trees grew (Eccles. ii, 6; Isa. xlv, 14), and where the wild beasts had their homes (Jer. v, 6; Mic. v, 8). Hosea (ii, 12) appears to use it as equivalent to the Arabic *ya'ar*, a *rugged and desolate place*, like *midbar* or "wilderness." See WOOD.

2. חֹרֶשׁ, *cho'resh*, is apparently derived from a Chaldee root, חֹרֶשׁ, *to be entangled*, and would therefore signify a *thicket* of trees or bushes, such as might afford a safe hiding-place (comp. 1 Sam. xxiii, 15), and such as is now often seen in Palestine on the sites of ruined cities (comp. Isa. xvii, 9). It applies to woods of less extent, the word itself, according to others, involving the idea of what is cut down (from חֹרֶשׁ, Gesen. *Theo.* p. 530): it is only twice (1 Sam. xxiii, 15 sq.; 2 Chron. xxvii, 4) applied to woods properly so called; its sense, however, is illustrated in the other passages in which it occurs, viz. Isa. xvii, 9 (A. V. "bough"), where the comparison is to the solitary relic of an ancient forest, and Ezek. xxxi, 3, where it applies to trees or foliage sufficient to afford shelter (Vulg. *frondibus nemorosus*; A. V. "with a shadowing shroud"). The term occurs seven times in Scripture, but is only once rendered *forest*—"In the forests (Sept. *ἐν τοῖς ἔρμυσι*) he built castles and towers" (2 Chron. xxvii, 4). The locality here referred to appears to be the south of Judah, where the mountains were formerly, and are in places still, clothed with dwarf oaks and tangled shrubberies. See THICKET.

3. פַּרְדֵּס, *pardes*; a word of foreign origin, like the Greek *παράδεισος* and the Arabic *pardasim*, q. d. *park*, means an *enclosed garden* or *plantation* attached to a palace, intended either for ornament or for containing animals of the chase (Eccles. ii, 5; Cant. iv, 13; comp. Xenophon, *Cyrop.* i, 3, 12). It is found only three times in the Bible, and is once translated *forest*. In Neh. ii, 8, Asaph is called "the keeper of the king's forest" (Sept. *τοῦ παραδείσου*), where it appropriately expresses the care with which the forests of Palestine were preserved under the Persian rule, a regular warden being appointed, without whose sanction no tree could be felled. Elsewhere the word describes an orchard (Eccles. ii, 5; Cant. iv, 13). See ORCHARD.

Although Palestine has never, in historical times, been a woodland country, yet there can be no doubt that it contained much more wood formerly than it has at present. Tracts of woodland are mentioned by travellers in Palestine, but rarely what we should call a forest. There are still some remnants of ancient oak forests on the mountains of Bashan, Gilead, Hermon, and Galilee. One solitary grove of cedars exists on Lebanon, but fir-trees are there abundant. The other forests of Palestine (2 Kings ii, 23; 1 Sam. xiv, 25; vii, 2, etc.) have almost disappeared. Yet here and there, in every district of the country, north and south, east and west, one meets with a solitary oak or terebinth of huge dimensions, as at Hebron, and the valley of Elah, and Shiloh, and Dan. These are the last trees of the forests, and serve to indicate what the forests of Palestine once were. Hence it is probable that the highlands were once covered with a primeval forest, of which the celebrated oaks and terebinths (e. g. those of Abraham, Tabor, etc.) scattered here and there were the relics. The woods and forests mentioned in the Bible appear to have been situated where they are usually found in cultivated countries, in the

valleys and defiles that lead down from the high to the low lands, and in the adjacent plains. They were therefore of no great size, and correspond rather with the idea of the Latin *saltus* than with our *forest*. The following are those that occur in Scripture. See TREE.

(1.) The most extensive was the *forest (yaar, "wood") of Ephraim*, implying a region of Ephraim covered with forests where Mount Jearim (*Hill of Forests*) was situated (Josh. xv, 10); or in allusion to the name of the city Kirjath-jearim (1 Sam. vii, 1, 2). It clothed the slopes of the hills that bordered the plain of Jezreel, and the plain itself in the neighborhood of Bethshan (Josh. xvii, 15 sq.), extending, perhaps, at one time to Tabor, which is translated *ἐρμύς* by Theodotion (Hos. v, 1), and which is still well covered with forest-trees (Stanley, p. 350). It is, perhaps, the same with the *wood of Ephratah* (Psa. cxxxii, 6). See EPHRAIM.

(2.) There was a trans-Jordanic *forest (yaar, "wood") of Ephraim* (2 Sam. xviii, 6; Sept. *ἐρμύς*). It was here that the army of Absalom was defeated, and he himself slain. It lay near, probably a little to the west of, the town of Mahanaim, where David had his headquarters, and where he received the first tidings of the fate of his son (xvii, 26; xviii, 24). Why a forest east of the Jordan should bear the name *Ephraim* cannot now be determined; but one thing is certain—in the noble oaks which still clothe the hills of Gilead north of the Jabbok we see the remnants of "the wood of Ephraim," and the representative of that "great oak" in one of whose branches Absalom was strangely imprisoned (xviii, 9; see Porter's *Handbook for Syria and Palestine*, p. 311, 314). Winer places it on the west side of the Jordan; but a comparison of 2 Sam. xvii, 26; xviii, 3, 23, proves the reverse. The statement in xviii, 23, in particular, marks its position as on the highlands, at some little distance from the valley of the Jordan (comp. Joseph. *Ant.* vii, 10, 1, 2). See EPHRAIM, WOOD OF.

(3.) The *forest (yaar, Sept. πῶλις, A. V. "forest") of Hareth*, in the mountains of Judah, to which David withdrew to avoid the fury of Saul (1 Sam. xxii, 5), was somewhere on the border of the Philistine plain, in the southern part of Judah. See HARETH.

(4.) The *wood (choresh, Sept. ὄρος, A. V. "wood") in the wilderness of Ziph*, in which David concealed himself (1 Sam. xxiii, 15 sq.), lay south-east of Hebron. See ZIPH.

(5.) The *forest (yaar, Sept. ἐρμύς, A. V. "wood") of Bethel* (2 Kings ii, 23, 24) was situated in the ravine which descends to the plain of Jericho. See BETHEL.

(6.) The *forest (yaar, ἐρμύς, "wood")* through which the Israelites passed in their pursuit of the Philistines (1 Sam. xiv, 25) was probably near Ajalon (compare v, 31), in one of the valleys leading down to the plain of Philistia. See SAUL.

(7.) The *woods (choresh, ἐρμύς, "forest")* in which Jotham placed his forts (2 Chron. xxvii, 4) must have been similarly situated. See JOTHAM.

(8.) The plain of Sharon was partly covered with wood (Strab. xvii, 758), whence the Sept. gives *ἐρμύς* as an equivalent for that name in Isa. lxx, 10. It has still a fair amount of wood (Stanley, p. 260). See SHARON.

(9.) The *excellency or pride of the Jordan*, so called from its green and shady banks, clothed with willows, tamarisks, and cane, in which lions made their covert (Zech. xi, 3; Jer. xii, 5). See JORDAN.

(10.) The *forest (yaar) of cedars on Mount Lebanon* (2 Kings xix, 23; Hos. xiv, 5, 6), which must have been much more extensive formerly than at present; although, on the assumption that the "cedar" of Scripture is the *Pinus cedrus*, or so-called "cedar of Lebanon," its growth is by no means confined, among those mountains, to the famous clump of ancient trees which has alone engaged the attention of travellers. See CEDAR. The American missionaries and others, trav-

elling by unfrequented routes, have found woods of less ancient cedar-trees in other places. See **LEBANON**, 1.

"The house of the forest (*yaar*) of Lebanon" is several times mentioned. It appears to have been a part of the royal palace built by Solomon at Jerusalem, and used as an armory (1 Kings vii, 2 sq.; x, 17-21; 2 Chron. ix, 16-20). The house had "four rows of cedar pillars, with cedar beams upon the pillars, and it was covered with cedar above upon the beams." Hence, in all probability, its name (see Keil, ad loc.). See **SOLOMON**.

"The forest (*yaar*, *הַיַּרְדֵּן*) of Carmel" is a phrase used in 2 Kings xix, 23, and Isa. xxxvii, 24, in reference to the ravages committed by the army of Sennacherib on the land of Israel. The meaning of the clause, *הַיַּרְדֵּן הַיַּרְדֵּן* ("forest of his Carmel"), seems to be *its garden forest*; that is, the garden-like cedar forests of Lebanon, to which reference is made (see Keil on Kings, and Alexander on Isaiah, ad loc.).

(11.) "The forest (*yaar*) in Arabia" occurs in Isa. xxi, 13. The phrase is remarkable, because Arabia is a country singularly destitute of trees. In no part of it are there any traces of forests. (The Sept. translates the passage *ἐν τῷ ἔρημῳ ἑσπέρας*; and Lowth and others adopt it; but the Masoretic reading is preferable.) The meaning of the word *הַיַּרְדֵּן* in this place is probably the same as that of the Arabic *yaar*, a rugged region, whether wooded or not. See **ARABIA**.

(12.) In Zech. xi, 2 there is a singular expression: "Howl, O ye oaks of Bashan, for the forest of the vintage is come down." The Hebrew *הַיַּרְדֵּן הַיַּרְדֵּן* (Sept. *ὁ ἔρημος ὁ σήψοντος*) rather signifies "the fortified forest" (Vulg. *sultus munitus*), and it is probable that Jerusalem is thus figuratively alluded to, the houses of which are close together as the trees of a forest (compare Micah, iii, 12; see Henderson, *On the Minor Prophets*, ad loc.). It may, however, refer to the devastation of that region, for the greater portion of Peæra was, and still is, covered with forests of oak and terebinth (Isa. ii, 13; Ezek. xxvii, 6; comp. Buckingham's *Palestine*, p. 103 sq., 240 sq.; Stanley, p. 324). See **BASHAN**.

Forest is used symbolically to denote a city, kingdom, polity, or the like (Ezek. xiv, 26). Devoted kingdoms are also represented under the image of a forest, which God threatens to burn or cut down. (See Isa. x, 17, 18, 19, 34, where the briars and thorns denote the common people; "the glory of the forest" are the nobles and those of highest rank and importance. See also Isa. xxxii, 19; xxxvii, 24; Jer. xxi, 14; xxii, 7; xlv, 23; Zech. xi, 2). It was also an image of unfruitfulness as contrasted with a cultivated field or vineyard (Isa. xxix, 17; xxxii, 15; Jer. xxvi, 18; Hos. ii, 12). See WENYSS'S *Clavis Symbolica*, s. v.—KITTO, s. v.; SMITH, s. v. See **PALESTINE**.

**Fork** (*קֶשֶׁת*, *shelosh' killeshon'*, a trial of prongs), a three-pronged fork, i. e. pitch-fork with which hay, straw, and the like are gathered (occurs only 1 Sam. xiii, 21). The Targum (on Eccles. ii, 11) uses the same word to express a pointed instrument. See **AGRICULTURE**.

The Orientals do not use forks at meals as we do, but convey the food to their mouth with the fingers. See **EATING**.

**Forgiveness**, "the pardon of any offence committed against us. We are not apt to entertain any permanent or incurable ill will against the author of injuries to others, and why should we be irreconcilable when injuries have been done to ourselves? To love our enemies, or rather not to hate our enemies, is a duty which no guilt can annul, no injury efface. We are not required to love our enemies as our friends; but, when any injury has been done us, we are to endeavor to regard it with so much resentment as any

just and impartial person would feel on hearing it related, and no more. To revenge injuries is to retaliate evil for the sake of retaliation. We are all weak, frail, and sinful creatures. None of us passes through one day without feeling that he requires forgiveness from his God, and too often also from his fellow-creatures. Mercy is all our hope, forgiveness our constant prayer. In such a state, should we not pity and assist each other? Does not mutual weakness call for mutual forbearance? Weak, frail, and sinful as we are, we all hope, through the merits of Christ, to attain the happiness of heaven; and can creatures who, after a few short years, expect to be forever united in the presence of God, to be liberated from all unruly passions, and to live together forever in heaven, in peace, and joy, and everlasting love—can such creatures hate each other on earth? can they add to the sorrows of this state of trial, and spread more thorns in the path of life by acts of malice and revenge? can they risk their own eternal happiness by denying to each other that forgiveness without which they must not dare to hope that they shall be themselves forgiven? We know, from the express declaration of our Saviour, that if we forgive not men their trespasses, neither will our heavenly Father forgive us. Christ estimated virtues by their solid utility, and not by their fashion or popularity, and hence he prefers the duty of forgiveness to every other. He enjoins it more frequently, with more earnestness, and under a greater variety of forms; and he adds this weighty and peculiar circumstance, that the forgiveness of others is the sole condition on which we are to expect or even ask from God forgiveness for ourselves. This preference is justified by the superior importance of the virtue itself. The feuds and animosities which exist in families and among neighbors, which disturb the intercourse of human life, and collectively compose half its misery, have their foundation in the want of a forgiving temper, and can never cease except by the exercise of this virtue. Let us endeavor to forgive, that we may not be afraid to ask forgiveness. Let us take care so to pray for forgiveness, that our prayers may not justify and increase our condemnation. Let us remember the amazing condescension of the Son of God, in 'taking upon him the form of a servant,' and thence learn humility. Let us represent to our minds the terms of our salvation, in order to excite us to repentance. Let us adore the infinite love of our Redeemer, 'who laid down his life for his enemies,' and let this be the pattern of our charity" (Fellowes, *Body of Theology*, ii, 210-213; Paley, *Moral and Polit. Philosophy*, i, 269; Warner, *System of Divinity and Morality*, ii, 356).—Robinson, *Theological Dictionary*, s. v.; *American Presbyterian Review*, Oct. 1867, art. ii.

"Some confound things that are separate and different—the act of forgiving with the act of loving with approbation. Repentance and confession are indispensable, when one has intentionally injured us in any way, to restore him to our fellowship and approbation. But what is a necessary condition of this is not a necessary condition of forgiving. Blending these two things together, and thinking of them as if they were one and inseparable, has doubtless caused some to differ in opinion from others who clearly discern the proper distinctions. It is a mistaken idea that in the matter of forgiveness we are strictly to imitate God the Father, and not forgive those who trespass against us until they repent and ask our pardon. God is clothed with the responsibilities of moral government over his creatures, while we are not. If he had made it our duty to revenge our own wrongs, and administer just punishment to the doers of the wrong, then it would be right and wise to follow his example in that particular. But the case is far otherwise. The Lord not only relieves us of that responsibility, but has commanded us not to usurp his prerogatives: 'Avenge not yourselves.' No doubt there are certain cases in

civil and family governments in which the *outward acts* of forgiveness should be held in abeyance until forgiveness is duly sought. The offender in himself has no right to forgiveness until he seeks it in the true spirit of repentance. In the outward expressions of this, parents should often wait for the outward signs of penitence in their children. The same may be true sometimes in other relations, as between brothers and sisters, and other domestic and civil relations. Hence there is an *objective* and a *subjective* view to be taken of the duty of forgiveness—an act in the heart, and an appropriate outward and formal expression of it. The former should be performed at once, to prevent greater evil to ourselves, while the latter may wisely be delayed until the proper occasion for it arrives. One may say he forgives, when in reality he does not forgive from the heart; so we may forgive from the heart long before we proclaim it to the parties concerned” (*Zion’s Herald*, January 2, 1867).

FORGIVENESS OF SIN is that act of God’s free grace by which, in virtue of the merits of Christ’s atonement, appropriated by faith, he frees the sinner, who accepts Christ by such faith, from the guilt and penalty of his sins. “By the atonement of Christ, which is God’s own provision, his law is vindicated, and the penalty of sin is paid. To all who will believe in Christ with the heart, God offers a free, full, and present forgiveness (Acts v, 31; xiii, 38, 39; 1 John ii, 12). ‘Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus,’ etc. (Rom. iii, 24, et seq.). By a careful consideration of this language, we see, 1. That every believer in Christ Jesus is *justified* or *pardoned*, for justification is called, in verse 25, ‘remission of sins.’ Yet it is not simply forgiveness: the terms *justification* and *justify*, when applied to a guilty person, do not import his being morally just, but just with respect to law and the lawgiver: that is, placed in the position of a person who has not broken the law, both in respect to exemption from punishment, and the favor and kindness of the judge. Justification is pardon administered consistently with the requirements of justice and law. 2. That such believers are forgiven *freely*, as a *free gift*, not of *right*, not *meritoriously* and of *desert*. It is to grace, and not to justice, that the appeal for pardon is made; and we could ourselves have done nothing which could have legally cancelled our sins. The whole scheme is of grace, the result of the pure love of God, who compassionated our misery, himself provided the means of our deliverance, by sending his only-begotten Son into the world, who voluntarily submitted to die on the cross, that he might reconcile us to God. The whole was completed without our intervention, and the faith which is the condition of our salvation is by grace” (Farrar, *Biblical Dictionary*, s. v.). See JUSTIFICATION.

The “forgiveness of sins” is one of the articles of the (so-called) Apostles’ Creed, as well as of the Nicene. According to the so-called sacramental theology (Acts ii, 38), “forgiveness of sins” is conveyed to the penitent by the act of the priest pronouncing the absolution, making the priest the sole ordinary channel through which remission is to be obtained. But sin against God can only be forgiven by God, on the condition he prescribes, of repentance, and of this no man can infallibly judge. See Pearson, *On the Creed*, art. ix; Eden, *Churchman’s Dictionary*, s. v. See ABSOLUTION; JUSTIFICATION.

Form (Lat. *forma*, by transpos. from μορφή) is defined by Aristotle as λόγος τῆς οὐσίας, the doctrine of the substance or essence of a thing. “A trumpet may be said to consist of two parts, the matter or brass of which it is made, and the form which the maker gives to it. The latter is essential, but not the former; since, although the matter were silver, it would still be a trumpet, but without the form it would not. Now,

although there can be no form without matter, yet as it is the form which makes the thing what it is, the word form came to signify essence or nature” (Fleming, s. v.). The Scholastics distinguished form *substantial* from form *accidental*. Substantial form they defined as *actus primarius una cum materia constituens unum per se*; accidental form as *actus secundarius constitutus a unit per accidens*. The unit of being composed of soul and body was defined to be of the former sort. Form, according to the ancient definition, is therefore necessary to matter; absolutely formless matter is inconceivable. Lord Bacon (*Nov. Organ.* ii, 17, says: “When we speak of forms, we understand nothing more than the laws and modes of action which regulate and constitute any simple nature, such as heat, light, weight, in all kinds of matter susceptible of them; so that the form of heat, or the form of light, and the law of heat, and the law of light, are the same thing.” Also (*Nov. Organ.* ii, 15), “The form of a thing is the very thing itself, and the thing no otherwise differs from the form than as the apparent differs from the existent, the outward from the inward, or that which is considered in relation to man from that which is considered in relation to the universe.”

“The sense attached at the present day to the words form and matter is somewhat different from, though closely related to, these. The form is what the mind impresses upon its perceptions of objects, which are the matter; form therefore means mode of viewing objects that are presented to the mind. When the attention is directed to any object, we do not see the object itself, but contemplate it in the light of our own prior conceptions. A rich man, for example, is regarded by the poor and ignorant under the form of a very fortunate person, able to purchase luxuries which are above their own reach; by the religious mind under the form of a person with more than ordinary temptations to contend with; by the political economist under that of an example of the unequal distribution of wealth; by the tradesman under that of one whose patronage is valuable. Now the object is really the same to all these observers; the same rich man has been represented under all these different forms. And the reason that the observers are able to find many in one is that they connect him severally with their own prior conceptions. The form, then, in this view, is mode of knowing, and the matter is the perception or object we have to know” (Thomson, *Outline of Laws of Thought*, p. 34). Sir W. Hamilton calls the theory of substantial forms “the theory of qualities viewed as entities conjoined with, and not as mere dispositions or modifications of matter” (Hamilton’s edition of Reid’s *Works*, p. 827).

Dr. McCosh remarks, on the distinction between form and matter, that “this phraseology was introduced by Aristotle, who represented everything as having in itself both matter (ἔλη) and form (εἶδος). It had a new signification given to it by Kant, who supposes that the mind supplies from its own furniture a form to impose on the matter presented from without. The form thus corresponds to the *à priori* element, and the matter to the *à posteriori*. But the view thus given of the relation in which the knowing mind stands to the known object is altogether a mistaken one. It supposes that the mind in cognition adds an element from its own resources, whereas it is simply so constituted as to know what is in the object. This doctrine needs only to be carried out consequentially to sap the foundations of all knowledge; for if the mind may contribute from its own stores one element, why not another? why not all the elements? In fact, Kant did, by this distinction, open the way to all those later speculations which represent the whole universe of being as an ideal construction. There can, I think, be no impropriety in speaking of the original principles of the mind as forms or rules, but they are forms merely, as are the rules of grammar,

which do not add anything to correct speaking and writing, but are merely the expression of the laws which they follow. As to the word 'matter,' it has either no meaning in such an application, or a meaning of a misleading character" (*Intuitions of the Mind*, N. Y. 1866, p. 308). Formal, in philosophy, is that which relates to the form, as opposed to material, or that which relates to the matter. So formal logic gives the theory of reasoning as grounded in the laws of thought, without reference to the subject-matter to which reasoning may be applied.—Fleming, *Vocabulary of Philosophy*, s. v.; Krug, *Handwörter. der philosoph. Wissenschaften*, ii, 56.

**Form of Concord.** See CONCORD, vol. ii, p. 453.

**Formatæ.** See LITERÆ FORMATÆ.

**Formōsus I.** Pope (891–896), was bishop of Porto, and was sent by Nicholas I in 866 as legate to Bulgaria (q. v.), and would have been made archbishop there but that the canons (at that time) forbade transfers from one see to another. In the time of pope John VIII he was condemned on a charge of conspiracy against Charles the Bald and the pope (Hefele, *Concilien Geschichte*, iv, 496), A.D. 876. He was deprived of his episcopacy, and of all rights except lay communion. Pope Martin V restored him to his see in 883. Formosus was elected pope Sept. 21, 891, and was the first instance in the West of a bishop transferred from one see to another. Soon after his election, legates sent by the emperor Leo and the Eastern bishops arrived in Rome to obtain a confirmation of the ordinations of Photius (q. v.), but Formosus would not grant the request, and the East and West were still farther alienated. In 893 he took sides politically with Charles the Simple against Odo. On the death of Guido, 891, Formosus invited Arnulf to Rome, and crowned him emperor, 895. Formosus died on Easter day, 896. Pope Stephen VI caused the dead body of Formosus to be taken up and brought into a synod at Rome, condemned as guilty of intrusion into the holy see, and treated with gross indignity. Stephen declared all the acts of Formosus null and void. His "character" was restored by pope John IX, A.D. 898.—Bower, *Lives of the Popes*, v, 71–73; Baronius, *Annales*, A.D. 891–896.

**Forms of Prayer** are set prayers, prepared to be used in worship, public and private. As to the propriety and utility of such forms there has been much dispute. The arguments are about as follows.

I. *From Scripture.*—(1.) On the one hand it is asserted against the use of forms that "there is not the slightest trace in all the New Testament of any established liturgical service of Christian worship. There are no forms of prayer prescribed for such worship—a thing which we conceive must be inevitable if such liturgical form had been the best form, the most accordant with the will of the Great Head over all things to the Church, and the most consonant with the mind of the Spirit, the most appropriate for the bestowment and exercise of his influences. In things of much less importance we have explicit directions; and it is hardly to be supposed, if a liturgy for public worship were most appropriate for the wants of men, and most agreeable to the will of God, that there should have been no directions, nor even intimations in regard to it. It is hardly to be supposed, when all things were set in order in the churches, that this main thing should have been neglected, or left at loose ends—so loose that not a single trace even of so much as a prescribed articular confession of faith or form of prayer can be found in the New Testament oracles" (Cheever). In the same spirit, Coleman (*Apostolical and Primitive Church*, ch. xi) undertakes to prove, 1, that the use of forms of prayer is opposed to the spirit of the Christian dispensation; 2, that it is opposed to the example of Christ and of his apostles; and, 3, that it is unauthorized by their instructions. (2.) On the

other hand, in favor of forms, it is declared that "the slightest acquaintance with Scripture is enough to convince cavillers that contrary to Scripture could not be that practice for which we can plead the precedent of Moses and Miriam, and the daughters of Israel, of Aaron and his sons when they blessed the people, of Deborah and Barak; when the practice was even more directly sanctioned by the Holy Ghost at the time he inspired David and the Psalmists; for what are the Psalms but an inspired form of prayer for the use of the Church under the Gospel, as well as under the law? The services of the synagogue, too, it is well known, were conducted according to a prescribed form. To those services our blessed Lord did himself conform; and severely as he reproved the Jews for their departure, in various particulars, from the principles of their fathers, against their practice in this particular never did he utter one word of censure; nay, he confirmed the practice when he himself gave to his disciples a form of prayer, and framed that prayer, too, on the model, and in some degree in the very words, of prayers then in use. Our Lord, moreover, when giving his directions to the rulers of his Church, at the same time that he conferred on them authority to bind and to loose, directed them to agree touching what they should ask for, which seems almost to convey an injunction to the rulers of every particular Church to provide their people with a form of prayer" (Hook). But "far more weight than all other arguments together has the one obvious and simple reason that our Lord's especial blessing and favorable reception of petitions is bestowed on those who, assembling in his name, shall 'agree' touching what they shall ask in his name. Now this surely implies the exclusive use of precomposed prayers in a congregation, since it plainly seems an impossibility for uninspired men to agree together in a prayer offered up by one of them if they do not know at least the substance of the prayer before they hear him utter the words. In their private devotions, let individuals address their 'Father who seeth in secret' in any expressions (that are but intelligible to themselves) which occur at the moment. But congregational prayer, common supplication, joint worship, is a very different thing. And accordingly our Lord supplies to his disciples no form of words for solitary devotion, but does teach them a form evidently designed for joint worship. The contrast is most remarkable: 'Thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet,' etc.; 'when ye pray, say, Our Father,' etc. Our Lord, by teaching this form (and which he delivered on two distinct occasions in nearly the same words—Matt. vi, 9, and Luke xi, 1, 2), gave the strongest possible sanction to the use of precomposed prayers for congregational worship" (Eden).

II. *From Antiquity and Usage.*—Extreme views are maintained as to the usage of the primitive Church in prayer. (1.) On the one hand, lord King says (*Constitution of the Primitive Church*), "There is not the least mention of fixed forms in any of the primitive writings, nor the least word or syllable tending thereto, that I can find, which is a most unaccountable silence if ever such there were, but rather some expressions intimating the contrary." One of the principal authorities which he adduces is Justin Martyr, who, describing the manner of the prayer before the celebration of the Lord's Supper, says that the bishop sent up prayers and praises to God *with his utmost ability* (ὅσην ἐνθάρατο). This he expounds, that he prayed with the best of his abilities, invention, expression, and judgment, exerting his own gifts and parts in suitable manner and apt expression. He also quotes Tertullian and Origen in vindication of his views, that written forms of prayer were never used in the Church. To the same effect Coleman (*Apost. Church*, ch. xi) maintains that forms are "opposed to the simplicity and freedom of primitive worship," and that their use, in fact, "was un-

known in the primitive Church." In proof of this position, he (with lord King) adduces Justin Martyr († 165) (translation by Semisch, i, 72), and Tertullian († 220) (*Apolog.* ch. xxxix), who uses the phrase *we pray without a monitor, because from the heart* (sine monitore, quia de pectore), and also the fact that the four earliest liturgies originated in the 4th century. (2.) On the other hand, it is argued that the Jewish synagogue had its liturgy, to which Christ and the apostles conformed; that John Baptist taught his disciples to pray, and that Christ gave a form to his followers in answer to their request; that if the four ancient liturgies can only be traced to the 4th century, there are numerous passages in the fathers that imply their use in the apostolic age, and that fragments of them as far back as Clemens (A.D. 194) and Dionysius of Alexandria (247) are found; that the passages from Justin and Tertullian, rightly interpreted, bear as strongly in favor of liturgies as against them; that the Apostolical Canons (q. v.) enjoin them; and that, from the 4th century downwards, both the Eastern and Western churches have uniformly used forms of prayer (Hook; Eden, s. v.). On the historical questions as to the early use of liturgies, see LITURGY.

III. *From the Tendencies and Results of their Use.*—(1.) *Against forms*, it is alleged that those adopted in one age are unsuitable to another; that the perpetual repetition of the same prayers makes them wearisome, and destroys their significance; that they must often be unsuited to the occasion, to the sermon, and to the circumstances of the congregation; and that their general tendency is, and always has been, to formalism and a mere outside worship, not of the heart, but of the lips.

(2.) *For the use of forms*, it is asserted that the forms in use are, like the Psalms, from which they are largely derived, adapted to the worship of the Church in all ages; that forms are not as wearisome to a devout mind as extempore prayers of the same length; that for special occasions special prayers can always be framed; and that their tendency has been proved, in the history of the Church, to be most salutary. It is further objected to extemporaneous prayers that (1) "it must be generally impossible that the whole congregation should join in a prayer they never had heard before, the instant it is uttered; and totally impossible many distinct congregations should all be uniformly employing the same extemporaneous prayer." (2) That free prayer gives too little scope to the congregation; nothing is left for them to do; they are, throughout, passive and receptive; they hear the minister pray rather than join in public prayer; at best, they follow the minister rather than worship in prayer. (3) That free prayer tends to degenerate into preaching or exhortation; that the preacher can hardly fail to aim at edifying his congregation instead of being simply their mouthpiece in the act of worship, and so his prayers become homiletical instead of devotional. (4) That unpremeditated prayers are apt to depend on the impulse of the moment in the preacher, his state of health, etc., and may therefore be either short and cold on the one hand, or long and diffusive on the other; and that it is apt, therefore, to be personal rather than representative, if the prayer is the natural outflow of the minister's heart, which, on the theory, it ought to be.

A judicious writer in the *Brit. and For. Evang. Rev.* (July, 1857), after stating that there are only three positions possible on this question—(1) the use of forms, with the exclusion of free prayer; (2) free prayer, excluding all forms; (3) the combination, in greater or lesser measure, of both—argues that the Reformers and fathers of Protestantism favored the third. "In practice they stood precisely midway between the two antagonist positions of modern times, and can be legitimately claimed as partisans by neither. They were the advocates neither of form nor of freedom, but of both. They at once sanctioned the use of liturgical

aids, and vindicated the right of personal freedom. Whether rightly or wrongly, whether as a remnant of the old bondage which they could not all at once throw off, or the dictate of that divine conservative wisdom which in most things so marvellously guided them in reforming, not new founding, the Church, having regard also, perhaps, in some measure, to the circumstances and necessities of their times, the fact, at least, is historically certain that with one consent they aimed rather at the combination and mutual co-operation of both elements than the exclusive predominance of either. While not confining their churches to any unbending ritual, they yet deemed it their duty to provide for them such fit and solemn forms of common prayer as should serve at once as a model and as an aid in the public worship of God. This was the principle alike of Knox and of Crammer, of Calvin equally with Luther and Melancthon. At Geneva, at Zurich, at Wittenberg, at St. Andrew's—wherever the great leaders of the Reformation were at liberty to carry out their views, the solemn service of the house of God proceeded according to a certain normal order, which was designed to regulate and assist, not to restrain, the free outpourings of the heart. England was an apparent, but only an apparent, exception to this rule. In her case the more rigid enforcement of an unvarying ritual was rather the result of urgent circumstances than of the personal convictions of her leading divines. The principle of comprehension on which her reformation was based rendered a certain restraint necessary in the interest, not of ritual uniformity, but of Protestant truth. The object of suspicion then was the Roman priest, not the evangelical pastor, and the design of ritual restriction was rather to curb the license of the one than to fetter the liberty of the other. Ave Marias must be silenced, even though at the sacrifice of free prayer; the communion service must be prescribed by imperative rubric, or it will be turned by many into a mass. But for this adventitious, and, in their view, probably temporary necessity, there is every reason to believe that the liturgical ordinances of the English reformers would have been much less fixed and stringent, and that in the matter of worship, as well as in other elements of her constitution, the Church which they founded would have been brought into much nearer conformity with the general model of other Reformed communions. Be this, however, as it may, the real and essential point of difference, even in practice, between Canterbury and Geneva was not the use, but the exclusive use of forms. The one confined, the other permitted and encouraged, the spontaneous utterances of devotion. The one supplied an aid, the other ordained a law. In truth, in the Scottish form at least, while much was provided, *nothing* was prescribed. Instead of the Anglican 'then shall the priest say,' its gentler and wiser language is 'the minister useth one of these two confessions,' or 'this prayer following, or such like.' The accustomed order, in short, was rather observed as a rule than obeyed as a law; worn as a dress than borne as a burden; followed with free and willing heart in the spirit rather than the letter—as a law of liberty, not a yoke of bondage" (p. 600 sq.). We cite also the *Princeton Review* as follows: "As to stated forms of prayer, their value must vary with circumstances. In no case ought the liberty of extemporaneous prayer to be taken from the minister in the pulpit. As well might preaching be confined by authority to prescribed forms of words. The discretion of the ministry may be trusted as freely in the one as the other. But if, in the solemn office of leading the united devotions of the assembly, the ministry might exercise a judgment better informed by approved examples set forth for that end, and if it might even have an election between extemporaneous prayer and a form appointed to be used at option, the standard of extemporary prayer itself would rise, and



the edification of our people in public worship would be enlarged. We must not make our liberty a cloak of licentiousness. There are few of our most able and eminent ministers who come as near the true standard of pulpit prayer as they do that of the sermon. When we hear it said of such a man as Robert Hall that his prayers were felt by his hearers to be strikingly unequal to his sermons, we seem to discern in a mind keenly sensitive to the proprieties of pulpit prayer an aversion to making prayer the work of genius, and at the same time some lack of zeal in cultivating the peculiar talent for its just and most useful performance. But among our brethren of the lower grades of ability and industry we not infrequently observe habits in this service from which many of our sensible and pious people would gladly take refuge in a book of prayers. When we sometimes hear the intimation that the Book of Common Prayer, could it be quietly introduced, would be an improvement upon the present forms of devotion in many of our pulpits, we know this preference not to be for written prayers in general, but as an alternative and a way of escape from peculiar and unnecessary faults in prayers with which the observers are often afflicted. We cannot assent to such a remark, but we have a deep impression of the needless imperfection of our present standard, and desire to speak that impression with emphasis. We are confident that our standard may be so raised that all would feel the transition from extemporaneous to written prayers as a descent and a defection. When we observe the special satisfaction of thousands of devout worshippers with what appear to us the indefinite and comparatively barren forms of the English liturgy, we see the great power of a few striking points of propriety in public prayer to engage the heart of true devotion" (January, 1847, p. 81, 82).

The conclusion arrived at by Richard Watson (*Institutes*, ii, 507) is just and temperate, viz. that there are advantages in each mode of worship, and that, when combined prudently, the public service of the sanctuary has its most perfect constitution. Much, however, in the practice of churches is to be regulated by due respect to differences of opinion, and even to prejudice, on a point upon which we are left at liberty by the Scriptures, and which must therefore be ranked among things prudential. Here, as in many other things, Christians must give place to each other, and do all things "in charity."

Among the modern Protestant churches, the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church use forms of prayer to the exclusion (generally) of free prayer in public worship. The Methodist Episcopal Church uses liturgical forms for sacraments and other services, and free prayer in worship. The Presbyterian churches use free prayer (*Directory of Worship*, ch. v). The Lutheran and Reformed churches have liturgical forms for certain services, but generally use free prayer in worship. A movement towards more full liturgical services has been going on for some time in the German Reformed Church. See GERMAN REFORMED CHURCH, and LITURGY. A tendency in the same direction appears to have arisen in the Presbyterian Church in the United States (see Shields, *Liturgia Expurgata*, Philadel. 1864; see also Baird, *Eutaxia, or the Presbyterian Liturgies*, N. York, 1855, 18mo; reprinted in London as *A Chapter on Liturgies*, edited by Thomas Binney, 1856, 18mo). In the Established Church of Scotland, Dr. Robert Lee, of Edinburgh, was tried before the General Assembly in 1859 for using a book entitled *Prayers for Public Worship* in the public services of Old Grayfriars' Church, Edinburgh; and the Assembly enjoined Dr. Lee to discontinue the practice. But the tendency went on; and in 1867 appeared *Enchological, or Book of Prayers, being Forms of Worship issued by the Church-service Society* (Edinb. and Lond. 1867), under the auspices of Dr. Lee and Dr. Macleod. See, besides the works al-

ready mentioned, Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. xiii; Palmer, *Origines Liturgicæ*; Leighton, *Works*, ii, 422; Milton, *Prose Works* (Philadel. 1850), i, 96 sq. (against forms); Shields, *The Book of Comm. Prayer as amended by the Westminster Divines A. D. 1661, with a historical and liturgical Treatise* (Philadelphia, 1867, 12mo); Brownell, *Family Prayer-book* (Introduction); Butler, *Common Prayer Illustrated*, ch. i; *Princeton Review*, vii, 389 sq.; xviii, 487 sq.; xxvii, 445 sq.; *Mercersburgh Review*, Jan. 1868, art. vii; *Evangelical Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1869, p. 80.

**Formularies**, a general name for the articles of religion, forms of service, etc., adopted by any particular church. See CREEDS; CONFESSIONS; LITURGY.

**Formula Concordiæ**. See CONCORD, FORMULA OF.

**Formula Consensus Helvetica**. See HELVETIC CONFESSIONS.

**Fornication** (ἡδονή, *taznuth'*, πορνεία, illicit sexual intercourse, especially of a married woman). See ADULTERY. From the Scriptures we learn that long before the time of Moses morals had become very much corrupted, and not only the prostitution of females, but of boys, was very common among many nations, and even made a part of the divine worship, as may be inferred from the Hebrew words *kadesh*, a prostitute boy, and *kedeshah*, the feminine of it, which words properly and originally mean a person religiously set apart and consecrated to the flagitious vice in question (Deut. xxiii, 18; 1 Kings xiv, 24; Job xxxvi, 14; Gen. xxxviii, 21, 22; Numb. xxi, 1; Deut. xxiii, 18; Hos. iv, 14). How great the corruption of manners with reference to the marriage relation was among the Egyptians appears from Herodotus (ii, 111) as well as the Bible. The wife of one of the oldest kings was untrue to him. It was a long time before a woman could be found who was faithful to her husband; and when one was at last found, the king took her without hesitation for himself. With impudent shamelessness Potiphar's wife seeks to seduce Joseph (Gen. xxxix, 7). The evidence of the monuments is also not very favorable to the Egyptian women. Thus they are represented as addicted to excess in drinking wine, as even becoming so much intoxicated as to be unable to stand or walk alone, or "to carry their liquor discreetly" (Wilkinson's *Egypt*, ii, 167). To prevent those evils to which the Greek and Roman philosophers refused to oppose any decided resistance, Moses made the following regulations: 1. That among the Hebrews no prostitute, either male nor female, should be tolerated; and that if the daughter of a priest especially were guilty of fornication, she should be stoned and her body burnt (Lev. xxi, 9); because these things, as Moses observes in Lev. xix, 29; Deut. xxiii, 17, 18, were a great abomination in the sight of God. Further, in order that priests of avaricious minds should not, in imitation of other nations, make crimes of this kind a part of the divine worship, he enacted, 2. That the price of prostitution, though presented in return for a vow, should not be received at the sanctuary (Deut. xxiii, 18). This law, it seems, was sometimes violated in the times of the kings (2 Kings xxiii, 7). He also enacted, 3. That the man who had seduced a female should marry her, and in case the father would not consent, should pay the customary dowry, viz. thirty shekels; in case violence had been offered, fifty shekels (Exod. xxii, 16; Deut. xxii, 23-29). This law appears to have originated in an ancient custom alluded to in Gen. xxxiv, 1-12. Finally, to secure the great object, he enacted, 4. That any one who, when married, was not found to be a virgin, as she professed before marriage, should be stoned before her father's house (Deut. xxii, 20, 21). These laws, it must be admitted, were severe; but prostitutes of both sexes, notwithstanding their severity, were set apart in the time of the kings for the service of idols (Prov. ii, 16-19;

7, 3-6; vii, 5-27; 1 Kings xiv, 24; xv, 12; Amos ii, 7; vii, 17; Jer. iii, 2; v, 7; John viii, 3-11). Among the Greeks and Romans of the apostles' day licentiousness was fearfully prevalent. See HARLOT.

In Scripture this word occurs more frequently in its symbolical than in its ordinary sense. In the Prophets woman is often made the symbol of the church or nation of the Jews, which is regarded as affianced to Jehovah by the covenant on Mount Sinai. In Ezek. xvi there is a long description of that people under the symbol of a female child, growing up to the stature of a woman, and then wedded to Jehovah by entering into covenant with him. Therefore, when the Israelites acted contrary to that covenant by forsaking God and following idols, they were very properly represented by the symbol of a harlot or adulteress offering herself to all comers (Isa. i, 2; Jer. ii, 20; Ezek. xvi; Hos. i, 2; iii, 11). Thus fornication, or adultery (which is fornication in a married state), became, and is used as the symbol of idolatry itself (Jer. iii, 8, 9; Ezek. xvi, 26, 29; xxiii, 37). See Wemyss's *Clavis Symb.* s. v. Woman. See IDOLATRY.

**Forjulian Manuscript** (*Codex Forjuliensis*), an important copy of the early Latin version of the Gospels at Triuli, published in part by Blanchini (*Evangel. Quadruplex*, append.). Mark's Gospel is partly at Venice in a state of decay, and partly at Prague, the last having been edited by Dobrowsky in 1778.—Scribner, *Introd.* p. 265; Tregelles, in Horne's *Introd.* iv, 254. See LATIN VERSIONS.

**Forskal, Peter**, a Swedish naturalist, was born at Smaland in 1736, and was educated at Göttingen. He devoted his life to natural science, travelled extensively, and died on an Eastern tour at Djerim, in Yemen, July 11, 1763. His name is mentioned here on account of his *Descriptiones Animalium, orium, amphibi-orum*, etc., *que in itinere orientali observavit P. Forskäl*, published after his death (Copenh. 1775, 4to); *Flora Egyptiaco-Arabica sive descriptiones plantarum*, etc. (ed. C. Niebuhr (Copenhagen. 1775, 4to); and *Icones vrum naturalium*, etc. (Copenhagen, 1776, 4to), which are of value for the natural history of Scripture.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Log. Générale*, xviii, 198.

**Forster, Bartholomæus**, a German Roman Catholic theologian, was born Aug. 12, 1753. He was ordained a secular priest in 1776, and went then to Altdorf. Here his opposition to the celibacy of the clergy, etc., brought him into trouble. He finally became professor of rhetoric and Greek literature in the Gymnasium of Landshut in 1803. Among his writings are *Entlarvter Aberglauben bei Reliquien, Bildern*, etc. (München, 1803);—*Von d. Interesse d. römischen Curie an Ablässen u. Brüderschäften* (Mün. 1803).—Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 436.

**Forster, Johann**, an eminent German theologian and scholar, was born at Augsburg in 1495. He became professor of Hebrew at Zwicken, and assisted Luther in his translation of the Bible. In 1535 he was made pastor of St. Moritz at Augsburg by the influence of Luther. His zeal for the Lutheran doctrines often brought him into conflict with his colleagues at the university. He even attacked Blarer and (Ecolampadius. A visiting committee, sent from Stuttgart in 1540, laid the matter before the duke, who decided against Forster. The latter retired to Nuremberg, from whence he proceeded to Ratisbon, and in 1543 accepted a call to Schleusingen. He finally succeeded Cruciger as professor of theology in the University of Wittenberg. In 1554 he assisted Melancthon in the Osiandrian controversies, and died at Wittenberg Dec. 8, 1556. He wrote a Hebrew Lexicon, *Dictionarium Hebraicum Novum*, etc. (Basel, 1557, fol.), founded purely on the Hebrew of the Bible, and throwing out Rabbinical sources of information. His letters are of considerable importance for the history of that time.—Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 436. There

is an elaborate article on Forster in the *Zeitschrift f. d. hist. Theologie*, 1869, p. 210 sq.

**Forster, Nathaniel**, a learned English divine, was born at Stadscombe, Devonshire, Feb. 3, 1717; educated at Corpus Christi, of which he became fellow in 1729; obtained a prebendal stall in the cathedral of Bristol and the vicarage of Rochdale in 1754. In 1757 he became preacher at the Rolls, and died Oct. 20 in that year. He wrote *Reflections on the high Antiquity of Government, Arts, and Sciences in Egypt* (Oxf. 1743, 8vo):—*A Dissertation on Josephus's Account of Jesus Christ* (Oxf. 1749):—*Bibliu Hebraica sine punctis* (1750, 2 vols. 4to):—*Papery destructive of the Evidences of Christianity* (Oxf. 1746).—*Biog. Britannica*, s. v.

**Forster, William**, a member of the Society of Friends, was born at Tottenham, England, in 1794. He was carefully trained by his parents, who were excellent "Friends," and at nineteen began to exercise his gifts as a "minister." Most of his life was devoted to missionary journeys through the British Islands, the Continent of Europe, and the United States, on his third visit to which, "with an antislavery address to the president and governors," he died in Tennessee, in the sixty-ninth year of his age. In the preceding year, 1852, he visited the Vaudois of Piedmont, and printed a large number of books and tracts in Italian for circulation. Everywhere he scattered blessings by word and deed, "leaving his mark for good on everything he set his hand to." His son, William E. Forster, is (1869) a member of the British Parliament, and an eminent Liberal in politics.—Seebohm, *Memoirs of William Forster* (London, 1865, 2 vols.); *Christian Remembrancer*, January, 1866, art. iv.

**Fort**, the rendering in the A. V. of the following Heb. words: מִצְדָּה, *metsal'* (so called as a place of *lying in wait*), a *castle*, esp. on a hill, Ezek. xxxiii, 27 (elsewhere usually "stronghold"); or fem. מִצְדָּה, *metsulah'*, a similar kind of fastness, e. g. the *citadel* of Zion, 2 Sam. v, 9 (elsewhere "fortress," etc.). מַצְוֵה, *maoz'* (so called from its *strength*), a *stronghold*, fortified by nature and art, Dan. xi, 19 (elsewhere usually "strength," etc.). דּוּקְלָה, *duykel'* (so called from *looking out*), a *watch-tower*, especially a scaling-tower in a siege, 2 Kings xxv, 1; Jer. lii, 4; Ezek. iv, 2; xvii, 17; xxi, 22; xxvi, 8. מִצְרָה, *metsarah'* (so called as being *compact*), a *fortification*, e. g. in the siege of a city; generally for defence ("fenced city," q. v.), but also for assault, Isa. xxix, 3. מִגְדָּל, *o'phel* (q. v.), a *mount* (so called from its tumulus form), Isa. xxxii, 14 (elsewhere "tower," "stronghold"). מִגְדָּל, *misgal'* (so called from its *height*), a *refuge* (as often rendered; also "tower," "defence"), Isa. xxv, 13. See FORTIFICATION.


**Fortia d'Urban**, Marquis of, was born Feb. 18, 1756, and died at Paris Aug. 4, 1843. After completing his studies at the Military School in Paris, he entered the army in 1773, but resigned his commission in 1779 to attend to an important suit in Rome before the papal court of appeals (the Rota), pending the decision of which he devoted himself to the study of the fine arts, antiquities, and mathematics. He was a prolific author, and wrote on a variety of subjects, of which we mention *Principes et Questions de Morale Naturelle* (Paris, new ed., 1834, 2 vols. 12mo):—*Direction pour la Conscience d'un roi* (Paris, 1821, 12mo):—*Chronologie de la vie de Jesus-Christ* (Paris, 1827, 8vo, and 1830, 12mo):—*Note sur la Genie du Christianisme* (Par. 1830, 8vo):—*Essai sur l'origine de l'écriture*, etc. (Paris, 1832, 8vo):—*Sur les trois systemes d'écriture de Egyptiens* (Paris, 1833, 12mo):—*Essai sur l'immortalité de l'âme et sur la resurrection* (Paris, 1835, 12mo):—*Discours prononcés au Cercle de Morale Universelle* (Paris, 1835-9, 12mo):—*Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'introduction du Christianisme dans les Gaules* (Par.

1838, 8vo). He was also a collaborator in the *Chefs-d'Œuvres des Pères de l'Église* (Paris, 15 vols, 8vo), and the *Annales de la Philosophie Chrétienne*.—Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xviii, 217–221. (J. W. M.)

**Fortification.** The Hebrews had several terms which include the idea of military walls, and which are variously rendered in the Auth. Vers., as “fort,” “fortress,” “fenced city,” “castle,” “strong-hold,” “mound,” “trench,” etc., all of which see in their places.

Inventions for the defence of men in social life are older than history. The walls, towers, and gates represented on Egyptian monuments, though dating back to a period of fifteen centuries before the Christian era, bear evidence of an advanced state of fortifications—of walls built of squared stones, or of squared timber

judiciously placed on the summit of scarped rocks, or within the circumference of one or two wet ditches, and furnished along the top with regular battlements to protect the defenders (see Wilkinson, i, 407 sq.). All these are of later invention than the accumulation of unhewn or rudely-chipped uncemented stones, piled on each other in the form of walls, in the so-called Cyclopean, Pelasgian, Etruscan, and Celtic styles, where there are no ditches, or towers, or other gateways than mere openings occasionally left between the enormous blocks employed in the work. As the first three styles occur in Etruria they show the progressive advance of military architecture, and may be considered as more primitive, though perhaps posterior to the era when the progress of Israel, under the guidance of Joshua, expelled several Canaanitish tribes, whose system of civilization, in common with that of the rest of Western Asia, bore an Egyptian type, and whose



Ancient Assyrians attacking a Fort.



Ancient Egyptians attacking a Fort.


towers and battlements were remarkably high, or, rather, were erected in very elevated situations. When, therefore, the Israelites entered Palestine, we may assume that the “fenced cities” they had to attack were, according to their degree of antiquity, fortified with more or less of art, but all with huge stones in the lower walls, like the Etruscan. Indeed, Asia Minor, Armenia, Syria, and even Jerusalem, still bear marks of this most ancient system, notwithstanding that this region, the connecting link between Asia and

Africa, between the trade of the East and the West, and between the religious feelings of the whole earth, has been the common battle-field of all the great nations of antiquity, and of modern times, where ruin and desolation, oftentimes repeated, have been spread over every habitable place. Stones from six to fifty feet in length, with suitable proportions, can still be detected in many walls of the cities of those regions, wherever quarries existed; from Nineveh, where, beneath the surface, there still remain ruins and walls of huge stones, sculptured with bas-reliefs, originally painted, to Babylon, and Bassorah, where bricks, sundried or baked, and stamped with letters, are yet found, as well as in all the plains of the rivers where that material alone could be easily procured. See ARCHITECTURE.

As among the Hebrews there was no system of construction strictly so called, but simply an application of the means of defence to the localities, no uniformity of adaptation existed, and therefore we refer to the foregoing as specimens of the numerous illustrations of this subject that occur on the Egyptian and Assyrian monuments, and to other explanations which are given under the several terms in other parts of this work. See also CITY; SIEGE; WAR, etc.

The wall, חֹמָה, *chomah*, was sometimes double or triple (2 Chron. xxxii, 5), successively girding a rocky elevation; and “building a city” originally meant the construction of the wall. See WALL. Before wall-towers, מִגְדָּלוֹת, *migdaloth*, were introduced, the gate of a city, originally single, formed a kind of citadel, and was the strongest part of all the defences: it was the armory of the community, and the council-house of the authorities. “Sitting in the gate” was, and still is, synonymous with the possession of power, and even now there is commonly in the fortified gate of a royal palace in the East, on the floor above the doorway, a council-room with a kind of balcony, whence the sovereign sometimes sees his people, and where he may sit in judgment. Hence the Turkish government is not unfrequently termed *the Porte*, and in this sense allusion to gates often occurs in the Scriptures. The tower, טֵרֵיִךְ, *teri'ach*, was another fortification of the earliest date, being often the citadel or last retreat when a city was taken; or, standing alone in some naturally strong position, was intended to protect a frontier, command a pass, or to be a place of refuge and deposit of treasure in the mountains, when the plain should be no longer defensible. This was the kind of citadel which defended passes, and in the mountains served for retreat in times of calamity, and for the security of the royal treasures; and it was on account of the confined space within, and the great elevation of the ramparts, that private houses frequently stood upon their summit, as was the case when the harlot Rahab received Joshua's spies in Jericho (Josh. ii, 1). Watch-towers, מִצְפָּה, *mizpah*, and טֵרֵיִךְ, *tu-*

*rah'*, used by shepherds all over Asia, and even now built on eminences above some city in the plain, in order to keep a look-out upon the distant country, were already in use, and occasionally converted into places of defence (2 Chron. xxvi, 10; xxvii, 4). See TOWER. The gateways were closed by ponderous folding-doors, שַׁא'ר, *shu'ar*, the valves or folds, דַּלְתָּיִם, *delutha'yim*, being secured by wooden bars: both the doors and bars were in after times plated with metal. See GATE. A ditch (שֶׁלַח, *cheyl*), where the nature of the locality required it, was dug in front of the rampart, and sometimes there was an inner wall, with a second ditch before it. See DITCH. As the experience of ages increased, huge "counter forts," double buttresses, or masses of solid stone and masonry (not bulwarks), were built in particular parts to sustain the outer wall, and afford space on the summit to place military engines (2 Chron. xxvi, 15).—Kitto, s. v. See FENCED CITY; MUNITION.



Modern Persian Fort.

**Fortress**, the rendering in the A. V. of the following Hebrew terms: מַצְוֵר, *matzor'* (from its *intrenchment*), *fortification*, Jer. x, 17 (elsewhere "bulwark," "fenced city," etc.). מִצְדָּה, *mitsudah'* (from its *security*), a *castle*, espec. poet., 2 Sam. xvii, 2; Psa. xviii, 2, 3; lxxi, 3; xci, 3; cxliv, 2 (elsewhere usually "stronghold"). מִבְּצָר, *mitsbar'* (as being *inaccessible*), a *fortified place*, Isa. xviii, 3; xxv, 12; xxxiv, 13; Hos. x, 14; Amos v, 9 (elsewhere "fenced city" [q. v.], "stronghold," etc.). מַצְוֵז, *maoz'* (from its *strength*), a *stronghold*, Jer. xvi, 19; Dan. xi, 7, 10 (elsewhere "strength," etc.). See FORTIFICATION.

**Fortunatianus**, bishop of Aquileia, was of African origin, and an active participant in the strifes which agitated the Church in the 4th century. At the Council of Milan, A. D. 355, he joined in the condemnation of Athanasius, but after 357 we hear no more of him. He wrote commentaries on the Gospels, characterized by Jerome as useful, though incorrect in style.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xviii, 232; Ceillier, *Histoire des Auteurs Ecclésiastiques*, t. vi, p. 11. (J. W. M.)

**Fortuna'tus** (Græcized Φορτοσύνατος), a disciple of Corinth, of Roman birth or origin, as his name indicates, who visited Paul at Ephesus, and returned, along with Stephanus and Achaicus, in charge of that apostle's first Epistle to the Corinthian Church (1 Cor. xvi, 17), A. D. 54. Some have supposed that these three Corinthian brethren were "they which are of the house of Chloe" (οἱ Κλωῆ), alluded to in 1 Cor. i, 11; but the language of irony, in which the apostle must in that case be interpreted in ch. xvi as speaking of their presence, would become sarcasm too cutting for so tender a heart as Paul's to have uttered among his valedictions. "The household of Stephanus" is mentioned in chap. i, 16 as having been baptized by Paul himself: perhaps Fortunatus and Achaicus may have been members of that household. There is a Fortunatus mentioned at the end of Clement's first Epistle to the Corinthians, who was possibly the same person.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

**Fortunatus, Venantius, Honorius Clemen-**

**tianus**, bishop of Poitiers, and a Latin poet, was born about A. D. 530, near Treviso, in Italy. He studied grammar, rhetoric, literature, and law, and became so distinguished as an orator as to receive the surname of "Scholasticissimus." From Italy he came to France, where he acquired great reputation as a poet, and was received with favor at the court of Sigebert, king of Austrasia, in honor of whose marriage with Brunhilde (566) he wrote one of his poems. Having gone to Poitiers, he became preacher and confessor of the convent to which the former queen Radegunde and her sister had retired. Here he continued his philosophical and theological studies with great ardor, and became connected with Gregory of Tours (q. v.) and other dignitaries of the Church. He was appointed bishop of Poitiers in 599, but died soon after, probably about 609. He wrote eleven books of poetry on divers subjects; hymns, many of which have been used by the Church; epistles to different bishops, especially to Gregory of Tours; stories dedicated to his protectors, Radegunde and Agnes, which have given rise to an unfounded accusation of improper intimacy between them; the life of St. Martin; an explanation of the Lord's prayer, etc. He was the first to use rhyme with a certain degree of mastery, though with considerable license; he also mastered the trochaic tetrameter. His best known hymns are *Vexilla Regis prodeunt*, and *Pange Lingua Gloriosi*, which are incorporated into the Roman breviary. They may be found in Daniel, *Thesaurus Hymnologicus*, i, 160 sq., and are given, with Neale's translations, by Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, iii, 596 sq., and in Schaff, *Christ in Song* (New York, 1869). A *Commentary on the Athanasian Creed* is attributed to him; Waterland vindicates his authorship of it (*Works*, Oxford, 1843, iii, 134 sq.), but Lucchi and other critics deny it. Muratori conjectured (without adequate ground) that Fortunatus was the author of the Athanasian Creed itself. His writings were collected by Brower, *Opera Omnia*; published also in *Bibl. Mar. Patrum* (1677). The best edition is that of Lucchi (Rome, 1786-7, 2 vols. 4to; reproduced in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, vols. lxxii and lxxviii). A full account of the writings of Fortunatus is given in Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacrés* (Paris, 1862), xi, 402 sq. See also Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xviii, 227-31.

**Fosbroolke**, THOMAS DUDLEY, a distinguished archæologist, was born in London May 27, 1770. He was educated at St. Paul's School, and elected scholar at Pembroke College, Oxford, in 1785. In 1794 he became curate of Horsley; in 1810, curate of Walford; in 1830, vicar of Walford. He died January 1, 1842. His archæological writings are very valuable. His works are *British Monachism: Manners and Customs of Monks and Nuns in England* (Lond. new ed. 1843, imp. 8vo);—*Encyclopædia of Antiquities, Classical and Medieval* (new ed. Lond. 1843, 2 vols. imp. 8vo);—*Arts, Manufactures, etc. of the Greeks and Romans* (London, 1833-5, 2 vols. fcp. 8vo). A memoir of his life is prefixed to the *British Monachism*.

**Fossors, Fossorii.** See COPATE.

**Foster, Benjamin, D. D.**, a Baptist preacher and author, was born at Danvers, Mass., June 12, 1750, and graduated at Yale College in 1774. Near the close of his college course, having been appointed to take part in a discussion of the subject of baptism on the Pedobaptist side, his investigations made him a convert to Baptist views. He pursued his studies in theology under the Rev. Dr. Stillman, of Boston, and was ordained pastor of a church in Leicester, Mass., in 1776. He was afterwards pastor successively at Newport, R. I., and at New York. During the prevalence of yellow fever in 1798 he declined to seek immunity from it by leaving his post of duty, and died from exposure to the pestilence. He was a diligent and zealous preacher, a devoted pastor, and respecta-

ble scholar. He was the author of, 1. *The Washing of Regeneration, or the Divine Right of Immersion*:—2. *Primitive Baptism defined*:—3. *A Dissertation on the Seventy Weeks of Daniel* (Newport, 1787). (L. E. S.)

**Foster, James, D.D.**, an eminent Nonconformist divine, was born at Exeter in 1697. He began preaching as an Independent in 1718. In 1724 he became a Baptist, succeeding the eminent Gale. His eloquence gained for him enthusiastic popularity. Pope, Savage, and Bolingbroke were among his eulogists. But, with all his personal virtues and popular talents, "he neither professed nor possessed much zeal for the essential doctrines of Christianity." He published *Sermons* (Lond. 1745, 4th ed. 8vo):—*Discourses on Natural Religion and the Social Virtues* (Lond. 1749); and an *Essay on Fundamentals*, especially the doctrine of the Trinity. His most important work, and that by which he is best known, is his *Defence of the Usefulness, Truth, and Excellency of the Christian Religion*, written against Tyndale (Lond. 1734, 3d ed. 8vo). He died in 1753. (L. E. S.)

**Foster, John**, the celebrated essayist, was born at Halifax, Yorkshire, Sept. 17, 1770. In early life he was set to the trade of a weaver. At the age of seventeen, having joined a Baptist church, he entered the Baptist College at Bristol. On the completion of his studies he began preaching at Newcastle-on-Tyne. Being somewhat unsettled in his doctrinal views, he sought a connection with the "General Baptists," and made an unsuccessful attempt to establish himself at Dublin. Returning to England, he labored successively at Chichester, Frome, and Downend. His moderate success as a preacher was in striking contrast with his unquestioned intellectual power and his literary reputation. While residing at Downend he produced the *Essays* which have won a permanent place in English literature. Becoming disabled for labor in the pulpit, he removed to Stapleton, near Bristol, and gave himself wholly to literary pursuits. For thirteen years he was a principal contributor to the *Eclectic Review*. In 1819 he published his essay *On the Evils of Popular Ignorance*, which he esteemed his best production, though it has never attained to the popularity of the essay *On Decision of Character*. His contributions to the *Eclectic Review* were published in 1840, in two volumes. A volume selected from these has been published in this country. He died in 1843. Since his death have appeared *Lectures delivered at Broadmead Chapel, Bristol* (2 vols.), a discourse on *Missions*, an essay *On the Importance of Religion*, written as an introduction to Doddridge's *Rise and Progress*, and an unfinished essay *On the Improvement of Time*. His *Life and Correspondence*, edited by J. E. Ryland (1846), is a work of great interest (republished in Boston). A letter written late in life, and then first published, disclosed the fact, before unsuspected, that he had renounced the doctrine of the eternity of future punishment. His writings are marked by strong, original, often sombre thought, stimulating to the best principles and purposes. (L. E. S.)

**Fothergill, Samuel**, an eminent and highly respected Quaker preacher, travelled and preached in many parts of England, Scotland, Ireland, and North America, and died in 1773. He wrote *Remarks on an Address to the People called Quakers*, etc. (1761, 8vo):—*Reply to E. Owen on Water Baptism* (1763, 8vo):—*Letters* (1816).—Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, s. v.; Rose, vii, 423. (J. W. M.)

**Foucher, Paul**, a learned French abbot, was born at Tours in 1704, and died at Paris in 1778. He studied theology at the Sorbonne, but showed more fondness for the ancient languages. His chief work, *Traité historique de la Religion des Perses*, inserted in the Memoirs of the Academy of Inscriptions (tom. xxv, xxvii, xxix, xxxi, xxxix; German translation by Kleuker,

Riga, 1781–3, 2 vols. 4to), combats the opinion of Hyde that the Persians had preserved natural religion and the worship of the true God. A supplement, after the appearance of Du Perron's *Zend Avesta*, retracts many of his previous opinions. His next most important work, *Récherches sur l'Origine et la Nature de la Religion des Grecs*, also inserted in the Memoirs of the Academy, considers the gods of the Greek and Roman pantheon as only deified men, and claims a historical basis for their myths.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xviii, 284, 285. (J. W. M.)

**Foucher de Chartres.** See FULCHERIUS.

**Foulis, Henry**, was born about 1638, and died in 1685. He pursued his studies at Oxford, was ordained for the ministry, but devoted himself to history. We have from him, *History of the wicked Plots and Conspiracies of our pretended Saints*, etc. (Lond. 1662, and Oxford, 1674, fol.):—*History of the Romish Treasons and Usurpations*, etc. (Oxford, 1671, fol.); and, according to Watt, *Cubala, or the History of the Conventicle Uncased* (1664, 4to):—*Sermons*, etc.—Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, s. v.; Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* (J. W. M.)

**Foulques de Neuilly.** See FULCO.

**Foundling Hospitals** are institutions for the reception and care of children, especially illegitimate ones, abandoned by their parents. They owe their origin, it is said, to the desire of preventing infanticide and the exposure of children. Among the ancient Greeks and Romans, infanticide and abortion not only prevailed to a fearful extent, but were tolerated, nay, in certain cases, even sanctioned by the laws and by the opinions of philosophers (see Plato, *De Repub.* v, 460, C.; Aristotle, *Polit.* vii, 16; Livy, *Hist.* xxvii, 37; Cicero, *De Leg.* iii, 8, al.). The exposure of children was a still more prevalent custom, commending itself, we may suppose, to the natural feelings of the parents as less cruel than infanticide, since it promised a chance, at least, of saving life. The foundling became the slave of the individual or community at whose expense it was cared for and educated. To facilitate the finding of exposed infants, places of public resort were chosen for the exposure, such as market-places, temples, road-crossings, wells, etc. In Athens the *gynostarges*, and in Rome the *columna lactaria*, were usually selected for this purpose. Frequently tokens (*crepundia*), as rings or other costly ornaments, or, in the case of poor parents, trinkets of small value, were deposited with the child, for the purpose of inducing some one to receive it, or as a means of identifying the child, should its parents afterwards wish to recover it. Gibbon, treating of the limitations of paternal authority in his chapter on Roman jurisprudence (*Hist.* iv, 344, N. Y. 1852), says: "The exposition of children was the prevailing and stubborn vice of antiquity; it was sometimes prescribed, often permitted, almost always practised with impunity by nations who never entertained the Roman ideas of paternal power; and the dramatic poets, who appeal to the human heart, represent with indifference a popular custom which was palliated by the motives of economy and compassion." As some relief to the dark shading of this picture, and yet a proof of its correctness, we may instance the praise which Strabo (lib. xvii) bestows on the Egyptians, and Ælian (*Varie Historie*, ii, 7) on the Bœotian Thebes, because their laws and customs forbade the killing or exposure of children; as also the statement of Tacitus (*De Mor. Germ.* 19), that the Germans reckoned infanticide a crime. It is said, however, that they exposed children before the introduction of Christianity among them.

Though the laws of Moses contained no express provisions on this subject, the Jews rightly interpreted their spirit as forbidding this unnatural conduct (see Tacitus, *Hist.* v, 5; Josephus, *Contra Apion*, ii, 24; Philo Judeus, *De Legib. Special.* ad præcept. 6 et 7).

The teachings of Christianity, by causing infanticide and child-exposure to be regarded as sins, gradually wrought a change in the laws and customs in regard to them, though the first Christian emperors did not venture to forbid exposure as a crime. Constantine, however, termed it a sort of murder, and, prompted perhaps by the humane Lactantius, sought in his decrees, A. D. 315, 322, 331, to prevent the murder, sale, giving in pawn or exposure of children, by making provision out of the public treasury for those whose parents were too poor to support them (*Codex Theodos.* lib. xi, tit. 27), and by depriving parents of the hope of recovering exposed children, or making good the expenses incurred by those who had received and maintained them (*Codex Theodos.* lib. v, tit. 7, *De Expositis*. l. i, p. 487, ed. Kitter). The cruel custom was, however, not entirely prohibited until the latter half of the 4th century, when, under Valentinian and his colleagues, such murders were brought "within the letter and spirit of the Cornelian law" (*Codex Justin.* lib. iv, tit. 52). A further advance of opinion in the right direction was indicated by a special law of Justinian, A. D. 529, which forbade the enslavement of foundlings (*Codex Justin.* lib. viii, tit. *De Infant. Expos.* l. iii).

Some suppose that foundling hospitals, or institutions of a similar character, were, at a very early period, established at or near the *columna lactaria* at Rome and the *gynasarges* at Athens, mentioned above as places of exposure. The Justinian Codes, by the term *brephotrophium* (*Βρεφοτροφίον*), mentioned in connection with, but as distinct from, other institutions (for the relief of strangers, the poor, orphans, etc.), appear to refer to hospitals for foundlings. An establishment of the kind is said to have been founded at Treves in the 6th or 7th century. The Capitularies of Charlemagne employ the Justinian term *brephotrophia* apparently with reference to foundling hospitals, though the Franks at that time regarded foundlings as the property of those who should receive and educate them. The earliest foundling hospital concerning which we have any authentic information was that founded at Milan, A. D. 787, by Datheus, a priest, because of the prevalence of infanticide. If the child had not been baptized, salt was strewed between its swaddling-clothes before bringing it to the hospital to denote that fact. The children were suckled by hired nurses, supplied with necessaries, taught some handicraft, and at seven years of age discharged as freeborn. In 1070 Oliver de la Trau founded at Montpellier the order of the *Hospitularii Sancti Spiritus*, one of whose vows was to provide for the maintenance and education of foundlings. Since that time hospitals for foundlings have been gradually established in most European, and Spanish, and Portuguese-American states, to the most important of which only we have space to refer. Attached to the hospital of the *Spirito Santo* in Rome is one for foundlings, with accommodations for 3000 children; the number annually received is about 800, some of whom are sent to the country to be nursed; the mortality in the hospital was (1859) 57 per cent., and still greater in the country. The *Spedale degli Innocenti* at Florence was founded in 1316; here special means are taken to identify each child by securely fastening a leaden badge, stamped with a certain number, around the neck. The use of tokens of some sort, attached to the person or clothing of the child, for the purpose of identification, is not uncommon in the history of other hospitals. There are many other foundling hospitals in Italy to provide for the numerous foundlings, for whom it is stated that Naples makes the best provision (1859). The *Hospice des Enfants Trouvés* at Paris was founded in 1610 by Vincent de Paul. In this, as well as many others in France, in order to secure secrecy in depositing the child, a turning-box (*tour*) is provided, in which the child is placed, and a bell rung for its re-

moval without the person who brought it being seen. A decree in 1811 ordered that such *lozes* should be provided for all the French foundling hospitals, but, owing to a conviction that the great increase in the number of foundlings since that time was due largely to the *tours*, they were retained in 1856 in only 65 of the 141 hospitals then existing in France. In 1856 the number of foundlings in France was estimated at 120,000 under 12 years of age, when the administrative control ceases; and 60,000 to 70,000 between the ages of 12 and 21. The proportion of foundlings to population was 1 to 353; to births, 1 to 39; the annual number, 25,000 to 30,000, of whom nine tenths were illegitimate. The average life of the foundlings was only 4 years; the mortality 52 per cent. the first year, and 78 per cent. up to 12 years; while the general average for the community was only 50 per cent. up to 21 years. The male foundlings constituted 15 per cent. of the convicts and prisoners, and the female one fifth of the prostitutes in that country. Foundling hospitals are numerous in Belgium, where the number of abandoned children was estimated in 1859 to be 1 to 18 births. In 1826 there were only two foundling hospitals in Holland; that of Amsterdam receives about 3000 children annually. There is a well-managed one in Vienna, founded in 1784 by Joseph II, and others in the chief cities of the Austrian empire, but the system of maintaining such institutions is said to be no longer regarded with favor in Germany. In Spain the number may be reckoned at 60 to 70, with some 13,000 foundlings, with larger proportional numbers for Portugal. The great hospitals of Moscow and St. Petersburg are said to be well managed under strict governmental supervision, to which annually great numbers of children are sent from various parts of the Russian empire, very many of which die on the way. The children are, it is said, carefully educated, those of superior promise specially so; and many of them become useful, the females as governesses, teachers, etc., and the males as engineers and mechanics. Recruits for the army and navy are also supplied from these hospitals. Foundling hospitals are numerous in Sweden, where the average of illegitimate births is said to be large, 1 to 11 in the country, and 1 to 2 in Stockholm. Norway has fewer, and also a less proportion of illegitimate children. The foundling hospital in London was established in 1739 through the efforts of captain Thomas Coram, but not opened fully until 1756, from which time to 1760, 4 years, 14,934 children were received into it, but only 4400 lived to be apprenticed, or 30 per cent. In view of this frightful mortality, and the abuses in the matter of admission, and the difficulty of correcting them or adequately providing against their recurrence, Parliament withdrew its grant of public funds, and the institution "ceased to be a receptacle for foundlings," and was made a hospital for poor illegitimate children whose mothers are known, and children of soldiers and sailors killed in the service of their country. One was also established in Dublin in 1730, in which the mortality is said to have been even greater than in London. The average yearly admissions from 1805-1825 were about 2000. A foundling hospital has been established in Canton, but had not, up to 1859, much influence in preventing infanticide. The most important ones in America are those in the city of Mexico and Rio Janeiro. There are no foundling hospitals in the United States where provision is made for foundlings in common with other objects of public or private charity, and the number of such children is comparatively small. Whether such institutions may or may not have proved beneficial under the conditions of ancient or mediæval society, we cannot at this day determine, but the trial of them as parts of the systems of the charitable and philanthropic agencies of modern times, either as controlled and supported in whole or part by the state, or as left to the care and direction of private benevolence, presents re-

sults, we think, contrary to the expectations of their founders; and the general tendency of opinion, especially in Protestant countries, is against their usefulness as means for the attainment of the desired ends. Granting that they may have some effect in diminishing the frequency of direct infanticide (which, however, their statistics do not prove), they certainly tend to increase the number of children abandoned by their parents, while the frightful mortality connected with them would seem to demonstrate that there can be no actual saving of human life through such establishments. We believe that vastly more children have prematurely died from causes inseparably connected with their transmission to and treatment in these hospitals than would have been destroyed outright by the parents from the same motives. Statistics seem clearly to show that they tend to foster licentiousness, increase the number of illegitimate births, and relax morals. In reviewing all the facts, the language of the author of the article Medical Jurisprudence, in the *Encyclop. Britannica*, xiv, 444, 8th ed.), seems hardly too strong: "Foundling hospitals, from the mortality in them, even under the best management, seem to be amongst the most pestilential institutions of mistaken benevolence."—*New Amer. Cyclop.* vii, 634-640; Beckmann, *History of Inventions*, ii, 434-449 (Bohn's ed.); Cassel's *Magazine*, i, 123-4; Knight, *Popular History of England*, vii, 118-19; Chambers, *Encyclopaedia*, s. v.; *Encyclop. Britannica*, s. v.; Guerry, *Statistique Morale de la France*; Benoiston de Châteaufort, *Considérations sur les Enfants-trouvés dans les principaux états de l'Europe.* (J. W. M.)

**Fountain**, the rendering in the A. V. of the following Hebrew terms: 1. Properly and usually  $\text{עַיִן}$ , *ayin* (lit. the eye), so called from *flowing* (Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 1017), a natural source of *living* water. See EN-. 2. Likewise  $\text{מַיְוֹן}$ , *mayon'* (from the same root), a well-watered place (Psa. lxxxiv, 6, "well"); also a single *spring* (as rendered in Psa. lxxxvii, 7; civ, 10) of running water (Lev. xi, 36; Josh. xv, 9; 1 Kings xviii, 5; 2 Chron. xxxii, 4; Psa. lxxxv, 15; cxiv, 8; Prov. v, 16; viii, 24; xxv, 26; Cant. iv, 12, 15; Isa. xli, 18; Hos. xiii, 15; Joel iii, 18); spoken of the tide or influx of the sea (Gen. vii, 11; viii, 2). Its force and meaning are unfortunately sometimes obscured by the rendering in the A. V., "well," as in Exod. xv, 27; in Elmer "were twelve wells of water;" that is, not artificial wells, but *natural fountains*, as still seen in wady Ghurundel (Bartlett's *Forty Days in the Desert*, p. 43). These two words, on the contrary, like the corresponding Greek  $\pi\eta\eta\eta$ , always denote a stream of "living" or constantly-running water, in opposition to standing or stagnant pools, whether it issues immediately from the ground or from the bottom of a well. See AIN. 3.  $\text{מַבְּבֹּא}$ , *mabbu'a* (so called from *gushing* or bubbling forth), a native rill (fig. of the vital flow, Eccl. xii, 6; elsewhere literally a "spring" in general, Isa. xxxv, 7; xlix, 10). 4.  $\text{מַקּוֹר}$ , *makor'* (so called from having been opened by *digging*), an artificial source of flowing water, used both literally and figuratively, but mostly in such phrases as "fountain of life" (Prov. xiii, 14), "fountain of wisdom" (xviii, 4), etc.; occasionally rendered "spring," "well," etc. 5. Improperly  $\text{בֹּר}$ , *bor*, or  $\text{בְּאֵר}$ , *ba'yr* (Jer. vi, 7), which designates only a *pit* or standing water. See WELL. The idea of a fountain is also implied in the phrase  $\text{מֹצֵא מַ'יִם}$ , *motsa' ma'yim*, or *going forth of waters* ("spring," 2 Kings ii, 21; Psa. cvii, 33, 35; Isa. xli, 18; lviii, 11; "course," 2 Chron. xxxii, 30); as likewise in  $\text{גֹּל}$ , *gal* (from its *rolling* down the water), or  $\text{גֻּלְלֵה}$ , *gullah'*, a *purling stream* or overflowing fountain ("spring," Cant. iv, 12; Josh. xv, 19; Judg. i, 15). See TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS.

Among the attractive features presented by the

Land of Promise to the nation migrating from Egypt by way of the desert, none would be more striking than the natural gush of waters from the ground. Instead of watering his field or garden, as in Egypt, "with his foot" (Shaw, *Travels*, p. 408), the Hebrew cultivator was taught to look forward to a land "drinking water of the rain of heaven, a land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths springing from valleys and hills" (Deut. viii, 7; xi, 11). In the desert of Sinai, "the few living, perhaps perennial springs," by the fact of their rarity, assume an importance hardly to be understood in moister climates, and more than justify a poetical expression of national rejoicing over the discovery of one (Numb. xxi, 17). But the springs of Palestine, though short-lived, are remarkable for their abundance and beauty, especially those which fall into the Jordan and its lakes throughout its whole course (Stanley, *Palest.* p. 17, 122, 123, 295, 373, 509; Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 344). The spring or fountain of living water, the "eye" of the landscape (see No. 1), is distinguished in all Oriental languages from the artificially sunk and enclosed well (Stanley, p. 509). Its importance is implied by the number of topographical names compounded with En or (Arab.) *Ain*: En-gedi, *Ain-july*, "spring of the gazelle," may serve as a striking instance (1 Sam. xxiii, 29; see Reland, p. 763; Robinson, i, 504; Stanley, App. § 50). Fountains are much more rare on the eastern side of the Jordan than on the western. There are a few among the mountains of Gilead; but in the great plateaus of Moab on the south, and Bashan on the north, they are almost unknown. This arises in part from the physical structure of the country, and in part from the dryness of the climate. Huge cisterns and tanks were constructed to supply the want of fountains. See CISTERN. Some of the fountains of Palestine are of great size. All the perennial rivers and streams in the country have their sources in fountains, and draw comparatively little strength from surface water. Such are the fountains of the Jordan at Dan and Banias; of the Abana at Fijeh and Zebedany; of the Leontes at Chalcis and Baalbek; of the Orontes at Ain and Lebweh; of the Adonis at Afka, etc. Palestine is a country of mountains and hills, and it abounds in fountains of lesser note. The murmur of their waters is heard in every dell, and the luxuriant foliage which surrounds them is seen on every plain. For a good classification of these natural springs, see Robinson's *Physical Geog. of Palestine*, p. 238 sq.; and for descriptions of many of them, see Tristram's *Land of Israel*, and Sepp's *Heilige Land*.

Advantage was taken of these fountains to supply some of the great cities of Palestine with water. Hence, in Oriental cities generally, public fountains are frequent (Poole, *Englishw. in Eg.* i, 180). Perhaps the most remarkable works of this kind are at Tyre, where



Fountain near Beyrut.

several copious springs were surrounded with massive walls, so as to raise the water to a sufficient height. Aqueducts, supported on arches, then conveyed it to the city (Porter, *Handb. for Syria and Pal.* p. 142, 555, 390). One of less extent conveyed an abundant supply to Damascus from the great fountain at Fijeh. Hence no Eastern city is so well supplied with water as Damascus (*Aqueduct Trav.* p. 291). At Beyrut there is an ancient aqueduct that brings water from a source at least twenty miles distant, and two thousand feet above the level of the sea (Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 48). An aqueduct some ten miles in length brought water to Jerusalem from a fountain near Solomon's Pools by subterranean channels. In these may perhaps be found the "sealed fountain" of Cant. iv, 12 (Hasselquist, p. 145; Maundrell, *Early Trav.* p. 457). Traces of fountains at Jerusalem may probably be found in the names En-Rogel (2 Sam. xvii, 17), the "Dragon-well" or fountain, and the "gate of the fountain" (Neh. ii, 13, 14). But Jerusalem, though mainly dependent for its supply of water upon its rain-water cisterns, appears from recent inquiries to have possessed either more than one perennial spring, or one issuing by more than one outlet (see Robinson, i, 343, 345; Williams, *Holy City*, ii, 458, 468; comp. Ezek. xlvi, 1, 12). With this agrees the "fons perennis aque" of Tacitus (*Hist.* v, 12), and the *ὕδρων ἀνικελευπτος σύστασις* of Aristeus (Josephus, ii, 112, edit. Havercamp; compare Raumer, p. 298; Kitto, *Physical Geogr.* p. 412, 415). See JERUSALEM. In the towers built by Herod, Josephus says there were cisterns with *χαλκοσφγήματα* through which water was poured forth (*War*, v, 4, 4); these may have been statues or figures containing spouts for water after Roman models (Plin. *Epist.* v, 6; *Hist. Nat.* xxxvi, 15, 121). The fountain of Nazareth bears a traditional antiquity, to which it has probably good derivative, if not actual claim (Roberts, *Views in Palestine*, i, 21, 29, 33; Fisher, *Views in Syria*, i, 31; iii, 44). See NAZARETH.



Fountain at Nazareth.

The volcanic agency which has operated so powerfully in Palestine has from very early times given tokens of its working in the warm springs which are found near the Sea of Galilee and the Dead Sea. These have been famous from time immemorial for their medicinal properties (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* v, 15; Lightfoot, *Opp.* ii, 224). They are confined to the volcanic valley of the Jordan, and all are strongly impregnated with sulphur. The temperature of that of Tiberias is 144° Fahr. (Porter, *Handbook for Syr. and Pal.* p. 311, 320, 423). One of the most celebrated of these was Callirrhœe, mentioned by Josephus as a place resorted to by Herod in his last illness (*War*, i, 33, 5; Kitto, *Phys. Geogr. of Pal.* p. 120, 121; Stanley, p. 285). His son Philip built the town, which he named Tiberias (the Hamath of Josh. xix, 35), at the sulphureous

hot springs on the south of the Sea of Galilee (Joseph. *Ant.* xviii, 2, 3; Hasselquist, *Travels*, App. p. 283; Kitto, p. 114; Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 328, 330). Other hot springs are found at seven miles' distance from Tiberias, and at Omkeis or Amathe, near Gadara (Reland, p. 775; Burckhardt, p. 276, 277; Kitto, p. 116, 118). See CALLIRHŒE.

From the value of such supplies of water in arid countries, fountains figure much in the poetry of the East as the natural images of perennial blessings of various kinds. In the Scriptures fountains are made the symbols of refreshment to the weary, and also denote the perpetuity and inexhaustible nature of the spiritual comforts which God imparts to his people, whether by the influences of the Spirit, or through the ordinances of public worship. There are also various texts in which children, or an extended posterity, are, by a beautifully-apt image, described as a fountain, and the father or progenitor as the source or spring from which that fountain flows (Deut. xxxiii, 28; Psa. lxxviii, 26; Prov. v, 16, 18; xiii, 14, etc.). See WEMYSS, *Symbol. Dict.* s. v. — Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See WATER.

The FOUNTAIN-GATE (שַׁרְיָר הַחַ'אֲיִינִי, *sha'ar ha-'Ayin*; Sept. πύλη τοῦ Ἄιου or αἰνῶν, Vulg. *porta fontis*; A. V. "gate of the fountain") at Jerusalem was in the first or old wall, along the Valley of Hinnom, south of the Dung-gate, and adjoining the Pool of Siloam (from which it doubtless derived its name), at the mouth of the Tyropœon (Strong's *Harm. and Expos.* Append. p. 11). See JERUSALEM.

**Fouqueré, DOM ANTOINE-MICHEL**, a learned Benedictine of the Congregation of St. Maur, was born at Châteauroux in 1641, and died at Meaux Nov. 3, 1709. He was made teacher of rhetoric in the monastery of St. Pierre de Mauriac, where he acquired the reputation of being an excellent professor, especially of Greek. In 1678 he was appointed superior of his convent, and held the post for fifteen years, after which he retired to the abbey of St. Faron at Meaux, where he died. His works are, (1) a Latin translation of a work of Dionysius, patriarch of Constantinople, on points of controversy between the Calvinists and Roman Catholics, published, together with original text, under the title of *Dionysii patriarche Constantinopolitani super Calvinistarum erroribus ac reali imprimis presentia Responsio*; and with the preceding, (2) a Latin translation of the acts of the council held at Jerusalem A. D. 1672, under the title of *Synodus Bellesmética pro reali presentia anno 1672 celebrata, græce et lat.* (Paris, 1676, 8vo). (By the advice of François Combefis and A. Arnauld, these translations were revised and corrected, and a new edition published in 1678, the latter under the title of *Synodus Hierosolymitana pro reali presentia*). (3) Under the pseudonym of Tamaguis, *Celebris historia Monothelitarum atque Honorii controversia scrutiniis octo comprehensa* (Paris, 1678, 8vo), a work which excited a good deal of interest. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xviii, 309-10. (J. W. M.)

**Fouquet, JEAN-FRANÇOIS**, a French Jesuit, was sent as a missionary to Central Asia in the early part of the 18th century. He made himself acquainted with the language, idioms, and the theogony of the Celestial Empire, and was struck with their points of resemblance not only to Christian doctrine, but especially to the prophecies contained in the holy Scriptures. According to him, the Chou-King (sacred book of Confucius) is only a paraphrase of Genesis, and the praises addressed to Wen-wang and to Tchou-Koung in the Chi-King are only hymns in honor of the Messiah. One can see how much this ingenious interpretation would aid in proselyting the Chinese, who thus had only to change the names of their deities to claim priority in holding the doctrines of revelation over Christians themselves. Strict theologians attacked his opinions and censured his means of conversion;



nevertheless, on his return to Rome in 1720, pope Clement XI made him bishop of Eleutheropolis. He was recommended by the Academy of Inscriptions as the only person capable of criticising Fournont's Chinese Grammar. His *Tabula Chronologica historię sinicę*, 1729 (on 3 sheets), contains a list of the Chinese monarchs, and the chief events of their reign, and a complete series of the *Nianhao*, or names of years (new edition by Seutter, Augsburg, 1746). He wrote also a letter to the duke of La Force, and inserted in tom. v of *Lettres édifiantes*, which furnishes curious details in regard to the Chinese army and the Lonzes.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xviii, 332. (J. S. M.)

**Fourier, François Charles Marie**, a philosophical socialist, was born at Besançon April 7, 1772. His father designed him for trade, but he never took to it willingly. In 1796 he entered the French army, but in 1798 he left it and entered a mercantile house at Marseilles. His mind seems to have been turned about this time to social questions by the scarcity of food and the terrible sufferings of the poor. The relations of capital to labor, and similar social problems, occupied his mind intensely for several years, and in 1808 he issued his first book, entitled *Théorie des Quatre Mouvements et des Destinées Générales*. "It is the strangest, most mystical, and most startling of all his works, though merely given as a general announcement of his theory. Surprise and wonder were the only effects which it produced on those who read it, and the few public writers who reviewed it." In 1821 he removed to Paris, in order to publish his writings, and he lived there, with some interruptions, to his death, Oct. 10, 1837. His principal works are *Théorie des Quatre Mouvements et des Destinées Générales* (1808, 8vo);—*Traité de l'Association Domestique Agricole* (1822, 2 vols, 8vo);—*Le Nouveau Monde, Industriel et Social* (1829); et *un Livret d'annonce* (1830);—*Püges et Charlatanisme des deux Sectes St. Simon et Owen* (1831);—*La Fausse Industrie, morale, repugnante, mensongère, et l'Antidote, l'Industrie naturelle, combinée, attrayante*. His *Œuvres complètes* were published at Paris in 6 vols. (1840-46). The *Passions of the Human Soul*, translated by Morell, was published in London in 1851 (2 vols. 8vo). "His philosophy may be divided into science and praxis, or his psychological and ontological theory and its application in his societary system. The first comprises what he styles passionnal attraction, the last its application to society in industrial association. His psychology is confined to an analysis of the affections, from which he infers that the Newtonian principle of attraction is equally applicable to the social and mental worlds, and that society should be moulded in accordance with the diversity and intensity of individual attractions. Unity in diversity and harmony in contrast is what he professes to achieve in his new social system. This principle of passionnal attraction is regarded by Fourier as his grand discovery, which had been culpably neglected and overlooked by past philosophers" (Tennemann, *Hist. Philos.* § 435). Among the followers of Fourier are counted Considérant, Pempéry, Lemoyn, Hennequin, Jules Lechevalier, and Trausen. Several periodicals, mostly short-lived, have been established for the defence of Fourierism, as *Le Nouveau Monde*, *Le Phalanstère*, *La Phalange*, *La Démocratie Pacifique*. Several attempts to carry out the view of Fourier were made in France, the United States, and Brazil, but all failed. See Gamond, *Fourier and his System* (London, 1842, 8vo); Doherty, *False Association, with Memoir of Fourier* (London, 1841, 8vo); *Christian Examiner*, xxxv, 57; *Methodist Quarterly Rev.* v, 545. See COMMUNISM.

**Fourier, Pierre**, of Mataincourt, a Roman Catholic religious reformer, was born at Miré (Lorraine) Nov. 30, 1565, and died at Gray Dec. 9, 1640. He reformed the regular canons of the congregation of St.


Sauveur de Lorraine, and established the *religieuses* of the congregation of Notre Dame for the instruction of girls. He died in the odor of sanctity, and his name was placed on the list of the beatified at Rome Jan. 29, 1730. See lives of him by Bedel (Paris, 1645, 8vo) and Friant (Nancy, 1746, 12mo).—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xviii, 344-5. (J. W. M.)

**Fourmont, Etienne** (Stephen), a French Orientalist, known as Fourmont the elder, to distinguish him from his brother, the abbé Fourmont, was born at Herbelay, near Paris, June 23, 1683, and died Dec. 19, 1745. He was an earnest and indefatigable student, and being endowed with an unusually quick and retentive memory, stored his mind with a vast amount of information in regard to the classic and Oriental languages and their literature. On the death of the abbé Galland in 1715, Fourmont succeeded him as professor of Arabic in the College of France and as member of the Academy of Inscriptions, and subsequently became a member of the learned societies of Paris, Berlin, and London. Fréret describes him as being of a gentle and cheerful disposition, wholly absorbed in his labors, and possessed of little knowledge of men, but offensively vain of his knowledge. For a list of Fourmont's numerous writings, published or in manuscript, see his life by De Guignes et Des Hautes-Rayes (*Vie d'Etienne Fourmont et Catalogue de ses Ouvrages*) in the second edition of his *Critical Reflections on Ancient History, and Catalogue des Ouvrages de M. Fourmont* (Amst. 1731), which is said, however, to contain some works only projected and never completed. Besides his famous commentary on the Psalms and Hebrew poetry, we mention here only *Méditations Sinicæ, complectens artem legendi linguę Sinicę Characteres* (Paris, 1737, fol.), which is the preliminary portion of the following, published separately: *Lingę Sinarum mandarinicę hierarchicę grammaticę duplex, latinę et cum characteribus Sinesium* (Paris, 1742, fol.);—*Reflexions sur l'Origine, l'Histoire et la succession des anciens peuples, Chaldéens, Hébreux, Phéniciens, Egyptiens, Grecs jusqu'au temps de Cyrus* (Paris, 1735 and 1747, 2 vols. 4to).—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xviii, 354-365; Rose, *New General Biog. Dict.* vii, 427; Quérrard, *La France littéraire*. (J. W. M.)

**Fowl** is the rendering of the following Heb. words in the Bible: 1. Usually פֶּהָ (oph, a flier), πτερόν, any winged animal, a generic term for the feathered race, frequently with the addition of שָׁמַיִם, "of the heavens." 2. אָיִל (a'yil, so called from rushing on its prey; compare Jer. xii, 9, where it is spoken of a beast), a ravenous bird (Job xxviii, 7); as an emblem of a warlike king (Isa. xlvi, 11); collect. for birds of prey (Gen. xv, 11; Isa. xviii, 6; Ezek. xxxix, 4); like ὄρνειον, as a vulture (Rev. xviii, 2; xix, 17, 21); translated fowl in Gen. xv, 11; Job xxviii, 7; Isa. xviii, 6. 3. צִפּוֹרִים (sipporim, so called from its twittering; Chald. צִפּוֹר, Dan. iv, 9, 11, 18, 30), a small bird, spec. a sparrow (Psa. lxxxix, 4; cii, 8; Prov. xxvi, 2; xxvii, 8; Job xl, 29; Eccles. xii, 6, etc.), or similar small birds (Psa. ci, 1; civ, 17; cxxiv, 7; as caught by the fowler, Prov. vi, 5; vii, 23; Amos iii, 5, etc.; also collect., birds of any kind, Gen. xv, 10; Lev. xiv, 4-53; Deut. iv, 17; Psa. viii, 9; cxlviii, 10, etc.; and even a bird of prey, Ezek. xxxix, 4, occasionally rendered by swallow and sparrow. In Neh. v, 18, the word seems to have the special sense which "fowl" has with us, as it is enumerated among the viands provided for Nehemiah's table. 4. בָּרְבָרִים (barburim), "fatted fowls," 1 Kings iv, 23, as provided for the table of Solomon, where Kimchi understands capons, but Gesenius, with the Jerus. Targum, geese, so called from the pureness and whiteness of their plumage. The ancient Egyptians had spacious poultry-yards, set apart for keeping geese and other

wild-fowl, which they fattened for the table; and their poulterers bestowed especial care upon the geese (Wilkinson, i, 215; ii, 174, abridgm.). See FATTED FOWL.

kuche, *De gallis et gallinis ad aram Jehovah non fractis*, Rint. 1741). The Talmud mentions geese (גֵּזֵי, *Chol.* xii, 1; *Lekor.* vii, 4), a well-known article of luxury



Geese brought and numbered. *British Museum—from Thebes.*

Fig. 1. A scribe. 2. Men bringing eggs in baskets. 3. One of the holders of geese, written on a papyrus he holds in his hands. 4. Table, on which are baskets containing eggs and flowers. 5. The scribe reading the account before the steward or master of the estate, others seated in an attitude of respect; and 8, bowing as he brings up the geese with their young, 9. A large flock of geese brought by others, 10, 11, 12.

In the N. T. the word translated "fowls" is most frequently τὰ πτερωτά, which comprehends all kinds of birds (including *ravens*, Luke xii, 24); but in Rev. xix, 17-21, where the context shows that birds of prey are meant, the Greek is τὰ ὄρνεα. The same distinction is observed in the apocryphal writings: comp. Judith xi, 7; Ecclus. xvii, 4; xliii, 1, with 2 Macc. xv, 33. See COCK; SPARROW.

The following statements are from Winer, ii, 663. Clean birds (כְּלֵי-צִפּוֹר טְהוֹרִים, Deut. xiv, 11, 20), i. e. all not named in Lev. xi, 13-19; Deut. xiv, 12-18, were (as well as their eggs, כְּלֵי-צִפּוֹר טְהוֹרִים) used for food (Luke xi, 12), e. g. quails (q. v.), chickens, doves, also wild-fowl; hence bird-catching was very common (Psa. cxxiv, 7; Amos iii, 5; Hos. v, 1; vii, 12, etc.), for which purpose nets, traps, and stool-birds (Jer. v, 27; Ecclus. xi, 31 [37]) were used (see Gesen. *Thes.* p. 685). See FOWLER. In robbing a nest of its eggs or young, however, the mother-bird must be allowed to escape (Deut. xxii, 6 sq.; see Michaelis, *Synagoga. Comm.* ii, 89 sq.; *Mos. Recht*, iii, 181 sq.), a prescription founded not only on motives of humanity (comp. Lev. xxii, 28; yet see Heumann, *De legis dir. sensu*, Gött. 1748; also in his *Novi Sylloge Dissertation.* p. 282 sq.); although the Talmudists (Mishna, *Chollin*, xii, 2) refer this only to clean birds, and make many nice distinctions in the matter, with various penalties attached (*Maccoth*, iii, 4). Birds were not regularly offered in sacrifice, except in commutation for some costlier victim (Lev. i, 15-17; compare Mishna, *Kinnim*, v, 11). See DOVE. The bird was first brought to the altar, where the priest (with his nail) nipped off the head, or rather cracked (כָּרַק) the neck, so that it still hung to the bird (Lev. v, 8); he then squeezed out the blood (sufficient, at least, in quantity for sprinkling), and finally threw the body into the fire, but without the crop, which (with its contents and the offal) was separately (בְּרֵל) thrown into the ash-heap under the altar. Before the flesh was committed to the flames, however, a folding back or breaking of the wings (כָּרַק בְּרֵל) is prescribed, a symbol of which the meaning is not clear (see Dassov, *De ave ungue secta*, Viteb. 1697; Es-

with modern Jews. The Hebrews were accustomed to play with parlor-birds, especially children (Job xl, 29 [24]; Baruch iii, 17; comp. Catull. ii, 1 sq.; Plaut. *Capt.* v, 4, 5). Of that form of divination which drew omens from the appearance or flight of birds (Müller, *Etrusk.* ii, 187 sq.), an example occurs in the history of the Herodian family (Josephus, *Ant.* xix, 8, 2). See SOOTHSAFER. The fable of the phoenix (Pliny, x, 2; Ovid, *Met.* xv, 392 sq.; comp. Herod. ii, 73) is thought by some (also Ewald) to be alluded to in Job xxix, 18 (see Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 453 sq.). See generally Tenzel, in the *Thesaur. theol. philol.* i, 559 sq. Comp. BIRD.

**Fowler** (some form of the verb יָקַח, *yakach'*, to lay snares; thus rendered in Psa. xci, 3; cxxiv, 7; Prov. vi, 5; Jer. v, 26; Hos. ix, 8). The act of tak-



Ancient Egyptian fowling with the Throw-stick.

ing birds by means of nets, snares, decoys, etc., is frequently alluded to in Scripture, mostly in a figurative and moral way (Prov. vii, 23; Eccl. ix, 12; Ezek. xvii, 20, etc.). The Egyptian paintings and sculptures exhibit various scenes of hunting and fowling; there is scarcely any process now followed which was not known in very ancient times. The ancients had not only traps, nets, and springs, but also bird-line smeared upon the twigs; they used likewise stalking-horses, setting-dogs, bird-calls, etc. The Egyptian paintings exhibit birds shot with arrows while upon the wing by peasants, and in others they are shown as knocked down by amateur sportsmen with sticks thrown at them as they perched or flew in the thickets or marshes. Game of all kinds was a favorite food of the Egyptians, and the capture of birds was a lucrative occupation to some and an amusement to others. Persons engaged in this act are represented as accompanied by their families in the boat, and often by a favorite cat (q. v.). See Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* i, 234 sq. (abridgm.). The Egyptians were also well skilled in preserving and preparing for the table the game thus secured, as well as poultry reared by domestication (*ib.* ii, 183 sq.). See FATTED FOWL.

on or in the ground (Psa. cxl, 6; cxlii, 4). The form of this spring, or trap net, appears from two passages (Amos iii, 5, and Psa. lxxix, 23). It was in two parts, which, when set, were spread out upon the ground, and slightly fastened with a stick (trap-stick), so that, as soon as a bird or beast touched the stick, the parts flew up and inclosed the bird in the net, or caught the foot of the animal. See SNARE.

By a humane as well as wise regulation, Moses forbade any one finding a bird's nest to take also the dam with the eggs or young (Deut. xxii, 6, 7), lest the species should become exterminated (Kitto, *Pictorial Bible*, ad loc.). See BIRD.

**Fowler, Christopher**, an eminent Puritan divine, was born at Marlborough in 1611, and died in 1676. He was educated at Oxford, and took orders first in the English Church, but became a Presbyterian in 1641, and signaled his zeal by the earnestness of his preaching. He was made vicar of St. Mary's, Reading, but lost the post at the Restoration. Wood's prejudices doubtless influenced his view of Fowler, whom he calls "a conceited and fantastical Presbyterian." He wrote, 1. *Demonium Meridianum* (1655, pt. i, 4to; 1656, pt. ii, 4to);—2. *Anti-Christian Blas-*



Ancient Egyptian Fowlers catching Geese, and Poultryers.

Fig. 1. A clear space, for the clap-net, *A, A*, and the decoys, *c*. 2. Watching among the reeds, *d*, and reporting when the trap is ready to spring. 3. Passing along the word to 4, the men who pull the ropes. 5. Carrying away the captured game. 6. Brings it to the poultry-house, where 7 plucks and 8 draws the birds, and 8 salts and hangs them up for sale, or 7 pots them for future use. See FOWL.

Birds of various kinds abound, and no doubt abounded in ancient times, in Palestine. Stanley speaks of "countless birds of all kinds, aquatic fowls by the lake side, partridges and pigeons hovering, as on the Nile bank, over the rich plains of Gennesaret" (*Sinai and Palestine*, p. 427). The capture of these for the table or other uses would, we might expect, form the employment of many persons, and lead to the adoption of various methods to effect it. See PALESTINE.

We read of the "snare," פַּח, *pach* (Psa. xci, 3; xxiv, 7; Hos. ix, 8), and of the "net," רֶשֶׁת, *re'sheth* (Prov. i, 17; Hos. vii, 11); "of the fowler," רֹדֵף, *rodhaph* = *snarer*. In Hos. v, 1, both net and snare are mentioned together. The *mokesh*' (מֹכֶשֶׁת) is used synonymously with the *pach* in Amos iii, 5. This was employed for taking either beasts or birds. It was a trap set in the path (Prov. vii, 23; xxii, 5), or hidden

*phemies*, etc. (1655, 4to);—3. *Answer to Thomas Speed, a Quaker* (1656), in which Simon Ford assisted him:—4. *Sermons* (1675, 4to); and some occasional sermons.—Rose, *New Gen. Biog. Dict.* vii, 428; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, s. v. (J. W. M.)

**Fowler, Edward**, bishop of Gloucester, was born in 1632 at Westerleigh, in Gloucestershire, where his father was minister. He was educated at Corpus Christi College, but, removing to Cambridge, he took his master's degree as a member of Trinity College, and, returning to Oxford, was incorporated in the same degree July 5, 1656. About the same time he became chaplain to Arabella, countess dowager of Kent, who presented him to the rectory of Northill, in Bedfordshire. As he had been brought up among the Puritans, he at first objected to conformity with the Church of England, but became afterwards one of its greatest ornaments. In 1681 he was made vicar of

St. Giles's, Cripplegate, when he took his degree of D.D. He was an able defender of Protestantism, and appears as the second of the London clergy who refused to read James II's declaration for liberty of conscience in 1688. He was rewarded for his eminent services in the cause of religion, and in the promotion of the revolution, by being made in 1691 bishop of Gloucester. He died at Chelsea in 1714. He belonged to the moderate or latitudinarian school of divines. His writings are, *The Principles and Practice of Latitudinarians* (so called) *defended* (London, 1671, 8vo):—*The Design of Christianity* (Lond. 1676, 8vo; pub. in *Watson's Tracts*, vol. vi). This work was attacked by Bunyan (to whom Fowler replied in a tract entitled *Dirt wiped out*, 1672, 4to):—*Libertas Evangelica* (1680, 8vo); various tracts against Popery, two on the Trinity, and a number of sermons.—*Biographia Britannica*, s. v.; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* v, 164; Orme, *Life of Baxter*, ii, 238.


**Fowler, Orin**, a Congregational minister, was born July 29, 1791, in Lebanon, Conn. He graduated at Yale 1815, entered the ministry Oct. 14, 1817, and in June, 1818, started as missionary to the Western States, through which he traveled a year, and was ordained pastor in Plainfield, Conn., March 1, 1820, where he remained eleven years, when he was dismissed, and July 7, 1831, became pastor in Fall River. He was elected to the Senate of Rhode Island in 1847, and in 1848 to the U. S. Senate, in which office he remained until his death, Sept. 3, 1852. Mr. Fowler published a *Disquisition on the Evils attending the Use of Tobacco* (1833):—*Lectures on the Mode and Subjects of Baptism* (1835):—*History of Fall River* (1841):—*Papers on the Boundary* (1847), a sermon, several speeches in Congress, etc.—*Sprague, Annals*, ii, 648.

**Fowles, James H.**, a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at Nassau, N. P., in 1812, and died in 1854. He graduated at Yale College in 1831, and about 1843 was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of New York, but afterwards joined the Protestant Episcopal Church, and was ordained by bishop Bowen, of South Carolina, in which state he labored until 1845, when he succeeded Dr. S. H. Tyng as rector of the Church of the Epiphany, Philadelphia, where he remained until compelled by ill health to resign, only a few months before his death. He edited Good's *Better Covenant*, etc., and *The Convict Ship*, for which he wrote introductions; and was the author of *Protestant Episcopal Views of Baptism Explained and Defended* (Philadel. 1846, 18mo):—*Sermons* (30) *preached in the Church of the Epiphany, Philadelphia*, preceded by a biographical sketch (Phila. 1855, 8vo):—*Allibone, Dictionary of Authors*, s. v. (J. W. M.)

**Fox** is the rendering in the A. V. of שׁוּאֵל (*shual*), Sept. ἀλώπηξ, as in Matt. viii, 20; Luke ix, 58; xiii, 32; Judg. xv, 4; Neh. iv, 3; Psa. lxxiii, 10; Cant. ii, 15; Lam. v, 18; Ezek. xiii, 4), a name derived, according to Bochart (*Hieroz.* ii, 190), from the coughing or yelping of that animal, but, according to Gesenius (*Thes. Heb.* p. 1457), from its digging or burrowing under the ground. The latter remarks that *jackals* must be meant in Judg. xv, 4, since the fox is with great difficulty taken alive; and also in Psa. lxxiii, 11, inasmuch as foxes do not feed on dead bodies, which are a favorite repast for the jackal. There is also another word, צִימ' (*z'im'*, literally *howlers*), occurs only in Isa. xiii, 32; xxxix, 14; Jer. i, 39, where it is rendered "wild beasts of the islands"), which seems to refer to the jackal, or some other species of the fox family. Fox is again the translation of ἀλώπηξ in Matt. viii, 20; Luke ix, 5-8; xiii, 32; but here also the word in the original texts may apply generically to several species rather than to one only. See ANIMAL.

Fox is thus applied to two or more species of the *Canide*, though only strictly applicable in a systematic view to *Taaleb*, which is the Arabic name of a wild

canine, probably the Syrian fox, *Vulpes Thaleb* or *Taaleb* of modern zoologists, and the only genuine species indigenous in Palestine. This animal is of the



Syrian Fox.

size of an English cur fox, and similarly formed; but the ears are wider and longer, the fur in general ochry-rufous above, and whitish beneath: there is a faint black ring towards the tip of the tail, and the back of the ears are sooty, with bright fulvous edges. The species burrows, is silent and solitary, extends eastward into Southern Persia, and is said to be found in Natolia. The Syrian *Taaleb* is reputed to be very destructive in the vineyards, or, rather, a plunderer of ripe grapes; but he is certainly less so than the jackal, whose ravages are carried on in troops, and with less fear of man. Ehrenberg's two species of *Taaleb* (one of which he takes to be the *Anubis* of ancient Egypt, and Geoffroy's *Canis Niloticus*, the Abū Hossein of the Arabs) are nearly allied to, or varieties of the species, but residing in Egypt, and further to the south, where it seems they do not burrow. The Egyptian *Vulpes Niloticus*, and doubtless the common



Egyptian Dog-Fox.

fox (*V. vulgaris*), are Palestine species. There is also the so-called Turkish fox (*Cynulopex Turcicus*) of Asia Minor, not unknown to the south as far as the Orontes, and therefore likely to be an occasional visitant at least of the woods of Libanus. This animal is one of an osculant group, with the general character of vultures, but having the pupils of the eyes less contractile in a vertical direction, and a gland on the base of the tail marked by a dark spot. There is, besides, one of a third group, namely, *Thous anthus*, or *deeb* of the Arabs, occasionally held to be the wolf of Scripture, because it resembles the species in general appearance, though so far inferior in weight, size, and powers as not to be in the least dangerous, or likely to be the wolf of the Bible. The first two do not howl, and the third is solitary and howls seldom; but there is a fourth (*Canis Syriacus*, Ehrenb. *Mammal.* ii) which howls, is lower and smaller than a fox, has a long, ill-furnished tail, small ears, and a rufous-grey livery. This can hardly be the *Canis aureus*, or jackal of Palestine, and certainly not the χρίστος of Ælian. The German naturalists seem not to have considered it identical with the common jackal (*Sacalius aureus*),

which is sufficiently common along the coast, is eminently gregarious, offensive in smell; howls intolerably in complete concert with all others within hearing; burrows; is crepuscular and nocturnal, impudent, thievish; penetrates into outhouses; ravages poultry-yards more ruinously than the fox; feeds on game, lizards, locusts, insects, garbage, grapes; and leaves not even the graves of man himself undisturbed. It is probable that *Canis Syriacus* is but a chryseus, or wild dog, belonging to the group of Dholestes, well known in India, and, though closely allied to, distinct from the jackal. Russell heard of four species of *Canidae* at Aleppo, Emprich and Ehrenberg of four in Libanus, not identical with each other; nor are any of these clearly included in the thirteen species which the last-named writers recognise in Egypt. They still omit, or are not cognizant of, wild dogs [see DOG], and likewise other wild species in Arabia and Persia; all, including foxes, having migratory habits, and therefore not unlikely to visit Palestine. Some of these may have accompanied the movements of the great invasions of antiquity, or the caravans, and become acclimated; and, again, may have departed, or have been gradually extinguished by local circumstances, such as the destruction of the forests or of the inhabitants, and the consequent reduction of the means of subsistence; or, finally, they may have been extirpated since the introduction of gunpowder. Hasselquist (*Travels*, p. 184) says foxes are common in the stony country about Bethlechem, and near the Convent of St. John, where, about vintage time, they destroy all the vines unless they are strictly watched. Thomson started up and chased one when passing over that part of the plain where Timnath is believed to have been situated (*Land and Book*, ii, 340). That jackals and foxes were formerly very common in some parts of Palestine is evident from the names of places derived from these animals, as Hazer-Shual (Josh. xv, 28), Shaal-bim (Judg. i, 35). See JACKAL.

The fox is proverbially fond of grapes (*Aristoph. Equit.* 1076 sq.; Theocr. v, 112 sq.; Nicand. *Alexipharm.* 185; Phedr. iv, 2; Galen, *Alim. Facult.* iii, 2), and a very destructive visitor to vineyards (Cant. ii, 15). The proverbially cunning character of the fox is alluded to in Ezek. xiii, 4, where the prophets of Israel are said to be like foxes in the desert, and in Luke xiii, 22, where our Saviour calls Herod "that fox." The fox's habit of burrowing among ruins is referred to in Neh. iv, 3, and Lam. v, 18 (see also Matt. viii, 20). (On Psa. lxxiii, 11, see Pausan. iv, 18, 4.) The Rabbinical writers make frequent mention of the fox and his habits. In the Talmud it is said, "The fox does not die from being under the earth; he is used to it, and it does not hurt him." And again, "He has gained as much as a fox in a ploughed field," i. e. nothing. Another proverb relating to him is this:

"If the fox be at the rudder,  
Speak him fairly, 'My dear brother.'"

Foxes are figured in hunting-scenes on the Egyptian monuments (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt*, i, 224, abridgm.). See CHASE.

None of the usual explanations of the controverted passage in Judg. xv, 4, 5, relative to the foxes, jackals, or other canines which Samson employed to set fire to the corn of the Philistines is altogether satisfactory. First, taking Dr. Kennicott's proposed explanation of the case (*Remarks on Select Passages in the O. T.*, Oxf. 1787, p. 100), on the authority of seven Heb. MSS., by changing לַיְהוָה לַיְהוָה, thus reading *handfuls* (comp. the Sept. at 1 Kings xx, 10), i. e. "sheaves" instead of "foxes," and translating עֲנַף, "end" instead of "tail," the meaning then would be, that Samson merely connected three hundred shocks of corn, already reaped, by bands or ends, and thus burned the whole. We admit that this, at first view, appears a rational explanation (see Hopkins, *Plumb-line Papers*,

Auburn, 1862, p. 20 sq.); but it should be observed that three hundred shocks of corn would not make two stacks, and therefore the result would be quite inadequate, considered as a punishment or act of vengeance upon the Philistine population, then predominant over the greater part of Palestine; and if we take shocks to mean corn-stacks, then it may be asked how, and for what object, were three hundred corn-stacks brought together in one place from so large a surface of country. The task, in that hilly region, would have occupied all the cattle and vehicles for several months; and then the corn could not have been thrashed out without making the whole population travel repeatedly, in order finally to reload the grain and take it to their threshing-floors. Nor will the verb נִקְחָה ("caught") bear the rendering thus required, for it properly means to ensnare, to take captive, and is specially applied to the act of catching animals (e. g. Amos iii, 5). (See, also, what an anonymous French author has written under the title of *Révérends de Samson*, and his arguments refuted in a treatise, "De Vulpibus Simsonis," by Gebhard, in *Theol. Nov. Theol. Phil.* i, 553 sq.; and comp. Gasser, *Comment. ad loc.* [Hal. 1751]; Pfaff, *Von dem Fuchsen Simsons* [Tüb. 1753]; Schröder, *De vulpibus Simsonis* [Marb. 1713]; Täge, *De vulpibus Simsonis* [Griefsw. 1707].) The proposed reading of Kennicott has deservedly found little favor with commentators. Not to mention the authority of the important old versions which are opposed to this view, it is pretty certain that נִקְחָה cannot mean "sheaves." The word, which occurs only three times, denotes in Isa. xl, 12 "the hollow of the hand," and in 1 Kings xx, 10; Ezek. xiii, 19, "handfuls." Reverting, therefore, to the interpretation of foxes burning the harvest by means of firebrands attached to their tails, the case is borne out by Ovid (*Fast.* iv, 681)—

"Cur igitur missæ junctis ardentia telis  
Terga ferunt vulpes"—

in allusion to the fact that the Romans, at the feast in honor of Ceres, the goddess of corn, to whom they offered animals injurious to cornfields, were accustomed to turn into the circus foxes with torches so fastened to them as to burn them to death, in retaliation of the injuries done to the corn by foxes so furnished. Again, in the fable of Athonius, quoted by Merrick; but not, as is alleged, by the brick with a bas-relief representing a man driving two foxes with fire fastened to their tails, which was found twenty-eight feet below the present surface of London (*Leland, Collectanea*); because tiles of similar character and execution have been dug up in other parts of England, some representing the history of Susanna and the elders, and others the four Evangelists, and therefore all derived from Biblical, not pagan sources. Commentators, following the rendering of the Sept. (κίρκος, Vulg. *cauda*), have, with common consent, adopted the interpretation that two foxes were tied together by their tails with a firebrand between them. Now this does not appear to have been the practice of the Romans, nor does it occur in the fable of Athonius. Hence some have understood the text to mean that each fox had a separate brand; for it may be questioned whether two united would run in the same direction. They would be apt to pull counter to each other, and perhaps fight most fiercely; whereas there can be no doubt that every canine would run, with fire attached to its tail, not from choice, but necessity, through standing corn, if the field lay in the direction of the animal's burrow; for foxes and jackals, when chased, run direct to their holes, and sportsmen well know the necessity of stopping up those of the fox while the animal is abroad, or there is no chance of a chase. But this explanation requires that by the words rendered "tail to tail" we should understand the end of the firebrand attached to the extremity of the tail, i. e. one apiece; this would be using the word in a double sense in the same pas-

sage, an equivoque not in accordance with the direct style of the narrative. It is also probable that after a few fruitless efforts at trying to pursue each his own course, the animals would soon agree sufficiently to give the firebrand its fullest effect. Again, we know nothing as to the length of the cord which attached the animals, a consideration which is obviously of much importance in the question at issue, for, as jackals are gregarious, the couples would naturally run together if we allow a length of cord of two or three yards, especially when we reflect that the terrified animals would endeavor to escape as far as possible out of the reach of their captor, and make the best of their way out of his sight. Finally, as the operation of tying 150 brands to so many fierce and irascible animals could not be effected in one day by a single man, nor produce the result intended if done in one place, it seems more probable that the name of Samson, as the chief director of the act, is employed to represent the whole party who effected his intentions in different places at the same time, and thereby insured that general conflagration of the harvest which was the signal of open resistance on the part of Israel to the long-endured oppression of the Philistine people. (See Clarke's *Comment. ad loc.*; Kitto's *Daily Bible Illustrations*, ad loc.; Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 341).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See SAMSON.

**Fox, Edward**, one of the English Reformers, was born in Gloucestershire (date not known precisely). He was educated at Eton, and at King's College, Cambridge, of which he became provost in 1528. He held this post during his life. Wolsey sent him on an embassy to Rome, with Gardiner, to promote a bull from Clement VII authorizing the divorce of the king from Catharine of Aragon. "It was in conversation with Fox and Gardiner, in 1529, that Crammer suggested his method of settling the question of the king's divorce, by taking the opinion of the most learned men and universities in Christendom; and he it was who made it known to the king as Crammer's suggestion, when Gardiner would have taken the credit of it to himself. In the prosecution of this plan he was sent with Stephen Gardiner, in 1530, to obtain the determination of the University of Cambridge. The heads of the university, the vice-chancellor, and the afterwards notorious Bonner, were on the king's side, but the university was divided. It was honorable to the University of Cambridge that so strong a resistance was offered to the will of the king. The royal authority being at this time on the side of reform, the commissioners, Fox and Gardiner, the latter being afterwards the great opponent of the Reformation, at length, though with difficulty, carried their point, and it was determined that 'the king's marriage was contrary to the law of God.' In 1531 he became archdeacon of Leicester, and in 1533 archdeacon of Dorset. In 1535 he was appointed bishop of Hereford. Shortly after his consecration he was sent ambassador to the Protestant princes in Germany assembled at Smalkald, whom he exhorted to unite, in point of doctrine, with the Church of England. He spent the winter at Wittenberg, and held several conferences with some of the German divines, endeavoring to conclude a treaty with them upon many articles of religion; but nothing was effected." Bishop Burnet gives a particular account of this negotiation in his *History of the Reformation* (pt. iii). He returned to England in 1536, and died at London May 8, 1538. He published a book, *De vera differentia Regni Potestatis et Ecclesiasticæ, et qua sit ipsa veritas et virtus utriusque* (Lond. 1531 and 1538), which was translated into English by Henry Lord Stafford.—Burnet, *History of the Reformation*, vols. i, iii; Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, v, 165; Collier, *Eccles. History of England*, iv, 342 sq.

**Fox, George**, founder of the Society of Friends, was born at Drayton, Leicestershire, England, in July, 1624. His parents were pious members of the Church

of England, and brought him up carefully. "His mother, Mary Lago, was of the martyr stock, and had inherited their intense feelings and religious enthusiasm. To her he probably owed his education and many of the determining impulses of his life; as to his father, he was indebted for the incorruptible integrity and tenderly scrupulous regard for truth by which he was characterized. As a child, he was singularly quiet, docile, observant, and meditative. He sat among his elders silently, watching their frivolity, untruthfulness, gluttony, and intemperance, and inwardly resolving, 'If ever I come to be a man, surely I shall not do so, nor be so wanton.' Some of his relatives would have had the thoughtful lad trained for a clergyman, but others objecting, he was apprenticed to a person who, as the manner then was, combined a number of trades—shoemaking, wool-stapling, cattle-dealing, and so on. George proved a valuable assistant to him. The fear of God rested mightily upon him, and he was anxiously watchful in all things to maintain strict integrity. 'Verily' was a favorite word of his, and it became a common saying among those who knew him, 'If George says "Verily" there is no altering him'" (*Christian Times*). His early religious experience was very deep; and, after the termination of his apprenticeship, he felt himself impelled by a divine monition (1643) to leave his home and friends, seeking "light." For economy's sake, in these travels he wore a leathern doublet. In 1647, after, as he says, "forsaking the priests and the separate preachers also, and those esteemed the most experienced people," none of whom could "speak to his condition," he "heard a voice" calling him to Christ, and his "heart leaped for joy." This was in 1647, in which year he began the ministry, which lasted during his life. When he began his work the mind of England was in a state of ferment, and he found many willing auditors. His personal peculiarities of dress and manner attracted attention and persecution. "When the Lord sent me forth into the world, he forbid me to put off my hat to any, high or low, and I was required to 'thee' and 'thou' all men and women, without any respect to rich or poor, great or small; and as I travelled up and down, I was not to bid people 'good-morrow' or 'good-evening,' neither might I bow or scrape with my leg to any one; and this made the sects and professions to rage" (*Journ.* 1648). He taught (*Journ.* 1649, p. 26) that "it is not the Scriptures, but the Holy Spirit, by which opinions and religions are to be tried." Of course these novel and earnest views excited great opposition; Fox was imprisoned for some time as a "disturber of the peace." He continued, however, to travel up and down England, preaching, and exhorting, and leaving permanent traces behind him almost everywhere. His followers were first called "Quakers" at Derby, in 1650, by Justice Bennet, as Fox says, "because I bid them tremble at the word of the Lord." In 1655 he was brought before Cromwell, who pronounced favorably upon both his doctrines and character. Nevertheless, he was frequently imprisoned by country magistrates. "In 1669 he married the widow of Judge Fell. He then went to America, where he spent two years in propagating his views with much success. On his return to England in 1673, he was imprisoned for some time in Worcester Jail, under the charge of having 'held a meeting from all parts of the nation for terrifying the king's subjects.' On his release he visited Holland, and afterwards Hamburg, Holstein, and Dantzic, always endeavoring to persuade men to listen to the voice of Christ within them. He died in London, January 13, 1691" (Chambers, *Cyclopaedia*, s. v.).

The personal character of George Fox was, in many respects, a lofty one. In self-sacrifice, earnestness, and purity, he was a model. His intellectual powers were not of a very high order. His doctrine of the "inner light" was elaborated by Robert Barclay (q.

v.) with a clearness and method of which Fox was incapable. Fox carried this doctrine, and also his abhorrence of "a hireling ministry," to almost absurd extremes. "But, amid all his extremes and obscurities, the substance of George Fox's 'testimony' was a truth of which every generation is in danger of forgetfulness, and of which no generation ever so much needed to be reminded as this, namely, 'that the kingdom of God is not meat and drink—not forms and ceremonies—not creeds, however sound—not organizations, however efficient—but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost'" (*Christian Times*). Sir James Mackintosh calls Fox's *Journal* "one of the most extraordinary and instructive narratives in the world, which no reader of competent judgment can peruse without revering the virtue of the writer, pardoning his self-delusion, and ceasing to smile at his peculiarities" (*Works*, London, 1851, p. 362). See *Collection of Christian Epistles written by George Fox* (London, 1698, 2 vols. fol.); *Journals of George Fox* (London, 1691; Leeds, 1836, 2 vols.); *Works of George Fox* (Philadelph. 8 vols.); Sewell, *History of the Quakers* (1795, 2 vols.); Neal, *History of the Puritans*, Harper's edition, ii, 118; Janney, *Life of George Fox, with Dissertations*, etc. (Philadelphia, 1853, 8vo); Marsh, *Life of George Fox* (London, 1847, 8vo); *Westminster Review*, xvii, 371.

**Fox, John**, author of the *Book of Martyrs*, was born at Boston, Lincolnshire, in 1517, was educated at Brazenose, Oxford, and was elected a fellow of Magdalen College in 1543. In his youth he showed a talent for poetry, and wrote several Latin comedies, the subjects taken from the Scriptures. One of them, *De Christo Triumphante*, printed in 1551, was translated into English by Richard Day, with the title *Christ Jesus Triumphant, wherein is described the glorious triumph and conquest of Christ over sin, death, and the law*, etc. (1579, 1607, 1672). He embraced the principles of the Reformation, and for that cause was expelled from his fellowship in 1545 (according to Wood, *Athen. Oxon.*, he resigned it), for having espoused the Reformation, and, till he was restored to it by Edward VI, he subsisted by acting as a tutor, first to the family of Sir Thomas Lucy, of Charlecote Park, and afterwards to the children of the earl of Surrey. In 1556 he was ordained deacon by Bishop Ridley. During the reign of Mary he sought an asylum at Basle. Returning on the accession of Elizabeth (1559), he was taken into the house of the duke of Norfolk, and Cecil obtained for him a prebend in the cathedral of Salisbury in 1563. He died in 1587. His great work is the *Acts and Monuments of the Church*, first published in 1563, usually known by the name of *Fox's Book of Martyrs*, the merits and demerits of which have been a source of violent dispute between Protestant and Catholic writers; but no faults, beyond unimportant mistakes, have been detected in it. To the credit of Fox it must be recorded, that he strenuously, though vainly, endeavored to prevail upon Elizabeth not to disgrace herself by carrying into effect the sentence which, in 1575, condemned two Baptists to the flames as heretics. The best edition of the *Martyrs* is *Acts and Monuments of Matters most special and memorable happening in the Church*, or *Acts and Monuments of Martyrs*, with additions, etc. (London, 1784, 9th ed. 3 vols. fol.); the latest are *Fox's Acts and Monuments*, new edition, with a Life of the Martyrologist, and Vindication of the Work, by the Rev. Geo. Townsend (Lond. 1843-49, 8 vols. 8vo), and a still better edition by Mendham and Pratt, 8 vols. 8vo (Lond. 1853 sq.). There is an American reprint in one large volume (New York, royal 8vo, p. 1082), revised by Rev. M. H. Seymour.

**Fox, Richard**, bishop of Winchester, and the founder of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, was born at Grantham, Lincolnshire, of humble parentage, and educated at Boston school and Magdalen College, Oxford. Through the friendship of Morton, bishop of

Ely, he was brought to the notice of the earl of Richmond, who, when he became king (Henry VII), made Fox a privy councillor, bishop of Exeter, employed him on several embassies, then transferred him to the see of Durham, and finally to that of Winchester. Fox evinced his appreciation of learning by founding Corpus Christi College, Oxford, with two lectures for Greek and Latin, and by establishing several free schools. He died in 1528, and was buried in Winchester Cathedral. He wrote *The Contemplacyon of Synners* (Lond. 1499, 4to):—*Letter to Cardinal Wolsey*.—Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, s. v.; Rose, *New Gen. Biog. Dict.* vii, 428; Wood, *Athenæ Ozonienses*; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* (J. W. M.)

**Fox, William Johnson**, an English Unitarian minister, and also a politician, was born at Uggleshall Farm, near Wrentham, Suffolk, in 1786, the son of a small farmer. In youth he gave promise of talent, and was dedicated to the Christian ministry, and studied at Homerton College, then under the direction of Dr. Pye Smith. He soon abandoned the orthodox Independents, and became first a Unitarian, and later "a deistical heresiarch, who preached more on politics than on religion." His chapel at Finsbury Square was filled by auditors attracted by his eloquence and his spirit of philanthropy. Politics at last became more attractive to him than preaching, and in 1847 he entered Parliament, in which he held a seat for Oldham until 1862, when failing health compelled him to resign. He died June 3, 1864. He was a man of literary tastes, and was a frequent contributor to the *Westminster Review* and to the *Retrospective Review*. His peculiar theological views are set forth in his *Religious Ideas* (Lond. 1849). He also published *Lectures on Morality* (1836, 8vo). These, with other writings of his, are collected in *Memorial Edition of the Works of W. J. Fox* (Lond. 1865, 2 vols. 8vo).

**Frachet, Gérard de**, a monkish ecclesiastical historian, was born at Châlus (Limousin), in France, about the beginning of the 13th century, and died at Limoges Oct. 4, 1271. He entered the Dominican order in 1225, and filled in succession the posts of prior of the convent of Limoges (1233-45), then of that of Marseilles, provincial of Provence (1251-9), and (1266) was chosen assistant (*definitour*) provincial by the chapter of Limoges. He wrote (according to Lacordaire), by the order of the chapter general which assembled at Paris in 1256, *Vite Fratrum ordinis Predicatorum* (Douay, 1619, and Valence, 1657):—*Chronicon ab initio Mundi*; and left, besides, some manuscripts.—Hoefr., *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xviii, 421-2. (J. W. M.)

**Fragments of Wolfenbüttel.** See WOLFENBÜTTEL FRAGMENTS.

**Form** is the rendering in the A. V. of פְּרָמָה, *ye'f-tser*, *form* (usually spoken figuratively of *imagination*), e. g. the bodily *formation* (Psa. ciii, 14; "thing framed," Isa. xxix, 16); and מִבְּנֵי, *mibneh'*, *building*, e. g. of a city (Ezek. xl, 2).

**France**, a country of Europe, having an area of 209,428 square miles, and in 1866 a population of 38,192,094 inhabitants.

I. CHURCH HISTORY.—(1.) *From the first Establishment of Christianity until the 16th Century.*—France, or, as it was formerly called, Gaul, was among the first of the European countries in which Christian churches were founded. Roman Catholic writers tell us that the apostle Peter ordained bishops for Limoges, Toulouse, Bordeaux, Rheims, Arles, Sens, le Mans, Vienne, Chalons, Bourges, Clermont, and Saintes. This statement is not historical; but it is certain that Christianity was planted in many parts of Gaul at least as early as the 2d century. The first Christians in Gaul doubtless came from Asia Minor. We may assume as certain that the number of churches was already tolerably large at the time of Irenæus (q. v.).

who in 198 presided at three provincial synods, and seems to have established a school of catechists at Lyons. At the beginning of the 4th century there was no province in Gaul as to which we have not accounts of bishoprics, or at least of Christian churches. Of the nations which founded new kingdoms in Gaul in the 5th century, the Burgundians were already Christians when they left the southern districts of Germany, and settled between the rivers Saone and Rhone and the Alps, before the year 417. Among the Franks, king Clovis (q. v.) first embraced Christianity, together with more than 3000 soldiers, after the battle of Tolbiacum, in 496. In the mean time Christianity became so generally extended in all parts of the country, in the north as well as in the south, that Church provinces began to be formed everywhere, the capital of each political province generally becoming also the seat of the metropolitan. The Franks, embracing the Catholic faith while a considerable part of Europe was still under the rule of the Arians, began soon to be regarded as the chief Catholic nation of Europe. Through the establishment of the empire of Charlemagne, France seemed for a time to become only a part of the union of all the German nations, but soon after the division of the empire in 843 it recommenced its development as an independent state. King Lothaire I was obliged to humble himself before the pope, as the hostile princes of his own family stood ready to execute the papal threats, and the Frankish bishops did not object to have the spurious decretals [see PSEUDO-DECRETALS] used for the first time against Hincmar (q. v.) of Rheims, for they thought it better to obey a distant pope than a threatening metropolitan at home. But when, after the death of Lothaire I (869), Hadrian II attempted to interfere in the political and ecclesiastical controversies of France, Hincmar gave him to understand that in France a wide distinction was made between spiritual and secular power, and that the bishops of older times had had independent privileges. The emperor Charles the Bald compelled the French bishops to acknowledge Ansegius, archbishop of Sens, as the primate and papal vicar for Gaul and Germany; but, under the counsel of Hincmar, they persisted in obeying the holy father only as far as was consistent with the rights of all the metropolitans and with the laws of the Church. In general, the bishops of France, as well as the kings, resisted more energetically than any other nation the ever-growing claims of the popes, and their unceasing efforts to establish an absolute sway over all bishops, synods, and kings. The Gallican Church stands forth in Church History as the prominent defender of national and episcopal rights against papal usurpations. Urban II, at the Council of Clermont (1095), excommunicated king Philip for his adulterous connection with the countess Bertrade, and, aided by the sympathy of the people, compelled him to give up his paramour. Louis IX (q. v.), though so firmly attached to the doctrines and usages of his Church that, after his death, he was declared a saint, confirmed the rights of the nation by the Pragmatic Sanction in 1269, the great palladium of the Gallican Church. See GALLICANISM. In opposition to pope Boniface VIII, who declared every one a heretic who did not believe that the king in temporal as well as in spiritual matters was subject to the pope, the three estates of France, convened in a General Diet (1302), were unanimous in maintaining the independence of the French kingdom. The pope pronounced an interdict upon the whole of France, but popular opinion effectually protested against all attempts to blend the spiritual with the secular authority. In 1303 the king of France even succeeded in having a pope elected who took up his residence at Avignon (q. v.), and for more than a hundred years (until 1408) the papacy remained a tool in the hands of the French kings. The concordat which Martin V proposed to France was rejected in 1418 by the Par-

liament, which has ever since remained the steadfast advocate of Gallican liberties. The kings, however, were not equally steadfast in their opposition to the demands of the popes, and often made concessions in the hope, with the aid of the popes, of increasing their power at home. Thus the new Pragmatic Sanction, which the Council of Bourges (q. v.) established in 1438, was soon set aside by the succeeding kings. In all the great ecclesiastical movements of the Middle Ages France took a prominent part. Most of the efforts made either to overthrow the papacy for the purpose of restoring a purer form of Christianity [see WALDENSES; ALBIGENSES], or to reform the Church from within, either centred in France, or found there the most vigorous support.

(2.) *History of the Roman Catholic Church since the beginning of the 16th Century.*—At the beginning of the 16th century Francis I concluded a concordat, Aug. 18, 1516, in which he sacrificed many of the liberties of the Gallican Church. After the rise of the Reformation the Roman Church succeeded in securing her ascendancy by long-continued and cruel persecution (see below, *History of the French Reformed Church*). Henry IV, when contesting the throne of France, found the public sentiment so strongly in favor of the old Church that he thought it expedient, from political reasons, to change his faith. Henceforth the ascendancy of the Roman Church over Protestantism was secured, and the reformatory movements of the Jansenists (q. v.) and others were likewise suppressed, at the request of the popes, by the secular arm. The Golden Age of France, under Louis XIV, produced also in the Church some master minds, as Bossuet, Fénelon, Bourdaloue, and many others, who were ornaments of their Church, but were not able to stay the rising tide of an infidel philosophy. The episcopate, under the leadership of Bossuet, reaffirmed the liberties of the Gallican Church at the famous assembly held in 1682. This assembly, which consisted of eight archbishops, twenty-six bishops, and thirty-eight other clergymen, unanimously affirmed the principles of the *Regale* (the Pragmatic Sanction of 1438), announcing them in the form of four propositions, which were registered by the Parliament of Paris March 23, 1682. Though the popes often succeeded in enforcing obedience to their decrees, most of the great theologians of the 17th and 18th centuries adhered to Gallican doctrines, and the *Regale* continued in force until the revolution of 1789. Monasticism, in the same period, reached the climax of literary culture in some congregations of the French Benedictines and Oratorians. Nevertheless, the very foundations of the Roman Church were gradually undermined by the spread of French philosophy, and the success of the French Revolution seemed for a time to sweep away the entire Church of France. The National Assembly decreed (Nov. 27, 1790) that all ecclesiastical officers, under penalty of losing their offices, should take an oath for the civil constitution of the clergy, which Pius VI declared (April 13, 1791) inadmissible. Bishops were chosen in accordance with the new law, and consecrated without having the confirmation of the pope. In 1793 Christianity itself was declared to be abolished. Napoleon, though perhaps personally indifferent towards all churches, regarded the re-establishment of the Roman Church as the religion of the state as indispensable to the tranquillity of the country, and therefore concluded in 1801 a concordat [see CONCORDAT], the introduction of which was solemnized in 1802. Napoleon added to the concordat certain organic laws, which make the promulgation of papal decrees dependent on the authorization of the government, establish an appeal to the Council of State against the abuses of ecclesiastical power, and bind the theological seminaries to the four propositions of the Gallican clergy of 1682. Two years later Napoleon was crowned emperor by the pope. When, however, the States of the Church



were taken possession of by the French (1808), and when the pope declared every one who laid his hand upon the patrimony of St. Peter excommunicated, Napoleon had the pope arrested and brought to France. An attempt to render, by means of a synod convoked at Paris (1811), the French Church independent of Rome, failed. In 1813 Napoleon extorted, in a new concordat, some important concessions from the imprisoned pope; and when the pope revoked all he had done, Napoleon published the concordat as the law of the empire on the very next day (March 25). After the overthrow of Napoleon (1815), Louis XVIII recognised the Roman Church as the religion of the state, though granting religious toleration to every form of public worship. Powerful efforts were made to re-establish among the French the belief in the doctrines of the Roman Church, and the leaders in this contest—Lamennais (q. v.), de Maistre (q. v.), and the “priests of the Mission” (q. v.)—attached themselves more closely to the papal than to the Gallican school. Gallicanism, at least in its ancient form, began to die out. The Apostolic Congregation, though in opposition to the inclinations of the prudent king, obtained a concordat (1817) by which the concordat of 1801 was revoked, and that of 1516 substituted for it. So decided, however, was the opposition of public opinion that it was never laid before the Chamber of Deputies. Without the consent of the Chambers, the government of Louis XVIII, and still more that of Charles X, did as much for the Church as was in their power, although, to appease public excitement, a royal ordinance (June 16, 1828) had to close the schools of the Jesuits. The revolution of 1830 was connected with some outbreaks of popular indignation against the Church, which lost the prerogative of being the religion of the state. Yet Louis Philippe made as great concessions to the Church as the origin of his own authority would allow. Lamennais, Lacordaire, Montalembert, and others anticipated great results from a union between ultramontanism and democracy, but the condemnation of their organ, *L’Avenir*, by the pope, put a stop to their novel schemes, and drove Lamennais out of the Church. An attempt, made by the abbé Chatel in 1830, to found a new *French Catholic Church* in the spirit of an extravagant liberalism, and without any Christian basis, was an utter failure. A plan of national education, which placed (1833) the public schools under the superintendence of the university, was violently assailed by the Church, yet the government never ceased to seek a reconciliation, or at least a compromise, with the Church; and when Thiers called up in the Chamber of Deputies the laws still in existence against the Jesuits, the government executed them with the utmost possible mildness. To the Republican Revolution of 1848 the Church offered no opposition, and the priests did not hesitate to bless the tree of liberty and pray for the sovereign people. The Church received almost everything she had been in vain demanding during the reign of Louis Philippe. Nevertheless, the dread of the Red Republic made most of the clergy and of the leaders of the Catholic party partisans of Napoleon. Having become emperor, Napoleon III attached a majority of the bishops and of the ultramontane school to his interests by increasing the salaries of the bishops, raising their influence in the supreme educational and political boards of the state, and by permitting the bishops to revive the provincial councils which had been in desuetude for more than a hundred years. The ultramontane school, headed by the *Univiers*, readily approved of all the measures of the government by which the political liberties of the nation were curtailed, and many hoped that the emperor would realize their boldest dream—the restoration of a politico-ecclesiastical theocracy under the rule of the pope. Yet many leading men in the Church, especially among the laity, dissented from this view, and organized a moderate school, which not only op-

posed the political views of the government and of the ultramontanes, but also accused the latter of ultraism in their defence of ecclesiastical institutions and practices. Montalembert, Lacordaire, prince de Broglie, Falloux, Lenormant, and bishop Dupanloup of Orleans were the most distinguished men of the party, the *Correspondant* and the *Ami de la Religion* its most important organs. The controversy between the two parties grew not only very bitter and violent, but even led several times to a split between the bishops, whose sympathies were almost equally divided between the two parties. Several bishops took decided ground against the *Univiers*, and even in Paris it required the mediation of the pope to prevent its prohibition by archbishop Sibour. An entire change in the relation of Napoleon to the Church and the so-called Catholic party took place in consequence of the war in Italy (1857) and the attitude of Napoleon with regard to the temporal sovereignty of the pope. The war silenced all the eulogies of the emperor, and only a few solitary voices, like that of Lacordaire, dared to express sympathy with the cause of Italian independence. But after Napoleon had advised the pope to give up a portion of his states, both the parties, the ultramontane and the moderate, turned against the government. All the bishops except one condemned, more or less explicitly, the course pursued by the government, and every ecclesiastical journal in France took the same ground. The government used all means to keep down the agitation of the public mind on the subject, and to force the leading advocates of the ecclesiastical interests to submission. The *Univiers* and several Catholic papers in the provinces were suppressed, and almost every other organ of the party received an official warning; and the bishops were threatened, in the case of a continuance of the agitation, with the re-enforcing of the organic articles. It is generally admitted that the Roman Church in France has grown strong in comparison with its condition during the 18th and at the beginning of the 19th century. All the leading religious societies, confraternities, and associations of the Roman Church centre in France, which contributes for some religious purposes, as the foreign missions, more than the rest of the Roman Church together.

(3.) *The History of French Protestantism.*—The Reformation of the 16th century, soon after its rise in Germany and Switzerland, found many friends and patrons in France; but it met at once with a determined opposition on the part of the University of Paris, which declared against it in 1521. Among the earliest preachers of the Reformed faith were Bucer, Melancthon, Lefevre, and Farel; somewhat later, Calvin published his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, with a dedication to king Francis I. In 1521 the first Protestant congregation was formed at Meaux, the bishop of which city, Briçonnet (q. v.), was one of the converts of Lefevre and Farel. The bishop subsequently yielded to persecution and recanted, but the congregation maintained itself. (For a fuller account of the beginnings of Protestantism in France, see REFORMATION.) Under the reign of Henry II (1547–59), the members of the French Reformed Church had increased so greatly in numbers and strength that it became difficult to treat them any longer as holders of a forbidden religion. The Protestants did not content themselves with seeking to secure toleration, but, regarding the Roman Church as doomed to destruction, and themselves as called by God to take its place, they often entered into plans for establishing Protestantism as the religion of the state. The adhesion to the Reformation of several members of the royal family, as the king of Navarre and his brother, the prince of Condé, and several grandees of the empire (among whom the three brothers Chatillon and the noble admiral Coligny distinguished themselves), early introduced into the Protestant Church a political element

which was strengthened by the cruel rigor with which the princes generally persecuted it. This element was developed the more strongly as the general spirit of those times was democratic, and as Calvin himself, the father of the Reformed Church, inclined to theocratic principles. "In 1555 the first avowed French Reformed church was established in Paris. All the chief towns followed this example. The first synod of the French Protestant Church assembled privately in Paris, May 25, 1559. Owing to the danger of the enterprise only thirteen churches sent deputies. Nevertheless, the foundations of an important superstructure were then and there laid. A complete system of ecclesiastical polity was speedily adopted, for the members of the synod had too vivid a sense of the dangers to which they were exposed to waste time in unprofitable discussions among themselves. The form of government thus established was thoroughly Presbyterian in its character. It seems to have corresponded very closely to that of the Church of Scotland. The Consistory may be viewed as representing the Kirk Session, the Colloquy the Presbytery, while the Provincial Synods of each are analogous; and the National Synod corresponds to the General Assembly. The Consistory was elected at first by the whole congregation over which it was to rule, but vacancies occurring afterwards were filled up by the Colloquy. The ministers were elected by the Colloquy. A minister, on being thus elected, was required to preach before the congregation on three consecutive Sabbaths; whereafter, if no objection was made, the congregation was considered as acquiescing in the appointment. If there was any objection, the matter was referred to the Provincial Synod, whose decision was final. These provincial synods have been generally sixteen in number. The National Synod has met but seldom, owing to the severe persecutions to which the Church has been exposed, and the increasing restrictions which have been imposed upon her. The *Confession of Faith* adopted at the first synod consisted of forty articles. Its doctrines were strictly Calvinistic. Though the Church was much harassed by persecution during the reign of Henry II, still it greatly increased; so much so that we are told that Beza, who died in 1605, could count 2150 churches in connection with the Protestant Church of France; and the churches were not small or insignificant in point of strength. In some there were 10,000 members. The church of Orleans had 7000 communicants, and the ministers in such churches were proportionally numerous: two ministers to a church was common, and that of Orleans had five. At this period there were 305 pastors in the one province of Normandy, and in Provence there were 60' (Eadie, s. v.). The cruel persecution to which the Calvinists were subjected after the death of Henry II, under the reign of Francis II, led them to organize the Conspiracy of Amboise, in which some discontented members of the Roman Catholic Church also took part, though the majority of the conspirators were Calvinists. Its aim was the overthrow of the proud duke of Guise and his brother, the cardinal of Lorraine, who were the uncles of the king, and the chief instigators of the persecution of the Protestants. The conspiracy was betrayed, and many of the participants lost their lives. Calvin and Beza had been notified of the enterprise, but discouraged it, though they did not feel themselves bound to betray it. The weak king of Navarre, and still more his brother, the prince of Condé, were implicated in the plot, and nothing but the death of the king saved their lives. The Calvinists henceforth received the name Huguenots, a name whose etymology is not quite certain. See HUGUENOTS. During the regency of Catharine de Medicis the Huguenots increased in number, and the court party, which feared that their extirpation was not possible without exposing France to the terrors of civil war, was inclined to grant them religious toleration.

The dukes of Guise saw the necessity of enlarging and consolidating the Catholic party. They prevailed on the aged and vainglorious constable of Montmorency to form with them a triumvirate, which was soon also joined by the king of Navarre, who was induced by false promises to abandon the cause of the Huguenots. The cardinal of Lorraine even feigned an inclination to the Confession of Augsburg, and, contrary to the wishes of his own party, brought about a religious conference with the Calvinists at Poissy (1561), at which Beza brilliantly defended the Reformation against the whole prelatic strength of the Roman Church. A committee, consisting of five members of each party, was appointed to conciliate the views of the two churches concerning the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. It succeeded in drawing up a formula which was accepted by the Calvinists, as well as by the queen-mother and the cardinal. But the Sorlonne declared it to be heretical, and it was soon generally abandoned. The celebrated edict of January, 1562, granted to the Huguenots provisionally the right to assemble for religious worship outside of the towns, until further provisions should be made by an oecumenical council. Beza and the Huguenots in general accepted this trifling concession with gratitude, but a number of Parliaments, especially that of Paris, raised against it the strongest remonstrances. The duke of Guise threatened to cut it with the edge of his sword, and commenced hostilities in the same year at Vassy, where a number of the Huguenots were massacred. A bloody civil war ensued, in which the Huguenots suffered heavy losses, and which was ended by the Peace of St. Germain (1570), in which the government gave to the Huguenots four fortified towns as security for the future. The Huguenots conceived new hopes; their chief defender, Henry of Navarre, was married to the king's sister; but when all their chief men were assembled at Paris to celebrate the nuptials, the queen-mother gave treacherously the sign for that general and bloody massacre known in history as the *Night of St. Bartholomew*, in which from 20,000 to 100,000 Protestants perished, and among them the great Coligny (q. v.). The Protestants again rose in despair, and received new concessions in the Edict of Poitiers (1577), but the Holy League, which had been organized by the duke of Guise and his brother, compelled the king to revoke everything, and to take a pledge not to rest until the last heretic should be extirpated from France. The assassination of the duke of Guise and his brother by order of the king, who wished to free himself from the influence of the League, stirred up anew the fanaticism of the Catholic population, and led to the expulsion, and, later, to the assassination of the king himself. The legitimate heir to the throne, Henry of Navarre, had been the head of the Protestants, yet, to overcome the hostility of the Roman Catholic party, he believed it necessary to join the Roman Church (1593). He gave, however, to his former coreligionists, by the Edict of Nantes (1598), which he declared irrevocable, freedom of faith and of public worship (with only a few restrictions), their rights as citizens, and great privileges as an organized political corporation. They were declared eligible for admission into the university, and for appointments in the public service, and received an annual grant of 1000 crowns. The remonstrances of several magistrates and provinces against this decree were in vain. Thus brighter days seemed to approach. During the twenty-six years which intervened between the massacre of St. Bartholomew and the publication of the Edict of Nantes only six National Synods had been held, and the only thing that had served to cheer up the drooping hearts of Protestants had been the publication of a new and improved edition of the Geneva version of the Bible. After the assassination of Henry IV (1610) the Protestants were again forced by persecution to take up arms in defence of their rights; but they were disarmed as

a political party by cardinal Richelieu, though, by an act of amnesty at Nismes (1629), he secured to them their former ecclesiastical privileges. About this time their number had been reduced to only about half of what it was before the massacre of St. Bartholomew. Louis XIV regarded it as his special mission to break the power of Protestantism in the state. The Protestants were deprived of a great many churches and schools; the utmost efforts were made to convert all who were accessible to fear, promises, or persuasion; children were taken from their parents; "booted missions of dragoons" were sent in every direction (after 1681), and at last the Edict of Nantes was formally repealed in 1685. See NANTES, EDICT OF. One mountain tribe [see CAMISARDS] in the *Cevennes* took up arms against the king, but its prophets and heroes either perished on the battle-field, or gained only the privilege of going into exile (1704). It is calculated that from 30,000 to 40,000 Protestants fled from France at this time. Nevertheless, two millions of the Reformed remained, with no congregations except in the wilderness, and in 1744 they again held their first National Synod. "In the closing years of the reign of Louis XIV, and during the regency of Philippe d'Orleans, the Protestants were more leniently dealt with. Though now enjoying external peace, the Church began to exhibit signs of internal declension. The chief causes producing this effect were the want of trained and educated men to fill the office of pastor, and the spirit of fanaticism which had sprung up among the members of the Church. These defects were remedied mainly by the exertions of Antoine Court, who has been styled the 'Restorer of the Protestantism of France.' He instituted prayer-meetings wherever he could, and also held synods or conferences of the ministers, along with a few intelligent laymen. By thus exciting a spirit of prayer and a love of order he much benefited the Church. But, while the Protestant Church was gradually recovering from its depressed condition, it was startled by the proclamation by Louis XV, on May 14, 1724, of the last great law against the Protestants. This law re-enforced the most severe measures of Louis XIV. It sought not so much to intimidate Protestants into a recantation, or to punish them if they refused, but rather sought to force them, willing or not, to receive the ordinances of the Roman Catholic Church. For instance, it made baptism by the parish curate compulsory in every case, and declared that no marriage was valid unless performed by a Roman priest. This attempt to force people into the Church of Rome only drove them further from it. Antoine Court (q. v.) was supported by multitudes. The Provincial Synods, which he had reinvigorated, multiplied; and, to meet the want of pastors, he opened a school of theology at Lausanne, which continued to supply the Protestant Church with pastors until the time of Napoleon. From 1730 to 1744 the Protestants enjoyed quiet. In the latter year a National Synod was held in Lower Languedoc. When the news of the holding of this synod reached Paris, it caused the king and his ministers to embark in a new crusade of horrors against the defenceless Protestants. This caused a new emigration. Calmer days followed the storm, and, after 1760, principles of toleration began to prevail. The school of Voltaire, while doing incalculable injury to the cause of religion and morality generally, did good service in spreading the principles of toleration and of religious liberty. The nation gradually became leavened with these principles. Louis XVI, though rather inclined to the opposite principles, was ultimately obliged to yield to the spirit of the age, and in November, 1788, he published an edict of toleration. The privileges granted by this edict to those who were not Roman Catholics were the following: 'The right of living in France, and of exercising a profession or trade in the kingdom, without being disturbed on account of religion; the permission to marry legally before the officers

of justice; the authority to record the births of their children before the local judge.' It also included a provision for the interment of those who could not be buried according to the Roman Catholic ritual" (Eadie, s. v.).

The Reformation of Luther found early adherents in France, some of whom suffered martyrdom for their faith [see REFORMATION in France], but the influence of Calvin soon prevailed. In 1648, Alsace, and a number of other districts and towns in which the Lutheran Church was either exclusively or partly established, were ceded to France by the Peace of Westphalia. Religious liberty was guaranteed to the Lutherans, and again confirmed by the Peace of Nymvegen in 1678. On the same terms France acquired, in 1681, Strasburg, and in 1796, from Wurtemberg, Mompelgard. The congregations of these districts gradually coalesced into the one evangelical Lutheran Church of France, showing the divergencies of its origin by the variety of liturgies, hymn-books, catechisms, etc. which are still in use. The free exercise of their worship has not, on the whole, been interfered with; yet many royal decrees have favored the Roman Church and proselytism, and the number of entire congregations which have been brought back to the Roman Church is said to be over sixty.

The National Assembly of 1789 gave to all religious denominations equal rights, yet the Revolution soon afterwards raged against the Protestant churches as much as against the Roman Catholic. Peace and order were first restored by the decree of 1802, in which Napoleon assigned to the clergymen of the French Reformed and the French Lutheran churches salaries from the public treasury, and gave them, of his own authority, a new constitution. The principal points of this constitution were as follows: The lowest ecclesiastical board for both denominations is the *Consistory*, which consists of the pastors of the consistorial district, and from six to twelve laymen. There is to be one Consistory for every 6000 souls, no matter whether they belong to one or to several congregations. The lay members are elected every other year from the number of those citizens who pay the highest taxes. The Consistory is presided over by the oldest pastor. In the Reformed Church five consistorial districts form one synodal district. The *Provincial Synod* consists of one pastor and one elder from every congregation. The president is elected. The synod cannot be convoked without the permission of the government; can discuss only subjects which have previously been brought to the knowledge of the minister of public worship, and in the presence of the prefect or an officer delegated by him; and can remain in session only six days. The Lutheran Church is divided into *Inspections*, the assemblies of which correspond to the Provincial Synods of the Reformed Church, with this difference, however, that the assemblies of the Lutheran Church elect for lifetime one inspector and two lay adjuncts, who have the right to visit the churches. Above these provincial synods stands in the Lutheran Church a kind of central synod, called the *General Consistory*. It consists of a lay president and two clerical inspectors, appointed by the government for life, and of one lay deputy from every inspection elected for life. This board is subject to the same restrictions as the Provincial Synods and the Assemblies of the Inspections. In the interval between the sessions, a committee, consisting of the president, the elder of the two inspectors, two lay members designated by the General Consistory, and a commissary appointed by the head of the state, acts as the supreme administrative board of the Church. This responsible committee is called the *Directory*. At first this new constitution was regarded with great favor by the Protestants, but its defects soon revealed themselves. The Reformed Church complained that the Provincial Synods were never convoked. The want of Presbyterian Councils

was so palpable that they were organized in spite of the silence of the law, in the Reformed Church, under the name of *Consistoires Sectionnaires*; in the Lutheran Church, under the name *Conseils Presbyteraux*. The larger Reformed congregations also appointed *deacons*, to have the care of the poor, and this example was imitated by the Lutheran congregation of Colmar. During the reign of Napoleon and that of the Bourbons, no improvement of the law could be expected, because the one was too absolute, and the other too hostile to Protestantism. Under Louis Philippe several attempts were made to reorganize the Church, but dissension between the government and the Church boards, and, in the Lutheran Church, between the Inspections and the General Consistory, frustrated all these efforts. After the Revolution of 1848, both churches availed themselves of the liberty granted to them, and held General Assemblies, which prepared drafts of new constitutions, and also expressed a desire for union between the two churches. Louis Napoleon returned to the principles of the former legislation, and by a decree of March 26, 1852, re-established the law of 1802, with a few alterations. According to these alterations, Presbyterial Councils, based on universal suffrage, are established in both churches; from them Consistories proceed, which elect their clerical president, who must, however, be approved by the government. The Reformed Church receives, moreover, from the government a *Conseil Central*, as supreme ecclesiastical board, the members of which are appointed by the government. But the Consistories have not yet admitted the authority of the *Conseil*, which, in fact, is only an organ for the government rather than for the churches. In the Lutheran Church the inspectors are in future to be appointed for life by the government, instead of being elected by the district assemblies. The supreme Church board is called the *Supreme Consistory*, and the government appoints its president and one member. All the inspectors are also members of this Supreme Consistory, with two lay deputies from each inspection district, and one deputy of the theological seminary. The election of these latter two classes is left to the Church. The Directory has the right of appointing all pastors, subject to the approval of the government. Soon after the publication of the decree of March 26, a new division and an increase of the consistories of the two churches, and of the Inspections of the Lutheran Church, took place. This reorganization of the two churches afforded to both this theoretical advantage, that each department was assigned to a Consistory, and that henceforth congregations could be formed without having to encounter obstacles on the part of Roman Catholic boards. On the other hand, it was pernicious to the interests of the dissenters, many of whose churches and schools were closed in the purely Roman Catholic districts. In consequence of the hostility of the bishops, and their influence in the provinces, the Protestants had frequently to suffer from articles 291, 292, and 294 of the Napoleonic Criminal Code, according to which all associations of twenty persons or more, without previous authorization of the government, are forbidden. This law has frequently been put in force against the religious meetings of the Protestants, both in the state and in the free churches, in places where there are no church edifices. Many of these grievances were redressed on the establishment of the Republic, when a minister of public worship declared those articles not to be applicable to religious meetings. They hope to find some relief from a recent law of March 19, 1859, which takes the authorization of new churches, chapels, and oratories out of the hands of the prefects, and transfers it to the State Council, which is less suspected of yielding to the influence of the bishops and the Roman Catholic party.

A great revival in the Protestant churches commenced about 1820. Those who, under the influence of this revival, sought to unite themselves by closer spiritual bonds than the state churches afforded them, were generally designated by the name *Methodists*, although they were not organized as a Methodist denomination. Many of the converts kept themselves aloof from the state churches, and began to lay the foundation of independent congregations. In the state Church a violent contest arose between the Evangelical and the Rationalistic parties. The "*Evangelical Association*," founded in 1833, was supported as a home missionary society by evangelical Christians both in and out of the state churches. A large number of religious societies sprung up, partly supported by only one of the great parties, but partly also by both. In 1848, Frederick Monod (q. v.), with several other clergymen of the Evangelical school, seceded from the Reformed State Church because the synod of the Church refused to demand from all ministers an adhesion to the fundamental articles of the evangelical faith. With the assistance of count de Gasparin and others, he succeeded in having all the dissident churches united into a *Union des églises évangéliques de France*," which held its first General Synod in 1849. The churches belonging to this union are entirely independent of the state, and their General Synods now meet biennially. In both the state churches some leading men and journals of the Rationalistic party have gone so far as to avow undisguised deistical views, and all attempts to force them out of the Church have failed. On the other hand, when a pastor of the Evangelical school showed an inclination towards Baptist views, the choice was left to him either to recant or to secede.

11. *Ecclesiastical Statistics of France.*—(1.) *The Roman Catholic Church.*—The Roman Catholic Church had, at the beginning of the year 1869, eighteen archbishoprics, viz. Aix, Alby, Algiers (established in 1867), Auch, Avignon, Besançon, Bordeaux, Bourges, Cambrai, Chambray, Lyons, Paris, Rheims, Rennes (established in 1859), Ronen, Sens, Toulouse, and Tours. A number of the archbishops are generally cardinals (in 1868, five), who, as such, are senators of the empire, and receive a higher salary. The number of bishoprics is 69 in France, 2 in Algeria, 3 in the colonies (Martinique, Guadeloupe, and Reunion); total, 74. Since the overthrow of Louis Philippe, the bishops have claimed the right to meet, without previous authorization from the government, in Provincial Synods, and many such synods have since been held. The archbishops and bishops are assisted in the administration of their dioceses by vicar-generals, whose number ranges from two to fifteen, and by two or three secretaries. The ecclesiastical courts have risen in importance since the re-establishment of the provincial and diocesan synods, and consist of a president, an *official*, a *vice-official*, a *promoteur*, one or several assessors, and one *greffier*. As the bishops are not elected, but nominated by the government, the chapters have less importance than in other countries. The canons of these chapters, all of whom are appointed by the bishops, form three classes, called *chanoines d'honneur*, *chanoines honoraires*, and *chanoines titulaires*. The third class contains the active resident members. The first class contains bishops of other dioceses; the second class (the most numerous), many pastors, vicars, professors of theological faculties, presidents of seminaries, colleges, and institutions, both Frenchmen and foreigners. Rural deaneries, other chapters, and the office of archdeacon were swept away by the Revolution, but a new chapter of St. Denys (Dionysius), prominent not so much by influence as by high position, has been founded, near the tomb of the imperial family, by Louis Napoleon. It has two classes of members: first, the bishops who have retired; and, secondly, ten canons, with ten honorary members, these latter including the imperial chaplains. The

lower clergy are divided into *curés, desservants, and vicaires*. There are about 3600 of the first, about 32,000 of the second, and more than 9000 of the third class. Besides, there are a number of *aumôniers* (chaplains) appointed for the lycæums, colleges, normal schools, hospitals, and jails; also for the army and the navy, each of which has its *aumônier en chef*. Thus the total number of the lower (secular) clergy exceeds 40,000. In the administration of the secular affairs of the parishes, some members of the laity take part as *marquilliers de paroisse* (treasurers), or members of the so-called *Fabrique* (church council).

In the Roman Church, the religious orders and communities of the clergy, and societies and confraternities among the laity, are very numerous. Among the monastic orders the Jesuits (q. v.) occupy a prominent position, both by the number of their establishments and by their influence. Some of their members (e. g. Ravignan and Félix) have shone as the greatest pulpit orators of modern France. The Benedictines (q. v.) have re-established a convent at Solemnes, and have resumed the literary labors of their order, but have not been able as yet to obtain many members. The Dominicans, though not very numerous, have gained prestige from the reputation of Lacordaire, who re-established the order in France. Nearly all the monastic orders of the Roman Church have now some establishments in France, and a number of new ones (e. g. the *Oblates, Marists*, and society of *Piepus*) have been founded. Many of the religious orders and communities devote themselves with great zeal to the work of foreign missions. At the head of them are the *Lazarists* (q. v.), whose principal establishment is in Paris. With them vies especially the *Seminary of Foreign Missions* at Paris, which was founded in 1663, abolished in 1792, and re-established in 1825. It is under the administration of a superior and six directors, and sends out every year large numbers of missionaries to Eastern Asia. The *Oblates, the Marists, the Piepus Society, the Jesuits, the Priests of Mercy, the Capuchins*, and many other orders and congregations, sustain missions in foreign lands. A new missionary seminary for the missions in Africa was established at Lyons in 1858. The communities of *women*, who nurse the sick and the aged poor, or devote themselves to teaching and to the reformation of prisoners and wretched females, are very numerous and prosperous. Many of these congregations and societies—as the *Sisters of Charity* (q. v.), the congregation of the *Good Shepherd* (q. v.), the *Little Sisters of the Poor*, etc.—increase with a rapidity which is almost without example in the entire history of the Roman Church. The religious societies among the *laity* also increase in strength and numbers every year. The most important among them are the *Society for the Propagation of the Faith*, the central missionary society of the Roman Church, to which now nearly all countries of the world contribute. It was founded in France in 1822, has its centres at Paris and Lyons, and its contributions amount to about 5,000,000 francs annually, more than one half of which is contributed by France. The society publishes a bimonthly, *Annals of the Propagation of Faith*, in various languages. The central children's missionary society of the Church, called the *Society of the Holy Childhood*, has its central organization in France. Its annual income amounts to about 1,000,000 francs. The *St. Vincent Society*, for visiting and assisting the poor, has established branch associations in more than 3000 localities, and expends for the assistance of the poor more than 3,000,000 francs annually. Primary education in France is almost entirely under the control of the bishops. Most of the schools are conducted by religious congregations, such as the Brothers of the Christian Schools, the Brothers of the Christian Doctrine, the Brothers of St. Joseph, Brothers of Mary, Brothers of the Society of Mary, Daughters of the Holy Spirit, and many others. The

seminaries, in which those who have the priesthood in view are educated from their early boyhood (*Grands et Petits Séminaires*), are now, as they always have been, under the sole control of the bishops. The relations of the Church to the State colleges were, until the Revolution of 1848, not to the satisfaction of the bishops, although every college had its chaplain. The controversy between Church and State on this point was terminated by the law of March 15, 1850, which grants to the Church the liberty to found free colleges. This permission has called into existence a very considerable number of Roman Catholic colleges and boarding-schools. Faculties of theology exist at Paris (the *Sorbonne*), at Lyons, Rouen, and Bordeaux, but, as the professors and deans are appointed by the minister of public worship, they do not enjoy the patronage of the bishops, and have but a limited number of students. Moreover, the course of studies at the three last-named is by no means superior to that of the *Grands Séminaires*. In order to promote the study of scientific theology, which, on the whole, is cultivated but little, the bishops have organized at Paris an *école ecclésiastique des hautes études*.

Nominally, the immense majority of the population of France is still connected with the Roman Catholic Church. The census of 1851 claimed out of the entire population (35,781,627) 34,931,032 as Roman Catholics. At the last French census the religious denominations were not taken into consideration. In 1866 the Roman Catholic population of the French dominions was estimated as follows: France, 36,000,000; French possessions in America, 314,000; Algeria, 190,000; other French possessions in Africa, 133,000; possessions in Asia, 200,000; possessions in Oceania, 30,000. A very large portion of these, however, are practically not only without any connection whatever with the Church, but even decided opponents of it. Among the daily journals published at Paris only a few are considered as Roman Catholic papers. The number of religious journals, in proportion both to the Roman population of France and to the religious press of other Roman Catholic countries, is small. The most important among the Roman Catholic papers are the *Monde* and the *Univers*, both dailies of Paris, and counted among the most important organs of the ultramontane party in the world.

The following table gives the list of ecclesiastical provinces, with number of dioceses, clergy, and religious communities in each, as reported in 1868:

Provinces.	Dioceses.	Curés.	Succursales, or Perpetual Curates.	Vicaires, or Curates.	Relig. Communities.
Aix.....	7	226	1373	362	163
Alby.....	5	185	1830	572	114
Alger.....	3	17	166	51	22
Anet.....	4	128	1461	4 5	65
Avignon....	5	188	1303	522	146
Besançon... 7	300	3603	761	141	
Bordeaux... 10	481	2834	616	219	
Bourges.... 6	278	2029	826	155	
Cambrai... 2	121	1249	281	89	
Chambéry... 4	65	578	284	28	
Lyons..... 6	986	2754	704	193	
Paris..... 6	235	1919	267	201	
Rheims.... 5	208	2461	216	123	
Rennes.... 4	193	1151	1427	105	
Rouen..... 5	276	2821	890	119	
Sens..... 4	153	1350	120	97	
Toulouse... 4	133	1455	247	77	
Tours..... 5	192	1446	743	153	
Total..... 92	3665	31,824	9307	2210	

(2.) *Protestantism*.—Of the Protestant churches of France, two, the Reformed and the Lutheran, are recognised as state churches. The French government appropriates a certain sum of money every year for their support. The budget for 1861 gave, as the total sum of this appropriation, 1,462,236 francs—a little less than 300,000 dollars. It was divided as follows, namely: for the salaries of Reformed pastors, 890,400 francs; salaries of Lutheran pastors, 415,750 francs; in aid of

theological schools, 32,000 francs. The remainder was devoted to buildings and repairs, to the support of widows, and to incidental expenses. The salaries are allotted by law, according to the population of the communes, or districts. The pastors of Paris receive 8000 francs; pastors of communes with a population of over 30,000 souls have 2000 francs; from 30,000 down to 5000 souls, 1800 francs; below 5000 souls, 1500 francs. Thus a pastor in one of the state churches in the poorest village in France, or in a remote country parish, is insured a salary of 300 dollars a year. The communes are allowed to add to the stated salary where they are able and willing to do so. Some of the parishes, especially in the departments of the Doubs, Bas-Rhin, Haut-Rhin, and Vosges, have funded or real property, the proceeds of which are devoted either to the support of the pastor, or to repairs, church expenses, etc. Collections for parish purposes, or for the poor, are taken up at the church-doors every Sunday. In general, the parishes have parsonages; where they have not, the communes are bound by law to furnish a subsidy for rent, unless the funds of the parish afford sufficient income for the purpose. "A garden," to cite the language of the law, "is not *de rigueur*, but the communes are authorized to provide it" (*Napoleon's Decree of May 5, 1806*). The state also provides for two Protestant theological seminaries—one at Strasburg, for the Lutheran Church, and the other at Montauban, for the Reformed Church. None but French citizens can become pastors. No doctrinal decision or formulary, whether called a confession of faith or by any other title, can be published, or be made the basis of instruction, without authorization from the government, nor can any change of discipline be made without the same authorization. No one can be admitted to the ministry before twenty-five years of age. No parish can augment its number of ministers without the consent of the government. No religious service at which more than twenty persons shall assemble can be held except in an authorized place of worship. No preacher is allowed to inculcate individuals, directly or indirectly, in his sermons, or to attack the Roman Catholic religion, or any other authorized by the state. The highest Church judicatories are, in part, filled with nominees of the government, and no real autonomy of the churches is allowed. The professors in the theological schools, though nominated by the Church authorities, are appointed by the government.

*Reformed Church.*—The highest judicatory of the Reformed Church, as already stated, is the *Conseil Général* (Central Council) at Paris. The decree of 1852, which established this council, ordered that it should be composed, "for the first time, of eminent Protestants appointed by the government, together with the two oldest pastors in Paris." How vacancies are to be filled was not stated. Its president for 1868 was General Dantheville, of the Engineers; secretary, M. Sayous, sub-director of the non-Catholic cults in the Ministry of Worship. Besides them there were 11 other members. The Council is the organ of communication between the Reformed Church and the government of the state. Its functions are not clearly defined, and its working, on the whole, has not been satisfactory. The governing bodies of the Church, under the Central Council, are the Consistories, Synods, and Presbyterian Councils. The whole of France was in 1868 divided, for the Reformed Church, into 104 Consistorial Districts, intended to embrace at least 6000 souls each, though this result can only be approximately reached. The Consistory is composed of all the ministers of the Consistorial District, and of a body of laymen elected by the Presbyterian Councils of towns other than the chief town of the parish. The Presbyterian Council of the chief town belongs to the Consistory *ex-officio*. The president is elected by the Consistory, subject to the approbation of the government of the state. The functions of the Consistory are to see that church-worship

and discipline are regularly observed; to receive, judge of, and transmit to the government the acts of the Presbyterian Councils; and to superintend the schools of the district. It has no legislative power whatever, but superintends the general interests, both religious and financial, of the parishes under its jurisdiction. It nominates to the government pastors for vacant parishes. The *Presbyterial Council* is a body of laymen in each parish, not less than four in number, nor more than seven. They are elected by the parish every three years. The minister of the parish is president of the council. Its functions are to administer the property, order, and discipline of the parish, under the authority of the Consistory. The *Synods* are essentially ecclesiastical bodies, superintending the spiritual element, as the Consistories do the general administration of the Church. Five consistorial churches constitute a Synodal District, and each send a clerical and lay deputy to the Synod, which thus consists of ten members. Of these Provincial Synods there are twenty-one in France. No periodical sessions are allowed, nor can any session be called without the permission of the government, to whom the questions to be treated at the session must be stated beforehand. A preface, or sub-preface, must be present at the sessions, which cannot last more than six days. The result of all these restrictions may readily be imagined. The Provincial Synods either do not meet at all, or, if they do, their sessions have no import for the life and government of the Church. No *National Synod* is provided for, and none is held. Thus the Reformed Church of France lacks the most vital element of presbyterian connectional government—a General Assembly. The feebleness of the Church government is lamentably manifest in many points. The present contest about Rationalism brings this weakness out in the strongest light. The old French confession of faith is nominally the standard of doctrine, but a man may preach Unitarianism, Universalism, or even Pantheism, and there is no power to call him to an account before any ecclesiastical tribunal competent to try him and to depose him. The *Theological Seminary* of the Reformed Church is at Montauban, in the South of France (Tarn et Garonne). No one can be a minister in the Reformed Church of France without a certificate that he has studied at one of the theological schools (of France or Geneva), and the diploma of bachelor in theology. All the regulations of the theological schools must be approved by the government. According to Th. de Prat, *Annuaire Protestant*, 1868-1870 (Paris, 1868), the statistics of the Reformed Church in 1868 were as follows: Consistories, 104; parishes, 508, with 597 "*auxerres*;" temples or oratories, 403; schools, or "*salles d'asile*," 1385; official pastors, 606; auxiliary pastors, suffragans, and *aumoniers* (chaplains), 86. The population reported by the Consistories (eight Consistories which made no report being estimated) amounts to 630,000.

*Lutheran Church.*—The highest judicatories of the Lutheran Church are the Higher Consistory and the Directory. Under these are Inspections, Consistories, and Presbyterian Councils. The *Higher Consistory* consists of 27 members, all holding office for life. It is composed of a president and one layman nominated by the government; of 16 laymen chosen by the Inspections or Inspectoral Assemblies; of one professor from the theological seminary, chosen by the faculty; and of eight pastors, who are at the same time inspectors. It meets at least once a year, and at any other time when summoned by the government. Its duty is to watch over the constitution, discipline, and worship of the Church; to form a final court of appeal; to audit the account of lower judicatories. Its seat of government is Strasburg, but it is represented officially by the Consistory of Paris. The *Directory* consists of five members, also holding office for life; the president, appointed by the government (who is also pres-

ident of the Higher Consistory); one lay member and one clerical inspector appointed by government; and two deputies named by the Higher Consistory. Its functions are purely administrative, but that means a great deal in France. It nominates to the government all the pastors, and has full authority over the schools and the theological seminary, not only to name the professors, but to direct the course of instruction. The *Inspections* are territorial districts, under the government of Inspectors or Inspectoral Assemblies. Of those there are now eight in France, composed of one or more Consistories; the largest Inspection includes nine Consistories. The Inspectoral Assembly includes all the pastors embraced in the district, and an equal number of laymen chosen by the Consistories. They meet only at times fixed by the state. In each Inspection there is an ecclesiastical inspector appointed by the government, who convokes and presides over the Inspectoral Assemblies. These inspectors, under the authority of the Directory, visit each parish at least once in four years; ordain and install ministers; have supervision over the publication of books for schools, etc.; and, in fact, have general administrative supervision of the district. The *Consistories* of the Lutheran Church of France are forty-four in number. They are composed of both lay and clerical members, the laymen holding office for three years. All the pastors of the district, with the members of the Presbyterial Council of the chief city, and an equal number of laymen chosen by the more popular parishes, constitute the Consistory. The functions and jurisdiction of the Consistories are very much the same as those of the Consistories of the Reformed Church, which have already been described. One of the most important points of difference between them is, that in the Reformed Church the Consistories nominate the pastors, while in the Lutheran this function is discharged by the Directory, as above stated. The powers and duties of the *Presbyterial Councils* are similar to those of the Reformed Church. The theological seminary of the Lutheran Church is at Strasburg. The president of the Directory is *ex-officio* director of the seminary. There are six professors, whose salaries are paid by the state. The faculty of theology are also professors in the *Seminary* of Strasburg, which has, besides, five other professors in philosophy and philology. The school is well organized and conducted.

According to the *Annuaire Protestant*, the statistics of this Church in 1868 were as follows: 44 Consistories, 233 parishes, 202 annexes, 386 temples (96 were subject to the *simultaneum*, or joint use by the Reformed Church), 713 schools, 271 official pastors, 46 vicars, auxiliary pastors, and *armoniers*. According to the reports furnished by 42 Consistories, and estimates for the two other Consistories, the Lutheran population amounted to 305,000.

In Algeria, the United Protestant Church (Reformed and Lutheran) has 3 Consistories, 16 parishes (9 Reformed, 7 Lutheran), 66 annexes, 25 temples or oratories, 14 schools, 16 official pastors (7 Reformed, 9 Lutheran).

*Indépendant Churches.*—The largest body of independent (i. e. not state) Protestants in France is that which is organized under the name *Union des Eglises Evangéliques de France* (Union of Evangelical Churches of France). Five churches in Paris, with nine stations, are connected with the Union. The number of provincial churches is 49. There are 18 additional stations connected with the provincial churches. The total membership is 2735, an average of 60 to each church. The largest church is that of the Taitbout, in Paris, with 210 members. There are seven independent churches not in connection with the Union, and numerous small congregations served by pastors of the societies. In Algeria the Union has six stations. As yet the Union has no theological seminary. Its candidates for the ministry study at Geneva or Lausanne,

and aid is furnished by an education society to such students as need it. There is great vitality in this organization; it numbers Pressensé, Bersier, and de Gasparin among its leaders.

The Evangelical Society of France is a powerful auxiliary to the Union of Evangelical Churches. It reported for 1868 the following statistics: Expenditure, £5240; agents aided by its funds, nearly 50, of whom 11 are pastors, 8 evangelists, and 27 teachers.

The Independent Evangelical Church of Lyons (not included in the Union) had in 1868 six places of worship, with five pastors and eight evangelists. Number of members, 700, mostly converts from Roman Catholicism; children in Sunday-schools, 250; in day-schools, 300. The Church has eight libraries, an infirmary for the indigent, and a retreat for aged women.

The Baptists have had societies in France for more than twenty years. They are in relation with the American Baptist Missionary Union, from whose funds they derive a part of their support. Their number of members in 1868 was reported at about 300, mostly converts from Romanism; nine churches, ten pastors, and perhaps forty preaching-places.

Though there were Methodists in France before the beginning of the 19th century, they were not organized as a French denomination until 1852. Their Conference embraces also French Switzerland. The theological students attend the lectures of the theological faculty of the Free Church of the Canton of Vaud. At the seventeenth Conference, held in Paris in June, 1868, the following statistics were reported: districts, 3; circuits, 16; chapels and preaching-rooms, 184; ministers and probationers, 30; colporteurs and day-school-masters, 20; local preachers, 110; members, 1979; on trial, 146; day-schools, 11; Sunday-schools, 57; Sunday-school teachers, 277; scholars, 2588.

The *Annuaire Protestant* gives five Moravian and four "Anabaptist" churches. It has no statistics of the Darbyites, Irvingites, Hinshists, and other small sects, of which it says there are some churches in France.

The Jews have 10 high rabbis, with salaries of from 3500 to 7000 francs; 66 rabbis, with incomes ranging from 800 to 1500 francs; and 64 preceptors, with allowances of from 500 to 2000 francs. The Jewish population in 1866 was estimated at 159,000 in France, and 35,700 in Algeria.

See Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, iv, 489 sq., 529 sq.; *Gallia Christiana in provinciis ecclesiasticis distributa opere et studio Dionysii Sammarthani* [St. Martine] (Paris, 1715-25, vol. i-iii; *Opere et studio monach. cong. S. Mauri*, 1728-70; vol. iv-xii; 1785, vol. xiii); Fiquet, *La France Pontificale* (*Gallia Christiana*) *Hist. chronologique et biographique des archevêques et évêques de tous les diocèses*, etc. (Paris, 1865, vol. i; 1866, vol. ii); Jager, *Histoire de l'Eglise Catholique en France depuis son origine jusqu'au Concordat de Pie VII* (Paris, 1863-66, vol. i-xiii); (Beza), *Histoire ecclésiastique des églises réformées du royaume de France*; De Félice, *Hist. des Protestants de France* (Paris, 1850); Vincent, *Vues sur le Protestantisme en France* (Nismes, 1829, 2 vols.); Bost, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire du reveil religieux des églises prot. de la Suisse et de la France* (Paris, 1854, 2 vols.); Mäder, *Die protestant. Kirche Frankreichs von 1787 bis 1846* (ed. by Gieseler, Leipzig, 1848, 2 vols.); Reuchlin, *Das Christenthum in Frankreich* (Hamburg, 1837); Puaux, *Hist. de la Réformation Française* (Paris, 1863-64, 6 vols., of popular caste and little scientific value); Soldan, *Gesch. des franz. Protestantismus bis zum Tod Carl's IX* (1853, 2 vols.); Polenz, *Gesch. des franz. Calvinismus* (Gotha, 5 vols.). A periodical specially devoted to the history of French Protestantism is published by Haag (*Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français*). A biographical dictionary of celebrated French Protestants was also published by Haag (*La France Protestante*, 8 vols.). For the statistics of France, see

Wiggers, *Kirchl. Statistik*, ii, 60-84; Neher, *Kirchl. Geographie und Statistik*, vol. i (Ratisbon, 1864); *La France Ecclesiastique* (annual, Paris) gives the statistics of the Roman Catholic Church; De Prat, *L'Annuaire Protestant*, 1868-70 (Paris, 1868); McClintock, in *The Methodist*, 1861, February, March, and April. (A. J. S.)

**Francfort.** See FRANKFURT.

**Francis of Assisi**, founder of the order of Franciscans, was born in 1182 at Assisi, in Umbria, where his father, Peter Bernardone, was a rich merchant. The son was intended also for business; but, having a taste for military life, he took part in a contest between Assisi and Perugia, and was taken prisoner. After a year's captivity he was released. Soon after, an illness brought him near the gates of death. He determined to renounce the world. But, on recovering his health, he abandoned his religious life and plunged into gayety. Suddenly conscience-stricken, he vowed to live a life of poverty. The following incident illustrates the character of his religion at this time. "Worshipping in a country church consecrated to St. Damian, he seemed to hear a voice saying, 'Francis, go and prepare my house, which thou seest falling into ruins.' What was the man pledged to poverty to do? He quietly went home, stole a horse from his father's stable, then went to his father's warehouse, and stole from thence silks and embroideries, with which he laded the purloined horse, and sold both horse and goods at the neighboring town of Foligno. Romish casuists say that this action was justifiable by the simplicity of his heart. It is clear that his religious training had not instructed him in the ten commandments. He offered the money to the officiating priest at St. Damian, who cautiously refused to take it. Francis cast the money into the mire, but vowed that the building should be his home until the divine behest had been fulfilled. His father found him out, and, though Francis was twenty-five years old, gave him a sound whipping, and put him into prison in his own house. Francis was set at liberty by his mother during his father's absence from home. He returned to St. Damian's, and his father followed him thither, insisted that he should either return home, or renounce before the bishop all his share in his inheritance, and all manner of expectations from his family. The son accepted the latter condition with joy, gave his father whatever he had in his pockets, told him he was ready to undergo blows and chains for the love of Jesus Christ, and went with his father before the bishop of Assisi to make a legal renunciation of his inheritance in form." By the world, and, it would seem, by his father himself, he was regarded as a madman, but the bishop viewed the enthusiasm of the youth with allowance, and treated him with kindness. He soon after renewed his vow of poverty, imagining himself warned from heaven to do so. He begged for and labored at the restoration of several churches. At this time he pretended to the gifts of prophecy and miracles. He soon attracted followers, and, associating with himself Bernard of Quintavalle and Peter of Catania, on the 16th of August, 1209, laid the first foundation of the *Franciscan order*. The number of his adherents increased rapidly, and he drew up, in twenty chapters, a rule for his order. He carried his rule to Rome, there to obtain for it the sanction of pope Innocent III, who regarded Francis as a madman, but saw how well fitted for his purposes such a man and such an order might be. He ordained Francis a deacon in 1210, and gave his verbal approbation to the rule he had drawn up. Among his triumphs we must record his conversion of Clara, or St. Clare. See CLARE, ST. Born to rank and fortune, St. Clare had recourse from her early years to ascetic practices. She heard of Francis, was captivated by the lustre of his piety, and,

assisted by him, she eloped from her friends. "Although a saint, Francis was obviously deficient in the moral sense. They fled to the Portiuncula, a church which the Benedictines had now given to the Franciscans. He was in his thirtieth, she in her nineteenth year. She was welcomed by the monks and attended by her spiritual guide, and took sanctuary in the neighboring church of St. Paul until arrangements could be made for her reception in a convent. Francis, regardless of filial duty and parental authority, induced her two sisters, Agnes and Beatrice, notwithstanding the agony of her father, to follow her in her flight, and to partake of her seclusion. The church of St. Damian became the convent of the *Order of Poor Sisters* thus established. It was at first the design of Francis and his associates to study how they might die to the world, living in poverty and solitude. But, now that he had reached a summit of renown and influence, he imagined that he had a further commission. He consulted Silvester and Clara, who declared that it was revealed to them that the founder of their order should go forth to preach. And the Franciscans became a preaching order, though the founder was an illiterate man. He persevered in his devotion to poverty, though many of his followers soon showed an inclination to appropriate to themselves some of the comforts of life. He would not permit even his churches to be richly decorated; they were to be low and unadorned. He was continually devising new methods of afflicting and mortifying his body. If any part of his rough habit seemed too soft, he sewed it with packthread. Unless he was sick he rarely ate anything that was dressed with fire, and when he did he usually put water or ashes upon it. He fasted rigorously eight Lents in the year" (Hook, s. v.).

It is unnecessary to record the miracles he was said to have performed. In Roman Catholic phrase, he had a singular devotion to the Virgin Mary, whom he chose for the patroness of his order, and in whose honor he fasted on the feast of St. Peter and St. Paul to that of the Assumption. Roman writers tell us that he was endowed with an extraordinary gift of weeping; his eyes seemed two fountains of tears, which were almost continually falling from them, inasmuch that at length he almost lost his sight. "When the physician prescribed that, in order to drain off the humors by an issue, he should be burnt with a hot iron, Francis was very well pleased, because it was a painful operation and a wholesome remedy; when the surgeon was about to apply the searing iron, Francis spoke to the fire, saying, 'Brother fire, I beseech thee, burn me gently, that I may be able to endure thee;' he was seared very deep from the ear to the eyebrow, but showed no sign of pain!"

At length, finding Europe insufficient for his zeal, he resolved to preach to the Mohammedans. With this view he embarked, in the sixth year after his conversion, for Syria, but a tempest drove him upon the coast of Dalmatia, and he was forced to return to Ancona. In 1214 he set out for Morocco, to preach to the famous Mohammedan king Miramelin, and went on his way; but in Spain he was detained by a fit of sickness, and by various accidents, so that he could not go into Mauritania. But he wrought several pretended miracles in Spain, and founded there some convents, after which he returned through Languedoc into Italy. Ten years after the first institution of the order in 1219, Francis held near the Portiuncula the famous general chapter called the *Matts*, because it was assembled in booths in the fields. Five thousand friars met on the occasion. The growing ambition of the order showed itself in their praying Francis to obtain from the pope a license to preach everywhere, without the leave of the bishops of each diocese. Francis rebuked them, but employed the more ambitious spirits on foreign missions. He reserved for himself the mission to Syria and Egypt, but the affairs of his order



obliged him to defer his departure. Innocent III had approved of his order by word of mouth. Honorius III, who succeeded Innocent in 1219, had appointed cardinal Ugolino to the post of protector of the Minorite brethren, and approved of their missions. Francis set sail with Illuminatus of Reate and other companions from Ancona, and landed at Acre or Ptolemais in Palestine. The Christian army in the sixth crusade lay at that time before Damiatta. Francis was taken by the infidel scouts, and brought before the sultan, who treated him as a madman, and sent him back to the Christian camp. He returned by Palestine into Italy, where he had the affliction to find that Elias, whom he had left vicar-general of his order, had introduced several novelties and mitigations, and wore himself a habit of finer stuff than the rest, with a longer capuche or hood, and longer sleeves. Francis called such innovators bastard children of his order, and deposed Elias from his office. Resigning the generalship that year (1220), he caused Peter of Cortona to be chosen minister general, and after his death, in 1221, Elias to be restored. Francis continued always to direct the government of his order personally while he lived. Having revised his rule and presented it to Honorius III, it was confirmed by a bull dated the 29th of November, 1223. In 1215, Count Orlando of Cortona had bestowed on Francis a secluded and agreeable residence in Mount Alberno, a part of the Apennines, and built a church there for the friars. To this solitude Francis was accustomed to retire. Shortly before his death, according to his monkish chroniclers, he had a vision of Christ under the form of a seraph. "The vision disappearing, left in his soul a seraphic ardor, and marked his body with a figure conformed to that of the crucified, as if his body, like wax, had received the impression of a seal; for soon the marks of the nails began to appear in his hands and feet, such as he had seen in the image of the God-man crucified. See STIGMATA. His hands and feet were pierced with nails in the middle: *the heads of the nails, round and black, were on the palms of the hands and fore part of the feet. The points of the nails, which were a little long, and which appeared on the other side, were bent backwards on the wound which they made. He also had on his right side a red wound, as if he had been pierced with a lance, which often shed sweet blood on his tunic.*" Francis is said to have concealed this singular favor of heaven ever after by covering his hands with his habit, and by wearing shoes and stockings—a modesty which prevented others from seeing, and therefore from bearing witness to the marks, for whose existence we have no evidence. The bishop of Olmutz denounced the miracle as irrational. A papal bull in 1255 vindicated the claims of the miracle. "The Dominicans represented the whole affair as an imposture, the invention of the new order of Franciscans to raise their credit, but it is now generally believed in the Romish Church." Worn out at last, Francis retired to Assisi. In a year he began to act as an itinerant preacher throughout Umbria, and it was "during this time that a woman of Bagnarea brought an infant to him that it might be healed. Francis laid his hands on the child and it recovered; that child grew to be a man, and that man Bonaventura (q. v.), who proved his gratitude by becoming the biographer of Francis, carefully recording all the wonderful circumstances of his life, and working them up into a beautiful fiction." In the latter part of his life he "attributed no value to self-mortification, in itself considered, but regarded it solely as a means for overcoming sensual desires and for promoting purity of heart. Love appeared to him to be the soul of all. Once, when one of the monks, who had carried his fasting to excess, was deprived by it of his sleep, and Francis perceived it, he brought him bread with his own hands, and exhorted him to eat; and as the monk still shrunk from touching it, he set him the example, and ate first. On the next morn-

ing, when he assembled his monks, he told them what he had done, and added, 'Take not the eating, but the love, my brethren, for your example.' Later in life, he did not shrink from preaching before the pope and the cardinals. 'His words,' says Bonaventura, 'penetrated, like glowing fire, to the inmost depths of the heart.' Once, when he was to preach before the Roman court, for which occasion he had committed to memory a carefully written discourse, he felt all of a sudden as if he had forgotten the whole, so that he had not a word to say. But after he had openly avowed what had occurred to him, and invoked the grace of the Holy Spirit, he found utterance for words full of power, which produced a wonderful effect on all present. Again, as the ascetic bent admits of being easily converted into a contempt of nature, so we cannot but regard as the more remarkable that love, pushed even to enthusiasm, with which Francis embraced all nature as the creation of God; that sympathy and feeling of relationship with all nature, by virtue of its common derivation from God as Creator, which seems to bear more nearly the impress of the Hindoo than of the Christian religion, leading him to address not only the brutes, but even inanimate creatures, as brothers and sisters. He had a compassion for brute animals, especially such as are employed in the sacred Scriptures as symbols of Christ. This bent of fanatical sympathy with nature furnished perhaps a point of entrance for the pantheistic element which in later times found admission with a party among the Franciscans" (Neander, *Church History*, Torrey's transl. iv, 273 sq.). Francis died in 1226, and was canonized by Gregory IX in 1230. His order soon rose to great power and splendor. See FRANCISCANS. His writings (epistles, sermons, ascetic treatises, discourses, poems, etc.), with his life by Bonaventura, were published by La Haye, general of the Minorites (Par. 1641, fol.). His life will also be found in Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, vol. i (Rome, 1731); Voigt, *Leben von Franz von Assisi* (Tübing. 1840); Clavin de Malan, *Vie de St. François* (Par. 1811, 8vo); and in Böhringer, *Kirche Christi in Biographien*, vol. ii, pt. ii, p. 489; Hase, *Franz von Assisi, ein Heiligenbild* (Lips. 1856).—Hase, *Ch. History*, p. 265; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. xiii, pt. ii, ch. ii, n. 49; Jortin, *Remarks on Eccles. History*, vol. v; Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, v, 206.

**Francis of Borgia**, a Jesuit and saint of the Roman Catholic Church, was a Spanish nobleman, born in Valencia in 1510. After a careful education he became a courtier of the reign of Charles V, but was turned to a religious life by the solemn circumstances attending the funeral of the empress Isabella, after which he became a disciple of Ignatius Loyola, and was appointed by him to preach the Gospel in Spain and Portugal. On the death of Lainez in 1565, he was elected general of the order of Jesuits. He is the author of many ascetic writings, and contributed much to the perfection of the organization of the Jesuits. He would have been made pope on the death of Pius V, had not the state of his health prevented it. Francis of Borgia died at Rome in 1572, and was canonized by Clement IX in 1671. See *Vie de S. François de Borgia*, by Verjus, after Ribadancira (1672, 4to); Crétineau-Joly, *Histoire de La Comp. de Jesus* (vols. i, ii). The writings of Francis were translated into Latin by the Jesuit Deza (Brux. 1675, fol.).—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xviii, 487.

**Francis of Paula**, founder of the order of *Minims*, was born at Paula, in Calabria, in 1416. He was brought up in a Franciscan convent at St. Mark, where he distinguished himself by rigid asceticism. In order to exceed St. Francis himself in austerity of life, he retired to a cell on the desert part of the coast, where he soon obtained followers, built a monastery in 1436, and thence commenced a new order, called *Hermits of St. Francis*. Sixtus IV confirmed the statutes, and

named Francis superior general, 1474. He enjoined on his disciples a total abstinence from wine, flesh, and fish; besides which, they were always to go barefoot, and never to sleep on a bed. Alexander VI changed the name of the order to *Minims*, as better expressing the humility professed by the new monks. Francis died at Plessis-les-Tours, in France, April 2, 1507, and was canonized by Leo X. Francis was in high favor with Louis XI, Charles VIII, and Louis XII of France, and established many houses of his order in that kingdom, where they are called *Dons Hommes*.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xviii, 489; Hilarian de Coste, *Le Portrait en petit de St. François de Paul* (Paris, 1655).

**Francis of Sales** (Saint) was born near Annecy, Aug. 21, 1567, and was carefully educated at the colleges of La Roche and Annecy. He went to Paris in 1578, and studied with great success at a Jesuit college; afterwards he studied law at Padua. But in 1590, much to the regret of his parents, he devoted himself to the Church, and in 1593 was ordained priest. For some years he was employed in "converting" the Protestants in Savoy, and in 1599 he got the duke of Savoy to expel the Protestant ministers from several districts. He promised Beza a cardinal's hat if he would turn Roman Catholic. In return for this service he was made coadjutor-bishop of Geneva; and on the death of the bishop of Geneva Francis succeeded him, and redoubled his zeal for the reform of the diocese and the monasteries. He instituted, in connection with Madam de Chantal, the Order of the Visitation at Annecy in 1610. He died at Lyons, Nov. 28, 1622, and was canonized in 1665. The Roman writers report the number of converts to Popery through his means as 72,000. His writings are published in a complete edition under the title *Œuvres de St. François de Sales* (Paris, 1823, 6 vols. 8vo; another edition, Paris, 1834, 16 vols.). The abbé Migne has published a new edition, 7 vols. royal 8vo (2861 sq.). His *Traité de l'amour de Dieu* (On the Love of God), and his *Philothea, or Introduction à la vie dévote*, are greatly admired, have passed through scores of editions in French, and are translated into most of the European languages. There are many lives of him; the latest are Hamon, *Vie de St. François de Sales* (Paris, 1854, 2 vols. 8vo), and Pérennès, *Hist. de St. François de Sales* (Paris, 1864, 2 vols.).

**Francis Xavier.** See XAVIER.

\* **Francis, Converse, D.D.**, a Unitarian minister, was born in West Cambridge, Mass., in 1796, and was educated at Harvard, where he passed A.B. in 1815. After completing his theological course at the divinity school in Cambridge, he became (1819) pastor of the Unitarian church in Watertown, Mass., where he remained until 1842, when he was made Parkman professor of pulpit eloquence and pastoral care at Cambridge. He filled this post acceptably until his death, April 7, 1863. He published *The Life of John Eliot, Apostle to the Indians* (1836), in Sparks's Collection of American Biography; several memoirs in the Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, and a number of occasional discourses. He was also a frequent contributor to periodicals.—Appleton, *Annual Cyclopaedia*, 1863, p. 202.

**Francis I**, king of France, son of Charles of Orleans, count of Angoulême, and Louisa of Savoy, was born at Cognac Sept. 12, 1494, and died at Rambouillet March 31, 1547. He came to the throne on the death of his father-in-law, Louis XII, Jan. 1, 1515. He made a concordat with pope Leo X which sacrificed the independence of the Gallican Church, and was resisted by the Parliament of France until its registry was compelled by the arbitrary measures of Francis. In 1519 he was a candidate for the imperial throne of Germany, made vacant by the death of Maximilian II, but was beaten by Charles V, and thereafter gave

expression to his disappointed ambition in efforts to humble his successful rival, which led to almost incessant wars between them, and wasted the lives and treasures of his subjects without adding to his fame or possessions. Francis sought to secure the support of Henry VIII of England, and a personal interview was held between these monarchs on a plain near Calais, called, from the magnificence displayed, the "Field of the Cloth of Gold;" but the crafty Wolsey managed to nullify the results of the meeting. The contests which followed were generally unfortunate for Francis, who in 1525 led an army into Italy, and was defeated and made prisoner at the battle of Pavia. He was only released on signing a treaty dishonorable to himself and his country, which he secretly protested against, and when once more at home openly repudiated. A powerful combination, called the Holy League, was formed to curb the ambition and power of Charles, but failed, chiefly from lack of energy and discretion on the part of Francis, whose mind was too much under the control of favorites and mistresses. With alternations of success and failure, of truce and war, these conflicts continued during the life of Francis, who sought aid of the Turks, the pope, the English, and the German Protestants, and abandoned the one or the other ally as the vacillations of feeling, the promptings of policy, or the influence of favorites determined. It is said that he finally died from the effects of a disease which an injured husband found means of communicating to him. Francis was a patron of artists and literary men, and his name is justly associated with the *renaissance* of literature and art; but he was despotic, devoted to pleasure, and grossly licentious—now inclining to religious toleration, now witnessing himself the torch applied to light the fires of the stake; in 1531 an ally of the Protestant "*league of Smalcald*," in 1545 permitting a most atrocious persecution of the peaceful Vaudois, his life presents a picture wherein the virtues of the brave chevalier are overlapped and almost hid by vices that darkened the lustre of his early fame, and left their traces in the corrupt morals of successive reigns.—Wright, *History of France* (London, 3 vols. 4to), i, 626-676; Sismondi, *Histoire des Français* (Bruxelles, 1849, 18 vols. 8vo; see Index in vol. xviii); Ranke, *History of the Papacy* (1851, 2 vols. 8vo); Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xviii, 510-530. (J. W. M.)

**Franciscans**, the name of several monastic orders which follow the rule of Francis of Assisi (q. v.). Francis himself founded three orders: an order of friars, called Minorites (*Fratres Minores*), an order of nuns [see CLARISSES], and an order of Tertiaries (q. v.). These orders split into a large number of divisions, some of which even assumed other names, and became entirely independent of the original Franciscans. See MIXIMS; CAPUCIANS.

1. *Franciscan Friars.*—This order was founded in 1210; in that year, at least, Francis gave the rule which united his followers into a monastic community. As, however, their life in common commenced before that period, some historians assume the year 1208 or 1206 as the year of foundation. The origin of the Franciscans marks a turning-point in the history of monasticism, for they were the first and most prominent representa-



St. Francis.

tives of the mendicant (q. v.) orders. Francis with some difficulty, obtained the papal approbation of his order [see FRANCIS OF ASSISI] in 1210, and in 1215 he received also the sanction of the Council of Lateran. The growth of the order was astonishingly rapid. At the first General Chapter, held in 1219, more than 5000 friars assembled, and it was resolved to send out preachers of repentance to Germany, France, Spain, England, Hungary, and Greece. In 1223 the rule of the order was written down, and at the same time the order received extensive privileges from Honorius III. Francis resigned the burden of the generalship in 1220. His first successors, Peter of Corbona, and Elias, assumed, however, only the title of ministers general, regarding Francis, notwithstanding his resignation, as the chief superior. Elias introduced various changes; the monks assumed a less coarse garb, built beautiful churches and convents, and commenced to cultivate science. Francis had severely censured these mitigations, but after his resignation they soon began to prevail. The advocates of the primitive rigor, at their head Anthony (q. v.) of Padua, succeeded, however, in enlisting the sympathy of pope Gregory IX, by whom Elias was deposed. But a few years later (1236) Elias was re-elected general, and returned to his old principles of mitigation. The rigorous party, and especially their leader, Cæsarinus (q. v.) of Spire (hence their name, *Cæsariines*), were subjected to a cruel persecution, by which Cæsarinus even lost his life (1239). This, however, caused the second deposition of Elias, and the first two of his successors favored the strict party. But Crescentius of Jesi, elected in 1244, followed the footsteps of Elias, and the Cæsariines were again persecuted until Bonaventura (q. v.) was elected general in 1256. He gradually restored the strict discipline, and raised the order to a degree of prosperity which it had never enjoyed before. The ascendancy of the strict party lasted until the generalship of Matheo di Aquas Spartas, who again sided with the other party, which henceforth remained predominant until the whole order permanently split into two parties. The advocates of the primitive rigor sought to form themselves into independent congregations, such as the Celestines, the Minorites of Narbonne, and the Spirituals [see DISCALCEATI, 13], but they suffered from their opponents an almost uninterrupted persecution. The Celestines (established in 1294) were condemned by the Inquisition as heretics in 1307, the Minorites of Narbonne and the Spirituals in 1318. The Minorite Clarenines, founded in 1302 by the ex-Celestine Angelo di Cordona, obtained toleration as an independent congregation, and existed as such until 1517, when they united with the Observants. Two other congregations, the Minorites of the Congregation of Philip of Majorca, and the Minorites of John of Valeos and Gentile of Spoleto, were of very short duration. In 1368 Paoletto di Foligno founded a new congregation, which followed the unaltered rule of Francis, spread rapidly, was approved by the popes, and thus caused the order of Franciscan friars to split into two main branches, the Conventuals, who followed the mitigated rule, and the Observants, who adhered to the primitive strict rule. The efforts of the Conventuals to suppress their opponents failed, for the latter were confirmed by the Council of Constance in 1415, received the permission to hold General Chapters, and obtained possession of the church of Portiuncula, the celebrated birthplace of the order. From both the Observants and Conventuals other congregations branched off. The consequent confusions in the order induced pope Julius II to command by a bull all congregations to unite either with the Observants or Conventuals. The former received also, in 1517, from Leo X, the right to elect the general of the whole order, while the Conventuals could only elect a minister general, whose election had to be ratified by the general. The following independent congregations joined the



Conventual Franciscan.

Observant Franciscan.

Observants in consequence of the measures of Julius II and Leo X: the Minorites of Peter of Villacrezes, founded in 1390 upon Mount Celis; the Minorite Coletans, founded by the Clarisse Colette of Corbie, in Savoy; the Minorite Amadeists, founded by the Spaniard Amadeo in 1457. Some congregations became extinct before the sixteenth century; thus the Minorites of Philip of Berbegal (Minorites of the Little Cowl, della Capucciella) existed only from 1426-1434, the Minorites Caperolans from 1475 to 1481, the Minorites of Anthony of Castel St. Jean, who were suppressed soon after their foundation in 1475. The Minorites of Mathias of Tivoli, founded in 1495, were united with the Conventuals. The Minorites of Juan de la Puebla, founded in Spain in 1489, joined in 1566, when they counted fourteen convents, the Observants, but continued to remain a separate province with a number of peculiarities. The Minorites of John of Guadeloupe (a disciple of Juan de la Puebla), also called Discalceate Minorites of the Cowl, or Minorites of the Holy Gospel, were founded in Spain in 1494, and united with the Observants in 1517; but they assumed the name Reformed Observants, and formed two separate provinces, which gradually increased to twelve (in Spain, Portugal, Italy, and America). They still have a procurator general at Rome. An Italian Congregation of the Strict Observance (*Riformati*) was founded in 1525, and still exists; a French Congregation, called *Recollets*, by the Duke of Nevers in 1592. The most rigorous among the congregations of Reformed Observants was that founded by Peter of Aleantara in 1540. It spread especially in Italy and Spain, was joined by the Paschasites, or Reformed Minorites of St. Paschasius, and then formed into a province, which was afterwards divided into several. This branch of the Reformed Observants had also in Rome a procurator general. At present it has only a small number of convents. In 1852 some Observants of Westphalia received papal permission to erect convents of this congregation in Germany, but they soon fell out with the bishops, and then also with the pope, and at the request of the bishops the incipient organization was suppressed by the Prussian government. The Franciscan friars have always been, and still are, very numerous. In the eighteenth century they counted more than 180,000 members, in 9000 convents. The Conventuals, by far the less numerous, had in 1789 about 30 provinces, with about 15,000 monks.

As a literary order, the Franciscans have chiefly been eminent in the theological sciences. The great school of the Scotists takes its name from John Duns Scotus [see SCOTUS], a Franciscan friar, and it has been the pride of this order to maintain his distinctive doctrines both in philosophy and in theology against

the rival school of the Thomists, to which the Dominican order gave its allegiance. See THOMISTS. In the Nominalistic controversy the Thomists were for the most part Conceptualists; the Franciscans adhered to the rigid Realism. See NOMINALISM. In the Free-will question the Franciscans strenuously resisted the Thomist doctrine of 'predetermining decrees.' Indeed, all the greatest names of the early Scotch school are the Franciscans, St. Bonaventure, Alexander de Hales, and Ockham. The single name of Roger Bacon, the marvel of mediæval letters, the divine, the philosopher, the linguist, the experimentalist, the practical mechanic, would in itself have sufficed to make the reputation of his order, had his contemporaries not failed to appreciate his merit. Two centuries later the great cardinal Ximenes was a member of this order. The popes Nicholas IV, Alexander V, Sixtus IV, the still more celebrated Sixtus V, and the well-known Ganganelli, Clement XIV, also belonged to the institute of St. Francis. In history this order is less distinguished; but its own annalist, Luke Wadding, an Irish Franciscan, bears a deservedly high reputation as a historian. In lighter literature, and particularly poetry, we have already named the founder himself as a sacred poet. Jacopone da Todi, a Franciscan, is one of the most characteristic of the mediæval hymn-writers; and in later times the celebrated Lope de Vega closed his eventful career as a member of the third order of St. Francis. We may add that in the revival of art the Franciscan order bore an active, and it must be confessed, a liberal and enlightened part" (Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, s. v.).

No order of monks, save the Benedictines, has had so many members as that of the Franciscans. About fifty years after its foundation it reckoned no fewer than 33 'provinces,' the aggregate number of convents in which exceeded 8000, while the members fell little, if at all, short of 200,000. Some idea, indeed, of the extraordinary extension of this remarkable institute may be formed from the startling fact that, in the dreadful plague of the Black Death in the following century, no fewer than 121,000 Franciscans are said to have fallen victims to their zeal for the care of the sick, and for the spiritual ministration to the dying! The Reformation destroyed a large number of its convents; but, on the other hand, it spread so rapidly that at the beginning of the 18th century it still numbered 115,000 monks in 7000 monasteries, and 28,000 nuns in 1000 convents.

"The supreme government of the Franciscan order, which is commonly said to be the especial embodiment of the democratic element in the Roman Catholic Church, is vested in an elective general, who resides at Rome. The subordinate superiors are, first, the 'provincial,' who presides over all the brethren in a province; and, secondly, the 'guardian,' who is the head of a single convent or community. These officers are elected only for two years. The provincial alone has power to admit candidates, who are subjected to a probation of two years [see NOVITIATE], after which they are, if approved, permitted to take the vows of the order. Those of the members who are advanced to holy orders undergo a preparatory course of study, during which they are called 'scholars;' and if eventually promoted to the priesthood they are styled 'fathers' of the order, the title of the other members being 'brother' or 'lay brother'" (Chambers, *Cyclopædia*).

2. *Statistics*.—At present the number of Franciscans is much smaller than it was in former times. It exists in Italy, France, Austria, Belgium, England, Ireland, Holland, Switzerland, Prussia, Bavaria, Poland (54 convents in 1843), Russia, Turkey, Ionian Isles, Greece, Mexico (60 convents in 1843), in most of the states of Central and South America, China, India, Egypt, Tripoli, Tunis, Morocco, in Australia, and Polynesia. In the United States of

America there are Observants in the dioceses of New York, Buffalo, Philadelphia, Alton, Cincinnati, and Louisville. The principal convent of the Regular Observants is Ara Cœli; that of the Reformed, St. Francisco a Ripa—both at Rome. The Conventuals have convents in Italy, Austria (45 convents and 455 members in 1843), Bavaria, Switzerland, Poland, and the United States of America (in Philadelphia). Their principal convent is at Rome (the Twelve Apostles). The superiors now residing in Rome are a general of the Observants, a minister general of the Conventuals, a procurator general of the Reformed Franciscans, a procurator general of the Alcantarines, a general of the Capuchins, and a general of the Tertiaries. Together, all these branches of Franciscans had in 1862 about 3600 houses and 50,000 members.

See Herzog, *Real-Encyclopædie*, iv, 466; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, iv, 126; Henrion-Fehr, *Gesch. der Mönchsorden*, vol. i.; Helyot, *Ordres Religieux*, s. v.; Wadding, *Annals Minorum* (Rome, 1731-41, vol. i-xvii, reaching to 1540; continued by De Luca to the year 1553); Dom. de Gubernatis, *Orbis Seraphicus, s. historia de tribus ordin. a S. Francisco institutis* (Rom. 1682); Ozanam, *Les Poètes Franciscains en Italie au 13<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1852); P. Karl von heil. Aloys, *Jahrbuch der Kirche* (Ratisbon, 1862), gives an alphabetical list of all the convents. (A. J. S.)

**Francisco de Vittoria**, a Spanish theologian, was born at Vittoria, and died at Salamanca August 14, 1549. He completed his studies at Paris, entered the order of St. Dominic, and returned to his native country to teach. His *Theologicae Praelectiones* (of which there have been several editions; last one, Antwerp, 1604, 2 vols. 8vo) embrace divers treatises. He published also *Confessionario*, etc. (Salamanca, 1562, 12mo);—*Instrucción y Refugio del Anima* (Salamanca, 1552, 8vo); and left in MS. *Comentaria in universam Summam Theologicæ Sancti Thomæ et in lib. Sententiarum*.—Hofer, *Nouv. Liv. Gén.* xviii, 540. (J. W. M.)

**Francke, August Hermann**, an eminently pious divine and philanthropist of Germany, was born at Lubec March 23, 1663, and studied theology and philosophy at the universities of Erfurt, Kiel, and Leipsic; and Hebrew, with great success, at Hamburg. In 1685, in connection with Paul Anton, he established at Leipsic the *Collegium Philobiblicum*, for the study of the Bible with practical exegesis. It met with great success, but made him many enemies. In 1687 he went to Lüneburg to study exegesis with Sandhagen, and here he imbibed a deep spiritual experience. The aims of his whole life from this time were purely Christian; all his labors and studies were consecrated to the glory of God. In 1688 he taught school in Hamburg, and laid the basis of his subsequent mastery of the art of teaching. After visiting Spencer, from whom he derived comfort and strength in the Christian life, he returned to Leipsic in 1689, where he gave exegetical lectures on St. Paul's epistles. Crowds attended them, and a new impulse was given to the study of the Bible. His instructions developed also a new religious spirit among the students. Opposition was soon awakened, and he and his friends were stigmatized as *pietists*. In 1690 his lectures were arrested by the faculty. He then "accepted an invitation to preach at Erfurt, where his sermons attracted such numbers (among them many Roman Catholics) that the elector of Mentz, to whose jurisdiction Erfurt then belonged, ordered him to leave the city within twenty-four hours. On this he went to Halle (1692) as professor in the new university, at first of the Oriental languages, and afterwards of theology. At the same time he became pastor of Glaucha, a suburb of Halle, the inhabitants of which he found sunk in the deepest ignorance and wretchedness, and for whose benefit he immediately began to devise schemes of usefulness. He first instructed destitute children in his own house, and gave

them alms; he then took into his house some orphans, the number of whom rapidly increased. In this charitable work he was aided by some benevolent citizens of Halle, and his charitable institutions increased from year to year. In 1698 was laid the first stone of the buildings which now form two rows eight hundred feet long. Sums of money poured in to him from all quarters; and frequently, when reduced to the utmost embarrassment in meeting the expense, the providence of God, in which he implicitly trusted, appeared for his relief. A chemist, whom he visited on his death-bed, left him the recipe for compounding several medicines, which afterwards yielded an annual income of from twenty thousand to thirty thousand dollars, by which he was enabled to prosecute his benevolent undertakings without any assistance from government?

The following account of the several institutions founded by Francke is taken from an excellent article by professor Stoever, in the *Evangelical Quarterly Review*, April, 1868:

1. *The Orphan House* engaged Francke's most assiduous attention. The main edifice, six stories high and 159 feet wide, was the largest in the city, colossal in proportions, handsomely finished, and imposing in appearance. Connected with this were other buildings, adapted to the various wants of the children, and intended to accommodate upwards of 1000 orphans. This was erected without capital, without soliciting the funds for the purchase of the material, or for the payment of the workmen. The Lord, from day to day, in answer to prayer, supplied everything that was required. In 1704 it was educating 125 orphans; at a subsequent period, as many as 500. 2. *The Normal Seminary*, designed for the education of teachers. Poor young men received gratuitous instruction and boarding, and, as an equivalent, rendered services in the Orphan House. In 1704 there were seventy-five students in this department. The course of instruction extended to five years. For its maintenance no contributions were ever asked. 3. *The Divinity School* grew out of the necessity of assisting in their studies indigent students in theology. From the very first Francke had employed the services of these young men studying in the university as his co-laborers in the Orphan House and the schools for the poor. Many were thus prepared for the ministry. They received special instruction from Francke and other professors in the university, and funds came in freely for their support. In this institution many of the earlier American Lutheran ministers were trained. 4. *The Seven Schools*, partly designed for the children of citizens who were able to pay tuition, and partly for those in the humble walks of life. In 1704, the pupils in these schools, independently of the orphan children, amounted to 800, the teachers to 70. 5. *The Royal Pedagogium*, an institution designed for the sons of noblemen and men of wealth. Its benefits were subsequently extended to others. The school at first consisted of only twelve pupils, but in 1704 numbered seventy scholars and seventeen teachers. Instruction was here communicated in the ancient and modern languages, the sciences, and in literature. 6. *The Collegium Orientale*, designed to advance the critical study of the Scriptures in the Oriental languages in 1704, consisted of thirteen individuals, but accessions to the number were made from time to time. 7. *The Institution to provide free Board for poor Students*. This was a most excellent feature in Francke's operations. Without any special resources, he furnished, at first, gratuitous boarding to twelve young men; the number gradually increased, until nearly one hundred regularly sat down to their meals in the great hall of the Orphan House. 8. *The Book-store and Publishing Department*, small in the beginning, expanded till it became one of the most extensive enterprises of the kind in Germany. Not only were school-books issued, but standard religious books, and also works in the Hebrew and Ori-

ental languages. The fonts in the Greek, Hebrew, Syriac, and Arabic characters, in the course of time, were the most complete in the country. The presses were also extensively used for printing the Scriptures. In the early history of the American Lutheran Church, the Bible, through this instrumentality, was furnished to hundreds who were destitute of the Word of Life. This department always sustained itself, as the greater part of the labor was performed by the older boys in the school, all of whom were trained to industrious habits. 9. *The Chemical Laboratory and Apothecary Department*. Occasional cases of sickness, at the beginning, rendered it necessary to make provision for such exigencies. This department soon became very much enlarged. A dispensary, with separate rooms for putting up medicines connected with it, was extensively used by the people of Halle. 10. *Other Eleemosynary Departments*. In these are included various benevolent agencies, viz. *The Infirmary; A Home for indigent Widows; An Institution for the care of the Poor in Glaucha; A Home for itinerant Beggars*. In 1714, 1775 scholars and 108 teachers were connected with the different schools under Francke's superintendence. At the present time there are nearly 4000, and a corps of 200 teachers.

The whole establishment forms one of the noblest monuments of Christian faith, benevolence, and zeal; and the philological and exegetical labors of Francke are gratefully acknowledged by Biblical scholars of the present day, whose views of the doctrines of revelation widely differ from his. In his *Collegia Biblica*, at Halle, there was a return from human forms and systems to the sacred Scriptures, as the pure and only source of faith, and the substitution of practical religion for scholastic subtleties and unfruitful speculations. Thus Scripture interpretation again became, as among the first Reformers, the basis of theological study. His labors as a lecturer were as industrious and thorough as if he had no other occupation; the philanthropist never trespassed on the student in his well-balanced life.

After a life full of labor, faith, zeal, and usefulness, Francke died at Halle June 8, 1727. Among his writings are *Manductio ad Lectionem Scripturæ Sacræ* (Halle, 1693, 1704; Lond. 1706; also, translated, with life of Francke by Jacques, Lond. 1813, 8vo);—*Observationes Biblicæ* (Halle, 1695, 8vo);—*Prælectiones Heremeticæ* (Halle, 1717, 8vo);—*Methodus Studiæ Theologici* (Halle, 1723, 8vo); besides many practical works, among which we have, in English, his *Nicomemus, a Treatise against the Fear of Man* (Lond. 1709, 12mo);—*Footsteps of Divine Providence* (London, 1787, 8vo). For the life of Francke, and accounts of the philanthropic institutions founded by him, see biographies by Guericke (*A. H. Francke, eine Denkschrift*, Halle, 1827), Leo (Zwickau, 1818), Koch (Breslau, 1854), Niemeyer (*Uebersicht von Francke's Leben*, etc., Halle, 1778); *Life of Francke* (Christ. Family Library, Lond. 12mo); *Princeton Rev.* 1830, p. 408; Stoever, in *Evang. Qu. Review*, 1863; Kramer, *Beiträge z. Gesch. Francke's* (Halle, 1861), from MSS. recently found in the Orphan House, containing, among other matter, an account by Francke of "the Beginning and Progress of his Conversion;" a chronological summary of the principal events in Francke's life, also written by himself, and the correspondence between Francke and Spenser; Hurst, *History of Rationalism*, ch. iii. See also PRITISM.

**Francke, Theophil August**, son of August Hermann Francke, was born at Halle March 21, 1696, and died Sept. 2, 1769. In 1720 he was made pastor of the House of Correction in Halle, in 1723 adjunct to the faculty of theology, and in 1727 succeeded his father as diocesan inspector and a director in the Orphan House and pedagogium, and subsequently became archdeacon and consistorial councillor to the king of Prussia. He was the editor of several works,

and wrote introductions to Niekamp's *Missions-Geschichte* and the *Canstein Bibel*, and published a continuation of the memoirs of Danish missionaries in the East Indies.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xviii, 572. (J. W. M.)

**Francken, Ægidius**, was probably born at Dort, where his father, Rev. Henricus Francken, was settled from 1662 to 1704. The son was called in 1704 to take charge of a church at Rijsoort. Having labored here nine years, he accepted a call to Maassluis, where he exercised his ministry till removed by death in 1743. He was warmly attached to the Voetian party in the Reformed Church. He was a zealous advocate of their views, and was highly esteemed by the party. He insisted much on experimental and practical religion. He excelled in analyzing the workings of the human heart, and in exposing to view its hidden recesses. His writings, though not wholly free from mysticism and asceticism, were productive of great good. His work on ascetic theology, entitled *Heilige Godgeleerdheid*, published in 1719, was frequently reprinted; this was also the case with his *Kern der Godgeleerdheid*. His *Witte Keursteen of tien Lereedene* appeared in 1724. Several other volumes on practical religion were published by him. Their titles are sufficiently quaint, and remind us of Rutherford's mode of expression. His brother Peter was settled at Geertruidenberg from 1695 to 1728. See Glasius, *Godgeleerd Nederland*, blz. 471 en verv. (Te 's Hertogenbosch, 1851); *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk door Ypeij en Dermont*, 111 Deel, blz. 306 en verv. (Te Breda, 1824); *Geschiedenis van de Predikant in de Protestantische Kerk van Nederland door J. Hartog. Predikant bij de Doopsgezinde Gemeente te Zaanland* (Amsterdam, 1865). (J. P. W.)

**Francken, Christian**, a German divine, sur-named the weathercock from the instability of his religious opinions, was born at Gardeleben in 1549, and died about the close of that century. He was first a Lutheran, then became a Jesuit, afterwards returned to the Lutheran faith, then became a Socinian, and finally a Roman Catholic again. The most important of his writings is *Colloquium Jesuicum*, etc. (Leipzig, 1579 and 1580), a severe satire on the Jesuits.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xviii, 466-7; Rose, *New Biog. Dict.* vii, 439. (J. W. M.)

**Franco**. See BONIFACE VII.

**François, Laurent**, a French abbé, was born Nov. 2, 1698, at Arinthod (Franche-Comté), and died at Paris Feb. 24, 1782. He was for some time a chevalier of St. Lazarus, but, quitting that society, went to Paris, and engaged in teaching. He there composed several books, defending Christianity against the attacks of the philosophers, which attracted the attention of Voltaire, who sought to cast ridicule upon their author, but only succeeded in giving him a more prominent position in the list of apologists. His principal works are, *Les Preuves de la Religion de Jésus-Christ, contre les spinosistes et déistes* (Par. 1751, 4 vols. 12mo):—*Défense de la Religion Chrétienne contre les difficultés des incrédules* (Paris, 1755, 2 vols. 12mo):—*Examen du Catechisme de l'honnête homme*, etc. (Brussels and Paris, 1764, 12mo):—*Réponse aux difficultés proposées contre la religion Chrétienne par J.-J. Rousseau*, etc. (Paris, 1765, 12mo):—*Examen des faits qui servent de fondement à la religion Chrétienne*, etc. (Paris, 1767, 3 vols. 12mo):—*Observations sur la "Philosophie de l'Histoire" et sur le "Dictionnaire philosophique," avec des réponses à plusieurs difficultés* (Paris, 1770, 2 vols. 8vo).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xviii, 547; Rose, *New General Biog. Dict.* vii, 440. (J. W. M.)

**François de Toulouse**, a French theologian and preacher, lived in the latter half of the 17th century, and was notably zealous in striving to bring the Protestants of the Cevennes back to the Roman faith. He belonged to the order of Capuchin monks, of which

he became provincial. Of his writings, we name *Le Parfait Missionnaire* (Paris, 1662, 2 vols. 4to):—*Le Missionnaire Apostolique* (Paris, 1664, 8 vols. 8vo):—*Sermons sur les Fêtes des Saints* (Paris, 1673, 2 vols. 8vo); *Sermons sur les fêtes et les mystères de Jésus-Christ et de la Sainte Vierge* (Paris, 1678, 8vo).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biographie Générale*, xviii, 543-4. (J. W. M.)

**Francus, or Frank, SEBASTIAN**, a so-called enthusiast of the times of the Reformation, was born about 1500 at Donauwerth. He was first a Roman priest, then a Lutheran minister, afterwards soap manufacturer and printer, always a thinker and writer. He anticipated a class of modern divines in certain views: e. g. extolling the spirit of Scripture in distinction from the letter; viewing religion in a thoroughly subjective way; holding that one believes only on the united testimony of one's heart and conscience. Well read in ancient and mystical philosophy, he imbibed from it a sort of pictistic pantheism. He held that whenever man passively submits to God, then God becomes incarnate in him. The divines at Smalcald (1540) requested Melancthon to write against him, and signed a severe declaration about his writings "as the devil's favorite and special blasphemer." He was driven out of Strasburg and Ulm, and died at Basle 1543. An account of him may be found in Wald, *De Vita Franci* (Erlangen, 1793); Ch. K. am Ende, *Nachlese zu F.'s Leben u. Schriften* (Nurem. 1796). See also Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 450; Erikmum, *Gesch. d. protest. Sekten im Zeitalter der Reformation*; C. A. Hase, *Seb. Franck von Wörd, der Schwärmergeist* (Leip. 1869); Hase, *Ch. History*, § 373; Bayle, *Dictionary*, s. v.

**Frank, JACOB** (*Kieniew Lelowicz*), founder of the Jewish sect of the *Frankists*, was born in Poland in 1712. While a young man he travelled through the Crimea and neighboring parts of Turkey, where he received the surname of Frank, given by the Turks to Europeans, and which he retained. Having returned to Poland in 1750, he acquired great reputation as a Kabbalist, and settled in Podolia, where he was soon surrounded by adepts, among whom were several rabbis. His most zealous followers were among the Jewish communities of Landskron, Busk, Osiran, Opotschnia, and Kribtschin. He preached a new doctrine, the fundamental principles of which he had borrowed from that of *Sabbathai-Seri*, and which he explained in a book which his disciples looked upon as directly inspired from God. The rabbis of Podolia, jealous of his influence, caused him all sorts of annoyances, and had him arrested, but he was liberated through the influence of the Roman Catholic clergy, and authorized by the king to profess freely his tenets. His followers then, under the name of *Zoharites* (from their sacred book *Zohar*) and *Anti-Talmudists*, oppressed their former adversaries in turn, and even obtained an order from the cardinal of Kamienitz to have all the copies of the Talmud in his diocese burned. They soon, however, lost their influence, the papal nuncio at Warsaw declaring against them. Some fled to Moldavia, where they were badly treated, and most of the others, including Frank, professedly embraced Christianity: but, as he continued to make proselytes, he was imprisoned in the fort of Zzenstochow until the invasion of Poland by the Russians in 1773. His sect had increased in the mean time, and he made large collections in Poland and Bohemia. In 1778 he went to Vienna, and then went to Brunn, in Moravia, where he lived in princely style on the means furnished him by his followers. Driven again from Vienna, where he had returned, he settled at Offenbach, in Hesse, where he died of apoplexy (notwithstanding his disciples believed him immortal) Dec. 10, 1791. The sect exists yet, and has its head-quarters in Warsaw, but the mystery which surrounds it has not yet been dissipated. Their profession of faith has

been published at Lemberg in rabbinical Hebrew and in Polish.—Hofer, *Novv. Biog. Gcn.* xviii, 565; see Czacki, *Dissertation sur les Juifs*; Peter Beer, *Histoire des Juifs*; Fort, *Histoire des Juifs*; Franck, *La Cabale*; Leon Hollaenderski, *Les Israélites de Pologne*; Salomon Maimon, *Des sectes religieuses des Juifs polonois*; Carmoly, *Etat des Israélites en Pologne*; Gätz, *Frank u. d. Frankisten* (Breslau, 1868); *Jahrbucher f. deutsche Theologie* (1868), p. 555; *Jüdische Zeitschrift* (Geiger's), vi, 1, 49.

**Frankenberg, JOHANN HEINRICH**, count of Frankenberg, a cardinal of the Roman Cath. Church, was born at Glogau September 18, 1726. He studied first at Breslau, and afterwards in the German-Hungarian College at Rome. After his return to Germany he became successively coadjutor of the archbishop of Görtz in 1749, archbishop of Mehelun in 1759, soon after member of the Belgian Council of State, and cardinal in 1778. He defended the liberties of the Church and of the episcopal seminaries against the innovations of the emperor, Joseph II, but, being accused of having taken part in some disturbances which occurred in Brabant in 1789, the emperor deposed him. Accused afterwards of having opposed the measures taken by the French against the churches of his diocese, he was condemned to deportation, and taken to Brussels. He lived for a while at Emmerich, then in the village of Ahaus, in Westphalia, and finally removed to Breda, in Holland, where he died, June 11, 1804. See A. Theiner, *Der Cardinal von Frankenberg* (Freiburg, 1850); Pie'er, *Universal-Lexikon*, s. v.

**Frankfurt, Concordat of.** See CONCORDAT.

**Frankfurt, Council of (CONCILIUM FRANCO-FORDIENSE)**, a synod of great importance in Church history, held at Frankfurt-on-the-Main, A.D. 794. Some Roman writers deny the authenticity of the acts of the Council of Frankfurt (e. g. Barruel, *Du Rom. Pope*, Paris, 1803, ii, 402), but Baronius (*Annales*, A.D. 791) admits it, and Labbe publishes the canons enacted at it (*Council*, vii, 1057). Mansi publishes but two of the canons (*Council*, xii, 999), referring to *Capit. Reg. Franc.* (ed. Baluz, i, 263) for the rest. Dupin holds that it was considered in France to be a general council, and that three hundred bishops attended it (*Eccles. Hist.*, cent. viii). They came from Germany, Gaul, Spain, Italy, and England, and there were two delegates from the pope.

The occasion of the council was as follows. After the close of the second Council of Nicaea, A.D. 787, the pope sent a copy of its acts to Charlemagne, seeking the approval of the French bishops, which they declined on the ground that the worship of images, sanctioned at Nicaea, was unauthorized in the Church, and unlawful. The *Libri Carolini* (see CAROLINE BOOKS) were composed under the name of Charlemagne, and by his order, to refute the canons of Nicaea. "Nothing can be stronger than the opposition which they offer to every act of or appearance of worship as paid to images, even to bowing the head and burning lights before them. Romanists pretend that the Gallican bishops, as well as the author of these books, were deceived by a false translation of the acts of the second Council of Nicaea, which, they say, led them to fancy that the council had inculcated the paying divine honor and worship to images, and that it was this false notion which induced them to condemn the council; but this is evidently untrue, since it is an historical fact that authentic copies of the acts of the council were sent into France by the pope, as also that Charlemagne received another copy direct from Constantinople" (Palmer, *On the Church*, pt. iv, ch. x, § 4). Roger de Hoveden has the following: "In the year 792, Charles, king of the Franks, sent into Britain" [to Offa, king of the Mercians] "a synodal book, sent to him from Constantinople, in which, alas! were

found many things inconvenient, and contrary to the true faith, especially in this, that it was established by unanimous consent of almost all the doctors and bishops of the East, no less than three hundred, that images ought to be worshipped" [imagines adorari debere], "which the Church of God doth altogether abominate" [execratur]. "Against which Albinus" [Alcuinus] "wrote an epistle, fortified with the authority of the holy Scriptures." Matthew of Westminster, anno 793, gives a similar account.

Finally, Charlemagne called the Council of Frankfurt for A.D. 794, to consider this question, and also that of the Adoptianist heresy (q. v.). Fifty-six canons were passed at the council, of which the following are the most important: Canon 1. Condemning Felix and Elipandus, the propagators of the Adoptian heresy. 2. Condemning the second Council of Nicaea, and all worship of images. "Allata est in medium questio de nova Grecorum Synodo, quam de adorandis imaginibus Constantinopoli fecerunt, in qua scriptum habebatur ut qui imaginibus sanctorum, ita ut deificæ Trinitati, servitium aut adorationem non impenderent, anathema judicarentur. Qui supra sanctissimi patres nostri omnimodis adorationem et servitium renuentes contempserunt atque consentientes condemnaverunt." 6. Ordering that bishops shall see justice done to the clergy of their diocese; if the clergy are not satisfied with their judgment, they may appeal to the metropolitan in synod. 11. Ordering all monks to abstain from business and all secular employments. 16. Forbidding to take money for the ordination of monks.—See, besides the authorities already cited, Gieseler, *Church History*, period iii, § 12; Landon, *Manual of Councils*, s. v.; Inett, *History of the English Church*, pt. i, chap. xiii; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, iii, 635 sq.; Harduin, *Council*, iv, 394; Schröckh, *Kirchengeschichte*, xx, 508; and the article IMAGE WORSHIP.

**Frankfurter, MOSES BEN-SIMEON**, a distinguished printer and Hebraist, lived at Amsterdam between 1700 and 1762. His reputation as a scholar chiefly rests on the "Great Rabbinic Bible" (called קה"ת הגדולה, the *Congregation of Moses*, Amsterdam, 1724-1727, 4 vols. fol.), which he edited, and to which he gave the greatest part of his life and fortune. This work constitutes in itself a library of Biblical literature and exegesis, and is indispensable to every critical expositor of the O. T. Besides giving the text in Hebrew and Chaldee by Onkelos, it contains the Massora, the commentaries by Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Kimchi, Levi b. Gershon, Jacob b. Asher, Samuel b. Laniado, Ibn Jachob, Duran, Saadia, Chaskuni, Seporno, a number of other rabbis, and by the editor, Frankfurter. Not less noteworthy are his *Index Rerum*, the different Introductions written either by himself or by distinguished rabbis; his Index to all the chapters and sections of the O. T., giving the commencement of the verses; a treatise on the design of the law by Obadiah Seporno; the Great Massora; the various readings of the Eastern and Western Codd.; a treatise upon the Accents; and last, but not least, the differences in text between Ben-Naphthali and Ben-Asher, to the latter of whom so great prominence is given by Maimonides, who, in his treatise upon the sacred Scriptures, regards Ben-Asher's revision as the most correct, and adopts it himself as a model. It is from this revision of the text that the Hebrew Bibles of the present day are printed. Frankfurter wrote also glosses on the different portions of the Bible, entitled מנחה קטנה (*a small offering*); מנחה גדולה (*the great offering*); מנחה הערב (*the evening offering*).—Kitto, *Cyclopaedia of Heb. Lit.*, ii, 57; Etheridge, *Intro. to Heb. Liter.*, 301; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.*, i, 295. See RABBINICAL BIBLES. (J. H. W.)

**Frankincense** (לְבָנֹתִים, *lbanah*); whence *Nizenc*, an odoriferous resin, so called from its whiteness (Plin. xii, 14, 32); mostly imported from Arabia (Isa.

Ex. 6; Jer. vi, 20; see also Strabo, 16; Virgil, *Georg.* ii, 117), yet growing also in Palestine (Cant. iv, 14; and perhaps some odoriferous kind of *plant* is here referred to); and used for perfume (Cant. iii, 6), but more especially in sacrifices for fumigation (Lev. ii, 2, 16; v, 11; Isa. xliii, 23; Isai, 3; Luke i, 9); and it also was one of the ingredients in the perfume which was to be prepared for the sanctuary (Exod. xxx, 34). Its use as an accompaniment of the meat-offering (Lev. ii, 1, 16; vi, 15; xxiv, 7; Numb. v, 15) arose from its fragrant odor when burnt, in which respect the incense was a symbol of the divine name, and its diffusion an emblem of the publishing abroad of that name (Mal. i, 11; comp. Cant. i, 3); and from this, as prayer is a calling on God's name, the incense came to be an emblem of prayer (Psa. cxli, 2; Luke i, 10; Rev. v, 8; viii, 3). In this symbolical representation the frankincense especially set forth holiness as characteristic of the divine attributes, so that the burning of it was a celebration of the holiness of Jehovah (Bähr, *Symbolik d. Mos. Cultus*, i, 466; ii, 329, etc.). In this respect its name (=whiteness) likewise became significant. Frankincense was also used in the religious services of the heathen (Herod. i, 183; Ovid, *Trist.* v, 5, 11; *Metam.* vi, 164; Arnob, *adv. Gentes*, vi, 3; vii, 26, etc.). On the altars of Mylitta and the Paphian Venus only incense was burnt (Münter, *Relig. der Babylonier*, p. 55; *Der tempel d. himmel. Göttin zu Paphos*, p. 20; Homer, *Od.* viii, 263; see Damm, s. v. *ῥύϊνς*; Tacitus, *Hist.* ii, 3). The substance itself seems to have been similar to that now known as such, a vegetable resin, brittle, glittering, and of a bitter taste, obtained by successive incisions in the bark of a tree called the *arbor thuris*, the fruit of which yields the purest and whitest kind (תְּרִיבִי, *λίβανος ἰαφαρής*, or *καθαρός*); while the produce of the after incisions is spotted with yellow, and, as it becomes old, loses its whiteness altogether. The Indian olibanum, or frankincense, is imported in chests and casks from Bombay as a regular article of sale. It is chiefly used in the rites of the Greek and Roman churches; and its only medical application at present is as a perfume in sick rooms. The olibanum, or frankincense used by the Jews in the Temple services, is not to be confounded with the frankincense of commerce, which is a spontaneous exudation of the *Pinus abies*, or Norway spruce fir, and resembles in its nature and uses the Burgundy pitch which is obtained from the same tree. See INCENSE.

The ancients possessed no authentic information respecting the plant from which this resin is procured (Strabo, xvi, 778, 782; Diod. Sic. ii, 49; Pliny, vi, 26, 32; Arrian, *Periopl.* p. 158; Ptolemy, vi, 7, 24; Herod. iii, 97, 107; Arrian, *Alex.* vii, 20; Virg. *Æn.* i, 416; *Georg.* i, 57, etc.), and modern writers are nearly as much confused in their accounts of it. Even Pliny and Theophrastus, who had never seen it, give merely contradictory statements concerning it. It is described by the latter as attaining the height of about five elle, having many branches, leaves like the pear-tree, and bark like the laurel; but at the same time he mentions another description, according to which it resembles the *mastic-tree*, its leaves being of a reddish color (*Hist. Plant.* ix, 4). According to Diodorus (v, 41), it is a small tree, resembling the Egyptian baythorn, with gold-yellow leaves like those of the *wood*. The difficulty was rather increased than otherwise in the time of Pliny by the importation of some shoots of the tree itself, which seemed to belong to the *terebinthus* (xii, 31). García de Horta represents it as low, with a leaf like that of the *mastic*: he distinguishes two kinds: the finer, growing on the mountains; the other, dark and of an inferior quality, growing on the plains. Chardin says that the frankincense-tree on the mountains of Caramania resembles a large pear-tree. The Arabian botanist Abulfadl says it is a vigorous shrub,

growing only in Yemen and on the hills, and in respect to its leaves and fruit resembling myrtle; a description which has been thought (Sprengel, *Hist. rei bot.* i, 12, 257) to apply very well to the *Amgris katab* (Forsk. *Flor.* p. 80), or (*Gesch. d. Botan.* i, 16) to the *Amgris kafal* (Forsk. p. 19), or even to the *Juniperus thurifera* (Martius, *Pharmakogn.* p. 384). Niebuhr, in his *Descript. of Arabia*, ii, 556, says, "We could learn nothing of the tree from which the incense distils, and Forskal does not mention it. I know that it is to be found in a part of Hadramaut [comp. Wellstedt, i, 196; ii, 333], where it is called *oliban*. But the Arabians hold their own incense in no estimation, and make use of that only which comes from India. Probably Arabian incense was so called by the ancients because the Arabs traded in it, and conveyed it from India to the ports of Egypt and Syria." The Hebrews imported their frankincense from Saba (Isa. lx, 6; Jer. vi, 20); but it is remarkable that at present the Arabian libanum, or olibanum, is of a very inferior kind, and that the finest frankincense imported into Turkey comes through Arabia from the islands of the Indian Archipelago. The Arabian plant may possibly have degenerated, or it may be that the finest kind was always procured from India, as it certainly was in the time of Dioscorides. Burckhardt, in his *Travels in Nubia*, p. 262, observes: "The *liban* is a species of gum, collected by the Bedouin Arabs, who inhabit the deserts between Korlofan and Shilluk, on the road to Sennaar. It is said to exude from the stem of a tree, in the same manner as gum arabic. It is sold in small thin cakes, is of a dull gray color, very brittle, and has a strong smell. The country people use it as a perfume, but it is dear. It is much in demand for the inhalants of Taka, and all the tribes between the Nile and the Red Sea. It is exported to Sonakin; the Cairo merchants receive it from Jidda. At Cairo it is considered as the frankincense, and is called incense. There are two sorts, one of which is much coarser than the other. It is also imported into Jidda from Sonabel, on the eastern coast of Africa, beyond Cape Gardafui." Colonel James Bird likewise observes: "There are two kinds of frankincense, or *loban*, one of which is the produce of Hadramaut, and is collected by the Bedouin Arabs, the other is brought by the Sumalis from Africa. The former, which is met with in small globular lumps, has a tinge of green in its color; but the other, which is more like common resin in appearance, is of a bright yellow appearance. What the Sumalis import and name *loban mati* is less fragrant than the Arabian kind; it is therefore preferred for chewing, but the last is more used for fumigation. Both kinds are exported by the Hindû merchants to India, along with gum, myrrh, and small portions of honey collected in the country near Aden." The Arabs, says Rosenmüller (*Alterthumsk.* iv, 153), call the most excellent species of frankincense *cmdhur*; and that this is an Indian production appears from Colebrooke's observation (*Asiatic Researches*, ix, 377), that in Hindû writings on medicaments an odorous gum is called *kmubara*, which, according to the Indian grammarians, is a Sanscrit word. They unanimously state it to be the produce of a tree called *sallaki*, and in the vulgar language *sabzi*. When the bark is pierced there exudes a gum of a whitish or yellowish color, externally powdery from friction, but internally pellucid, very brittle, with a balsamic or resinous smell, and a somewhat acrid taste; it burns with a clear blaze and an agreeable odor. The tree grows in the Indian mountains, and is one of considerable size, somewhat resembling the sumach, and belonging to the same natural family, *terebinthaceæ*, or turpentine-bearing trees (see Ainslie, *Mat. Ind.* i, 265). It is known to botanists by the name of *Boswellia serrata* or *thurifera* (Roxburgh, *Flora Indica*, iii, 388); it has pinnated leaves, the folioles of which are pubescent, ovate acuminate and serrate, and very small flowers disposed in



simple axillary racemes. By incisions in the bark a very odorous gum is obtained, which the spice-merchants of London recognised as *olibanum* or frankincense, although it had been sent to England as an entirely different species of perfume (see Oken, *Lehrb. d. Botan.* II, ii, 687 sq.; Geiger, *Pharmac. Botan.* ii, 1204 sq.). The *Boswellia serrata* grows to a height of forty



*Boswellia Serrata*, with enlarged view of the flower and capsule.

feet, and is found in Amboyna and the mountainous districts of India. Another species, the *B. papyrifera*, occurs on the east coast of Africa, in Abyssinia, about 1000 feet above the sea-level, on bare limestone rocks, to which the base of the stem is attached by a thick mass of vegetable substance, sending roots to a prodigious depth in the rocky crevices (Hogg's *Veg. Kingdom*, p. 249). Its resin, the olibanum of Africa and Arabia, usually occurs in commerce in brownish masses, and in yellow-tinted drops or "tears," not so large as the Indian variety. The last is still burnt in Hindû temples under the names of "rhûnda" and "lûban"—the latter evidently identical with the Hebrew *lebônah*; and it is exported from Bombay in considerable quantities for the use of Greek and Roman Catholic churches. From Cant. iv, 14 it has been inferred that the frankincense-tree grew in Palestine (compare Athen. iii, 101), and especially on Mount Lebanon. The connection between the names, however, goes for nothing (Lebanah, Lebanon); the word may be used for aromatic plants generally (Gesén. *Lex. s. v.*); and the rhetorical flourishes of Florus (Epit. iii, 6, "thuris silvas") and Ausonius (*Monosyl.* p. 110) are of little avail against the fact that the tree is not at present found in Palestine. (See Celsii *Hierob.* i, 231; Bod. a Stapel, *comment. in Theophr.* p. 976 sq.; Gesenius, *Heb. Thesaur.* p. 741; *Penny Cyclop.* s. v. Olibanum and *Boswellia Thurifera*.) See AROMATICS.

**Franks, Conversion of.** See CHLODWIG; FRANCE.

**Franz, or Franzius, WOLFGANG**, a Lutheran theologian, was born at Plauen, 1564. He became professor of history, and afterwards of theology, at Wittenberg, where he died Oct. 26, 1628. Among his voluminous writings are *Animalium historia Sacra* (best ed. Frankfurt, 1712, 4 vols. 4to);—*Tractatus theologici de interpretatione s. s.* (Wittenb. 2d edit. 1708, 4to);—*Schola sacrificiorum patriarchalium sacra*, asserting the orthodox doctrine of the atonement against the Socinians (Wittenb. 1654, 4to, and often).

**Fra Paolo.** See SARPI.

**Fraser, Alexander**, minister of Kirkhill, Scotland.—T R

land, wrote *Key to Prophecies not yet accomplished* (Edinburgh, 1795, 8vo), described by Orme (*Bibl. Bib.*) as "a work of some merit," containing "rules for the arrangement of the unfulfilled prophecies, observations on their dates, and a general view of the events foretold in them;" also *Commentary on Isaiah* (1800, 8vo).—Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, s. v. (J. W. M.)

**Fraser, James**, a minister of the Church of Scotland, born about 1700, and died 1769, was the author of *The Scripture Doctrine of Sanctification* (Edinburgh, 1774, 12mo), of which several editions have appeared, the last an abridgment (London, Tract Society, 1849, 18mo). This work was edited by Dr. Erskine, and is highly praised by Orme (*Bibl. Bib.*).—Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, s. v. (J. W. M.)

**Frasen, CLAUDE**, a Franciscan monk, was born in Picardy in 1620. He was doctor of the Sorbonne, theological professor at Paris, and superior of the Franciscan convent there. He wrote *Dissertationes Biblicæ* (Paris, 1682, 2 vols. 4to);—*Cours de Philosophie* (Paris, 1668, 2 vols. 4to);—*Cours de Théologie* (Paris, 1672, 4 vols. fol.); reprinted, with additions by the author, in Latin, as *Scotus Academicus seu universa doctoris subtilis theologica dogmata* (Venice, 12 vols. 4to). He died in Paris, Feb. 26, 1711.

**Frater**, the Latin word for brother. See BROTHER.

**Fraternity** (*confraternitas, sodalitas*), the name of associations in the Roman Catholic Church which pursue special religious and ecclesiastical purposes, observe corresponding statutes and religious exercises, and are endowed with indulgences, and sometimes with other privileges. Among the purposes to which fraternities are devoted are the nursing of the sick, support of the poor, the practice of a special devotion to some part of the Roman Catholic worship, the veneration of a particular saint, etc. In the earlier times of the Christian Church, as all Roman Catholic writers admit, there is no trace of fraternities. The first reference to them is found in an order of bishop Odo, of Paris (died 1208), providing for the annual meeting of a Marianic fraternity. In the 12th century the fraternity of Bridge Brethren (q. v.) arose at Avignon. Among the oldest associations of this class belongs also the fraternity of the Gonfalonieri, who were confirmed by pope Clement IV. In the 17th and 18th centuries the "Marianic Congregations" spread widely, especially in Southern Germany, and in connection with the order of Jesuits. Among the other most noted associations were that of the Scapulary (q. v.), Rosary (q. v.), and Corpus Christi. The popes Clement VIII, Paul V, Benedict XIII, and Benedict XIV issued several constitutions and decrees concerning fraternities. All the fraternities of the Church are subject to the jurisdiction of the bishop and his right of visitation. No fraternity can be erected in a diocese without the consent of the bishop, who has the right of examining, sanctioning, and, whenever he chooses, altering their statutes. Among the fraternities of modern origin, none has extended so widely as the "Fraternity of the most Holy and Immaculate Heart of Mary for the Conversion of Sinners," which was founded in 1837 by the abbé Dufrique Desgenettes in Paris. Among the many religious societies which have been of late established by the High-Church school in the Anglican Church are many which assume the name "Brotherhood" or "Confraternity." The "Kalendar for the English Church" for the year 1869 mentions all societies of this kind then in existence in England, among them the "Guild of St. Alban the Martyr," all the branches of which call themselves brotherhood or sisterhood; the "Confraternity of the most Holy Trinity;" the "Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ;" the "Brotherhood of St. Luke the Physician and Evangelist."—*Allgemeine Real-Encyclop.* iii, 134 (s. v. *Brw*

*derschryften*); *Kalendar for the English Church for 1869* (London, 1869, p. 198-211). (A. J. S.)

**Fratres**, plural of *frater*. See BROTHERS.

**Fratricelli, Fraticelli, or Fratelli**, a low Latin or Italian diminutive, denoting *fratres minores*, little brothers. The term has been applied to so many different sects that its use in writers of the Middle Age is confusing. It was first applied to a sect of Franciscans which arose in Italy about the year 1294. It was used as a term of derision, as the greater number of them were apostate monks; and for this reason it was sometimes given to other sects, as the Catharists, Waldenses, etc. When this name was applied to the more rigid of the Franciscans, it was deemed honorable. As there were many divisions among the Franciscans (q. v.), pope Cælestin V authorized *Pet. de Macerata* and *Pet. de Sempronio* to form a new order, who were called *Pauperes eremiti Dom. Cælestini*, and who obtained permission to live in solitude, as hermits, and to observe the rule of St. Francis in all its rigor. Many of the more ascetic and extravagant monks joined them, who, living according to their own fancies, and making all perfection consist in poverty, and opposed by the regular Franciscans, were condemned by Boniface VIII (1302), and the inquisitors were ordered by John XXII (1318) to proceed against them as heretics, which commission they executed with the utmost barbarity. After this, many of them adopted the views of Peter John Oliva de Serignan, published in his commentary. See OLIVA. They held the Roman Church to be Babylon; that the rule of St. Francis was observed by Jesus Christ and his apostles. They foretold the reformation of the Church, and the restoration of the true Gospel of Christ. They affirmed that St. Francis was the angel mentioned in Rev. xiv, 6; that the Gospel was to be abrogated in 1260, and to give place to a new Gospel, a book published under the name of the abbot Joachim; that the ministers of this reformation were to be barefooted friars. They were repeatedly condemned; and from authentic records it appears that no fewer than two thousand persons were burnt by the Inquisition from 1318 to the time of Innocent VI. These severities were repeated by pope Nicholas V and his successors; nevertheless, they maintained themselves down to the 15th century.—*Herzog, Real-Encyklop.* iv, 562; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cont. xiii, pt. ii. chap. ii, § 39, notes 86, 87; Hase, *Ch. Hist.* § 265; Limborch, *History of the Inquisition*. See EVERLASTING GOSPEL; FRANCISCANS.

**Frauds, Pious**, “artifices and falsehoods made use of in propagating what is believed to be useful to the cause of religion.” They are the offspring of sincerity and insincerity; of religious zeal combined with a defective morality; of conscientiousness in respect of the end, and unscrupulous dishonesty as to the means; without the one of these ingredients, there could be no fraud; without the other, it could in no sense be termed a pious fraud. These frauds have been more particularly practised in the Church of Rome. But Protestants, in their abhorrence of the frauds that have been so often employed in support of that corrupt system, are prone to forget, or at least not sufficiently to consider, that it is not the corruptness of the system that makes the frauds detestable, and that their separation from the Church of Rome does not place them in a situation which exempts them from all danger of falling into corruptions; among the rest, into the justification of pious frauds, substantially similar to those with which that Church is so justly reproached. See Whately, *Errors of Romanism*.—Eden, *Church Dictionary*, s. v. See CASISTRITY; PROBABILISM.

**Frayssinous, DENIS, COUNT OF**, an eminent prelate of the Gallican Church, bishop of Hermopolis, peer of France, commander of the order of the Holy Ghost, etc., was born May 9, 1765, at Currières, in Gascony. His father designed him for the law, but he preferred

the Church, and in 1788 he attached himself to the community of Laon, directed by the priests of St. Sulpice, in Paris. The society was broken up by the Revolution, but after the adoption of Napoleon's concordat in 1801 it was reunited, and Frayssinous became lecturer on dogmatic theology. In 1803 he commenced a series of “catechetical conferences” in St. Sulpice, which had great success. Napoleon threatened to break up these conferences unless Frayssinous would make certain political recommendations to his hearers; but he would not consent, nor was he further disturbed. These meetings were suspended by the Church authorities from 1809 to 1814, then continued till 1822; and his lectures at them were printed under the title *Défense du Christianisme* (Paris, 1823, 3 vols. 8vo), containing a résumé of previous books on the evidences, with additional scientific arguments. It was translated into English, *Defense of Christianity, in a Series of Lectures*, etc. (London, 1836, 2 vols. 8vo). After the restoration (1814) he became very popular at court, and was made first almoner of Louis XVIII. He refused to accept the bishopric of Nismes, but in 1822 was made bishop of Hermopolis *in partibus infidelium*. In the same year he was made grand master of the University and a member of the Academy, and one of his first acts was to put an end to Guizot's lectures on history “as of dangerous tendency.” In 1824 he became peer of France and minister of public instruction and worship. He was also minister of worship under Charles X, but soon retired; and gave his advice, in retirement, against the famous *Ordonnances* which led to the Revolution of 1830. He followed the fortunes of Charles X, who died in his arms at Goritz. Frayssinous died at St. Genièz Dec. 12, 1841. His life was written by Henrion (2 vols. 8vo). Besides the work mentioned above, he wrote *Les Vrais Principes de l'Eglise Gallicane sur la puissance ecclésiastique, la papauté*, etc. (1817, 8vo), a work said by the Ultramontanists to “look towards Jansenism, or something worse.” According to it, the pope is infallible only when in harmony with the voice of the entire Church.—Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xviii, 619.

**Frédégise or Fridugise**, a mediæval monkish writer, was of English origin, and flourished in the 9th century. He was a pupil of Alcuin, who took him to France, where he obtained employment at the court of Charlemagne. He succeeded Alcuin in the abbey of St. Martin, and had also conferred on him those of St. Bertin and Cormery, and was chancellor to Louis le Débonnaire. His *Epistola de Nihilō et tenebris* (preserved in the *Miscellanea* of Baluze, tom. i) is divided into two parts, and the author attempts to show in the first part that the nihilum is something real, and in the second that the tenebre are a corporeal substance. His work against Agobard is lost, but the description of Cormery in the poems of Alcuin is generally attributed to him.—Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xviii, 626. (J. W. M.)

**Frederiks, WILLEM**, was an enlightened Roman Catholic priest, who contributed much to prepare the way for the Reformation in Holland. In earlier life he enjoyed the friendship of John Wessel and R. Agricola, and in later years that of Erasmus. He was a man of learning, and also skilled in medicine. He was pastor of St. Martin's church in Groningen. He also frequently served the city in a political capacity. He acquired great influence, and was highly esteemed. Erasmus regarded him not only as an enlightened man, but as a model priest. He belonged to a circle in which the spirit of Wessel continued to live. Associated with such men as Eyerard Jarghes, Herman Abring, Nikolaas Lesdorp, Johannes Timmermans, and Gerard Pistoris, he diffused liberal ideas more in harmony with the views of the Reformers than with those of the Roman hierarchy. The Dominicans attempted to counteract these liberal views

by offering to defend certain theses. A debate ensued in 1523. In the progress of it it became apparent that this circle of friends had deeply imbibed the spirit and sentiments of the illustrious Wessel. The liberty which they enjoyed in the expression of their views was greatly due to the extraordinary influence of Frederiks. He laid Groningen under still further obligations to him by bequeathing to the St. Martin's church his library, volumes of which are still found on the shelves of the University Library of that place. He died in 1525. He left a son, who was a civilian, and who rendered himself very useful by his hospitality and readiness to assist those who were persecuted for their faith. See Glasius, *Godgeleerd Nederland*, blz. 472 en verv.; Ypeij and Dermont, *Geschiedenis der Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk*, 1 Deel, blz. 66 (Breda, 1819). (J. P. W.)

**Free Church of Scotland.** See SCOTLAND, FREE CHURCH OF.

**Free Congregations** (*Freie Gemeinden*), an organization of advanced German Rationalists and opponents of Christianity who have formally seceded from the state churches. They arose out of the society of Protestant Friends (*Protestantische Freunde*), or, as they were called by their opponents, Friends of Light (*Lichtfreunde*). The first impulse to the organization of Protestant Friends was given by pastor Uhlich, who, on June 29, 1841, presided at Gnadau in the Prussian province of Saxony, at a meeting of 16 theologians and school-teachers. A second meeting, held at Halle on the 20th of September, 1841, was attended by 56 Friends of Prussia, Saxony, and Anhalt, and agreed upon nine fundamental articles. The third meeting, held in Leipsic in 1842, counted about 200 participants, ministers and laymen; the seventh, held in Coethen in 1844, about 150 ministers and 500 laymen. In 1845 the Prussian government deposed two of the leaders of the movement, Uhlich and Dr. Rupp, from their positions as ministers of the State Church. Both at once established Free Congregations, Uhlich at Magdeburg and Rupp at Königsberg. The former, within a few months, numbered 7000 members. Other congregations were soon after established in Halle (by Wislicenus), in Nordhausen (by E. Balzer), in Marburg (by prof. Bayrhofer). In 1847, the first Conference of Free Congregations took place at Nordhausen, to which also the German Catholics (q. v.) were invited. The revolution of 1848 gave to the Free Congregations greater liberty, and consequently a considerable increase of members. At the second Conference, held at Halberstadt in 1849, the way was prepared for a union with the German Catholics; and by the third Conference, held in May, 1850 (it was opened at Leipsic, but, when some members were ordered out of the city, adjourned to Coethen), the union was consummated. At this Conference the Apostles' Creed was formally rejected, and the creed of the new organization summarized in the formula "I believe in God and his eternal kingdom as it has been introduced into the world by Jesus Christ." With regard to baptism, the Lord's Supper, and all forms of divine worship, full liberty was given to individual congregations. After the overthrow of the free political constitutions established in Germany in 1848, the Free Congregations were in most German states again subjected to very oppressive laws. In Saxony they were altogether suppressed. In Bavaria, the baptisms performed by their ministers were declared invalid. At the same time, dissensions broke out among the congregations themselves. Some leaders, like Dr. Rupp, desired to retain the name Christian, and to be regarded as Christians; but the majority wished to drop the name Christian, and even declared against the belief in a personal God. In 1868 the Union of Free Congregations numbered in Germany 121 congregations, with 25,000 members; and six periodicals advocated

their views. Among the Germans of the United States, the Union (*Bund*) of Free Congregations embraces five congregations, viz. Philadelphia (since 1852); St. Louis (1850); Sauk Co., Wis. (three branches); Dane Co., Wis.; Hoboken (1865). A periodical is published in Philadelphia. The Union acts hand in hand with the "Alliance of Freethinkers" (a German society in New York), and a number of "Free Men's Associations" in different parts of the country. Similar Free Societies exist in France, Italy, Belgium, and Holland. —See Zschiesche, *Die protestant. Freunde* (Altenburg, 1846); Haym, *Krisis unserer relig. Bewegung* (1847); Nippold, *Handbuch der neuesten Kirchengesch.* (2d edit. Elberfeld, 1868); Schem, *American Eccles. Almanac for 1868* (N. Y. 1868). (A. J. S.)

**Freedom** (פְּרוּדוֹת, *chuphshah'*, *manumission*, Lev. xix, 20; entirely different from πολιτεια, *citizenship*, Acts xxii, 28; "commonwealth," i. e. *polity*, Eph. ii, 12). Strangers resident in Palestine had the fullest protection of the law, equally with the native Hebrews (Lev. xxiv, 22; Numb. xv, 15; Deut. i, 16; xxiv, 17); the law of usury was the only exception (Deut. xxiii, 20). The advantage the Hebrew had over the Gentile was strictly spiritual, in his being a member of the ecclesiastical as well as the civil community of Jehovah. But even to this spiritual privilege Gentiles were admitted under certain restrictions (Deut. xxiii, 1-9; 1 Sam. xxi, 7; 2 Sam. xi, 13). The Ammonites and Moabites were excluded from the citizenship of the theocracy, and the persons mentioned in Deut. xxiii, 1-6. See FOREIGNER. The Mosaic code points out the several cases in which the servants of the Hebrews were to receive their freedom (Exod. xxi, 2-4, 7, 8; Lev. xxv, 39-41, 47-55; Deut. xv, 12-17). See SLAVE. There were various modes whereby the freedom of Rome could be attained by foreigners, such as by merit or favor, by money (Acts xxii, 28), or by family. The *ingenuus* or freeman came directly by birth to freedom and to citizenship. The *libertinus* or freedman was a manumitted slave, and his children were denominated *libertini*, i. e. freedmen or freedmen's sons. See LIBERTINE. Among the Greeks and Romans the freedmen had not equal rights with the freemen or those of free birth. The Roman citizen could not be legally scourged; neither could he be bound, or be examined by question or torture, to extort a confession from him. If, in any of the provinces, he deemed himself and his cause to be treated by the president with dishonor and injustice, he could, by appeal, remove it to Rome to the determination of the emperor (Acts xvi, 37-39; xxi, 39; xxii, 25; xxv, 11, 12). Christians are represented as inheriting the rights of spiritual citizenship by being members of the commonwealth or community of Jehovah (Eph. ii, 12; Phil. iii, 20). See CITIZENSHIP. The Christian slave is the Lord's freedman, and a partaker of all the privileges of the children of God; and the Christian freeman is the servant of Christ (1 Cor. vi, 22; Rom. vi, 20-22). Paul acknowledges that freedom is worthy of being eagerly embraced; but the freedom which he esteemed most important in its consequences was that which is given through our Lord Jesus Christ (1 Cor. vii, 21-23). The Jews, under the Mosaic law, are represented as in a state of servitude, and Christians as in a state of freedom (John viii, 31-36; Gal. iv, 22-31). See SLAVERY.

**Free (or FREE-WILL) offering** (נְדָבָה, *nedabah'*, i. e. *voluntary*, as often), spoken of a spontaneous gift (Exod. xxxv, 29; Ezra i, 4; comp. 7), but chiefly of a *voluntary sacrifice* (Lev. xxii, 23; Ezra iii, 5; Ezek. xlv, 12; plur. 2 Chron. xxxi, 14; Lev. xxiii, 38; Amos iv, 5; fig. Psal. cxix, 108), as opposed to one in consequence of a vow (נֶזֶק), or in expiation of some offence. See THANK-OFFERING.

**Freeke**, WILLIAM, an English Socinian, born in 1663, wrote a book in the form of questions and an-

swers, entitled *A Dialogue on the Deity*, and a *Confutation of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, which was publicly burned; and the author was fined £500 and compelled to make a recantation in Westminster Hall.—Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, s. v.; Rose, *New Biog. Dict.* vii, 448—9. (J. W. M.)

**Freeman** (*ἀπλευξίρα*, one manumitted, a freedman, 1 Cor. vii, 22; so Josephus, *Ant.* vii, 11, 2; Æschines, lix, 25; Xenophon, *Athen.* i, 10), FREEWOMAN (*ἐλευξίρα*, a free-born female, Gal. iv, 22, 23, 30; elsewhere simply "free"). See FREEDOM.

**Freeman, JAMES**, the first pastor of a Unitarian church in New England, was born in Charlestown, April 22, 1759, and graduated at Harvard in 1777. His theological studies were carried on with difficulty during the war. In 1782 he was invited to officiate as reader in King's Chapel for six months, and in 1783 he was chosen pastor of the church, stipulating, however, for permission to omit the Athanasian Creed from the service. He soon began to feel doubts as to the doctrine of the Trinity, and finally preached a series of sermons to his people renouncing the doctrine. The church resolved (in 1785) to alter their liturgy and retain their pastor. Thus the first Episcopal church in New England became the first Unitarian church in America. Application was made to Bishop Provost in 1787 to ordain Mr. Freeman; but the bishop, of course, refused, and the pastor was ordained by his own people. He was a man of fine social qualities, and of excellent intellectual powers, and was very successful as pastor and preacher. He died November 14, 1835. Besides contributions to periodical literature and to the Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, he published *Sermons and Addresses* (Boston, 1832).—Ware, *Unitarian Biography*, i, 143, sq.; Sprague, *Annals*, viii, 162.

**Free Religious Association**, the name of an association established in Boston, United States, in May, 1867. The Constitution adopted at the first meeting declared the objects of the association to be to promote the interests of pure religion, to encourage the scientific study of theology, and to increase fellowship in the spirit; and to this end all persons interested in these objects are cordially invited to its membership. Each member of the association is left individually responsible for his own opinions alone, and affects in no degree his relations to other associations. Any person desiring to co-operate with the association will be considered a member, with full right to speak in its meetings, but is required to contribute a small annual fee as a preliminary to the privilege of voting on questions of business. The association is to hold an annual meeting at Boston, one month's notice of the meeting being previously given. A permanent organization was effected of officers and committees. At the first meeting speeches were made by Unitarians, Universalists, Spiritualists, Progressive Friends, Progressive Jews, and others connected with no particular religious denomination. At the second meeting, held in 1868, a Baptist clergyman, who had been censured for close communion practice, and an Episcopalian clergyman, who had been tried for an exchange of pulpit with a non-Episcopal clergyman, were among the speakers. (A. J. S.)

**Free Spirit, Brethren of the.** See BRETHREN OF THE FREE SPIRIT.

**Free-thinkers**, "a name adopted by sceptics to express the liberty which they claim and exercise, to think (or doubt) as they please upon all subjects, especially those connected with religion. The term originated in the 18th century, though 'free-thinking' had earlier appeared in England. In 1718, a weekly paper, entitled *The Free-thinker*, was published; and in France and Germany a corresponding spirit extensively prevailed."—Eden, *Churchman's Dict.* s. v. See INFIDELITY.

**Free will.** See WILL.

**Free-will Baptists.** See BAPTISTS.

**Frelinghuysen**, the name of a family eminent in the history of the American Church.

1. **FRELINGHUYSEN, THEODORUS JACOBUS**, first minister of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church in Somerset County, N. J. He was born at Lingen, in East Friesland (now in Hanover, Prussia), about 1691, was educated there, and was ordained in 1717. By the personal influence of Sico Tjadde, one of the ministers of the classis of Amsterdam, Holland, he was induced to come to America, where he arrived in January, 1720, and became pastor of the Dutch people in the vicinity of the present city of New Brunswick, upon the banks of the Raritan and its tributaries. Encountering all the difficulties of a newly-settled country and a sparse population, whose religious spirit was very formal and relaxed, his faithful and fearless ministry gave great offence to many, and aroused a spirit of persecuting opposition. But, with apostolic zeal, he declared, "I would rather die a thousand deaths than not preach the truth." A great revival of religion resulted from his evangelical labors. The highest testimony to his success has been left on record by such men as Rev. Gilbert Tennent, George Whitefield, and President Edwards; and by Rev. Dr. A. Messler, in his *Historical Review of the R. D. Church of Raritan*; also in his paper entitled "The Hollanders in New Jersey," read before the New Jersey Historical Society, September, 1850—a valuable document. A characteristic volume of his sermons, translated from the Dutch language by Rev. William Demarest, was issued in 1856 (12mo, pp. 422) by the Board of Publication of the R. P. D. Church, New York. His biographer says "his labors continued for more than a quarter of a century; and although he was often attacked in the civil courts, before the colonial authorities, and by complaint to the Classis of Amsterdam, he never succumbed. He was always sustained by the ecclesiastical authorities. All his children were believers. His five sons were ordained to the ministry, and his two daughters were married to ministers." His ministry closed about 1747 (see *Memoir of Hon. Theo. Frelinghuysen*, by Rev. T. W. Chambers, D.D., N. Y., Harpers, 1863). (W. J. R. T.)

2. **FRELINGHUYSEN, REV. THEODORE**, eldest son of the above-named, came to this country in 1745 an ordained minister, and was settled over the Reformed Dutch Church in Albany, N. Y. He is represented to have been an ardent, frank, and popular man; earnest, eloquent, tender, and warm-hearted as a preacher; of spotless life, and of eminent piety—"the apostolic and much-beloved Freylinghuysen," as the name was formerly written. After a ministry of fifteen years in Albany, he returned to Holland in 1760, partly because of ministerial discouragements from the excessive worldliness of the city, partly to visit his native land, and, according to some accounts, to procure funds for founding a literary and theological institution. But he never returned, having been lost at sea on the voyage. It is remarkable that his two brothers, Jacobus and Ferdinandus, both of whom had been educated and ordained as ministers in Holland, also died at sea in 1753, of small-pox; and that the youngest brother, Henricus, pastor of the churches in Wawarsing and Rochester, Ulster County, N. Y., died of the same disease soon after his settlement in 1756. (W. J. R. T.)

3. **FRELINGHUYSEN, JOHN**, second son of T. J. Frelinghuysen, was educated and ordained in Holland, and succeeded his father as pastor at Raritan, N. J., in 1750. He "was a man of greater suavity than his father, but was equally firm in upholding the claims of spiritual Christianity. He was distinguished for his gifts in the pulpit, for his assiduity in the religious training of the young, and for his zealous endeavors to raise up

worthy candidates for the sacred office." He died, greatly lamented, in 1754, in the twenty-eighth year of his age. His wife, who afterwards married the Rev. Dr. Jacobus Rutea Hardenbergh, and who survived her first husband more than fifty years, is represented to have been "as eminent in her day for intelligent piety as any of the female saints of the Old Testament or of the New" (see Chambers, *Memoir of Hon. Theo. Frelinghuysen*, Harpers, 1863). (W. J. R. T.)

4. FRELINGHUYSEN, THEODORE, an eminent Christian lawyer, statesman, orator, and educator of youth, was great-grandson of the Rev. Theodorus Jacobus Frelinghuysen, and the son of major-general Frederick Frelinghuysen, of the Revolutionary army, member of the Provincial Congress of New Jersey and of the Continental Congress, and senator of the United States from his native state (New Jersey). He was born at Millstone, Somerset County, N. J., March 28, 1787, educated in schools at New Brunswick and at Basking Ridge, and graduated at Nassau Hall, Princeton, in 1804, with the highest honors of the institution. After studying law in the offices of his brother John at Millstone and of the Hon. Richard Stockton at Princeton, he was admitted to the bar in 1808, at the age of twenty-one. His eminent qualities as a lawyer led to his appointment in 1817 as attorney general of the state, which office he held until, in 1829, he was elected to the Senate of the United States. At the end of his term in the Senate he resumed the profession of the law, but soon accepted the chancellorship of the University of the City of New York. From 1839 to 1850 he occupied this high place, and then became president of Rutgers College at New Brunswick, N. J., where he died, April 12, 1861, after a protracted illness. During his residence in New York he was a candidate for the vice-presidency of the United States, on the same ticket with Henry Clay for president, in 1844. Mr. Frelinghuysen's civil, forensic, and political eminence was eclipsed by the lustre of his Christian and philanthropic career. His piety was humble, devout, genial, simple, and most carefully cultivated. His religious life was felt with unusual power at the bar, in the Senate, in society, and in the Church. He was a Sunday-school teacher almost until his death. His efforts for the salvation of public men—presidents, governors, senators, judges, and others—were most remarkable and blessed. Especially was he in the place of father, pastor, and adviser to the young men over whom he presided in the university and college. He was one of the foremost Temperance advocates and laborers in his generation. His eloquent tongue was ever ready to plead for every good Christian or humane cause. The American Sunday-school Union, the American Colonization Society, and other benevolent enterprises, often shared in these efforts. At one time, and for years together, he was the president of those three greatest of our Christian voluntary associations—the American Bible Society, the American Tract Society, and the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Necessarily he was a Christian patriot of the first order. His eloquent speech in the United States Senate on the Indian Bill, and his course on the Sunday-mail Question, told with electric force upon the whole country. And when the civil war broke out in 1861, he was among the first, the most decided, pronounced, and enthusiastic of all the eminent defenders of the Union. The completeness of his elevated character and record is remarkable, and his name will ever be illustrious for its goodness and greatness. A memoir of his life and services by Rev. T. W. Chambers, D.D., was issued by Harper and Brothers, N. Y., 1863, 12mo. (W. J. R. T.)

**French, WILLIAM.** D.D., a distinguished divine and mathematician, was educated at Caius College, Cambridge, and became second wrangler in 1811. He

soon after became fellow and tutor of Pembroke College, was made M.A. in 1814, master of Jesus College in 1820, and D.D. in 1821. He was successively appointed vice-chancellor in 1821 and 1834, rector of Moor-Monkton, Yorkshire, in 1827, and canon of Ely in 1832. He died in 1849. He published *A new translation of the Book of Psalms from the original Hebrew* (new ed. Lond. 1842, 8vo):—*A new translation of the Proverbs of Solomon from the original Hebrew*, with Notes by W. French and G. Skinner (Lond. 1831, 8vo).—Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s. v.

**French Confession** (*Confessio Gallicana*). See GALLICAN CONFESSION.

**French Lutheran Church.** See FRANCE.

**French Reformed Church.** See FRANCE, and REFORMATION.

**French Roman Catholic Church.** See FRANCE, and GALLICAN CHURCH.

**French Prophets**, the name given in England to a sect formed by the Camisards, who came over to England about 1706, and who brought with them the "gift of prophecy," and soon made converts in England. The great subject of their predictions was the speedy establishment of Messiah's kingdom. "Their message was (and they were to proclaim it as heralds to every nation under heaven), that the grand jubilee, 'the acceptable year of the Lord,' the accomplishment of those numerous scriptures concerning the *new heavens* and the *new earth*, the *kingdom of the Messiah*, the *marriage of the Lamb*, the *first resurrection*, or the *new Jerusalem descending from above*, was now even at the door; that this great operation was to be effected by spiritual arms only, proceeding from the mouths of those who should by inspiration, or the mighty gift of the Spirit, be sent forth in great numbers to labor in the vineyard; that this mission of God's servants should be witnessed to by signs and wonders from heaven, by a deluge of judgments on the wicked universally throughout the world, as famine, pestilence, earthquakes, wars, etc.; that the exterminating angels should root out the tares, and there shall remain upon earth only good corn; and the works of men being thrown down, there shall be but one Lord, one faith, one heart, and one voice among mankind. And they declared that all the great things they had spoken of would be manifest over the whole earth within the term of *three years*. These prophets also pretended to the gift of languages, of miracles, of *discerning*, etc.; discerning the secrets of the heart; the power of conferring the same spirit on others by the laying on of hands, and the gift of healing. To prove they were really inspired by the Holy Ghost, they alleged the complete joy and satisfaction they experienced, the spirit of prayer which was poured forth upon them, and the answer of their prayers by the Most High. These pretensions, however, laid the foundation of their detection and complete overthrow. They went so far as to pretend to raise the dead, and fixed upon one of their own number for the experiment, who was to rise on a particular day. But Dr. Emes did not rise" (Adams, *View of all Religions*). They obtained, for some time, considerable success in Great Britain, having their admiring followers not only in London, but also in the chief provincial towns. They were even joined by some parties of influence, such as Sir Richard Bulkeley, Lady Jane Forbes, John Lacey, Esq., and others. Mr. Lacey, who was originally a member of Dr. Calamy's congregation, entered, we are told, "into all their absurdities, except that of a community of goods, to which he strongly objected, having an income of £2000 per annum." The influence of the prophets speedily declined; but their proceedings left a stigma for a time upon the reputation of the Huguenot refugees settled in Britain. See Hughson, *A Copious Account of the French and English Prophets*, etc. (London, 1814). A curious tract, entitled *A Brand*

snatched from the Burning, by Samuel Keimer, who was one of the sect, and afterwards became a Quaker and came to America, professes to give an account of the French prophets "by one of themselves." The claims of the French prophets resemble, in some respects, those of the modern Irvingites (see *English Review*, ix, 22 sq.).

**French Versions of the Holy Scriptures.**—I. We may gather from the conciliar edicts prohibiting the use of translations of the sacred books in the vulgar tongue that such existed as early as the beginning of the 13th century (*Acta Concil. Tolos.* c. 14, ap. Mansi, xxiii, 197; comp. those also of the Synod of Tarragona in 1234, and Beziers in 1246), and even as early as 1199, Pope Innocent III had heard that "evangelia, epistolas Pauli, moralia Job, et plures alios libros in Gallico sermone," were in use among the Albigenses (*Epist.* ed. Baluze, i, 432); but we are very much in the dark as to the character of these translations, or the source whence they emanated. Writers on the Waldensian Church assert the existence of translations in the Romance dialect possessed by that church anterior to the 12th century (*Monastier, History of the Vaudois*, p. 73; Henderson, *The Vaudois*, p. 248; Gilly, *The Roman Version of the Gospel of St. John*, etc., Lond. 1848); but the evidence on which this is advanced does not stand the test of a thorough scrutiny. In the *Nobla Leyezon*, which contains the religious belief of that church, there are several citations of Scripture, but there is no evidence that these are made from any extant version; and, at any rate, this work cannot be placed earlier than the end of the 12th or beginning of the 13th century (Hallam, *Hist. of Literature*, i, 26). Walter de Mapes says that, during the pontificate of Alexander III (1159-1181), he was present at a synod at Romè where certain Waldensians presented to the pope a book written in the Gallic tongue, "in quo textus et glossa Psalterii plurimorumque legis utriusque librorum continebatur" (*De Nugis Curial.* p. 64, Camden Society ed.; Usher, *De Chr. Eccles. Success.* in *Opp.* ed. Elrington, ii, 244); but it is doubtful whether any part of this was in the vernacular except the gloss, which in a translation would be of little use. That Peter Valdo himself possessed a vernacular translation of the Scriptures has been asserted; but, when examined, this tradition resolves itself into the fact that he requested a grammarian, Stephanus de Ansa, to supply him with a translation of the Gospels and other books of the Bible, "et auctoritates sanctorum;" but whether it was a "textus cum glossa," or "sententias per titulos congregatas," the witnesses leave uncertain. From what Reimer says (ap. Usher, *l. c.*), "Cum esset [Valdus] aliquantulum literatus, Novi Testamenti textum docuit eos vulgariter," the presumption is that no vernacular version existed, but that Valdo in preaching translated for his hearers, i. e., probably gave them the glosses which Stephanus had collected for him. Trithemius, however, expressly says, "Libros sacre scripturæ maxime Novi Testamenti sibi in linguam Gallicam fecit transferri" (*Ann. Hirsaugiens.* ann. 1160, i, 442). The MSS. of the Waldensian versions preserved at Zürich, Grenoble, Dublin, and Paris are not of an earlier date than the 16th century, nor can the version they present claim any high antiquity. That vernacular versions of the N. T., and portions of the Old, existed among the so-called Sectaries of the south of France from an early period does not admit of doubt, but we are not in circumstances to say anything definite concerning them. Dr. Gilly (p. xxii) has called attention to the curious fact that an English ecclesiastic in 1345 disposed by will of a copy of the Romance Bible, "Bibulum (Bibulum?) in Romanam linguam translataum" (*Publications of Surtees Soc.* for 1836, ii, 10). In the library of the Academie des Arts at Lyons there is a Codex containing the N. T. in Romance, to which is appended the liturgy of the Cathari, indicating its origin among

them (Gieseler, *Church Hist.* iii, 409). In the north of France also we have some clear traces of vernacular copies of the Scriptures. A translation of the four books of Kings in the dialect of the north of France (*langue d'Oïl*) has been published (Paris, 1841, 4to) by M. Leroux de Lincy, who attributes it to the 12th century. M. Reuss has examined and described in the *Revue de Strasbourg* (iv, 1 sq.), a Codex preserved in the library of that city, which contains in the same dialect, somewhat varied, the Pentateuch, Joshua, and Judges, with the *Glossa ordinaria et interlinearis* [see Gloss], and the rest of the historical books of the O. T., with the Psalter without the gloss. As respects the translation said to have been executed, cir. 1250, for Louis IX, that of Du Vignier (cir. 1340), that of De Sy (1350), and that of Vaudetar (1372), we can say nothing more than that tradition asserts that such did once exist.

Of translations of parts of Scripture, chiefly the Psalms, into the more modern French, a large number exist in MS., of which a copious list is given by Le Long in his *Bibliotheca Sacra*. About the year 1380 a translation was undertaken by command of Charles V of France, by Raoul de Prailles, of which more than one copy exists. Le Long gives a description of a Codex containing it, with some extracts, by way of specimen, of the language; and there is another MS. of it in the British Museum, of which a full description is given in the *Bibliotheca Lansdowniana*, p. 284 sq. The version in these codices does not go beyond Proverbs.

II. Emerging from these obscurer regions of inquiry, we come to those versions which have been printed, and of which it is possible to give a certain account.

1. That of Guiars des Moulins, an ecclesiastic of Picardy. Taking as his basis the *Historia Scholastica* of Peter Comestor, a digest of the Bible History with glosses, he freely translated this; adding a sketch of the history of Job, the Proverbs, and probably the other books ascribed to Solomon; substituting for Comestor's history of the Maccabees a translation of this from the Vulgate, and in general conforming the whole more closely to the text of the Vulgate than Comestor had done. The Psalms, Prophets, and Epistles were not in the work as at first issued, and it is uncertain whether the Acts were not also omitted: all these, however, were added in later copies. Many MSS. of this work exist, the most important of which is at Jena. An edition of this Bible, as completed by different hands, was issued from the press by order of Charles VIII, about the year 1487, edited by the king's confessor, J. de Reley, and printed by Verard, Paris, 2 vols. fol. Twelve editions of this, some at Paris and some at Lyons, appeared between 1487 and 1545. This is called *La Grande Bible*, to distinguish it from a work entitled *La Bible pour les simples gens*, which is a summary of the history of the O. T., and of which several undated editions have been examined. Previous to the edition of 1847, an edition of the N. T., of the same translation as that found in the completed works of Guiars, but not by Guiars himself, was printed at Lyons by Barth. Buyer, fol., and edited by two Augustinian monks, Julien Macho and Peter Farget: it is undated, but is referred to the year 1478, and justly claims to be the *Éditio Princeps* of the French Scriptures.

2. In the year 1523 appeared at Paris, from the press of Simon de Colines, an anonymous translation of the N. T., which was often reprinted, and to which, in 1525, was added the Psalter, and in 1528 the rest of the O. T. (together 7 vols. 8vo), the last portion being issued at Antwerp, in consequence of attempts on the part of the French clergy to prevent its appearance. Tradition ascribes this version to Jacques le Fevre d'Étapes, who had before this distinguished himself by a Latin translation of Paul's epistles, and by exegetical works on the Gospels and Epistles; and there is no

reason to question the justice of the ascription. This version is made from the Vulgate, with slight variations in the N. T., where the author follows the Greek. The complete work appeared in one vol. fol., at Antwerp, in 1530, and again from the same types in 1532. It was placed in the papal *Index* in 1516; but in 1550 it was reissued at Louvain in fol., edited by two priests, Nicolas de Leuze, and Franz van Larben, who corrected the style, and struck out all that savored of what they deemed heresy. Of this corrected version many editions have been issued.

3. The first French Protestant version was prepared by Pierre Robert Olivetan, a relation of Calvin, and was printed at Serrieres, near Neufchatel, in Switzerland, in 1535, fol. Of this edition very few copies remain. It was reprinted at Geneva in 1540, at Lyons in 1541, and, with a few emendations from the pen of Calvin, again at Geneva in 1545. In 1551 a thoroughly revised edition, with the addition of some of the apocryphal books by Beza, and a new translation of the Psalms by Budé, was issued at Geneva. It has often been reprinted since. An edition for the use of the Vaudois, and for which they subscribed 1500 golden crowns, was printed at Neufchatel in 1556. This translation was made for the O. T. from the Latin version of Santes Pagninus, and for the N. T. after the versions of Lefevre and Erasmus. In its first form it was very imperfect, and even after the revival of Calvin, and the emendations of subsequent editors, it remained behind the requirements of an authorized version.

4. To remedy the defects of Olivetan's version, and to produce one more suited to the wants of the age, the Venerable Company of Pastors at Geneva undertook a thorough revival of the work, with the special aid of Beza, Goulart, Fay, etc., and under the editorial care of Cornelius Bertram. This appeared in 1588. In this revision, יהוה יהוה, which in all the other Protestant versions is rendered by a word equivalent to *Lord*, is throughout translated *L'Eternel*. Revised editions have been issued by the Venerable Company in 1693, 1712, 1726, 1805, and of the N. T. in 1833; the last two very much modernized in style. This claims to be the most elegant of the French versions, but it is far from being an adequate rendering of the original.

5. The Bible of Diodati, Gen. 1614; of Desmarets, Amst. 1669; of Martin, Utr. (N. T.) 1696, (Bible) 1707, 2 vols. fol.; of Roques, Basle, 1744; Osterwald, Amst. 1724; Neufch. 1744, are revisions of Olivetan's text, undertaken by individuals. Of these, Osterwald's is the most thorough, and may be viewed as occupying the place in the French Protestant Church of an authorized version, though Martin's is the one most esteemed by the more orthodox of its members, while that of Desmarets is sought by those who attach much value to fine paper and printing. A carefully revised edition of Osterwald's Bible, with parallels by the Rev. W. Mackenzie, has been issued by the French Bible Society, Paris, 1861.

6. Of avowedly new translations from the original by individuals may be mentioned that of Seb. Chastillon (Castalio), 2 vols. fol., Basle, 1555, in which the translator aimed to impart classical elegance to the style, but which was universally regarded as neither conveying the just sense of the original, nor being in accordance with French idiom; that of Le Clerc, 2 vols. 4to, Amst. 1703, in the interests of Arminianism; that of Le Cene, published after his death in 2 vols. fol., Amst. 1741, deeply marked by Socinian leanings; and that of Beausobre and L'Enfant, 2 vols. 4to, Amst. 1718. This last is by much the best, and has been repeatedly reprinted. See BEAUSOBRE.

7. Of Roman Catholic versions of the Bible, the first is that of René Benoist, a member of the theological faculty at Paris, which appeared in 1566. It was condemned by Pope Gregory XIII in 1575, and involved the author in much trouble because of its supposed

Protestant leanings. It is, in fact, only a slightly altered transcript of the Geneva Bible. A revised edition, conformed to the Vulgate, was proposed and issued by the divines at Louvain. Four translations of the N. T. had appeared before this, viz. that of Claude Deville, 1613; that of Jacques Corbin, an advocate of Paris, 1643; and that of Michel de Marolles, abbé of Villeloin, 1649; and in 1666 that of Denys Amelotte, a priest of the oratory, whose hatred of the Jansenists and desire to damage their version, then in the press, prompted him to a work for which he was wholly unfit, and the blunders of which drew down on him the unsparring criticism of Richard Simon, a priest of his own order. Marolles had begun a translation of the O. T., but it was suppressed after the printing had proceeded as far as Lev. xxiii. A translation of the N. T. by the theologians of Louvain appeared in 1686; of this only a few copies exist. All these are made from the Vulgate. So also is the famous Jansenist translation begun by Antoine Lemaître, and finished by his brother Isaac Louis Lemaître de Sacy, aided by Antoine Arnauld, P. Nicole, etc. The N. T. was first published in 2 vols. 8vo in 1667, and subsequently the O. T., nominally at Mons, but really at Amsterdam. It is variously styled the version of Mons, the version of Port Royal, but now commonly the version of De Sacy. Many editions of it have appeared, with and without notes; the best is that of Fossé and Beauvrou, Par. 1682, 3 vols. 8vo; a beautifully illustrated edition was issued at Paris in 1789-1804, in 12 vols. 8vo. It was with an edition of this version, altered so as to be more conformed to the Vulgate, that Quesnel published his *Reflections*, 1671-80. The translation of Calmet, in his *Commentaire Littéral et Critique*, Paris, 1724, may be also viewed as a revised edition of the Mons Bible. Antoine Godeau, bishop of Grasse, published a translation made from the Vulgate, in 2 vols. 8vo, Paris, 1668. It holds a middle place between a literal version and a paraphrase. The translation of Nic. Le Gros was published anonymously at Cologne in 1739, and afterwards with his name in several editions. Of the N. T., a translation, from the pen of Richard Simon, appeared anonymously in 1702 at Trevoux. This version was charged by Bossuet with Socinian leanings, and was condemned by Cardinal de Noailles. Of the translation by Huré, 1702, and that by the Jesuits Bouhours, Tellier, and Bernier, between 1697 and 1703, it may suffice to make mention.

8. In our own day several versions of the Psalms have appeared in France. A translation of the whole Bible from the Vulgate, by Eugene Geronde, in 23 vols. 8vo, appeared at Paris between 1820 and 1824. This has frequently been reprinted, and has excited much attention, some of the journals vehemently commending it, while by others it has been no less severely criticised. The latest appearance in this department is the translation of the Gospels by La Mennais, 1846, the style of which is admirable, but the notes appended to it are in the interest of Socialism. But the most important work of this kind is undoubtedly the translation from the Hebrew of the O. T. by S. Cahen, *La Bible: Traduction Nouvelle avec l'Hebreu en regard*, etc. Par. 1832-39, 18 vols. 8vo. (Le Long, *Bibliotheca Sacra*; Simon, *Hist. Crit. du N. Test.* liv. ii; Brunet, *Manuel du Libraire*; Horne, *Introduction*, vol. ii, pt. 2; Reuss, *Gesch. des V. T.* sec. 466, etc.; and in Herzog's *Real-Encyclop.* s. v. *Romanische Bibelübers.*; Darling, *Encycl. Bibliogr.* ii, 99 sq.)—Kitto, *Cyclop.* s. v.

Fréret, NICOLAS, a celebrated French scholar, was born at Paris February 15, 1688, and died in the same city March 8, 1749. He at first studied law, but abandoned it for literature, especially for investigations into the languages, history, and religious systems of ancient and Oriental peoples. At the age of twenty-five he was admitted to the Academy of Inscriptions, and gave as his inaugural a discourse on the origin of the Franks, which, though favorably received by the Academy, and

vindicated in great part by the subsequent progress of historical research, was strongly opposed by the abbé Vertot, and led to Fréret's being sent for a short time to the Bastille. On his release he produced a long series of papers for the Academy of Inscriptions, which gave him great reputation for learning and research. In treating mythology, he rejected the theory which traces back religious fables to historical facts [see ETIEMERUS], assigned to the historical element a secondary place, and thought that the Greeks had borrowed most of their divinities from the Egyptians and Phœnicians. He extended his investigations also to the religions of the Celts, the Germans, the Hindus, the Chinese, the Persians, and the Romans, and was one of the first in France to prosecute the study of Chinese. Of his writings we name only those which belong more especially to the subjects embraced in this work, viz.: *Essai sur la Chronologie de l'Écriture Sainte* (Histoire de l'Acad. tom. xxiii);—*Observations sur les fêtes religieuses de l'année persane, et en particulier sur celle de Mithra, tant chez les Persans que chez les Romains* (Mem. de l'Acad. t. xvi);—*Réflexions générales sur la Nature de la religion des Grecs, et sur l'idée qu'on doit se former de leur Mythologie* (Hist. de l'Acad. tom. xxiii);—*Recherches sur le Culte de Bacchus parmi les Grecs* (Mem. de l'Acad. t. xiii);—*La Nature du Culte rendu en Grèce aux héros, et particulièrement à Esculape* (Hist. de l'Acad. t. xxi);—*Hist. des Cyclopes, des Dactyles, des Telchines, des Curètes et Corybantes, et des Cabires* (Hist. de l'Acad. t. xxiii et xxvii);—*Les Fondemens historiques de la fable de Bellérophon et la manière de l'expliquer* (Hist. de l'Acad. t. vii; Mem. t. vii);—*Observations sur les recueils de prédictions écrites qui portaient le nom de Musée, de Bacis et de la Sibylle* (Mem. de l'Acad. t. xxiii);—*Observations sur les oracles rendus par les âmes des morts* (Mem. t. xxiii);—*Observations sur la religion des Gaulois et sur celle des Germains* (Mem. de l'Acad. t. xxiv);—*Étymologie du mot Druide* (Hist. de l'Acad. t. xvii);—*La Nature et les dogmes des plus connus de la religion gauloise* (Hist. de l'Acad. t. xviii);—*L'Usage des sacrifices humains établi chez les différentes nations et particulièrement chez les Gaulois* (Hist. de l'Acad. t. xviii);—*Recherches sur le dieu Hercule Endovelicus et sur quelques autres antiquités ibériques* (Hist. de l'Acad. t. iii);—*Les Assassins de Perse* (Mem. t. xvii). Leclerc de Septelunes published a collection of Fréret's works under the title *Œuvres complètes, nouv. édit. considérablement augmentée de plusieurs ouvrages inédits* (Paris, 1796-99, 20 vols, 12mo), but, despite its title, by no means a complete edition.—Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xviii, 807-818; Rose, *New Biog. Dict.* vii, 451. (J. W. M.)

**Fresco Painting**, a method of painting with mineral and earthy colors dissolved in water, upon freshly-plastered walls. As only so much can be painted in one day as can be executed while the plaster is wet, and as the colors become lighter on drying, fresco painting is very difficult of execution. As the wall dries, all the color that is applied is carried to the surface, and there forms a coating to the wall. But little retouching can be done. Fresco painting was carried to great perfection by the ancients. It was revived, by the Italian painters especially, during the Middle Ages. It again fell into disuse from the seventeenth till the present century, when it has been revived by Cornelius, Overbeck, and others. With the exception, perhaps, of mosaic painting (q. v.), fresco painting is better adapted than any other style to the production of monumental works of art. For full effectiveness, it requires the natural light, and hence cannot be used with success in churches or other buildings which are lighted with windows of stained glass.—Kugler and Schnaase, *Gesch. der Malerei.* (G. F. C.)

**Fresenius**, JOHANN PHILIP, a German Lutheran clergyman, was born Oct. 22, 1705. After finishing his theological studies at the University of Stras-

burg in 1725, he became tutor of the young Rhinegrave of Salm-Grumbach. In 1727 he succeeded his father as pastor of Oberwieschen, and in 1734 became second "Burgprediger" at Giessen. In the following year he also began to give exegetical and ascetic lectures at the university of that city. From 1736 to 1742 he was Hofliconcus (aulic deacon) at Darmstadt; from 1742 to 1743 again preacher and professor at Giessen. In 1743 he accepted a call from the magistracy of Frankfort on the Main, where he remained until his death, which occurred July 4, 1761. In 1749 he received from the University of Göttingen the title of doctor of divinity. Fresenius enjoyed great reputation as a powerful preacher and experienced spiritual guide. From early youth he displayed a great zeal in the defence of Lutheran orthodoxy and of Lutheran prerogatives, and thus became involved in numerous controversies. In 1731 he wrote a work (*Antivestimentarius*) against a scurrilous pamphlet (*Friss Vogel oder Stüb*) against Lutheranism by the Jesuit Weislinger, and produced thereby so great an excitement among Roman Catholics that a plan was made to kidnap him, with the aid of an Austrian army then stationed on the Rhine. He had to flee for safety to Darmstadt. In that city he caused the establishment of an institute for proselytes, and became its director and inspector. In Frankfort he opposed the effort of the Reformed congregations to obtain the public exercise of their religion and the permission for building churches. He was, in particular, a determined and even violent opponent of count Zinzendorf and the Moravians. Zinzendorf regarded him as the most energetic opponent, and called him an "incarnate devil" (*eingefleischten Teufel*). Some of his works are still in common use in the German Lutheran Church. Thus the *Heilsame Betrachtungen ueber die Sonn- und Festtags-evangelien*, which first appeared in 1750, were published in a new edition in 1845 (2d ed. 1854) by Johann Friedrich von Meyer (q. v.), and of his *Epistelpredigten*, first published in 1754, a new edition was issued in 1858 by Ledderhose. His controversial writings against the Moravians number 24 volumes (*Streitschriften gegen die Herrnhüter*, Frankf. 1748-60).—Steitz in Herzog, *Real-Encycl.* xix, 501. (A. J. S.)

**Fresne, Du.** See DU CANGE.

**Frey, Jean Louis**, a Swiss theologian and philologist, was born at Basle in 1682, and died in the same place in 1759. He is said to have been familiar with Hebrew at ten years of age. He was a pupil of Jean Buxtorf, under whom he studied Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic. In 1703 he became a minister, and then travelled through Europe to increase his knowledge. In 1711 he was made professor of history and theology at Berne, and subsequently of Biblical exegesis, which chair he filled till his death. He was distinguished for the extent and variety of his knowledge. He left a considerable sum of money, and his own library of more than 8000 volumes, for the benefit of the library and students of the college at Basle. Together with other works, we have from him *Disputatio in qua Mohammedis de Jesu-Christo sententia expenditur* (Basle, 1703);—*De Officio Doctoris Christiani dissertationes* iv (1711-1715). He edited a corrected and enlarged edition of Suicer's *Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus* (Amsterdam, 1728, 2 vols. fol.), an edition of J. Grynæus's *Opuscula*, etc., and wrote many of the notes for the edition of the *Patres Apostolici*, published in Basle in 1742.—Hofer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xviii, 841-2. (J. W. M.)

**Frey, Joseph Samuel Christian Frederick**, was born in Germany of Jewish parents. At the age of twenty-five he became a Christian, and in 1816 came to the United States. He was then and for some years a Presbyterian minister, and subsequently became a Baptist. But he never ceased to be a Jew in feeling, and was an enthusiastic votary of Rabbinical studies,



which influenced him as a Biblical interpreter. He labored chiefly for the conversion of the Jews, was agent of "The American Society for Ameliorating the Condition of the Jews" and edited a periodical called *The Jewish Intelligencer*. He died at Pontiac, Michigan, in 1850, in the 79th year of his age. He was the author of a "Narrative" of his life:—"Joseph and Benjamin," a work on the differences between Jews and Christians:—*Judah and Israel; or the Restoration of Christianity* (1837, 12mo):—*Lectures on Scripture Types* (1841, 12mo). He also published an edition of the Hebrew Bible, a Hebrew Lexicon, Grammar, and Reader, and *The Hebrew Student's Pocket Companion*. See Sprague, *Annals*, vi, 757. (L. E. S.)

**Freya**, the goddess of the moon and love in the Scandinavian mythology, was the daughter of Niord and sister of Freyr, and is regarded by some as originally the same with Frigga (q. v.), to whom, among the goddesses, she ranks next in power and honor. She is described as beautiful, virtuous, and gentle, and ever ready to hear the prayers of men; as fond of music, flowers, fairies, and the spring, and the source of inspiration of the love-songs of the scalds. In the myths, which represent her, like Isis, as seeking her absent spouse (Odin), and as ranking next to Frigga, the earth-goddess, we may have symbolized the relation of the moon to the earth and the sun, and find an explanation of those resemblances which have led to the confounding her with Frigga. "She is always described as attended by two of her maids" (see pl. 13, fig. 4, *Mythology and Religious Rites*, in *Icon. Encyclop.*). The name of Friday, the sixth day of the week, is derived from her.—*Iconographic Encyclopædia*, iv, 279-80 (N. Y. 1851); Thorpe, *Northern Mythology*. (J. W. M.)

**Freylinghausen**, JOHANN ANASTASIUS, an eminent German Pietist theologian, was born at Gaudersheim Dec. 2, 1670. He studied theology at Jena in 1689, and at Halle in 1692. In the latter place he gained the friendship of Aug. H. Francke, whose vicar he became in 1695 at Glaucha, a suburb of Halle. In 1715 he became Francke's son-in-law, his adjunct in the church of St. Ulrich, and was afterwards made director of the Waisenhaus (orphan house). He died Feb. 12, 1739. His principal works are, *Grundlegung der Theologie* (Halle, 1703, often reprinted):—*Predigten ü. d. Sonn u. Festtagespfeilsten* (Halle, 1728):—*Busspredigten* (1734):—he also published *Geistliches Gesangbuch*, etc. (Halle, 1704-1714, 2 vols.; latest edit. 1741). Forty of these hymns are of his own composition, and some of the best of them are translated in Miss Winkworth's *Lyra Germanica*. See A. H. Niemeyer, *Lebensbeschreibung* (Halle, 1786); J. L. Schulze, *Dankmal d. Liebe u. Hochachtung für F.* (Halle, 1784); L. Pasig, *Biographische Skizze F's* (A. Knapp's Christoterpe, 1852, p. 211); Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* iv, 591; Doering, *Gelehrt. Theol. Deutschlands*, i, 491. (J. N. P.)

**Freyr**, in the Scandinavian mythology, one of the dynasty of the Vanir, or second class of gods, and son of Niord, was, together with his father and sister Freya, given as a hostage to the Asir, or first class of gods, who adopted them, and bestowed on Freyr for a dwelling the celestial castle of *Alfheim*. He was the god of the sun and fruitfulness, to whom men prayed for favoring seasons and peace, and was regarded as well disposed to men. He was a patron of marriage, and the patron god of Sweden and Iceland. His chief temple was at Upsala, and sacrifices of men and animals were made to him. His festival was at the winter solstice, and his procession the signal for the ceasing of strife. The myths relate that Freyr, once mounting *Illidskialf*, the lofty seat of Odin, whence everything on earth was visible, beheld in the high north, where dwelt the giants, the wondrously beautiful Gerda, the brightness of whose naked arms filled both air and sea with light, and was so smitten with love for her that he could neither eat, drink, or sleep. His parents, by means

of his faithful servant Skyrnir, found out the cause of his malady, and, after much trouble, succeeded in obtaining Gerda for his wife. Freyr is represented (*Icon. Encyclop. Mythology and Religious Rites*, pl. 13, fig. 3) with a halo around his head, and holding in his right hand ears of wheat, and in his left an urn whence water flows, with the boar Gullinbursti at his feet, and sometimes (*Ibid.* pl. 11, fig. 6) as standing at the left of Odin, with a branch of something in his right and a drinking-horn in his left hand.—*Iconographic Encyclopædia*, iv, 279 (N. Y. 1851); Thorpe, *Northern Mythology*. (J. W. M.)

**Friar** (Lat. *frater*, Fr. *frère*, brother), a term common to monks of all kinds, founded on the supposition that there is a brotherhood between the persons of the same monastery. It is especially applied to members of the four mendicant orders, viz. 1. *Franciscans*, *Minorites*, or *Gray Friars*; 2. *Augustines*; 3. *Dominicans*, or *Black Friars*; 4. *Carmelites*, or *White Friars*. In a more restricted sense, the word means a monk who is not a priest: those in orders are generally denominated *further*.

**Frick, Albert**, a German theologian, was born at Ulm Sept. 13, 1714, and died May 30, 1776. He studied at Leipsic, and was appointed assessor (judge) to the faculty of theology. In 1743 he became minister at Jungingen, but, returning to Ulm in 1744, filled the post of librarian and professor of morals. In 1751 he went to Münster as preacher, and in 1768 was named head librarian. Among his writings are *Historia traditionum ex monumentis Ecclesie Christiane* (Ulm, 1740):—*De Natura et Constitutione Theologie Catechetice* (Ulm, 1761-64, 4to).—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xviii, 871. (J. W. M.)

**Frick, Elias**, a German theologian, was born at Ulm Nov. 2, 1673, and died Feb. 7, 1751. He studied at the gymnasium of his native city and at the universities of Leipsic and Jena, and in 1704 was pastor at Boehringen, in 1708 pastor at Bermaringen, in 1712 preacher in Ulm, in 1729 professor of morals in the gymnasium of Ulm, and also, in 1739, head librarian. We have from him *De Studio pacis et benevolentie omnium erga omnes* (1704):—*Diss. i et ii de cura veterum circa hereses* (Ulm, 1704 and 1736), followed by his treatise *De Catechisatione veteris et recentioris Ecclesie*:—*Hell-leuchtende Wahrheit der Lehre vom heiligen Abendmahl*, etc. (Ulm, 1725).—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xviii, 871.

**Frick, Johann**, a German theologian, brother of the preceding, was born at Ulm Dec. 30, 1670, and died March 2, 1739. After studying at the gymnasium of his native city he went to the University of Leipsic, where he applied himself especially to theology, and at an early date took part in editing the *Acta Eruditorum*. In 1698 he was named archdeacon of Ilmenau, but, owing to bad health, could not perform the duties. After his recovery he was appointed pastor at Pfuhl. In 1701 he went to Münster as preacher, and in 1712 was called to the chair of theology there. His principal works are, *Grund der Wahrheit von dem grossen Hauptunterschiede der evangelischen und roemisch-catholischen Religion* (1707):—*Britannia rectius de Lutheranis docta*, etc. (Ulm, 1709, 4to):—*In-clementia Clementis examinata*, etc. (Ulm, 1714):—*Die bulla Unigenitus, oder Clementis XI Constitution*, etc. (1714):—*Dissertatio solennis de culpa schismatis protestantibus immerito imputata*, etc. (Ulm, 1717, 4to):—*Zozimus in Clemente XI redivivens* (Ulm, 1719, 4to):—*Ἡσπὶ τοῦ λόγου, sire de Verbo aeterno Dei Filio, ad promissum Evangelii Joannis* (Ulm, 1725, 4to):—*De Cura Ecclesiarum veteris circa Canonem S. Scripture et ad conservandum eodum puritatem* (Ulm, 1728, 4to).—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xviii, 869-70; Ersch u. Gruber, *Allgemeine Encyclopædie*, s. v. (J. W. M.)

**Friday** is a day of fasting in the Greek and Latin churches in memory of the crucifixion of Christ. It

is a fast-day in the Church of England, unless Christmas-day happens to fall on a Friday.

**Fridegode** was a monk of Dover in the 10th century, who was chosen by his patron, Odo, archbishop of Canterbury, to write in heroic verse a life of St. Wilfrid, when, in 956, the relics of that saint were brought from Northumbria to Canterbury. Eadmer (*Vita Oswaldi*, in Wharton's *Angliæ Sacra*) says that Fridegode was Oswald's teacher, and was thought to excel the men of his time in secular and divine learning (*Ang. Sac.* ii, 193). His life of Wilfrid is merely a poetic version of that by Eddius Stephanus, and so abounds in Greek words that, according to William of Malmesbury (*De Gest. Pont.* p. 200), it needed a sibil to interpret it. Mabillon has published it in the *Acta Sanctorum*, etc.; a part from an imperfect MS. at Corvei in *Sac. iii, pars prima*, p. 171-196, and the remainder from a MS. in England in *Sac. iv, pars prima*, p. 722-726. Several other works not now extant have been attributed to Fridegode.—Wright, *Biog. Brit. Lit.* (Anglo-Saxon Period, p. 433-4). (J. W. M.)

**Fridolin, St.** The history of Fridolin, written in the 10th century by Valtherus (Walter), a monk of Säkingen, cannot, according to Rettberg, be considered as a really historical source, yet is received by learned Roman Catholics as an authority. The best edition is contained in Mone's *Quellensammlung d. bündischen Landesgeschichte*. All our knowledge of him is derived from this biography. The exact time of his life even is unknown, but he is generally considered as a contemporary of Chlodwig I († 511). According to this biography he was a Celt, but left the British islands to escape the reputation he had gained by his preaching. In Poitiers he brought back the people and the clergy to the veneration of their St. Hilary, whose relics he brought to light, and to whom he erected a church. He is also said to have been the first apostle of Germany. While seeking an island in the Rhine which had been shown him in a vision by Hilary, he came to Char, or, according to others, to Glarus, where he brought a dead man back to life; in consequence, he is considered as the patron of the canton, and is still represented on its coat of arms. He finally found the island he sought between Schaffhausen and Basel, and founded there a church to St. Hilary and the nunnery of Säkingen, where, after the Rhine had, at his request, moved to another bed (!), he died, on the 6th of November, on which day he is commemorated. According to Rettberg, this biography is a legend invented for the purpose of establishing the right of the convent to the whole island; and his travels were imagined to give the divers churches erected to St. Hilary in different places a renowned founder.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* iv, 595.

**Friedländer, David**, a Jewish scholar, was born at Königsberg (Prussia) Dec. 6, 1749. The Reform movement at Berlin, under the leadership of Mendelssohn (q. v.), attracted him to the Prussian metropolis, and brought him into relations with Mendelssohn. He devoted himself to educational and other reforms among the Jews, and at one time went so far as to propose a union of the Jewish Church with the Christian. In a *Schuttschreiben* addressed to the Protestant clergyman Teller, he asked "how it might be possible for a conscientious Jew to enter into Christian fellowship without making a hypocritical confession." The unfavorable reply which he received to this inquiry, and the disapprobation with which it was met from many Jews, caused him to abandon the project. Friedländer was a constant contributor to the *Berlinische Monatsschrift*, and to the *Sammler* (a Jewish periodical at Königsberg, supported mainly by disciples of Kant). Besides a number of works of inferior merit, he translated the liturgies, and contributed to Mendelssohn's great Bible work (תורה). *Das Buch Koheleth*, im Original mit d. hebräisch. Commentar

Mendelssohn's u. d. Uebers. David Friedländer's (Berlin, 1772). He died at Berlin, Dec. 26, 1834.—Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenthums u. s. Sitten*, iii, 316; *Biographie Universelle*, lxxiv, 513; Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bib. Lit.* ii; Etheridge, *Intro. to Bib. Lit.* 477. (J. H. W.)

**Friend** "is taken for one whom we love and esteem above others, to whom we impart our minds more familiarly than to others, and that from a confidence of his integrity and good will towards us; thus Jonathan and David were mutually friends. Solomon, in his book of Proverbs, gives the qualities of a true friend. 'A friend loveth at all times;' not only in prosperity, but also in adversity; and, 'There is a friend that sticketh closer than a brother.' He is more hearty in the performance of all friendly offices; he reproves and rebukes when he sees anything amiss. 'Faithful are the wounds of a friend.' His sharpest reproofs proceed from an upright and truly loving and faithful soul. He is known by his good and faithful counsel, as well as by his seasonable rebukes. 'Ointment and perfume rejoice the heart, so does the sweetness of a man's friend by hearty counsel;' by such counsel as comes from his very heart and soul, and is the language of his inward and most serious thoughts. The company and conversation of a friend is refreshing and reviving to a person who, when alone, is sad, dull, and inactive. 'Iron sharpeneth iron, so a man sharpeneth the countenance of his friend.' The title, 'the friend of God,' is principally given to Abraham: 'Art not thou our God, who gavest this land to the seed of Abraham, thy friend, forever?' And in Isaiah xli, 8, 'But thou Israel art the seed of Abraham, my friend.' 'And the Scripture was fulfilled, which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness; and he was called the friend of God' (James ii, 23). This title was given him, not only because God frequently appeared to him, conversed familiarly with him, and revealed his secrets to him, 'Shall I hide from Abraham that thing which I do?' (Gen. xviii, 17), but also because he entered into a covenant of perpetual friendship both with him and his seed. Our Saviour calls his apostles 'friends': 'But I have called you friends;' and he adds the reason of it, 'For all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you' (John xv, 15). As men use to communicate their counsels and their whole minds to their friends, especially in things which are of any concern, or may be of any advantage for them to know and understand, so I have revealed to you whatever is necessary for your instruction, office, comfort, and salvation. And this title is not peculiar to the apostles only, but in common with them to all true believers. The friend of the bridegroom is the bride-man, he who does the honors of the wedding, and leads his friend's spouse to the nuptial chamber. John the Baptist, with respect to Christ and his Church, was the friend of the bridegroom; by his preaching he prepared the people of the Jews for Christ (John iii, 29). Friend is a word of ordinary salutation, whether to a friend or foe; he is called friend who had not on a wedding garment (Matt. xxii, 12). And our Saviour calls Judas the traitor friend. Some are of opinion that this title is given to the guest by an irony, or antiphrasis, meaning the contrary to what the word importeth; or that he is called so because he appeared to others to be Christ's friend, or was so in his own esteem and account, though falsely, being a hypocrite. However, this being spoken in the person of him who made the feast, it is generally taken for a usual compellation, and that Christ, following the like courteous custom of appellation and friendly greeting, did so salute Judas, which yet left a sting behind it in his conscience, who knew himself to be the reverse of what he was called. The name of friend is likewise given to a neighbor. 'Which of you shall have a friend, and shall go to him at midnight, and say, Friend, lend me three loaves?' (Luke xi, 5).—Watson, *Dictionary*, s. v.

**Friendly Islands**, "as distinguished from the Fiji Islands (q. v.), generally reckoned a part of them, are otherwise styled the **TONGA GROUP**. They stretch in S. lat. from  $18^{\circ}$  to  $23^{\circ}$ , and in W. long. from  $172^{\circ}$  to  $176^{\circ}$ , and consist of about 82 greater and 150 smaller islands, about 30 of which are inhabited. The great majority are of coral formation, but some are volcanic in their origin, and in Tofua there is an active volcano. The principal member of the archipelago is *Tongatapu*, or *Sacred Tonga*, which contains about 7500 inhabitants, out of a total population of about 25,000" (Chambers, s. v.). In 1817 the missionaries estimated the population at 50,000. Next to Tongatapu, the most important islands are Vavau, with about 5000 inhabitants, and the Habai group, with about 4000. "The Friendly Islands were discovered by Tasman in 1643, but received their collective name from Cook. Both these navigators found the soil closely and highly cultivated, and the people apparently unprovided with arms. The climate is salubrious, but humid; earthquakes and hurricanes are frequent, but the former are not destructive" (Chambers, s. v.). The first attempt to introduce Christianity was made in 1797, when captain Wilson, of the *Duff*, left ten mechanics at Hihifo, or Tongatapu, in the capacity of missionaries. This attempt met with no success. The chief under whose protection they resided was murdered by his own brother, and the island involved in a civil war. Three of the missionaries were murdered by the natives; the others were robbed of all their goods, and in 1800, being utterly destitute, and having but little prospect of usefulness among the natives, accepted from the captain of an English ship a passage to New South Wales. For twenty years after this no missionaries visited the islands. In August, 1822, the Rev. Walter Lawry, of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, arrived at Tongatapu, but he left again the next year for New South Wales. In 1825 the Rev. Messrs. John Thomas and John Hutchinson were appointed to Tongatapu. They arrived in June, 1826, at Hihifo. In 1827 they were re-enforced by the arrival of Rev. Nathaniel Turner, Rev. William Cross, and Mr. Weiss. They found at Nukualofa, one of the chief towns of the island, two native preachers from Tahiti, who had been some time employed in that locality, preaching to the people in the Tahitian language. They had erected a chapel, and 240 persons attended their teaching. In 1830 Mr. Thomas proceeded to Lifuka, the chief of the Habai Islands. On his arrival he found that the king, Taufaaahu, had renounced idolatry. Schools were soon opened both for males and females, which were well attended, chiefly by adults, and taught principally by the natives themselves. After being some months in the island, Mr. Thomas baptized king Taufaaahu, whose conversion was followed by that of a large portion of the people. Among others was Tamaha, a female chief of the highest rank, who had been regarded as a deity, and was one of the pillars of popular superstition. In the island of Vavau, king Finau also yielded to the exhortations of the missionaries and of king Taufaaahu, and with him about a thousand of his people renounced idolatry. In 1831 three new missionaries arrived, one of whom was a printer. A printing-press was now established, at which were printed large editions of several school-books, select passages of Scripture, hymn-books, catechisms, and other useful books. Thus education made great progress, and numerous native helpers assisted the missionaries in preaching the Gospel in the various islands. In 1834 a powerful religious revival occurred, beginning in Vavau, and soon extending to the Habai and Tonga islands. It was followed by a remarkable reformation of manners. Polygamy was now abandoned, marriage became general, and greater decency and modesty prevailed in dressing. Among the most zealous of the converts was king Taufaaahu, who at his baptism was called

king George, while his queen was named Charlotte. He erected for the missionaries a very large chapel in Habai, and, being a local preacher, preached himself an appropriate sermon on the occasion. In 1839, king George, in a large assembly of the chiefs and people, promulgated a *code of laws*, and appointed judges to hear and decide all cases of complaint which might arise among them. In June, 1840, the heathen chiefs of Tonga, where Christianity had made much less progress than in Habai and Vavau, broke out in rebellion. Captain Croker, of the British ship *Favorite*, who happened to arrive just at this time, united the force under his command to that of king George, but he and two of his officers were killed, and the first lieutenant and nineteen men dangerously wounded. The mission in Tongatapu was broken up for a time, but it was resumed at the restoration of peace. In 1844 king George for a short time became a backslider in heart, but soon penitently acknowledged his fall, and ever since remained a devoted Christian. In 1845 he succeeded to the sovereignty of all the islands. In 1852 a new rebellion broke out in Tonga. It was instigated by a few chiefs who still adhered to heathenism; but the Roman Catholic missionaries made common cause with them, and one of them went in search of a man-of-war to chastise king George. The latter, however, succeeded in suppressing the revolt. In November, 1852, a French man-of-war arrived, the commander of which, captain Bolland, had been commissioned by the French governor of Tahiti to inquire into certain complaints lodged against king George by the captain of a French whaler, and by the Roman Catholic priests residing in Tonga. The king obeyed the summons of the captain, went on board the man-of-war, and had a five-hours' conversation with the captain, who declared himself satisfied with the reports made by the king, and in the name of the French government recognised him as the king of the Friendly Islands, only stipulating that the king should protect the French residents and tolerate the Roman Catholic Church. These conditions were accepted by the king. In 1868 paganism in the Friendly Islands was almost extinct. Great numbers of the islanders can speak English, and, in addition, have learned writing, arithmetic, and geography, while the females have been taught to sew. The missions are still under the care of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, which in 1868 had in the islands 5 circuits, 178 chapels, 2 other preaching-places, 19 missionaries and assistant missionaries, 1686 subordinate paid and unpaid agents, 8615 members, 795 on trial for membership, 6617 scholars in schools, and 23,484 attendants on public worship. See Newcomb, *Cyclopaedia of Missions*, p. 714; Walter Lawry, *Missions in Tonga and Feejee*; *Wesleyan Almanac* for 1869. (A. J. S.)

**Friends, SOCIETY OF.** This body of Christians now subsists in two main divisions, generally known to the public as the Orthodox and the Hicksite; but these designations are not used by the bodies themselves. The former body is designated below as No. 1, and the article is written by William J. Allinson, editor of *The Friends' Review*; the latter body is designated as No. 2, and the article is written by Samuel M. Janney, of Lincoln, Loudon County, Va.

**FRIENDS (No. 1).** The organization of the Friends as a distinct society or church was not the result of any deliberate design to form a sect, but must be regarded as a providential ordering, and as a necessity growing from the degeneracy, corruptions, and worldliness which permeated the churches in the early part of the 17th century. They did not profess to establish a new religion, or claim to have discovered any new truth. Their object was the revival of primitive Christianity, which had been maintained through the centuries of the Christian æra by successive testimony-bearers, many of whom had sealed the truth with their

blood, and been counted unto the Lord for a generation. Especially they were led to call the attention of the people to the Holy Spirit as the living and infallible guide, as a precious and glorious reality, essential to the Christian life, and sufficient to lead into true holiness. They never held the doctrine of the Spirit as a mere theory, or ignored the great truth that this unspeakable gift proceeded from the adorable Giver, and was consequent upon the death and vicarious sacrifice of him who for our sakes laid down his life upon Calvary. They always regarded the close connection of cause and effect as described in our Lord's words: "I tell you the truth; it is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart I will send him unto you" (John xvi, 7). This truth George Fox began to teach and preach, not as an invention of his own, but as a priceless jewel thrown aside and hidden under the rubbish of dogmas and forms. The Divine Spirit asserted himself almost simultaneously in the hearts of many contemporaries, who were ready to respond to the preaching of Fox: "It is the very truth." Had the clergy and other professors of that day opened their hearts to the spirituality of the Christian religion, and yielded themselves to the Spirit's guidance, the Church would have been reformed, and Fox would have been satisfied. The religious awakening of this period was well described by the pen of Milton: "Thou hast sent out the spirit of prayer upon thy servants over all the land to this effect, and stirred up their vows as the sound of many waters about thy throne. Every one can say that now certainly thou hast visited this land, and hast not forgotten the uttermost corners of the earth, in a time when men thought that thou wast gone up from us to the farthest end of the heavens, and hadst left to do marvellously among the sons of these last ages." Christ the object of faith, the Spirit the transforming power, was the doctrine of the first Friends, as it has ever been that of their true successors. The divinity of our Lord was not called in question by the teachers of that day, whilst the guidance of His Spirit, the light of Christ in the conscience, was denied or ignored; and hence the prominence given to the latter truth, and the comparative silence respecting the other, in the controversial writings of the early Friends. George Fox, the founder of the Society of Friends, was born in 1624, and in 1647, after much deep experience of the blessedness of the Comforter, "even the Spirit of Truth which proceedeth from the Father," he went forth through England, on foot and at his own charges, freely preaching to the people the unsearchable riches which Christ had purchased for them, and was ready to give liberally to all who would ask for it, coming unto God by him. To the spiritual standard thus raised many flocked—ministers of various churches, sin-sick members of their flocks who had wandered unsatisfied upon "barren mountains and desolate hills," magistrates, rich men and poor, and "honorable women not a few." Eight years from the date last given, ministers of the new society preached the Gospel in various parts of Europe, in Asia, and Africa, and bore, with heroic endurance, persecutions, imprisonment, and the tortures of the Inquisition in Rome, Malta, Austria, Hungary, etc. An authentic history of their sufferings was collected by Joseph Besse, and published, London, 1753, in two large folios. The systematic interference by the state in matters of religion and conscience, which was the policy of England through all the political overturnings, caused shameless oppressions and wrongs to be perpetrated upon this peaceable and God-fearing people, three thousand four hundred of them at one time being incarcerated in filthy and unwholesome prisons, where many of them died martyrs to the truth. No one seemed to think of purchasing exemption from persecution by yielding, even in appearance, a point of principle.

"No—nursed in storm and peril long,  
The weakest of their band was strong;"

and, whilst men and women were perishing in jails, even the little boys and girls would meet together at the places appointed, and in the beauty and sweetness of early piety worship the God of their fathers in spirit and in truth. But not even childhood was sacred from religious intolerance and official interference. These babes in Christ (as truly they might be called) were disturbed at their worship, savagely threatened, and sometimes cruelly beaten.

The early history of Friends is closely connected with that of George Fox, and necessarily included in the various biographies of that remarkable man. He commenced his career as a seeker after the truth, and meeting, in Europe and America, with many whose yearnings were similar, they were called *Seekers*. The epithet of Quakers was given in derision, because they often trembled under an awful sense of the infinite purity and majesty of God, and this name, rather submitted to than accepted by them, has become general as a designation. "To this man will I look," said the Holy Spirit by Isaiah, "even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and *trembleth at my word.*" To tremble, then, at the presence of the God of the whole earth, and especially when speaking in his name, is not to be regarded as any reproach; but their name, as a body, is "*The Religious Society of Friends.*" The spread of the society in North America was rapid, especially after the founding of Pennsylvania in 1680 by William Penn, whose career as a wise legislator is prominent in history, and who, as a Christian philanthropist, a statesman, a writer, and a minister of the Gospel of Christ, established a reputation which even the vindictive attacks of Macaulay could not undermine. As early as 1672 George Fox found an established settlement of Friends in Perquimans County, N. C., which proved the germ of an independent diocese, or Yearly Meeting, whose members from that time have been exemplary upholders, at the cost of persecution and much loss of substance, of the principles of civil and religious liberty, steadily testifying against slavery and war, and maintaining the freeness of the Gospel. During the War of the Rebellion their heroic firmness in refusing to bear arms was proof against cruel tyranny, so that some of these simple testimony-bearers, who "loved not their lives unto the death," by meek yet brave endurance of tortures and privations have made their names historic. It is noteworthy that in North Carolina, within a very few years (during and since the Rebellion), about seven hundred persons joined the society from conviction. The membership of that Yearly Meeting, although many times thinned by emigration to free states, is now about three thousand souls. The persecution of Friends in New England was so sanguinary that

"Old Newbury, had her fields a tongue,  
And Salem's streets, could tell their story  
Of fainting woman dragged along,  
Gashed by the whip accursed, and gory;"

and four Friends actually suffered martyrdom—a Quaker woman of remarkable refinement and piety, and three men of equal worth, being hanged on Boston Common. The number of victims was likely to be increased, when proceedings were checked by a royal mandamus.

The membership of the society becoming very widely extended, a formal organization by a system of Church government became necessary, and George Fox evinced much sagacity, mental soundness, and spiritual guidance in successful efforts to establish rules for the government of the Church, and meetings for discipline in a harmonious chain of subordination, the highest and final authority being a Yearly Meeting. The Yearly Meetings are, in a sense, diocesan, having each a defined territorial jurisdiction, and independent of each other in their government and law-

making powers, whilst by a sort of common law there are principles of discipline sacred to all, and membership in any meeting involves a connection with the society wherever existing, and may be transferred by certificate when the person claiming such credential is not liable to Church censure.

The transaction of the business of these meetings is regarded as the Lord's work; and as he declared "where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them," they regard his immediate presence with his Church as the foundation of its authority. Hence, in these meetings, and in those especially for worship, it is held to be necessary for all minds to be turned to him who is present by his Spirit, and whose anointing teacheth all things, and alone can enable his people to serve him according to the counsel of his will.

In the ministry of the Word, no Friend who is true to the principles of the society will speak without feeling a direct call and movement of the Holy Spirit for the service. Under this influence, the Gospel ministry is regarded as very precious, and a blessing to be guarded and cherished. Elders are appointed, who are believed to be prudent persons, gifted with a discerning spirit, and it is their duty to counsel, foster, and aid the ministers, and either to encourage or restrain the vocal offerings of those who attempt to speak in this capacity, according as they are or are not believed to be called of God to the work.

No system of theological training is known or could be permitted among the Friends. They are favorable to education, and provide for its free extension to the children of poor members; but they regard it as the exclusive province of the Holy Spirit to select his own ministers, and to instruct them what they shall say. It is, however, considered the duty of all, and especially of those who stand as ambassadors for Christ, to be diligent and prayerful in the perusal of the Holy Scriptures, through which the man of God, led as he will assuredly be by the Spirit which gave them forth, will be "thoroughly furnished unto all good works." So great is the stress which Friends place upon the perusal of the Scriptures, and upon the bringing up of their children and others under their care in this practice, that it is made a matter of semi-annual investigation in all their meetings, and so long ago as 1754 London Yearly Meeting enacted a rule of discipline that the families of poor Friends should be provided with Bibles—a gratuitous Scripture distribution which was in advance of any Bible Society.

The privilege and duty of prayer, both secretly and vocally, under a reverent and filial sense of the character of the engagement, are regarded as of the very highest importance. It is believed that "men ought always to pray," but a jealousy is felt lest any should in a light and flippant way rush into this exercise. He who knoweth what we have need of before we ask him, will, if reverently waited upon, extend his kingly sceptre and put into the heart the prayer of faith; and before any one shall pray vocally in their meetings, as mouthpiece for the people, it is requisite that a direct movement of the Holy Spirit should prompt the offering, lest the words of rebuke be applicable: "Ye ask and receive not, because ye ask amiss." The following clause in the London Discipline expresses the creed of the society respecting this part of the service of Almighty God:

"As prayer and thanksgiving are an important part of worship, may they be offered in spirit and in truth, with a right understanding seasoned with grace. When engaged herein, let ministers avoid many words and repetitions, and be cautious of too often repeating the high and holy name of God or his attributes; neither let prayer be in a formal or customary way, nor without a reverent sense of divine influence."

The meetings of the society are characterized by practical recognition of the presidency and headship

of Christ in the Church, and a conviction that every movement of the body should be dictated by its Head.

The Society of Friends is not at issue with other orthodox churches on the general points of Christian doctrine. Avoiding the use of the word Trinity, they reverently believe in the Holy Three: the Father, the Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten of the Father, by whom are all things, who is the mediator between God and man, and in the Holy Spirit, who proceedeth from the Father and Son—ONE GOD, blessed forever. They accept in its fullness the testimony of holy Scripture with regard to the nature and offices of Christ, as the promised Messiah, the Word made flesh, the atonement for sin, the Saviour and Redeemer of the world. They have no reliance upon any other name, no hope of salvation that is not based upon his meritorious death on the cross. The charge that they deny Christ to be God William Penn denounced as "most untrue and uncharitable," saying, "We truly and expressly own him to be so, according to the Scripture." As fully do they admit his humanity, and that he was truly man, "sin only excepted." They so fully believe in the Holy Spirit of Christ, that without the inward revelation thereof they feel that they can do nothing to God's glory, or to further the salvation of their own souls. Without the influence thereof they know not how to approach the Father through the Son, nor what to pray for as they ought. Their whole code of belief calls for the entire surrender of the natural will to the guidance of the pure, unerring Spirit, "through whose renewed assistance," says one of their writers, "they are enabled to bring forth fruits unto holiness, and to stand perfect in their present rank." As it was the design of Christ, in going to the Father, to send as a comforter his Spirit to his disciples, so it is with his Spirit that he baptized and doth baptize them, it being impossible, in the estimation of the Friends, that an outward ablution should wash from the spirit of man the stains of sin. Hence they attach importance only to "the baptism which now saveth," and which John the Baptist predicted should be administered by Christ. And it is by his Spirit, also, that his followers are enabled to partake of the true supper of the Lord: "Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear my voice and open unto me, I will come in and sup with him, and he shall sup with me." Thus they hold that the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ in the flesh was the grand epoch and central fact of time, and that types, and shadows, and all ceremonial observances, which had their place before as shadows of good things to come, now that they have been fulfilled in him, are only shadows of those shadows. The type properly precedes the reality, and truly this was worthy of being foreshadowed; "but," says Paul (1 Cor. xiii, 10), "when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away."

Their view respecting the resurrection may be briefly stated in the language of one of the society's documents: "The Society of Friends believes that there will be a resurrection both of the righteous and the wicked; the one to eternal life and blessedness, and the other to everlasting misery and torment, agreeably to Matt. xxv, 31-46; John v, 25-30; 1 Cor. xv, 12-58. That God will judge the world by that man whom he hath ordained, even Christ Jesus the Lord, who will render unto every man according to his works; to them who by patient continuing in well-doing during this life seek for glory and honor, immortality and eternal life; but unto the contentious and disobedient, who obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that sinneth, for God is no respecter of persons" (Thomas Evans).

They have ever regarded war as inconsistent with Christianity. For this they refer to the teachings of Christ and his apostles, the example of the early Christians, and to the witness for truth in their own con-

sciences, tested and confirmed by the sacred writings. They find that all the emotions which are exercised in wars and fightings are traced to evil lusts, and are inconsistent with that love which is the substance of the first, the second, and the new commandment, which "worketh no ill to his neighbor," and on which "hang all the law and the prophets."

They consider oaths to be inadmissible, as being positively forbidden by our Lord in language not to be mistaken, and this testimony was made the occasion of inflicting severe penalties upon the first Friends. When their persecutors failed to convict them upon false charges, it was customary to administer the test-oaths to them, on refusing to take which they were thrown into prison. They decline to employ the complimentary and false language of the world, and to apply to the months and days the names given in honor of pagan gods, preferring the numerical nomenclature adopted in the Scriptures. In dress they aim at plainness and simplicity, avoiding the tyranny of an ever-changing fashion. As a natural result, a degree of uniformity of dress prevails among them, bearing much resemblance to the style in vogue at the rise of the society. This approach to uniformity, which at first was unintentional, came to be cherished as a hedge of defence against worldly and ensnaring associations, and a means by which they recognised each other. The principle at stake is not in the fashion of a garb, but in simplicity and the avoidance of changes of fashion. Were the customary patterns all abandoned to-day, and the principle of simplicity still consistently adhered to, the kaleidoscope of fashion would make frequent changes in the people around them, and Friends would soon be left as peculiar in their appearance as at present.

Whilst Friends, as good citizens, have cheerfully paid all legal assessments for the support of public schools and of the poor, and have contributed abundantly to the various charities and general claims of benevolence, they have always been characterized by their scrupulous care in relieving their own poor, so that none of their members come upon the public for maintenance or for gratuitous education.

A dangerous tendency to "hold the truth in parts" led a portion of the society, in the early part of the present century, into the error of insisting too singly upon the precious doctrine of Christ within the hope of glory, and of denying, or at best holding lightly, a belief in his true divinity whilst incarnate, and in the atoning, cleansing, saving efficacy of his blood which was shed for us. Thus Socinianism gained a footing in the society, to the grief of those who held the ancient faith, and in 1827 an extensive and much-to-be-regretted secession occurred, in which doctrinal and personal considerations were mingled; and, in the excitement of the division, it is believed that many failed to comprehend the true issues, and that not a few who were essentially one in faith were discovered for life as regards church fellowship. Thus two entirely distinct societies now exist, each claiming exclusive right to the same name, and causing confusion among other professors as to their identity. In this secession portions of six out of ten Yearly Meetings then existing joined with the body popularly designated by the name of their leader (though they have never acknowledged the title). In Great Britain and Ireland, and in two of the American Yearly Meetings then existing, no schism occurred.

There are twelve independent Yearly Meetings of the Religious Society of Friends. The oldest of these is that of London, the records of which are preserved from the year 1672. This body is regarded by the others with respectful affection as the mother of Yearly Meetings, and its General Epistle of Christian Counsel, which is issued annually, is gladly received, republished, and circulated by nearly all the co-ordinate bodies. The number of members in England is 13,815,

whilst there is an attendance of its meetings by non-members of 3658. There are settlements of Friends in France, Germany, Norway, and in several parts of Australasia, which all make annual reports to London Yearly Meeting, and acknowledge subordination to it. Friends in England are a highly influential body in proportion to their number. There is a Yearly Meeting in Ireland, one in Canada, and nine in the United States, viz., the Yearly Meetings of New England, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, North Carolina, Ohio, Indiana, Western Indiana, and Iowa. The increase of membership in the Western States has been rapid of late years, and settlements of Friends are starting up in Kansas, Missouri, etc. The membership of the society may be rated at 80,000.

In all these Yearly Meetings, First-day Schools are conducted with zeal and efficiency, exerting a wide evangelical influence. In a number of the Yearly Meetings these are under the direct care of the society, and made the subjects of annual statistical reports. Thus, in Indiana Yearly Meeting, there are 115 such schools, with 710 teachers, and 6953 pupils, of whom 2307 are over twenty-one years of age. In the Yearly Meeting of Western Indiana there are 63 First-day Schools, with 6170 pupils, and 411 teachers. North Carolina Yearly Meeting has taken the lead in the establishment of a *Normal* First-day School, the benefit of which has been very decided.

There are in England and Ireland several educational institutions of merit under care of the society. In this country Friends have three colleges, viz., *Haverford College*, Pennsylvania; *Earlham College*, Richmond, Ind.; and *Waltier College*, Salem, Iowa. There are also large boarding-schools under the care of different Yearly Meetings, the most noted of which are those of *West Town*, Pa., *Providence*, R. I., *Union Springs*, N. Y., and *New Garden*, N. C. (W. J. A.)

FRIENDS (No. 2).—I. *History*.—The origin of the Religious Society of Friends dates from about the middle of the 17th century. George Fox, the chief instrument in the divine hand by whom it was gathered, was born in Leicestershire, England, in the year 1624. His parents were pious members of the National Church, and from his childhood he was religiously inclined. When about nineteen years old he was led by a sense of duty to seek retirement from the world, and he spent much time in reading the holy Scriptures, with meditation and prayer. In the year 1647 he began to appear as a preacher of the Gospel, and he found many prepared to receive his message of love, calling them away from a reliance upon all rites and ceremonies to the word of divine grace, or Spirit of Christ, as the efficient cause of salvation. Converts in large numbers were soon gathered, who met together for divine worship, waiting upon God in silence, or engaging in preaching, prayer, or praise, as they believed themselves prompted by the Spirit of Christ, their ever-present teacher. The persecutions endured by the early Friends, both in Europe and America, were exceedingly severe, and were chiefly on account of their absenting themselves from the Established Church, refusing to pay tithes, openly attending their own religious meetings when prohibited by law, and declining to take oaths of any kind, or to engage in military service. "Between the years 1650 and 1689, about fourteen thousand of this people suffered by fine and imprisonment, of which number more than three hundred died in jail, not to mention cruel mockings, buffetings, scourgings, and afflictions innumerable."

It has been estimated that, at the death of George Fox in the year 1690, the number of Friends in Europe and America was about 75,000, and that 10,000 of these inhabited the British colonies. They afterwards declined in the mother country, and greatly increased in America, where they became most numerous in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Rhode Island, and North Carolina.

In the year 1827 a schism took place in Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, which afterwards extended to most of the other Yearly Meetings in America. The space allotted for this article will not suffice to give an intelligible account of it (see Janney's *Hist. of Friends*, vol. iv. The part relating to the separation has been republished in a small volume by T. Ellwood Zell, Philadelphia). At the time of the separation, those who took the name of Orthodox Friends were in the Western States the more numerous; but in the Atlantic sea-board States they were less numerous than those who are by some called Hicksites, but who persistently refuse to acknowledge any other name than that of Friends or Quakers. It is of this branch only that we now treat.

*II. Doctrines.*—We hold the doctrines of the early Friends, as expounded in the writings of Fox, Penn, Pennington, and Barclay. A committee which represents Philadelphia Yearly Meeting has recently so far approved of a "Summary of Christian Doctrines," from which the following abstract is taken, as to order its purchase for distribution:

*The Scriptures.*—The Religious Society of Friends, from its rise to the present day, has always maintained its belief in the authenticity and divine authority of the holy Scriptures, referring to them for proof of its principles, and acknowledging them to be the only fit outward test of Christian doctrines. We do not call them the Word of God, because this appellation is applied by the writers of the Scriptures to that Eternal Power by which the worlds were made; for "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God."

We assign to the Scriptures all the authority they claim for themselves, which is chiefly expressed in the following texts: " whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we, through patience and comfort of the Scriptures, might have hope" (Rom. xv, 4). "The holy Scriptures are able to make wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus" (2 Tim. iii, 15-17). "All Scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works" (Barclay's *Apology*, prop. iii, § 5).

In the advices issued by our several Yearly Meetings, the Scriptures are very frequently and earnestly recommended to the attention of our members. In the year 1851, Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, after referring to "those sublime truths which are recorded in the holy Scriptures," thus continues: "In these invaluable writings we find the only authentic record of the early history of our race, the purest strains of devotional poetry, and the sublime discourses of the Son of God. Their frequent perusal was therefore especially urged upon our younger members, who were encouraged to seek for the guidance of divine grace, by which alone we realize in our experience the saving truths they contain."

In the year 1863, the following minute of Baltimore Yearly Meeting was sent down to its subordinate meetings, viz.: "We have been reminded that this Yearly Meeting has at various times issued advices to its members inciting them to the frequent reading of the holy Scriptures, the authenticity of which has always been acknowledged by the Society of Friends. We believe it is not the part of true wisdom to dwell upon defects, whether real or imaginary, in the sacred records, but rather to use them as they were intended, 'for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness,' remembering that it is only through the operation of the Spirit of Truth upon our hearts that they can be made availing to us in the promotion of our salvation."

The following extract is taken from the Rules of Discipline of the Yearly Meeting of Friends held in

Philadelphia: "If any in membership with us shall blaspheme, or speak profanely of Almighty God, Christ Jesus, or the Holy Spirit, he or she ought early to be tenderly treated with for their instruction, and the conviction of their understanding, that they may experience repentance and forgiveness; but should any, notwithstanding this brotherly labor, persist in their error, or deny the divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the immediate revelation of the Holy Spirit, or the authenticity of the Scriptures; as it is manifest they are not one in faith with us, the monthly meeting where the party belongs, having extended due care for the help and benefit of the individual without effect, ought to declare the same, and issue their testimony accordingly."

*Immediate Revelation.*—The highest privilege granted to man is that of entering into communion with the Author of his being. "Ye are the temples of the living God," writes the apostle Paul; "as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people" (2 Cor. vi, 16). "The anointing which ye have received of him," says the beloved disciple, "abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you; but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him" (1 John ii, 27).

In the ordering of divine Providence, instrumental means are often employed to convey religious truth, such as the reading of the Scriptures, the preaching of the Gospel, and the vicissitudes of life; but in all cases the good effected is from the immediate operations of divine grace upon the heart or conscience. In fact, there can be no saving knowledge of Christ but from immediate revelation. "No man can come to me," said Jesus, "except the Father which hath sent me draw him." This drawing of the Father is the operation of his Spirit, for "the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal" (1 Cor. xii, 7). To the wicked he comes as a reprover for sin, a "spirit of judgment and a spirit of burning," but to the prayerful and obedient as a comforter in righteousness.

*The Original and Present State of Man.*—It is a scriptural doctrine that neither righteousness nor unrighteousness can be transmitted by inheritance, but every man shall be judged according to his deeds. The language of the prophet Ezekiel is very clear on this point. "As I live, saith the Lord God, ye shall not have occasion any more to use this proverb in Israel." . . . "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." . . . "Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine: the soul that sinneth, it shall die." . . . "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son: the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him" (Ezek. xviii, 2-25).

Man was created in the image of God; he was pure, benevolent, and blissful, and he enjoyed the privilege of communion with God, that is, to partake of "the tree of life which is in the midst of the paradise of God" (Rev. ii, 7). But, although he was made a free agent, he was not to be so independent of God as to know of himself good or evil without divine direction. And when he presumed to set up his own will, and to be governed by it in opposition to the divine will, he assumed the place of God, and having thus turned away from the Holy Spirit, he ceased to partake of "the tree of life," and consequently died a spiritual death. It was then he experienced the fulfilment of the divine prediction, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die;" for "to be carnally minded is death, but to be spiritually minded is life and peace."

Animal propensities may be transmitted from parents to children, but the Scriptures do not teach that we inherit any *guilt* from Adam, or from any of our

ancestors; nor do we feel any compunction for their sins. The language of our Saviour clearly implies that little children are innocent, for "of such," he says, "is the kingdom of heaven."

*The Divine Being.*—The unity, omnipresence, omnipotence, and omniscience of God, the only fountain of wisdom and goodness, are fully set forth in the Scriptures of both the Old and the New Testament. He declares by the mouth of his prophet, "Thus saith the Lord, the Holy One of Israel, his Maker." . . . "I, even I, am the Lord, and besides me there is no Saviour." . . . "Thus saith the Lord, your Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel" (Isa. xliii, 11, 14). These declarations are reiterated and confirmed in the New Testament. "Jesus answered, The first of all the commandments is, 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord,'" etc. (Mark xii, 29).

That spiritual influence or medium by which the Most High communicates his will to man is called his Word, and the same term is applied to his creative power, by which all things were made. The unity of the Eternal Word, or Logos, with God, may be illustrated by the light which emanates from the sun; for "God is light," and of Christ it is said, "In him was life, and the life was the light of men." The connection between the great luminary of the solar system and the light proceeding from him is so perfect that we apply the term Sun to them both. So, in relation to the Eternal Word, which was in the beginning with God, and was God, it is a manifestation of his wisdom and power, being called in the Old Testament "The angel of his presence" (Isa. lxiii, 9), "The Redeemer of his people;" and in the New Testament, "The Son of God, by whom also he made the worlds" (Heb. i, 2). The term Christ was also applied by the apostles to the Spirit of God as manifested in men. For instance, Paul writes of the children of Israel under Moses, "They did all eat the same spiritual meat, and they did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ" (1 Cor. x, 4). Peter says that the prophets "propheesied of the grace that should come unto you, searching what, or what manner of time the *Spirit of Christ* which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand of the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow" (1 Pet. i, 11).

The most full and glorious manifestation of the divine Word, or Logos, was in Jesus Christ, the immaculate Son of God, who was miraculously conceived and born of a virgin. In him the manhood or son of man was entirely subject to the divinity. The Word took flesh, or was manifested in the flesh. "He took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham." . . . "Of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God, blessed forever." Being "in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin," he was an example to all succeeding generations, "a man approved of God by miracles, wonders, and signs which God did by him." The intimate union between Christ and his Church is illustrated in the epistles of Peter and Paul by two similitudes: that of a body having many members, of which Jesus Christ is the head; and that of a temple, of which he is the chief corner-stone. The holy manhood of Christ, that is, the soul of him in whom the Holy Spirit dwelt without measure, is now, and always will be, the head, or chief member of that spiritual body which is made up of the faithful servants of God of all ages and nations.

"There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus" (1 Tim. ii, 5). As Moses was a mediator to ordain the legal dispensation, so Jesus Christ was and is the Mediator of the new covenant; first, to proclaim and exemplify it in the day of his outward advent; and, secondly, through all time, in the ministration of his Spirit.

"The Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with

groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God" (Rom. viii, 26).

When the apostles went forth preaching Christ and his spiritual kingdom, they attributed to his name or power their wonderful success. Acts ii, 52, 33; iv, 10, 11, 12: "This is the stone," said Peter to the rulers, "which was set at naught of you builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved."

*Salvation by Christ.*—The great work of the Messiah for the salvation of men is beautifully portrayed in the passage which he read from Isaiah in the synagogue at Nazareth. "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord" (Luke iv, 18, 19). He came to establish a spiritual kingdom of truth and love in the hearts of mankind, and thereby to put an end to the kingdom of evil. A work of reformation was then begun which has not ceased to this day, though often obstructed and retarded. Then was laid the foundation on which succeeding generations have built, and no moral reform of any value or permanency can take place unless it be founded on Christian principles.

Another prophecy of Isaiah is referred to by the evangelist Matthew as having been fulfilled by the miracles of Christ. He says, "When the even was come they brought unto him many that were possessed with devils, and he cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses" (Matt. viii, 16). As in the outward relation he took away the infirmities of the people and healed their sicknesses, so in the inward and spiritual relation he heals the maladies of the soul, and raises it from death in sin to a life of righteousness.

The great object of the Messiah's advent is thus declared by himself: "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice" (John xviii, 37). He could not bear witness to the truth among that corrupt and perverse people without suffering for it. He foresaw that they would put him to death, and he went forward calmly doing his Father's will, leading a life of self-sacrifice, wounded for the transgressions of the people, baptized spiritually in suffering for them, and finally enduring on the cross the agonies of a lingering death, thus sealing his testimony with his blood. His obedience in drinking the cup of suffering was acceptable to God, for "he hath loved us and hath given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God, for a sweet-smelling savor" (Eph. v, 2).

It was to reconcile man to God by removing the enmity from (man's) his heart that Jesus Christ lived, and taught, and suffered, and for this purpose the Spirit of Christ is still manifested as a Redeemer from the bondage of corruption. Hence the apostle says, "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation." . . . "We pray you, in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God" (2 Cor. v, 19, 20). It is in man that the change must be wrought and the reconciliation effected, for there can be no change in Deity.

"If, when we were enemies," says Paul, "we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life" (Rom. v, 10); for "in him was life, and the life was the light



of men" (John i, 4). It is the life of God, or spirit of truth revealed in the soul, which purifies and saves from sin. This life is sometimes spoken of as the blood; for, according to the Mosaic law, "the blood is the life." And when Jesus told the people, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you," he alluded to the life and power of God which dwelt in him, and spake through him. In explanation of this, he said to his disciples, "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life."

It is obvious that the sinner cannot come into a state of concord with God until the sinful nature is removed, and that nothing can remove it but the baptism of the Holy Spirit. The dealings of the Most High with the children of men are beautifully exemplified in the parable of the prodigal son, who had wandered far from his father's house, and spent his substance in riotous living. When he came to himself, and determined to go back, confessing his sins, and offering to become as one of the hired servants, his father did not stand off and order him to be punished, neither did he lay his punishment upon the other son who had been faithful; but his compassion was awakened by his penitence and the sufferings he had brought upon himself, and "while he was yet a great way off he ran and fell on his neck, and kissed him." The conduct of the parent, as represented in this parable, answers exactly to the divine character, and corresponds entirely with the character of Jesus Christ, who was filled with the divine perfections. But the doctrine that God cannot, or will not forgive sins without a compensation or satisfaction, and that man, not being able to make this satisfaction, it was made by Jesus Christ, who was appointed or given up to be killed for this purpose, is so inconsistent with the divine character, that it cannot be reconciled with the teachings of the Son of God. It appears to deprive the Deity of that infinite love which is his most endearing attribute; and if a human parent were to act upon the same principle towards his children, we could not justify his conduct.

When the *sinful nature* in man is slain by the power of God being raised into dominion *in us*, then is divine justice satisfied, for there is nothing vindictive in the character of the Deity. He does not afflict his creatures for any other purpose than their own reformation or purification, and, when that purpose is accomplished, he is ready to pardon his repenting children. The only sure ground of acceptance is the new birth; for, when Christ's kingdom is established within us, then his righteousness becomes ours; not by imputation, but by our becoming really "partakers of the divine nature" (2 Pet. i, 4). "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour" (Titus iii, 5).

*Baptism and the Lord's Supper.*—Friends believe that the "washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost" is the only baptism essential to salvation. "There is one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, through all, and in you all" (Eph. iv, 5, 6). The baptism of Christ is inward and spiritual, as may be shown by the following texts: Matt. iii, 11, 12; Acts i, 5; xviii, 25, 26; 1 Cor. xii, 13; vi, 11; Col. ii, 20, 23; 1 Pet. iii, 21.

We have no grounds to believe that "the passover" which Jesus ate with his disciples was intended to be perpetuated in the Christian Church; nor does it appear that he instituted a new ceremony on that occasion. He conformed to the Mosaic law, which was not abrogated until his crucifixion, when he blotted out the handwriting of ordinances, and "took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross" (Col. ii, 14). "Behold, I stand at the door and knock," says Christ; "if any

man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me" (Rev. iii, 20). This is the Lord's Supper, in which the new wine of the kingdom and the bread of life are distributed to sustain the soul.

III. *Worship, Discipline, etc.*—The author of Christianity has prescribed no set form of worship, enjoining only that it must be in spirit and in truth. Friends have adopted silence as the basis of public worship, believing that it is free from the objections that exist against all prescribed forms; that it gives to each worshipper an opportunity for self-examination and secret prayer, with the benefit that results from the sympathy of other minds present; and that it affords the best preparation for the exercise of spiritual gifts in preaching, prayer, or praise.

The Christian ministry can be rightly exercised by those only who have received a call and qualification from the Head of the Church, and the prophecy of Joel, quoted by Peter, is fulfilled under the Gospel: "It shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy." As it was in the primitive Church, so it is now in the Society of Friends, women as well as men are permitted to preach the Gospel. No salary or pecuniary compensation is allowed to ministers, but those who travel in the service of the Gospel may partake of the needful hospitality or assistance of their friends.

*Testimonies.*—The testimonies of Friends against war, slavery, oaths, lotteries, and the use, as a beverage, of intoxicating drinks, as also against vain fashions, corrupting amusements, and flattering titles, are founded on Christian principles, and have been found salutary in practice.

*Discipline.*—The system of Church government existing in this society is in accordance with the doctrine, "One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren." There is no distinction like that of clergy and laity, but all the members of *both sexes* have a right to participate in the deliberations and decisions of the body. In meetings for discipline the men and women meet in separate apartments, and are co-ordinate branches of the body, each transacting the business pertaining to its own sex; but, in some cases, when desired, they act in concert, by the appointment of joint committees of men and women. The co-operation of women in the administration of discipline has been found salutary in many respects, but especially in promoting among them self-reliance and dignity of character.

IV. *Statistics.*—We have six Yearly Meetings, connected by epistolary correspondence, but independent of each other in regard to discipline. The aggregate membership of these is about 35,000.

Large numbers of persons not members, but who affiliate with us in religious profession, regularly attend our meetings for divine worship.

We have, in the cities of New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Richmond, Indiana, extensive and well-sustained schools, adapted to a high standard of useful and practical education. There are also numerous schools of varied character throughout the Yearly Meetings.

Swarthmore College, situated about eight miles south-west from Philadelphia, on the line of the Westchester Railroad, is designed for three hundred pupils of both sexes. Here our children, and those intrusted to our charge, may receive the advantages of a thorough collegiate education, under the guarded care of members of our religious society. (S. M. J.)

FRIENDS, PROGRESSIVE. A religious society organized in 1853, in Chester County, Pa., as a result, in part, of a division in Kennett Monthly Meeting of Friends ("Hicksite"). The division was caused by differences of opinion upon questions of reform and

progress; the official members of the Society of Friends generally discouraging activity in temperance, anti-slavery, and other similar organizations, while a large proportion—in many localities a majority—of the laity were warmly in favor of co-operating with them. After years of contention, the two parties in Kennett Monthly Meeting fell asunder, and finally, in 1853, an association was organized under the name of "Pennsylvania Yearly Meeting of Progressive Friends." The new society opened its doors to all who recognised the equal brotherhood of the human family, without regard to sex, color, or condition, and who acknowledged the duty of defining and illustrating their faith in God, not by assent to a creed, but by lives of personal purity, and works of beneficence and charity. It disavowed any intention or expectation of binding its members together by agreement as to theological opinions, and declared that it would seek its bond of union in "identity of object, oneness of spirit in respect to the practical duties of life, the communion of soul with soul in a common love of the beautiful and true, and a common aspiration after moral excellence." It disclaimed all disciplinary authority, whether over individual members or local associations; it set forth no forms or ceremonies, and made no provision for the ministry as an order distinguished from the laity; it set its face against every form of ecclesiasticism, and denounced as the acme of superstitious imposture the claim of churches to hold an organic relation to God and to speak by his authority, maintaining that such bodies are purely human, the repositories of no power save that rightly conferred upon them by the individuals of whom they are composed. Besides the Yearly Meeting, which includes persons living in places widely distant from each other, there is a local association, which meets for worship at Longwood, near Hamorton, on every First day, and, during a large portion of every year, maintains a First-day School for children. This local body has never employed a religious teacher, though there is nothing in the principles of the organization to forbid such a step whenever its members may think it necessary or expedient. Uniformity of practice in this respect is neither expected nor desired, it being held that the arrangements for meetings should be in every case adapted to the peculiar needs and tastes of the communities in which they are held. The division in the Society of Friends was not confined to Kennett Monthly Meeting, but extended to every Yearly Meeting in the body. As early as 1849, that division led to the organization, at Green Plain, Ohio, of a society exactly similar to that of the Progressive Friends, but under a different name. This society is now extinct. At Junius, near Waterloo, N. Y., in the same year, a society of "Congregational Friends" was formed. This society afterwards took the name of "Progressive Friends," and, at a later day, that of "Friends of Human Progress," by which it is still known. In Salem, Columbiana County, Ohio, in 1852, a society called "Progressive Friends" was organized, which had but a brief existence. In North Collins, Erie County, N. Y., there is a society bearing the name of "Friends of Human Progress," which, in its principles, is very similar to the "Progressive Friends." (O. J.)

**Friends of God.** In the 14th century a spirit of mysticism pervaded nearly all Western Germany, from the Low Countries to the very borders of Italy. It brought under its influence all ranks and classes, and led ultimately to the formation of an extensive but unorganized brotherhood, the so-called Friends of God. Among their chief seats were the cities of Strasburg, Cologne, Basel, Constance, Nuremberg, and Nordlingen. Their distinguishing doctrines were self-renunciation, the complete giving up of self to the will of God, the continuous activity of the Spirit of God in all believers, the possibility of intimate union between God and man, the worthlessness of all religion based

upon fear or the hope of reward, and the essential equality of the laity and clergy, though, for the sake of order and discipline, the organization of the Church was held to be necessary. They often appealed to the declaration of Christ (John xv, 15), "Henceforth I call you not servants, for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth; but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you;" and from this probably arose their name, which was not intended to designate an exclusive party or sect, but simply to denote a certain stage of spiritual life, the stage of disinterested love to God. From this association went forth monks and ecclesiastics who cherished a lively interest in the spiritual guidance of the laity, preached in the German language (the vernacular of the people), and labored not only to educate the people to perform their duties as required by the Church laws, and to all manner of good works, but also "to lead them forward to a deeper experience of Christianity, to a truly divine life according to their own understanding of it." From their number also went forth "those priests who, scorning to be troubled by the common scruples during the time of the papal interdict, and amid the ravages of the Black Death, bestowed the consolations of religion on the forsaken people" (Neander, *Church History*, vol. v). Many of their leaders were in close connection with convents, especially those of Eugenthal and Maria Medingen, near Nuremberg; and it is said that Agnes, the widow of king Andrew of Hungary, and various knights and burghers, were in close connection with this association. But foremost among their leaders was the Dominican monk Tauler (q. v.), of Strasburg, who spent his life in preaching and teaching with wonderful success in the country extending from his native city to Cologne, and whose influence is to this day active among his countrymen by means of his admirable sermons, which are still widely read. Much of his religious fervor and light he himself attributed to the instruction of his friend, Nicholas of Basel (q. v.), a layman, whom Schmidt, in his work below cited, mentions as the greatest of the leaders of the Friends of God. He has often been called a Waldensian, but Schmidt denies this, and says that the only sympathy which any of the Friends of God had with the Waldensians was anti-sacerdotalism. On the strength of documents which Schmidt has lately discovered, the Friends of God are said to have been "mystics to the height of mysticism: each believer was in direct union with God, with the Trinity, not the Holy Ghost alone." He says also, "they were faithful to the whole mediæval imaginative creed: transubstantiation, worship of the Virgin and saints, and Purgatory. Their union with the Deity was not that of pantheism, or of passionate love; it was rather through the fantasy. They had wonders, visions, special revelations, prophecies. Their peculiar heresy was the denial of all special prerogative to the clergy except the celebration of the sacraments; the layman had equal sanctity, equal communion with the Deity, saw visions, uttered prophecies. . . . Neither were they Bible Christians; they honored and loved the Bible, but sought and obtained revelation beyond it. They rejected one clause of the Lord's prayer. Temptations were marks of God's favor not to be deprecated. But, though suffering was a sign of divine love, it was not self-inflicted suffering. They disclaimed asceticism, self-maceration, self-torture. All things to the beloved were of God; all therefore indifferent" (Milman, *Latin Christianity*, viii, 399). The Friends of God are frequently charged with pantheism, but Neander undertakes to defend them against this charge, admitting, however, that those of them who knew not how to "guard against the danger of falling into the unfathomable abyss of God unrevealed, instead of holding fast to the God revealed in Christ, plunged into

the gulf of pantheistic self-deification." And that this gave rise to "the wild, fanatic, pantheistic mysticism, which was for getting beyond Christ, beyond all positive revelation, all humanization of the divine, as we see it exemplified particularly among a portion of the so-called Beghards (q. v.) . . . and the so-called Brothers and Sisters of the Free Spirit (q. v.). Among those of the Friends of God who by unwise speculation, and by an intoxication of self-forgetting love discarding all calm reflection, "were unconsciously betrayed into effusions and expressions upon which that wild, fanatical pantheism afterwards seized and fastened itself," is reckoned Master Eckhart (q. v.), from whose writings and sermons twenty-six propositions connected with a pantheistic mode of thinking, or verging upon such a mode of thinking, had been drawn, were formally condemned. But he promptly retracted all those propositions which were found to be heretical or scandalous, "and in general submitted himself to be corrected by the pope and the Church." These "pantheistic and quietistic views" were earnestly opposed by Ruysbroek (q. v.) and by Tauler. The former especially secured himself against the danger of pantheism by the prominence he gives to the will, "which he describes as the main-spring on which all development of the higher life depends." Another of the leaders of the Friends of God was the Dominican monk Heinrich Suso (q. v.), of Suabia, who, like Tauler, gave "prominence to the mediation of Christ as necessary to the attaining to true communion with God, and was thus distinguished from those pantheistic mystics who, notwithstanding mediation, were for sinking directly into the depths of the divine essence." Many of the leaders of the Friends of God were put to death by order of the Inquisition on the charge of being Beghards. Among these were Nicholas of Basel and two of his associates, Martin of Reichenau, and a Benedictine and follower of Martin. Milman (*Latin Christianity*, p. 408) says that the influence of the doctrines taught by the Friends of God, especially of Tauler and his followers, were "seen in the earnest demand for reformation by the councils; the sullen estrangement, notwithstanding the reunion to the sacerdotal yoke, during the Hussite wars; the disdainful neutrality when reformation by the councils seemed hopeless;" and that it is especially "seen in the remarkable book *German Theology*, attributed by Luther to Tauler himself, but doubtless of a later period."—Neander, *Church History*, v, 380; Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, x, 159; Schmidt, *Gottesfreunde im vier Jahrhundert* (Jena, 1855); Pfeiffer, *Deutsche Mystiker des 14 und 15 Jahrh.*; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, viii, 309; Kurtz, *Church Hist.*, i, 484; Bennet, in *Methodist Quart. Rev.* Jan. 1869, p. 45 sq.; *Theologia Germanica*, edit. by Dr. Pfeiffer and transl. by Susanna Winkworth. (J. H. W.)

**Friends of Light.** See FREE CONGREGATIONS.

**Fries, Jacob Friederich**, an eminent German, philosopher, was born at Barby August 23, 1773. He was at first private tutor in Switzerland, became professor of philosophy in 1804, then successively professor of mathematics at Heidelberg in 1805, and of theoretical philosophy at Jena in 1816. In 1819 he was deposed for political reasons, but restored in 1824 as professor of natural philosophy and mathematics, and died there August 10th, 1843. The personal religious life of Fries was not a happy one. His father was a Moravian, but died when the son was only five years old. The school education to which he was subjected seems to have estranged him from Christianity when quite young. While yet a young man, he wrote: "The lectures of Garve on imagination and superstition have changed my religious sentiments. All the religious system in which I was bred has been overthrown; but this causes me no uneasiness. It was easy for me to throw the atonement overboard; I have never had any dread of God; the thought of the

Holy One has always been to me a thought of peace." In 1799, when his mother died, he wrote: "The belief in a reunion I leave to others; I am not phantast enough to hold it." Yet in 1806 he wrote to a Moravian brother: "My peace cannot compare with yours; the deserted Penates will probably punish me for a long time yet." A sketch of his life has recently appeared, by E. L. D. Henke, *J. F. Fries aus seinem handschriftlichen Nachlasse dargestellt* (Leipzig, 1867, 8vo).

The professed aim of Fries in philosophy was to give a firmer basis to Kant's system than that philosopher himself had laid down. "He found two faults with Kant: 1st. The vicious logical arrangement of his doctrine, by which he makes the value of his categories to depend on transcendental proofs, and that of his ideas on moral proofs, instead of rising, without any proof, to the immediate knowledge of reason. On this point Fries approaches the views of Jacobi. 2d. The confounding of psychological ideas with philosophy, properly so called, and not properly distinguishing the aids that psychology furnish to metaphysics from metaphysics themselves. He regarded the life and independence of Kant's practical philosophy as the most beautiful part of his system. Fries maintains that he has remedied the errors of Kant, and that he has placed the *doctrine of faith*, which is the focus of all philosophical conviction, on a solid basis. And he asserts that he has effected this by means of researches carried on in the spirit of Kant himself. Fries, as well as Kant, makes the limits of science his starting-point; hence he arrives at pure faith of reason in that which is eternal, a faith that is strengthened by presentiment (*Ahnung*). Knowledge, or science, is only concerned with sensuous phenomena; the true essence of things is the object of faith; we are led by feeling to anticipate, even amidst appearances, the value of belief, which is the offspring of the limitation itself of knowledge. Here again, in placing feeling and presentiment (*Ahnung*) above science, Fries approaches the doctrine of Jacobi. His labors in connection with philosophical anthropology, which he regards as the fundamental science of all philosophy, are of great interest. They contain particular theories on spiritual life, and particularly on the three fundamental faculties of the mind—cognition, feeling (*Gemüth*), the faculty of being interested), and the faculty of action, which is supposed to precede the two former. Afterwards follow theories on the three degrees of development—*sense, habit, understanding* (as the power of self-command and self-formation); on the degrees of thought, qualitative and quantitative abstractions of the imagination, mathematical intuition, attention, the difference between the understanding and the reason, etc. His *anthropological logic* contains also some excellent views on the subject of reasoning, method, and system. He regards practical philosophy as the theory of the value and end of human life and of the world, or the theory of human wisdom. It is there that you find the last goal of all philosophical research; it is divided into a moral theory and a religious theory (theory of the final goal of the universe). The former may be also subdivided into general ethics, or theory of the value and end of human actions, theory of virtue, and theory of the state" (Tenenmann, *Manual Hist. Philos.*, revised by Morell, § 422).

Fries "called his system 'Philosophical Anthropology,' since he made all further philosophical knowledge dependent on man's self-knowledge. He distinguished three grades of *Erkenntniß*; we know (*wissen*) the phenomena of our subjective thinking; this is the realm of philosophy. We believe (*glauben*) that there are appearances—*Erscheinungen*—out of the mind that all is not a mere subjective creation. We have a feeling, a presentiment (*ahnen*), that there is a reality, a substance behind these appearances; here Fries places all that pertains to God, the existence of the soul and

immortality. De Wette had much conversation with Fries, first at Jena, then at Heidelberg, and to him he essentially owed his transition from the dry Kantian rationalism to the method which may be most simply named the *ideal-belehing*. After listening to this system, De Wette says that he gathered up, as by magic, his previously scattered knowledge and convictions into a well-ordered and beautiful whole. The philosophy of Fries seemed to commend itself in this, that it preserved the formal, logical reflection of Kant, without sharing in the metaphysical insipidity, yea, emptiness of the contents of that philosophy" (Edwards, in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1850, p. 780).

His principal writings are: *Reinhold, Fichte u. Schelling* (Lpz. 1803);—*Philosophische Rechtslehre* (Jena, 1804);—*System der Philosophie* (Lpz. 1804);—*Wissen, Glauben und Ahnung* (Lpz. 1805);—*Neue Kritik der Vernunft* (Heidelberg, 1807, 3 vols.; 2d edit. 1830);—*System d. Logik* (Lpz. 1811; 3d edit. 1837);—*Populäre Vorles. über d. Sterikunde* (Lpz. 1813; 2d edit. 1833);—*Ueber d. Gefährdung d. Wohlstandes u. Charakters d. Deutschen durch d. Juden* (Lpz. 1816);—*Vom Deutschen Bunde*, etc. (Lpz. 1817);—*Handbuch der praktischen Philosophie* (Lpz. 1817-32, 2 vols.);—*Handbuch d. psychischen Anthropologie* (Jena, 1820; 2d edit. 1837-39, 2 vols.);—*Die mathematische Naturphilosophie* (Jena, 1822);—*Julius u. Eragoras* (a philosophical novel) (Jena, 1822);—*Die Lehre d. Liebe, d. Glaubens, u. d. Hoffnung* (Jena, 1823);—*System d. Metaphysik* (Jena, 1824);—*Polemische Schriften* (Halle, 1824);—*Die Gesch. der Philosophie*, etc. (Halle, 1837-40, 2 vols.). In connection with Schmid and Schröter, he published the *Oppositionsschrift f. Theologie u. Philosophie*.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xviii, 876 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, vii, 355 sq.; Morell, *Modern Philosophy*, pt. ii, ch. vii.

**Fries, Justus Henry**, a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in Westphalia, Germany, April 24, 1777, and came to America in 1803. He could not pay his passage, and hence became a "Redemptioner," and served a farmer in York County, Pa., three years. Being free, he studied theology with Rev. Daniel Wagner, in Frederick, Md. He was licensed in 1810, and not long afterwards ordained. For two years he served eight congregations in York County, Pa., and in 1812 he removed to Buffalo Valley, in Union County, Pa., where he continued the remainder of his life, doing a pioneer work, his labors extending over several counties. He died October 9, 1839. He was noted for his extraordinary memory, his eccentricities of character, his great love of American institutions, his fondness for politics, his active life in the ministry, and his great success in laying the foundation of numerous now flourishing German Reformed congregations in the beautiful valleys of the Susquehanna. He preached only in German. (II. H.)

**Friese, or Fries, or Frisius, MARTIN**, a Jutland theologian, was born at Riepen in 1688, and studied theology at the University of Copenhagen under Wandalin, Masius, and the ex-rabbi Steenbuch. In 1712 he was appointed instructor in philosophy, and in 1717 preacher and confessor to the household of a nobleman. In 1719 he was called to the university at Kiel as third professor of theology. Here he lectured especially upon Exegesis of the New Testament, and wrote several polemical works. After a visit to the libraries at Nuremberg and Wolfenbüttel, he was, on his return in 1725, promoted to the second professorship, and at nearly the same time was elected *Prokanzler*, which position he held up to the time of his death, August 15, 1750. His principal works are: *Dissertationes iii de erroribus pictorum contra historiam sacram* (Copen. 1703-5, 4to);—*Schediasma de carminibus τῶν ἱεραρχῶν τῶν κοίνοτον ad Matt. x, 14* (Copen. 1706, 4to);—*Dissertatio de concupiscentia exhortationis Irenæi, ad mōnem inter Evangelicos et reformatos procurandam holic factæ* (Kiel, 1722 and 1733);—*Fundamenta Theologie thicæ, selec-*

*tionibus dictis probantibus eorumque, ubi opus est, eregesi et observationibus præcipuis instructa* (Hamb. 1724);—*Demonstratio eregetica de nominalis valde notatu dignis modis quibus I. T. in Noxum adlegatur, partiterque de graeca 70 interpretum versione*, etc. (Hamb. 1730, 4to);—*Dissert. de usu et abusu Graecorum in prinitis scriptorum in illustrandis N. T. vocabulis et dicendi modis* (Kiel, 1733).—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xviii, 879. (J. W. M.)

**Friesland, Frisians.**—Friesland, in the wider sense of the word, was formerly the name of the whole north-western coast of Germany and the coast of Holland, embracing the country from the mouth of the Weser to the central mouth of the Rhine. It was divided by what is now called the Zuyder Zee into West Friesland and East Friesland. The latter was subsequently again divided into two parts, the country between the Zuyder Zee and the Ems, now forming the Dutch provinces of Friesland and Groningen, and the country between the Ems and the Weser, constituting the modern East Friesland, which was until 1744 a separate principality, was then united with Prussia, fell in 1815 to Hanover, with the whole of which it was in 1866 again annexed to Prussia. A branch of the Frisians, the North Frisians, inhabited the western coast of Schleswig and the islands of Heligoland, Föhr and Sylt.

The first Christian missionary among the Frisians was bishop Amandus, who entered the country in the train of the conquering Franks. He met with but little success, but established two convents at Ghent, Blandinum and Gandanum. In 636, Dagobert, king of the Franks, built the first Christian church of Friesland at Utrecht, at that time called Wiltenburg; and St. Eligius (q. v.), bishop of Noyon, made great efforts to gain a footing for Christianity among the people, but he had likewise but little success. About 675, Adgill I, who ruled over that part of Friesland which was not conquered by the Franks, gave permission to the English bishop Wilfrid to preach. The defeat of his successor Radbod by Pepin of Heristal extended the territory of the Franks up to the Yssel and the Fly, and thus opened a wider field to the Christian missionary. The English monk Wilbrod was consecrated by pope Sergius I archbishop of the Frisians, and took up his residence at Wiltenburg. After the death of Pepin in 714, Radbod made an attempt to shake off the yoke of the Franks, and to expel Christianity from his territory, but he was again defeated by Charles Martel in 717, and had to become a Christian himself. He died, however, a pagan in 719. Poppo, the guardian of Radbod's minor son, Adgill II, was apparently friendly to Christianity, which found now a very zealous missionary in Winfred (St. Boniface, q. v.), but when a favorable opportunity seemed to offer he risked a new war against the Franks, in which, in 734, he lost his life. Adgill II, who received the title of king, but was a vassal of the Franks, openly professed Christianity, but the resistance of the people to the new doctrine continued. Adgill II was succeeded by his two sons: first Gundobald, and, later, Radbod II, the latter of whom was a violent opponent of Christianity, and was expelled from the country by Charlemagne, who embodied the whole of Friesland with his empire. Christianity at this time was firmly established in the southern part of Friesland. The successor of Wilbrod as bishop of Utrecht, Gregory, established in his episcopal city a theological school, in which many missionaries for Friesland and North-western Germany were educated. Among his assistants, Lebuin and Willehad are mentioned. The latter was subsequently appointed by Charlemagne bishop of Bremen, and in that position he zealously worked for the conversion of the Frisians. With him labored for seven years S. Liudger (q. v.), a native of Friesland, and pupil of the school of Utrecht, when the rising of the Saxons under Wittekind was followed by a general revolt of the Frisians. The defeat of

this revolt terminated the resistance of the Frisians to the Franks and Christianity. Friesland was now regarded as a Christian country, but remnants of paganism maintained themselves until late in the Middle Ages.

At the time of the Reformation, West Friesland was a part of the Netherlands. Into East Friesland, which was ruled by a count, and a part of the German empire, the Reformation was introduced by count Edzard I, who, as early as 1519, became acquainted with the writings of Luther, and favored the Reformation, without, however, using any coercive measures against those who preferred to remain in the Church of Rome. Among those who successfully labored in behalf of the Reformation was master Jörgen von der Düre (*Magister Apertuus*), who had been educated at Zwolle by the Brethren of the Common Life. After the death of Edzard, in February, 1528, his son Enno began to despoil the churches, suppress the convents, and introduce the Reformation by force. In 1529, Bugenhagen, at the request of count Enno, sent two Lutheran preachers from Bremen to organize the new administration of the churches. But already a number of the Protestant ministers and laity had come under the influences of the Anabaptists and Reformed (Zwinglian) views. Count Enno expelled Carlstadt, and ordered all the Anabaptists out of the country; but the clergy, in 1530, could not be prevailed upon to adopt the whole of the Lutheran Church discipline which was laid before them. Several other attempts to introduce Lutheranism by force failed, and the Reformed system of Zwinglius maintained the ascendancy. In 1543, the widow of Enno, countess Anna, who, during the minority of her son, acted as regent, called a distinguished Reformed theologian, Johann a Lasco [see LASCO], to Friesland. He was appointed superintendent general, and under his administration the Reformed Church of Friesland attained a high degree of prosperity and reputation. As a refuge of many Protestant exiles from France, the Netherlands, and Great Britain, it received the name "Refuge of the oppressed and exiled Church of God."—Herzog, *Real-Encycl.* iv. 607; Onno Klopp, *Geschichte Ostfrieslands* (Hanover, 1854-56, 2 vols.). (A. J. S.)

**Frieze**, in classical architecture, the middle division of an entablature, lying between the architrave and the cornice. In the Tuscan order it is plain. In the Doric it is divided by three raised flutes, called triglyphs, into spaces called metopes, which are usually filled with sculpture. In the Ionic it is sometimes ornamented with sculpture; sometimes the metopes swell out in the middle. In the Corinthian and Composite it is ornamented in various ways, but usually either with flowers or figures. Any horizontal band that is occupied with sculpture is called a frieze by some writers.—Parker, *Glossary of Architecture*, s. v.

**Frigga**, the wife of Odin, and supreme goddess of the race of the Asir (or Ases), the celestial gods of the Scandinavian mythology, was a daughter of the giant Fjörgym, presided over marriages and in the assemblies of the goddesses, which were always held in her palace, was present of, but never revealed, the fate of men, knew the language of plants and animals, and through her great wisdom aided Odin by her counsels. Her abode was said to be "the magnificent mansion of Fensalir (the marshy halls), which denotes the deep, moist earth," and from her relation to Odin, the sun in this mythology, she may be regarded as typifying the earth, which, drawing from him the generative principles of light and warmth, gives growth and fruitfulness


to living things. She is closely related to, and frequently confounded with Freya (q. v.), and is generally represented (see pl. 12, fig. 1, *Mythology and Religious Rites in Icon. Encyclop.*) seated in a golden chariot drawn by two white cats, her tresses and veil floating in the wind, with two attendants, with veils and tresses likewise floating, flying near her.—*English Cyclopædia*, s. v.; *Icon. Encyclop.* iv. 277-8 (N. Y. 1851); Thorpe, *Northern Mythology*. (J. W. M.)

**Fringe** (פְּרִיָּה, *gedil*, twisted thread, i. e. a *tassel*, Deut. xxii, 12; a "wreath" or *festoon* for a column, 1 Kings vii, 17; צִיִּטִּיחַ, *tsitsikh*, a flower-like projection, i. e., a *tassel*, Numb. xv, 38, 39; the "fore-lock," Ezek. viii, 3), an ornament worn by the Israelites upon the edges, and especially at the corners of their robes, as an affectation of piety (comp. Matt. xxiii, 5). These terms must have denoted pedicles in the shape of bobs or flowing threads. Fringed garments, elaborately wrought, were very common among both the ancient Egyptians and Babylonians. See EMBROIDERY. Such fringes, however, as appear upon the tunics and outer



Ancient Assyrian Fringed Garments: 1. From the Egyptian Paintings; 2. From the Ninevite Monuments.

robes of figures delineated on the Assyrian and Egyptian monuments probably did not entirely correspond with those in use among the Jews, although it may be presumed that there was a general resemblance between those worn for general purposes, i. e. as *ornamental* appendages. Moreover, it may be doubted whether fringes of that description were intended by the Jewish legislator, since they were in such common use that they could form no proper mark of distinction between an Israelite and a Gentile; and, besides, they seem appropriate to state-dresses rather than to ordi-




Varieties of ancient Assyrian Tassels and Fringe.

nary attire, while it is plainly the latter which is contemplated in the prescription of Moses, and this especially with a religious reference. See PHYLACTERY.

The Mosaic law respecting these ornaments is contained in Numb. xv, 38-41; Deut. xxii, 12, where the children of Israel are enjoined to append fringes or tassels (פְּתִילִים, פְּתִילִים), consisting of several threads, to the four corners (אַרְבַּע קַנְפֵי) of their outer garment (בְּגָד, בְּגָדֵי), to put one distinguishing thread (פְּתִילֵי) not "ribbon," as the A. V.) of deep blue in each of these fringes, and constantly to look at them, in order to be put in mind thereby of God's commandments to keep them. What number of threads each of these symbolical fringes is to have besides the said blue one, of what material, or how they are to be made, the injunction does not say. Like most of the Mosaic laws, it leaves the particulars to be determined by the executive powers according to the peculiar circumstances of the time. The following account of them is chiefly from Kitto's *Cyclop.* s. v.

Guided by the fact that they are symbolical, tradition, in determining the manner in which these fringes are to be made, endeavored to act in harmony with their spiritual import, and hence fixed that each of these four fringes or tassels for the four corners of the garment should consist of eight threads of white wool, the emblem of purity and holiness (Isa. i, 18); that one of these threads is to be wound round the others, first *seven* times, and then a double knot to be made: then *eight* times, and a double knot (15=ה"ה); then *eleven* times (=ל"א), and a double knot; and finally *thirteen* times (=י"ג), and a double knot, so as to obtain, from the collective number of times which this thread is wound round, the words יהוה אחד (Jehovah is one), constituting the creed which was the distinguishing mark of the Hebrew nation, and which was inscribed on their banners, whilst the five knots represent the five books of the law. As the law, however, is said to contain 613 commandments [see SCHOOL], and as the design of these fringes is to remind the Jews of all these commandments, tradition has so arranged it that the word ציצית, which is numerically 600, with the 8 threads and 5 knots, should exactly comprise this number, and thus constitute a perfect symbol of the law.



Original Form of the Jewish fringed Mantle.

Originally, as we have seen, this fringed or tasseled garment was the outer one. It was more like a large oblong piece of cloth, with a hole in the centre through which the head was put, thus dividing it into two halves, one covering the front, and the other the back of the body, like a tunic.

But when the Hebrews began to mix with other nations, and especially when they were dispersed and became a by-word and a lissing, this ancient badge of distinction which God conferred upon them became the signal of persecution, inas-much as it indicated that the wearer of it was a Jew, on whom Christians thought they ought to avenge the blood of Christ. Hence the Israelites found it necessary to discard the fringed garment as an outer dress, and to wear it in a smaller size, and a somewhat altered form, as an under garment, in order to conceal it from their persecutors. This under fringed garment is called אַרְבַּע קַנְפֵי, the *four-cornered dress*, or simply ציצית, *fringes* or *tassels*, and is worn by every orthodox Jew to the present day.

Yet, though the Jews have been compelled to relinquish the large outer fringed garment as a permanent article of apparel, they still continue to wear it in a somewhat modified form at their morning prayers, and call it טַלִּית, *talith'*, i. e. *cover* or



Modified Form of the Jewish fringed Garment.

*wrapper*. This *talith*, or fringed wrapper, is generally made of a white woollen material: the wool must be spun by Jews for this ex-



Modern Jewish mode of wearing the Talith.

press purpose. It has three or more blue stripes running in parallel lines across the whole garment, at the right and left side. In some cases, however, the *talith* is also made of silk. Every married Jew must wear it at morning prayer; a single man can do what he likes. When putting it on, the following prayer is offered: "Blessed art thou, O Lord, King of the universe, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and enjoined us to array ourselves with fringes." The

Jews attach the utmost importance to the fringed garment. Thus it is related in the Talmud that "R. Joseph asked R. Joseph b. Rabba, which commandment has your father admonished you to observe more than any other? He replied, The law about the fringes. Once when my father, on descending a ladder, stepped on one of the threads and tore it off, he would not move from the place till it was repaired" (*Sabbath*, 118, b). Some of the Rabbins go so far as to say that the law respecting the fringes is as important as all the other laws put together (see Rashi on Numb. xv, 41). It was for this reason that the woman with the issue of blood (Matt. ix, 20), and the inhabitants of Gennesaret (Matt. xiv, 36), were so anxious to touch a fringe of our Saviour's garment (σπάρτιον τοῦ Ἰησοῦ). This superstitious reverence for the external symbol, with little care for the things it symbolized, led the Pharisees to enlarge their fringes, believing that the larger they made the tassels, the letter they did God service (comp. the Rabbinical sayings, "Whoso diligently keeps this law of fringes is made worthy, and shall see the face of the majesty of God"—Baal Haturim on Numb. xv; "When a man is clothed with the fringe, and goes out therewith to the door of his habitation, he is safe and God rejoiceth, and the angel [of death] departeth from thence, and the man shall be delivered from all hurt," etc.—R. Menachem on do.); and this it was that our Saviour rebuked (Matt. xxiii, 5). See Maimonides, i, 100, etc.: *Orach Chayim*, § 7; the Hebrew Prayer-book, called סִפְתָּרֵי הַתְּפִלָּה (Vien. 1859), p. 21, a, etc. See HEM.

**FRINT**, JACOB, a Roman Catholic bishop of Austria, was born in 1766 at Bömisch-Kamnitz, in Austria. He was for several years professor of theology at the University of Vienna, and caused the establishment of a higher theological institution for secular priests, of which he himself became the first director. He was appointed in 1827 bishop of St. Poelten, and died in 1831. He is the author of numerous theological works, as *Handbuch der Religionswissenschaft* (Vienna, 1806-14, 6 vols.):—*Das alte und das neue Christenthum, od. Krit. Beleuchtung der Stunden der Andacht* (Vienna, 1822-24, 4 numbers):—*Geist des Christenthums* (Vienna, 1808, 2 vols.). From 1813 to 1826 he was the editor of a journal for scientific theology, which was continued by Plötz and Seback. (A. J. S.)

**Frisbie, LEVI**, professor in Harvard College, was born at Ipswich, Mass., in 1784. He entered Harvard College in 1798, and during most of the time till his graduation in 1792, he supported himself by labor as a clerk or in teaching. He commenced the study of law, but was compelled to desist by an affection of the eyes, which hindered his progress through life. In 1805 he was made Latin tutor at Harvard, and in 1811 professor of Latin, which post he held until 1817, when he was transferred to the chair of moral philosophy, for which he had peculiar qualifications. His lectures on ethics, government, etc., were considered very able; they were chiefly delivered extempore; but some of them have been published (see below). He died July 9, 1822. He was a contributor to the *North American Review*, and to other periodicals; and a "Collection of the Writings of Professor Frisbie," edited by Andrews Norton, appeared in 1823, containing portions of his *Lectures*, as well as of his periodical contributions.—Ware, *Unitari in Biography*, ii, 231 sq.; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, s. v.


**Frischmuth, JOHANN**, a German theologian and Orientalist, was born at Wertheim in 1619, and died at Jena in 1687, in which city he was professor of Hebrew. He was also acquainted with Arabic. Besides other works, he wrote 60 dissertations on philological, Biblical, and theological subjects, of which the most important are, *De Pontificum Hebraeorum vestitu sacro:—De Sacrificiis:—De Pontificatu Mosis contra Nihilismum:—De Græca LXX Interpret. versione:—De Meditatione Mortis et Memoria clarissimorum quorundam in re sacra et literaria Virorum.*—Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xviii, 889. (J. W. M.)

**Frisians.** See FRIESLAND.

**Frith or Fryth, JOHN**, an English reformer and martyr, was born at Seven Oaks, in Kent, where his father kept an inn, and was educated at King's College, Cambridge, where he so greatly distinguished himself that, when Wolsey formed his new college at Oxford, he was appointed one of its first members. About 1525 he became acquainted with Tyndale, and by him was won over to the principles of the Reformation. With others, he found it necessary to retire to the Continent in 1528. On his return to England in 1530 he was put into the stocks at Reading as a vagabond, but was taken out of them by the school-master of the town, to whom he made his case known in so elegant Latin as to prove himself a scholar. From Reading he went to London, and there engaged in controversy with Sir Thomas More, publishing a tract on Purgatory against Sir Thomas. His zeal led to his apprehension. While in the Tower he was examined, by the king's command, before archbishop Cranmer; Brandon, duke of Suffolk; Boleyn, earl of Wiltshire; Stokesley, bishop of London; Gardner, bishop of Winchester, and the chancellor Audley. The prisoner maintained that the dogma of transubstantiation was not *de file*; at the same time, he did not condemn those who held the doctrine of a corporeal presence; he only reprobated the prevalent notions respecting propitiatory masses and the worshipping of the sacramental elements. He denied also the doctrine of purgatory. At length he was brought before an episcopal commission at St. Paul's, where many efforts were made to induce him to recant, but in vain. At last the bishop of London pronounced sentence upon him as an obstinate heretic, and he was delivered to the secular power. A writ was issued for his execution, and he was burnt at Smithfield on the 4th of July, 1533, "maintaining his fortitude to the last, and charitably extending his forgiveness to a bigoted popish priest, who endeavored to persuade the people that they ought no more to pray for him than for a dog." Frith was an excellent scholar. He wrote *Treatise of Purgatory:—Antithesis between Christ and the Pope:—Mirror, or Glass to know thyself, written in the Tower, 1532:—Articles* (for which he died) writ-

ten in *Newgate Prison*, June 23, 1533:—*Answer to Sir Thomas More's Dialogues concerning Heresies:—Answer to John Fisher, bishop of Rochester*, etc., all of which treatises were reprinted at London (1573, fol.), with the works of Tyndale and Barnes. They may be found also in Russell, *Works of the Reformers*, vol. iii (Lond. 1828, 3 vols. 8vo). See Hook, *Eccl. Biog.*, v, 235; Burnet, *Hist. of the English Reformation*, i, 263-277.

**Frithstool or Freedstool**, literally the seat of peace; a seat or chair, usually made of stone, placed near the altar in some churches, and intended as the last and most sacred resort for those that claimed the privilege of the sanctuary. The violation of the *Freedstool* was attended by the most severe punishment. "According to Spelman, that at Beverley had this inscription: 'Hæc sedes lapidea freedstol' dicitur i. e. pacis cathedra, ad quam reus fugiendo pervenies omnimodam habet securitatem.'" Frithstools still exist in the church at Hexham and Beverley Minster, both in the north aisle of the chancel: the former of these has the seat hollowed out in a semicircular form, and is slightly ornamented with patterns of



Deverley Minster (Parker). Norman character; that at Beverley is very rude and plain."—Parker, *Glossary of Architecture*, s. v.

**Fritigild**, a queen of the Marcomans in the 4th century. She was converted to Christianity, and applied to Ambrose for further religious instruction. He sent her a catechism composed expressly for the purpose. Through her influence the Marcomans were converted as a people, and remained at peace with Rome during the incessant wars of the time.

**Fritz, SAMUEL**, a German Jesuit and missionary, was born in 1650, and died in 1730. He was sent as missionary to South America, and established mission settlements between the Napo and Rio Negro, into which nearly 40,000 natives were gathered. The Portuguese from Brazil attacked and broke up these settlements, carrying many of the Indians to Para. Fritz, after vainly striving to obtain redress, retired to the village of Xeberos in Peru, where he died. His map of the Amazon, though superseded by the fuller and exacter works of more recent explorers, procured for him for a long time a just renown as a geographer.—Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xviii, 895-7. (J. W. M.)

**Fritzsché**, the name of a German family distinguished for learning. **I. CHRISTIAN FRIEDRICH**, a theologian, was born at Nauendorf Aug. 17, 1776. He studied at the Orphan School of Halle, and afterwards theology at Leipzig. He became successively pastor of Steinbach in 1799, superintendent at Dobrilugk in 1809, professor of theology at Halle in 1830, and was in 1833 appointed censor for theological works. Besides a number of occasional articles, pamphlets, etc., collected in the *Fritzschorum Opuscula Academica* (Lpz. 1838), published by himself and two of his sons, he wrote *Vorlesungen u. d. Abendmahl*, etc.:—*De Anamartesia Jesu Christi* (Halle, 1835-37):—*De Revelationis Notione biblica* (Lpz. 1828).—Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, vi, 754.

**2. KARL FRIEDRICH AUGUST**, eldest son of Christian Fritzsché, also a distinguished theologian, was born at Steinbach December 16, 1801. After receiving his first instruction from his father he continued his studies at the University of Leipzig, where he became professor extraordinary of theology in 1825. The year following he went to Rostock as ordinary professor, and in 1841 to Giessen, where he died Dec. 6, 1846. Besides some important exegetical essays published in the *Fritzschorum Opuscula Academica*, he

wrote *De nonnullis secunde Pauli ad Corinthios Epistola Locis* (Lpz. 1824):—*Commentar z. Matthæus* (Lpz. 1826):—*Commentar z. Marcus* (Lpz. 1830):—*De Conformatione Nori Testamenti critica, quam C. Luchmannus edidit* (Giessen, 1841):—*Pauli ad Romanos Epistola, c. comment. perpet.* (Halle, 1836-43, 3 vols. 8vo). As a commentator, his philological acuteness is perhaps extreme.—*Pierer, Universal-Lexikon*, vi, 754; *Christian Rev.* ix, 469; *Herzog, Real-Encycl.* xix, 510.

**Fritzlar** (probably from Frideo lare = *domus pacis*) is a city of Prussia, situated on the shores of the Eder, and one of the oldest seats of the Church in Central Germany. Here Boniface founded in 732 a church dedicated to St. Peter, and a small convent, with a school chiefly intended for the accommodation of clerical students. He first directed it himself, but afterwards gave up the charge to his countryman Wigbert, who thus became the first regular abbot of the institution († 747). The second abbot was Tatian; the third, Wigbert II. The school soon gained a great reputation. Sturm, abbot of Fulda, and Megingoz, bishop of Würzburg, were among its first scholars. The institution remained for centuries at the head of both clerical and secular education. Under Charlemagne, Fritzlar was in 774 burned down by the heathen Saxons, and the church alone escaped. As it stands at present, it is in the Roman style of the 12th century. Fritzlar was for a time a bishopric (in 786), but was soon joined to that of Mayence. See S. Schminke, *De antiquitat. Fritslariens. diss.* (Marburg, 1715, 4to).—*Herzog, Real-Encyclop.* iv, 612. (J. N. P.)

**Fritzlar**, HERMANN OF. See HERMANN.

**Frog** (פְּרִיָּוִט, *tsephorde'a*, a *marsh-leaper* [*Gesenius, Thes. Heb.* p. 1181]. βάρπαχος; *Exod.* viii, 2 et sq.; *Psa.* lxxviii, 45; *ev.* 80; *Rev.* xvi, 13), the animal selected by God as an instrument for humbling the pride of Pharaoh (*Exod.* viii, 2-14; *Psa.* lxxviii, 45; *ev.* 30; *Wisd.* xix, 10). Frogs came in prodigious numbers from the canals, the rivers, and the marshes; they filled the houses, and even entered the ovens and kneading-troughs; when, at the command of Moses, the frogs died, the people gathered them in heaps, and "the land stank" from the corruption of the bodies. There can be no doubt that the whole transaction was miraculous; frogs, it is true, if allowed to increase, can easily be imagined to occur in such multitudes as marked the second plague of Egypt—indeed, similar plagues are on record as having occurred in various places, as at Pœonia and Dardania, where frogs suddenly appeared in such numbers as to cause the inhabitants to leave that region (see Eustathius on *Hom. Il.* i, and other quotations cited by Bochart, *Hieroz.* iii, 575); but that the transaction was miraculous appears from the following considerations: 1. The numbers were unprecedented, and suddenly produced, and they were found in extraordinary places. 2. The time of the occurrence was in spring, when ordinarily the old frogs would be engaged in spawning, and the younger ones would be in their tadpole state, or, at any rate, not sufficiently developed to enable them to go far from the water. 3. The frogs would not naturally have died, in such prodigious numbers as is recorded, in a single day. Amongst the Egyptians the frog was considered a symbol of an imperfect man, and was supposed to be generated from the slime of the river—*ἐκ τῆς τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἰλύος* (see *Horapollon*, i, 26). A frog sitting upon a lotus (*Nelumbium*) was also regarded by the ancient Egyptians as symbolical of the return of the Nile to its bed after the inundations. Hence the Egyptian word *Ihrur*, which was used to denote the Nile descending, was also, with the slight change of the first letter into an aspirate, *Chur*, the name of a frog (*Jablonski, Panth. Egypt.* iv, § 9).

The mention of this reptile in the O. T. is confined to the passage in *Exod.* viii, 2-7, etc., in which the

plague of frogs is described, and to the two allusions to that event in *Psa.* lxxviii, 45; *ev.* 30. The term also occurs in *Wisd.* xix, 10, in reference to the same event. In the N. T. the word occurs once only in *Rev.* xvi, 13, "three unclean spirits like frogs." There is no question as to the animal meant. Although the common frog is so well known that no description is needed to satisfy the reader, it may be necessary to mention that the only species recorded as existing in Palestine is the green (*Rana esculenta*), and that Dr. Richardson alone refers the species of Egypt to the rarer speckled gray frog (*Rana punctata*). The only known species of frog which occurs at present in Egypt is the *Rana esculenta*, of which two varieties are described, differing from Spallanzani's species in some slight peculiarities (*Descript. de l'Égypte, Hist. Natur.* i, 181, fol. ed.). The *Rana esculenta*, the well-known edible frog of the Continent, has a wide geographical range, being found in many parts of Asia, Africa, and Europe. How the *R. punctata* (*Pelodytes*) came to be



*Rana Punctata.*

described as an Egyptian species it is difficult to say, but it is almost certain that this species is not found in Egypt, and it is almost as certain that none but the *R. esculenta* does occur in that country (Günther, "On the Geographical Distribution of Batrachia," *Annals N. II.* 1859). It is not at all unlikely, however, that an unusual species was selected on this extraordinary occasion, in order to deepen the impression of the visitation. A species of tree-frog (*Hyla*) occurs in Egypt, but with this genus we have nothing to do. (See Haselquist, *Trav.* p. 68, 254; Seetzen, *Reise*, iii, 245, 350, 364, 490.) But, considering the immense extent of the Nile from south to north, and the amazing abundance of these animals which it contains in the state of spawn, tadpole, and complete frog, it is likely that different species, if they do not occur in the same locality, are at least to be met with in different latitudes. Storks and other waders, together with a multitude of various enemies, somewhat restrain their increase, which nevertheless, at the spawning season, is so enormous that a bowl can scarcely be dipped into the water without immediately containing a number of tadpoles. The speckled species is found westward even to the north of France, but is not common in Europe. It is of ash color with green spots, the feet being marked with



transverse bands, and is said to change its color when alarmed. It is lively, but no strong swimmer, the webs on the hinder toes extending only half their length: hence, perhaps, it is more a terrestrial animal than the common green frog, and, like the brown species, is given to roam on land in moist weather. (See *Penny Cyclopædia*, s. v.).

Although it is very hazardous, in transactions of an absolutely miraculous nature, to attempt to point out the instruments that may have served to work out the purposes of the Almighty, we may conjecture that, in the plague of frogs, a species, the one perhaps we have just mentioned, was selected for its ability on land, and that, although the fact is not expressly mentioned, the awful visitation was rendered still more ominous by the presence of dark and rainy weather—an atmospheric condition never of long duration on the coast of Egypt, and gradually more and more rare up the course of the river. Travellers have witnessed, during a storm of rain, frogs crowding into their cabin, in the low lands of Guiana, till they were packed up in the corners of the apartment, and continually falling back in their attempts to ascend above their fellows; and the door could not be opened without others entering more rapidly than those within could be expelled (see Roberts, *Oriental Illustrations*, in loc.). Now, as the temples, palaces, and cities of Egypt stood, in general, on the edge of the ever-dry desert, and always above the level of the highest inundations, to be there visited by a continuation of immense number of frogs was assuredly a most distressing calamity; and as this phenomenon, in its ordinary occurrence within the tropics, is always accompanied by the storms of the monsoon or of the setting in of the rainy season, the dismay it must have caused may be judged of when we reflect that the plague occurred where rain seldom or never falls, where none of the houses are fitted to lead off the water, and that the animals appeared in localities where they had never before been found, and where, at all other times, the scorching sun would have destroyed them in a few minutes. Nor was the selection of the frog as an instrument of God's displeasure without portentous meaning in the minds of the idolatrous Egyptians, who considered that animal a type of Pthah, their creative power (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* iv, 351 sq.), as well as an indication of man in embryo. The magicians, indeed, appeared to make frogs come up out of the waters (Exod. viii, 7), but we must not understand that to them was given also the power of producing the animals. The effect which they claimed as their own was a simple result of the continuation of the prodigy effected by Moses and Aaron; for that they had no real power is evident not only from their inability to stop the present plague, the control which even Pharaoh discovered to be solely in the hands of Moses, but also the utter failure of their enchantments in that of lice, where their artifices were incompetent to impose upon the king and his people. (See Kitto's *Daily Bible Illustra.* in loc.)—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See PLAGUES (OF EGYPT).

**Froissard de Broissia**, CHARLES, a French Jesuit missionary, died Oct. 10, 1704, near Pekin, in China, where he was laboring in the missionary work of his order. In the bitter controversy between the Dominicans and Jesuits, (1) whether the Chinese terms *Tien* and *Chang-ti* meant the material heavens or the God of heaven, and (2) whether the ceremonial honors paid to ancestors and to Confucius are religious acts or only civil and political customs, he took an active part, and, in agreement with his colleagues, resolved these questions in the way most favorable to secure apparent success. The Jesuits, adopting the view that these terms meant the God of heaven, and that these ceremonies were simply commendable customs, not repugnant to the Catholic faith, employed *Tien* and *Chang-ti* to designate God in the Christian sense, and, following the doctrine of Escobar (q. v.), that intention gives character

to the deed, allowed their converts to continue their ceremonial practices, provided they received baptism, took the name of Christians, and recognised the supremacy of their missionary teachers. The number of nominal conversions was, as might be expected, great. The dispute, which excited ridicule of Christianity among the educated Chinese, was referred, on the one hand, to the Chinese emperor Kiang-li, who decided in favor of the Jesuits, and, on the other, to pope Clement XI, who decided in favor of the Dominicans as the orthodox view. Froissard left only some fragments of translations of important Chinese works.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xviii, 920–21. (J. W. M.)

**Fromage**, PIERRE, a French Jesuit missionary and Orientalist, was born at Laon May 12, 1678, and died in Syria Dec. 10 or 23, 1740. He went on his mission-work first to Egypt, where he remained some years, and then to Syria, where he passed the remainder of his life, mostly at Aleppo. He became superior of his order, and, in despite of great difficulties, established at the monastery of St. John the Baptist, near Antura, a printing-press, and published, mostly in the Arabic language, a great number of translations and imitations of religious and theological works. Fromage was present and made an opening discourse at the great synod of the Maronites, held Oct. 15, 1736, near Tripoli, in Syria.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xviii, 931–2; Rose, *New Gen. Biog. Dictionary*, vii, 456. (J. W. M.)

**Froment**. See FROMMENT.

**Fromment**, ANTOINE, one of the French and Swiss Reformers, was born near Grenoble in 1510. Of his early life little is known. A disciple of Farel, he passed with him into Switzerland, and labored especially in Neuchâtel and Vaud. When Farel was obliged to leave Geneva in 1532 [see FAREL], he sent for Fromment, who reached Geneva November 3, and found his task a fearful one. He began his work as a school-master, promising to teach "reading and writing in a month" to all comers, and to charge nothing in case of failure. Many flocked to the school, and were taught not only reading and writing, but also the principles of the Reformation. On New-Years' day, 1533, Fromment preached in the fish-market against Romanism; a crowd of Roman Catholics broke up the meeting, and Fromment was obliged to leave Geneva. He returned in 1534. A Dominican named Furbitz, preaching in the cathedral in favor of transubstantiation, challenged the Protestants to answer his arguments. Fromment, who was in the audience, at once began to speak. A tumult arose, and again Fromment was compelled to depart from the city. He went to Berne, accompanied by one of the burgesses of Geneva, and obtained the protection of the Bernese government, under which both Fromment and Farel returned to Geneva. From 1537 to 1552 Fromment was pastor of the quarter of St. Gervais. In 1552 he was deposed from the ministry on account of certain misconduct on the part of his wife, the rigid discipline of Geneva not allowing the husband of such a wife to remain a pastor. He became a notary, and in 1559 was made one of the council of Two Hundred. His own life becoming disorderly, he was banished in 1562, and was only allowed to return in 1572. He died in 1585. He wrote a history of the reform in Geneva, which has recently been edited by Gustave Revilliod, under the title *Les Actes et les Gestes merveilleux de la cité de Genève, suietz du temps de la Réformation*, etc. (Genève, 1854)—Ruchat, *Réformation en Suisse*, t. iii; Haaz, *La France Protestante*, s. v.; Polenz, *Französ. Calvinismus*, i, 314 sq.; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xviii, 936; *London Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1857, 190 sq.

**Fromond** (*Fromondus*), a theologian of Liege, was born at Hacourt in 1587. He taught philosophy and theology at Louvain, and was, in 1633, appointed dean of the chapter of St. Peter, in that city. He appears


to have possessed some scientific knowledge, besides a pretty extensive acquaintance with theology and philology. Des Cartes was one of his friends. Fromond, however, defended Ptolemy's system (of the immobility of the earth and the motion of the sun) against Philippe Lænsberg. He was an intimate friend of Jansenius, and was one of the two theologians to whom the latter confided, when dying, his renowned *Augustinus*. He died at Louvain in 1653. The best work of Fromond is a *Commentaire des Actes des Apôtres* (Paris, 1670, 2 vols. fol.). He wrote also *Anti-Aristarchus, sive de orbe Terre immobili, adversus Philippum Lænsbergium* (Antw. 1631, 4to);—*Vesta, sive Anti-Aristarchi vindex, contra Jacobum Lænsbergium et Copernicanos* (Antw. 1633, 4to);—*Brevi Anatomia Hominis* (Louvain, 1641, 4to).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xviii, 918.

**Front or Facade.** In ancient descriptions of churches, the front of the church is spoken of as the east or altar end. In modern writings, when churches are "oriented" or located with reference to the points of the compass, the principal front or façade is the west end, the end away from the altar. (G. F. C.)

**Frontier** (פְּרִיָּת, *katsch'*, end, as often rendered, comp. Jer. li, 31; Isa. lvi, 11), the extremity or border of a country (Ezek. xxv, 9).

**Frontlet** (only in the plur. פְּרִיָּתִים, *totaphoth'*, prob. *fillets*, from an obsolete root פָּרַט, to bind about [Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 518]; Sept. ἀσκληυρά [v. r. ἀσκληυρόν, apparently pointing פְּרִיָּתִים, i. e. *immovable*; Vulg. vaguely *appendium quid, movensur, and collocat*) occurs only in three passages (Exod. xiii, 16; Deut. vi, 8; xi, 18), and each time in the form of a proverbial similitude, "as frontlets between your eyes," and also coupled with another similar expression, "as a sign (or token) upon your hand" (comp. Exod. xiii, 9, "as a memorial between your eyes"), in connection with a command to observe the Mosaic law. In Exodus the expression is used more immediately with reference to the ordinance respecting the consecration of the first-born and the Passover solemnity; but in the two passages of Deuteronomy it relates to the precepts and statutes of the old covenant generally. The meaning in charging the Israelites to "bind them for a sign upon their land, and have them as frontlets between their eyes," evidently is, that they should keep them as distinctly in view, and as carefully attended to them, as if they had them legibly written on a tablet between their eyes, and bound in open characters upon their hands; so that, wherever they looked, and whatever they did, they could not fail to have the statutes of the Lord before them. That no actual written memorial was intended to be enjoined upon the Israelites is clear from the nature of the case, since no writing to be worn either between the eyes or upon the hand could by possibility have served the purpose of legibly expressing all the statutes and ordinances of the law. It is clear, also, from the alternative phrases with which those in question are associated, such as, "That the Lord's law may be in thy mouth" (Exod. xiii, 9); "That these words shall be in thine heart"; "That ye shall lay up these my words in your heart and in your soul" (Deut. vi, 6; xi, 18), as well as from the parallel sayings of a later day (Prov. vi, 21; comp. iii, 3; iv, 21). But the Jews, some time after their return from Babylon (it is not known exactly when), gave the direction about having the precepts of the law as frontlets a literal turn, and had portions of it written out and worn as badges upon their person. These are called by the modern Jews *tephillim'*, תְּפִלִּיִּם (a word signifying *prayers*, but not found in the Bible; Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* col. 1743). These were strips of parchment, on which were written four passages of Scripture (Exod. xiii, 2-10, 11-17; Deut. vi, 4-9, 13-22) in an ink prepared for the purpose. They

were then rolled up in a case of black calfskin, which was attached to a stiffer piece of leather, having a thong one finger broad, and one and a half cubits long. Those worn on the forehead were written on four strips of parchment (which might not be of any hide except cow's hide—Nork, *Braunm. und Rabb.* p. 211; comp. Hesych. s. v. Σκυριακή ἐπιτομία), and put into four little cells within a square case,



Form of the Jewish "Frontlet," according to Calmet.

on which the letter פ was written; the three points of the פ being "an emblem of the heavenly Fathers, Jehovah our Lord Jehovah" (*Zohar*, fol. 54, col. 2). The square had two thongs (פְּרִיָּתִים), on which Hebrew letters were inscribed; these were passed round the head, and after making a knot in the shape of פ, passed over the breast. This was called "the *tephillah* on the head," and was worn in the centre of the forehead (Leo of Modena, *Ceremonies of the Jews*, i, 11, n. 4; Calmet, s. v. *Phylactery*; Otho, *Lex. Rabbin.* p. 656). The Karaites, on the contrary, explained Deut. vi, 8; Exod. xiii, 9, etc., as a figurative command to remember the law (Reiland, *Ant. p.* 132), as in similar passages (Prov. iii, 8; vi, 21; vii, 3; Cant. viii, 6, etc.), and appealing to the fact that in Exod. xiii, 9 the word is not פְּרִיָּתִים, but פְּרִיָּתִים "a memorial" (Gerhardus on Deut. vi, 8; Edzardus on *Lev. choth.* i, 209; Heidanus, *De Orig. Erroris*, viii, B. 6; Schöttgen, *Hor. Hebr.* i, 199; Rosenmüller, ad loc.; Heugstenberg, *Pent.* i, 458). Considering, too, the nature of the passages inscribed on the phylacteries (by no means the most important in the Pentateuch—for the fathers are mistaken in saying that the Decalogue was used in this way, Jer. l. c.; Chrysost. l. c.; Theophyl. ad Matt. xxiii, 5), and the fact that we have no trace whatever of their use before the exile (during which time the Jews probably learnt the practice of wearing them from the Babylonians), they were justified in claiming that the object of the precepts (Deut. vi, 8; Exod. xii, 9) was to impress on the minds of the people the necessity of remembering the law. But the figurative language in which this duty was urged upon the Jews was mistaken by the Talmudists for a literal command. An additional argument against the literal interpretation of the direction is the dangerous abuse to which it was immediately liable. Indeed, such an observance would defeat the supposed intention of it, by substituting an outward ceremony for an inward remembrance. Accordingly, these badges were turned into instruments of religious vanity and display, and abused for selfish purposes by those who sought, by a great profession of legal ritualism, to hide their deficiency of inward principle. They even came eventually to be employed as charms or amulets, having a divine virtue in them to preserve the wearer from sin or from dæmoniacal agency; hence such sayings as these concerning them in the Talmudical writings: "Whosoever has *tephillim* upon his head . . . is fortified against sin;" "They are a bandage for cutting off," i. e. from various kinds of danger or hostility (Spencer, iv, e. 5). Jerome (on Matt. xxiii, 5) speaks of them generally as worn by the Jews for guardianship and safety (*ob custodiam et munimentum*); "not considering that they were to be borne in the heart, not on the body."—Smith, s. v.; Fairbairn, s. v. See PHYLACTERY.

On the analogous practice alluded to in Rev. xiii, 16; xiv, 1, see FOREHEAD.

**Fronton le Duc, or Fronto Ducaeus.** See DUC, FRONTON DE.

**Froriep, Justus Friedrich,** a learned Oriental-

ist, was born at Lubeck June 1, 1745, and was educated at Leipzig, where he passed B.D. in 1767. In 1771 he was made professor of Oriental literature at Erfurt, and in 1792 superintendent at Bückeburg. He died at Wetzlar Jan. 26, 1800. Among his numerous writings are, *De utilitate lingue Arabicæ* (Lips. 1767, 4to);—*Arabische Bibliothek*, 8vo;—*Bibliothek d. theolog. Wissenschaften* (Lenigo, 1771-86, 2 vols. 8vo).—*Doering, Gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands*, s. v.

**Frossard, Benjamin Sigismond**, a Protestant theologian, was born at Nyon, Canton Vaud, Switzerland, in 1754, and died at Montauban, France, Jan. 3, 1830. He finished his education at Geneva, and was a pastor in Lyons until the siege of that city in 1793. On the establishment of departmental schools (*écoles centrales*) in France, under the decree of Oct. 25, 1795, Frossard was made professor of morals in that of Clermont-Ferrand. In 1802 he was engaged in the compilation of the organic rules for the reformed worship, and in 1809 was charged with the organization of a faculty of theology at Montauban, of which he became dean. This demerly he lost in 1815, but retained the chair of morals and eloquence. We have from him *La Cause des Esclaves nègres et des habitants de la Guinée*, etc. (Paris, 1788, 2 vols. 8vo); a French translation of Hugh Blair's *Sermons* (Lyons, 1782, 3 vols. 8vo); and of Willerforce's *Practical View*, etc., under the title *Le Christianisme des Gens du Monde, mis en opposition avec le véritable Christianisme* (Montauban, 1821, 2 vols. 8vo).—Haag, *La France Protestante*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xviii, 949-50. (J. W. M.)

**Frost** (prop. כֶּפֶר, *kephor'*, so called from covering the ground, "hoar-frost," Exod. xvi, 14; Job xxxviii, 29; Psa. cxlvii, 16; also כֶּרֶחַח, *ke' rach*, from its smoothness, ice, as rendered Job vi, 16; xxxviii, 29; "frost," Job xxxvii, 10; hence *cold*, "frost," Gen. xxxi, 40; Jer. xxxvi, 30; and "crystal," from its resemblance to ice, Ezek. i, 22), frozen dew. It appears in a still night, when there is no storm or tempest, and descends upon the earth as silently as if it were produced by mere breathing (Job xxxvii, 10). Throughout western Asia, very severe and frosty nights are often succeeded by days warmer than most western summers afford (Gen. xxi, 40; see Jer. xxxvi, 30). Dr. Robinson says (*Researches*, ii, 97), in Jerusalem "the ground never freezes; but Mr. Whiting had seen the pool back of his house (Hezekiah's) covered with thin ice for one or two days." Dr. Barclay states (*City of the Great King*, p. 50) that "frost at the present day is entirely unknown in the lower portion of the valley of the Jordan [the Ghor]; but slight frosts are sometimes felt on the sea-coast, and near Lebanon." See PALESTINE.

The word חֲנַמַל, *chanamal'*, found only in Psa. lxxviii, 47, where (in accordance with the Sept., Vulg., Chald., Arabic, Syr., and most interpreters) it is rendered "frost," signifies (according to Michaelis) a species of ant, as destructive to trees (?) as the hail (Aben-Ezra) in the parallel member. (See Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 499; Bochart, *Hieroz.* iii, 255, edit. Lips.) Perhaps, if an animal at all be meant, it may be a designation of the *caterpillar* (so some of the Rabbins), an insect nowhere else peculiarly distinctly referred to in the Scriptures, but peculiarly destructive to the foliage of trees. See LOCUST.

**Froude, Richard Hurrell**, M.A., was born in Devonshire in 1803, entered Eton College in 1816, and Oriel College, Oxford, 1821. In 1826 he became fellow and tutor of Oriel, where he remained till 1830. He took priests' orders in 1829, and for the last four years of his life he resided alternately in the south of Europe and in the West Indies. He was a man of fine genius, but of ill-regulated temper and will. He shared in the so-called Oxford movement under Newman and Pusey, and was himself, before he died, a

thorough but unhappy ascetic. Every day, according to his own account, he became "a less and less loyal son of the Reformation." His *Remains* (Lond. 1838, 4 vols. 8vo) contain his *Journal*, *Sermons*, *Essays on Rationalism*, on *Erastianism*, on *Becket*, *Henry II*, etc.—*Edinburgh Review*, lxxvii, 525 sq.

**Fructuosus, Sr.**, archbishop of Braga, sprung from the blood royal of the Goths, devoted his property chiefly to the founding of monasteries. He was abbot of his own monastery of Complutum; was ordained bishop of Dama, and in 656 archbishop of Braga. He died A.D. 665. He is commemorated in the Roman Catholic Church on the 16th of April. He wrote a *Rule* for his monks at Complutum, and a *Supplement*. They are published in Holstenius, *Cod. Regul.* part ii, p. 133 (Paris, 1663); also with his *Epistole*, in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* lxxxvii, 1087 sq.; comp. Mabillon, *Ord. St. Benedict*, i, 437.—Clarke, *Succ. Sac. Lit.* ii, 408.

**Fruit** (properly פֵּרִי, *peri'*, καρπός), an extensive term, denoting produce in general, whether vegetable or animal, and also used in a figurative sense (see Gesenius's *Heb. Lex.* and Robinson's *Greek Lex.*). The Hebrews had three generic terms designating three great classes of the fruits of the land, closely corresponding to what may be expressed in English as, 1. *Corn-fruit*, or field produce; 2. *Vintage-fruit*; 3. *Orchard-fruit*. The term פֵּרִי, *ka' yit*, "summer-fruits," appears to denote those less important species of fruit which were adapted only to immediate consumption, or could not easily or conveniently be conserved for winter use (Jer. xl, 10, 12). The three terms spoken of as being so frequently associated in the Scriptures, and expressive of a most comprehensive triad of blessings, are the following:

1. דָּגָן, *dagan'*, "fruit of the field," or agricultural produce. Under this term the Hebrews classed almost every object of *field-culture* [see AGRICULTURE]. Jahn says, "The word is of general signification, and comprehends in itself different kinds of grain and pulse, such as wheat, millet, spelt, wall-barley, barley, beans, lentils, meadow-cumin, pepper-wort, flax, cotton, various species of the cucumber, and perhaps rice" (*Bib. Archaeol.* § 58). There is now no doubt among scholars that *dagan* comprehends the largest and most valuable species of vegetable produce, and therefore it will be allowed that the rendering of the word in the common version by "corn," and sometimes by "wheat," instead of "every species of corn" or field produce, tends to limit our conceptions of the divine bounty, as well as to impair the beauty of the passages where it occurs. See CORN.

2. תֵּירוֹשׁ, *tiroshe'*, "the fruit of the vine" in its natural or its solid state, comprehending grapes, moist or dried, and the fruit in general, whether in the early cluster or the mature and ripened condition (Isa. lxxv, 8, which is rendered by βότρυς, *grape*, in the Sept., refers to the young grape; while Judg. ix, 13, where "the vine said, Shall I leave my *tiroshe* [fruit], which cheereth God and man?" as evidently refers to the ripened produce which was placed on the altar as a first-fruit offering in grateful acknowledgment of the divine goodness). "Sometimes," says Jahn, "the grapes were dried in the sun, and preserved in masses, which were called מְנִיבִים, *menibim'*, אֲשִׁישִׁים, *ashishim'*, and מְצֻמְמִים, *tsimmukim'* (1 Sam. xxv, 18; 2 Sam. xvi, 1; 1 Chron. xii, 40; Hos. iii, 1)" (*Bib. Archaeol.* § 69). It is also distinctly referred to as the *yielder* of wine, and therefore was not wine itself, but the raw material from which it was expressed or prepared, as is evident from its distinctive contrast with wine in Amos vi, 15, last clause. See WINE.

3. גִּישְׁתָּר, *gishthar'*, "orchard-fruits," especially winter or keeping-fruits, as dates, figs, olives, pomegranates, citrons, nuts, etc. As we distinguish *dagan* from

חֵטְא (wheat), and *tiros* from טִירוֹס and יָרֵן, so must we *yitshar* from יִתְשָׁר (oil), which are unfortunately confounded together in the common version. *Shemen*, beyond question, is the proper word for *oil*, not *yitshar*; hence, being a specific thing, we find it in connection with a great variety of specific purposes, as sacrificial and holy uses, edibles, traffic, vessels, and used in illustration of taste, smoothness, plumpness, insinuation, condition, fertility, and luxury. *Yitshar*, as to the mode of its use, presents a complete contrast to *shemen*. It is not, even in a single passage, employed either by way of comparison or in illustration of any particular quality common to it with other specific articles. In one passage only is it joined with יָזֵית, *zayith*, "olive," the oil of which it has erroneously been supposed to signify, and even here (2 Kings xviii, 32) it retains as an adjective the generic sense of the noun, "preserving-fruit." It should be read, "a land of preserving-olives (*zeyth-yitshar*) and dates (*debash*)." Cato has a similar expression, *oleum conditivum*, "preserving-olive tree" (*De Re Rust.* vi). It may be observed that the Latin terms *maum* and *pomum* had an extended meaning very analogous to the Hebrew *yitshar*. Thus Varro asks, "Is not Italy so planted with fruit-trees as to seem one entire *pomarium*?" i. e., orchard (*De Re Rust.* i, 2). See OLIVE; OIL.

Thus the triad of terms we have been considering would comprehend every vegetable substance of necessity and luxury commonly consumed by the Hebrews of which first-fruits were presented or tithes paid, and this view of their meaning will also explain why the injunctions concerning offerings and tithes were sufficiently expressed by these terms alone (Numb. xviii, 12; Deut. xiv, 23). See ORCHARD.

On the terms rendered in our version "fruitful field," "fruitful place," etc., see CARMEL.

The term "fruit" is also used of *persons* (2 Kings xix, 30; Jer. xii, 2), and of *offspring, children* (Psa. cxxi, 10; Hos. ix, 16; Exod. cxxi, 22), so in the phrases "fruit of the womb" (Gen. xxx, 2; Deut. vii, 13; Isa. xlii, 18; Luke i, 42), "fruit of the loins" (Acts ii, 30), "fruit of the body" (Psa. cxxxii, 13; Mic. vi, 7), and also for the *progeny* of beasts (Deut. xxviii, 51; Isa. xiv, 29). This word is also used metaphorically in a variety of forms, the figure being often preserved: "They shall eat the fruit of their doings," i. e., experience the consequences (Isa. iii, 10; Prov. i, 31; Jer. vi, 19; xvii, 10); "with the fruit of thy works (of God) is the earth satisfied," i. e., is watered with rain, which is the fruit of the clouds (Psa. civ, 13); "fruit of the hands," i. e., gain, profits (Prov. xxxi, 16); "fruit of a proud heart," i. e., boasting (Isa. x, 12); "fruit of the mouth," i. e., what a man says, or his words (Prov. xii, 14; xviii, 10); "fruit of the righteous," i. e., counsel and example (Prov. xi, 30); "to pay over the fruits," i. e., produce as rent (Matt. cxi, 41); "fruit of the vine," i. e., wine (Matt. xxvi, 29; Mark xiv, 25; Luke xxii, 18); "fruits meet for repentance," i. e., conduct becoming a profession of penitence (Matt. iii, 8); "fruit of the lips," i. e., what the lips utter (Heb. xiii, 15; Hos. xiv, 3); "fruits of righteousness," i. e., holy actions springing from a renewed heart (Phil. i, 11). "Fruit," in Romans xv, 28, is the contribution produced by benevolence and zeal. "Fruit unto God," and "fruit unto death," i. e., to live worthy of God or of death (Rom. vii, 4, 5). The "fruits of the Spirit" are enumerated in Gal. v, 22, 23; Eph. v, 9; James iii, 17, 18. Fruitfulness in the divine life stands opposed to an empty, barren, and unproductive profession of religion (John xv, 2-8; Col. i, 10; 2 Pet. i, 5-8; Matt. vii, 16-20). See GARDEN.

FRUIT, "the product of the earth, as trees, plants, etc. 1. 'Blessed shall be the fruit of thy ground and cattle.' The fruit of the body signifies children: 'Blessed shall be the fruit of thy body.' By fruit is

sometimes meant reward: 'They shall eat of the fruit of their own ways' (Prov. i, 31); they shall receive the reward of their bad conduct, and punishment answerable to their sins. The fruit of the lips is the sacrifice of praise or thanksgiving (Heb. xiii, 15). The fruit of the righteous—that is, the counsel, example, instruction, and reproof of the righteous—is a tree of life, is a means of much good, both temporal and eternal, and that not only to himself, but to others also (Prov. xi, 30). Solomon says, in Prov. xii, 14, 'A man shall be satisfied with good by the fruit of his mouth; that is, he shall receive abundant blessings from God as the reward of that good he has done by his pious and profitable discourses. 'Fruits meet for repentance' (Matt. iii, 8) is such a conduct as befits the profession of penitence.

"2. The fruits of the Spirit are those gracious habits which the Holy Spirit of God produces in those in whom he dwelleth and worketh, with those acts which flow from them, as naturally as the tree produces its fruit. The apostle enumerates these fruits in Galatians v, 22, 23. The same apostle, in Eph. v, 9, comprehends the fruits of the sanctifying Spirit in these three things, namely, goodness, righteousness, and truth. The fruits of righteousness are such good works and holy actions as spring from a gracious frame of heart: 'Being filled with the fruits of righteousness,' Phil. i, 11. Fruit is taken for a charitable contribution, which is the fruit or effect of faith and love: 'When I have sealed unto them this fruit,' Rom. xv, 28; when I have safely delivered this contribution. When fruit is spoken of good men, then it is to be understood of the fruits or works of holiness and righteousness; but when of evil men, then are meant the fruits of sin, immorality, and wickedness. This is our Saviour's doctrine, Matt. vii, 16-18.—Watson, *Theological Dictionary*, s. v.

FRUIT-TREE (פְּרִי עֵץ, *ets-peri'*, Gen. i, 11, etc.).

From the frequent mention of fruit in the Scriptures, we may infer that fruit-bearing trees of various sorts abounded in Palestine. Among the number are specially noticed the vine, olive, pomegranate, fig, sycamore, palm, pear, almond, quince, citron, orange, mulberry, carob, pistacia, and walnut. Other trees and plants also abounded, which yielded their produce in the form of odorous resins and oils, as the balsam, galbanum, frankincense, ladanum, balm, myrrh, spike-nard, storax gum, and tragacanth gum. See PALESTINE. The ancient Egyptians bestowed great care upon fruit-trees, which are frequently delineated upon the monuments (Wilkinson, i, 36, 55, 57, abridgment). The Mosaic law contains the following prescriptions respecting fruit-trees:

1. The fruit of newly-planted trees was not to be plucked for the first four years (Lev. xix, 23 sq.). The economical effect of this provision was observed by Philo (*Opp.* ii, 402). Michaelis remarks (*Laws of Moses*, art. 221), "Every gardener will teach us not to let fruit-trees bear in their earliest years, but to pluck off the blossoms; and for this reason, that they will thus thrive the better, and bear more abundantly afterwards. The very expression, 'to regard them as uncircumcised,' suggests the propriety of *pinching* them off." Another object of this law may have been to exclude from use crude, immature, and therefore unwholesome fruits. When fruits are in season the Orientals consume great quantities of them. Chardin says the Persians and Turks are not only fond of almonds, plums, and melons in a mature state, but they are remarkable for eating them before they are ripe. But there was also a higher moral object in the Mosaic regulation. Trees were not regarded as full-grown until the fifth year, and all products were deemed immature (*ἀτελής*) and unfit for use until consecrated to Jehovah (Josephus, *Ant.* iv, 8, 19). See FORESKIN. The Talmud gives minute rules and many puerile dis-

functions on the subject (*Orah*, i, 10). See FIRST-FRUIT.

2. In besieging fortified places fruit-trees were not to be cut down for fuel (q. v.) nor for military purposes (Deut. xx, 19; compare Josephus, *Ant.* iv, 8, 42; Philo, *Opp.* ii, 400). See SIEGE. This humane prohibition, however, was not always observed (2 Kings iii, 25). See TREE.

**Frumentius, Sr.**, called the apostle of Christianity in Ethiopia, was born in Tyre towards the beginning of the 4th century. He was brought up by his uncle Meropius, whom he accompanied (with his relative Edesius) on a voyage of scientific discovery. They landed on the coast of Abyssinia or Ethiopia to procure water, but the natives murdered all on board except the two boys, whom they found sitting under a tree and reading. Edesius became cup-bearer and Frumentius private secretary to the prince. After the death of the prince, Frumentius was appointed tutor to the young prince Ezizanus, and obtained great influence in state affairs. He succeeded in founding a church, and in 326 went to Alexandria, where Athanasius (recently made bishop of Alexandria) consecrated him bishop of Axum (Auzuma), the chief city of the Abyssinians, and an important mart of trade. His labors were rewarded by extraordinary success. He is supposed to have translated the Bible into Ethiopian. Theophilus of Arabia visited Abyssinia, and "repaid to the principal town, Auzuma (Axum). Theophilus being an Arian, and Frumentius, the friend of Athanasius, professing in all probability the doctrines of the Council of Nice, it is possible a dispute may have arisen in their announcement here of their respective doctrines, which would necessarily be attended with unfavorable effects on the nascent church; but perhaps, too, Frumentius, who had not received a theological education, did not enter so deeply into theological questions. Still the emperor Constantius considered it necessary to persecute the disciples of the hated Athanasius even in these remote regions. After Athanasius had been banished from Alexandria, in the year 356, Constantius required the princes of the Abyssinian people to send Frumentius to Alexandria, in order that the Arian bishop Georgius, who had been set up in place of Athanasius, might inquire into his orthodoxy, and into the regularity of his ordination" (Neander, *Church Hist.* ii, 120). The princes refused, and Frumentius continued at work until his death, the date of which is uncertain (perhaps A.D. 360). He is celebrated as a saint by the Latins on October 27, by the Greeks on November 30, and by the Abyssinians on December 18.—Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* i, 19; Theodoret, i, 22; Ludolf, *Hist. Ethiop.* iii, 7; Butler, *Lives of Saints*, Oct. 27.

**Fruytier, JACOBUS**, a Dutch divine, was born June 5, 1659, at Middelburg. He was descended from Jan Fruytier, a courtier of William, prince of Orange, and a zealous advocate of the Reformation. Jacobus was educated at Utrecht. His first settlement was at Aardenburg, where he remained seven years. In 1688 he accepted a call to Dirksland, in 1691 removed to Vlissingen (Flushing), and in 1695 to Middelburg. In 1700 he was called to Rotterdam. Here he was installed April 25, 1700, and labored zealously in the ministry till his death, May 23, 1731. He was one of the favorite preachers in that city. Fruytier was a zealous Voetian, and became deeply involved in the controversy which at that time raged in the Reformed Church between the Coccejans and Voetians. His first efforts were those of a pacificator. The violent attack on the Coccejans made by Pierre de Joucourt, minister of the Walloon church at the Hague, was ably answered by Braunius, Van Til, and D'Outreïn. Fruytier was so much pleased with the replies of the two latter that he wrote an article expressive of his gratitude, and designed to effect a reconciliation. The

effort was premature and fruitless. D'Outreïn replied, showing that things were not yet ripe for such a result, and, moreover, that Fruytier himself was not prepared to make sufficient concessions to the opposing party. Fruytier replied, but to this rejoinder D'Outreïn made no public response. This is thought to have had an exasperating effect on Fruytier, who is said to have been a man of choleric temperament. In 1713 he issued a work that involved him in serious difficulties. Its title is, *Sion's worstelingen, of historische Zamenkomsten over de verscheidene en zeer bittere wederwaardigheden van Christus Kerke* (Zion's Struggles, or historical Conferences respecting the various and very grievous Adversities of Christ's Church). The work was specially directed against the Cartesian Coccejans, and such as were regarded as rationalistic, but it assailed also the Biblical Coccejans and Coccejus himself. Three speakers are introduced—*Truth, Piety, and Nathanael*. The Coccejans are represented as open or secret enemies to the truth. The charges brought against them by *Truth* are briefly the following: such a misinterpretation of the Scriptures as was intolerable to those who cordially loved the truth; such an undermining, on the part of others, of the principal mysteries of Christianity that there seemed to be a design to reinstate heathenism, or enthrone the blasphemies of Socinus; the vital truths of the Bible were misunderstood by some, not believed by others, and openly ridiculed by still another class in their writings, while they were excessively pleased with imaginary discoveries of truth; and, finally, all these things were palliated and defended by others. The following are the charges made by *Piety*: an attempt to introduce a heathenish morality as a substitute for spiritual religion; as a consequence of this, that worldly and natural men began to ridicule religion and to entertain atheistic views; and, finally, the power of religion was no longer visible in the lives of many who professed to love the truth, but who, under the pretext of Christian liberty, had become conformed to the world. *Nathanael* is introduced as an unsuccessful apologist for the Coccejans. The gravity of the charges and the acrimonious spirit pervading the work gave just offence, and the Classis of Schieland refused their approbation. Notwithstanding this, it was sent forth to the world with the stamp of Church authority affixed to its title-page. This rendered the Classis indignant. Cited before them, he put the blame upon the publisher. His apology was deemed insufficient, but he continued inflexible. The case was carried before the Synod of South Holland in 1717, and that body, after laboring with him and finding him intractable, voted to deprive him of his seat in the same until he should repent and submit. After persisting for seven years in his refusal, he finally, in the year 1724, confessed his fault and testified his sorrow. He was immediately restored. It is conceded that Fruytier may have been actuated by zeal for what he regarded as truth in the publication of this work; but his piety, which is admitted to have been deep and fervent, was not free from the admixture of fanaticism, nor was his devoted attachment to the truth, as he viewed it, free from bigotry. A new edition of *Sion's Worstelingen* has just (1869) been issued at Utrecht. His controversy with Lampe on the eternal generation of the Son, and the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, may be reserved for the article on Lampe. His ministry was long and laborious, and he seems to have been influenced by a sincere desire to be useful, and to promote vital godliness. He is still represented and honored by a respectable posterity. See Ypeij and Dermot, *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk*, iii Deel, blz. 181, 182, 187-191, 202-204; en Aanteekeningen (Breda, 1824); Glasius, *Godeleerd Nederland*, i Deel, blz. 475 en verv. (J. P. W.)

**Fry, ELIZABETH**, an eminent female philanthropist,

was the daughter of John Gurney, a rich banker near Norwich, and a member of the Society of Friends. She was born May 21, 1780, at Bramerton. "The benevolence of her disposition displayed itself by her habit, while yet a girl, of visiting the poor on her father's property, and forming a school for the education of their children. Under the teaching of William Savery, an American Friend, she was brought to the knowledge and love of the truth. Her character from that day was entirely changed, and she became a genuine and consistent Christian. In 1800 she was married to Joseph Fry, Esq., of London, and consequently settled in the metropolis. There she resumed her early habit of visiting the poor; and although she became the mother of a large family, who were most tenderly loved and assiduously trained, she yet found leisure, by a rigid economy of time and arrangement of domestic duties, to render her beneficent offices to her poor and suffering fellow-creatures. In 1810 she became a preacher among the Friends. Every day was she found visiting charity-schools, in the houses and lanes of the poor, and in the wards of sick hospitals, till at length, by a providential train of circumstances, she was led to extend her benevolent attentions to the inmates of a prison and a lunatic asylum (1813). The accents of Christian love found entrance into the hearts of those wretched outcasts, and she became the honored instrument of remodeling the discipline and improving the state of our national prisons. At the commencement of her career there was no classification of any sort, no separation between male and female prisoners; all criminals, parents and children, men and women, those who were comparatively innocent with the inveterately depraved, were indiscriminately huddled together, and in these circumstances many left the prison far more familiar with crime than when they entered it. It required no small resolution and faith to enter such a den of iniquity as a British jail at that period was, but Mrs. Fry attempted it and was successful. Her dignity, and at the same time her feminine gentleness, subdued their ferocity and won their attention. She told them that vice was the cause of all their misery; that if they would return to virtuous habits they might again be happy, and she proposed rules for their observance, of which they unanimously expressed their approval. Repeating her visit after a brief interval, and finding them equally tractable and submissive, she proceeded with her contemplated measures. She appointed a teacher to those children who had been committed for petty offences, and many of whom were under seven years of age. Even their profligate mothers took an interest in this infant school. Mrs. Fry next devised some employment for the women, by teaching them to sew, and supplying them with work. For the accomplishment of this arduous undertaking she formed a ladies' committee (1817), some of whom made it a sacred duty to attend in the prison daily, so that there was not a moment when the females were not under the superintendence of some proper and efficient guide. A matron was at length appointed to live in the prison, and take the oversight of the female prisoners. But the ladies' committee still continued their attendance, one giving instruction in needlework, another in knitting, while a third read some good religious book, and spoke to them about the guilt and the wages of sin, the duty and superior happiness of a sober, chaste, and religious life. In a few weeks the most astonishing moral revolution was effected within the walls of the prison; not only the language of blasphemy, obscenity, and fiendish discord entirely disappeared, but women of the most abandoned characters were reclaimed to established habits of sobriety, industry, and piety. The public interest was most excited by the intelligence. Visitors of the highest official station and noble rank visited the schools, and the most undoubted testimonies were borne to the excellent principles and effi-

cient working of these benevolent schemes. Mrs. Fry, while she continued her inspection of the prisons, extended her benevolent regards to other classes, such as making provision for female convicts both during their voyage out and at their allotted stations. She also visited all the principal jails in Scotland and Ireland, France, Holland, Denmark, and Prussia, and her last scheme of philanthropy was begun with a view to benefit British seamen, particularly to alleviate the miserable state of the coast guard; forming libraries and adopting means for circulating books and tracts in men-of-war ships. These anxious and multifarious labors made serious inroads on the health of this excellent lady. After trying the waters of Bath in the spring of 1845, she returned home no way improved, and gradually sank till she expired at Ramsgate, October 11. Her death was lamented throughout Europe as a loss to humanity. She was, as she has often been called, 'the female Howard,' and, like her prototype, her benevolent exertions were the fruit of a lively and established faith in the Gospel of Christ."—Rich, *Cyclopaedia of Biography; Memoirs of Elizabeth Fry*, by her daughters (London, 1848, 2 vols.; New York, 1850, 2 vols. 8vo); Corder, *Life of Mrs. Fry* (London, 1853); *Methodist Quart. Review*, April, 1851, art. iii; *North Brit. Rev.* ix, 136; *Princeton Review*, xx, 31.

**Frye, JOSEPH**, a Methodist Episcopal minister of the Baltimore Conference, was born in Winchester, Frederick Co., Va., in 1786, of Lutheran parents; was converted under Methodist preaching, and began to exhort while young, and entered the itinerancy in 1809. He retired from the ministry in 1836, and died in Baltimore May, 1845. Mr. Frye had remarkable powers as a preacher. Hundreds were converted through his preaching. The Rev. Alfred Griffith relates that on one occasion General Jackson (then President of the United States) heard Mr. Frye preach. "The tears ran down the President's face like a river; and, indeed, in this respect, he only showed himself like almost everybody around him. When the service was closed, he moved up towards the altar with his usual air of dignity and earnestness, and requested an introduction to the preacher. Mr. Frye stepped down to receive the hand of the illustrious chief magistrate; but the general, instead of merely giving him his hand, threw his arms around his neck, and, in no measured terms of gratitude and admiration, thanked him for his excellent discourse" (Sprague, *Annals*, vii, 472).—*Minutes of Conferences*, iv, 8.

**Frying-pan** (פָּרִיחַ, *marché' sluth*, prop. a boiler), a pot for boiling meat, etc. (Lev. ii, 7; vi, 9). See POT. Jarchi says it was a deep vessel, so that the oil could not become ignited upon the fire. The Rabbins distinguish it from the פָּרִיחַ, *machabath'*, iron "pan," flat plate, or slice (Lev. ii, 5; Ezek. iv, 3), and say that the former was concave and deep, though both were used for the same purpose. The Bedouins, and some other Arab tribes, use a shallow earthen vessel, somewhat resembling a frying-pan, and which is employed both for frying and baking one sort of bread. See BAKE. There is also used in Western Asia some modification of this pan, resembling the Eastern oven, which Jerome describes as a round vessel of copper, blackened on the outside by the surrounding fire which heats it. This baking-pan is also common enough in England and elsewhere, where the villagers bake large loaves of bread under inverted round iron pots, with embers and slow burning fuel heaped upon them. Something like a deep concave pan may be seen in the paintings of the tombs of Egypt, in their representations of the various processes of cookery [see COOK], which no doubt bears a resemblance to the one used by the Hebrews on this occasion. See PAN.

**Fryth, JONN.** See FRIITH.

**Fuel** (פָּרִיחַ, *oklah'*, and פָּרִיחַ, *maako' leth*, both

general terms for anything *consumed*, whether by eating or combustion). From the extreme scarcity of wood in many places, the Orientals are accustomed to use almost every kind of combustible matter for fuel; even the withered stalks of herbs and flowers (Matt. vi, 28, 30), thorns (Psa. lviii, 9; Eccl. vii, 6), and animal excrements are thus used (Ezek. iv, 12-15; xv, 4, 6; xxi, 32; Isa. ix, 5, 19). Prof. Hackett speaks of seeing the inhabitants of Lebanon picking up dried *grass*, roots and all, for fuel, and says that it even becomes an article of traffic (*Illust. of Script.* p. 131). The inhabitants of Baku, a port of the Caspian, are supplied with scarcely any other fuel than that obtained from the naphtha and petroleum with which the neighboring country is highly impregnated. The Arabs in Egypt draw no inconsiderable portion of their fuel, with which they cook their victuals, from the exhaustless mummy-pits so often described by travellers. Wood or charcoal is still, as it was anciently, chiefly employed in the towns of Egypt and Syria. The roots of the *rothem*, a species of the broom-plant (called in the English Bible "juniper"), which abounds in the deserts, are regarded by the Arabs as yielding the best charcoal (Job xxx, 4; Psa. cxx, 5). Although the coal of the ancients was that obtained from charring wood (but fossil coal from Liguria and Elis was occasionally used by smiths, Theophrastus, *Frag.* ii, 61, edit. Schneider), yet the inhabitants of Palestine now to some extent use anthracite coal, which crops out in some parts of Lebanon (Kitto, *Phys. Hist.* p. 67). See COAL. Wood, however, is their chief article of fuel, especially at Jerusalem, and it is largely brought from the region of Hebron (Tobler, *Denkblätter aus Jerusalem*, p. 180). See WOOD. As chimneys are but little known in the East, apartments are warmed in cold weather by means of pans, chafing-dishes, or braziers of various kinds, and either of metal or earthen-ware, which are set in the middle of the room after the fire of wood which it contains has been allowed to burn for some time in the open air, till the flame and smoke have passed away. Charcoal is also extensively employed for the same purpose (Jer. xxxvi, 22). Grates are not known even where chimneys are found, but the fuel is burnt on the hearth, or against the back of the chimney. In cottages, a fire of wood or animal dung is frequently burnt upon the floor, either in the middle of the room or against one of the side walls, with an opening above for the escape of the smoke. It is also common to have a fire in a pit sunk in the floor, and covered with a mat or carpet, so as not to be distinguished from any other portion of the floor. In all cases where wood is scarce, animal dung is used for fuel in the East. Cow-dung is considered much preferable to any other, but all animal dung is considered valuable (Ezek. iv, 15). When collected it is made into thin cakes, which are stuck against the sunny side of the houses, giving them a curious and rather unsightly appearance. When it is quite dry and falls off, it is stored away in heaps for future use. It is much used for baking, being considered preferable to any other fuel for that purpose. See FIRE.

**Fugitive** is the rendering in the A. V. of the following Heb. terms: פָּזַז, *na* (*weaving*), a *rover* (Gen. iv, 12, 14; elsewhere "wander," etc.); פָּלִיט, *palit'* (one that has *escaped*, as often rendered), a *refugee* (Judg. xii, 4); נֹפֶלֶת, *nophel'* (*falling*), as usually rendered, i. e. away to the enemy), a *deserter* (2 Kings xxv, 11); מִבְּרַח, *mibrach'* (lit. *a breaking away*, i. e. flight), *fugitives* (only in the plur. and Ezek. xvii, 21); בֶּרֶךְ אַח, *ber'ach* (from the same root as the last, prop. a *bolt*, as often rendered, hence a *prince*; but here perhaps simply a *breaker away*), a *fugitive* (Isa. xv, 5).

**Fuh-he**, sometimes spelled *Fohh*, is not unfrequently confounded with Fo, the Chinese Buddha, from whom, however, he was separated by centuries, and with whose

religious teachings those of Fuh-he had nothing in common. Fuh-he is the reputed founder of Chinese civilization, having "established social order, instituted marriage, and taught the use of writing" among that people. He is alleged to have been born in the province of Shenzy, and to have reigned B. C. 2952. It is not probable, however, that matters of this kind concerning him can be determined with any tolerable accuracy. According to Chinese tradition, the first man who was created was Pwanko, or Animated Chaos, who was "succeeded by three sovereigns, styled Heaven Emperor, Earth Emperor, and Man Emperor, or Heaven, Earth, and Man, the three powers of nature, and the triplication of the Great Extreme, or Supreme Unit." This first creation was destroyed by a deluge. When this had subsided, the first man who reappeared was Fuh-he. He issued with his wife and six children from the "sacred circle." "Fuh-he," says the Chinese text, "is the first [who appears] at each opening and spreading out" [of the universe]. Thus Fuh-he is but the reappearing of Pwanko, and, as he escaped from the deluge, he has many of the characteristics of Noah.

*His Writings.*—The Chinese were originally worshippers of the heavenly bodies. Fuh-he reduced their religious notions to a philosophical system. He was the author of the most ancient of the Chinese canonical books, called *Yih-King*, "The Book of Changes," an "expanded form of ancient and recondite speculations on the nature of the universe in general, the harmonious action of the elements, and the periodic changes of creation." It is based on some eight peculiar diagrams called *Kwa*. In the hands of the commentators this "cosmological essay" became a "standard treatise on ethical philosophy." The following summary of the *Yih-King*, or *Y King*, is given by Faber, *Origin of Pagan Idolatry*, i, 246: "The Book of Y received its name from the mystery of which it treats, the mystery being hieroglyphically represented by a figure resembling the Greek Y or Roman Y. It teaches that the heaven and the earth had a beginning, and therefore the human race; that of the heaven and earth all material things were formed, then male and female, then husband and wife. The Great Term (as they call it) is the Great Unity and the Great Y. Y has neither body nor figure, and all that has body and figure was made by that which has neither body nor figure. The Great Term, or the Great Unity, comprehends Three, and the One is Three, and the Three One. Tao is life. The first has produced the second, and the two have produced the third, and the three have produced all things. He whom the spirit perceiveth, and whom the eye cannot see, is called Y."—Morrisson, *Chinese Disc.* vol. i, pt. i, p. 92, 93; Du Halde, *Description de l'Empire de la Chine*; *Journal of Asiatic Society* (1856), xvi, 403, 404; Faber, *Origin of Pagan Idolatry*, i, 246; Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, ii, 17, 18; Legge, *Life and Teachings of Confucius* (Philadelphia); Gützlaff, *Chinese History*, i, 119. (J. T. G.)

**Fulbert**, bishop of Chartres, one of the most eminent and learned prelates of the 11th century. The place of his birth is unknown. He was probably born about A. D. 950, in Italy, but educated in France. About A. D. 990 he commenced a school at Chartres, where he continued his instructions for some time, and with such renown that his fame for learning spread to the most distant parts of the kingdom. Many of the best scholars of those times were Fulbert's pupils, and he contributed largely to the revival of literature. Berengar of Tours was one of his pupils, and king Robert was his patron and friend. His pupils always spoke of him with affection and veneration. He was not "satisfied with imparting to his scholars all possible knowledge, but he regarded it of the greatest moment to take care for the welfare of their souls. One of Berengar's fellow-students at that time, named Adelmann, in a letter written at a later period, of which letter we shall have occasion to speak on a future page,

reminded him of those hearty conversations which they had at eventide, while walking solitarily with their preceptor in the garden, how he spoke to them of their heavenly country, and how sometimes, unmanned by his feelings, interrupting his words with tears, he adjured them by those tears to strive with all earnestness to reach that heavenly home, and for the sake of this to beware, above all things, of that which might lead them from the way of truth handed down from the fathers" (Neander, *Church Hist.*, Torrey's transl., iii, 502, where Adelmann's letter is cited). A.D. 1007 he was ordained bishop of Chartres, and died in 1029. It is said that he was the first who introduced the celebration of the festival of the Virgin's Nativity in France: it is certain that he was a zealous upholder of her honor, since he built the church of Chartres to her praise. His writings consist of 134 *Epistole*:—*Tractatus contra Judæos*:—*Sermones*:—*Carnæna*, etc. According to bishop Cosin, his doctrine on the Eucharist was altogether conformable to that of the primitive Church; but his first epistle (the fifth in Migne) to Adeodatus teaches transubstantiation. Yet his language on the Eucharist is sufficiently indefinite to have probably led his pupil Berengar (q. v.) to his more scriptural and spiritual views of that sacrament. His works were edited by Masson (Paris, 1585), by Villiers ("in bad faith," Mosheim, Par. 1608, 8vo), and in the *Bib. Mar. Patr.* xviii, 1. They are given in most complete form in Migne, *Patrol. Latina*, t. 141, where also several biographies of Fulbert are collected. See Oudin, *Script. Eccl.* ii, 519; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacrés* (Paris, 1865), xiii, 78; Dupin, *Eccl. Writers*, ix, 1 sq.; Mosheim, *Church Hist.* cent. xi, pt. ii, ch. ii, § 31, n. C5; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* iii, 470, 502; Clarke, *Succession of Sacred Literature*.

**Fulcherius, CARNOLENSIS** (*Foucher de Chartres*), a mediæval French priest and historian, was born at Chartres in 1059, and died in 1127 at Jerusalem, whither he had gone on the first Crusade (1096) as chaplain to Baldwin, whom he followed in all his expeditions. His *Histoire de Jerusalem*, continued to the year of his death, embraces the greater part of the events of the Crusade from the council at Clermont (1095), and is especially important as being a record of such facts only as himself or other eye-witnesses could verify. It was published by Bongars in *Recueil des Historiens de la Croisade*, and in a fuller and corrected form by Duchesne in *Historiens de France* (vol. iv), and in the *Historiens des Croisades* published by the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres.—Hoefcr, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xviii, 282-3; *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, t. xi. (J. W. M.)

**Fulco** (FOULQUES, FULK) OF NEULLY, one of the most popular preachers of the Middle Ages, was born in the second half of the 12th century. "He was one of the ordinary, ignorant, worldly-minded ecclesiastics, the priest and parson of a country town not far from Paris. Afterwards he experienced a change; and as he had before neglected his flock, and injured them by his bad example, so now he sought to build them up by his teaching and example." Feeling his lack of education for the ministry, "he went on week-days to Paris, and attended the lectures of Peter Cantor, a theologian distinguished for his peculiar scriptural bent and his tendency to practical reform; and of the knowledge here acquired he availed himself by elaborating it into sermons, which he preached on Sundays to his flock. These sermons were not so much distinguished for profoundness of thought as for their adaptation to the common understanding and to the occasions of practical life. At first neighboring clergymen invited him to preach before their congregations. Next he was called to Paris, and he preached not only in churches, but also in the public places. Professors, students, people of all ranks and classes, flocked to hear him. In a coarse cowl, girt about

with a thong of leather, he itinerated as a preacher of repentance through France, and fearlessly denounced the reigning vices of learned and unlearned, high and low. His words often wrought such deep compunction that people scourged themselves, threw themselves on the ground before him, confessed their sins before all, and declared themselves ready to do anything he might direct in order to reform their lives, and to redress the wrongs which they had done. Usurers restored back the interest they had taken; those who, in times of scarcity, had stored up large quantities of grain to sell again at a greatly advanced price, threw open their granaries. In such times he frequently exclaimed, 'Give food to him who is perishing with hunger, or else thou perishest thyself.' He announced to the corn-dealers that before the coming harvest they would be forced to sell cheap their stored-up grain, and cheap it soon became in consequence of his own announcement. Multitudes of abandoned women, who lived on the wages of sin, were converted by him. For some he obtained husbands; for others he founded a nunnery. He exposed the impure morals of the clergy; and the latter, seeing the finger of every man pointed against them, were obliged to separate from their concubines. A curse that fell from his lips spread alarm like a thunderbolt. People whom he so addressed were seen to fall like epileptics, foaming at the mouth and distorted with convulsions. Such appearances promoted the faith in the supernatural power of his words. Sick persons were brought to him from all quarters, who expected to be healed by his touch—by his blessing; and wonderful stories were told of the miracles thus wrought. . . . The personal influence of this man, who stood prominent neither by his talents nor his official station, gave birth to a new life of the clergy, a greater zeal in discharging the duties of the predicatorial office and of the cure of souls, both in France and in England. Young men who, in the study of dialectic theology at the University of Paris, had forgotten the obligation to care for the salvation of souls, were touched by the discourses of this unlearned itinerant, and trained by his instrumentality into zealous preachers. He formed and left behind him a peculiar school; he sent his disciples over to England, and his example had a stimulating effect even on such as had never come into personal contact with him. 'Many,' says Jacob of Vitry, 'inflamed with the fire of love, and incited by his example, began to teach and to preach, and to lead not a few to repentance, and to snatch the souls of sinners from destruction'" (Neander, *Church Hist.*, Torrey's transl., iv, 209). When Innocent III proclaimed the fourth Crusade, A.D. 1198, Fulco devoted himself wholly to preaching in its favor, and among all the "orators who blew the sacred trumpet" he was the most successful. "Richard of England was satiated with the glory and misfortunes of his first adventure, and he presumed to deride the exhortations of Fulco, who was not abashed in the presence of kings. 'You advise me,' said Plantagenet, 'to dismiss my three daughters, pride, avarice, and incontinence. I bequeath them to the most deserving: my pride to the Knights Templars, my avarice to the monks of Cîteaux, and my incontinence to the prelates.'" But the preacher was heard and obeyed by the great vassals" (Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, Harper's edition, vi, 60). Fulco did not live to see the results of the Crusade; he died at Neully A.D. 1201.—Villehardouin, *Hist. de la Conquête de Constantinople* (transl. by T. Smith, London, 1829, 8vo); Hoefcr, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xviii, 308; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, bk. ix, ch. vii; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.*, per. iii, § 80; Huter, *Geschichte Pabst Innocent's III* (Hamburg, 1834), vol. i; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xix, 516.

**Fulda**, MONASTERY of, a celebrated convent, established in 744 by Boniface, and one of his pupils named Sturm. The latter, a young man of good fam-



ily, having decided on becoming a hermit, was sent by Boniface to search out a spot in the forest of Buchonia, secure from the inroads of the Saxons. Sturm set out with two companions, and finally selected a plot of land on the banks of the Fulda, which was given them by duke Karlmann. In January, 744, Sturm and seven companions took possession, and immediately commenced improving and building. The convent was organized on the plan of Monte Cassino, after the rule of St. Benedict, and Sturm became its first abbot. In Nov. 4, 751, pope Zachariah exempted it from episcopal jurisdiction. The convent prospered rapidly, its inmates numbering 400 before Sturm's death in 779. Its prosperity still increased under Sturm's successor, Bangulf. Both Pepin the Short and Charlemagne were very liberal towards this convent, which in its turn did great good in disseminating the knowledge of agriculture as well as literature throughout the surrounding country. Its celebrated theological school was particularly prosperous under Rabanus Maurus, who afterwards became abbot of Fulda. There were twelve seniors or sub-instructors, and the scholars were instructed in grammar, rhetoric, dialectics, theology, and the German language. Nor were either fine or mechanical arts overlooked, for the convent produced both clever artists and talented artisans. Under the abbot Werner (968 to 982), Fulda became the first among the abbeys of Germany and France. Otto I named its abbots arch-chancellors of the empire. In 1331 the duke John of Ziegenhein led the citizens of Fulda to assault the convent, but the assailants were overpowered and their leaders put to death. The Reformation at first made an impression in the convent, but abbot Balthasar succeeded in 1573 in checking the progress of evangelical doctrines within its walls. In 1631 Fulda was subjected to Sweden, and an attempt was made to introduce Protestantism into the district, but, after the defeat of Nördlingen, the Roman Catholic abbots resumed their sway. In 1809, Fulda, which six years before had become a principality of the prince of Orange, was by Napoleon I annexed to the grand-duchy of Frankfurt, but Prussia finally joined it in 1815 to the electorate of Hesse-Cassel, of which it remained a part until the incorporation of that country, in 1866, with Prussia. See Brower, *Antiq. Full.* lib. iv (Antwerp, 16); Dronke, *Traditiones et Antiquitates Fuldenses* (Fulda, 1844); Niedner, *Zeitschrift f. hist. Theol.* (1846); Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 624; McLearn, *Christian Missions in the Middle Ages*, p. 214.

**Fulda Manuscript** (*Codex Fuldensis*), one of the best copies of the early Latin version, containing the whole N. T., written by order of Victor, bishop of Capua, A.D. 546, and now in the Abbey of Fulda, in Hesse-Cassel. The Gospels are arranged in a kind of harmony. It was described by Schaunat (*Vindemiæ Literariæ Collectio*, 1723, p. 218), collated by Lachmann and Buttmann in 1839 for the Latin portion of the N. T., and has been edited by Ern. Ranke (Marb. 1867, 8vo)—Scrivener, *Introd.* p. 264; Tregelles, in *Horne's Introd.* iv, 254. See LATIN VERSIONS.

**Fulfil** (usually  $\text{N}\tilde{\text{Z}}\tilde{\text{Z}}$ , *mille*,  $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\omega$ , to fill up), generally used with reference to the accomplishment of prophecy. It is used in the O. T. with respect to various kinds of prophecies, such as are imminent (e. g. the death of Jeroboam's child, 1 Kings xiv, 17), or distant (e. g. that referring to the rebuilding of Jericho, 1 Kings xvi, 34); those that are accomplished in a near as well as in a remote event [see DOUBLE SENSE], those that relate to some similar typical occurrence, class, or character [see TYPE], proverbial expressions [see PROVERB], and especially predictions relating to the Messiah. Several distinguished scholars consider that some texts in the N. T. containing references to the O. T., and introduced by the formulas, "All this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of

the Lord by the prophet (Matt. i, 22; ii, 15); "For thus it is written by the prophet" (Matt. ii, 5); "Then was fulfilled that which was spoken" (Matt. ii, 17), may be mere allegations, without its being intended to declare that the literal fulfilment took place on the occasion described. Even if those passages could not be applied to certain events, otherwise than by accommodation or illustration, the phrases which introduce them will easily bend to that explanation; for it may be shown, by examples from the Rabbins and from the earliest Syriac writers, that in the East similar modes of speech have always been in use. See ACCOMMODATION. It is to be observed, however, concerning the formulas "that it might be fulfilled," "then was fulfilled," etc., when used with reference to the fulfilment of prophecy in the New Testament, the events are not to be understood as happening merely for the purpose of making good the predictions, but rather that in or by this event was fulfilled the prophecy. The ambiguity in the understanding of the first of these formulas arises from what are technically called the *telic* and the *ebatic* uses of the Greek particle *iva*. It is also to be noted that the individuals or nations actually engaged in fulfilling prophecy often had no such intention, or even any knowledge that they were doing so. See Stuart, in *Biblical Repos.* 1835, p. 86; Woods, *Lectures on Inspiration*, p. 26; Pye Smith, *Principles of Prophetic Interpretation*, p. 51, and others. Some, however (e. g. Davidson, *Sacred Hermeneutics*, p. 471 sq.), contend that the phrase *iva*  $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\sigma\tilde{\text{Z}}$ , "that it might be fulfilled," and similar expressions in both the Heb. and Gr. Scriptures, always designate an intentional and definite fulfilment of an express prediction (*Meth. Quar. Rev.* April, 1867, p. 194). See PROPHECY.

**Fulgentius, St., Fabius Claudius Gordianus**, bishop of Ruspe, called "the Augustine of the 6th century," was born at Telepta (Leptis), in the province of Byzacena, North Africa, A.D. 468. His father dying in his childhood, the care of his education fell on his mother, who had him carefully instructed in the Greek language. It is said that when a boy he could repeat the whole of Homer. In early manhood he was made procurator of his native place, but, disgusted with the world, he threw up his office and devoted himself to the monastic life, against his mother's will. He first entered a monastery at Byzacena, but in the disorder of the times he was compelled to abandon it, and retired to Sicca, where he was severely treated by the Arians. Afterwards he resolved to go into Egypt, but was dissuaded by Eulalius, bishop of Syracuse, because the monks of the East had separated from the Catholic Church. He went from Sicily to Rome about A.D. 500, and then returned to Africa and founded a new monastery. The see of Ruspe becoming vacant, he was ordained bishop, much against his will, in the year 504. "Though become a bishop, he did not change either his habit or manner of living, but used the same austerities and abstinence as before. He defended his faith at once boldly and respectfully against his Arian sovereign. He speaks thus to the king in an apologetic treatise which the monarch himself had called for (*Lib. iii ad Trasimundum*): 'If I freely defend my faith, as far as God enables me, no reproach of obstinacy should be made against me, since I am neither forgetful of my own insignificance nor of the king's dignity; and I know well that I am to fear God and honor the king, according to Rom. xiii, 7; 1 Pet. ii, 17. He certainly pays you true honor who answers your questions as the true faith requires.' After praising the king in that he, the monarch of a yet uncivilized people, showed so much zeal for the knowledge of scriptural truth, he says: 'You know well that he who seeks to know the truth strives for far higher good than he who seeks to extend the limits of a temporal kingdom.' He was banished twice to Sardinia. 'There he was the spiritual guide of many other exiles, who united themselves to

him. From hence he imparted counsel, comfort, and confirmation in the faith to his forsaken Christian friends in Africa, and to those from other countries who sought his advice in spiritual things and in perplexities of the heart" (Neander, *Light in Dark Places*, N. Y. 1853, 31 sq.). After the death of Thrasimund, he and all the other expelled bishops were recalled by Hilderic, son of Thrasimund (A. D. 523). Fulgentius thenceforward enjoyed the quiet possession of his see till A. D. 533, when he died, "full of honor, and renowned for piety, learning, and every Christian virtue." He is commemorated in the Church of Rome as a saint on the 1st of January. His writings are mostly controversial, against Arianism and Pelagianism. The most important are, against Arianism: *Libri vii ad Thrasimundum*;—*De Trinitate Liber*;—*Contra Sermonem Fasiidiosi Ariani*; against Pelagianism: *Libri Tres ad Monemum*;—*De Veritate Predestinationis et gratia Dei*;—*Liber de Predestinatione et Gratia*. Fulgentius was led to write against Pelagianism by the writings of Faustus of Rhegium (q. v.), which were laid before him for his judgment. He explained "the system of Augustine with logical consistency, but in doing this he carefully avoided the harsh points of the Predestination view of the matter. He severely censured those who talked of a predestination to sin. He spoke, indeed, of a two-fold predestination (predestination duplex), but by this he understood either the election to eternal happiness of those who were good by the grace of God, or the predestination of those who were sinners by their own choice to deserved punishment" (Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 650. See also Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, § 114). Editions of his writings: Basel, 1556, 1566, 1587; Antwerp, 1574; Cologne, 1618; Lyons, 1633, 1652, 1671; best, that of Paris, 1684, 4to; reprinted at Venice, 1742, fol., and in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, t. lxxv. See Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 627; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iv, 249; Coellier, *Auteurs Sacrés* (Paris, 1682), xi, 1 sq.; Dupin, *Eccles. Writers*, v, 13 sq.; Fleury, *Hist. Eccles.* v. b. xxx, xxxi.


**Fulgentius, Ferrandus**, a friend and pupil of Fulgentius of Ruspe, who with him partook of exile in Sardinia. On his return to Carthage he became a deacon, A. D. 523. He died A. D. 551. He was one of the first to declare against the condemnation of the Three Chapters. He also took part in the controversy at that time agitating the Church whether it was orthodox to say, "One person of the Trinity has suffered." Fulgentius defended this expression, but recommended to add "in the flesh which he assumed." Of his writings, we have a *Breviatio Canonum* (An Abridgement of the Ecclesiastical Canons), containing 232 canons of the councils of Ancyra, Laodicea, Nice, Antioch, Gangra, and Sardica, the canons of which last council, it is most probable, he took from Dionysius Exiguus. It was published by the Jesuit Chifflet at Dijon (1649, 4to). He left also a number of *Epistles*, which, with the *Canons*, may be found in *Bib. Max. Patr.* ix, 475, and in Migne, *Patrol. Latina*, vols. lxxv, lxxvii, lxxviii. A work against the Arians and other heretics was first published by A. Mai (*Coll. novæ*, t. iii).—Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 626; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iv, 250; Cave, *Hist. Liter.*; Clarke, *Succession of Sac. Lit.*

**Fulke, WILLIAM, D. D.**, a famous Puritan divine, was born in London, and went in 1555 to St. John's College, Cambridge, of which he became fellow in 1564. He spent six years at Clifford's Inn, studying law, but preferred letters, and especially theology. "He took orders, but, being suspected of Puritanism, as he was the intimate friend of Cartwright, then professor of divinity, he was expelled from college. The earl of Leicester presented him in 1571 to the living of Warley, in Essex, and two years after to Kedington, in Suffolk. He afterwards took his degree of D. D. at Cambridge, and, as chaplain, accompanied the earl of Lincoln when he went as ambassador to France,

and on his return he was made master of Pembroke Hall, and Margaret professor. He died in 1589. "In force of argument and criticism he was one of the ablest divines of his time, and one of the principal opponents of the Roman Church" (Darling). His writings, which were very numerous, both in Latin and English, were directed chiefly against Popery. The most important of them are the *Ichemes Translation of the New Testament, and the authorized English Version, with the Arguments of Books, Chapters, and Annotations of the Rhemists, and Dr. Fu'ke's Confutation of all such Arguments, Glosses, and Annotations* (first edition, 1580; often reprinted; last. ed. by Hartshorne, Cambridge, 1843, 8vo; New York, 1834, 8vo);—*Defence of the sincere and true Translation of the Scriptures, against Gregory Martin* (new edit. by Parker Society, Camb. 1843, 8vo);—*Answers to Stapleton, Martiell, and Sanders* (on the controversy with Rome, reprinted by the Parker Society, Cambridge, 1848, 8vo).

**Fullenius, BERNARDUS**, was born in 1602. He pursued his collegiate course at the University of Franeker. He devoted himself specially to the study of the Hebrew and mathematics. His proficiency in both studies was great. When only twenty-seven he was appointed to fill the chair made vacant by the death of the distinguished Orientalist, Sixtinus Amama. He accepted the appointment, and in 1630 he entered upon the discharge of its duties. For seven years he filled the office with fidelity and acceptance. The professorship of mathematics was then tendered to him, and the celebrated Coceus appointed him his successor in the department of Oriental literature. He was one of the committee appointed by the Synod of Dort to revise the new translation of the New Testament. An edition of *J. Drusii Commentaria ad librum Coseleth Salomonis et Jobi* was brought out under his editorial supervision, and with prefaces prepared by him. See Glasius, *Godgeleerd Nederland*, i Deel, blz. 479; G. Brandt, *Histoire der Reformatie*, etc., iii Deel, blz. 53 (Rotterdam, 1704). (J. P. W.)

**Fuller** (פולר, *kobes'*, from פולר, to tread [comp. Gesenius, *Monum. Phœn.* p. 181]; γράσις). The art of the fuller is beyond doubt of great antiquity, and seems to have reached at an early period a comparative degree of perfection. Very scanty materials, however, exist for tracing its progress, or for ascertaining exactly, in any particular age or country (see Pliny, vii, 57), what substances were employed in the art, and what methods were resorted to for the purpose of making them effectual. At the transfiguration our Saviour's robes are said to have been white, "so as no fuller on earth could whiten them" (Mark ix, 3). Elsewhere we read of "fullers' soap" (Mal. iii, 2), and of "the fullers' field" (2 Kings xviii, 17). Of the processes followed in the art of cleaning cloth and the various kinds of stuff among the Jews we have no direct knowledge. In an early part of the operation they seem to have trod the cloths with their feet (Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 1261), as the Hebrew *Ain-Rogel*, or En-rogel, literally Foot-fountain, has been rendered, on Rabbinical authority, "Fullers' fountain," on the ground that the fullers trod the cloths there with their feet (comp. Höst, *Marokko*, p. 116). They were also rubbed with the knuckles, as in modern washing (Synes. *Ep.* 44; compare Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* ii, 1, 2). A subsequent operation was probably that of rubbing the cloth on an inclined plane, in a mode which is figured in the Egyptian paintings (Wilkinson, ii, 106, abridgm.), and still preserved in the East. It seems from the above notices that the trade of the fullers, as causing offensive smells, and also as requiring space for drying clothes, was carried on at Jerusalem outside the city (comp. Martial, vi, 93; Plaut. *Asin.* v, 2, 57). A fullers' town (officina fullonis) is mentioned in the Talmudical writers (Midrash, *Kohel*, xci, 2) by the name of פולרית, "house of maceration." So far as it is



Ancient Egyptian Fullers, 1, 2: *a, b*, Inclined tables; *c, d*, The water running off into the trough below; *d*, A stone used for rubbing the cloth; *f*, Jars of soap.

mentioned in Scripture, fulling appears to have consisted chiefly in cleansing garments and whitening them (compare Ælian, *Var. Hist.* v, 5). The use of white garments, and also the feeling respecting their use for festal and religious purposes, may be gathered from various passages: Eccl. ix, 8; Dan. vii, 9; Isa. lxiv, 6; Zech. iii, 3, 5; 2 Sam. vi, 14; 1 Chron. xv, 27; Mark ix, 3; Rev. iv, 4; vi, 11; vii, 9; compare Mishna, *Taanith*, iv, 8; see also Statius, *Silv.* i, 2, 237; Ovid, *Fast.* i, 79; Claudian, *De Laud. Stil.* iii, 289. This branch of the trade was perhaps exercised by other persons than those who carded the wool and smoothed the cloth when woven (Mishna, *Baba Kama*, i, x, 10). In applying the marks used to distinguish cloths sent to be cleansed, fullers were desired to be careful to avoid the mixtures forbidden by the law (Lev. xix, 19; Deut. xxii, 11; Mishna, *Massek. Kilaim*, ix, 10). Colored cloth was likewise fulled (Mishna, *Shabb.* xix, 1). See Schöttgen, *Triauna et fullonia antiquitates* (2d ed. Lips. 1763).—Smith, s. v.; Kitto, s. v. See HANDICRAFT.

FULLER'S SOAP (בְּרִיתֵי מִקְבָּשִׁים, *borith' mekabbe-shim'*, *alkali's* of those treading cloth, i. e. *washers' pot-ash*; Sept. *ποια πλυνόντων*), some alkaline or saponaceous substance mixed with the water in the tubs used for stamping or beating cloth. Two substances of the nature are mentioned in Scripture: נִיָּהַר, *ne'-ther*, nitre (γίτρων, *nitrum*, Prov. xxv, 20; Jer. ii, 22), and בְּרִיתֵי, *borith'*, soap (*ποια, herba fullonia, herba borith*, Mal. iii, 2). Nitre is found in Egypt and in Syria, and vegetable alkali was also obtained from the ashes of certain plants, probably *Salsola kali* (Gesenius, *Thesaur. Heb.* p. 246; Pliny, xxxi, 10, 46; Hasselquist, p. 275; Burekhardt, *Syria*, p. 214). The juice also of some saponaceous plant, perhaps *Gypsophila struthium*, or *Saponaria officinalis*, was sometimes mixed with the water for the like purpose, and may thus be regarded as representing the soap of Scripture. Other substances also are mentioned as being employed in cleansing, which, together with alkali, seem to identify the Jewish with the Roman process (Pliny, xxxv, 57), as urine and chalk (*creta cimolia*), and bean-water, i. e. bean-meal mixed with water (Mishna, *Shabb.* ix, 5; *Niddah*, ix, 6). Urine, both of men and of animals, was regularly collected at Rome for cleansing cloths (Plin. xxxviii, 26, 48; Athen. xi, p. 484; Mart. ix, 93; Plautus, *Asin.* v, 2, 57); and it seems not improbable that its use in the fullers' trade at Jerusalem may have suggested the coarse taunt of Rabshakeh during his interview with the deputies of Hezekiah in the highway of the fullers' field (2 Kings xviii, 27); but Schöttgen thinks it doubtful whether the Jews made use of it in fulling (*Antiq. full.* § 9). The process of whitening garments was performed by rubbing into them chalk or earth of some kind (אֶשְׁמֵלֶת). *Creta cimolia* (cimolite) was probably the earth most frequently used ("cretae fulloniae," Pliny, xvii, 4; compare Theophr. *Charact.* 11). The whitest sort of earth for this purpose is a white pot-

ters' clay or marl (Hoffmann, *Hanab. d. Minerae*, II, ii, 230 sq.), with which the poor at Rome rubbed their clothes on festival days to make them appear brighter (Pliny, xxxi, 10, § 118; xxxv, 17). Sulphur, which was used at Rome for discharging positive color (Plin. xxxv, 57), was abundant in some parts of Palestine, but there is no evidence to show that it was used in the fullers' trade. The powerful cleansing properties of *borith* or soap are employed by the prophet Malachi as a figure under which to represent the prospective results of Messiah's appearance (Mal. iii, 2). See Beckmann, *Hist. of Inv.* ii, 92, 106, edit. Bohn; Saalschütz, i, 3, 14, 32; ii, 14, 6; Smith, *Dict. of Classical Antiq.* s. v. Fullo.—Smith, s. v. See SOAP.

FULLER'S FIELD (שְׂדֵה קוֹבֵס, *sedeh' kobes'*; Sept. ἀγρός τοῦ γυαθῆως, or κναθῆως; Vulg. *ager fullonis*), a spot near Jerusalem (2 Kings xviii, 17; Isa. xxxvi, 2; vii, 3) so close to the walls that a person speaking from there could be heard on them (2 Kings xviii, 17, 26). It is only incidentally mentioned in these passages, as giving its name to a "highway" (הַרְחֵק = an embanked road, Gesen. *Thes.* p. 957 b), "in" (אֵין) or "on" (עַל, A. V. "in") which highway was the "conduit of the upper pool." The "end" (קֵצֵה) of the conduit, whatever that was, appears to have been close to the road (Isa. vii, 3). In considering the nature of this spot, it should be borne in mind that *sedeh*, "field," is a term almost invariably confined to cultivated arable land, as opposed to unreclaimed ground. See TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS. One resort of the fullers of Jerusalem would seem to have been below the city on the south-east side. See EX-ROGEL. But Rabshakeh and his "great host" can hardly have approached in that direction. They must have come from the north—the only accessible side for any body of people—as is certainly indicated by the route traced in Isa. x, 28-32 (see GIBBEAN); and the fuller's field, from this circumstance, has been located by some (Hitzig, *zu Jesa.* vii, 3; Williams, *Holy City*, ii, 472) on the table-land on the northern side of the city, near the Damascus gate. See FULLER'S MONUMENT (below). The "pool" and the "conduit" would be sufficient reasons for the presence of the fullers, and their location would therefore determine that of the "field" in question. See CONDUIT. On the other hand, Rabshakeh and his companions may have left the army and advanced along the east side of Mount Moriah to En-rogel, to a convenient place under the temple walls for speaking. There can be little doubt, however, that the "upper pool" is the cistern now called Birket el-Mamilla, at the head of the Valley of Hinnom, a short distance west of the Yafa gate (Porter, *Handbook for S. and P.* p. 99, 136). Hezekiah conveyed the waters from it by a subterranean aqueduct to the west side of the city of David (2 Chron. xxxii, 30). The natural course of this aqueduct was along the ancient road to the western gate beside the castle, and this was the road by which the Assyrian ambassadors would doubtless approach the city, coming as they did from Lachish. The position of the fuller's field is thus indicated. It lay on the side of the highway west of the city. See FULLER'S GATE (below). The fullers' occupation required an abundant supply of water, and an open space for drying the clothes. We may therefore conclude that their "field" was beside, or at least not far distant from, the upper pool.—Smith, s. v.; Kitto, s. v. See GIION.

FULLER'S GATE (*porta fullonis*), one of the mediæval gates on the western side of Jerusalem (Adamnanus, i, 1), thought by Dr. Robinson (*Researches*, i, 475) to be the *Porta Judicaria* of Brocardus (ch. viii, fin.), in the wall of those days, somewhere over against

the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, leading to Sillo (Neby Samwil) and Gibeon, and also the *Serb* of Arabian writers (Edrisi, about A.D. 1150, ed Jaubert, i, 314; "History of Jerus." in the *Fundgr. des Orients*, ii, 129). It seems to have derived its name from leading to the FULLER'S FIELD (Isa. vii, 3).

**FULLER'S MONUMENT** (*μνημα τοῦ γραφέως*), a conspicuous object mentioned by Josephus in his account of the course of the third or outer wall of Jerusalem (*War*, v, 4, 2), as situated near "the tower of the corner," where the wall bent, after passing the sepulchres of the kings, to the valley of the Kidron; evidently, therefore, at the north-east angle of the ancient city (Strong's *Harm. and Expos. of the Gospel*, Append. p. 23). It does not follow, as Dr. Barclay supposes (*City of the Great King*, p. 25), that the monument in question was situated in the FULLER'S FIELD. See JERUSALEM.

**Fuller, Andrew**, perhaps the most eminent and influential of Baptist theologians, was born in 1754, at Wicken, Cambridgeshire, England. His opportunities for education were scanty, and his subsequent attainments as a theologian resulted from the activity of a mind naturally vigorous working earnestly on no very ample materials. He was baptized in 1770, began preaching in 1774, and in 1775 became pastor of a church in Soham. His doctrinal system at this time was unsettled. The prevailing type of opinion then prevalent among the Baptists was an exorbitant Calvinism, verging to an Antinomian and fatalistic extreme. It was deemed necessary to a consistent orthodoxy for a preacher to avoid offering freely to all men the invitation of the Gospel. Dr. Gill (q. v.) was the standard of doctrinal soundness. Fuller states that Gill and Bunyan were authors to whom he was much indebted. He gradually found that they did not agree, and still more was he impressed with the practical difference between the accepted teaching and the New Testament. In 1776 he became acquainted with Messrs. Ryland and Sutcliffe, names to be afterwards honorably associated with his in the foreign missionary work. The works of the New England theologians, particularly Edwards and Bellamy, confirmed him in the views to which his mind had been tending. The change in the spirit of his preaching awakened violent opposition. His congregation, however, increased, and the effects of his doctrine confirmed his faith in it. In 1782 he removed to Kettering, which was the scene of his labors to the close of life. Here, in 1784, he gave deliberate expression to his views in the treatise, *The Gospel worthy of all Acceptation*. In the same year he concerted with his friend Sutcliffe a meeting for united prayer for the revival of religion and the conversion of the world—the origin of the "Monthly Concert." Out of these counsels grew the missionary movement under the leadership of Carey (q. v.), in which, as secretary of the Baptist Missionary Society, Mr. Fuller bore a laborious and responsible part. In 1793 appeared his celebrated treatise, *The Calvinistic and Socinian Systems compared*. Princeton College in 1795, and Yale in 1805, conferred upon him the degree of D.D., which he modestly declined. He died in 1815. His other works are, 3. *The Gospel its own Witness* (1800);—4. *Dialogues, Essays, and Letters*;—5. *Exposition of Genesis*;—6. *The Great Question answered* (1806);—7. *Strictures on Sandemanianism* (1809);—8. *Sermons on various Subjects*;—9. *Exposition of the Revelation*;—10. *Letters on Communion* (1815). His writings are marked by solid force of reasoning, plainness and simplicity of statement, and an ingenuous candor. In reference to his unaffected style, he has been called "the Franklin of theology." Without the opportunity to become a critical student of the Scriptures, he is a better Biblical theologian than many whose scholarship he could not aspire to. For his theological position, see the article CALVINISM.—*Works*,

with Life prefixed, 5 vols. London, 1831; also 1853, imp. 8vo; more complete edition, edited by Belcher, 3 vols. Philadel. (L. E. S.)

**Fuller, Thomas**, divine, historian, genius, and wit, was a son of the Rev. T. Fuller, minister of Aldwinkle, in Northamptonshire, at which place he was born in June, 1608. He was educated at Queen's College, Cambridge, and removed to Sidney College, of which he became fellow in 1631. In 1632 he was appointed minister of St. Bennet's parish, Cambridge, and acquired great popularity as a pulpit orator. He obtained, in the same year, the prebend of Salisbury, and afterwards the rectory of Broad Windsor, of both of which he was deprived during the Civil War, in consequence of his activity on the side of the monarch. Between 1640 and 1656 he published nearly the whole of his works. In 1648 he obtained the living of Waltham, in Essex, which in 1658 he quitted for that of Cranford, in Middlesex. At the Restoration he recovered the prebend of Salisbury, was made D.D. and king's chaplain, and was looking forward to a mitre, when his prospects were closed by death, August 15, 1661. Fuller possessed a remarkably tenacious memory. He had also a large share of wit and quaint humor, which he sometimes allowed to run riot in his writings. Among his chief works are, *A History of the Holy War* (Camb. 1640, 2d edit. fol.);—*The Church History of Britain* (new edit. edited by Nichols, Lond. 1837, 3 vols. 8vo);—*The History of the University of Cambridge* (new edit. Lond. 1840, 8vo);—*The History of the Worthies of England* (new ed. by Nuttall, Lond. 1840, 3 vols. 8vo);—*Pisgah Sight of Palestine, a History of the Old and New Test.* (Lond. 1662, fol.). Cole ridge says that "Fuller was incomparably the most sensible, the least prejudiced great man of an age that boasted a galaxy of great men. He is a very voluminous writer, and yet, in all his numerous volumes on so many different subjects, it is scarcely too much to say that you will hardly find a page in which some one sentence out of every three does not deserve to be quoted for itself as a motto or as a maxim." See Russell, *Memorials of the Life and Works of Fuller* (Lond. 1844, sm. 8vo); Rogers, *Fuller's Life and Writings* (Edinb. Rev. LXXIV, 328).

**Fullerton, HUGH STEWART**, a Presbyterian minister, was born near Greencastle, Penn., Feb. 6, 1805. Not long after, his parents removed to Orange Co., N. Y., and in 1815 to Fayette Co., Ohio. He studied one year at the Ohio University, and was licensed to preach in 1830. In 1832 he accepted a call to the church at Chillicothe, where he labored four years, and then resigned from ill health. In 1837 he removed to Salem, Ohio, where he remained until his death, Aug. 15, 1862.—Wilson, *Presbyterian Hist. Almanac*, 1864.

**Fulness**, a term variously used in Scripture. (1.) "The fulness of time" is the time when the Messiah appeared, which was appointed by God, promised to the fathers, foretold by the prophets, expected by the Jews themselves, and earnestly longed for by all the faithful: "When the fulness of the time was come, God sent his Son," Gal. iv, 4. (2.) The fulness of Christ is the superabundance of grace with which he was filled: "Of his fulness have all we received," John i, 16. And whereas men are said to be filled with the Holy Ghost, as John the Baptist, Luke i, 15; and Stephen, Acts vi, 5; this differs from the fulness of Christ in these three respects: (a.) Grace in others is by participation, as the moon bath her light from the sun, rivers their waters from the fountain; but in Christ all that perfection and influence which we include in that term is originally, naturally, and of himself. (b.) The Spirit is in Christ infinitely and above measure, John iii, 34; but in the saints by measure according to the gift of God, Eph. iv, 16. (c.) The saints cannot communicate their graces to others, whereas the gifts of the Spirit are in Christ as a head

and fountain, to impart them to his members. "We have received of his fulness," John i, 16. (3.) It is said that "the fulness of the Godhead dwells in Christ bodily," Col. ii, 9; that is, the whole nature and attributes of God are in Christ, and that really, essentially, or substantially; and also personally, by nearest union; as the soul dwells in the body, so that the same person who is man is God also. (4.) The Church is called the fulness of Christ, Eph. i, 23. It is the Church which makes him a complete and perfect head; for, though he has a natural and personal fulness as God, yet as Mediator he is not full and complete without his mystical body (as a king is not complete without his subjects), but receives an outward, relative, and mystical fulness from his members (Watson, *Dictionary*, s. v.). (5.) It is probable that the expression *fulness of the Godhead*, as applied to Christ (Col. i, 19; ii, 9), contains an allusion to the theories of some speculators, who taught that there were "certain distinct beings" (æons as they called them), "who were successive emanations from the Supreme Being himself," to whom they gave the title of "the Fulness." They pretended that one of these had assumed human nature in Jesus Christ. It was probably in designed contradiction to this that the apostle asserts the indwelling in Jesus "of all the fulness of the Godhead" (Eden).

**Fulvia** (the name of a noble Roman family, Græcized *Φουλβία*), a lady of Rome who had embraced Judaism, but having been defrauded of a sum of money by a Jewish impostor, complained through her husband Saturninus to the emperor Tiberius, who thereupon proscribed the Jews from the city (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 3, 5). No contemporary historian notices this expulsion, and it seems to have been but of temporary and partial force, different from the later and more formal edict of Acts xviii, 2. See CLAUDIUS.

**Functus** (*Funeccius*), JOHANN, a celebrated Lutheran divine, was born at Werden, near Nuremberg, Feb. 1, 1518, and was beheaded at Königsberg, Oct. 28, 1566. He married the daughter of Osiander (q. v.), and adopted the opinions of his father-in-law on justification (q. v.), and, after the death of Osiander, 1552, he came to be the leader of the mediation party, but in 1556 he assented to the Augsburg Confession and to Melancthon's *Loci Communes*. He was declared to be orthodox in 1561 by the divines of Leipsic and Wittenberg. He was made chaplain to Albert, duke of Prussia, but, having given him advice deemed disadvantageous to Poland, was, with his friends Snellius and Horstius, condemned and executed in 1566. He wrote a *Chronology* from Adam to A. D. 1560 (continued by an anonymous hand to 1578) in folio; Latin biographies of Vert Dietrich, and Andrew Osiander, his father-in-law; and Commentaries in German on Daniel and the Revelations, published by Sachsen (Frankfort, 1596, 4to), with wood-engravings by Spies.—Hofer, *Nouv. Biogr. Génér.* xix, 58; Gieseler, *Ch. History*, per. 4, § 39. (J. W. M.)

**Functionaries**, "persons who are appointed to discharge any office. Thus the clergy are 'functionaries' of the particular church of which they are members, to fulfil an 'office and administration in the same,' in that capacity deriving their station and power from Christ, by virtue of the sanction given by him to Christian communities. Thus the authority of those officers comes direct from the society so constituted, in whose name and behalf they act as its representatives, just to that extent to which it has empowered and directed them to act. In conformity with these views, each person about to be ordained as priest in the Church of England is asked whether he thinks he is 'truly called,' both 'according to the will of Christ and the order of this Church of England.'"—Eden, *Churchman's Dict.* s. v.

**Fundamentals**. A distinction has been drawn, both in the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches,

between *fundamental* and *non-fundamental* articles of faith.

1. Roman theologians understand by *articuli fundamentales* those doctrines which every Christian is obliged to know, to believe, and to profess, on pain of damnation; and by *articuli non-fundamentales* such doctrines as a man may be involuntarily ignorant of, without losing the name of Christian and the hope of salvation, it being taken for granted that he would believe them if made known to him by the Church. Substantially the Roman doctrine is that whatever the Church teaches is *fundamental*.

II. In the Lutheran Church the distinction between *fundamental* and *non-fundamental* doctrines was introduced by Hunnius, and after him was further developed by Quenstedt. See Hunnius, *De fundamentalibus dissensu doctrinæ Lutherianæ et Calvinianæ* (1626). According to this distinction, fundamental doctrines are those which are essential to the faith unto salvation, viz. the doctrine of Christ the Mediator, of the Word of God as the seed of truth, etc. The later theology has abandoned this distinction, so far as its scientific use is concerned. Practically, however, all Christians agree in considering certain doctrines as essential to the Christian system, and others as comparatively non-essential. See Bergier, *Dict. de Théologie*, s. v. *Fundamentaux*; Pelt, *Theolog. Encyclop.* art. 66; Dodd, *On Parables*, i, 14; Chillingworth, *Religion of Protestants*, pt. i, ch. iii; Hammond, *Works*, vol. i; Stillington, *Works*, iv, 56 sq.; Turretin, *De Articulis Fundamentalibus*, 1719. Waterland treats the subject largely in his *Discourse on Fundamentals* (*Works*, Oxf. 1853, 6 vols., vol. v, p. 73 sq.). He remarks that when we apply "the epithet *fundamental* either to religion in general or to Christianity in particular, we are supposed to mean something essential to religion or Christianity, so necessary to its being, or, at least, to its well-being, that it could not subsist, or maintain itself, without it." He holds that Scripture indicates this distinction of things more or less weighty: e. g. Paul, with regard to certain Judaizers, exhorted his converts to bear with them (1 Cor. ix, 19–23), while to others he would not give place by subjection, no, not for an hour (Gal. ii, 5, 21). That the primitive Church recognised the distinction he thinks has been fully shown by Spanheim, iii, 1059; Hoornbeck, *Socin. Confut.* i, 9, 210, etc. Bingham remarks that as to fundamental articles of faith, the Church had them always collected or summed up out of Scripture in her creeds, the profession of which was ever esteemed both necessary on the one hand, and sufficient on the other, in order to the admission of members into the Church by baptism; and, consequently, both necessary and sufficient to keep men in the unity of the Church, so far as concerns the unity of faith generally required of all Christians, to make them one body and one Church of believers (*Orig. Eccles.* bk. xvi, ch. i). The difficulty of the subject, according to Waterland, lies not so much in deciding what is fundamental to the *Christian system* as such, as in deciding whether these things are to be held essential in the belief of *particular persons* in order to their salvation. The former are as fixed as Christianity itself; the latter will always vary with the capacities and opportunities of the persons themselves. So the terms of communion may be one thing, the terms of salvation another. Herein Roman Catholic theology differs from Protestant, as it makes the terms of communion identical with the terms of salvation. Jonathan Edwards cites Stapfer to the same purport: "On account of the various degrees of men's capacities, and the various circumstances of the times in which they lived, one man may know truths which another cannot know. Whence it follows that the very same articles are not fundamental to all men; but, accordingly as revelation hath been more or less complete, according to the several dispensations under which men have lived, their various natural abilities, and their various

modes of circumstances of living, different articles are, and have been, fundamental to different men. This is very plain from the different degrees of knowledge before and since the coming of Christ, for before his coming many truths were hid which are now set in the most clear light; and the instance of the apostles abundantly shows the truth of what I have now advanced, who, although they were already in a state of grace, and their salvation was secured, yet for some time were ignorant of the necessity of the suffering and death of Christ, and of the true nature of his kingdom; whereas he who now does not acknowledge, or perhaps denies, the necessity of Christ's death, is by all means to be considered as in a fundamental error. Therefore, as a man hath received of God greater or less natural abilities, so let the number of articles to which he shall give his assent be greater or smaller; and as revelation hath been made, or information hath been given, to a man more clearly or obscurely, in the same proportion is more or less required of him. Therefore, in our own case, we ought to be cautious of even the smallest errors, and to aim at the highest degree of knowledge in divine truths. In the case of others we ought to judge concerning them with the greatest prudence, mildness, and benevolence. Hence we see that a certain precise number of articles which shall be necessary and fundamental to every man cannot be determined" (Edwards, *Works*, N. Y. ed., 4 vols., vol. iii, p. 545).

After Cromwell came into power in England in 1653, a committee of divines was appointed by Parliament to draw up a catalogue of "fundamentals" to be presented to the House. "Archbishop Usher was nominated, but he declining, Mr. Baxter was appointed in his room; the rest who acted were Dr. Owen, Dr. Goodwin, Dr. Cheynel, Mr. Marshal, Mr. Reyner, Mr. Nye, Mr. Sydrach Simpson, Mr. Vines, Mr. Manton, Mr. Jacob. Mr. Baxter desired to offer the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments alone, as containing the fundamentals of religion; but it was objected that this would include Socinians and papists. Mr. Baxter replied that it was so much fitter for a centre of unity or concord, because it was impossible, in his opinion, to devise a form of words which heretics would not subscribe, when they had perverted them to their own sense. These arguments not prevailing, the following articles were presented to the House, under the title of 'The Principles of Faith, presented by Mr. Thomas Goodwin, Mr. Nye, Mr. Sydrach Simpson, and other Ministers, to the Committee of Parliament for Religion, by way of Explanation to the Proposals for propagating the Gospel.' 1. That the Holy Scripture is that rule of knowing God and living unto him, which whose does not believe cannot be saved. 2. That there is a God, who is the creator, governor, and judge of the world, which is to be received by faith, and every other way of the knowledge of him is insufficient. 3. That this God, who is the creator, is eternally distinct from all creatures in his being and blessedness. 4. That this God is one in three persons or subsistences. 5. That Jesus Christ is the only mediator between God and man, without the knowledge of whom there is no salvation. 6. That this Jesus Christ is the true God. 7. That this Jesus Christ is also true man. 8. That this Jesus Christ is God and man in one person. 9. That this Jesus Christ is our Redeemer, who, by paying a ransom and bearing our sins, has made satisfaction for them. 10. That this same Lord Jesus Christ is he that was crucified at Jerusalem, and rose again, and ascended into heaven. 11. That this same Jesus

Christ being the only God and man in one person, remains forever a distinct person from all saints and angels, notwithstanding their union and communion with him. 12. That all men by nature are dead in sins and trespasses; and no man can be saved unless he be born again, repent, and believe. 13. That we are justified and saved by grace and faith in Jesus Christ, and not by works. 14. That to continue in any known sin, upon what pretence or principle soever, is damnable. 15. That God is to be worshipped according to his own will; and whosoever shall forsake and despise all the duties of his worship, cannot be saved. 16. That the dead shall rise; and that there is a day of judgment, wherein all shall appear, some to go into everlasting life, and some into everlasting condemnation. Mr. Baxter (*Life*, p. 205) says Dr. Owen worded these articles; that Dr. Goodwin, Mr. Nye, and Mr. Simpson were his assistants; that Dr. Cheynel was scribe; and that Mr. Marshal, a sober, worthy man, did something; but that the rest were little better than passive. It appears by these articles that these divines intended to exclude not only Deists, Socinians, and papists, but Arians, Antinomians, Quakers, and others" (Neal, *History of the Puritans*, Harpers' ed., i, 131).

**Funeral.** Burying was (as generally, Cicero, *Leg. ii*, 22; Pliny, vii, 55) the oldest, as in all antiquity the customary, and among the Israelites the only mode of disposing of corpses (Gen. xxiii, 19; xxv, 9; xxxv, 8, 19; Judg. ii, 9; viii, 32; 1 Sam. xxv, 1, etc.; John xi, 17; Matt. xxvii, 60, etc.). So likewise among the Egyptians, Babylonians, and Persians (Lucian, *Suet.* 21; Curtius, iii, 12, 11 and 13), of which people ruins of necropolises and tombs still remain. Of *burning* (which among the Greeks was a well-known custom—although in no age altogether prevalent, see Becker, *Charicles*, ii, 181 sq.), the first trace occurs in 1 Sam. xxxi, 12, and even there as an extraordinary case (ver. 10). The practice has also been inferred from Amos vi, 10, where the term מֵשֶׁרֶפֹּה, *meserepho*, "he that burneth him" (i. e. the nearest relative, who kindled the pyre; compare Gen. xxv, 9; xxxv, 29; Judg. xvi, 31), occurs; but De Rossi, with several MSS., reads (so Hitzig, ad loc., although Rosenmüller, ad loc., otherwise explains) מֵשֶׁרֶפֶה, alluding to the different custom of burning—not the *body* itself, but—sweet spices at the funeral, as in Chron. xvi, 14; xxi, 19; Jer. xxxiv, 5 (comp. Deut. xii, 31), as confirmed by Josephus (*War*, i, 33, 9; see Geier, *De luctu*, vi, 2 sq.; Kirchnann, *De funerib.* p. 248 sq.; Douglæi *Analect.* i, 196 sq.). After the exile the burning of dead bodies was still less an Israelitish custom, and the Talmud classes it with heathenish practices; hence even Tacitus (*Hist.* v, 5, 4) mentions burial as an altogether Jewish usage. The same conclusion is confirmed by the fact that combustion of the person is affixed by the Mosaic law (Lev. xx, 14; xxi, 9) as a special penalty for certain crimes (see Michaelis [who,




Ancient Egyptian Funeral Rites: 1. The mummy in its shrine; 2. A priest presenting an oblation before it; 3, 4, 5. Female relatives present, and exhibiting their homage and grief.

however, reaches a false result], *De combustione et humatione mortuorum ap. Hebraeos*, in *His Syntagma comm.* i, 225 sq.). See GRAVE. To leave the dead unburied was to the Hebrews a most dreadful thought (1 Kings xiii, 22; xiv, 11; xvi, 4; xxi, 24; Jer. vii, 33; viii, 2; ix, 22; xiv, 16; xvi, 4; xxv, 33; Ezek. xxix, 5; Psa. lxxix, 3), and was regarded by the ancients universally as one of the grossest insults (Sophocles, *Ajax*, 1156; Herodian, viii, 5, 24; iii, 12, 25; Plutarch, *Virt. mul.* p. 226, ed. Tauchn.; Isocr. *Panath.* p. 638; see Musgrave, *al Soph. Antiq.* 25); hence to inter the remains of the departed was a special work of affection (Tobit i, 21; ii, 8), and was an imperative duty of sons toward their parents (Gen. xxv, 9; xxxv, 29; 1 Macc. ii, 70; Tobit vi, 15; Matt. viii, 21; compare Demosth. *Aristog.* p. 496; Val. Max. v, 4, ext. 3; see Kype, *Observ.* i, 46), and next devolved upon relatives and friends (Tobit xiv, 16). If the corpse remained unburned, it became a prey to the roving, hungry dogs and ravenous birds (1 Kings xiv, 11; xvi, 4; xxi, 24; Jer. vii, 33; 2 Sam. xxi, 10 [2 Kings ix, 35 sq.]; compare Homer, *Il.* xxii, 41 sq.; Eurip. *Iheral.* 1050). Nevertheless, that was not often the fate of the dead among the Israelites, except in consequence of the atrocities of war, since Deut. xxi, 23 (Josephus, *War*, vi, 72) was held to entitle even criminals to interment (Josephus, *War*, iv, 5, 2; comp. Matt. xxvii, 58; yet it was otherwise in Egypt, Gen. xl, 19). According to the Talmud (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* p. 499) there were two especial burial-places at Jerusalem for executed persons.—Winer, i, 147. See TOMB.

What form or ceremonies of obsequies was observed by the ancient Hebrews is almost altogether unknown, except that in the earlier and simpler age the act of interment was performed by the relations (sons, brothers) with their own hands (Gen. xxv, 9; xxxv, 29; Judg. xvi, 31; the later passages, 1 Macc. ii, 70; Tobit xiv, 16, only indicate the attendance of the kindred at the rites; so also Matt. viii, 22). In later times the Jews left this to others, and in Amos v, 16 it is spoken of as something shocking that kinsmen should be obliged to carry the corpse to the grave (this pious care, however, was due from friends, e. g. from pupils towards their teacher, 1 Kings xiii, 30; Mark vi, 29). Closing the eyes and giving the last kiss (Thilo, *Apocr.* i, 44) are mentioned (Gen. xlvii, 4; 1, 1; Tobit xiv, 15) as natural expressions of farewell (the Talmud has a prescription concerning them, *Shabb.* xxiii, 5) from early antiquity (Homer, *Il.* xi, 452; *Odys.* xi, 425 sq.; xxiv, 296; Eurip. *Iher.* 428; Virg. *Æn.* ix, 487; Ovid, *Trist.* ii, 3, 43; iv, 3, 43 sq.; Val. Max. ii, 6, 8; Pliny, xi, 55; Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* vii, 22). Immediately after decease (the sooner the better) the body was washed (Acts ix, 37), then wrapped in a large cloth (*αντίωρ*, Matt. xxvii, 59; Mark xv, 46; Luke xxiii, 53), or all its limbs wound with bands (*ὀβόλια, κτωία*, see John xi, 44; compare Chifflet, *De linteis sepulchrali Christi*, Antw. 1624, 1688), between the folds of which, in the case of a person of distinction, aromatics were laid or sprinkled (John xix, 39 sq.; compare John xii, 7; the custom of anointing the corpse with spiced unguents was very prevalent anciently, Pliny, xiii, 1; Homer, *Odys.* xxiv, 45; *Iliad*, xviii, 350; xxiv, 582; Lucian, *Luct.* 11). See Douglai *Annal.* ii, 64 sq. At public funerals of princes sumptuous shrouds were usual, and

there was a prodigal expense of odors (Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 3, 4; xvii, 8, 3; *War*, i, 33, 9). The speedy burial customary with the later Jews (Acts v, 6, 10; as a rule on the same day, before sundown) had its origin in the Levitical defilement (Numb. xix, 11 sq.); in earlier times it did not prevail (Gen. xxiii, 2 sq.; comp. Chardin, vi, 185). The removal (*ἐκφέρειν*) to the grave was done in a coffin (*σορός*, Luke vii, 14; *λάραξ*, Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 3, 2), which probably was usually open (? Luke vii, 14; comp. Schulz, *Leitung*, iv, 182; but see Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 1, 2); and on a bier (מִצְבֵּי,



Mohammædan Bier, for the Body of a Female or Boy (Lane).

2 Sam. iii, 31; *κλίση*, Josephus, *Lift*, 62; *Ant.* xvii, 8, 3; of costly materials in the case of royal personages, even adorned with precious stones, Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 16, 1; xvii, 8, 3; *War*, i, 33, 9), borne by men (Luke vii, 14; Acts v, 6, 10), with a retinue of the relatives and friends (2 Sam. iii, 31; Luke vii, 12; the Talmud speaks of funeral processions with horns (*Parah*, xii, 9; on royal funeral processions, see Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 16, 1; xvii, 8, 3; *War*, i, 33, 9) in a long train (Job xxi, 33), and with loud weeping and wailing (2 Sam. iii, 32; compare Baruch vi, 31). Even in the house of grief, before the funeral, lamentation was kept up with accompaniment of mourning pipes (Matt. ix, 23; Mark v, 38; compare Jer. ix, 17; 2 Chron. xxxv, 25; Ovid, *Fast.* vi, 660; see Hilliger, *De tibicin. in funere adhib.* Viteb. 1717; Kirchner, *Fun. Roman.* ii, 5). Female mourners, especially (Jer. ix, 17), were hired for the purpose (Mishna, *Moed Katon*, iii, 8), who prolonged the lamentation several days (Wellsted, i, 150; Prokesch, *Erinner.* i, 93, 102, 130). After the burial a funeral meal was given (2 Sam. iii, 35; Jer. xvi, 5, 7; Hos. ix, 4; Ezek. xxiv, 17, 24; Tobit iv, 18; Epist. Jer. 30; compare Homer, *Il.* xxiii, 28; xxiv, 802; Lucian, *Luct.* 24; see Geier, *De luctu Ebr.* ch. vi; Hebenstreit, in the *Miscell. Lips.* ii, 720 sq.; vi, 83 sq.; Garmann, in Iken's *Thesaur.* i, 1028 sq.). and among the later Jews, in families of distinction, invitations were extended to the honorable as well as to the people, so that these entertainments eventually became scenes



Ancient Egyptian Funeral Procession (Caillaud).

of luxurious display (Josephus, *War*, ii, 1, 1). Warriors were buried with their arms (Ezek. xxxii, 27; 1 Macc. xiii, 29; comp. Homer, *Odyss.* xi, 74; xii, 13; Virgil, *Æn.* vi, 233; Diod. Sic. xviii, 26; Curtius, x, 1, 31; see Tavernier, i, 284), and persons of rank or royalty with jewels and valuables (Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 3, 4; xvi, 7, 1). In later times, when the belief in the resurrection became generally distinct, a funeral sacrifice was made (2 Macc. xii, 43). See generally Weber, *Observat. sacr. circa funera populor. orient.* (Argent. 1767); Montbron, *Essai sur la littérature des Hébreux* (Par. 1819), III, i, 1 sq., 253 sq.; also Meursius, *De funere lib. sing.*, in his *Opp.* v.—Winer, ii, 15. For the funeral customs of the ancient Egyptians, see Wilkinson, chap. x (abridgm.); for those of the modern Egyptians, see Lane, chap. xxviii. See BURLIAL.



Modern Egyptian Funeral Procession (Lane).

Monographs on funerals in general have been written by Fuderici (Jen. 1755), Ingler [in Germ.] (Lüneb. 1757), Pomeg (L. B. 1659); on burial in general, by Heidegger (Heidelb. 1670), Nettelbladt (Rost. 1728), Lugh (Holm. 1672); on ancient modes of burial, by Gyraldus (Helms. 1676), Quenstedt (Viteb. 1660), Strauch (Viteb. 1660), Cellarius (Helms. 1682), Florinus (Aboe, 1695); among the Greeks, by Norberg (*Opusc.* ii, 507-526); on the right and duty of sepulture, by Brückner (Jena, 1708), Böhmer (Halle, 1717), Burchard (Lips. 1700), Hofmann (Viteb. 1726), Horer (Viteb. 1661), Sahme (Regiom. 1710), Saurmann (Brem. 1737), Schlegel (Lips. 1679); in time of war, by Preibis (Viteb. 1685); in temples, by Allegranza (Medio. 1773), Platner (Lips. 1788), Winkler (Lips. 1784), Woken (Viteb. 1752), Lampe (Argent. 1776), Gundling (*Obs. select.* i, 137 sq.); on sepulchres, by Eckhard (Jena, 1726); on cenotaphs, by Bidermann (Frib. 1755); and cemeteries, by Bachon (Gott. 1725), Berger (Rost. 1689), Böhmer (Hal. 1716, 1726), Fuhrmann [in Germ.] (Hal. 1801), Spondanus (Par. 1638); and their sanctity, by Lederer (Viteb. 1661), Lichtwehr (Viteb. 1747), Niespen (L. B. 1723), Plaz (Lips. 1725), Schöpfer (Bremen, 1747), Junius (Lips. 1744); on the Catacombs, by Cyprian (Helms. 1699); Fehmel (Lips. 1710-13); on mourning, by Eminga (Gryph. 1751); Nicolai (Marb. 1739), Geier (Lips. 1666), Kirchmann (Hamb. 1605, Lübec, 1625), Sopranus (Lond. 1643); on funeral dresses, by Mayer (Hamb. 1706); on the expense of funerals, by Philipp (Lips. 1684); on placing money in the mouth of the corpse, by Seyffert (Lips. 1709); on lamps at the grave, by Ferrari (Patavium, 1764), Schürzleisch (Viteb. 1710), Willech (Alt. 1715); and flowers, by Flügge (Hafn. 1704); on funeral feasts, by Jenichen [in German] (Lpz. 1747), Schmidt (Lips. 1693), Tropfanger (Viteb. 1710); on funeral incense, by Brönel (Jen. 1687); on funeral orations, by Böhmer (Helms. 1713, 1715), Mayer (Lips. 1670), Rosenberg (Budiss. 1689), Senf (Lips. 1689), Wildvogel (Jen. 1701), Witte (1691); and as a Roman custom, by Fortlage (Osnabr. 1789); on monuments, by Behnauer [in German] (Frib. 1755), Herfordt (Hafn. 1722), Hoitinger (Heidelb. 1659); on cuttings for the dead, by Michaelis (F. ad V. 1734); on Christian burial, by Behnauer (Budiss. 1732), Gretsa (Ingolstadt, 1611), Joch (Jen. 1726), Kiesling (Viteb. 1736), Franzen (Lips. 1713), Larrow

quans (*Advers. sacr.* L. B. 1688, p. 187 sq.), Panvinus (Lond. 1572, Rom. 1581, Lips. 1717), Rosenberg (Budiss. 1690), Samellius (Taurin. 1678), Schürzleisch (*Controv.* p. 34); on the burial of the patriarchs, by Carpzov (*Dissert.* p. 1670 sq.), Semler (Halle, 1706), Zeibich (Viteb. 1742); on Asa's funeral, by Müller (Viteb. 1716); on the burial of animals, by Dasson (Viteb. 1697), Lange (Altorf, 1705), Castaeus [at Jer. xxii, 19] (Lips. 1716). See GRAVE; CEMETERY; DEAD, etc.

**Funeral Discourses**, (1) addresses delivered either at the house of mourning or the grave; (2) funeral sermons or panegyrics. 1. We see, in Acts viii, 2, that certain ceremonies were observed in the early Church on the occasion of funerals. The apostolical constitutions prescribe certain services in cases of Christian burial (bk. viii, cap. 41, 42, *Celebretur dies tertius in psalmis, lectionibus et precibus, ob eum, qui tertia die resurrexit; item dies nonus*, etc.). But these services did not all take place at the time of the funeral, since it is known that bodies were not kept for three days in the East before burial. Of addresses delivered at funerals there is no mention made until after Basil, the two Gregories, and Chrysostom had introduced Greek rhetoric into the Christian Church. The funeral addresses of that age are mostly panegyrics delivered on the deaths of distinguished persons, such as martyrs, bishops, princes, etc. In the Middle Ages, funeral services were chiefly masses and prayers for the dead. The Reformation, while abolishing masses for the dead, instituted in its stead the practice of proclaiming the Word of God by the side of the open grave. The objects of this practice were stated, as early as 1536, in the *Church Discipline* of Würtemberg, to be (1) public recognition of the Christian's hope of resurrection; (2) a public testimony of Christian affection; (3) an earnest *memento mori*. Since the introduction of Rationalism, addresses at the grave have lost much of their general religious character in Germany, and have become, to a certain extent, panegyrics of the deceased. In other Protestant countries usages vary: sometimes there is simply a liturgical service at the house or at the grave; sometimes simply the reading of the Scriptures and prayer; sometimes an address of consolation or warning is added. This latter is generally the usage of the churches which do not make use of forms of prayer.

II. *Funeral Sermons*.—These are generally delivered from the pulpit. The funeral sermon differs from the simple funeral address, inasmuch as instead of being, as the former originally was, a mere exhortation, or, as it afterwards became, a personal panegyric, it is a regular sermon, preached from a text, which, however adapted to the circumstances, reminds the officiating minister, as does also the place from whence it is delivered, that he addresses a congregation, not a mere circle of family or friendship, and that his whole discourse should consequently be more objective than personal. The funeral sermon proper, as contrasted with orations and panegyrics, may be considered as having originated with Protestantism, in the place of the Roman Catholic ceremonial, which was necessarily rejected with the doctrine of purgatory (see Klieforth, *liturgische Abhandlungen* (vol. i, p. 275 sq.). The earliest Protestant discipline made the principal part of the funeral ceremony the Word of God, either as a simple lesson, or as a regular sermon (see *Hallsche Kirchenordnung*, A. D. 1526; Richter, i, 47). "At the following church-service after the burial of the party he shall be remembered and his death announced; his friends shall be comforted by the Word of God, and others reminded to hold themselves in readiness, with strong faith and hope, to obey God's call at any time and in any way." The reformator *ecclesiarum Hussie*, 1526 (ib. p. 61), says: "*Laudandum autem, si in funere habeatur aut sincera predicatio verbi Dei, aut saltem juxta ipsum brevis admonitio.*" In those days liturgy and homiletics were



not so distinct from each other as they have become since. In some places texts were prescribed for funeral sermons, and even sermons were given as models for similar productions. Luther himself gives two such in his *Hauspostille*. The sermon was gradually made more like the panegyric. Hunnius says, in the preface of his twenty-seven funeral sermons: "Men are no longer simply buried with the customary Christian ceremonies, but by request of the survivors there are sermons preached on the Word of God, and testimony rendered of the life and especially of the end of the dead, in what faith and hope they ended their life." Added to these, comparison with similar persons, reference to other members of the family, etc., furnished much material for discourses as acceptable to the hearer as to the preacher. From the middle of the 16th century to the beginning of the 18th, funeral sermons were either mere eulogies, or utterly objective and speculative discourses. A. H. Francke gave in 1700 a funeral sermon of 40 pages fol., with a long appendix. In the Roman Church some of the most brilliant sermons of the 16th and 17th centuries were funeral discourses; e. g. the *oraisons funèbres* of Bossuet and other French orators. In modern Protestant churches (England and America) funeral sermons are generally preached only on the death of some person distinguished for piety or position. Still, in some parts of the United States they are in more frequent use; sometimes they are even preached with regard to the decease of children. See Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* s. v. Grabreden. See BURIAL; HOMILETICS.

**Furlong** (*στάδιον* or *στάδιον*, a *stadium*), a Greek measure of distance, equal to 606 feet 9 inches (Luke xxiv, 13; John vi, 19; xi, 18; [1 Cor. ix, 24, "race,"] i. e. a course or lists for running); Rev. xiv. 20; xx, 16). See Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s. v. Stadium. See MEASURE; STADE.

**Furman, RICHARD**, a leading Baptist minister in the Southern States, was born at Æsopus, N. Y., in 1755. While he was a child, his father removed to South Carolina. His education was carefully attended to by his father, who instructed him in English studies and in mathematics, and particularly in the Scriptures. He began at the early age of eighteen to preach in destitute places, and soon gained a wide influence. Many churches were formed by his agency. During the Revolutionary War he was an ardent supporter of the cause of Independence, and his eloquence and patriotism attracted the attention of Patrick Henry and other leading statesmen. In 1787 he became pastor of a church in Charleston. He sat in the Convention for ratifying the Constitution of the United States. He received the degree of D. D. from Brown University in 1800. He was elected in 1814 the first president of the Baptist General Convention for missionary purposes. He died in 1825. He was a solemn and impressive preacher, an able presiding officer in deliberative assemblies, and in every relation an object of reverence and affection. He published, 1. *Rewards of Grace, a Sermon on the Death of Rev. Oliver Hart* (1796);—2. *An Oration at the Charleston Hospital* (1796);—3. *Sermon Commemorative of General Washington* (1800);—4. *A Sermon on the Death of the Rev. Edmund Botsford*.—Sprague, *Annals*, vi, 161. (L. E. S.)

**Furnace** is the rendering in the Engl. Vers. of the following words. See BURNING.

1. אֶתֶּן, *attun'* (a Chald. term, of uncertain, prob. foreign derivation; Sept. *κάμνος*), a large furnace, with a wide opening at the top to cast in the materials (Dan. iii, 22, 23), and a door at the ground by which the metal might be extracted (ver. 26). It was probably built like the Roman kiln for baking pottery-ware (Smith, *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s. v. Fornax). The Persians were in the habit of using the furnace as a means of inflicting capital punishment (Dan. iii; comp. Jer.



Ancient Roman Potter's Furnace.

xxix, 22; 2 Macc. vii, 5; Hos. vii, 7; see Hoffmann, *De flamma furni Babylonici*, Jen. 1668). A parallel case is mentioned by Charlin (*Voyage en Perse*, iv, 276), two ovens having been kept ready heated for a whole month to throw in any bakers who took advantage of the dearth. See PUNISHMENT.

2. כִּבְשָׁן, *kibshan'* (so called from *subduing* the stone or ore), a smelting or calcining furnace (Gen. xix, 28), perhaps also a brick-kiln (Exod. ix, 8, 10; xix, 18); but especially a lime-kiln, the use of which was evidently well known to the Hebrews (Isa. xxxiii, 12; Amos ii, 1). See BRICK; LIME.

3. כּוּר, *kur* (so called from its *boiling up*), a refining furnace (Prov. xvii, 3; xxvii, 21; Ezek. xxii, 18 sq.), metaphorically applied to a state of trial (Deut. iv, 20; 1 Kings viii, 51; Isa. xlvi, 10; Jer. xi, 4). The form of it was probably similar to the one used in Egypt (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* ii, 137, abridgm.). The jeweller appears to have had a little portable furnace and blow-pipe, which he carried about with him, as is still the case in India. See METALLURGY.



Ancient Egyptian blowing the fire for melting gold, with blow-pipe (c), forceps (b), and firepot having cheeks to confine and reflect the flame.

4. אֶלֶל, *all'* (perhaps so called from *working over*, Sept. *δοκιμασις*, Vulg. *probatum*), according to some, a *workshop*; others a *crucible* (only in Ps. xii, 6, where it probably denotes a *mould* in the sand for casting). See FINING-POT.

5. תַּנּוּר, *tannur'* (of uncertain etymology), an *oven* (as usually rendered) for baking bread ("furnace," Gen. xv, 17; Isa. xxxi, 9; Neh. iii, 11; xii, 38), perhaps sometimes in a more general sense (Gen. xv, 17; Isa. xxxi, 9). The *tannur* is still in use by the Arabs under the same name, being a large round pot of earthen or other materials, two or three feet high, narrowing towards the top; this being first heated by a fire made within, the dough or paste is spread upon the sides to bake, thus forming thin cakes (see Jahn, *Bibl. Archaeol.* § 140). Of the Gr. *καίβανος*, by which the Sept. render this word, Jerome says, on Lam. v, 10, "The *clibanus*, an extended round vessel of brass for

baking bread, the fire being applied internally." See OVEN.

6. *Kámuoc*, a general term for *furnace*, *kiln*, or *oven* (Matt. xiii, 42, 50; Rev. i, 15; ix, 2); especially the potter's furnace (Eccles. xxvii, 5; xxxviii, 30), which resembled a chimney in shape, and was about five or six feet high, having a cylindrical frame, in which the fire was kindled at the bottom, and the narrow funnel produced a strong draught, that raised the flame above the top (Wilkinson,



Ancient Egyptian Potter's Furnace.

*Ancient Egypt*, ii, 108, abridgment); also a blacksmith's furnace (Eccles. xxxviii, 28). The same also describes the calcining furnace (Xenophon, *1ectig.* iv, 49). It is metaphorically used in the N. T. in this sense (Rev. i, 15; ix, 2), and in Matt. xiii, 42 with an especial reference to Dan. iii, 6. See POTTER.

The TOWER OF THE FURNACES (מִגְדַּל הַתַּנּוּרִים, *Migdal' hat-Tannurim'*; Sept. *πύργος τῶν θανουρούριπ* v. r. *θανουρίπ*, Vulg. *turris furnorum*), i. e. of the *Ovens* (Neh. iii, 11; xiii, 38), was one of the towers on the second or middle wall of Jerusalem, at its N.W. angle, adjoining the "corner gate," and near the intersection of the present line of the Via Dolorosa with the Street of St. Stephen (Strong's *Harm. and Expos.* Append. p. 17). It may have derived its name from "the Bakers' Street" (Jer. xxxvii, 21) or "bazaar," which probably lay in that vicinity (Josephus, *War*, v, 8, 1, init.), as similar shops still do (Barclay, *City of the Great King*, p. 434). See JERUSALEM.

**Furneaux**, PHILIP, D.D., an English Nonconformist minister, was born at Totness in 1726, and died in 1783. He was first an assistant to a dissenting congregation in Southwark, then lecturer at Salters' Hall, and in 1753 succeeded Moses Lowman (q. v.) at Clapham, in Surrey, where he remained twenty-three years. For the last six years of his life he was totally deranged. He published *Sermons* (1758-69), and *Letters to Justice Blackstone on his Exposition of the Act of Toleration* (1793, 8vo), which, it is said, induced that learned commentator to change some of his positions in the subsequent editions of his work.—Rose, *New Gen. Biog. Dict.* vii, 462; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, s. v. (J. W. M.)

**Furniture** is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. in one passage of *kar*, a camel's litter or canopied saddle, in which females are accustomed to travel in the East, Gen. xxxi, 34, elsewhere a *lamb*, etc.; also in a few passages of *keli'*, a general term for *vessels*, utensils, or implements of any sort. The manufacture of all kinds of furniture is represented on the Egyptian monuments with great minuteness. The recent excavations among the Assyrian mounds have also disclosed a high degree of refinement among the people of that age. See Wilkinson's *Anc. Egypt.*, Rosellini's *Illustra.*, and Layard and Botta's works on ancient Nineveh and Babylon; also the various articles of household furniture in their alphabetical order. See CARPENTER.

It appears that the furniture of Oriental dwellings, in the earliest ages, was generally very simple; that of the poorer classes consisted of but few articles, and those such only as were absolutely necessary. See HOUSE. The interior of the more common and useful apartments was furnished with sets of large nails with square heads, like dice, and bent at the head, so as to

make them cramp-irons; a specimen of these may be seen in the British Museum. In modern Palestine the plan is to fix nails or pins of wood in the walls, while they are still soft, in order to suspend such domestic articles as are required; since, consisting altogether of clay, they are too frail to admit of the operation of the hammer. To this custom there is an allusion in Ezra ix, 8, and Isa. xxii, 23. On these nails were hung their kitchen utensils or other articles. Instead of chairs, they sat on mats or skins; and the same articles, on which they laid a mattress, served them instead of bedsteads, while their upper garment was used for a covering. See CHAIR. Sovereigns had chairs of state, or thrones with footstools (Exod. xxii, 26, 27; Dent. xxiv, 12). The opulent had (as those in the East still have) fine carpets, couches, or divans and sofas, on which they sat, lay, and slept (2 Sam. xvii, 28; 2 Kings iv, 10). They have also a great variety of pillows and bolsters, with which they support themselves when they wish to take their ease, and there is an allusion to these in Ezek. xiii, 18. In later times these couches were splendid, and the frames inlaid with ivory (Amos vi, 4), which is plentiful in the East; they were also richly carved and perfumed (Prov. vii, 16, 17). See BED. On these sofas, in the latter ages of the Jewish state, for before the time of Moses it appears to have been the custom to sit at table (Gen. xliii, 33), they universally reclined when taking their meals (Amos vi, 4; Luke vii, 36-38). See ACCUBATION. Anciently splendid hangings were used in the palaces of the Eastern monarchs, embroidered with needle-work, and ample draperies were suspended over the openings in the sides of the apartments, for the twofold purpose of affording air, and of shielding them from the sun. Of this description were the costly hangings of the Persian sovereigns mentioned in Esth. i, 6, which passage is confirmed by the statements of Quintus Curtius relating to their superb palace at Persepolis. See EMBROIDERY. In the more ancient periods other articles of necessary furniture were both few and simple. Among these were a hand-mill, a kneading-trough, and an oven. See BREAD. Besides kneading-troughs and ovens they must have had various kinds of earthen-ware vessels, especially pots to hold water for their several ablutions. In later times baskets formed an indispensable article of furniture to the Jews. See BASKET. Large sacks are still, as they anciently were (Gen. xlv, 1-3; John ix, 11), employed for carrying provision and baggage of every description. The domestic utensils of the Orientals in the present day are nearly always of brass; those of the ancient Egyptians were chiefly of bronze or iron. Bowls, cups, and drinking-vessels of gold and silver were used in the courts of princes and great men (Gen. xlv, 2, 5; 1 Kings x, 21). Some elegant specimens of these are given in the paintings of the tombs of Egypt. See BOWL. Bottles were made of skins, which are chiefly of a red color (Exod. xxv, 5). See BOTTLE. Apartments were lighted by means of lamps, which were fed with olive-oil, and were commonly placed upon elevated stands (Matt. v, 15). Those of the wise and foolish virgins (Matt. xxv, 1-10) were of a different sort; they were a kind of torch or flambeau, made of iron or earthen-ware, wrapped about with old linen, moistened from time to time with oil, and were suitable for being carried out of doors. See LAMP.

**Furrow** (מְדִירָה, *g'dud'*, an *incision*, e. g. in the soil, Psa. lxxv, 10; מְדִירָה, *maanah'*, a *tilling* with the plough, Psa. cxxix, 3; מְדִירָה, *te'lem*, Job xxxi, 38; xxxix, 10; Hos. x, 4; xii, 11, a *ridge*, as rendered Psa. lxxv, 10; מְדִירָה, *arugah'*, Ezek. xvii, 8, 10, a *bed* in a garden, as rendered Cant. v, 13; vi, 2), an opening in the ground made by a plough or other instrument (Psa. lxxv, 10; Hos. x, 4, 16). Roberts, on Job xxxi, 38, "If my land cry against me, or that the fur-

rows likewise thereof complain," observes that similar proverbs are common among the Hindūs. See AGRICULTURE.

In Hos. x, 10, the text has עֵינֵי הַחֲרֹן, i. e. עֵינֵי הַחֲרֹן, their [two] eyes, which the A. Vers. seems to have pointed עֵינֵי הַחֲרֹן; and even thus it will hardly bear their rendering, "these [two] furrows" (as if from חָרַף, to till, the same root as in the second Heb. word above); but the margin, with all the versions (Davidson's Hebrew Text, p. 125), has עֲוֹנוֹתֵינוּ, their [two] iniquities, referring to the golden calves at Dan and Bethel (Henderson, Comment. ad loc.). See CALF, GOLDEN.

**Furseus**, a missionary and abbot in the British Isles, and the founder of the convent of Lagny, near Paris, was born in Ireland, where he founded also a convent, to which he gave very strict rules. He then went to West Anglia, and erected the abbey of Knobbersburg, which he afterwards resigned to his brother Poillan, in order to withdraw into solitude. During the persecution of the Christians by Penda, king of the Mercians, he fled to France, where, under the protection of Chlodwig II, he founded the convent of Lagny. He is supposed to have died in 650-654. He had acquired particular consideration by his visions, in which he pretended to see and hear angels; they are related in Bollandus, in *vita S. Fursei ad 16 Jun.* See Mabillon, *Acta SS. Ord. S. B. I. ad a. 650; Annal. Mabill. I. catal. general.* p. 731; Beda, *Hist. gent. Angl. eccl.* ii, 19-23; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 629.

**Fury** (חֲרֹן, *chema'*, or יְרֵא, *charon'*, both signifying intense anger) is attributed to God like anger, metaphorically, or speaking after the manner of men; that is, God's providential actions are such as would be performed by a man in a state of anger; so that when he is said to pour out his fury on a person or on a people, it is a figurative expression for dispensing afflictive judgments (Lev. xxvi, 28; Job xx, 23; Isa.

lxiii, 3; Jer. iv, 4; Ezek. v, 13; Dan. ix, 16; Zech. viii, 2, etc.). See ANTIPOPOMORPHISM.

**Future Life.** See ETERNAL LIFE; IMMORTALITY; INTERMEDIATE STATE.

**Future Punishment.** See PUNISHMENT.

**Fyne**, PASSCHIER DE, was born Jan. 31, 1588, at Leyden. He was inducted into the ministerial office somewhat irregularly. His first charge was that of Jaarsveld. He was zealously attached to the cause of the Remonstrants. In consequence of his refusal to subscribe the Canons of the Synod of Dort, he was suspended from the ministry. This did not deter him from avowing his intention to exercise his gift as the opportunity should be afforded him. Refusing to subscribe the act, which imposed silence upon him, he was sentenced to be banished. Notwithstanding this sentence, he still persisted in preaching from place to place, and was successful in evading his persecutors. After enduring many hardships and privations in his itinerant ministry, he was in 1638 settled over a church in Haarlem. Here he was at first molested, but was subsequently permitted to exercise his ministry without further annoyance. He labored here till his death, which took place in 1661. He was a man of natural shrewdness, of great intrepidity, and full of zeal as a minister of the Gospel. The asperity of his language towards his opponents finds an apology in the treatment he received at their hands. His account of the *Rijnsburgeren* is regarded as valuable, being the testimony of one personally acquainted with the facts. It is entitled *Kort en waerachtig verhael van het eerste begin en opkomen van de nieuwe secte der profeten of Rijnsburgeren.* See Brandt's *Historie der Reformatie*, etc., iii en iv Deelen, op verscheidene plaatsen; *De Remonstrantsche Broederschap*, etc., door J. Tulenman, *Phil. Theor. Mag. Lit. Hum. Dr., Predikant te Rotterdam*, 1847; Glasius, *Godgeleerd Nederland*, blz. 479 en verv. (J. P. W.)

G.

**Gaab**, JOHANN FRIEDRICH, a German theologian, was born at Göppingen, in Württemberg, Oct. 10, 1761. In 1792 he became professor extraordinarius, in 1798 professor ordinarius of philosophy at Tübingen; in 1814, librarian of the university; in 1822, general superintendent, in which office he remained till his death, March 2, 1832. He was a voluminous writer, chiefly in Biblical literature. Among his works are *Observationes ad historiam Judaicam* (Tüb. 1787, 8vo);—*Beiträge z. Erklärung des 1, 2, 3 büchen Mosis* (Tüb. 1776, 8vo);—*Das Buch Hiob* (Tüb. 1809, 8vo);—*Erklärung schwerer Stellen Jeremias* (Tüb. 1824, 8vo);—*Handbuch zum philolog. Verstehen der Apocryph. Schriften des A. T.* (1818-19, 5 parts);—*Dogmengeschichte der ält. griech. Kirche* (Jena, 1790, 8vo);—*Programma de Judio Immortali* (Tüb. 1815).—Migne, *Biog. Chrétienne*, s. v.

**Ga'al** (Heb. גַּאֵל, *loathing*; Sept. Γαῖλ, Josephus Γαῖλις), son of Ebed (Judg. ix, 26 sq.). He went to Shechem with his brothers when the inhabitants became discontented with Abimelech, and so engaged their confidence that they placed him at their head. He does not seem to have been a native of Shechem, nor specially interested in the revolution, but rather one of a class of *condottieri*, who at such a period of anarchy would be willing to sell their services to the highest bidder (compare Josephus, *Ant. v.* 7, 3 and 4). At the festival at which the Shechemites offered the first-fruits of their vintage in the temple of Baal, Gaal, by apparently drunken bravadoes, roused the valor of the people, and strove yet more to kindle their wrath against the absent Abimelech. It would seem as if the natives had been in some way intimately connected with, or descended from, the original inhabitants,

for Gaal endeavored to awaken their attachment to the ancient family of Hamor, the father of Shechem, which ruled the place in the time of Abraham (Gen. xxxiv, 2, 6), and which seems to have been at this time represented by Gaal and his brothers. This appeal to ante-Israelitish traditions (Judg. ix, 28), together with the re-establishment of idolatry at Shechem, shows that the movement in which he took part was a reactionary one, and proceeded upon the principle of a combination of the aborigines with the idolatrous Israelites against the iconoclastic family of Gideon as represented by Abimelech. Although deprived of Shechem, the family appears to have maintained itself in some power in the neighborhood, which induced the Shechemites to look to Gaal when they became tired of Abimelech. Whether he succeeded in awakening among them a kind feeling towards the descendants of the ancient masters of the place does not appear; but eventually they went out under his command, and assisted doubtless by his men, to intercept and give battle to Abimelech when he appeared before the town. He, however, fled before Abimelech, and his retreat into Shechem being cut off by Zebul, the commandant of that place, he went to his home, and we hear of him no more. The account of this attempt is interesting, chiefly from the slight glimpse it affords of the position, at this period, of what had been one of the reigning families of the land before its invasion by the Israelites. B.C. 1319.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See ABIMELECH.

**Ga'ash** (Heb. גַּאֵשׁ, *a shaking or earthquake*; Sept. Γαᾶς or Γαᾶς), a "hill" (rather *mount*, גַּר) among the mountains of Ephraim, near Timnath-se-

rah, on the north side of which Joshua was buried (Josh. xxiv, 30; Sept. Γααῶν; Judg. ii, 9). Hence "the brooks of Gaash," i. e. the valleys or water-courses (גַּאשׁוֹת, *wašyot*, Sept. Ναχαλί or Ναχαλίη) around the mountain, which were the native place of Hiddai or Hurai, one of David's warriors (2 Sam. xxiii, 30; 1 Chron. xi, 32). Eusebius and Jerome merely state that Joshua's tomb was still a remarkable monument near Timnah in their day (*Onomast.* s. v. Γαῶς, Gaas). See JOSHUA. If Timmath (q. v.) be the modern Tibneh, then Mt. Gaash is probably the hill full of sepulchral caverns now facing it on the south. See EPHRAIM, Mt.

**Ga'ba**, a less correct mode of Anglicizing (Josh. xviii, 24; Ezr ii, 26; Neh. vii, 30) the name GĒBA (q. v.).


**Gaba** (evidently a form of the Heb. גַּבָּתָא, i. e. *hill*; see GIBĒATH), a town mentioned by Josephus, and always in connection with Ptolemais: it was destroyed by the insurgent Jews in the time of Florus (*War*, ii, xviii, 1, *Γάβα* v. r. *Γάμαλα* and *Γάβαλα*); it adjoined Mt. Carmel, and was called "the city of horsemen" (πόλις ἵππέων), because those horsemen that were dismissed by Herod dwelt there (*War*, iii, 3, 1, *Γαβὰ* v. r. *Γάμαλα*, *Γάβαλα*, *Γάβλα*, *Γαβλαά*); but it was different from the *Gibeā* (Γαβὰ) that lay about 20 stadia from Ptolemais (*Life*, 23), as this was apparently the Gibeah of Benjamin. Reland, who notices several ancient allusions to places of a similar name (*Palest.* p. 269), thinks that the town in question was the modern *Haifa*, on the shore near Carmel (q. d. גַּיְפָא), the *Sycamianus* of later writers (see Robinson, *Researches*, iii, 194, note), a conclusion in which Schwarz coincides (*Palest.* p. 69, note). See GABALA.

**Gab'aël** (Γαβαίλ) v. r. Γαμαίλ; Vulg. *Gabelus*), the name of two persons in the Apocrypha.

1. An ancestor of Tobit (Tobit i, 1).

2. A poor Jew (Tobit i, 17, Vulg.) of "Rages in Media," to whom Tobias lent (Vulg. *sub chirographo dedit*) ten talents of silver, which Gaba afterwards faithfully restored to Tobias in the time of Tobit's distress (Tobit i, 14; iv, 1, 20; v, 6; ix, x, 2).—Smith, s. v. See GABRIAS.

**Gabāla** (Γαβάλα), a place located by Ptolemy in Phœnicia (Reland, *Palest.* p. 458), and the seat of one of the Palestinian bishops (*ibid.* p. 220). Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 170) refers to Josephus's mention of a Galilean village by this name built by Herod (*Ant.* xv, 8, 5, where, however, the text has Γαβα v. r. Γάβαλα and Γάμαλα, evidently the GABA [q. v.] of other passages), and to the Talmudical notices of a *Gebul* (גַּבּוּל, *border*); finding both in "the village *Jebul*, three Eng. miles N.E. of Beth-Shean," doubtless the ruins by that name marked on Van de Velde's *Map* five miles N. of Beisan. See GAMALA.



Coin of Gabala.

**Gabāra** (τὰ Γάβαρα), a place several times mentioned by Josephus as one of the principal cities of Galilee (*Life*, § 25, 61; comp. 10), thought by Reland (*Palest.* p. 771) to be also the *Gubaroth* (Γαβαριούθ) of Josephus (*Life*, § 45, 47), and to have sometimes been supplanted by *Gadara* (q. v.) in that historian's text (*War*, iii, 7, 1). It was situated twenty stadia from Sogane (Josephus, *Life*, § 51), and was discovered by Schulz in the ruins still called *Kubarech*, in the specified locality (Ritter, *Erdk.* xvi, 769). They are situated on the northern brow of the table-land looking

down upon the plain of Rameh, and consist of the remains of a large ancient building, with four cisterns, still unbroken, adjoining, and hewn stones strewn around over the space of an acre or more (Robinson, *Liter. Bib. Res.* p. 86 sq.).

**Gab'atha** (Γαβαθά), one of the eunuchs of king Xerxes, the exposure of whose plots by Mardochæus led to their execution (Esth. xii, 1, Apoc.); evidently the BIGTHAN (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Esth. ii, 21).

**Gabātha** (Γαβαθά), a village (κώμη) mentioned only by Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v. Γαβαθών, Gabathon) as lying on the eastern part of the great plain Daroma (Esdrælon), near Diocæsarea; a position corresponding with that of the modern village *Jebata*, north of the Kishon (Ritter, *Erdk.* xvi, 748), seen but not visited by Robinson (*Researches*, iii, 201). Euseb. and Jerome elsewhere (*ib.* s. v. Γαβαάς, Gabath) mention a place of the same name as being twelve miles from Eletheropolis, and containing the tomb of the prophet Habakkuk (a statement which Reland, *Palest.* p. 772, reconciles with their location of the same prophet's tomb at Keilah); but this seems to have been the Benjamite Gibeah (q. v.). For the *Gabatha* (Γαβαθά) of Josephus (*Ant.* xiii, 1, 4; comp. Reland, *Palest.* p. 772), see the NABĒBATHA (Ναββαθά) of the Apocrypha (1 Macc. iv, 37).

**Gab'bai** (Heb. *Gabbay'*, גַּבְבָּי, *tax-gatherer*; Sept. Γηβεί v. r. Γηβέ), a chief of the tribe of Benjamin, who settled in Jerusalem after the captivity (Neh. xi, 8). B. C. ante 536.

**Gab'batha** (Γαββαθά, in some MSS. Γαβαθά) occurs John xix, 13, where the evangelist states that Pontius Pilate, alarmed at last in his attempts to save Jesus by the artful insinuation of the Jews, "If thou let this man go thou art not Cæsar's friend," went into the prætorium again, and brought Jesus out to them, and sat down once more upon the βῆμα or tribunal, in a place called *Λιθόστρωτον*, but in the Heb. *Gabatha*. The Greek word, signifying literally *stone-paved*, is an adjective, and is generally used as such by the Greek writers; but they also sometimes use it substantively for a stone pavement, when *ἐξαφός* may be understood. In the Sept. it answers to גַּבּוּל (2 Chron. vii, 3; Esth. i, 6). Jerome reads, "Sedit pro tribunali in loco qui dicitur Lithostrotos." The Greek word, as well as the Latin, is frequently used to denote a pavement formed of ornamental stones of various colors, commonly called a *tesselated* or *mosaic pavement*. The partiality of the Romans for this kind of pavement is well known. It is stated by Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* xxxvi, 61) that, after the time of Sylla, the Romans decorated their houses with such pavements. They also introduced them into the provinces. Suetonius relates (*Cæsar*, 46) that Julius Cæsar, in his military expeditions, took with him the materials of tessellated pavements, ready prepared, that wherever he encamped they might be laid down in the prætorium (Casaubon, *ad Sueton.* p. 38, etc., edition 1605). From these facts it has been inferred by many eminent writers that the *τόπος λιθόστρωτος*, or place where Pilate's tribunal was set on this occasion, was covered by a tessellated pavement, which, as a piece of Roman magnificence, was appended to the prætorium at Jerusalem. The emphatic manner in which John speaks of it agrees with this conjecture. It further appears from his narrative that it was *outside* the prætorium; for Pilate is said to have "come out" to the Jews, who, for ceremonial reasons, did not go into it, on this as well as on other occasions (John xviii, 28, 29, 38; xix, 4, 13). Besides, the Roman governors, although they tried causes, and conferred with their council (Acts xxv, 12) *within* the prætorium, always pronounced sentence in the open air. May not, then, this tessellated pavement, on which the tribunal was now placed, have been inlaid on some part of the terrace,

etc., running along one side of the prætorium, and overlooking the area where the Jews were assembled, or upon a landing-place of the stairs, immediately before the grand entrance?

It has been conjectured that the pavement in question was no other than the one referred to in 2 Chron. vii, 3, and by Josephus (*War*, vi, 1, 8), as in the *outer court of the Temple*; but though it appears that Pilate sometimes sat upon his tribunal in different places, as, for instance, in the open market-place (*War*, ii, 9, 3), yet the supposition that he would on this occasion, when the Jews were pressing for a speedy judgment, and when he was overcome with alarm, *adjourn* the whole assembly, consisting of rulers of every grade, as well as the populace, to *any* other place, is very unlikely; and the supposition that such place was any part of the Temple is encumbered with additional difficulties. It is suggested by Lightfoot (*Exerc. on John*, ad loc.) that the word is derived from גַּבְדָּה, a *surface*, in which case Gabbatha would be a mere translation of Ἀπόστροφον. There was a room in the Temple in which the Sanhedrim sat, and which was called Gazith (גַּזִּיִּת) because it was paved with smooth and square flags; and Lightfoot conjectures that Pilate may on this occasion have delivered his judgment in that room. But this is not consistent with the practice of John, who in other instances gives the Hebrew name as that properly belonging to the place, not as a mere translation of a Greek one (compare John xix, 17). Besides, Pilate evidently spoke from the bema—the regular seat of justice—and this, in an important place like Jerusalem, would be in a fixed spot. Nor in any case could the prætorium, a Roman residence with the idolatrous emblems, have been within the Temple. Yet it may be said that the names גַּבְדָּה and Ἀπολλών, which John introduces in a similar way (Rev. ix, 11), are synonymous; and if the word Gabbatha be derived, as is usual, from גַּבְדָּה, “to be high or elevated,” it may refer chiefly to the *terrace*, or uppermost landing of the stairs, etc., which might have been inlaid with a tessellated pavement. Schleusner understands an elevated mosaic pavement, on which the βῆμα was placed, before the prætorium. The most natural inference from John’s statement is that the word Gabbatha is “Hebrew;” but it has been contended that the writers of the New Testament used this word by way of accommodation to denote the language (*Syriac*, or *Syro-Chaldee*, it is said) which was commonly spoken in Judea in their time, and that when John says Ἐβραϊστί, he means in the Syro-Chaldaic; but into the extensive controversy respecting the vernacular language of the Jews at Jerusalem in the time of our Saviour, this is not the place to enter. It may suffice for the present purpose to remark that the ancient Syriac version, instead of *Gabbatha*, reads *Gepphtha*. See Iken, *De Αποστροφῶν* (Bremæ, 1725); Lightfoot’s *Works*, ii, 614, 615 (London, 1684); Hamesford, *Bibl. Geogr.* ii, 129; Seelen, *Medit. Exeg.* i, 613.—Kittó, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See PAVEMENT.

**Gab’des** (Γαββῆς, Vulg. *Gabea*), a man whose descendants (or rather a place whose natives) returned from the captivity (1 Esdr. v, 20); evidently the GEBÆ (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra ii, 26).

**Gabè** (Γαβῆ), a considerable place (πολιχνη, *oppidum*) mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v. Γαβαθών, Gabbathon) as lying 16 R. miles from Casarea, in the edge of the plain of Esdraelon; thought by Robinson to be the modern *Jeba* (i. e. *Gibeah*), a large village on the slope of the range of hills N. of Nablús, containing an ancient town (*Researches*, iii, 151). It can hardly have been of sufficient importance to be commemorated by the coins found with the inscription “of the Gabinians” (Γαβηνών, Reland, *Palastr.* p. 769).

**Gabinus** (Græcized Γαβίνος), AULUS, of un-

known parentage, from a noted but plebeian family of Rome; one of Pompey’s generals, who was sent into Judea against Alexander (q. v.) and Antigonus (q. v.) with proconsular authority, B. C. cir. 64 (Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 2, 3, 4). He was profligate in his youth (Cicero, *pro Sext.* 8, 9, etc.), and was made tribune of the people in B. C. 66, prætor in B. C. 61, and consul in B. C. 59; in all which offices he was active in political intrigues and party measures. On arriving in Syria, he made important changes there (Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 10; *War*, i, 6). He restored Hircæus at Jerusalem, confirmed him in the high-priesthood, and settled governors and judges in the provinces, so that Judea from a monarchy became an aristocracy. He established courts of justice at Jerusalem, Gadara (or at Dora), Anatha, Jericho, and Sepphoris, that the people, finding judges in all parts of the country, might not be obliged to go far from their habitations. On returning to Rome, Gabinius was prosecuted by the Syrians and exiled, B. C. 54. He was recalled by Julius Cæsar, B. C. 49, and fell in the civil war between the triumvirs (Appian, *Illyr.* 12 and 27; *Bell. Civ.* ii, 59; Dion Cass. xlii, 11, 12). Rachenstein has written a monograph entitled *Ueber A. Gabinius* (Aarau, 1826). See Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s. v.

**Gabirol.** See GEBIROL.

**Gabish.** See PEARL.

**Gabler, Georg Andreas**, son of Johann Philipp, was born in Altdorf in 1786. He was for several years (from 1807) tutor in the family of Schiller at Weimar, became in 1811 teacher of the gymnasium of Ansbach, in 1817 professor, and in 1821 rector of the gymnasium in Bayreuth, in 1824 professor of classical literature at the lyceum in the same city, and, after the death of Hegel, professor of philosophy at the University of Berlin. He died in 1853 at Teplitz. He wrote *Lehrbuch der philosoph. Propädeutik* (Erlangen, 1827, 1 vol.).—*De veræ philosophiæ erga religionem Christianam pietate* (trying to establish the harmony between the Christian religion and the Hegelian philosophy, Berlin, 1836); *Beiträge zur richtigen Beurtheilung d. Hegelschen Philosophie* (Berlin, 1843). (A. J. S.)

**Gabler, Johann Philipp**, a German theologian, was born June 4, 1753, at Frankfort on the Maine. He studied at the gymnasium of his native city for ten years; then at the University of Jena from 1772 to 1778, under Griesbach and Eichhorn, from whom he received his theological and literary bias. In 1785 he was made professor of theology at Altdorf, and in 1801 he was called to Jena as second to Griesbach, whose place he filled after Griesbach’s death in 1812. Here he achieved great distinction, both as teacher and writer, and he was five times chosen prorector of the university. In theology he was an extreme Rationalist. He died Feb. 17, 1827. He wrote *Entwurf einer Hermeneutik des N. T.* (Altdorf, 1788).—*Hist.-krit. Einleitung ins N. T.* (Altdorf, 1789). He is known chiefly by his edition of Eichhorn’s *Urgeschichte* (Altdorf, 1790–93, 2 vols.), and the appendix he wrote to it (*Versuch über d. Mosaische Schöpfungsgeschichte*, Altdorf, 1795). From 1791 to 1800 he edited the *Neuestes theologisches Journal* (begun by Ammon, Hänlein, and Paulus); from 1800 to 1804 the *Journal f. theol. Literatur*; 1805 to 1811, the *Journal f. auserlesene theol. Literatur*. A collection of his essays was published by his sons in 1831 (Ulm, 2 vols.).—*Saintes, Hist. of Rationalism*, bk. i, ch. xi; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 632; W. Schröter, *Erinnerungen an J. P. Gabler* (Jena, 1827).

**Gab’riās** (Γαβρίαζ v. r. Γαβραῖ, i. e. גַּבְרִיאֵל, *hero of Jehovah*), according to the present text of the Sept. the brother of Gabael, to whom Tobit intrusted (παρὶ-ἔρω) ten talents of silver (Tob. i, 14), though in another place (Tob. iv, 20, τῶ τοῦ Γαβρία; compare Fritzsche, *Exeg. Handb.* ad loc.) he is described as his father. The readings throughout are very uncertain,

and in the versions the names are strangely confused. It is an obvious correction to suppose that Γαβριήλ *τῷ ἀελέφῳ τῷ Γαβρίᾳ* should be read in i, 14, as is in fact suggested by *Cod. F. A.*, Γαβριήλ . . . τῷ ἀε. τῷ Γαβρί. The misunderstanding of τῷ ἀελέφῳ (comp. Tob. i, 10, 16, etc.) naturally occasioned the omission of the article. The old Latin has *Gabelo fratri meo jilio Gabuhel*; and so also iv, 20.—Smith, s. v.

**Ga'br'iel** (Heb. *Gabriel*, גַּבְרִיֵּאל, *champion of God*; Sept. and N. T. Γαβριήλ), a word which is not in itself distinctive, but merely a description of the angelic office, used as a proper name or title to designate the heavenly messenger who was sent to Daniel to explain the vision of the ram and the he-goat (Dan. vii), and to communicate the prediction of the Seventy Weeks (Dan. ix, 21–27). Under the new dispensation he was employed to announce the birth of John the Baptist to his father Zechariah (Luke i, 11), and that of the Messiah to the Virgin Mary (Luke i, 26). See **ANNUNCIATION**. (It is also added in the Targums as a gloss on some other passages of the O. T.) In the ordinary traditions, Jewish and Christian, Gabriel is spoken of as one of the archangels (q. v.). In Scripture he is set forth only as the representative of the angelic nature, not in its dignity or power of contending against evil [see **MICHAEL**], but in its ministrations of comfort and sympathy to man. His prominent character, therefore, is that of a "fellow-servant" of the saints on earth; and there is a corresponding simplicity, and absence of all terror and mystery, in his communications to men; his own words, "I am Gabriel, that stand in the presence of God" (Luke i, 19), are rather in favor of the notion of his superior dignity. See **ANGEL**.

In the Book of Enoch, "the four great archangels, Michael, Raphael, Gabriel, and Uriel," are described as reporting the corrupt state of mankind to the Creator, and receiving their several commissions. To Gabriel he says, "Go, Gabriel, against the giants, the spurious ones, the sons of fornication, and destroy the sons of the watchers from among the sons of men" (*Greek Fragment of the Book of Enoch*, preserved by Syncellus in Scaliger's notes on the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, Amstel. 1658, p. 404). In the Rabbinical writings Gabriel is represented as standing in front of the divine throne, near the standard of the tribe of Judah (Buxtorf, *Lex. Talmud.* col. 46). The Rabbins also say that he is the Prince of Fire, and appointed to preside over the ripening of fruit; that he was the only one of the angels who understood Chaldee and Syriac, and taught Joseph the seventy languages spoken at the dispersion of Babel; that he and Michael destroyed the host of Sennacherib, and set fire to the Temple at Jerusalem (Eisenmenger's *Entd. Judenthums*, ii, 365, 379, 380, 383).

By the Mohammedans Gabriel is regarded with profound veneration. To him, it is affirmed, a copy of the whole Koran was committed, which he imparted in successive portions to Mohammed. He is styled in the Koran the Spirit of Truth and the Holy Spirit. In his hands will be placed the scales in which the actions of men will be weighed at the last day (D'Herbelot, *Bibliothèque Orientale*, s. v. Gebrail).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

**Gabriel de Chinon**, a French Roman Catholic missionary, was born towards the beginning of the 17th century. He became a Capuchin, and was sent as missionary to Persia about 1640. He settled at Isbahan, and learned most of the Oriental languages, which enabled him to make a great number of proselytes. The favor he enjoyed at the court of Shah Abbas II excited the envy of the Armenian priests, who caused him great annoyance. Gabriel withdrew about 1660 to Tabriz (Tauris or Tebrzez, the capital of the province of Azerbijan, in North Persia), where he founded a convent of Capuchins, and established missions in Kurdistan and at Tillsi. About 1670 he went

on a mission to Malabar, where he died (at Tellichery) June 27, 1670. He wrote observations on the countries he had resided in, which were afterwards published by Moréri, with a life of Gabriel, under the title *Relations nouvelles du Levant, ou traité de la religion, du gouvernement, et des coutumes des Perses, des Arméniens et des Gaures* (Lyon, 1671, 12mo). They contain some curious details on Persian customs and manners, but the greater part of the work is taken up with details concerning religious questions, Gabriel's order, and himself. See Nicéron, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des hommes illustres*, xxvii, 311; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xix, 109.

**Gabriel Sionita**, a learned Maronite, was born at Edden, on Mount Libanus, 1574. He came to Rome when seven years old, and studied at the Maronite College there. He was made professor of Oriental languages at Rome. In 1614 he accompanied the French ambassador (at Rome) to Paris, and was made professor of Arabic at the College de France. In 1620 he became doctor of theology. In 1630 he began to work on Le Jay's Polyglot Bible, for which he furnished the Syriac and Arabic versions. He died at Paris in 1648. Of his writings, we name *Liber Psalmorum ex Arab. in Lat. translatus* (Rome, 1614, 4to); —*Grammatica Arabica Maronitarum, in libros v. divisâ* (Paris, 1616, 4to).—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xix, 106.

**Gabriel, St., Congregation of**, the name of two monastic congregations in the Roman Catholic Church. 1. The first Congregation of St. Gabriel was established at Bologna by Cesar Bianchetti, a senator of Bologna, who was born May 8, 1585, and after the death of his wife in 1638, devoted himself with great zeal to giving religious instruction to the youth and the ignorant. In order to obtain aid in his work he established a congregation of lay gentlemen, who, without living in common, pledged themselves to promote the cause of Christian instruction, and assembled on certain days for devotional exercises and for deliberation on their work. Subsequently a second congregation was organized of such laymen as preferred to live in common, and to devote their whole lives to the cause. The latter were called *Converventi*, the former *Confluenti*. The founder died in 1655. The congregation does not appear to have spread beyond Bologna. Members can be received from the eighteenth to the fiftieth year of age. The novitiate lasts three years, after which the novices may be received into the congregation by a two-thirds vote. They have to wait three years more before they have the right to vote. The officers are elected annually. See Delprat, *Vita del Venerab. Servo di Dio Cesare Bianchetti* (Bologna, 1704). Helyot, *Dictionnaire des Ordres Religieux*, s. v. 2. Another "Congregation of the Brothers of St. Gabriel" has been established in the present century by abbé Deshayes in France. The object of the congregation is to instruct the children, especially those of the country, in the Christian doctrine. Abbé Deshayes at first acted in concert with abbé Jean Marie Robert de Lamennais (q. v.), but subsequently they separated, Lamennais organizing the congregation of the "Brothers of the Christian Instruction" (q. v.). The congregation of which Deshayes



Brother of St. Gabriel.

of the "Brothers of the Christian Instruction" (q. v.). The congregation of which Deshayes

remained the superior assumed in 1835 the name of "Congregation of Brothers of St. Gabriel," after the patron saint of the founder. Abbé Deshayes died in 1841. In 1858 the congregations had 73 establishments and about 400 members. Every fifth year the congregation elects a superior general, who may be re-elected after the expiration of his term. The head establishment of the congregation is at St. Laurent de Sèvre. See Migne, *Dict. des Ordres Relig.* vol. iv, s. v. (A. J. S.)

**Gabrielites.** See ANABAPTISTS.

**Gaches, RAYMOND,** a French Protestant divine, was born at Castres towards 1615. In 1649 he was appointed pastor of his native city, where he soon became distinguished as a preacher. In 1654 he was called to Paris to supply the Protestant church of Charonton. He died at Paris in December, 1668. During his sojourn at Castres he contributed to the formation of an academy, which did not last long, but counted among its members many distinguished men. He published a number of separate sermons, sixteen of which have been collected under the title *Seize Sermons sur différents sujets* (Geneva, 1660, 8vo). See Haug, *La France Protestante*, s. v.; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xix, 120; Vinet, *Hist. de la Prédication* (Paris, 1860, 8vo, § 7, p. 286-302).

**Gad** (Heb. *גַּד*, *fortune*, Gen. xxx, 11, although another signification is alluded to in Gen. xlix, 19; Sept. and N. T. Γάδ), the name of two men, and of the descendants of one of them; also of a heathen deity and of a plant. See also BAAL-GAD; MIGDAL-GAD.

1. (Josephus Γάδας.) Jacob's seventh son, the first-born of Zilpah, Leah's maid, and whole-brother to Asher (Gen. xxx, 11-13; xli, 16, 18), born autumn B.C. 1915. The following account is largely from the article in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*. See JACOB.

1. As to the *name*, there are several interpretations: (a.) The passage in which the bestowal of the name of Gad is preserved—like the others, an exclamation on his birth—is more than usually obscure: "And Leah said, 'In fortune' (*be-gad*, גַּדְתִּי), and she called his name Gad" (Gen. xxx, 11). Such is supposed to be the meaning of the old text of the passage (the *Kethib*); so it stood at the time of the Sept., which renders the key-word by *ἐν τύχῃ*, in which it is followed by Jerome in the *Vulg. feliciter*. In his *Quæst. in Genesim*, Jerome has *in fortuna*. Josephus (*Ant. i*, 19, 8) gives it still a different turn—*τυχεῖος* = *fortunate*. But in the marginal emendations of the Masoretes (the *Keri*) the word is given גַּד אֵל, "Gad has come." This construction is adopted by the ancient versions of Onkelos, Aquila (ἡλθεν ἡ ζώσισ), and Symmachus (ἡλθεν Γάδ). (b.) In the blessing of Jacob, however, we find the name played upon in a different manner: "Gad" is here taken as meaning a piratical band or troop (the term constantly used for which is *g. dud'*, גַּדְתִּי), and the allusion—the turns of which it is impossible adequately to convey in English—would seem to be to the irregular life of predatory warfare which should be pursued by the tribe after their settlement on the borders of the Promised Land. "Gad, a plundering troop (*gedud'*) shall plunder him (*ye-gud-en'nu*), but he will plunder (*ya-gud'*) [at the] heel" (Gen. xlix, 19). Jerome (*De Benedict. Jacobi*) interprets this of the revenge taken by the warriors of the tribe on their return from the conquest of Western Palestine for the incursions of the desert tribes during their absence. (c.) The force here lent to the name has been by some partially transferred to the narrative of Gen. xxx, e. g. the Samaritan version, the Veneto-Greek, and our own A. V. (uniting this with the preceding)—"a troop (of children) cometh." But it must not be overlooked that the word *gedud'*—by which it is here sought to interpret the *gad* of Gen. xxx, 11—possessed its own special signification of turbulence and fierceness, which makes it hardly applica-

ble to children in the sense of a number or crowd, the image suggested by the A. V. Exactly as the turns of Jacob's language apply to the characteristics of the tribe, it does not appear that there is any connection between his allusions and those in the exclamation of Leah. The key to the latter is probably lost. To suppose that Leah was invoking some ancient divinity, the god Fortune, who is conjectured to be once alluded to—and once only—in the latter part of the book of Isaiah, under the title of *Gad* (Isa. lxxv, 11; A. V. "that troop;" Gesenius, "dem Glück!"), is surely a poor explanation. See below, 3.

2. Of the childhood and life of the individual Gad nothing is preserved. At the time of the descent into Egypt seven sons are ascribed to him, remarkable from the fact that a majority of their names have plural terminations, as if those of families rather than persons (Gen. xli, 16). The list, with a slight variation, is again given on the occasion of the census in the wilderness of Sinai (Numb. xxvi, 15-18). See ARON; EZBON; OZNI.

TRIBE OF GAD.—The position of Gad during the march to the Promised Land was on the south side of the tabernacle (Numb. ii, 14). The leader of the tribe at the time of the start from Sinai was Eliasaph, son of Reuel or Denel (ii, 14; x, 20). Gad is regularly named in the various enumerations of the tribes through the wanderings—at the dispatching of the spies (xiii, 15), the numbering in the plains of Moab (xxvi, 3, 15)—but the only inference we can draw is an indication of a commencing alliance with the tribe which was subsequently to be his next neighbor. He has left the more closely-related tribe of Asher to take up his position next to Reuben. These two tribes also preserve a near equality in their numbers, not suffering from the fluctuations which were endured by the others. At the first census Gad had 45,650, and Reuben 46,500; at the last Gad had 40,500, and Reuben 43,330. This alliance was doubtless induced by the similarity of their pursuits. Of all the sons of Jacob, these two tribes alone returned to the land which their forefathers had left five hundred years before with their occupations unchanged. "The trade of thy slaves hath been about cattle from our youth even till now"—"we are shepherds, both we and our fathers" (Gen. xli, 34; xlii, 4)—such was the account which the patriarchs gave of themselves to Pharaoh. The civilization and the persecutions of Egypt had worked a change in the habits of most of the tribes, but Reuben and Gad remained faithful to the pastoral pursuits of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; and at the halt on the east of Jordan we find them coming forward to Moses with the representation that they "have cattle"—"a great multitude of cattle," and the land where they now are is a "place for cattle." What should they do in the close precincts of the country west of Jordan with all their flocks and herds? Wherefore let this land, they pray, be given them for a possession, and let them not be brought over Jordan (Numb. xxxii, 1-5). They did not, however, attempt to evade taking their proper share of the difficulties of subduing the land of Canaan, and after that task had been effected, and the apportionment amongst the nine and a half tribes completed "at the doorway of the tabernacle of the congregation in Shiloh, before Jehovah," they were dismissed by Joshua "to their tents," to their "wives, their little ones, and their cattle," which they had left behind them in Gilead. To their *tents* they went—to the dangers and delights of the free Bedouin life in which they had elected to remain, and in which—a few partial glimpses excepted—the later history allows them to remain hidden from view.

The country allotted to Gad appears, speaking roughly, to have lain chiefly about the centre of the land east of Jordan. The south of that district—from the Arnon (wady Mojeb), about half way down the Dead Sea, to Heshbon, nearly due east of Jerusalem—

was occupied by Reuben, and at or about Heshbon the possessions of Gad commenced. They embraced half Gilead, as the oldest record specially states (Deut. iii, 12), or half the land of the children of Ammon (Josh. xiii, 25), probably the mountainous district which is intersected by the torrent Jabbock—if the wady Zúrka be the Jabbock—including as its most northern town the ancient sanctuary of Mahanaim. On the east the furthest landmark given is “Aroer, that faces Rabbah,” the present Amman (Josh. xiii, 25). The Arabian desert thus appears to have been the eastern boundary. West was the Jordan (Josh. xiii, 27). The northern boundary is somewhat more difficult to define. Gad possessed the whole Jordan valley as far as the Sea of Galilee (xiii, 27), but among the mountains eastward the territory extended no farther north than the river Jabbock. The border seems to have run diagonally from that point across the mountains by Mahanaim to the southern extremity of the Sea of Galilee (Josh. xii, 1-6; xiii, 26, 30, 31; Deut. iii, 12, 13; see Porter’s *Damascus*, ii, 252). The territory thus consisted of two comparatively separate and independent parts, (1) the high land on the general level of the


country east of Jordan, and (2) the sunk valley of the Jordan itself; the former diminishing at the Jabbock, the latter occupying the whole of the great valley on the east side of the river, and extending up to the very Sea of Cinnereth or Gennesaret itself.

Of the structure and character of the land which thus belonged to the tribe—“the land of Gad and Gilead”—we have only vague information. From the western part of Palestine its aspect is that of a wall of purple mountain, with a singularly horizontal outline; here and there the surface is scamed by the ravines, through which the torrents find their way to the Jordan, but this does not much affect the vertical wall-like look of the range. But on a nearer approach in the Jordan valley, the horizontal outline becomes broken, and when the summits are attained a new scene is said to burst on the view. “A wide table-land appears, tossed about in wild confusion of undulating downs, clothed with rich grass throughout; in the southern parts trees are thinly scattered here and there, aged trees covered with lichen, as if the relics of a primeval forest long since cleared away; the northern parts still abound in magnificent woods of sycamore, beech, terebinth, ilex, and enormous fig-trees. These downs are broken by three deep defiles, through which the three rivers of the Yarmúk, the Jabbock, and the Arnon fall into the valley of the Jordan and the Dead Sea. On the east they melt away into the vast red plain, which by a gradual descent joins the level of the plain of the Haurán, and of the Assyrian desert” (Stanley, *Palestine*, p. 320). It is a very picturesque country—not the “flat, open downs of smooth and even turf” of the country round Heshbon (Irby, p. 142), the sheep-walks of Reuben and of the Moabites, but “most beautifully varied with hanging woods, mostly of the vallonía oak, laurestinus, cedar, arbutus, arbutus andrachne, etc. At times the country had all the appearance of a noble park” (*ib.* p. 147), “graceful hills, rich vales, luxuriant herbage” (Porter, *Handb.* p. 310). See GILEAD.

Such was the territory allotted to the Gadites; but there is no doubt that they soon extended themselves beyond these limits. The official records of the reign of Jotham of Judah (1 Chron. v, 11, 16) show them to have been at that time established over the whole of Gilead, and in possession of Bashan as far as Salcah—the modern Sukhad, a town at the eastern extremity of the noble plain of the Haurán—and very far both to the north and the east of the border given them originally, while the Manassites were pushed still further northwards to Mount Hermon (1 Chron. v, 23). They soon became identified with Gilead, that name so memorable in the earliest history of the nation; and in many of the earlier records it supersedes the name of Gad, as we have already remarked it did that of Bashan. In the song of Deborah, “Gilead” is said to have “abode beyond Jordan” (Judg. v, 17). Jephthah appears to have been a Gadite, a native of Mizpeh (Judg. xi, 34; compare 31, and Josh. xiii, 26), and yet he is always designated “the Gileadite;” and so also with Barzillai of Mahanaim (2 Sam. xvii, 27; Ezra ii, 61; comp. Josh. xiii, 26).

The following is a list of all the Biblical localities in this tribe, with their probable identifications:

Abel-ceramin.	Town.	[Merj-Ekkeh]?
Abel-shittim.	do.	[On Wady Surj]?
Argob.	District.	<i>Rajib.</i>
Aroer.	Town.	<i>Atrah.</i>
Atroth-shophan.	do.	[E. of Merj-Ekkeh]?
Bethbarah (Beth- any).	Ford.	{ [Opposite Betá-barah (in Manassch)]?
Beth-aram, or Beth-haran }	Town.	<i>Zeit-Iharan.</i>
Beth-nimrah.	do.	<i>Nimrin.</i>
Betonim.	do.	<i>Batneh.</i>
Carmon.	do.	[ <i>Reimán</i> ]?
Debir.	do.	See LO-DEBAR.
Galeed.	Stone-heap.	See GILEAD.
Gerasa [Gergesa].	Town.	<i>Jerash.</i>
Gilead.	Mount.	<i>Jebel Osha.</i>



Map of the Tribe of Gad.



Holon, or Horonaim.	Town.	[ <i>Nir</i> ?]
Jaazer.	do.	<i>Seir</i> .
Jabbok.	River.	<i>Wady Zurka</i> .
Jabesh.	Town.	<i>Ed-Dier</i> , on Wady Jabes?
Jazer.	do.	See <i>GAZER</i> .
Jegar-sahadutha.	Stone-heap.	[ <i>El-Jebelbeh</i> ?]
Jogbehah.	Town.	[ <i>El-Jebelbeh</i> ?]
Lo-lebar.	do.	[ <i>Duheret el-Temar</i> ?]
Madma.	do.	<i>Mthueh</i> .
Mahanaim.	do.	See <i>RAMOTH</i> .
Mizpeh.	do.	See <i>BEZTH-NIMRAH</i> .
Nimrah, or Nimrim.	do.	[N. of Wady Zurka.]
Peniel, or Pennel.	do.	
Ramath-mizpeh, or Ramoth-Gil- eal.	do.	<i>Es-Salt</i> .
Rogelim.	do.	[ <i>Ajlun</i> ?]
Shihon.	do.	<i>Shihon</i> .
Sneoth.	do.	[At the Bridge S. of Wady Ajlun?]
Zaphon.	do.	[S. of Wady Zurka.]

The character of the tribe is throughout strongly marked—fierce and warlike—"strong men of might, men of war for the battle, that could handle shield and buckler, their faces the faces of lions, and like roes upon the mountains for swiftness." Such is the graphic description given of those eleven heroes of Gad—"the least of them more than equal to a hundred, and the greatest to a thousand"—who joined their fortunes to David at the time of his greatest discredit and embarrassment (1 Chron. xii, 8), undeterred by the natural difficulties of "flood and field" which stood in their way. Surrounded as they were by Ammonites, Midianites, Hagarites, "Children of the East," and all the other countless tribes, animated by a common hostility to the strangers whose coming had dispossessed them of their fairest districts, the warlike propensities of the tribe must have had many opportunities of exercise. One of its greatest engagements is related in 1 Chron. v, 19-22. Here their opponents were the wandering Ishmaelitic tribes of Jetur, Nephtish, and Nodab (comp. Gen. xxv, 15), nomad people, possessed of an enormous wealth in camels, sheep, and asses, to this day the characteristic possessions of their Bedouin successors. This immense booty came into the hands of the conquerors, who seem to have entered with it on the former mode of life of their victims: probably pushed their way further into the Eastern wilderness in the "steads" of these Hagarites. Another of these encounters is contained in the history of Jephthah, but this latter story develops elements of a different nature and a higher order than the mere fierceness necessary to repel the attacks of the plunderers of the desert. In the behavior of Jephthah throughout that affecting history there are traces of a spirit which we may almost call chivaleresque; the high tone taken with the elders of Gilead, the noble but fruitless expostulation with the king of Ammon before the attack, the hasty vow, the overwhelming grief, and yet the persistent devotion of purpose, surely in all these there are marks of a great nobility of disposition, which must have been more or less characteristic of the Gadites in general. If to this we add the loyalty, the generosity, and the delicacy of Barzillai (2 Sam. xix, 32-39), we obtain a very high idea of the tribe at whose head were such men as these. Nor must we, while enumerating the worthies of Gad, forget that in all probability Elijah the Tishbite, "who was of the inhabitants of Gilead," was one of them.

But, while exhibiting these high personal qualities, Gad appears to have been wanting in the powers necessary to enable him to take any active or leading part in the confederacy of the nation. The warriors, who rendered such assistance to David, might, when Ishbosheth set up his court at Mahanaim as king of Israel, have done much towards affirming his rights. Had Abner made choice of Shechem or Shiloh instead of Mahanaim—the quick, explosive Ephraim instead of the unready Gad—who can doubt that the troubles of David's reign would have been immensely increased, perhaps the establishment of the northern kingdom antedated by nearly a century? David's

presence at the same city during his flight from Absalom produced no effect on the tribe, and they are not mentioned as having taken any part in the quarrels between Ephraim and Judah.

Cut off as Gad was by position and circumstances from its brethren on the west of Jordan, it still retained some connection with them. We may infer that it was considered as belonging to the northern kingdom—"Know ye not," says Ahab in Samaria, "know ye not that Ramoth in Gilead is ours, and we be still, and take it not out of the hand of the king of Syria?" (1 Kings xxii, 3). The territory of Gad was the battlefield on which the long and fierce struggles of Syria and Israel were fought out, and, as an agricultural pastoral country, it must have suffered severely in consequence (2 Kings xx, 33).

Gad was carried into captivity by Tiglath Pileser (1 Chron. v, 26), and in the time of Jeremiah the cities of the tribe seem to have been inhabited by the Ammonites. "Hath Israel no sons? hath he no heir? why doth Malcham (i. e. Moloeh) inherit Gad, and his people dwell in his cities?" (xlix, 1). See *Reiland, Palæst.* p. 162 sq.; *Burckhardt, Trav. in Syria*, p. 345 sq.

2. (Josephus *Γάδος*, *Ant.* vii, 13, 4.) "The seer" (גָּדוֹן), or "the king's seer," i. e. David's—such appears to have been his official title (1 Chron. xxix, 29; 2 Chron. xxix, 25; 2 Sam. xxiv, 11; 1 Chron. xxi, 9)—was a "prophet" (נָבִיא), who appears to have joined David when in "the hold," and at whose advice he quitted it for the forest of Hareth (1 Sam. xxii, 5), B.C. 1061. Whether he remained with David during his wanderings is not to be ascertained; we do not again encounter him till late in the life of the king, when he reappears in connection with the punishment inflicted for the numbering of the people (2 Sam. xxiv, 11-19; 1 Chron. xxi, 9-19), B.C. cir. 1016. But he was evidently attached to the royal establishment at Jerusalem, for he wrote a book (see *CHRONICLES, BOOK OF*) of the Acts of David (1 Chron. xxix, 29), and also assisted in settling the arrangements for the musical service of the "house of God," by which his name was handed down to times long after his own (2 Chron. xxix, 25). In the abruptness of his introduction Gad has been compared with Elijah (Jerome, *Qu. Hebr.* on 1 Sam. xxii, 5), with whom he may have been of the same tribe, if his name can be taken as denoting his parentage, but this is unsupported by any evidence. Nor is there any apparent ground for Ewald's suggestion (*Gesch.* iii, 116) that he was of the school of Samuel. If this could be made out, it would afford a natural reason for his joining David.—Smith, s. v. See *DAVID*.

3. The name *GAD* (with the art. גָּדוֹן; Sept. *δαίμωνιον* v. r. *δαίμων*, or, according to the reading of Jerome and of some MSS., *τύχη*) is mentioned in Isa. lxy, 11 (A. V. "troop"). The word, by a combination with the Arabic, may be legitimately taken to denote *fortune* (see Pococke, *Spec. Hist. Arab.* p. 140). So Gesenius, Hitzig, and Ewald have taken *Gad* in their respective versions of Isaiah, rendering the clause, "who spread a table to fortune." This view, which is the general one, makes fortune in this passage to be an object of idolatrous worship. There is great disagreement, however, as to the power of nature which this name was intended to denote, and, from the scanty data, there is little else than mere opinion on the subject. The majority, among whom are some of the chief rabbinical commentators (see Buxtorf, *Lex. Tal'm.* col. 1034), as well as Gesenius, Münter, and Ewald, consider Gad to be the form under which the planet *Jupiter* was worshipped as the greater star of good fortune (see especially Gesenius, *Comm. über den Jesaja*, ad loc.). Others, among whom is Vitringa, suppose Gad to have represented the *Sun*, while Huetius regards it as a representative of the *Moon*, and Movers, the latest writer of any eminence on Syro-Arabian idolatry, takes it to

have been the planet *Venus* (*Die Phœnicier*, i, 650). See BEL. On the other hand, if *Gad* be derived from גָּד in the sense of *press*, to *crowd*, it may mean a *troop*, a *heap* (to which sense there is an allusion in Gen. xlix, 19); and Hoheisel, as cited in Rosenmüller's *Scholia*, ad loc., as well as Deyling, in his *Obsevat. Miscell.* p. 673, have each attempted a mode by which the passage might be explained if *Gad* and *Meni* were taken in the sense of *troop* and *number* (see further Dav. Mill's diss. ad loc. in his *Diss. Selectæ*, p. 81-132). —Kitto, s. v. See MENI.

Some have supposed that a trace of the Syrian worship of *Gad* is to be found in the exclamation of Leah, when Zilpah bare a son (Gen. xxx, 11), גָּד גָּד, *ba-gad*, or, as the *Keri* has it, גָּד נָגַד, "Gad, or good fortune cometh." The Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan and the Jerusalem Targum both give "a lucky planet cometh," but it is most probable that this is an interpretation which grew out of the astrological beliefs of a later time, and we can infer nothing from it with respect to the idolatry of the inhabitants of Padan Aram in the age of Jacob. That this later belief in a deity Fortune existed, there are many things to prove. Buxtorf (*Lex. Talm.* s. v.) says that anciently it was a custom for each man to have in his house a splendid couch, which was not used, but was set apart for "the prince of the house," that is, for the star or constellation Fortune, to render it more propitious. This couch was called the couch of *Gada*, or good-luck (Talm. Babil. *Sanhed.* f. 20 a; *Nedarim*, f. 56 a). Again, in *Bereshith Rabba*, § 65, the words גָּד גָּד נָגַד, in Gen. xxvii, 31, are explained as an invocation to *Gada* or Fortune. Rabbi Moses the Priest, quoted by Aben-Ezra (on Gen. xxx, 11), says "that גָּד גָּד (Isa. lxx, 11) signifies the star of luck, which points to everything that is good, for thus is the language of *Kedar* (Arabic); but he says that גָּד נָגַד (Gen. xxx, 11) is not used in the same sense." Illustrations of the ancient custom of placing a banqueting table in honor of idols will be found in the table spread for the sun among the Ethiopians (Herod. iii, 17, 18), and in the feast made by the Babylonians for their god Bel, which is described in the apocryphal history of Bel and the Dragon (comp. also Herod. i, 181, etc.). The table in the temple of Belus is described by Diodorus Siculus (ii, 9) as being of beaten gold, 40 feet long, 15 wide, and weighing 500 talents. On it were placed two drinking-cups (*καρχήσα*) weighing 30 talents, two censers of 300 talents each, and three golden goblets, that of Jupiter or Bel weighing 1200 Babylonian talents. The couch and table of the god in the temple of Zeus Tryphilius at Patara, in the island of Panchæa, are mentioned by Diodorus (v, 46; comp. also Virgil, *Æn.* ii, 763). In addition to the opinions which have been referred to above, may be quoted that of Stephen le Moyne (*Var. Sacror.* p. 363), who says that *Gad* is the goat of Mendes, worshipped by the Egyptians as an emblem of the sun; and of Le Clerc (*Comm. in Isa.*) and Lakemacher (*Obs. Phil.* iv, 18, etc.), who identify *Gad* with Heate. Macrobius (*Sat.* i, 19) tells us that in the later Egyptian mythology *Tύχη* was worshipped as one of the four deities who presided over birth, and was represented by the moon. This will perhaps throw some light upon the rendering of the Sept. as given by Jerome. Traces of the worship of *Gad* remain in the proper names Baal *Gad* and Gildeneme (Plant. *Pan.* v, 3), the latter of which Gesenius (*Mon. Phœn.* p. 407) renders גָּד נָגַד, "favoring fortune" (comp. Wirth, *De Gad et Meni Judæorum hodiernorum diis*, Altorf, 1725). —Smith, s. v. See BAAL.

4. For the plant *gad*, see CORIANDER.

**Gadāra** (τὰ Γάδαρα in Josephus, prob. from גָּד, a wall [see GEDERAH]: only in N. T. in the Gentile Γαδάρῳ), a strong city (Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 13, 3), situated near the river Hieromax (Pliny, *H. N.* v, 16),

east of the Sea of Galilee, over against Scythopolis and Tiberias (Eusebius, *Onomasticon*, s. v.), and 16 Roman miles distant from each of those places (*Itin. Anton.* ed. Wess. p. 196, 198; *Tab. Pent.*), or 60 stadia from the latter (Joseph. *Life*, § 65). It stood on the top of a hill, at the foot of which, upon the banks of the Hieromax, three miles distant, were warm springs and baths called Amatha (*Onom.* s. v. Ætham and Gadara; *Itin. Ant. Martyr.*). Josephus calls it the capital of Peræa (*War.* iv, 3), and Polybius says it was one of the most strongly fortified cities in the country (v, 71, 3). A large district was attached to it, called by Josephus *Gadaritis* (Γαδάρῳ, *War.* iii, 10, 10); Strabo also informs us that the warm healing springs were "in the territory of Gadara" (ἐν τῇ Γαδάρῳ, *Geog.* xvi). They were termed *Thermæ Heliae*, and were reckoned inferior only to those of Baia (Euseb. *Onomast.*). According to Epiphanius (*adv. Hæres.* i, 131), a yearly festival was held at these baths (Reland, p. 775). The caverns in the rocks are also mentioned by Epiphanius (*l. c.*) in terms which seem to show that they were in his day used for dwellings as well as for tombs. Gadara itself is not mentioned in the Bible, but it is evidently identical with the "country of the Gadarenes" (χώρα καὶ περιχώρος τῶν Γαδάρῳν, Mark v, 1; Luke viii, 26, 37).

Gadara seems to have been founded and chiefly inhabited by Gentiles, for Josephus says of it, in conjunction with Gaza and Hippos, "they were Grecian cities" (*Ant.* xvii, 11, 4). The first historical notice of Gadara is its capture, along with Pella and other cities, by Antiochus the Great, in the year B. C. 218 (Joseph. *Ant.* xii, 3, 3). About twenty years afterwards it was taken from the Syrians by Alex. Jannæus, after a siege of ten months (*Ant.* xiii, 13, 3; *War.* i, 4, 2). The Jews retained possession of it for some time; but the place having been destroyed during their civil wars, it was rebuilt by Pompey to gratify his freedman Demetrius, who was a Gadarene (*War.* i, 7, 7). When Gabinius, the proconsul of Syria, changed the government of Judæa by dividing the country into five districts, and placing each under the authority of a council, Gadara was made the capital of one of these districts (*War.* i, 8, 5). The territory of Gadara, with the adjoining one of Hippos, was added by Augustus to the kingdom of Herod the Great (*Ant.* xv, 7, 3); from which, on the death of the latter, it was surrendered, and joined to the province of Syria (Joseph. *War.* ii, 6, 3). According to the present text of the Jewish historian, Gadara was captured by Vespasian on the first outbreak of the war with the Jews, all its inhabitants massacred, and the town itself, with the surrounding villages, reduced to ashes (Joseph. *War.* iii, 7, 1); but there is good reason to believe (see Robinson, *Later Bib. Res.* p. 87, note) that the place there referred to is GABARA (q. v.). However that may have been, Gadara was at this time one of the most important cities east of the Jordan (Joseph. *War.* iv, 8, 3). Stephen of Byzantium (p. 254) reckoned it a part of Cœle-Syria, and Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* v, 16) a part of the Decapolis (comp. William of Tyre, xvii, 13). At a later period it was the seat of an episcopal see in Palæstina Secunda, whose bishops are named in the councils of Nice and Ephesus (Reland, *Palæst.* p. 176, 215, 223, 226). It is also mentioned in the Talmud (Reland, p. 775; Ritter, *Erdk.* xvii, 318). For coins, see Eckhel (*Doctr.* Num. iii, 348). It fell to ruins soon after the Mohammedan conquest, and has now been deserted for centuries,



Coin of Gadara.

with the exception of a few families of shepherds, who occasionally find a home in its rock-hewn tombs.

Most modern authorities (Raumer, in his *Palästina*, Burckhardt, Seetzen) find Gadara in the present village of *Um-Keis*. Buckingham, however, identifies this with Gamala (*Trav. in Palest.* ii, 252 sq.); though it may be added that his facts, if not his reasonings, lead to a conclusion in favor of the general opinion. On a partially isolated hill at the north-western extremity of the mountains of Gilead, about sixteen miles from Tiberias, lie the extensive and remarkable ruins of *Um-Keis*. Three miles northward, at the foot of the hill, is the deep bed of the Sheriat el Mandhür, the ancient Hieromax; and here are still the warm springs of Amatha (see Irby and Mangles, p. 298; Lindsay, ii, 97, 98). On the west is the Jordan valley; and on the south is wady el 'Arab, running parallel to the Mandhür. *Um-Keis* occupies the crest of the ridge between the two later wadys; and as this crest declines in elevation towards the east as well as the west, the situation is strong and commanding. The city formed nearly a square. The upper part of it stood on a level spot, and appears to have been walled all round, the acclivities of the hill being on all sides exceedingly steep. The eastern gate of entrance has its portals still remaining. The prevalent orders of architecture are the Ionic and the Corinthian. The whole space occupied by the ruins is about two miles in circumference, and there are traces of fortifications all round, though now almost completely prostrate. These ruins bear testimony to the splendor of ancient Gadara. On the northern side of the hill is a theatre, and not far from it are the remains of one of the city gates. At the latter a street commences—the *via recta* of Gadara—which ran through the city in a straight line, having a colonnade on each side. The columns are all prostrate. On the west side of the hill is another larger theatre in better preservation. The principal part of the city lay to the west of these two theatres, on a level piece of ground. Now not a house, not a column, not a wall remains standing; yet the old pavement of the main street is nearly perfect, and here and there the traces of the chariot-wheels are visible on the stones, reminding one of the thoroughfares of Pompeii. Buckingham speaks of several grottoes, which formed the necropolis of the city, on the eastern brow of the hill. The first two examined by him were plain chambers hewn down so as to present a perpendicular front. The third tomb had a stone door, as perfect as on the day of its being first hung. The last was an excavated chamber, seven feet in height, twelve paces long, and ten broad; within it was a smaller room. Other tombs were discovered by Buckingham as he ascended the hill. He entered one in which were ten sepulchres, ranged along the inner wall of the chamber in a line, being pierced inward for their greatest length, and divided by a thin partition left in the rock, in each of which was cut a small niche for a lamp. Still more tombs were found, some containing sarcophagi, some without them; all, however, displaying more or less of architectural ornament. One of the ancient tombs was, when our traveller saw it, used as a carpenter's shop, the occupier of it being employed in constructing a rude plough. A perfect sarcophagus remained within, which was used by the family as a provision-chest. See Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 270 sq.; Porter, in *Journal of Sac. Lit.* vi, 281 sq.; Hackett, *Illustr. of Script.* p. 190; Traill's *Josephus*, i, 145.

Gadara derives its greatest interest from having been the scene of our Lord's miracle in healing the dæmoniacs (Matt. viii, 28-34; Mark v, 1-21; Luke viii, 26-40). "They wore no clothes, neither abode in any house, but in the tombs." Christ came across the lake from Capernaum, and landed at the south-eastern corner, where the steep, lofty bank of the eastern plateau breaks down into the plain of the Jordan. The dæmoniacs met him a short distance from the

shore; on the side of the adjoining declivity the "great herd of swine" were feeding; when the dæmons went among them the whole herd rushed down that "steep place" into the lake and perished; the keepers ran up to the city and told the news, and the excited population came down in haste, and "besought Jesus that he would depart out of their coasts." The whole circumstances of the narrative are thus strikingly illustrated by the features of the country. Another thing is worthy of notice. The most interesting remains of Gadara are its *tombs*, which dot the cliffs for a considerable distance round the city, chiefly on the north-east declivity, but many beautifully-sculptured sarcophagi are scattered over the surrounding heights. They are excavated in the limestone rock, and consist of chambers of various dimensions, some more than 20 feet square, with recesses in the sides for bodies. The doors are slabs of stone, a few being ornamented with panels; some of them still remain in their places (Porter, *Damascus*, ii, 54). The present inhabitants of *Um-Keis* are all troglodytes, "dwelling in tombs," like the poor maniacs of old, and occasionally they are almost as dangerous to the unprotected traveller.—In the above account, in the Gospel of Matt. (viii, 28), we have the word *Gergesenes* (Γεργεσηνῶν, instead of Γαδάρηνῶν), which seems to be the same as the Hebrew גֵּרְגֵּסַיִם (Sept. Γεργεσαῖος) in Gen. xv, 21, and Deut. vii, 1—the name of an old Canaanitish tribe [see GERGASSITES], which Jerome (*in Comm.* ad Gen. xv) locates on the shore of the Sea of Tiberias. Origen also says (*Opp.* iv, 140) that a city called *Gergesa* anciently stood on the eastern side of the lake. Even were this true, still the other Gospels would be strictly accurate. Gadara was a large city, and its district would include *Gergesa*. But it must be remembered that the most ancient MSS. give the word Γερασηνῶν, while others have Γαδάρηνῶν—the former reading is adopted by Griesbach and Lachmann, while Schoiz prefers the latter; and either one or other of these seems preferable to Γεργεσηνῶν.—Smith, s. v.; Kitto, s. v. See GERASA.

**Gadarene** (Γαδάρηνός), an inhabitant of GADARA (q. v.), occurring only in the account of the dæmoniacs cured by Christ (Mark v, 1; Luke viii, 26, 37), and perhaps to be read in the third Evangelist (Matt. viii, 28) instead of GERGSENE (q. v.).

**Gaddah**. See HAZAR-GADDAH.

**Gad'di** (Heb. *Gaddi'*, גַּדִּי, *fortunate*; Sept. Γαδδῖ), son of Susi, of the tribe of Manasseh, sent by Moses as the representative of that tribe among the twelve "spies," on their exploring tour through Canaan (Numb. xiii, 11). B.C. 1657.

**Gad'diel** (Heb. *Gaddiel'*, גַּדְיֵל, *fortune* [i. e. *sent*] of God; Sept. Γαδδῖήλ v. r. Γουδῖήλ), son of Sodi, of the tribe of Zebulun. He represented that tribe among the twelve "spies" sent by Moses to explore Canaan (Numb. xiii, 10). B.C. 1657.

**Gader**. See BETU-GADER.

**Gad'ite** (Heb. *Gadi'*, גַּדִּי, a *Gadite*; Sept. Γαδί v. r. Γαδῖ and Γαδῖ), the father of the usurper Menahem, who slew Shallum, king of Israel (2 Kings xv, 14, 17). B.C. ante 769.

**Gad'ite** (Heb. *Gadi'*, גַּדִּי, mostly collect. and with the art.; Sept. Γαδί, Γαδί, *v. r.* Γαδί, etc.), the descendants of GAD (q. v.), the son of Jacob (Numb. xxxiv, 14; Deut. iii, 12, 16; iv, 43; xxix, 8; Josh. i, 12; xii, 6; xiii, 8; xxii, 1; 2 Sam. xxiii, 36; 2 Kings x, 33; 1 Chron. v, 18, 26; xii, 8, 37; xxvi, 32).

**Gadsden**, CHRISTOPHER, D.D., Protestant Episcopal bishop of South Carolina, was born in Charleston Nov. 25, 1785. His early training was partly Episcopal and partly Congregational. In 1804 he passed A.B. of Yale College, where he formed a lasting friendship with John C. Calhoun. He was ordained deacon

in 1807, and priest in 1810. In 1808 he took charge of St. John's, Berkley, and soon after became assistant minister of St. Philip's, Charleston, of which he became rector in 1814, and in connection with which he spent the residue of his life. In 1810 he founded the Protestant Episcopal Society in South Carolina, which has proved an important auxiliary to clerical education and missionary effort. In 1814 he became rector of St. Philip's, Charleston, and the following year was made D.D. by the College of S. C. He was elected bishop in 1840, and in the earnest discharge of his duties gave particular attention to the spiritual interests of the colored people. He was distinguished for thorough learning and deep piety. He died in Charleston June 24, 1852. He published *The Prayer-book as it is*; three chapters to his clergy, entitled *The Times morally considered*, *The Times ecclesiastically considered*, and *The Times theologically considered*; and some Sermons.—*Sprague, Annals*, v, 510.

**Gaetanus.** See CAJETAN.

**Gafarel, Jacques**, a French mystic, was born at Mannes, in Provence, in 1601, and studied at Valence. He showed special aptitude for Oriental and cabalistic studies, and was made librarian at Paris to cardinal Richelieu. In 1625 he published *Abditæ divinæ Cabalæ Mysteria* (4to); and got into trouble by *Curiositez innuoyez sur la sculpture talismanique des Persans* (Paris, 1629-30, also 1631, 1637, and in Latin, *Curiositates Innuoytæ* [Hamburg, 1706, 8vo]), which was condemned by the Sorbonne. In 1632 he went to Rome, and became intimate with Leo Allatius. He travelled in Italy, Greece, and Asia; and on his return to Paris received several valuable Church preferments. He devoted himself to reclaiming Protestants, but was himself charged with preaching against purgatory. Bayle hints that he did this by order, in order to seduce Protestants. He died in 1681. Among his writings, other than those mentioned, are *Dies Domini, sive de fine mundi*, etc. (Paris, 1629, 12mo):—*Index Codicum cabalisticorum quibus usus est Joannes Mirambolanus* (Paris, 1651):—*Histoire universelle du monde souterrain* (1666, fol.).—Bayle, *Dictionary*, s. v.; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xix, 146.

**Gage, Thomas**, an English divine, noted especially for his conversion from Roman Catholicism, was born in Haling, in Surrey, about 1597. He entered into the Dominican order in Spain, after which he was sent as a missionary to the Philippine Islands; but instead of going thither, he went to Mexico, and then to Guatemala, where he spent ten years in missionary labors among the Indians. He returned to England in 1637, after an absence of twenty-four years, during which he had forgotten his native language. On examining into his domestic affairs, he found himself unnoticed in his father's will, forgotten by some of his relations, and with difficulty acknowledged by others. While abroad he had imbibed doubts of Romanism, and now he resolved to take another journey to Italy, to "try what better satisfaction he could find for his conscience at Rome in that religion." At Loretto his conversion from Popery was completed by his observation of the false miracles attributed to the picture of the Virgin there, and on his return home he preached a recantation sermon at St. Paul's, by order of the bishop of London. He continued above a year in London, but soon received from the parliamentary party the living of Deal, in Kent. His accounts of the West Indies and Spanish America gave rise to the expedition of admiral Penn against Jamaica in 1655. Page accompanied the fleet, and died of dysentery at Jamaica (1655). He published his *Recantation Sermon* (1642); a piece entitled *A Duel fought between a Jesuit and a Dominican* (4to); and *Survey of the West Indies* (1648, and again in 1655, fol.). This work was greatly admired, and was soon translated into most European languages. See Hook, *Eccles. Biogr.* v, 243; Eclard,

*Script. Ord. Predicatorum*, vol. ii; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xix, 151.

**Gage, William**, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Salem, Mass., Nov. 16, 1797. He graduated at Amherst College in 1828, then entered Andover Theological Seminary, where he graduated in 1831. He was licensed to preach the same year, and was settled in 1832 pastor over the churches of Concord and Pisgah, Ohio, where he remained until his death. He early espoused the anti-slavery views for which the presbytery of Chillicothe has been so long distinguished. Upon one occasion his house was pelted with eggs and stones, and he himself was threatened with tar and feathers if he would not desist from preaching and praying on the subject. He kept on in his course, however. He died July 9, 1863.—Wilson, *Presbyterian Almanac*, vi, 150.

**Gagelin, François Isidore**, a French missionary and martyr, was born at Mont-Pereux (Doubs), May 5, 1799, and educated at Besançon, and at the seminary of Foreign Missions at Paris. Having been appointed subdeacon, he embarked at Bordeaux in Dec., 1820, for Cochin China, and in 1822 was consecrated priest by Bishop Labarthe. The Christian religion had been tolerated in Cochin China since April 22, 1774, but the example of Tonquin, where it was strictly prohibited, was not without influence. In 1820 Miim-Mehn ascended the throne, and soon gave evidences of his dislike towards the new religion, yet did not begin persecuting the Christians until 1826. At that time the bonzes and mandarins addressed a petition to the emperor, asking for the expulsion of the missionaries. The Jesuits, becoming alarmed, fled; but Gagelin, less fortunate than his colleagues, was arrested and brought back to Hue-Fo. He was, however, permitted to continue his missionary efforts, and in 1828 was allowed to settle in the province of Dong Nai; but a strife between the different sects led to a general edict against the Christians, Jan. 6, 1833. Gagelin was again taken to Hue, and hung, Oct. 11, 1835.—François Pèrennes, *Vie de l'abbé Gagelin* (Besançon, 1836, 12mo); Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xix, 154 sq. (J. N. P.)

**Gagnier, Jean**, a French divine and Orientalist, was born in Paris about 1670. He was bred a Roman Catholic, entered into holy orders, and became a canon in the abbey of St. Genevieve, but became a Protestant and settled in England. He was patronized by archbishop Sharp and other eminent persons, and received the degree of M.A. at Cambridge and Oxford. He obtained the Arabic professorship at Oxford in 1715, and died in 1740. He published an edition of Ben Gorion's "History of the Jews," in Hebrew, with a Latin translation and notes (Oxf. 1706, 4to):—*L'indicie Kirchriane* (Oxf. 1718, fol.):—*L'église Romaine contrairement d'idolatrie* (La Haye, 1706, 8vo):—*Vie de Mahomet, traduite et compilée de l'Alcoran* (Amst. 1732, 2 vols.).—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xix, 166.

**Ga'ham** (Heb. *Gach'am*, גַּחַם, "in pause" *Ga'cham*, גַּחַם; perhaps, *having flaming eyes*; otherwise, *swarthy*; Sept. Γαῆμ v. r. Ταῆμ), one of the sons of Nabor by his concubine Reumah (Gen. xxii, 24), B.C. cir. 2200.

**Ga'har** (Heb. *Gach'ar*, גַּחַר, "in pause" *Ga'char*, גַּחַר; a *lurking-place*; Sept. Γαῆρ), one of the chief Nethinim whose descendants returned with Zerubbabel from the captivity to Jerusalem (Ezra ii, 47; Neh. vii, 49), B.C. ante 536.

**Gaianitæ.** A Monophysite sect of the 6th century, which derived its name from Gaianus, bishop of Alexandria, who denied that Jesus Christ, after the hypostatical union, was subject to any of the infirmities of human nature. See EUTYCHANISM.

**Gailer of Kaisersburg.** See GEILER.

**Gaillard, Jacques**, a French Protestant theo-

gian, was born at Montauban towards 1620. He became professor of philosophy in the Protestant academy of that city, but in 1659, certain disorders arising in the schools, he was expelled from Montauban, and resolved to quit the country. He went to Holland, and in 1662 became pastor of the Walloon church of Bois-le-Duc. He was subsequently director of the College of Leyden, and afterwards professor of theology in the university. He wrote *Genealogia Christi, cum enodatione difficultatum que occurrunt in evangelis Matthæi et Lucæ* (Leyden, 1683, 8vo);—*Melchisedecus Christus, unus rex justitie et rex pacis, seu exercitationes xii de Melchisedeco* (Leyd. 1686, 8vo). See E. Benoit, *Hist. de l'Édit de Nantes* (iii, p. 320-322; Bayle, *Nouv. de Li République des Lettres* (1684); Haag, *La France Protestante*, s. v.

**Gaisford**, THOMAS, D.D., an English divine and eminent classical scholar, was born in Wiltshire, Dec. 22, 1779. He was educated at Winchester school, where he was noted for his proficiency in Greek. He entered Christ Church, Oxford, in 1797, and was elected a student in 1800 by the unanimous suffrage of the chapter. He proceeded B.A. June 3, 1801, and M.A. April 11, 1801. He acted for several years as tutor in his college. His edition of the *Enchiridion of Iulianus*, published in 1810, established his reputation as an accurate and profound scholar. In 1811 he was made regius professor of Greek, and, after a number of valuable preferments, in 1831 he was made dean of Christ Church, which office he filled most ably till his death, June 2, 1855. So high was his reputation as a classical scholar that he was elected a member of the Institute of France and of the Royal Academy of Munich. In private life he "did justly, loved mercy, and walked humbly before God." The list of his classical publications is too great to be published here; among them were editions, in whole or in part, of Euripides, Plato, Aristotle, Herodotus, Sophocles. In theological literature he edited, besides other works, the following: *Cherubosci Dictata in Theodosii Canonibus, necnon Epimerismi in Psalmos* (3 vols. 1842);—*Eusebii Eclogæ Prophetice* (1842);—*Eusebii Præparatio Evangelicæ* (1843);—*Pearsoni Adversaria Hæsiatica* (2 vols. 1844);—*Etymologicum Anonymum* (fol. 1848);—*Vetus Testamentum ex Versione LXX Interp.* (3 vols. 12mo, 1848);—*Stobæi Eclogæ Physicæ et Ethicæ* (2 vols. 1850);—*Eusebii contra Hieroclem et Marcellum* (1852);—*Eusebii Demonstratio Evangelicæ* (2 vols. 8vo, 1852);—*Theodoretii Historia Ecclesiastica* (1854).—Hardwick, *Annual Biogr.* (Lond. 1850, 12mo).

**Gaius** (Γάιος, for Lat. *Caius*, a common Roman name), the name of three or four men in the N. T.

1. A Macedonian, and fellow-traveller of Paul, who was seized by the populace at Ephesus (Acts xix, 29), A.D. 54.

2. A man of Derbe (an epithet which some have very unnaturally transferred to Timothy) who accompanied Paul in his last journey to Jerusalem (Acts xx, 4), A.D. 55.

3. An inhabitant of Corinth with whom Paul lodged, and in whose house the Christians were accustomed to assemble (Rom. xvi, 23; 1 Cor. i, 14), A.D. 55. He was perhaps the same with one of the preceding.

4. A Christian (probably of Asia Minor) to whom John addressed his third epistle (3 John 1), A.D. cir. 92. See JOHN, EPISTLES OF. There is no good reason for regarding him as identical with either of the foregoing (Wolf, *Curæ*, ad loc.).

**Gaius**, DR. See CAIUS.

**Gal**, SAINT. See GALL.

**Gal'aad** (Γαλαάδ, 1 Macc. v, 9, 55; Jud. i, 8; xv, 5) and THE COUNTRY OF GALAAD (ἡ Γαλααδίτις, *Galaditis*, 1 Macc. v, 17, 20, 25, 27, 36, 45; xiii, 22), a Græcized form of the word GILEAD (q. v.).

**Gal'al** (Heb. *Galal'*, גַּלְגַּל, perhaps *weighty*; Sept. Γωλίλ, Γαλιλ, Γαλαάλ), the name of two Levites after the exile.

1. A descendant of Jeduthun, and father of Shemai-ah or Shammai (1 Chron. ix, 16; Neh. xi, 17), B.C. ant. 536.

2. One of those who dwelt in the villages of the Netophathites and served at Jerusalem (1 Chron. ix, 15), A.D. 536.

**Galanos**, DEMETRIOS, a Greek scholar, was born in Athens in 1760. He studied at Missolonghi, and subsequently at Patmos, where he remained six years perfecting himself in Greek learning. At the end of this time he was sent for by his uncle, Gregory, bishop of Cæsarea, who desired him to enter the priesthood. But Demetrios was resolved to devote himself to letters, and went to Calcutta as tutor in the family of a wealthy Greek in 1786. "After remaining six years in Calcutta, pursuing the study of the English, and also of the Sanscrit, Persian, and other Oriental languages, in addition to his duties as an instructor, he resolved to devote himself henceforth wholly to philosophy. Investing the property which he had acquired while there in a commercial establishment, he removed to Benares. Here he assumed the dress of a Brahmin, and lived in this way for forty years, respected alike by the native population and by European residents. He undertook the task of translating the most important portions of the Brahmical literature relating to philosophy into Greek. When he was seventy years old he began to think of returning to his native land, but he died with this wish unfulfilled, May 3, 1833. He bequeathed to the University of Otho, at Athens, all his library, consisting of Sanscrit books and MS. translations from them into Greek. Six or eight volumes of these translations have been published by the librarian of the university, and are found in the collection of modern Greek literature in the library of Harvard University. In this selection are included translations of the Vhagavata Purana, the Gita, the Dourga, and a portion, or, rather, an epitome of the Mahabharata, the most extensive and the most celebrated of all the works of Indian literature."—*Watchman and Reflector*, Nov. 7, 1861.

**Galante**, ABRAHAM ben-Mordecai, a Cabalist and Jewish commentator of the 16th century. He was a disciple of the new-school Cabalist, Moses Cordovero, and is best known by his mystical commentary on the Lamentations (קִינֵי תִּירְיָה קִינֵי בְּרָכָה), published, with additions, by Ibn-Shoëb under the title קִינֵי בְּרָכָה (Venice, 1589; 2d ed. Prague, 1621). Galante wrote also a commentary on the Sohar (or Zohar) (q. v.), entitled קִינֵי הַקָּדוֹשׁ, extending over the Pentateuch, but of which only the first part, on Genesis, was printed under the title קִינֵי הַקָּדוֹשׁ (Venice, 1655). The MS. of the unpublished parts of this work remain unedited in the Oppenheim Library. Jost (p. 237) says that the name of Galante's father was originally Mordecai *Angelo*, but that he, on account of his beauty, was called Galante, or, rather, Galant'uomo, in Rome, where he lived. When his sons, Abraham and Moses, afterwards emigrated to Palestine, they retained the new name of their father.—Jost, *Gesch. d. Juden-thums u. s. Sekten*, iii, 150; Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebr. Lit.* p. 360, 418; Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* i, 313. (J. II. W.)

**Galante**, MOSES ben-Mordecai, brother of Abraham (see above), was president of the celebrated Jewish college for rabbins at Safed. His קִינֵי הַקָּדוֹשׁ, *Index to Sohar (Zohar)* (Venice, 1666; 2d ed. Frankf. a. M. 1681), explains all the passages of the O. T. occurring in the Zohar (q. v.). This book exhibits the manner in which the Messianic passages of the Old Test. are treated in the Talmud and Cabbala. We have also from him a commentary on Eccle-

siastes (קָהֵלֵי רַגְלֵי, Saged, 1578), which is illustrated throughout with extracts from the Sohar. The time of his death is a matter of much dispute. Robinson (*Biblical Researches in Palestine*, ii, 430) and Fürst give it 1618; Steinschneider (*Catal. lit. hebr. in Biblioth. Bodliana*) places it much earlier, but Jost says that he was sixty-eight years old at the time of his death (1689), which would be impossible, as Abraham Galante is said to have died about 1600.—Kitto, *Encyclop. of Bib. Lit.* ii, 52; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenthums u. s. Sektén*, iii, 237; Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* i, 313. (J. H. W.)

**Galat'ia** (Γαλατία, also [Acts xvi, 6; xviii, 23] ἡ Γαλατικὴ χώρα), an important central district of Asia Minor (q. v.).

Galatia is literally the "Gallia" of the East. Roman writers call its inhabitants *Galli*, just as Greek writers call the inhabitants of ancient France *Γάλαται* (see Pritchard, *Nat. Hist. of Man*, iii, 95). From the intermixture of Gauls and Greeks (Pausan. i, 4), Galatia was also called *Gallo-Grecia* (Γαλλογρακία, Strabo, xii, 5), and its inhabitants Gallo-Graeci. But even in Jerome's time they had not lost their native language (*Prolog. ad Comment. in Ep. ad Gal.*; De Wette's *Lehrbuch*, p. 231). In 2 Tim. iv, 10, some commentators suppose Western Gaul to be meant, and several MSS. have *Γαλιαν* instead of *Γαλατιαν*. In 1 Macc. viii, 2, where Judas Maccabeus is hearing the story of the prowess of the Romans in conquering the *Γάλαται*, it is possible to interpret the passage either of the Eastern or Western Gauls; for the subjugation of Spain by the Romans, and the defeat of Antiochus, king of Asia, are mentioned in the same context. Again, *Γάλαται* is the same word with *Κέλται*; and the Galatians were in their origin a stream of that great Celtic torrent (apparently Kymry, and not Gael) which poured into Macedonia about B.C. 280 (Strabo, iv, 187; xii, 566; Livy, xxxviii, 16; Flor. ii, 11; Justin, xxv, 2; Appian, *Syr.* xxxii, 42). Some of these invaders moved on into Thrace, and appeared on the shores of the Hellespont and Bosphorus, when Nicomedes I, king of Bithynia, being then engaged in a civil war, invited them across into Asia Minor to assist him against his brother, Zybectas (Mennon, *op. Phot. Cod.* 224, p. 374), B.C. cir. 270. Having accomplished this object, they were unwilling to retrace their steps; and, strengthened by the accession of fresh hordes from Europe, they overran Bithynia and the neighboring countries, and supported themselves by predatory excursions, or by imposts exacted from the native chiefs. Antiochus I, king of Syria, took his title of Soter in consequence of his victory over them. After the lapse of forty years, Attalus I, king of Pergamus, succeeded in checking their nomadic habits, and confined them to a fixed territory within the general geographical limits, to which the name of Galatia was permanently given. The Galatians still found vent for their restlessness and love of war by hiring themselves out as mercenary soldiers. This is doubtless the explanation of 2 Macc. viii, 20, which refers to some struggle of the Seleucid princes in which both Jews and Galatians were engaged. In Josephus (*War*, i, 20, 3) we find some of the latter, who had been in Cleopatra's body-guard, acting in the same character for Herod the Great. Meanwhile the wars had been taking place which brought all the countries round the east of the Mediterranean within the range of the Roman power. The Galatians fought on the side of Antiochus at Magnesia. In the Mithridatic war they fought on both sides. Of the three principal tribes (Strabo, xiii, 429), the Troemi (Τρόεμοι) settled in the eastern part of Galatia, near the banks of the Halys; the Teetosages (Τεκτόσαγες) in the country round Ancyra; and the Tolistobogii (Τολισταβόγιοι) in the south-western parts near Pessinus. They retained their independence till the year B.C. 189, when they were brought under the power of Rome by the pro-

consul Cn. Manlius (Livy, xxxviii; Polyb. xxii, 24), though still governed by their own princes. Their government was originally republican (Pliny, v, 42), but at length regal (Strabo, xii, 390), Deiotarus being their first king (Cicero, *pro Deiot.* 13), and the last Amyntas (Dio Cass. xlix, 32), at whose death, in the year B.C. 25, Galatia became a province under the empire (see Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xviii, 597-610).



Coin of Galatia, with the Head of the Roman Emperor.

The Roman province of Galatia may be roughly described as the central region of the peninsula of Asia Minor, with the provinces of Asia on the west, Cappadocia on the east, Pamphylia and Cilicia on the south, and Bithynia and Pontus on the north (Strabo, xii, 566; Pliny, v, 42; Ammian. Marcell. xxv, 10). It would be difficult to define the exact limits. In fact, they were frequently changing. (See Smith's *Diet. of Class. Geogr.* s. v.) Under the successors of Augustus, the boundaries of Galatia were so much enlarged that it reached from the shores of the Euxine to the Pisidian Taurus. In the time of Constantine a new division was made, which reduced it to its ancient limits; and by Theodosius I, or Valens, it was separated into *Galatia Prima*, the northern part, occupied by the Troemi and Teetosages, and *Galatia Secunda*, or *Salutaris*: Ancyra was the capital of the former, and Pessinus of the latter. Thus at one time there is no doubt that this province contained Pisidia and Lycæonia, and therefore those towns of Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe, which are conspicuous in the narrative of Paul's travels. But the characteristic part of Galatia lay northward from those districts. On the mountainous (Flor. ii, 12), but fruitful (Strabo, xii, 567) table-land between the Sangarius and the Halys, the Galatians were still settled in their three tribes, the Teetosages, the Tolistobogii, and the Troemi, the first of which is identical in name with a tribe familiar to us in the history of Gaul, as distributed over the Cevennes near Toulouse (Cæsar, *Bell. Gall.* iv, 24; comp. Jablonsky, *De Lingua Lycaonica*, p. 23 sq.). The three capitals were respectively Tavium, Pessinus, and Ancyra. The last of these (the modern Angora) was the centre of the roads of the district, and may be regarded as the metropolis of the Galatians. These Eastern Gauls preserved much of their ancient character, and something of their ancient language. At least Jerome says that in his day the same language might be heard at Ancyra as at Trèves; and he is a good witness, for he himself had been at Trèves. The prevailing speech, however, of the district was Greek (Livy, xxxvii, 8; xxxviii, 12; Flor. ii, 11; see Spanheim, *ad Callim. Del.* 184). Hence the Galatians were called Gallogreci (Manlius in Livy, xxxviii, 17). The inscriptions found at Ancyra are Greek, and Paul wrote his epistle in Greek. (See *Penny Cyclopadia*, s. v. Celtæ, Galatia; Mannert's *Geographie der Griechen und Römer*, vi, 3, ch. 4; Merleker's *Lehrbuch der Historisch-comparativen Geographie*, iv, 1, p. 284.)

It is difficult, at first sight, to determine in what sense the word Galatia is used by the writers of the N. T., or whether always in the same sense. In the Acts of the Apostles the journeys of Paul through the district are mentioned in very general terms. We are simply told (Acts xvi, 6) that on his second missionary circuit he went with Silas and Timothy "through Phrygia and the region of Galatia" (ὡὰ τὴν Φρυγιαν καὶ τὴν

Γαλατικὴν χώραν). From the Epistle, indeed, we have this supplementary information, that an attack of sickness (*δι' ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκός*, Gal. iv, 13) detained him among the Galatians, and gave him the opportunity of preaching the Gospel to them, and also that he was received by them with extraordinary fervor (ib. 14, 15); but this does not inform us of the route which he took. So on the third circuit he is described (Acts xviii, 23) as "going over all the country of Galatia and Phrygia in order" (*διερχόμενος καθέξῃς τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν*). We know from the first Epistle to the Corinthians that on this journey Paul was occupied with the collection for the poor Christians of Judæa, and that he gave instructions in Galatia on the subject (*ὡςπερ ἐπέταξα ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας*, 1 Cor. xvi, 1); but here again we are in doubt as to the places which he had visited. We observe that the "churches" of Galatia are mentioned here in the plural, as in the opening of the Epistle to the Galatians themselves (Gal. i, 2). From this we should be inclined to infer that he visited several parts of the district, instead of residing a long time in one place, so as to form a great central church, as at Ephesus and Corinth. This is in harmony with the phrase *ἡ Γαλατικὴ χώρα*, used in both instances. Since Phrygia is mentioned first in one case, and second in the other, we should suppose that the order of the journey was different on the two occasions. Phrygia also being not the name of a Roman province, but simply an ethnographical term, it is natural to conclude that Galatia is used here by Luke in the same general way. In confirmation of his view, it is worth while to notice that in Acts ii, 9, 10, where the enumeration is ethnographical rather than political, Phrygia is mentioned, and not Galatia, while the exact contrary is the case in 1 Pet. i, 1, 2, where each geographical term is the name of a province (see Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, i, 243).

The Epistle to the Galatians was probably written very soon after Paul's second visit to them. Its abruptness and severity, and the sadness of its tone, are caused by their sudden perversion from the doctrine which the apostle had taught them, and which at first they had received so willingly. It is no fancy if we see in this fickleness a specimen of that "impetuous, mobile, impressible spirit" which Thierry marks as characteristic of the Gaulish race (*Hist. des Gaulois*, Intro. iv, v). From Josephus (*Ant.* xvi, 6, 2) we know that many Jews were settled in Galatia, but Gal. iv, 8 would lead us to suppose that Paul's converts were mostly Gentiles. The view advocated by Böttger (*Schauplatz der Wirkbarkeit des Apostels Paulus*, p. 28-30, and the third of his *Beiträge*, p. 1-5) is that the Galatia of the Epistle is entirely limited to the district between Derbe and Colossæ, i. e. the extreme southern frontier of the Roman province. On this view the visit alluded to by the apostle took place on his first missionary circuit, and the *ἀσθένεια* of Gal. iv, 13 is identified with the effects of the stoning at Lystra (Acts xiv, 19). Geographically this is not impossible, though it seems unlikely that regions called Pisidia and Lycaonia in one place should be called Galatia in another. Böttger's geography, however, is connected with a theory concerning the date of the Epistle (see Rückert, in his *Mog. 12., für Euseb., i*, 98 sq.), and for the determination of this point we must refer to the article on the GALATIANS, THE EPISTLE TO THE. (See Schmidt, *De Galatiis* [Hfeld. 1748, 1784]; Mynster, *Kleine theol. Schrift.* p. 60 sq.; Cellarii *Notit.* ii, 173 sq.; Forbiger, *Alle Geogr.* ii, 361 sq.; Hofmann, *De Galatia Antiqua* [Lips. 1726]; Wernsdorf, *De republ. Galatar.* [Norimb. 1743]; Hamilton, *Asia Minor*, i, 379).—Smith, s. v.; Kitto, s. v.

**GAL'atian** (Γαλατία), the patral designation (1 Macc. viii, 2; 2 Macc. viii, 20; Gal. iii, 1) of an inhabitant of GALATIA (q. v.).

**GALATIANS, EPISTLE TO THE**, the fourth in or-

der of the Pauline epistles of the N. T., entitled simply, according to the best MSS. (see Tischendorf, *N. T. ad loc.*), *πρὸς Γαλάτας*. (See the *Mercersburg Review*, Jan. 1861.)

I. *Authorship.*—With regard to the genuineness and authenticity of this epistle, no writer of any credit or respectability has expressed any doubts. Its Pauline origin is attested not only by the superscription which it bears (i, 1), if this be genuine, but also by frequent allusions in the course of it to the great apostle of the Gentiles (comp. i, 13-23; ii, 1-14). It is corroborated also by the style, tone, and contents of the epistle, which are perfectly in keeping with those of the apostle's other writings. The testimony of the early Church on this subject is most decided and unanimous (see Lardner, *Works*, vol. ii). Besides express references to the epistle (Irenæus, *Her.* iii, 7, 2; v, 21, 1; Tertullian, *De Præscr.* ch. 60, *al.*), we have one or two direct citations found as early as the time of the apostolic fathers (Polyc. *ad Phil.* ch. 3), and several apparent allusions (see Davidson, *Introd.* ii, 318 sq.). The attempt of Bruno Bauer (*Kritik der Paulin. Briefe*, Berlin, 1850) to demonstrate that this epistle is a compilation of later times, out of those to the Romans and to the Corinthians, has been treated by Meyer with a contempt and a severity (*Torrede*, p. vii; *Eindeut.* p. 8) which, it does not seem too much to say, are completely deserved.

II. *Occasion, etc.*—The parties to whom this characteristic letter was addressed are described in the epistle itself as "the churches of Galatia" (i, 2; comp. iii, 1) in Asia Minor, otherwise called Gallogræcia (Strabo, xii, 566)—a province that bore in its name its well-founded claim to a Gallic or Celtic origin (Pausanias, i, 4), and that now, after an establishment, first by predatory conquest, and subsequently by recognition but limitation at the hands of neighboring rulers (Strabo, *l. c.*; Pausanias, iv, 5), could date an occupancy, though not an independence, extending to more than three hundred years; the first subjection of Galatia to the Romans having taken place in B. C. 189 (Livy, xxxviii, 16 sq.), and its formal reduction (with territorial additions) to a regular Roman province in A. D. 26. See GALATIA. Into this district the Gospel was first introduced by Paul himself (Acts xvi, 6; Gal. i, 8; iv, 13, 19). Churches were then also probably formed, for on revisiting this district some time after his first visit it is mentioned that he "strengthened the disciples" (Acts xviii, 23). These churches seem to have been composed principally of converts directly from heathenism (ch. iv, 8), but partly, also, of Jewish converts, both pure Jews and proselytes. Unhappily, the latter, not thoroughly emancipated from early opinions and prepossessions, or probably influenced by Judaizing teachers who had visited these churches, had been seized with a zealous desire to incorporate the rites and ceremonies of Judaism (especially circumcision, ch. v, 2, 11, 12; vi, 12 sq.) with the spiritual truths and simple ordinances of Christianity. (See Cruse, *De statu Galatarum*, etc., Hafn. 1722.) So active had this party been in disseminating their views on this head through the churches of Galatia, that the majority at least of the members had been seduced to adopt them (i, 6; iii, 1, etc.). To this result it is probable that the previous religious conceptions of the Galatians contributed; for, accustomed to the worship of Cybele, which they had learned from their neighbors the Phrygians, and to theosophic doctrines with which that worship was associated, they would be the more readily induced to believe that the fulness of Christianity could alone be developed through the symbolical adumbrations of an elaborate ceremonial (Neander, *Apostolisches Zeitalter*, 2d edit. p. 400). It would seem that on his last visit to this region, Paul found the leaven of Judaism beginning to work in the churches of Galatia, and that he then warned them against it in language of the most decided character (comp. i,

9; v, 3). From some passages in this epistle (e. g. i, 11-24; ii, 1-21) it would appear also that insinuations had been disseminated among the Galatian churches to the effect that Paul was not a divinely-commissioned apostle, but only a messenger of the church at Jerusalem; that Peter and he were at variance upon the subject of the relation of the Jewish rites to Christianity; and that Paul himself was not at all times so strenuously opposed to those rites as he had chosen to be among the Galatians. Of this state of things intelligence having been conveyed to the apostle, he wrote this epistle for the purpose of vindicating his own pretensions and conduct, of counteracting the influence of these false views, and of recalling the Galatians to the simplicity of the Gospel which they had received. The importance of the case was probably the reason why the apostle put himself to the great labor of writing this epistle with his own hand (vi, 11).

III. *Time and Place of Writing.*—On the date of this epistle great diversity of opinion prevails. (See Fischer, *De tempore quo ep. ad G. scripta fuerit*, Longos, 1808; Keil, *De tempore*, etc., in his *Opus. acad.* p. 351 sq.; also *Ueb. d. Zeit.* etc., in Tschirner's *Analekten*, iii, 2, 55 sq.; Niemeyer, *De tempore*, etc., Gött. 1827; Ulrich, *Ueb. d. Abfassungzeit*, etc., in the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1836, p. 448 sq.) Marcion held this to be the earliest of Paul's letters (Epiphanius, *adv. Hæres.* xlii, 9); and Tertullian is generally supposed to favor the same opinion, from his speaking of Paul's zeal against Judaism displayed in this epistle as characteristic of his being yet a neophyte (*adv. Marc.* i, 20); though to us it does not appear that in this passage Tertullian is referring at all to the *writing* of this epistle, but only to Paul's personal intercourse with Peter and other of the apostles mentioned by him in the epistle (ii, 9-14). Michaelis also has given his suffrage in favor of a date earlier than that of the apostle's second visit to Galatia, and very shortly after that of his first. Koppe's view (*Nor. Test.* vi, 7) is the same, though he supposes the apostle to have preached in Galatia *before* the visit mentioned by Luke in Acts xvi, 6, and which is usually reckoned his first visit to that district. Others, again, such as Mill (*Proleg. in Nor. Test.* p. 4), Calovius (*Biblia Illust.* iv, 529), and, more recently, Schrader (*Der Ap. Paulus*, i, 226), place the date of this epistle at a late period of the apostle's life: the last, indeed, advocates the date assigned in the Greek MSS., and in the Syriac and Arabic versions, which announce that it was "written from Rome" during the apostle's imprisonment there. But this subscription is of very little critical authority, and seems in every way improbable; it was not unlikely suggested by a mistaken reference of the expressions in ch. vi, 17 to the sufferings of imprisonment. See Alford, *Prolegomena*, p. 459. Lightfoot (*Journal of Sacred and Class. Philol.* Jan. 1857) urges the probability of its having been written at about the same time as the Epistle to the Romans, and finds it very unlikely that two epistles so nearly allied in subject and line of argument should have been separated in order of composition by the two epistles to the Corinthians. He would therefore assign Corinth as the place where the epistle was written, and the three months that the apostle staid there (Acts xx, 2, 3) as the exact period. But when the language of the epistle to the Galatians is compared with that to the Romans, the similarity between the two is such as rather to suggest that the latter is a development at a later period, and in a more systematic form, of thoughts more hastily thrown out to meet a pressing emergency in the former. The majority of interpreters, however, concur in a medium view between these extremes, and fix the date of this epistle at some time shortly after the apostle's second visit to Galatia. From the apostle's abrupt exclamation in chap. i, 6, "I marvel that ye are *so soon* removed from him that called you," etc., it seems just to infer that he wrote this epistle not very long after he had left

Galatia. It is true, as has been urged (see especially Conybeare and Howson's *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, ii, 132), that *ὄχι το ταχέως* in this verse may mean "so quickly" as well as "so soon;" but the abruptness of the apostle's statement appears to us rather to favor the latter rendering; for, as a complaint of the *quickness* of their change respected the *manner* in which it had been made, and as the apostle could be aware of that only by report, and as it was a matter on which there might be a difference of opinion between him and them, it would seem necessary that the *grounds* of such a charge should be stated; whereas if the complaint merely related to the shortness of time during which, after the apostle had been among them, they had remained steadfast in the faith, a mere allusion to it was sufficient, as it was a matter not admitting of any diversity of opinion. We should consider, also, the obvious fervor and freshness of interest that seems to breathe through the whole epistle as an evidence that he had but lately left them.

The question, however, still remains, which of the two visits of Paul to Galatia mentioned in the Acts was it after which this epistle was written? In reply to this, Michaelis and some others maintain that it was the *first*; but in coming to this conclusion they appear to have unaccountably overlooked the apostle's phraseology (iv, 13), where he speaks of circumstances connected with his preaching the Gospel among the Galatians, *τὸ πρότερον*, the *former time*, an expression which clearly indicates that at the period this epistle was written, Paul had been at least *twice* in Galatia. On these grounds it is probable that the apostle wrote and dispatched this epistle not long after he had left Galatia for the second time, and perhaps whilst he was residing at Ephesus (comp. Acts xviii, 23; xix, 1 sq.), i. e. A. D. 51. The apostle would in that city have been easily able to receive tidings of his Galatian converts; the dangers of Judaism, against which he personally warned them, would have been fresh in his thoughts; and when he found that these warnings were proving unavailing, and that even his apostolic authority was becoming undermined by a fresh arrival of Judaizing teachers, it is then that he would have written, as it were on the spur of the moment, in those terms of earnest and almost impassioned warning that so noticeably mark this epistle. The reasons which Michaelis urges for an earlier date are of no weight. He appeals, in the first place, to chap. i, 2, and asks whether Paul would have used the vague expression, "all the brethren," without naming them, had it not been that the parties in question were those by whom he had been accompanied on his first visit to Galatia, viz. Silas and Timothy, and, "perhaps, some others." The answer to this obviously is that, had Paul referred in this expression to these individuals, who were known to the Galatians, he was much more likely, on that very account, to have named them than otherwise; and besides, the expression "all the brethren that are with me" is much more naturally understood of a considerable number of persons, such as the elders of the church at Ephesus, than of *two* persons, and "perhaps some others." Again, he urges the fact that, about the time of Paul's first visit to Galatia, Asia Minor was full of zealots for the law, and that consequently it is easier to account for the seduction of the Galatians at this period than at a later. But the passage to which Michaelis refers in support of this assertion (Acts xv, 1) simply informs us that certain Judaizing teachers visited Antioch, and gives us no information whatever as to the time when such zealots entered Asia Minor. In fine, he lays great stress on the circumstance that Paul, in recapitulating the history of his own life in the first and second chapters, brings the narrative down only to the period of the conference at Jerusalem, the reason of which is to be found, he thinks, in the fact that this epistle was written so soon after that event that nothing of moment had sub-



sequently occurred in the apostle's history. But, even admitting that the period referred to in this second chapter was that of the conference mentioned Acts xv (though this is much doubted by many writers of note), the reason assigned by Michaelis for Paul's carrying the narrative of his life no further than this cannot be admitted; for it overlooks the design of the apostle in furnishing that narrative, which was certainly not to deliver himself of a piece of mere autobiographical detail, but to show from certain leading incidents in his early apostolic life how from the first he had claimed and exercised an independent apostolic authority, and how his rights in this respect had been admitted by the pillars of the Church, Peter, James, and John. For this purpose it was not necessary that the narrative should be brought down to a lower date than the period when Paul went forth as the apostle of the Gentiles, formally recognised as such by the other apostles of Christ.

Some of the advocates of a date earlier than A.D. 50 suppose that the persons addressed under the name of Galatians were not the inhabitants of Galatia proper, but of Lystra and Derbe (Acts xiv, 6), since among the seven districts into which Asia Minor was divided by the Romans the name of Lycaonia does not occur; the latter therefore, with its cities of Derbe and Lystra, must have been included in the province of Galatia, as indeed Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* v, 27) makes it a part thereof. (See Schmidt, *De Galatis*, etc., Hefeld, 1748.) It is urged, in addition, that, while copious details are given in Acts xv respecting the founding of the Lycaonian churches, the first mention of Galatia (Acts xvi, 6) is merely to the effect that Paul passed through that country. On these grounds Paulus, Ulrich (*Stud. und Krit.* 1836), Böttger, and others hold that under the term *περιχωρον*, "the region round about" (Acts xiv, 6), Galatia must be included; and therefore they put back the composition of the epistle to a date anterior to the apostolic council (Acts xv). It is certain, however, that Luke did not follow the Roman division into provinces (which, moreover, was frequently changed), because he specially mentions Lycaonia, which was no province, and distinguishes it from Galatia. As to the latter point, no valid inferences can be drawn from the comparative silence of the inspired history upon the details of Paul's labors in particular places, provided his presence there is clearly recorded, although in brief terms. There seems, therefore, no reason to depart from the common opinion that the apostle's first visit is recorded in Acts xvi, 6; and consequently the epistle must have been written subsequently to the council (Acts xv). With this, too, the references in the epistle itself best agree. The visit to Jerusalem alluded to in chap. ii, 1-10, is, on the best grounds, supposed to be identical with that of Acts xv (A.D. 47); and the apostle speaks of it as a thing of the past. See PAUL.

IV. *Contents*.—The epistle consists of three parts. In the first part (i, ii), which is apologetic, Paul vindicates his own apostolic authority and independence as a directly-commissioned ambassador of Christ to men, and especially to the Gentile portion of the race. After an address and salutation, in which his direct appointment by heaven is distinctly asserted (i, 1), and a brief doxology (i, 5), the apostle expresses his astonishment at the speedy lapse of his converts, and reminds them how he had forewarned them that even if an angel preached to them another gospel he was to be anathema (i, 6-10). The gospel he preached was not of men, as his former course of life (i, 11-14), and as his actual history subsequent to his conversion (i, 15-24), convincingly proved. When he went up to Jerusalem it was not to be instructed by the apostles, but on a special mission, which resulted in his being formally accredited by them (ii, 1-10); nay, more, when Peter dissembled in his communion with Gentiles, he rebuked him, and demonstrated the danger of such in-

consistency (ii, 11-21). In the second part (iii, iv), which is polemical, having been led to refer to his zeal for the great doctrine of salvation by the grace of God through faith in Christ, the apostle now enters at large upon the illustration and defence of this cardinal truth of Christianity. He appeals to the former experience of the Galatians, and urges specially the doctrine of justification, as evinced by the gift of the Spirit (iii, 1-5), the case of Abraham (iii, 6-9), the fact of the law involving a curse, from which Christ has freed us (iii, 10-14), and, lastly, the prior validity of the promise (iii, 15-18), and that preparatory character of the law (iii, 19-24) which ceased when faith in Christ and baptism into him had fully come (iii, 25-29). All this the apostle illustrates by a comparison of the monage of an heir with that of bondage under the law: they were now sons and inheritors (iv, 1-7); why, then, were they now turning back to bondage (iv, 8-11)? They once treated the apostle very differently (iv, 12-16); now they pay court to others, and awaken feelings of serious mistrust (iv, 17-20); and yet, with all their approval of the law, they show that they do not understand its deeper and more allegorical meanings (iv, 21-31). In the third part (v, vi), which is hortatory and admonitory, the Galatians are exhorted to stand fast in their freedom, and beware that they make not void their union with Christ (v, 1-6): their perverters, at any rate, shall be punished (v, 7-12). The real fulfilment of the law is love (v, 13-15): the works of the Spirit are what no law condemns, the works of the flesh are what exclude from the kingdom of God (v, 16-26). The apostle further exhorts the spiritual to be forbearing (vi, 1-5), the taught to be liberal to their teachers, and to remember that as they sowed so would they reap (vi, 6-10). Then, after a noticeable recapitulation, and a contrast between his own conduct and that of the false teachers (vi, 11-16), and an affecting entreaty that they would trouble him no more (vi, 17), the apostle concludes with his usual benediction (vi, 18).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.; Fairbairn, s. v.

V. *Commentaries*.—The following are special exegetical helps on the whole of this epistle, the most important being designated by an asterisk [\*] prefixed: Victorinus, *Commentarii* (in Mai, *Script. Vet.* III, ii, 1); Jerome, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* vii, 367; *Opp. Suppos.* xi, 979); Augustine, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* iv, 1248); Chrysostom, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* x, 779); also Erasmus *Opp.* viii, 267, tr. in *Lib. of Fathers*, Oxf. 1840, vol. vi, 8vo); Cramer, *Catena* (vol. vi); Claudius Taur., *Commentarius* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* xiv, 139); Aquinas, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* vii); \*Luther, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1519, 4to, and often since; also in *Opp.* iii, 1, etc.; tr. London, 1807, 1835, 8vo); also his fuller *Commentarius* (Vitemb. and Haag. 1535, 8vo, and later; both works also in Germ. often); Bugenhagen, *Annotationes* (Basil. 1525, 8vo); Megander, *Commentarius* (Tigur. 1533, 8vo); Seripandus, *Commentaria* (in his work on Romans, Lugd. 1541, 8vo; also separately, Antw. 1565, 8vo, and later); Calvin, *Commentarius et Sermones* (both in *Opp.*; the former tr. Edinb. 1854, 8vo; the latter, Lond. 1574, 4to); Meyer, *Adnotationes* (Berne, 1546, Hanov. 1602, 8vo); Sarcer, *Adnotationes* (Frankfort, 1542, 8vo); Salmeron, *Disputationes* (in *Opp.* xv); Major, *Enarratio* (Vitemb. 1560, 8vo; also in German, ib. cod.); Musculus, *Commentarius* (Basil. 1561, 1569, fol.); Cogelnerus, *Solutiones* (Vitemb. 1564, 8vo); Chytræus, *Enarratio* (Franc. 1569, 8vo); Heshusius, *Commentarius* (Helmst. 1579, 8vo); Wigand, *Adnotationes* (Vitemb. 1580; Lips. 1596, 8vo); Grynæus, *Analysis* (Basil. 1583, 4to); Cornerus, *Commentarius* [after Luther] (Heidell. 1583, 8vo); Prime, *Expositio* (Oxford, 1587, 8vo); Heilbrunner, *Commentarius* (Lanng. 1591, 8vo); Perkins, *Commentary* (in *Works*, ii, 153; Camb. 1601, Lond. 1603; in Latin, Genev. 1611, 2 vols. fol.); Rollock, *Analysis* (London, 1602, Geneva, 1603, 8vo); Hoe, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1605, 4to); Winckelmann, *Commentarius* (Giess. 1608, 8vo); Weirich, *Expositio*

(Lips. 1610, 4to); Betuleus, *Paraphrasis* (Halle, 1612, 1617, 8vo); Battus, *Commentar. trii* (Gryphisen. 1613, 4to); Lysler, *Analysis* (Lips. 1616, 4to); Pareus, *Commentarius* (Heidelb. 1621, 4to; also in *Opp.* iii); Crell, *Commentarius* (Raconigi, 1628, 8vo; also in *Opp.* i, 373); Coutzen, *Commentarius* (Col. and Mog. 1631, folio); Himmel, *Commentarius* (Jena, 1641, 4to); Lithmann, *Συζητικὴ* (Upsal. 1641, 4to); Weimann, *Exercitationes* (Altorf. 1647, 4to); Terser, *Analysis* (Upsal. 1649, 4to); Linsington, *Commentary* (Lond. 1650, fol.); Coceius, *Commentarius* (Opp. v.); also *Explicatio* (ib. xii, 199); Feurborn, *Expositio* (Giess. 1653, 1669, 4to); Chemnitz, *Colligium* (Jen. 1656, 1663, 4to); \*Kunadus, *Disputationes* (Vitemb. 1658, 4to); Ferguson, *Expositio* (Edinb. 1657, Lond. 1841, 8vo); Lagus, *Commentatio* (Gryph. 1664, 4to); \*Stolberg, *Lectiones* (Vitemb. 1667, 4to); Kronmayer, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1670, 4to); Momms, *Meditationes* (Hag. 1678, 8vo); Van der Waeyen, *Verklaaring* (Lebard. 1682, 8vo; also in Latin, Franeker, 1681, 4to); \*Steengraacht, *Videgging* (Ench. 1688, 4to); \*Schmid, *Commentatio* (Kilon. 1690, Hamb. 1696, 1704, 4to); Leydeker, in *op. ad Gal.* (Tr. ad Rh. 1694, 8vo); \*Akersloot, *an de Gal.* (Leyd. 1695, 4to; in German, Brem. 1699, 4to); \*Spener, *Erklärung* (F. a. M. 1677, 1714, 4to); Aurivilius, *Animadversiones* (Halle, 1702, 4to); Locke, *Paraphrase* (Lond. 1705, 1733, 4to); Weisius, *Commentarius* (Helms. 1705, 4to); Mayer, *Dissertationes* (Gryph. 1709, 8vo); Van Dyck, *Anmerkungen* (Amst. 1710, 8vo); Boston, *Paraphrase* (in *Works*, vi, 240); Hazevoet, *Verklaaring* (Leyd. 1720, 4to); Vitringa, *De br. an d. Gal.* (Franq. 1728, 4to); \*Plevier, *Verklaaring* (Leyden, 1738, 4to); Rambach, *Erklärung* (Giess. 1739, 4to); Murray, *Erklärung* (Lips. 1739, 8vo); Wessel, *Commentarius* (L. Bat. 1750, 4to); Hoffmann, *Introductio* (Lips. 1750, 4to); \*Struensee, *Erklärung* (Flensb. 1764, 4to); Baumgarten, *Auslegung* (Hal. 1767, 4to); Michaelis, *Anmerk.* (2d ed. Götting. 1769, 4to); Zachariä, *Erklär.* (Götting. 1770, 8vo); Moldenhauer, *Erklärung* (Hamb. 1773, 8vo); Cramer, *Versuch* (in the *Beiträge zu Beförd.* i, 112 sq.); Chandler, *Paraphrase* (London, 1777, 4to); Weber, *Anmerkungen* (Lpz. 1778, 8vo); Semler, *Paraphrasis* (Hal. 1779, 8vo); Lavater, *Umschreibung* (in Pfenniger's *Magaz.* i, 33-72); Ricaulton, *Notes* (in *Works*, iii); Anon. *Erklär.* (in the *Beiträge zu Beförd.* v, 126 sq.); Esmarch, *Übersetzung* (Flensburg. 1784); Schütze, *Scho'ia* (Ger. 1784, 4to); Roos, *Auslegung* (Tüb. 1784, 1786, 8vo); Mayer, *Anmerk.* (Wien, 1788, 8vo); Krause, *Anmerkungen* (Frkf. 1788, 8vo); Stroth, *Erklär.* (in Eichhorn's *Repert.* iv, 41 sq.); Schilling, *Anmerkungen* (Leipzig, 1792, 8vo); Carpov, *Übersetzung* (Helmstadt, 1794, 8vo); Morus, *Azroaves* (Lips. 1795, 8vo); also *Erklär.* (Görl. 1798, 8vo); Anonym. *Anmerk.* (in Henke's *Magaz.* ii, 22); Bair, *Explicatio* (Freit. 1798, 8vo); Hensler, *Anmerk.* (Lpz. 1805); Borger, *Interpretatio* (L. Bat. 1807, 8vo); \*Winer, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1821, 1828, 1829, 1859, 8vo); Anon. *Uebers.* (Neust. 1827, 8vo); Platt, *Toples* (Tüb. 1828, 8vo); Paulus, *Erläuterung* (Heidelb. 1831, 8vo); Hermann, *In primis 3 cap.* (Lips. 1832, 4to); \*Usteri, *Commentar* (Zür. 1833, 8vo); \*Matthies, *Erklärung* (Greifs. 1833, 8vo); \*Ruckert, *Commentar.* (Lpz. 1833, 8vo); Fritzsche, *De wumillis lori*, etc. (Rostock, 1833-1, 4to); Zscheoke, *Erklärung* (Halle, 1834, 8vo); Schott, *Erklär.* (Lpz. 1834, 8vo); Sardinoux, *Commentaire* (Valence, 1837, 8vo); Windischmann, *Erklärung* (Mainz, 1843, 8vo); Barnes, *Notes* (N. Y. 1844, 12mo); Baumgarten-Crusius, *Galaterbrief* (in *Ereg. Schriften*, II, ii); Haldane, *Expositio* (London, 1848, 8vo); Olshausen, *Commentary* (tr. Edinb. 1851, 8vo); \*Hilgenfeld, *Erklärung* (Halle, 1852, 8vo); Brown, *Expositio* (Edinb. 1853, 8vo); Müller, *Erklärung* (Hamb. 1853, 8vo); \*Ellicott, *Commentary* (Lond. 1854, 1859, Andov. 1864, 8vo); \*Turner, *Commentary* (N. Y. 1855, 8vo); Jatho, *Erläuterung* (Hildesheim, 1856, 8vo); Anaker, *Auslegung* (Lpz. 1856, 8vo); Meyer, *Galaterbrief* (in *Commentar*, vii, Götting. 1857, 8vo); Bagee, *Commentary* (London, 1857, 8vo); Frana, *Commentarius* (Goth.

1857, 8vo); Twele, *Predigten* (Hann. 1858, 8vo); Wieseler, *Commentar* (Götting. 1859, 8vo); Jowett, *Notes* (in *Epistle*, I, London, 1859, 8vo); Gwinne, *Commentary* (Dubl. 1863, 8vo); Lightfoot, *Notes* (Lond. 1855, 8vo); Reithmayer, *Commentar* (Münch. 1865, 8vo); Vömel, *Anmerk.* (Freit. a. M. 1865, 8vo); Matthias, *Erklärung* (Cassel, 1865, 8vo); \*Eadie, *Commentary* (Glasg. 1869, 8vo); Brandes, *Freiheitsbrief* (Wiesb. 1869, 8vo). See EPISTLE.

**Gal'banum** (הַבְּנָנִי, *chelbenah'*, according to Fürst, *Hebr. Handb.* s. v., from בְּנָנִי, *fat*, i. e. resin, gum; Sept. and Vulg. merely Græcize and Latinize, χαλβάριον, *galbanum*) is mentioned in Exod. xxx, 34 as one of the substances from which the incense for the sanctuary was to be prepared: "Take unto thee sweet spices, stacte, and onycha, and *galbanum*." The Hebrew word is so very similar to the Greek χαλβάριον, which occurs as early as the time of Hippocrates, that they may be presumed to have a common origin. The substance is more particularly described by Dioscorides (iii, 8; comp. i, 71), who gives μετώπιον as an additional name, and states that it is an exudation produced by a ferula in Syria. So Pliny (xii, 25): "Moreover, we have from Syria out of the same mountain, Amanus, another kind of gum, called galbanum, issuing out of an herb-like fennelgeat, which some call by the name of the said resin, others *stagonotis*. The best galbanum, and which is most set by, is grisly and clear, withal resembling hameniacum." On the other hand, he describes the *metopion* as the product of a tree near the oracle of Ammon (xii, 49). Theophrastus had long previously (*Hist. Pl.* ix, 7) said that galbanum flows from a Panax of Syria. In both cases it is satisfactory to find a plant of the same natural family of Umbelliferae pointed out as yielding this drug, because the plant has not yet been clearly ascertained. The Arabs, however, seem to have been acquainted with it, as they give its names. Thus "galbanum" in Persian works has *barzu* assigned to it as the Arabic, *bireja* as the Hindostani, with *khulyan* and *metopion* as the Greek names (evident corruptions of χαλβάριον and μετώπιον, arising from errors in the reading of the diacritical points): *Künch* and *nuffl* are stated to be the names of the plant, which is described as being jointed, thorny, and fragrant (Royle, *Illustr. Himal. Bot.* p. 23). Lobel made an attempt to ascertain the plant by sowing some seeds which he found attached to the gum of commerce (*Obs.* p. 431). The plant which was thus obtained is the *Ferula ferulago* (see Kühn, *On Dioscor.* ii, 532) of Linnaeus (*System.* vi, 130 sq.), a native of North Africa, Crete, and Asia Minor (see Jacquin, *Hort. Vindob.* iii, pl. 36). It has been objected, however, that it does not yield galbanum in any of these situations; but the same objection might be made, though erroneously, to the mastich-tree, as not yielding mastich, because it does not do so except in a soil and climate suitable to it. Other plants, as the *Bubon galbanum* and *gummiferum*, have in consequence been selected, but with less claim, as they are natives of the Cape of Good Hope. The late professor Don, having found some seeds of an umbelliferous plant sticking to the galbanum of commerce, has named the plant, though yet unknown, *Galbanum officinale*. These seeds, however, may or may not have belonged to the galbanum plant (see Fropier, *Notizen*, xxix, 12). Dr. Lindley has suggested another plant, which he has named *Opa'ia galbanifera*, and which grows in Khorassan, in Durrad, whence specimens were sent to England by Sir John McNeill, as yielding an inferior sort of ammoniac. This plant has been adopted by the Dublin College in their Pharmacopœia as that which yields the galbanum (Pereira, *Mat. Med.* ii, pt. ii, p. 188). M. Bushe, in his Persian travels (quoted in Royle, *Mat. Medica.* p. 471, 472), identified the plant producing galbanum with one which he found on the Demawend mountains. It

was called by the natives *Khassuch*, and bore a very close resemblance to the *Ferula erubescens*, but belonged neither to the genus *Galbanum* nor to *Opoidea*. It is believed that the Persian galbanum and that brought from the Levant are the produce of different plants. See AROMATICS.

Galbanum is in the present day imported into Europe both from the Levant and from India. That from the latter country is exported from Bombay, having first been imported thither, probably from the Persian Gulf. It is therefore probable that it may be produced in the countries at the head of that gulf, that is, in the northern parts of Arabia, or in Persia (portions of which, as is well known, were included in the Syria of the ancients); perhaps in Kurdistan, which nearly corresponds with ancient Assyria. Galbanum, then, is either a natural exudation, or obtained by incisions from some umbelliferous plant. It occurs in commerce in the form either of tears or masses, commonly called *lump galbanum*. The latter is of the consistency of wax, tenacious, of a brownish or brownish-yellow color, with white spots in the interior, which are the agglutinated tears. Its odor is strong and balsamic, but disagreeable, and its taste warm and bitter. It is composed of 66 per cent. of resin and 6 of volatile oil, with gum, etc., and impurities. It was formerly held in high esteem as a stimulant and antispasmodic medicine, and is still employed as such, and for external application to discuss indolent tumors. The ancients believed that when burnt the smoke of it was efficacious in driving away serpents and gnats (Pliny, xii, 56; xix, 58; xxiv, 13; Virgil, *Georg.* iii, 415; Calpurn, v, 90; Lucan, ix, 916). Galbanum was also employed in adulterating the opobalsamum, or gum of the balsam plant (Pliny, xii, 54). It is still more to our purpose that we learn from Dioscorides that, in preparing a fragrant ointment, galbanum was mixed with other aromatic substances (compare Pliny, xiii, 2). The effect of such mixture must depend upon the proportion in which it or any other strong-smelling substance is intermixed, more than upon what is its peculiar odor when in a concentrated state. We need not, therefore, inquire into the reasons which have been assigned to account for galbanum being intermixed with stacte and onycha as sweet spices (see KALISCH, ad loc.). We see that the same practice existed among the Greeks and Egyptians (Virgil, *Georgics*, iv, 264; Colum. ix, 15, etc.). See *Penny Cyclopaedia*, s. v.; Celsius, *Herob.* i, 267 sq.; Michaelis, *Suppl.* iii, 753 sq.; Miller, *Herophyl.* i, 450.—KITTO, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See ANOINTING OIL.

**Gale, John**, a Baptist divine and learned controversialist, was born at London in 1680. He studied at the University of Leyden, and at the age of nineteen graduated M.A. and doctor of philosophy. He studied also at Amsterdam under Limborch, and was intimate with Le Clerc. The University of Leyden in 1703 offered him the degree of doctor of divinity if he would assent to the articles of the Synod of Dort. He became, in 1718, minister of the chapel in St. Paul's Alley, Barbican. But his ministry was of short duration. He died in 1721, at the age of 41. In 1711 he published his *Reflections on Wall's Defence of Infant Baptism*, and in 1719 held a dispute with the author. He was also the author of *Sermons on several Occasions* (2d ed. 1726, 4 vols.). He was an able preacher, highly appreciated by the respectable congregation to which he ministered, and brought to the discussion of matters in controversy large, exact, and well-digested learning, with no small dialectical skill. (L. E. S.)

**Gale, Theophilus**, a learned nonconformist divine, was born in 1628, at King's Teignton, in Devonshire. He entered Magdalen College, Oxford, in 1647, and became fellow in 1650. In 1652 he passed A.M., and soon became an eminent tutor and a distinguished preacher in the university. In 1657 he was invited to Winchester, and became a stated preacher there, in

which station he continued for several years. Having imbibed the principles of the nonconformists, on the re-establishment of episcopacy, at the restoration of Charles the Second, he refused to comply with the Act of Uniformity which passed in 1661. Deprived of his fellowship at Oxford, he was taken into the family of Philip, lord Wharton, in the capacity of tutor to his two sons. He was a diligent and multivarious student. In 1669 he published the first part of *The Court of the Gentiles*; or, a *Discourse touching the Original of human Literature, both Philology and Philosophy, from the Scriptures and Jewish Church* (Oxford and London 5 vols. 4to). It was received with great applause, and was reprinted in 1672-1682. "In the first part of this learned work, Mr. Gale endeavors to prove that all languages have their origin and rise from the Hebrew. To this he adds a deduction, importing that the pagan theology, physic, politics, poetry, history, rhetoric, are deduced from sacred names, persons, rites, and records; and showing, withal, how the Jewish traditions came to be corrupted and mistaken by pagans. In the second part he tries to prove that philosophy also has its origin from the Jewish Church. In the third part, the vanity of pagan philosophy is demonstrated from its causes, parts, properties, and effects; namely, pagan idolatry, Judaic apostasy, Gnostic infusions, errors among the Greek fathers, especially Origenism, Arianism, Pelagianism, and the whole system of popery, or anti-Christianism, distributed into three parts, mystic, scholastic, and canonic theology. In the fourth part he treats of reformed philosophy, wherein Plato's moral or metaphysic, or prime philosophy, is reduced to a useful form or method. He divides this, which is larger than any of the former parts, into three books, discoursing in the first of moral philosophy; in the second, of metaphysics; and in the third, of divine predetermination." In 1677 he was chosen to succeed Mr. Rowe as pastor. He died at Newington, 1678. Besides *The Court of the Gentiles*, he published in Latin an abridgment of it for the use of students, under the title of *Philosophia Generalis*, etc. (Lond. 1676, 8vo):—*Theophily*; or, a *Discourse of the Saints Amartyrieh God in Christ* (Lond. 1671, 8vo):—*The true Idea of Jansenism, both historic and dogmatic* (1669, 8vo):—*The Anatomy of Infidelity* (1672, 8vo):—*A Discourse on the coming of Christ* (1673, 8vo):—*Idea Theologicæ*, etc. (12mo):—*and The Life and Death of Thomas Treguisse* (1671, 8vo).—JONES, *Christ. Biog.*; Shedd, *Hist. of Doct.* i. 205.

**Gale, Thomas, D.D.**, a learned English divine and antiquarian, was born in 1636 at Scruton, in Yorkshire. He became fellow of Trinity, and was elected regius professor of Greek in 1666; was made prebendary of St. Paul's in 1676, and dean of York in 1697. He died April 8, 1702. He published *Opusculum Mythologicæ*, etc., Gr. and Lat. (Camb. 1671, 8vo):—*Historiæ Poeticæ antiqui Scriptores, Græce et Latine*:—*Herodoti Hælicarnassensis Historiarum*, lib. ix:—*Historiæ Britannicæ, Saxonicæ, Anglo-Danicæ Scriptores æt. ex ætate. codl. MS.* (Oxon. 1691, fol.). This work contains nearly all the original writers of English history.

**Ga'leëd** (Heb. *Gale'd*, גַּלְעָד, the heap of the wit-



Druidical Cairn and Kist-Vacens.

*ness*; Sept. *βουρὸς μάρτυς* et *βουρὸς μαρτυρεῖ*; Vulg. *Acerus testimonii* and *Galaud*), the name given by Jacob to the pile of stones [see GILGAL] erected by him and Laban to attest their league of friendship [see GILEAD], but called by Laban (Gen. xxxi, 47, 48) by the synonymous Syriac title of JEGAR-SAHADUTHA (q. v.). Traces of a similar custom appear in the consecrated mounds of the Druids and of the North-American aborigines of the Western States. See ALTAR; STONE.

**Galen** or **Galenus**, MATTHEUS VAN, D.D., was born about the year 1528, at West-Kapelle, on the island of Walcheren. As his parents were not in such circumstances as would enable them to give their son a liberal education, the expenses of his preparatory course at Ghent were borne by two benevolent gentlemen of his native place. From Ghent he went to Louvain, where he studied philosophy and theology. After taking his bachelor's degree, he gave instructions in this institution in sacred eloquence. Being licensed, he was, on the recommendation of the notorious Ruard Tapper, called to the professorship of theology in the recently founded university of Dillingen. This position he held from 1559 to 1563. Its duties were discharged in such a way as to secure for him a high reputation. From Dillingen he was called to occupy the chair of theology at Douay. Here, in 1564, he received his degree of D.D. With zeal and fidelity he labored at this post till his death, which occurred in 1573. He was a man of eminent learning, possessing for the time in which he lived an unusual familiarity with the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages. He was a member of the Council of Trent and of the Synod of Cambrai. He numbered among his friends some of the principal men of his time. Though a man of great learning, he is said to have been deficient in critical acumen. He wrote various works in Latin on practical and polemic theology. The substance of his lectures on pulpit eloquence was given to the public under the title of *Paralipomena*. He also wrote a *Commentarius in Epistolam D. Pauli ad Hebræos e Syro Sermonem in Latæum conversam* (Duaci, 1578; Lovan. 1599). An *Explicatio in Esaiam* is still preserved in manuscript in the University library at Leyden. His greatest merit consists in the service rendered to Church history by original contributions in this department, and by the publication of mediæval writings and documents. His works in this direction are *Vita S. Wilibrordi, Frisionum apostoli*:—*Oratio in vitam S. Georgii martyris*:—*Areopagitica seu opuscula quædam nusquam hæcenus excusa dicitur Chlodovici et Hilduicini de rebis gestis ac scriptis B. Macarii Jonici Dionysii Areopagite* (Colon. 1563; Paris, 1565):—*Alcuius Rhetorica ad Carolum Magnum* (Duaci, 1563; Colon. 1563):—*De originibus monasticis seu de prima Christianæ Monasticæ origine commentarius* (Dilling. 1564). See B. Glasius, *Godgeleerd Neerland*, D. i, blz. 485 en verv.; also J. N. Paquot, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire littéraire des dix-sept provinces des Pays-Bas, de la principauté de Liège et de quelques contrées voisines* (Louvain, 1763-1770, 18 vols. 8vo), iii, p. 301 suiv. (J. P. W.)

**Galenists**, a branch split off, in 1664, from the Waterlandians, who were Mennonites, or Anabaptists. The founder of the Galenists was called Galen Abraham Haan; he was a doctor of physic, and pastor of a Mennonite congregation at Amsterdam. He is celebrated as a man of great penetration and eloquence, and is supposed to have inclined to Socinian views. Assuming that the Christian system laid much more stress on practice than on faith, he was disposed to receive into the Mennonite Church all who acknowledged the divine origin of the books of the Old and New Testaments and led holy and virtuous lives. Such, in his judgment, were true Christians, and had an undoubted right to all the privileges that belong to that character.—Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. xvii, sec. ii, pt. ii, ch. v, § 7. See APOSTOOL; MENNONITES.

**Galenus**, HANS. See GALENISTS.

**Galerius**, VALERIUS MAXIMIANUS, Roman emperor, son of a shepherd, was born near Sardica, in Dacia, entered the imperial army, and served in the wars of Aurelius and Probus. Dioclesian (A. D. 292) conferred on him, along with Constantius Chlorus, the title of Cæsar, and gave him his daughter Valeria to wife. On the abdication of Dioclesian (A. D. 305), he and Constantius became *augusti*, or joint rulers of the Roman empire. On the death of Constantius at York (A. D. 306), the troops in Britain and Gaul immediately declared their allegiance to his son, Constantine (afterwards Constantine the Great), much to the chagrin of Galerius, who expected the entire sovereignty of Rome to fall into his hands. He died A. D. 311. Galerius hated the Christians bitterly, and is believed to have been the real author of Dioclesian's persecutions. See DIOCLESIAN. "Brought to reflection by a terrible disease, he put an end to the slaughter shortly before his death by a remarkable edict of toleration, which he issued from Nicomedia in 311, in connection with Constantine and Licinius. In that document he declared that the purpose of reclaiming the Christians from their wilful innovation and the multitude of their sects to the laws and discipline of the Roman state was not accomplished, and that he would now grant them permission to hold their religious assemblies, provided they disturbed not the order of the state. To this he added, in conclusion, the remarkable instruction that the Christians, 'after this manifestation of grace, should pray to their God for the welfare of the emperors, of the state, and of themselves, that the state might prosper in every respect, and that they might live quietly in their homes.' This edict brought the period of persecution in the Roman empire to a close."—Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, vol. i, § 57.

**Galfrid**, **Galfridus**. See GEOFFREY OF MONMOUTH.

**Gal'gala** (Γάλγала; Vulg. *Galgala*), the ordinary equivalent in the Sept. for GILGAL. In the A. V. it is named only in 1 Macc. ix, 2, as designating the direction of the road taken by the army of Demetrius, when they attacked Masaloth in Arbela—"the way to Galgala" (ὁδὸν τὴν εἰς Γάλγала). The army, as we learn from the statements of Josephus (*Ant.* xii, 11, 1), was on its way from Antioch, and there is no reason to doubt that by Arbela is meant the place of that name in Galilee now surviving as Irbid. Its ultimate destination was Jerusalem (1 Macc. ix, 3), and Galgala may therefore be either the upper Gilgal, near Bethel (Robinson, *Researches*, iii, 8), as Ewald thinks (*Isr. Gesch.* III, ii, 370, n.), or the lower one near Jericho, as the route through the centre of the country, or (as is preferable) that through the Ghor, is chosen. Josephus omits the name in his version of the passage. It is a gratuitous supposition of Ewald's that the Galilee which Josephus introduces is a corruption of Galgala—a view, however, which is favored by the reading in the margin of the above text, and which is adopted by Michaelis.—Smith, s. v. See GILGAL 3.

**Galicho** or **Galiko**, ELISHA BEN-GABRIEL, a Jewish commentator, was born about the middle of the 16th century (1552?). He was president of the Rabbinic college at Safed, over which Moses Galante (q. v.) at one time presided, and, like all the Safed men, was eminently cabalistic. He wrote a commentary on Ecclesiastes (בְּאֵיךְ עַל קִהָּלֵי, Venice, 1578), which he divided into 27 sections, according to the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet, including the finale. Ginsburg, in his *Historical and Critical Commentary on Ecclesiastes* (Lond. 1861, p. 67, etc.), gives an analysis and specimen of this work. The most cabalistic work of Galicho's is his commentary on the book of Esther (בְּאֵיךְ עַל אֶסְתֵּר, Venice, 1583). He wrote also a commentary on the "Song of Songs" (פִּירוּשׁ עַל שִׁיר)

גליליים, Venice, 1587), which has the Hebrew text and points, and in which he displays a genius for allegorical exposition.—Ftheridge, *Introd. to Hebr. Lit.* p. 415; Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit.* ii, 55; Fürst, *Bib. Jud.* i, 314. (J. H. W.)

**Galilæ'an** (Γαλιλαῖος), a native or inhabitant (John iv, 45, "of Galilee," Matt. xxvi, 69; Acts i, 11; v, 37) of GALILEE (q. v.); applied to the disciples of Christ as a term of contempt (Luke xxii, 59; Acts ii, 7). They were easily recognised as such, for the Galileans spoke a dialect of the vernacular Syriac different from that of Judæa, and which was of course accounted rude and impure, as all provincial dialects are considered to be, in comparison with that of the metropolis. It was this which occasioned the detection of Peter as one of Christ's disciples (Mark xiv, 70). The Galilæan dialect (as we learn from Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* col. 434; Lightfoot, *Cent. chorogr.* in Matt. proem. c. 86, 87; and others) was of a broad and rustic tone, which affected the pronunciation not only of letters, but of words. It partook much of the Samaritan and Syriac idiom; but, in the instance of Peter, it must have been the tone which betrayed him, the words being seemingly too few for that effect. (See A. Pfeiffer, *Dissert. de lingua Galilæor.*; also in his *de Talmude Judæor.* p. 137 sq.) The Galilæans are mentioned by Josephus (*Ant.* xvii, 10, 2; *War.* ii, 10, 6; iii, 3, 2) as a turbulent and rebellious people, ready on all occasions to rise against the Roman authority. This character of them explains what is said in Luke xiii, 1 with regard to "the Galilæans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices." Josephus, indeed, does not mention any Galilæans slain in the Temple by Pilate; but the character which he gives that people sufficiently corroborates the statement. The tumults to which he alludes were, as we know, chiefly raised at the great festivals, when sacrifices were slain in great abundance; and on all such occasions the Galilæans were much more active than the men of Judæa and Jerusalem, as is proved by the history of Archelaus (*Joseph. Ant.* xvii, 9, 10); which case, indeed, furnishes an answer to those who deny that the Galilæans attended the feasts with the rest of the Jews. The seditious character of the Galilæans also explains why Pilate, when sitting in judgment upon Jesus, caught at the word Galilee when used by the chief priests, and asked if he were a Galilæan (Luke xxiii, 6). To be known to belong to that country was of itself sufficient to prejudice Pilate against him, and to give some countenance to the charges, unsupported by impartial evidence, which were preferred against him, and which Pilate himself had, just before, virtually declared to be false. See Otho, *Lex. Rab.* p. 254 sq.—Kitto, s. v.

**GALILÆANS**, one of the names of reproach given to the early Christians. It was the ordinary phrase of Julian the apostate, when he spoke of Christ or Christians. He was accustomed to call Christ "the Galilæan God." Not only did he use this epithet himself, but made a law, requiring that no one should call the Christians by any other name, thinking thereby to abolish the name of Christians. He died fighting against them; and as he caught the blood in his hand which flowed from a wound in his side, he dashed it towards heaven, saying these memorable words: *Ἔ-cisti, O Galilæe!* "Thou hast conquered, O Galilæan!"—Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. i, ch. ii, § 2.

**Gal'ilee** (Γαλιλαία, often in the N. T. and Apocrypha, as well as Josephus), the rendering also in a few passages (Josh. xx, 7; xxi, 32; 1 Kings ix, 11; 1 Chron. vi, 76; Isa. ix, 1) of the Heb. גליל, *gallil'* (fem. גלילית, *g'ililath'*, 2 Kings xv, 29), which prop. signifies a *circle* (e. g. a ring, Esth. i, 6; Cant. v, 14), or circuit of country, i. e. one of the little circular plains among the hills of northern Palestine, such as is now seen near Kedesh. See **TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS**. As

a special locality, it is first mentioned by Joshua, who describes Kedesh as "in Galilee in Mount Naphtali" (xx, 7). Its limited extent is indicated in 2 Kings xv, 29, where the historian, detailing the conquests of Tiglath-pileser, states that "he took Ijon, and Abel-Beth-Maachah, and Janoh, and Kedesh, and Hazor, and Gilead, and Galilee, all the land of Naphtali." Galilee, therefore, did not extend beyond the bounds of Naphtali; and a comparison with other passages shows that it embraced only the northern section of that tribe, or at least that the name was at first confined to that district (Josh. xx, 7; xxi, 32; Josephus, *Ant.* v, 1, 18). The region thus lay on the summit of a broad mountain ridge. Here were situated the towns which Solomon offered to Hiram as payment for his services in procuring timber and stones for the Temple. Hiram, however, whose great want was grain for his island city, and who doubtless expected a portion of some of the rich plains of central Palestine, could not conceal his disappointment when he saw the mountain towns and their rugged environs, and declined them as useless (1 Kings ix, 11, and 2 Chron. viii, 2). See **CADUL**. At this period, Galilee, though within the allotted territory of Naphtali, does not appear to have been occupied by the Israelites. It was only after Hiram had declined the towns that Solomon rebuilt and colonized them (2 Chron. l. c.). Hazor, the great stronghold and capital of the northern Canaanites, lay within or near Galilee; and, though Joshua had captured and burned it (Josh. xi), yet during the rule of the judges it was possessed by a king, Jabin, whose general, Sisera, dwelt in the neighboring Harosheth of the Gentiles (Judg. iv). The presence of these powerful and warlike tribes, and the natural strength of the country, sufficiently account for the continued occupation of the old Gentile inhabitants. David subdued, but did not expel them. Solomon, as has been seen, took some of their towns; but they remained among these rugged mountains in such numbers that in the time of Isaiah the district was definitely known by the name of "Galilee of the Gentiles" (גליל גוים, *g'ilil g'oyim*, Isa. ix, 1: in Matt. iv, 15, Γαλιλαία τῶν ἔθνων; in 1 Macc. v, 15, Γαλιλαία ἀλλοθύλων). It is probable that the strangers increased in number, and became during the captivity the great body of the inhabitants; extending themselves also over the surrounding country, they gave to their new territories the old name, until at length Galilee became one of the largest provinces of Palestine. In the time of the Maccabees, Galilee contained only a few Jews living in the midst of a large heathen population (1 Macc. v, 20-23); Strabo states that in his day it was chiefly inhabited by Syrians, Phœnicians, and Arabs (xvi, p. 760); and Josephus says Greeks also dwelt in its cities (*Life*, 12). The name also occurs in Tobit i, 2; Judith xi, 8, etc.

In the time of our Lord, all Palestine was divided into three provinces, Judæa, Samaria, and Galilee (Acts ix, 31; Luke xvii, 11; Josephus, *War.* iii, 3). The latter included the whole northern section of the country, comprising the ancient territories of Issachar, Zebulun, Asher, and Naphtali. Josephus defines its boundaries, and gives a tolerably full description of its scenery, products, and population. He says the soil is rich and well cultivated; fruit and forest trees of all kinds abound; numerous large cities and populous villages, amounting in all to no less than two hundred and forty, thickly stud the whole face of the country; the inhabitants are industrious and warlike, being trained to arms from their infancy (*War.* iii, 3, 3; *Life*, 45). On the west it was bounded by the territory of Ptolemais, which probably included the whole plain of Akka to the foot of Carmel. The southern border ran along the base of Carmel and of the hills of Samaria to Mount Gilboa, and then descended the valley of Jezreel to Scythopolis to the Jordan. (The

Talmud, *Gittin*, vii, 7, gives a place called כְּפַר יְרִיחוֹ (as the southern limit.) The River Jordan, the Sea of Galilee, and the Upper Jordan to the fountain at Dan, formed the eastern border (Reiland, *Palest.* p. 181); and the northern ran from Dan westward across the mountain ridge till it touched the territory of the Phœnicians (Josephus, *War*, iii, 3, 1; compare Luke viii, 26). See PALESTINE.

Galilee was divided into two sections (Cyrill, *c. Jul.* ii), "Lower" (*ἡ κατώ*) and "Upper" (*ἡ ἄνω Γαλιλαία*, Josephus, *War*, ii, 20, 6; *Ant.* v, 1, 22). The Talmud has a threefold division, with reference to the Sabbatical year (*Shebi'ith*, ix, 2; "Upper Galilee [הַגְּלִילִי הַיָּבֵשׁ] embraces all above Capharnanias, and does not produce sycamores; Lower [הַגְּלִילִי הַיָּם], all below C., and bears sycamores; the valley is the territory of Tiberias" [the Ghor]). A single glance at the country shows that the division was natural. Lower Galilee included the great plain of Esdraelon, with its offshoots, which run down to the Jordan and the Lake of Tiberias; and the whole of the hill-country adjoining it on the north to the foot of the mountain range. The words of Josephus are clear and important (*War*, iii, 3, 1): "It extends from Tiberias to Zabulon, adjacent to which, on the sea-coast, is Ptolemais. In breadth it stretches from a village called Xaloth, lying in the Great Plain, to Bersabe." "The village of Xaloth" is evidently the Chesulloth of Josh. xix, 12, now called Iksâl, and situated at the base of Mount Tabor, on the northern border of the Great Plain (Porter, *Handbook*, p. 350). But a comparison of Josephus, *Ant.* xx, 6, 4, with *War*, iii, 2, 4, proves that Lower Galilee extended as far as the village of Ginea, the modern Jenin, on the extreme southern side of the plain. The site of the northern border town, Bersabe, is not known; but we learn incidentally that both Arbela and Jotopata were in Lower Galilee (Josephus, *Life*, 37; *War*, ii, 20, 6); and as the former was situated near the north-west angle of the Lake of Tiberias, and the latter about eight miles north of Nazareth (Porter, *Handbook*, p. 432, 377), we conclude that Lower Galilee included the whole region extending from the plain of Akka, on the west, to the shores of the lake on the east. It was thus one of the richest and most beautiful sections of Palestine. The plain of Esdraelon presents an unbroken surface of fertile soil—soil so good that to enjoy it the tribe of Issachar condescended to a semi-nomadic state, and "became a servant to tribute" (Deut. xxxiii, 18; Gen. xlix, 14, 15). With the exception of a few rocky summits around Nazareth the hills are all wooded, and sink down in graceful slopes to broad winding vales of the richest green. The outlines are varied, the colors soft, and the whole landscape is characterized by that picturesque luxuriance which one sees in parts of Tuscany. The blessings promised by Jacob and Moses to Zebulun and Asher seem to be here inscribed on the features of the country. Zebulun, nestling amid these hills, "offers sacrifices of righteousness" of the abundant flocks nourished by their rich pastures; he rejoices "in his goings out" along the fertile plain of Esdraelon; "he sucks of the abundance of the seas"—his possessions skirting the Bay of Haifa at the base of Carmel; and he "sucks of treasures hid in the sand," possibly in allusion to the glass, which was first made from the sands of the River Belus (Deut. xxxiii, 18, 19; Pliny, v, 19; Tacitus, *Hist.* v). Asher, dwelling amid the hills on the north-west of Zebulun, on the borders of Phœnicia, "dips his feet in oil," the produce of luxuriant olive groves, such as still distinguish this region; "his bread," the produce of the plain of Phœnicia, and the fertile upland valleys "is fat;" "he yields royal dainties"—oil and wine from his olives and vineyards, and milk and butter from his pastures (Gen. xlix, 20; Deut. xxxiii, 24, 25). The chief towns of Lower Galilee were Tiberias, Tarichea, at the southern end of

the Sea of Galilee, and Sepphoris (Josephus, *Life*, 9, 25, 29, 37). The latter played an important part in the last great Jewish war (Josephus, *Life*, 45; *War*, ii, 18, 11). It is now called Scfarieh, and is situated about three miles north of Nazareth (Porter, *Handbook*, p. 378). There were, besides, two strong fortresses, Jotopata, now called Jéfât, and Mount Tabor (Josephus, *War*, iii, 7, 3 sq.; iv, 1, 6). The towns most celebrated in N.-T. history are Nazareth, Cana, and Tiberias (Luke i, 26; John ii, 1; vi, 1).

Upper Galilee, according to Josephus, extended from Bersabe on the south to the village of Baca, on the borders of the territory of Tyre, and from Meloth on the west to Thella, a city near the Jordan (*War*, iii, 3, 1). None of these places are now known, but there is no difficulty in ascertaining the position and approximate extent of the province. It embraced the whole mountain range lying between the upper Jordan and Phœnicia. Its southern border ran along the foot of the Safed range from the north-west angle of the Sea of Galilee to the plain of Akka. To this region the name "Galilee of the Gentiles" is given in the O. and N. T. (Isa. ix, 1; Matt. iv, 15). So Eusebius states (*Onom.* s. v. Γαλιλαία). The town of Capernaum, on the north shore of the lake, was in Upper Galilee (*Onom.* s. v. Capharnaum), and this fact is important, as showing how far the province extended southward, and as proving that it, as well as Lower Galilee, touched the lake. The mountain range of Upper Galilee is a southern prolongation of Lebanon, from which it is separated by the deep ravine of the Leoutes. See LEBANON. The summit of the range is table-land, part of which is beautifully wooded with dwarf oak, intermixed with tangled shrubberies of hawthorn and albutus. The whole is varied by fertile upland plains, green forest glades, and wild picturesque glens breaking down to the east and west. The population is still numerous and industrious, consisting chiefly of Metâwileh, a sect of Mohammedans. Safed is the principal town, and contains about 4000 souls, one third of whom are Jews. It is one of the four holy Jewish cities of Palestine, and has for three centuries or more been celebrated for the sacredness of its tombs and the learning of its rabbins. Safed seems to be the centre of an extensive volcanic district. Shocks of earthquake are felt every few years. One occurred in 1837 which killed about 5000 persons (Porter, *Handbook*, p. 438). On the table-land of Upper Galilee lie the ruins of Kedesh-Naphtali (Josh. xx, 7), and Giseala (now el-Fish), a city fortified by Josephus, and celebrated as the last place in Galilee that held out against the Romans (*War*, ii, 22, 6; iv, 1, 1; 2, 1-5).

Galilee was the scene of the greater part of our Lord's private life and public acts (see Wichmannshausen, *De Galilæa*, Viteb. 1711; Buddeus, *De Galilæa rebus gestis Christi clara*, Jen. 1718 [*Miscell. Sacr.* iii, 1156 sq.]; Less, *De Gal. Serrat. mirac. theatro*, Gott. 1775 [*Opp.* 1781, ii, 309 sq.]). His early years were spent at Nazareth, and when he entered on his great work he made Capernaum his home (Matt. iv, 13; ix, 1). It is a remarkable fact that the first three Gospels are chiefly taken up with our Lord's ministrations in this province, while the Gospel of John dwells more upon those in Judæa (see Miller, *De ordine rerum Christi in Galilæa gestarum*, Hal. 1770). The nature of our Lord's parables and illustrations was greatly influenced by the peculiar features and products of the country. The vineyard, the fig-tree, the shepherd, and the desert in the parable of the Good Samaritan, were all appropriate in Judæa; while the corn-fields (Mark iv, 28), the fisheries (Matt. xiii, 47), the merchants (Matt. xiii, 45), and the flowers (Matt. vi, 28), are no less appropriate in Galilee. The apostles were all either Galileans by birth or residence (Acts i, 11), and as such they were despised, as their master had been, by the proud Jews (John i, 46; vii, 52; Acts ii, 7). It appears, also, that the pronunciation of those

Jews who resided in Galilee had become peculiar, probably from their contact with their Gentile neighbors (Matt. xxvi, 73; Mark xiv, 70; see Lightfoot, *Opp.* ii, 77). On the death of Herod the Great the province of Galilee was given by Caesar to his son Antipas (Joseph. *War.* ii, 6, 3). After the destruction of Jerusalem Galilee became the chief seat of Jewish schools of learning, and the residence of their most celebrated rabbins. The National Council or Sanhedrim was taken for a time to Jabneh in Philistia, but was soon removed to Sepphoris, and afterwards to Tiberias (Lightfoot, *Opp.* ii, p. 141). The *Mishna* was here compiled by Rabbi Judah Hakkodesh (cir. A.D. 109-220), and a few years afterwards the *Gemara* was added (Buxtorf, *Tiberias*, p. 19). Remains of splendid synagogues still exist in many of the old towns and villages, showing that from the 2d to the 7th century the Jews were as prosperous as they were numerous (Porter, *Handbook*, p. 427, 440).—Smith, s. v.; Kitto, s. v. See GALILEAN.

GALILEE, SEA OF (ἡ Θάλασσα τῆς Γαλιλαίας, Matt. iv, 18; xv, 29; Mark i, 16; vii, 31; John vi, 1), called also the *Sea of Tiberias* (John vi, 1; xxi, 1; hence its modern name *Bahr el-Tubariyeh*), the *Lake (Aiyun) of Gennesaret* (Luke v, 1), or emphatically the *Sea* (ἡ Θάλασσα simply, Matt. iv, 15); in the O. T.

mer says, "The Jordan discharges itself into a lake, by many writers known as *Gennesera*, 16 miles long and 6 wide, which is skirted by the pleasant towns Julius and Hippo on the east, of Tarichea on the south (a name which is by many persons given to the lake itself), and of Tiberias on the west" (v, 15). Josephus refers to other features. "The Lake of *Gennesareth* derives its appellation from the adjacent district. It is 40 furlongs (five Roman miles) broad, by 140 (17½ miles) long. Its waters are sweet, and extremely pleasant to drink, as they flow in a clearer stream than the muddy collections of marshes, and they can be drawn free from impurities, being throughout confined by abrupt and sandy shores. They are of a medium temperature, milder than those of the river or the fountain, yet uniformly colder than might be expected from the expanse of the lake. . . . The kinds of fish found here differ from those elsewhere met with" (*War.* iii, 10, 7). Both these are so near the truth that they could scarcely have been mere estimates. Its extreme length is 12½ geographical miles, and its breadth 6; equal to about 16 by 7½ Roman miles. It is of an oval shape, or rather the form of an egg, with the large end to the north. The Sea of Galilee has none of those picturesque or sublime features for which the lakes of Italy and Switzerland are justly celebrated; it has not even the stern grandeur of the Dead Sea. The shores are singularly uniform. There are no bold cliffs jutting far out into deep water; there are no winding bays running away inland. The bed of the sea is like a huge basin. Along its eastern and western sides the banks rise steep, bare, and rugged, to the height of nearly 2000 feet; and their tops, especially those on the east, are as level as a wall. At the north and south ends, where the Jordan enters and passes out, there are wide openings, through which views are gained up and down the valley. Yet nature has not left this scene altogether destitute of ornament. The scenery is not quite so dreary, nor are the hues of the landscape so dead and sombre as Dr. Traill would have us imagine (Traill's *Josephus*, ii, p. cvi). True, when the sun is high and the sky cloudless, and when the pilgrim looks down from the top of the mountains, there is a dreariness in the landscape, and a uniformity of cold gray color, which wearies the eye; but let him go down to the shore and wait till the sun declines, and he will be enchanted with the deep ethereal blue of the smooth water, and the tints, "rose-colored, pearl-gray, and purple, blended together," and thrown in soft shades over the sides of the encircling hills. The pale blue cone of Hermon, with its glittering crown of snow, forms a glorious background (Van de Velle, ii, 388; Robinson, ii, 380 sq.; Stanley, *Palestine*, p. 362; Porter, *Handbook*, p. 418). Round the whole shore, with only one or two short interruptions, there is a broad strand of white pebbles, mixed with little shells. The Jordan enters at the extreme northern end of the lake, and leaves again at the southern. In fact, the bed of the lake is just a lower section of the great Jordan valley. The utter loneliness and absolute



Shores of the Sea of Galilee.

rarely alluded to (Numb. xxxiv, 11; Josh. xii, 3; xiii, 27) as the *Sea of Cinnereth* or *Cinneroth* (q. v.). It is the second of the three lakes into which the Jordan flows (Tacitus, *Hist.* v, 6). This sheet of water is particularly described by Pliny and Josephus. The for-

stillness of the scene are exceedingly impressive. It seems as if all nature had gone to rest, languishing under that scorching heat. How different it was in the days of our Lord! Then all was life and bustle along the shores; the cities and villages that thickly studded

them resounded with the hum of a busy population, while from hill-side and cornfield come the cheerful cry of shepherd and ploughman. The lake, too, was dotted with dark fishing-boats, and spangled with white sails. Now, a mournful and solitary silence reigns alike over sea and shore. The cities are in ruins. Capernaum, Chorazin, the two (?) Bethsaias, Hippo, Gamala, and Tarichee, are completely deserted. Tiberias and Magdala are the only inhabited spots; and for several miles inland in every direction the country looks waste and desolate. The inhabitants—merchants, fishermen, and peasants—are nearly all gone. The few that remain in the shattered houses of Tiberias, and the mud hovels of Magdala, and the black tents of the wandering Bedouin, seem worn and wasted by poverty and sickness. In 1858 the Sea of Galilee could just boast of one small boat, and it was so rotten and leaky as not to be seaworthy. The fish, however, are as abundant as ever; for though only little hand-nets are used, a considerable sum is paid to the government for the privilege of fishing (Burckhardt, *Travels in Syria*, p. 332; Robinson, ii, 386). It was observed by Hasselquist that some of the same species of fish are found in the Sea of Galilee as in the Nile (*Travels*, p. 158): the same fact had been noted by Josephus (*War*, iii, 10, 8). The kinds referred to are *Cyprinus Benni*, *Silurus*, *Mormyrus*, etc. (See Wilson's *Lands of the Bible*, ii, 113; Robinson, ii, 386). Two modes are now employed to catch the fish. One is a hand-net, with which a man, usually naked (John xxi, 7), stalks along the shore, and, watching his opportunity, throws it round the game with a jerk. The other mode is still more curious. Bread-crumbs are mixed up with bichlorid of mercury, and sown over the water; the fish swallow the poison and die. The dead bodies float, are picked up, and taken to the market of Tiberias! (Porter, *Hand-book*, p. 432.) The water of the lake is sweet, cool, and transparent; and as the beach is everywhere pebbly, it has a beautiful sparkling look. This fact is somewhat strange, when we consider that it is exposed to the powerful rays of the sun, that many warm and brackish springs flow into it, and that it is supplied by the Jordan which rushes into its northern end, a turbid, ruddy torrent.

The most remarkable fact in the physical geography of the Sea of Galilee is its great depression. The results of barometrical observations have varied between 845 feet and 666 feet, but according to the trigonometrical survey of Lieut. Symonds, R.E., in 1841, its depression is only 328 feet. In this Van de Velde thinks there must have been some mistake, and he adheres to the figures of Lieut. Lynch, which give 653 feet, as probably the most accurate (*Memoir*, p. 168, 181). This has a marked effect on the temperature, climate, and natural products. The heat is intense during the summer months. The harvest on the shore is nearly a month earlier than on the neighboring high lands of Galilee and Bashan. Frost is unknown, and snow very rarely falls. The trees, plants, and vegetables are those usually found in Egypt; such as the palm, the lote-tree (*Zizyphus lotus*), the indigo plant, etc. (Robinson, ii, 388; Josephus, *War*, iii, 10, 7 and 8). The surrounding hills are sometimes described as bare and barren, sometimes as green and fertile. In April the tops of the hills are gray and rocky, and destitute of vegetation. Lower down, the grass, which during the winter rains had flourished, is there withering in the sun (Matt. xiii, 6); but in the valleys and ravines, wherever any of the many fountains and streams gushed forth, there is verdure and cultivation (Matt. xiii, 8). Though the whole basin of the lake, and indeed the Jordan valley, is of volcanic origin, as evidenced by the thermal springs and the frequent earthquakes, yet the main formation of the surrounding wall of mountains is limestone. A large number of black stones and boulders of basaltic tufa are scattered along the slopes and upland plains, and dikes of basalt here

and there burst through the limestone strata in the neighborhood of Tiberias and along the northern shore. Although the surface of the lake is usually very placid, yet travellers (Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 32; Hackett, *Illustra. of Scripture*, p. 319) testify to the sudden fury of storms bursting down into this sunken basin through the ravined shore as in the days of our Saviour (Luke viii, 23; see Michaelis, *De tempstate*, etc., Hal. 1739; also *De sensu spirituali tempestatis*, etc., ib. cod.; Duthovius, *Divinus Chr. ex miraculo hoc demonstrata*, in the *Bibl. Brem.* i, 60-85; ii, 484-7).—Kitto, s. v. See GENNESARETH; SEA.

Galilee, a porch or chapel, usually at the west end of a church, where the monks collected on returning from processions, and where females were permitted to visit their relatives among the monks; also a portion of the church, usually a step lower than the rest of the church, deemed less sacred than the remainder of the edifice, and beyond which women were not permitted to pass. Three of them remain in England, at Durham, Lincoln, and Ely cathedrals. The galilee at Durham has five aisles and three altars, and the consistory court is held in it; that of Lincoln is at the south-west corner of the south transept, and is cruciform in shape; while that of Ely differs little from an entrance porch. (G. F. C.)

Galileo Galilei, one of the most celebrated Italian writers on natural sciences, mathematics, and astronomy, was born February 18, 1564. He at first studied medicine, but soon devoted himself wholly to natural and mathematical science. In 1589 he was appointed professor of mathematics at the University of Pisa. In 1592 he was called by the republic of Venetia to the University of Padua. From 1604 Galileo devoted himself chiefly to astronomy, and soon became as celebrated by his astronomical discoveries as he had formerly been by those in mathematics and mechanics. It was especially the introduction of the telescope in 1609 which gave a powerful impulse to his genius. He was the first to notice the mountains of the moon, the satellites of Jupiter, the ring of Saturn, and the spots on the sun; and from the motion of the latter he derived an argument in favor of the motion of the sun. Galileo published his discoveries in his *Sidereus nuncius* (1610). Soon the grand-duke of Tuscany called him as first professor of mathematics to Pisa, without obliging him to lecture, in order to give him an opportunity to devote himself wholly to scientific researches. But his reputation awakened against him a great deal of hatred and envy, and finally he was denounced to the Inquisition for defending and developing the Copernican system. The Inquisition found the views of Copernicus and Galileo irreconcilable with the letter of the Scripture. Galileo went himself to Rome to defend himself, but without effect. His astronomical views were examined by the theological qualifiers, and declared to be absurd, false in philosophy, and contrary to the Holy Scriptures. In 1616 and 1620, decrees were issued allowing to set up the system of Copernicus as a hypothesis, but forbidding it to be defended as a thesis. Galileo paid no attention to this demand, but sixteen years later published his "Dialogues on the two greatest cosmic systems, that of Ptolemy and that of Copernicus," in which the two systems are compared, and, to satisfy the Inquisition, the victory is awarded to the champion of the system of Ptolemy; but, in fact, the arguments used in its behalf are so weak, and so manifestly inferior to those adduced in favor of the Copernican system, as to leave no doubt as to the real opinions of Galileo. His enemies found it easy to cause new measures to be taken against him by the Inquisition. Galileo was in 1633 again summoned to Rome. He was at first allowed to live in the Villa Medici; subsequently he was some time detained as a prisoner in the buildings of the Inquisition; finally he



was sent back to the Villa Medici. The result of the investigation was that Galileo was found guilty of having adhered to and of having supported heretical opinions; and he had to abjure his errors in a kneeling posture, and to sign the minutes of the proceedings against him. He was condemned to be imprisoned at the Inquisition during pleasure, and to recite once a week for three years the penitential Psalms. Galileo submitted to the judgment, and, kneeling and in sackcloth, swore upon the Gospels never again to teach the earth's motion and the sun's stability. When rising from the ground, he is reported to have said, in an undertone, *E pur si muove* ("And it does move, for all that"); but the authenticity of this report is doubted. After four days' confinement, he was allowed to remove to the residence of the Tuscan ambassador, but he was kept under surveillance during the whole remainder of his life. In 1634 he asked permission to visit Florence for medical assistance, but the permission was not granted until 1638. The severity of the Inquisition was somewhat relaxed in 1637, when he became almost totally blind. During the latter years of his life he seems to have paid less attention to astronomy, but the works of this period on other subjects show that his genius was as great as ever. He died January 8, 1642. The city of Pisa erected a statue in his honor. The completed edition of the works of Galileo is *Le Opere di Galileo Galilei* (Florence, 1842-56, 15 vols.). The most important of his works is *Discorsi intorno a due nuove scienze* (Leyden, 1638). Biographies of Galileo were written by Ghirardini, Viviani (1651), Frisi (Livorno, 1775), Jagemann (Weimar, 1783), Nelli (Lausanne, 1793), Venturi (Milan, 1818-21), Libri (Milan, 1841), Brewster (London, 1841), Cattaneo (Milan, 1843), Caspar (Stuttgart, 1854), Chasles (Paris, 1862). On the trial of Galileo by the Inquisition, there are special works and essays by Marini (*Galileo e l'Inquisizione*, Rome, 1850); Madden (*Galileo and the Inquisition*, London, 1863); Vosen (*G. und die Röm. Verurtheilung des copernicanischen Systems*, Frankf., 1865); *The Catholic World* (Jan. and Feb. 1869). (A. J. S.)

**Galitzin.** See GALLITZIN.

**Gall**, the representative in the A. V. of two Hebrew words and one Greek.

1. *Mererak' or merorak'* (מֵרַרֶקֶת or מֵרַרֶקֶת; Sept.  $\chi\omicron\lambda\eta$ ,  $\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\alpha}$ ,  $\zeta\iota\alpha\tau\alpha$ ; Vulg. *fel*, *amaritudo*, *viscera nea*) denotes etymologically bitterness; see Job xiii, 26, "Thou writest bitter things against me." Hence the term is applied to the "bile" or "gall" from its intense bitterness (Job xvi, 13). The metaphors in this verse are taken from the practice of huntsmen, who first surround the beast, then shoot it, and next take out the entrails. The term also stands for the gall-bladder or vitals (Job xx, 25). It is also used of the "poison" of serpents (Job xx, 14), which the ancients erroneously believed was their gall: see Pliny, *H. N.* xi, 37, "No one should be astonished that it is the gall which constitutes the poison of serpents" (comp. Heb. xii, 15, "root of bitterness"). See LIVER.

2. *Rosh* (רֹשׁ or רֹשׁ; Sept.  $\chi\omicron\lambda\eta$ ,  $\pi\iota\kappa\rho\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$ ,  $\alpha\gamma\rho\omega\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ ; Vulg. *fel*, *amaritudo*, *caput*), generally translated "gall" by the A. V., but in Hos. x, 4 rendered "hemlock;" in Deut. xxxii, 33, and Job xx, 16, it denotes the "poison" or "venom" of serpents. From Deut. xxix, 18, "a root that beareth *rosh*" (margin "a poisonous herb"), and Lam. iii, 19, "the wormwood and the *rosh*," compared with Hos. x, 4, "judgment springeth up as *rosh*," it is evident that the Heb. term denotes some bitter, and perhaps poisonous plant, though it may also be used, as in Psa. lxix, 21, in the general sense of "something very bitter." Celsius (*Hierob.* ii, 46-52) thinks "hemlock" (*Conium maculatum*) is intended, and quotes Jerome on Hosea in support of his opinion, though it seems that this commentator had in view the couch-grass (*Triticum repens*) rather than

"hemlock." Rosenmüller (*Bib. Bot.* p. 118) is inclined to think that the *Lolium temulentum* best agrees with the passage in Hosea where the *rosh* is said to grow "in the furrows of the field." Other writers have supposed, and with some reason (from Deut. xxxii, 32, "their grapes are grapes of *rosh*"), that some berry-bearing plant must be intended. Gesenius (*Theo.* p. 1251) understands "poppies;" Michaelis (*Suppl. Lex. Heb.* p. 2220) is of opinion that *rosh* may be either the *Lolium temulentum* or the *Solanum* ("nightshade"). Oedmann (*Vern. Samml.* pt. iv, c. 10) argues in favor of the *Colocynthis*. The most probable conjecture, for proof there is none, is that of Gesenius: the capsules of the *Papaveraceæ* may well give the name of *rosh* ("head") to the plant in question, just as we speak of poppy heads. The various species of this family spring up quickly in cornfields, and the juice is extremely bitter. A steeped solution of poppy heads may be "the water of gall" of Jer. viii, 14, unless, as Gesenius thinks, the מַרְרָה may be the poisonous extract, *opium*. This word is always used figuratively to represent sin, and never designates the animal secretion called gall. See HEMLOCK.

3. Gr.  $\chi\omicron\lambda\eta$ , prop. the bitter secretion gall. In the story of Tobit the *gall* of a fish is said to have been used to cure his father's blindness (Tobit vi, 8; xi, 10, 13). Pliny refers to the use of the same substance for diseases of the eye (*Hist. Nat.* xxxviii, 10); also speaking of the fish *callionymus*, he says it has a similar curative virtue (xxxii, 4, 7). Galen and other writers praise the use of the liver of the *silurus* in cases of dimness of sight. See BLINDNESS.

The passages in the Gospels which relate the circumstance of the Roman soldiers offering our Lord, just before his crucifixion, "vinegar mingled with gall," according to Matthew (xxvii, 34), and "wine mingled with myrrh," according to Mark's account (xv, 23), require some consideration. The first-named evangelist uses  $\chi\omicron\lambda\eta$ , which is the Sept. rendering of the Heb. *rosh* in the Psalm (lxix, 21) that foretels the Lord's sufferings. Mark explains the bitter ingredient in the sour vinous drink to be "myrrh" ( $\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\sigma\mu\omega\nu\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ ), for we cannot regard the transactions as different. "Matthew, in his usual way," as Hengstenberg (*Comment.* in Psa. lxix, 21) remarks, "designates the drink theologically: always keeping his eye on the prophecies of the O. T., he speaks of gall and vinegar for the purpose of rendering the fulfilment of the Psalm more manifest. Mark again (xv, 23), according to his way, looks rather at the outward quality of the drink." Bengel takes quite a different view; he thinks both myrrh and gall were added to the sour wine (*Gnom. Nov. Test.* Matt. l. c.). Hengstenberg's view is far preferable; nor is "gall" ( $\chi\omicron\lambda\eta$ ) to be understood in any other sense than as expressing the bitter nature of the draught. As to the intent of the proffered drink, it is generally supposed that it was for the purpose of deadening pain. It was customary to give criminals just before their execution a cup of wine with frankincense in it, to which reference is made, it is believed, by the  $\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\nu\acute{\omicron}\xi\omega\varsigma$  of Psa. lx, 3; see also Prov. xxxi, 6. This the Talmud states was given in order to alleviate the pain. See Buxtorf (*Lex. Talm.* col. 2131), who quotes from the Talmud (*Sanhed.* fol. 43, 1) to that effect. Rosenmüller (*Bib. Bot.* p. 163) is of opinion that the myrrh was given to our Lord, not for the purpose of alleviating his sufferings, but in order that he might be sustained until the punishment was completed. He quotes from Apuleius (*Metamor.* viii), who relates that a certain priest "disfigured himself with a multitude of blows, having previously strengthened himself by taking myrrh." How far the frankincense in the cup, as mentioned in the Talmud, was supposed to possess soporific properties, or in any way to induce an alleviation of pain, it is difficult to determine. The same must be said of the  $\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\sigma\mu\omega\nu\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$  of Mark, for it is quite certain

that neither of these two drugs in question, both of which are the produce of the same natural order of plants (*Amgrilaceæ*), is ranked among the hypnopoiotics by modern physicians. It is true that Dioscorides (i, 77) ascribes a soporific property to myrrh, but it does not seem to have been so regarded by any other author. Notwithstanding, therefore, the almost concurrent opinion of ancient and modern commentators, that the "wine mingled with myrrh" was offered to our Lord as an anodyne, we cannot readily come to the same conclusion. Had the soldiers intended a mitigation of suffering, they would doubtless have offered a draught drugged with some substance having narcotic properties. The drink in question was probably a mere ordinary beverage of the Romans, who were in the habit of seasoning their various wines, which, as they contained little alcohol, soon turned sour, with various, drugs, and perfumes, such as myrrh, cassia, myrtle, pepper, etc. (Smith, *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s. v. Vinum).—Smith, s. v. See MYRRH.

**Gall, Nikolaus.** See GALLUS.

**Gall, St.,** monastery of, one of the most celebrated monasteries of Europe, at St. Gall, in Switzerland. It was founded in the 7th century. Its wealth and reputation became very great under Othmar, its first abbot (720-760), who founded a hospital for lepers in connection with the monastery. In the 8th century it became distinguished for learning, especially under abbot Gosbert (815-837). "The abbey of St. Gall gradually became one of the masterpieces of mediæval architecture; and the genius and skill which were lavished on its construction, and on the decoration of its halls and cloisters, had a large share in developing the Christian art of the period. The monks of St. Gall, too, may be reckoned among the best friends and preservers of ancient literature. They were indefatigable in the collection and transcription of MSS.—Biblical, patristic, sacred and profane history, classical, liturgical, and legendary. Several of the classics, especially Quintilian, Silius Italicus, and Ammianus Marcellinus, have been preserved solely through the MSS. of St. Gall. For a time the abbey was subject to the bishop of Constance, and an animated dispute was for a long time maintained between that prelate and the monks as to the right of electing the abbot. It ended, however, in the recognition of the right of free election; and ultimately, from the growth of the monastic possessions, and the important position which the abbot held, the monastic domain, which comprised a great part of northern Switzerland, became a distinct jurisdiction, within which the abbot, like many of his brethren in the great Benedictine monasteries, exercised all the rights of a suzerain. For several centuries the abbey of St. Gall held one of the highest places in the order. Its schools enjoyed wide reputation. Its members held a distinguished place among the scholars of mediæval Germany; and many of them, as, for example, Notker, are known to have cultivated not only the ordinary learning of the schools, but also physic, mathematics, and astronomy. The school of St. Gall, too, was one of the most eminent for the cultivation of music, and its MSS., preserved in its library, have been extensively made use of by the restorers of ancient ecclesiastical music. A town of considerable importance grew up around the monastery, and was called by the same name; and as the wealth and influence which attached to the dignity of the abbot began to make it an object of ambition to rich and powerful families, we find the succession of abbots, in the 13th and 14th centuries, sadly degenerated from their pious and learned predecessors in the office. A stringent reform was enforced about the time of the Council of Constance; but the burghers of St. Gall had grown dissatisfied under this rule, and on the out-

break of the Reformation in 1525 they threw off their subjection, and embraced the new doctrines. At the close, however, of the religious war in 1532, the Catholic religion was re-established, and the abbot reinstated, though with diminished authority, in his ancient dignity. At the French Revolution, the abbey of St. Gall was secularized (1798), and its revenues were soon afterwards sequestrated (1805). By a later ecclesiastical arrangement, the abbacy of St. Gall was raised to the dignity of a bishopric, which in 1823 was united to that of Chur. They were afterwards, however, separated, and in 1847 St. Gall was erected into a bishopric, with a distinct jurisdiction."—Chambers, *Encyclopædia*, s. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyclopædie*, iv, 643.

**Gall, St., Manuscript** (CODÆX SANGALLENENSIS, usually designated as Δ of the Gospels), one of the most important of the later uncial MSS., containing the four Gospels (with only a single hiatus, John xix, 17-35) and an interlined Latin version, rudely written on coarse vellum in a very peculiar character. It comprises 197 leaves, 4to, 10 inches by 8½ in size, with 20 to 26 (usually 21) lines of text on each page. Before Matthew are placed prologues, Latin verses, the Eusebian canons in Roman letters, tables of the κεφάλαια in Greek and Lat., etc. The text is divided into regular στίχοι. There are also τίτλοι, and the Ammonian sections. It has so many resemblances to the Codex Boernerianus (G of Paul's epistles), as to show that they both once belonged together. See BOERNER MANUSCRIPT. The Gospel of Mark seems to represent a text different from that of the other evangelists. It agrees in general with the older MSS. There are scarcely any breathings or accents; the words are often wrongly divided, with dots at the end of almost every Greek word, and marks >>> inserted to fill up vacant spaces.

dixit uni eorū amice non iusto tibi nne  
 εἶπεν· μοναδί· αυτων· Ἐταρε· ουκ· ἀδικω· σε· Ουχι  
 ex denario convenisti μετ' tolle tuū et vade  
 ἡγραμου συνεφωρησας· μοι· Ἀρον· το· σον· κα· υπαγε  
 volo autē hūc novissimo dare sicut et tibi antā non it  
 Ἐλω δὲ τουτω τω εσχατω δοναι ωσ· κα· σοι· Η· ουκ· εἶ  
 Specimen of the Codex Sangallensis (Matt. xx, 13-15), in ordinary type.

This MS. is preserved in the monastery of St. Gall, Switzerland, where it was probably transcribed originally. It was first inspected by Gerbert in 1773, was named by Scholz (in his *N. T.* 1830), and has been published in a full lithographic fac-simile of every page by Rettig (Zürich, 1836), with Prolegomena. It seems to have been written by Latin (perhaps Irish) monks in the 9th century.—Scrivener, *Introd.* p. 122 sq.; Tregelles in Horne's *Introduction*, iv, 196 sq. See MANUSCRIPTS, BIBLICAL.

**Galland, ANDREA, or Gallandius, ANDREAS,** an Italian priest and abbot of the Oratorian congregation, was born at Venice Dec. 6, 1709, and died in the same city Jan. 12, 1779. He rendered great service to literature by his edition of the fathers, entitled *Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum, antiquorum que scriptorum eccl. Gr. et Lat.* (Venet. 1765-1781, 14 vols. fol.). It comprises in all 380 writers, and is considered to be one of the most accurate and useful of all the libraries of the fathers. He left in MSS. *Thesaurus Antiquitatis Ecclesiasticæ* (13 vols. fol.).—Hoefcr, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xix, 291.

**Gallas** ("invaders"), a race inhabiting the south and east of Abyssinia. "The general name by which the tribes designate themselves is *Oroma* (*orma*, men). Although generally belonging to the negro race, they are not purely negroes, but form with the Fulahs, Mandingoes, and Nubas, as it were, the transition to the Shemitic variety, and seem to belong to that great family inhabiting the east of Africa, from the frontiers

of the Cape land to Abyssinia, and usually denominated the Kafirs. They are a vigorous, well-formed people, of a dark-brown color, with hair frizzled, but not quite woolly, round faces, and small, sharp eyes, and are distinguished not less by their energy and warlike spirit than by their mental capacities. They first appear in history in the 16th century as a barbarous people, extending their conquests from the interior of Africa, laying waste, by constant incursions, the countries of Eastern Africa to the mountains of Abyssinia, gradually subduing or expelling the original inhabitants (hence their name), occupying great part of Abyssinia, and advancing as far as the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden. It is only of late years that their power in Abyssinia, and their incursions into that country, have been partially checked, chiefly by the vigorous government of the king of Shoa, who has subdued some of the Gallas tribes, and induced them to profess such Christianity as exists in Abyssinia. They still, however, occupy many districts of Abyssinia, and extend their power to an indefinite extent over the countries situated south and south-west of it. Politically, the Gallas do not form a single nation, but are divided into numerous tribes, forming separate kingdoms and states, which are frequently at war with each other. Most of the Gallas follow pastoral avocations. Some, however, through intercourse with the semi-Christian, semi-civilized Abyssinians, have become tillers of the soil. The wandering Gallas are mainly engaged in hunting and the slave-trade. The larger number of the Gallas are still heathens, though Mohammedanism has lately made great progress among them. Their religion bears a resemblance to that of the Kafirs" (Chambers, s. v.). Compare Jomard, *Notices sur les Gallas* (Paris, 1839); Beke, *On the Origin of the Gallas* (London, 1848); Plowden, *Abyssinia and the Galla Country* (London, 1868). Behm (*Geograph.-Jahrbuch*, vol. i, Gotha, 1864) assigns to the Gallas a territory of about 280,000 sq. miles and 7,000,000 people. The Roman Catholic Church has a mission among the Gallas, which in 1841 was erected into a vicariate apostolic. The letters of the vicar apostolic, Massaia, in the *Annales de la Propag. de Foi*, are among the chief sources of our information on the Gallas. Massaia was the founder of the mission, and was in 1869 still at its head. (A. J. S.)

**Gallaudet**, THOMAS HOPKINS, LL.D., an eminent Congregational minister and philanthropist, was born Dec. 10, 1787, in Philadelphia. He graduated at Yale College in 1805, and was chosen tutor in 1808, which office he held two years, after which he was engaged in mercantile business until 1811, when he entered the theological seminary. In 1814 he received his license, and became pastor at Portsmouth. Here he became interested in a little deaf and dumb girl, Alice Cogswell, and instructed her with success. Her father, Dr. Cogswell, became the founder of an association for the aid of deaf mutes; and funds being provided, Mr. Gallaudet resigned his ministry, and went to Europe in 1815 to study the existing deaf and dumb institutions. At the London Deaf and Dumb Asylum he was refused admission except as junior assistant. He then went to Edinburgh, but there the teacher had learnt his system from the Messrs. Braidwood, and had been compelled to sign an engagement not to impart the method to any other person intending to become a teacher. He then betook himself to Paris, and was warmly received by the abbé Sicard. Everything was laid freely open to him. He was able to return to America before the close of 1816, and Sicard allowed Laurent le Clerc, a deaf-mute, who was one of the best teachers of the institution, to accompany him to America. During his absence in Europe the society had been incorporated; Mr. Gallaudet was now appointed its principal, Le Clerc being his head assistant, and on the 15th of April, 1817, *The American Asylum for the Deaf and Dumb*, at Hartford, Conn., was

formally opened. Mr. Gallaudet remained head of the asylum until 1830, when he resigned from failing health. The system which he established was founded on that of Sicard, with modifications. "It is known as the American system. The main principle with Mr. Gallaudet was to call out the intelligence of the pupil as much as possible, by exercising him in describing things for himself, and to discourage the mere learning by rote; and the result was to stimulate the mind of the teacher, as well as of the pupil, in no ordinary degree. Mr. Gallaudet's exertions were by no means confined to the deaf and dumb asylum. He took an ardent and active interest in the improvement and extension of common schools, and in the raising up of a superior body of teachers, and wrote several pamphlets on the subject. He also zealously advocated the adoption of means of imparting moral and religious training to prisoners, and was an earnest promoter of the movement for improving the management of the insane. So strongly did he feel on this matter, that, though in but feeble health, he accepted in 1838 the office of chaplain of the state *Retreat for the Insane* at Hartford, where, it is stated, 'the experience of each successive year furnished accumulating evidence of the usefulness of his labors, and the efficacy of kind moral treatment and a wise religious influence in the melioration and care of the insane.'" He died Sept. 10, 1851. Besides a number of tracts and essays on the education of the deaf and dumb, and on the treatment of the insane, he published *Discourses on various Points of Christian Faith and Practice* (London, 1818, 8vo);—*Remarks on Teachers' Seminaries* (1826);—*The Child's Book on the Soul* (1830, often reprinted, and translated into most European languages);—*Scripture Biography* (5 vols. 1838-1844). See HUMPHREY, *Life and Labors of Gallaudet* (N. Y. 1857, 12mo); *English Cyclopædia*; Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 609.

**Gallery**, an architectural term describing the porticoes or verandas which are not uncommon in Eastern houses. See HOUSE. It is doubtful, however, whether two of the three Hebrew words so translated have any reference to such an object. See ARCHITECTURE.

1. גָּלֵרִיָּה, *attik'* (Ezek. xli, 15 [where the text has גָּלֵרִיָּה, *attuk'*], 16; Sept. ἀπόλοιπον; xlii, 3, 5, Sept. περίστουλον; according to Gesenius, from גָּלַץ, to cut off; according to Fürst, from an obsolete גָּלַץ, to set off), by some thought to mean (as in xlii, 6) *pillars* or columns (so Villalpandus, Cocceius); by others a *decrement* or *terrace* (so Gesenius, Fürst, Hävernick, Hitzig), as the context requires (Böttcher, *Froben*, p. 350). See TEMPLE. The ancient interpreters are wholly at fault; the Sept. renders ambiguously, the Talmud "corners," the Syr. "balustrade," and the Jewish interpreters confess their ignorance (Kimchi, Jarchi).


2. רַחִיט', *rachit'* (Cant. i, 17; either, with Fürst, from an obsolete root רָחַץ, to trim, or, with Gesenius, for רָחַץ, *rachit'*, as in the margin), prob. *panel-work* or *fretted ceiling* (so Sept. φανόματα, Vulg. *laquearia*, A. V. "rafters," marg. "gallery"). See CEILING. In consequence of the var. read. in the Masoretic text (q. d. *ambulatory* or place of exercise), this term has been confounded with

3. נַחֲת', *ra'hat* (from נָחַת, to flow down; spoken of watering-troughs, Gen. xxx, 38, 41; Exod. ii, 16), curled locks or *ringlets* of a maiden (Cant. vii, 6; Sept. παραδρομή, Vulg. *canalis*). See HAIR.

**Gallery**, originally a banqueting hall. The word is now applied, in ecclesiastical architecture, to any floor elevated above the floor of a main audience room of a church, and built to contain hearers. Galleries of this kind date from the time of the Reformation, though somewhat similar galleries existed in the Byzantine churches. Narrow covered passage-ways,

within or without a church, especially in Romanesque churches, are also termed galleries. (G. F. C.)

**Galley** is the rendering in the A. V. in one passage (Isa. xxxiii, 21) of *גליות*, *oni'*, a *ship or fleet*, elsewhere rendered "navy." See **SIMP.**



Ancient Assyrian Galley.

**Gallican Church**, a name often given to the Roman Catholic Church of France. The peculiar spirit of that Church, especially with regard to its relations to Rome, is called **GALLICANISM**. The term is especially used with reference to the principles of the French Church, in opposition to Ultramontanism (the extreme papal view of Church polity), as embodied in the four articles of 1682 (see below). But it is historically certain that from a very early period the national Church of France had a character and spirit of freedom peculiar to itself, and that the roots of the so-called modern Gallicanism are to be traced far back into antiquity (see Bossuet's sermon at the opening of the Assembly of 1682, and his *Defensio Declarationis*, and our article **FRANCE**).

The Frankish Church, in the time of Charlemagne, assumed a form and gave evidence of a spirit marked by the national temper, and obviously different from the Italian ideal of the Church as organized under the pope. In almost every century thereafter the monarchs and bishops of France resisted what they held to be unauthorized claims on the part of Rome. Nevertheless, the Gallican spirit often yielded, and not unfrequently the French bishops were themselves, in part at least, ultramontane. The French Parliaments were generally on the side, naturally, of the Gallican spirit. Hincmar, bishop of Rheims († 882), manfully stood by his king, Charles the Bald, when pope Adrian II attempted to drive him from the throne. Charles himself, in an epistle to Adrian, "argues respecting the distinction between the temporal and the spiritual power, and also alleges the peculiar supremacy of the kings of France. To prove these and similar points, he refers not only to the archives of the Roman Church, but to the writings of St. Gelasius, St. Leo, St. Gregory, and even St. Augustine himself. (See *Hist. Littéraire de la France*, Fleury, i, lii, s. 8, 22.) Hincmar wrote many of that king's letters, and may probably have been the author of this" (Waddington, *History of the Church*, chap. xiv). But no formal attempt to fix the position of the Church in France on a basis of independence was made by any of the monarchs of the country before Louis IX (St. Louis, † 1270). His "Pragmatic Sanction" (A. D. 1268) was directed chiefly against the pecuniary claims and extortions of Rome. It is comprised in six articles: (1.) The churches, the prelates, the patrons, and the ordinary collators of benefices, shall enjoy their rights to their full extent, and each shall be sustained in his jurisdiction. (2.) The cathedral and other churches shall possess the liberties of elections, which shall be carried into complete effect. (3.) We will that simony, the pest of the Church, be wholly banished from our kingdom. (4.) Promotions, collations, provisions and dispositions of prela-

tures, dignities, and other ecclesiastical benefices and offices, whatsoever they may be, shall be made according to the institutions of common law, of the councils, and of our ancient fathers. (5.) We renew and approve of the liberties, franchises, prerogatives, and privileges granted by the kings our predecessors, and by ourselves, to churches, monasteries, and other places of piety, as well as to ecclesiastical persons. (6.) We prohibit any one from in any manner levying and collecting the pecuniary exactions and heavy charges which the court of Rome has imposed, or may hereafter impose, upon the Church of our kingdom, and by which it has been miserably impoverished—unless it be for a reasonable and very urgent cause, or by inevitable necessity, and with the free and express consent of the king and of the Church. See *Ordonnances des Rois de France de la troisième race recueillies par M. de Laurière* (Paris, 1723, folio), i, 97. In the Latin text, "the chief points are: statumimus et ordinamus primo ut ecclesiarum regni nostri prelati, patroni, et beneficiorum collatores ordinarii jus suum plenarium habeant, et unicuique sua jurisdictioni debite serventur. II. Item ecclesie cathedrales et alie regni nostri liberas electiones et earum effectum integraliter habeant.—V. Item exactiones et onera gravissima pecuniarum per Curiam Romanam ecclesie regni nostri impositas vel imposita, quibus regnum nostrum miserabiliter depauperatum exitit, sive etiam imponenda vel imponenda, levari aut colligi nullatenus volumus, nisi duntaxat pro rationabili, pia et urgentissima causa, et inevitabili necessitate, ac de spontaneo et expresso consensu nostro et ipsius ecclesie regni nostri. The conclusion: Harum tenore universis justitiaris, officiaris et subditis nostris—mandamus, quatenus omnia et singula preedicta diligenter et attente servent—atque servari—inviolabiliter faciant: nec aliquid in contrarium quovis modo faciant vel attentent, seu fieri vel attentari permittant: transgressores aut contra facientes—tali pena plectendo, quod cæteris deinceps cedat in exemplum. The genuineness of this document, which is questioned chiefly by P. Daniel, is shown by E. Richer, *Hist. concil. general.*, lib. iii, p. 189; *Libertés de l'église Gallicane*, edit. ann. 1771, t. iii, p. 633, 667; Velly, *Hist. de France*, t. iii, p. 239" (Gieseler, *Church History*, per. iii § 62).

The "liberties" of the Gallican Church, according to Bossuet, were substantially set forth in these ordinances. The Gallican spirit was also strongly shown in the disputes between Philip le Bel and Boniface VIII towards the end of the 13th century, which disputes culminated in the bull *Unam Sanctam*, and in the abduction and death of the pope, A. D. 1303. See **BONIFACE VIII**. The questions involved in these disputes were vital ones: the authority of the pope in temporals, the royal prerogative, and the power of the episcopacy as related to the supremacy of the pope. The Gallican writers vindicated the rights of the Church and the supremacy of councils over the pope with brilliant talents and solid learning. The Roman writers nevertheless maintained the papal claims unwaveringly, but with little success, in France. In 1455 the bishop of Nantes undertook to appeal from a royal ordinance to the pope, but the Parliament of Paris decided that he had violated the privileges of the French Church, as well as the fundamental laws of the kingdom. The Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, called the "great bulwark of the Gallican Church against Rome," was adopted at the Synod of Bourges in 1438, and confirmed by the Parliament July 13, 1459. It involved two great principles: 1. That the pope has no authority in the kingdom of France over anything concerning temporals. 2. That, though the pope is acknowledged as sovereign lord in spirituals, his power even in these is restricted and controlled by the canons and regulations of the ancient councils of the Church received in the kingdom. (For details, see **BOURGES**, **PRAGMATIC SANCTION**

OF.) Louis XI himself strongly repressed all ultramontane reaction against the decisions of the French assemblies, or against the immunities of the national church. The ultramontanists obtained a temporary success in the revocation of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges in 1512 by the Council of Lateran, with the renunciation of it by Francis I (1516), with the understanding that his concordat with Leo X secured to him its substantial benefits. This act was instigated by certain private aims of the king's, and by the hope of his chancellor, Duprat, obtaining the dignity of cardinal. But this revocation gave rise to a long resistance by the Parliament and the Sorbonne, and to great anger and even turbulence of spirit among the French people. The effects of the revocation were practically insignificant, and Gallicanism only showed itself the more energetic and active afterwards. The Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges was, it is true, abrogated, but the fundamental principles established at the councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle, which inspired that sanction, remained intact as a guide for the opinions of the nation and of the clergy, while the antipathy of the Parliaments against ultramontanism became still more deeply rooted. The decrees of the Council of Trent (1545-1663) were, indeed, intended to supplant and supersede those of the earlier councils, but from among them France admitted only such as agreed with her own policy, with the privileges of the king, and with the customs and usages of her Church. Gallicanism was greatly advanced, in fact, by the issues of the Council of Trent, and by the discussions to which they gave rise. The numerous writings of Pithou (q. v.; † 1596) on the canon law gave true scientific and ecclesiastical expression to the tenets of Gallicanism. What Pithou advances in behalf of the Gallican Church in his *Corpus Juris Canonici*, in his *Codex Canonum*, and in his *Gallicæ Ecclesiæ in schismate status*, were by him collected in eighty-three articles, in 1594, in the *Libertés de l'église gallicane* (1633, 2 vols. fol.), by the aid of which it became easy both for the laity and the clergy to see how far the questions involved were questions of order and organization, and how little they applied to religion or dogmas. Pithou himself condensed the eighty-three articles into two: (1.) That the pope has no right of interference with the king's prerogative in temporals; (2.) That he cannot enforce a decision in spirituals in contradiction with those of the councils received in the kingdom. Ultramontanism, however, continued to assert its claims with the usual persistence of Rome. Cardinal Duperron, and the two succeeding cardinals and prime ministers of Louis XIII and Louis XIV, Richelieu and Mazarin, maintained the Concordat. But, in spite of the Concordat, the Sorbonne presented the six celebrated *Declarations* following to the king, May 8, 1663: 1. The pope has no authority over the king's temporal power. 2. In temporals the king has no superior but God. 3. The subjects of the king cannot be released from their fealty and obedience under any pretexes whatsoever. 4. It is inconsistent with the king's prerogative, and with the freedom of the Gallican Church, that the pope should depose bishops contrary to the decrees of councils. 5. It is not the doctrine of the Church that the pope is superior to general councils. 6. It is not matter of dogma that the pope is infallible, apart from the concurrence of the Church.

As Pithou was the legal pillar of Gallicanism, so Bossuet became its ecclesiastical champion. Under his guidance, the *Assemblée du clergé* of 1682 asserted the Gallican liberties, in the celebrated *Declaration du clergé de France*, which was upheld by the monarch and by all the state authorities. It runs as follows: "I. St. Peter and his successors, vicars of Jesus Christ, and the whole Church itself, have received power from God only over things spiritual, and which concern salvation, and not over things temporal and civil; Jesus Christ teaching us himself that his kingdom is not of

this world; and in another place, that we must render to Cæsar the things of Cæsar, and to God the things of God; and thus that precept of St. Paul can in nothing be altered or overthrown. Let every person be subject to the higher powers, for there is no power but comes from God, and it is he who ordains those that are on the earth. He, then, who opposes himself to the powers, resists the order of God. We, in consequence, declare that kings and sovereigns are not subject to any ecclesiastical power by the order of God in temporal matters; that they cannot be deposed, directly or indirectly, by the authority of the keys of the Church; that their subjects cannot be dispensed from the submission and obedience which they owe them, and absolved from the oath of fidelity; and that this doctrine, necessary for the public peace, and not less advantageous to the Church than the state, ought to be inviolably followed, as conformable to the word of God, the tradition of the holy fathers, and the examples of the saints. II. The plenitude of power which the holy apostolic see and the successors of St. Peter, vicars of Jesus Christ, have over spiritual is such, that nevertheless the decrees of the holy General Council of Constance, contained in the fourth and fifth sessions, approved by the holy apostolic see, confirmed by the practice of all the Church and the Roman pontiffs, and religiously observed at all times by the Gallican Church, remain in all their force and virtue; and that the Church of France does not approve the opinion of those who attack these decrees, or who enfeeble them by saying that their authority is not well established, that they are not approved, or that they are in force only in time of schism. III. That thus the use of the apostolic power must be regulated in following the canons made by the Spirit of God, and consecrated by the general respect of all the world; that the rules, the manners, and the constitutions received in the kingdom and in the Gallican Church ought to be maintained, and the usages of our fathers remain unassailable; and that the greatness of the holy apostolic see itself requires that the laws and customs established with the consent of that respectable see and the churches remain invariable. IV. Although the pope has the chief post in the questions of faith, and his decrees regard all the churches, and each church in particular, yet his judgment is still not unalterable, until the consent of the Church intervene. We have resolved to send to all the churches of France, and to the bishops who preside in them by the authority of the Holy Ghost, these *maxims* which we have received from our fathers, in order that we may all say the same thing, and that we may all be in the same mind, and that we may all follow the same doctrine."

The *Declaration du clergé de France* was sent to the pope, with an address from Bossuet. Alexander VIII annulled the declaration, but the clergy maintained their ground, although Louis XIV himself condescended to a step which was by some considered as a retraction. In consequence of this difficulty with Rome, the French Church found itself in 1691 with thirty-five bishoprics vacant; the king allowed the twelve signers of the declaration, whom he had nominated as bishops, but whom the pope had for ten years refused to recognise as such, to retract all which had displeased the pontiff. The king himself stated that he had given orders so that his edict of March 22, 1682, which had been promulgated in view of the then existing circumstances, should no longer have effect. But that he did not abandon the Gallican maxims is proved in his letter of July 7, 1713, directed to cardinal La Tremouille, and addressed to the See of Rome, wherein he enforced the recognition, as bishop of Beauvais, of the abbot of St. Aignan, who had defended the four propositions in a thesis in 1705. The position of the question was still more clearly defined by the decision of the *Conseil de Régence* of 1718, that the bishops could dispense with the papal inauguration bull, as, "the Sor-

bonne having so decided, the national churches could again avail themselves of the right suspended by the Concordat."

Gallicanism fell into disgrace through the political events of 1790 to 1800, and particularly through the *Constitution civile du clergé*, which was by many considered as a revolutionary triumph of Gallicanism over Ultramontaniam, and which resulted in the synods of 1795 and 1797 submitting themselves to the papal authority. Stanch Gallicans, on the other hand, found that the concordat of 1801 did not do justice to Gallicanism, and they regretted still more the forcible rejection of the Concordat of 1813, which would have somewhat restored their position. This led to a fierce internal conflict during the following years, in which Joseph de Maistre, Louis de Bonald, and François de Lamennais stand forth as the most prominent characters. Yet the four "principles" of 1682 have kept their authority under all the forms of government, republic, empire, and restored monarchy; they are received by the new university as they were by the old, and, whenever occasion demands it, are immediately brought forth. See FRANCE. They were recognised as law by the imperial ordinance of Feb. 25, 1810, and there is no likelihood of their being ever abrogated. In the present altered state of things there is no occasion for upholding or enforcing them, but should at any day a reactionary tendency be manifested, the state councils would again bring the Gallican doctrine forward as emphatically as did the decree of 1766 (*arrêt du conseil d'état* du 24 Mai), which stated that the rights and privileges enjoyed by the ecclesiastical body in the kingdom "*sont des concessions des souverains dont l'Eglise ne peut faire usage sans leur autorité*," which is also stated in the *Constitution civile du clergé* (1790).

The principles of 1682 are recognised as fundamental in the present French empire, but the majority of the French bishops are at present ultramontane. Political ultramontaniam, however, is extinct, in spite of the reassertion of its antiquated formulas by papal writers. The old system of taxation at the will of the court of Rome cannot be revived. The *hierarchy* is indestructible; for, so long as papacy retains its character, and so long as the French Church remains Roman Catholic, so long must the supremacy of the papal chair be upheld; and the favorite expression "National Church" is only correct in a restricted sense, since, not being independent, it cannot really be altogether national. Only in moments of high excitement did Gallicanism entertain the idea of having a separate, particular, independent patriarch. As to liturgical and even dogmatical ultramontaniam, it is complained of in periodicals and pamphlets, and even by bishops, and the old Gallicanism is appealed to against it, but with the less success, as there is a tendency to agree with Rome in dogmas and liturgies, for fear of her still exorbitant power, and also with the general aim of unity, so dear to the Roman Catholic mind. That the French nation, its episcopate, or its clergy will ever become Italianized, is neither to be hoped by Rome nor feared by France. Bossuet's statement to the cardinal d'Estrées is as correct now as it was when first written by him: "Trois points peuvent blesser les Romains: l'indépendance de la temporalité des rois; la juridiction épiscopale immédiatement de Jésus-Christ, et l'autorité des conciles. Vous savez bien que sur ces trois choses on ne blesse point en France." This is the true Gallican doctrine; other issues have arisen only as the effects of the momentary excitement of conflict.

As for the ruling powers of the Church of Rome at present, they hold Gallicanism to be simply the decayed, but not defunct view of a sect within the Church. For the revival of Gallican principles in Germany, see HONTHEIM. A good exponent of opinion is given by the fact that in Wetzer and Welte's

*Kirchen-Lexikon*, the best Roman Catholic Cyclopædia ever issued, to which the best and most learned German Roman Catholic theologians are contributors, Gallicanism is throughout classed with Jansenism as a pernicious mode of ecclesiastical thought. The reception of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception by the Church of France was a violation of the old Gallican spirit.

*Literature.*—See, besides the voluminous writings of Pithou and Bossuet on this subject, Maimbourg, *Traité historique de l'église d. Rome* (Paris, 1686, 4to); *Hist. du droit public franç. ecclési.* (Lond. 1737); J. de Maistre, *De l'égl. gallic.* (1 vol. 8vo); *Du Pape* (2 vols. 8vo); André Dupin, *Défence de la loi organique d. concordat; Les libérs. de l'église Gall.* (Paris, 1824, 12mo); Bordas-Dumoulin, *Les pouvoirs constitutifs de l'église* (Paris, 1855, 8vo); Fr. Huet, *Le Gallie., son passé, s. situation présente dans l'ordre polit. et relig.* (Paris, 1855); Fleury, *Discours sur les libérs. d. l'égl. gallic.*; Grégoire, *Essai hist. sur les libérs. d. l'égl. gallic.* (two editions); Frayssinon, *Les vrais principes de l'église gallic.* (three editions); Chausel de Montals (a French bishop of decided Gallican views), *Efféts probables d. disputes sur les art. Gall.* (1858); *Portrait fidèle de l'égl. gallic.* (1854); *Mémoire (anonyme) sur la situation présente d. l'église gallic., et ses maximes renvies contre les attaques de Monsieur le Comte de Montalembert*; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 647 sq. (from which much of this article is translated); Guettée, *Histoire de l'église de France* (12 vols. 8vo); Guettée's periodical journal *L'Observateur Catholique*; Dupin, *Manuel du droit public ecclésiastique français* (Paris, 1845); Phillips, *Kirchenrecht*, iii, 339-365; Hare, *Contest with Rome* (London, 1852), 209 sq.; *Westminster Review*, xii, 213; *North British Review*, xiii, 241; Ranke, *History of the Popes* (passim); *Erit. and For. Evang. Review*, October, 1866, art. iii; Gesselin, *Power of the Popes* (London, 1852, 2 vols. 8vo). See POPE, TEMPORAL POWER OF.

**Gallican Confession** (*Confessio Gallicana*). The *Confession of Faith of the Gallican Churches* was proposed and accepted at the first synod held by the Reformed at Paris in 1559. In 1560 it was presented to Francis II, and in 1561 it was presented to Charles IX, king of France, by Theodore Beza. This confession has been repeatedly printed, and in various forms, both separately and together, with Bibles, Psalters, Catechisms, and other ecclesiastical publications of the Reformed French Church. It is thoroughly Calvinistic in doctrine, and is supposed by many to have been written by Calvin himself, but there is no sufficient ground for the opinion (Niemeyer, *Prof.* xlix). It is given in Latin by Niemeyer, *Collectio Confessionum* (Lips. 1840, 311 sq.).

**Gallican Liturgy.** See LITURGY.

**Gallienus**, PUBLIUS LICINIUS, a Roman emperor, became sole sovereign A.D. 260, and was assassinated at Milan in 268. His reign is memorable in Church history, as he gave peace to the Christians by an edict in which he recognised the Church as a *civil corporation*.—Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vii, 13; Hase, *Ch. Hist.* § 48.

**Gallim** (Heb. *Gallim'*, גַּלִּים, *heaps*, or perhaps *fountains*), a place which is twice mentioned in the Bible: (1.) As the native place of the man to whom Michal, David's wife, was given—"Phalti, the son of Laish, who was from Gallim" (גַּלִּים, 1 Sam. xxv, 44; Sept. *Πόμμα*; Josephus *Γελλία*, *Ant.* vi, 13, 8); but there is no clew to the situation of the place. In 2 Sam. iii, 15, 16, where Michal returns to David at Hebron, her husband is represented as following her as far as Bahurim, i. e. on the road between the Mount of Olives and Jericho (comp. 2 Sam. xvi, 1). But even this does not necessarily point to the direction of Gallim, because Phalti may have been at the time with Ishbosheth at Mahanaim, the road from which would naturally lead past Bahurim. (2.) The name occurs

again in the catalogue of places terrified at the approach of Sennacherib (Isa. x, 30; Sept. Γαλλίη): "Lift up thy voice, O daughter (i. e. inhabitant) of Gallim! attend, O Laish! poor Anathoth!" The other towns in this passage—Aiath, Michmash, Ramah, Gibeah of Saul—are all, like Anathoth, in the tribe of Benjamin, a short distance north of Jerusalem. It should not be overlooked that in both these passages the names Laish and Gallim are mentioned in connection. Possibly the *Ben-Laish* in the former implies that Phalti was a native of Laish, that being dependent on Gallim. Its site was unknown to Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v. Γαλλίη, Gallim), although from hearsay (Λέγεται) they place a village of a similar name (Γαλλαία) near Accaron (Ekron). Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 131) reports a *Beit-Djallin* between Ramleh and Joppa, but by other explorers the name is given as *Beit-Dejan*. Porter suggests the little village of *Himsch* as a suitable locality (*Handb. for Syria*, p. 214); but there are no ruins there, as at *Khirbet el-Haiyeh* (Ruins of the Serpents), on a low tell, a little farther N. E., containing the remains of an ordinary village, with a cistern in the middle (Robinson, *Later Researches*, p. 288).

Among the names of towns added by the Sept. to those of Judah in Josh. xv, 59, Gallim (Γαλλίη v. r. Γαλλίη) occurs between Karem and Thether. In Isa. xv, 8, the Vulgate has Gallim for *Eglithim*, among the towns of Moab.—Smith, s. v.

**GAL'IO** (Græcized Γαλλιόν), a son of the rhetorician M. Annaeus Seneca, and elder brother of Seneca the philosopher. His name was originally *M. Ann. Novatus*, but changed to JUNIUS ANNEUS (or ANNIE-NUS) GALLIO, in consequence of his adoption by L. Junius Gallio the rhetorician (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xxxi, 33; Tacitus, *Annal.* xvi, 17; Quintil. *Inst. Orat.* iii, 1, 21; ix, 2, 91). Seneca dedicated to him his treatise *De Vita Beata*, and in the preface to the fourth book of his *Naturalis Questiones* describes him as a man universally beloved (comp. Stat. *Silv.* ii, 7, 32); and who, while exempt from all other vices, especially abhorred flattery. Dion Cassius (ix, 35) mentions a witty but bitter joke which he made in reference to the persons put to death by Claudius. According to Eusebius, he committed suicide before the death of Seneca (*Theaurus Temporum*, p. 161, Amstel. 1658), but Tacitus speaks of him as alive after that event (*Annal.* xv, 73), and Dion Cassius states that he was put to death by order of Nero (see Antonii *Bibl. Hispan.* vet. i, 121 sq.). One writer (Gelpo, *De familiarit. Pauli c. Senec.* Lips. 1813, p. 18) thinks that Seneca was converted through the instrumentality of Paul. He was *Proconsul* (ἀρχιπραιβύτης, Tex. rec.; ἀρχιπαίρων ὄντος, Tischendorf) of Achaia (Acts xviii, 12) under the emperor Claudius, when Paul first visited Corinth, and nobly refused to abet the persecution raised by the Jews against the apostle (see Dannhauer, *De Gallionismo*, Argent. 1664; also in his *Disp. theol.* p. 175 sq.), A. D. 49. See ACILIA. Dr. Lardner has noticed the strict accuracy of Luke in giving him this designation, which is obscured in the Auth. Vers. by the use of the term *deputy* (*Credibility*, pt. 1, bk. i, ch. i; *Works*, i, 34). See PROCONSUL. He is said to have resigned the government of Achaia on account of the climate not agreeing with his health (see Seneca, *Ep.* 104).—Kitto, s. v. See PAUL.

**Gallitzine** or **Galitzin**, DMITRI AUGUSTIN, son of the Russian princess Amalie of Gallitzine, was born at the Hague Dec. 22, 1770. His mother was an enthusiastic Roman Catholic convert, and under her influence he joined the Roman Church at seventeen. He entered the Austrian army, and served with it in the Netherlands in 1792. He set out, after leaving the army, for a journey in America, and on the voyage was led by the counsels of a missionary named Brosius to turn his mind to the priesthood. He was ordained

March 18, 1795, and devoted his life to missionary labors. In 1799 he selected a spot among the Alleghanies as the seat of a Roman Catholic town, and founded Loretto, now a town of several thousand inhabitants, with Roman Catholic schools for boys and girls in the neighborhood. As "Father Smith" he labored extensively in the wild region of the Alleghanies, and left enduring marks of his energy, faith, and devotion throughout that country. He died at Loretto May 6, 1840. He published a *Defence of Catholic Principles* (Pittsburg, 1816; new edit. Dublin, 1867);—*Appeal to the Protestant Public* (Pittsburg, 1818), and other small works.

**Gallows** (גָּלוּת, *ets, a tree or wood*), a post or gibbet, rendered in Esth. 6, 4 "gallows," but in Gen. xi, 19, and Deut. xxi, 22, "tree." Hanging appears to have been a punishment practised among the Egyptians and other ancient nations, as well as among the Hebrews. See PUNISHMENT.

**Galluppi**, PASQUALE, an Italian philosopher, was born at Tropea, in Calabria Ultra, April 2, 1770, and died at Naples in November, 1846. The groundwork of his education was laid at Tropea under the instructions of J. A. Ruffa, and he afterwards completed his studies at the University of Naples, in which institution he subsequently became professor of philosophy. In his writings he combated the philosophical doctrines in vogue in the 18th century, and strove to re-establish Italian philosophy on its old bases, recognizing in man's nature a double element, the spiritual and material, in accord with the philosophy of the Church fathers. His first work, a pamphlet, dated 1807, on Analysis and Synthesis, sets forth his philosophical method. Shortly after it he published his *Essay on Knowledge*, in four books, treating (1) of knowledge, (2) of the analysis of the faculties of the human mind, (3) of the analysis of ideas, and (4) of the legitimate reasons of our judgments and our errors. His *Saggio Filosofico sulla critica della conoscenza* (Naples, 1819, 6 vols. 8vo) contains an examination of the principal doctrines of ideology, Kantianism, and the transcendental philosophy. His *Elements of Philosophy* (*Elementi di Filosofia*, Messina, 1832) treats successively of pure logic, psychology, mixed logic, and morals, and has been often reprinted. In 1827 Galluppi published twelve *Letters on Philosophy* (*Lettere filosofiche sulle vicende della Filosofia*, etc.), of which a 2d edition appeared in 1838, and a French translation by Peisse in 1844. His other works are, *Filosofia della Volontà* (Naples, 1835–42, and Milan, 1845);—*Considerazioni filosofiche sull' Idealismo transcendente e sul Razionalismo assoluto* (Naples, 1841; Milan, 1846);—*Lezioni di Logica e di Metafisica* (Naples, 1842, 5 vols.);—*Storia della Filosofia* (Naples, 1842);—*Elementi di Teologia Naturale* (Naples, 1844, 4 vols.).—Hoefler, *Now. Biog. Générale*, xix, 334–5. (J. W. M.)

**Gallus, Cestius** (Græcized Κέστιος Γάλλος), son of C. Cestius Gallus Camerinus, a Roman senator of consular rank, was president ("legatus," Suetonius, *Vesp.* 4) of Syria, A. D. 64, 65, at the time of the final Jewish war (Tacitus, *Hist.* v, 10). Maddened by the tyranny of Gessius Florus (q. v.), the Jews applied to Gallus for protection; but, though he sent Neapolitanus, one of his officers, to investigate the case, and received from him a report favorable to the Jews, he took no effectual steps either to redress their injuries, or to prepare for any outbreak into which their discontent might drive them. When at last he found it necessary to act, he marched from Antioch, and, having taken Ptolemais and Lydda, advanced on Jerusalem. There he drove the Jews into the upper part of the city and the precincts of the Temple, and he might, according to Josephus, have finished the war at once, had he not been dissuaded by some of his officers from pressing his advantage. Soon after he unaccountably drew off his forces (leaving an interval of which the

Christians availed themselves to escape, according to our Saviour's direction, Luke xxi, 21, 22), and was much harassed by the Jews, who took from him a quantity of spoil. Nero was at this time in Achaia, and Gallus sent messengers to him to give an account of his affairs, and to represent them as favorably as possible for himself. The emperor, much exasperated, commissioned Vespasian to conduct the war; and the words of Tacitus (*ut sup.*) seem to imply that Gallus died before the arrival of his successor, his death being probably hastened by vexation (Josephus, *Life*, 43; *War*, ii, 14, 3; 16, 1, 2; 18, 9, 10; 19, 1-9; 20, 1; iii, 1).—Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s. v. See GOVERNOR.

**Gallus, C. Vibius Trebonianus**, Roman emperor (early history unknown), was elected to the throne A.D. 251. His reign was disgraced by concessions to the Goths, and by a renewal of the persecution of the Christians. See PERSECUTION. He was assassinated A.D. 253 or 254.

**Gallus, St. Gal, St. Gilian, or St. Gall**, was a native of Ireland, born about 560, and a disciple of Columban (q. v.). He founded the celebrated abbey of St. Gall (q. v.), in Switzerland, of which he was made abbot A.D. 614. He died in 646, Oct. 16, which is his day in the Roman Calendar. There are no writings of his except a sermon in Canisius, *Lectiones Antiq.* i, 781, in Galland, *Bib. Patr.* xii, 721, and in Migne, *Patrolologia Latina*, vol. lxxxvii.

**Gallus (or Gallo), Thomas**, a French theologian, who died Dec. 5, 1246, was a member of the regular Augustines, canon of the congregation of St. Victor of Paris, and in 1223 was appointed abbot of St. Andrew of Verceil, by which latter title he is frequently exclusively designated. The name Gallus is regarded by some as only the Latinized form of his real name, *Cog*; by others as indicating his nationality; while others suppose that he was of Italian origin. Gallus taught at St. Victor and other Augustine establishments, and, when abbot of Verceil, drew around him the best professors of Northern Italy, achieving for himself and his monastery a European reputation in theology and ecclesiastical learning. J. Gerson (q. v.), in the preface to his Commentary on the Canticles, praises highly Gallus's *Explications du Cantique des Cantiques* (published, with commentary, by Halgrin, Paris, 1521, and Lyons, 1571, fol.). This work was published at Rome in 1666 under the care of J. Magloire, together with a decree of the Congregation of the Index forbidding its publication under the name of *Scotus*, showing that it had been attributed to the celebrated Irish philosopher. Another work of Gallus's (*Traduction paraphrasée des livres sur la hiérarchie et la théologie mystique attribués à Saint Denis l'Aréopagite*) is found in the *Theologia Mystica* of J. Eckhius (Ingolstadt, 1519), and in the *Commentarius in S. Dionysii Aréopagite Opera* of Dionysius the Carthusian (Cologne, 1536). Léon Alacci (*Ipse urbanae*) erroneously attributes to Gallus some sermons (*Sermones*) which belong to John, abbot of Vincelles.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xix, 345; Oudin, *Comment. de Scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, iii, 9. (J. W. M.)

**Gam'aël** (Γαμαήλ v. r. Γαμαλιήλ), given (1 Esdr. viii, 29) as the name of one of the chief Levites that returned from the captivity, instead of the DANIEL (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra viii, 2).

**Gamal**. See CAMEL; GENALLI.

**Gamāla** (τὰ Γάμαλα, so called from its situation on a ridge like a camel's hump, Josephus, *War*, iv, 1, 1), a town of trans-Jordanic Palestine, in the district of Gamalitis (Josephus, *War*, iii, 3, 5) or Lower Gaulanitis (*ib.* iv, 1, 1), first mentioned as a fortress reduced by Alexander Jannæus (*ib.* i, 4, 8); it retained its allegiance to Rome on the first outbreak of the final hostilities (Josephus, *Life*, 11), but afterwards revolted, and was so strongly fortified by Josephus (*ib.* 37), as

to be only taken after a siege of seven months by a desperate assault (*War*, iv, 1, 2). It was situated on the Lake of Tiberias, opposite Taricheæ (*ib.* iv, 1, 1). Schwarz is inclined, from a notice in the Talmud and certain local traditions, to place it between Hurim and Kedesh in Naphtali (*Palest.* p. 190); and Pliny speaks of a Galilean town of the same name (*Hist. Nat.* v, 13); but this position is not to be thought of (see Reland, *Palest.* p. 784). Lord Lindsay found the site in the steep insulated hill east of the lake opposite Tiberias (*Travels*, ii, 92), now called *El-Hussn*, between the village of Fik and the shore, "having extensive ruins of buildings, walls, and columns on its top" (Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 278). This identification is confirmed by Thomson, who gives a detailed description of the spot (*Land and Book*, ii, 47 sq.); though Ritter thinks, on account of Josephus's mention of a large place back of the fortress, we should rather locate it at *Khan el-Akubah*, as described by Seetzen (*Erkunde*, xv, 350). See CAPHAR-GAMALA.

**Gama'iel** (Heb. *Gamliel*, גַּמְלִיֵּאל, *reward of God*; Sept. and N. T. Γαμαλιήλ), the name of two men in Scripture.

1. Son of Pedabzur, and chief (נֹרִאָה) of the tribe of Manasse at the census at Sinai (Numb. i, 10; ii, 20; vii, 54, 59), and at starting on the march through the wilderness (x, 23). B.C. 1657.

2. A Pharisee and celebrated doctor of the law, who gave prudent and humane advice in the Sanhedrim respecting the treatment of the followers of Jesus of Nazareth (Acts v, 34 sq.), A.D. 29. We learn from Acts xxii, 3 that he was the preceptor of the apostle Paul. He is generally identified with the very celebrated Jewish doctor Gamaliel, who is known by the title of "the glory of the law," and was the first to whom the title "Rabban," "our master," was given. The time agrees, and there is every reason to suppose the assumption to be correct. He bears in the Talmud the surname of גַּמְלִי, "the elder" (to distinguish him from a later rabbin of the same name), and is represented as the son of Rabbi Simeon, and grandson of the famous Hillel: he is said to have occupied a seat, if not the presidency, in the Sanhedrim during the reigns of Tiberius, Caligula, and Claudius, and to have died eighteen years after the destruction of Jerusalem (see Lightfoot, *Centuria chorographica Matthæo præmissa*, ch. xv). But, as this statement would give him an extreme old age, it may perhaps refer to the later Gamaliel; and the elder probably died about A.D. 50. Ecclesiastical tradition makes him become a Christian, and be baptized by Peter and Paul (Phot. Cod. 171, p. 199), together with his son Gamaliel, and with Nicodemus; and the Clementine Recognitions (i, 65) state that he was secretly a Christian at this time. But these notices are altogether irreconcilable with the esteem and respect in which he was held even in later times by the Jewish rabbins, by whom his opinions are frequently quoted as an all-silencing authority on points of religious law (see Thilo, *Codec. Apoc.* p. 501; Neander, *Planting and Training*, i, 46, Bohn). Neither does his interference in behalf of the apostles at all prove—as some would have it—that he secretly approved their doctrines. He was a dispassionate judge, and reasoned in that affair with the tact of worldly wisdom and experience, urging that religious opinions usually gain strength by opposition and persecution (Acts v, 36, 37), while, if not noticed at all, they are sure not to leave any lasting impression on the minds of the people, if devoid of truth (ver. 38); and that it is vain to contend against them, if true (ver. 39). That he was more enlightened and tolerant than his colleagues and contemporaries is evident from the very fact that he allowed his zealous pupil Saul to turn his mind to Greek literature, which, in a great measure, qualified him afterwards to become the apostle of the Gentiles; while by the laws of the Pales-



tinian Jews, after the Maccabean wars, even the Greek language was prohibited to be taught to the Hebrew youth (Mishna, *Sotah*, ix, 14). Another proof of the high respect in which Gamaliel stood with the Jews long after his death is afforded by an anecdote told in the Talmud respecting his tomb, to the effect that Onkelos (the celebrated Chaldaean translator of the Old Testament) spent seventy pounds of incense at his grave in honor of his memory (*Yuchasin*, 59). These last notices, however, have been shown to refer to Gamaliel II, the grandson of the apostle's teacher (comp. Grätz, in Frankel's *Monatschrift*, i, 320; *Geschichte der Juden* [Lpz. 1856], iii, 289; iv, 114, 152; Jost, *Gesch. der Juden* [Lpz. 1857], i, 281; and especially Frankel's *Hodegetien in Mishnam* [Lips. 1859], p. 57 sq., where all the fragments about Gamaliel are collected).—Kitto, s. v. See Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* in loc.; Pfaffreuter, *Diss. de consil. Gamal.* (Jen. 1680); Conybeare and Howson, *St. Paul*, i, 56, 67; Graun, *Hist. Gamalielis* (Viteb. 1687); Baier, *De consilio Gamalielis* (Jen. 1680); Bucher, *De Θεωμάχου* (Viteb. 1681); Chladenius, *De Θεωμάχου* (Viteb. 1715); Lange, *Julicium Gamalielis* (Hal. 1715); Meulengracht, *De religione Gamalielis* (Hafn. 1698); Palmer, *Paulus u. Gamaliel* (Giess. 1806).

**GAMALIEL BAR SIMON**, also called **GAMALIEL OF JAENE**, or the *younger*, was born about A.D. 50. He was a man of great erudition; was the teacher of Aquila, author of a Greek translation of the O. T., and of Onkelos, the Chaldee translator of the Pentateuch. Like his father, he labored earnestly to introduce the Platonic philosophy into Jewish theology. On the death of Jochanan ben Zachai, he was elected to the presidency of the rabbinical college at Jamnia. Shortly after his accession he reconstituted the Sanhedrim, which, though divested at this time of all secular authority, nevertheless exerted a great influence on the moral life of the Jews of their time. By the vigorous measures which Gamaliel adopted, he made many enemies, and was even for a time deposed from the presidency, and instead of being superseded by his lineal descendant, as had been customary, R. Eleazar b. Azzariah, was elected, and a re-examination of all the opinions which Gamaliel affirmed to belong to the Hillel school was ordered by the Sanhedrim. About twenty years before Christ a division arose among the Jewish rabbis, and the result was the founding of a separate rabbinical college, called "School of Shamai." When the Sanhedrim entered upon a re-examination of Gamaliel's doctrines, they "decided in favor of the opinions which were in harmony with the most ancient traditions, *irrespective of schools*." "This collection of decisions is called *Elnjoth* (עֲלֵנוֹת, *collection of witness*) or *Bechirah* (בְּחִירָה, *selection*). Among the decisions reconsidered was the opinion about the *book of Ecclesiastes* and the *Song of Songs*, which constituted one of the differences between the school of Shammai and Hillel." The former excluded and the latter included them in the canon, and "after a minute investigation of the evidence, it was found that, according to the most ancient traditions, these books were regarded as inspired, and hence the *former decision* of the school of Hillel was confirmed, viz. that the said books should be retained in the canon" (*Jadwin*, iii, 5; *Edjoth*, v, 3). Gamaliel was, however, reinstated in his position, but with defined and restricted power; and the regard in which he was held at the time of his death, about A.D. 116, is evinced by Onkelos, "who showed him royal honors at his funeral, and burned costly garments and furniture to the amount of *seventy Tyrian minæ*, i. e. about twenty-one pounds sterling. Such a funeral pile was generally raised only to kings."—Kitto, *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*, ii, 62; Etheridge, *Introduction to Hebrew Literature*, p. 59; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xix, 382. (J. H. W.)

**Gamba, FRANCIS**, a native of Como, one of the


Protestant martyrs of the 16th century. He was apprehended and condemned to death by the senate of Milan. At the place of execution a monk presented a cross to him, to whom he said, "My mind is so full of the real merits and godness of Christ, that I want not a piece of senseless stick to put me in mind of him." His tongue was perforated to prevent his addressing the crowd, but he gave a sign with his hand indicating peace and confidence. He was then strangled, and his body was burnt after his death, July 21, 1554.—Fox, *Book of Martyrs*, ii, 473; McCrie, *Reformation in Italy*, chap. v.

**Gambold, JOHN**, a pious bishop of the Moravians, was born April 10, 1711, at Punchedon, South Wales, and was educated at Christ Church, Oxford. In 1733 he became vicar of Stanton Harcourt, in Oxfordshire; but in 1742 he joined the Moravians, and was consecrated bishop in 1754. "And certainly few, in any age of the Church, ever possessed, in a higher degree, the spiritual qualifications which the apostle specified as distinguishing a good bishop—fervor of devotion, humility of mind, disinterestedness of spirit, a disposition to universal benevolence, and a willingness to undertake any labor, or submit to any privation, in order to promote the glory of God and the spiritual welfare of men. From the time of his consecration, he resided for ten years, performing all the duties of a primitive bishop over the Moravian congregation, in the metropolis, and at the same time maintaining an active oversight by correspondence with all the ministers of his communion throughout England." He died Sept. 13, 1771. Among his writings are *A Memoir of Count Zinzendorf:—Doctrine and Discipline of the United Brethren:—History of the Greenland Mission of the United Brethren:—Hymns* (1748):—*Summary of Christian Doctrine* (1767, 12mo). His *Works* were edited, with an introductory essay, by Thos. Erskine, Esq. (Glasg. 1822, 12mo).—Jamieson, *Cyclopædia of Biography*, s. v.

**Games** are so natural to man, especially in the period of childhood, that no nation has been or can be entirely without them. (I.) Accordingly, a few traces are found in the early Hebrew history of at least private and childish diversions. The heat of the climate in Syria would indispose the mature to more bodily exertion than the duties of life imposed, while the gravity which is characteristic of the Oriental character might seem compromised by anything so light as sports. Dignified ease, therefore, corresponds with the idea which we form of Oriental recreation. The father of the family sits at the door of his tent, or reclines on the house-top, or appears at the city gate, and there tranquilly enjoys repose, broken by conversation, under the light and amid the warmth of the bright and breezy heavens, in the cool of the retiring day, or before the sun has assumed his burning ardors (Deut. xvi, 14; Lam. v, 14). Of the three classes into which games may be arranged, juvenile, manly, and public, the first two alone belong to the Hebrew life; the latter, as noticed in the Bible, being either foreign introductions into Palestine, or the customs of other countries.

1. With regard to juvenile games, the notices are very few. It must not, however, be inferred from this that the Hebrew children were without the amusements adapted to their age. The toys and sports of childhood claim a remote antiquity; and if the children of the ancient Egyptians had their dolls of ingenious construction, and played at ball (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* abridgm. i, 197), and if the children of the Romans amused themselves much as those of the present day (Horace, 2 *Sat.* iii, 247), we may imagine the Hebrew children doing the same, as they played in the streets of Jerusalem (Zech. viii, 5; comp. Jer. xxx, 19). The only recorded sports, however, are keeping tame birds (Job xli, 5; compare Catull. 2, 1), and imitating the proceedings of marriages or funerals (Matt. xi,

16). Commenting on Zech. xii, 3, Jerome mentions an amusement of the young which is seen practised in more than one part of the north of England. "It is customary," he says, "in the cities of Palestine, and has been so from ancient times, to place up and down large stones to serve for exercise for the young, who, according in each case to their degree of strength, lift these stones, some as high as their knees, others to their middle, others above their heads, the hands being kept horizontal and joined under the stone." A similar mode of exercise prevailed in ancient Egypt (Wilkinson, i, 207). See CHILDREN.



Ancient Egyptians lifting Bags of Sand.

Music, song, and dancing were recreations reserved mostly for the young or for festive occasions. From Lam. v, 16, "the crown is fallen from our head" (see the entire passage on the subject of games), it might be inferred that, as among the Greeks and Latins, chaplets of flowers were sometimes worn during festivity. To the amusements just mentioned frequent allusions are found in holy writ, among which may be given Psa. xxx, 11; Jer. xxxi, 13; Luke xv, 25. In Isa. xxx, 29, a passage is found which serves to show how much of festivity and mirth was mingled with religious observances; the journey on festival occasions up to Jerusalem was enlivened by music, if not by dancing. Some of the chief objects aimed at in the Greek and other games were gained among the Hebrews by their three great national festivals—the Passover, the Feast of Weeks, and the Feast of Tabernacles. At the recurrence of these festivals the nation was brought together in honor of the true God; and in times of religious feeling these great meetings were looked forward to and were celebrated with perhaps not less joy, though joy of a somewhat different kind, from that with which the Greeks looked forward to and celebrated their Olympic, Isthmian, and Nemean games. The public games of the Hebrews seem to have been exclusively connected with military sports and exercises, and even of these the notices are few and brief. It was probably in this way that the Jewish youth were instructed in the use of the bow and of the sling (1 Sam. xx, 20, 30-35; Jude xx, 16; 1 Chron. xii, 2). Allusion to what would seem to have been a kind of wardance, such as we read of in different countries, seems to be made in 2 Sam. ii, 14, where Abner proposes that the young men should arise and "play" before the two armies. The Hebrew שָׁחַק (*shachak*), for "play," is frequently used for dancing (2 Sam. vi, 21; Jer. xxxi, 4); and Abner seems here to refer to a sport of this kind, not now to be used as an amusement, but turned into stern real-

ity. This may indicate the practice among the ancient Israelites of games somewhat similar to the jousts and tournaments of the Middle Ages. On the subject of dancing, see Michaelis, *Mosaische Recht*, article 197. No trace is found in Hebrew antiquity of any of the ordinary games of skill or hazard which are so numerous in the Western world. Dice are mentioned by the Talmudists (*Mishna, Sanhedr.* iii, 3; *Shabb.* xxiii, 2), probably introduced from Egypt (Wilkinson, ii, 424); and, if we assume that the Hebrews imitated, as not improbably they did, other amusements of their neighbors, we might add such games as odd and even, *mora* (the *micare digitis* of the Romans), draughts, hoops, catching balls, etc. (Wilkinson, i, 188). If it be objected that such trifling amusements were inconsistent with the gravity of the Hebrews, it may be remarked that the amusements of the Arabians at the present day are equally trifling, such as blind man's buff, hiding the ring, etc. (Wellsted's *Arabia*, i, 160). See SPORT.

2. With regard to manly games, they were not much followed up by the Hebrews; the natural earnestness of their character and the influence of the climate alike indisposed them to active exertion. The chief amusement of the men appears to have consisted in conversation and joking (Jer. xv, 17; Prov. xxvi, 19). The military exercise noticed above in 2 Sam. ii, 14, if intended as a sport, it must have resembled the *jeu de la paille*, with the exception of the combatants not being mounted; but it is more consonant to the sense of the passage to give the term there used the sense of *fencing or fighting* (Thenius, *Comm.* ad loc.). Even among the active Egyptians, however, whose games have been figured on their mural tablets, we find little that suggests a comparison with the vigorous contests of the Grecian games. One of the most remarkable is the following, showing what appears to be play with the single-stick (Wilkinson, i, 206). In some instances



Ancient Egyptians Fencing.

wrestling or similar athletic exercises are exhibited on the Egyptian monuments, and even *women* are represented as tumbling in like sportive manner; but



Ancient Egyptian Men swinging Women round by the Arms.

their favorite sport appears to have been the more sordid game of draughts, which even royalty did not disdain to share (Wilkinson, i, 189 sq.). See *PLAY*.

3. Public games were altogether foreign to the spirit of the Hebrew institutions; the great religious festivals supplied the pleasurable excitement and the feelings of national union which rendered the games of Greece so popular, and at the same time inspired the persuasion that such gatherings should be exclusively connected with religious duties. Accordingly, the erection of a *gymnasium* by Jason, in which the discus was chiefly practised, was looked upon as a heathenish proceeding (1 Macc. i, 14; 2 Macc. iv, 12-14), and the subsequent erection by Herod of a theatre and amphitheatre at Jerusalem (Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 8, 1), as well as at Caesarea (*Ant.* xv, 9, 6; *War.* i, 21, 8) and at Berytus (*Ant.* xix, 7, 5), in each of which a quinquennial festival in honor of Cæsar was celebrated with the usual contests in gymnastics, chariot-races, music, and with wild beasts—was viewed with the deepest aversion by the general body of the Jews (*Ant.* xv, 8, 1). In the Old Testament two passages contain a clear reference to games: Psa. xix, 5, "Rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race;" Eccl. ix, 11, "I said that the race is not to the swift." The entire absence of verbal or historical reference to this subject, however, in the Gospels shows how little it entered into the life of the Jews. Some of the foreign Jews, indeed, imbibed a taste for theatrical representations; Josephus (*Life*, 3) speaks of one Aliturus, an actor of farces (*μυμολόγος*), who was in high favor with Nero. (See Eichhorn, *De Jubeor. re scenica*, in the *Comment. Goetting. Rec.*)

(H.) Among the Greeks, on the other hand, and subsequently among the Romans likewise, the rage for theatrical exhibitions was such that every city of any size possessed its theatre and stadium. At Ephesus an annual contest (*ἀγὼν καὶ γυμνικός καὶ ποσειδώνος*, Thucyd. iii, 104) was held in honor of Diana, which was superintended by officers named Ἀσιάρχαι (Acts xix, 31; A. V. "chief of Asia"). See *ASLARCHI*. It is possible that Paul was present when these games were proceeding, as they were celebrated in the month of May (see Conybeare and Howson's *St. Paul*, ii, 82); but this hardly agrees with the notes of time in Acts xx, 1-3, 16.

1. *Roman Beast-fights and Gladiatorial Shows.*—(1.) A direct reference to the exhibitions that took place on such occasions is made in the term *ἔθρο μάχιστα*, "I fought with beasts" (1 Cor. xv, 32). The *θηρμαχία* or beast-fight (*venatio* in Latin) constituted among the Romans a part of the amusements of the circus or amphitheatre. It consisted in the combat of human beings with animals. The persons destined to this barbarous kind of amusement were termed *θηρομαχοί*, *bestiarii*. They were generally of two classes: 1. Voluntary, that is, persons who fought either for amusement or for pay: they were clothed and provided with offensive and defensive weapons. 2. Con-



Ancient Roman Beast-fighter.

demned persons, who were mostly exposed to the fury of the animals unclothed, unarmed, and sometimes bound (Cicero, *Pro Sext.* 64; *Ep. ad Quint. Frat.* ii, 6; Seneca, *De Benef.* ii, 19; Tertull. *Apol.* 9). Political offenders especially were so treated, and Josephus (*War.* vii, 3, 1) records that no less than 2500 Jews

were destroyed in the theatre at Caesarea by this and similar methods. The expression as used by Paul is usually taken as metaphorical, both on account of the qualifying words *κατ' ἄθροπον*, "after the manner of a man," the absence of all reference to the occurrence in the Acts, and the rights of citizenship which he enjoyed: none of these arguments can be held to be absolutely conclusive, while, on the other hand, the term *θηρομαχίαν* is applied in its literal sense in the apostolical epistles (Ignatius, *ad Eph.* 1; *ad Trall.* 10; *Mart. Polyc.* 3; comp. Euseb. *E. H.* iv, 15), and, where metaphorically used (Ignatius, *ad Rom.* 5), an explanation is added which implies that it would otherwise have been taken literally. Certainly Paul was exposed to some extraordinary suffering at Ephesus, which he describes in language borrowed from, if not descriptive of, a real case of *θηρομαχία*; for he speaks of himself as a criminal condemned to death (*ἐπιθανάσιον*, 1 Cor. iv, 9; *ἀποκρίμα τοῦ θανάτου ἰσχυράμεν*, 2 Cor. i, 9), exhibited previously to the execution of the sentence (*ἀπέδειξεν*, 1 Cor. i. c.), reserved to the conclusion of the games (*ἰσχυρόν*), as was usual with the *theriomachi* ("novissimos elegit, velut bestiarios," Tertull. *De Pudic.* 14), and thus made a spectacle (*θεῖατρον ἰσχυρίσθημεν*). Lightfoot (*Exercit.* on 1 Cor. xv, 32) points to the friendliness of the asiarchs at a subsequent period (Acts xix, 31) as probably resulting from some wonderful preservation which they had witnessed. Nero selected this mode of executing the Christians at Rome, with the barbarous aggravation that the victims were dressed up in the skins of beasts (Tacitus, *Ann.* xv, 44). Paul may possibly allude to his escape from such torture in 2 Tim. iv, 17. As none but the vilest of men were in general devoted to these beast-fights, no punishment could be more condign and cruel than what was frequently inflicted on the primitive Christians, when they were hurried away "to the lions" (as the phrase was), merely for their fidelity to conscience and to Christ its Lord. Ephesus appears to have had some unenviable distinction in these brutal exhibitions (Schleusner, *Lex. s. v.*), so that there is a peculiar propriety in the language of the apostle.

Of these beast-fights the Romans were passionately fond. The number of animals which appear to have been from time to time engaged in them is such as to excite in the reader's mind both pity and aversion. Sylla, during his praetorship, sent into the arena no fewer than 100 lions, which were butchered by beings wearing the human shape. Pompey caused the destruction in this way of 600 lions. On the same occasion there perished nearly twenty elephants. These numbers, however, are small compared with the butchery which took place in later periods. Under Titus, 5000 wild and 4000 tame animals, and in the reign of Trajan, 11,000 animals, are said to have been destroyed. See Smith, *Dict. of Class. Ant.* s. v. *Bestiarii*.

(2.) The fights of the gladiators with one another was also a common practice at Rome. It began B. C. 264, and increased to such a fearful extent that on a single occasion, in honor of the triumph of the emperor Trajan over the Dacians, 10,000 gladiators fought for the amusement of the people. They were at first composed of captives or



Ancient Figure of the famous Gladiator Baton.

condemned malefactors, but afterwards, as the passion for blood grew stronger, free-born citizens, men of noble birth, and even women, fought after this fashion. The spectators betted on their favorite gladiators with much the same feelings as they betted on the favorite horses which ran before them in the circus. See Smith, *Dict. of Class. Ant.* s. v. *Gladiatores*.


The games and theatrical exhibitions of the heathen were regarded by the early Christians with as strong disapprobation as they were by the Jews generally, and for better reasons (Neander's *Church Hist.* i, 365, § iii). National antagonism to everything foreign as such had much effect in producing Jewish opposition to the games. It was as ministering in themselves and by their attendant circumstances to the lusts of the flesh and of the eye, as producing almost of necessity a cruel temper in the beholders, and running counter to the moral feeling, modesty, and sobriety of the Christian character, that the public spectacles and games of the heathen were ranked among those pomps and vanities which the Christians were obliged to renounce by their baptismal vow. Even the better-minded among the heathen regarded these games with disapproval. Pliny the consul speaks with approval of Junius Mauricius, who expressed an earnest wish that they could be abolished at Rome (Pliny's *Letters*, iv, 22); nor does Tacitus appear to treat them with much greater respect (*Hist.* iii, 83). Rome added to the Greek example features of cruelty which were unknown in the original Grecian games; and there was one feature of difference between the Grecian and Roman games which rendered the former a much more fitting illustration of the Christian life than the latter were, namely, that in the Grecian games the most eminent men in the land came forward and contended personally for victory, while in Rome the most eminent men were merely spectators of the contests of their inferiors (Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, chap. xl, p. 11). Diomed and Menelaus, Antilochus and Ajax, and Ulysses, the kings, great warriors, and wise men of the Grecian states, deemed it an honor to contend for victory in their countries' games, and even old Nestor, the Homeric type of perfection in the qualities of mind and body, regretted that his years prevented him from joining in the glorious strife (*Iliad*, xxiii, 634); but "a senator, or even a citizen, conscious of his dignity, would have blushed to expose his person or his horses in the circus of Rome." See Smith's *Dict. of Class. Ant.* s. v. *Ludi*.

2. *Grecian Prize or Gymnastic Contests*.—The scriptural allusions (Gal. ii, 2; v, 7; Phil. ii, 16; iii, 14; 1 Tim. vi, 12; 2 Tim. ii, 5; Heb. xii, 1, 4, 12) are the more appropriate, because the Grecian games were in their origin and in their best days intimately connected with religion. Games in Greece were very numerous. They are traceable by tradition back to the earliest periods of Grecian civilization. Indeed, much of the obscurity which rests on their origin is a consequence and a sign of their high and even mythic antiquity. See Smith, *Dict. of Class. Ant.* s. v. *Athletæ*.

(1.) Four of these games stood far above the rest, bearing the appellation of *ἱεροί*, "sacred," and deriving their support from the great Hellenic family at large, though each one had special honor in its own locality: these four were the Olympic, Pythian, Nemean, and Isthmian. The first were held in the highest honor. The victors at the Olympic games were accounted the noblest and happiest of mortals, and every means was taken that could show the respect in which they were held. These games were celebrated every five years at Olympia, in Elis, on the west side of the Peloponnesus. Hence the epoch called the Olympiads.


The gymnastic exercises were laid down in a well-planned systematic series, beginning with the easier (*κοῖνὰ*), and proceeding on to the more difficult (*βαρῆα*). Some of these were specially fitted to give

strength, others agility; some educated the hands, others the feet. Among the lighter exercises was reck-



Ancient Leapers.

oned running (*δρόμος*), leaping (*ἄλμα*), quoiting (*εἰς-*



Ancient Game of Quoits.

*κοε*), hurling the javelin (*ἀκόντιον*). When skill had been obtained in these, and the consequent strength, then followed a severer course of discipline. This was twofold—1, simple; 2, compound. The simple con-



Ancient Wrestlers.

sisted of wrestling (*πάλη*), boxing (*πυγμαί*): the com-



Ancient Boxers.


compound we find in the *pentathlon* (*πένταθλον*, *quinquertium*, the five contests), made up of the union of leaping, running, quoiting, wrestling, and in hurling the spear; and in the *pankration* (*παγκράτιον*, general trial of strength), which consisted of wrestling and boxing. It is not necessary here to speak in detail of the distinctions which Galen makes between the ordinary motions of the body and those which were re-



Ancient hurling the Javelin.

quired in these exercises, since the names themselves are sufficient to make manifest how manifold, severe, long, and difficult the bodily discipline was, and the inference is easy and unavoidable that the effect on the bodily frame must have been of the most decided and lasting kind. See EXERCISE (BODILY).

*Racing*, which is the kind of contest chiefly referred to in the N. T., may be traced back to the earliest periods of Grecian antiquity, and may be regarded as the first friendly contest in which men engaged. Accordingly, the Olympic and Pythian, probably also the other games, opened with foot-races. Foot-racing, perfected by systematic practice, was divided into different kinds. If one ran merely to the end of the course (*στάδιον*), it was called stadium; if one went thither and back, he ran the double course (*δίανδρος*).



Ancient Foot-race.

The longest course was the *δολιχος*, which required extraordinary speed and power of endurance. What it involved the ancients have left in no small uncertainty. It is sometimes given as seven times over the stadium; at others, twelve times; at others again, twenty; and even the number of four- and twenty times is mentioned. In the preparatory discipline everything was done which could conduce to swiftness and strength. The exercises were performed with the body naked and well oiled. Minute directions were established in order to prevent foul play (*κακοτεχνία, κακούργια*), of any kind, so that all the competitors might start and run on terms of entire equality. The contest was generally most severe; to reach the goal sooner by one foot was enough to decide the victory. See Smith, *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s. v. Stadium. See DISCUS; LEAPING; WRESTLING.



Olympic Chariot-race.

Besides the athletic games above described, there were others, consisting of racing in chariots, on horseback, or with torches; and still others, in which the parties strove to excel one another in skill in playing upon various instruments. See RACE.

At the Olympic games the prize was simply a chaplet made of wild olive. The crowns were laid on a tripod, and placed in the middle of the course, so as to be seen by all. On the same table there were also exposed to view palm-branches, one of which was given into the hand of each conqueror at the same time with the chaplet. The victors, having been summoned by proclamation, were presented with the ensigns of victory, and conducted along the stadium, preceded by a herald, who proclaimed their honors, and announced their name, parentage, and country. The real reward, however, was in the fame which ensued. A chaplet won in the chariot-races at Olympia was the highest of earthly honors. What congratulations from friends; how was the public eye directed to the fortunate conqueror; what honor had he conferred on his native city, and for what office was such a one not fit! With what intense and deep delight must his bosom have been filled when the full acclaim of assembled Greece fell upon his ear, coming in loud salutations and applauses from every part of the crowded course! Then came the more private attentions of individual friends. One brought a chaplet of flowers; another bound his head with ribbons. Afterwards came the triumphal sacrifice made to the twelve gods, accompanied by sumptuous feasting. The poet now began his office, gaining in some cases, both for himself and the happy victor, an unexpected immortality. Music also lent her aid, and his name was sung wherever the noble accents of the Greek tongue asserted their supremacy. In order to perpetuate the memory of these great men, their names and achievements were entered into a public register, which was under the care of suitable officers. A no less privilege was that of having a statue of themselves placed, either at the expense of their country or their friends, in the sacred grove of Jupiter. A perhaps still greater honor awaited the victor on his return home. The conquerors at the Isthmian games were wont to be received in their chariots, superbly attired, amid thronging and jubilant multitudes. One or two other privileges belonged to these victors, such as immunity from public offices, and a certain yearly stipend. At the Isthmian games the prize was ivy during the mythic periods. In later ages the victor was usually crowned with a chaplet of pine-leaves. If the conqueror had come off victorious in the three great divisions—music, gymnastics, and racing—he was in the Pythian, as well as in the other sacred games, presented also with a palm-branch. See Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s. v. Isthmian, Olympian, Nemean, Pythian Games severally. See CROWN.



Corinthian Coin of Antoninus, with Isthmian Crown.

(2.) Paul's epistles (as above) abound with allusions to the Greek contests, borrowed probably from the Isthmian games, at which he may well have been present during his first visit to Corinth (Conybeare and Howson, ii, 206). These contests (*ἀγώνων*—a word of general import, applied by Paul, not to the *fight*, as the A. V. has it, but to the *race*, 2 Tim. iv. 7; 1 Tim. vi. 12) are minutely illustrated by his references, in which they are used as a figure of the Christian's

course of duty and struggle with opposing influences. The competitors (*ὁ ἀγωνιζόμενος*, 1 Cor. ix, 25; *ἐν ἀθλῷ τις*, 2 Tim. ii, 5) required a long and severe course of previous training (comp. *σωματικὴ γυμνασία*, 1 Tim. iv, 8), during which a particular diet was enforced (*πάντα ἐγκρατεύεται, ἐουλαγωγῶ*, 1 Cor. ix, 25, 27). In the Olympic contests these preparatory exercises (*προγυμνάσματα*) extended over a period of ten months, during the last of which they were conducted under the supervision of appointed officers. The contests took place in the presence of a vast multitude of spectators (*περικείμενον νέφος μαρτύρων*, Heb. xii, 1), the competitors being the spectacle (*θεάτρον=θέαμα*, 1 Cor. iv, 9; *θεαζόμενοι*, Heb. x, 33). The games were opened by the proclamation of a herald (*κηρῦξας*, 1 Cor. ix, 27), whose office it was to proclaim the name and country of each candidate, and especially to announce the name of the victor before the assembled multitude, as well as to signify the other crises of the game. Certain conditions and rules were laid down for the different contests, as, that no bribe be offered to a competitor; that in boxing the combatants should not lay hold of one another, etc.; any infringement of these rules (*ἐὰν μὴ νομίμως ἀθλήσῃ*, 2 Tim. ii, 5) involved a loss of the prize, the competitor being pronounced disqualified (*ἀδόκιμος*, 1 Cor. ix, 27, "cast-away," a term that seems to picture the condition of one disgraced by being adjudged unfit to enter the lists or rejected after the game was over). The judge was selected for his spotless integrity (*ὁ ἕκαστος κριτής*, 2 Tim. iv, 8): his office was to decide any disputes (*βραβεύειτω*, Col. iii, 15; A. V. "rule") and to give the prize (*τὸ βραβεῖον*, 1 Cor. ix, 24; Phil. iii, 14), consisting of a crown (*στέφανος*, 2 Tim. ii, 5; iv, 8) of leaves of wild olive at the Olympic games, and of pine, or, at one period, ivy, at the Isthmian games. These crowns, though perishable (*φθαρτόν*, 1 Cor. ix, 25; comp. 1 Pet. v, 4), were always regarded as a source of unflinching exultation (Phil. iv, 1; 1 Thess. ii, 19): palm-branches were also placed in the hands of the victors (Rev. vii, 9). Paul alludes to two only out of five contests, boxing and running, most frequently to the latter. In boxing (*πυγμαί*; compare *πεκτεῖω*, 1 Cor. ix, 26), the hands and arms were bound with the *cestus*, a band of leather studded with nails, which very much increased the severity of the blow, and rendered a bruise inevitable (*ὀσπυρίζω*, 1 Cor. I. c.; *ὀσπυρία=τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν ὀπαστῶν πλῆγῶν ἴχνη*, Pollux, *Onom.* ii, 4, 52). The skill of the combatant was shown in avoiding the blows of his adversary, so that they were expended on the air (*οὐκ ὄς αἶρα ἔειρον*, 1 Cor. I. c.), or the phrase may allude to the prejudicial trials of comparative strength (comp. Statius, *Theb.* vi, 487; Virgil, *Aeneid.* iv, 370). The foot-race (*δρομος*, 2 Tim. iv, 7, a word peculiar to Paul; comp. Acts xiii, 55; xx, 24) was run in the *stadium* (*ἐν σταδίῳ*; A. V. "race," 1 Cor. ix, 24), an oblong area, open at one end and rounded in a semicircular form at the other, along the sides of which were the raised tiers of seats on which the spectators sat. The race was either from one end of the *stadium* to the other, or, in the *διὰυλος*, back again to the starting-post. There may be a latent reference to the *διὰυλος* in the expression *ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτὴν* (Heb. xii, 2), Jesus being, as it were, the starting-point and the goal, the *locus a quo* and the *locus ad quem* of the Christian's course. The judge was stationed by the goal (*σκοπόν*; Auth. Vers. "mark," Phil. iii, 14), which was clearly visible from one end of the *stadium* to the other, so that the runner could make straight for it (*οὐκ ὄς ἀδύλω*, 1 Cor. ix, 26). Paul brings vividly before our minds the earnestness of the competitor, having cast off every encumbrance (*ὄγκον ἀποθεμεῖνοι πάντα*), especially any closely-fitting robe (*ἐμπόριστον*, Heb. xii, 1; comp. Conybeare and Howson, ii, 553), holding on his course uninterrupted (*ἐνώκω*, Phil. iii, 12), his eye fixed on the distant goal (*ἀφορῶντες, ἀπέβλεπε*, Heb. xii, 2;

xi, 26), unmindful of the space already past (*τὰ μὲν ὀπίσω ἐπιδεικνόμενος*, Phil. I. c.), and stretching forward with bent body (*τοῖς ἔπι ἐμπροσθεν ἐπικτεινόμενος*), his perseverance (*ἐπι-ὑπομονή*, Heb. xii, 1), his joy at the completion of the course (*μετὰ χαρᾶς*, Acts xx, 24), his exultation as he not only receives (*ἐλαβον*, Phil. iii, 12), but actually grasps (*καταλάβω*, not "apprehend," as A. V. Phil.; *ἐπιλάβω*, 1 Tim. vi, 12, 19) the crown which had been set apart (*ἀπόκειται*, 2 Tim. iv, 8) for the victor. The lengths of the bounds (a stade or furlong apart) give some idea of the severity of the trial, and serve to illustrate the meaning of the apostle when he speaks of running with patience the race set before him (*ὑπομονή*, sustained effort). Indeed, one Ladas, a victor of the Olympic games, in the *ὀδύχος*, or long race, was so exhausted by his efforts that, immediately on gaining the honor and being crowned, he yielded up his breath: a fact which also serves to throw light on scriptural language, as showing with what intense eagerness these aspirants (*κολυθόδρομοι*, long-runners) strove for perishing chaplets (*φθαρτὸν στέφανον*).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.; Fairbairn, s. v. See RUNNER.

On the subject here treated of, see West's *Odes of Pindar*, 2d ed.; Potter's *Antiquities of Greece*, bk. ii, ch. xxi-xxv; and Adams's *Roman Antig.* p. 224-234. By far the best work, however, is Krause's *Die Gymnastik und Agonistik der Hellenen* (Halle, 1835); his *Darstellung der Olympischen Spiele* (Vien, 1838); and his *Die Pythien, Nemeen und Isthmeen* (Leipzig, 1841). See also Nagel, *De ludis secularibus Romanorum in Gemara commemoratis* (Altorf, 1743); Eckhard, *De Paulo atleta* (Viteb. 1688); Guhling, *De locutionibus sacris e palustra petitis* (ibid. 1726); Schöpfer, *De locutionibus Pauli gymnasticis* (ibid. 1764); Auerswald, *De veterum arte luctu-i* (ibid. 1720); Günther, *De cursoribus veterum* (ib. 1709); Hofmann, *De athletis veterum* (Halle, 1717); Lydii *Agonistica sacra* (Franeq. 1700).


**Gam'madim** (Heb. *Gammadim*, גַּמְדִּים; Sept. *φύλακες*, Vulg. *Pugmaï*, A. V. "Gammadims") is the name of a class of men mentioned in Ezek. xxvii, 11, as defenders of the towers of Tyre in connection with the mercenaries from Arad. See TYRE. A variety of explanations of the term have been offered.

(1.) Some (e. g. Forster, *Dict. Ebr. Nor.* s. v.) suppose a connection with *גַּמְדָּא*, *go'med*, a cubit, q. d. *cubit-high men*, whence the Vulg. has *pigmies* (so Rashi, Kimchi, and others). Michaelis (*Supplem.* p. 326) thinks that the *apparent* height alone is referred to, with the intention of conveying an idea of the great height of the towers. Spencer (*De Leg. Heb. Rit.* ii, cap. 24) explains it of small images of the tutelary gods, like the Lares of the Romans (see also his *Dissert. de Gammadim*, in Ugolini *Thesaur.* xxiii, 18). This view seems to be refuted by Anthing, *Dissertat. de sublesta τῶν גַּמְדִּים per Pymaios interpretatione* (Viteb. 1710).

(2.) Others (e. g. Pfeiffer, *Dub. Ver.* p. 783; Ludolf, *Comment. hist. Ethiop.* p. 73, 74) treat it as a geographical or local term; Grotius holds *Gamad* to be a Hebrew form (*אָגמון* for *גַּמְדָּא*) of the name *Ancon*, a Phœnician town; the Chaldee paraphrase has *Cappadocians*, as though reading גַּמְדִּים; Fuller (*Miscell.* vi, 698) identifies them as the inhabitants of *Gamala* (Plin. v, 14); and again the word has been broken up into גַּמְדִּים גַּמְדָּא=*also the Medes*. Rosenmüller (*Schol.* ad loc.) thinks it the name of some obscure Phœnician town, not elsewhere mentioned. But these conjectures are equally without foundation (see Harduin, ad loc.; Reland, *Palæst.* p. 784).

(3.) Most later interpreters give a more general military sense to the word. Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 292) connects it with *גַּמְדָּא*, a *rough*, whence the sense of *brave warriors*. Lee renders *short-swordsmen*, from the same Arabic root. Hävernick (ad loc.) understands

daring ones, from an Aramaean root. Hitzig (ad loc.) suggests deserters (*Ueberläufer*), and draws attention to the preposition *in* as favoring this sense: he inclines, however, to the opinion that the prophet had in view Cant. iv, 4, and that the word גַּמְלוֹת in that passage has been successively corrupted into גַּמְלוֹת, as read by the Sept., which gives φύλακας, גַּמְלוֹת, as in the present text. The Syr. and Arabian interpreters agree with the Sept., rendering *watchmen* (so Luther, "Wächter"). Fürst (*Heb. Lex. s. v.*) refers the word to an obsolete גַּמְלָה, to *place or make stand* (akin with the above Arabic *gamal*, to be firm), and translates *garison* (Besatzung), a view that seems to agree with their context. The following words of the verse—"They hanged their shields upon thy walls round about"—are illustrated by one of the bas-reliefs found at Kouyunjik (Layard, *Nineveh*, ii, 296).—Smith, s. v.



Castle of a maritime People (probably the Tyrians), with the shields hanging upon the walls.

**Ga'mul** (Heb. *Gamul'*, גַּמְלוֹת, *weaned*; Sept. Γαμουλ v. r. Γαμουήλ), the chief of the twenty-second course of priests as reinstated after the captivity (1 Chron. xxiv, 17), B.C. 535. See BETH-GAMUL.

**Ganganelli.** See CLEMENT XIV.

**Ganges, or Gunga,** a great river in India, important not only in the geography, but also in the religion of Hindustan. The sources of the streams which unite to form it are within the snowy range of the Himalaya Mountains. The *Bhagiratti* rises from a snowfield near lat. 30° 54' N., and long. 79° 7' E. The *Aluknaada* joins it, with a volume of water one half greater than its own, at about lat. 30° 10' N., long. 78° 35' E., where it first receives the name *Ganges, or Gangā*. At Hurdwar, in lat. 29° 57' N., long. 78° 07' E., it enters the great plain of Hindustan. At Allahabad it is joined by the Jumna River; and again, about 270 miles below that, by the Ghogra, having previously received the Gumbi and some others. About half way between Allahabad and the Ghogra is the holy city of the Hindūs—Benares. Farther east it is joined by the Sone Gunduk and Koosy, and below Seebgunj it begins to divide into the multitudinous streams by which it enters the sea. The one of these many mouths of the Ganges which is most available for commerce is the Hooghly, upon whose banks is the city of *Calcutta*. The Ganges varies much in its width at different places and with the seasons. Bishop Heber, at the last of June, says that he could scarcely see across it: "It looked like a sea, with many sails upon it." Again, at Bogliipoor he writes: "A little below Bogliipoor, last year, it was nine measured miles across; and this year, though far less ground is covered, it is supposed to be full seven; and here we are perhaps 600 miles, reckoning the windings of the river, from the sea" (*Indian Journal*, i, 130). At Cawnpoor, after the rains, he writes: "The Ganges is still a noble stream; its width, at the usual place of ferrying, I should think not far from a mile and a half, but at this season the water is in many places shallow. At Allahabad it has an average width of four miles, within the limits of which it changes its course annually. Like all rivers that overflow their banks, the Ganges holds a large admixture of mud and sand. It has been computed that it delivers into the sea annually an average of 534,600,000 tons of solid matter."

*Its Religious Aspects.*—The worship of this river is enjoined in the Hindū Shasters. Certain places on it are particularly sacred. At Hurdwar, or the Gate of Vishnu, where the Ganges issues from the Himalaya, the number assembling annually is calculated to amount to two millions and a half. Most of them come to wash away their sins. After every twelve years, which is a more auspicious period, millions assemble on certain festival days, and it requires a strong police force to keep the people from drowning each other, in the rush to bathe at the auspicious moment. At Allahabad, where the Ganges and Jumna unite, a third river, called *Saraswatee*, sister to these two, according to Hindū notions, flows under them. The junction is called *Tribenee*, and the sanctifying and purifying influences are secured to the worshipper by lying for a short time in the water in a prescribed position. The place where the Ganges empties itself into the sea is also sacred (see Dass, *Manners and Customs of Hindūs*). According to Ward, the water is used for food, bathing, medicine, religious ceremonies, etc.; and formerly, when a Hindū king was crowned, it was poured upon his head as a part of his consecration. Until recently, the water of this river was used in the English courts of India in administering the oath to Hindūs. So much is this river revered among the Hindūs, that many Brahmans will not cook upon it, nor throw saliva into it, nor wash themselves nor their clothes in it. Some persons perform a journey of five or six months to bathe in the Ganges, or to perform rites for deceased relations, and to carry this water to places in their houses for religious and medicinal purposes. Many rich men, living at a great distance, keep men constantly employed in making the journey to and fro to bring Ganges water. In these cases a relay of men is established at convenient distances, and the water, carried in small bottles, carefully placed in baskets suspended on a bamboo swung across the shoulder. All castes worship *Gangā*. She is represented, according to Ward, as a white woman wearing a crown, sitting on the sea-animal named *Makara*, and having in her right hand a water-lily, and in her left the lute. In certain months the merit of bathing in the Ganges is greater than in others. In every month, on the first, sixth, and eleventh of the moon, and at its total wane also, bathing in the Ganges is recommended. According to the *Gangā, Yakya, Yulee*, there are 3,500,000 holy places belonging to *Gangā*. The person who looks at *Gangā*, or bathes in this river, will obtain all the fruit which arises from visiting all these 3,500,000 places. If a person who has been guilty of killing cows, Brahmans, or his holy teacher, or of drinking spirits, touch the waters of the Ganges, desiring in his mind the remission of these sins, they will be forgiven. "Amongst the rivers which, at the *classical* and the *Purāvic* period of India, were held in peculiar sanctity by the nation, the Ganges undoubtedly occupied the foremost rank. In the Vedic poetry it is but seldom mentioned; and, whenever its name occurs, whether in the hymns of the *Rigveda*, or the ritual text of the *Yajurveda*, no legendary fact or mythical narrative is connected with it. Nor does the law-book of Manu justify the conclusion that its author was acquainted with any of the myths which connect this river in the epic poems and in the Purānas with the Pantheon of India. The earliest, and by far the most poetical legend of the Ganges, occurs in that masterpiece of Sanscrit poetry, the *Rāmāyana*. We give its substance, because it explains the principal epithets by which this river is spoken of, or invoked in ancient and modern Hindū poetry, and because it may be looked upon as the type of the many fables which refer to the purifying and supernatural properties of its waters. There lived, says the *Rāmāyana*, in Ayodhyā (the modern Oude), a king, by the name of Sagara, who had two wives, Kesini and Sumati; but they bore him no issue. He therefore repaired to the Himalaya; and

after a hundred years' severe austerities, Bhṛigu, the saint, became favorable to his wishes, and granted him posterity. Kesini bore him a son, who was named Asamanjas, and Sumati brought forth a gourd, whence sprang 60,000 sons, who in time became as many heroes. Asamanjas, however, in growing up, was addicted to cruel practices, and was therefore banished by his father from the kingdom. His son was Ansumat, who thus became heir to the throne of Ayodhyā. Now it happened that Sagara resolved to perform a great horse-sacrifice; and, in accordance with the sacred law, chose for this purpose a beautiful horse, which he confided to the care of Ansumat. But while the latter was engaged in the initiatory rites of the sacrifice, a huge serpent emerged from the soil, and carried off the horse to the infernal regions. Thereupon Sagara, being informed of the obstruction which had befallen his pious undertaking, ordered his 60,000 sons to recover the horse from the subterranean robber. These then set to work, digging the earth, and striking terror into all creation. Having explored, for many years, the infernal regions, they at last found the sacred horse grazing, and watched by a fiery saint, in whom they recognised the serpent, the cause of their troubles. Enraged, they attacked him; but the saint, who was no other being than Vishnu, at once reduced them to ashes. Waiting in vain for the return of his sons, Sagara sent his grandson, Ansumat, in search of them and the sacred horse. Ansumat went, and soon ascertained the fate of his relatives; but when—mindful of his duties—he wished to sprinkle consecrated water on their ashes, so as to enable their souls to rise to heaven, Garuda, the bird of Vishnu, and brother of Sumati, came in sight, and told Ansumat that it was improper to use terrestrial water for such a libation, and that he ought to provide the water of the Gangā, the heavenly daughter of Himavat (the Himalaya). Ansumat, bowing to the behest of the king of birds, went home with the horse to Sagara; and the sacrifice being achieved, Sagara strove to cause the descent of the Gangā, but all his devices remained fruitless; and, after 30,000 years, he went to heaven. Nor was Ansumat more successful in his attempt with the austerities he performed for the same purpose, nor his son Dvīlipa, who, obeying the law of time, after 30,000 years, went to the heaven of Indra. Dvīlipa had obtained a son, named Bhāgiratha. He, too, was eager to obtain the descent of the Gangā; and having completed a course of severe austerities, he obtained the favor of Brahma, who told him he would yield to his prayers provided that Siva consented to receive the sacred river on his head, as the earth would be too feeble to bear its fall when coming from heaven. And now Bhāgiratha recommenced his penance, until Siva consented, and told the Gangā to descend from heaven. The river obeyed; but, enraged at his command, she assumed a form of immense size, and increased her celerity, thinking thus to carry him off to the infernal regions. Yet the god, becoming aware of her intentions, caught and entangled her in his matted hair, out of which she could find no means of extricating herself, though erring there for many years. Nor would she have been released had not Bhāgiratha, by his renewed penance, appeased the god, who then allowed her to descend from his head in seven streams—Māḍīni, Pāvini, and Nalinī, which went eastwards; and Sitā, Suchakshu, and Sindhu, which went westwards, while the seventh stream followed Bhāgiratha wherever he proceeded. But it so happened that the king, on his journey, passed by the hermitage of an irascible saint, whose name was Jahnu. The latter, seeing the Gangā overflowing in her arrogance the precincts of his sacrificial spot, and destroying his sacred vessels, became impatient, and drank up all her waters; thereupon all the gods became terrified, and promised him that, in future, the Gangā would pay him filial respect, and become his daughter, if he would restore her again

to existence. Quieted by this promise, Jahnu then allowed her to flow out from his ear, and therefore she is still called Jāhnavī, or the daughter of Jahnu. But, because Bhāgiratha, by dint of his exertions, enabled his ancestors, now sprinkled with the waters of the Gangā, to ascend to heaven, Brahma allowed him to consider her as his daughter, whence she is called Bhāgirathi. And she is also called the river of 'the three paths,' because her waters flow in heaven, on earth, and pervaded the subterranean regions. Such is the account of the *Rāmāyana*, and its substance is repeated by the *Mahābhārata* and several of the Purānas, though they differ in the names of the streams formed in her descent by the Gangā, some (for instance, the *Vishnu- and Vāyu-Purāna*) restricting their number from seven to four, called by the *Vishnu-Purāna* Sitā, Alakanandā, Chakshu, and Bhadrā. A further deviation may be seen in that, while in the *Rāmāyana* the Gangā springs from the Himavat (Himalaya), whose daughter she is, the *Vishnu-Purāna* assigns her source to the nail of the great toe of Vishnu's left foot, and allows Siva merely to receive her on his head. The following passage from this Purāna will show the ideas on the history and the properties of this river: "From that third region of the atmosphere, or seat of Vishnu, proceeds the stream that washes away all sin, the river Gangā, embrowned with the unguents of the nymphs of heaven, who have sported in her waters. Having her source in the nail of the great toe of Vishnu's left foot, Dhruva (Siva) reverses her, and sustains her day and night devoutly on his head, and thence the seven Rishis practice the exercises of austerity in her waters, wreathing their braided locks with her waves. The orb of the moon, encompassed by her accumulated current, derives augmented lustre from her contact. This applies to the *heavenly* Ganges. Falling from on high, as she issues from the moon she alights on the summit of Meru, and thence flows to the four quarters of the earth for its purification. The Sitā, Alakanandā, Chakshu, and Bhadrā, are four branches of but one river, divided according to the regions towards which it proceeds. The branch that is known as Alakanandā was borne affectionately by Siva upon his head for more than a hundred years, and was the river which raised to heaven the sinful sons of Sagara by washing their ashes. The offences of any man who bathes in this river are immediately expiated, and unprecedented virtue is engendered. Its waters, offered by sons to their ancestors in faith for three years, yield to the latter rarely attainable gratification. Men of the twice-born orders, who offer sacrifice in this river to the lord of sacrifice, Pūmshottama, obtain whatever they desire, either here or in heaven. Saints who are purified from all evil by bathing in its waters, and whose minds are intent on Kesava (Vishnu), acquire thereby final liberation. This sacred stream, heard of, desired, seen, touched, bathed in, or hymned day by day, sanctifies all beings; and those who, even at a distance of a hundred leagues, exclaim "Gangā, Gangā," atone for the sins committed during three previous lives!" (Chambers, s. v.).

*The Ceremonies.*—The following is taken from Ward's *Hindis*: "Crowds of people assemble from the different towns and villages near the river, especially at the most sacred places of the river, bringing their offerings of fruit, rice, flowers, cloth, sweetmeats, etc., and hang garlands of flowers across the river, even where it is very wide. After the people have bathed, the officiating Brahma ascends the banks of the river with them; and, after repeating religious texts, places before him a jar of water, and, sitting with his face to the north or east, performs what is called *Ghātā-st hapānā*. After this, the Brahma performs other ceremonies; then the worship of the five gods, of the nine planets, of the regions of the ten quarters, etc. To this succeeds meditation. The priest next presents the offerings, which may be



sixty-four, or eighteen, or sixteen, or ten, or five, or merely flowers and water, according to the person's ability. To these offerings the worshipper must add sesamum, clarified butter, and barley flour. The officiating Brahman next performs the worship of Narayāna, Māheshwārā, Bramha, Sōoryā Bhāgēcārāhā, and Hīmalāyā; then the worship of the inhabitants of the waters, as the fish, the tortoises, the frogs, the water-snakes, the leeches, the snails, the mākārās, the shell-fish, the porpoises, etc. The offerings, after having been presented to the inhabitants of the waters, are thrown into the Ganges. Ten lamps of clarified butter are then lighted up, and all the other offerings presented. After this the names of certain gods are repeated, with forms of praise; the fee is presented to the priest, the Brahmans are entertained, and the offerings sent to the houses of Brahmans. At the close of these ceremonies the people perform obeisance to Gangā, and then depart. Great multitudes assemble on the banks of the river on these occasions, and expect much, both in this life and hereafter, from this act of worship. If a person place on his head ten fruits of any kind, and thus immerse himself in the Ganges on this day, the sins of ten births will be removed. In this month also images of Gangā are set up in domestic temples and worshipped, and the next day thrown into the river. In some places clay images of this goddess are preserved in clay temples, and worshipped daily. Persons escaping dangers on water present offerings to Gangā, as well as to Varoona, the Indian Neptune, as mariners, having escaped the dangers of the sea, used to offer a sacrifice to Venus. On the thirteenth of the decrease of the moon in *Chaitra*, the people descend into the water, and, with their hands joined, immerse themselves, after which the officiating Brahman reads a portion of the Shastra, describing the benefits arising from this act of bathing. The people repeat after the priest certain significant words, as the day of the month, the name of Vishnu, etc., and then immerse themselves again. Gifts of rice, fruits, and money are offered to the poor, the Brahmans, and the priests. On this occasion groups of ten or twelve persons stand in the water in one spot, for whom one Brahman reads the formulas. These groups are to be seen extending themselves very far along the river. At the moment of the conjunction of the moon (on the thirteenth of its decrease) with the star Shatabhisha, this festival is called the Great Varoonee. The merit arising from bathing at this lucky moment is supposed to be very great. The people fast till the bathing is over. When there is a conjunction as above, and the day falls on Saturday, the festival is called the *Great Great Varāni*."

The exposure of sick and dying on the banks of the Ganges is of uncertain date. The following summary is from the *Calcutta Review*, No. xx, vol. x, 1848: "The *Kurma Purāna* says, 'Those that *consciously* die on the banks of the Ganges shall be absorbed into the essence of Brahma; and those who die *unconsciously* shall surely go to the heaven of Brahma.' The *Agni Purāna* says, 'those who die when half their body is immersed in Gangā water, shall be happy thousands of ages, and resemble Brahma.' In the *Skanda Purāna*, Shiva says, 'To him who dies in Gangā I give my footstool to sit upon.' There are a great many traditional stories concerning Gangā believed by the majority of Hindūs. The following is a specimen: 'On the banks of the Bhagirathi there grew a stately banian-tree, in whose ample folds a paddy-bird had made her nest. On a certain day the tree was torn up by the roots by the violence of the storm. The bird was destroyed, and its bones buried in the deep channel of the Gangā. The paddy-bird, in the next transmigration, was taken up into heaven simply because her bones had accidentally been deposited in the river. After this she became one of Indra's queens in his heaven.' In consequence of this sort of

teaching the Hindūs almost universally throw into the river the bones of those who had died at some distance from its shores. Even the bodies of those that die on the banks of the Ganges, and suffer cremation there, are not wholly burnt. Some part of the body, generally the part surrounding the navel, is thrown into the river. Those who are too poor to burn their dead throw them bodily into the river. The exposure of the sick and dying is as follows. When the patient seems to be beyond recovery, the relatives make preparations to 'give him to Gangā.' This is a stronger duty than seeking his recovery. 'Life and death are in the hands of God, but the carrying of the sick to the river lies in our own hands, therefore we must do our duty.' A couch is procured, called the *khal*, for the dead, a number of torches if it be night, and notice is given throughout the neighborhood. . . . On the way the attendants repeat loudly the names of the gods and goddesses. At the *ghat* they lay him close to the water, and cause him to say that he has come to see the Mother Ganges. He is laid in a miserable hut, amid dirt and nuisance, and multitudes of dying sick, whose shrieks and groans fill the air. A few minutes before his death he is again brought down on the brink of the river, half immersed in water, to give up the ghost. 'The habit of choking the dying patients with water and mud is unquestionably a legitimate portion of the rite, but is not uniformly put in practice.' . . . If any one survives the exposure, and return from the bank of the river, he ought to be regarded as rejected by the goddess, and be treated thenceforward as an outcast—'an alien to his mother's children.' The British government, which has so nearly extirpated *salt*, and is doing its utmost to abolish infanticide, whether in the Ganges or elsewhere, is giving its attention to the subject of these ghāt murders."—Ward's *Manners and Customs of the Hindūs; Vishnu Purāna* (Wilson's transl.); *Calcutta Review*, vol. x; Moore's *Hindū Pantheon*. (J. T. G.)

**Gangra**, COUNCIL of (*Concilium Gangrense*), a synod held at Gangra, in Paphlagonia, 4th century, against Eustathius of Sebaste. See EUSTATHIANS. The precise date of the council is uncertain. Pagi, following Socrates, fixes it about A.D. 360; Ceillier about A.D. 379 (*Auteurs Sacrés*, iv, 379); Hefele (*Concilienge-schichte*, ii, 765) leaves it uncertain. It has been questioned, also, whether the Eustathians (*οἱ πρὸς Ἐβεράθιον*), against whom this council was directed, really sprung from Eustathius of Sebaste. "All the facts are in favor of an affirmative answer to this question. Not only is the testimony of Socrates, ii, 43, and of Sozomen, iii, 14, to this effect, but the whole is in perfect accordance with the character of Eustathius, who was a zealous ascetic, and the first preacher of the ascetic life in the countries around the Pontus, and had formed a whole school. See *Basilii Cæsarensis*, ep. 233. (Here we find mentioned, in fact, the ascetic dress, to which the Eustathians, according to the report of the Council of Gangra, ascribed a peculiar sanctity—the *ἐξνα ἀφοσάματα*, that is, according to the letter of Basilus, τὸ κατὰ ἡμέρας, καὶ ἡ ζώνη καὶ τῆς ἀεὶ ἐξήτων βύρασι τὰ ὑποδήματα), and ep. 119 (Epiphanius, *Hæres.* 75.) We perceive, also, in the letters of Basilus a trace of opposition to the new monastic spirit in the districts of the Pontus. At least at Neocesarea, where the attachment to old usages prevailed, the spreading of the ascetic life among men and virgins was brought up as an objection against Basilus of Cæsarea. See ep. 207 *ad Neocesarensis*. § 2" (Neander, *Ch. History*, Torrey's transl. ii, 244).

The acts of the council are very important as testimonies against certain doctrines and practices which have since characterized the Church of Rome. Eustathius taught that it is unlawful to marry, and to eat certain meats. He separated several married persons; advised those who disliked the public offices of the Church to communicate at home. He wore, and made

his followers also wear, an extraordinary dress; obliged women to cut off their hair; and directed his followers to avoid, as the greatest profanation, the communion and the benediction of a married priest living with his wife. In opposition to these errors, twenty-one canons were published by the Council of Gangra. Fifteen bishops subscribed them, and addressed them, together with a synodal letter containing briefly the causes which led to the assembling of the council, to the bishops of Armenia. Canon 1. Condemns with anathema those who blame marriage, and who say that a woman living with her husband cannot be saved. 2. Condemns with anathema those who forbid the eating of meat. 4. Condemns those who separate themselves from the communion of a married priest, and refuse to partake of the holy communion consecrated by him. 9. Condemns those who embrace the state of virginity or continence, not for the sake of perfection, but from a horror of the married state. 10. Condemns those who, having themselves embraced the state of virginity, insult married persons. 11. Condemns those who despise the agapæ or love-feasts, and refuse to participate in them. 12. Condemns those who, under pretence of extraordinary strictness, wear a peculiar dress, and condemn those who wear ordinary clothing. 14. Condemns those who forsake their husbands through a false horror of marriage. 15. Condemns those who, under pretext of leading an ascetic life, forsake their children, without providing for their sustenance or conversion. 16. Condemns children who, upon the same plea, desert their parents.—Landon, *Manual of Councils*, s. v.; Hefele, *l. c.*; Neander, *l. c.*; Schröckh, *Kirchengeschichte*, vi, 247.

**Gano, John**, a Baptist minister, was born at Hope-well, New Jersey, July 22, 1727, and was there ordained to the ministry in 1754. His first labors were in the Southern States, where, as an itinerant, he was inferior, it is said, "to none but Whitefield." During the Revolutionary War he was an army chaplain. In 1762 he was ordained pastor of the first Baptist church in New York, where he remained until 1788, when he removed to Kentucky, where he became pastor of the Town Fork Church, near Lexington. He died at Frankfort, August 10, 1804. His pulpit talents were of a high order. See *Life of Gano*, principally an autobiography (1806, 12mo); Benedict, *History of the Baptists*, vol. ii; Sprague, *Annals*, vi, 62.

**Gano, Stephen**, a Baptist minister, was born in New York Dec. 25, 1762. After being educated for the medical profession, he spent two years in the army as surgeon during the Revolutionary war, and then settled as a physician in Rockland Co., N. Y. Becoming impressed with the belief that it was his duty to preach the Gospel, he was ordained Aug. 2, 1786; and after being for a while a missionary on the Hudson, became pastor of the Baptist church at Hillsdale and Hudson. In 1792 he became pastor of the first Baptist church in Providence, R. I., where his ministrations were very successful. He received the honorary degree of M. A. from Brown University in 1800, having been one of the overseers of that institution since 1794. He died pastor of the church in Providence, Aug. 18, 1828. Mr. Gano published a number of occasional sermons.—Sprague, *Annals*, vi, 229.

**Gannim**. See EX-GANNIM.

**Gans, David**, a Jewish historian, was born about the middle of the 16th century. He is considered by Jost to be an untrustworthy writer. Among his best works are *Zernach David*, or *The Branch of David*, in two parts; of which the first is a chronicle of sacred and Jewish history from the Creation to 1592; the second recounts some of the events of secular history (Prague, 1592; Furth, 1784). He died in Prague in 1613.—Grässe, *Allgem. Literärgeschichte*, v, § 311; Jost, *Geschichte d. Judenthums*, iii, 215; Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebr. Lit.* p. 444. (J. H. W.)

**Gap** (𐤒𐤓𐤁, *pe'rets*, a breach, as elsewhere rendered), a rent or opening in a wall (Ezek. xiii, 5; comp. Amos iv, 3). The Jewish false prophets did not stand in the gap (Ezek. xxii, 30); they did nothing to stop the course of wickedness which opened a door for the vengeance of God to break in upon their nation. See PEREZ.

**Gar** (Γάρ, Vulg. *Sasus*), a man whose "sons" are named in the Apocrypha among the "sons of the servants of Solomon" (1 Esdr. v, 34). There are not in the lists of Ezra and Nehemiah any names corresponding to the two preceding and the six succeeding this name.—Smith, s. v.

**Garasse, Francis**, a French Jesuit, was born at Angoulême in 1585; in 1600 he entered the society, and after teaching for a while took the vows in 1618. He subsequently wrote books of controversy (mostly under false names, and of which he repeatedly denied being the author). Their sarcastic tone, violent outburst of passion, and wholesale abuse of all whom he considered as enemies of his order, provoked the censure of Roman Catholics themselves. The expressions *fool, sot, ass*, etc., abound in his writings against the Protestants. The expressions *Modestia, affidilitate, mansuetudine, supra modum amabilis*, applied to him by the historian of his order, will always appear to any one acquainted with his works as a bitter sarcasm rather than a compliment. When the plague broke out at Poitiers, where he had been exiled by his superiors for writing a *Somme théologique* (1625, fol.), which was condemned by the Sorbonne, he asked permission to devote himself to the care of the sick, and fell a victim to his devotion June 14, 1631. Among his other works we notice *Elucid. Calvinisticum* (1615, 4to), under the name of Andrew Scioppius;—*Craison funèbre d'André de Nesmond* (1656);—*Le Rabelais réformé par les ministres* (1619, 12mo), a violent attack against Protestant ministers, and particularly Du Moulin;—*Recherche des Recherches d'Etienne Pasquier* (1622, 8vo), the full title of which affords a good example of Garasse's style: "Inscribed to Etienne Pasquier, wherever he may be; for never having been able to recognise your religion, I do not know the way and route you have taken on leaving this life, and therefore I am obliged to write to you at hazard, and to address this bundle, wherever you may be . . ." etc. See Nicron, *Mémoires*, vol. xxxi; Bayle, *Dictionnaire*; Alegambe, *Eiblioth. Script. Soc. Jesu*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xix, 426; *Mémoires du Père Garasse, de la Société de Jésus*, publ. by C. Nisard (Paris, 1861, 18mo).

**Garcia, D. Francisco**, a Portuguese Jesuit, joined the order at the age of eighteen, and went to the East Indies with fifty-eight other Jesuit missionaries. He resided successively at Goa and Cochín, and was appointed coadjutor of the archbishop of the mountain region inhabited by the Christians of St. Thomas (q. v.). The archbishop dying in 1641, Garcia succeeded him, and exerted great influence over the people by his knowledge of the native dialects. He had many disputes with the Christians of St. Thomas. He died Sept. 3, 1659. He left a MS. entitled *Relação dos sectarios da India oriental. Dialogos espirituos, carta escrita ao arcebispo dos christaos da Serra*, which is said to contain valuable information on the tribes of the East.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xix, 461. (J. N. P.)

**Garcia or Garzia, Gregorio**, a Spanish missionary, was born at Cozar, Andalusia, about the latter half of the 16th century. He studied in the Dominican convent of Baëza in 1627, and joined that order. Appointed missionary to America, he spent twelve years in Mexico and Peru, where he preached with success, and gathered numerous historical documents and traditions, which he published after his return under the title *Origen de las Indias del Nuevo Mundo y Indias occidentales, averiguanda con discurso de opiniones*, etc. (Valencia, 1607, 8vo; Madrid, 1729, fol.). This

work contains a great deal of information which has been made use of by subsequent historians. The author's theory is that America was successively settled by emigration from divers races coming from other parts of the world. He thus attempts to uphold the text of Scripture, which gives but three sons to Noah, one of whom peopled Europe, the second Asia, and the third Africa; and argues in favor of this opinion on the ground that, before the arrival of the Spaniards, the Mexicans possessed the tradition of the creation of the world, the flood, the confusion of tongues, and the dispersion of nations, as is proved by some sculptures he saw which represented these various events in a symbolic manner. He also wrote *Predicacion del Evangelio en el Nuevo Mundo viviendo los Apostoles* (Baeza, 1625, 8vo), in which he attempts to prove that it is impossible that any of the immediate disciples of Christ ever went to preach the Christian faith to America.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xix, 456 sq.; see also Echard, *Scriptores Ordinis Predicatorum*, ii, 437; Nicolas Antonio, *Bibliotheca Nova Hispana*, i, 544.

**Garden** (גַּן, *gan* [fem. הַגַּן, הַגָּן], a park or orchard inclosed and planted; Sept. *παράδεισος*, N. T. κήπος.) See FIELD; ORCHARD, etc.

1. Several gardens are mentioned in the Scriptures, as the garden of Eden (Gen. ii, 8, 9, 10, 15), Ahab's garden of herbs (1 Kings xxi, 2), the royal garden near the fortress of Zion (2 Kings xxi, 18; xxv, 4), the royal garden of the Persian kings at Susa (Esther i, 5; vii, 7, 8), the garden of Joseph of Arimathea (John xix, 41), and the garden of Gethsemane (John xviii, 1). It is clear, from Josh. v, 2, and Lam. ii, 6, that gardens were generally hedged or walled, as indeed Josephus expressly states respecting the gardens near Jerusalem (*War*, v, 7). In Neh. ii, 5, and John xx, 15, gardeners and keepers of gardens by occupation are indicated. See GARDENER.


The traditional gardens and pools of Solomon, supposed to be alluded to in Eccl. ii, 5, 6, are shown in the

wady Urtás (i. e. Hortus), about an hour and a quarter to the south of Bethlehem (compare Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 7, 3). The Arabs perpetuate the tradition in the name of a neighboring hill, which they call "Jebel-el-Fureidis," or "Mountain of the Paradise" (Stanley, *Sin. and Pal.* p. 166). Maundrell is sceptical on the subject of the gardens (*Early Trav. in Pal.* p. 457), but they find a champion in Van de Velde, who asserts that they "were not confined to the wady Urtás; the hillslopes to the left and right also, with their heights and hollows, must have been covered with trees and plants, as is shown by the names they still bear, as 'peach-hill,' 'nut-vale,' 'fig-vale,' etc. (*Syria and Pal.* ii, 27). See SOLOMON'S POOL.

The "king's garden," mentioned in 2 Kings xxv, 4; Neh. iii, 15; Jer. xxxix, 4; lii, 7, was near the Pool of Siloam, at the mouth of the Tyropeon, north of Bir Eyub, and was formed by the meeting of the valleys of Jehoshaphat and Ben-Hinnom (Wilson, *Lands of the Bible*, i, 498). Josephus places the scene of the feast of Adonijah at Enrogel, "beside the fountain that is in the royal paradise" (*Ant.* vii, 14, 4; comp. also ix, 10, 4). See KING'S DALE.

Strabo (xvi, 763), alluding to one of the rose-gardens near Jericho, calls it *ὁ τοῦ βασιλέως παράδεισος*. The rose-garden in Jerusalem, mentioned in the Mishna (*Maaseroth*, ii, 5), and said to have been situated westward of the Temple mount, is remarkable as having been one of the few gardens which, from the time of the prophets, existed within the city walls (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* on Matt. xxvi, 36). They were usually planted without the gates, according to the gloss quoted by Lightfoot, on account of the fetid smell arising from the weeds thrown out from them, or from the manure employed in their cultivation. See ROSE.

The gate Gennath, mentioned by Josephus (*War*, v, 4, 2), is supposed to have derived its name from the rose-garden already mentioned, or from the fact of its leading to the gardens without the city. It was near the garden-ground by the Gate of the Women that Titus



Ancient Egyptian Garden.

was surprised by the Jews while reconnoitring the city. The trench by which it was surrounded cut off his retreat (Joseph. *War*, v, 2). See GENNATH.

But of all the gardens of Palestine none is possessed of associations more sacred and imperishable than the garden of Gethsemane, beside the oil-presses on the slopes of Olivet. Eight aged olive-trees mark the site which tradition has connected with that memorable garden, and their gnarled stems and almost leafless branches attest an antiquity as venerable as that which is claimed for them. See GETHSEMANE.

The orange, lemon, and mulberry groves which lie around and behind Jaffa supply, perhaps, the most striking peculiarities of Oriental gardens — gardens which Maundrell describes as being “a confused miscellany of trees jumbled together, without either posts, walks, arbors, or anything of art or design, so that they seem like thickets rather than gardens” (*Early Trav. in Pal.*, p. 416). The Persian wheels, which are kept ever working, day and night, by mules, to supply the gardens with water, leave upon the traveller’s ear a most enduring impression (Lynch, *Exp. to Jordan*, p. 441; Siddon’s *Memoir*, 187). The gardens near Shechem, containing orange and citron trees (Schubert, *Reise*, ii, 116), are described by Dr. Olin (*Travels*, ii, 350). See FOREST.

2. Gardens are frequently represented in the tombs of Thebes and other parts of Egypt, many of which are remarkable for their extent. The one here introduced is shown to have been surrounded by an embattled wall, with a canal of water passing in front of it, connected with the river. Between the canal and the wall, and parallel with them both, was a shady ave-

nue of various trees; and about the centre was the entrance, through a lofty door, whose lintel and jambs were decorated with hieroglyphic inscriptions, containing the name of the owner of the grounds, who, in this instance, was the king himself. In the gateway were rooms for the porter, and other persons employed about the garden, and probably the receiving-room for visitors, with the *dim* and other trees along the whole length of the exterior wall: four tanks of water, bordered by a grass-plot, where geese were kept, and the delicate flower of the lotus was encouraged to grow, served for the irrigation of the grounds; and small kiosks or summer-houses, shaded with trees, stood near the water, and overlooked beds of flowers. The spaces containing the tanks, and the adjoining portions of the garden, were each inclosed by their respective walls, and a small subdivision on either side, between the large and small tanks, seems to have been reserved for the growth of particular trees, which either required peculiar care, or bore fruit of superior quality (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* i, 33-40, abridgm.).

One interesting but much defaced representation of a similar kind has been found on the Assyrian sculptures. Gardens and orchards, with various kinds of trees, appeared to be watered with canals similar to those which once spread fertility over the plains of Babylonia, and of which the choked-up beds still remain. A man, suspended by a rope, was being lowered into the water. Upon the corner of a slab, almost destroyed, was a hanging garden, supported upon columns, whose capitals were not unlike those of the Corinthian order (Layard, *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 198 sq.).



Ancient Assyrian Gardens.

3. Gardens in the East, as the Hebrew word indicates, are inclosures on the outskirts of towns, planted with various trees and shrubs. From the allusions in the Bible we learn that they were surrounded by hedges of thorn (Isa. v, 5) or walls of stone (Prov. xxiv, 31). For further protection, lodges (Isa. i, 8;

Lam. ii, 6) or watch-towers (Mark xii, 1) were built in them, in which sat the keeper (Job xxxvii, 18), to drive away the wild beasts and robbers, as is the case to this day. Layard (*Nin. and Bab.* p. 265) gives the following description of a scene which he witnessed: “The broad silver river wound through the plain, the

great ruin cast its dark shadows in the moonlight, the lights of 'the lodges in the gardens of cucumbers' flickered at our feet, and the deep silence was only broken by the sharp report of a rifle fired by the watchful guards to frighten away the wild boars that lurked in the melon-beds." The scarecrow also was an invention not unknown (*τροποσκακάνιον*, Bar. vi, 70). See LODGE.

In a climate like that of Palestine the neighborhood of water was an important consideration in selecting the site of a garden. The nomenclature of the country has perpetuated this fact in the name Engannim—"the fountain of gardens"—the modern *Jenin* (comp. Cant. iv, 15). To the old Hebrew poets "a well-watered garden," or "a tree planted by the waters," was an emblem of luxuriant fertility and material prosperity (Isa. lviii, 11; Jer. xvii, 8; xxxi, 12); while no figure more graphically conveyed the idea of dreary barrenness or misery than "a garden that hath no water" (Isa. i, 30). From a neighboring stream or cistern were supplied the channels or conduits by which the gardens were intersected, and the water was thus conveyed to all parts (Psa. i, 3; Eccl. ii, 6; Ecclus. xxiv, 33). It is a matter of doubt what is the exact meaning of the expression "to water with the foot" in Deut. xi, 10. Niebuhr (*Descr. de l'Arabie*, p. 138) describes a wheel which is employed for irrigating gardens where the water is not deep, and which is worked by the hands and feet after the manner of a tread-mill, the men "pulling the upper part towards them with their hands, and pushing with their feet upon the lower part" (Robinson, ii, 226). This mode of irrigation might be described as "watering with the foot." But the method practised by the agriculturists in Oman, as narrated by Wellsted (*Trav.* i, 281), may answer to this description, and serves to illustrate Prov. xxi, 1: "After ploughing, they form the ground with a spade into small squares with ledges on either side, along which the water is conducted. . . . When one of the hollows is filled, the peasant stops the supply by turning up the earth with his foot, and thus opens a channel into another." See IRRIGATION.

4. Gardens were dedicated to various uses among the Hebrews, such as we still find prevailing in the East. One most essential difference between them and our own is that they are not attached to or in any way connected with the residence, but are situated in the suburbs, sometimes from half a mile to a mile distant from the houses of the persons to whom they belong. It is manifest that all the gardens mentioned in Scripture were outside the several towns. This is, however, to be understood of regular gardens, for shrubs and flowers were often planted in the open courts of the dwelling-houses. People repair to their suburban gardens to take the air, to walk, and to refresh and solace themselves in various ways. For their use there is mostly in each garden a kind of summer-house or pavilion, fitted up with much neatness, gayly painted, and furnished with seats, where the visitors may sit and enjoy themselves. Here sometimes banquets were and are still given, attended by singing and music (Isa. li, 3; lxxv, 3). See GARDEN-HOUSE.

The kings and nobles had their country houses surrounded by gardens (1 Kings xxi, 1; 2 Kings ix, 27), and these were used on festal occasions (Cant. v, 1). So intimately, indeed, were gardens associated with festivity, that horticulture and conviviality are, in the Talmud, denoted by the same term (Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* s. v. ארריורה). It is possible, however, that this may be a merely accidental coincidence. The garden of Ahasuerus was in a court of the palace (Esth. i, 5), adjoining the banqueting-hall (Esth. vii, 7). In Babylon, the gardens and orchards were enclosed by the city walls (Layard, *Nin.* ii, 246). Attached to the house of Joachim was a garden or orchard (Sus. 4)—"a garden inclosed" (Cant. iv, 12)—provided with

baths and other appliances of luxury (Sus. 15; comp. 2 Sam. xi, 2). See PALACE.

It would seem that the Jews were much in the habit of performing their devotions in gardens, on account of their retirement (Gen. xxiv, 63; Matt. xvi, 30; xxvi, 36; John ii, 48; xviii, 1, 2). This interesting practice, however, was idolatrously abused; for the worship of idols in these shady seclusions was not of unfrequent occurrence, and is often mentioned in Scripture (1 Kings xiv, 23; 2 Kings xvi, 4; xvii, 10; 2 Chron. xviii, 4; Isa. i, 29; lxxv, 3; lxxvi, 17; Jer. ii, 20; iii, 6; Ezek. xx, 28). See GROVE.

The custom of burying the dead in gardens is indicated in Gen. xxiii, 19, 20; 2 Kings xxi, 4, 18, 26; 1 Sam. xxv, 1; Mark xv, 46; John xix, 41; and still occurs sometimes in the East, but is not very prevalent. We find it also among the Greeks (Heliiodorus, *Ethiop.* i, 2, p. 35), and the Romans (Suetonius, *Galba*, 20). See GRAVE.

5. Gardens were planted not only with fragrant and beautiful plants (Cant. vi, 2; iv, 16), but with various fruit-bearing and other trees (Gen. ii, 9; Exod. xxiii, 11; Jer. xxix, 5; Amos ix, 14). Thus we find mention of nut-gardens (Cant. vi, 11, 14), pomegranate-gardens (Cant. iv, 13), olive-gardens (Deut. viii, 8; 1 Chron. xxvii, 12), vine-gardens (Cant. iv, 2; viii, 8). Here, however, we are not to suppose that the gardens were exclusively occupied by these fruits, but that they were severally predominant in the gardens to which they gave name. The distinction, for instance, between a vine-garden and a vineyard would be, that, in the latter, the vine was cultivated solely for use, whereas in the former it was planted for solace and ornament, to cover walls, and to be trained in arbors and on trellises. The quince, medlar, citron, almond, and service trees are among those enumerated in the Mishna as cultivated in Palestine (*Kilaim*, i, 4). Gardens of herbs, or kitchen-gardens, are mentioned in Deut. xi, 10, and 1 Kings xxi, 2. Cucumbers were grown in them (Isa. i, 8; Bar. vi, 70), and probably also melons, leeks, onions, and garlic, which are spoken of (Numb. xi, 5) as the productions of a neighboring country. In addition to these, the lettuce, mustard-plant (Luke xiii, 19), coriander, endive, one of the bitter herbs eaten with the paschal lamb, and rue, are particularized in the precepts of the Mishna, though it is not certain that they were all, strictly speaking, cultivated in the gardens of Palestine (*Kilaim*, i, 8). It is well known that, in the time of the Romans, the art of gardening was carried to great perfection in Syria. Pliny (xx, 16) speaks of it as proverbially elaborate, and again (xii, 64) he describes the balsam plant as growing in Judæa alone, and there only in two royal gardens. It is evident that the gardens of the Hebrews were in a very considerable degree devoted to the culture of medicinal herbs, the preparation of which in various ways was a matter of much solicitude with them (Jer. viii, 22). This is still the case in the East, where vegetable simples are employed in medicine. See MEDICINE. In addition to the ordinary productions of the country, we are tempted to infer from Isa. xvii, 10, that in some gardens care was bestowed on the rearing of exotics. To this conclusion the description of the gardens of Solomon in the Targum on Eccl. ii, 5, 6 seems to point: "I made me well-watered gardens and paradises, and sowed there all kinds of plants, some for use of eating, and some for use of drinking, and some for purposes of medicine; all kinds of plants of spices. I planted in them trees of emptiness (i. e. not fruit-bearing), and all trees of spices which the spectres and demons brought me from India, and every tree which produces fruit; and its border was from the wall of the citadel, which is in Jerusalem, by the waters of Siloah. I chose reservoirs of water, which, behold! are for watering the trees and the plants, and I made me fish-ponds of water, some of them also for the plantation which rears the trees to water it." In

large gardens the *orchard* (פַּרְדֵּי, *parādēsus*) was probably, as in Egypt, the inclosure set apart for the cultivation of date and sycamore trees, and trees of various kinds (Cant. iv, 13; Eccles. ii, 5). Schroeder, in the preface to his *Thesaurus Linguee Armenicæ*, asserts that the word "parden" is of Armenian origin, and denotes a garden near a house, planted with herbs, trees, and flowers. It is applied by Diodorus Siculus (ii, 10) and Berossus (quoted by Josephus, *Ant.* x, 2, 1) to the famous hanging gardens of Babylon. Xenophon (*Anab.* i, 2, 7) describes the "paradise" at Celenæ in Phrygia, where Cyrus had a palace, as a large preserve full of wild beasts; and Aulus Gellius (ii, 20) gives "*riveria*" as the equivalent of *parādēsus* (comp. Philostratus, *Vit. Apol. Tyan.* i, 38). The officer in charge of such a domain was called "the keeper of the paradise" (Neh. ii, 8). See PARADISE.

The law against the propagation of mixed species (Lev. xix, 19; Deut. xxii, 9, 11) gave rise to numerous enactments in the Mishna to insure its observance. The portions of the field or garden, in which the various plants were sown, were separated by light fences of reed, ten palms in height, the distance between the reeds being not more than three palms, so that a kid could not enter (*Kilaim*, iv, 3, 4).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See DIVERSE.

See Schröder, *De hortis Hebraor.* (Marburg, 1722); Bradley, *Descript. œconom. et hortic. vett.* (Lond. 1725); Van Goeus, *De κηποταφίη* (Utr. 1763). See AGRICULTURE.

GARDENER (κηπότρος), a class of workmen alluded to in Job xxvii, 18, and mentioned in John xx, 15; but how far the art of gardening was carried among the Hebrews we have few means of ascertaining. That they were acquainted with the process of grafting is evident from Rom. xi, 17, 24, as well as from the minute prohibitions of the Mishna; and the method of propagating plants by layers or cuttings was not unknown (Isa. xvii, 10). Buxtorf says that אֲרִיסִין, *arisin* (Mishna, *Bikkurim*, i, 2) [or, rather, בְּטֵל אֲרִיסִין], were gardeners who tended and looked after gardens on consideration of receiving some portion of the fruit (*Lex. Talm.* s. v.); but that gardening was a special means of livelihood is clear from a proverb which contains a warning against rash speculations: "Who hires a garden eats the birds; who hires gardens, him the birds eat" (Dukes, *Rabbin. Blumenlese*, p. 141).—Smith, s. v. See GARDEN.

GARDEN-HOUSE is the rendering of the A. V. at 2 Kings ix, 27, of בַּיִת הַגַּן; where, however, a place is rather denoted. See BETH-HAGGAN.



Modern Oriental Garden-house.

Garden-houses are usual in the East, especially in the grounds of kings and wealthy persons. In Cant. i, 16, the bride, looking out from her boudoir into the gayly-planted court-yard, acknowledges the taste and affection of her beloved as she spies the summer-house, all shaded with verdure, and containing the *divan* (פַּרְדֵּי), that invited to the luxurious repose of which Orientals are so fond. See GARDEN.

**Gardiner, James**, Colonel, son of captain Patrick Gardiner, of the British service, was born at Carriden, Linlithgowshire, Scotland, Jan. 11, 1688, and at fourteen became ensign in a Scotch regiment in the Dutch service. In 1702 he obtained a commission in the English army, and was severely wounded at the battle of Ramillies in 1706. In several other battles he gave distinguished proofs of capacity and courage. His licentious habits, with his successful adventures in gallantry, gained for him among his dissolute companions the distinction of the "happy rake." But he was not happy. Passages of the Bible which were still imprinted on his memory, and the thought of his mother's pious character and early instructions, often recurred to make him miserable; and at one time, while entertaining a party of profligate young men by his licentious wit, he felt so degraded in his own estimation, and so inwardly wretched, that, a dog lying at his feet, the wish involuntarily rose in his breast, "Would I were as happy as that dog!" In 1719 he became the subject of profound religious impressions. The circumstances, as narrated by Dr. Doddridge, contain much that is marvellous, if not supernatural. "Doddridge himself hints at the possibility of the whole being a dream instead of a 'visible representation of the Lord Jesus Christ upon the cross, surrounded on all sides with a glory,' etc. He also mentions that Gardiner 'did not seem very confident' whether the voice which came to him was really 'an audible voice, or only a strong impression on his mind equally striking.' Considerable doubt has recently been cast on the whole story by the publication of the *Autobiography of Dr. Alexander Carlyle*, edited by John Hill Burton (Edinb., Blackwood and Sons, 1860), in which Carlyle denies altogether the truth of Doddridge's version of the story, at least of the supernatural portion of it. The attendant circumstances, however, are of little moment one way or another; the great fact is the conversion of the brave but wicked soldier into a pious and excellent Christian, and regarding this there has never been any doubt. In 1724 Gardiner was raised to the rank of major, and in 1726 he married lady Frances Erskine, daughter of the fourth earl of Buchan, by whom he had thirteen children, only five of whom survived him." On his becoming the head of a family he commenced the practice of domestic worship—the presence of no guest, the intervention of no engagement, was ever allowed to interfere with its daily performance. He was also regular in attendance on public worship on the Sabbath, and established a system according to which all the servants accompanied him to church. In 1730 he became lieutenant colonel of dragoons, and in 1743 colonel of a new regiment of dragoons. He was killed at the battle of Preston Pans in 1745.—Chambers, *Encyclopædia*, s. v.; Doddridge, *Life of Col. Gardiner*; Jamieson, *Religious Biography*, s. v.

**Gardiner, Stephen**, bishop of Winchester, was born at Bury St. Edmund's, Suffolk, in 1483. He was the illegitimate son of Dr. Woodville, bishop of Salisbury, the brother of Elizabeth, queen of Edward IV. He was educated at Trinity Hall, Cambridge, and in 1520 took the degree of LL.D. Having thoroughly studied the civil and canon law, he became Wolsey's secretary, and rose to the highest posts under Henry VIII, whom he served diligently in the matter of the divorce. At first he sided with the Reformers, but being unwilling to be second to Cranmer, he took the


Roman Catholic side during Henry's lifetime. Gardiner drew up articles accusing Henry VIII's last queen, Catharine Parr, of heresy; but the queen avoided the storm, and he fell into disgrace. At Henry's death Gardiner experienced a still greater reverse. The young king and his government made great religious changes, to which Gardiner set himself in opposition. The council committed him to the Fleet. "Here he was confined until the act of general amnesty, which passed in the December after the accession of Edward, released him. As soon as he was free he went down to his diocese, and while there he remained unmolested; but on his return to London, on account of a certain sermon which he preached on St. Peter's day, he was seized and committed to the Tower (1548). Various conferences were held with him, and his release was promised him on condition that he would express his contrition for the past, promise obedience for the future, subscribe the new settlement in religion, acknowledge the royal supremacy, and the abrogation of the six articles. With the first of these conditions alone did he absolutely refuse to comply. The terms of liberation were afterwards rendered still more difficult. The number of articles that he was called upon to subscribe was considerably increased. On his refusal to sign them his bishopric was sequestered, and he was soon afterwards deprived. For more than five years he suffered close imprisonment, and it was not until the beginning of the reign of Mary that his liberty was restored (1553). If his fall from power at the conclusion of Henry's reign had been sudden, still more sudden was the rapidity of his reinstatement. A Roman Catholic queen was on the throne, and he who had been ever the foremost of her partisans must necessarily be raised to be one of her first advisers. The chancellorship was conferred upon him. His bishopric was restored, and the conduct of affairs placed in his hands. The management of the queen's marriage-treaty was intrusted to him. He was chosen to officiate at her marriage, as he had also done at her coronation, and became her most confidential adviser. No matters, whatever they might be, could be proceeded in without his privity and concurrence; and he had his full share in the persecutions of this reign. The horrors which were not committed by his actual orders must at least have obtained his sanction, for he had reached a height of power, both civil and ecclesiastical, perhaps unequalled in this kingdom except by his master Wolsey alone. He died Nov. 12, 1555. A list of his writings is given in Tanner's *Bibl. Britannico-Hibernica* (p. 308). The character of Gardiner may be stated in a few words. He was a man of great ability; his general knowledge was more remarkable than his learning as a divine. He was ambitious and revengeful, and wholly unscrupulous. His first object was his own preservation and advancement, and his next the promotion of his party interest. He saw deeply into the characters of those with whom he dealt, dealt with them with remarkable tact, and had an accurate foresight of affairs" (*English Cyclopædia*, s. v.). See Burnet, *Hist. of English Reformation*, passim; Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, v, 256; Collier, *Eccles. History of Great Britain*, vi, 125.

**Ga'reb** (Heb. *Gareb'*, גַּרְעֵב, *scabby*; Sept. Γαριβ and Γαριβ), the name of a man and of a hill.


1. An Ithrite (q. v.), i. e. descendant of Jethro or Jether, and one of David's thirty heroes (2 Sam. xxiii, 38; 1 Chron. xi, 40). B.C. 1046. See DAVID.

2. A hill (גַּרְעֵב) near Jerusalem, apparently on the north-west (Jer. xxxi, 39). See JERUSALEM. According to Dr. Barclay, it is "the ridge running from the north-west corner of the city in the direction of Wely Kamat" (*City of the Great King*, p. 76). See GATH. He thinks it may have been so called because Gareb the Ithrite once owned it, or because it contained quarries for the seclusion of the lepers.

**Gargoyle**, a projecting spout, used in Gothic architecture to throw water from the gutter of a building, so as not to drop down the wall. Gargoyles are usually carved into the resemblance of the human figure or of grotesque animals, real or imaginary. They are placed on cornices and on buttresses, and form salient features in many buildings of the early



St. Stephen's, Vienna.



St. Alkmund's Church, Derby; circa 1450. Horsley Church, Derbyshire; circa 1450.

English and decorated styles of the Gothic architecture. (G. F. C.)

**Garissols, ANTOINE**, a French Protestant minister, was born at Montauban in 1587. He was ordained and appointed pastor at Puylaurens in 1610. In 1620 he was sent to Montauban, and in October, 1627, he was made professor of theology at that place. In 1645 he presided at the Synod of Charenton, and distinguished himself by his firmness in resisting demands made by the government which would have destroyed the Protestant liberties. He attacked at this synod the theory of mediate imputation as held by Placeus (q. v.). When the Protestant schools were disorganized, owing to the irregularity with which they received their subsidies, he remained at his post, with no hope of remuneration, and by teaching all branches of theology supplied the places of his absent colleagues as well as his own. He died at Montauban July, 1651. Among his works are *La voie du Salut, exposé en huit sermons* (Montauban, 1637, 8vo);—*Decretis synodici Carentoniensis de imputatione primi peccati Ade explicatio et defensio* (Montauban, 1648, 8vo);—*Theses theologicae de religione et cultu sive adoratione religiosa* (Montauban, 1648, 4to);—*Disputationes elencticae de capitulis fidei inter reformatos et pontificios controversis in acad. Montalb.*, habite sub presidio Ant. Garissolii et Joan. Verderii (Montauban, 1650, 8vo);—*Catecheses ecclesiarum in Gallia et alibi reformatarum Explicatio, opus a Paulo Carolo inchoatum et ab Ant. Garissolio continuatum et absolutum* (Genève, 1656, 4to).—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xix, 491, 492.


**Gar'izim** (Γαριζίν v. r. Γαριζίν), a Græcized form (2 Macc. v, 23; vi, 2) of MOUNT GERIZIM (q. v.).

**Garland** (στέμμα, Acts xiv, 13). See WREATH. It was customary in heathen sacrifices to adorn victims with fillets and garlands; but commentators are not agreed as to the purpose to which the "garlands" mentioned in the above passage are to be applied. As the idolaters used to put garlands on the head of their idol before they offered sacrifice, it has been thought by others that they were intended to be set on the heads of the apostles. They were generally composed of such trees or plants as were esteemed most agreeable to the god who was the immediate object of worship (see Kuinöl and others, in loc.). See Rose, *De στεφανοφορίᾳ* (Jena, 1669); Schmid, *De Coronis* (Lips. 1701); Hoefer, *id.* (En. 1646); Schmeizel, *id.* (ib.

1713); Paschalis, *id.* (L. B., 1671); Grege, *De coronis ephularibus* (Lips. 1670). See CROWN; WEDDING.

**Garlands** in the marriage service. It was usual in the early Church to crown persons contracted in marriage with garlands (Chrysostom, *Hom. ix.* in 1 Tim.). This practice was derived from the heathen ceremonies; but, as it was deemed innocent, the Christians made no scruple to adopt it. It is still practised in the Greek Church. At funerals, however, the custom of crowning the corpse and the coffin was rejected as savoring of idolatry (Tertullian, *De Corona Militis*, c. x). It was usual to strew flowers on the grave.—Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, bk. vii, ch. iii.

**Garlic** (大蒜, *shum*, so called from its odor; Sept. *σκόροδον*, Vulg. *allium*, A. V. "garlick") occurs only once in Scripture, and that in the plural, Numb. xi, 5; where the Israelites are described as murmuring, among other things, for the leeks, the onions, and the garlic of Egypt. There can be no doubt of its being correctly so translated, as the same Arabic word (*thum*) still signifies a species of garlic which is cultivated and esteemed throughout Eastern countries (Celsii *Herobot*, ii, 53). Ancient authors mention that garlic was cultivated in Egypt (Pliny, xix, 32). Herodotus (ii, 125) enumerates it as one of the substances upon which a large sum (1600 talents) was spent for feeding laborers employed in building the Pyramids, although Hasselquist expresses a doubt whether it was cultivated in that country (*Trav.* p. 562). The species considered to have been thus referred to is *Allium Ascalonicum*, which is the most common in Eastern coun-



*Allium Ascalonicum.*

tries, and obtains its specific name from having been brought into Europe from Ascalon (see Jac. de Vitriaco, in the *Gest. Franco.* iii, 1142). It is now usually known in the kitchen garden by the name of "eschalot" or "shallot." Its ranker congener is the common garlic (*Allium sativum*). See the *Penny Cyclopædia*, s. v. *Allium*. Rosellini, however, thinks he has discovered it upon a painting in Beni Hassan. The Talmudists frequently mention the use of this plant among the Jews, and their fondness of it (*Kilaim*, i, 3; vi, 10; *Maaser*. v, 8; *Terum*. vii, 7; *Nedar*. viii, 6, etc.). It formed a favorite viand with the common people among the Greeks and Romans (Pliny, xx, 23; *Plautus*, *Mostell.* I, i, 38; Horace, *Ep.* iii, 3; Suetonius, *Vesp.* 8). See BOTANY.

**Garment** (represented by several Heb. and Greek words) [see APPAREL; CLOTHING; DRESS; RAIMENT; VESTURE, etc.]. For a list of modern Arabic garments, see Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 167 sq. In 2 Kings xi, 13, it is said, "Then they hastened and took every man his garment, and put it under him on the top of the stairs, and blew with trumpets, saying, Jehu is king." Here they laid down their garments in-

stead of carpets. The use of carpets was common in the East in the remoter ages. The kings of Persia always walked upon carpets in their palaces. Xenophon reproaches the degenerate Persians of his time that they placed their couches upon carpets, to repose more at their ease. The spreading of garments in the street before persons to whom it was intended to show particular honor was an ancient and very general custom. Thus the people spread their garments in the way before our Saviour (Matt. xxi, 8), where some also strewed branches. In the *Agamemnon* of Æschylus, the hypocritical Clytemnestra commands the maids to spread out carpets before her returning husband, that, on descending from his chariot, he may place his foot "on a purple-covered path." We also find this custom among the Romans. When Cato of Utica left the Macedonian army, where he had become legionary tribune, the soldiers spread their clothes in the way. The hanging out of carpets, and strewing of flowers and branches in modern times, are remnants of ancient customs. See RENDING; SEWING.

A number of sumptuous and magnificent habits was, in ancient times, regarded as an indispensable part of the treasures of a rich man. Thus the patriarch Job, speaking of the riches of the wicked, says, "Though he heap up silver as the dust, and prepare raiment as the clay" (Job xxvii, 16). Joseph gave his brethren changes of raiment, but to Benjamin he gave "three hundred pieces of silver, and five changes of raiment" (Gen. xlv, 22). Naaman carried for a present to the prophet Elisha ten changes of raiment (2 Kings v, 5). In allusion to this custom, our Lord, when describing the short duration and perishing nature of earthly treasures, represents them as subject to the depredations of the moth, from which the inhabitants of the East find it exceedingly difficult to preserve their stores of garments: "Lay not up for yourselves treasures on earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt" (Matt. vi, 19). Paul, when appealing to the integrity and fidelity with which he had discharged his sacred office, mentions apparel with other treasures: he says, "I have coveted no man's gold, or silver, or apparel" (Acts xx, 33). The apostle James likewise (as do the Greek and Roman writers, when they particularize the opulence of those times) specifies gold, silver, and garments as the constituents of riches: "Go to now, ye rich men; weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you. Your riches are corrupted, and your garments moth-eaten" (James v, 1, 2). We find that the custom of hoarding up splendid dresses still exists in Palestine and the East. It appears that even Solomon received raiment as presents (2 Chron. ix, 24). Asiatic princes and grandees keep changes of raiment ready made, for presents to persons of distinction whom they wish particularly to honor. The simple and uniform shape of the clothes makes this custom practicable, and accounts also for the change of one person's dress for another's, which is mentioned in sacred history. This will, perhaps, apply to the parable of the wedding garment, and to the behavior of the king, who expected to have found all his guests clad in robes of honor (Gen. xxvii, 15; Deut. xxii, 5; 1 Sam. xviii, 4; 2 Kings v, 5, 22; Matt. xxii, 11; Luke xv, 22). The "changeable suits of apparel" in Isa. iii, 22, should be properly "embroidered robes." See BANQUET, etc.

Women were forbidden to wear male garments, and the reverse (Deut. xxii, 5; see Mill, *De commutatione vestium utriusq. sexus*, Utr. s. a.). On heterogeneous garments, see DIVERSE.

**Gar'mite** (Heb. with the art. גַּרְמִיתַי, *hag-Garmi'*; Sept. Γαρμι v. r. Ὀραρμι and Ὀγαρμι; Vulg. *Garmi*), an epithet of KEILAH (q. v.) in the obscure genealogy (1 Chron. iv, 19) of Mered (q. v.); apparently to denote its *strength* (i. q. *bony*, from גַּרְמִיתַי; see Prov. xxv, 15; Job xl, 18); but regarded by Gesenius and Fürst (after the Targum, ad loc.) as a proper name: the form



(like that of the associated soubriquets) is patrial, as if from a town, Gerem; but no such place is elsewhere mentioned, unless it be the *Beth-Garem* (בֵּית גֵּרֵם) of the Talmud (*Eruvin*, fol. 19, a), and the *Mansul Garem* of Astori, east of Gaza, referred to by Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 118) as now unknown.

**Garner** is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of the following words:  $\text{אֹסַר'}$ , *osar'*, a *treasure*, as it is usually rendered, a store or stock of goods laid up, hence the place where they are deposited (Joel i, 17; "treasury," 2 Chron. xxxii, 27);  $\text{מֵזֵב}$ , *me'zev* (Sept. *ταμιον*), a *cell* or store-room (Psa. cxliv, 13);  $\text{ἀποθήκη}$ , a *repository* or place for storing away anything, especially a granary (Matt. iii, 12; Luke iii, 17; elsewhere "barn"). See **BARN**. Cisterns (q. v.) are often used for this purpose in the East (Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 262 sq.). The structures of the ancient Egyptians for the storage of grain were above ground, and of great importance in so eminently a grain-growing country. See **AGRICULTURE**.



Ancient Egyptians Storing Grain.

This cut shows the section of a granary, to which the grain is in the act of being transferred after it has been winnowed. The clerk, seated on the heap, writes down the number of the measures borne to the granary, seemingly from the oral report of the man who stands on the ground with raised hands.

**Garnet.** See **SARDIUS**.

**Garnet, HENRY**, an English Jesuit, was born in Nottingham in 1555. He was educated as a Protestant at Winchester College; but, having turned Romanist, he travelled in Spain, and afterwards studied at Rome, and gained distinction for his skill in mathematics. He was made provincial of the Jesuits in England in 1586, and served with great astuteness and fidelity the Roman Church in that country. He was tried in 1606 for complicity in the Gunpowder Plot (q. v.), and was executed May 3. A good account of him is given in *Rule, Celebrated Jesuits*.—Mosheim, *Church History*, book iv, cent. xvii, sec. ii, pt. i, chap. i, § 10; Hume, *History of England*, ch. xlvi.

**Garnett, JOHN, D.D.**, an English divine, was born in 1707. He became fellow of Sidney College, Cambridge, and afterwards Lady Margaret's preacher. He was made bishop of Ferns in 1752, and bishop of Clogher in 1758. He died in 1782. His principal work is *A Dissertation on the Book of Job, its Nature, Argument, Age, and Author, wherein the celebrated Text, xix, 25, is occasionally considered and discussed; to which are added four Sermons* (London, 1749, 4to). He contends "that the book of Job is an allegorical drama, designed to represent the fall and restoration of a captive Jew, and with a view to recommend the virtue of patience. The author he supposes to have been Ezekiel, and the period of its production subsequent to the Babylonish captivity."—Orme, *Bibliotheca Biblica*, p. 200; Kitto, *Cyclopaedia*, s. v.

**Garnier, Jean**, a French Jesuit, was born at Paris in 1612. He joined the order in 1628, and soon displayed great talent and aptness for study and teaching. As usual, this gift was fostered by the society, and for forty years Garnier held different professorships of theology and literature. He died at Bologna, on his way to Rome, Oct. 16, 1681. His most important works are on the Pelagian controversy, his editions of *Juliani Eclan. episcopi libellus, notis illustr.*

(1668), and also of *Marii Mercatoris opera cum notis*, etc. (1673, fol.). The dissertations appended to this edition are still valuable to the history of Pelagianism. In 1675 he published the *Breviarium sive historia controversiarum Nestorianae et Eutylichianae* of the archdeacon Liberatus. After his death, father Hardoin published his *Supplement to the Works of Theodoretus*, at the beginning of which he gives a eulogy of Garnier's labors and talents.—Feller, *Dict. Biog.*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.*, xix, 510.

**Garnier, Julien, DE CONNERRE**, an eminent Benedictine of St. Maur, was born about 1670, and died at Paris June 3, 1725. He enjoyed great reputation for learning, and was highly esteemed both as a man and a priest. His superiors intrusted him with the preparation of a new edition of St. Basil, and the result of his labors was one of the best ever produced at St. Maur; *Scti. Patris nostri Basilii Opera* (Paris, Coignard). The preface is a remarkable production. Garnier, however, was able to complete but two volumes. Maran, who continued the work after the death of Garnier, brought

out the third and last in 1730. See *Histoire littér. de la Congrégation de Saint-Maur*, p. 470; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 662.

**Garnish:**  $\text{הָפָץ}$ , *tsiphah'*, in Piel, to *overlay* (as usually rendered), e. g. with stones, 2 Chron. iii, 6; in a similar sense,  $\text{κοσμίω}$ , to *adorn*, Rev. xxi, 19, which is used of *decking* with garlands, Matt. xxiii, 29; or of a *furnished* apartment, Matt. xii, 44; Luke xi, 25). In Job xxiii, 16, the term is peculiar,  $\text{הַפָּצִים}$ , *shiphrah'*, which Gesenius regards as a noun denoting *brightness*, with which the heavens are clothed; although Fürst, with many others, pointing  $\text{הַפָּצִים}$ , regards it as a Piel form of  $\text{פָּצַע}$ , in the sense of *arch*, referring to the vaulted form of the sky. See **ASTRONOMY**.

**Garrettson, FREEBORN**, a distinguished pioneer preacher of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Maryland August 15, 1752, was converted in 1775, and entered the Conference in the same year. In December, 1784, he was ordained elder by Dr. Coke, and volunteered as missionary to Nova Scotia. In 1788, with twelve young ministers, he opened the work of evangelizing Eastern New York and Western New England. From 1818 to his death, Sept. 26, 1827, he mostly had the relation of Conference missionary. Mr. Garrettson was a very widely-useful minister. "He was among the earliest Methodist preachers of American birth, and, being active and zealous from the commencement of his ministerial career, his life and labors are intimately connected with the rise and progress of Methodism in this country." He preached in almost all the Eastern States, from Nova Scotia to the Gulf of Mexico, and on all his appointments many souls were converted and many churches built up. Although not a man of great learning, Mr. Garrettson was a man of vigorous mind and powerful character. He was imbued with fervor and zeal; and during fifty-two years he was one of the most laborious and efficient evangelists of the age. He died greatly honored

and lamented.—*Minutes of Conferences*, i, 574; Bangs, *Life of F. Garrison* (N. Y. 12mo); Stevens, *Memorials of Methodism*, vol. i; *Methodist Magazine*, March, 1828; Stevens, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church*. (G. L. T.)

**Garrison**, denoted by four or five Heb. words from the root  $\text{נָצַב}$ , *natsub'*, to stand firm or erect (i. q.  $\text{נָצַב}$ ). 1.  $\text{מַטְּסָב}$ , *matstsab'* (fem.  $\text{מַטְּסָבָה}$ , *matstsabah'*, 1 Sam. xiv, 12), a station, i. e. lit. a standing-place (e. g. where the priests stood in Jordan, "place," Josh. iv, 3, 9); hence a military or fortified post (e. g. the Philistine camp, 1 Sam. xiii, 23; xiv, 1, 4, 6, 11, 12, 15; 2 Sam. xxiii, 14); metaph. an office or public "station" (Isa. xxii, 19). 2.  $\text{מַטְּסָב}$ , *matstsab'*, a cordon of troops ("mount," Isa. xxix, 3; perhaps also "pillar," Judg. ix, 6). 3.  $\text{נֹטֵיב}$ , *netsib'*, properly a prefect or superintendent ("officer," 1 Kings iv, 19; 2 Chron. viii, 10); hence a military post (1 Sam. x, 5; xiii, 3, 4; 2 Sam. viii, 6, 14; 1 Chron. xi, 16; xviii, 13; 2 Chron. xvii, 2); also a monumental "pillar" (q. v.) or *cippus* (e. g. a statue of salt, Gen. xix, 26; a sense in which some take the word also in 1 Sam. x, 5; xiii, 3, like the *stela* erected by Sesostris in conquered countries in token of subjugation, Herod. ii, 102, 106). 4. An improper rendering, Ezek. xxvi, 11, of  $\text{מַטְּסָבָה}$ , *matstsebah'*, which always designates a standing object, either an architectural or monumental column (usually rendered "pillar;" in the passage of Ezekiel perhaps referring to those of the Tyrian temples; comp. Herod. ii, 14), or an idolatrous "image" (q. v.). See FORTIFICATION.

**Garsis**, a town mentioned in the Talmud ( $\text{גַּרְסִיָּה}$ , *Erubim*, fol. 21, b) as the residence of one Rabbi Joshua; also by Josephus (*Γαρσίς*, *Itav*, v, 11, 5) as the native city (*πόλις*) of one Tephthæus, and situated in Galilee—Schwarz adds (*Palest.* p. 178) 20 stadia from Sephoris (evidently confounding it with the *Garisimè*, *Γαρισίμη* v. r. *Γαρίξ κόμη*, of Josephus, *Life*, § 71), but that the site is now unknown.

**Garve**, KARL BERNHARD, a German divine and Christian poet, was born near Hanover, Jan. 4, 1763. He studied theology in the seminary of Barby, and soon after became professor of philosophy and history at Niesky. This he left in 1797, and afterwards served in different functions in Amsterdam, Ebersdorf, Norden, and Berlin successively, distinguishing himself particularly in the latter place, where his ministrations were eminently successful, despite the disordered state of affairs during the years 1810-16. He was afterwards at the head of the Moravian community at Neusalz, on the Oder, which post age and infirmities compelled him to resign in 1838. He died June 22, 1841. Garve was one of the best of modern German hymn writers, especially excelling in versification, and combining fecundity and ease of production with rare beauty of language and deep religious feeling. He published *Christliche Gesänge* (Görlitz, 1825), containing 303 pieces, mostly original:—"Brüdergesänge" (Gnadau, 1827); and left many hymns in manuscript.—*Herzog, Real-Encyclopädie*, iv, 663.

**Garrison**, DANIEL, was born in Washington Co., Md., January 9, 1830. He graduated at Pennsylvania College in 1850, and passed his theological studies in the seminary at Gettysburg. He was licensed to preach, and soon after accepted a professorship in Illinois State University. This position he occupied with honor to himself and advantage to the institution for several years. After spending some time in visiting portions of Europe, Asia, and Africa, he returned to this country, and successively preached at Canton, Ohio, and Greensburg, Pa. He died Sept. 30, 1865. He was an earnest, impressive, and successful minister of the Lutheran Church, a man of enlarged mind and liberal heart, whose memory will be cherished with affectionate interest. His only publications are, *Our*

*Country in the Light of History*, delivered before the alumni of Pennsylvania College, 1861; and *The Sudden Death of Henry J. M. Millan*, pronounced in the Lutheran Church, Greensburg, 1864. (M. L. S.)

**Gary**, GEORGE, a Methodist Episcopal minister and missionary to Oregon, was born at Middlefield, Otsego Co., N. Y., Dec. 8, 1793; entered the New England Conference in 1809; in 1813 was transferred to Genesee Conference; in 1818 was made presiding elder; in 1825 was Conference missionary; in 1834, missionary to the Onondia Indians; in 1836 was transferred to Black River Conference; and in 1844 was appointed missionary superintendent of Oregon, where he remained four years. After his return he labored on until 1854, when his health entirely failed. He died March 25, 1855. Mr. Gary was an eminently holy and useful minister. He was six times delegate to the General Conference, and was deeply engaged in all the ecclesiastical, religious, and educational interests of the Church. He was a wise and safe counsellor, and his influence in his Conference was very great. As a preacher he was widely known for "true, persuasive, and sanctified eloquence," which "mightily moved his hearers."—*Minutes of Conferences*, v, 560; Peck, *Early Methodism* (N. York, 1860, 12mo), p. 480; Sprague, *Annals*, vii, 478. (G. L. T.)

**Gash'mu** (Hebrew *Gashmū'*,  $\text{גַּשְׁמוֹ}$ ; Sept. omits, Vulg. *Gossem*), prob. a prolonged form (Neh. vi, 6) of the name GESHEM (q. v.).

**Gassendi** or **Gassend**, PIERRE, an eminent French philosopher and scholar, was born of humble parentage Dec. 24, 1595, at Champtericier, a village near Digne, in Provence. He died at Paris Oct. 24, 1655. From his earliest years he was noted for sweetness of disposition, quickness of apprehension, keenness of observation, and precocity of genius. As a child he would wander in the fields on clear nights to admire the beauty, variety, and order of the starry hosts, and would thus excite the anxieties of his family, till his habits and occupations became familiar to them. At four years of age he made sermons for the entertainment of his childish companions, at ten he delivered a Latin address to the bishop of his diocese, and at sixteen he had already adopted the motto of his life—*sapere aude*—dare to be wise. He was early sent to school, and, fortunately, fell at Digne into the hands of a teacher able to appreciate and develop his wonderful powers. His father was with difficulty induced to permit his attendance at the University of Aix, along with the sons of a relative, and at that relative's expense. He was required to return after a two-years' course. At Aix he was under the care of Fesaye, a learned Minorite, who introduced him into the thorny labyrinths of philosophy. At the expiration of the appointed time Gassendi returned to the plough, but left it to teach rhetoric at the age of sixteen in the academy of Digne. At nineteen he was appointed, on the death of Fesaye, to give instructions in philosophy at the University of Aix; but he devoted himself chiefly to the study of theology, as he had selected the Church for his career. In 1616, however, he was simultaneously elected to the chairs of theology and philosophy, and he accepted the latter. The authority of Aristotle had been long declining among the learned, and, in common with many of his precursors and contemporaries, Gassendi employed himself in the confutation of the peripatetic dogmas. The controversial views thus promulgated were systematized in his *Exercitationum Paradoxiarum adversus Aristoteleos libri septem*. Before publishing the work he submitted it to the judgment of Nicholas Peirese and the prior of Valetta. By them he was persuaded to complete his design of entering the Church; and, after receiving his doctorate of divinity, was through their influence presented to a canonry at Digne. A portion of the *Paradoxes* was published in 1624, but the

last five books were withheld by the advice of his friends, and his labors in this direction were arrested by the discovery that the subject had been sufficiently discussed by Francisco Patrizzi.

These writings, petulant in character, and full of youthful cavils and superficial objections, provoked opposition, which was not mitigated by Gassendi's manifest predilection for the opinions of Epicurus. The young philosopher had been born at the close of the religious wars of France, and had entered upon life amid the turmoil and strife of the regency of Anne of Austria, during a period when many speculative minds sought relief from controversy, and from the agitation of religious and political dissensions, in the careless scepticism and easy morality which had been rendered attractive by Montaigne. Ecclesiastical duties having summoned him to Paris, he profited by the occasion to augment his multifarious learning, and to form the acquaintance of the learned in the capital. It was probably at this time that he was brought into intimacy with Des Cartes, an intimacy which was interrupted and shaken by his *Observations on the Philosophical Meditations*, and by the disingenuous conduct of Des Cartes in regard to them. Gassendi was induced to accept in 1645 the professorship of mathematics in the Royal College of France; but the exertion of lecturing, in conjunction with his other studious avocations, undermined his health, and compelled him to seek its restoration by a return to his native air. During this period he gave to the world the treatise *De Vita et Moribus Epicuri* (Lugduni, 1647), and his edition of the *Tenth Book of Diogenes Laertius* (1649), with copious annotations, in which he collected and arranged the abundant literary materials which he had gathered for the illustration of the philosophy and the philosopher of the Garden. In 1653 Gassendi returned to Paris, and, after publishing the lives of Tycho Brahe, Copernicus, Purbach, Regiomontanus, and Peiresce, devoted himself assiduously to the completion and perfection of his scheme of speculation, though these last results of his labors did not appear till after his death in the *Synagma Philosophiæ Epicureæ*. His health finally gave way in 1654, and, after much suffering from pulmonary disease, he died, having survived his illustrious rival Des Cartes five years.

The complete works of Gassendi were collected and published in 1658, in 6 vols. fol., by his friends Louis de Montmor and François Henry, with a biography by Sorbière prefixed. The most important of these works have been already mentioned, but they were accompanied by numerous essays on various topics of mathematics, astronomy, natural history, etc. These it is unnecessary to notice, though all branches of contemporaneous investigation engaged the attention of Gassendi, and his reputation was higher and less assailable in science than in philosophy. The range of his inquiries in the latter department is illustrated by his early refutation of the mystical doctrines of Robert Fludd, in the *Examen Philosophiæ Fluddianæ*, by his *Disquisitio Metaphysica*, in opposition to Des Cartes, and by his life-long labors in resuscitating the Epicurean doctrine, especially in its physical developments. His zealous attachment to the daring imaginations of Epicurus, and his ardent rehabilitation of the character of the "*Græius homo*" who first forced the barriers of nature—

"et extra  
Processit longe flammantia moenia mundi"—

invited misapprehension, and were obnoxious to grave criticism. To repel misconception, he appended to the *Synagma Philosophiæ Epicureæ* a series of elaborate essays, in which he repudiated and refuted the infidel tenets ascribed to Epicurus. This late defence, however consonant with the whole tenor of his own life, was inadequate to preclude unfavorable presumptions, particularly on the part of those predisposed to welcome them. Nor was his intimate association with

Hobbes, La Mothe le Vayer, and other notable sceptics of the time, calculated to inspire confidence in his orthodoxy. But there is no reason to suppose that the piety of Gassendi was less sincere than it was habitual, or that he ever questioned the validity of the religion which he professed. It was an age of paradox, and of promiscuous and vague, but earnest inquiry. His early resistance to the Aristotelians may have attracted his favor to the ethical as well as the physical scheme which was most strongly contrasted with the positions of the peripatetic school. The temper of the period, too, after long theological controversy and a century of religious war, desired the conciliation or the relegation of polemical asperities, and cherished a careless scepticism or an uninquiring faith. The morals of Epicurus were contemplated by Gassendi in their original innocence and purity, divested of the corruptions which vitiated them in their later and more familiar applications, and adorned with that chaste simplicity which won the earnest and repeated commendations of the Stoic Seneca.

*Philosophy of Gassendi.*—Neither the desire nor the design of founding a sect was entertained by Gassendi. He left no school, though he made his mark on the scientific and speculative development of Europe. He was distinguished by quick perception, accurate observation, remarkable penetration and discrimination, various research, and manifold accomplishment. He was enthusiastic in the discovery of new facts, eager in the exposure of inveterate error, but he had no taste for system-mongering, and was free from the weaknesses of personal ambition. He aimed rather at rejuvenating ancient knowledge than at inaugurating new fancies. The cardinal principle of Epicurus was accepted and expounded by Gassendi in such a manner as to harmonize with the simplicity, temperance, and purity of his life. Pleasure is the *summum bonum*—the final object, the highest motive of human action, the crown of human aspirations; but this pleasure is the pleasure of the good man; the perfect state of the pagan; the present and eternal bliss of the Christian. It is neither to be attained nor sought by personal indulgences, nor by concession to appetites; but only by the punctilious discharge of every duty, in expectation of that serenity of a conscience at ease, which is the most abiding and the most assuring reward of virtue. Such a theory is liable to great abuses, and is certain to be ultimately abused. An easy conscience is easily mistaken for a conscience at ease, and happiness is identified with pleasure when pleasure ceases to be identical with happiness. Pleasure, in its vulgar sense, thus becomes at once the aim of life and the means of securing that aim; and pleasure, in its philosophic sense, which implies the concord of desire with duty, is totally forgotten or ignored. Thus all the vices of the Epicurean stye are introduced. But it is as uncharitable as it is uncharitable to stigmatize the philosopher instead of the philosophy for the perverseness or the perverse tendency of his doctrine. In the most defeated Epicureanism there is assuredly an intricate confusion which eventuates in grievous error. Violence is habitually done to words, and a greater violence is done to thoughts. There is a continual paronomasia and *paragnomesia*—a play upon terms and upon conceptions—which dazzles, bewilders, and misleads; but the perilous thesis may be held in conjunction with the purest intentions and the most rigorous observance of moral rectitude. So it was held by Gassendi. It must be admitted that the Hedonic theory is not more incompatible with Christianity than the utilitarianism of William Paley, Jeremy Bentham, or John Stuart Mill. The mental philosophy of Gassendi corresponded with his ethical assumptions. He espoused sensationalism, though in no rigid or consistent form. He was the legitimate precursor of Locke in both the statement and the vacillation of his views. While recognising sensation and

reflection as the origin of our ideas, he was by no means inclined to pure materialism. This incoherence of language and doctrine was not peculiar to him. It characterizes the whole school of Locke, and may be ascribed in part to the ambiguity of the terms employed, in part to the indistinctness and undistinguished character of the phenomena commented on. There was a similar inconsequence in the physical system of Gassendi. He received from Epicurus, or, rather, from Lucretius, the doctrine of atoms, of a vacuum, and of the regular operation of natural forces; but he did not admit the accidental collision and casual implication of primary particles, nor did he exclude the divine will and the divine intelligence from the order of creation. In his separate tenets as in his general intellectual habit, he presented a strong contrast to his more famous and more methodical contemporary, Des Cartes. Positions apparently materialistic were maintained by him in conjunction with a faithful adherence to both natural and revealed religion; and he offered the strange spectacle of a sincere and preposterous Epicurean who was equally sincere as a Christian and as an ordained teacher of Christianity. Des Cartes, on the other hand, with principles essentially idealistic, combined the postulates of the infinite tenuity and divisibility of matter, of a *pleuum*, and of the vertiginous evolution of the universe, with practical but unavowed Pyrrhonism. There was point, but there was also inadequacy and injustice in the reciprocated antinomias with which these philosophers discredited each other's system—in the *O anime!* applied by Gassendi to Des Cartes, and in the *O caro!* with which Des Cartes retorted upon Gassendi. No doubt the controversial attitude of Gassendi betrayed him into exaggerated and unguarded expression; but his physical system, though borrowed from Epicurus, may be so limited and explained as to offer no offence to religious faith.

It should be remembered that his speculations were hazarded in the infancy of physical science; that his aptitudes, studies, and aims were chiefly scientific; that the materials, processes, and instruments of science were as yet rude, cumbrous, and unshapen; that, even after the lapse of two centuries, the scientific method and scientific conclusions often appear irreconcilable with religion and revelation. The certain harmony of the book of nature and the Book of God may, indeed, be asserted *à priori* to be a necessity, and was so asserted by Lord Bacon; but this harmony is still very indistinct. The Epicurean creed was an extravagant and premature attempt at scientific procedure, yet it has been recently recognised by high scientific authority to be essentially scientific in form and aim, however conjectural and arbitrary in development. In character as in purpose, it is curiously analogous to the most recent speculations of scientific infidelity. The sublimated Epicureanism of Gassendi was, in like manner, an imperfect anticipation of modern scientific reasoning. It resembles the heterogeneous schemes of those who too hastily combine problematical science with old religious dogmatism. Though it proved itself incapable of instituting a school, it was a potent influence in stimulating, directing, and moulding the scientific spirit which illumined the latter half of the 17th century, and inaugurated the brilliant era of modern science. Dalton's atomic theory is not the only dream of present scientific belief which may be traced back to Gassendi. Hobbes and Locke, Barrow and Newton, were largely indebted to the impetus communicated by him, if not to his teachings; and it is needless to acknowledge our continued and manifest obligations to those great names. On the subject of Gassendi, there is little to be consulted beyond the several editions of his works, the historians of modern philosophy, and the lives of the philosopher by Sorbière (Paris, 1658) and by Bongereel (Paris, 1737), with M. de Levarde's *Historical and Critical Epistle* to the latter biographer. (G. F. H.)

**Gassner**, JOHANN JOSEPH, a Roman Catholic priest, was born at Branz, near Pludenz, August 20, 1727, studied theology at Innsbruck and Prague, was ordained priest in 1750, and in 1758 was settled as pastor at Klösterle. After filling that station for some fifteen years, he began to believe in the cure of physical disorders by exorcism, in virtue of the power conferred on him by his ordination. His first attempts were made upon himself, and having been, as he thought, successful, he felt encouraged to follow what he considered his calling. He travelled much, curing the sick, who were brought to him often from places afar off. "The bishop of Constance called him to his residence, but, having come very soon to the conviction that he was a charlatan, advised him to return to his parsonage. Gassner betook himself, however, to other prelates of the empire, some of whom believed that his cures were miraculous. In 1774 he even received a call from the bishop at Ratisbon to Ellwangen, where, by the mere word of command, *Cesset* (Give over), he cured persons who pretended to be lame or blind, but especially those afflicted with convulsions and epilepsy, who were all supposed to be possessed by the devil. Although an official person kept a continued record of his cures, in which the most extraordinary things were testified, yet it was found only too soon that Gassner very often made persons in health play the part of those in sickness, and that his cures of real sufferers were successful only so long as their imagination remained heated by the persuasions of the conjuror" (Chambers, from *Conn. Lexikon*, s. v.). Finally, the emperor, Joseph II, forbade his exorcisms, and the archbishops Anton Peter of Prague and Hieronymus of Salzburg declared themselves against him (see *Act. histor. eccl. nostri temporis*, xix, 315). Pope Pius VI expressed his disapprobation both of Gassner's deeds and writings. He died in retirement April 4, 1779. Lavater (q. v.) believed in the reality of many of the cures ascribed to Gassner, and regarded them as the result of an extraordinary power of faith. Among his works, the most remarkable are *Weise, fromm und gesund zu leben, und ruhig und gottselig zu sterben*, etc. (Kempten, 1774; Augsb. 1775, 3d ed.), and *J. J. Gassner's Antwort auf d. Anmerkungen wider seine Gründe u. Weise z. exorciren* (Augsburg, 1774).—Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 664; Hoefler, *Nov. Biog. Générale*, xix, 595; Sterzinger, *Die aufgedeckten Gassnerschen Wundcuren* (1775); Semler, *Sammlung von Briefen u. Aufsätzen über die Gassnersche Geistesbeschwörung* (Halle, 1776).

**Gaston**. See ANTHONY, ST., ORDERS OF (vol. i, p. 252).

**Gastrell**, FRANCIS, bishop of Chester, was born at Slapton, in Northamptonshire, about 1662, and was educated at Westminster School and at Christ Church College, Oxford. He became preacher at Lincoln's Inn, and Boyle lecturer. In 1700 he took the degree of D.D., and in 1702 he was appointed canon of Christ Church, Oxford. In 1711 he was made chaplain to the queen, and in 1714 bishop of Chester, with permission to retain his canonry, but he resigned his preachership at Lincoln's Inn. Though never friendly to bishop Atterbury's politics, he stood by him in Parliament when the Bill of Pains and Penalties was brought in against him, and voted against his banishment. He survived that event but a few years. The gout put an end to his life, Nov. 24, 1725. His most important writings are, *The Certainty of Religion in general*, Boyle lecture (Lond. 1697, 8vo);—*The Certainty of the Christian Revelation* (Lond. 1699, 8vo);—*The Christian Institutes* (Lond. 1717, 12mo, 3d ed.);—*Lat. Institutiones Christianæ* (Lond. 1718, 12mo);—*Deism truly represented* (Lond. 1722, 8vo);—*Remarks on Clarke's Doctrine of the Trinity* (Lond. 1714, 8vo).—Hook, *Biog. Eccles.* vol. v; Chalmers, *Biog. Dictionary*, s. v.

**Gataker**, Charles, son of Thomas Gataker (see


below), was born at Rotherhithe about 1614, and was educated at St. Paul's School, at Sidney College, Cambridge, and at Pembroke College, Oxford. He became chaplain to viscount Falkland, and afterwards rector of Hoggeston, in Buckinghamshire, where he continued from 1647 till his death in 1680. Among his writings are, *The Way of Truth and Peace, or a Reconciliation of St. Paul and St. James concerning Justification* (1669, 8vo):—*An Answer to five captious Questions propounded by a Factor for the Papacy, by parallel Questions and positive Resolutions* (Lond. 1673, 4to):—*The Papists' Bait, or their usual Method of gaining Proselytes answered* (Lond. 1674, 4to):—*Ichnographia Doctrinæ de Justificatione secundum Typum in Monte* (Lond. 1681, 4to). Gataker wrote *Animadversions on Bull's Harmonia Apostolica*, which brought out Bull's *Execræ Censuræ*.—Hook, *Ecl. Biog.* v, 276; Woods, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. ii.

**Gataker, Thomas**, was born Sept. 4, 1574, in London, where his father was rector of St. Edmund's. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, and about 1601 became preacher at Lincoln's Inn. He held this employment for ten years, and applied himself especially to the study of the Scriptures in Hebrew and Greek, and wrote several works in illustration of the Old Testament. He also wrote *Of the Nature and Use of Lots* (Lond. 1619, 4to), in which he distinguishes between innocent and unlawful games of chance. In 1611 he was appointed rector of Rotherhithe. In 1637 he printed a defence of his treatise on *Lots* under the title *Thomæ Gatakeri Londinensis Antithesis partim G. Aresii, partim G. Voetii de Sorte thestibus reposita* (4to). In 1642 he was chosen to sit in the Westminster Assembly, where in several instances he differed from the majority. He afterwards wrote, with others, the *Annotations on the Bible*, which were published by the Assembly; the notes on Isaiah and Jeremiah are by him. "In 1648, Gataker, with other London clergymen, to the number of forty-seven, remonstrated against the measures taken by the Long Parliament with respect to king Charles, and he became, in consequence, an object of suspicion to the ruling powers, but by his mild conduct he escaped personal annoyance. In 1652 he published a Latin translation of M. Aurelius's *Meditations*, with valuable notes, tables of reference, and a preliminary discourse on the philosophy of the Stoics. In the latter part of his life he had to sustain a controversy against the pretended astrologer William Lilly." He died June 27, 1654. His *Opera Crivica*, edited by Witsius, were published at Utrecht, 1698, 2 vols. fol., containing, besides the *Meditations*, his *Cinnus* and *Adversaria Miscellanea*, being disquisitions on Biblical subjects, and *De Novi Testamenti Stylo*, with other philological and critical essays. Gataker was a man of high reputation for learning. Echard remarks of him that he "was the most celebrated of the assembly of divines, being highly esteemed by Salmasius and other foreigners; and it is hard to say which is most remarkable, his exemplary piety and charity, his polite literature, or his humility and modesty in refusing preferments."—Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* v, 275; Jones, *Christian Biography*; *English Cyclopædia*, s. v.; Wood, *Athene Oxon.* vol. ii.

**Gat'am** (Heb. *Gatam'*, גַּתְאִם, according to Gesenius from the Arab. *puny*; according to Fürst from גַּתְאִם, a burnt valley; Sept. Γοθώμ and Γοθάμ v. r. Γουθώμ; Vulg. *Gotham* and *Gothan*), the fourth named of the sons of Eliphaz, the son of Esau, and founder of a corresponding Edomitish tribe (Gen. xxxvi, 11, 16; 1 Chron. i, 36). B.C. post 1927. Knobel (*Gen.* ad loc.) compares *Jodam*, an Arab tribe inhabiting the Hisma, a part of Mt. Sherah, the 2 having dropped from the name (Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 976); while Rödiger (*ib.* Append. p. 80) refers to the Arab tribe *Setham*, mentioned by Ibn-Duraid (1854, p. 300). See IDUMÆA.

**Gatch**, PHILIP, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Maryland March 2, 1751; was converted in 1772; entered the Philadelphia Conference as a travelling preacher in 1774; labored in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Maryland for some years, and in Virginia for about twenty years. He then emigrated to the Northwestern Territory in 1798, and settled near the village of Cincinnati, where, after a useful career as a citizen and minister in that new country, he died, December 28, 1835. See McLean, *Sketch of Philip Gatch* (Cincinnati, 1854); *Minutes of Conferences*, ii, 403; Sprague, *Annals*, vii, 50.

**Gate** (prop. גַּת, *sha'ar*, πύλη; which are also used [espec. the Heb. word] for door [q. v.], although this latter is more properly designated by פֶּתַח, *pe'thach*, an opening, of which פֶּתַח, *de'leth*, was the valve, Gr. θύρα; there also occur גַּת, *saph*, 1 Chron. ix, 19, 21, a vestibule or "threshold," as usually elsewhere rendered; and the Chald. גַּתְרָא, *tera'*, an entrance, only in Ezra and Dan.), the entrance to inclosed grounds, buildings, dwelling-houses, towns, etc. (see Thomson, *Lawd and Book*, i, 29 sq.). Thus we find mentioned—1. *Gates of Cities*, as of Jerusalem, its sheep-gate, fish-gate, etc. (Jer. xxxvii, 13; Neh. i, 3; ii, 3; v, 3); of Sodom (Gen. xix, 1); of Gaza (Judges xvi, 3). 2. *Gates of royal palaces* (Neh. iii, 8). 3. *Gates of the Temple*. The temple of Ezekiel had two gates, one towards the north, the other towards the east; the latter closed (Ezek. xliv, 1, 2), the other must have been open. The gates of Solomon's Temple were very massive and costly, being overlaid with gold and earrings (1 Kings vi, 34, 35; 2 Kings xviii, 16). Those of the Holy Place were of olive-wood, two-leaved, and overlaid with gold; those of the Temple of fir (1 Kings vi, 31, 32, 34; Ezek. xli, 23, 24). Of the gates of the outer courts of Herod's temple, nine were covered with gold and silver, as well as the posts and lintels; but the middle one, the Beautiful Gate (Acts iii, 2), was made entirely of Corinthian brass, and was considered to surpass the others far in costliness (Joseph. *War*, v, 5, 3). This gate, which was so heavy as to require twenty men to close it, was unexpectedly found open on one occasion shortly before the close of the siege (Joseph. *War*, vi, 5, 3; *Ap.* ii, 9). 4. *Gates of tombs* (Matt. xxvii, 60). 5. *Gates of prisons*. In Acts xii, 10, mention is made of the iron gate of Peter's prison (xvi, 27). Prudentius (*Peristephanon*, v, 346) speaks of gate-keepers of prisons. 6. *Gates of caverns* (1 Kings xix, 13). 7. *Gates of camps* (Exod. xxxii, 26, 27; see Heb. xiii, 12). The camps of the Romans generally had four gates, of which the first was called *porta pretoria*, the second *decumana*, the third *principalis*, the fourth *quintana* (Rosin. *Antiq. Rom.* x, 12). The camp of the Trojans is also described as having had gates (Virgil, *Æn.* ix, 724). The camp of the Israelites in the desert appears to have been closed by gates (Exod. xxxiii, 27). We do not know of what materials the inclosures and gates of the temporary camps of the Hebrews were formed. In Egyptian monuments such inclosures are indicated by lines of upright shields, with gates apparently of wicker, defended by a strong guard. In later Egyptian times, the gates of the temples seem to have




Ancient Egyptian Camp-gate guarded.

been intended as places of defence, if not the principal fortifications (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* i, 409, abridgm.).




Egyptian Gateway at Medinet Abâ.

The gateways of Assyrian cities were arched or square-headed entrances in the wall, sometimes flanked by towers (Layard, *Nineveh*, ii, 388, 395; *Nin. and Bab.* p. 231; *Mon. of Nin.* pt. ii, pl. 49; see also Assyrian bas-reliefs in Brit. Mus. Nos. 49, 25, 26). The entrances



Ancient Assyrians setting fire to an enemy's gates.

to their own royal mansions were a simple passage between two colossal human-headed bulls or lions. See PALACE.



Portal of Ancient Assyrian Palace.

As the gates of towns served the ancients as places of security [see FORTIFICATION], a durable material was required for them, and accordingly we find mentioned—1. *Gates of iron and brass* (Psa. cvii, 16; Isa. xlv, 2; Acts xii, 10). It is probable that gates thus described were, in fact, only sheeted with plates of copper or iron (Faber, *Archæol.* p. 297), and it is probably in this sense that we are to interpret the hundred brazen gates ascribed to the ancient Babylon. Thevenot (*Voyage*, p. 283) describes the six gates of Jerusalem as covered with iron, which is probably still the case with the four gates now open. Other iron-cover-

ed gates are mentioned by travelers, such as some of the town gates of Algiers (Pitt's *Letter*, viii, 10), and of the towers of the so-called iron bridge at Antioch (Pococke, vol. ii, pt. i, p. 172). Gates of iron are also mentioned by Hesiod (*Theog.* 732), by Virgil (*Æneid*, i, 482; vii, 609), and by Ovid (*Metamorphoses*, vii, 126). 2. *Gates of stone*, and of pearls, are mentioned in Isa. liv, 12, and Rev. xxi, 12, which, it has justly been supposed, refer to such doors, cut out of a single slab, as are occasionally discovered in ancient countries (Shaw, p. 210; Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 58, 74; Porter, *Damasc.* ii, 22, 192; Ray, *Coll. of Trav.* ii, 429). At Esswan (Syene), in Upper Egypt, there is a granite gateway bearing the name of Alexander, the son of Alexander the Great (Wilkinson, iii, 403). The doors leading to the several chambers of the so-called "Tombs of the Kings," near Jerusalem, were each formed of a single stone seven inches thick, sculptured so as to resemble four panels: the stiles, muntins, and other parts were cut with great art, and exactly resembled those of a door made by a carpenter at the present day—the whole being completely smooth and polished, and most accurate in its proportions. The doors turned on pivots, of the same stone of which the rest of them were composed, which were inserted in corresponding sockets above and below, the lower tenon being of course short. This is one of the modes in which heavy doors of wood are now hung in the East. One of these doors was still hanging in Maundrell's time, and "did not touch its lintel by at least three inches." But all these doors are now thrown down and broken (Monconys, p. 308; Thevenot, p. 261; Pococke, ii, 21; Maundrell, *sub Mar.* 28; Wilde, ii, 299; Robinson, i, 530). Similar doors are described by Dr. Clarke (*Travels*, pt. ii, vol. i, p. 252) in the remarkable excavated sepulchres at Tellmessus, on the southern coast of Asia Minor; and others were noticed by Irby and Mangles (*Travels*, p. 302) in the sepulchres near Byzan (Bethshan). There are stone doors to the houses in the Hauran beyond the Jordan (Burckhardt, p. 58); and in the north of Persia the street doors of superior houses are often composed of a single slab of a kind of slate. In the ancient sepulchre recently discovered, as described by Dr. Wilde (*Narrative*, ii, 343), the *outer* door is formed by a single slab, and moves on *horizontal* pivots that run into sockets cut in the pilasters at the top, in the manner of a swinging hinge. 3. *Gates of wood*. Of this kind were probably the gates of Gaza (Judg. xvi, 3). They had generally two valves, which, according to Faber's description (*Arch.* p. 300), had sometimes smaller doors, or wickets, to afford a passage when the principal gate was closed—a fact which he applies to the illustration of Matt. vii, 13.

The parts of the doorway were the threshold (שׁוּבַת, Judg. xix, 27; Sept. πρὸ-θύρα, Vulg. *limen*), the side-posts (שׁוּבַת; σθαβ-ποι; *uterque postis*), and the lintel (שׁוּבַת; φάλα, *superliminare*, Exod. xii, 7). It was on the lintel and side-posts that the blood of the Passover lamb was sprinkled (Exod. xii, 7, 22). A trace of some similar practice in Assyrian worship seems to have been discovered at Nineveh (Layard, *Nin.* ii, 256). Gates were generally protected by some works against the surprises of enemies (Jer. xxxix, 4). Sometimes two gates were constructed one behind another, an outer and inner one, or there were turrets on both sides (2 Sam. xviii, 24, 33; see Faber's *Archæology*, p. 361). The gates of the ancients were generally secured with

strong, heavy bolts and locks of brass or iron (Deut. iii, 5; 1 Sam. xxiii, 7; 1 Kings iv, 13; 2 Chron. viii, 5; Jer. xlv, 2; xlix, 31; Psa. cxlvii, 13). This was probably done with a view to the safety of the town, and to prevent hostile inroads (Harmer's *Observations*, i, 188). The keys of gates, as well as of doors, were generally of wood; and Thevenot observes that gates might be opened even with the finger put into the key-hole—from which Harmer elucidates the passage in the Song of Solomon, v. 4. The doors themselves of the larger gates mentioned in Scripture were two-leaved, plated with metal (Judg. xvi, 3; Neh. iii, 3-15; Psa. cvii, 16; Isa. xlv, 1, 2). Gates not defended by iron were of course liable to be set on fire by an enemy (Judg. ix, 52).

The gates of towns were kept open or shut according to circumstances: in time of war they were closed against the inroads of the enemy (Josh. ii, 5), but they were opened when the enemy had been conquered. On festive occasions they were also thrown wide open, to which Psa. xxiv, 7 alludes. This opening of the gates, as well as closing them, was done by means of keys. That near the gates towers were often constructed, serving for defence against attacks of the enemy, may be inferred from Deut. iii, 5; 2 Sam. xviii, 24; Judg. ix, 35, comp. with 52. So Juvenal (*Sat.* vi, 290) puts the towers of the gates for the gates themselves. Virgil (*Æn.* vi, 550) represents the infernal gate as having a tower. Enemies, therefore, in besieging towns, were most anxious to obtain possession of the gates as quickly as possible (Deut. xviii, 52; Judg. ix, 40; 2 Sam. x, 8; xi, 33; 1 Kings viii, 37; Job v, 4; Isa. xxii, 7; xxviii, 6); and generally the town was conquered when its gates were occupied by the invading troops (Deut. xxxviii, 57; Judg. v, 8). This observation is made also by several Greek and Roman authors (Herodian, *Histor.* i, 12, § 14; Virgil, *Æn.* ii, 802 sq.). In or near the gates, therefore, they placed watchmen, and a sufficiently strong guard, to keep an eye on the movements of the enemy, and to defend the works in case of need (Judg. xviii, 16; 2 Kings vii, 3; Neh. xiii, 22; see Herodian, *Histor.* iii, 2, § 21; Virgil, *Æn.* ii, 265 sq., 365). Regarded, therefore, as positions of great importance, the gates of cities were carefully guarded and closed at nightfall (Deut. iii, 5; Josh. ii, 5, 7; Judg. ix, 40, 44; 1 Sam. xxiii, 7; 2 Sam. xi, 23; Jer. xxxix, 4; Judith i, 4). They contained chambers over the gateway, and probably also chambers or recesses at the sides for the various purposes to which they were applied (2 Sam. xviii, 24; Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 57, and note). In the Temple, Levites, and in houses of wealthier classes and in palaces, persons were especially appointed to keep the gates (Jer. xxxv, 4; 2 Kings xii, 9; xxv, 18; 1 Chron. ix, 18, 19; Esth. ii, 21; פֶּרְזֵי הַשַּׁעַיִם; Sept. *θυρωροί, πύλωροι*; Vulg. *portarii, juniores*). In the A. V. these are frequently called "porters," a word which has now acquired a different meaning. The chief steward of the household in the palace of the shah of Persia was called chief of the guardians of the gate (Chardin, vii, 369).

We read that some portions of the law were to be written on the gates of towns, as well as on the doors of houses (Deut. vi, 9; xi, 20); and if this is to be literally understood (comp. Isa. liv, 12; Rev. xxi, 21), it

receives illustration from the practice of the Moslems in painting passages of the Koran on their public and private gates (Maundrell, *E. T.* p. 488; Lane, *Mod. Eg.* i, 29; Rauwolff, *Travels*, pt. iii, chap. 10; Ray, ii, 278). Various artificial figures and inscriptions were engraved on their gates by the Romans (Virgil, *Georg.* iii, 26 sq.). See *POSTR.*

Gates are often mentioned in Scripture as places at which were held courts of justice, to administer the law and determine points in dispute: hence *judges in the gate* are spoken of (Deut. xvi, 18; xvii, 8; xxi, 19; xxv, 6, 7; Josh. xx, 4; Ruth iv, 1; 2 Sam. xv, 2; xix, 8; 1 Kings xxii, 10; Job xxix, 7; Prov. xxii, 22; xxiv, 7; Lam. v, 14; Amos v, 12; Zech. viii, 16). The reason of this custom is apparent; for the gates being places of great concourse and resort, the courts held at them were of easy access to all the people; witnesses and auditors to all transactions were easily secured (a matter of much importance in the absence or scanty use of written documents); and confidence in the integrity of the magistrate was insured by the publicity of the proceedings (comp. Polyb. xv, 31). There was within the gate a particular place, where the judges sat on chairs, and this custom must be understood as referred to when we read that courts were held *under the gates*, as may be proved from 1 Kings xxii, 10; 2 Chron. xviii, 9. Apart from the holding of courts of justice, the gate served for reading the law, and for proclaiming ordinances, etc. (2 Chron. xxxii, 6; Neh. viii, 1, 3). We see from Prov. xxxi, 23; Lam. v, 14, that the inferior magistrates held a court in the gates, as well as the superior judges (Jer. xxxvi, 10); and even kings, at least occasionally, did the same (1 Kings xxii, 10, comp. with Psa. xxvii, 5). The gates at Jerusalem served the same purpose; but for the great number of its inhabitants, many places of justice were required. Thus we find that Nehemiah (iii, 32) calls a particular gate of this city the counsel-gate, or justice-gate, which seems to have had a preference, though not exclusive, since courts must have been held in the other gates also. After the erection of the second Temple, the celebrated great Sanhedrim, indeed, assembled in the so-called *conclave cesure* of the Temple; but we find that one of the Synedria of Jerusalem, consisting of twenty-three members, assembled in the east gate, leading to the court of Israel, the other in the gate leading to the Temple Mount. The same custom prevails to the present day among other Oriental nations, as in the kingdom of Morocco, where courts of justice are held in the gate of the capital town (Döpler, *Theatrum pænarum*, p. 9 sq.). Hence came the usage of the word "Porte" in speaking of the government of Constantinople (*Early Trav.* p. 349). Respecting the Abyssinians and inhabitants of Hindūstan, we are likewise assured that they employed their gates for courts of justice. Homer (*Iliad*, i, 198 sq.) states of the Trojans that their elders assembled in the gates of the town to determine causes, and Virgil (*Æn.* i, 509 sq.) says the same. From Juvenal (*Satir.* iii, 11) it appears that with the Romans the porta Capena was used for this purpose (Graevii *Thesaurus Antiquit. Roman.* x, 179). We may refer to J. D. Jacobi's *Dissertat. de foro in portis*, Leipzig, 1714, where the custom of holding courts in the gates of towns is explained at large. See *TRIAL*. The



A Persian Satrap dictating Terms to Greek Chiefs at a City Gate. (From the Lycian Monuments.)

Egyptian and Assyrian monuments represent the king as giving an audience, especially to prisoners, at his tent-door.

In Palestine gates were, moreover, the places where, sometimes at least, the priests delivered their sacred addresses and discourses to the people; and we find that the prophets often proclaimed their warnings and prophecies in the gates (Prov. i, 21; viii, 3; Isa. xxix, 21; Jer. xvii, 19, 20; xxvi, 10; xxxvi, 10).

Among the heathen gates were connected with sacrifices, which were offered in their immediate vicinity; in which respect the hills near the gate are mentioned (2 Kings xxiii, 8). In Acts xiv, 13, the gates of Lystra are referred to, near which sacrifice was offered; in which passage Camerarius, Dedicen, and Heinsius take *πυλώνας* to mean the town-gate. The principal gate of the royal palace at Ispahan was in Chardin's time held sacred, and served as a sanctuary for criminals (Chardin, vii, 368, and petitions were presented to the sovereign at the gate. See Esth. iv, 2, and Herod. iii, 120, 140).

The gate was, further, a public place of meeting and conversation, where the people assembled in large numbers to learn the news of the day, and by various talk to while away the too tedious hours (Psa. lxxix, 13). It was probably with this view that Lot sat under the gate of Sodom (Gen. xix, 1); which is more probable than the Jewish notion that he sat there as one of the judges of the city (comp. Gen. xxiii, 10, 18; xxxiv, 20; 1 Sam. iv, 18; 2 Sam. xviii, 24; see Shaw, *Trav.* p. 207).

Under the gates they used to sell various merchandises, provisions, victuals, e. g. at Samaria (2 Kings vii, 1); and for this purpose there were generally recesses in the space under them (see Herodian, vii, 6, § 6). The same is stated by Aristophanes (*Equit.* 1245, ed. Dind.) of the gates of the Greeks. But the commodities sold at the gates are almost exclusively country produce, animal or vegetable, for the supply of the city, and not manufactured goods, which are invariably sold in the bazaars in the heart of the town. The gate-markets also are only held for a few hours early in the morning. See BAZAAR.

On an uproar having broken out at Jerusalem, the heads of the people met under the New-gate (Jer. xxix, 26), where they were sure to find insurgents. The town-gates were to the ancient Orientals what the coffee-houses, exchanges, markets, and courts of law are in our large towns; and such is still the case in a great degree, although the introduction of coffee-houses has in this, and other respects, caused some alteration of Eastern manners. In capital towns the quidnuncs occasionally sat with the same views near the gate of the royal palace, where also the officers and messengers of the palace lounged about; and where persons having suits to offer, favors to beg, or wishing to recommend themselves to favorable notice, would wait day after day, in the hope of attracting the notice of the prince or great man at his entrance or coming forth (Esth. ii, 19, 21; iii, 2).

Criminals were punished without the gates (1 Kings xxi, 13; Acts vii, 59), which explains the passage in Heb. xiii, 12. The same custom existed among the Romans (see Plaut, *Milit. Glorios.* act ii, sc. iv, 6, 7). At Rome executions took place without the Porta Metia or Esquilina. As to the gate through which Christ was led before his crucifixion, opinions differ; some taking it to have been the Dung-gate (Lamy, *Apparat. Geograph.* ch. xiii, § 3, p. 321); others, following Hottinger (*Cipp. Hebr.* p. 16) and Godwyn, understand it of the Gate of Judgment. But for all that concerns the gates of Jerusalem, we must refer to the article JERUSALEM.

Gates are put figuratively for public places of towns and palaces. The gates of a town are also put instead of the town itself (Gen. xxii, 17; xxiv, 60; Judg. v, 8; Ruth iv, 10; Deut. xii, 12; Psa. lxxxvii, 2; cxxii, 2).

By *gates of righteousness* (Psa. cxviii, 19) those of the Temple are no doubt meant. The *gates of death* and of *hell* occur in Job xxxviii, 17; Psa. ix, 14; Micah ii, 13. Doors and gates of hell are especially introduced, Prov. v, 5; Isa. xxxviii, 10; Matt. xvi, 19; and the Jews go so far in their writings as to ascribe real gates to hell (Wagenseil, *Sota*, p. 220). Virgil (*Æn.* vi, 126) also speaks of infernal gates. The origin of this metaphorical expression is not difficult to explain; for it was very common to use the word gates as an image of large empires (Psa. xxiv, 7); and in pagan authors the abode of departed souls is represented as the residence of Pluto (see Virgil, *Æn.* vi, 417 sq.). In the passage, then, Matt. xvi, 19, by "gates of hell" must be understood all aggressions by the infernal empire upon the Christian Church.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See CITY.

**Gath** (Heb. *יד גת*, a wine-vat, as in Isa. lxiii, 2, etc.; Sept. usually Γέθ; Josephus Γίττα or Γέττα), one of the five royal cities of the Philistines (Josh. xiii, 3). It was one of the cities upon which the ark is said to have brought calamity (1 Sam. v, 8, 9), and which offered in connection therewith a trespass-offering, each one a golden emerald (1 Sam. vi, 17). Goliath, of the family of giants which Joshua spared (Josh. xi, 22), of which other members may be found mentioned in Scripture (1 Chron. xxi, 5-8; 2 Sam. xxi, 19-22), has rendered Gath a word familiar from our childhood; but it is not certain whether Goliath was a native or merely a resident of Gath (1 Sam. xvii, 4). To Achish, king of Gath, David twice fled for fear of Saul (1 Sam. xxi, 10; xxvii, 2-7; Psa. lvi). At his own entreaty David received from Achish the city of Ziklag. David dwelt in the country of the Philistines "a full year and four months." David's connection with Gath throws light on the feelings which dictated the words (2 Sam. i, 20), "Tell it (the death of) Saul and Jonathan his son" (not in Gath." Micah also (i, 10) says, "Declare it (the wound come unto Judah, ver. 9) say at Gath." It was conquered by David, and fortified both by him and by Rehoboam (2 Sam. viii, 1; 1 Chron. xviii, 1; 2 Chron. xi, 8). From 2 Sam. xv, 18, it appears that David had a band (600 men) of Gittites in his service at the time of the rebellion of Absalom. Their devotedness to him under Ittai their leader forms a beautiful episode in the history of David's varied fortune (2 Sam. xv, 19 sq.). Shimei's visit to Gath and its fatal consequences to himself may be read in 1 Kings ii, 39-46. In the reign of Solomon mention is made of a king of Gath (1 Kings iv, 24), who was doubtless a tributary prince, but powerful enough to cause apprehension to Solomon, as appears from the punishment he inflicted on Shimei. Under Jehoash, Hazael, king of Syria, took Gath (2 Kings xii, 17); from his successor, Benhadad, the place was recovered (2 Kings xiii, 24). It must, however, have soon revolted; for Uzziah (2 Chron. xxvi, 6), finding it necessary to war against the Philistines, "broke down the wall of Gath." Probably the conquest was not of long duration. This constant withstanding of the power of Jerusalem shows that Gath was a place of great resources and high eminence—a conclusion which is confirmed by the language employed by the prophets (Amos vi, 2; Micah i, 10). The ravages of war to which Gath was exposed appear to have destroyed it at a comparatively early period, as it is not mentioned among the other royal cities by the later prophets (Zeph. ii, 4; Zech. ix, 5, 6).

Gath occupied a strong position (2 Chron. xi, 8) on the border of Judah and Philistia (1 Sam. xxi, 10; 1 Chron. xviii, 1). It was near Shocoh and Adullam (2 Chron. xi, 8), and it appears to have stood on the way leading from the former to Ekron; for when the Philistines fled on the death of Goliath, they went "by the way of Shaaraim, even unto Gath and unto Ekron" (1 Sam. xvii, 1, 52). Yet, with all these indications,



there has been great uncertainty as to the site (Iteland, *Palæst.* p. 785 sq.). Josephus places it in the tribe of Dan (*Ant.* v, i, 22; in *Ant.* viii, 10, 1, he calls it *Ipan*, *Ἰπαν*, by an error of the copyist, *Reland*, p. 747). The accounts of Eusebius and Jerome are confused. In the *Onomast.* (s. v. *Γεθ*) they both say, "Gath, from which the Anakim and Philistines were not exterminated, is a village seen by such as go from Eleutheropolis to Diospolis, at about the fifth milestone." Yet in the same connection Eusebius mentions another Gath (or *Γεθ*), a large village between Antipatris and Jamnia, which he considered to be that to which the ark was carried (1 *Sam.* v, 8); hence the Crusaders identified Gath with Jamnia (*Gesta Dei*, p. 886). On the other hand, Jerome says (on *Micah*, i), "Gath is one of the five Philistine cities lying near the confines of Judah, on the road from Eleutheropolis to Gaza; now it is a very large village." On *Jer.* xxv, the same authority declares that Gath was not far from Azotus. Yet in his preface to *Jonah* he says that Geth, in Opher, the native place of the prophet, is to be distinguished. Bonfère suggests (In the *Onomast.* s. v.) that there were several places of the same name, and this may account for the discrepancies. Dr. Robinson sought in vain for some traces of its site (*Researches*, ii, 421); yet Schwarz (*Palæst.* p. 121) says it still remains in "a village by the name of *Gath*, three English miles south of Jaifa, on the shore of the Mediterranean"—a statement confirmed by no other traveller. See also GITTAIM. Thomson (*Land and Book*, ii, 360) contends for *Beit-Jibrin* or Eleutheropolis as the true site; but Mr. Porter, who made a special visit to Philistia in 1857 for the purpose of discovering the spot, argues for its identification with the conspicuous hill now called *Tell es-Sâfieh*. This hill stands upon the side of the plain of Philistia, at the foot of the mountains of Judah, ten miles east of Ashdod, and about the same distance south by east of Ekron. It is irregular in form, and about 200 feet high. On the top are the foundations of an old castle; and great numbers of hewn stones are built up in the walls of the terraces that run along the declivities. On the north-east is a projecting shoulder, whose sides appear to have been scarped. Here, too, are traces of ancient buildings; and here stands the modern village, extending along the whole northern face of the hill. In the walls of the houses are many old stones, and at its western extremity two columns still remain on their pedestals. Round the sides of the hill, especially on the south, are large cisterns excavated in the rock (*Hand-book for Syria and Pal.* p. 252).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See MIZPEH.

The inhabitants are called GITTITES (גִּתִּיִּם, Sept. Γεθῆῖται). See also GATH-HEPHER; GATH-RIMMON; MORESHETH-GATH.

**Gath-he'pher** (Heb. with the art. *Gath ha-Ché'pher*, גַּת הַחֶפְרַיִם, wine-press of the well; Sept. Γεθ'χόφρ. Vulg. *Geth que est in Opher*), a town in Galilee, the birthplace of the prophet *Jonah* (2 *Kings* xiv, 25). It is stated by Eusebius and Jerome to have been in the tribe of Zebulun (*Onomast.* s. v. *Γεθ'χόφρ*, Gethfer). The latter (*Præf. ad Jon.*) speaks of it as a small place two miles from Sepphoris, on the way to Tiberias, and says that the sepulchre of *Jonah* was shown in his day. Benjamin of Tudela, in the 12th century, says that the tomb of *Jonah* was still shown on a hill near Sepphoris (*Early Travels in Pal.* p. 89). It was doubtless the same as GITTAIM-HEPHER, situated in the east of Zebulun (*Josh.* xix, 13). The position corresponds well to that of *el-Meshal*, a village on the top of a rocky hill, in which is still shown a Muslim tomb of the prophet *Jonah* (Robinson, *Researches*, iii, 209, note; De Saulcy, *Narrative*, ii, 318; Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 122; Schwarz, *Palæst.* p. 89; Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 312). See GUFTA.

**Gath-rim'mon** (Heb. *Gath-Rimmon'*, גַּת רִמּוֹן, press of the pomegranate; Sept. Γεθ'ρμμών, Vulgate *Gethrimmon*), a town in the tribe of Dan (*Josh.* xix, 45), and a Levitical city (*Josh.* xxi, 24; 1 *Chron.* vi, 69). In the time of Eusebius and Jerome it was a very large village, "twelve miles from Diospolis as you go hence to Eleutheropolis" (*Onomast.* s. v. *Γεθ'ρμμών*, Gethrimmon); but the same writers also mention a Gath five Roman miles north of Eleutheropolis (*ib.* s. v. *Γεθ*, Geth). Dr. Robinson thinks them to be one place, and that the site is found in *Deir Dabbân*, where are some remarkable excavations (*Researches*, ii, 421). In that case, however, it could not have lain within the territory of Dan, which passed at a point between the two positions. The first-mentioned distance would correspond to that of the modern site *Rafat*, containing wide-spread ruins (Robinson, *Researches*, iii, 20).

The Gath-rimmon mentioned in *Josh.* xxi, 25 as being in the tribe of Manasseh, Raumer (*Palästina*, p. 173) supposes to be another Levitical city; but Winer (*Realwörterbuch*, s. v. Gath) ascribes its origin to a mistake of the transcriber, who repeated the word from the preceding verse. The Sept. has *Γεθ'αζά* (v. r. Βαζαά), probably intended for the IBEAM (q. v.) of *Josh.* xvii, 11.

**Gaubil**, ANTOINE, a Roman Catholic missionary, was born at Gallac (Languedoc) July 14, 1689. He joined the Jesuits in 1704, and was sent to China as a missionary in 1723. He arrived in China just after the accession of the emperor *Young-Tsching*, who was bent on banishing the Jesuits. Through the skilful management of Gaubil, most of the members of the order kept their positions. When the son of *Young-Tsching*, *Kiang-Loung*, ascended the throne in 1736, Gaubil, who had become thoroughly acquainted with the Chinese and Mantchou languages, was appointed chief director of the imperial colleges where the children of the nobility were educated. He thus managed to remain in high standing at the Chinese court until his death, which took place at Pekin July 24, 1759. He was a correspondent of the Academy of Sciences of Paris, and a member of that of St. Petersburg. He wrote *Le Chou-King*, trad. du Chinois (Paris, 1771, 4to); the oldest and most important historical book of the Chinese, compiled by Confucius, and giving the basis of the Chinese government and law:—*Histoire de Gentchiscan et de toute la dynastie des Manyoux, ses successeurs, conquérants de la Chine* (Paris, 1739, 4to):—*Traité de Chronologie chinoise* (publ. by De Sacy, Paris, 1814, 4to):—*Traité historique et critique de l'Astronomie chinoise:—Traité de Chronologie chinoise (Mémoires concernant les Chinois, vol. xv):—Histoire de la Dynastie des Tang (Mémoires concernant les Chinois, vols. xv and xvi):—Journal de mon Voyage de Canton à Pekin (Prévost, Hist. des voyages, vol. v):—Notices et description sur la Chine, le Thibet, etc. (in Lettres éditantes). M. Abel de Rémusat considers him also as the author of the *Description de la ville de Péking* (Paris, 1785, 4to), published under the names of Delisle and Pingré. See Amyot, *Mémoires sur les Chinois; Lettres éditantes*, t. xxxi; G. Pauthier, *La Chine (Univers pittoresque*, p. 22, 31, 363); Abel de Rémusat, *Nouveaux Mélanges Asiatiques*.—Hofer, *Nouvelle Biog. Générale*, xix, 636.*

**Gauden**, JOHN, D.D., bishop of Worcester, was born at Mayfield, Essex, in 1605. He studied at St. John's College, Cambridge, and subsequently obtained the rectorship of Brightwell, Berkshire, and the deanery of Boeking. In 1660 he became bishop of Exeter, and was translated to Worcester in 1662, "much disappointed at missing the lucrative see of Winchester." He died in the same year. He was a man of great talents, and very industrious, but ambitious and avaricious. He was the publisher of king Charles I's *Edkon Basilike*, of which some have considered him as the

author. Of his own works, the principal are, *Three Sermons preached upon several public Occasions* (London, 1642, 4to):—*Hieraspistes*, a defence of the ministry and ministers of the Church of England (London, 1653, 4to):—*Considerations touching the Liturgy of the Church of England*, etc. (London, 1661, 4to):—*A Sermon preached on the Occasion of the Death of Ep. Brownrig* (London, 1660, sm. 8vo):—*Ecclesie Anglicanæ suspiria* (London, 1659, fol.):—*Anti Baul Berith* (London, 1661, 4to):—*Analysis of the Covenant* (London, 1660, 4to).—Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, s. v.; Nichols, *Catechism and Arminianism*, vol. i ad fin.; Hook, *Ecol. Biog.* v, 279.

**Gaudentius**, bishop of Brescia, succeeded Philastrius in the see of Brescia in the 4th century. He was chosen while away upon his travels, and extraordinary means were used that he might be induced to assume the office. He was ordained by St. Ambrose about 387. He does not appear to have interfered in the disturbances of the times except in being one of the deputies sent to Constantinople in 404 or 405 by the bishops of the West for the reinstatement of St. Chrysostom in his see of Constantinople. When he died is unknown; some fix the date at 410, others at 427. Nineteen sermons of his are extant, preceded by a preface to *Benevolus*, which may be found in *Bib. Marc. Patrol. vol. v*; in *Migne's Œuvres tres complètes des écrivains ecclés. du v siècle* (Paris, 1849, 4to); and in *Migne, Patrol. Latine*, vol. xx.—Clarke, *Succ. of Suc. Lit.* vol. i; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i, 180; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacrés* (Paris, 1861), viii, 34.

**Gaul.** See FRANCE.

**Gaulonitis.** See GOLAN.

**Gaultier** or **Gautier**, FRANÇOIS DE, of St. Blacard, a Protestant writer and divine, was born in the first half of the 17th century at Gallargues, in the department of Gard, and died at Berlin in 1703. He was minister at Montpellier, and presided over the last synod of Bas-Languedoc, held at Uzès in 1681; but, having compromised his safety through his zeal for Protestant interests, he withdrew to Switzerland with his family in 1683, and afterwards to Holland. The prince of Orange esteemed him highly, and employed him in several important affairs; among others, on a confidential mission to the elector of Brandenburg, who retained Gaultier at his court, and named him his chaplain. We have from his pen *Réflexions générales sur le liere de Mgr. de Meaux, ci-devant évêque Condom*, etc. (on Bossuet's Exposition of the Catholic Doctrine, Berlin, 1685, 12mo):—*Histoire Apologétique ou défense des libertés des Eglises réformées de France* (Amst. 1688, 2 vols. 12mo):—*Sermons* (Berlin, 1696, 8vo).—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xix, 675; Haag, *La France Protestante*, s. v. (J. W. M.)

**Gaume**, JEAN, a Roman Catholic theologian of France. He was a prolific writer of the strictest ultramontane school, and in 1852, while vicar general of the diocese of Nevers, kindled a great literary controversy by his pamphlet *Ver Rongeur*, in which he condemned the study of the Latin and Greek classics, and advocated the substitution for them of the Church fathers in the course of classical education. The leading organ of the ultramontane party in France, the *Univers*, and several bishops, sided with Gaume; but many others declared against his views, and his own diocesan, the bishop of Nevers, censured him for the publication of the pamphlet. In consequence of this censure, Gaume resigned at the close of the year 1852. He died in 1869. Among his other numerous writings are, *Du Catholicisme dans l'éducation* (1835):—*Manuel des Confesseurs* (6th edit. 1842):—*Catéchisme de Persévérance* (1838):—*Tableaux de l'histoire de la religion*:—*Histoire de la Société domestique* (1844):—*Credo ou refuge du Chrétien dans les temps actuels* (Paris, 1867). (A. J. S.)

**Gaus**, supposed descendants of the Parsees, still

subsisting in different parts of the East. See PARSEES.

**Gausson, Étienne**, a French Protestant theologian, was born at Nismes in the early part of the 17th century, and died at Saumur in 1675. In 1651 he was made professor of philosophy in the Protestant Academy of Saumur, and in 1655 succeeded Josué de la Place in the chair of theology. He agreed with La Place that the study of philosophy was useful to the theologian, and strongly urged it upon his pupils. His works are marked by vigor and depth of thought, and enjoyed for a long time a high reputation in the schools of Holland and Germany. The titles are, *Theses inaugurales de Verbo Dei* (Saumur, 1655, 4to):—*De Consensu Gratie cum Natura* (ib. 1659, 4to):—*De Ratione Studii theologicæ*:—*De Natura Theologicæ*:—*De Ratione Concionandi*:—*De Utilitate Philosophiæ ad theologiam, quibus accessit breve scriptum de recto usu clariorum erga ægrotantes* (ib. 1670, 4to: this collection, regarded by Bayle as the best guide for the study of the theology of the time, has passed through numerous editions—last one Halle, 1727):—*Theses theologicæ, altera de natura theologicæ, altera de divinitate Scripturæ Sacre* (ib. 1676, 4to).—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xix, 690, 691; Haag, *La France Protestante*, s. v. (J. W. M.)

**Gausson, Louis**, a Swiss divine, was born in Geneva Aug. 25, 1790, and in 1816 became pastor of Satigny, near Geneva. Here he came under the influence of pastor Cellier, who had retained his Christian fidelity and simple faith amid the general falling away of the Swiss clergy. The revival of religion in Switzerland about that time, due largely to the labors of the brothers Haldani (q. v.), was odious to the majority of the Geneva clergy, and the *Vénérable Compagnie des Pasteurs* passed some ordinances infringing strongly upon Christian liberty. Gausson and Cellier protested against the proceeding by republishing the Helvetic Confession in French, with a preface advocating the need and utility of confessions of faith. Gausson continued to labor faithfully in Satigny for twelve years, and his name became known throughout Switzerland as an earnest upholder of evangelical Christianity. His aim was, not to divide the national Church, but to reinspire it with Christian life. His energy and orthodoxy were alike displeasing to the Rationalists, and he was involved in long disputes with the *Vénérable Compagnie*. They ordered him to use the emasculated and Rationalistic Catechism which had been substituted in Geneva for Calvin's: he refused, and was censured (see *Letters du Pasteur Gausson à la Vénérable Compagnie*, etc., 1831; and, on the other side, *Exposé des discussions entre la Compagnie etc. et M. Gausson*, 1831). He kept on his way, and, in union with Merle (d'Aubigné) and Galland, formed the "Evangelical Society" for the distribution of Bibles, tracts, etc. The Consistory at last suspended him, so low had orthodox Christianity sunk in Geneva, the home of Calvin. In 1834 he took the chair of theology in the newly-founded evangelical school of Geneva, where he taught a strictly orthodox doctrine, perhaps without sufficient knowledge of the condition of modern thought. In his *Theopneustic* (1840; translated in England and America) he maintained, in its strongest form, the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures. In 1860 he published his *Canon des Ecritures Saintes* (translated, *Canon of Holy Scripture*, 1862) in which he vindicated his theory of inspiration against the attacks of Scherer and others. His *Leçons sur Daniel* contained the substance of his lectures and catechetical lessons on Daniel. He died June 18, 1863. We have translations of several of his writings besides those already named, viz. *Geneva and Jerusalem* (1844):—*Geneva and Rome, a discourse* (1844):—*It is written, Scripture proved to be from God* (1856):—*Lessons for the Young on the six Days of Creation* (1860).—Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* xix, 538.

**Gautama.** See **GOTAMA.**

**Gautbert,** also called **AUTBERT** or **GAUZBERT**, one of the earliest missionaries of Sweden. He was a nephew of archbishop Ebbo (q. v.), and was appointed bishop of Sweden by St. Ansgar. Accompanied by his nephew Nithard and several other priests, he set out in 834 for Sweden, and at once began to preach the Gospel. He built the first Christian church of Sweden at Birka. A large number of pagans were soon converted, and the prospects of the mission appeared to be brilliant, but the pagan priests raised a tumult against the missionaries, in which Nithard was killed, while Gautbert had a narrow escape, being chained and transported with his companions across the frontier. All of them repaired to the monasteries of Welna (now Münsterdorf, in Holstein), in order to await there a favorable occasion for returning to Sweden. As, however, no new opening seemed to present itself, he accepted, in 845, the see of Osnabruck, which he administered until April 11, 860, when he resigned. He died three or four years afterwards. (A. J. S.)

**Gavanti,** **BARTHELEMI,** an Italian ecclesiastic, was born at Monza in 1569, and died at Milan in 1638. He was consultor of the Congregation of Rites and general of the Barnabites (q. v.). His most important work, *Thesaurus Sacrorum Rituum*, is a commentary on the rubrics of the Missal and the Roman Breviary, more learned than critical. The best edition of the *Thesaurus* is that containing the observations of Merati (Turin, 1736, -40, 4 vols. 4to); another, in 2 vols. fol., was published at Venice in 1762. Gavanti wrote also *Præcis visitationis episcopalis et synodi diœcesane celebrande* (Rome, 1628, 4to), and *Manuale Episcoporum* (Paris, 1647, 4to).—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xix, 735. (J. W. M.)

**Gay,** **EBENEZER,** D.D., a Unitarian clergyman, was born in Dedham, Mass., Aug. 15, 1696. He graduated at Harvard College in 1714; was admitted into the ministry in 1718, and installed as pastor of the church in Hingham, which position he held till his death. While quite a young man he gained a high reputation for scholarship, and he received many testimonials of public respect, both in his earlier and later days. He was opposed to all creeds and confessions of faith considered as binding, and is often mentioned as the father of American Unitarianism. He had no sympathy with the "great revival" of 1740. His name is signed to a paper entitled "The Sentiments and Resolutions of an Association of Ministers, convened at Weymouth January 15, 1745," in which they bear testimony against Whitefield's "enthusiastic spirit." In 1781 he delivered a sermon on his eighty-fifth birthday, which was published under the title of "The Old Man's Calendar." It has passed through several editions in this country, been reprinted in England, and translated into the Dutch language and published in Holland. He died March 8, 1787. He printed a number of occasional sermons.—Sprague, *Annals*, viii, 1.

**Gay de Vernon,** **LEONARD,** a French priest and politician, was born at St. Léonard (Limousin) in 1748. When the French Revolution broke out he was curate of Compeignac, a town near Limoges. Siding at once with the people, he was the first to place the *Domine salvem fac q. ntem* before the *Domine salvem fac regem*, and, in consequence, was appointed constitutional bishop of Haute-Vienne, March 13, 1791. Sent as deputy to the Legislature, he sided with Torné, metropolitan of Cher, in demanding that the clergy should be permitted to lay aside their peculiar dress. Having been re-elected to the Convention, he joined the extreme Republicans, and from the midst of "La Montagne" cast his vote for the death of Louis XVI, and caused the arrest of some of the Girondists. In the Council of Five Hundred, of which he was a member, he maintained the same opinions. The Directory, to get rid of him, appointed him, June 9, 1798, on a commercial

mission to Tripoli, in Syria. He afterwards became general secretary of the Roman republic at Rome, but was deposed by Barras, and even forbidden to enter France. He nevertheless secretly came back, and remained hidden in the department of Doubs until June 18, 1799, when a change of government enabled him to obtain the repeal of the sentence of exile. About 1802 he founded a school in Paris, in connection with several other learned men, but was again exiled in consequence of the law of Jan. 12, 1816. In 1819 he finally obtained leave to return, and died at Vernon, near Limoges, Oct. 20, 1822. See Mahul, *Ann. nécrologique* (1822, p. 99); Thiers, *Hist. de la Révolution*.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xix, 756.

**Gayley,** **SAMUEL MAXWELL,** a Presbyterian minister, was born in Co. Tyrone, Ireland, June 4, 1802. He came to this country in 1823, studied in Philadelphia, and was licensed to preach in 1828. In 1832 he was installed pastor in Wilmington, Del., where he also established the Wilmington Classical Institute, which he conducted with great success until July 4, 1854, when his house was burnt to the ground. In Oct., 1854, he removed to Media, Pa., and established the Media Classical Institute, which he conducted successfully until his death, Dec. 19, 1862. As an educator of youth Mr. Gayley did a great work. He was most thorough and conscientious in his instructions, aiming to make solid thinkers rather than conceited coxcombs. He had more than one thousand youths under his care. They were from twenty different states, and from Canada, Cuba, Ireland, England, Mexico, Poland, Barbadoes, India.—Wilson, *Presbyterian Historical Almanac*, 1864.

**Ga'za** (Heb. *Azzah*, אַזָּח, *strong*, q. d. *fortress* or *Valentia*, or fem. of *goat*, Sept. and other Greek writers *Γάζα*, sometimes confounded with *Gazara* [q. v.]; "Azzah" in Deut. ii, 23), a city remarkable for its early importance and continuous existence, lying along the Mediterranean sea-coast, in latitude 31° 29', longitude 34° 29' (Robinson), on the great thoroughfare between the head of the Persian Gulf and Hebron, as well as between Egypt and Palestine, of which it was indeed the frontier town (Arrian, *Exp. Alex.* ii, 26). It is chiefly noted as having been one of the cities of the Philistine pentarchy (Josh. xv, 47). It is mentioned in Gen. x, 19 as one of the border-cities of the Canaanites. Its earliest inhabitants of whom we find any mention, though probably not the aborigines, are the *Azim*, who appear to have lived in a semi-nomad state, roving over the neighboring plain and desert. They were attacked and driven northward by "the Caphtorim, who came forth out of Capthor, and which dwell in their stead" (Deut. ii, 23, with Josh. xiii, 2, 3; see Keil's note on the latter passage). The Caphtorim and Philistines were identical, or at least different families of the same tribe who afterwards amalgamated and formed the powerful nation of whom we read so much in the Bible (comp. Deut. ii, 23; Amos ix, 7; Gen. x, 14; Jer. xlvii, 4). See **CAPHTORIM**; **PHILISTINES**. The time of the conquest of Gaza by the Philistines is not known. It must have been long before Abraham's time, for they were then firmly established in the country, and possessed of great power (Gen. xxi, 32). Gaza was from the first their principal stronghold. Joshua smote the Canaanites as far Gaza (Josh. x, 41), but spared the Anakim (giants) that dwell there (Josh. xi, 21, 22). In the division of the land, Gaza fell to the lot of Judah (Josh. xv, 47), and was taken by him with the coast thereof (Judg. i, 18), but its inhabitants ("Gazites," Judg. xvi, 2; "Gazathites," Josh. xiii, 3) were not exterminated (Judg. iii, 3). Gaza was one of the five Philistine cities which gave each a golden eimer as a trespass-offering to the Lord (1 Sam. vi, 17). Gaza is celebrated for the exploit recorded of Samson (Judg. xvi, 1-3), who "took the doors of the gate of the city,

and the two posts, and went away with them, bar and all, and put them on his shoulders, and carried them up to the top of a hill that is before Hebron." The Philistines afterwards took Samson, and put out his eyes, and brought him to Gaza, and bound him with fetters of brass, and he did grind in the prison-house: he, however, pulled down the temple of Dagon, god of the Philistines, and slew, together with himself, "all the lords of the Philistines," besides men and women (Judg. xvi, 21-30). Solomon's kingdom extended as far as Gaza (1 Kings iv, 24). But the place always appears as a Philistine city in Scripture (Judg. iii, 3; xvi, 1; 1 Sam. vi, 17; 2 Kings xviii, 8). Hezekiah smote the Philistines as far as Gaza (2 Kings xviii, 8). Gaza fell into the hands of the Egyptians, probably Pharaoh-Necho, as a diversion of Nebuchadnezzar in his efforts against Jerusalem (Jer. xlvii, 1), an event to which has been incorrectly referred (Rawlinson, *Herod.* i, 411) the statement of Herodotus (ii, 159) respecting the capture of *Calytis* by the Egyptians. See JERUSALEM. During this period of Jewish history, it seems that some facts concerning the connection of Gaza with the invasion of Sennacherib may be added from the inscriptions found at Nineveh (Layard's *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 114). See CUNEIFORM INSCRIPTIONS. The prophets speak in severe terms against it (Jer. xxv, 20; xlvii, 5; Amos i, 6, 7; Zeph. ii, 4; Zech. ix, 5). After the destruction of Tyre it sustained a siege of two (Quint. Curt. iv, 6, 7, says five) months against Alexander the Great (Josephus, *Ant.* xi, 8, 4), a fact that illustrates the propriety of its name and its military importance. As Van de Velde says (p. 187), it was the key of the country. So vigorously was it then defended by the forces under the command of the eunuch Batis, and of such massive strength were its walls, that the engineers of Alexander's army found themselves completely baffled in their attempts to effect a breach. They were obliged to erect an enormous mound 250 feet in height, and about a quarter of a mile in width, on the south side of the town; and even with this advantage, and the use also of the engines that had been employed at the siege of Tyre, the besiegers were frequently repulsed, and Alexander himself sustained no slight bodily injury. It was at last carried by escalade, and the garrison put to the sword. The town itself was not destroyed, but most of the inhabitants that remained were sold into slavery, and a fresh Arab population settled in their stead (Arrian, ii, 27). What had happened in the times of the Pharaohs (Jer. xlvii, 1) and Cambyzes (Pomp. Mel. i, 11) happened again in the struggles between the Ptolemies and the Selencidae (Polybius, v, 68; xvi, 40). Jonathan Maccabeus (1 Mace. xi, 61) destroyed its suburbs; Simon Maccabeus (1 Mace. xiii, 43) took the city itself, though not without extraordinary efforts. Alexander Jannæus spent a year (B.C. cir. 96) in besieging it and punishing its inhabitants (Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 13, 3). The place was rebuilt by Gabinius (Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 5, 3). It was among the cities given by Augustus to Herod (Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 7, 3), after whose death it was united to the province of Syria (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 11, 4). It was near Gaza—on the road from Jerusalem to that place—that Philip baptized the eunuch "of great authority under Candace, queen of the Ethiopians" (Acts viii, 26 sq.). As Gaza lay some distance from the sea (Arrian, ii, 26), it had a port on the sea (? *Ἐλπίων λιμὴν*, Ptol. v, 16) called *Ἐλπίων θάλασσα*, "Gaza on the sea;" called also *Μαίημα* (*ὁ Μαίημας*), which Constantine called *Constantia*, from the name of his son, giving it, at the same time, municipal rights. Julian took away this name, and ordered it to be called the port of Gaza. Subsequent emperors restored the name and the privileges of the place. It was afterwards called the sea-coast of Gaza. Further particulars may be read in Reland (*Palästina*, p. 791 sq.), where mention is made, from Pausanias,

of something like a parallel to the feat of Samson; and where, as well as in Kuinöl (in loc.) and in Winer (*Realwörterbuch* in voc.), explanatory circumstances may be found of the words in Acts viii, 26—"Gaza, which is desert;" an expression that appears to refer rather to the road (*ὁδός*) from Jerusalem in that direction than to Gaza itself (see Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 640). Besides the ordinary road from Jerusalem by Ramleh to Gaza, there was another, more favorable for carriages (Acts viii, 28), further to the south, through Hebron, and thence through a district comparatively without towns, and much exposed to the incursions of people from the desert. The matter is discussed by Raumer in one of his *Beiträge*, incorporated in the last edition of his *Palästina*; also by Robinson in the Appendix to his second volume. The latter writer suggests a very probable place for the baptism, viz. at the water in the *wady el-Hazy*, between Eleutheropolis and Gaza, not far from the old sites of Lachish and Eglon. The legendary scene of the baptism is at *Beit-sar*, between Jerusalem and Hebron: the tradition having arisen apparently from the opinion that Philip himself was travelling southwards from Jerusalem. But there is no need to suppose that he went to Jerusalem at all. Lange (*Apost. Zeitt.* ii, 109) gives a spiritual sense to the word *ἄνθρωπος*. About A.D. 65 Gaza was laid in ruins by the Jews, in revenge for the massacre of their brethren in Caesarea (Josephus, *War.* ii, 18, 1). It soon recovered again; and it was one of the chief cities of Syria during the reigns of Titus and Adrian (see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geogr.* s. v.). Though Christianity was early intro-



Roman imperial Coin of Gaza.

duced into Gaza, the city long remained a stronghold of idolatry. In the beginning of the 5th century its bishop received authority to demolish its temples and build a large Christian church (Sozomen, *H. E.* ii, 5). In A.D. 634 Gaza was taken by the Moslems, and its splendid church turned into a mosque (Elmakim, *Hist. Saracen.* ch. ii, p. 20). From this period it gradually declined under the blight of Islamism, and the Crusaders found it deserted. They built a castle on the hill, which became the nucleus of a new town (*William of Tyre*, xvii, 12). In the 12th century we find the place garrisoned by the Knights Templars. It finally fell into the hands of Saladin, A.D. 1170, after the disastrous battle of Hattin.

The modern town is called *Ghuzzeh*, and contains about 15,000 inhabitants. It resembles a cluster of large villages. The principal one stands on the flat top of a low hill, and has some good stone houses, though now much dilapidated. The others lie on the plain below; their houses are mean mud hovels, and their lanes narrow and filthy. The hill appears to be composed in a great measure of the accumulated ruins of successive cities. We can see fragments of massive walls, and pieces of columns cropping up everywhere from the rubbish. Traces of ruins have been discovered at various places among the sand-hills to the west, which are supposed to be those of primeval Gaza. The great mosque crowns the hill, and can be distinguished in the distance by its tall minaret and pointed roof. The town has no walls or defences of any kind. Its inhabitants have been long known as a fierce and lawless set of fanatics. Between Gaza and the sea there is a broad belt completely covered with mounds of drifting sand. A mile east of the town a long ridge of low hills runs parallel to the coast line. Between

the sand and the hills the ground is very fertile, and supplies the town with abundance of the choicest fruit and vegetables. The climate of the place is almost tropical, but it has deep wells of excellent water. There are a few palm-trees in the town, and its fruit-orchards are very productive. But the chief feature of the neighborhood is the wide-spread olive-grove to the N. and N.E. Hence arises a considerable manufacture of soap, which Ghuzzeh exports in large quantities. It has also an active trade in corn. For a full account of nearly all that has been written concerning the topographical and historical relations of Gaza, see Ritter's *Erdkunde*, xvi, 45-60. Among the travellers who have described the place we may mention especially Robinson (*Biblical Researches*, ii, 375 sq.) and Van de Velde (*Syria and Palestine*, ii, 179-188); also Thomson (*Land and Book*, ii, 331 sq.). The last writer speaks of the great extent of corn-land near Gaza, and of the sound of mill-stones in the city. Even now its bazaars are better than those of Jerusalem. "Those travelling towards Egypt naturally lay in here a stock of provisions and necessities for the desert, while those coming from Egypt arrive at Gaza exhausted, and must of course supply themselves anew" (Robinson, ii, 378). The place is often mentioned in the Talmud (*Otho, Ler. Rabb. p.* 258). See Cellarii *Nolit.* ii, 603 sq.; Siber, *De Gaza* (Lips. 1715); Burscher, *De Gaza narr. t.* (Lips. 1767), and *De Gaza delicta* (Lips. 1768).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

**Gazæus.** See GAZET.

**Gazam.** See PALMER-WORM.

**Gaz'ara** [usually *Gaz'ara'*] (*g* or *ra* Γάζαρα), a town of Palestine, often mentioned in the Apocrypha and by Josephus as the scene of many battles in the Maccabæan period, and as alternately possessed by each of the opposing parties. When Gorgias, general of Antiochus Epiphanes, was defeated by Judas Maccabæus, his forces were pursued "unto Gazara, and unto the plains of Idumæa, and Azotus, and Jamnia" (*εως Γαζαρων*, etc., 1 Macc. iv, 15; *μέχρι Γαζάρων*, etc., Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 7, 4); Nicanor was also defeated by Judas, and pursued from "Adasa to Gazara" (*εις Γάζαρα*, 1 Macc. vii, 45). After the defeat of the Idumæans, Judas went against Timotheus, who fled to Gazara for refuge. Judas, after several days' siege, took the city (2 Macc. x, 32-37; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 8, 1-4); many of its towers were burnt, and Timotheus himself killed (2 Macc. l. c.). When Bacchides returned to Jerusalem, after the defeat of Jonathan, he fortified several cities, and among them Bethsura and Gazara, and the tower (*ἀκρόα*) of Jerusalem (1 Macc. ix, 52; Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 1, 3), and it was again fortified by Simon when it had been recovered by the Jews (1 Macc. xiv, 7, 33, 34; Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 6, 6; *War.* i, 2, 2). Simon built himself a house at Gazara, and also made it the abode of his son John, the captain of all his hosts (1 Macc. xiii, 53; xvi, 1, 19, 21). It is described as being "a very strong hold" (*ὄχυρον*, 2 Macc. x, 32; Γάζαρα . . . οὐσαν ὄχυρὸν ὄρει, comp. Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 6, 1). Gazara is mentioned with Joppa in the treaty of friendship between Hyrcanus and the Romans after the death of Antiochus VII, Sidetes, B. C. cir. 129-8 (Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 9, 2; comp. Clinton, *F. II.* iii, 332). The *Gaza* in 1 Macc. (xiii, 43) and the *Gadara* in Josephus (*Ant.* v, 1, 22; xii, 7, 4) should doubtless be read Gazara (comp. Prideaux, *Connection*, lib. iv, p. 267, note; Reland, *Palæst.* p. 679). It may perhaps be identified with the *Gadaris* of Strabo (xvi, 2, Didot, ed., p. 646), also described by him as a town not far from Azotus (Reland, *Palæst.* l. c.; Cellarius, *Geog.* ii, 530). See also GAZERA.

It is mentioned by Eusebius (*Nicomasticon*, s. v. Γαζάρη) as being four miles from Nicopolis or Emmaus, but it was more probably nearer the sea-coast, as in the Maccabees and Josephus it is nearly always coupled with Joppa, Azotus, and Jamnia (1 Macc. xiv, 34;

xv, 28, 35; iv, 15; Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 7, 4; xiii, 6, 6; 9, 2; *War.* i, 2, 2), and again in distinct language as bordering upon Azotus (1 Macc. xiv, 34). It appears to have been the same place with GAZER or GEZER (q. v.), a town frequently mentioned in the O. T. under similar connections. As David chased the Philistines from Geba to Gazer (2 Sam. v, 25; 1 Chron. xiv, 16; *ἀχρι πόλεως Γαζάρων*, Josephus, *Ant.* vii, 4, 1), so Judas defeated Gorgias at Emmaus and pursued him to Gazara (1 Macc. iv, 15). Pharaoh, the father-in-law of Solomon, took Gazer (1 Kings ix, 16, 17), then a Canaanitish city, burnt it, slew the Canaanites that were in it, and gave it in dowry to his daughter, Solomon's wife (compare Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 6, 1). This must have occurred during the reign of David, or early in that of Solomon, and it seems out of the question to suppose that Pharaoh, when the Israelitish kingdom was so powerful, could have advanced far into the interior of the country. The site near the sea-coast is therefore confirmed by this circumstance.

Gazara may be identified with the modern village *Yazur*, 3½ miles E. of Joppa; though as a coast town and a place of strength in the time of the Maccabees it is unlikely that it should have so entirely lost its importance (comp. Kitto, *Palestine*, i, 695 n.). It must be remembered, however, that names sometimes linger in the neighborhood of sites.—Kitto, s. v.

**Gazares**, a sect of Paulicians, so named from Gazarre, a town of Dalmatia. They were particularly distinguished by this tenet—that no human government had any right to sentence men to death for any crime whatever. See PAULICIANS.

**Gaz'athite** [usually *Ga'zathite*] (Heb. with the art. *ha-Azathî*, *הַאֲזַתִּי*; Sept. *ὁ Γαζαῖος*, A. V. "the Gazathites"), a designation (Josh. xiii, 3) of the inhabitants of the city of GAZA (q. v.), elsewhere rendered *Gazites* (Judg. xvi, 2).

**Gazelle** (*Antelope dorcas*), an animal of the genus *Antelopidae*, probably designated by the Gr. term *δορκας* (comp. Acts ix, 36) and the Heb. *תְּשִׁבִי*, *tsebi'* (rendered "roe" in 2 Sam. ii, 18; 1 Chron. xii, 8; Prov. vi, 5; Cant. ii, 7, 9, 17; iii, 5; viii, 14; Isa. xiii, 14; and "roebuck" in Deut. xii, 15, 22; xiv, 5; 1 Kings iv, 23), or in the feminine form *תְּשִׁבִיָּה*, *tsebiyah'* ("roe," Cant. iv, 5; vii, 3); "both terms, however, being applicable to the whole group; and the Hebrew name is by distant nations now used for allied species which are unknown in Arabia and Syria. Of this sub-genus *gazelle* at least one species, but more probably four or five, still inhabit the uplands and deserts of Egypt, Arabia, and the eastern and southern borders of Palestine. All these species are nearly allied, the largest not measuring more than two feet in height at the shoulder, and the least, the corinna, not more than about twenty inches. They are graceful and elegant in form, with limbs exceedingly slender, and have large and soft eyes, lyrate horns, black, wrinkled, and striated—most robust in *sub-gutturosa* and *kevela*, most slender in *corinna*, and smallest in *cora*. Their livery is more or less buff and dun, white beneath, with small tufts of hair or brushes on the fore-knees; they have all a dark streak passing from each ear through the eyes to the nostrils, and a band of the same color from the elbow of the fore-leg along the sides to the flank, excepting the corinna, whose markings are more rufous and general colors lighter. Most, if not all, have a feeble bleating voice, seldom uttered, are unsurpassed in graceful timidity, gregarious in habit, and residents on the open deserts, where they are unceasingly watchful, and prepared to flee with such speed that greyhounds are liable to be killed by over-exertion in the chase" (Kitto). They roam over the plains of Syria sometimes in herds of one thousand (Russell, *Aleppo*, ii, 14). Their flesh is lean, but highly prized (Prosop. Alpin, *Hist. nat. Æg.* iv, 9). They are often

made the symbol of female beauty (Cant. ii, 9, 17; viii, 14) by Orientals (Seth, *al ben Zohair*, p. 98 sq.; Döpfke, *Comment. z. Hohesl.* p. 97; Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* iv, 129). See Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 251 sq.; Kelly's *Syria*, p. 38 sq. See ANTELOPE; DEER.



Ariel (*Gazella Arabica*).

**Ga'zer** (2 Sam. v, 25; 1 Chron. xiv, 16). See GEZER.

**Gaze'ra**, the name of a place and also of a man in the Apocrypha.

1. (ἡ Γάζηρα v. r. Γάζηρα, Vulg. *Gazeron, Gazara*), the town of Palestine (1 Macc. iv, 15; vii, 45), elsewhere called GAZARA (q. v.).

2. (Καζήρα v. r. Γαζήρα, Vulg. *Geze*), one of the Temple-servants whose "sons" returned from Babylon (1 Esdr. v, 31); evidently the GAZZAM (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra ii, 48).

**Gazet** (Latinized *Gazicus*), GUILLAUME, a French ecclesiastical historian and theologian, was born at Arras in 1554, and died in the same city Aug. 25, 1611. He was for a time professor of belle-lettres at Louvain, quitting that position about 1580. He was also canon of the collegiate Church of St. Peter of Aire, and subsequently *curé* of the parish of St. Marie Madeleine of Arras. Gazet was an ardent student, especially of hagiography, but is by some regarded as credulous and inexact in giving the results of his investigations, though the Flemish historians and litterateurs, who have treated of his epoch, bestow high praise upon him. His most noted work, the *Ecclesiastical History of the Low Countries*, published after his death under the care of his nephew, G. Montearré, contains much of the material found in his other writings bearing on the subject, only recast to suit it. Among his works are, *Histoire de la vie, mort, passion et miracles des Saints desquels l'Église catholique fait fête et mémoire*, etc. (t. i, Arras, 1584, 12mo; t. ii, Rouen, 1605, less carefully printed than the i; a 2d edit. Rouen, 1619, 4to);—*Magdalis, tragœdia Sacra* (Douay, 1589, 8vo);—*La Somme des Pêchés et le remède d'eux*, etc. (ibid. 1592, 8vo);—*Hymnorum Libri septem in Christi Jesu etc. gloriam* (ib. 1592, sm. 4to); the poems of Robert Obridge, with epistolary dedication and laudatory verses);—*L'Ordre et Suite des Evesques et Archevesques de Cambrai*, etc. (ibid. 1597, 12mo);—*Thesaur. Precum et Litaniarum, Script. Sacra*, etc. (ibid. 1602, 18mo);—*Idiota de Vita et Moribus Religiosorum*, etc. (ibid. 1606, 18mo);—*Tableaux Sacrez de la Gambe Belg.*, etc. (ibid. 1610, 8vo, of which the *Biblioth. Sacrée* forms the second part);—*Brieve hist. de la sacrée Manne, et de la sainte Chredelle*, etc. (ibid. 1612, 16mo; new editions 1625, 1682, 1710, 1738, Arras, 12mo);—and the following posthumous works: *Les Vies des Saints, avec des exhortations Morales* (Rheims, 1613, 2 vols. 8vo);—*Histoire ecclésiastique des Pays-Bas*, etc. (Arras and Valenciennes, 1614, 4to);—*Le Consolateur des Ames Scrupuleuses*, etc.

(Arras, 1617, 18mo);—*Les Règles et Constitutions des Ordres réformés*, etc. (ibid. 1623, 18mo). Gazet wrote also *Le Sacré Banquet*:—*Exercices spirituels, with Litaniés pour toute la semaine*, and some ascetic tracts, *pour la consolation et instruction du peuple Chrétien*.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xix, 781-784. (J. W. M.)

**Ga'zez** (Heb. *Guzzz'*, גִּזְזִי, *shearer*; Sept. Γαζοζι'), the name of two men, supposed by some to have been identical.

1. A "son" of Caleb (son of Hezron, son of Judah) by his concubine Ephah (1 Chron. ii, 46). B.C. cir. 1856.

2. A grandson of the same Caleb, through another of his sons Haran (1 Chron. ii, 46). B.C. post 1856.

**Ga'zite** (Heb. in the plur. with the art. *ha-Azza'im*, אֲזַיִם; Sept. oi Γαζοιτοί, Vulgate *Philiſthim* A. V. "the Gazites"), the designation (Judg. xvi, 2) of the inhabitants of GAZA (q. v.); elsewhere rendered "Gazathites" (q. v.).

**Gaz'zam** (Heb. *Gazzam'*, גַּזְזָם, *devouring* [comp. לוֹעֵטֵר], or [Fürst] *swaggerer*; Sept. Γαζζιμ and Γηζζιμ, Vulg. *Gazzam* and *Gezem*), the progenitor of one of the families of Nethinim that returned from the captivity with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 48; Neh. vii, 51). B.C. ante 536.

**Geb.** See LOCUST.

**Geb'a**, the name of at least two places in Central Palestine.

1. (Heb. *Gé'ba*, גִּבְעָה, often with the art. i. e. *the hill*, in pause "*Ga'ba*," גַּבְעָה, Josh. xviii, 24; Ezra ii, 26; Neh. vii, 30; yet this form is also Anglicized "Geba" in 2 Sam. v, 25; 2 Kings xxiii, 8; Neh. xi, 31), a city of Benjamin with "villages" (Josh. xviii, 24; on its settlement, see 1 Chron. viii, 6), hence more fully "Geba of Benjamin" (1 Kings xv, 22; 1 Sam. xiii, 16 [Josephus *Gibcon, Γαβζαών, Ant.* vi, 6, n.; for which, perhaps, compare 1 Chron. viii, 29; ix, 35), situated on the northern border of the kingdom of Judah (2 Kings xxiii, 8; Zech. xiv, 10), near to Gibeah, apparently towards the east or north-east (Isa. x, 29; Josh. xviii, 24, 28). It is often asserted that *Geba* and *Gibeah* were names of the same place; the A. V. in at least 1 Sam. xiii, 15, 16, confounds them; the Sept. and Vulg. render both indifferently by *Γαβζαα* and *Gabau*; and in two passages (Judg. xx, 10, 33) the same error has crept into the original. Schwarz's identification of these places (*Phys. Descrip. of Palest.* p. 132) is full of errors in locality. The two names are indeed only masculine and feminine forms of the same word, signifying "hill;" but that they were two different places is evident from Josh. xviii, 24, compare 28; 1 Sam. xiii, 2, compare 3; Isa. x, 29. In 2 Sam. xx, 8, the name "Geba" stands erroneously for GIBCON (compare 1 Chron. xiv, 16). Gela, with its "suburbs," was assigned to the priests (Josh. xxi, 17; 1 Chron. vi, 60). The Philistines were smitten from Geba unto Gazer by David (2 Sam. v, 25). As it lay on the frontiers of Judah and Israel, Asa rebuilt Geba and Mizpah with the stones of Ramah (1 Kings xv, 22; 2 Chron. xvi, 6). "From Geba (in the north) to Beersheba" (in the south) (2 Kings xxiii, 8) expressed the whole extent of the separate kingdom of Judah, just as "from Dan to Beersheba" expressed the whole length of Palestine. It would seem from the manner in which Geba (Gaba) and Lamah are coupled in Neh. vii, 30, that they were very near each other. Reland (*Palest.* p. 802) thinks it the *Gebath* (גִּבְתָּה) or *Gibbethon* (גִּבְתֹּן) mentioned by Talmudical writers in connection with Antipatris (comp. 2 Sam. v, 25). During the wars of the earlier part of the reign of Saul, Geba was held as a garrison by the Philistines (1 Sam. xiii, 8), but they were ejected by Jonathan, a feat which, while it added greatly to his renown, exasperated them to a more overwhelming invasion. Later in the same campaign we find it re-

ferred to in defining the position of the two rocks which stood in the ravine below the garrison of Michmash, in terms which fix Geba on the south and Michmash on the north of the ravine (1 Sam. xiv, 5; the A. V. has here Gibeah). Exactly in accordance with this is the position of the modern village of *Jeba*, which stands picturesquely on the top of its steep terraced hill, on the very edge of the great wady Suweinit, looking northwards to the opposite village, which also retains its old name of Mikhmas. (See Stanley, *Pal. Est.* p. 210, 489; Porter, *Hand-book for Syria*, p. 215.) The names, and the agreement of the situation with the requirements of the story of Jonathan, make the identification all but certain; but it is still further confirmed by the list of Benjaminite towns visited by the Assyrian army on their road through the country southward to Jerusalem, which we have in Isa. x, 28-32, where the minute details—the stoppage of the heavy baggage (A. V. “carriages”), which could not be got across the broken ground of the wady at Michmash; then the passage of the ravine by the lighter portion of the army, and the subsequent bivouac (“lodging,” יָרַחְנוּ = rest for the night) at Geba on the opposite side—are in exact accordance with the nature of the spot. Standing as it does on the south bank of this important wady—one of the most striking natural features of this part of the country—the mention of Geba as the northern boundary of the lower kingdom is very significant. Thus commanding the pass, its fortification by Asa (1 Kings xv, 22; 2 Chron. xvi, 6) is also quite intelligible. It continues to be named with Michmash to the very last (Neh. xi, 31). Geba is probably intended by the “Gibeah-in-the-field” of Judg. xx, 31, to which its position is very applicable. The “fields” are mentioned again as late as Neh. xii, 29. The town was occupied by the Benjamites after the captivity (Ezra ii, 26). It appears to have been unknown to Eusebius and Jerome (*Orientalion*, s. v. Γαβαί, *Gabe*; comp. Reland, *Pal. Est.* p. 708). The village of Jeba is small, and is half in ruins. Among these are occasionally seen large hewn stones indicating antiquity. There is here the ruins of a square tower, almost solid, and a small building having the appearance of an ancient church (Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 113; *Bib. Sac.* 1844, i, 598-602; *Lat. Researches*, p. 288).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See GIBEAH.

2. The Geba (Γαβαί v. r. Ταυζάν) between which and Scythopolis (therefore S. of Mount Gilboa) Holofernes is said to have made his encampment (Judith, iii, 10), must be the *Jeba* on the road between Samaria and Jenin, about 45' S. of Sanur (Van de Velde, *Narrat.* i, 367), with evident traces of antiquity (Wilson, *Lands of Bible*, ii, 84; Robinson, i, 440). The Vulg. strangely renders *venit ad Idumeos in terram Gabba*.

**Gē'bal** (kindred with the Arabic *Jebel*, a mountain), the name of two places in Palestine (although some regard them as one, Schwarz, *Pal. Est.* p. 63), both doubtless so called as being situated in a mountainous region. The root is the Heb. גַּבַּל, *gibal'*, to *mount*; whence גַּבְעוֹן, a line or natural boundary, such as mountain ranges usually form. There seems also to have been an orthography גַּבְעוֹן, *Go'bel* (Γόβελ, Euseb, *Onomast.* s. v. Βίβλος; comp. *Alcoñle*, i. e. El-Gobel, of the Pentinger tables), whence *Gobolites* = *Sobal*. The *Gablan* (גַּבְלָן) in the Mishna, along with Galilee (*Sotah*, fol. 49, 6), arose out of the גַּבְלָן, or *Jaulan*, which is considered as the eastern border of Galilee (Josephus, *War*, iv, 1, 1).

1. (Heb. *Gēbal'*, גַּבְעוֹן; Sept. Βιβλοια, Vulg. *Giblii*, Ezek. xxvii, 9), better known from the Gentile form GIBLITES (גַּבְלִיִּים, Sept. Γαβλί, Vulg. omis, Josh. xiii, 5; plur. גַּבְלִיִּים, Sept. Γιβλοια, Vulg. *Giblii*, Auth. Vers. “stone-squarers,” 1 Kings v, 18 [32]), the inhabitants of the city and district of Gebal, in Phœni-

cia, 34° 7' N. latitude, 35° 42' E. longitude, on the shore of the Mediterranean, under Mount Lebanon. (See a passage from Lucian, quoted by Reland, *Pal. Est.* p. 269.) “The land of the Gibletes,” with “all Lebanon,” was assigned to the Israelites by the original appointment (Josh. xiii, 5); but it does not seem that they ever possessed themselves of it. Gebal was called *Byblos* (Βύβλος, sometimes Βιβλος) by the Greeks, and so the Sept. has it in one passage. It was an important place, and celebrated for the birth and worship of Adonis, the Syrian Tammuz. Pliny and other Roman authors call it *Gabale* (*Hist. Nat.* v, 20). The Gibletes, or Bybllians, seem to have been pre-eminent in the arts of stone-carving (2 Kings v, 18) and ship-calking (Ezek. xxvii, 9); but, according to Strabo, their industry suffered greatly from the robbers infesting the sides of Mount Lebanon. Pompey not only destroyed the strongholds from whence these pests issued, but freed the city from a tyrant (Strabo, xvi, 2, 18). Some have confounded Gebal, or Bybllus, with the *Gabala* of Strabo, just below Laodicea, and consequently many leagues to the north, the ruins and site of which, still called *Jebili*, are so graphically described by Maundrell (*Early Travellers in Palestine*, by Wright, p. 394). By Moroni (*Dizion. Eccles.*) they are accurately distinguished under their respective names. Finally, Bybllus became a Christian see in the patriarchate of Antioch, subject to the metropolitan see of Tyre (Reland, *Pal. Est.* p. 214 sq.). It shared the usual vicissitudes of Christianity in these parts; and even now furnishes episcopacy with a title. It is called *Jebail* by the Arabs, thus reviving the old Biblical name. It is seated on a rising ground near the sea, at the foot of Lebanon, which here approaches close to the coast. It is walled on the three sides towards the land, and open on the west towards the sea, being perhaps about half a mile in circuit. Within the wall, which seems to be of the age of the Crusades, the chief building is an old castle, which has received modern repairs, and is now used as the abode of the agha or commandant. There are three or four open and lofty buildings belonging to the chief people of the place, a mosque with a low minaret, and an old Maronite church of good masonry; but the houses generally are of poor construction, and nearly half the space within the walls is occupied with the gardens of the inhabitants. The population is estimated at 600, none of whom are Jews (Maundrell's *Journey*, p. 45; Burekhardt's *Syria*, p. 180; Buckingham's *Arab Tribes*, p. 455; Pococke, *Travels*, ii, 98; Wilson, *Lands of Bible*, ii, 40). Its antiquity is attested by multitudes of granite columns which are built into the walls and castles, choke up the small harbor, and lie scattered over the fields. The substructions of the old castle are of bevelled masonry, and some of the stones are nearly twenty feet long. Beautiful sarcophagi are frequently dug out of the ruins. The columns are of the Grecian style, like those of the other cities of ancient Phœnicia (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1848, p. 7). See BYBLUS.

2. (Heb. *Gēbal'*, גַּבְעוֹן, Sept. Γεβάλ, Vulg. *Gēbal*; Psa. lxxxiii, 7), a district, or perhaps sovereignty, south of Judæa, in the land of Edom. Gebal signifying a mountain, apparently belongs not to the most ancient times, as it does not occur when the Israelites were actually in this quarter, but is first found in Psa. lxxxiii, which was probably written in the time of Jehoshaphat. That king had, in the beginning of his reign, humbled the Philistines and Arabians (2 Chron. xvii, 9, 10), and still more recently had assisted Ahab against the Syrians (ib. ch. xviii). Now, according to the poetic language of the Psalmist, there were symptoms of a general rising against him: on the south, besides these Gebalites, the other Edomites, the Ishmaelites, and the Hagarenes; on the south-east, Moab and Ammon; along the whole line of the south-west coast (and, with Jehoshaphat's maritime projects, this

would naturally disturb him most; see 2 Chron. xx, 36), the Amalekites, Philistines, and Phœnicians, or inhabitants of Tyre; with the aid and comfort even of Assur, i. e. the Syrians, or Assyrians, from the more distant north. The country south of the Dead Sea, and on the east of the Ghor, or great Jordan valley, bears the same name (*Jebal*) at the present day (Burckhardt, p. 401 sq.), and is doubtless the same as the Gebal of Scripture, the *Gebalitis* (or, rather, *Gobolitis*) of Josephus (*Γοβολίτις*, *Ant.* ii, 1, 2; iii, 2, 1; *Γαβαλίται*, *Ant.* ix, 9, 1), and the *Gebalene* of the Romans (Euseb. and Steph. Byz. have *Γάβαλα*, *-ληνίη*; *Γέβαλα*, *-ληνίη*). Josephus says, indeed, that the sons of Eliphaz, son of Esau, settled in that part of Idumæa which was called Gebalitis, and that denominated from Amalek Amalekitis: "For Idumæa," he adds, "was the name of a large country, which in its several parts retained the names of its peculiar inhabitants" (*Ant.* ii, 2, 1). We may therefore take Gebal as the name of the northernmost portion of Idumæa, which was nearest to Palestine. In Judith iii, 1, Lat. Vers., and also in the writings of the Crusaders, it is called Syria *Sobal* (q. v.). The Jerusalem *Targum* generally reads *Mount Gablah* (*גַּבְלָהּ מִצְרַת*) instead of Mount Seir; so also the Samar. in Deut. xxxii, 2. Seir, however, was the ancient name of Edom, whereas Gebal was only a part of it. (See Reland, *Palæst.* p. 84; Michaelis, *Suppl.* i, 261 sq.; Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 552.)—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See IDUMÆA.

**Gebalênê.** See GEBAL, 2.

**Gebath.** See GEBAL, 1.

**Ge'ber** (Heb. *גֵּבֵר*, a valiant man, as often; Sept. *Γάβρο*, Josephus *Γαβάροης*, *Ant.* viii, 2, 3), the son of Uri, and one of Solomon's purveyors, having sole (i. e. supreme) jurisdiction (*גֵּבֵר*) over Gilead (1 Kings iv, 19); from which fact he appears to be the same as BEN-GE'BER ("son of Geber") mentioned in ver. 13 as having charge of the same region, unless, indeed, the latter were a deputy or assistant to his father. B.C. 1013. See also EZION-GE'BER.

**Gebelin.** See COURT, ANTOINE.

**Gebhard, TRUCESSE,** archbishop of Cologne, was born at Waldburg Nov. 10, 1547; was made prebendary of Augsburg in 1562, of Strasburg in 1567, of Cologne in 1570, and in 1577 elector and archbishop of Cologne. In 1582 he became a Protestant, and in the following year he married the countess Agnes von Mansfeld. He proclaimed unrestricted religious liberty, and intended to convert his spiritual into a temporal electorate. His plan was highly approved by the people and the nobility, but the cathedral chapter opposed it with all its might. The pope fulminated a ban against him, and the emperor, Rudolph II, declared him deposed. The Protestant princes ultimately deserted him, and the newly-elected archbishop, duke Ernest of Bavaria, overcame him by force of arms (1584). He fled to Holland, but not receiving any help there, he returned to Germany, where he vainly solicited the assistance of the Protestant princes, as well as petitioned queen Elizabeth of England for aid in regaining his bishopric; he finally retired to Strasburg, where he officiated as dean of the cathedral, and died May 21, 1601. See Köhler, *De actis et factis Gebhardi* (Altd. 1723); Barthold, in *Rammer's Historisches Taschenbuch* (1820); Pierer, *Universæl-Lexikon*, s. v.

**Ge'bin** (Heb. *Gebim'*, *גֵּבִים*, cisterns [as in Jer. xiv, 3, "pits"], or locusts [as in Isa. xxxiii, 4]; Sept. *Γεβίμεις*, Vulg. *Gabin*), a small place a short distance north of Jerusalem, mentioned between Madmenah and Nob, Isa. x, 31, where its inhabitants are prophetically described as fleeing at the approach of the invading Assyrian army. Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v. *Γεβέρα*, *Gebin*) identify it with "*Geba*, a village five miles from Guphna towards Neapolis;" and Schwarz

(*Palæst.* p. 131) identifies it with the Gob of 2 Sam. xxi, 18; but both these are at variance with the order of the places named by the prophet. The associated localities require a position corresponding to that of the present *El-Isawiyyeh*, a little village in a valley near the road leading N.E. from Jerusalem (Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 108). See NOB. It probably derived its Heb. name from the vicinity of excavations (*גְּבִים* = the ditches; comp. 2 Kings iii, 16).

**Gedali'ah** (Heb. *Gedalyah'*, *גְּדַלְיָהּ*, made great by *Jehovah*, Ezra x, 18; Jer. xl, 5, 8; xli, 16; Zeph. i, 1; elsewhere in the prolonged or full form *Gedalya'hu*, *גְּדַלְיָהוּ*; Sept. usually *Γοδολία*, Vulgate *Godolia*), the name of five men.

1. The son and second assistant of Jeduthun in the Levitical choir of the Temple in the time of David (1 Chron. xxv, 3, 9). B.C. 1013.

2. The (son of Amariah and father of Cushî) grandfather of the prophet Zephaniah (Zeph. i, 1). B.C. ante 635.

3. Son of Pashur, and one of the Jewish nobles who conspired to accuse and imprison Jeremiah (Jer. xxxviii, 1). B.C. 589.

4. The son of Ahikam (Jeremiah's protector, Jer. xxvi, 24), and grandson of Shaphan, the secretary of king Josiah. After the destruction of the Temple, B.C. 588, Nebuchadnezzar departed from Judæa, leaving Gedaliah with a Chaldaean guard (Jer. xl, 5) at Mizpah, a strong (1 Kings xv, 22) town, six miles north of Jerusalem, to govern, as tributary (Josephus, *Ant.* x, 9, 1) of the king of Bablyon, the vine-dressers and husbandmen (Jer. lii, 16) who were exempted from captivity. He was probably of the number of those who left the city at the instance of the prophet, justly despairing of the successful defence of a place which God had abandoned. Gedaliah had inherited his father's respect for Jeremiah (Jer. xl, 5 sq.), and was, moreover, enjoined by Nebuzaradan to look to his safety and welfare. Gedaliah was in every way worthy of the difficult post he had to fill; and he adopted, as the principle of his conduct, that submission to existing circumstances which was requisite in one who believed that Judah had, according to the declared will of God, been justly doomed and punished for her iniquities, and who yet believed that his loving kindness had not utterly departed from her. He established the seat of his melancholy government at Mizpah, in the tribe of Benjamin; and there the inhabitants, who had fled at the advance of the Chaldaean armies, or when the troops of Zedekiah were dispersed in the plains of Jericho, quitting their retreats, began to gather around him. Gedaliah wisely counselled them to submission and quietness; and he promised, on that condition, to insure them the undisturbed enjoyment of their possessions, and of the produce of the ground. In this hope the labors of the field were resumed, and the extraordinary returns of that season secured as if specially given to repair the recent injuries of war. Jeremiah joined Gedaliah; and Mizpah became the resort of Jews from various quarters (Jer. xl, 6, 11), many of whom, as might be expected at the end of a long war, were in a demoralized state, unrestrained by religion, patriotism, or prudence. The gentle and popular character of Gedaliah (Joseph. *Ant.* x, 9, 1 and 3), his hereditary piety (Rosenmüller on Jer. xxvi, 24), the prosperity of his brief rule (Jer. xl, 12), the reverence which revived and was fostered under him for the ruined Temple (xli, 5), fear of the Chaldaean conquerors, whose officer he was—all proved insufficient to secure Gedaliah from the foreign jealousy of Baalis, king of Ammon, and the domestic ambition of Ishmael, a member of the royal family of Judah (Joseph. *Ant.* x, 9, 3). This man came to Mizpah with a secret purpose to destroy Gedaliah. Gedaliah, generously refusing to believe a friendly warning which he received of the intended treachery, was murdered, with his



Jewish and Chaldaean followers, two months after his appointment. After his death, which is still commemorated in the Jewish Calendar (Prideaux, *Connexion*, anno 588, and Zeel. vii, 19) as a national calamity, the Jews, in their native land, anticipating the resentment of the king of Babylon, gave way to despair. Many, forcing Jeremiah to accompany them, fled to Egypt under Johanan. By this series of tragical events the utter ruin of Judæa was consummated (2 Kings xxv, 22-26; Jer. xxxix, 14; xli, 18).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See JEREMIAH.

5. A descendant of Jeshua, and one of the priests who divorced their heathen wives after the return from the Babylonian captivity (Ezra x, 18). B. C. 458.

**Gebirol.** See IEN GEBIROL.

**Geddes, Alexander**, a Roman Catholic divine, was born in 1737, at Arradowl, Banffshire, Scotland. He studied theology at the Scotch College in Paris, and, after his return to Scotland, he officiated at various chapels till 1782, when he desisted entirely from clerical functions. For many years he was engaged on a new translation of the Old and New Testament, and Lord Petre allowed him a pension of £200 a year to enable him to carry it into effect. "The prospectus, which contained an account of his plan, was published in 1786; this was soon followed by a letter to the bishop of London, containing 'Queries, doubts, and difficulties relative to a vernacular version of the Holy Scriptures,' by a specimen of the work, and by a 'General Answer to the queries, counsels, and criticisms' which his prospectus and specimens had called forth. It was not, however, till 1792 that the first volume of the translation was published under the title of '*The Holy Bible, or the Books accounted Sacred by the Jews and Christians, otherwise called the Books of the Old and New Covenants, faithfully translated from corrected texts of the originals, with various readings, explanatory notes, and critical remarks.*' The second, which contained the translation to the end of the historical books, appeared in 1793; and the third, which contained his critical remarks upon the Pentateuch, in 1800. The remainder of the work was never finished; he was employed, at the time of his death, on a translation of the Psalms, which he had finished as far as the 118th Psalm, and which was published in 1807." In 1800 he published *Critical Remarks on the Hebrew Scriptures* (Lond. 4to). He died Feb. 26, 1802. *A Memoir of his Life and Writings*, by Dr. John Mason Goode, appeared in 1803 (London, 8vo). See Graves, *On the Pentateuch*; *British Critic*, vols. iv, xix, xx; *English Cyclop.*; Cotton, *Rheims and Douay*, Oxford, 1864.

**Geddes, Janet**, "known in Scottish ecclesiastical history as 'Jenny Geddes,' has had her name transmitted as the person who took a prominent part in resisting the introduction of the Liturgy, or Service-book, into the Church of Scotland in 1637. The circumstances were these. Sunday, 23d July, 1637, was the day fixed for this innovation, so obnoxious to the Scottish Presbyterians, and an immense crowd filled the High Church of St. Giles's, Edinburgh, on the occasion. On the dean of Edinburgh beginning to read, his voice was lost in a tumultuous shout, and an old woman, said to have been one Jenny Geddes, who kept a green-stall in the High Street, bawling out, 'Villain! dost thou say mass at my lug' (that is, ear), launched her stool at the dean's head. Universal confusion ensued, and the dean, throwing off his surplice, fled, to save his life. The bishop of Edinburgh, on attempting to appease the storm, was assailed by a volley of sticks, stones, and other missiles, accompanied by cries and threats that effectually silenced him. This tumult proved the death-blow of the liturgy in Scotland. It has been doubted, however, if there ever was such a person as Jenny Geddes. In 1756, a citizen of Edinburgh, of the name of Robert Mein (who died in 1776), known for his exertions for the improvement of his

native city, published a tract called *The Cross Removed, Prelacy and Patronage Disproved*, etc., in which he claims the exploit of Jenny G. for his great-grand-mother, 'the worthy Barbara Hamilton, spouse to John Mein, merchant and postmaster in Edinburgh, who, in the year 1637, spoke openly in the church at Edinburgh against archbishop Laud's new Service-book, at its first reading there, which stopped their proceedings, and dismissed their meeting, so that it never obtained in our Church to this day.' In the obituary notice of Robert Mein, *Weekly Magazine*, vol. xxxix, and *Scots Magazine*, vol. xxxvi (1776), this Barbara Hamilton is said to have been descended from the Hamiltons of Bardowie, 'but was better known in our history by the name of Jenny Geddes, though called so erroneously.' Jenny Geddes's famous stool is said to have been burned by herself in the bonfires at the cross of Edinburgh at the Restoration, and what has been called hers in the Museum of the Society of Antiquaries at Edinburgh has no claim to that name beyond gratuitous conjecture. See *Proceedings of Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, vol. iii, pt. ii, p. 179, 180."—Chambers, *Cyclopaedia*, s. v.

**Geddes, Michael**, a divine of the Church of England, was born in Scotland, and in 1678 was appointed chaplain to the English factory at Lisbon. In 1686 he was summoned to appear before the court of the Inquisition. The judges received him at first with great affectation of civility and courtesy, desiring him to sit down and to be covered before they proceeded to examine him. After this ceremony was over, they sternly asked him how he dared to preach or exercise his function in that city? He answered that he enjoyed that liberty by virtue of an article in the treaty between the crowns of Portugal and England; that it was a privilege which had never been called in question; and that he had resided at Lisbon for eight years, during which time he had served the English factory in the capacity of chaplain, as many others had done before him. To these declarations they falsely replied that they were entirely ignorant till lately that any such liberty had been assumed, and that if they had known it they would never have suffered it. They strictly forbade him to minister any more to his congregation; and, after threatening him with vengeance if he should disobey, dismissed him. It is said that they were encouraged to take this step by the Romanist party in England. Upon this interdiction, letters of complaint were addressed by the factory to the bishop of London; but as they did not reach England before the suspension of his lordship, all hopes of speedy redress were lost. Geddes returned to his native country in the beginning of 1688. He was soon made LL.D. by the University of Oxford, and was made chancellor of Sarum by bishop Burnet. He wrote a *History of the Church of Malabar* (Lond. 1694, 8vo).—*The Church History of Ethiopia* (Lond. 1696, 8vo).—*Miscellaneous Tracts against Popery* (Lond. 1730, 3 vols. 8vo); and the *Council of Trent no Free Assembly*. He died in 1715.—Birch, *Life of Tillotson*; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* v, 308.

**Ged'ar** (Γεδ'άρ), one of the "Temple servants" or Nethinim, whose "sons" are stated to have returned from the exile (1 Esdr. v. 30); evidently the GADAR (q. v.) of the Heb. texts (Ezra ii, 47; Neh. vii, 49).

**Ged'eon** (Γεδεών, the Grecized form of *Gideon*), the name of two men.

1. The judge GIDEON (q. v.), thus Anglicized in the N. T. (Heb. xi, 32).

2. The son of Rephaim and father of Ananias, among the ancestors of Judith (Judg. viii, 1; where, however, many copies have "Gideon").

**Ged'er** (Heb. גֶּדֶר, Sept. Γάδερον), a name signifying a wall (e. g. of a court, garden, sheepfold, etc., Prov. xxiv, 31; Ezek. xlii, 10), hence an inclosed or fortified place, and thus the basis of several names of

castellated towns (e. g. Gederah, Gedor, Gadara, Gederoth, etc.); used once only (Josh. xii, 13) in this simple form as that of one of the thirty-one ancient royal towns of the Canaanites, whose kings were defeated by Joshua. It is mentioned between Debir and Hormah; but, as the localities in that list are not strictly in geographical order, it may be identified with the GEDOR (q. v.) in the mountains of Judah (Josh. xv, 58), and with the BETI-GADER (q. v.) of 1 Chron. ii, 51. The notices of Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 86, 104) are quite confused.

**Ged'erah** (Heb. with the article *hag-Ged'erah'*, גְּדֵרָה, the fortress or *sh ep-cote* [see GEDER]; Sept. Γάρα, a town in the Shephelah or plain of Judah (Josh. xv, 36, where it is mentioned between Adithaim and Gederothaim [q. v.]). According to Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v. Γάρα, Gaddera), it was still a village (Γάρα, *Gadara*) near Jerusalem "around the Terebinth," an expression which Rammur (*Palest.* p. 133) interprets of the valley of Elah or the terebinth (1 Sam. xvii, 1); although Keil (on *Joshua*, ad loc.) shows that it means the wood of Mamre, near Hebron, and Reland had pointed out that this was in the mountains and not the lowlands of Judah (*Palest.* p. 802). Van de Velde has identified the site with that of "Gheterah or Ghederah, a village on the south banks of wady Surar, near the high road from Ramleh to Ghuzzel" (*Memoir*, p. 313); a position exactly agreeing with that of the *Cedus* (Κέδου, Jerome *Gedrus*), described by Eusebius (*Onomast.* s. v. Γέδου, Jerome *Gadur*) as a very large village ten miles from Diospolis (Lydda) towards Eleutheropolis (Beit-Jibrin). The inhabitants seem to be those designated as *Gederites* (q. v.) in 1 Chron. xxvii, 28.

**Ged'erathite** (Heb. only with the art. *hag-Gederathite*, ἡ γὰδερᾶθιτῆ, as if from *Gederah*; Sept. ὁ Γαδερῶσιτι v. r. Γάρασιτίπ, Vulg. *Gaderothites*), an epithet of Josabab (q. v.), one of David's famous warriors at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 4); so called as being a native probably of the GEDOR (q. v.) of the same passage (ver. 7).

**Ged'erite** (Heb. with the art. *hag-Gederi'*, הַגְּדֵרִי, as if from *Geder*; Sept. ὁ Γεδωρίτης v. r. Γέδω, Vulg. *Gederites*), an epithet of Baal-hanan, David's overseer of olive and sycamore groves in the lowland of Judah (1 Chron. xxvii, 28); hence probably so called as being a native of GEDERAH (q. v.) in that region (Josh. xv, 36).

**Ged'eroth** (Heb. *Gederoth'*, גְּדֵרוֹת, fortresses or *sheep-cotes* [see GEDER]; in Chron. with the art.; Sept. Γαδρωθ v. r. in Chron. Γαδρωθ, etc.; Vulg. *Giderothim*, *Gederoth*), a town in the "valley" of Judah (Josh. xv, 41, where it is mentioned between Kithish and Beth-dagon); one of those captured by the Philistines from Ahaz (1 Chron. xxviii, 18). It cannot be identical with the Gederah or Gederothaim (q. v.) of Judah (which lay in a different group), nor yet with either Gedor or Gedor (which were in the mountains). The associated names require a position "in the actual plain from north to south between the hilly region and the Philistine coast" (Keil, on *Josh.* ad loc.); perhaps at the modern *Beit-Tima*, marked on Van de Velde's *Map* as 6 miles east of Ascalon.

**Gederothaim** (Heb. *Gederothaim'*, גְּדֵרוֹתַיִם, two folds [see GEDER]; Sept. omits, but some copies translate it ἐπ' αὐταῖσι ἀβυθῆ, Vulgate *Gederothaim*), the name of a town in the plain of Judah (Josh. xv, 36), mentioned in connection with GEDERAH (q. v.); where, probably, instead of rendering the copulative "and," we should (with the margin) translate it "or," since otherwise there would be 15 instead of 14 cities enumerated, as stated in the text. So Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 103), who, however, confounds it with Gederoth, and even with the Gazara (q. v.) of the Apocrypha (see Reland, *Palest.* p. 778).

**Gedi.** See GOAT; EX-GEDI.

**Gediyah.** See GOAT.

**Ge'dor** (Heb. *Gedor'*, גְּדוֹר or [in 1 Chron. iv, 4, 18] גְּדָר, a wall [see GEDER]; Sept. Γεδωρ, but 1 Chron. viii, 31 Γεδωρ, and 1 Chron. xii, 7 Γέγαρα; Vulg. *Gedor*), the name of one or two places, and also of a man.

1. An ancient city in the mountains of Judah (Josh. xv, 58), some of whose inhabitants joined David at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 7). It was probably this town to which "Josabab the *Gederathite*" (q. v.) belonged (1 Chron. xii, 4); as also "Jeroham of Gedor," whose sons Joelah and Zebadiah were among the mighty men that joined David in his difficulties at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 7); for it does not appear that all in that list were "Saul's brethren of Benjamin" (compare the terms "Haruphite," "Korhite," following). See HAREPH. The name has the definite article to it in this latter passage (גְּדוֹר־יְרֹחָם). The place was probably the same as the GEDER (q. v.) of the ancient Canaanites (Josh. xii, 13), rebuilt as BETI-GADER (q. v.) by Hareph (1 Chron. ii, 51), in conjunction with Penuel (1 Chron. iv, 4) and Jered (1 Chron. iv, 18). See MERED. It is doubtless the *Gibra* of the *Onomasticon*, between Jerusalem and Hebron. See GEDERAI. It is very doubtful (see below) whether this be the same Gedor in whose fertile valley the Simeonites found good pasture for their flocks (1 Chron. iv, 39), yet Reland regards them both as the same (*Palest.* p. 803). Dr. Robinson, travelling from Jerusalem to Gaza, came in sight of a place called *Jedür*, with ruins, on the brow of a mountain ridge, which he identifies with Gedor (*Researches*, ii, 338; also new ed. iii, 283). It was also recognised by M. De Saunay (*Narrative*, ii, 451); comp. Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 86) and Wilson (*Lands of Eble*, i, 386).

2. The above-named place (1 Chron. iv, 39) was originally inhabited by Hamites, and its fertility induced a predatory incursion and forcible occupation by a party of Simeonites. From this it would seem to have adjoined the territory of Simeon on the south; and a writer in the *Journal of Sacred Literature* (July, 1860, p. 318) suggests the solution that these aborigines were Philistines, the place itself being no other than GERAR (by the slight and frequent error in transcription of גְּדָר, which latter the Sept. appears to have actually read). Ewald had already adopted this emendation (*Gesch. Isr.* i, 332, note), although the term (גְּדָר, *wady*) elsewhere applied to Gerar (q. v.) is different from that here used (גְּדָר־יְרֹחָם, the valley).

3. A chief of the Benjamites (apparently of the house of Gibeon) resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. viii, 31; ix, 37). B.C. 536 or ante.

**Gee, JOSUA**, a Congregational minister, was born at Boston in the year 1698. He graduated at Harvard in 1717, and was early regarded as a young man of promise. He accepted an invitation to settle as colleague of Cotton Mather, and was ordained December 18, 1723, Cotton Mather giving the charge. In this relation he continued till the close of his life. Mr. Gee distinguished himself by a vigorous and earnest defence of the great Whitfieldian revival. He cordially welcomed Whitfield to Boston, adopted in his own church the measures which Whitfield recommended, and opposed the action of a convention of Congregational ministers in 1743 which protested against his doings. Mr. Gee was an invalid during the latter part of his life, and was obliged to have an assistant. He died May 22, 1748. He published *A Sermon on the Death of Cotton Mather* (1728);—*Two Sermons on Luke xiii, 24* (1729);—*Letter to the Rev. Nathaniel Eelle, Moderator of the late Convention of Pastors at Boston* (1743).—Sprague, *Annals*, i, 312.

**Geffcken, JOHANNES**, a Lutheran clergyman of Germany, was born in 1803 at Hamburg. He became

in 1829 pastor of St. Michael's church, in his native city, and retained this position until his death, Oct. 2, 1865. He wrote a history of Semipelagianism (*Gesch. des Semipelagianismus*, Hamb. 1826); on the division of the Decalogue (*Ueber die verschiedene Einteilung des Dekalogus*, Hamb. 1838); on the picture catechism of the 15th century (*Ueber d. Bilderkatechismus, des 15<sup>ten</sup> Jahrhunderts*, Leipzig, 1855), and several other works.—*Allgem. Real-Encyclop.* s. v. (A. J. S.)

**Gegnæsius**, **TIMOTHEUS**, a leader of the Paulicians about A. D. 700. About this time "the sect was divided into two parties. The schism grew out of the antagonism betwixt a Catholic and a Protestant principle. Gegnæsius held that spiritual gifts were communicated by tradition, and connected with the regularity of succession. But his younger brother, Theodore, refused to acknowledge any such principle, maintaining that any such outward mediation was unessential, and that he had received the Spirit immediately from the same divine source with his father. Under the reign of Leo the Isaurian, new complaints were lodged against the Paulicians at Constantinople, and the emperor ordered Gegnæsius to appear at the capital and undergo a trial. The examination was committed to the patriarch, before whom Gegnæsius contrived to answer all the questions proposed to him respecting his orthodoxy in a satisfactory manner; attaching, however, quite a different sense from the true one to the formularies of Church orthodoxy. The patriarch asked him why he had left the Catholic Church? Gegnæsius replied that he had never entertained the remotest wish of forsaking the Catholic Church, within which alone salvation was to be found. But by the Catholic Church he meant only the Paulician communities, called, as they believed, to restore the Church of Christ to its primitive purity. The patriarch demanded why he refused to give the mother of God the reverence which was her due? Gegnæsius here pronounced the anathema himself on all who refused reverence to the mother of God—to her into whom Christ entered, and from whom he came—the mother of us all. But he meant the invisible, heavenly city of God, the celestial Jerusalem, mother of the divine life, for admission of the redeemed into which Christ had prepared the way by first entering it himself as their forerunner. He was asked why he did not pay homage to the cross? Gegnæsius here pronounced the anathema on all who refused to venerate the cross; but by this he understood Christ himself, called by that symbolical name. Furthermore, he was asked why he despised the body and blood of Christ? The reply to this also was satisfactory; but by the body and blood of Christ he was accustomed to understand the doctrines of Christ, in which he communicated himself. So also he answered the question respecting baptism; but by baptism he understood Christ himself, the living water, the water of life. This trial having been reported to the emperor, Gegnæsius received from his sovereign a letter of protection securing him against all further complaints and persecutions."—Neander, *Church History* (Torrey's transl.), iii, 249. See PAULICIANS.

**Gehazi** (Heb. *Geychazi*, גֵּחָזִי, as if for גֵּחָזִי; גֵּחָזִי, *valley of vision*; but, according to Fürst, *denier*, from an obsol. גֵּחָזִי; occasionally contracted *Gechazi*, גֵּחָזִי, 2 Kings iv, 31; v, 25; viii, 4, 5; Sept. Γαζό, the servant of Elisha, whose entire confidence he at first enjoyed. He personally appears first in reminding his master of the best mode of rewarding the kindness of the Shunammite (2 Kings iv, 14). B. C. 889. He was present at the interview in which the Shunammite made known to the prophet that her son was dead, and was sent forward to lay Elisha's staff on the child's face, which he did without effect (2 Kings iv, 31). B. C. cir. 887. The most remarkable incident in his career is that which caused his ruin. When Elisha,

with a noble disinterestedness, declined the rich gifts pressed upon him by the illustrious leper whom he had healed, Gehazi felt distressed that so favorable an opportunity of profiting by the gratitude of Naaman had been so wilfully thrown away. He therefore ran after the retiring chariots, and requested, in his master's name, a portion of the gifts which had before been refused, on the ground that visitors had just arrived for whom he was unable to provide. He asked a talent of silver and two dresses; and the grateful Syrian made him take two talents instead of one. Having deposited this spoil in a place of safety, he again appeared before Elisha, whose honor he had so seriously compromised. His master asked him where he had been, and on his answering, "Thy servant went no whither," the prophet put on the severities of a judge, and, having denounced his crime, passed upon him the terrible doom that the leprosy of which Naaman had been cured should cleave to him and his forever. "And he went forth from his presence a leper as white as snow" (2 Kings v, 20-27). B. C. cir. 885. The case is somewhat parallel with that of Ananias (q. v.) and Sapphira (Acts v). The rebuke inflicted on Gehazi, though severe, cannot justly be reckoned too hard for the occasion. He ought to have understood, from the determined rejection of Naaman's offers by Elisha, that there were important principles involved in the matter, which he should have been careful on no account, or by any movement on his part, to bring into suspicion. There was a great complication of wickedness in his conduct. He first arrogated to himself a superior discernment to that of the Lord's prophet; then he falsely employed the name of that prophet for a purpose which the prophet himself had expressly and most emphatically repudiated; further, as an excuse for aiming at such a purpose, he invented a plea of charity, which had no existence but in his own imagination; and, finally, on being interrogated by Elisha after his return whither he had gone, he endeavored to disguise his procedure by a lie, which was no sooner uttered than it was detected by the prophet. Such accumulated guilt obviously deserved some palpable token of the divine displeasure; the more so, as it tended to give a covetous aspect to the Lord's servant at a time when the very foundations were out of course, and when the true worshippers of God were called to sit loose to all earthly possessions. This, indeed, is the thought that is most distinctly brought out in the prophet's denunciation of Gehazi's conduct (ver. 26)—the false impression it was fitted to give of Elisha's position and character. See NAAMAN.

We afterwards find Gehazi recounting to king Joram the great deeds of Elisha, and, in the providence of God, it so happened that when he was relating the restoration to life of the Shunammite's son, the very woman with her son appeared before the king to claim her house and lands, which had been usurped while she had been absent abroad during the recent famine. Struck by the coincidence, the king immediately granted her application (2 Kings viii, 1-6). B. C. 876. Lepers were compelled to live apart outside the towns, and were not allowed to come too near to uninfected persons. See LEPROSY. Hence some difficulty has arisen with respect to Gehazi's interview with the king. Several answers occur. The interview may have taken place outside the town, in a garden or garden-house; and the king may have kept Gehazi at a distance, with the usual precautions which custom dictated. Some even suppose that the incident is misplaced, and actually occurred before Gehazi was smitten with leprosy. Others hasten to the opposite conclusion, and allege the probability that the leper had then repented of his crime, and had been restored to health by his master, a view which is somewhat corroborated by the fact that he is there still called "the servant of the man of God," from which it is supposed that the relationship between him and Elisha contin-

ued to subsist. — Kitto, s. v.; Fairbairn, s. v. See ELISHA.

**Gehēn'na** (Γέεννα, A. V. invariably "hell"), the Greek representative of גֵּהֶנְנוֹם, Josh. xv, 8; Neh. xi, 30 (rendered by the Sept. Γαέννα, Josh. xviii, 16); more fully, גֵּהֶנְנוֹם הַבְּרָזִי, or גֵּהֶנְנוֹם בְּרָזִי (2 Kings xxiii, 10; 2 Chron. xxviii, 3; xxxiii, 6; Jer. xix, 2), the "valley of Hinnom," or "of the son" or "children of Hinnom," a deep narrow glen to the south of Jerusalem, where, after the introduction of the worship of the fire-gods by Ahaz, the idolatrous Jews offered their children to Moloch (2 Chron. xxviii, 3; xxxiii, 6; Jer. vii, 31; xix, 2-6). In consequence of these abominations the valley was polluted by Josiah (2 Kings xxiii, 10); subsequently to which it became the common lay-stall of the city, where the dead bodies of criminals, and the carcases of animals, and every other kind of filth was cast, and, according to late and somewhat questionable authorities, the combustible portion consumed with fire. From the depth and narrowness of the gorge, and, perhaps, its ever-burning fires, as well as from its being the receptacle of all sorts of putrefying matter, and all that defiled the holy city, it became in later times the image of the place of everlasting punishment, "where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched;" in which the Talmudists placed the mouth of hell: "There are two palm-trees in the valley of Hinnom, between which a smoke ariseth . . . and this is the door of Gehenna" (Talmud, quoted by Barclay, *City of Great King*, p. 90; Lightfoot, *Centur. Chorograph. Matt.* proem, ii, 200). The Mohammedans still use the term as the current designation of the infernal regions (see D'Herbelot, *Bibliothèque Orient.* s. v. Gehennem). In this sense the word is used by our Lord, Matt. v, 29, 30; x, 28; xxiii, 15, 33; Mark ix, 43, 45; Luke xii, 5; and with the addition *τοῦ πυρός*, Matt. v, 22; xviii, 9; Mark ix, 47; and by James, iii, 6. See HINNOM, VALLEY OF; TORNET; HELL.

**Geibel**, JOHANNES, a clergyman of the Reformed Church of Germany, was born April 1, 1776, at Hanau. After finishing his theological studies at the University of Marburg, he was for a short time tutor in a family at Copenhagen. In 1797 he was appointed vicar of the aged pastor of the Reformed church at Lubeck, and, when the latter died in 1798, Geibel became his successor. In his theological views Geibel had been influenced at first by Daub, Jacobi, and Schleiermacher, subsequently by the mysticism of Kerner and the peculiar tenets of the Darbyites; but gradually he conformed himself more fully to the Reformed Church, in which he found the best expression of apostolical simplicity and truth. His theology remained, however, always more Biblical than denominational. He gained a great reputation as a pulpit orator, and was regarded as one of the most successful champions of Biblical orthodoxy against Rationalism, which at that time prevailed in a large number of the Reformed churches of Germany. He severely criticised the Lutheran theses of Harms (q. v.), which he designated as obscure, one-sided, and dictatorial, and inspired with an injurious spirit of sectarianism. He published an "Introduction into the Christian Doctrine" (*Einleitung in die christliche Lehre*, 1821), and two "Guides to the Instruction in the Christian Doctrine" (*Leitfaden bei dem Unterrichte in der christl. Glaubenslehre*, 1822; and *Kurzer Leitfaden*, etc., 1825). He also wrote several pamphlets in defence of his son, pastor Karl Geibel, of Brunswick, who by his orthodox zeal had offended the rationalistic majority of his own congregation, and was censured by the Reformed Synod of Lower Saxony. Geibel declined several calls to other more lucrative positions, and remained in Lubeck until April 11, 1847, when he resigned. He died on the 25th of July, 1853. He is the father of the celebrated Ger-

man poet Geibel. — Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, xix, 543. (A. J. S.)

**Geier**, MARTIN, D.D., a German theologian, was born at Leipzig in 1614, became court-preacher at Dresden in 1656, professor of theology at Leipsic in 1661, and died at Freiburg in 1680. Among his writings are commentaries on the Psalms, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes, which, with some valuable theological treatises, are collected in his *Opera omnia que Latine edita sunt* (Amst. 1695, 2 vols. fol.). His commentary on the Psalms has been often published separately, and is still esteemed.

**Geiger, Franz Tiburtius**, a Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Harting, near Ratisbon, in 1755. He studied at first under the Jesuits, then joined the Franciscans at Lucerne in 1772, and after 1773 applied himself to the study of philosophy at Ratisbon, and of theology at Würzburg. He subsequently became professor of Hebrew at Ratisbon, of rhetoric at Offenburg, of philosophy at Freiburg, and afterwards in the Franciscan school of Solothurn, and finally, in 1792, professor of theology at Lucerne, whence he became a leader of ultramontaniam through Switzerland and Germany. This, however, made him many enemies, and in 1819 he was obliged to resign his position. He died May 8, 1843. A collection of his works has been published (Lucerne, 8 vols.). — Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, s. v. (J. N. P.)

**Geiger, Jacob**, a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in Allentown, Lehigh County, Pa., Oct. 17, 1793. He began his studies with the Rev. Dr. J. C. Becker in Northampton County, Pa., in 1814, and subsequently completed them with the Rev. Dr. C. L. Becker in Baltimore, Md. He was licensed and ordained in 1816, and in 1817 took charge of congregations in and around Manchester, Md., and not far from Baltimore, in which he labored up to the time of his death, Oct. 19, 1848. He was a very successful minister, having baptized 2714 and confirmed 1668 during a ministry of thirty-one years. His charge at the time of his death numbered 1200 members. He preached only in the German language. (H. H.)

**Geiler von Kaisersberg**, an eminent preacher, was born March 16, 1445, at Schaffhausen, and was educated at the University of Freiburg, where he became bachelor in 1462, master in 1463, member of the faculty of philosophy in 1465, and dean in 1469. In 1470 he went to Basel, where he studied theology for five years, and was received as doctor in 1475. The following year he accepted the professorship of theology in Freiburg, and became also rector; but the bent of his genius led him to abandon a literary life, and devote himself to the pulpit. He was preacher of the cathedral of Strasburg until 1488, when he removed to Augsburg, but returned to Strasburg, where he remained until his death, March 10, 1510. As an earnest, powerful, and popular preacher, he had few rivals in that age. "His sermons, usually composed in Latin and delivered in German, are marked by great eloquence and earnestness; nor do they disdain the aids of wit, sarcasm, and ridicule. Vivid pictures of life, warmth of feeling, and a bold, even rough morality, are their leading characteristics. In fact, Geiler's ethical zeal often urged him to a pungency of satire hardly in keeping with modern views of the dignity of the pulpit, but quite congruous with the taste of his own age. His style is vigorous, free, and lively, and in many respects he may be regarded as a sort of predecessor of Abraham a Sancta-Clara" (Chambers, s. v.). The only work of his published during his lifetime was the *Oratio habita in synodo Argentinensi* (1482); he also edited the first collection of Gerson's Works (Strasb. 1488, 3 vols.). From his MSS. a large number of sermons were compiled and published after his death. Of these, the best known are his *Navicula sive speculum futuro-*

*rum* (Strasb. 1510, 1511, 1513), translated into German by Pauli, *D. Kaisersbergers Narrenschiff* (Strasb. 1520); there is also another translation (Basel, 1513). Of another of his works, *Das Schiff des Heils, dann der Seelen Paradies* (first edit.), a free translation into modern German has been published by H. Bone (Mentz, 1864). Many collections of his sermons have been published. See Von Ammon, *G.'s Leben, Lehren und Predigten* (Erl. 1826); Weick, *Johann G. von Kaisersberg, sein Leben u. seine Schriften*, etc. (Frankf. 1826, 3 vols.); Illgen's *Zeitschrift*, xxvii, 530; Höber, *Ueber G.'s Leben und Schriften* (1834); also in the French language, *Essai historique et littéraire sur la vie et les sermons de G.*, Strasburg, 1834, containing a selection from G.'s works); Kehrein, *Geschichte der katholischen Kanzelredtsamkeit d. Deutschen* (Ratisb. 1843, 2 vols.); Pierer, *Universals-Lexikon*, s. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, iv, 714.

**Geissenhainer, Frederick Wilbono, D.D.**, was born June 26, 1771, at Mülheim, on the Ruhr. In early life he gave evidence of great intellectual precocity, and a wonderful facility in the acquisition of knowledge. He studied in the universities of Giessen and Göttingen, and in the latter institution became for a season *professor extraordinarius*. When he reached his twentieth year he applied for ministerial ordination, which, although usually withheld from all under twenty-five years of age, was granted to him as an honorable exception to the general rule, on account of his superior qualifications for the office. For nearly two years he preached in his native land, and then came to America in 1793. For fifteen years he labored in the Goschenhoppen and associated churches in Pennsylvania, and in 1808 removed to the city of New York as successor to Dr. Kunze. His health failing, he suspended for a time his ministerial labors, and repaired to Clearfield Co., Pa. Subsequently he resumed the pastoral work, and labored at the Trappe, Pottstown, Vincent, and other places. In 1822 he returned to New York. He died May 27, 1838, in the 67th year of his age, and the 47th of his ministry. Dr. Geissenhainer enjoyed the reputation of an eminent divine in the Lutheran Church. He possessed an intellect of the highest order, which had been brought under the influence of the most thorough culture. The Latin and Greek were as familiar to him as his native tongue. From the University of Pennsylvania he received the doctorate of divinity in 1826. His MS. lectures on Church History, on the Gospels, Epistles, and portions of the Old Testament, in the hands of surviving relatives, we trust, will yet be given to the Church. (M. L. S.)

**Geistweit, George**, a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in the year 1761; licensed and ordained in 1794; became pastor of churches in Northumberland Co., Pa. His large field of labor lay on both sides of the Susquehanna, and along both its branches. He became pastor in York, Pa., May, 1804. By failing health he was compelled to resign and quit the active duties of the ministry in 1820. He died Nov. 11, 1831. He was a very useful man, in his old age highly venerable, and always greatly beloved for his childlike piety, well-tempered zeal, and amiable spirit. He preached only in the German language. (H. H.)

**Gelasius Cyzicenus** was son of a presbyter of Cyzicum. He flourished about A.D. 476. He compiled *A History of the Council of Nice*, put together without judgment, in three books, the last of which is lost. It was published under the title of *Gelasii Histor. Nicen.*, cura Rob. Balfour, Gr. et. Lat. (Paris, 1599, 8vo). It may be found also in Labbe, *Concilia*, vol. ii, and in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. lxxxv. See Dupin, *Ecc. Writers*, vol. iv; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, vol. ix; Cave, *Hist. Lit. Ann.* 476.

**Gelasius of Cæsarea** was nephew of Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, by whose influence he was made

bishop of Cæsarea perhaps about A.D. 370. Of his works there are extant only some fragments, explanatory of the Apostles' Creed and of the traditions of the Church. He died in 394. The accounts of him are obscure; some writers make two persons of the same name. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* vol. ix.

**Gelasius I.**, a pope and saint of the Roman Church, succeeded Felix III March 1, 492. He is one of the popes who contributed most to the extension of the temporal power of the see of Rome. He was the first to claim for the Papacy a complete independence of the emperors or from the synods in matters of faith. See his *Letter to Faustus* (Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et ampliss. collectio*, viii, 19), in which he argued that the pope has not only a right to decide all ecclesiastical questions, but that an appeal from such decision to any other tribunal is inadmissible; that the pope holds the first rank (*prima sedes*) in the Church, and councils derive their authority from his countenance and co-operation (*pro suo scilicet principatu*). "There are two powers," he wrote to the emperor, "who have sovereign rule over the world: the spiritual and the temporal authority; the sacred authority of the bishops is so much the greater, as on the day of judgment they must render an account of the actions of kings. You know, magnanimous emperor, that your dignity surpasses that of other princes of the earth; nevertheless, you are obliged to submit to the power of the ministers in sacred things, for it is to them you address yourself to know what are the sources of your safety, and the rules which you ought to follow in receiving the sacraments, and in disposing of religious things. The bishops persuade the people that God has given you a sovereign power over temporal things, and they cause them to submit to your laws. In return, you should obey, with entire submission, those who are destined to distribute to you the holy sacraments. If the faithful ought blindly to follow the orders of bishops who acquit themselves worthily in their functions, so much the more ought they to receive the decree of the pontiff of Rome, whom God has established as the first of his bishops, and whom the Church has always recognised as its supreme chief." The schism of the Eastern Church, which had already taken place, continued during his administration, notwithstanding the efforts he made in the Synod of Rome, 495, to heal the breach. He wrote on this controversy his *De duabus in Christo naturis aduersus Eutychen et Nestorium*. He is said to have written also the so-called *Decretum Gelsii de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis*, which is a list of the scriptural books, etc., considered authentic and unauthentic by another synod, which he held at Rome in 496, but this work was probably compiled in the 6th century. Among the minor works ascribed to Gelasius are a *Liber sacramentorum*, published by Jos. Maria Thomasius (Rome, 1680), and a number of letters. He died in Rome Nov. 19, 496. See Schröckh, *Kirchen-gesch.* (xvii, 181 sq.); Regenbrecht, *de canonibus Apostolorum et codice Eccl. hispanæ Diss.* (Vratisl. 1828).—Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* iv, 761; Bower, *History of the Popes*, ii, 216 sq.

**Gelasius II.**, Pope (JOHN OF GAETA), studied theology at Monte Casino, ascended gradually to the higher degrees of the Roman hierarchy, and was finally elected pope in 1118, as successor of Pascal II. The emperor Henry V, dissatisfied with this election, took upon himself to appoint another pope, under the name of Gregory VIII; and one of his generals took Gelasius prisoner, but was obliged to release him. Gelasius then went to Gaeta, where he was ordained, and afterwards to Capua, where he called a council, and excommunicated both Gregory VIII and Henry V. He finally retired to France, where he died in the convent of Cluny, Jan. 29, 1119. See Muratori, *Scriptores Rerum Italicarum*, iii, 367; Mansi, xxi, 162.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xix, 819; Bower, *Hist. of Popes*, vi, 1.

**Geldenhaur**, GERARD (*Gerardus Noxiomagus*, *Gerard of Nimeguen*), an eminent German writer, was born in 1422 at Nimeguen, and educated at Louvain and at Deventer, where he had for his instructor Alexander Hegius, the preceptor of Erasmus. In 1517 his skill in Latin versification obtained for him the laurel crown from the emperor Maximilian I. He afterwards became chaplain and secretary to Philip of Burgundy, bishop of Utrecht. He was sent to Wittemberg in 1526 to visit the schools and Church, and found that he "could not oppose a doctrine so consonant with that of the prophets and apostles" as that of Luther. He renounced popery, and retired towards the Upper Rhine, where, at Worms, he married, and became a school-master. Afterwards he was called to Augsburg, and eventually became professor, first of history, and then of theology, at Marburg. Erasmus, who at one time was his friend, attacked him violently on his secession to Lutheranism. Geldenhaur died of the plague in 1542. He wrote *Historia Batavica:—Historie sue Etatis*, lib. vii.;—*Descriptio Insule Batavorum:—Catalogus Episcoporum Ultrajectinorum:—Epistola Zelandica:—De Viris illustribus Inferioris Germaniæ*, and several controversial pieces.—Hook, *Eccles. Litig.* v, 285; Bayle, *Dictionary* (London, 1736), iii, 145.

**Gel'ilôth** (Heb. *Gelilôth*, גְּלִילוֹתַי, *circuits* [see below]; Sept. Γαλιλάζ, Vulg. *tumulii*), the name of a place on the boundary of Judah and Benjamin, between En-Shemesh and the ascent to Adummim (Josh. xviii, 17); apparently another form of the GILGAL (q. v.) of the parallel passage (Josh. xv, 7).

The same word is distinctively used (see Stanley, *Sinai and Pal.* Append. § 23) five times in the original: twice with reference to the *precincts* of the Philistine heptarchy ("borders of the Philistines," Josh. xiii, 2; "coasts of Palestine," Joel iii [iv], 4); twice to the *circle* [see CICCARE] of the Jordan ("borders," Josh. xxi, 10, 11); and once (in the sing.) to the *district* sloping easterly towards the Dead Sea ("country," Ezek. xlvi, 8). Its derivation (from גְּלִיל, to *roll*) connects it with that of *Gal'lee* (q. v.), with which the versions sometimes confound it. See TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS.

**Gell**, ROBERT, D.D., an English divine, who was rector of St. Mary Aldermanbury, London, and chaplain to the archbishop of Canterbury. His "*Remains* contain much ingenious and solid criticism." They are commended by John Wesley, and also by Charles Wesley, who took from them some hints for hymns. He died in 1655. We have from him *Sermons* (London, 1650, 4to);—*Sermons* (1654, 4to);—*Essays towards the Amendment of the English Trans. of the Bible* (1659, fol);—*Remains, or select Script. of the New Test.* (1676, 2 vols. fol.).—Darling, *Cycloped. Bibliographica*, i, 1230; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 638; Wesley, *Works* (N. Y. ed.), vii, 601.

**Gellatly**, ALEXANDER, a minister of the Associate Church, was born in Perth, Scotland, in 1720. In 1752 he became a student of theology in connection with the Antiburgher Synod of Scotland. By that synod he was sent out in 1753 as a missionary to the inhabitants of the eastern counties of Pennsylvania, who were chiefly emigrants from Scotland and Ireland. He was accompanied by the Rev. Andrew Arnot, and together they formed themselves into a Presbytery, under the name of the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania. They soon became obnoxious to the Presbyterians who had occupied the ground before them, and who issued a series of publications against them, which were answered by Mr. Gellatly and others. Mr. Gellatly was settled first at Middle Octorara, Lancaster County, and then at Oxford, Chester County, Pa., where he labored with great diligence during the remainder of his life. He died March 12, 1761. He was a man of vigorous intellect, and an

earnest, faithful minister of the Gospel.—Sprague, *Annals of Am. Pulpit*, ix (*Associate*), 1.

**Gellert**, CHRISTIAN FÜRCHTEGOTT, a German poet and hymn writer, was born July 4, 1715, in Hainichen, Saxony, and studied philosophy and theology at Leipzig. In 1744 he was made *privat docent*, and in 1751 professor extraordinary of philosophy in the University of Leipzig. He became professor *ordinarius* in 1761, and died Dec. 13, 1769, after gaining the high esteem of Frederick the Great. His *fables* have never been surpassed in German literature, and his narrations and moral essays occupy a creditable place in German literature, while his *comedies* are forgotten. He also composed some fifty-four hymns, which will give him a more enduring reputation than all his other writings. A translation of his hymn *Jesus lebt, mit ihm auch ich*, is given in Schaff's *Christ in Song*, p. 275. "In order to understand Gellert's position as spiritual song-writer, we must consider him with reference to his age. The *spirit* which was the basis of the old songs of Germany had altogether departed. Gellert's songs were so fully the expression of his pious inner nature that they found a hearty response in the breasts of many kindred natures. 'Never did he attempt a spiritual poem,' his biographer, Cramer, informs us, 'without carefully preparing himself, and striving with all his soul to experience previously the truth of his utterances. He then chose his most ecstatic moments for composition, and as soon as his ardor cooled he laid aside his pen until the golden moments came again. . . . Even among Roman Catholic circles Gellert's songs found a welcome reception. A country priest in the mountains of Bohemia had been so impressed by them that he wrote to Gellert and urged him to join the Catholic Church, since this Church could much better reward his good works than the Protestants were able to do. Also in Milan, Vienna, and other great Catholic cities, Gellert found many warm admirers. There can be more purely *Christian* songs than Gellert's; songs that would be the evidences of recent improvement in our language and literature, and might partake of more of the old fire of reformative times, or bear the romantic coloring of mysticism or recent orthodoxy; but all these perfections could not supply the place of the simple, glowing language of a Gellert, which was his expression of inner, self-experienced truth. Gellert will long remain the poet of our masses. By the agency of pious mothers he will long continue to plant the seeds of virtue in the hearts of tender youth; and where the later tendencies have not obliterated the old German method of domestic training, he will continue to save many a young man from the ways of sin. He will still console the sick and broken-hearted. And though but few of his songs have been reserved for use in our churches, even these few—for instance, the Easter song, *Jesus lives, and I live with him*—will continue to elevate our Christian congregations, and help them to gain the victory over the world. Gellert has not only influenced one generation by his songs, but has deeply affected succeeding ones. That humble man wished no higher honor than the salutation of any one whom he met, "You have saved my soul—you!" But in the coming world of bliss there will thousands meet him who on earth would have gladly done what the Prussian sergeant did, walk five miles to press the hand of the man who had saved his soul" (Hagenbach, *Recent Church History*, translated by J. F. Hurst). Among his works are, *Fabeln und Erzählungen* (Lpz. 1746);—*Geistliche Oden u. Lieder* (Lpz. 1757);—*Moralische Vorlesungen* (Schlegel and Hoyer, 1 pz. 1770);—*Sämmtliche Schriften* (Lpz. 1769-74, 10 vols.; 1840-41, 6 vols.; and 1853, 6 vols.). See J. C. Cramer, *Lebensbeschreibung* (Lpz.: 1774); H. Döring, *Lebensbeschreibung* (Greiz, 1833, 2 vols.); Eck, *Gellert's Empfehlung* (Lpz. 1770); F. Naumann, *Gellertbuch* (Dresd. 1854); Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* s. v.

**Gelmon.** See GILOH.

**Gem** (קָמָרִים or קָמָרִים, usually "precious stone"). The Hebrews, among whom, as among all Asiatic nations (see especially Heeren, *Jden*, I, i, 118 sq.), gems constituted an essential and highly-prized ornament of kings (2 Sam. xii, 30; Ezek. xxviii, 13), of the high-priest (Exod. xxviii, 17), and of distinguished persons generally (Judith, x, 21; xv, 15), especially when set in rings (Cant. v, 15), derived them chiefly from Arabia (see Ezek. xxvii, 22; 1 Kings x, 2) and India, by the overland as well as maritime traffic of the Phœnicians (Ezek. i. c.). In the time of Solomon they procured them themselves directly from Ophir (1 Kings x, 10 sq.). The art of cutting (engraving letters) and setting them was a highly respectable vocation (Exod. xxxv, 33). In the Bible (especially Exod. xxviii, 17 sq.; xxxix, 10 sq.; Ezek. xxviii, 13; Rev. xxi, 19 sq.) the following names and kinds of gems chiefly occur (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* iii, 7, 6; *War*, v, 5, 7; Epiphani. *Opp.* ii, 225; see Hiller, *Syntagn. hermen.* p. 83 sq.; De Dieu, on Exod. xxviii; Braun, *De vestit. sacerdot.* Hebr. II, viii, p. 497 sq.; Hartmann, *Hebräerinn.* i, 278 sq.; iii, 27 sq.; Bellermann, *Urim und Thummim*, p. 32 sq.; Eichhorn, *De gemmis sculptis Hebr.* in the *Commentat. Soc. Gotting.* rec. ii; Rosenmüller, *Alt. terth.* IV, i, 28 sq.; Wetstein, *A. T.* ii, 844 sq.). See ENGRAVING.

1. *O' dem*, קָמָרִים (Exod. xxviii, 17; xxxix, 10), according to the Sept. and Vulg., the *Sardius* (compare Rev. xxi, 20), i. e. *carneolium*, a well-known, mostly flesh-colored, semi-transparent gem, akin to the chalcedony, valued for its hardness, which, however, did not render it incapable of being cut. The most beautiful specimens come from Arabia (Niebuhr, *Beschr.* p. 142). Josephus (*War*, v, 5, 7) assigns the above meaning to the word; but elsewhere (*Ant.* l. c.) he calls it the *sardonyx*. (For other significations, see Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 26.) See SARDIUS.

2. *Pitdah'*, קָמָרִים (Exod. i. c.; Ezek. xxviii, 13; Job xxviii, 19), according to most of the versions, the *Topaz*, τὸπάζιον (Josephus τὸπάζιον), described by the Greeks as a gold-yellow stone (Strabo, xvi, 770; Diod. Siculus, iii, 39), although Pliny (xxvii, 32) assigns it a green color. Hence moderns have regarded the topaz of the ancients as our *chrysolite*. The passage in Job describes the mineral in question as coming from Cush, and Pliny (vi, 34) mentions a topaz-island in the Red Sea (comp. Diod. Sic. l. c.). The topaz now so called is a transparent, chiefly wine-colored or citron-yellow stone of the silicious species (Hoffmann, *Mineral.* i, 557 sq.; comp. Pareau, *Comment.* ad Job xxviii, p. 333 sq.). See TOPAZ.

3. *Bare'keth*, קָמָרִים (Exod. xxviii, 17; xxxix, 10; Ezek. xxviii, 13), according to the Sept., Vulg., and Josephus, the *Emerald* (Rev. xxi, 19; Tobit xiii, 21, etc.), grass-green, very hard, transparent, with double refraction (Pliny, xxxvii, 16 sq.). The Hebrews obtained this stone almost entirely from Egypt (Pliny, l. c.; comp. Braun, *Vestit.* p. 517 sq.; yet see Theophr. *Lapid.* xxiv). See CARBUNCLE.

4. *No'phet*, קָמָרִים (Exod. xxxix, 11; Ezek. xxvii, 16; xxviii, 13), according to the Sept. and Josephus, the *av'paz*, i. e. *Carbuncle*. By this name the ancients (Theophr. *Lapid.* xviii sq.; Pliny, xxxvii, 25) mostly designate red (like glowing coals) brilliant stones ("a similitudine ignium appellati," Pliny, l. c.), as rubies and garnets. But their most valued carbuncles appear to have been the Oriental or Indian rubies. They were engraved (Theophr. *Lapid.* xxi; comp. Eichhorn, *ut sup.* p. 12), which is also the case with the ruby, although they had a great degree of hardness—not greater, however, than the sapphire, which was likewise engraved. See EMERALD.

5. *Sappir'*, קָמָרִים (Exod. xxiv, 10; xxviii, 18; xxxix, 11; Ezek. xxviii, 13), σάπφειρος. Our *Sap-*

*phire* is sky blue (comp. Ezek. i, 26; Exod. xxiv, 10), transparent, and harder than the ruby. What the ancients so named must, according to the description (Pliny, xxxvii, 39; Theophr. *Lapid.* xxiii, xxxvii), be the *lapis lazuli*, azure-stone (Beckmann, *Erftw.* 111, i, 182 sq.). This is opaque, often shading into dark blue (violet), and sometimes has gold-colored quartzose spots (Hoffmann, *Mineral.* ii, 276 sq.; comp. i, 548). But as this stone is not so costly as to be justly estimated, as in Job xxviii, 16, nor possessed of sufficient hardness ("inutile sculptura," Pliny, l. c.) to correspond with its use in Exod. xxviii, it is probable that the Heb. term denotes the true sapphire, which occurs in notices of ancient gems. See SAPPHIRE.

6. *Yahalom'*, קָמָרִים (Exod. xxxix, 11; Ezek. xxviii, 13), by which most of the ancient versions and Josephus appear (if we can trace the order of the gems enumerated, see Bellermann, *ut sup.* p. 47) to understand the *Onyx* (Luther, with some of the Rabbins, the *Diamond*), a kind of *chalcedony*, in resembling the human nail with the flesh showing through. The simply so-called onyx (of the ancients) has milk-white or brown streaks, and is non-transparent, but takes on, when polished, a mirror-like lustre (Pliny, xxxvi, 12; xxxvii, 24). Eichhorn understands the *Beryl*. See DIAMOND.

7. *Le'shem*, קָמָרִים (Exod. xxviii, 19; xxxix, 12), Sept., Josephus, Vulg. *λεγιόνιον* (figure) or *λεγιόνιον*, i. e. *Jacinth* (as in Rev. xxi, 20), a transparent, hard, usually hyacinthine stone, but sometimes shading into yellow or brown. In the fire it loses its color. Many ancient cut specimens are still extant. See LIGURE.

8. *Shebo'*, קָמָרִים (Exod. xxviii, 19; xxxix, 12), Sept., Vulg., and Josephus *Agate* (ἀγάθης), a mixed sort of stone, consisting of quartz, chalcedony, carnelian, flint, jasper, and so forth, so that two kinds are usually compounded; hence agates have all possible ground-colors, with numerous streaks, spots, and even figures. The Oriental are finer than the European. In high antiquity they were very valuable, but later their value sank considerably (see Pliny, xxxvii, 54; Hoffmann, *Mineral.* i, 123 sq.). See AGATE.

9. *Achlamah'*, קָמָרִים (Exod. xxviii, 19), Sept., Vulg., *Amethyst* (ἀμύθυστος; comp. Rev. xxi, 20), a transparent, mostly violet-blue stone, usually found in a six-sided crystalline form, but sometimes pebble-shaped. The ancients prized it highly, especially the specimens from India. But Arabia and Syria also afforded amethysts (Pliny, xxxvii, 40). As the Greek name points to a superstitious attribute of the stone (dispelling intoxication; see Harduin, *ad Plin.* ii, 783), so the Heb. designation refers to another property (q. d. "dream-stone;" see Simonis, *Lex.* p. 331). See AMETHYST.

10. *Tarshish'*, קָמָרִים (Exod. xxviii, 20; xxxix, 13; Ezek. i, 16; Dan. x, 6, etc.), according to the Sept. (in the Pentat.) and Josephus (comp. Rev. xxi, 20), the *Chrysolite* (χρυσόλιθος). The stone now so called is generally found crystallized, and is of a pale green color, wholly transparent, with double refraction. According to Pliny (xxxvii, 42), the ancients appear to have had a yellow stone called the *chrysolite*, which would seem to have been our *topaz* (but compare Bellermann, *ut sup.* p. 62). Bredow (*Histor. Untersuch.* p. 295) would take the *tarshish* to be *amber*, as the name probably came from the place so called [see TARSHISH], whence the Phœnicians imported it; a not altogether unlikely view, inasmuch as *electrum* was well known in earliest antiquity, was highly prized, and bore an excellent polish (Pliny, xxxvii, 11). Nevertheless, the authority of the ancient versions must here prevail; and when our attention is once directed by the name to Spain, the statement of Pliny (xxxvii, 43) makes it clear that the *chrysolite* was also produced there. See BERYL.

11. *Sho'ham*, קָמָרִים (Gen. ii, 12; Exod. xxviii, 9;

Ezek. xxviii, 13; Job xxviii, 16, etc.), according to the Sept., Vulg., and most others, as well as Josephus (*Jar.*, nt sup.), the *Beryl* (Rev. xxi, 20), a pale green gem, passing at times into water-blue, at others into yellow, with a hexagonal crystallization, streaked longitudinally. The most esteemed specimens came from India (but comp. Dionys., *Perieg.* 1012), and were of a clear sea-green (Pliny, xxxvii, 20; see Hoffmann, *Mineral.* i, 601 sq.). The *chrysoprase* (λίθος ὁ παράστρος), which the Sept. has in the passage in Gen for *shoham*, may be the *beryl*. Many versions (with Braun, Michaelis, Eichhorn, Pareau, Ewald, and others) understand the *onyx* (see Huec, *De situ paradisi*, c. 11). Reland (following the Sept. in Exod. xxviii, 9, 20) holds it to be *emerald*, on the ground that Havilah (q. v.) was a part of Scythia, whence emeralds were obtained (Pliny, xxxvii, 16 and 17). See ONYX.

12. *Yashepheh'*, יַשְׁפֵּה or יַשְׁפֵּה (Exod. xxviii, 20; xxxix, 13; Ezek. xxviii, 13), according to the Sept., Vulg., and Josephus, the *Jasper* (comp. Rev. xxi, 19), a well-known opaque stone, sometimes of one, at others of many colors, of a shelly, compact fracture, granulous texture, often wrought by the ancients into gems and ornaments (Pliny, xxxvii, 37; comp. Fuller, *Miscell.* vi, 8). See JASPER.

13. *Kalkol'*, כַּלְכֹל (Ezek. xxvii, 16; Isa. liv, 12), and

14. *Ekdah'*, עֲדָה (Isa. ib.); both a red (fiery), brilliant, costly stone, like the ruby, garnet, etc. (see Hartmann, *Hebräer.* iii, 91 sq.). The ancient versions give no definite clew to the identity (see Gesenius, *Thees.* p. 600). See AGATE; CARUNCLE.

15. *Chrysoprase*, χρυσόπρασος (Rev. xxi, 20), a pale green stone, inclining to yellow or brown, and transparent (Pliny, xxxvii, 20). See CHRYSOPRASUS.

16. *Chalcedony*, χαλκιδών (Rev. xxi, 16), semi-transparent, sky-blue, with a dash of other colors (compare No. 8 above). See CHALCEDONY.

17. *Sardonyx*, σαρδόνυξ (Rev. xxi, 20), a mixture of the agate and carnelian (comp. No. 6 above), very highly valued by the ancients (Pliny, xxxvii, 23). See SARDONYX.

18. *Shamir'*, שָׁמִיר (Jer. xvii, 1; Ezek. iii, 9; Zech. vii, 12), according to the Sept. (in Jer.) and Vulg., the *Diamond*, the hardest of minerals (Pliny, xxxvii, 15), hence compared with adamant (Pinder, *De adamante*, Berl. 1829). Bochart (*Nieroz.* iii, 843 sq.) compares the *σμίρις* or *σμίρις* (σμιρτίτης λίθος, Job xli, 7 or 15, Sept.; comp. Veltheim in Velthusen's *Theolog. Magaz.* ii, 219 sq.), or *emery* (Diosc. v, 160), a quartzose earth mixed with calcined iron, used for polishing (Hoffmann, *Mineral.* i, 561 sq.); but the origin of this Greek word is not Shemitic (see Passow, s. v.).—Winer, i, 281. See DIAMOND.

See generally Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xxxvii, 14 sq.; Theophrastus, *Ἡσίο λίθων* (in *Opp.* iv, ed. Schneider); Rau, *Specim. e libris Achemed de gemmis* (Utr. 1784); Dutens, *Pierres précieuses* (Par. 1776. Lond. 1777); Mariette, *Pierres gravées* (Par. 1750); Blum, *Taschenbuch d. Edelsteink.* (2d ed. Stuttg. 1835); Hindmarsh, *Precious Stones of Scripture* (Lond. 1851); Anon. *Gems, ancient and modern* (Lond. 1852); King, *Antique Gems* (Lond. 1861); Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 437 sq. See MINERALOGY.

**Gemal'li** (Hebrew *Genallí'*, גִּמְלָלִי, camel-driver; Sept. Γαμάλι), the father of Ammiel, which latter was the Danite messenger among those who explored the land of Canaan (Numb. xiii, 12). B.C. ante 1657.

**Gemará.** See TALMUD.

**Gemari'ah** (Heb. *Gemaryah'*, גִּמְרִיָּה [Jer. xxix, 3], and in its prolonged form, *Gemarya'hu*, גִּמְרִיָּהּ, whom *Jehozah has made perfect*; Sept. Γαμαριάς), the name of two men.

1. The son of Shaphan, one of the nobles of Judah, and a scribe of the Temple in the time of Jehoiakim. B.C. 605. Baruch read aloud the prophecies of Jeremiah to the people at the official chamber of Gemariah (or from a window in it), which was attached to the new gate of the Temple built by king Jotham (Jer. xxxvi, 10; comp. 2 Kings xv, 35). Gemariah's son Michaiah having reported this to his father, Baruch was invited to repeat the reading at the scribe's chamber in the palace, before Gemariah and other scribes and councillors, who gave an account of the matter to the king (Jer. xxxvi, 11-20). Gemariah, with the other princes, heard the divine message with terror, but without a sign of repentance; though Gemariah joined two others in entreating king Jehoiakim to forbear destroying the roll which they had taken from Baruch (Jer. xxxvi, 21-25). See JEREMIAH.

2. The son of Hilkiah, who, with Elash, son of Shaphan, was sent to Babylon by king Zedekiah with his tribute-money for Nebuchadnezzar. He also took charge of a letter from Jeremiah to the Jewish captives at Babylon, warning them against the false prophets who deluded them by promises of a speedy return to their own land (Jer. xxix, 3, 4). B.C. 594. See JEREMIAH.

**Gems.** See GEM.

**Gená.** See GINA.

**Genealogy** (Γενεαλογία), literally the act or art of the γενεαλόγος, i. e. of him who treats of birth and family, and reckons descents and generations. Hence, by an easy transition, it is often (like *ιστορία*) used of the document itself in which such series of generations is set down. In Hebrew the term for a genealogy or pedigree is סֵפֶר הַיְהוּדָה, or סֵפֶר הַיְהוּדִים, "the book of the generations;" and because the oldest histories were usually drawn up on a genealogical basis, the expression is often extended to the whole history, as in the case of the Gospel of Matthew, where "the book of the generation of Jesus Christ" includes the whole history contained in that gospel. So Gen. ii, 4, "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth," seems to be the title of the history which follows. Gen. v, i; vi, 9; x, 1; xi, 10, 27; xxv, 12, 19; xxxvi, 1, 9; xxxvii, 2, are other examples of the same usage, and these passages seem to mark the existence of separate histories from which the book of Genesis was compiled. Nor is this genealogical form of history peculiar to the Hebrews or the Shemitic races. The earliest Greek histories were also genealogies. Thus the histories of Acusilaus of Argos and of Hecataeus of Miletus were entitled *Γενεαλογίαι*, and the fragments remaining of Xanthus, Charon of Lampascus, and Hellanicus are strongly tinged with the same genealogical element (comp. Josephus, *Apion*, i, 3), which is not lost even in the pages of Herodotus. The frequent use of the patronymic in Greek, the stories of particular races, as Heraclides, Alcmaeonidae, etc., the lists of priests, and kings, and conquerors at the games, preserved at Elis, Sparta, Olympia, and elsewhere; the hereditary monarchies and priesthoods, as of the Branchidae, Eumolpidae, etc., in so many cities in Greece and Greek Asia; the division, as old as Homer, into tribes, fratricae, and γέννη, and the existence of the *tribe*, the *gens*, and the *familia* among the Romans; the Celtic clans, the Saxon families using a common patronymic, and their royal genealogies running back to the Teutonic gods, these are among the many instances that may be cited to prove the strong family and genealogical instinct of the ancient world. Coming nearer to the Israelites, it will be enough to allude to the hereditary principle, and the vast genealogical records of the Egyptians, as regards their kings and priests, and to the passion for genealogies among the Arabs, mentioned by Layard and others, in order to show that the attention paid by the Jews to genealogies is in entire accordance with the manners and tendencies of their contemporaries.



In their case, however, it was heightened by several peculiar circumstances. The promise of the land of Canaan to the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob successively, and the separation of the Israelites from the Gentile world; the expectation of the Messiah as to spring from the tribe of Judah; the exclusively hereditary priesthood of Aaron with its dignity and emoluments; the long succession of kings in the line of David; and the whole division and occupation of the land upon genealogical principles by the tribes, families, and houses of fathers, gave a deeper importance to the science of genealogy among the Jews than perhaps in any other nation. We have already noted the evidence of the existence of family memoirs even before the flood, to which we are probably indebted for the genealogies in Gen. iv, v; and Gen. x, xi, etc., indicate the continuance of the same system in the times between the flood and Abraham. But with Jacob, the founder of the nation, the system of reckoning by genealogies (הַיְהוּדָה, or in the language of Moses, Numb. i, 18, הַיְהוּדָה) was much further developed. In Gen. xxxv, 22-26, we have a formal account of the sons of Jacob, the patriarchs of the nation, repeated in Exod. i, 1-5. In Gen. xlvi we have an exact genealogical census of the house of Israel about the time of Jacob's demise in Egypt. The way in which the former part of this census, relating to Reuben and Simeon, is quoted in Exod. vi, where the census of the tribe of Levi is all that was wanted, seems to show that it was transcribed from an existing document. When the Israelites were in the wilderness of Sinai, in the second month of the second year of the Exodus, their number was taken by divine command, "after their families, by the house of their fathers," tribe by tribe, and the number of each tribe is given "by their generations, after their families, by the house of their fathers, according to the number of the names, by their polls" (Numb. i, iii). This census was repeated 38 years afterwards, and the names of the families added, as we find in Numb. xxvi. According to these genealogical divisions they pitched their tents, and marched, and offered their gifts and offerings, and chose the spies. According to the same they cast the lots by which the troubler of Israel, Achan, was discovered, as later those by which Saul was called to the throne. Above all, according to these divisions, the whole land of Canaan was parcelled out amongst them. But now of necessity that took place which always has taken place with respect to such genealogical arrangements, viz. that by marriage, or servitude, or incorporation as friends and allies, persons not strictly belonging by birth to such or such a family or tribe, were yet reckoned in the census as belonging to them, when they had acquired property within their borders, and were liable to the various services in peace or war which were performed under the heads of such tribes and families. Nobody supposes that all the Cornelii, or all the Campbells, sprang from one ancestor, and it is in the teeth of direct evidence from Scripture, as well as of probability, to suppose that the Jewish tribes contained absolutely none but such as were descended from the twelve patriarchs. (Jul. Africanus, in his *Ep. to Aristides*, expressly mentions that the ancient genealogical records at Jerusalem included those who were descended from proselytes and *γεῖνῶται*, as well as those who sprang from the patriarchs. The registers in Ezra and Nehemiah include the Nethinim, and the children of Solomon's servants.) The tribe of Levi was probably the only one which had no admixture of foreign blood. In many of the Scripture genealogies, as e. g. those of Caleb, Joab, Segub, and the sons of Rephaiah, etc., in 1 Chron. iii, 21, it is quite clear that birth was not the ground of their incorporation into their respective tribes. See BECHER; CALEB. However, birth was, and continued to be throughout their whole national course, the foundation of all the Jewish organization, and the

reigns of the more active and able kings and rulers were marked by attention to genealogical operations. When David established the Temple services on the footing which continued till the time of Christ, he divided the priests and Levites into courses and companies, each under the family chief. The singers, the porters, the trumpeters, the players on instruments, were all thus genealogically distributed. In the active stirring reign of Rehoboam, we have the work of Iddo concerning genealogies (2 Chron. xii, 15). When Hezekiah reopened the Temple, and restored the Temple services which had fallen into disuse, he reckoned the whole nation by genealogies. This appears from the fact of many of the genealogies in Chronicles terminating in Hezekiah's reign, from the expression, "So all Israel were reckoned by genealogies" (1 Chron. ix, 1), immediately following genealogies which do so terminate, and from the narrative in 2 Chron. xxxi, 16-19, proving that, as regards the priests and Levites, such a complete census was taken by Hezekiah. It is indicated also in 1 Chron. iv, 41. We learn, too, incidentally from Prov. xxv, that Hezekiah had a staff of scribes, who would be equally useful in transcribing genealogical registers as in copying out Proverbs. So also in the reign of Jotham, king of Judah, who, among other great works, built the higher gate of the house of the Lord (2 Kings xv, 35), and was an energetic as well as a good king, we find a genealogical reckoning of the Reubenites (1 Chron. v, 17), probably in connection with Jotham's wars against the Ammonites (2 Chron. xxvii, 5). When Zerubbabel brought back the captivity from Babylon, one of his first cares seems to have been to take a census of those that returned, and to settle them according to their genealogies. The evidence of this is found in 1 Chron. ix, and the duplicate passage Neh. xi; in 1 Chron. iii, 19; and yet more distinctly in Neh. vii, 5, and xii. In like manner, Nehemiah, as an essential part of that national restoration which he labored so zealously to promote, gathered "together the nobles, and the rulers, and the people, that they might be reckoned by genealogy" (Neh. vii, 5; xii, 26). The abstract of this census is preserved in Ezra ii and Neh. vii, and a portion of it in 1 Chron. iii, 21-24. That this system was continued after their times, as far at least as the priests and Levites were concerned, we learn from Neh. xii, 22; and we have incidental evidence of the continued care of the Jews still later to preserve their genealogies in such passages of the apocryphal books as 1 Macc. ii, 1-5; viii, 17; xiv, 29, and perhaps Judith viii, 1; Tob. i, 1, etc. Passing on to the time of the birth of Christ, we have a striking incidental proof of the continuance of the Jewish genealogical economy in the fact that when Augustus ordered the census of the empire to be taken, the Jews in the province of Syria immediately went each one to his own city, i. e. (as is clear from Joseph going to Bethlehem, the city of David), to the city to which his tribe, family, and father's house belonged. Thus the return, if completed, doubtless exhibited the form of the old censuses taken by the kings of Israel and Judah.

Another proof is the existence of our Lord's genealogy in two forms, as given by Matthew and Luke. (See below.) The mention of Zacharias as "of the course of Abia," of Elizabeth as "of the daughters of Aaron," and of Anna, the daughter of Phanel, as "of the tribe of Aser," are further indications of the same thing (Luke i, 5; ii, 36). This conclusion is also expressly confirmed by the testimony of Josephus in the opening of his *Life*, § 1. There, after deducing his own descent, "not only from that race which is considered the noblest among the Jews, that of the priests, but from the first of the twenty-four courses" (the course of Jehoiarib), and on the mother's side from the Asmonæan sovereigns, he adds, "I have thus traced my genealogy as I have found it recorded in the public tables" (*ἐν ταῖς δημοσίαις δέλτοις ἀναγεγραμμένην*); and

again, *contr. Apion*, i, 7, he states that the priests were obliged to verify the descent of their intended wives by reference to the archives kept at Jerusalem; adding that it was the duty of the priests, after every war (and he specifies the wars of Antiochus Epiph., Pompey, and Q. Varus), to make new genealogical tables from the old ones, and to ascertain what women among the priestly families had been made prisoners, as all such were deemed improper to be wives of priests. As a proof of the care of the Jews in such matters, he further mentions that in his day the list of successive high-priests preserved in the public records extended through a period of 2000 years. From all this it is abundantly manifest that the Jewish genealogical records continued to be kept till near the destruction of Jerusalem. Hence we are constrained to disbelieve the story told by Africanus concerning the destruction of all the Jewish genealogies by Herod the Great, in order to conceal the ignobleness of his own origin. His statement is, that up to that time the Hebrew genealogies had been preserved entire, and the different families were traced up either to the patriarchs, or the *γεῖωροι* or mixed people; but that on Herod's causing these genealogies to be burnt, only a few of the more illustrious Jews who had private pedigrees of their own, or who could supply the lost genealogies from memory, or from the books of chronicles, were able to retain any account of their own lineage—among whom, he says, were the Desposyni, or brethren of our Lord, from whom was said to be derived the scheme (given by Africanus) for reconciling the two genealogies of Christ. But there can be little doubt that the registers of the Jewish tribes and families perished at the destruction of Jerusalem, and not before. Some partial records may, however, have survived that event, as it is probable, and indeed seems to be implied in Josephus's statement, that at least the priestly families of the dispersion had records of their own genealogy. We learn, too, from Benjamin of Tudela, that in his day the princes of the captivity professed to trace their descent to David, and he also names others, e. g. R. Calonymos, "a descendant of the house of David, as proved by his pedigree" (*Itin.* ed. Asher, i, 32), and R. Eleazar ben-Tsemach, "who possesses a pedigree of his descent from the prophet Samuel, and knows the melodies which were sung in the Temple during its existence" (*ib.* p. 106, etc.). He also mentions descendants of the tribes of Dan, Zabulon, and Naphtali, among the mountains of Khasvin, whose prince was of the tribe of Levi. The patriarchs of Jerusalem, so called from the Hebrew *אֲבֹתֵי יְרוּשָׁלַיִם*, claimed descent from Hillel, the Babylonian, of whom it is said that a genealogy, found at Jerusalem, declared his descent from David and Abital. Others, however, traced his descent from Benjamin, and from David only through a daughter of Shephathiah (*Wolf, B. II.* iv, 380). But, however tradition may have preserved for a while true genealogies, or imagination and pride have coined fictitious ones after the destruction of Jerusalem, it may be safely affirmed that the Jewish genealogical system then came to an end. Essentially connected as it was with the tenure of the land on the one hand, and with the peculiar privileges of the houses of David and Levi on the other, it naturally failed when the land was taken away from the Jewish race, and when the promise to David was fulfilled, and the priesthood of Aaron superseded by the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God. The remains of the genealogical *spirit* among the later Jews (which might, of course, be much more fully illustrated from Rabbinical literature) has only been glanced at to show how deeply it had penetrated into the Jewish national mind. It remains to be said that just notions of the nature of the Jewish genealogical records are of great importance with a view to the right interpretation of Scripture. Let it only be remembered that these records have respect to

political and territorial divisions, as much as to strictly genealogical descent, and it will at once be seen how erroneous a conclusion it may be, that all who are called "sons" of such or such a patriarch, or chief father, must necessarily be his very children. Just as in the very first division into tribes Manasseh and Ephraim were numbered with their uncles, as if they had been sons instead of grandsons (*Gen. xlviii, 5*) of Jacob, so afterwards the names of persons belonging to different generations would often stand side by side as heads of families or houses, and be called the sons of their common ancestor. For example, *Gen. xli, 21* contains grandsons as well as sons of Benjamin [see *BELAI*], and *Exod. vi, 24* probably enumerates the son and grandson of Assir as heads, with their father, of the families of the Korhites; and so in innumerable other instances. If any one family or house became extinct, some other would succeed to its place, called after its own chief father. Hence, of course, a census of any tribe drawn up at a later period would exhibit different divisions from one drawn up at an earlier. Compare, e. g. the list of courses of priests in Zerubbabel's time (*Neh. xii*) with that of those in David's time (*1 Chron. xxiv*). The same principle must be borne in mind in interpreting any particular genealogy. The sequence of generations may represent the succession to such or such an inheritance or headship of tribe or family rather than the relationship of father and son. Again, where a pedigree was abbreviated, it would naturally specify such generations as would indicate from what chief houses the person descended. In cases where a name was common the father's name would be added for distinction only. These reasons would be well understood at the time, though it may be difficult now to ascertain them positively. Thus, in the pedigree of Ezra, (*Ezra vii, 1-5*), it would seem that both Seraiah and Azariah were heads of houses (*Neh. x, 2*); they are both therefore named. Hilkiah is named as having been high-priest, and his identity is established by the addition "the son of Shallum" (*1 Chron. vi, 13*); the next named is Zadok, the priest in David's time, who was chief of the sixteen courses sprung from Eleazar, and then follows a complete pedigree from this Zadok to Aaron. But then, as regards the chronological use of the Scripture genealogies, it follows from the above view that great caution is necessary in using them as measures of time, though they are invaluable for this purpose whenever we can be sure that they are complete. What seems necessary to make them trustworthy measures of time is, either that they should have special internal marks of being complete, such as where the mother as well as the father is named, or some historical circumstance defines the several relationships, or that there should be several genealogies, all giving the same number of generations within the same termini. When these conditions are found, it is difficult to overrate the value of genealogies for chronology. In determining, however, the relation of generations to time, some allowance must be made for the station in life of the persons in question. From the early marriages of the princes, the average of even thirty years to a generation will probably be found too long for the kings.

Another feature in the Scripture genealogies which it is worth while to notice is the recurrence of the same name, or modification of the same name, such as Tobias, Tobit, Nathan, Mattatha, and even of names of the same signification, in the same family. This is an indication of the carefulness with which the Jews kept their pedigrees (as otherwise they could not have known the names of their remote ancestors); it also gives a clew by which to judge of obscure or doubtful genealogies. In some cases, however, this repetition seems to have resulted from erroneous transcription.

The Jewish genealogies have two forms, one giving the generations in a descending, the other in an ascending scale. Examples of the descending form may be

seen in Ruth iv, 18-22, or I Chron. iii. Of the ascending, I Chron. vi, 33-43; Ezra vii, 1-5. The descending form is expressed by the formula A begat B, and B begat C, etc.; or, the sons of A, B his son, C his son, etc.; or, the sons of A, B, C, D; and the sons of B, C, D, E; and the sons of C, E, F, G, etc. The ascending is always expressed in the same way. Of the two, it is obvious that the descending scale is the one in which we are most likely to find collateral descents, inasmuch as it implies that the object is to enumerate the heirs of the person at the head of the stem; and if direct heirs failed at any point, collateral ones would have to be inserted. In all cases, too, where the original document was preserved, when the direct line failed, the heir would naturally place his own name next to his predecessor, though that predecessor was not his father, but only his kinsman; whereas in the ascending scale there can be no failure in the nature of things. But neither form is in itself more or less fit than the other to express either proper or imputed filiation.

Females are named in genealogies when there is anything remarkable about them, or when any right or property is transmitted through them. See Gen. xi, 29; xxii, 23; xxv, 1-4; xxxv, 22-26; Exod. vi, 23; Numb. xxvi, 33; 1 Chron. ii, 4, 19, 35, 50, etc.

The genealogical lists of names are peculiarly liable to corruptions of the text, and there are many such in the books of Chronicles, Ezra, etc. Jerome speaks of these corruptions having risen to a fearful height in the Septuagint (*Præfat. in Parakip.*). In like manner, the lists of high-priests in Josephus are so corrupt, that the names are scarcely recognisable. This must be borne in mind in dealing with the genealogies.

The Bible genealogies give an unbroken descent of the house of David from the creation to the time of Christ. The registers at Jerusalem must have supplied the same to the priestly and many other families. They also inform us of the origin of most of the nations of the earth, and carry the genealogy of the Edomitish sovereigns down to about the time of Saul. Viewed as a whole, it is a genealogical collection of surpassing interest and accuracy (Rawlinson, *Herodot.* vol. i, ch. ii; Burrington, *Geneal. Tables of the Old and New Test.* London, 1836; Selden's *Works*, passim).—Smith, s. v.

GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST, the only one given in the New Testament.

I. *Object of this Genealogical Record.*—From the foregoing article it is evident that no nation was more careful to frame and preserve its genealogical tables than Israel. Their sacred writings contain genealogies which extend through a period of more than 3500 years, from the creation of Adam to the captivity of Judah. Indeed, we find from the books of Ezra and Nehemiah that the same carefulness in this matter was observed after the captivity; for in Ezra ii, 62 it is expressly stated that some who had come up from Babylon had sought their register among those that were reckoned by genealogy, but were not found; therefore were they, as polluted, removed from the priesthood. The division of the whole Hebrew nation into tribes, and the allotment to each tribe of a specified portion of the land of Canaan as an inalienable possession, rendered it indispensable that they should keep genealogical tables. God had, however, a still higher object than that of giving stability to property in Israel in leading successive generations of his people thus to keep an accurate list of their ancestry. That they should do this was especially required from the moment that the voice of prophecy declared that the promised Messiah should be of the seed of Abraham, of the posterity of Isaac, of the sons of Jacob, of the tribe of Judah, and of the family of David.

The Rabbins affirm that after the Captivity the Jews were most careful in keeping their pedigrees (*Babyl. Gemar. Gloss.* fol. xiv, 2). Since, however, the period of their destruction as a nation by the Romans, all their

tables of descent seem to be lost, and now they are utterly unable to trace the pedigree of any one Israelite who might lay claim to be their promised and still expected Messiah. Hence Christians assert, with a force that no reasonable and candid Jew can resist, that *Shiloh must have come*.

The priesthood of Aaron having ceased, the possession of the land of Canaan being transferred to the Gentiles, there being under the N.-T. dispensation no difference between circumcision and uncircumcision, Barbarian and Scythian, bond and free, there is but one whose genealogy it concerns us as Christians to be acquainted with, that of our Lord Jesus Christ. Him the prophets announced as the seed of Abraham, and the son of David, and the angels declared that to him should be given the throne of his father David, that he might reign over the house of Jacob forever. His descent from David and Abraham being therefore an essential part of his Messiahship, it was right that his genealogy should be given as a portion of gospel truth. Considering, further, that to the Jews first he was manifested and preached, and that his descent from David and Abraham was a matter of special interest to them, it seems likely that the proof of his descent would be one especially adapted to convince them; in other words, that it would be drawn from documents which they deemed authentic. Such were the genealogical records preserved at Jerusalem. See GENEALOGY. Now when to the above consideration we add the fact that the lineage of Joseph was actually made out from authentic records for the purpose of the civil census ordered by Augustus, it becomes morally certain that the genealogy of Jesus Christ was extracted from the public registers. Another consideration adds yet further conviction. It has often excited surprise that the genealogies of Christ should both seem to be traced through Joseph, and not Mary. But if these genealogies were those contained in the public registers, it could not be otherwise. In them Jesus, the son of Mary, the espoused wife of Joseph, could only appear as Joseph's son (comp. John i, 45). In transferring them to the pages of the gospels, the evangelists only added the qualifying expression "as was supposed" (Luke iii, 23, and its equivalent, Matt. i, 16).

We find other traces of the existence of the public tables of descent in the New Testament: the taxation spoken of by Luke ii, 2, 3, would clearly indicate this, for how could each one be able to go to his own city unless he knew the specific tribe to which he belonged? Hence it was, we think, that Paul was able with confidence to appeal to the Hebrews concerning the lineage of Christ, "for it is evident," says he, "that our Lord sprung out of Judah" (Heb. vii, 14; 2 Tim. ii, 8). To evince this beyond reasonable doubt, it pleased God to give us, by his inspired servants Matthew and Luke, these genealogies.

II. *Statement of the Subject.*—The following is a tabular view of these records, with which it will be convenient to compare the parallel lists as found in the Hebrew copies of the Old Testament.

No.	Luke iii, 23-38. (Inverted.)	Matt. i, 2-17.	Gen. v, x, xi, and Ruth iv.	1 Chron. i, ii, iii.
1.	Adam	Adam	Adam	Adam.
2.	Seth	Seth	Seth	Sheth.
3.	Enos	Enos	Enos	Enosh.
4.	Cainan	Cainan	Cainan	Kenan.
5.	Maleleel	Mahalaheel	Mahalaheel	Mahalaheel.
6.	Jared	Jared	Jared	Jered.
7.	Enoch	Enoch	Enoch	Henoeh.
8.	Methuselah	Methuselah	Methuselah	Methuselah.
9.	Lamech	Lamech	Lamech	Lamech.
10.	Noe	Noah	Noah	Noah.
11.	Sem	Shem	Shem	Shem.
12.	Arphaxad	Arphaxad	Arphaxad	Arphaxad.
13.	Cainan	.....	.....	.....
14.	Salah	Salah	Shelah	Shelah.
15.	Eber	Eber	Eber	Eber.
16.	Phalec	Peleg	Peleg	Peleg.
17.	Ragau	Reu	Reu	Reu.
18.	Sarouch	Serug	Serug	Serug.
19.	Nachor	Nahor	Nahor	Nahor.

No.	Luke iii, 23-38. (Inverted.)	Matt. i, 2-17.	Gen. v, x, xi, and Ruth iv.	1 Chron. i, ii, iii.
20.	Thara	.....	Terah	Terah.
21.	Abraam	Abraam	Abram	Abra(ha)m.
22.	Isaac	.....	Isaac	Isaac.
23.	Jacob	Jacob	.....	Israel.
24.	Joudas	Joudas	.....	Judah.
25.	Phares	Phares	Pharez	Pharez.
26.	Esrom	Esrom	Hezron	Hezron.
27.	Aram	Aram	Ram	Ram.
28.	Aminadab	Aminadab	Amminadab	Amminadab.
29.	Naason	Naason	Nahshon	Nahshon.
30.	Salmon	Salmon	Salmon	Salma.
31.	Booz	Booz	Booz	Boaz.
32.	Obed	Obed	Obed	Obed.
33.	Jessai	Jessai	Jesse	Jesse.
34.	David	David	David	David.
35.	Nathan	Solomon	.....	Solomon.
36.	Mattathia	Roboam	.....	Rehoboam.
37.	Mainan	.....	.....	.....
38.	Melea	.....	.....	.....
39.	Eliakeim	Abia	.....	Abia.
40.	Jonan	Asa	.....	Asa.
41.	Joseph	Josaphat	.....	Jehoshaphat.
42.	Jouda	Joram	.....	Joram.
43.	Simoon	.....	.....	Ahaziah.
44.	Levi	.....	.....	Joash.
45.	Matthai	.....	.....	Amaziah.
46.	Joreim	Ozias	.....	Azariah.
47.	Eliezer	Jotham	.....	Jotham.
48.	Jese	Ahaz	.....	Ahaz.
49.	Er	Ezekias	.....	Hezekiah.
50.	Elmodam	Manasses	.....	Manasseh.
51.	Cosam	Amon	.....	Amon.
52.	Addi	Josias	.....	Josiah.
53.	Melehi	Jechonias	.....	Jehoiakim.
54.	Neri	.....	.....	Jechoniah.
55.	Salathiel	Salathiel	.....	Salathiel and Pedaiah.
56.	Zorobabel	Zorobabel	.....	Zerubbabel.
57.	.....	.....	.....	Hananiah.
58.	Rhesa	.....	.....	Pelathiah and Rephaiah.
59.	Joanna	.....	.....	Arnan.
60.	Joudas	Abioud	.....	Obadiah.
61.	Joseph	Eliakeim	.....	Shechaniah.
62.	Scimi	.....	.....	Shemaiah.
63.	Mattathias	.....	.....	.....
64.	Maath	.....	.....	.....
65.	Naggai	.....	.....	.....
66.	Esi	Azor	.....	.....
67.	Naoum	.....	.....	.....
68.	Amos	.....	.....	.....
69.	Mattathias	Sadek	.....	.....
70.	Janna	Acheim	.....	.....
71.	Jouba	Elioud	.....	.....
72.	Melehi	Eliouad	.....	.....
73.	Levi	Elezar	.....	.....
74.	Matthai	Matthan	.....	.....
75.	Eli	Jacob	.....	.....
76.	Joseph	Joseph	.....	.....
77.	Jesca	Jesca	.....	.....

ted generations in the latter part of the list. See RAHAB; RUTH.

On the other hand, the names Menan and Melea, also Mattathias and Maath, seem to be superfluous repetitions of others in the same list.

1. *Difficulties that apply to the Evangelists INDIVIDUALLY.*—(1.) It is objected that Jechoniah was not the son of Josiah, but his grandson. Answer: Matthew does not mean to say he was his son; for verses 11 and 12 are obviously intended to designate two different persons, viz. *Jehoiakim*, and his son *Jehoiachin*. That the former is the person meant in ver. 11 is evident from the addition of "his brethren." Whose brethren? Not Jehoiachin's (or Jechonias), for he had none, but Jehoiakim's, viz. Jehoahaz and Zedekiah, the former of whom reigned before him (though a younger brother), and the latter after him (1 Chron. iii, 15-17). Admitting this, we see the consistency of the evangelist as to the number of generations in the second and third series; whereas they who make Jechonias (ver. 11, 12) to be the same person leave only thirteen in the second series, if Jechonias be added to the third; or in the third, if he be placed to the second. If the objection had any truth, the evangelist would be palpably inconsistent with himself! St. Jerome (*in Matthæum*, cap. i) confirms this view: "If Jechonias be included in the first tessarodecade there will not be fourteen generations; we may therefore assume that the first Jechonias meant *Joakim* and the latter *Joachin*—the one spelt with the letters *k* and *m*, the other with *ch* and *n*; which letters, in the course of time, by fault of transcribers, were confounded by Greeks and Latins." Porphyry brought forward this objection against Matthew's genealogy, and we find the same father, in his *Comment. on Daniel*, thus replying: "In the Gospel of Matthew one generation seems to be wanting, for the second tessarodecade ends with Joakim, the son of Josiah, and the third begins with Joachin, the son of Joakim. Porphyry, ignorant of this, would exhibit his own skill in proving the falsity of the evangelist Matthew." We may add that some respectable MSS. still exhibit the name of Jehoiakim as well as that of Jechonias. (See Strong's *Greek Harmony of the Gospels*, ad loc.) The triple series of fourteen generations will therefore stand thus

1. Abraham.	1. Solomon.	1. Jechoniah.
2. Isaac.	2. Rehoboam.	2. Salathiel.
3. Jacob.	3. Abijah.	3. Zerubbabel.
4. Judah.	4. Aza.	4. Abiad.
5. Phares.	5. Jehshaj hat.	5. Eliakim.
6. Esrom.	6. Jehoram.	6. Azor.
7. Aram.	7. Uzziab.	7. Sadek.
8. Aminadab.	8. Jotham.	8. Achim.
9. Nanson.	9. Abaz.	9. Eliud.
10. Salmon.	10. Hezekiah.	10. Eleazar.
11. Boaz.	11. Manasseh.	11. Matthan.
12. Obed.	12. Amon.	12. Jacob.
13. Jesse.	13. Josiah.	13. Joseph.
14. David.	14. <i>Jehoiakim</i> .	14. Jesus.

III. *Solution of Difficulties.*—We do not find that there was any objection made to these genealogies, either by Jew or Gentile, during the 1st century. Had any difficulty on this head existed, we may reasonably suppose that the Jews, of all others, would have been but too ready to detect and expose it. We may, therefore, fairly conclude that, whatever difficulty meets us now in harmonizing our Lord's pedigree as given by the two evangelists, it could have had no place in the first age of the Christian Church. In subsequent ages, however, objections were and still are made to the genealogies of Matthew and Luke.

A preliminary difficulty, which applies, however, equally to the O.-T. lists, lies in the small number of names between Judah and David, being only nine for an interval of 833 years, making the incredible average of nearly a century for each generation. Hence arises the presumption that some names have been omitted (see Browne, *Ordo Sacclorum*, p. 283), and at least three—more probably *nine*—must be supplied, in order to reduce this average to the ordinary age of paternity; three, Judah, Boaz, and Jesse, are known to have been advanced in life at the birth of their youngest sons, and Salmon was considerably so. The synchronism of Nahshon with the Exode, and Boaz with the earlier judges, requires the insertion of these omit-

(2.) It is objected that Matthew omits three kings, viz. Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah (comp. 1 Chron. iii, and 2 Kings viii), from his second series. In reference to this objection, it might suffice to say that Matthew, finding fourteen generations from Abraham to David inclusively, contracted, most likely in order to assist memory and give uniformity, the second, and possibly the last series. If we compare Ezra vii, 1-5 with 1 Chron. vi, 3-15, it will be seen that Ezra, in detailing, with apparent particularity, his own lineal descent from Aaron, calls Azariah, who was high-priest at the dedication of the first Temple, the son, not of Johanan his father, but of Meraioth, his ancestor at the distance of six generations. Doubtless the desire of abridgment led him to omit those names with which there were connected no very remarkable associations. Some of the early fathers, however, give a different solution of this difficulty. Hilary (*in Matthæum*, cap. i) says: "Three generations are designedly passed

over by Matthew, for Jaras is said to have begotten Ozias, when, in fact, he was the fourth from him, i. e. Jaras begat Oehazias from the Gentile family of Ahab, whose wife was Jezebel." That the omission of the three kings was a punishment inflicted upon the house of guilty Joram to the fourth generation is the view yet more pointedly put forth by St. Jerome also, and by many of our own best commentators. See SOX.

(3.) Moreover, it is said that Matthew terms Zorobabel the son of Salathiel, whereas in 1 Chron. iii, 19, he is called the son of *Pedaiah*. How is this? We answer that the Sept. version of 1 Chron. iii agrees with Matthew, and that this is the manner in which Zorobabel is designated in Ezra, Nehemiah, and Haggai. Josephus also calls him the son of Salathiel. Were he not the immediate son of Salathiel, but of *Pedaiah*, yet is it suitable to the language of the Jewish nation to count the grandson the son of the grandfather. Thus Laban is called the son of Nahor (Gen. xxix, 5), as being the son of Bethuel, who was, in fact, the son of Nahor (xxiv, 47). If, according to another manner of rendering ver. 17 and 18, Salathiel and *Pedaiah* were brothers, Zorobabel might have been, by the Levirate law, the natural son of the one and the legal son of the other. See *PEDAIAH*.

(4.) It is again asked, if it be, as Matthew states, that Salmon, son of Naason, prince of Israel, had married so remarkable a person as Rahab, how then comes it that such a circumstance is not noticed in the book of Joshua? This objection will have no force if we remember that this book, full as it is in describing the partition of Canaan among the several tribes, is yet very silent concerning the exploits, and even names, of the subordinate leaders of Israel. There is nothing, therefore, surprising in the circumstance that it should pass over in total silence Salmon's marriage with Rahab. Had the matter in question been the espousal of Rahab by Joshua himself, the presumption against its truth would be very different. Indeed Kimchi, in his *Commentary on the Book of Joshua*, alludes a tradition to this effect, taken from the Babylonian Talmud. Every consideration, moreover, of a *chronological* character is in favor of the circumstance of the son of Naason, born to him in the wilderness, being married to Rahab. See *RAHAB*.

(5.) But a far graver objection than that which is alleged against Matthew for having omitted names is brought against Luke for having inserted that of *Cainan* as son of Arphaxad—a name neither to be found in the Hebrew nor Samaritan text, nor yet in any of the Targums or versions, save the Sept. We may infer from the fact that neither Philo nor Josephus, who in other respects followed this version, receive this name as genuine, that it was not found in the earlier copies of the Sept.: it was, no doubt, borrowed from the corrupted Sept. which has come down to us, containing the name in question, but which cannot, with any propriety, be raised to a level of authority with the Heb. text. It is clear, moreover, that Irenæus, Africanus, Eusebius, and Jerome reject it as an interpolation. [See, on this subject, Whitty's *Preface to the Reader*, and Lightfoot's *Harm.*; also Usher's *Dissertation on Cainan*, and Kidder's *Demonstr. of Messiah.*] See *CAINAN*.

2. We are now to compare the evangelists as to the points on which they agree and differ. It does not appear that Celsum attacked the genealogies on the score of any *inconsistency* with each other. Not so the emperor Julian; he made their discrepancies the specific ground of attack. Jerome (*in Matt.* i) thus writes: "Julianus Augustus in this place attacks the evangelists on the ground of *discrepancy*: Matthew calls Joseph the son of Jacob, whereas Luke calls him the son of Heli! Had Julian been better acquainted with the modes of speech of the Jews, he would have seen that one evangelist gives the natural and the other the legal pedigree of Joseph."

(1.) The first solution of the apparent discrepancies of the evangelists (one to which this ancient father obviously here alludes) is that of Africanus, which, he informs us (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* i, 7), he received from the relatives of our Lord, who, because of their consanguinity to him, were called *Δεσπόσωνοι*. It is to the effect that Matthan, the third in the list from Joseph in Matthew's genealogy, and Melchi, the third in Luke's list, married successively the same woman, by whom the former begat Jacob, and the latter Heli. Heli dying without issue, his maternal brother took his widow to wife, by whom he had Joseph, who, according to law (Deut. xxv, 6), was registered by Luke as the son of Heli, though naturally the son of Jacob, as Matthew records him. This is the explanation which was generally admitted by Eusebius, Nazianzen, the writer of *Ad orthodoxos*, and others, *for ages*.

(2.) Grotius, however, availing himself of the tradition that Heli and Jacob were both sons of the same mother, but of different fathers (Matthan and Melchi), supposes that Luke traces the *natural* pedigree of Christ, and Matthew the *legal*. This he argues on two grounds: first, that Salathiel *could not* have been the natural son of Jechonias, who was *childless*—according to the declaration of God by Jeremiah (xxii)—and was, therefore, as Luke states, the son, properly so called, of Neri, of Nathan's line; and, secondly, that the *Levirate* law imposed no necessity on Jacob to marry Heli's widow, they being only *uterine* brothers. The learned commentator might have been led to this view by St. Ambrose, who, in his *Commentary on Luke*, says, "Heli, fratre sine liberis decedente, copulatus est fratris uxori, et generavit filium Joseph, qui juxta legem Jacobi filius dicitur." But both the reasons assigned by Grotius for differing from the solution of Africanus would seem to be founded on a *petitio principii*. It does not appear an ascertained fact that Salathiel was not the natural son of Jechonias, nor yet that the law which obliged a man to marry the widow of his deceased brother might be departed from when they were only *maternal* brethren; for even in cases of distant relationship the law seemed obligatory, as we see in the case of Boaz marrying Ruth, the widow of his distant kinsman. Whitty defends Africanus's account; Hammond, Le Clerc, and Wetstein agree with Grotius.

(3.) Dr. Barrett, who, in his preliminary dissertation to a curious *fac-simile* of a most ancient MS. of Matthew's Gospel (an abridgment of which treatise may be found in Clarke's *Commentary*, at the end of Luke iii), brings to bear upon this difficult question a large share of sound learning and correct criticism, objects to the above theory as given by Africanus and altered by Grotius, on the ground principally that it refers entirely to the descent of Joseph from David, without attempting to prove that the son of Mary was the son of David. Dr. Barrett then states his own hypothesis, viz., that Matthew relates the genealogy of Joseph, and Luke that of Mary. He supposes a sufficient reason, that after Matthew had given his genealogical table another should be added by Luke, fully to prove that Christ, according to the flesh, derived his descent from David, not only by his supposed father Joseph, but also by his real mother Mary. The writers who agree in this opinion Dr. B. divides into two classes: first, those who assert that the families of Solomon and Nathan met in Salathiel and Zorobabel, after which they separated, and were again reunited in Joseph and Mary; secondly, those who suppose that Salathiel and Zorobabel were distinct individuals, and deny that any union took place between them previously to the marriage of Joseph and Mary. He rejects this latter opinion because it seems to contradict the divine promise (2 Sam. vii, 12-16), which intimates that Christ should be *lineally* descended from David through *Solomon*. He therefore receives the former hypothesis, and supports it by numerous and profound arguments. (See his *Preliminary Dissertation to Codex Rescriptus*; see

also, on both hypotheses, Lightfoot's *Harmony Ev.*; South's *Sermon on Rev. xii, 16*, vol. iii; Wetstein, *ad Matthæum*, i, 17; Bishop Kidder's *Demonst. of Messiah*, part. ii to ch. xiii; Hale's *Analysis of Chronology*, vol. iii.)

In constructing their genealogical tables, it is well known that the Jews reckoned wholly by males, rejecting, where the blood of the grandfather passed to the grandson through a daughter, the name of the daughter herself, and counting that daughter's husband for the son of the maternal grandfather (Numb. xxvi, 33; xxvii, 4-7). On this principle Joseph, begotten by Jacob, marries Mary, the daughter of Heli, and in the genealogical register of his wife's family is counted for Heli's son. Salathiel, begotten by Jecaniah, marries the daughter of Neri, and, in like manner, is accounted his son: in Zorobabel, the offspring of Salathiel and Neri's daughter, the lines of Solomon and Nathan coalesce; Joseph and Mary are of the same tribe and family; they are both descendants of David in the line of Solomon; they have in them both the blood of Nathan, David's son. Joseph deduces his descent from Abiud (Matt. i, 13), Mary from Rhesa (Luke iii, 27), sons of Zorobabel. The genealogies of Matthew and Luke are parts of one perfect whole, and each of them is essential to the explanation of the other. By Matthew's table we prove the descent of Mary, as well as Joseph, from Solomon; by Luke's we see the descent of Joseph, as well as Mary, from Nathan. But still it is asked how know we that Mary was the daughter of Neri?

[1.] Because the angel Gabriel, at the Annunciation, told the Virgin that God would give her divine son the throne of his father David (Luke i, 32), and thus it was necessary to prove this by her genealogy afterwards.

[2.] Mary is called by the Jews ברת עלי, "the daughter of Heli," and by the early Christian writers "the daughter of Joakim and Anna" (Lightfoot, *on Luke* iii, 23). But Joakim and Eliakim (as different names in Hebrew for God) are sometimes interchanged (2 Chron. xxxvi, 4): Eli or Heli, then, is the abridgment of Eliakim.

[3.] The evangelist Luke has critically distinguished the *real* from the *legal* genealogy by a parenthetical remark: Ἰησοῦς ὢν (ὡς ἐνομιάζετο) υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ, τοῦ Ἥλι, "Jesus being (as was reputed) the son of Joseph (but in reality), the son of Heli," or his grandson by the mother's side, for so the ellipsis should be supplied. Moreover, on comparing the two tables, we find that from Abraham to David they agree with each other because they are in accordance with the genealogies of Genesis, Ruth, and 1 Chron. iii; but from David to Joseph they are evidently distinct lines of pedigree, agreeing only in two persons, viz. Salathiel and Zorobabel.

Again, it is objected that there are now in Luke's genealogy seventy-seven names; whereas Ireneus, Africanus, and other early fathers, acknowledge but seventy-two. But if we omit the names *Maath*, *Mattathias*, *Melen*, *Mainan*, and *Cuinan*, as being interpolations, then the number will be reduced to seventy-two.

It is said that Abiud and Rhesa are called by the evangelists the sons of Zorobabel, though in 1 Chron. iii, 19 we have no mention of them among his sons. We remark that it was a custom with the Jews to call the same person by different names, and that this custom was peculiarly prevalent about the time of the captivity (Dan. i, 6, 7; also comp. 2 Sam. iii, 3 with 1 Chron. iii, 1).


Lastly, it is inquired whence the evangelists had their genealogies from Zorobabel to Christ, there being nothing of them to be found in Scripture. We answer, from those authentic public tables kept by the Jews, of which, as before noticed, Josephus speaks; and regarding which also Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* i, 1)

says, "Omnes Hebræorum generationes descriptæ in archivis Templi secretioribus habebantur." It was doubtless from this source that they had the above-named parts of our Lord's legal and natural pedigree; for, otherwise, they would have exposed themselves to the cavils of the Jews; nor could the apostles have appealed, as they did, with confidence, to Christ's pedigree, as answering all the requirements of prophecy. —Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

No.	Luke iii.	Maternal Line.	Born. B.C.	Paternal Line.	Born. B.C.	Matt. i.
1.	38.	ADAM.....	(4172)			
2.		Seth.....	3041			
3.		Enos.....	3936			
4.	37.	Cuinan.....	3846			
5.		Mahlahael.....	3776			
6.		Jared.....	3711			
7.		Enoch.....	3549			
8.		Melusealah.....	34-4			
9.	36.	Lamech.....	3297			
10.		Noah.....	3115			
11.		Shem.....	3013			
12.		Arphaxad.....	2513			
		Cuinan.....				
13.	35.	Salah.....	2478			
14.		Eber.....	2448			
15.		Peleg.....	2414			
16.		Reu.....	2384			
17.		Serug.....	2352			
18.	34.	Nahor.....	2322			
19.		ABRAHAM.....	2293			
20.		ISAC.....	2183	ABRAHAM.....	2183	2
21.		Isac.....	2063	Isac.....	2063	
22.		Jacob.....	2003	Jacob.....	2003	
23.	33.	Judah.....	1916	Judah.....	1916	
24.		Pharez.....	1860	Pharez.....	1860	3
25.		Herezon.....	1820	Herezon.....	1820	
26.		Rair.....	1750	Rair.....	1750	
27.		Aminadab.....	1740	Aminadab.....	1740	4
28.	32.	Nahshon.....	1700	Nahshon.....	1700	
29.		Salmon.....	1660	Salmon.....	1660	
30.		[Unknown].....	1610	[Unknown].....	1610	5
31.		[Unknown].....	1570	[Unknown].....	1570	
32.		[Unknown].....	1530	[Unknown].....	1530	
33.		[Unknown].....	1500	[Unknown].....	1500	
34.		[Unknown].....	1460	[Unknown].....	1460	
35.		Boaz.....	1430	Boaz.....	1430	
36.		Obed.....	1360	Obed.....	1360	
37.		[Unknown].....	1325	[Unknown].....	1325	
38.		[Unknown].....	1285	[Unknown].....	1285	
39.		[Unknown].....	1245	[Unknown].....	1245	
40.		[Unknown].....	1210	[Unknown].....	1210	
41.		Jesse.....	1170	Jesse.....	1170	
42.	31.	DAVID.....	1083	DAVID.....	1083	6
43.		Nathan.....	1032	Solomon.....	1032	
44.		Mattathiah.....	1008	Rehobam.....	1014	7
		Matan.....				
		Melen.....				
45.	30.	Eliakim.....	984	Abijah.....	992	
46.		Jonn.....	959	Ass.....	970	
47.		Joseph.....	935	Jehoshaphat.....	947	8
48.		Adajah (Judah).....	901	Jehoram.....	908	
49.		Musselah (Simeon).....	885	Abaziah.....	892	
50.	29.	Levi.....	862	Jehoshaphat.....	884	
51.		Mattath.....	838	Amaziah.....	862	
52.		Jorin.....	818	Uzziah.....	824	
53.		Elizer.....	789	Jotham.....	806	9
54.		Joseph.....	765	Boaz.....	770	
55.	28.	Er.....	741	Heczekiah.....	751	
56.		Elmodan.....	717	Manasseh.....	709	10
57.		Cosen.....	692	Amon.....	664	
58.		Abas.....	678	Josiah.....	648	
59.		Musselah (Melch).....	644	Jehokim.....	634	11
60.	27.	Neriah.....	620	Jecaniah.....	616	
		[A daughter].....	597	[Captivity].....		
61.		SALATHIEL, stepfather of.....	580	SALATHIEL, uncle of.....	580	12
62.		Zorobabel.....	560	Zerubbabel.....	560	
63.		[Humaniak].....	530	[Hannaniah].....	530	
64.		Rephaniah (Resab).....	500	[Rephaniah].....	500	
65.		Arnan (Jonniah).....	470	Arnan.....	470	
66.	26.	Obediah (Judah).....	440	Obediah (Abiud).....	440	13
67.		Schechaniah (Joseph).....	410	Schechaniah (Eliakim).....	410	
68.		Shemaiah (Semei).....	380	[Shemaiah].....	380	
		Mattathiah.....				
69.	25.	Maath.....	350	[Nerialiah].....	350	
70.		Nerialah (Nagad).....	320	Azrikam (Azor).....	310	
71.		Elioenai (Ezi).....	285	[Unknown].....	280	
72.		Johannan (Nahum).....	255	[Unknown].....	250	
73.		Amoz.....	225	[Unknown].....	220	
74.		Mattathiah.....	195	Sadok.....	190	14
75.	24.	Joseph.....	165	Jachim.....	160	
76.		Jaunsh.....	135	Elud.....	130	
77.		Melchi.....	105	Elezar.....	100	15
78.		Levi.....	75	Matthan.....	70	
79.		Matthath.....	45	Jacob.....	40	
80.	23.	Eli.....	25	Joseph, stepfather of.....	20	
		Mary.....	25	father of.....	20	16
		JESUS.....	0	JESUS.....	0	

(4.) Rejecting all the above identifications and Levirate marriages, Lord Hervey (*Genealogies of our Lord*, Cambr. 1853) contends that both evangelists give the genealogy of Joseph, Matthew's being the legal or royal line, and Luke's the private. He supposes that Mary was the daughter of Jacob, and thus the first cousin of Joseph. The discrepancies in the latter names of the two lists he attempts to reconcile by supposing "Rhesa" to be merely a title (Chald. for prince) of Zorobabel, so that "Joanna" of Luke will

be the "Hananiah" of 1 Chron., but omitted by Matt.; then identifying Matthew's "Abiad" with Luke's "Juda," and both with the "Hodaiah" of 1 Chron.; also Matthew's "Matthan" with Luke's "Matthat;" and finally cutting off all the remaining names in 1 Chron., and supposing a number of generations to have been omitted in the following names of Matthew; so that the lists will, in this part, stand thus:



The violent character of these suppositions is sufficiently obvious. (See each name in its place.)

(5.) Others, like Alford (*Comment. ad loc.*), content themselves with saying that solution is impossible without further knowledge than we possess. But this is a view in which, with the actual documents before us, few will be disposed to acquiesce.

See, in addition to the works already referred to, Mill, *Indication of the Genealogies* (Cambridge, 1842); Beeston, *Geneal. of Matt. and Luke* (3d ed. Lond. 1842); *Jour. Sac. Lit.* July, 1856; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* Oct. 1852, p. 593 sq.; Schleyer, in the *Theolog. Quartalschr.* 1836. Older treatises may be seen in Darling's *Cyclop. Bibliograph.* ii, col. 771 sq., 1854; Volbigen, *Index*, p. 7; Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 51. See LINEAGE.

**Genebrard**, GILBERT, a celebrated Benedictine, was born at Rioni, in Auvergne, in 1537. Having entered into the Benedictine order at the abbey of Mauseac, he studied at Paris, where he learned Greek under Turnebius. In 1569 he was made professor of Hebrew at the Royal College of Navarre. In 1592 he was made archbishop of Aix by Gregory XIV. He had, in the same year, published a "Treatise of Elections" (*De Sacrarum Electionum Jure et necessitate, ad Ecclesie Gallicane Reintegrationem*), in which he maintained that the elections of bishops belong of right to the clergy and people, and argued acutely against the nominations of kings and princes. The Parliament of Aix in 1596 decreed that his book should be burnt by the hands of the common executioner, and, after depriving the author of his see, condemned him to banishment from the kingdom, prohibiting his return to it on pain of death. He was afterwards permitted to return to his priory at Semur, where he died March 24, 1597. Genebrard was one of the most learned men of his time. He wrote in Latin, besides the work above mentioned, and others of which a list is given in Dupin, *A*

*Sacred Chronology* (8vo).—*Notes upon the Scripture*.—*A Commentary upon the Psalms* (8vo), in which he particularly applies himself to reconcile the Hebrew text with the vulgar Latin, and defends the Septuagint version; the best edition is that of Paris (1588, fol.).—*A Translation of the Canticles into Iambic Verse*.—*Notes upon the Hebrew Grammar*. He published an edition of *Origen's Works*, with a Latin version (1578); and a translation into French of *Josephus* (2 vols. 8vo).—*Dupin, Eccl. Writers*, cent. xvi; *Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xix, 865; *Hook, Eccl. Biog.* v, 287.

**General** (of religious order), "in the Roman Catholic Church, the supreme head, under the pope, of the aggregated communities throughout Christendom belonging to a religious order. The governing authorities of the monastic orders in the Roman Catholic Church may be arranged in three classes: (1.) The superiors of individual convents or communities, called in different orders by the various names of abbot, prior, rector, guardian, etc.; (2.) The provincials, who have authority over all the convents of an entire province—the provinces, in the monastic sense of the word, being usually coincident as to local limits with the several kingdoms in which the order is established; (3.) The general, to whom not only each member of the order, but all the various officials of every rank, are absolutely subject. The general is usually elected by the general chapter of the order, which, in the majority of orders, consists properly of the provincials, with whom, however, are commonly associated the heads of the more important monasteries, as also the superiors of certain subdivisions of provinces. The office of general in most orders is held for three years. In that of the Jesuits it is for life; but in all, the election of the general chapter must be confirmed by the pope. In most orders, too, there is assigned to the general a consultor (*almonitor*) or associate (*socius*), who, however, is entitled to advise, but has no authority to control the superior. The general, also, is supposed to consult with and to receive reports from the various local superiors. He sends, if necessary, a visitor to inquire into particular abuses, or to report upon such controversies as may arise, and he holds a general chapter of the order at stated times, which differ according to the usage of the several orders. The general is exempt from episcopal jurisdiction, being subject to the immediate jurisdiction of the pope himself. He resides in Rome, where he enjoys certain privileges, the most important of which is the right to sit and vote with the bishops in a general council of the Church."—*Chambers, Encyclopædia*, s. v.

**General Assembly.** See ASSEMBLY, GENERAL.

**General Councils.** See COUNCILS.

**General-Vicar.** See VICAR-GENERAL.

**Generation** (הַגֵּרָה, *γένεσις*, the act; *γέννημα*, the result; הַיּוֹר, *γενεά*, a period). Considerable obscurity attends the use of this word in the English version, which arises from the translators having merged the various meanings of the same original word, and even of several different words, in one common term, "generation." The remark, too, is just, that in the literal translations of the Scriptures, the word "generation" generally occurs wherever the Latin has *generatio*, and the Greek *γενεά* or *γένεσις* (*Rees's Encyclopædia*, article Generation). The following instances seem to require the original words to be understood in some one of their derivative senses: Gen. ii, 4, "These are the generations" (הַגֵּרָה); Sept. ἡ βιβλὸς τῆς γενέσεως; *Vulg. generationes*), rather "origin," "history," etc. The same Greek words, Matt. i, 1, are rendered "genealogy," etc., by recent translators: *Campbell* has "lineage." Gen. v, 1, "The book of the generations" (סֵפֶר הַגֵּרָה); Sept. as before; *Vulg. liber generationis*) is properly a *family register*, a history

of Adam. The same words, Gen. xxxvii, 2, mean a history of Jacob and his descendants; so also Gen. vi, 9; x, 1, and elsewhere. Gen. vii, 1, "In this generation" (בְּיָמֵינוּ; Sept. *ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ τάρτην*, Vulg. *in generatione hac*) is evidently "in this age." Gen. xv, 6, "In the fourth generation" (דָּוָר; Sept. *γενεᾷ*, Vulg. *generatio*) is an instance of the word in the sense of a *certain assigned period*. Psa. xlix, 19, "The generation of his fathers" (דָּוָר אֲבוֹתָיו; Sept. *γενεᾶς πατέρων αὐτοῦ*) Gesenius renders "the dwelling of his fathers," i. e. the grave, and adduces Isa. xxxviii, 12. Psa. lxxiii, 15, "The generation of thy children" (דָּוָר בְּנֵיךָ; Sept. *γενεᾷ τῶν υἱῶν σου*) is "class," "order," "description;" as in Prov. xxx, 11, 12, 13, 14. Isa. liii, 8, "Who shall declare his generation?" (דָּוָר; Sept. *τὴν γενεάν αὐτοῦ τίς ἀγγήσεται*, Vulg. *generatio*) Lowth renders "manner of life," in translation and note, but adduces no precedent. Some consider it equivalent to דָּוָר, ver. 10; *γενεᾷ* (Sept.) answers to דָּוָר, Esth. ix, 28. Josephus uses πολλῶν *γενεῶν*, Ant. i, 10, 3 (Hengstenberg, *Christology of the Old Testament*, vol. i, Washington, 1836-9; Pauli, *Analect. Hebraic.* p. 162, Oxford, 1839). Michaelis renders it, "Where was the providence that cared for his life?" Gesenius and Rosenmüller, "Who of his contemporaries reflected?" Seiler, "Who can describe his length of life?" In the New Testament (Matt. i, 17), *γενεαί* is a series of persons, a succession from the same stock; so used by Josephus (Ant. i, 7, 2); Philo (Vit. Mos. i, 603); Matt. iii, 7, *γεννηματα ἑλιδῶν*, is well rendered by Doddridge and others "brood of vipers." Matt. xxiv, 34, *ἡ γενεᾷ αὐτῆς* means the generation or persons then living *contemporary with Christ* (see Mac-knight's *Harmony* for an illustration of this sense). Luke xvi, 8, *εἰς τὴν γενεάν τὴν ἑαυτῶν*, "in their generation," etc., wiser in regard to their dealings with the *men* of their generation; Rosenmüller gives, *inter se*. 1 Pet. ii, 8, *γένος ἐλεκτόν*, is a "chosen people," quoted from Sept. Vers. of Isa. xliiii, 20. The ancient Greeks, and, if we may credit Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus, the Egyptians also, assigned a *certain period* to a generation. The Greeks reckoned three generations for every hundred years, i. e. 33½ years to each; Herod. ii, 142, *γενεαί τρεῖς ἀνθρώπων ἑκατὸν ἑταί ἴσται*, "Three generations of men make one hundred years." This is nearly the present computation. To the same effect Clem. Alexandrinus speaks (*Strom.* i, 2); so also Phavorinus, who, citing the age of Nestor from Homer (*Il.* i, 250), *τῷ δ' ἦδη ἑκοστὸν μὲν γενεαί*, "two generations," says it means that *ἡπείροισι τὰ ἔξῃκοιντα ἔτη*, "he was above sixty years old." The Greeks, however, assigned different periods to a *γενεᾷ* at different times (Perizonius, *Orig. Egypt.* p. 175 sq.; Jemsius, *Fercal. Literar.* p. 6). The ancient Hebrews also reckoned by the generation, and assigned different spaces of time to it at different periods of their history. In the time of Abraham it was one hundred years (comp. Gen. xv, 16, "In the fourth generation they shall come hither"). This is explained in ver. 13, and in Exod. xii, 40, to be four hundred years. Caleb was *fourth* in descent from Judah, and Moses and Aaron were *fourth* from Levi. In Deut. i, 35; ii, 14, Moses uses the term for thirty-eight years. In later times (Baruch vi, in the Epistle of Jeremiah, ver. 2) *γενεᾷ* clearly means ten years. In Matt. i, 17, *γενεᾷ* means a single descent from father to son. Homer uses the word in the same sense (*Il.* i, 250); also Herodotus (i, 3). (See Gesenius's and Robinson's *Lexicons*, under the above Heb. and Gr. words.)—Kitto, s. v. See GENEALOGY.

**Generation, Eternal, of the Son of God.** See CHRISTOLOGY; SONSHIP OF CHRIST.

**Genesis** (Sept. *Γένεσις*, *generation*), the first book of the Law or the Pentateuch, is in Hebrew called

בְּרֵאשִׁית, *Beresith*, from the word with which it begins. See LAW.

I. *General Character.*—The book of Genesis has an interest and an importance to which no other document of antiquity can pretend. If not absolutely the oldest book in the world, it is the oldest which lays any claim to being a trustworthy history. There may be some papyrus-rolls in our museums which were written in Egypt about the same time that the genealogies of the Semitic race were so carefully collected in the tents of the patriarchs. But these rolls at best contain barren registers of little service to the historian. It is said that there are fragments of Chinese literature which, in their present form, date back as far as 2200 years B.C., and even more (Gröner, *Urgeschichte*, i, 215); but they are either calendars containing astronomical calculations, or records of merely local and temporary interest. Genesis, on the contrary, is rich in details respecting other races besides the race to which it more immediately belongs; and the Jewish pedigrees there so studiously preserved are but the scaffolding whereon is reared a temple of universal history.

If the religious books of other nations make any pretensions to vie with it in antiquity, in all other respects they are immeasurably inferior. The Mantras, the oldest portions of the Vedas, are, it would seem, as old as the 14th century B.C. (see Colebrooke, *Asiat. Res.* vii, 283, and professor Wilson's preface to his translation of the *Rig-Veda*). The Zendavesta, in the opinion of competent scholars, is of very much more modern date. Of the Chinese sacred books, the oldest, the Yih-king, is undoubtedly of a venerable antiquity, but it is not certain that it was a religious book at all; while the writings attributed to Confucius are certainly not earlier than the 6th century B.C. (Gröner, i, 270).

But Genesis is neither like the Vedas, a collection of hymns more or less sublime; nor like the Zendavesta, a philosophic speculation on the origin of all things; nor like the Yih-king, an unintelligible jumble whose expositors could twist it from a cosmological essay into a standard treatise on ethical philosophy (Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, III, i, 16). It is a history, and it is a religious history. The earlier portion of the book, as far as the end of the eleventh chapter, may properly be termed a history of the world; the latter is a history of the fathers of the Jewish race. But from first to last it is a religious history: it begins with the creation of the world and of man; it tells of the early happiness of a paradise in which God spake with man; of the first sin and its consequences; of the promise of redemption; of the gigantic growth of sin, and the judgment of the Flood; of a new earth, and a new covenant with man, its unchangeableness typified by the bow in the heavens; of the dispersion of the human race over the world. It then passes to the story of redemption; to the promise given to Abraham, and renewed to Isaac and to Jacob, and to all that chain of circumstances which paved the way for the great symbolic act of Redemption, when with a mighty hand and a stretched out arm Jehovah brought his people out of Egypt.

It is very important to bear in mind this religious aspect of the history if we would put ourselves in a position rightly to understand it. Of course the facts must be treated like any other historical facts, sifted in the same way, and subjected to the same laws of evidence. But if we would judge of the work as a whole we must not forget the evident aim of the writer. It is only in this way we can understand, for instance, why the history of the Fall is given with so much minuteness of detail, whereas of whole generations of men we have nothing but a bare catalogue. Only in this way, too, can we account for the fact that by far the greater portion of the book is occupied, not with the fortunes of nations, but with the biographies of the three patriarchs. For it was to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob that God revealed himself. It was to



them that the promise was given, which was to be the hope of Israel till "the fulness of the time" should come. Hence to these wandering sheiks attaches a grandeur and an interest greater than that of the Babels and Nimrods of the world. The minutest circumstances of their lives are worthier to be chronicled than the rise and fall of empires. This is not merely from the patriotic feeling of the writer as a Jew, but from his religious feeling as one of the chosen race. He lived in the land given to the fathers; he looked for the seed promised to the fathers, in whom himself and all the families of the earth should be blessed. See ABRAHAM.

II. *Unity of Design*.—This venerable monument, with which the sacred literature of the Hebrews commences, and which forms its real basis, is divided into two main parts; one universal, and one special. The most ancient history of the whole human race is contained in chapters i-xi, and the history of Israel's ancestors, the patriarchs, in chapters xii-l. These two parts are, however, so intimately connected with each other that it would be erroneous to ascribe to the first merely the aim of furnishing a universal history. That a distinct plan and method characterize the work is now generally admitted. This is acknowledged, in fact, quite as much by those who contend for, as by those who deny the existence of different documents in the book. Ewald and Tuch are no less decided advocates of the unity of Genesis, as far as its plan is concerned, than Ranke or Hengstenberg. Ewald, indeed (in his *Composition der Genesis*), was the first who established it satisfactorily, and clearly pointed out the principle on which it rests.

What, then, is the plan of the writer? First, we must bear in mind that Genesis is, after all, but a portion of a larger work. The five books of the Pentateuch form a consecutive whole; they are not merely a collection of ancient fragments loosely strung together, but, as we shall prove elsewhere, a well-digested and connected composition. See PENTATEUCH.

The great subject of this history is the establishment of the theocracy. Its central point is the giving of the law on Sinai, and the solemn covenant there ratified, whereby the Jewish nation was constituted "a kingdom of priests and a holy nation to Jehovah." With reference to this great central fact all the rest of the narrative is grouped.

Israel is the people of God. God rules in the midst of them, having chosen them to himself. But a nation must have laws, therefore he gives them a law; and, in virtue of their peculiar relationship to God, this body of laws is both religious and political, defining their duty to God as well as their duty to their neighbor. Further, a nation must have a land, and the promise of the land and the preparation for its possession are all along kept in view.

The book of Genesis then (with the first chapters of Exodus) describes the steps which led to the establishment of the theocracy. In reading it we must remember that it is but a part of a more extended work; and we must also bear in mind these two prominent ideas, which give a characteristic unity to the whole composition, viz. the people of God, and the promised land.

We shall then observe that the history of Abraham holds the same relation to the other portions of Genesis that the giving of the law does to the entire Pentateuch. Abraham is the father of the Jewish nation: to Abraham the land of Canaan is first given in promise. Isaac and Jacob, though also prominent figures in the narrative, yet do but inherit the promise as Abraham's children, and Jacob especially is the chief connecting link in the chain of events which leads finally to the possession of the land of Canaan. In like manner, the former section of the book is written with the same obvious purpose. It is a part of the writer's plan to tell us what the divine preparation of

the world was, in order to show, first, the significance of the call of Abraham, and, next, the true nature of the Jewish theocracy. He does not (as Tuch asserts) work backwards from Abraham till he comes, in spite of himself, to the beginning of all things. He does not ask, Who was Abraham? answering, of the posterity of Shem; and who was Shem? a son of Noah; and who was Noah, etc. But he begins with the creation of the world, because the God who created the world and the God who revealed himself to the fathers is the same God. Jehovah, who commanded his people to keep holy the seventh day, was the same God who, in six days, created the heavens and the earth, and rested on the seventh day from all his work. The God who, when man had fallen, visited him in mercy, and gave him a promise of redemption and victory, is the God who sent Moses to deliver his people out of Egypt. He who made a covenant with Noah, and through him with "all the families of the earth," is the God who also made himself known as the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob. In a word, creation and redemption are eternally linked together. This is the idea which, in fact, gives its shape to the history, although its distinct enunciation is reserved for the N. T. There we learn that all things were created by and for Christ, and that in him all things consist (Col. i, 16, 17); and that by the Church is made known unto principalities and powers the manifest wisdom of God. It would be impossible, therefore, for a book which tells us of the beginning of the Church, not to tell us also of the beginning of the world.

The book of Genesis has thus a character at once special and universal. It embraces the world; it speaks of God as the God of the whole human race. But, as the introduction to Jewish history, it makes the universal interest subordinate to the national. Its design is to show how God revealed himself to the first fathers of the Jewish race, in order that he might make to himself a nation who should be his witness in the midst of the earth. This is the inner principle of unity which pervades the book. Its external framework we are now to examine. Five principal persons are the pillars, so to speak, on which the whole superstructure rests, Adam, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

(I.) *Adam*.—The creation of the world, and the earliest history of mankind (ch. i-iii). As yet, no divergence of the different families of man.

(II.) *Noah*.—The history of Adam's descendants to the death of Noah (ch. iv-ix). Here we have (1) the line of Cain branching off while the history follows the fortunes of Seth, whose descendants are (2) traced in genealogical succession, and in an unbroken line as far as Noah, and (3) the history of Noah himself (ch. vi-ix), continued to his death.

(III.) *Abraham*.—Noah's posterity till the death of Abraham (x-xxv, 18). Here we have (1) the peopling of the whole earth by the descendants of Noah's three sons (xi, 1-9). The history of two of these is then dropped, and (2) the line of Shem only pursued (xi, 10-32) as far as Terah and Abraham, where the genealogical table breaks off. (3) Abraham is now the prominent figure (xii-xxv, 18). But as Terah had two other sons, Nahor and Haran (xi, 27), some notices respecting their families are added. Lot's migration with Abraham into the land of Canaan is mentioned, as well as the fact that he was the father of Moab and Ammon (xix, 37, 38), nations whose later history was intimately connected with that of the posterity of Abraham. Nahor remained in Mesopotamia, but his family is briefly enumerated (xxii, 20-24), chiefly, no doubt, for Rebekah's sake, who was afterwards the wife of Isaac. Of Abraham's own children, three branches off first the line of Ishmael (xxi, 9, etc.), and next the children by Keturah; and the genealogical notices of these two branches of his posterity are apparently brought together (xxv, 1-6, and xxv, 12-18), in order that, being here severally dismissed at the end of Abra-

ham's life, the main stream of the narrative may flow in the channel of Isaac's fortunes.

(IV.) *Isaac*.—Isaac's life (xxv, 19—xxxv, 29), a life in itself retiring and uneventful. But in his sons the final separation takes place, leaving the field clear for the great story of the chosen seed. Even when Nahor's family comes on the scene, as it does in ch. xxix, we hear only so much of it as is necessary to throw light on Jacob's history.

(V.) *Jacob*.—The history of Jacob and Joseph (xxxvi, 1).—Here, after Isaac's death, we have (1) the genealogy of Esau (ch. xxxvi), who then drops out of the narrative, in order that (2) the history of the patriarchs may be carried on without interruption to the death of Joseph (ch. xxxvii-1).

Thus it will be seen that a specific plan is preserved throughout. The main purpose is never forgotten. God's relation to Israel holds the first place in the writer's mind. It is this which it is his object to convey. The history of that chosen seed who were the heirs of the promise, and the guardians of the divine oracles, is the only history which interprets man's relation to God. By its light all others shine, and may be read when the time shall come. Meanwhile, as the different families drop off here and there from the principal stock, their course is briefly indicated. A hint is given of their parentage and their migrations; and then the narrative returns to its regular channel. Thus the whole book may be compared to one of those vast American rivers which, instead of being fed by tributaries, send off here and there certain lesser streams or bayous, as they are termed, the main current meanwhile flowing on with its great mass of water to the sea.

Beyond all doubt, then, we may trace in the book of Genesis in its present form a systematic plan. It is no hasty compilation, no mere collection of ancient fragments without order or arrangement. It coheres by an internal principle of unity. Its whole structure presents a very definite and clearly marked outline. But does it follow from this that the book, as it at present stands, is the work of a single author?

III. *Unity of Composition*.—This, which is a point in dispute among the critics with regard to all the books of the Pentateuch, has been particularly questioned in the case of Genesis. The question was raised whether the sources from which the writer of Genesis drew his information were written documents or oral tradition. Writers as early as Vitrina (*Obs. Sac.* i, 4), Richard Simon, Clericus, and others, though they were of opinion that Genesis is founded on written sources, did not undertake to describe the nature and quality of those sources. Another opinion, advanced by Otmar in Henke's *Magaz.* ii, that Egyptian pyramids and other monuments of a similar nature were the sources of Genesis, was but transient in the critical world; while the attempt of some critics not only to renew the previous assumption that Genesis is founded on written sources, but also to determine more closely the character of those sources, has gained more lasting approval among the learned. Why different names of God are prevalent in different portions of Genesis is a question much discussed by early theologians and rabbis. Astruc, a Belgian physician, in his *Conjectures sur les Mémoires originaux*, etc. (Bruxelles, 1753-8), was the first to apply the two Hebrew names of God, *Jehovah* and *Elohim*, to the subject at issue. Astruc assumed that there had originally existed a number of isolated documents, some twelve in all, which had subsequently, by the fault of transcribers, been joined and strung together in the present form of Genesis. Eichhorn's critical genius procured for this hypothesis a favorable reception almost throughout the whole of Germany. See Astruc. Eichhorn pruned away its excrescences, and confined his own view to the assumption of only two different documents, respectively characterized by the two different names of *Jehovah* and

*Elohim*. Other critics, such as Illgen (*Urkunden des Jerusalem Tempel-Archivs*, 1798), Gramberg (*Adumbratio libri Geneseos secundum fontes*, 1828), and others, went still farther, and presupposed three different documents in Genesis. Vater went much beyond Eichhorn. He fancied himself able to combat the authenticity of the Pentateuch by producing a new hypothesis. He substituted for Eichhorn's "document-hypothesis" his own "fragment-hypothesis," which obtained great authority, especially on account of its being adopted by De Wette. According to this opinion, Genesis, as well as the greater part of the Pentateuch, consists of a great number of very small detached fragments, internally unconnected with each other, but transcribed *seriatim*, although originating in very different times and from different authors. This "fragment-hypothesis" has now been almost universally given up. Even its zealous defenders, not excepting De Wette himself, have relinquished it. In its place the former "document-hypothesis" has been resumed by some critics, simplified, however, and supported by new and better arguments. There is at present a great variety of opinion among divines concerning this hypothesis. The leading features of this diversity may be comprised in the following summary. According to the view of Stäbelin, De Wette, Ewald, Von Bohlen, Tuch, Knobel, Delitzsch, and others, Genesis is founded on two principal original documents. That of *Elohim* is closely connected in its parts, and forms a whole, while that of *Jehovah* is a mere complementary document, supplying details at those points where the former is abrupt and deficient, etc. These two documents are said to have been subsequently combined by the hand of an editor, so ably as often to render their separation difficult, if not altogether impossible. But Ranke, Hengstenberg, Drechsler, Hävernick, Baumgarten, Keil, and others, maintain that Genesis is a book closely connected in all its parts, and composed by only one author, while the use of the two different names of God is not owing to two different sources on which Genesis is founded, but solely to the different significations of these two names. The great weight of probability lies on the side of those who argue for the existence of different documents, but only as sources to some extent which, together with original materials, were wrought by the author into one homogeneous whole.

1. It is almost impossible to read the book of Genesis with anything like a critical eye without being struck with the great peculiarities of style and language which certain portions of it present. Thus, for instance, chap. ii, 3-iii, 24 is quite different both from chap. i and from chap. iv. Again, chap. xiv and (according to Jabn) chap. xxiii are evidently separate documents, transplanted in their original form without correction or modification into the existing work. In fact, there is nothing like uniformity of style till we come to the history of Joseph.

2. We are led to the same conclusion by the *inscriptions* which are prefixed to certain sections, as ii, 4; v, 1; vi, 9; x, 1; xi, 10, 27, and seem to indicate so many older documents.

3. The resumptive form of some of the narratives, e.g. the repetition of the account of the creation of man in chap. ii, with additional particulars, is evidence of the same character. We may even hazard the conjecture that the pure *cosmogony* of chap. i may have been one of the mysteries of the Egyptian theosophy, while the more distinct accounts of the subsequent chapters may have been derived from the early traditions of the Hebrews and cognate nations. See Moses.

4. Lastly, the distinct use of the divine names, *Jehovah* in some sections, and *Elohim* in others, is characteristic of two different writers; and other peculiarities of diction it has been observed fall in with this usage, and go far to establish the theory. All this is quite in harmony with what we might have expected *à priori*, viz., that if Moses or any later writer were the author

of the book, he would have availed himself of existing traditions, either oral or written. That they *might have been* written is now established beyond all doubt, the art of writing having been proved to be much earlier than Moses. That they *were* written we infer from the book itself. Yet these peculiarities are not so absolute as to show that the same writer did not embody them all into one composition, for they are sometimes found blended in the same piece.

The evidence alluded to is strong; and nothing can be more natural than that an honest historian should seek to make his work more valuable by embodying in it the most ancient records of his race; the higher the value which they possessed in his eyes, the more anxious would he be to preserve them in their original form. Those particularly in the earlier portion of the work were perhaps simply transcribed. In one instance we have what looks like an omission (ii, 4), where the inscription seems to promise a larger cosmogony. Here and there throughout the book we meet with a later remark, intended to explain or supplement the earlier monument. In some instances there seems to have been so complete a fusion of the two principal documents, the Elohist and the Jehovist, that it is no longer possible accurately to distinguish them. The later writer, the Jehovist, instead of transcribing the Elohist account intact, thought fit to blend and intersperse with it his own remarks. We have an instance of this, according to Hupfeld (*Die Quellen der Genesis*), in chap. vii: vers. 1-10 are usually assigned to the Jehovist; but whilst he admits this, he detects a large admixture of Elohist phraseology and coloring in the narrative. But this sort of criticism, it must be admitted, is very doubtful. Many other instances might be mentioned where there is the same difficulty in assigning their own to the several authors. Thus in sections generally recognised as Jehovistic, chaps. xii, xiii, xix, here and there a sentence or a phrase occurs which seems to betray a different origin, as xii, 5; xiii, 6; xix, 29. These anomalies, however, though it may be difficult to account for them, can hardly be considered of sufficient force entirely to overthrow the theory of independent documents which has so much, on other grounds, to recommend it. Certainly when Keil, Hengstenberg, and others, who reject this theory, attempt to account for the use of the divine names on the hypothesis that the writer designedly employed the one or the other name according to the subject of which he was treating, their explanations are often of the most arbitrary kind. As a whole, the documentary character of Genesis is so remarkable when we compare it with the later books of the Pentateuch, and is so exactly what we might expect, supposing a Mosaic authorship of the whole, that, whilst contending against the theory of different documents in the later portions, we feel convinced that this theory is the only tenable one in Genesis.

Of the two principal documents, the Elohist is the earlier. So far as we can detach its integral portions, they still present the appearance of something like a connected work. This has been very well argued by Tuch (*Die Genesis, Allgem. Einl.* li-1xv), as well as by Hupfeld (*Die Quellen der Genesis*), Knobel, and Delitzsch. This whole theory of a double origin of the book, however, is powerfully opposed by Tiele in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1852, i.

Hupfeld, however, whose analysis is very careful, thinks that he can discover traces of three original records, an earlier Elohist, a Jehovist, and a later Elohist. These three documents were, according to him, subsequently united and arranged by a fourth person, who acted as editor of the whole. His argument is ingenious and worthy of consideration, though it is at times too elaborate to be convincing.

The following table of the use of the divine names in Genesis will enable the reader to form his own judgment as to the relative probability of the hypotheses

above mentioned. Much as commentators differ concerning some portions of the book, one pronouncing passages to be Elohist which another, with equal confidence, assigns to the Jehovist, the fact is certain that whole sections are characterized by a separate use of the divine names. (See Quarry, *Genesis*, p. 400 sq.)

(1.) Sections in which Elohim is found exclusively, or nearly so: chap. i-ii, 3 (creation of heaven and earth); v (generations of Adam), except ver. 29, where Jehovah occurs; vi, 9-22 (generations of Noah); vii, 9-24 (the entering into the ark), but Jehovah in ver. 16; viii, 1-19 (end of the flood); ix, 1-17 (covenant with Noah); xvii (covenant of circumcision), where, however, Jehovah occurs once in ver. 1, as compared with Elohim seven times; xix, 29-38 (conclusion of Lot's history); xx (Abraham's sojourn at Gerar), where again we have Jehovah once and Elohim four times, and Ha-elohim twice; xxi, 1-21 (Isaac's birth and Ishmael's dismissal), only xxi, 1, Jehovah; xxi, 22-34 (Abraham's covenant with Abimelech), where Jehovah is found once; xxv, 1-18 (sons of Keturah, Abraham's death, and the generations of Ishmael), Elohim once; xxvii, 46-xxviii, 9 (Jacob goes to Haran, Esau's marriage), Elohim once, and El Shaddai once; xxxi (Jacob's departure from Laban), where Jehovah twice; xxxiii-xxxvii (Jacob's reconciliation with Esau, Dinah and the Shechemites, Jacob at Bethel, Esau's family, Joseph sold into Egypt). It should be observed, however, that in large portions of this section the divine name does not occur at all. (See below.) xl-i (history of Joseph in Egypt): here we have Jehovah once only (xlix, 18). [Exod. i-ii (Israel's oppression in Egypt, and birth of Moses as deliverer).]

(2.) Sections in which Jehovah occurs exclusively, or in preference to Elohim: iv (Cain and Abel, and Cain's posterity), where Jehovah ten times and Elohim only once; vi, 1-8 (the sons of God and the daughters of men, etc.); vii, 1-9 (the entering into the ark), but Elohim once, ver. 9; viii, 20-22 (Noah's altar and Jehovah's blessing); ix, 18-27 (Noah and his sons); x (the families of mankind as descended from Noah); xi, 1-9 (the confusion of tongues); xii, 1-2) (Abram's journey first from Haran to Canaan, and then into Egypt); xiii (Abram's separation from Lot); xv (Abram's faith, sacrifice, and covenant); xvi (Hagar and Ishmael), where  $\text{אֱלֹהִים}$  once; xviii-xix, 28 (visit of the three angels to Abram, Lot, destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah); xxiv (betrothal of Rebekah and Isaac's marriage); xxv, 19-xxvi, 35 (Isaac's sons, his visit to Abimelech, Esau's wives); xxvii, 1-40 (Jacob obtains the blessing), but in ver. 28 Ha-elohim; xxx, 25-43 (Jacob's bargain with Laban), where, however, Jehovah only once; xxxviii (Judah's incest); xxxix (Jehovah with Joseph in Potiphar's house and in the prison). [Exod. iv, 18-31 (Moses's return to Egypt); v (Pharaoh's treatment of the messengers of Jehovah).]

(3.) The section Gen. ii, 4-iii, 24 (the account of Paradise and the Fall) is generally regarded as Jehovistic, but it is clearly quite distinct. The divine name as there found is not Jehovah, but Jehovah Elohim (in which form it only occurs once beside in the Pentateuch, Exod. ix, 38), and it occurs twenty times; the name Elohim being found three times in the same section, once in the mouth of the woman, and twice in that of the serpent.

(4.) In Gen. xiv the prevailing name is El-Elyon (Auth. Vers. "the most high God"), and only once, in Abram's mouth, "Jehovah, the most high God," which is quite intelligible.

(5.) Some few sections are found in which the names Jehovah and Elohim seem to be used promiscuously. This is the case in xxii, 1-19 (the offering up of Isaac); xxviii, 10-22 (Jacob's dream at Bethel); xxix, 31-xxx, 24 (birth and naming of the eleven sons of Ja-

cob); and xxxii (Jacob's wrestling with the angel). [Exod. iii, 1-iv, 17 (the call of Moses).]

(6.) It is worthy of notice that of the other divine names Adonai is always found in connection with Jehovah, except Gen. xx, 4; whereas El, El-Shaddai, etc., occur most frequently in the Elohist sections.

(7.) In the following sections neither of the divine names occur: Gen. xi, 10-32; xxii, 20-24; xxiii; xxv, 27-34; xxvii, 40-45; xxix, 1-30; xxxiv; xxxv; xxxvii; xl [Exod. ii, 1-22].

IV. The *historical* character of the contents of Genesis forms a more comprehensive subject of theological discussion. It is obvious that the opinions regarding it must be principally influenced by the dogmatical views and principles of the respective critics themselves. Hence the great variety of opinion that still prevails on that subject. Some, as Vatke, Von Bohlen, and others, assert that the whole contents of Genesis are unhistorical. Tuch and others consider Genesis to be interwoven with mythical elements, but think that the rich historical elements, especially in the account of the patriarchs, can be clearly discerned. Some, again, limit the mythological part to the first two chapters only; while others perceive in the whole book a consistent and truly historical impress. The field of controversy is here so extensive, and the arguments on both sides are so numerous, that we must content ourselves in this article with a very few remarks on the subject.

Genesis is a book consisting of two contrasting parts; the first introduces us into the greatest problems of the human mind, such as the creation and the fall of man; and the second into the quiet solitude of a small, defined circle of families. In the former, the most sublime and wonderful events are described with child-like simplicity; while in the latter, on the contrary, the most simple and common occurrences are interwoven with the sublimest thoughts and reflections, rendering the small family circle a whole world in history, and the principal actors in it prototypes for a whole nation and for all times. Not the least trace of mythology appears in it. Genesis plainly shows how very far remote the Hebrew mode of thinking was from mythical poetry, which might have found ample opportunity of being brought into play when the writer began to sketch the early times of the Creation. It is true that the primeval wonders, the marvellous deeds of God, are the very subject of Genesis. None of these wonders, however, bear a fantastical impress, and there is no useless prodigality of them. They are all penetrated and connected by one common leading idea, and all are related to the counsel of God for the salvation of man. This principle sheds its lustrous beams through the whole of Genesis; therefore the wonders therein related are as little to be ascribed to the invention and imagination of man as the whole plan of God for human salvation. The foundation of the divine theocratic institution throws a strong light upon the early patriarchal times; the reality of the one proves the reality of the other, as described in Genesis.

Luther used to say, "Nihil pulchrius Genesi, nihil utilius." But hard critics have tried all they can to mar its beauty and to detract from its utility. In fact, the bitterness of the attacks on a document so venerable, so full of undying interest, hallowed by the love of many generations, makes one almost suspect that a secret malevolence must have been the mainspring of hostile criticism. Certain it is that no book has met with more determined and unsparing assailants. To enumerate and to reply to all objections would be impossible. We will only refer to some of the most important.

1. The story of Creation, as given in the first chapter, has been set aside in two ways: first, by placing it on the same level with other cosmogonies which are to be found in the sacred writings of all nations; and

next, by asserting that its statements are directly contradicted by the discoveries of modern science.

(a.) Now when we compare the Biblical with all other known cosmogonies, we are immediately struck with the great *moral* superiority of the former. There is no confusion here between the divine Creator and his work. God is before all things, God creates all things; this is the sublime assertion of the Hebrew writer. On the contrary, all the cosmogonies of the heathen world err in one of two directions: either they are dualistic, that is, they regard God and matter as two eternal co-existent principles; or they are pantheistic, i. e. they confound God and matter, making the material universe a kind of emanation from the great Spirit which informs the mass. Both these theories, with their various modifications, whether in the more subtle philosophemes of the Indian races, or in the rougher and grosser systems of the Phœnicians and Babylonians, are alike exclusive of the idea of creation. Without attempting to discuss in anything like detail the points of resemblance and difference between the Biblical record of creation and the myths and legends of other nations, it may suffice to mention certain particulars in which the superiority of the Hebrew account can hardly be called in question. First, the Hebrew story alone clearly acknowledges the personality and unity of God. Secondly, here only do we find recognised a distinct act of creation, by creation being understood the calling of the whole material universe into existence out of nothing. Thirdly, there is here only a clear intimation of that great law of progress which we find everywhere observed. The *order* of creation, as given in Genesis, is the gradual progress of all things, from the lowest and least perfect to the highest and most completely developed forms. Fourthly, there is the fact of a relation between the personal Creator and the work of his fingers, and that relation is a relation of love; for God looks upon his creation at every stage of its progress, and pronounces it very good. Fifthly, there is throughout a sublime simplicity which of itself is characteristic of a history, not of a myth or of a philosophical speculation. See CREATION.

(b.) It would occupy too large a space to discuss at any length the objections which have been urged from the results of modern discovery against the literal truth of this chapter. One or two remarks of a general kind must here suffice. It is argued, for instance, that light could not have existed before the sun, or, at any rate, not that kind of light which would be necessary for the support of vegetable life; whereas the Mosaic narrative makes light created on the first day, trees and plants on the third, and the sun on the fourth. To this we may reply, that we must not too hastily build an argument upon our ignorance. We do not *know* that the existing laws of creation were in operation when the creative fiat was first put forth. The very act of creation must have been the introducing of laws; but when the work was finished, those laws must have suffered some modification. Men are not now created in the full stature of manhood, but are born and grow. Similarly, the lower ranks of being might have been influenced by certain necessary conditions during the first stages of their existence, which conditions were afterwards removed without any disturbance of the natural functions. Again, it is not certain that the language of Genesis can only mean that the sun was *created* on the fourth day. It *may* mean that then only did that luminary become visible to our planet.

With regard to the six days, many have thought that they ought to be interpreted as six periods, without defining what the length of those periods is. No one can suppose that the divine rest was literally a rest of twenty-four hours only. On the contrary, the divine Sabbath still continues. There has been no *creation* since the creation of man. This is what Genesis teaches, and this geology confirms. But God, after six periods of creative activity, entered into that

Sabbath in which his work has been, not a work of creation, but of redemption (John v, 17). No attempt, however, which has as yet been made to identify these six periods with corresponding geological epochs can be pronounced satisfactory. See GEOLOGY. On the other hand, it seems rash and premature to assert that no reconciliation is possible. What we ought to maintain is, that no reconciliation is necessary. It is certain that the author of the first chapter of Genesis, whether Moses or some one else, knew nothing of geology or astronomy. It is certain that he made use of phraseology concerning physical facts in accordance with the limited range of information which he possessed. It is also certain that the Bible was never intended to reveal to us knowledge of which our own faculties, rightly used, could put us in possession. We have no business, therefore, to expect anything but popular language in the description of physical phenomena. Thus, for instance, when it is said that by means of the firmament God divided the waters which were above from those which were beneath, we admit the fact without admitting the implied explanation. The *Hebrew* supposed that there existed vast reservoirs above him corresponding to the "waters under the earth." We know that by certain natural processes the rain descends from the clouds. But the *fact* remains the same that there are waters above as well as below. Further investigation may perhaps throw more light on these interesting questions. Meanwhile it may safely be said that modern discoveries are in no way opposed to the great outlines of the Mosaic cosmogony. That the world was created in six stages, that creation was by a law of gradual advance, beginning with inorganic matter, and then advancing from the lowest organisms to the highest, that since the appearance of man upon the earth no new species have come into being; these are statements not only not disproved, but the two last of them at least amply confirmed by geological research.

2. To the description of Paradise, and the history of the Fall and of the Deluge, very similar remarks apply. All nations have their own version of these facts, colored by local circumstances, and embellished according to the poetic or philosophic spirit of the tribes among whom the tradition has taken root. But if there be any one original source of these traditions, any root from which they diverged, we cannot doubt where to look for it. The earliest record of these momentous facts is that preserved in the Bible. We cannot doubt this, because the simplicity of the narrative is greater than that of any other work with which we are acquainted. This simplicity is an argument at once in favor of the greater antiquity, and also of the greater truthfulness of the story. It is hardly possible to suppose that traditions so widely spread over the surface of the earth as are the traditions of the Creation, the Fall, and the Deluge, should have no foundation whatever in fact. It is quite as impossible to suppose that that version of these facts, which in its moral and religious aspect is the purest, is not also, to take the lowest ground, the most likely to be true.

(1.) Opinions have differed whether we ought to take the story of the Fall in Gen. iii to be a literal statement of facts, or whether, with many expositors since the time of Philo, we should regard it as an allegory, framed in child-like words as befitting the childhood of the world, but conveying to us a deeper spiritual truth. But in the latter case we ought not to deny that spiritual truth. Neither should we overlook the very important bearing which this narrative has on the whole of the subsequent history of the world and of Israel. Delitzsch well says, "The story of the Fall, like that of the Creation, has wandered over the world. Heathen nations have transplanted and mixed it up with their geography, their history, their mythology, although it has never so completely changed form, and color, and spirit that you cannot recognise it.

Here, however, in the Law, it preserves the character of a universal, human, world-wide fact; and the groans of Creation, the Redemption that is in Christ Jesus, and the heart of every man, conspire in their testimony to the most literal truth of the narrative." See FALL OF MAN.

(2.) The universality of the Deluge, it may be proved, is quite at variance with the most certain facts of geology. But then we are not bound to contend for a universal deluge. The Biblical writer himself, it is true, supposed it to be universal, but that was only because it covered what was then the known world: there can be no doubt that it did extend to all that part of the world *which was then inhabited*; and this is enough, on the one hand, to satisfy the terms of the narrative, while, on the other, the geological difficulty, as well as other difficulties concerning the ark, and the number of animals, disappears with this interpretation. See DELUGE.

3. When we come down to a later period in the narrative, where we have the opportunity of testing the accuracy of the historian, we find it in many of the most important particulars abundantly corroborated.

(1.) Whatever interpretation we may be disposed to put on the story of the confusion of tongues, and the subsequent dispersion of mankind, there is no good ground for setting it aside. Indeed, if the reading of a cylinder recently discovered at Birs Nimrûd may be trusted, there is independent evidence corroborative of the Biblical account. But, at any rate, the other versions of this event are far less probable (see these in Josephus, *Ant.* i, 4, 3; Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* ix, 14). The later myths concerning the wars of the Titans with the gods are apparently based upon this story, or rather upon perversions of it. But it is quite impossible to suppose, as Kalisch does (*Genesis*, p. 313), that "the Hebrew historian converted that very legend into a medium for solving a great and important problem." There is not the smallest appearance of any such design. The legend is a perversion of the history, not the history a comment upon the legend. The incidental remark concerning the famous giants, the progeny of the "sons of God" and the "sons of men" (Gen. vi, 4), seems to be the true key to the demigod heroes of ancient mythology.

(2.) As to the fact implied in this dispersion, that all languages had one origin, philological research has not as yet been carried far enough to lead to any very certain result. Many of the greatest philologists (Bopp, Lepsius, Burnouf, etc.; Rénan, *Histoire des Langues Semitiques*, l. v, c. 2, 3) contend for real affinities between the Indo-European and the Shemitic tongues. On the other hand, languages like the Coptic (not to mention many others) seem at present to stand out in complete isolation. The most that has been effected is a classification of languages into three great families. This classification, however, is in exact accordance with the threefold division of the race in Shem, Ham, and Japhet, of which Genesis tells us. See PHILOLOGY (COMPARATIVE).

(3.) Another fact which rests on the authority of the earlier chapters of Genesis, the derivation of the whole human race from a single pair, has been abundantly confirmed by recent investigations. For the full proof of this, it is sufficient to refer to Pritchard's *Physical History of Mankind*, in which the subject is discussed with great care and ability. See ADAM.

(4.) One of the strongest proofs of the *bonâ-fide* historical character of the earlier portion of Genesis is to be found in the valuable ethnological catalogue contained in chap. x. Knobel, who has devoted a volume (*Die Völkertafel der Genesis*) to the elucidation of this document, has succeeded in establishing its main accuracy beyond doubt, although, in accordance with his theory as to the age of the Pentateuch, he assigns to it no greater antiquity than between 1200 and 1000 B.C. See ETHNOLOGY.

Of the minute accuracy of this table we have abundant proof: for instance (Gen. x, 4), Tarshish is called the son of Javan. This indicates that the ancient inhabitants of Tarshish or Tartessus in Spain were erroneously considered to be a Phœnician colony like those of other towns in its neighborhood, and that they sprang from Javan, that is, Greece. That they were of Greek origin is clear from the account of Herodotus (i, 163). Also (ver. 8), Nimrod, the ruler of Babel, is called the son of *Cush*, which is in remarkable unison with the mythological tales concerning *Bel* and his Egyptian descent (comp. Diodor. Sic. i, 28, 81; Pausanias, iv, 23, 5). *Sidon* alone is mentioned (ver. 15), but not *Tyrus* (comp. xlix, 13), which arose only in the time of Joshua (Josh. xix, 29); and that Sidon was an older town than Tyrus, by which it was afterwards eclipsed, is certified by a number of ancient reports (comp. Hengstenberg, *De Rebus Tyriorum*, p. 6, 7).

4. With the patriarchal history (xii sq.) begins a historical sketch of a peculiar character. The circumstantial details in it allow us to examine more closely the historical character of these accounts. The numerous descriptions of the mode of life in those days furnish us with a very vivid picture. We meet everywhere a sublime simplicity quite worthy of patriarchal life, and never to be found again in later history. One cannot suppose that it would have been possible in a later period, estranged from ancient simplicity, to invent such a picture.

The authenticity of the patriarchal history could be attacked only by analogy, the true historical test of negative criticism; but the patriarchal history has no analogy; while a great historical fact, the Mosaic theocracy itself, might here be adduced in favor of the truth of Genesis. The theocracy stands without analogy in the history of the human race, and is, nevertheless, true above all historical doubt. But this theocracy cannot have entered into history without preparatory events. The facts which led to the introduction of the theocracy are contained in the accounts of Genesis. Moreover, this preparation of the theocracy could not consist in the ordinary providential guidance. The race of patriarchs advances to a marvellous destination; the road also leading to this destination must be peculiar and extraordinary. The opponents of Genesis forget that the marvellous events of patriarchal history which offend them most, partake of that character of the whole by which alone this history becomes commensurate and possible.

(1.) There are also many separate vestiges warranting the antiquity of these traditions, and proving that they were neither invented nor adorned; for instance, Jacob, the progenitor of the Israelites, is introduced not as the first-born, which, if an unhistorical and merely external exaltation of that name had been the aim of the author, would have been more for this purpose.

(2.) Neither the blemishes in the history of Abraham, nor the gross sins of the sons of Jacob, among whom even Levi, the progenitor of the sacerdotal race, forms no exception, are concealed.

(3.) The same author, whose moral principles are so much blamed by the opponents of Genesis, on account of the description given of the life of Jacob, produces, in the history of Abraham, a picture of moral greatness which could have originated only in facts.

(4.) The faithfulness of the author manifests itself also especially in the description of the expedition of the kings from Upper to Western Asia; in his statements concerning the person of Melchizedek (Gen. xiv); in the circumstantial details given of the incidents occurring at the purchase of the hereditary burial-place (chap. xxiii); in the genealogies of Arabian tribes (chap. xxv); in the genealogy of Edom (chap. xxxvi); and in many remarkable details which are interwoven with the general accounts.

(5.) Passing on to a later portion of the book, we

find the writer evincing the most accurate knowledge of the state of society in Egypt. The Egyptian jealousy of foreigners, and especially their hatred of shepherds; the use of interpreters in the court (who, we learn from other sources, formed a distinct caste); the existence of caste; the importance of the priesthood; the use of wine by the kings (Wilkinson, ii, 142-158); the fact that even at that early time a settled trade existed between Egypt and other countries, are all confirmed by the monuments or by later writers. So again Joseph's priestly dress of fine linen, the chain of gold round his neck, the chariot on which he rides, the body-guard of the king, the rites of burial (though mentioned only incidentally), are spoken of with a minute accuracy which can leave no doubt on the mind as to the credibility of the historian. In particular, the account given (xlvii, 13-26) of the manner in which the Pharaohs became proprietors of all the lands, with the exception of those belonging to the priests, is confirmed by Herodotus (ii, 109), and by Diodorus Siculus (i, 73). The manner of embalming described in Gen. i entirely agrees with the description of Herodotus, ii, 84, etc. For other data of a similar kind, compare Hengstenberg (*Die Bücher Moses und Aegypten*, p. 21 sq.). See EGYPT.

5. It is quite impossible, as has already been said, to notice all the objections made by hostile critics at every step as we advance. But it may be well to refer to one more instance in which suspicion has been cast upon the credibility of the narrative. Three stories are found in three distinct portions of the book, which in their main features no doubt present a striking similarity to one another, namely, the deliverances of Sarah and Rebekah from the harems of the Egyptian and Philistine monarchs (xii, 10-20; xx; xxvi, 1-11). These, it is said, besides containing certain improbabilities of statement, are clearly only three different versions of the same story.

It is of course possible that these are only different versions of the same story. But is it psychologically so very improbable that the same incident should happen three times in almost the same manner? All men repeat themselves, and even repeat their mistakes; and the repetition of circumstances over which a man has no control is sometimes as astonishing as the repetition of actions which he can control. Was not the state of society in those days such as to render it no way improbable that Pharaoh on one occasion, and Abimelech on another, should have acted in the same selfish and arbitrary manner? Abraham, too, might have been guilty twice of the same sinful cowardice; and Isaac might, in similar circumstances, have copied his father's example, calling it wisdom. To say, as a recent expositor of this book has done, that the object of the Hebrew writer was to represent an idea, such as "the sanctity of matrimony," that "in his hands the facts are subordinated to ideas," etc., is to cut up by the very roots the historical character of the book. The mythical theory is preferable to this, for that leaves a substratum of fact, however it may have been embellished or perhaps disfigured by tradition. If the view of Delitzsch is correct, that xii, 10-20 is Jehovistic; xx, Elohistie (with a Jehovistic addition, ver. 18); xxvi, 1-13, Jehovistic, but taken from written documents, this may to some minds explain the repetition of the story.

There is a further difficulty about the age of Sarah, who at the time of one of the occurrences must have been 65 years old, and the freshness of her beauty, therefore, it is said, long since faded. In reply it has been argued that as she lived to the age of 127, she was then only in middle life; that consequently she would have been at 65 what a woman of modern Europe would be at 35 or 40, an age at which personal attractions are not necessarily impaired.

But it is a minute criticism, hardly worth answering, which tries to cast suspicion on the veracity of the

writer, because of difficulties such as these. The positive evidence is overwhelming in favor of his credibility. The patriarchal tent beneath the shade of some spreading tree, the wealth of flocks and herds, the free and generous hospitality to strangers, the strife for the well, the purchase of the cave of Machpelah for a burial-place—we feel at once that these are no inventions of a later writer in more civilized times. So again, what can be more life-like, more touchingly beautiful, than the picture of Hagar and Ishmael, the meeting of Abraham's servant with Rebekah, or of Jacob with Rachel at the well of Haran? There is a fidelity in the minutest incidents which convinces us that we are reading history, not fable. Or can anything more completely transport us into patriarchal times than the battle of the kings and the interview between Abraham and Melchizedek? The very opening of the story, "In the days of Amraphel," etc., reads like the work of some old chronicler who lived not far from the time of which he speaks. The archaic forms of names of places, Bela for Zoar; Chatsatson Tamar for Euedi; Emek Shaveh for the King's Vale; the Vale of Siddim, as descriptive of the spot which was afterwards the Dead Sea; the expression "Abram the Hebrew;" are remarkable evidences of the antiquity of the narrative. So also are the names of the different tribes who at that early period inhabited Canaan; the Rephaim, for instance, of whom we find in the time of Joshua but a weak remnant left (Josh. xiii, 12), and the Zuzim, Emim, Chorim, who are only mentioned besides in the Pentateuch (Deut. ii, 10, 12). Quite in keeping with the rest of the picture is Abraham's "arming his trained servants" (xiv, 14)—a phrase which occurs nowhere else—and, above all, the character and position of Melchizedek: "Simple, calm, great, he comes and goes the priest-king of the divine history." The representations of the Greek poets, says Creuzer (*Symb.* iv, 378), fall very far short of this; and, as Hävernick justly remarks, such a person could be no theocratic invention, for the union of the kingly and priestly offices in the same person was no part of the theocracy. Lastly, the name by which he knows God, "the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth," occurs also in the Phœnician religions, but not amongst the Jews, and is again one of those slight but accurate touches which at once distinguishes the historian from the fabulist. See MELCHIZEDEK.

*V. Author and Date of Composition.*—It will be seen, from what has been said above, that the book of Genesis, though containing different documents, owes its existing form to the labor of a single author, who has digested and incorporated the materials he found ready to his hand. A modern writer on history, in the same way, might sometimes transcribe passages from ancient chronicles, sometimes place different accounts together, sometimes again give briefly the substance of the older document, neglecting its form.

But it is a distinct inquiry who this author or editor was. This question cannot properly be discussed apart from the general question of the authorship of the entire Pentateuch. Under that head we shall show that this could have been no other than Moses, and that the entire work was finished when he deposited a copy of the law within the "sides" of the sacred Ark (Deut. x, 5). See PENTATEUCH. We shall here confine ourselves to a notice of the attempt of some critics to ascertain the period when Genesis was composed, from a few passages in it, which they say must be *anachronisms*, if Moses was really the author of the book (e. g. Tuch, *Commentar über Genesis*, p. lxxxv sq.).

A distinction, it is obvious, must be made between anachronisms of a subjective character, originating merely in dogmatic preconceptions, and such as relate to matters of fact. Thus the rejection of prophecy leads critics like Vater, Von Bohlen, and Kalisch to conclude that passages of Scripture declaratory of matters realized in the history of Israel must have been

written subsequent to such events. But even as regards matters of fact, the existence of anachronisms requires to be placed beyond doubt, before they can have any weight in such a case, just because of the improbability of a writer who wished his work to pass as that of an earlier age allowing such contradictions. To notice, however, a few examples: *Hebron* (Gen. xiii, 18; xxiii, 2), it is alleged from Josh. xiv, 15; xv, 13, was not so named until the entrance into Canaan, its ancient name being Kirjath-Arba (Gen. xxiii, 2). That Hebron was the original name appears from the fact that on its first mention it is so designated. In Abraham's time it was also called Mamre (xxiii, 19), from an Amoritic prince of that name (xiii, 18; xiv, 13). Subsequently, but prior to the Mosaic age, the Anakim possessed the place, when it received the name of Kirjath-Arba, or the city of Arba, "a great man among the Anakim" (Josh. xv, 15). The place *Dan* (Gen. xiv, 14), it is also alleged, received that name only in the time of the judges from the tribe of Dan, its original name being Laish or Leshem (Josh. xix, 47; Judg. xviii, 29). The localities, however, are by many thought to be quite distinct; the former being Dan-Jaan, between Gilead and the country round about Zidon (2 Sam. xxiv, 16), the adjunct Jaan being intended to distinguish it from Dan-Laish in the same neighborhood. See DAN. In Genesis, these critics further add, frequently occurs the name *Bethel* (xii, 8; xxviii, 19; xxxv, 15); while even in the time of Joshua, the place was as yet called Luz (Josh. xviii, 13). But the name Bethel was not first given to the place by the Israelites in the time of Joshua, there being no occasion for it, since Bethel was the old patriarchal name, which the Israelites restored in the place of Luz, a name given by the Canaanites. The explanatory remarks added to the names of certain places, as "Bela, which is Zoar" (Gen. xiv, 2, 8); "En-mishpat, which is Kadesh" (ver. 7), and some others, the opponents of the genuineness regard as indications of a later age, not considering that these explanations were required even for the Mosaic age, as the ancient designations were forgotten or rarely used. For proving them to be anachronisms, it must be shown that the new names were unknown in the time of Moses, though with the exception of "the king's dale" (xiv, 17), which does not again occur till 2 Sam. xviii, 16, all the names are referred to as well known in the books of the period immediately succeeding. The notice that "the Canaanite was then in the land" (xii, 6; xiii, 7), is thought to imply that the Canaanites were still in possession of Palestine, and so could not have been written till after their expulsion. But such is not the import of the passage. The descent of the Canaanites from Ham, and their progress from the south towards Palestine, had been described (x, 15-19), and they are now represented as in possession of the land to which the "sons of Eber" were advancing from an opposite point. Standing in connection with the promise of the land to Abraham, this notice contrasts the present with the promised future. The passage (Gen. xv, 18) where the land of Israel is described as extending from the river of Egypt (the Nile) to the great river (Euphrates), it is alleged, could only have been penned during the splendid period of the Jews, the times of David and Solomon. *Literally* taken, however, the remark is inapplicable to any period, since the kingdom of the Jews at no period of their history extended so far. That promise must, therefore, be taken in a rhetorical sense, describing the central point of the proper country as situated between the two rivers. The remark, "Before there reigned any king over the children of Israel" (xxxvi, 31), could not have been made, it is maintained, until the establishment of the Hebrew monarchy—an assumption which overlooks the relation of this statement to the promises of a royal posterity to the patriarchs, and especially that in an immediately preceding passage

(xxxv, 11). It stands in a relation similar to Deut. xvii, 14, where the erection of a kingdom is viewed as a necessary step in Israel's development. This explanation will of course not satisfy those who hold that in a simple historical style, a statement having such prophetic reference "is not only preposterous, but impossible" (Kalisch, *Genesis*, p. 601); but against rationalistic prepossessions of this kind there is no arguing.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.; Fairbairn, s. v.

VI. *Commentaries*.—The following are expressly on the whole of this book, the most important being designated by an asterisk (\*) prefixed: Origen, *Commentaria* (in *Opp.* ii, 1); also *Homiliv* (ib. ii, 52); Chrysostom, *Homiliv* (in *Opp.* iv, 3; also [*Spuria*] *ib.* vi, 619); and *Sermone* (ib. iv, 746, 796); Jerome, *Questiones* (in *Opp.* iii, 301); Eucherius, *Commentaria* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* v); Isidore, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* p. 283); Damianus, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* iii, 889); Bede, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* iv, 19); also *Questiones* (ib. viii, 78); Alcuin, *Interrogationes* (Hagenau, 1529, 8vo; also in *Opp.* i, ii, 303); Angelomus, *Commentarius* (in *Pez, Thesaur.* IV, i, 45); Renigius, *Commentarius* (ib. IV, i, 1); Hugo, *Annotationes* (in *Opp.* i, 8); Rupert, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* i, 1); Aquinas, *Expositio* (Antwerp, 1572, Lugd. 1573, 8vo; Paris, 1641, fol.); Ecolampadinus, *Abolaciones* (Basil. 1523, 1536, 8vo); Zwingle, *Adnotationes* (Tigur. 1527; also in *Opp.* iii, 4); Zeigler, *Commentarii* (Basil. 1540, fol.); Frisius, *Adsertiones* (Rom. 1541, fol.); \*Luther, *Enarrationes* (by different eds., part i, Vitemb. 1544, fol.; ii-iv, Norib. 1550-4; together, Francof. 1545-50, 8vo, and later; also in *Op. Exeg.* I, ii; in English, London, 1855, 8vo); Melancthon, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* ii, 377); Musculus, *Commentaria* (Basil. 1554, 1565, 1600, fol.); Honcala, *Commentarius* (Complut. 1555, fol.); Chytraeus, *Commentarius* (Vitemb. 1557, 1558, 1590, 8vo); \*Marloratus, *Expositio* (Par. 1562; Morg. 1568, 1580, 1584, fol.; Genev. 1580, 8vo); \*Calvin, *In Genesim* (in *Opp.* i); also tr. Lond. 1578, 4to; also ib. 1847-50, 2 vols. 8vo); Strigel, *Scholia* (Lips. 1566, 1574, 8vo); Selnecker, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1569, fol.); Martyr, *Commentarius* (Tigur. 1572, 1579, 1595; Heidelb. 1606, fol.); Brentius, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* i); Brocard, *Interpretatio* [mystical] (L. B. 1580, 8vo; ib. 1584, 4to; Bremen, 1585, 1593, 4to); Fabricius, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1584, 1592, 8vo; 1596, Argent. 1584, 4to); \*Pererius [Romanist], *Commentarius* (Rom. 1589-1598, 4 vols. fol.; Colon. 1601, 1606, Ven. 1607, fol.; Lugd. 1616, 4 vols. 4to; and later); Musæus, *Auslegung* (Magdeb. 1595, fol.); Martineugus, *Glossa* (Patav. 1597, 2 vols. fol.); Daabitz, *Predigten* (Lpz. 1597, 8vo); Mercer, *Commentarius* (Genev. 1598, fol.); Kalmankas, *מִשְׁפָּחַת הַיְהוָה* (Lublín, s. a. fol.); Hammelmann, *Adnotationes* (Lips. 1600, fol.); Stella, *Commentaria* (Rom. 1601, fol.); Schmuck, *Auslegung* (Lpz. 1603-9, in 8 pts. 4to); Gesner, *Disputationes* (Vitemb. 1604, 1613, 1629, 4to); Lyser, *Commentarius* (in 6 pts., Lips. 1604 sq., 4to); \*Willett, *Sixfold Commentary* (London, 1605, fol.); Delrio, *Commentarii* (Lugd. 1608, 4to); Runge, *Prolectiones* (Vitemb. 1608, 8vo); Pareus, *Commentarius* (Francof. 1609, 1614, 4to); Gedick, *Auslegung* (Lpz. 1611, 1632, fol.); De Petiglian, *Commentaria* (Ven. 1616, 4to); Ferdindez, *Commentationes* (Lugd. 1618-28, 3 vols. fol.); Babington, *Notes* (in *Works*, i); Merseonus, *Questiones* [polemical] (Par. 1623, fol.); Garzia, *Discussio* (Caesaraug. 1624, fol.); Böhme, *Erklärung* [mystical] (s. l. 1624; also in his other works); Rivetus, *Erraticiones* (L. B. 1633, 4to); Gerhard, *Commentarius* (Jen. 1637, 1654, 1693, 4to); De la Haye, *Commentarii* (Lugd. 1638, Par. 1651, 1663, 2 vols. fol.); Sylvius, *Commentarius* (Dnaci, 1639, 4to); Lightfoot, *Observations* (Lond. 1642; also in *Works*, ii, 329); and *Annotationes* (ib. x, 532); Gauduntius, *Conatus* (Pisis, 1644, 4to); Cartwright, *Adnotationes* [from Targums] (Lond. 1648, 8vo; also in *Critici Sacri*, i); Rivet, *Exercitationes* (in *Opp.* i, 1); Terser, *Adnotationes* (Upsal. 1657, fol.); Chemnitz, *Disputationes* (Jen.

1665, Lips. 1711; Vitemb. 1716, 4to); Calov, *Commentarius* (Vitemb. 1671, 4to); Hughes, *Expositio* (Lond. 1672, fol.); Cocecius, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* i, 1); also *Curæ* (ib. ii, 1); Anonymous, *Traduction*, etc. [patristic] (Paris, 1682, 12mo); Masson, *Questiones* (Paris, 1685-8, 3 vols. 12mo); Bomparte, *Notæ* [from profane sources] (Amst. 1689); Akiba-Bar, *מִשְׁפָּחַת הַיְהוָה* [Rabbinical] (Sulzb. 1690, 1700, 4to, and later); \*Patrick, *Commentary* (Lond. 1695, 4to; afterwards embodied in Patrick, Lowth, Arnold, and Whitby's *Commentary* on the Bible); Schmid, *Adnotationes* (Argent. 1697, 4to); Güntzburg, *מִשְׁפָּחַת הַיְהוָה* (Amst. 1713, 4to); Barch ben-Isaak, *מִשְׁפָּחַת הַיְהוָה* [polemical] (Halle, 1714, 4to); Von Sanden, *Questiones* (Regim. 1716, 4to); Duquet, *Explication* (Paris, 1732, 6 vols. 12mo); Sandus, *Lectiones* (Ven. 1733, 4to); Hagemann, *Betrachtungen* (in 3 parts, Brunswiek, 1734-6, 4to); Lookup, *Transtlation* (1740, 8vo); Haitsma, *Curæ* (Franck. 1753, 4to); Dawson, *Notes* (Lond. 1763-87, 3 vols. 4to); Murray, *Lectures* (Newe. 1777, 2 vols. 8vo); Dubno, *מִשְׁפָּחַת הַיְהוָה*, etc. (in Mendelssohn's *Pentateuch*, Berl. 1781-3, 8vo, and later); Giesebrecht, *Erklärung* (Rostock, 1784 sq., 2 vols. 4to); Sösmans, *Notes*, etc. (London, 1787, 8vo); Rüdiger, *Erklärung* (Stendal, 1788, 8vo); Harwood, *Annotations* (Lond. 1789, 8vo); Ilgen, *Urkunde*, etc. (Halle, 1798, 8vo); Franks, *Remarks* (Halif. 1802, 8vo); Dimock, *Notes* (Gloucester, 1804, 4to); Rosenmüller, *Scholia* (Lips. 1821, 8vo); Fuller, *Discourses* (London, 1825, 1836, 12mo); Close, *Discourses* (London, 1828, 12mo); Rudge, *Lectures* (London, 1828, 2 vols. 8vo); Schumann, *Annotatio* (Lips. 1829, 8vo); Seltmann, *Uebers.* (Hamm, 1831, 8vo); Coghill, *Commentary* (London, 1832, 2 vols. 8vo); \*Von Bohlen, *Erläuterung* (Königsb. 1835, 8vo); Von Schrank, *Commentarius* (Salzburg, 1835, 8vo); Sitthorp, *Observations* (Lond. 1835, 8vo); \*Tiele, *Commentar* (Erl. 1836, 8vo, vol. i); Warner, *Exposition* (Lond. 1838, 8vo); \*Fuch, *Commentar* (Halle, 1838, 8vo); Priaux, *Comparison*, etc. [antiquarian] (London, 1842, 8vo); \*De Sola and others, *Notes* (Lond. 1844, 8vo); Heim, *Lehre* (Stuttg. 1845, 8vo); \*Turner, *Companion* (N. York, 1846, 8vo); Trevanion, *Sermone* (Lond. 1847, 8vo); Schröder, *Auslegung* (Berl. 1848, 8vo); Evans, *Sermone* (Lond. 1849, 12mo); Sörensen, *Commentar* (Kiel, 1851, 8vo); \*Knobel, *Erklärung* (Lpz. 1852, 8vo, in the *Kurzgef. excg. hdbk.*); Candlish, *Lectures* (Edinb. 1852, 2 vols. 12mo; Lond. 1868, 2 vols. 8vo); Paul, *Analysis* (Edinb. 1852, 8vo); \*Delitzsch, *Auslegung* (Lpz. 1852, 1853, 8vo); Jervis, *Notes* (Lond. 1852, 8vo); \*Bush, *Notes* (N. Y. 1852, 2 vols. 12mo); Macgregor, *Notes* (London, 1853, 8vo); Cumming, *Readings* (Lond. 1853, 8vo); Preston, *Notes* (London, 1853, 8vo); Putnam, *Gosp. in Gen.* (N. Y. 1854, 8vo); Howard, *Tr. from Sept.* (Camb. 1855, 8vo); \*Kalisch, *Commentary* (Lond. 1859, 8vo); Wright, *Notes* (Lond. 1859, 8vo); Groves, *Commentary* (Camb. 1861, 12mo); Mandelstamm, *Erklärung* (Berl. 1862, 4to); Böhmer, *Commentarius* (Halle, 1860, 8vo); also *Uebers.* etc. (Hal. 1862, 8vo); Rahmer, *Questiones* (Breslau, 1863, 8vo); \*Murphy, *Commentary* (Belfast, 1863; Andover, 1866, 8vo); Jacobus, *Notes* (N. York, 1865, 2 vols. 12mo); Quarry, *Authorship of Gen.* (Lond. 1866, 8vo); Conant, *Revised Version* (N. Y. 1868, 8vo); \*Tayler Lewis, *Commentary* (in the Am. ed. of Lange's *Bibelwerk*, ed. Dr. Schaff, New York, 1868, 8vo). See OLD TESTAMENT.

**Genesisus, ST.**, a comedian of the time of Dioclesian, of whose conversion the following marvellous but doubtful story is told. He was playing, before the emperor, the part of a candidate for Christian baptism, robed in the habit of a catechumen. But at the moment in the farce when the emperor was to judge the new convert, he was suddenly convinced by the Holy Spirit, and declared himself really a convert. He was scourged and tortured, but nothing could shake his fidelity, and he was decapitated. Different dates are



assigned for his death: Tillemont and Ruinart fix it at A. D. 286; Baronius and Fleury at A. D. 303. His day in the Roman Catholic calendar is Aug. 25. Rotrou has made this apocryphal history the subject of a tragedy. See *Acta Sanctorum*, August, vol. v; Ruinart, *Acta Sincera*, p. 269; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, Aug. 25.

**Genet**, FRANÇOIS, a French prelate, was born at Avignon Oct. 16, 1640. He became canon and theologian of the cathedral of Avignon, and in 1685 bishop of Vaison. Implicated in the affair of the *Daughters of Childhood* of Toulouse, whom he had received in his diocese, and who were held to be Jansenists, he was arrested in 1688, and imprisoned for fifteen months. The pope finally persuaded Louis XIV to restore Genet to his diocese. He was drowned in 1702, while on his way from Avignon to Vaison. He is the author of *Théologie Morale*, which was disapproved by the bishops, and condemned by the University of Louvain, March 10, 1703. The best edition is that of 1715 (8 vols. 12mo); it was reprinted at Rouen in 1749.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xix, 873.

**Genethliäci**, astrologers, who pretended to calculate mens' naticities by erecting schemes and horoscopes, to know what position the stars were in at their birth, and thence to foretell their good or bad fortune. "And because some of these pretended to determine positively of the lives and deaths of kings, which was reputed a very dangerous piece of treason, therefore the laws of the state were more severe against them even under the heathen emperors, as Gothofred shows out of the ancient lawyers, Ulpian and Paulus; and that was another reason why the Church thought it proper to animadvert upon these with the utmost severity of ecclesiastical censures, as thinking that what the heathen laws had punished as a capital crime ought not to pass unregarded in the discipline of the Christian Church. It was this crime that expelled Aquila from the Church. For Epiphanius says (*De Mensuris et Ponderibus*) he was once a Christian, but, being incorrigibly bent upon the practice of astrology, the Church cast him out, and then he became a Jew, and in revenge set upon a new translation of the Bible, to corrupt those texts which had any relation to the coming of Christ."—Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bx. xvi, ch. v. See DIVINATION.

**Geneva** (French Genève), capital of the Swiss canton of the same name, celebrated for its historical and religious associations, and in particular as the seat of the reformatory labors of Calvin. The canton had, in 1860, 82,876 inhabitants, of whom 40,069 were Protestants, 42,099 Roman Catholics, 331 Dissidents, 377 Jews. During the Middle Ages Geneva was an object of dispute between the bishop of Geneva, who was an immediate feudatory of the German empire, and the count of Genevois, who ruled the adjoining province of Savoy. After the extinction of the line of the counts of Genevois, the dukes of Savoy were appointed their successors by the German emperor Sigismund (1422). Hence the claim of Savoy upon Geneva, from which the Genevans could only free themselves by alliances with the Swiss cantons of Fribourg (1519) and Berne (1526), and by the aid of the Reformation. The latter was introduced into Geneva by Farel, Fromment, and others, about 1532, and in 1535 was officially established. Being put under the ban by the bishop, the city declared the episcopal see vacant, and declared itself a republic. Calvin first came to Geneva in 1536, and after an absence of a few years returned in 1541, when he soon succeeded in making himself the temporal as well as the spiritual ruler of the town. Thus Geneva became the metropolis of Calvinism, and, as such, exercised a great influence upon all the Calvinistic churches. From 1798 to 1814 Geneva was united with France; in 1814, its territory having been enlarged by the annexation of a few Savoyan and French communes, it joined the Swiss Confederation as the 22d canton. The

Reformed State Church, which in 1868 had 16 congregations and 35 ministers, has for some time been under the influence of Rationalism, and a part of the orthodox members have therefore organized a Free Evangelical Church, which has a celebrated theological school, several of whose professors, as Merle d'Anbigné and Gausson, have established a great theological reputation throughout the Protestant world.—Thourel, *Histoire de Genève* (Geneva, 1863); Cherbuliez, *Genève et les Genevois* (Geneva, 1868). (A. J. S.)

**Geneva Bible.** See ENGLISH VERSIONS.

**Geneviève, St.**, the patron saint of Paris, was, according to tradition, born at Nanterre, near Paris, about 423. By the advice of St. Germain, bishop of Auxerre, she took the vow of chastity, and when afterwards accused of hypocrisy and superstition, she was warmly defended by the bishop. When the inhabitants of Paris, frightened at the approach of Attila, contemplated leaving their city, Geneviève dissuaded them, saying that Paris would be spared; and as the prediction proved true, she became the object of general veneration. She also advised the building of a church to St. Peter and St. Paul, in which she was afterwards buried, and which bears her name. She died in 512. Her reputation for sanctity became so great that Simon Stylites inquired about her from all persons coming from Gaul. Miracles were said to take place at her tomb. There exists a life of her in Latin, claiming to have been written eighteen years after the death of Clovis. The life of St. Germain by the priest Constance, said to have been written during her lifetime, relates her consecration by that bishop. See the Bollandists, *Acta Sanct.* July 31; Charpentier, *Vie de St. Geneviève* (1687); Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, Jan. 3.

**Geneviève, St., Canons of**, called also canons regular of the Congregation of France, a congregation of canons regular (q. v.) established in 1614 by Charles Faure, a member of the abbey of St. Vincent of Senlis, who effected a reformation of the French canons which was soon adopted by several other abbeys. Cardinal de la Rochefoucauld, who in 1619 had been made abbot of the abbey of St. Geneviève du Mont at Paris, being desirous to reform his abbey, sent, in 1624, for twelve members of St. Vincent of Senlis, and made Faure its spiritual superior. In 1634 the pope confirmed the new congregation. Soon after its first chapter general was held, which was attended by the superiors of fifteen houses, and elected Faure coadjutor of the abbot of St. Geneviève and general of the congregation. The king had previously given up his right of nominating the abbot of St. Geneviève, and consented that he be elected every third year. Helyot, in his *History of Religious Orders*, states that at his time the congregations had in France 67 abbots, 28 priors, 2 provosts,



Canon of St. Geneviève. Daughter of St. Geneviève.

and 3 hospitals, besides, in the Netherlands, 3 abbots and 3 priors. A large number of parishes were served by its members. It was customary to elect one of the chancellors of the University of Paris from this congregation. Helyot, *Dict. des Ordres Relig.*, art. Génovéfains. (A. J. S.)

**Geneviève, St., Daughters of** (more commonly called Miramions), a monastic order in the Roman Catholic Church, founded, in 1636, at Paris, by Francisca de Blosset, for the purpose of nursing the sick and instructing girls. In 1665 it was united by Marie Bonneau de Kubelle Beauharnois de Miramion with a similar order which she had founded in 1661, under the name of the Holy Family. The order obtained considerable reputation, and extended widely. Its members took no vows, but only promised a faithful observation of the rule and the statutes of the society as long as they might belong to it.—Helyot, *Dict. des Ordres Relig.*, art. Miramiones. (A. J. S.)

**Genius, ATTENDANT.** See GUARDIAN ANGEL.

**Gennadius**, patriarch of Constantinople, succeeded Anatolius in that dignity A.D. 458. He was a man of quick parts, and composed *Homilies*; a *Commentary on Paul's Epistles*; and a *Commentary on Daniel*. He died A.D. 471. His writings are lost, except an *Epistle* preserved by Gryneus, and other fragments, all of which are given by Migne, *Patrologia Græca*, tom. lxxxv.—Evagrius, *Hist. Eccl.* ii, 11; Dupin, *Eccl. Writers*, iv, 156; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacrés* (Paris, 1861), xi, 345.

**Gennadius**, patriarch of Constantinople (whose proper name was George Scholarius), was one of the most original and prolific writers in the Greek Church of the 15th century. He was secretary to the emperor John Palæologus, and attended the Council of Florence in 1438, while yet a layman. He became an ecclesiastic in 1449 or 1450, and entered a monastery, taking the name of Gennadius. At Florence he had declared himself strongly on the side of union with the Latin Church, in three orations to be found in Hardouin, *Concilia*, ix, 446 (supposed to be much interpolated). After becoming a monk he changed his views, and wrote against the Council of Ferrara-Florence. In 1453 he was made patriarch by the sultan, but retired in 1458, and died about 1460. Some have disputed the identity of Scholarius with Gennadius, but Renaudot puts it beyond doubt. A list of his writings will be found in Renaudot, who edited his homily *De Eucharistia* (Paris, 1704), and, in a larger edit., with Meletius and others (Paris, 1709, 4to). His treatise *περί προορισμού, De Predestinatione*, was edited by Libertinus (Prague, 1673, 8vo). Migne, in *Patrologia Græca*, tom. clx, gives Renaudot's dissertation on the life and writings of Gennadius, with his writings as follows: *Confessio Fidei* (i, ii);—*Homilia*:—*Orationes in Synodo Florent.*:—*De Predestinatione*:—*De Deo in Trinitate uno*:—*Epistole*; and other writings. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Græca* (ed. Harles), xi, 349 sq., gives Renaudot's list of the writings of Gennadius, seventy-six in number, and adds twenty-four more. See also a list of his writings and their various editions, in Hoffmann, *Bibliographisches Lexikon*, ii, 155 sq. Of the writings attributed to him, perhaps the most important are the two Confessions made for the sultan, (1) *Ὁμλία (or ὁμολογία) ῥηθῆσα περί τῆς ἁθῆς καὶ ἁγιωμῆτων πίστεως τῶν Χριστιανῶν*; and (2) a dialogue *περὶ τῆς οὐδοῦ τῆς σωτηρίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων*, both given in Migne (Gr. and Lat.), in Kimmel, *Monumenta Fidei Eccles. Orientalis* (Jena, 1850, 8vo), and in Gass, *Gennadius and Pletho* (see below). These confessions have been critically studied by Dr. Otto, who gives the text of the dialogue, a literary history of the two confessions, and an investigation of the genuineness of the dialogue, in *Zeitschrift für histor. Theologie*, xx, 389 sq.; xxxiv, 111 sq.; and separately, from additional sources, *Des Patriarch Gennados Confession* (Wien,

1864). Otto decides that the dialogue was not written by Gennadius, but is probably a recension of the *ἑρπαι τινες ἰσορήσεις* (falsely ascribed to Athanasius), made by some Greek, in the interest of the Church of Rome, to favor the union of the Greek and Latin churches. As it gives the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son (Migne, tom. clx, p. 322 D), the Latins and Latinizing Greeks have made much use of it in the *Filioque* controversy.—Mosheim, *Church History*, cent. xv, pt. ii, chap. ii, § 23; Dupin, *Eccl. Writers*, v, 110; Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*, l. c.; Hoefel, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xix, 913; Gass, *Gennadius and Pletho* (Breslau, 1844).

**Gennadius**, MASSILIENSIS, a presbyter of Marseilles, a Gaul (end of 5th century). Although some modern writers assert that he was a bishop, some say of Marseilles, others of Toledo, he was only a presbyter. He was versed in Greek and Latin, and a laborious student of the Scriptures and the fathers. He wrote a number of books, of which only two have come down to us: (1) *De Viris illustribus*, or *De Scripturibus Ecclesiasticis* (Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers), a continuation of that of Jerome, to which it is usually joined. It begins where Jerome's ends, A.D. 392, and ends 493. There have been many editions of it, besides that which is inserted in the works of St. Jerome; the best is that of Fabricius, in his *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica* (Hamb. 1718, fol.). (2) *De Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus* (Hamb. 1594 and 1614, 4to). Gennadius advocates doctrines on free-will and predestination similar to those of Faustus of Rhegium. "In his treatise *De Dogmatibus Ecclesiasticis*, he says, God first of all warns man, and invites him to salvation; it is in the power of man to follow him. In his work *De Viris Illustribus*, cap. 58, he speaks of Augustine with commendation, yet does not hesitate to add, that by writing so much he fell into the error of which Solomon says in the 10th chapter of Proverbs, 'In the multitude of words there wanteth not sin.' He makes mention of an error which had arisen from much speaking, and evidently refers to the doctrine of absolute predestination. This arose from carrying things to an extreme, but for all this Augustine had not fallen into heresy" (Neander, *History of Dogmas*, Ryland's transl. p. 383).—Dupin, *Eccl. Writers*, iv, 185; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 341; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 647; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* v, 289; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* (Genev. 1720, fol.), i, 299.

**Gennæus** (Γενναῖος, i. e. *high-born*, but v. r. Γένεος), apparently given (2 Macc. xii, 2) as the name of the father of the Syrian general Apollonius (q. v.); but perhaps it is a mere epithet.

**Gennath** (Γεννάθ, apparently for the Chald. ܓܢܢܐ or ܓܢܢܐ, *garden*, q. d. "garden-gate;" perhaps [as Schwarz suggests, *Palest.* p. 254] from the "rose-garden," גַּן הַרֹּסֵם, mentioned in the Talmud [*Maaser*, ii, 5] as lying west of the Temple mount), the name, according to Josephus (*Jar.* v, 4, 2), of one of the gates of Jerusalem, important as mainly determining the course of the second wall, which has been greatly disputed. See CALVARY. His account is as follows: "But the second wall, while it had its beginning from that gate which they called 'Gennath,' which belonged to the first wall, yet encircling only the northern slope [or quarter], reached as far as Antonia" (Τὸ δὲ δεύτερον τὴν μὲν ἀρχὴν ἀπὸ πύλης εἶχεν, ἣν Γεννάθ ἐκάλεον, τοῦ πρώτου τείχους οὖσαν, κεικλούμενον ἐν τῷ προσάκτιον κλίμα μόνον ἀνῆγει μέχρι τῆς Ἀντωνίας); from which, together with the context, the following conclusions are certain: (1.) The gate in question formed part of the first wall that skirted the northern brow of Mount Zion, for the second wall must have started from this quarter, since it ran northward, and lay between the first and the third wall on the same side of the city. (2.) It was situated at some point east of the tower Hippicus, which formed the common

starting-point of both the other walls, but not of this; its distance from this tower is the chief matter of disagreement between topographers; the following considerations will serve to show that it was considerable: [1.] There were two other adjacent towers, not very far from each other, along the same wall, and the gate must have been beyond them all, as they would have been useless for defense if inclosed within the second wall; nor does the precipitous rock here admit egress for some distance. [2.] Several indications of the junction of the walls, if not of the gate in question itself, have been discovered about 1000 feet east of the present Jaffa gate (Williams, *Holy City*, i, Append. p. 83 sq.); this would make the line of the second wall correspond very nearly to the modern division between the Christian and Mohammedan quarters. The only objection of any force against this location of the gate, and consequently of the wall in question, is that it brings the latter upon the side of a descent, where no engineer would think of constructing a mural defence, as it would be commanded by the higher ground outside. On the other hand, the hill is not so steep as is implied in this argument; there is no evidence that the wall here was erected specially because the nature of the ground afforded a peculiarly favorable situation, but simply to include the existing buildings; nor would the matter be much improved by carrying the wall a little further up the same general shelving wedge of land, which here extends indefinitely westward. Moreover, the weakness of the second wall at this point may have been the reason for the construction of the three impregnable towers expressly so as to flank it. See JERUSALEM.

**Genne'sar**, THE WATER OF (τὸ ὕδωρ Γεννησάου), a place where Jonathan Maccabeus encamped on his way to attack the forces of Demetrius at Kadesh (1 Macc. xi, 67); doubtless the Lake GENNESARET (q. v.).

**Gennes'aret** [*g* pron. hard] (Γεννησαῖρ), the Greek form of the lake (Luke v, 1) and plain (Matt. xiv, 34; Mark vi, 53), invariably found in the N. T. in place of the GENNESAR (Γεννησάου) of the Apocrypha (1 Macc. xi, 67), and usually also of Josephus (*War*, iii, 10, 7, 8). In the Talmudical writings and Targums we always find the latter form Hebraized גִּנְסָרָא, *Ginsesar'*, as an equivalent of גִּנְנֵסָרָא, *Kinnere'th* or CHINNERETH (Lightfoot, *Works*, ii, 222); from which accordingly it has usually been derived, by an interchange of א for ס, and the insertion of ו; although others derive it from נֶסֶר, a valley, and גִּנְנֵסָרָא, a shoot or flower, as if i. q. "the vale of flowers" (Jerome, *Opp.* vii, 103, ed. Migne), or from גִּן, a garden, and נֶסֶר, a prince, as if i. q. "the prince's garden" (Lightfoot, i, 489), or even from Sharon, a fertile vale not far distant (Retland, *Palæst.* p. 193, 259).

1. *The town.* This is variously named in the O. T. as *Chinnereth* (or "Chinnereth," Josh. xix, 35), where it is assigned to Naphtali. In later times it was called *Genusar* (גִּנְנֵסָרָא, *Megilla*, 6, a), and in the Talmudic period one Jonathan ben-Charsa was from there (*Tosiphta Kelim*, s. f.). At the time of Farchi (beginning of the 14th century) it was still in existence; doubtless the ruins *Gansur*, still found at the present day one hour north-west of Tubariyeh, according to Fürst (*Heb. Lex.* p. 676, a), although no modern map lays it down. See CHINNERETH.

2. *The district* (N. T. γῆ, *land*), named from its basin-like form (like the body of a גִּנְנֵסָרָא, or lyre). This was a small region of Galilee, on the western shore of the lake, visited by Christ on his way (southward along the lake) to Capernaum (Matt. xiv, 35, 36). It is described by Josephus (*War*, iii, 10, 8) as about four miles in length and three in breadth, and as distinguished for its fertility and beauty. The Talmud also (*Berak.* 44) describes the luxuriant growth of this low-

lying district (גִּנְנֵסָרָא) under the same name (גִּנְנֵסָרָא). Dr. Robinson thus describes it (*Bib. Res.* iii, 282 sq.): "The plain upon which we now entered from Medjel is at first called Ard el-Medjel, but further on takes the name of *el-Ghuacir*, 'Little Ghor,' which strictly, perhaps, includes the whole. It is exceedingly fertile and well watered; the soil, on the southern part at least, is a rich black mould, which in the vicinity of Medjel is almost a marsh. Its fertility, indeed, can hardly be exceeded; all kinds of grain and vegetables are produced in abundance, including rice in the moister parts, while the natural productions, as at Tiberias and Jericho, are those of a more southern latitude. Indeed, in beauty, fertility, and climate, the whole tract answers well enough to the glowing though exaggerated description of Josephus. Among other productions, he speaks here also of walnut-trees, but we did not note whether any now exist." It is a crescent-shaped plain, about three miles long and two broad, shut in by steep, rugged hills. Only a few patches of it are cultivated, its melons and cucumbers being the first and best in market, owing to its deep depression. The rest is covered with tangled thickets of lotus-trees, oleanders, dwarf palms, and gigantic thistles and brambles. (See also Wilson, *Lands of Libe*, ii, 136 sq.; Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 555; Stanley, *Palestine*, p. 368.) In this identification of the plain of Gennesaret with the one in question, Mr. De Sauley coincides (*Narrative*, ii, 356-8; see also Hackett's *Illustra.* p. 320). See CAPERNAUM.

3. *The Lake* (λίμνη, N. T. and Josephus), or *water* (ὕδωρ, 1 Macc. xi, 67; ὕδατα Γεννησάρα, Joseph. *Ant.* xiii, 5, 7), or *sea* (θάλασσα, O. T.). Josephus calls it *Gennesaritis* (Γεννησαῖτις, *Ant.* xviii, 2, 1), and this seems to have been its common name at the commencement of our era (Strab. xvi, p. 755; Plin. v, 16; Ptol. v, 15). At its north-western angle was a beautiful and fertile plain (Matt. xiv, 34), from which the name of the lake was taken (Josephus, *War*, iii, 10, 7). The lake is also called in the N. T. "Sea of Galilee," from the province of Galilee which bordered on its western side (Matt. iv, 18; Mark vii, 31; John vi, 1); and "Sea of Tiberias," from the celebrated city (John vi, 1); so also Barhebr. *Chron.* p. 400; the Talmud, *Midrash Kohel.* fol. 102, 1; Pausanias, *λίμνη Τιβεραίας*, v, 7, 3; Eusebius, *λίμνη Τιβεραίας*, *Onom.* s. v. *Σαζών*; see also Cyr. ad *Jes.* i, 5). It is a curious fact that all the numerous names given to this lake were taken from places on its western side. Its modern name is likewise *Bahr Tubariyeh*.

In Josh. xi, 2, "the plains south of Chinnereth" are mentioned. It is the sea and not the city that is here referred to (comp. Deut. iii, 17; Josh. xii, 3), and "the plains" are those along the banks of the Jordan. Most of our Lord's public life was spent in the environs of the Sea of Gennesaret. On its shores stood Capernaum, "his own city" (Matt. iv, 13); on its shore he called his first disciples from their occupation as fishermen (Luke v, 1-11); and near its shores he spoke many of his parables and performed many of his miracles. This region was then the most densely peopled in all Palestine. No less than *nine* cities stood on the very shores of the lake, while numerous large villages dotted the plains and hill-sides around (Porter, *Handbook*, p. 424).

A "mournful and solitary silence" now reigns along the shores of the Sea of Gennesaret, which were in former ages studded with great cities, and resounded with the din of an active and industrious people. Seven out of the nine cities above referred to are now uninhabited ruins; one, Magdala, is occupied by half a dozen mud hovels; and Tiberias alone retains a wretched remnant of its former prosperity.—Smith, s. v. See GALILEE, SEA OF.

**Gennesareth; Gennesaritis.** See GENNESARET.

**Genne'us.** See GENNEUS.

**Genoude, ANTOINE EUGÈNE DE,** a French priest and publicist, was born in 1792 at Montélimart. After the first expulsion of Napoleon he entered the service of Louis XVIII, and became adjutant of the prince de Polignac. In 1820 he established the journal *Le Défenseur*. In 1821 he bought the journal *Etoile*, the name of which in 1827 was changed into *Gazette de France*. In 1822 he was ennobled. After being for some time censor under the ministry of Villèle, he entered the priesthood, but soon devoted himself again wholly to the editing of political papers. After the Revolution of July he was one of the most violent defenders of the fallen dynasty, and was involved on that account in difficulties with the pope and the French bi-shops. In 1846 he was elected member of the Chamber of Deputies for Toulouse; and after the outbreak of the Revolution of 1848, he moved in the Chamber of Deputies, though without effect, an appeal to the people concerning a restoration of the elder branch of the Bourbons. Besides several political pamphlets, he wrote, *La Raison du Christianisme* (3d edit. Paris, 1841, 12 vols.);—*Les pères de l'église des trois premiers siècles* (Paris, 1837);—*Leçons et modèles de litt. sacrée* (Paris, 1837);—*La Vie de Jésus Christ et des Apôtres* (Paris, 1836; 2d edit. 1846);—*Histoire d'un âme* (Paris, 1844);—*Hist. de France* (Paris, 1844-1847, 16 vols.). He also published a new translation of the Bible, as well as of Thomas à Kempis's *Imitation of Christ*, and new editions of the works of Malebranche, of the spiritual works of Fénelon (1842), and of select works of Bossuet.—Broekhaus, *Conversat.-Lex.* s. v.; Hoefor, *Nouv. Biogr. Gén.* xix, 927. (A. J. S.)

**Genovesi, ANTONIO,** an Italian metaphysician, was born at Castiglione Nov. 1, 1712. He studied theology at Salerno, and was ordained priest in 1736. He lectured on philosophy at Naples with great reputation for some time, but at length he was attacked by numerous enemies for publishing his metaphysics, in which he recommended the works of Galileo, Grotius, and Newton. He was protected by the archbishop of Tarentum, and by the king of Naples, who made him professor of moral philosophy, and even of theology, in the Neapolitan university. In 1754 the chair of political economy was founded for him, and he continued to teach this science until his death in 1769. He was the author of *Elementa Metaphysicæ* (Naples, 1744, et seq., 5 vols. 8vo);—*Element. art. logico-criticæ* (1745, 8vo). In these books he followed D'Alembert and Helvetius. He published also *Elementa Theologicæ* (Naples, 1751), which caused him to be interdicted by the Church from teaching theology. A historical eulogy of Genovesi was published by Galanti (Venice, 1774, 8vo).—Hoefor, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xix, 932.

**Genoveva.** See GENEVIÈVE.

**Genovevans.** See GENEVIÈVE, ORDERS OF.

**Gentile** (usually in the plur. גֵּוֹיִם, *goyim'*; Sept. and N. T. ἔθνη). The Hebrew word גֵּוֹי, *a people*, is derived from the obsolete verb גִּיַּע, *to flow together*, as a crowd, and was originally used in a general sense of any nation, including the Jews themselves, both in the singular (Gen. xii, 2; Deut. xxxii, 28; Isa. i, 4), and in the plural (Gen. xxxv, 11). It is also used poetically (like the Gr. ἔθνη, Hom. II, ii, 87; Od. xiv, 73, and the Latin *gentes*, Virg. *Georg.* iv, 430) of insects and animals (Joel i, 6; Zeph. ii, 14).

But as the sense of a peculiar privilege dawned on the minds of the Jewish people, they began to confine the word גֵּוֹי to other nations (Neh. v, 8), and although at first it did not connote any unpleasant associations, it began gradually to acquire a hostile sense, which never attached itself to the other terms, לְשׁוֹנֵי לְשׁוֹנֵי, *tongues* (Isa. lxvi, 18), or עַמֵּי עַמֵּי, *the peoples*. In proportion as the Jews began to pride themselves upon

being "the first-born of God" (Exod. iv, 22), "the people of the covenant," "a holy nation, and a kingdom of priests" (Exod. xix, 4), they learned to use the indifferent expression *Goyim* to imply that all other nations were more or less barbarous (Psa. ii, 1, 8; ix, 7; x, 16; cvi, 47), profane (Jer. xxxi, 10; Ezek. xxiii, 30), idolatrous, uncircumcised, and unclean (Isa. lii, 1; Jer. ix, 26). Thus age after age the word became more invidious, and acquired a significance even more contemptuous than that of the Greek βάρβαρος, which, being an onomatopœia to imitate the strange sound of foreign tongues, is paralleled by the Hebrew גֵּוֹיִם, גֵּוֹיִם, *a stammerer*, applied to foreigners in Psa. cxiv, 1; Isa. xxviii, 11; xxxiii, 19. The word גֵּוֹיִם gains its last tinge of hatred as applied by Jews to all Christians. Other expressions, intended to point out the same distinction, are used with a shade less of scorn; such, for instance, as גֵּוֹיִם בְּרִיּוֹת (see Buxtorf, *Lex.* col. 723), *oi êxoi, those without*, which is Hebraistically used in the N. T. (1 Tim. iii, 9. See Otho, *Lex. Rab.* p. 111; Schöttgen, *Hor. Hebr.* in 1 Cor. v, 12. In Mark iv, 11 it is applied to the incredulous Jews themselves); and מְלָכּוּתֵי, *kingdoms* (1 Chron. xxix, 30). The Jews applied the terms מְלָכּוּתֵי, *lands*, and, according to some Rabbis, מְלָכּוּתֵי הַיָּם, *region of the sea*, to all countries except Palestine, just as the Greeks distinguished between Hellas and ἡ βάρβαρος (2 Chron. xiii, 9; xvii, 10; Ezra ix, 1; Luke xii, 30; Lightfoot, *Centuria Chorogr.* i, ad init.). Although the Jews thus separated between themselves and other nations, they hesitated as little as the Romans did to include themselves in the Greek term βάρβαρος (Josephus, *Ant.* xi, 7, 1; comp. Justin Mar. *Apol.* i, 46). See BARBARIAN.

In the N. T. ἔθνη (although sometimes used in the singular of the Jewish nation, Acts x, 22; Luke vii, 5) is generally opposed to Israel (τῶ λαῶ Θεοῦ), God's people (Luke ii, 32). But the term most frequently thus rendered is (not ἔθνη, but) Ἕλληνας, which is distinguished from Ἕλληνας (Acts vi, 1), and, although literally meaning Greeks (as in Acts xvi, 1, 3; xviii, 17; Rom. i, 14), yet usually denotes any non-Jews, because of the general prevalence of the Greek language (Rom. i, 16, and passim; 1 Cor. i, 22; Gal. iii, 28, etc.). Thus Timothy, who was of Lystra, is called Ἕλληνα (Acts xv, 1, 3), and a Syrophenician woman Ἕλληνίς (Mark vii, 26), and the Jews of the Dispersion, ἡ διασπορά τῶν Ἑλλήνων (John vii, 35). This usage is even found in the apocryphal writings, where Ἕλληνας is made a synonymy to ἀλλοφιλισμός (2 Macc. iv, 13), and τὰ Ἕλληνικά ἔθνη are pagan morals (vi, 9); and even so early as the Sept. version of Isa. ix, 12, Ἕλληνας is adopted as a rendering of גֵּוֹיִם בְּרִיּוֹת, *Philistines*. In the Greek fathers Ἕλληνας is used for the pagan, in contradistinction to the Christian world (Justin Mart. *Resp. ad Quæst.* 42, etc.), and they call their Apologies λόγοι πρὸς Ἕλληνας, or κατὰ Ἕλληνας (Schleusner, *Lex.* N. T. ii, 759). See GREEK.

It was perhaps impossible for the Jews, absorbed as they were in the contemplation of their own especial mission, to rise into any true or profound conception of the common brotherhood of all nations. Hedged round by a multitude of special institutions, and taught to regard the non-observance of these customs as a condition of uncleanness, imbued, too, with a blind and intense national pride—they often seem to regard the heathen as only existing at all for the purpose of punishing the apostasy of Judæa (Deut. xxviii, 49; 1 Kings viii, 33, etc.), or of undergoing vengeance for their enmity towards her (Isa. lxiii, 6). The arrogant, unreasoning hatred towards other nations, generated by too exclusive a brooding upon this partial and narrow conception, made the Jews the most unpopular nation of all antiquity (Tacitus, *Hist.* v, 2; "gens terrifica," *ib.* v, 8; Juvenal, *Sat.* xiv, 103; Quint. *Just.* iii, 7, 21; Pliny, xiii, 9; Diod. Sic. *Ecl.* 34; Dio Cass.

ixviii, 32; Philostr. *Apolog.* v, 33; Ammian. Marcel. xxii, 5, "fatentes Judæi," etc., "contrary to all men," 1 Thess. ii, 15). See **JEW**. This disgust and scorn unfortunately fell on the early Christians also, who were generally confused with the Jews until the time of Bar-Cochba (Tacit. *Ann.* xv, 44; Sueton. *Claud.* 25; *Ner.* 16). To what lengths the Jews were carried in reciprocating this bitter feeling may be seen in the writings of the Rabbins; the Jews did not regard the Gentiles as brethren, might not journey with them, might not even save them when in peril of death (Maimonides, *Roseach.* iv, 12, etc.), and held that they would all be destroyed and burned at the Messiah's coming (Otho, *Lex. Rabbin.* s. v. Gentes, p. 231; Eisenmenger, *Entdeckt. Judent.* ii, 206 sq.). There is the less excuse for this violent bigotry, because the Jews not only held that all nations sprang from one father (Gen. x), but had also received abundant prophecies that God was but leaving his heathen children in temporary darkness (Acts xiv, 16), and intended hereafter, in his mercy, to bring them under the Messiah's sceptre, and make them "one fold, under one shepherd" (Isa. lx, 2, and passim; Mic. iv, 1; Zeph. iii, 9; Psa. xlv, 18; ex, 1, etc.). The main part of the N.-T. history is occupied in narrating the gradual breaking down of this *μυστήριον τοῦ φραγμοῦ* (the strong barrier of immemorial prejudice which separated Jew and Gentile, Eph. ii, 14), first in the minds of the apostles, and then of their converts. The final triumph over this obstacle was mainly due to the inspired ministry of him who gloried in the title of *ἀπίσκαλος τῶν ἔθνων* (1 Tim. ii, 7; see Conybeare and Howson, i, 219 sq.), who has also given, in a few pregnant sentences, the most powerful description of the blessings which God had granted to the Gentiles, the means of serving him which they possessed, and the shameless degeneracy which had ensued on their neglect of the natural law, written on their consciences (Rom. i, 18-32). See **HETHEN**.

In one or two places the words גִּימִים and ἔθνη are used as proper names. Thus we have "Tidal, king of nations," i. e. of several conquered tribes (Gen. xiv, 1, 2; Kalisch, ad loc.). In Josh. xii, 23 we find "the king of the nations of Gilgal," where *Goyim* is possibly the name of some local tribe (*βασίλευς παρθολι-ας*, Interp. Anon.). In Judg. iv, 2, "Harosheth of the Gentiles" probably received its name from the mixture of races subjugated by Jabin, and settled in the north of Palestine (Donaldson, *Jashur*, p. 263). See **HAROSHETH**. The same mixture of Canaanites, Phœnicians, Syrians, Greeks, and Philistines, originated the common expression "Galilee of the Gentiles," גִּלְיָהוּ לְבָנִים, Sept. *Γαλιλαία ἀλλοφύλων* v. r. *τῶν ἔθνων*, Isa. ix, 1; Matt. iv, 15 (Strabo, xvi, 760; Josephus, *Life*, 12; Euseb. *Onom.* s. v.). See **GALILEE**.

On the various meanings of the phrase "Isles of the Gentiles" (יְבֵנֵי הַגִּימִים, Gen. x, 5; Zeph. ii, 11; Ezek. xxvii, 15, etc.), see Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, p. 38, 272, and **ISLE**. On the Court of the Gentiles, see **TEMPLE**, and Josephus, *War*, vi, 3.—Kitto, s. v.

**Gentilis**, GIOVANNI VALENTINO, an Arian, was born at Cosenza, in Calabria, about 1520. Having become a convert to the Reformation, he was obliged to take refuge at Geneva, where several Italian families had already formed a congregation. Here he became dissatisfied with the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity, and, together with George Blandrata, John Paul Alciati, and Matthew Grimbaldi, formed a society to discuss the sense of the passages of Scripture referring to the subject. "The result of their discussions was that the terms co-essential, co-equal, and co-existent, were improperly applied to the Son and Spirit, and that they were subordinate in nature and dignity to the Father. But however privately their meetings were held, such information was conveyed to the Italian consistory as led them to suspect that the associates had departed

from the orthodox creed; upon which they drew up articles of faith, subscription to which was demanded from all the members of their communion. These articles consisted of Calvin's confession of faith, which had been lately approved of by the ministers, syndics, councils, and general assembly of the people; to which a promise was annexed, never to do any thing directly or indirectly that should controvert the doctrine of the Trinity as therein defined." Gentilis signed these articles, influenced, not improbably, by his recollection of the tragical fate of Servetus. In private, however, he still avowed and maintained his change of sentiment, which coming to the ears of the magistrates, they committed him to prison. At length he "declared his readiness to abjure whatever should be pronounced erroneous. Upon this he was sentenced to make the *amenæ honorable*, to throw his writings into the fire, and to take an oath not to go out of Geneva without the leave of the magistrates." He satisfied himself "that he was justifiable in breaking an oath which had been extorted from him by terror, and withdrew into the country of Gex, where he joined Grimbaldi; thus proving himself to have, with much obstinacy, very little true religion." He went to Lyons, thence to Savoy, and finally to Gex. As soon as he was known there he was sent to prison, but was liberated within a few days, when, upon the bailiff's demanding from him a confession of faith, that he might cause it to be examined by some ministers, and sent to Berne, Gentilis printed the same, with a dedication to the bailiff. From Gex, Gentilis went again to Lyons, where he was imprisoned, but soon obtained his liberty, and went to Poland, where he joined Blandrata and Alciati, who were very successful in propagating their opinions. In 1566, the king of Poland, at the instigation of the Calvinists as well as the Catholics, published an edict, by which all strangers who taught doctrines inconsistent with the orthodox notion concerning the Trinity were ordered to quit the kingdom. From Poland, Gentilis withdrew into Moravia, whence he went to Vienna, and then resolved to return to Savoy, where he hoped still to find his friend Grimbaldi, and flattered himself that he might be suffered to remain unmolested, as Calvin was dead. The bailiff of Gex seized him and delivered him to the magistrates of Berne. He was convicted of obstinately impugning the mystery of the Trinity, and was condemned to death. This sentence was carried into execution September, 1566. "Gentilis triumphed over his enemies by the fortitude with which he met his death, rejoicing, as he said, that he suffered for asserting and vindicating the supremacy and glory of the Father. His hypothesis concerning the person of Christ was that of the Arian school. His history affords a striking evidence that the first reformers, when they renounced the communion of Rome, entertained but imperfect and contracted notions of Christian freedom and toleration." Benedict Aretius wrote an account of his trial and punishment (1567, Lat. 4to). See also Beza, *Val. Gentilis, Teterrimi Hæretici*, etc. (Geneva, 1567); Hook, *Ecol. Biog.* v, 293; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. xvi, sec. iii, pt. ii, chap. iv, § 6; Hoefcr, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xix, 948; Bayle, *Dictionary*, s. v.; Bock, *Hist. Antitrin.* i, 369; ii, 427; Trechsel, *Antitritin.* iv, 316; *Christum Examinauer*, l, 206; Gieseler, *Church Hist.* (ed. Smith), iv, 360.

**Gentillet**, INNOCENT, a learned Protestant jurist, consult of the 16th century. The time of his birth is unknown, though it is settled that he was born at Vienne, in Dauphiny, and that he fled his country on account of the edicts against Protestants in 1585. He is supposed to have been afterwards syndic of the republic of Geneva. Besides other works, he wrote two of great value: (1.) *Apologia pro Christianis Gallis relig. evangelicæ sen reformatæ* (2d ed. Geneva, 1588, 8vo; also in French, same year);—(2.) *Le Bureau du Concile de Trente*; and in Latin, *Examen Concilii Tridentini* (Geneva, 1568, 8vo). The full title is, "The trial of the

Council of Trent, wherein the said council is proved in many points to be contrary to the ancient councils and canons, and to the king's authority." He died about 1595. See Bayle, *Diet. s. v.*; Ilaag, *La France Protestante*, vol. iv; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xix, 949.

**Gentilly**, COUNCIL OF (*Concilium Gentiliacense*), held on Christmas day, A.D. 767. Six legates from Rome, six ambassadors from the emperor Constantine Copronymus, several Greek bishops, and most of the bishops of Gaul and Germany, were present, together with king Pepin and many of his nobles. The question of the procession of the Holy Spirit was discussed, with regard to the addition made by the Latins of the words "filioque" to the creed. There was also a discussion concerning the use of images.—Landon, *Manual of Councils*, s. v.; Gieseler, *Ch. History*, per. iii, § 12.

**Gentoos**. See HINDOOS; INDIA.

**Gen'ubath** [many *Gen'ubath*] (Heb. *Genubath'*, גִּנְוּבַת, Sept. Γαρυβάτ), the son of Hadad, of the Edomitic royal family, by the sister of Tahpenes, the queen of Egypt (in the time of David), reared in Pharaoh's household (1 Kings xi, 20), to save him from the extermination by Joab (ver. 16). He was born (B.C. cir. 1036) in the palace of Pharaoh, and weaned by the queen herself; after which he became a member of the royal establishment, on the same footing as one of the sons of Pharaoh. Some connect the name with the Heb. root גָּנַב, *to steal*, and suppose an allusion either to his being the product of a *furtive* amour (Clericus), or to his existence being owing to his father's having *stolen away* from the destructive fury of the Israelites (Thenius); others, with greater probability, find in it an allusion to the Egyptian deity *Kneph* or *Cnuphis*. See HADAD.

**Genueflectentes**, γονυκλινοῦντες, *kneelers*, a class of penitents in the ancient Church; also called *prostrati*, prostraters, because they were allowed to stay after the hearers were dismissed, and to join in certain prayers particularly offered for them while they knelt. Forms of prayer, prepared for such occasions, are to be found in the Apostolical Constitutions (lib. viii, cap. viii); also in Chrysostom (*Hom. 18 in 2 Cor.*). The station of this class was within the nave or body of the church, near the *ambo* or reading-desk, where they received the bishop's benediction, and imposition of hands. Some canons call these the *penitents*, by way of emphasis, without any other distinction, because they were most noted, and the greatest number of penitential acts were performed by them whilst they were in this station.—Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. x, ch. ii, § 4, and xviii, ch. i, § 5.

**Genueflection**, the act of bending the knee, or kneeling in prayer. Baronius says that the early Christians carried the practice of genueflection so far, that some of them had worn cavities in the floor where they prayed; and Jerome relates of St. James, that he had, by this practice, contracted a hardness on his knees equal to that of camels. The Church of England gives many directions in her rubrics as to the proper time of kneeling in prayer; but warns all worshippers, in the last rubric on the communion service, that by the posture prescribed for receiving the symbols, "no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread and wine there bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood."—Farrar, *Eccl. Dictionary*, s. v.; Buck, *Theol. Dictionary*, s. v. See KNEELING.

**Genus Idiomaticum**. See CHRISTOLOGY, vol. ii, p. 281.

**Geoffrey** (*Geoffroi*) of Auxerre, a French theologian, was born at Auxerre about 1120. He studied under Abelard, and was at the University of Paris when St. Bernard came there to preach on the conversion of the clergy (*de conversione ad clericos*). Deeply impressed by Bernard's preaching, he entered the con-

vent of Clairvaux in 1140. For thirteen years he was principal secretary and travelling companion of St. Bernard. In 1161 or 1162 he was elected abbot of Clairvaux, but the monks, dissatisfied with the severity of his rule, petitioned Alexander III to depose him. Geoffrey voluntarily resigned, and withdrew to Cîteaux. In 1167 the abbot of Cîteaux sent him to Italy to attempt a reconciliation between the pope and emperor Frederick, but he did not succeed. The following year he endeavored to make peace between the archbishop of Canterbury and Henry II of England, who invited him to remain in his kingdom. Geoffrey became successively abbot of Fosse-Neuve in 1170, and of Haute-Combe in 1176. We have no information concerning him after 1188, though Oudin claims that he lived until 1215. He compiled the letters of St. Bernard, and his own writings have been inserted in the works of that saint. A number of his letters, together with a life of St. Bernard, and a tract against Gilbert de la Porrée, will be found in Bernardi *Opera*, vol. ii. He is considered as the author of the *Compendium Gaufridi de corpore Christi et sacramento Eucharistie*, a manuscript tract against Abelard. See Oudin, *De Scriptor. eccles.* vol. ii; *Hist. littér. de la France*, xiv, 430; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xx, 27 sq.

**Geoffrey of Monmouth** (*Gaufridus, Galfridus, Gaufridus*) was first archdeacon of Monmouth, afterwards (1152) bishop of St. Asaph. He died in 1154. He wrote a *Chronicon sive Historia Britonum* in xii books, supposed by some to be a translation from the Welsh. It is one of the sources for the legendary history of Britain. The first edition is that of Paris, 1668, 4to; the latest, that of J. A. Giles (London, 1844, 8vo). Translated. *The British History*, from the Latin by A. Thompson, Esq. (Lond. 1718, 8vo; new ed. revised by J. A. Giles, Lond. 1842, 8vo); also in Bohn's *Antiquarian Library*. See Wright, *Biog. Britann. Lit.*, Anglo-Norman Period, p. 143-149.

**Geogony**. See COSMOGONY.

**Geography**, considered as a systematic description of the earth, took its rise at a much later period than other sciences, probably because it is of less essential necessity to man; yet the elements of the knowledge out of which scientific geography is constructed must have existed as soon as men turned their attention to the earth on which they dwelt, and found it necessary to journey from one part of its surface to another. See COSMOLOGY.

1. In the absence of positive statements, we have to gather the views of the Hebrews as to the form of the earth from scattered allusions, and these for the most part in the poetical books, where it is difficult to decide how far the language is to be regarded as literal, and how far as metaphorical. There seem to be traces of the same ideas as prevailed among the Greeks, that the world was a disk (Isa. xl, 22; the word עִירְוּל, *circle*, is applied exclusively to the circle of the horizon, whether bounded by earth, sea, or sky), bordered by the ocean (Deut. xxx, 13; Job xxvi, 10; Psa. cxxxix, 9; Prov. viii, 27), with Jerusalem as its centre (Ezek. v, 5), which was thus regarded, like Delphi, as the *navel* (שֵׁבֶט; Judg. ix, 37; Ezek. xxxviii, 12), or, according to another view (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* s. v.), the highest point of the world. The passages quoted in support of this view admit of a different interpretation; Jerusalem might be regarded as the centre of the world, not only as the seat of religious light and truth, but to a certain extent in a geographical sense; for Palestine was situated between the important empires of Assyria and Egypt; and not only between them, but above them, its elevation above the plains on either side contributing to the appearance of its centrality. A different view has been gathered from the expression "four corners" (אַרְבַּע קְצוֹת, generally applied to the skirts of a garment), as though implying



The World as known to the Romans.

the quadrangular shape of a garment stretched out, according to Eratosthenes's comparison; but the term "corners" may be applied in a metaphorical sense for the extreme ends of the world (Job xxxvii, 3; xxxviii, 13; Isa. xi, 12; xxiv, 16; Ezek. vii, 2). Finally, it is suggested by Bähr (*Symbolik*, i, 170) that these two views may have been held together, the former as the actual and the latter as the symbolical representation of the earth's form. See EARTH.

In the account of creation mention is made of a spot called Eden, out of which a river, after watering Paradise, ran, and "from thence it was parted, and became into four heads" (fountains), which sent forth as many rivers—Pison, Gihon, Hiddekel, Phrat or Euphrates. See EDEN. Josephus, on this point, says (*Ant.* i, 2), "The garden was watered by one river

which ran round about the whole earth and was parted into four parts." The idea here presented is that of a vast circular plain (the earth), with water, a river, or the sea (*ὄκεανός* in Homer, *Il.* xxi, 196) encircling it, from which encircling body of water ran the said four rivers. Such, whether derived from the Hebrew Scriptures or not, was the earliest conception entertained of the earth. That some such idea was entertained among the Hebrews, even at a later period, appears from the words found in Psa. xxiv, 2: "He hath founded it (the earth) upon the seas, and established it upon the floods" (see also Prov. viii, 27); though Job xxvi, 7, "He stretcheth out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the earth upon nothing" (compare Job xxxviii, 4, 6), would seem to intimate that the writer of that book entertained superior notions on the

point. That, however, the general idea was that the earth formed an immense disk ("the circle of the earth"), above which were the substantial and firmly-fixed heavens, the abode of God, while the earth beneath was his footstool, appears from the general phraseology employed in the sacred books, and may be found specially exhibited or implied in the following passages: Isa. xl, 21 sq.; Job xxxvii, 18; Psa. cii, 25. See ASTRONOMY.

As to the size of the earth, the Hebrews had but a very indefinite notion; in many passages the "earth," or "whole earth," is used as co-extensive with the Babylonian (Isa. xlii, 5; xiv, 7 sq.; xxiv, 17) or Assyrian empires (Isa. x, 14; xiv, 26; xxxvii, 18), just as at a later period the Roman empire was styled *orbis terrarum*; the "ends of the earth" (עֲצָמוֹת הָאָרֶץ) in the language of prophecy was applied to the nations on the border of these kingdoms, especially the Medes (Isa. v, 26; xliii, 5) in the east, and the islands and coasts of the Mediterranean in the west (Isa. xli, 5, 9); but occasionally the boundary was contracted in this latter direction to the eastern shores of the Mediterranean (Isa. xxiv, 16; Zech. ix, 10; Psa. lxxii, 8). Without unduly pressing the language of prophecy, it may be said that the views of the Hebrews as to the size of the earth extended but little beyond the nations with which they came in contact; its solidity is frequently noticed, its dimensions but seldom (Job xxxviii, 18; Isa. xliii, 5). The world in this sense was sometimes described by the poetical term *tebel* (תְּבֵל), corresponding to the Greek *oikouménē* (Isa. xiv, 21).

The earth was divided into four quarters or regions corresponding to the four points of the compass; these were described in various ways, sometimes according to their positions relatively to a person facing the east, *before* (בְּפָנָיִךְ), *behind* (בְּאִחֲרֵי־פָנָיִךְ), the *right hand* (בְּיְמִינֵי־יְהוָה), and the *left hand* (בְּשֵׁמֶלֶי־יְהוָה), representing respectively E., W., S., and N. (Job xxiii, 8, 9); sometimes rela-

tively to the sun's course, the *rising* (קִרְיָא), the *setting* (סִבְיָא), Psa. l, 1), the *brilliant quarter* (קִרְיָא, Ezek. xl, 24), and the *dark quarter* (סִבְיָא, Exod. xxvi, 20; comp. the Greek *ζόφος*, Hom. *Il.* xii, 240); sometimes as the seat of the four winds (Ezek. xxxvii, 9); and sometimes according to the physical characteristics, the *sea* (יָם) for the W. (Gen. xxviii, 14), the *parched* (יָבֵשׁ) for the S. (Exod. xxvii, 9), and the mountains (הָרֵי) for the N. (Isa. xliii, 4). The north appears to have been regarded as the highest part of the earth's surface, in consequence, perhaps, of the mountain ranges which existed there, and thus the heaviest part of the earth (Job xxxvi, 7). The north was also the quarter in which the Hebrew *El-Dorado* lay, the land of gold mines (Job xxxvii, 22, margin; comp. Herod. iii, 116).

These terms are very indistinctly used when applied to special localities; for we find the north assigned as the quarter of Assyria (Jer. iii, 18), Babylonia (Jer. vi, 22), and the Euphrates (Jer. xli, 10), and more frequently Media (Jer. i, 3; comp. li, 11), while the south is especially represented by Egypt (Isa. xxx, 6; Dan. xi, 5). The Hebrews were not more exact in the use of terms descriptive of the physical features of the earth's surface: for instance, the same term (יָם) is applied to the sea (Mediterranean), to the lakes of Palestine, and to great rivers, such as the Nile (Isa. xviii, 2), and perhaps the Euphrates (Isa. xxvii, 1); mountain (הָרֵי) signifies not only high ranges, such as Sinai or Ararat, but an elevated region (Josh. xi, 16); river (נָחַל) is occasionally applied to the sea (Jonah ii, 3; Psa. xxiv, 2) and to canals fed by rivers (Isa. xli, 27). Their vocabulary, however, was ample for describing the special features of the lands with which they were acquainted, the terms for the different sorts of valleys, mountains, rivers, and springs being very numerous and expressive. We cannot fail to be



The Countries known to the Patriarchs.



struck with the adequate ideas of descriptive geography expressed in the directions given to the spies (Numb. xiii, 17-20) and in the closing address of Moses (Deut. viii, 7-9); nor less, with the extreme accuracy and the variety of almost technical terms with which the boundaries of the tribes are described in the book of Joshua, warranting the assumption that the Hebrews had acquired the art of surveying from the Egyptians (Jahn, i, 6, § 104). See TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS.

2. We proceed to give a brief sketch of the geographical knowledge of the Hebrews down to the period when their distinctive names and ideas were superseded by those of classical writers. Like most other sciences, geography owes its elementary cultivation as a science to the Hellenic race, who, from the mythic period of their history down to the destruction of the Western empire (A.D. 476), continued to prosecute the study with more or less system, and to more or less definite results; yet it must be added that it is only in a qualified sense that the ancients may be said to have known or advanced scientific geography.

The highlands of Armenia would appear to have been the first known to the human family. Descending from these, some may have gone eastward, others westward. The latter alone are spoken of in Scripture. Coming south and west, the progenitors of the world first became acquainted with the countries lying between the Euphrates and the Tigris, roughly termed Mesopotamia, whence they advanced still more south and west into Aram or Syria, Arabia, Canaan, and Egypt. These are the chief countries with which the ancient Hebrews seem to have possessed an acquaintance; yet if the national geographical table found in Gen. x is to be referred to the early period which its position in the Bible gives it, it would appear that the geographical knowledge of the Hebrews was, even before the flood, far more extensive, embracing even "the isles of the Gentiles." See ETHNOLOGY. Other parts of Scripture by no means warrant us in ascribing to the Hebrews, before the Babylonian captivity, a wider range of knowledge than we have indicated above. This national calamity had the effect of enlarging the circle of their knowledge of the earth, or at least of making their knowledge of Assyria, Media, and Babylonia more minute and definite. It was to their neighbors, the Phœnicians, that the Israelites owed most of their geographical knowledge. This commercial people must have early acquired a superficial acquaintance with remote regions, while engaged in their maritime commercial expeditions. The knowledge they brought back to Palestine would spread beyond their own borders and reach the Hebrews, though they may not have been given to inquiry and study on subjects of the kind; nor is it safe to attempt to define at how early a period some rough notions of the isles of the Gentiles may, by means of the Phœnician navigators, have been spread about in the East. According to Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* vi, 4, 36), the Egyptians had in circulation writings on geography. Their king Sesostrius may have had maps (*Schol. ad Apoll. Rhod.* iv, 292; *Goznet, Orig. des Loix*, ii, 227), though probably the first attempt to form a map (that is, a written catalogue of places, with something like their relative positions and distances roughly guessed) is to be ascribed to the men whom Joshua (Josh. xviii) sent with orders to "go through the land and describe it;" and the men "went and passed through the land," and described it "by cities into seven parts in a book."

At a later period, it is unquestionable that the Hebrews possessed a knowledge of the north-west, and a wider knowledge of the east, and even of the north of Asia (*Ezek.* xxvii; *Isa.* li, 27). From the period of the Maccabees the Jews entered into relations of a mercantile and political character, which extended their knowledge of the earth, and made them better acquainted with Asia Minor, Greece, and Italy. In the time embraced by the New-Testament history

they must have been widely acquainted with the then known world, since colonies and individuals of their nation were spread over nearly the entire surface covered by ancient civilization, and identified with the Roman empire. The occasional, if not periodical, return of the Jews thus scattered abroad, or at least the relations which they would sustain with their mother country, must have greatly widened, and made less inaccurate, the knowledge entertained in Palestine of other parts of the world. Accordingly we read (*Acts* ii, 5 sq.) that, at the effusion of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, "there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews out of every nation under heaven."

3. The Hebrews do not seem to have devoted any attention to geography as a science, though they were widely scattered at the commencement of our era, and occupied a distinguished place in literature. The Greeks probably led the way in systematic geography. The first map is said to have been constructed by Anaximander, about B.C. 600. Nearly a century later, Hecateus of Miletus wrote a geographical work entitled *Περίοδος γῆς* (*Ukert, Geographie des Hecat. und Damastes*). These were followed by Strabo and Ptolemy. The Phœnicians and Egyptians were likewise distinguished as geographers. Ptolemy acknowledges that his great work was based on a treatise written by Marinus of Tyre (*Heeren, Commentatio de Fontibus Geographicorum Ptolemæi*, etc.). Pliny, the only Roman writer deserving of special mention in this place, was a mere compiler. As a geography his book is of little value (see *Ukert, Geographie d. Griech. u. Römer*; *Mannert, Geographie*, etc.). Sacred geography was not reduced to a system until a comparatively recent time. The *Onomasticon* of Eusebius and Jerome is an alphabetic list of places, with brief descriptions. The *Tract* of Brocardus, written in the 12th century, is little more than an itinerary. To Samuel Bochart, a French Protestant minister (born 1599), belongs the honor of writing the first systematic work on Biblical geography. His *Geographia Sacra* is a storehouse of learning from which all subsequent writers have drawn freely. Wells wrote his *Historical Geography of the O. and N. T.* in the beginning of last century. *Reland's Palæstina*, published in 1714, remains to this day the standard classic work. Dr. Robinson's *Researches* open a new era in Biblical geography. It, however, is neither complete nor systematic; it is only a book of travels, with most important historical and geographical illustrations. Ritter's *Palæstina und Syrien* aims at system and completeness, but it is too diffuse. It gives a *résumé* of everything that has been written on Bible lands. A systematic and thorough treatise on Biblical geography is still a great desideratum in literature. See ARCHEOLOGY, BIBLICAL.

Among the profane writers, Herodotus mentions Palestine, and probably Jerusalem, which he names Cadytis (*Herod.* i, 105; ii, 106, 157, 159; iii, 5, 62, 64, 91; iv, 39). Strabo (in the time of Augustus) treats of Palestine in the second chapter of his sixteenth book on Geography, mingling together much truth and much error. Ptolemy, who died A.D. 161, treats of Palestine and the neighboring countries in chaps. xv-xvii of his fifth book (see *Reland*, p. 456 sq.). Dion Cassius relates the conquest of Palestine by Pompey (xxvii, 15-17), the siege of Jerusalem by Titus (xii, 4-7), the restoration of the Temple by Hadrian, and the insurrection of the Jews under the same emperor (lix, 12-14). Of the Roman writers, Pliny, in his *Natural Hist.* (v, 13-19), treats of Syria, including Palestine, and supplies much useful information. Tacitus's *History*, from the first to the thirteenth chapter of the fifth book, also relates to our subject. He hated both Jews and Christians (*Annal.* xv, 44), and in consequence gave false colorings to much of what he said relating to them (*Hist.* v, 3, 4; ii, 79; *Annal.* ii, 42; xii, 23). Some information may also be found in Justin (xxxvi, 2), in Suetonius (*Augustus*, 93; *Claudius*, 25, 28; *Fespasian*,

4, 5; Titus, 4, 5), in Pomponius Mela (i, 2), and in Amianus Marcellinus (xiv, 8; xxiii, 1).

Among the fathers of the Church much serviceable knowledge on the subject of Biblical geography may be found in the expository writings of Theodoret and Jerome. The most important work, however, is the *Onomasticon urbium et locorum sacre Scripturæ* (ed. J. Bonfferri, 1707). Living as they did for a long time in Palestine, the writings both of Eusebius and Jerome possess peculiar value, which, however, grows less as the times of which they speak recede from their own.

Some Arabian writers are not without value. We have Edrisi, *Geographia Nubiensis* (Paris, 1619); also Abulfeda *Tabula Syriæ*, and his *Anales Muslimici*. Schultens, in his *Index Geographicus in Vitam Saladinæ* (Lugduni Batav. 1732), has collected many observations of Arabian authors on Palestine. See also Rosenmüller, *Handb. Bibl. Alterth.* i, 34; Ritter, *Erdkunde*, ii, 478;—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. Earth.

Modern works of travel in Bible countries have contributed much original information on this subject. They are too numerous, especially those on Palestine (q. v.), to be enumerated here in detail. Some of them may be seen in Darling's *Cyclopædia*, col. 1819 sq.; and most of them are referred to under each country in this work. The following lists embrace the most important in the several classes, including the above:

a. *Ancient and Mediæval Writers who have incidentally furnished Information on Sacred Geography.*—The chief text-book is of course the Bible. Next to this are (1.) *Jewish*—The *Apocrypha*; Josephus, *Opera* (ed. Hudson, 1720, 2 vols. fol.). Traill's translation of the *War* (London, 1851, 2 vols.) contains important notes and illustrations. (2.) *Heathen*—Herodotus, especially Rawlinson's translation (Lond. and N. York, 1858-60, 4 vols.); Strabo, *Geographia* (ed. Casaubon, Geneva, 1587); Pliny, *Historia Naturalis* (ed. Sillig, Geneva, 1831-36, 5 vols.). Dio Cassius (Hamburg, 1752) gives some short notes on Palestine. The few remarks in Tacitus and Livy are of little value. (3.) *Christian*—Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, in *Historiæ Ecclesiæ. Scriptor. Græci* (1635, 3 vols. fol.); Jerome, *Opera* (ed. Migne, 9 vols. 8vo); Theodoret, *Opera* (ed. Migne, 5 vols.). In the exegetical writings of Jerome and Theodoret are some useful notes; they both resided in Palestine. William of Tyre, *Historia Belli Sacri*; James de Vitry, *Historia Orientalis*, etc. (these two works, with several others, are contained in Bongier's *Gesta Dei per Francos*, fol. 1611); *Chronicles of the Crusades* (ed. Bohu, 1848), containing Richard of Devizes, Geoffrey de Vinsauf, and De Joinville.

b. *Geographical Works and Itineraries.*—Ptolemy, *Geographiæ* (fol. 1535); *Tabula Peutingeriana*, a rude chart of the Roman empire, made in the 3d century. Reland gives the part including Palestine. Eusebius and Jerome, *Onomasticon Urbium et Locorum S. Scripture* (ed. Clerico, fol. 1707; last edit. by Larsow and Parthey, Ber. 1862); *Vetera Romanorum Itineraria* (ed. Wesselingio, 1735), containing the important itineraries of the Bordeaux pilgrim, and of Antonine, with *Synektismus* of Hierocles; Edrisi, *Geographia Universalis* (in Rosenmüller's *Annot. Arabica*, 1828); Topographical Index in *Behandlung Vita et Res Geste Saladinæ* (ed. Schultens, folio, 1732); Brocardus, *Locorum Terre Sæc. Descriptio* (ed. Clerico, appended to the *Onomasticon*, folio, 1707); Abulfeda, *Tabula Syriaca* (1766); Bochart, *Opera* (ed. Leusden et Villemadan, 1712, 3 vols. fol.); Sanson, *Geographia Sacra* (ed. Clerico, folio, 1701); Caroli A. S. Paulo, *Geographia Sacra* (ed. Holsten, fol. 1701); Cellarius, *Notitia Orbis Antiqui* (1701-5, 2 vols. 4to); Wells, *Historical Geography of the O. and N. T.* (1819, 2 vols.); Reland, *Palestina e monumentis veteribus Illustrata* (1714, 2 vols. 4to); Busching, *Erdbeschreibung*, Palästina, Arabien, etc. (1785); Rosenmüller, *Bib. Geogr. of Central Asia* (by Morren, 1836, 2 vols.); Raumer, *Palästina* (1850); Forster, *Historical Geography of Arabia* (1844, 2 vols.);

Röhr, *Historico-Geograph. Account of Palestine* (1843); Ritter, *Die Sinai-Halbinsel, Palästina und Syrien* (1848-55, 4 vols. in six parts; an English transl. has appeared, Lond. 1868, 2 vols.); Kitto, *Physical Geography of Palestine* (1841, 2 vols.); Conybeare and Howson, *Life of St. Paul* (1855, 2 vols. 4to); Smith, *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul* (2d ed. 1856); Porter, *Hand-book for Syria and Palestine* (1858, 2 vols.); Van de Velde, *Memoir of Map of Palestine* (1858); Robinson, *Phys. Geog. of the Holy Land* (1865).

c. *Books of Travel.*—Wright's *Early Travels in Palestine* (1848, containing, among others, Arculf, Sæwulf, Benjamin of Tudela, Maundeville, and Maundrell); Cotovicus, *Hicvarium Hierosolymitanum* (1619); Quaresmius, *Historia Theologica et Moralis Terre Sanctæ Elucidatio* (1639, 2 vols. fol.); D'Arvicus, *Travels in Arabia the Desert* (1732); Shaw, *Travels in Barbary and the Levant* (1808, 2 vols.); Pococke, *Description of the East* (1743-45, 2 vols. fol.); Hasselquist, *Travels in the Levant* (1766); Niebuhr, *Travels through Arabia* (1792, 2 vols.); Volney, *Voyage en Syrie*, etc. (Paris, 1807, 2 vols.); Ali Bey, *Travels in Morocco, Egypt, Syria*, etc. (1816, 2 vols. 4to); Seetzen, *Risen durch Syrien, Palästina*, etc. (1854-55, 3 vols.); Burckhardt, *Travels in Syria* (1822, 4to); *Travels in Arabia* (1829, 4to); *Notes on the Bedouin and Wahabys* (1830, 4to); *Travels in Nubia* (1822, 4to); Buckingham, *Travels in Palestine* (1822, 4to); *Travels among the Arab Tribes* (1825, 4to); Irby and Mangles, *Travels in Egypt and Nubia, Syria, and Asia Minor*, etc. (1822); Laborde, *Journey through Arabia Petrea to Sinai and Petra* (1838); Lord Lindsay, *Letters on Egypt, Edom, and the Holy Land* (1838, 2 vols.); Addison, *Damascus and Palmyra* (1838, 2 vols.); Bowring, *Report on Statistics of Syria* (1840); Williams, *The Holy City* (1849, 2 vols.); Bartlett, *Forty Days in the Desert* (5th ed.); *Walks about Jerusalem; Jerusalem Revisited* (1855); *Footsteps of our Lord and his Apostles* (1852); Wilson, *Lands of the Bible* (1847, 2 vols.); Tobler, *Bethlehem* (1849); *Topographie von Jerusalem und seinen Umgebungen* (1853-54, 2 vols.); Lynch, *Official Report of Expedition to Explore the Dead Sea*, etc. (1852, 4to); *Narrative of Expedition*, etc. (1849); De Saulcy, *Narrative of Journey round the Dead Sea*, etc. (1853, 2 vols.); Van de Velde, *Narrative of Journey through Syria and Palestine* (1854, 2 vols.); Lepsius, *Discoveries in Egypt, the Peninsula of Sinai*, etc. (1853); Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine in 1838-52*, 2d edit. (1856, 3 vols.); Porter, *Five Years in Damascus, Researches in Palmyra, Lebanon, and Bashan* (1855, 2 vols.); Layard, *Nineveh and its Remains* (1849); *Nineveh and Babylon* (1853); Loftus, *Chaldaea and Susiana* (1857); Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine* (1856); Thomson, *The Land and the Book* (1858). In addition to the above, important articles on Biblical Geography and Topography may be seen in various numbers of the American *Bibliotheca Sacra*, the *Journal of Sacred Literature*, and the *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society*, by Robinson, Thomson, Porter, Rawlinson, Layard, Wallin, Peole, Ainsworth, and others.

d. The best small maps are those in Robinson's *Researches* (1st edit.) and Porter's *Hand-book*; Van de Velde's large map of Palestine is the most complete and accurate hitherto published (2d ed. 1865); Henke's *Bibel-Atlas* (Gotha, 1868) is valuable for the ancient divisions.—Kitto, s. v.

**Geology**, the science that treats of the earth's crust, its rocky strata, and the fossil remains found in them. Its interest to the Biblical student chiefly arises from its bearings upon the Mosaic account of the creation. (See McCaul, *Notes on Gen. i* [London, 1861]; Challis, *Creation* [Lond. 1861]; Pratt, *Genealogy of Creation* [Lond. 1861]; *Christ. Remembrancer*, Apr. 1861; *Evang. Review*, Oct. 1861; Keel, *Einb. d. bib. Urgesch.*, etc. [Basle, 1863]; Von Schleiden, *Das Alter des Menschen Geschlechts* [Lpz. 1863]; *Free-will Baptist Quarterly*, Apr. 1864; Burton, *Creation* [Lond.

1836]; Dawson, *Archæa* [Lond. 1862]; Glog, *Relations of Geology to Theology* [Edinb. 1858]; Huxtable, *Record of Creation Vindicated* [London, 1861]; Hutton, *Chronol. of Creation* [Lond. 1860]; Lime, *Mosaic Record* [Edinburgh, 1857]; Anon. *Sacred Geology* [Lond. 1847]; Sumner, *Records of Creation* [6th ed., London, 1850]; Wight, *Mosaic Creation* (Lond. 1847); Crofton, *Geology and Genesis* [London, 1854]; Young, *Scriptural Geology* [London, 1840]; De Serres, *La Cosmogonie de Moïse* [Par. 1840; in Germ., Tüb. 1841]; Bosizo, *Hexameron und Geologie* [Mainz, 1865]; Korison, *The Creative Week*, art. v. of *Replies to "Essays and Reviews"* [Lond. and N. Y. 1862]; Lewis, *God's Week of Work* [Lond. 1865]; Amer. Presb. Rev. Oct. 1865; Poole, *Genesis of Earth and Man* [2d ed. Lond. 1860]; Wolf, *Die Urgeschichte* [Homb. 1860]; Baltzer, *Schöpfungsgeschichte* [Lpz. 1867 sq.]; Brit. and For. Evang. Rev. Apr. 1867; Reusch, *Bibel und Natur* [Freib. 1866]; Lucas, *Biblic. Ant. of Man* [Lond. 1866]; Pitcairn, *Ages of the Earth* [Lond. 1868]; Worgan, *The Divine Week* [Manchester, 1864]; Wright, *Geology and Antiquity of Earth* [Lond. 1864]; Anon. *Phys. Theory of the Earth* [Lond. 1864]; Mc'ausland, *The Adamite* [Lond. 1864]; Gärtner, *Bibel und Geologie* [Stuttg. 1868.] See CREATION.

I. *History of the Inquiry.*—(This we condense from Pattison, *The Earth and the Word*, Lond. 1858, p. 123–129.) The prevalent opinion among the learned for upwards of two centuries after the revival of letters was that organic remains were mere mineral concretions. Hypotheses were invented purporting to account for their production in methods quite worthy of the school of subtle philosophy whence they issued. This was maintained, not by obscure monks, but by really accomplished persons, the lights of natural history in their day, such as Fallopio, Mercati, and Olivi in Italy, Plot and Lister in England, and Agricola in Germany.

The excavations made for repairing the city of Verona in 1517 brought to light a number of fossil remains, the appearance of which exercised the wits of that time; and, among others, Fraecastoro boldly expounded their true meaning and relations. He declared that they had not originated in any such "plastic force" as was pretended, nor could they have been the results of the waters of the deluge. After having been thus rescued from the mineral kingdom, they were, however, universally attributed to the deluge. Fabio Colonna, in 1600, and the whole of the Italian writers of this period, considered that all petrifications were the remains of the Noachian deluge.

In 1669, Steno, a Dane, attached to the court of Tuscany, expounded the true theory of organic fossils; he labored to harmonize his views with Scripture by selecting strata which appeared to him to be unfossiliferous, and treating them as having been created before the existence of animals and plants. In 1676, Quirini contended that the diluvial waters could not have effected all the operations attributed to them, and maintained that the universality of the Mosaic deluge was not to be insisted on. In 1688, Robert Hook, in his posthumous treatise on earthquakes, assigns to organic remains their true character, and supposes that some species may have been lost. In his diluvial theory he attempts to crowd into the time between the creation and the deluge, and into the latter, all the visible phenomena of upheaval or dislocation.

In 1690, Dr. Thomas Burnet, in his *Sacred Theory of the Earth*, describes the earth at the beginning as a fluid mass composed of all kinds of materials. The heaviest descended to the bottom and formed a solid kernel, around which the waters, and afterwards the atmosphere, united; but between the water and atmosphere there was formed an oily stratum, which received, little by little, all the earthy constituents with which the air was still charged. On this consolidated bed, marshy, thin, uniform, level, without mountains, without valleys, without either seas or rivers, lived

the antediluvian generations. At this epoch the marshy crust, dried up by the heat of the sun, split, and fell down in the great abyss of waters. From thence came the universal deluge, the disarrangement of the axis of the globe, and the changing of climates. The earth, thus drowned, had still some cavities into which the waters entered, little by little, and so returned to their subterranean reservoir. Thus the ocean is a part of the great abyss, the isles are the fragments,, the continents are the great residuary masses of the old world. To the confusion brought about by the breaking up of the waters are owing the mountains and other undulations that we now see. This is a specimen of a large class of writings which passed for the effusions of learning and piety in the Augustan age of English literature.

In 1686, Whiston, the great astronomer, published his new theory of the earth. He conceived of the earth as still having in its midst a solid and burning kernel, retaining the heat which it received from the sun when it was only the nucleus of the comet, and continually spreading it towards its circumference. This nucleus is it-self surrounded by a great abyss, which is composed of two rings, of which the lower is a heavy fluid, and the upper water; it is this layer of water which constitutes the foundation of our earth. The deluge was occasioned by another comet striking the earth, and was the parent of all the disturbances now manifest in its crust.

About 1680 the great Leibnitz wrote of the earth as an extinct sun vitrified. According to him, its greater portion was the subject of a violent fire, at the time when Moses tells us that the light was separated from the darkness. The fusion of the globe produced a vitrified crust; when the crust was cold, the humid parts, which had risen in vapor, fell again, and formed the ocean. The sea then deposited calcareous rocks. It at first enveloped all the surface of the globe, and surmounted the higher parts which at present form the continents and isles. Thus the shells and other rubbish of marine animals that one finds everywhere prove that the sea has covered all the land; and the great quantity of fixed salts, of sand, and other matters, fused and calcined in the earth, testify to the universal fire, and that it preceded the existence of the sea.

In 1695, Dr. Woodward, in his *Discourse on the Natural History of the Earth*, most ably vindicates the proper nature of organic remains, and disposes of the views of those who attribute them to casual inundations, or to the wash of the sea when the land was first made; but he is equally unsuccessful in the formation of a hypothesis with his predecessors. He holds that at the deluge the solid strata of the earth were dissolved in the water; the remains of animals sank down and became imbedded according to their relative gravity.

In Italy, Vallisneri, finding by his own careful observations that the facts were not in accordance with the theories then in vogue, which were affirmed to be founded in the interpretation of Scripture, attacked the interpreters, and demonstrated that they were in error. He wisely contented himself with recording his own observations, and would not attempt the construction of a theory.

In 1740, Moro, on the other hand, with much that is valuable in his onslaught upon other cosmogonists, fell into the error of becoming one of their number. His theory, however, is much more consistent, as well as reverential to the truth, than that of any of his predecessors.

In 1749, Buffon published, like his fellow philosophers, a theory of the earth, which is now found in the first part of his collected works. It is a free and easy way of world-making with the aid of a sun, a comet, volcanic and aqueous forces at pleasure. The Sorbonne required him to recant so much of his work

as expressed the sentiment that the waters of the sea had produced the land, and then left it dry, and that the land was again, by wear and tear, gradually merging into the sea. The recantation is published with his works. These gorgeous dreams cost their author forty years' thought, and enjoyed uncommon reputation. Even now their decision of tone and eloquence of statement command an interest.

In 1756, Lehmann, the German mineralogist, confined the action of the flood to the production of a few only of the rocks, and assigned the unfossiliferous strata to the original creation, and the conglomerates to an intermediate revolution.

In 1760, Michell, who held for eight years the Woodwardian professorship at Cambridge, showed himself the true predecessor of modern geology. Neglecting cosmogony altogether, and applying himself to the description of the strata as they appeared under his own observation, he discovered the true sequence of the beds, and indicated a direction in which the geologist might pursue his labors without infringing on theology.

After Michell, the visions of the cosmogonists were again reproduced by various English writers. Sound geology, however, began to take precedence of world-making; the actual wonders of the subterranean world were preferred to the gay creations of the world-makers. Hutton, William Smith, and a host of followers, comprising Cuvier and Brogniart, kept the republic of letters well employed in acquiring the grammar of the new science, which was created by physical researches into the strata and their contents. Henceforward cosmogony assumes a second-rate position.

De Luc, in 1799, wrote the chronology of Moses, as only commencing with the creation of man; and of the days of creation as being not natural days, but indefinite periods. A long line of illustrious men, many of whom are now living, diverted attention from the vain attempts of the early philosophers, and occupied themselves exclusively with descriptive geology. A classification of opinions—taking only the views of the leading men—will serve to show, in a general way, what has been said and done for the last fifty years in this department of knowledge. The following are the principal hypotheses:

1. That the days of creation are indefinite periods, during which all the phenomena of geology occurred; that the deluge is now marked by the drift and gravel remains of the post-tertiary age (Cuvier, Parkinson, Jameson, and others).

2. That the first sentence of Genesis has no connection with the subsequent verses. The phenomena of geology have place between the first and second verses. The chaos was universal, and ushered in the present creation (Chalmers, 1804. See also *The Earth's Antiquity in harmony with the Mosaic Account of Creation*, by James Gray, M.A., 1849).

3. That the earth that now is was the bed of the ante-diluvian sea. That all the phenomena now visible resulted from operations in the interval between the creation and the end of the deluge. That, save this, the rocks were created as they now exist (Granville Penn, Young).

4. That we cannot rely on an interpretation of the Hebrew records, and therefore we may set them aside when apparently at variance with geological facts (Babbage).

5. That the records are poetical representations, and not historical (Baden Powell).

6. That the first verse is a detached account of the original creation. The chaos, the six days' creation, and the flood were local phenomena, and refer to what was transacted in the province occupied by man only (Dr. Pye Smith).

7. That the "days were great natural periods. The Palaeozoic system, pre-eminently that of plants, is the work of the third day; the secondary, pre-eminently

the epoch of sea-monsters and creeping things, is the work of the fifth day; and the tertiary, the time of mammalian creatures, is the work of the sixth day" (Hugh Miller).

8. That the Mosaic narrative is a revelation made in visions to the mind of the prophet; the days are therefore spoken of not in connection with the events, but the duration of the vision. The events occurred in extremely lengthened periods. The deluge was partial (Lime, *Mosaic Record in harmony with Geological*, 1854; Poole, *Genesis of the Earth and Man*, 1856).

9. That all creation took place consecutively, according to the literal reading of Gen. i. All things, fossil and recent, form part of one whole system of life, and were created at once on the successive days of creation. That the fossil species have become gradually extinct, and their remains buried by disturbances occurring from the first (L'abbé Soignet, *Cosmogonie de la Bible*, Paris, 1854).

10. P. H. Gosse (*Omphalos*, Lond. 1857). The theory of this writer is a reproduction of Granville Penn, with a dash of the old, arbitrary, anti-geologic notion of the creation of the rocks, with fossils complete as they are. He affirms a principle which he calls the law of "Prochronism," in virtue of which the strata of the surface of the earth, with their fossil flora and fauna, may possibly belong to a "prochronic" (i. e. to an unreal and symbolical or typical) development of the mighty plan of the life history of the world.

The preceding account, though it is only a very general view of the principal hypotheses on this subject, yet sufficiently shows how the minds of the framers have felt the power of the sacred writings. They have done homage, unconsciously in many instances, to divine truth, by acknowledging the necessity of accordance with it, however widely they have diverged from its plain teaching. It is a notable instance of the commanding power of the Scriptures that thus, through ages of ignorance and periods of enlightenment, they should still have been the polestar, guiding all voyagers in their pathless track towards the unknown.

11. We have reserved until last, as being, on the whole, the most comprehensive and satisfactory, the conclusions of Mr. Crofton, which have now for some years been before the world (originally sketched in *Kitto's Journal*, Jan. 1850), and have not been refuted by any philologer. He affirms that, apart from geological considerations, and judging from analogy with Scripture alone, the interpretation of the sacred volume renders the following ten propositions credible.

(1.) That the absolute age of our earth is not defined in the sacred volume.

(2.) That there may have been a long interval in duration between the creation of "the heaven and the earth" mentioned in the first verse of the first chapter of Genesis and the continuation of the earth's history in the second verse.

(3.) That the term "the earth" does not apply necessarily, in every instance, to the whole of our planet, but sometimes only to a part of it.

(4.) That the state of the earth, described in the second verse as "without form and void," does not necessarily mean matter never reduced to form and order, but may signify matter reduced to disorder, after previous organization and arrangement.

(5.) That the "darkness" "upon the face of the deep," also mentioned in the second verse, is not negative of the previous existence of light, but may have been only a temporary one.

(6.) That the commencement of the account of the first six days' creation dates from the beginning of the third verse, "And God said, Let there be light."

(7.) That the act of "the first day" does not necessarily signify the creation of light, but may have been only the calling of it into operation upon the scene of "darkness" described in the second verse.

(8.) That the calling of "the light Day" and "the darkness Night," with the declaration that "the evening and the morning were the first day," does not necessarily imply that this was the first day, *absolutely* speaking.

(9.) That the work of "the second day," mentioned in the sixth, seventh, and eighth verses, may have been only an operation performed upon the atmosphere of our earth.

(10.) That the work of "the fourth day," described from the fourteenth to the eighteenth verses, does not necessarily imply that the sun, moon, and stars were then first created or formed, for the first time, from pre-existent matter; but may only have been that they were then, for the first time in the detail of the history of the present earth, made visible to it, and ordained to their offices with respect to the coming human creation (*Genesis and Geology*, Lond. 1852; Phila. 1853).

II. *Controversy between Geologists and Theologians.*— "The kindred sciences of geology and palæontology cannot yet be said to have been in existence more than eighty years. But they had scarcely begun to assume the form and lineaments of sciences when that jealousy, which has never since the days of Galileo ceased to exist to some extent between the religionist and the natural philosopher, began to evince itself. The religionist was alarmed by rumors that the rocks, under the searching eye of the geologist, disclosed a state of facts which was wholly at variance with the Mosaic detail of the manner and order of the creation; and the studies of the geologists were, without much inquiry, condemned and denounced, in no very measured terms, as destructive of the doctrine of the divine inspiration of the Scriptures, and as infidel in their inception and tendency. On the other hand, the man of science was not slow in retorting that, if the record of Moses was of divine origin, it had nothing to apprehend from the development of facts; and that, if it could not bear the test of physical truth, it must give way, even though it stood on the threshold of the treasury of inspiration; for that, in such a crisis, the testimony of the senses with which man has been endowed for his guidance must prevail against mere matters of faith. In argument the man of science had the advantage, but in practice he erred by too frequently assuming geological facts and Scripture interpretation without sufficient inquiry, and so contributed, by hastily formed conclusions, to put asunder the word and the works of God, which, by the decrees of Omniscience, must ever be joined together.

"The contest, in its early stages, was carried on by those religionists who construed the Mosaic days of the creation to have been six successive natural days of twenty-four hours each, measured by the revolution of our globe on its axis; and the objection of the geologist was founded on the obvious impossibility or absurdity that the world could have been stocked with the various animal and vegetable organisms, whose remains have been found in the crust of the earth, in the brief period of the six natural days that preceded the birth of Adam. The evidence was incontrovertible that for untold ages before that event generation upon generation of extinct animals had lived and died upon the earth.

1. "To meet this difficulty, which threatened to blot out the first page of the Scriptures from inspired revelation, and which was obviously subversive of the authenticity and inspiration of all Scripture, a host of champions arose, who, instead of examining with patience and testing with care the alleged facts of geology, recklessly denied their existence, or sought to explain and account for them on wholly inadequate, and in many instances on false and absurd principles and grounds. Some ascribed the existence of fossil remains to the flood in the days of Noah; others to what was termed a plastic power that existed as one

of the natural laws of matter; and others, again, insisted that the various systems of rocks were created by the fiat of the Almighty with the fossil remains of animals that had never lived, and of plants that had never grown, imbedded in them. These were the reasonings of Granville Penn, Fairholm, Kirby, Sharon Turner, Gisborne, Taylor, dean Cockburn, etc.; and of them it is unnecessary to say more than that the progress of scientific discovery has extinguished their arguments, not only without injury to the cause of Scripture truth, but with the effect of establishing it on a surer basis.

2. "Another class of inquirers sought to solve the difficulty by conceding the well-established facts of geology and the geological explanations of those facts, but suggesting that the imperfection of our knowledge of the original Hebrew at the present day was such as to preclude all certainty of a right interpretation of its meaning. This was the position of Babbage; while Baden Powell insisted that the narrative of the creation is couched in the language of mythic poetry, and was not intended to be a historical detail of natural occurrences. It is satisfactory to know that the necessity for arguments so injurious in their tendencies to the cause of the truth and integrity of the Bible no longer exists; for the precision of the Mosaic phraseology will be found confirmed by every step that has been taken in the development of the truths of geology.

3. "At an early period of this controversy, Dr. Chalmers, whose sagacious mind and prudent foresight comprehended the importance of this issue between the facts of geology and the language of the Scriptures, propounded the proposition that 'the writings of Moses do not fix the antiquity of the globe'—that after the creation of the heavens and the earth, which may have comprehended any interval of time and any extent of animal and vegetable life, a chaotic period ensued, when death and darkness reigned upon our globe, and the earth became, in Scripture language, 'without form and void,' and all that had previously existed was, by some catastrophe, blotted out, and a new world of light and life produced, by fiat of the Deity, in a period of six natural days, closing with the birth of Adam; and thus the world which now exists was cut off from that which preceded it by a period of black, chaotic disorder. The geologist had thus ample room for the existence of all the organisms whose remains are found in the rocks that compose the crust of the earth, and he might labor in his investigation of the nature and order of geological events without endangering the truth of the Mosaic record of the creation" (Kitto).

Against this view Dr. Conant urges several objections (*Revised Version of Genesis*, p. xx), the force of which, however, may in a great measure be readily parried. 1. The sacred writer himself gives no intimation of such an interval. Of course not, since its mention forms no part of his plan. An *argumentum a silentio* is wholly invalid. It is sufficient if a space can be found in point of fact. 2. It assumes that Moses has given us an account of only a *part* of the creative work. But no one claims that he has given all the details of creation, or even a complete outline of it. His object was merely to state so much as stands connected with *human* history; and on the view in question, this is more perfectly done than by any other interpretation, since it was the last creative stage by which the earth was specially fitted for man's abode. 3. Science shows no such convulsion in the period preceding man's introduction on the earth. On the contrary, an innumerable series of such cataclysms are revealed between the various strata of the earth's crust, and there is special evidence of some general ice-wave almost immediately preceding the historic period, in the phenomena of drift, boulders, and striated rocks, all of which are everywhere strewn upon the present surface of the globe. 4. Six extended cre-

ative periods allow time for the operation of second causes, such as were obviously at work for long ages in the formation of the earth, whereas six mere days would be no more called for than a single instant, such as that in which the Almighty fiat evoked the primitive matter into being. But we are not competent to prescribe what would be a worthy process for the Creator, and this objection overlooks the moral significance of these week-days as compared with the Sabbath. Besides, the theory in question affords equal scope with any other for the cycles of geogony, geology, and geontology, while it brings the inspired narrative closer to man's present home, with his animal and vegetable companions. For example, on the opposite view, little propriety could be made out of the historical statement, Gen. ii, 19, 20: "Now Jehovah God had formed from the ground every living [thing] of the field, and every bird of the heavens, and brought [each] to the man to see what he would call it; so [that] whatever the man might call it [as] a living creature, that [was] its name; accordingly, the man called names to all the cattle, and to the bird of the heavens, and to every living [thing] of the field; but for the man [one] did not find a helper as his counterpart [(or mate)]." Surely Adam did not call forth in review the fossil forms of long-extinct species from the bowels of the earth; and yet he must have done so if the animated tribes just spoken of, which are obviously the same with those of the sixth demurgic day, were those of the geological ages. The advocates of a literal—although not local—creation on the sixth day are at liberty to apply the above-quoted language to an inspection of merely the surrounding creatures, or those inhabiting the garden of Eden along with Adam, as specimens of the various races roaming the earth—as in the case of the animals assembled from his own neighborhood by Noah into the ark [see DELUGE]; for their interpretation gradually narrows down the scope of the Mosaic cosmogony to man's special accommodation; but this symbolical theory, being throughout of cosmopolitan extent, requires all its terms to be taken in their most universal application. Indeed, in order to be consistent, it should not be content with the creation of a single human pair, and their location in a particular spot; but it really favors the modern skeptical demand for an aboriginally widespread humanity in various independent centres of origin. See ADAM.

The objections of Kalisch (*Commentary on Genesis*, p. 48 sq.), who concludes that, "with regard to astronomy and geology, the Biblical records are, in many essential points, utterly and irreconcilably at variance with the established results of modern researches" (p. 52), are as follows: (1.) That the connecting <sup>ו</sup>, and, of ver. 2, "expresses immediate sequence." So little force is there in this as an absolute or universal remark, that the connection in question occasionally appears at the beginning of a book (Exod. i, 1; 1 Kings i, 1; Ezra i, 1) or even an isolated epistle (2 Kings v, 6; x, 2). See Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, p. 395, h. (2.) Exod. xx, 11, "For in six days the Lord made the heaven and the earth," etc., so far from being "in direct opposition" to this view, is in exact agreement with it, since that expression, which is a mere repetition of the summary statement in Gen. ii, 1, contains not one syllable concerning the creation (it is <sup>וַיִּבְרָא</sup> there, not <sup>וַיִּשְׁרַב</sup>, as in Gen. i, 1) of matter. The formula "heavens and earth" in Gen. i, 1 denotes the *universe*, as its absolute position there shows; whereas in Exod. xx, 11 it merely designates the sky and the land as subdivisions of our planet, in distinction from the sea, which is immediately added to embrace the whole. (3.) "In Matt. xix, 4 man is said to have been created 'in the beginning,' the work of the sixth day was therefore believed to be coeval with the time specified in the first verse." This is a piece of reason-

ing which refutes itself. (4.) "The earth could not have been termed 'dreary and empty' if it [had] teemed with life and vegetation long before." Certainly it could if this life and vegetation had been destroyed, as we suppose. (5.) For the same reason, the argument cited by the same author (p. 45) from Hugh Miller (*Testimony of the Rocks*, p. 121, 122) is inapposite here, that "for many ages ere man was ushered into being not a few of [the species of] his humble contemporaries of the fields and woods enjoyed life in their present haunts, and that for thousands of years previous to their appearance many of the existing [species of] mollusks were in our seas;" for these species may very readily have been *recreated*, on the theory we are now advocating, even if they had been exterminated just before the period of man—which, however, does not necessarily follow, for their germs may have survived the cataclysm supposed.

The objections which Dr. Taylor Lewis urges against this "chasm theory," as he styles it, and which he regards as "the most difficult as well as the most unsatisfactory" of all the proposed solutions, are still less forcible (Lange's *Commentary on Genesis*, p. 167): 1. The incongruity between the events spoken of before and after the chasm. But on this theory there is *no* direct connection. 2. Want of natural or moral reasons for the alleged catastrophe. But no catastrophe is stated in the narrative; it is only an inference of modern times. 3. The theory is evidently brought in as an escape from geological difficulties. That is little against it, for all the modern explanations are but ingenious devices to meet some speculative view, except the bald one that holds to the literal creation of the universe in six periods of twenty-four hours each. On the other hand, the interpretation under consideration simply allows Moses to say nothing about matters with which he had nothing to do. We protest against making him wise in all the modern scientific ratiocinations. 4. It makes the "heavens" of ver. 1 different from those of ver. 8. This is true only as to the *extension* of the term, which the different character of the two contexts requires us to vary. Does any reasonable interpreter suppose the mere *sky* alone to be meant in ver. 1, as in ver. 8? 5. The connecting <sup>ו</sup>, "and," does not admit "so sharp and remote a severance" in the history. We may reply that there was no wide gap in the imagination of the writer; it exists only in the mind of the modern savant. But, supposing that Moses did know all about the period thus ignored by him, every Bible reader is aware how often such gaps are silently bridged by the conjunction in question, which might almost be described as a "disjunctive" rather than a copulative. The erudite objector himself candidly admits (p. 130) that such minute grammatical points as the tense of the verb <sup>וַיִּבְרָא</sup>, "was," instead of <sup>וַיִּשְׁרַב</sup>, as well as the question whether the first day is exclusive or inclusive of the "beginning," are inconclusive.

On the other hand, the sacred text itself discloses several positive indications of such a hiatus as we have supposed between verse 1 and 2 of Gen. i. (1.) The term "beginning" implies a sequel or later stage of creation, especially as it stands in so emphatic a position and absolute a form. (2.) The act here designated by the word "created" is not a general one, of which the details follow, but one totally distinct in kind from them, namely, the *aboriginiation* of matter itself: hence it is not used again until the bringing into existence of animal life is specified. (3.) Accordingly, the phrase "heavens and earth," although expressive of the universe, does not mean the celestial and terrestrial worlds as such, or as now extant, but merely their elementary state or materials. This will be disputed by few if any interpreters. But thus, under any theory, a long interval must have elapsed between this primordial state of matter, and its organization or crystalli-

zation into the most rudimentary forms to which it is possible to apply the statements of the succeeding verse. (4) For "the earth" is there spoken of separately as at least a segregated globe, and special prominence is given to it by its emphatic position in the sentence, as well as by the strong disjunctive accent placed upon it by the Masoretes, whereas the reduction of the heavenly bodies to their present order is not spoken of till a much later point—a fact utterly irreconcilable with the view that makes the latter phenomena coincide with their astronomical production.

(5) The force of the substantive verb  $\text{הָיָה}$ , "was," which, as being *expressed* in ver. 2, is not the simple copula, adds intensity to this distinction of the terrene from the aerial sphere, and shows that the writer has descended from the universal creation to our own planet as the immediate abode of man. Now, although the verb in question ought not perhaps, with some, be rendered *became, remained*, etc., yet as the equivalent of  $\text{ἔπαυσα}$ , in distinction from  $\text{εἶπὶ}$ , it certainly serves to point out a particular condition of the earth at a definite stage of its history as an actual event in contrast with its later and prior state; q. d. "The earth, however, still existed as," etc. (6) The peculiar phrase employed to describe the condition in question is even more conclusive of this interpretation; for not only is this not an adjective, which would have expressed simple quality, but the nouns  $\text{תִּבְיָהּ}$ ,  $\text{תִּבְיָהּ}$ , literally *wasteness and desolation, or emptiness and vacuity* (for both these ideas are implied, and the two words are almost synonymous), used superlatively by way of reiterated asseveration, are both expressive of a positive rather than a negative fact, the result of an active cause, and not a mere continuance of disorder or the absence of organic principles, q. d. "wreck and ruin" (compare Isa. xxxiv, 11, "He shall stretch out upon it the line of confusion [*ḥōhu*], and the stones of emptiness [*bōhu*]," speaking of the complete demolition of a city). (7) The same picture of devastation is contained in the parallel terms  $\text{תְּהוֹמוֹת}$ , *abyss*, and  $\text{תְּהוֹמוֹת הַיָּם}$ , *surface of the water*; by which the face of the globe (not its interior) is represented as a vast and billowy sea, just such as an arctic deluge or a suddenly melted *mer de glace* would exhibit. (8) Finally, the *brooding* ( $\text{רַחֵם}$ ) of the divine Spirit over this dark and turbid nest (not chaotic world-egg) does not exclude all previous creative or reductive energy, but rather implies the already fecundated germ or organized embryo, which only needed incubation to bring it to perfection and manifestation. The *semina rerum* survived the extinction of the parent races, and a fresh brood was to repopulate the globe. Or perhaps the figure may still better be interpreted of the fledgling earth, chilled and stunned by the recent catastrophe, nestling for warmth and protection beneath the genial wings of its Creator, to gather new vigor for the final essay at independent life and action.

4. "Dr. Pye Smith, in his *Geology and Scripture*, suggested that the chaotic period had been confined and limited to one particular portion of the earth's surface, viz. that part which God was adapting for the dwelling-place of man and the animals connected with him. This section of the earth he designates as 'a part of Asia lying between the Caucasian range, the Caspian Sea, and Tartary on the north, the Persian and Indian seas on the south, and the mountain ridges which run, at considerable distances, on the eastern and western flanks;' and he suggests that this region was brought by atmospheric and geological causes into a condition of superficial ruin, or some kind of general disorder. This theory left to the geologist his unbroken series of plants and animals in all parts of the world, with the exception of this particular locality. But the explanation was never received with favor, and was obviously inconsistent with the language of

Scripture, inasmuch as the term 'the earth,' in the first verse of the first chapter of Genesis, embraces the whole of the terrestrial globe, and 'the earth' that is, in the next verse, described as 'without form and void,' cannot be more restricted in its meaning and extent." This theory, however, is maintained by one of the latest expositors of this portion of Scripture (Murphy, *Commentary on Genesis*, ad loc.).

5. Another scheme of reconciliation of Scripture and geology has for its foundation the assumption that the Mosaic days designate periods of vast and undefined extent—that the six days of creation portray six long periods of time, which commenced with "the beginning," and have succeeded each other from thence through the various scenes depicted by Moses, up to and inclusive of the creation of man; and that the seventh day, on which God rested from his work of creation, is still current. Against such a construction of the word "day" in the Mosaic record, Dr. Buckland, who was one of the advocates for the natural-day interpretation, asserts that "there is no sound critical or theological objection;" an admission, however, which there is abundant reason to dispute. See DAY.

"Long before the question had assumed the importance and interest which the discoveries of geology have given to it, many well-informed philologists advocated the opinion that the Mosaic days were periods of long duration. Among the Jews, Josephus and Philo, and of Christians, Whiston, Des Cartes, and De Luc, have so expressed themselves; while of those who have written with full knowledge of geological facts, we have Cuvier, Parkinson, Jameson, Silliman, and Hugh Miller—all of them holding the opinion that the Mosaic days of creation were successive periods of long duration." Nevertheless, in a hermeneutical point of view, this theory is open to the gravest objections. See COSMOGONY, MOSAIC.

The statement of Prof. Taylor Lewis is perhaps the most finished form of this fashionable theorizing, namely, that, as St. Augustine expresses it, "common solar days are mere *vicissitudines calidæ*, mere changes in the position of the heavenly bodies, and not *spatia morarum*, or evolutions in nature belonging to a higher chronology, and marking their epochs by a law of inward change instead of incidental outward measurements. . . . This is not a metaphorical, but the real and proper sense of the word 'day'—the most real and proper, the original sense, in fact, inasmuch as it contains the essential idea of cyclicity or rounded periodicity, or self-completed time, without any of the mere accidents that belong to the outwardly measured solar or planetary epochs, be they longer or shorter. . . . Wonderful things are told out of the common use of language, and therefore common terms are to be taken in their widest compass, and in their essential instead of their accidental idea. . . . No better term could be used for the creative *moræ*, pauses, or successive *naturæ*, as Augustine styles them; and so no better words than 'evening' and 'morning' could be used for the antithetical vicissitudes through which these successions were introduced" (Lange's *Genesis*, p. 131). This appears to us a gratuitous assumption of the whole question in debate, and that in a form so nearly akin to pure *transcendentalism* as to be beyond the reach of sober criticism. Its acceptance or rejection will depend upon the subjective condition of the inquirer's own mind. But this interpretation, whether true or false, does not, in fact, at all touch the real difficulty between the geologists and Moses; it rather occasions that difficulty, for it essentially identifies the creative acts of the two schemes. Now the discrepancy in question, as we shall see, relates not so much to the absolute or comparative length of the several creative processes, as to their relative *order* and *character*. These are unmistakably fixed in the most marked and indelible characters in the respective records of geology and Genesis, and, unfortunately for the theory in

question, they altogether fail to tally. However indefinite an extension, therefore, we may give to the word "day" in the sacred narrative, this will avail little so long as the successive events themselves so widely differ from those of the scientific system. Moreover, the creations of the geological world overlap each other, and vary in their relative position in different regions, whereas those of the Biblical cosmogony are strictly consecutive and universal.

Similar objections apply to an ingenious theory of Prof. S. D. Hillman (in the *Meth. Quar. Rev.*, Oct. 1868), who, while admirably defending the "nebular hypothesis," proposes to identify the *days* of creation with astronomical æras. He leaves no room for the alternations of "evening and morning."

"The consistency or harmony of these two records of the creation—that of Moses and that of the geologist—has, in conformity with the foregoing interpretation of the word 'day,' been attempted to be traced and vindicated by the late Hugh Miller in a lecture delivered by him to the Young Men's Christian Association in the year 1855, and afterwards republished in *The Testimony of the Rocks*, and also by Dr. McCausland in his *Sermons in Stones*. The former sought to show the consistency between the facts of geology and the events recorded by Moses as having occurred on the third, fifth, and sixth days or periods of creation, stating that, as a geologist, he was only called on to account for those three of the six days or periods, inasmuch as geological systems and formations regard the remains of the three great periods of plants, reptiles, and mammals, and those only; and 'that of the period during which light was created—of the period during which a firmament was made to separate the waters from the waters—or of the period during which the two great lights of the earth, with the other heavenly bodies, became visible from the earth's surface, we need expect to find no record in the rocks.' But the author of the latter work (*Sermons in Stones*) has undertaken further to show that geology confirms and establishes the truth of every statement in the record of Moses, from the beginning down to the creation of man—the original state of the globe 'without form and void'—the first dawn of light—the formation of the firmament, and the separation of the waters below from the waters above it—and the first appearance of the sun, moon, and stars on the fourth day, intermediate between the creation of the vegetable world on the third, and the creation of the creeping things and birds on the fifth day." But neither of these writers, however acute and accurate in matters of natural science, was competent to appreciate the philological and exegetical bearings of the subject, and hence both have palpably warped the statements of the sacred text into a forcible conformity to their geological prepossessions. The many and striking discrepancies will appear in the following discussion of the facts of geology in detail. See section iv.

The only objection which even these geologists have deemed sufficient to set aside the above explanation of Dr. Chalmers is that geology (in their view) furnishes no evidence of such a sudden and total break in the order of creation immediately previous to the introduction of man. It is difficult to see how they can maintain this argument in the face of the two well-known facts, that no remains of the present races of animals or vegetables are to be found in the fossiliferous rocks (at least none in those below the "tertiary"), and that none of the fossil species are now extant upon the globe. The few exceptions claimed to these rules are too trifling and doubtful to affect their validity (these are strongly adduced by Lyell, *Antiq. of Man*, Lond. and N. Y. 1863; a careful synopsis may be found in Bruce's *Races of the Old World*, N. Y. 1863, ch. xxxii; comp. *Brit. and For. Exam. Rev.*, Oct. 1861; *Meth. Quar. Rev.*, Jan. 1864), and the cases of striking resemblance may be referred to the maintenance of analogous types

of being in each fresh creation. Indeed, the universal presence of "drift," and the *striae* everywhere found upon rocks at the surface, seem to be conclusive evidence of some grand cataclysm closing the pre-Adamic period with universal wreck, which the flippant assertions of some modern writers cannot gainsay. Several of the recently discovered cases of human remains or art, covered by deposits computed to be of immense age, are examined by an expert in the *Meth. Quarterly Review* for Oct. 1865, and the preposterous conclusions derived from them by Lyell and others fully exploded. The well-known rate of the growth of deltas at the alluvial mouths of all great rivers proves that they began their course not over six thousand years ago. Prof. Jewell, of Chicago, in the *Meth. Quar. Review* for Jan. 1869, carefully examines all the most recent discoveries alleged in favor of the antiquity of man under the five heads: "1. *Lacustrine habitations* of Central and Southern Europe; 2. '*Kjocken-middings*' or *Kitchen refuse-heaps* of the coasts of Denmark and Norway, and the Atlantic coast of North America; 3. *Deltas*, as those of the Nile, Po, Ganges, and Mississippi; 4. *Cave deposits*, in various parts of Europe; 5. *Remains* [of human bones and other objects] found in the peat, clay, and gravel-beds and terrace-formations of various parts of the world." He then sums up the proper scientific conclusions from these geological data thus:

(1) Man and the mammoth in some parts of the globe were contemporaneous.

(2) Instead of carrying man back to the period assigned to the mammoth and other great extinct pachyderms, we are required rather to bring the mammoth down to the period of man.

(3) We may safely say that the facts elicited not only show that those deposits in which remains of man have been found may have been formed within the six thousand years of historical chronology, but that in all probability such was the case.

(4) The knowledge we yet have of the dynamical geology of the various superficial formations from the "pleistocene" upward, is not such as to enable us to reach trustworthy conclusions with regard to past time.

(5) Geological changes have taken place in the past with a rapidity seldom if ever witnessed at present.

6. In view of all the difficulties, some interpreters in despair abandon all attempt at reconciliation between the Mosaic record and scientific findings, e. g. Kalisch, as above, and in general the whole Rationalistic school. Even Quarry (*Genesis and its Authorship*, Lond. 1866 chap. i), while acutely and forcibly showing the untenableness of the adjustments proposed in favor of the geological schemes, is not content with pronouncing the effort premature, in view of the unsettled state of the sciences involved, but proceeds to lay down the axiom that we must "give up looking for physical truth where moral truth alone is to be expected." But surely this is not simply a case where the phenomenal theory of interpretation is competent to explain the whole discrepancy—applicable as that principle was seen to be to much of the phraseology of the Mosaic account as early as the time of Gregory of Nyssa (*Hexæmeron*, in *Opp. Greg. Nys.*, where the optical explanation is advocated); for as Moses is expressly writing on the subject of creation, a just exegesis demands that his statements—so far as they are parallel—must tally with all later discoveries and conclusions. See HERMENEUTICS.

Mr. Quarry (*Genesis*, p. 17 sq.) adduces the following alleged discrepancies as evidence of the non-historical character of the narrative in Gen. i, ii: (1.) The apparently simultaneous creation of both "the heavens and the earth" in the beginning, whereas the firmament, the celestial bodies at least, are represented as being formed in detail at a later day. But if, as we hold, the first verse merely declares the calling into existence of the primordial matter or elements, not only does all repetition vanish, but the distinction inherent in the nature of the case between creation proper and progressive development is duly observed. Our ex-



planation likewise dissipates his objection to the use of the term "days" before the creation of the sun. (2.) He alleges that the numeral  $\aleph$ , one, being here anathorous, cannot properly be rendered "first" in connection with the opening eve-morn of creation, in the sense of the order of time. But certainly it can have no other meaning when followed in the same series by the other undoubted ordinals "second," "third," etc. That the *sixth* day alone has the article is due to its emphasis as the concluding one of the working week. (3.) The correlation between the two triads of works—"the luminaries of the fourth day corresponding to the light of the first, the fishes and birds of the fifth to the waters and the firmament of the second, and the terrestrial animals of the sixth to the dry land of the third"—constitutes no valid argument against the matter-of-fact character of the representation; for these are merely signs of the progress and harmony observable in all God's plans, and a special coincidence arising in this case from the necessarily gradual preparation of the globe for its varied classes of tenants. The assumptions that birds are impliedly represented as being produced from the air, that the creatures were all brought before Adam immediately upon their creation, and that the woman was formed on a different day from the man, are all gratuitous and erroneous, as is likewise the supposition that the absence of vegetation in chap. ii, 5 was absolute and universal, instead of referring to a mere spontaneous *growth*, and that in Eden simply.

III. *Geological Formations.*—"The crust of the earth is composed of rocks, which have been formed, some by the action of fire, such as granite, basalt, porphyry, and greenstone, which are termed igneous rocks, and some by sedimentary deposit at the bottom of water, such as sandstone, limestone, shale, etc., which are known as aqueous or stratified rocks. Igneous rocks were first formed; and on these, from time to time, through the long ages of our planet's existence, were deposited the many successive layers of sedimentary stratified rocks, in which are found the fossil remains of the animals and plants that were in existence during the several periods of deposition. These layers of rocks have been frequently and extensively, throughout these eras of their formation, broken up and distorted by volcanic action, and the protrusion of igneous rocks from beneath, upwards, and through them; and by these the mountain ranges, in all parts of the earth, have been elevated, and those diversities of land and sea which the face of our planet presents, have been formed." We shall continue, in accordance with the prevalent theory, to characterize the basis rocks, i. e. granite, and its unstratified congeners, as *igneous*, although recent investigations tend to the conclusion that they, as well as the superincumbent animal series, are the result of the disintegrations, decompositions, and fresh combinations of aqueous agency.


"The first aspect of the globe which the investigations of the cosmogonist have enabled us to realize, present to view a viscid igneous ball revolving on its axis, and wheeling its annual course around the sun, its centre of attraction. Its present oblate spheroidal form, flattened at the poles and elevated at the equator, is the exact form that a liquid sphere of the size and weight of the earth, revolving on its axis in twenty-four hours, would assume; and the still prevailing central heat, which is indicated by the gradual increase of temperature as we descend in mines from the surface in the direction of the earth's centre, reveals the igneous origin of the mass. The gradual cooling down of this fiery sphere, by radiation into space, would result in the formation of a crust of granite or some other igneous rock on the surface; and as the cooling progressed, the gases which are the constituents of water, and which are kept asunder by intense heat, would naturally combine, and thus the crust, in

process of time, would be covered with an ocean. Thus we have all the elements requisite for the production of the first series of sedimentary rocks, which were formed out of the disturbed particles or detritus of the igneous crust at the bottom of the waters which encircled the globe. The lowest of our sedimentary rocks, gneiss and mica schist, which rest on the primordial granite, or some other rock of igneous origin, are found, on inspection, to be composed of the débris or broken particles of granite, and so far the foregoing theory of their origin is confirmed. This series of rocks has been styled 'metamorphic,' from the great change that has been wrought in their structure by the action of the intense heat to which, at the time of their formation, they must have been exposed, and by which they have been partially crystallized, and their lines of stratification obliterated. They form a portion of that vast pile of the bottom rocks which have been termed 'the Cambrian,' and which have been calculated to be 25,000 feet, or nearly five miles, in depth or thickness.

"Throughout the long ages occupied by the deposition of the mass of sediment of which these bottom rocks are composed, the temperature of the globe must have been very high, though gradually becoming more cool; and the traces of animal life in them are extremely rare and difficult to detect and identify. The scanty fossil remains which have been discovered by the industry and research of the geologist, reveal no type of animal life of a higher order than the zoophyte (a creature partly of animal and partly of a vegetable nature), annelids, or sea-worms, and bivalve mollusks—all of their marine creatures devoid of the senses of sight and hearing; and with them have been found traces of fucoids or sea-weeds, but no land vegetation. In fact, all that has been discovered of organic matter in these rocks indicates a beginning of life at the time of their formation, and a beginning of life in the lowest and most humble of its forms.

"The long era of the Cambrian formation was succeeded by another as extensive, during which the rocks which have been denominated 'the Silurian' were formed, by sedimentary deposits, to the depth (as some estimate) of 30,000 feet. The fossil remains of animals throughout this formation are abundant, and disclose the zoology of the era to have been confined to submarine invertebrates, zoophytes, mollusks, and crustaceans; and no vertebrate animal appears until the close of the era, when the remains of fishes are found in the beds which lie immediately at the top of the Silurian formation. Light to some extent must have pervaded the earth during this period; for many of the mollusks, and all of the crustaceans, were furnished with eyes, some of them, as in the instance of the trilobite, of a peculiarly elaborate and perfect structure. It appears to be a law of nature, that animals whose entire existence is passed in darkness are either wholly devoid of the organs of sight, or, if rudimentary eyes are discoverable, they are useless for the purposes of vision, as exemplified in the animals of all orders, from the mollusk to the mammals, which have been discovered in the caverns of Illyria, in the caverns of South America, mentioned by Humboldt, in the Mammoth Cave of Kentucky, in deep wells, and in depths of the sea where no ray of light can penetrate.

"The system that succeeded the Silurian was that in which the Devonian or Old-Red-Sandstone rocks were formed; and all geologists concur in stating that the position in which these rocks are found indicates that the era was ushered in by violent commotions, during which most of the principal mountain ranges in the world were thrown up. The fossil remains of this era, during which sedimentary rocks, calculated to be about 10,000 feet in thickness, were formed, present to our view, in addition to the previous existing orders of animals, vertebrate fish of the Placoid and Ganoid species. These have been graphically described by Hugh Miller, in *The Old Red Sandstone*, as



Section of the Earth's Crust, showing the Relative Position of its Strata.

N. B.—The above distribution of the successive layers consist merely of the titles and systems adopted by different authors. Some of the strata are found only in certain localities of limited extent, and there are modifications peculiar to other places. The "rocks" (a general term in geology for all strata, of whatever character) are represented in the cut as tilted up by an adjacent mountain. Several such changes of level, and not seldom even by depression, are sometimes exhibited as having successively taken place. The layers are frequently corrugated or otherwise disturbed, either singly or throughout the whole or various parts of the series. Any one of them may appear at the surface, in consequence of derangement or the absence of those properly belonging above it. Seldom or never are they all found together as here. They exist in endless variety of combination, both chemical and mechanical, and are sometimes thrown into almost promiscuous confusion by volcanic and other causes; but when present and in their natural site, they observe the arrangement indicated on the diagram.

cartilaginous, and clad in strong integuments of bone composed of enamelled plates, instead of the horny scales which form the covering of the fish of the present day; and it has been suggested by Dr. Buckland that this hard coating may have formed a defence against the injurious effects of water of a high temperature. The first traces of land vegetation have been found at the top of the Silurian, where the Old Red Sandstone rests on it." "The fossil remains of a small reptile, which is stated to have been found in a rock at the top of the Old Red Sandstone, have been supposed to be the first traces of terrestrial life upon the globe; but professor Owen is of opinion that the rock in question does not belong to the Old Red Sandstone formation, but to another long subsequent—the Trias.

"The system that succeeded the Devonian is the Carboniferous, which is one of importance and interest to mankind, as having been the period of the formation of coal, iron, and the mountain limestone—a com-

bination of products that have contributed so largely in these latter days to the comfort and convenience of the human race. The coal-measures, it is well ascertained, are the product of profuse and extensive vegetation, and the nature of the plants of which it has been formed is easily discoverable by a close examination of the mineral itself, which, on inspection, discloses them to have been almost entirely of the cryptogamic order, and such as would be produced in abundance in positions of shade, heat, and humidity. Ferns, calamites, and esquisitaceous plants preponderate, and wood of hard and ligneous tissue, which is, in a great measure, dependant on the unshaded light of the sunbeam, is of rare occurrence in this formation, while season rings, which result from the impact of the direct rays of sunlight on the tree, are not found at all in the fossil woods of this or the previous formation, though they appear in those of the succeeding systems."

"In confirmation of these views, it is remarkable

that other geological phenomena, besides that of the absence of the season rings in the trees, indicate that there was no variation of seasons on our earth before the close of the carboniferous æra. Temperature appears, up to that period, to have been tropical and uniform in all latitudes; for the fossil remains testify that the animals and plants that lived and grew in the carboniferous and preceding æras at the equator were of the same species as those that lived and grew at the same period in the arctic regions—and the coal-measures are as abundant in the high latitudes as in the temperate and tropical zones. These phenomena can only be accounted for by the continued prevalence of the central heat, and the consequent neutralization of the effect of the sun's rays, the influence of which now operates to produce the variety of seasons. The climatal condition of the earth in those ages must have been similar to those of a vast humid hothouse shaded from the direct radiance of the sun, and which would be eminently conducive to the production of a prolific vegetation, such as that which has been stored up in our extensive coal-measures.

"The zoology of this æra furnishes us with the first undoubted traces of terrestrial animal life, in the form of insects of the beetle and cockroach tribes, scorpions, and reptiles of the batrachian order—creatures which were adapted by nature to live in the dull, hazy, tepid atmosphere that overspread our planet at this time.

"At the close of the carboniferous æra another commenced, during which the system of rocks, which has been denominated 'the Permian' system, was formed, the fossil remains of which indicate that great changes must have taken place in the physical constitution and aspect of the earth. The exuberant vegetation which had supplied the material of the coal-measures of the preceding formation had died away, and a vegetation of a higher order succeeded." "The animals, too, which inhabited the Permian earth disclose an advance in organic life. The Saurian, or true reptile, here made its first appearance; and the earliest traces of birds present themselves in the New Red Sandstone, a member of this system. The foot-tracks of these birds, of immense magnitude, which stalked on the Permian sands and mud, are found impressed on the now hardened slabs of sandstone and shales of that formation both in Scotland and in America.

"The Permian was succeeded by the systems of the Trias and Oolite, whose fossil remains attest an advance in animal as well as in vegetable organization. Trees of the palm, pine, and cypress species were mingled with the diminished ferns, calamites, and conifers of the coal æra; and with this improved vegetation, a higher order of insects appears to have come into existence to feed on and enjoy the increasing bounties of Providence. But the peculiar and most striking feature of the age was the extraordinary increase, in number and magnitude, of the Saurian reptiles which then peopled the earth. The Saurians were divisible into three distinct classes—the terrestrial, or Dinosaurians; the marine, or Elnanosaurians; and the aerial, or Pterosaurians. They were all of them air-breathing creatures—amphibious, and more or less aquatic in their nature and habits; together with the birds whose tracks have appeared in these same systems." "The fossil remains of the reptilian inhabitants of earth, ocean, and air of the Oolite world, more especially of the Lias member of it, have revealed them to have then swarmed out in such amazing numbers, and of such vast dimensions, that geologists have always dwelt on the scenes which the earth of those days must have presented with astonishment and wonder, and have named that æra 'the age of the reptiles.'"

"The Chalk or Cretaceous system succeeded that of the Oolite, and presents little, if any evidence of advance in creation. There is, however, a manifest decrease of the Saurian reptiles, which reigned in such

abundance in the preceding formation, and some traces of the true mammals have, it is said, been found in this system. At all events, in the next formation, the Tertiary, we have distinct evidence of the existence of the mammal race of animals, including the quadruped mammals, resembling those now extant."

"No traces of human remains, or of any work of art, have been found below the superficial deposits, or outside coating of the globe; yet there is no evidence of the introduction on the earth of any species of animal whose prototype was not in being before the human race became inhabitants of the earth. Man's pedigree is of less antiquity than that of any other known creature, though, geologically and physically, he is at the top of the ascending orders or scale of created beings; for it is admitted by the most eminent and best-informed geologists that the well-attested facts of their science demonstrate that the plan or law of the creation was progressive, beginning with the zoophyte in the bottom rocks, and ascending through the succeeding formations in the advancing forms of the Mollusk, Crustacean, Fish, Reptile, and Mammal, culminating with Man, since which no new species has been introduced on the scene. See SPECIES.

"The length of the time which has elapsed since our planet was a ball of liquid fire, and during which our world of light and life was elaborated in its various stages by the hands of the Almighty, admits of no calculation. It is not to be reckoned by days or years, or any known measure of time. We can only look at the vast piles of the sedimentary rocks which have been laid down at the bottom of the waters in that period, to the depth of fifteen miles at the lowest calculation, and ask how long was the space of time occupied in the formation of those masses by the slow process of depositing grain after grain of the particles of the matter of which they have been formed, and yet that is but a brief portion of duration when compared with that which must have been occupied by the cooling down of the globe, so as to admit of the existence of life upon its surface." "The Scriptures do not fix the age of the earth, or supply any means by which we could calculate the length of time that had elapsed between 'the beginning' and the first appearance of the creation, including that of Adam; and the Biblical records have unfolded to us that nearly six thousand years have passed away since he became an inhabitant of the earth. Facts, however, have recently come to light on which it has been argued that, though the extent of the human æra must have been short indeed when compared with the vastness of the geological ages, yet some of the human race must have tenanted the earth at a time long anterior to that assigned by the Bible records to have been the date of Adam's birth. Mr. Leonard Horner's experimental researches in Egypt, instituted with a view to ascertain the depths of the sedimentary deposits in the valley of the Nile, have brought to light relics of works of art and specimens of man's handiwork, such as pieces of pottery and sculpture, that tend to prove the existence of intelligent manufacturers at a period of time that could not be less than eleven or twelve thousand years; but the premises from which this conclusion has been deduced are too uncertain and fallible to warrant such an extension of the commonly received age of man. The rate of accretion of sedimentary deposits of a river like the Nile is subject to so many varying external influences, that, as a measure of time, it may be most fallacious, and no reliance can be placed upon it as disproving the record of Moses. Still greater importance has been ascribed to the discoveries in the gravel quarries of Abbeville and Amiens, in the north of France, and also in Suffolk in England, of flint implements, such as hatchets, spears, arrow-heads, and wedges of rude manufacture, associated in undisturbed gravel, with the bones of extinct species of the elephant, rhinoceros, and other animals, whose remains

are found in the diluvium formed by the last great geological revolution. If these implements are of artificial origin, they afford strong evidence that the races of men by whom they were manufactured were the contemporaries of animals which geologists affirm could not have existed within the Scripture term of human life. Nevertheless, many of those best acquainted with geological phenomena and the knowledge to be derived from them have not admitted that this association of a mixture of the flint implements with the extinct animal remains is conclusive evidence of the co-existence in life of the manufacturer of the implements with those animals, and affirm that mere juxtaposition is no evidence of contemporaneity, when no remains of the human frame are to be found in the same place" (Kitto, *Cyclopaedia*, s. v. Creation). The few instances in which such remains have been found together are all resolvable into cases of animals of comparatively recent extinction (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1867, p. 457 sq.). The age of the diluvium also in which these remains have been discovered, uncertain as it was before, has not been determined by the presence of these human relics in it, so that the Scripture chronology of the human era has not been displaced.

IV. *Proposed Identification of these Geological Periods with the Mosaic "Days."*—Most geologists have frankly avowed the utter incompatibility of these rocky revelations with that of Genesis, if intended as the records of the same events; while those who have believed them to be reconcilable have usually contented themselves with vaguely referring to the progress and order evinced in both accounts as a proof of their general agreement, without attempting anything like a minute comparison—doubtless for the reason that any distribution of the geological aeras into precise portions, such as those of Moses, whether six or any other number, must be highly arbitrary and fanciful. A few, however, following out the suggestion of Jameson, have of late ventured upon such a collation in detail, e. g. Hugh Miller and Dr. McCausland (see above).

1. The most ingenious of these schemes makes the first Mosaic "day" correspond to the age of the lower, metamorphic, or Cambrian rocks, in which the eyeless zoophytic life is compared with the vivifying influence of the Spirit brooding over the abyss as yet in darkness; the second "day," on which the firmament was formed, would answer to the Silurian series, containing only submarine invertebra, evincing the presence of light; the third "day," when the dry land brought forth the vegetable tribes, would be represented by the Old Red Sandstone period, containing also vertebrated fish and traces of land vegetation; the fourth "day," which witnessed the development of the celestial luminaries, would agree with the Carboniferous era, which indicates the lifting up of the veil of vapor that had before enshrouded the globe, thus giving rise to a more solid form of woody fibre; the fifth "day," when birds and reptiles were produced, would be denoted by the group of the Permian, New Red Sandstone, Trias, and Oolite systems, with their gigantic Saurians and bird-tracks; and finally, the sixth "day," which saw the creation of land animals, would fall in the Cretaceous or rather the Tertiary epoch, which presents the most perfect fossil mammals. Unfortunately, however, there exist several important discrepancies in this effort at identification, which go to show that it is altogether artificial and untrue. In the first place, there are not exactly six of these strata of rocks, but some ten or a dozen; indeed, geologists are not agreed among themselves as to their proper number and classification, some making them out to be a score or more. Each of these is well defined in itself, and most of them contain their own peculiar fossil forms; yet even they are evidently in general but progressive developments of the same organic types, and not totally fresh orders

of being, such as the successive stages of the Mosaic creation exhibit. Nor are they uniformly distributed over the earth's surface, but some here and others there, although preserving almost invariably the same relative order; so that it is doubtful whether in all cases they mark regularly consecutive aeras in the earth's history as a whole. Neither are they equal in extent or thickness, so as to lead us to conclude that they occupied fixed portions of time, such as the Mosaic days of co-ordinate length. In the second place, they do not tally in their productions with the Mosaic series. The account in Genesis does not introduce life at all until the third day, whereas we find the very lowest stratified rocks teeming with certain kinds of animation. Nor is this the vegetable life, which first appears in the record of Moses; on the contrary, it is such as belongs to the animal kingdom, and is precisely of the marine order, which Moses withholds till the fifth day; while geology does not discover vegetation (unless inferentially) till the junction of the Silurian with the Old Red Sandstone, and it does not become characteristic till we reach the Carboniferous era. In like manner, Moses makes the creation of birds simultaneous with that of fishes, whereas fish appear in the strata of the period prior to that of the bird-tracks—indeed, anterior to plants themselves. Moreover, reptiles, which figure so conspicuously in the geological annals, are passed over with little, if any distinction in the Mosaic statement. Terrestrial animation, on the other hand, to which Moses does not allude till the sixth day, begins in the geological series as early as the Carboniferous age. In a word, the animal and vegetable kingdoms, which the sacred narrative places at a decided interval, go on in parallel progression through the rocky cycles; and their relative order of appearance is, if anything, rather the reverse of that given by Moses, while as little coincidence appears in the order of land and water products. In the third place, not only is this theory opposed to the obviously literal meaning of the word "day" in the Mosaic record, and hampered by exegetical difficulties at every point in its details (such as the application of the Spirit's formative "hovering," ver. 2, upon the dark chaos, to the evolution of zoophytes; the segregation of the "firmament," to the deposition of the Silurian rocks; the emergence of "dry land," to the fossil casts of the Old Red Sandstone; the bursting forth of the heavenly "lights," to the production of the coal-measures; the formation of marine "creatures and fowl," to a motley stratification that chanced to contain huge lizards and nondescript rocs; and the creation of animated nature, to the piling up of chalky or earthy sediment as a basis for alluvial soil)—aside from these formidable difficulties, the whole interpretation of Moses's simple language as adumbrating the vast and complicated systems of geological changes is preposterous in the highest degree. We conclude, therefore, that a hypothesis, which, while it outrages every just and natural principle of hermeneutics, at the same time so utterly breaks down the moment it is actually brought to the test of scientific comparison, is wholly unworthy our acceptance. Moses is clearly relating a historic creation of the present races of animal and vegetable life, and the analogies between the events and progression of his days and those of the geological cycles are merely such resemblances as the successive restorations from a chaotic state would naturally present, although on a vastly different scale in point of duration.

2. Prof. Dana, in his *Manual of Geology* (Phila. 1862), gives (p. 742), as the latest conclusion of science on the relation between the Mosaic and the geological cosmogonies, the following, which he has condensed from the lectures of Prof. Guyot (see *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Apr. 1855, p. 324 sq.), and which we here place in parallel columns with the statements of the first chapter of Genesis:

1. THE BEGINNING OF ACTIVITY IN MATTER.—In such a beginning from matter in the state of a gaseous fluid the activity would be intense, and it would show itself at once by a manifestation of light, since light is a resultant of molecular activity. A flash of light through the universe would therefore be the first announcement of the work begun.

2. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE EARTH.—A dividing and subdividing of the original fluid going on would have evolved systems of various grades, and ultimately the orbs of space, among these the earth, an igneous sphere enveloped in vapors.

3. THE PRODUCTION OF THE EARTH'S PHYSICAL FEATURES, by the outlining of the continents and oceans. The condensable vapors would have gradually settled upon the earth as cooling progressed.

4. THE INTRODUCTION OF LIFE UNDER ITS SIMPLEST FORMS, as in the lowest of plants, and perhaps, also, of animals. The systems of structure characterizing the two kingdoms of nature, the *Radiate* of the vegetable kingdom, and the *Radiate*, *Molluscan*, *Articulate*, and *Vertebrate* of the animal, are not brought out in the simplest forms of life. The true *Zoic* era in history began later. As plants are primarily the food of animals, there is reason for believing that the idea of life was first expressed in a plant.

5. THE DISPLAY OF THE SYSTEMS IN THE KINGDOMS OF LIFE—the exhibition of the four grand types under the animal kingdom, being the predominant idea in this phase of progress.

6. THE INTRODUCTION OF THE HIGHEST CLASS OF VERTEBRATES—that of the *Mammals* (the class to which *Man* belongs), viviparous species, which are eminent above all

And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light; and there was light. And God saw the light, that it was good; and God divided the light from the darkness. And God called the light day, and the darkness he called night. *And the evening and the morning were the first day.*—Ver. 2-5.

And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters. And God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament; and it was so. And God called the firmament heaven. *And the evening and the morning were the second day.*—Ver. 6-8.

And God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear; and it was so. And God called the dry land earth, and the gathering together of the waters he called the seas; and God saw that it was good.—Ver. 9-10.

And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit-tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth; and it was so. And the earth brought forth grass, and herb yielding seed after his kind, and the tree yielding fruit, whose seed is in itself, after his kind; and God saw that it was good. *And the evening and the morning were the third day.*—Ver. 11-13.

And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven, to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs and for seasons, and for days and years; and let them be for lights in the firmament of the heaven, to give light upon the earth; and it was so. And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night; he made the stars also. And God set them in the firmament of the heaven, to give light upon the earth, and to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness; and God saw that it was good. *And the evening and the morning were the fourth day.*—Ver. 14-19.

And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven. And God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind; and God saw that it was good. And God blessed them, saying, Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas; and let fowl multiply in the earth. *And the evening and the morning were the fifth day.*—Ver. 20-3.

And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind; and it was so. And God made the

other vertebrates for a quality prophetic of a high moral purpose, that of suckling their young.

7. THE INTRODUCTION OF MAN—the first being of moral and intellectual qualities, and one in whom the unity of nature has its full expression.

And the earth after his kind, and cattle after their purpose, and everything that creepeth upon the earth after his kind; and God saw that it was good.—Ver. 24-25.

And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. . . . And God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good. *And the evening and the morning were the sixth day.*—Ver. 26-31.

Now, however probable these stages of creative progress may be as an *exposition of science*, yet we find the following (among other) discrepancies in them when compared with the Biblical text, which to our mind show their utter incompatibility, IF INTENDED AS AN ACCOUNT OF THE SAME SERIES OF EVENTS, and which would hopelessly entangle the philologist and expositor in any careful and judicious comparison of the geological details with the language of the sacred writer.

(1.) It is not clear how light would necessarily be the first *result* of molecular activity in a gaseous fluid; the mass, we should suppose, would have already been in an incandescence state. Nor would such "cosmical light" (whatever that phrase may mean) have been subject to the ebb and flow constituting the alternations of "day and night," or "evening and morning." Indeed, the phraseology of Moses reveals to us at the outset a turbulent *surface* rather than a homogeneous but quiescent mass of igneous vapor as the primeval chaos.

(2.) "Waters" is certainly a very inappropriate term for a fiery nebular substance in whatever stage of fluidity; and the division of the supra from the infra-firmamental liquid is a strange description of the disintegration of melted spheres from each other, whether still vaporized or cooled to semi-solidity.

(3.) The picture of the chaotic floods retiring to their proper beds bears very little resemblance to the crystallization of the azoic rocks, or the hardening of the metamorphic basis of the earth's crust, and but slightly more to the condensation of steam and other volatilized matter by a radiation of heat. Besides, as geology itself shows, the present configuration of land and water, plain and mountain chain, river and desert, has been the effect of innumerable changes, elevations, and subsidences at vastly different periods scattered throughout the pre-Adamic history of the globe.

(4.) On the third day life was not merely "introduced under its *simplest* forms," but there were created, besides "grass" and "herb yielding seed," also the fully developed "fruit-tree, whose seed is in itself;" whereas geology, instead of exhibiting in the lowest stratified rocks any of these higher forms of vegetation, leaves but the bare presumption (for the author is only able to state, page 120, that "sea-weeds or *algæ* are the earliest of the globe, *probably* preceding animal life") of the existence of any plants whatever in that age. The fourth day, which was devoted to the production or manifestation of the heavenly luminaries, has, it will be observed, nothing corresponding to it in the geological cycles. A notable chasm!

(5.) The "four grand types of the animal kingdom (radiate, mollusk, articulate, and vertebrate)," however, are not to be found in the Mosaic statement, which refers only to marine creatures and (aquatic) birds as belonging to the fifth "phase of progress" (day), for the reason obviously that the soil was still too humid for land animals, such as geology, never-

theless, exhibits in company with the finny and feathered tribes indiscriminately.

(6.) If the rendering "whales" be allowable in ver. 21, Moses has already anticipated the lactiferous animals on the preceding "day;" and, at any rate, some of the lower orders of vertebrates, if not actual reptiles (for the author's gloss of "prowling" for "creeping" things is an unheard-of interpretation), are here first introduced in connection with their terrene associates.

(7.) In the Mosaic account man is not assigned to a separate era from the quadrupeds, although he is mentioned last. The planting of Eden and the formation of Eve likewise must have taken place on the same sixth day.

In short, striking as are the general features of resemblance between the above geological and Mosaic schemes of creation, especially in the idea of systematic progression manifest in both, yet, when closely examined, in no instance are the epochs found to tally in particulars. It is only by a most violent distortion of facts on the one side, or of language on the other, that the two can be assimilated in detail. We prefer, therefore, to adhere to the older explanation, which finds a silent place for the records of geology in the first and second verses of Genesis, and refers the narrative of Moses to a subsequent creation of the present order of terrestrial things in six literal days. Nor are we deterred by the supposed "belittling conception of a Deity working like a day-laborer by earth-days of twenty-four hours," since the Almighty has grounded upon precisely this fact the institution of the Sabbath for man during all the weeks of time. See COSMOGONY.

3. A still more recent and plausible schedule is propounded by Prof. C. H. Hitchcock, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1867, as follows:

Days.	Order of Scripture.	Order of Geology.		Names of Formations.
		When Introduced.	Predominance.	
6.	MAN. Mammals.	MAN. Large Mammals.	MAN. Mammals.	Aluvium. Tertiary.
5.	Birds. Water. Animals.	Small Mammals. Birds.	Reptiles and Reptilian birds.	Cretaceous. Jurassic. Triassic.
4.	Sun, Moon, and Stars.	Reptiles, Fishes, Articulata, Molluscs, and Radiata.	Plants. Amphibians. Fishes, Plants, Mollusks, and Trilobites.	Permian. Carboniferous. Devonian. Silurian.
3.	Plants. Dry land, and sens.	Protozoans. Plants, Dry land, and Ocean.		Huronian. Labradorian.
2.	Clouds and water separ- ated. Atmosphere.	Development of Atmosphere. Gradual cooling and condensation of earth.		Previous to the formation of Strata.
1.	Day and night.  Light. Creation of matter.	Day and night. Igneous fluidity, Nebular state. Light. Creation of mat- ter.		

The author carries out the parallel between the Mosaic narrative and the geological phenomena at considerable length under each day, and makes a closer approximation to a harmony in the details than any previous writer. He wisely abstains, however, from a minute examination of the sacred text in comparison with the scientific elements; for here, like all his predecessors in this direction, his *exegesis* would inevitably have broken down. The obvious purport of the account in Genesis is sacrificed to the geological theory, and its phraseology is forced into the geological formulae. There is no natural or critical agreement. Nearly all the above strictures apply with more or less force to this new version: we have space to point out but a few special discrepancies: "day and night" are only provided for at the close of the first "day," and then as an indefinite series of alternations between light and darkness, not as a single  $\nu\chi\alpha\eta\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\nu$ ; each day in the

geological order laps over into the other, instead of being sharply defined as in the scriptural statement; it is the "plants" of the fourth geological "day," rather than those of the third, that correspond with the vegetable productions of the scriptural progression; the marine creatures of the fifth Scripture day are only to be recognised in the "amphibians" and "fishes" of the fourth geological cycle; indeed, the fourth of the Scripture days, which is occupied only with the appearance of the heavenly luminaries, is the most active of the geological periods in the production of every form of animated existence, beginning with trilobites and running up to complete vegetation.

But, most of all, we object to the general view under which this is set forth as an interpretation of the Biblical passage in question, namely, that it is a "pictorial" description, or "symbol," or "vision," "retrospectively prophetic;" whereas it seems to us a plain literal history, utterly destitute of the least semblance of imagery or seer-like import beyond the mere use of a few anthropomorphisms familiar to the Hebrews. If such liberties are allowable in hermeneutics, that is the end of all meaning in words. For instance, when the successive scenes in the Mosaic narrative are compared (*Meth. Quart. Rev.* April, 1868, p. 298) with the regularly numbered emblems of the Apocalypse (the seven seals, trumpets, angels, vials, etc.), the very important fact is overlooked that the latter are avowedly set forth as *symbolical representations* of ecclesiastical import, while the former are unaccompanied by any intimation of an ulterior significance. Indeed, this comparison is suicidal to the interpretation which it is put forth to support; for, as the visions of John in the Revelation could only have authority as premonitions of the future on the concession of their actual occurrence in the manner related by himself, so the description of Moses in the opening chapters of Genesis must be accepted as literal statements of real phenomena, in the most obvious and *bona-fide* sense, before they can be made the basis of a symbolical application. See COSMOLOGY, p. 528.

This much only may, however, be granted as true in the hypothesis upon which these and similar explanations are based: that the geological and the Mosaic creations being, like all of God's acts in a given line, mutually typical of each other, inasmuch as they proceed upon a uniformity in the divine plan—the development of an archetypal idea—were in their *great outlines*, of course, similar, and hence may, to a considerable extent, be justly compared together, and even portrayed in the same general terms; but on this very account interpreters of the Bible ought to be the more careful not to confound the two, and especially not to substitute the distant and more dimly shadowed event for the one directly in the mind of the sacred writer. See DOUBLE SENSE (*of Scripture*). In the present instance, moreover, there is eminently a natural ground of necessity for the coincidences above discernible: although no amount of ingenuity has been able to dramatize the facts of geology into precisely *sic* acts, yet the aboriginal creation of matter is of course the first scene in each case; light is a prerequisite of vegetation, and this, again, must be the antecedent food for the animal tribes, while man forms the fit outcome of the entire plot; the incidental details of the two schemes might be expected to vary, as, in fact, they are found to do.

V. *Scriptural Allusions to Geological Facts.*—(Condensed from Pattison, *ut sup.* p. 103–108.) The sacred writers make frequent references to the physical phenomena of the earth beneath. Are such references in accordance with the facts established by subsequent researches and the observation of travellers, or do the latter convict the former of ignorance and error? The question is the more important as the materials of the earth are not treated *conventionally* in the Scriptures, but naturally. In speaking of the sand on the sea-

shore, one writer alludes to it as a barrier placed by God against the encroachments of ocean, another as an illustration of the countless host of the Philistines, a third as representative of the multitude of God's people. Far different and more adapted to universal use is this than the employment of one object always to express one and the same idea, as in the symbolic picture-writing of the Egyptians and Assyrians, and as is the usage in much of the literature of the East. Freedom of language, if not of thought, is unknown where every object is used as a conventional sign, always appropriated to one fixed sentiment. We shall find incidental accords between the facts and the record in regard to all things capable of such verification. Take, for instance, the references to stone as an illustration.

The patriarchs and Israelites are frequently directed to build an altar; the injunction to form it of unhewn stones will be found given where rocks abound; the permission to make it of earth refers to districts in which we now find that stone cannot readily be procured. The numerous instances given of the setting up of commemorative stones in Palestine by the Israelites could not have occurred in the rockless plains of the Euphrates. See *STONE*. The geological traveller can readily understand the perfect congruity of the picture which represents the army of the Philistines encamped on one hill, the bands of Israel on the opposite slope, and a brawling brook in the valley between, to which David descended, and from its water-worn pebbles selected five for his sling, smoothed and sharpened by the stream.

The mention of slime for mortar, and brick for stone, in the Babylonian plains (Gen. xi, 3), in Egypt (Exod. i, 14), and again by the Euphrates during the captivity (Nah. iii, 14); and of bitumen in the vale of Siddim (Gen. xiv, 10), equally corresponds with the present geological character of the regions referred to.

The frequent occurrence of rocks and broken ground in Syria is the groundwork of much of the scenery reflected in the general language of Scripture writers, and of many incidents in the history. This accurately accords with the actual physical character of the land itself.

The representations of scenery are so minute in some cases—for instance, the rocky defile in Gibeah, 1 Sam. xiv, 4—that it becomes quite easy for travellers to test the fidelity of the writer. To this kind of criticism the Bible is more exposed than any other book, owing to its variety in time and place; and it need hardly be said that it has escaped not only unscathed, but illustrious, from the trial. The peninsula of Sinai is nowhere formally geographically described in the Bible; but from the record of events alleged to have taken place there, we infer that it was a mountainous district, full of barren, rugged rocks, towering into peaks, and cleft by deep, dry valleys. Laborde, and the numerous tribe of Oriental travellers, in describing the surface scenery, bring before us evidence of the peculiarly appropriate terms in which Scripture alludes to this region. One of the latest travellers thus writes: "Soon after this we came to an immense plain of hard rocks. The mountains which bounded it were truly magnificent: their numerous summits seemed not so much peaks as spikes, or tall spires of rocks. The whole scene is one of the most magnificent desolation and unmingled terror" (H. Bonar, *Desert of Sinai*).

So, in the limestones, there exist now caverns which are the verifications of the cave of Machpelah, of Adullam, and others, by showing the occurrence of strata in which the requisite phenomena are found; while the water-supply of the whole country at present is an accurate reflection of the scriptural account of wells and streams. The language of David and of the prophet Isaiah could only have been employed by persons familiar with the need of irrigation, and its modes, peculiar to the countries to which they profess to belong. How vividly were the mountains of the Holy Land

impressed upon the minds of the principal writers of the Bible! There are about three hundred distinct references in Scripture to mountains; a glance at a good physical map of the region will show the correspondence between the statements of the record and the facts of the earth's surface in the districts referred to.

Were a student shut up in a cell, without any other channel of knowledge than the Word, he might construct a physical geography of the East which would contain all the leading features of that remarkable portion of the globe. The river of Egypt, with its fertile plains, the stony desert, the rocky Sinai, the hills of Judaea, the rivers and lakes, the mountain chains, and the Great Sea, would all fall into their proper places on his ideal map.

So the allusions to "the dust of the earth" will carry a fulness of meaning to persons living in a land where, during a large portion of the year, the whole surface is reduced to dust by the influence of heated winds. God's power in creating man out of such incoherent matter, and man's humble bodily origin and end in this life, are forcibly represented by the frequent employment of this illustration, so familiar to the inhabitant of the East.

In like manner, the references to the inundation of the Nile (Amos ix, 5; Job xxviii, 11), to earthquakes (Isa. ii, 19; Job ix, 6; xxxiv, 20), to mines, metals, precious stones, flints, and other mineral substances, are all found to be in accordance with the actual physical phenomena.

The references to *clay* in the Scriptures are frequent, and accord with its uses and localities at the present day. See *CLAY*.

VI. *Geology of Bible Lands*.—(Condensed from Pattison, *ut sup.* p. 111-116.) The geology of the countries mentioned in holy Scripture is as yet but imperfectly known to us, but quite sufficient has been ascertained to test the accuracy of the incidental allusions made by the writers of the Bible.

1. The framework of Syria is composed of two mountainous ranges, running in a parallel strike with the coast of the Mediterranean, much broken by transverse clefts, extended by irregular spurs on either side, with detached minor masses, having the same north and south bearing. Between the two ridges runs the valley of the Jordan, occupying a deep depression, terminating in the Dead Sea.

The body of the country is a mass of Jurassic (oolitic) rocks, overlaid unconformably by a spread of cretaceous deposits (chalk and green sandstones), both much disturbed by outbursts of trappan matter (greenstone and basalt), and scooped into valleys along numerous lines of ancient fracture. The oolite was eroded before the deposition of the chalk, and the latter has been washed and worn away prior to the deposition of the third system, namely, the eocene tertiary, which is found in patches, and abounds along the lands of medium height on the shores of the Great Sea. There are a few reconsolidated rocks and gravels of a more recent period, but the bulk of the whole region is a highly contorted, inclined, and broken mass of secondary, metamorphic, and igneous rocks.

The Libanus is an axis of Jurassic rock, with some thin beds of oolite coal, surmounted by chalk, and flanked towards the coast by the great tertiary nummulitic limestone so universal along this parallel of the earth. The chalk contains fossils similar to that of the south of France. The tertiaries are often found isolated after the fashion prevalent in other countries. In some places conglomerates of the later Jurassic age occur, containing pebbles and fossils of the lower oolites.

Towards the sources of the Jordan we find igneous rocks prevailing, with their usual concomitants of metallic minerals, highly-colored landscapes, abundant springs, and verdant pastures. Hermon (the highest



Geological Map of Palestine.

mountain in Palestine) is formed of limestone, with bursts of trap. In this range occur the strata containing abundant remains of fish and vegetable impressions.

Galilee exposes similar conditions: an underlying oolite rock, an overlying cretaceous, with quartz, much broken up by trap.

The upper portion of the Jordan valley, as far south as the lower shores of the Sea of Tiberias, are much diversified by greenstone, lavas, pumice, and other kinds of igneous rock.

On the east rise the granitic and trappan mountains of Moab, inclosing a limestone country. In the valley itself are tertiary and post-tertiary accumulations, while on the west the tertiary sandstone occupies in force the plateaus of the subjacent limestone. Mount Tabor is a mass of chalk rock, and the cliffs around the Sea of Galilee are much intersected by basalts and lavas.

The Jordan valley itself shows two terraces far

above its present waters, both due to its former condition, first as an arm of the Red Sea, and then as a lake.

The Mount of Olives and the other eminences around Jerusalem are composed of chalk with flints; the older limestones appear in the bottom of the deep valleys. This is the substratum of the Holy City and its vicinity. Bethlehem is surrounded by coarse yellow cretaceous limestone.

The Dead Sea is bounded on the west principally by tall cliffs of stratified limestone, with much rubble of an ancient date: towards the south, tertiary marls and clays prevail, the whole abounding with traces of volcanic agencies. The upper portion of the long mound at the south of the lake is gypsum, overlying rock salt, which is furrowed into knolls and pillars. The south-eastern shore is colored by the bright red of the sandstone; on the east are heavy limestones and chalk, altered by the igneous masses forming the mountains of Moab. The north-east angle is formed of basaltic rocks, with volcanic slag and pumice.

The whole Jordan valley was undoubtedly a vale in tertiary periods; but the Dead Sea appears to have received the remarkable features which now characterize it subsequently to the deposition of the tertiary beds.

2. Extending our survey eastward from Palestine, we may embrace a wide area, extending from Ararat to the head of the

Persian Gulf, the general features of which are now well known. Many of the groups of secondary sedimentary strata familiar to us in Western Europe also occur here, upheaved, together with their overlying tertiary deposits, by igneous rocks, in like manner.

Along the margin of the present river-courses are alluvial deposits now in process of formation. Next, marine alluvium, following the direction of the existing great valleys, opening out into the sea, and still increasing at the outlet. Colonel Rawlinson and Mr. Ainsworth represent the marine alluvium as increasing at the head of the Persian Gulf at the rate of a mile in thirty years (*Quarterly Journal*, x, 465). There are occasional fresh-water deposits, showing the former existence of small lakes; somewhat of earlier date are extensive formations of gravel, proving the occurrence here, as in the West, of a period of turbulence at the commencement of the post-tertiary epoch.

The highest tertiary deposits form a system of red sandstone and marls underlying the valleys of the



Mesopotamian rivers. This newest red sandstone tertiary is much developed in Asia Minor, and thence eastward. It has subordinate beds of gypsum, with occasional nephth and bitumen springs. Underneath this the nummulitic series extends for 800 miles with a thickness of 3000 feet. This has been much disturbed by elevation, which has thrown it into domes and waves, constituting much of the peculiar scenery of the Turkish eastern frontier. Below this occurs the cretaceous series in the form of blue marls, white limestone with flints, and hippurite limestone. A few traces of Palæozoic rocks are brought to the surface; the whole is sustained by the granitic axis of the Caucasian chain, and occasionally metamorphosed by ancient volcanic contact.

There are no fossils common to the cretaceous series and the beds above, though both are marine deposits, nor are there any common to the two great tertiary divisions, the nummulitic and the red.

3. On turning westward towards the head of the Red Sea we encounter the remarkable peninsula of SINAI, formed of red sandstone, borne up and rifted by one of the most forcible exhibitions of igneous rocks to be found in the world.

On approaching the spurs of the Sinaitic range, boulders of red granite and metamorphic rock give indications of the disturbed district beyond.

4. The well-known narrow plain of EGYPT is a valley bordered by nummulitic rocks of eocene age, interspersed with sandstones. As the plain narrows, the scenery becomes diversified by frowning precipices of granite, basalt, and porphyry, which confine the foaming river at the cataracts, and expand into the mountains of Nubia. The sands, which stretch away towards the peninsula, cover tertiary strata, with silicified forests of the same age.

**Geometrical Style.** See GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE.

**Ge'on** (Γε'ων), a Græcized form (comp. Gen. ii, 13, Sept. Γε'ων) of the name ΓΗΩΝ (q. v.), one of the rivers of Paradise, mentioned (Ecclus. xxiv, 27) along with the Jordan, Euphrates, etc., in a description of wisdom ("as Geon in the time of vintage," meaning apparently the Nile at its period of annual overflow. Fritzsche, ad loc.).

**George, David.** See JONAS.

**George**, duke of Saxony, celebrated for his antagonism to Luther and to the Reformation, was born Aug. 3, 1471. He began to govern his province in 1500, and immediately showed a persecuting spirit against those who inclined to the Reformation. In 1519 he attended the four-days' controversy between Eck and Carlstadt at Leipzig, and afterwards that of Eck and Luther, from the 4th to the 14th of July. Discussions followed between the duke and Luther, which were afterwards continued alternately in Dresden and Wittenberg. He several times accused Luther to his uncle, the elector of Saxony, and sought to prejudice him against the reformer. Family misfortunes, such as the death of his brother Frederick in 1510, of his daughter Margaret in 1524, and of his wife in 1525, also contributed to embitter his disposition. He died April 17, 1539, but his religious views had some time before undergone a change; and under his successor and brother, Henry, the Reformation made great progress in Saxony. There is a MS. life of George of Saxony by George Spalatinus in the library of Gotha.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* v, 28; Schulze, *Georg u. Luther* (Leipz. 1834).

**George**, elector of Brandenburg-Anspach, one of the first German princes who embraced the doctrines of the Reformation, and who was therefore surnamed the Confessor, and the Pious, was born at Onolzbach March 4, 1484. In 1515 he became, conjointly with his brother Casimir, regent of the province, in consequence of

the infirmities of his father, Frederick. Both his father and his brother having died, he assumed the government in his own name in 1527. In 1524 he had become acquainted with Luther, and adopted his views. In 1529 he accompanied the reformer to the Diet of Spire, where he signed, on the 19th of April, the celebrated protestation against the "Majority Decision" of the German princes. The next year he went to the Diet of Augsburg, where he indorsed the Evangelical Confession on the 25th of June, on which occasion he boldly said to the emperor that "he would rather lose his head than renounce his religious convictions." Following out the plans of ecclesiastical reform of his brother Casimir, he framed in 1533 the Church organization of Brandenburg-Nuremberg, as also the liturgy which accompanied it, and which has been recently revived. He died at Onolzbach Dec. 17, 1543. See Pauli, *Allgem. Preuss. Staatsgesch.* iii, 457, 476; Buchholz, *Gesch. d. Kurmark Brandenburg.* iii, 217, 296, 305; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* iii, 42; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* v, 28.

**George, Enoch**, bi-shop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Lancaster Co., Virginia, in 1767 or 1768; was converted at about eighteen; entered the itinerancy in 1790; was made presiding elder in 1796; 1801 and 1802 located; in 1803 re-entered the travelling ministry; was elected bishop in 1816; and died at Staunton, Va., August 23, 1828. He was the son of a planter in moderate circumstances, and of no religious profession. His mother died while he was young, and he acquired in youth the gay and dissolute morals of the district where he lived. He was, however, at this period deeply convinced of sin under the preaching of that holy man, the Rev. D. Jarratt (q. v.), of the English Church. But the subsequent removal of his father to North Carolina for a time left him to grow more wicked than before, until at length, with his father, he was converted by the instrumentality of the Rev. John Easter. Although young, and exceedingly reluctant, he was thrust out by his brethren and his own inward convictions into public service, and for two or three years was very useful as an exhorter, local preacher, and assistant on circuits with Philip Cox and Daniel Asbury. In 1790 he entered the itinerancy, and from that time he bore for many years the hardships and trials of a pioneer Methodist preacher. His usefulness and influence continually increased, and in 1796 he was made presiding elder on a district which included Charleston, S. C., and his labors there resulted in a great revival of religion. In 1799 his health failed, and he became "superannuated." In 1800 he re-entered the itinerancy, but in 1801 his health failed again, and he located and opened a school at Winchester, in Virginia, and soon after married. In 1803 he re-entered the Conference. In 1816 he was delegate to the General Conference at Baltimore. In the same year his wife died. Bishop McKendree's health had now nearly failed, and when the Conference met it was decided to elect more bishops, and the choice fell upon R. R. Roberts and Enoch George. From this time he labored with untiring zeal and universal acceptability in supervision, visitation, and in preaching the word with mighty power, until he was taken from labor to reward. His funeral sermon was preached by bishop McKendree at the General Conference of 1852. Bishop George was a man of large information, and of great activity and force of mind. His genius was very original; the effect of his preaching was very great. Dr. Samuel Luckey gives the following account of a sermon by bishop George at John Street Church, New York, in June, 1816. "The subject of the discourse was the conquest which Christ achieved over sin and death. He announced his text: 'When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive;' and, from the moment he uttered it, had complete command of his audience. The picture he drew of sin, and the desolations it has wrought, was truly terrific. Like a mighty cataract, he rushed on with

constantly increasing impetuosity, till every nerve that had braced itself to resist was unstrung, and his hearers seemed passively to resign themselves to an influence which was too strong for them. At a felicitous moment, when the feelings of his audience would bear to be turned into a different channel, he exclaimed, in the language of holy triumph, and in a manner peculiar to himself, 'But redemption smiled, and smiled a cure!' His train of thought was now changed, but the power of his eloquence was not at all diminished. Sin had been personified as the tyrant monster, swaying his daemon sceptre over our race, and death in his train, dragging the conquered millions to their dark abode. A mightier than these was now introduced—the sinner's Friend and the conqueror of death. He came to destroy the works of the devil, and to deliver those who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage. The risen and ascended Saviour was represented as coming up from the empire of death, having seized the tyrant upon his throne, and then as triumphantly passing the portals of heaven amid the acclamations of heaven's shining hosts. The description was so vivid as to be almost overwhelming. The audience, which had just before seemed like a terror-stricken multitude, almost within the very grasp of the destroyer, now exhibited countenances relumed with returning smiles. The whole assembly was actually in a commotion" (Sprague, *Annals*, vii, 193).—*Minutes of Conferences*, ii, 35; Wakely, *Heroes of Methodism*, p. 137; Fry, *Life of Ep. George* (18mo); Stevens, *Hist. of the Methodist Episc. Church*, vols. iii, iv.

**George of LAODICEA**, one of the Semi-Arian leaders in the theological controversies of the 4th century. He was born at Alexandria, and was presbyter of the church there before the Council of Nicea in 325, when his Arian opinions caused him to be deposed. He then removed to Syria, where he became bishop of Laodicea. He attended the Council of Antioch in 329 or 330, and the Council of Tyre in 335. He failed to be present at the Council of Sardica in 347 (his enemies said through fear), and, while absent, was deposed and excommunicated, but the sentence was never carried into effect. He was in great favor during the reign of Constantius II, and took part in many matters of importance; among others, in the elevation of Miletus to the bishopric of Antioch. Basil of Ancyra (q. v.) and George of Laodicea were the heads of the so-called *Semi-Arians*, who adopted the Eusebian doctrine that the Son is of *similar* essence with the Father. They published, "in conjunction with other bishops assembled in a synod at Ancyra, A. D. 358, a long and copious document, of a doctrinal and polemical nature, in which the doctrines of this party concerning the resemblance of essence, as well in opposition to the Nicene as to the Eumonian articles, were fully unfolded; at the same time that the Church was warned against the artifices of those who, by expunging the term *ὁμοία*, were seeking to suppress the doctrine of the resemblance of essence itself. It was here very clearly shown that true resemblance in all other things presupposed resemblance of essence, and that without this the notion of a Son of God, essentially different from created existences, could not be maintained" (Neander, *Ch. History*, ii, 405). This creed was adopted by the emperor Constantius and by the Synod of Sirmium, A. D. 358. We know nothing of him after the death of Constantius. His works are, *Letters to Alexander, bishop of Alexandria*:—*Ἐγκύριον εἰς Ἐπίσκοπον τὸν Ἐμισσηρόν*:—A work against the Manicheans, now lost.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xx, 116; Neander, *Church History*, Torrey's transl., ii, 405; Baur, *Trinitätslehre*, i, 471; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* v, 30; Lardner, *Works*, iii, 596.

**George of POLENZ**, the first regular Roman Catholic bishop who embraced the Reformation, was born

at Meissen in 1478. He studied theology in Italy, was licensed there, and, having gone to Rome, became private secretary to pope Julius II. Having been admitted to the order of Teutonic Knights, he went to Prussia, where, in 1518, the grand master, Albrecht, margrave of Brandenburg, appointed him bishop of Sambia. His diocese was the first in which the Reformation strongly established itself. Brissman, a pupil of Luther, who had previously been a Franciscan, came to Königsberg, and the bishop invited him to preach the first evangelical sermon in the cathedral, Sept. 24, 1523. The bishop himself soon openly adopted the Reformed doctrines. In January, 1524, he ordered that all sermons and baptisms should take place in the vernacular throughout Prussia, and at the same time recommended Luther's Bible and writings. Luther went to Spalatin (Feb. 1, 1524), *Episcopus tandem unus Christo nomen dedit et evangelizavit in Prussia, neque Scabienensis*, and in the following year, 1525, he dedicated to *Dr. Georgio a Polentis*, vere episcopo Sambiensis ecclesie, his Latin commentary on Deuteronomy. In 1525 bishop George resigned all secular government. He then retired to the palace of Balga, and died April 28, 1550.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* v, 26.

**George of TREBIZOND** was really a native of Crete, but as that island has a bad name, especially unfit for a priest, he took that of Trebizond, whence his ancestors had come. In 1420 he came to Italy—first to Venice, afterwards to Rome, where he lectured on rhetoric and philosophy. He was made secretary to Nicholas V, but lost the favor of the pope by his fierce advocacy of Aristotle against Bessarion, Pletho, and other learned Greeks. Alphonso, king of Naples, received him at his court and gave him a pension. He died at Rome in 1486, aged 91. He was undoubtedly a man of talent and learning, but quarrelsome and vain. He translated some of Plato's writings, and Eusebius's, but inaccurately. He published also a treatise *De Rhetorica* (Venice, 1523, fol.); controversial pieces against the Greek Church, to be found in Allatius, *Græcia Orthodoxa* (Rome, 1652, vol. i); *Comparatio Aristotelis et Platonis* (Ven. 1523, 8vo). See Brucker, *Hist. Phil.* iv, 65; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, v, 23; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* ii, App. p. 49; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, iii, 102; Niccron, *Mém. pour Serris*, etc., tom. xix; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xx, 127.

**George**, prince of Anhalt and bishop of Merseburg, was born at Dessau Aug. 13, 1507, and educated at Leipsic. In 1525 he was made subdeacon, and in 1526 cathedral provost at Magdeburg. When twenty-two years of age his attainments were such that he was chosen by Albert, elector of Mentz, to be one of his council, and gained his highest confidence. About this time the Reformation attracted the attention of all men, and Luther's writings concerning the difference between the law and gospel, etc., were dispersed and read everywhere. Prince George was no idle spectator. At first he diligently opposed the so-called "novelties," and devoted himself specially to the study of Church history and to the Scriptures, the better to defend the "Church." He began all his investigations with prayer. The result was that he openly embraced the doctrines of the Reformation, and renounced all connection with popery. He put down superstition and set up seminaries of learning—the surest way, under God, of exterminating the errors which superstition had engendered. All, however, was done with Christian mildness, and multitudes were soon brought by divine grace to rejoice experimentally in the light of the Gospel. By 1534 Anhalt may be said to have become Lutheran. In 1545, by the persuasion of Luther, he consented to give himself to the work of the ministry, and was made bishop of Merseburg—an office full of danger and difficulty, which no worldly man would covet. He was ordained by Luther, Melancthon, and other divines,

August 2, 1545, in the cathedral at Merseburg. His whole time was thenceforth devoted to this holy work. Above all low ambition and revenge himself, he endeavored to remove them from others. He was a peacemaker among princes. Insults he bore with Christian magnanimity. He lived with God in his heart, and for God in his intercourse with men. Luther, Justus, Jenius, and others were his most intimate friends. As in life, so in death, he was full of resignation, faith, and love; dwelling most sweetly on the promises, especially John iii, 16; x, 27, 28, and Matt. xi, 28. He died Oct. 17, 1553, aged forty-six. His synodal addresses, in Latin, were published by Camerarius (1555); his German writings by Melancthon (7th edit. 1741). Melancthon wrote two elegies on his death, and Camerarius wrote his life in Latin, which was translated into German by Schubert, and published, with additions (Zerbst, 1854).—Middleton, *Biog. Evang.* i, 292; Beckmann, *Hist. d. Fürst. Anhalts*, vols. v, vi; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* v, 24.

**George Scholarius.** See GENNADIUS OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

**George**, patron of England, and of several other countries and towns, according to the legend, was a prince of Cappadocia, who fell a martyr under Dioclesian, 303. His greatest achievement was the conquest of a dragon, by which he delivered a king's daughter from death. He is commonly figured on horseback, in full armor, with the dragon writhing at his feet. It is difficult to separate the mythical from the historical in the accounts of St. George. Calvin and the Magdeburg centuriators deny that there ever was such a person. But it is certain that he was honored, and churches named after him, at a very early period, in the Eastern Church, especially in Georgia. Gregory of Tours mentions the honors paid him in France in the 6th century; and Gregory the Great ordered the renewal of an ancient church of St. George that was falling to ruin. His relics are said to be still preserved in the church of St. Germain des Prés at Paris. The Crusaders held St. George in special devotion; the English Council held at Oxford, 1222, made St. George's day a festival for all England; in 1347 Edward III instituted the Order of the Garter under his protection. Some writers identify St. George with the Arian George of Cappadocia (so Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, Harpers' edit., ii, 454). Mr. John Hogg, secretary of the Royal Society of Literature, published a pamphlet in 1862, entitled *Supplementary Notes on St. George the Martyr*, in which he professes to settle the question by a Greek inscription taken from a very ancient church at Ezra, in Syria, in which George is styled Martyr, and the date of his death fixed before A.D. 346, while George the Arian, of Cappadocia, was yet living. See Heylyn, *Historie of St. George* (Lond. 1631, 4to); Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, chap. xxiii; *Acta Sanctorum*, t. iii; Milner, *Historical and critical Inquiry into the History and Character of St. George*; Lowick, *Life and Martyrdom of St. George*; *Methodist Quarterly Review*, 1862, p. 499.

**George the Arian**, also **George the Fuller**, or of CAPPADOCIA, was called by the first name from the occupation of his father, and by the second because he was an inhabitant of that province. Few men have been more corrupt and more despicable. He began life as a parasite. Afterwards he was provided with a subaltern office in the commissariat department of the army, and he there embezzled the money intrusted to him, and was obliged to fly. He then became a vagabond. To so many bad qualities he added profound ignorance: he had no knowledge of letters, and still less of the holy Scriptures and theology. Notwithstanding these disadvantages, this man appeared to the Arians a fit instrument to work their will. They brought the emperor Constans into their views; he was their protector and their support. At

Antioch, in the year 356, there was an assembly of thirty Arian bishops, and in this assembly George was ordained, and received the mission to go and govern the Church of Athanasius. George entered Alexandria accompanied, by the order of Constans, by soldiers under the command of Sebastian, duke of Egypt, and a Manichaean. Under pretext of searching for Athanasius, they violated the most sacred places, and committed every kind of crime. The Alexandrians rose against him and obliged him to fly; but, supported by Constans, he returned more powerful than ever. But "the pagans, whose temples George had pillaged, afterwards rose in revolt, threw themselves upon George, and overwhelmed him with abuse and with blows. The next day they paraded him through the town upon a camel, and, having lighted a pile, they threw him and the animal on which he was mounted upon it, after which they threw his ashes to the winds, and plundered his house and his treasures (A.D. 361). Julian, on learning this outrage, was much irritated, or pretended to be so; he wrote a severe letter to the insurgents, but pursued them no further. As a lover of books, he endeavored to recover the library of George, which was very numerous. It is hard to reconcile the accounts of George's extreme ignorance with the accounts given of this library.—Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* bk. ii, ch. xiv, 28; bk. iii, ch. ii; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 60; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* v, 295; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* iii, 5; iv, 10; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xx, 116.

**George the Pisidian** (*Georgius Pisides* or *Pisida*) flourished about the middle of the 7th century. (This account is taken substantially from Smith, *Dictionary of Biography*, s. v.) George is described, in the manuscripts of his writings, as deacon and *γραφωφύλαξ*, "record-keeper," or *Σενοφύλαξ*, "keeper of the sacred vessels" of the Great Church (that of St. Sophia) at Constantinople. He appears to have accompanied the emperor Heraclius in his first expedition against the Persians, and to have enjoyed the favor both of that emperor and of Sergius, i. e. nothing further is known of him. Among his writings are *Εἰς τὴν κατὰ Περσῶν Ἐκστρατείαν Ἡρακλείου τοῦ βασιλέως ἀρροσάσεις τρεῖς*, *De Expeditione Heraclii Imperatoris contra Persas Libri tres*. This work is mentioned by Suidas, and is probably the earliest of the extant works of this writer. The three books are written in trimeter iambs, and contain 1098 verses. They describe the first expedition of Heraclius, whose valor and piety are in moderately praised, against the Persians, A.D. 622, when he attacked the frontier of Persia in the neighborhood of the Taurus. *Πόλεμος Ἀβαρκῶς ἢ Ἀβαρκῆ, Bellum Avanicum ἢ Avanicum*, a poem of one book of 541 trimeter iambic verses, describing the attack of the Avars on Constantinople, and their repulse and retreat (A.D. 626); *Εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἀνάστασιν*, *In Sanctum Jesu Christi, Dei Nostri, Resurrectionem*, consisting of 129 trimeter iambic verses, in which George exhorts Flavius Constantine, the son of Heraclius, to emulate the example of his father; probably written about A.D. 627. *Ἑξαήμερον ἴπτοι Κοσμονογία, Opus Sex Dierum seu Mundi Orphicium*, a poem of 1910 iambic verses in the edition of Quercius, who restored some lines omitted by previous editors. It has been supposed that this work has come down to us in a mutilated condition, for Suidas speaks of it as consisting of 3000 verses. But it is possible that the text of Suidas is corrupt, and that we should read *εἰς ἐπι ἑσχαδία* instead of *τρισκαδία*. The poem has no appearance of incompleteness. The *Ἑξαήμερον* contains a prayer as if by the patriarch Sergius for Heraclius and his children. The poem was probably written about A.D. 629. *Εἰς τὸν μάρτυρα Βιοῦ, De Vinitate Vitæ*, 262 iambic verses; *Κατὰ Σεήθου, Contra Sererum*, or *Κατὰ ἑνασεβίου Σεήθου Ἀντιοχείας, Contra impium Sererum Antiochie*. This poem consists of 731 iambic verses. A passage of Nicephorus Callisti

(*Hist. Eccl.* xviii, 48) has been understood as declaring that George wrote a poem against Johannes Philoponus, and it has been supposed that Philoponus is aimed at in this poem under the name of Severus, while others have supposed that Nicephorus refers to the Hexæmeron, and that Philoponus is attacked in that poem under the name of Proclus. But the words of Nicephorus do not require us to understand that George wrote against Philoponus at all. This poem against Severus contains the passage to which Nicephorus refers, and in which the Monophysite opinions which Philoponus held are attacked. *Εγκώμιον εἰς τὸν ἄγιον Ἀναστάσιον μάρτυρα, Encomium in Sanctum Anastasium Martyrem*, in prose; *Ἐῖς τὸν ἐν Βλαχέρωναις ναόν, In Templum Dēipræ Constantinopoli in Blachernis situm*; a short poem in iambic verse. Some works known or asserted to be extant have been ascribed to George, but without sufficient reason. Usher and others have conjectured that he was the compiler of the *Chronicon Paschale*, but Quercius refutes the supposition. Le Long speaks of Greek commentaries on the epistles of Paul by George of Pisidia as being extant in the Imperial Library at Vienna, but they are not noticed in the catalogues of Lambecius and Reimannus; and it is probable that Le Long's statement is erroneous. Some persons have improperly confounded George of Pisidia with George of Nicomedia, who lived two centuries later; and Cave erroneously makes George of Pisidia archbishop of Nicomedia, although he correctly fixes the time in which he lived. The versification of George is correct and elegant, and inharmonious verses are very rare. He was much admired by the later Byzantine writers, and was very commonly compared with Euripides, to whom some did not hesitate to prefer him. But his poems, however polished, are frequently dull, though in the *Hexæmeron* there are some passages of a more elevated character. The *Hexæmeron* and *De Vanitate Vitæ*, with such fragments as had been collected, with a Latin version by Fred. Morel, were first published in 4to, Paris, 1584. Some copies of the edition have the date 1585 in the title-page. The *Hexæmeron* was also published by Brunellus, as a work of Cyril of Alexandria, together with some poems of Gregory Nazianzen and other pieces (Rome, 1590, 8vo). Both pieces, with the fragments, were reprinted in the appendix to the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of La Bigne (Paris, 1624, fol.), and with the version of Morel, and one or two additional fragments, in the Paris edition of the *Bibliotheca Patrum* (1654, fol.), xiv, 389, etc. The Latin version of Morel is in the edition of the *Bibliotheca* (Lyon, 1677, fol.), xii, 323, etc. (Quercius, ut sup.; Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* i, 185; vii, 450, 472, etc.; viii, 612, 615; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i, 583).—Smith, *Dictionary of Gr. and Rom. Biography*, ii, 253, 254.

**Georgia**, or **GRUSIA**, formerly an independent country of Asia, now included in the Russian provinces of Tiflis and Kutais. The name is sometimes employed to designate the whole territory possessed or claimed by the Russians south of the Caucasus, and embracing the districts of Kacheth, Kartli (Karthalia, Karduel), Imereth, Mingrelia, and Guria. In this larger sense it has an area of about 28,000 square miles, and in 1862 a population of 1,142,611 inhabitants; while Georgia proper, embracing the three first-named districts, contains only 12,800 square miles and 577,267 inhabitants. The Georgians are one of that numerous group of nations or tribes that inhabit the Caucasus, to which Dr. Latham has given the name of Dioscurians. They are celebrated for the athletic frames of their men and the beauty of their women, but their long oppression by the Mohammedans has had its effect both upon their intelligence and their morality. Of the total population of Georgia, taken in the larger sense, 835,830 belong to the Georgian race (inclusive of Mingrelians and Lazi); the remainder are Turcomanni, Ossetes, Armenians, Jews, Rus-

sians, and Germans. The Christian population numbers 1,003,791, and the non-Christian 138,820 souls. On their language and literature, see the articles **GEORGIAN LANGUAGE** and **GEORGIAN VERSION**.

The ancient history of Georgia is altogether fabulous. It submitted to Alexander the Great, but after his death was made an independent kingdom. In this condition it remained for about twenty-one centuries. Christianity spread in Georgia about the close of the 4th century and dislodged the ancient religion, which was probably kindred to the Mithras service of the ancient Persians. In consequence of the profession of the Christian faith, Georgia became allied to the Byzantine empire, conjointly with which it resisted the attacks of the Sassanides. More successful than the inroads of the Sassanides were those of the Arabs, and under the dynasty of the Bagratides, a branch of the Armenian dynasty of that name (since 614), Georgia became a province of the empire of the Arabian caliphs, and only the mountainous districts in which the kings of Georgia found a refuge preserved a kind of independence. In the 9th century, during the decline of the Arabian caliphate, the Georgians recovered their independence for a short period, but in the 10th century they became tributary to the Mohammedan dynasties in Persia. Toward the end of the 10th century they again achieved independence, and inaugurated the most brilliant era in Georgian history; for from this period to the 13th century, when they were conquered by the Mongols, Georgia was governed by a series of able sovereigns, who increased its extent and raised it to great prosperity. Toward the end of the 14th century the country was conquered by Timour, who was driven from it in the beginning of the following century by George VII. Alexander I, the successor of George VII, divided the kingdom between his three sons. Each of these states was again divided, and at one time 26 different princes reigned in Georgia. The general history of Georgia now divides into two parts: that of the eastern states, Kartli and Kacheth; and that of the western states, including Imereth, Mingrelia, and Guria. From the 16th to the 18th century the eastern states were heavily oppressed by Persia, and in 1799, Gregory XI, after many attempts to establish their independence, resigned the states in favor of Paul, emperor of Russia, and in 1802 the emperor Alexander proclaimed the territory a Russian province. Of the three states forming Western Georgia, Guria fell into the hands of Russia in 1801, and formally surrendered itself to that empire by the treaty of 1810; Mingrelia was virtually added to Russia in 1803, and fully incorporated with it in 1868, and the state of Imereth toward the close of the 18th century. Thus the whole of Georgia has been brought

under the dominion of Russia, and has been united, along with the other Transcaucasian possessions of that country, into a general government, the head of which unites in his own person the military and civil powers, and exercises military supremacy over the whole of the Caucasus.

The Georgians were represented in the synods convened by the Armenian patriarch in the 5th and 6th centuries, and embraced the Monophysite faith, and they also withdrew from the communion of the patriarch of Constantinople. In the latter part of the 6th cen-



Mingrelian Monk.

tury they resumed their former ecclesiastical connection, and they have since been considered as a part of the Greek Church. When Georgia passed into the hands of Russia it lost the independence of its national Church. The differences between the Russian and the Georgian forms of religion being very small, the latter became subject to the Synod of Petersburg; the authority of the Georgian *catholicoi* was also transferred, and a Russian archbishop set to occupy the see of Georgia. Convents and nunneries are abundant, and the inmates are all mendicants. Most of the bishops are rich, but the majority of the priests are both very poor and ignorant. The best and fullest information about Georgia is contained in the works of Brosset, *Hist. ancienne de la Géorgie* (Petersb. 1849, 2 vols.; Additions, 1851), and *Histoire Moderne de la Géorgie* (Peters. 1854-57, 3 vols.).—Brockhaus, *Couvers.-Lex.*; Farrar; Helvot, *Ordres des Relig.* (ed. Migne), s. v. Melchites. (A. J. S.)

**Georgian Language.** The Georgian language, which is also spoken by the Mingrelians, Lazians, and the Suani, belongs to the Iberian family. The chief characteristics of it are as follows. Its alphabet consists of thirty-five letters; it has no articles; the substantives have eight cases and no genders; the adjectives, when associated with nouns, are indeclinable, but when they stand by themselves are declined; the comparative is formed by the prefix *n* and the suffix *si*, and cardinals are obtained by prefixing *me* to the ordinals. It possesses eight conjugations with several minor subdivisions, and the different persons are indicated by terminations and personal prefixes; it has several forms for the praterite and the future tenses, and only one form for the present tense; three modes, viz. indicative, imperative, and the participle, and supplies the place of the infinitive by a verbal noun; it has postpositions governing different cases, in addition to the prepositions, and can multiply verbs to any extent by the terminations *eleba* and *ola*, form abstracts from adjectives by the terminations *oba* and *eba*, as well as active personal nouns, adjectives—both active and passive—and diminutives, by various terminations and prefixes, and its construction allows many liberties. From the venerable old Georgian language a dialect developed itself, in the course of time, by the introduction into it of many Armenian, Greek, Turkish, and other foreign words, and by the vitiation of the pronunciation and spelling of many expressions. The two dialects have distinct alphabets: the alphabet in which the old Georgian is written is called *Kuzuri*, i. e. the sacred, and consists of the letters invented by Miesrob; and the alphabet of the modern Georgian is called *Keluli*, and is supposed to have been invented by the Georgians themselves in the 14th century. The old language is the ecclesiastical or literary, and is employed in all sacred and literary writings, while the modern is the civil dialect, or the dialect of common life (*lingua vulgaris*). Compare Ersch und Gruber's *Encyclopædie*, s. v. Georgier, p. 192; Eichhorn, *Allgemeine Bibliothek der biblischen Literatur*, i, 156 sq.—Kitto, s. v.

**Georgian Version.** This is one of the oldest versions of the Bible extant.

1. *Name, Date, and Source of this Version.*—The Georgians call their Bible by different names—1. *Biblia*, i. e. the Bible; 2. *Zmunda Zerili*, the holy Scripture; 3. *Sanкто Zerili*, the divine Scriptures; 4. *Zighni Zueliso da akalio aghkwnisa*, the books of the O. and N. T.; and 5. *Dabaleba*, Genesis, after the first book of the Bible. The version is supposed to have been made about A.D. 570, when the Georgians, stimulated by the example of the Armenians [see ARMENIAN VERSION], sent young men of talent to Greece to study the Greek language, who, on their return, translated the Scriptures and liturgical books of the Greek Church. The translation of the O. T. is made from the

Sept., and of the N. T. from Greek MSS. of the Constantinopolitan family, and is composed in the *ecclesiastical* or ancient dialect. See GEORGIAN LANGUAGE.

II. *Text and Editions of the Version.*—This venerable version has shared in all the troubles to which Georgia has been subject. The entire books of Maccabees and Ecclesiasticus were lost in the many revolutions of the country, passages disappeared from different parts of the volume, and the whole text got into a state of confusion. It was only in the beginning of the 18th century that prince Vaktangh published at Tiflis the Psalms, the Prophets, and the New Testament, and split up the text into chapters and verses. Shortly after, prince Arcil, uncle of prince Vaktangh, who fled from Kartel to Russia, undertook a revision of this version, making it conformable to the Russian translation as it then was, and divided it only into chapters, because the Russian translation was divided into chapters only. But this prince only lived to carry through the revision from Genesis to the Prophets, and to translate from the Russian Bible the lost books of Maccabees and Ecclesiasticus. His son, prince Vakuset, was, however, induced by the solicitations of his brother, prince Bachar, and the Georgian clergy resident in Russia, to continue the work of revision. He made the text conform still more to the Russian translation, newly revised according to the command of Peter the Great, supplied from this translation all the passages which were wanting in the Georgian version, made also the portions which his father had published conformable to this translation, and divided the whole into chapters and verses. He had Georgian types cast at Moscow, and at once began printing in that city; the correction of the press he committed to four native Georgians, and the first edition of the entire Georgian Bible appeared in 1743, fol., prince Bachar, brother of the editor, defraying the entire expense. From this edition the Moscow Bible Society reprinted the N. T. in 1816, 4to, under the superintendence of the Georgian metropolitan Ion and of archbishop Pafnut, with types cast from the very matrices which had been used for the former edition, and which had escaped the conflagration of the city at the time of Napoleon's invasion. Another edition was published in 1818, in the *civil* character, 4to. It is said that there have appeared more recent editions of various portions of this version both at Tiflis and in Russia, but there is no particular account of them.

III. *Critical Value of the Version.*—The value of this version, in a critical point of view, has been greatly impaired by the corruptions which it has suffered during the centuries of political changes to which the country has been exposed, and especially by the endeavor of its editors to make it conform to the Russian translation. It must not, however, be supposed that its value is entirely gone. Both Tischendorf (*N. T. Græc.* 2d ed. præf. p. lxxviii) and Mr. Malan regard it as a good auxiliary to the criticism of the Greek text. Indeed, Mr. Malan, who has published an English translation of the Georgian version of John's Gospel, goes so far as to say that "it differs from the Slavonic in many places in which it might be expected to agree, it has a character of its own, is a faithful version, and valuable for criticism" (*The Gospel according to St. John, translated from the eleven oldest Versions, etc.*, by the Rev. S. C. Malan, M.A., Lond. 1862, p. ix, note 3).

IV. *Literature.*—A very interesting treatise on this version, containing a brief account of its history and publication, from the preface of prince Vaktangh, was communicated by professor Adler, of Copenhagen, to Eichhorn, who published it in his *Allgemeine Bibliothek der biblischen Literatur*, i, 153 sq., and afterwards reprinted it in his *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, vol. ii, sec. 318, b, etc. Dr. Henderson, who had visited both Georgia and Russia, could do no more in his *Biblical Researches and Travels in Russia* (London, 1826, p.

518, etc.) than to give a literal translation of this account. A valuable book has also been published by Franz Carl Alter, entitled *Ueber Georgiatische Literatur* (Wien, 1798), in which is given an extensive collation of the various readings from both the O. and N. T.—Kitto, s. v.

**Georgius Syncellus**, termed also "Abbas and Monachus," lived in the latter part of the 8th and beginning of the 9th century. He obtained his distinguishing epithet from having been syncellus or personal attendant of Tarasius, patriarch of Constantinople, who died A.D. 806. Theophanes, who was his friend, describes him as a man of talent and learning, especially well versed in chronographical and historical subjects, which he had studied very deeply. He died in "the orthodox faith," without completing his principal (and, indeed, only known) work, the completion of which he strongly urged, as his dying request, upon his friend Theophanes. He is the author of a chronography or chronicle, the title of which in full is as follows: "Ἐκλογή Χρονολογίας συνταγίσα ὑπὸ Γεωργίου Μοναχοῦ Συγκέλλου γερονότου Ταρασιῶν Πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ μέχρι Διοκλητιανοῦ," *A select Chronicle, drawn up by George the Monk, Syncellus of Sarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, from Adam to Diocletian*. The author states that he intended to bring his work down to A.D. 800; but, as already stated, he was cut off by death, and the work only comes down to the accession of Diocletian, A.D. 284. The work is included in the various editions of the Byzantine writers. Goar, the Parisian editor, contended that we have the work of Syncellus in a complete form, but the contrary opinion seems to be the better founded. Possevino, Vossius, and others have identified Syncellus with Georgius Harmartolus; but Allatius has shown that this identification is erroneous. Syncellus has transcribed verbatim a considerable part of the Chronicon of Eusebius, so that his work has been employed to restore or complete the Greek text of the Chronicon. The *Chronographia* of Theophanes, which extends from A.D. 285 to A.D. 813, may be regarded as a continuation of that of Syncellus, and completes the author's original design. The Bonn edition of Syncellus is edited by W. Dindorf, and with the brief *Chronographia* of Nicephorus of Constantinople, occupies 2 vols. 8vo, 1829. (Theophanes, *Proœmium ad chronog.*; Cedren. *Compend.* sub. init.; Allatius, *Ibid.* p. 24; Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* vii. 457; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 611).—Smith, *Dictionary of Gr. and Rom. Biography*, ii. 254. See SYNCELLUS.

**Gephen**. See VINE.

**Gephrus** (Γεφρούρες, prob. a Græcized form of the Heb. גֶּפְרוֹר, a village; see CAPRAR), a town mentioned by Polybius (v. 70, 12) as captured by Antiochus along with Pella and Camus (Camon), and therefore situated in the same vicinity east of the Jordan (Reland, *Palaest.* p. 804); perhaps the present *Kefr-Aban*, a short distance N.E. of Kefr-Abil (Robinson, *Later Researches*, p. 318).

**Ge'ra** (Heb. גֶּרָא, גֶּרָא, a grain [see GERAR]; Sept. Γηρά), the name of at least three Benjamins.

1. The son of Bela and grandson of Benjamin (1 Chron. viii. 3); probably the same with the one mentioned (with some confusion) in verses 5, 7, unless one of these be identical with No. 2 below. In Gen. xlvii. 21, he is given as if directly the son of Benjamin; and he there appears among the descendants of Jacob, at the time of that patriarch's removal to Egypt, B.C. 1871. See JACOB. "Gera is not mentioned in the list of Benjamite families in Numb. xxvi. 38-40, of which a very obvious explanation is that at that time he was not the head of a separate family, but was included among the Belaites; it being a matter of necessity that some of Bela's sons should be so included, otherwise there could be no family of Belaites at all.

To the remarks made under Becher should be added that the great destruction of the Benjamins recorded in Judg. xx may account for the introduction of so many new names in the later Benjamite lists of 1 Chron. vii and viii, of which several seem to be women's names" (Smith). See BENJAMIN. In 1 Chron. vii. 7, UZZIEL occupies the same position as Gera elsewhere in the genealogy. See BELA.

2. The father (or ancestor) of Ehud the judge (Judg. iii. 15); compare 1 Chron. viii. 5, 7; possibly identical with No. 1 above. B.C. ante 1509. See EHUD.

3. The father (or ancestor) of Shimei, which latter so grossly abused David (2 Sam. xvi. 5; xix. 16, 18; 1 Kings ii. 8); thought by some to be identical with both the foregoing. B.C. ante 1023. See SHIMEI.

**Gerah** (גֶּרָה, *gerah'*, a berry or granule [compare English "barley-corn" and "grain" as measure and weight]; Sept. ὀβολος, Vulgate *obolus*), the smallest weight, and likewise the smallest piece of money among the Hebrews, equivalent to the twentieth part of a shekel (Exod. xxx. 13; Lev. xxvii. 25; Numb. iii. 47; xviii. 16; Ezek. xlv. 12). It would therefore weigh 13 $\frac{1}{2}$  Paris grains, and be worth about 3 cents. The same Hebrew word also signifies *cut*, as being a round mass. It has been supposed by many that the *gerah* was so called from the fact that some kernel, as of pepper or barley, or perhaps the seeds of the carob-tree (κεράτιον) may have been originally used for this weight, but it would be equal in weight to 4 or 5 beans of the carob, and according to the Rabbins, it weighed as much as 16 grains of barley.—Gesenius. See METROLOGY.

**Gerardo**, JOSEPH MARIE, BARON DE, a French statesman and philosophical writer, was born at Lyons February 29, 1772, and was educated for the priesthood. During the Revolution he served in the French army, and, under Napoleon, he filled various high civil offices. He was made a French peer in 1837, and died at Paris November 10, 1842. He is mentioned here for his philosophical and ethical writings. Having sent an article to the French Academy in 1799, which received a prize, he enlarged it into a treatise entitled *Des Signes et de l'art de penser* (1800, 4 vols. 8vo). This was followed by *De la Generation des connaissances humaines* (1802, 8vo), which was crowned by the Berlin Academy. His most important work is his *Histoire complete des systemes de Philosophie considérés relativement aux principes des connaissances humaines* (1803, 3 vols; 3d ed. 1817-8, 4 vols. 8vo):—*Da perfectionnement moral ou de l'éducation de soi-même* (1824; 1832, 2 vols.), which received the Montyon prize from the French Academy, and was translated into English and published under the title *Self-Education* (Boston, 1860, 12mo). De Gerardo wrote many works on economical and political science.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xx. 143.

**Ge'rar** (Heb. גֶּרָר, גֶּרָר, according to Simonis a *bolging-place*, according to others from the Arabic *water-spots*, but more prob. with Fürst, a *region*, as being the centre of a distinct Philistine kingdom; Sept. and Josephus [ῥά] Γε'ραρα), a very ancient town and district on the southernmost borders of Palestine, in the country of the Philistines, and not far from Gaza. It was visited by Abraham after the destruction of Sodom (Gen. xx. 1), and by Isaac when there was a dearth in the rest of Canaan (Gen. xxvi. 1). The intercourse, differences, and alliances of the Hebrew fathers with the king and people of Gerar form a very curious and interesting portion of patriarchal history (Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii. 350). See ISAAC. In Genesis the people are spoken of as Philistines; but their habits appear, in that early stage, more pastoral than they subsequently were. Yet they are even then warlike, since Abimelech had "a captain of the host," who appears from his fixed title, "Phicol," like that

of the king, "Abimelech," to be a permanent officer (comp. Gen. xxi, 32; xxvi, 26; and Psa. xxxiv, title). See ABIMELECH. The local description, xxi, 1, "between Kadesh and Shur," is probably meant to indicate the limits within which these pastoral Philistines, whose chief seat was then Gerar, ranged, although it would by no means follow that their territory embraced all the interval between those cities. It must have trenched on the "south" or "south country" of later Palestine. From a comparison of xxi, 32 with xxvi, 23, 26, Beersheba would seem to be just on the verge of this territory, and perhaps to be its limit towards the N.E. For its southern boundary, though very uncertain, none is more probable than the wady El-Arish ("River of Egypt") and El-'Ain; south of which the neighboring "wilderness of Paran" (xx, 15; xxi, 22, 31) may probably be reckoned to begin. Isaac was most probably born in Gerar. The great crops which he subsequently raised attest the fertility of the soil, which, lying in the maritime plain, still contains some of the best ground in Palestine (xxi, 2; xxvi, 12). It was still an important place in later times, as we may gather from 1 Chron. xiv, 13, 14. According to the ancient accounts, Gerar lay in or near a valley ("the valley of Gerar," Gen. xxvi, 17; comp. 1 Sam. xv, 5), which appears to be no other than the great wady *Sheriah* (or one of the branches of it) that comes down from Beersheba; besides, we know that it was in the land of the Philistines, and that it was not far from Beersheba when Isaac resided there (Gen. xxvi, 1, 20, 23; 26-33; comp. xx, 1). The name continued to exist (perhaps as a matter of tradition) for several centuries after the Christian era. Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v. Gerar) place it twenty-five Roman miles southward from Eleutheropolis; and Sozomen (*Hist. Eccles.* vi, 32; ix, 17) reports that a large and celebrated monastery stood there, near a winter torrent. The abbot Silvannus resided there towards the end of the 4th century, and the name of Marcion, bishop of Gerar, appears among the signatures of the Council of Chalcedon in A.D. 451. In the Talmudical writings the district is termed *Gerarki* (Schwarz, *Palestine*, p. 109). The name seems to have been afterwards lost, and Dr. Robinson (*Researches*, i, 279; ii, 383) was unable to discover any traces of it in the locality; but he unnecessarily disparages the claims of wady *El-Jerar*, which runs into the wady El-Arish at Jebel el-Helal, to be regarded as a southernmost trace of the ancient kingdom (*Jour. Sac. Lit.* July, 1860, p. 309-319). It is possible that the wells mentioned by him as lying in the shallow wady El-Kusaimeh, in the same neighborhood (i, 280), may represent those digged by Abraham and reopened by Isaac (Gen. xxvi, 18-22).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. J. Rowlands, in travelling from Gaza to Khulassah, came after 3 hours' march to a broad, deep wady, *Jurf el-Gerar*, a little below its junction with a branch-valley from wady Sheriah. Near this junction are ruins called *Kiurbet el-Gerar* (Williams, *Holy City*, 1845, App. p. 488-492), which he identifies with Gerar. This account Van de Velde heard confirmed by the people of Gaza, with a slight modification (*Narrative*, ii, 183). There are no ruins yet standing, but scattered stones which appear to have been once used in buildings; and in the absence of old wells, it would seem as if the ancient city had been supplied from some spring. Stewart's suggestion of the ruins of *El-Abdeh* (*Tent and Khan*, p. 207) is out of the question (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 314). In 1 Chron. iv, 39, the Sept. substitutes Gerar (*Γεραρα*) for Gedor (q. v.).

**Gerard, Alexander**, an eminent Scotch divine, was born Feb. 22, 1728, at Garioch, in Aberdeenshire, and was educated at Marischal College and the University of Edinburgh. In 1750 he succeeded Fordyce as professor of moral philosophy at Marischal College, and in 1760 was appointed divinity professor. In 1771 he obtained the theological professorship at King's

College, Aberdeen. He died in 1795. He wrote (1.) *An Essay on Taste* (1759, 8vo; enlarged edition, 1780). This work obtained the prize of a gold medal offered by the Philosophical Society of Edinburgh. (2.) *An Essay on Genius* (Lond. 1767, 8vo);—(3.) *Sermons* (London, 1780, 1782, 2 vols. 8vo);—(4.) *Dissertations on the Genius and Evidences of Christianity* (Lond. 1766, 8vo);—(5.) *The Pastoral Care*, edited by his son (Lond. 1799, 8vo).

**Gerard, Gilbert, D.D.**, son of Alexander Gerard, was born and educated at Aberdeen. He was for some time pastor of the English church at Amsterdam, and afterwards professor of Greek in King's College, Aberdeen, and in 1775 of divinity. He died in 1815. His "Institutes" are valuable for the numerous references to authorities which they contain, and are very scarce. The greater part of the first edition was lost at sea. His writings are, *Institutes of Biblical Criticism* (Edinb. 1808, 2d edit. 8vo);—*Compendious View of the Evidences of natural and revealed Religion* (London, 1828, 8vo).—Darling.

**Gerard, Thom, Tum, Tunc, or Tenque**, founder and first grand master of the order of St. John of Jerusalem, was born about 1040, on the isle of Martigues, on the coast of Provence. While Jerusalem was in the hands of the Saracens, some merchants of Amalfi obtained permission from the sultan of Egypt and Syria, in 1050, to erect a Benedictine monastery near the holy sepulchre, for the convenience of the pilgrims. It was called Sainte Marie la Latine. Among others, Gerard arrived to pay his devotions, and he acquired a high character for his piety and prudence. The number of pilgrims increased every year, enriching the treasury of the monastery. In 1080 the abbot built a hospital for the reception of poor and sick pilgrims, the management of which he gave to Gerard. The chapel of that hospital was consecrated to St. John, because of a tradition among the inhabitants of Jerusalem that Zacharias, the father of St. John, had lived on the spot where it was built. After the conquest of Jerusalem by Godfrey of Bouillon, Gerard projected a new religious order, in which the ecclesiastical and military characters were to be blended. This design he began to carry out in the year 1100, when numbers associated with him under the denomination of "Hospitalers of St. John of Jerusalem," "who, besides the three vows of chastity, poverty, and obedience, took a particular vow to devote themselves to the relief of all Christians in distress. This order, and the rules drawn up for its government, were approved and confirmed by pope Paschal II, who, by a bull which he issued, granted it various considerable privileges, and recognised Gerard as the first grand master. Gerard died in the year 1120. Such was the commencement of that order which in succeeding times became so celebrated in history, when its members were commonly known by the name of knights of Rhodes, and afterwards by that of knights of Malta."—Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* v, 298; Hoefer, *Nov. Biog. Générale*, xx, 149.

**Gerard or Gerhard Groot.** See GROOT, GERHARD.


**Gerāsa** ([j] Γερασα, prob. of Heb. origin), a celebrated city on the eastern borders of Perea (Josephus, *War*, iii, 3, 3), placed by some in the province of Coele-Syria and region of Decapolis (Steph. s. v.), by others in Arabia (Epipl. *adv. Ier.*; Origen, in *Johan.*). It is doubtless the *Gelusa* assigned by Pliny (v, 18) to the Decapolis. These various statements do not arise from any doubts as to the locality of the city, but from the ill-defined boundaries of the provinces mentioned. In the Roman age no city of Palestine was better known than Gerasa (Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s. v.). It lay on elevated ground, according to Ptolemy, in 68° 15' = 31° 45' (Reland, *Palest.* p. 459), who distinguishes it from the *Gerasa* (Γερασσα) of Arabia Petraea (*ib.* p. 463). It is not mentioned in the O. T.,

nor in the New, unless in the reading *Gerascene* (q. v.) at Matt. vii, 28. It is not known when or by whom Gerasa was founded. Its inhabitants were mostly heathen (Josephus, *War*, iii, 3, 3; comp. iv, 9, 1; ii, 18, 5; *Ant.* xiii, 15, 5). It is first mentioned by Josephus as having been captured by Alexander Jannæus (B. C. cir. 85), who was actuated by a desire of gaining a large treasure (Josephus, *War*, i, 4, 8; *Ant.* viii, 2, 3). That king died near it while besieging Regaba (*Ant.* xv, 5). Before the place had time to recover from this capture, it was included among the number of those cities which were burnt by the enraged Jews in their vengeance on the Syrians, and on the Roman power generally, for the massacre of a number of their nation at Casarea (Josephus, *War*, ii, 18, 1). A terrible revenge was taken by other cities, but Gerasa is honorably excepted (*War*, ii, 18, 5). It had scarcely recovered from this calamity when the emperor Vespasian dispatched Annius, his general, to capture it. Annius, having carried the city at the first assault, put to the sword one thousand of the youth who had not effected their escape, enslaved their families, and plundered and fired their dwellings. It appears to have been nearly a century subsequent to this period that Gerasa attained its greatest prosperity, and was adorned with those monuments which give it a place among the proudest cities of Syria. History tells us nothing of this, but the fragments of inscriptions found among its ruined palaces and temples show that it is indebted for its architectural splendor to the age and genius of the Antonines (A. D. 138-80). It subsequently became the seat of a bishopric. Baldwin II of Jerusalem destroyed its castle in the year 1122 (Will. Tyr. p. 825; *Histor. Hierosol.* p. 615). This was the native place of Nicomachus Gerascenus. Coins of Gerasa may be seen in Eckhel (*Nom. Vet.* iii, 356). There is no evidence that the city was ever occupied by the Saracens. There are no traces of their architecture—no mosques, no inscriptions, no reconstruction of old edifices, such as are found in most other great cities in Syria. All here is Roman, or at least ante-Islamic; every structure remains as the hand of the destroyer or the earthquake shock left it, ruinous and deserted. It is now called *Jerash*. Its ruins were first discovered by Setzen (i, 388 sq.), and have often been subsequently visited. They are by far the most beautiful and extensive east of the Jordan. They are situated on both sides of a shallow valley that runs from north to south through a high undulating plain, and falls into the Zurka (the ancient Jabbok) at the distance of about five miles. A little rivelet, thickly fringed with oleander, winds through the valley, giving life and beauty to the deserted city. The first view of the ruins is very striking, and such as have enjoyed it will not

soon forget the impression made upon the mind. The long colonnade running through the centre of the city, terminating at one end in the graceful circle of the forum; the groups of columns clustered here and there round the crumbling walls of the temples; the heavy masses of masonry that distinguish the positions of the great theatres; and the vast field of shapeless ruins rising gradually from the green banks of the rivulet to the battlemented heights on each side—all combine in forming a picture such as is rarely equalled. The form of the city is an irregular square, each side measuring nearly a mile. It was surrounded by a strong wall, a large portion of which, with its flanking towers at intervals, is in a good state of preservation. Three gateways are still nearly perfect, and within the city upwards of two hundred and thirty columns remain on their pedestals. A description of them may be found in Burckhardt's *Syria*, p. 252-64; also in those of Lord Lindsay and others, which are well condensed in Kelley's *Syria*, p. 448 sq. See also Buckingham's *Palestine*, p. 405; Keith, *Evidence of Prophecy* (36th ed.).—Smith, s. v.; Kitto, s. v.

**Gerascène** (Γερασσηνός), an inhabitant of *Gerasa* (q. v.). Several MSS. read Γερασσηνός instead of Γερασσηνών, in Matt. viii, 28; but the city of Gerasa lay too far from the Sea of Tiberias to admit the possibility of the miracles having been wrought in its vicinity. If the reading Γερασσηνός be the true one, the χῶρα, "district," must then have been very large, including Gadara and its environs; and Matthew thus uses a broader appellation, where Mark and Luke use a more specific one. This is not impossible, as Jerome (*ad Obad.*) states that Gilead was in his day called Gerasa, and Origen affirms that Γερασσηνών was the ancient reading (*Opp.* iv, 140).—Smith, s. v. See GADARA. The nature of Origen's argument makes this statement very doubtful. It looks like a bold hypothesis to get over a difficulty (see Alford, *ad loc.*). The rival Gergesa, however, is also mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome. The latter thus writes: "Hodieque super montem viculus demonstratur iuxta stagnum Tyberiadis in quod porci præcipitanti sunt" (*Onomast.* s. v.). Thomson thinks he has discovered Gergesa as a ruin called *Kersa* or *Gersa*, on the bank of wady Semak, east of the lake. He describes it as "within a few rods of the shore, and an immense mountain rises directly above it, in which are ancient tombs. . . . The lake is so near the base of the mountain, that the swine rushing madly down it could not stop, but would be hurried on into the water and drowned" (*Land and Book*, ii, 34-38). It is uncertain which reading has the highest authority, and consequently these conjectures are very doubtful (see, however, Ellicott's *Lectures on the Life of our Lord*, p. 188, note; Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 311; Reland, p. 502, 807). See GERGSENE.

**Gérauld**, HUGUES, a French priest of evil name in the 12th cent., first mentioned as chaplain of pope Clement V. He afterwards became archdeacon of Eu, in the diocese of Rouen. Clement V finally appointed him bishop of Cahors, in consideration, it is said, of a large sum of money. He soon, however, took advantage of his position to despoil the inhabitants of his diocese, and pope John XXII appointed the bishops of Riez and Arras to investigate the charges against Gérauld. Accused of simony, of ingratitude towards the see of Rome, of cruelty to those who appealed from his decisions, of spoliation, and of criminal con-



Principal Ruins of Jerash.



nection with women, he was condemned to prison for life. An author of that period, Bernard Guidonis, says that Géraud, after being stripped of the insignia of his office, was condemned to be dragged on the public highway, flayed in some parts, and finally burned alive. The execution took place in July, 1317. See Raynaldus, anno 1317; Martene, *Veterum Scriptorum*, t. v, p. 174; Bzovius, *Num.* 16; Duchesne, *Histoire des Cardinaux français*, t. ii, p. 290.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xx, 185.

**Gerbaïs, JEAN**, doctor of the Sorbonne, was born at Rupois in 1629, and became professor of rhetoric at the royal college of Paris, 1662, and principal of the college of Rheims, where he died in 1699. He was commissioned by the French clergy to publish the *Décisions touchant les Réguliers* (decreed in the assembly of 1645), with Hallier's notes. He wrote, 1. *De Causis Majoribus* (1679, 4to), in which he ably supports the liberties of the Gallican Church, and maintains that episcopal causes ought to be first judged by the metropolitan, and the bishops in his province; Innocent XI condemned this work in 1680:—2. *Traité du Pouvoir de l'Eglise et des Princes sur les empêchemens du Mariage* (A Treatise on the authority of Kings over the hindrances to Marriage, 1690, 4to):—3. *Lettres touchant le Péculé des Religieux* (1698, 12mo):—4. A translation of the treatise by Panormus on the Council of Basle (8vo):—5. *Lettre sur la Comédie* (12mo):—6. *Lettre sur les Dorures et la Luxe des Habits des Femmes*.—Dupin, *Eccles. Writers*, cent. xvii; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* v, 299; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xx, 186; Nicéron, *Mémoires*, tom. xiv.

**Gerberon, GABRIEL**, an indefatigable Benedictine author, was born at St. Calais, in the province of Maine, France, Aug. 12, 1628. He became a Benedictine in the congregation of St. Maur in 1649. After teaching theology with reputation for several years, he declared himself in favor of Jansenism, and for this he was ordered to be arrested in 1682 by Louis XIV. He escaped to Holland, and in 1703 was seized by the bishop of Mechlin and imprisoned at Amiens, and afterwards at Vincennes, for no crime but following strictly the Augustinian theory of grace. He died at the abbey of St. Denis March 29, 1711. His chief work is the *Histoire Générale du Jansénisme* (General History of Jansenism, Amsterd. 1703, 3 vols. 12mo), but he wrote very largely also on the Jansenist and other controversies.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* v, 31; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* v, 299; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xx, 194 sq.

**Gerbert.** See SYLVESTER II, Pope.

**Gerbert, Martin**, baron of Hornau and Benedictine abbot of St. Blasien, one of the most learned Roman Catholic prelates of the last century, was born at Ilorb, on the Neckar, Aug. 13, 1720. He was educated at the Jesuits' college in Freiburg, and at the cloister of St. Blasien, where he became priest in 1744, and abbot in 1764. He enlarged his mind by travel and varied culture, and his works bear every mark of industry and learning. He died May 3, 1793. His principal works are *Historia nigre sylve ord. St. Benedicti* (Colon. 1783-88, 3 vols. 4to):—*Principia theologiæ* (St. Blasien, 1757-59, 7 vols.):—*Theologia Vetus et Nova circa Presentiam Christi in Eucliaristia* (Freiburg, 1756, 12mo):—*Monumenta Veteris Liturgiæ Alemannicæ, ex antiquis MSS. collecta et digesta* (St. Blasien, 1777-79, 4to):—*De Cantu et Musicâ Sacrà a primâ Ecclesiæ Ætate usque ad presens Tempus* (1774, 2 vols.). Gerbert divided his history of church music into three parts: the first ends at the pontificate of St. Gregory; the second goes as far as the fifteenth century; and the third to his own time. In 1784 he published a work of more importance, under the title of *Scriptores Ecclesiastici de Musicâ Sacrà, potissimum ex variis Italiæ, Galliæ, et Germaniæ Codicibus collecti* (3 vols. 4to). This is a collection of all the ancient authors who have written on music, from the 3d century to the invention of print-

ing, and whose works had remained in manuscript.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* v, 33; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vol. v.; Choron, *Dictionnaire des Musiciens*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xx, 198 sq.

**Gerbillion, JEAN FRANÇOIS**, a French Jesuit missionary to China, was born at Verdun Jan. 11, 1634. He studied at Nancy under the Jesuits, and was, with five others, sent as missionary to China, where he arrived March 25, 1686. The missionaries at once sought an audience from the emperor, who refused to admit the new religion, on the ground that as the sects of Fo, Tao-sse, the Lamas, and the Ha-changs taught men to do good and avoid evil, there was no need of a fourth for the same purpose, which would only lead to doctrinal disputes. Yet, by special edict, he retained at his court the missionaries Gerbillion, Pereira, and Bouvet, with permission to practice the religion, but not to teach it. He commanded them to learn the Chinese and other dialects, and sent them on several diplomatic missions. In 1692 Christian worship was finally permitted in China; but Gerbillion's attempts to introduce the Roman Catholic religion, and to open the country to European commerce, failed through the jealousy of the divers other orders of Roman missionaries. He was for some time rector of the French College of China, and died at Pekin March 25, 1707. He wrote *Elements of Geometry* in Chinese and Tartar (Pekin):—*Theoretical and Practical Geometry*, in the same languages, and published also at Pekin:—*Observations historiques sur la grande Tartarie* (in Du Halde's *Description de la Chiné*, t. xxxiii):—*Relation de huit Voyages en Tartarie* (in Du Halde). He is also considered by some as the author of the *Elementa Lingue Tartaricæ*, which others attribute to the missionaries Couplet or Bouvet. See *Lettres édifiantes*, tom. xviii; *Hist. génér. des Voyages*, t. vii and viii.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xx, 203 sq.

**Gerdes, DANIEL**, a learned German divine, and member of the Berlin Academy, was born at Bremen April 19, 1698. He took his doctor's degree at Utrecht, after which (1726) he became professor of theology and ecclesiastical history at Duisburg. He removed to Groningen in 1735, and died Feb. 11, 1765. His works are accurate, and of great utility for the history of the Reformation. Among them are *Historia Reformationis, sive Introductio in historiam evangelii sæculo xvi passim per Europam renovati*, etc. (Gron. 1744-52, 4 vols. 4to):—*Florilegium historico-criticum librorum variorum* (Gron. 1763, 8vo):—*Meltemata Sacra* (Gron. 1759, 4to):—*Specimen Italiæ Reformate* (L. Bat. 1765, 4to):—*Doctrina gratiæ sive compendium theologiæ dogmaticæ* (Duisb. 1751, 4to).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xx, 206; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* v, 34.

**Gerdil, HYACINTHE SIGESMOND**, a Roman Catholic theologian, and cardinal of the Congregation of St. Paul, was born at Samoens, in Savoy, June 23, 1718. In 1732 he entered the order of the Barnabites, and studied at Bologna, where his talents attracted the notice of the cardinal archbishop Lambertini, who secured his aid in the preparation of his great work on *Canonization*. He was subsequently made professor of philosophy and theology, first at Macerata (1737) and afterwards at Turin (1749). In 1777 pope Pius VI made him cardinal, with the title of St. Cecilia, and afterwards prefect of the Propaganda. He would probably have been elected pope on the death of Pius VI but for his great age. He died August 12, 1802. Gerdil was undoubtedly a man of considerable intellect and of large acquirements. His writings on metaphysical subjects, especially against Locke's philosophy, have secured the admiration of many Protestants as well as of Roman Catholics. He also wrote largely on the evidences of Christianity, and against Bayle and the Encyclopedists. Editions of his works were published by P. Toselli (Bologna, 1781-1794, 6 vols.), and by Fontana and Grandi (Rome, 1805 sq., 20 vols.). In

the 20th vol. of the latter edition there is a biography of Gerdil by Fontana. See Tiplado, *Biografia degli Italiani illustri*, tom. iv.; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xx, 207 sq.; Gams, *Gesch. der Kirche Christi im 19<sup>ten</sup> Jahrhundert* (Junsb. 1853, vol. i.).

**Gerem.** See GARMITE.

**Gergäsa, Gergësa.** See GERASENE; GADARA; GERSENE.

**Gergeséne** (Γεργεσηνός), a reading (Γεργεσηνών) found in the Received Text (with many fragmentary uncial and other MSS.) in the account of the expulsion of the swine by our Lord (Matt. viii, 28), instead of *Gadarene* (Γαδαρηνών, as Tischendorf, with several of the earliest and many later MSS.), or *Gerasene* (Γερασσηνών, so Lachm. with most of the cursive MSS. and several versions), or even *Gazarene* (Γαζαρηνών, so the Codex Sinaiticus). In the parallel passages (Mark v, 1; Luke viii, 26) the readings are different, but equally disputed (R. T. Γαζαρηνών, with by far the greatest weight of authority; Lachm. and Tisch. Γερασσηνών, with N [in Mark only, in Luke Γεργεσηνών], B, etc.). It is evident that the evangelists did not write the same name; and we may therefore suppose that the exact spot was one on the immediate lake shore, within the bounds of the region indifferently known by either of the general names *Gadara* or *Gerasu*; or if "Gergesenes" be retained, it may refer to the ancient territory of the *Girgashites* (q. v.), in the same neighborhood. See GERASENE.

**Ger'gesite** (only in the plur. Γεργεσαίτοι), a Græcized form (Judith v, 16) of the ancient GIRGASHITE (q. v.).

**Gerhard, Johann**, an eminent theologian of the Lutheran Church of Germany, was born in Quedlinburg October 17, 1582. In 1599 he went to the University of Wittenberg, and studied medicine for a time, then went to Jena, where he privately studied Hebrew, the Scriptures, and the fathers. After passing A.M., he began to give private lectures in those branches and in theology. Thence he went to Marburg, where the teachings of Winckelmann and Mentzer deeply impressed him. After lecturing on theology at Jena, he accepted the superintendency of Heldburg, offered him by Casimir, duke of Coburg, in 1606. Declining two calls to Jena in 1610 and 1611, and one to Wittenberg in 1613, he finally accepted the seniorate of the faculty of Jena, at the command of George I, elector of Saxony, in 1615. Here he devoted his great talents industriously to his duties to the university, the Church, and the state. He held the first place in the ecclesiastical conferences at Jena, 1621; Leipsic, 1624 and 1639; and was consulted by princes both in ecclesiastical and secular matters. He died Aug. 20, 1637. Gerhard's great points of excellence as a dogmatic writer are comprehensiveness of plan, thoroughness of the treatment of topics, and perspicuity of style. The *Loci Communes Theologici* has not only been a standard of Lutheran theology for two centuries, but has also been greatly valued by Roman Catholic and Reformed theologians.

The exegetical writings of Gerhard are also of great value, the most important being *Comment. in Harmoniam hist. evang. de Passione et Resurrectione Christi* (1617, 4to), a continuation of the commentaries of Chemnitz and Lyser, and published with them (Hamburg, 1652, 3 vols. fol.). It is specially valuable for its patristic learning. Posthumously appeared his *Comm. in Genesis* (1637, 4to); *Comm. in Deuteronomium* (1638, 4to); in 1 and 2 *Tim.* (1643); in 1 and 2 *Peter* (1641); *ad Coloss.* (1660, 4to); *ad Romanos* (1666, 4to). He also published *De Sacræ Script. Interpretatione* (1610, 4to):—*Methodus Stud. Theol.* (1620)—still valuable as a methodological work. In the sphere of dogmatic theology Gerhard has made his name immortal by two great works; the first is *Doctrina catholica et evangelica, quam*

*ecclesiæ Augustanæ confessioni addictæ profitentur ea Romano-catholicorum scriptorum suffragiis confirmata* (1634, 3 vols.), a work which many theologians consider the best of Gerhard's writings. The other great work is *Loci Theologici, cum pro adstruenda veritate, tum pro destruenda quorundam contradi. sententiarum falsitate*, which he began in Heldburg when only twenty-seven years of age, and of which he celebrated the completion (ninth volume) at Jena in 1629 (first edit. Jena, 1610-1625, 9 vols.; frequently reprinted; one of the best editions is that by Cotta, Tüb. 1762-1789, 22 vols. 4to, the two last volumes containing index by G. H. Müller; a new edition was begun by Dr. Preuss, Berlin, 1867 sq.). That part of the *Loci* which treats of God and of the person of Christ was developed more fully in his work published in 1625, under the title *Exegesis sive uberior explicatio articulorum*, etc. The value of the *Loci Theologici* in comparison with the predecessors of Gerhard in the Lutheran Church, especially with Hutter and with his successors, especially with Calov and Quenstedt, is ably treated by Gass in his *Geschichte der protest. Dogmat.* i, 261.

The practical writings of Gerhard are full of the spirit of Christian love and devotion. He was, indeed, charged by the cold dogmatists of the time with pietism and mysticism. Among them are *Meditationes Sacræ ad veram pietatem excitandam* etc. (Jena, 1606):—*Schola Pietatis, d. i. christl. Unterrichtung z. Gottseligkeit* (Jena, 1622-23, 12 vols.):—*52 Heilige Betrachtungen*. These have been frequently reprinted; the *Meditationes* has passed through scores of editions, and has been translated into English and often reprinted (last, Lond. 1841, 12mo). For a list of all his writings, see Fischer, *Vita Joannis Gerhardi* (Lips. 1723); see also Herzog, *Real-Encyclopædie*, v, 40; Gieseler, *Church History* (ed. Smith), iv, 574.

**Gerhard, Johann Ernst**, (1.) a theologian, was born at Jena December 15, 1621. He studied at the universities of Jena, Altdorf, Helmstadt, Leipzig, and Wittenberg, devoting himself to Oriental literature and theology. He visited successively the libraries of Holland, Switzerland, and France, and in his journey became acquainted with some of the most eminent literary men of that period. After his return to Jena he became professor of history, afterwards of theology, in the university, and died in that city Feb. 24, 1688. He wrote *Harmonia linguarum orientalium*:—*Consensus et Dissensus religionum profanarum Judæismi, Samaritanismi, Muhamedismi et pygmismi*.—Ersch and Gruber, *Allg. Encycl.*; Jöcher, *Allg. Gel.-Lex.*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xx, 213.

**Gerhard, Johann Ernst**, (2.) son of Johann Ernst (1.), was born at Jena Feb. 19, 1662. He studied theology at Jena and Altdorf, became a member of the *Societas Discrevendum*, and contributed a number of *Memoirs* to the *Acta Eruditorum* of Leipzig. He was afterwards appointed church and school inspector of Gotha; was called to Giessen in 1696 as professor of theology, and became preacher in the same city in 1698. He wrote some controversial works little sought after now; the most remarkable of them is entitled *Der lutherischen und reformirten Religion Einigkeit*.—Ersch u. Gruber, *Allg. Encycl.*; Fischer, *Vita Gerhardi*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xx, 213.

**Gerhard, St.**, was born at Staves, diocese of Namur, in 890. In his youth he served under Berengar, count of Namur. Being once at a hunt, he left his companions and retired to pray in a chapel built on a high cliff near the village of St. Gerhard. Having fallen asleep there, he had a dream in which he thought that he saw the apostles, and that Peter, taking him by the hand, took him around the chapel, afterwards telling him that it was to be enlarged in honor of St. Peter and the martyr Eugene, and that the bones of the latter were to be brought there. Gerhard fulfilled this dream, and in 918 built there a church and also a

convent. Some time after he was sent by Berengar on a mission to count Robert of Paris, after fulfilling which he entered the abbey of St. Denis, near Paris. The relics of St. Eugene and of several other saints were given him by the abbey of St. Denis, which was said to possess enough of them to supply all France! The fame of the miracles wrought by the relics of St. Eugene was soon spread around, and drew crowds of visitors, obliging Gerhardt to live in a cell near the church in order to obtain some quiet. After spending twenty-two years in the reformation of convents, he died Oct. 3, 957. He was canonized by Innocent II. See Mabillon, *Acta ss. ord. s. Bened.* v, 248 sq.—Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* v, 89.

**Gerhardt**, PAUL, the "prince of German hymnists," was born at Gratenhainichen, in the electorate of Saxony, in 1606 or 1607. He received his first appointment in 1651 as minister at Mittenwalde. In 1657 he was called to the church of St. Nicholas, in Berlin. In 1668 he became archdeacon at Lübben, in Saxony, where he died in 1676. As a theologian, he is noted particularly in the controversies between the Lutherans and the Reformed. As a poet, his hymns are remarkable for depth of Christian feeling and suggestive thought. They are the expression of his own feelings and experience, and characterized generally by their subjective tone. Among his 120 hymns there are no less than 16 commencing with "I," and 60 others referring exclusively to God and the individual heart; yet their popular element distinguishes his productions from the poets of the Reformation and those of the later rationalistic period. "His hymns happily combine simplicity with depth and force. They are the heart-utterances of one who had a simple but sublime faith in God, and who recognised his fatherly presence in the operations of nature, the superintendence of Providence, and the daily bestowment of the surpassing gifts of redemption." He never published a complete edition of his hymns, but after 1649 they found their way into Protestant hymn-books. J. E. Ebeling, music director in Gerhardt's church, had them published in 1667, with music of his own composition. There have been many editions since; among the latest are those of Wackernagel (Stuttg. 1843; new edit. 1849), Schultz (Berlin, 1842), Becker (Lpz. 1851), and Langbecker, *Leben und Lieder Gerhardts* (Berl. 1841). Many of his hymns have been translated into English; the fullest collection is Paul Gerhardt's *Spiritual Songs*, translated by John Kelly (Lond. 1867), a well-meant but unsuccessful effort. His noble hymn, *O Haupt voll Blut und Wunden* (based on Bernard's *Salve caput cruciatum*), has been repeatedly rendered; the best version is that of Dr. J. W. Alexander (*O sacred Head now wounded*), given in Schaff's *Christ in Song*, p. 178. His *Befiehl du deine Wege* is admirably translated by John Wesley in the hymns, *Commit thou all thy griefs* (779 of Methodist Episcopal Hymn-book), and *Give to the winds thy fears* (780 of the same collection). His *O Jesu Christ mein schönes Lust* is also translated by John Wesley (*Jesus, thy boundless love to me*, Hymn 833, Methodist Hymn-book). Dr. Schaff also gives versions of his *Wir singen dir, Immanuel*, *We sing to thee, Immanuel* (*Christ in Song*, p. 56); *Fröhlich soll mein Herze springen*, *All my heart this night rejoices* (*Christ in Song*, p. 58, C. Winkworth's version); *O Welt, dich hier dein Leben*, *O world, behold upon the tree* (*Christ in Song*, p. 174, C. Winkworth's version). Some of these, and also versions of other of Gerhardt's hymns, are given by Cox, *Hymns from the German* (Lond. 1865); and by C. Winkworth, *Lyra Germanica* (London; reprinted in New York). See, besides the works already cited, Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, v, 45; Hofer, *Nov. Biog. Génér.* xx, 214; Miller, *Our Hymns, their Authors and Origin* (Lond. 1866, 12mo); Wimmer, *Leben G.'s* (Altenburg, 1723); Roth, *G. nach seinem Leben u. Wirken* (Leipz. 1829); Schulz, *Paul G. u. der grosse Kurfürst*

(Berl. 1840); Wildenhahn, *Paul G., ein kirchen-gesch. Lebensbild* (Leips. 1845; 2d edit. 1850).


**Gerhoch** or **Geroch**, a Roman Catholic priest of Germany, was born in 1093 at Polling, in Bavaria. Soon after completing his theological studies he took an active part in the conflict between the popes and the emperors in favor of the former. Bishop Herman of Augsburg made him a canon and scholasticus of the cathedral school; but he soon left this position, as the bishop, who sided with the emperor, appeared to him to be a schismatic. He withdrew to the Augustinian monastery of Raitenbuch (now Rottenbuch), where he remained until 1122, when, peace having been made between the pope and the emperor, the bishop of Augsburg recalled him. In 1123 he accompanied the bishop to Rome, to reconcile him with the pope. After his return from Rome he was again for a time *Magister* and *Doctor Juvenum* at Augsburg, but, being disgusted with the want of ecclesiastical discipline which prevailed there, he left the city again for Raitenbuch. But there also his reformatory efforts were unsuccessful, although they were supported by the pope. In 1126, bishop Kuno, of Ratibon, made him his secretary; soon after he ordained him priest, and gave him the parish of Cham, to establish there a house for regular canons; but the opponents of a rigid discipline again thwarted the whole plan. After the death of bishop Kuno, Gerhoch found a new patron in archbishop Conrad I of Salzburg, who, in 1132, made him provost of the monastery of Reichersberg, which position he retained until his death in 1169. Gerhoch was a zealous defender of a rigid orthodoxy and of all the claims of the pope, and a violent and quarrelsome opponent of the rights claimed by the emperors in Church affairs, of simony, and of the marriage of priests. He devoted throughout his life a special attention to the reformation of the clergy, and was a steadfast adherent of the theological method of the earlier fathers in opposition to the rising scholasticism. He even went so far as to charge the *Magister Sententiarum* with heresy. His eagerness in combating Adoptionism and Nestorianism carried him off into the other extreme, and he used many expressions on the person of Christ which seem to be Eutychian. Of his writings, a commentary on the 64th Psalm, in which he treats of the corrupt condition of the Church, is best known. He gives, himself, a list of all his works, in the preface to the Commentary on the Psalms, which has been published by Pez as the fifth volume of his *Thesaurus Anecdotorum*, in 1728. Some of these works have not yet been found. Those that are known are given in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, vols. ccxcii, ccxiv.—See Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* v, 49; Neander, *Church History* (Torrey's transl., vol. iv). (A. J. S.)

**Ger'izim** (always with the prefix גֵּרִיזִים, גֵּרִי, *Ger'izim'*, *Mount of the Gerizites* [from גֵּרִיזִי, *Gerizzi'*, dwellers in a *shom* (i. e. desert) land, from גֵּרַז, *garaz'*, to cut off; possibly the tribe subdued by David, 1 Sam. xxvii, 8]; Sept. Γαριζῖν, Josephus Γαριζῖν) and **Ebal** were two mountains of Samaria, forming the opposite sides of the valley which contained the ancient town of Shechem, the present Nablús. From this connection it is best to notice them together. The valley which these mountains enclose is about 200 or 300 paces wide, by above three miles in length; and Mount Ebal rises on the right hand and Gerizim on the left hand of the valley (which extends west-north-west) as a person approaches Shechem from Jerusalem (see Ritter, *Erdk.* xvi, 641 sq.). These two mountains were the scene of a grand ceremony—perhaps the most grand in the history of nations—duly performed by Joshua as soon as he gained possession of the Promised Land (Deut. xxvii; Josh. viii, 30-35). See below. These mountains are mentioned by Josephus as being similarly situated on either side of Shechem (*Ant.* iv, 8, 44). He also refers to the temple

built upon one of them by the Samaritans after the exile as the seat of their national worship (*Ant.* xi, 7, 2; 8, 2-6), as related in the Apocrypha (2 Macc. vi, 2). See below. In order to justify their traditions in this respect, they have corrupted the reading of their text of the Pentateuch in Deut. xxvii, 4, so as to read "Gerizim" instead of "Ebal." It was from the top of this mountain that Jotham uttered the famous parable of the trees to the Shechemite insurrectionists under Abimelech, gathered in the plain below (*Judg.* ix, 7), a position from which he could easily be heard (see Hackett's *Illustra. of Script.* p. 198). The ascent of the hill is so difficult that, ere any of the followers of Abimelech could climb it, Gerizim would be far away among the defiles of the neighboring mountains. See JOTHAM.

1. Mount Gerizim has been fully described by several travellers who have ascended it. The latest and most complete account of the objects of interest extant upon it may be found in M. Sauley's *Narrative*, chap. viii, where also its history is given in detail. See also Robinson's *Bibl. Researches*, iii, 96 sq.; Olin's *Travels*, ii, 340 sq. Dr. Robinson says: "Mounts Gerizim and Ebal rise in steep, rocky precipices immediately from the valley on each side, apparently some 800 feet in height. The sides of both these mountains as here seen (i. e. from Nablús) were, to our eyes, equally naked and sterile. The side of the northern mountain, Ebal, along the foot, is full of ancient excavated sepulchres. The southern mountain is now called by the inhabitants *Jebul et-Túr*, though the name Gerizim is known at least to the Samaritans. The modern appellation of Ebal we did not learn." Dr. Olin states that the summit of Gerizim is somewhat higher than that of Ebal. The top of Gerizim affords a commanding view of a considerable region, chiefly occupied with mountains of inferior elevation, but also embracing several fruitful valleys, especially those of Nablús and of wady Sahl, through which lies the road to Jerusalem. A great number of villages are seen all along its north-eastern side, upon high and apparently precipitous spurs of the mountain which push out into the valley from (wady Sahl) the main ridge. Cultivation is carried quite to the top of the mountains, which are adorned with plantations of fruit-trees, while every level spot and a vast number of small fields, supported by terraces, are sown in wheat. A considerable portion of the table-land on the summit of Gerizim itself exhibits marks of recent tillage. Mount Ebal, as viewed from Gerizim, spreads out, like the latter, into a table-land, but is apparently rocky and more broken, and less susceptible of cultivation. Mount Gerizim is ascended by two well-worn tracks, one leading from the town of Nablús at its western extremity, the other from the valley on its northern side, near one of the two spots pointed out as Joseph's tomb. It is on the eastern extremity of the ridge that the holy places of the Samaritans are collected. First, there occurs the small hole in the rocky ground where the lamb is roasted on the evening of the Passover; next, the large stone structure occupying the site of the ancient temple. In one of the towers of this edifice, on the north-east angle, is the tomb of a Mussulman saint, Sheik Ghranem. Under the southern wall of this castle or temple is a line of rocky slabs, called the "ten stones," in commemoration of the ten (or twelve) stones brought by Joshua, or of the ten tribes of the northern kingdom; they have every appearance of a large rocky platform, divided by twelve distinctly marked *natural* fissures. Beyond this platform, still further to the east, is a smooth surface of rock, sloping down to a hole on its south side; the scene, according to Samaritan tradition, which some recent travellers have endeavored to vindicate, of Abraham's sacrifice (*Moriah*, Gen. xxiv), of his meeting with Melchizedek (*Gen.* xiv; so Theodotus in Eusebius, *Prap. Ev.* ix, 22), and several other sacred

events. (See Stanley's *Sinai and Palest.*, p. 245.) Mr. Bartlett also ascended Mount Ebal, but he says he "could discover no trace of by-gone generations, though the view, like that from Gerizim, is splendid and extensive" (*Footsteps of our Lord*, p. 186). The remains of the temple on Mount Gerizim are fully described by Thomson (*Land and Book*, ii, 213 sq.).—Kitto, s. v. See SHECHEM.



Foundations of Samaritan Temple on Gerizim.

2. The leading historical incidents connected with Mount Gerizim are of a highly interesting character, and some of them (as above intimated) have been the subjects of controversy.

(1.) High places had a peculiar charm attached to them in those days of external observance. The law was delivered from Sinai: the blessings and curses affixed to the performance or neglect of it were directed to be pronounced upon Gerizim and Ebal. (See Michaelis, *De montibus Ebal et Gerizim*, Argent. 1773; Stiebritz, *Vindicie τῶν ἑβραίων contra Kennicottum*, Hal. 1767; Zeffel, *id.* ib. 1766; Vershuir, *De lectione Samar.* ad loc., Francee, 1767.) Six of the tribes—Simeon, Levi (but Joseph being represented by two tribes, Levi's actual place probably was as assigned below), Judah, Issachar, Joseph, and Benjamin, were to take their stand upon the former to bless; and six, namely, Reuben, Gad, Asher, Zebulun, Dan, and Naphtali, upon the latter to curse (*Deut.* xxvii, 12-13). Apparently, the ark halted midway between the two mountains, encompassed by the priests and Levites, thus divided by it into two bands, with Joshua for their coryphaeus. He read the blessings and cursings successively (*Josh.* viii, 33, 34), to be re-echoed by the Levites on either side of him, and responded to by the tribes in their double array with a loud Amen (*Deut.* xxxvii, 14). Curiously enough, only the formula for the curses is given (*ibid.* v, 14-26); and it was upon Ebal, and not Gerizim, that the altar of the whole unwrought stone was to be built, and the huge plastered stones, with the words of the law (*Josh.* viii, 52; Josephus, *Ant.* iv, 8, 44, limits them to the blessings and curses just pronounced) written upon them, were to be set up (*Deut.* xxvii, 4-6)—a significant omen for a people entering joyously upon their new inheritance, and yet the song of Moses abounds with forebodings still more sinister and plain-spoken (*Deut.* xxxiii, 5, 6, and 15-28). See JOSHUA.

(2.) The next question is, Has Moses defined the localities of Ebal and Gerizim? Standing on the eastern

side of the Jordan, in the land of Moab (Deut. i, 5), he asks: "Are they not on the other side Jordan, by the way where the sun goeth down (i. e. at some distance to the W.), in the land of the Canaanites, which dwell in the champaign over against Gilgal (i. e. whose territory—not these mountains—commenced over against Gilgal; see Patrick on Deut. xi, 30), beside the plains of Moreh?" . . . These closing words would seem to mark their site with unusual precision; for in Gen. xii, 6 "the plain (Sept. 'oak') of Moreh" is expressly connected with "the place of Sichem or Shechem" (N. T. *Sychem* or *Sychar*, which last form is thought to convey a reproach. See Reland, *Diss. on Gerizim*, in Ugolini, *Thes.* p. dcxxv; in Josephus the form is *Sicima*), and accordingly Judg. ix, 7, Jotham is made to address his celebrated parable to the men of Shechem from "the top of Mount Gerizim." The "hill of Moreh," mentioned in the history of Gideon his father, may have been a mountain overhanging the same plain, but certainly could not have been farther south (comp. vi, 33, and vii, 1). Was it therefore prejudice, or neglect of the true import of these passages, that made Eusebius and Epiphanius, both natives of Palestine, concur in placing Ebal and Gerizim near Jericho, the former charging the Samaritans with grave error for affirming them to be near Neapolis? (Reland, *Dissert.*, as above, p. dcxxx). Of one thing we may be assured, namely, that their scriptural site must have been, in the fourth century, lost to all but the Samaritans, otherwise these two fathers would have spoken very differently. It is true that they consider the Samaritan hypothesis irreconcilable with Deut. xi, 30, which it has already been shown not to be. A more formidable objection would have been that Joshua could not have marched from Ai to Shechem, through a hostile country, to perform the above solemnity, and retraced his steps so soon afterwards to Gilgal, as to have been found there by the Gibeonites (Josh. ix, 6; comp. viii, 30-35). Yet the distance between Ai and Shechem is not so long (under two days' journey). Neither can the interval implied in the context of the former passage have been so short as even to warrant the modern supposition that the latter passage has been misplaced. The remaining objection, namely, "the wide interval between the two mountains at Shechem" (Stanley, *S. and P.* p. 238, note), is still more easily disposed of, if we consider the blessings and curses to have been pronounced by the Levites, standing in the midst of the valley—thus abridging the distance by one half—and not by the six tribes on either hill, who only responded. How indeed could 600,000 men and upwards, besides women and children (comp. Num. ii, 32 with Judg. xx, 2 and 17), have been accommodated in a smaller space? Besides, in those days of assemblies "sub dio," the sense of hearing must have been necessarily more acute, just as, before the aids of writing and printing, memories were much more retentive. We may conclude, therefore, that there is no room for doubting the scriptural position of Ebal and Gerizim to have been—where they are now placed—in the territory of the tribe of Ephraim; the latter of them overhanging the city of Shechem or Sicima, as Josephus, following the scriptural narrative, asserts. Even Eusebius, in another work of his (*Præp. Evang.* ix, 22), quotes some lines from Theodotus, in which the true position of Ebal and Gerizim is described with great force and accuracy; and St. Jerome, while following Eusebius in the *Onomasticon*, in his ordinary correspondence does not hesitate to connect Sichem or Neapolis, the well of Jacob, and Mount Gerizim (*Ep.* cviii, c. 13, ed. Migne). Procopius of Gaza does nothing more than follow Eusebius, and that clumsily (Reland, *Palæst.* ii, 13, p. 503); but his more accurate namesake of Cæsarea expressly asserts that Gerizim rose over Neapolis (*De Edif.* v, 7)—that Ebal was not a peak of Gerizim (see Quaresm. *Elucid. T. S.* lib. vii, per. i, c. 8), but a distinct mountain to the north of it, and

separated from it by the valley in which Shechem stood, we are not called upon here to prove; nor again, that Ebal was entirely barren, which it can scarcely be called now; while Gerizim was the same proverb for verdure and gushing rills formerly that it is now, at least where it descends towards Nablith. See EBAL.

(3.) It is a far more important question whether, as the Samaritans believe, Gerizim was the mountain on which Abraham was directed to offer his son Isaac (Gen. xxii, 2, and sq.). It has been observed that it is not the mountain, but the district which is there called Moriah (of the same root with *Morch*: see Corn. a Lapid. on Gen. xii, 6), and that antecedently to the occurrence which took place "upon one of the mountains" in its vicinity—a consideration which of itself would naturally point to the locality, already known to Abraham, as the plain or plains of Moreh, "the land of vision," "the high land," and therefore consistently "the land of adoration," or "religious worship," as it is variously explained. That all these interpretations are incomparably more applicable to the natural features of Gerizim and its neighborhood than to the hillock (in comparison) upon which Solomon built his Temple, none can for a moment doubt who have seen both. Jerusalem unquestionably stands upon high ground; but owing to the hills "round about" it, cannot be seen on any side from any great distance; nor, for the same reason, could it ever have been a land of vision or extensive views. Even from Mount Olivet, which must always have towered over the small eminences at its base to the southwest, the view cannot be named in the same breath with that from Gerizim, which is one of the finest in Palestine, commanding, as it does, from an elevation of nearly 2500 feet (Arrow-smith, *Geograph. Dict. of the H. S.* p. 145), "the Mediterranean Sea on the west, the snowy heights of Hermon on the north, on the east the wall of the trans-Jordanic mountains, broken by the deep cleft of the Jablok" (Stanley, *S. and P.* p. 235), and the lovely and tortuous expanse of plain (the Mukhna) stretched as a carpet of many colors beneath its feet. Neither is the appearance which it would "present to a traveller advancing up the Philistine plain" (*ib.* p. 252)—the direction from which Abraham came—to be overlooked. On the other hand, it is clear that the "land of Moriah" was only thus designated as containing the notable mountain there referred to; and any of the hills about Jerusalem are sufficiently conspicuous for the purpose. Abraham was undoubtedly at Beersheba when he received the command (comp. Gen. xxi, 33, and xxii, 1-3, 19). It appears from the narrative that on the third day he reached the place, offered the sacrifice, and returned to the spot where he had left his servants. The distance from Beersheba to Gerizim is about 70 geographical miles, as the crow flies, which, in such a country, will give 90 of actual travel. Abraham's servants were on foot, carrying wood; Isaac was also on foot, and Abraham rode an ass. It is not, indeed, absolutely necessary, as Mr. Porter thinks (*Hand-book of S. and P.* i, 359), that he should have started from Beersheba (see Gen. xxi, 34—"the whole land being before him," c. xx, 15). But had he set out, even from so southern a spot, "on the morning of the third day, he would arrive in the plain of Sharon, exactly where the massive height of Gerizim is visible afar off" (Stanley, p. 248), and from thence, with the mount always in view, he would proceed to the exact "place which God had told him of" in all solemnity—for again, it is not necessary that he should have arrived on the actual spot during the third day. All that is said in the narrative is that, from the time that it hove in sight, he and Isaac parted from the young men, and went on together alone. Still this interpretation is not the natural and obvious one, and supposes too protracted a journey for the circumstances. The Samaritans, therefore, through whom the tradition of the site of Gerizim has been preserved,

are probably wrong when they point out still—as they have done from time immemorial—Gerizim as the hill upon which Abraham's "faith was made perfect;" a natural result of their desire to magnify their national seat of worship. It is, moreover, strange that a place once called by the "Father of the faithful" Jehovah-jireh, should have been merged by Moses, and ever afterwards, in a general name so different from it in sense and origin as Gerizim. Josephus, in more than one place, asserts that where Abraham offered, there the Temple was afterwards built (*Ant. i, 13, 2; vii, 13, 9*). St. Jerome follows Josephus (*Quest. in Gen. xxii, 5, ed. Migne*), and the Rabbinical traditions respecting Mount Moriah are strongly in the same direction (Cunæus, *De Republ. Heb. ii, 12*). The Christian tradition, which makes the site of Abraham's sacrifice to have been on Calvary, is merely a monkish transference from the Jewish vicinity. See MORIAH.

(4.) Another tradition of the Samaritans is still less trustworthy, viz., that Mount Gerizim was the spot where Melchizedek, met Abraham—though there certainly was a Salem or Shalem in that neighborhood (*Gen. xxxiii, 18; Staley, S. and P. p. 217, and sq.*). The first altar erected in the land of Abraham, and the first appearance of Jehovah to him in it, was in the plain of Moreh, near Sichem (*Gen. xii, 6*); but the mountain overhanging that city had not in any case, as yet, been hallowed to him by any decisive occurrence. He can hardly, therefore, be supposed to have deviated from his road so far, which lay through the plain of the Jordan; nor again is it likely that he would have found the king of Sodom so far away from his own territory (*Gen. xiv, 17, and sq.*). See SHAVEN, VALLEY OF. Lastly, the altar which Jacob built was not on Gerizim, as the Samaritans contend, though probably about its base, at the head of the plain between it and Ebal, "in the parcel of a field" which that patriarch purchased from the children of Hamor, and where he spread his tent (*Gen. xxxiii, 18-20*). Here was likewise his well (*John iv, 6*), and the tomb of his son Joseph (*Josh. xxiv, 32*), both of which are still shown, the former surmounted by the remains of a vaulted chamber, and with the ruins of a church hard by (Robinson, *Bibl. Res. ii, 283*) the latter with "a fruitful vine" trailing over its whitewashed inclosure, and before it two dwarf pillars hollowed out at the top to receive lamps, which are lighted every Friday or Mohammedan Sabbath. There is, however, another Mohammedan monument claiming to be the said tomb (Stanley, *S. and P. p. 241* note). The tradition (Robinson, *ii, 283* note) that the twelve patriarchs were buried there likewise (it should have made them eleven without Joseph, or thirteen including his two sons) is probably an erroneous inference from Acts vii, 16 (where *αὐτός* is not to be included in the subject of *μετέστησαν*; see Hackett, ad loc.). See MELCHIZEDEK.

(5.) We now enter upon the second phase in the history of Gerizim. According to Josephus, a marriage contracted between Manasseh, brother of Jaddus, the then high-priest, and the daughter of Sanballat the Cuthæan (comp. 2 Kings xvii, 24), having created a great stir amongst the Jews (who had been strictly forbidden to contract alien marriages; Ezra ix, 2; Neh. xiii, 23)—Sanballat, in order to reconcile his son-in-law to this unpopular affinity, obtained leave from Alexander the Great to build a temple upon Mount Gerizim, and to inaugurate there a priesthood and altar rival to those of Jerusalem (*Ant. xi, 8, 2-4*, and, for the harmonizing of the names and date, Prideaux, *Connect. i, 396*, and sq., McCaul's edit.). "Samaria thenceforth," says Prideaux, "became the common refuge and asylum of the refractory Jews" (*Ibid.*; see also Joseph. *Ant. xi, 8, 7*), and for a time, at least, their temple seems to have been called by the name of a Greek deity (*Ant. xii, 5, 5*). Hence one of the first acts of Hyrcanus, when the death of Antiochus Sidetes

had set his hands free, was to seize Shechem, and destroy the temple upon Gerizim, after it had stood there 200 years (*Ant. xiii, 9, 1*). But the destruction of their temple by no means crushed the rancor of the Samaritans. The road from Galilee to Judæa lay then, as now, through Samaria, skirting the foot of Gerizim (*John iv, 4*). Here was a constant occasion for religious controversy and for outrage. "How is it that thou, being a Jew, askest to drink of me, which am a woman of Samaria?" said the female to our Lord at the well of Jacob—where both parties would always be sure to meet. "Our fathers worshipped in this mountain, and ye say that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship?" . . . Subsequently we read of the depredations committed on that road upon a party of Galileans (*Ant. xx, 6, 1*). The liberal attitude, first of the Saviour, and then of his disciples (*Acts viii, 14*), was thrown away upon all those who would not abandon their creed. Gerizim thus continued to be the focus of outbreaks through successive centuries. One, under Pilate, while it led to their severe chastisement, procured the disgrace of that ill-starred magistrate, who had crucified "Jesus, the king of the Jews," with impunity (*Ant. xviii, 4, 1*). Another hostile gathering on the same spot caused a slaughter of 10,600 of them under Vespasian. It is remarkable that, in this instance, want of water is said to have made them easy victims; so that the deliciously cold and pure spring on the summit of Gerizim must have failed before so great a multitude (*War, iii, 7, 32*). At length their aggressions were directed against the Christians inhabiting Neapolis—now powerful, and under a bishop—in the reign of Zeno. Terlebinthus at once carried the news of this outrage to Byzantium: the Samaritans were forcibly ejected from Gerizim, which was handed over to the Christians, and adorned with a church in honor of the Virgin; to some extent fortified, and even guarded. This not proving sufficient to repel the foe, Justinian built a second wall round the church, which his historian says defied all attacks (*Procop. De Edif. v, 7*). It is probably the ruins of these buildings which meet the eye of the modern traveller (Porter, *Handb. of S. and P. ii, 339*). Previously to this time the Samaritans had been a numerous and important sect—sufficiently so, indeed, to be carefully distinguished from the Jews and Calcolists in the Theodosian Code. This last outrage led to their comparative disappearance from history. Travellers of the 12th, 14th, and 17th centuries take notice of their existence, but extreme paucity (*Early Travellers*, by Wright, p. 81, 181, and 432), and their numbers now, as in those days, is said to be below 200 (Robinson, *Bibl. Res. ii, 282, 2d ed.*). We are confined by our subject to Gerizim, and therefore can only touch upon the Samaritans, or their city Neapolis, so far as their history connects directly with that of the mountain. We may observe, however, that as it was undoubtedly this mountain of which our Lord had said, "Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem (i. e. exclusively), worship the Father" (*John iv, 21*)—so likewise it is a singular historical fact, that the Samaritans have continued on this self-same mountain century after century, with the briefest interruptions, to worship according to their ancient custom ever since to the present day. While the Jews—expelled from Jerusalem, and therefore no longer able to offer up bloody sacrifices according to the law of Moses—have been obliged to adapt their ceremonial to the circumstances of their destiny; here the Paschal Lamb has been offered up in all ages of the Christian era by a small but united nationality (the spot is accurately marked out by Dr. R., *Bibl. Res. ii, 277*). Their copy of the law, probably the work of Manasseh, and known to the fathers of the 2d and 3d centuries (Prideaux, *Connection, i, 600*; and Robinson, *ii, 297-301*), was, in the 17th, vindicated from oblivion by Scaliger, Usher, Morinus, and others;

and no traveller now visits Palestine without making a sight of it one of his prime objects. Gerizim is likewise still to the Samaritans what Jerusalem is to the Jews, and Mecca to the Mohammedans. Their prostrations are directed towards it, wherever they are; its holiest spot in their estimation being the traditional site of the tabernacle, near that on which they believe Abraham to have offered his son. Both these spots are on the summit; and near them is still to be seen a mound of ashes, similar to the larger and more celebrated one north of Jerusalem; collected, it is said, from the sacrifices of each successive age (Dr. R., *Bibl. Res.* ii, 202 and 209, evidently did not see this on Gerizim). Into their more legendary traditions respecting Gerizim, and the story of their alleged worship of a dove—due to the Jews, their enemies (Heland, *Diss. op. Ugolin. Thesaur.* vii, p. cccxxix—xxxiii)—it is needless to enter.—Smith, s. v. See SAMARITANS.

**Gerizite.** See GERIZITE.

**Gerlach, Otto von,** a German theologian, was born in 1801 at Berlin, and studied first law and then theology at the university there. In 1828 he became *privat docent* in theology; in 1834, pastor of the Elizabeth-Kirche; in 1847, court preacher; in 1849, professor ordinarius of theology. He was a man of earnest piety, and labored zealously as pastor and in fostering missions at home and abroad. In this respect he has been called "the Wesley" of the Berlin Church. The translation of Wesley's sermon on "Awake, thou that sleepest!" was his first literary work. He translated Baxter's *Saint's Rest* into German. His reputation was largely extended by his *Commentar z. N. T.* (Berlin, 1841; 3d ed. 1844, 2 vols. 8vo; new ed. 1858). The O. T. was also added, the whole under the title *Die heilige Schrift nach Luther's Uebersetzung mit Einleitungen u. erklärenden Anmerkungen* (1847–53, 6 vols.). He also published a new edition of select writings of Luther (Berl. 1840–48, 24 vols.):—*Relig. Zustand der Angli. Kirche* (Potsdam, 1845):—*Kirchliche Armenpflege* (trans. from Chalmers, 1847). The last two works were the fruit of a tour in England and Scotland, undertaken by Gerlach in 1842 at the command of the king, to investigate the workings of British Christianity. Gerlach died at Berlin, greatly lamented, Oct. 24, 1849.—*Methodist Quarterly Review*, April, 1849, p. 268; *Herzog, Real-Encyklop.* v, 83.

**Gerle, Christophe-Antoine,** a French religious enthusiast, was born A. D. 1740, in Auvergne, and died about 1805. When quite a young man he entered the order of Carthusian monks, and soon afterwards was made prior of Pont-Sainte-Marie. In 1789 he was chosen deputy to the Estates General by the clergy of Riom, and was one of the first representatives of the clergy who supported the policy of the Tiers État. In the famous Tennis-Court session of the National Assembly (*Séance du Jeu de Paume*) he exhibited so much earnestness and patriotic fervor that David assigned him a conspicuous place in his painting (*Serment du Jeu de Paume*) (Tennis-Court Oath) representing the most imposing scene in that meeting. Having become a member of the Constitutional Assembly, Gerle proposed, Dec. 12, 1789, that all monks who wished to do so might be allowed to retire to the monasteries of their order and live according to their particular rules, provided they conformed to the general laws, and, April 12, 1790, urged in vain the issuing a proclamation declaring the Roman Catholic faith to be the only one accepted by the French nation. In June following he brought to the notice of the Convention the prophecies of Susanne de Bouze, of Perigord, made eleven years before, in regard to an impending general revolution, and the reforms consequent thereon. In 1792 he was chosen one of the electors of Paris. There was a strange mixture of philosophism and superstition in his nature, as was evinced by his becoming a Theist, or follower of Catharine Théos or Théot, an old

woman who styled herself the mother of God, and announced the near advent of a regenerating Messiah, and in whose following a number of silly, superstitious, or intriguing characters were gathered. Gerle thought that both himself and the French Revolution were clearly indicated in the prophecies of Isaiah. As these visionaries were politically friendly to Robespierre, whom they invoked as supreme pontiff, Robespierre's enemies sought to increase the odium against him by a public exposure of their absurdities, and accordingly Vadier, the organ of the Committee of General Safety, made a report to the National Convention demanding the prosecution of Théos, Gerle, and others as guilty of plotting a fanatical conspiracy, which was adopted, and on May 16, 1794, these persons were arrested and imprisoned on the orders of the committee. In the excitement and confusion following the fall of Robespierre they seemed to have been forgotten. Théos died in prison, and Dom Gerle remained there until the advent of the Directory. He was for some time one of the editors of the *Messenger du Soir*, and afterwards employed in the bureau of the minister of the interior, Benezech. A memoir written by him in regard to his arrest appeared in the *Revue Rétrospective*, No. xi, 2<sup>me</sup> série, Nov. 30, 1835.—Hœfer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xx, 233–236; Alison, *History of Europe*, iii, 92 (9th ed. Edinburgh, cr. 8vo). (J. W. M.)

**Germain, St.** See GERMANUS.

**Germain, St., en Laye,** a place near Paris, noted for a treaty of peace concluded between the king of France and the Huguenots, Aug. 8, 1570, in which it was provided that the Protestants should thereafter be unmolested on account of their religion. This treaty was only made to be broken, as the massacre of St. Bartholomew, only two years later (Aug. 24, 1572), terribly demonstrated. See Mosheim, *Church Hist.* iii, 173; Smedley, *Reformed Religion in France*, i, 322.

**Germain, St., Manuscripts** (CODICES SANGERMANENSES), the name of two very ancient Latin MSS. of the N. T. (usually designated as *g*<sup>1</sup> and *g*<sup>2</sup>), so called from having formerly been in the library of the Benedictine monastery of St. Germain des Prés at Paris, partially examined by Marteanay (whose citations were repeated by Blanchini), and afterwards throughout by Sabatier.—Tregelles, in Horne's *Introd.* iv, 238; Scrivener, *Introd.* p. 257. See MANUSCRIPTS, BIBLICAL.

**German Baptists.** See DUNKERS, and MENNONISTS.

**German Catholics,** the name of a sect in Germany which sprung up in 1844 in consequence of the exhibition of the holy coat at Treves [see HOLY COAT]. This proceeding called forth a vigorous protest from Johannes Ronge, a priest in Silesia, who, having been suspended from his office, was living in retirement. Ronge addressed a public letter to bishop Arnoldi, of Treves, Oct. 1, 1844, in which he characterized the exhibition of the coat as idolatry. Even before the publication of this letter, another priest, J. Czarski, at Schneidemühl, in the Prussian province of Posen, had formally seceded from the Roman Catholic Church, and was about to form a congregation of "Christian Apostolic Catholics." Czarski and Ronge were naturally drawn into confederacy, though their views on doctrine radically differed; the former sympathizing with evangelical Protestantism, and the latter being an ultra Rationalist. Ronge addressed an appeal to the lower orders of the priesthood, calling upon them to use their influence in the pulpit and everywhere to break the power of the court of Rome, and priesthood in general throughout Germany; to set up a national German Church independent of Rome, and governed by councils and synods; to abolish auricular confession, the Latin mass, and the celibacy of the priests; and to aim at liberty of conscience for all Christians, and perfect freedom for the religious education of chil-

dren. Czerski, on the other hand, drew up a confession of faith differing but little from that of the Roman Catholic Church, though it declared the Holy Scriptures and the Nicene Creed as the only standards of Christian faith. The new sect quickly increased. At the beginning of 1845 more than a hundred congregations were in existence, each adopting its own confession of faith, some agreeing with that of Czerski, and the majority adopting the rationalistic views of Ronge. In the confession of faith adopted by the Congregation of Breslau, of which Ronge was chosen preacher, the essentials of belief were restricted to a few doctrines: belief in God as the Creator and Governor of the world, and the Father of all men; in Christ as the Saviour, in the Holy Spirit, the holy Christian Church, the forgiveness of sins, and eternal life. Baptism and the Lord's Supper were held to be the only sacraments. Confirmation was retained, but most of the rites and practices peculiar to the Roman Catholic Church were given up. The first council of German Catholics was held at Leipzig, March 22, 1845, and attended by deputies from many of the leading congregations. The majority declared in favor of the principles expressed in the rationalistic Breslau confessions. The interpretation of Scripture, the only source of Christian belief, was left to the free exercise of reason, pervaded and actuated by the "Christian idea." Forms of worship were to be adapted to the requirements of time and place. With regard to church government, the council declared in favor of the presbyterial and synodical constitution. The congregations were to have the free election of their clergy and eldership. The increase of the sect continued to be so rapid that by the end of 1845 it numbered nearly 300 congregations. Many prominent Roman Catholics joined it, and even a number of Protestant rationalistic clergymen went over to it. Distinguished historians like Gerwinus looked upon the movement as a momentous event in the history of Germany. It even exercised a considerable influence upon the Protestant Church of Germany, by causing the organization of the Free Congregations (q. v.), a similar rationalistic sect, chiefly consisting of seceders from the Protestant state churches. Several state governments, as those of Saxony, Prussia, Baden, Bavaria, and Austria, took very severe measures against them, and either altogether suppressed them, or at least tried to put as great obstacles as possible in their way. The internal disagreements between the orthodox and the rationalistic sections also discouraged the spread of the movement, which, at the second council, held in Berlin in 1847, appeared to be on the decrease. The revolutionary movements of 1848 gave the German Catholics full liberty, and, consequently, some additions were made to the number of their congregations, especially in Austria. But the further advance which the majority of the German Catholics now made in their opposition to evangelical Christianity, and the profession of some of their prominent men, that on their part the religious movement had been merely a cloak for covering their revolutionary tendencies in politics, estranged many of their friends. After the political reaction set in, in 1849, strong measures against them were again taken by most of the state governments, and in Austria they were again wholly suppressed. In 1850 delegates of the German Catholic congregations attended the council of the Free Congregations, and a union of the two organizations was agreed upon. This union was consolidated at the council held in Gotha in 1857, when the united body assumed the name of "*Bund freireligiöser Gemeinden.*" For their further history, see FREE CONGREGATIONS. (A. J. S.)

**German Methodists.** See UNITED BROTHERS.

**German Reformed Church in America.** The German Reformed Church is the historical continuation in America of the Reformed branch of the

Protestant Reformation of Germany. The great movement of the 16th century in the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church was at first known as simply the Reformation, or Reformed Church, the term *Reformed* being used in a general sense as designating the whole religious movement in its opposition to the errors and corruptions of Rome. Two distinct tendencies, embracing theology and practical life, were, however, at work from the beginning. The one received its type and character primarily from the genius, faith, and spirit of Martin Luther, and prevailed chiefly among the northern states of the German nation. The other is not thus related to the peculiar spirit of one man. Its character was wrought out rather by a succession of ministers and theologians in Switzerland, France, the Netherlands, and the German provinces bordering on the Rhine, among whom are prominent Zwingle, Bullinger, Calvin, Melancthon, Olevianus, Ursinus, and others of the same type of faith. Lutheran theology reached its full development in the Form of Concord, 1580; Reformed theology in the Palatinate Catechism, 1563, so called from the German province in which the Catechism originated; called also the *Heidelberg* Catechism, from the University of Heidelberg, in which Ursinus and Olevianus, the authors of the work, were professors of theology.

Palatinate was the name formerly borne by two provinces of Germany, distinguished as Upper and Lower, and situated along the river Rhine. The first (Oberpfalz) bordered on Bohemia and Bavaria; the other (Unterpfalz) was situated on both sides of the Rhine, touching on different sides Mayence, Würtemberg, Baden, Alsace, and Lorraine. The Palatinate did not yield to the power of the Reformation movement until 1546, when it embraced the Lutheran faith. It was moulded, however, rather by the gentle spirit of Melancthon than by the stern spirit of Luther. Under Frederick III, surnamed the Pious, who acceded to power in 1559, these German provinces passed over from the Lutheran to the Reformed faith. The theological controversies which preceded and accompanied this transition gave rise to the formation of a catechism, the design of which was to reconcile opposing Lutheran and Reformed elements on a new basis. The principle and the scope of this new confession is Reformed, not Lutheran; but, resting on the Apostles' Creed as its animating and form-giving principle, it rises above extreme antagonisms, and aims at resolving into one consistent whole the divergent tendencies of faith characterizing the two original branches of Protestantism. The adoption of this catechism by a synod of the Palatinate, convened for the purpose Jan. 19, 1563, was followed by the preparation of an order of worship answerable to it, and by a complete religious and educational organization of the two provinces; the great design of Frederick III being to establish and perpetuate the Reformed faith in this German electorate. Thus arose the Reformed Church of Germany, or the *German* Reformed Church, in distinction from the Reformed Church of Switzerland, of France, Holland, Scotland, and other states and countries.

Religious persecution at home, civil oppression and confusion, and the gratuitous offer of land in Pennsylvania by William Penn, led to the emigration of a large number of Palatines to America in the beginning of the last century. From year to year their numbers increased. To these were added hundreds and thousands coming from other states of Europe, holding the Reformed faith. They settled in New York, along the Hudson, in New Jersey, Maryland, Virginia, and even extended into the Carolinas; but the greater number located in Pennsylvania, east of the Susquehanna. The first minister was the Rev. George Michael Weiss, who, assisted on his way by the Classis of Amsterdam, emigrated from the Palatinate in company with about 400 Palatines in the year 1727. They settled along the Skippach, Montgomery County, Pa.



Here a congregation was organized, and a wooden church immediately built. This, so far as known, was the first German Reformed Church in America.

Until the year 1747 the religious condition of these people was very sad. They had no ministers; no Church organization; no school-teachers; no books, excepting a few Bibles, Catechisms, Liturgies, and Hymn-books, which they brought with them from the fatherland; and no pecuniary resources, for the majority were extremely poor. Besides, they were separated by national customs and by language from the large English population of the country. So helpless and destitute, yet anxious to enjoy the means of grace, they were exposed to the danger of being misled into all sorts of errors by irresponsible teachers. But they were distinguished for morality, industry, and thrift. In the course of time they began to accumulate property, and acquire a reputation for honesty and integrity. With this came respect, influence, and general prosperity.

Yet this chaotic state of the Reformed Church grew worse rather than better. Emigration continued. This, added to the natural increase of population, extended the religious destitution, and multiplied their moral and spiritual dangers; for from the first settlement of Palatines in America, throughout this entire period, there were at no time more than three or four ordained ministers of the Reformed Confession among them.

The arrival in 1746 of the Rev. Michael Schlatter, a Reformed minister from St. Gall, Switzerland, who was commissioned and supported by the synods of North and South Holland, introduces the *formative* period in the history of the Church. A man of great energy, strong faith, burning zeal, and indomitable perseverance, he visited all the German settlements in Virginia, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and some in New York; gathered the people; preached the Gospel; administered the sacraments; organized churches; located pastors; established schools; and on Sept. 29, 1747, in the city of Philadelphia, succeeded in effecting the organization of the first synod, or the *Coetus*, as it was called, of the German Reformed Church. Subsequently he visited Europe for the purpose of representing the extreme destitution of the Germans in America. He travelled through Holland, Switzerland, Germany, and England, and everywhere awakened profound interest. He succeeded in creating a large fund, the yearly interest of which was devoted to the support of ministers and school-teachers in America, and to the purchase of Bibles for gratuitous distribution among the people. He also induced a number of young ministers to go forth as missionaries to their brethren in the New World, of whom five came with him on his return to America.

The first *Coetus* consisted of *thirty-one* members—five ministers and twenty-six elders—and represented forty-six churches and a population then estimated at thirty thousand. Organized by direction of the Synod of Holland, the *Coetus* stood under the jurisdiction of that body. Its proceedings were sent annually for review and confirmation to the Classis of Amsterdam, that Classis having been charged by the Synod of Holland with the duty of superintending the affairs of the German Church in America. No one was ordained to the office of the ministry without its consent.

This subordinate relation to the Church of Holland continued until 1793, a period of forty-six years. Emigration increased. From time to time, ministers and school-teachers from the Palatinate and other Reformed provinces of Europe arrived. But the increase of ministers was not in proportion to the increase of the population. Though the Church grew, yet the spiritual destitutions multiplied, so that at the end of this period there were at least one hundred and fifty churches, but no more than about twenty-two ordained ministers.

In 1793 the *Coetus* resolved no longer to transmit its acts and proceedings for revision to the Classis of Amsterdam, and assumed the right to govern itself, and to have the care of the churches in America, independently of foreign oversight and control. A constitution was adopted, entitled "*Synodal-Ordnung des hochdeutschen Reformirten Synods und der mit ihr verbundenen Gemeinden in den Vereinigten Staaten von Nord-America.*" By this act the *Coetus* became the *Synod*, and the *Reformirte Kirche*, or *Reformed Church*, became the *Hoch-deutsche Reformirte Kirche*, or *High-German Reformed Church*, in order to distinguish it from the *Nieder-Deutsche*, or *Low-German*, or *Low-Dutch Church*.

This event introduces a *period of thirty-two years*, extending to the establishment of a theological seminary in 1825, a period which it is not easy to characterize. In one respect there was progress. The people increased in numbers and wealth. There were also large accessions to the population by immigration. Congregations multiplied. Many Germans migrated westward, and churches were organized in Ohio. There was also proportionally a larger accession to the ranks of the ministry, the number rising from twenty-two to *eighty-two*. But in another respect there was retrogression. So long as the Church stood directly under the supervision of Holland, the great majority of ministers were men who had been thoroughly educated in the gymnasiums and universities of Europe. But now, while some men of thorough education still came from Europe, the larger number came from the membership of the American Church. As the synod had no theological seminary, no college, and no academy, candidates for the office could acquire only a superficial or partial knowledge of Latin and Greek, of science and theology. Young men had to prosecute their studies under the tuition of pastors who had charge of from two to eight churches. As a natural consequence, the standard of ministerial qualifications had to be lowered; and with the loss of broad culture, departed also, in great measure, the sense of its value. Some of the leading ministers saw the evils to which the Church was exposed from this tendency, and endeavored to resist it manfully, but without avail.

With the depression of the ministry came ecclesiastical disorders, the fruit of tendencies at work from the beginning. Some laymen presumed to administer the sacraments; some ministers, also, were disorderly. They were disposed to ordain men to the holy office on their own judgment and authority as individuals. The Church, moreover, felt the enervating influence of German rationalism or neology, and of the deism of England. The most active and influential men, though struggling earnestly against these downward forces, could offer but a feeble resistance; for, taking the faith of the Reformation as the standard of judgment, they themselves occupied a false theological attitude. The rationalistic habit of thought of the 18th century, taking hold of them, gave an undertone to their preaching and ecclesiastical life, which, though they cherished firm faith in the truth of supernatural revelation, nevertheless nourished comparative indifference to the *original* faith of the Reformed Church as embodied in the Palatinate Catechism, and even exerted an influence in direct opposition to it.

Though separated by the ocean, the Church in America was always in close sympathy with the Church of Germany. The profound reaction against Rationalism, which began to reveal its presence there during the second decade of the present century, was almost simultaneous with a revival of a better faith in the bosom of the American Church. The first decided indications appear in the records of 1815, and from that time onward with gradually increasing clearness. In that year we meet the first recognition of the Heidelberg Catechism. In all the records preceding this time, we find no reference to any confession of faith.

In 1820, the synod enjoins on all ministers to use no other book but the Heidelberg Catechism in the instruction of youth preparatory to confirmation. The want of literary and theological institutions seems to be more deeply and generally felt. Earnest and persevering efforts are made to establish a theological seminary. In 1819 the constitution is revised and amended. The territory is subdivided into classes; a classis corresponding to a presbytery in the Presbyterian Church. And the synod, instead of being a general convention of all the ministers and one elder from each parish, as it had been since 1747, becomes a delegated body composed of ministers and elders chosen by the classes.

The revival of faith and activity resulted finally, after a struggle against much opposition extending through seven years, in the creation of a theological seminary by the Synod of Bedford, Pa., in 1824. The Rev. Lewis Mayer, D.D., was chosen professor of theology. The seminary opened at Carlisle, Pa., the following spring. Removed to York in 1829, the institution was finally, 1835, located at Mercersburg, Pa., where it still remains. With the seminary was removed also to Mercersburg the high-school opened at York in 1830. This school, under a charter granted by the Legislature of the state, became Marshall College in 1836.

The opening of the theological seminary constitutes the most important epoch in the history of the Church in America. Followed soon after by the creation of a classical institution of a high order, it was the means of quickening the historical faith and dormant energies of the Church. Though several decades of years were necessary in order to unfold the moulding power of these institutions in the sphere of philosophy, theology, and practical life, yet a new impulse was at once given to thought and life. The standard of qualification for the ministry was elevated. A much larger number of pious young men responded to the call of God to preach the Gospel. The ministry increased rapidly. Religious periodicals were established: first, one in English, 1828; and several years later, one in German, 1836. A board of domestic missions and a board of beneficiary education were created. The benevolence of the people was evoked. Greater zeal manifested itself for the extension of the Church. About this time, also, some men were admitted to the ministry who could preach acceptably in English, and were thus prepared to meet the wants of the younger membership in the cities and larger towns; wants arising from the growing prevalence of that language among the German people; for, until 1825, with perhaps but two or three exceptions, all the pastors conducted public worship exclusively in the mother tongue; in consequence of which, scores of families, who preferred the English language, had, during the previous fifteen or twenty years, in particular localities, passed over to other denominations. The transition, though generally gradual, caused no little discussion and confusion in nearly every congregation where the change was felt to be necessary, owing to the firmness with which the older people clung to German worship. At present this difficulty has been surmounted throughout nearly all portions of the Church west of the Susquehanna and south of the Potomac, where the English language is now generally used either exclusively or in conjunction with the German; but east of the Susquehanna, where the Pennsylvania dialect of the German language has been perpetuated among not less than fifty thousand of her people, and where the great majority of ministers conduct public worship in the mother tongue, the problem still awaits solution.

Though the theological seminary and the gradual introduction of the English language both met a great want and proved to be a great good, yet the Church was thereby exposed to new and serious dangers. This spiritual awakening united positive and negative ele-

ments. It was the assertion and development of the old faith, and, at the same time, a reaction against what was defective and wrong in her American history. This reaction, modified by contact with the Presbyterian, Methodist, and other denominations, for a while confounded what was true and good in the past with what was false and evil, and was disposed, with the abuse of catechisation, confirmation, the observance of the great festivals of the Church year and other customs, to set aside these customs themselves, and thus ignore the historical character of the German Reformed Church. The false tendency prevailed most generally among the congregations that had introduced the use of the English language. The German sections of the Church enjoyed a large measure of protection. As the prevalence of the German language deprived them of the advantage of fellowship with the English denominations, so it shielded them also measurably against the transforming influence of a foreign spirit.

But even where this spirit, foreign to the genius of the Church, had acquired the most commanding influence, the traditional habit of thought and life was not extinct. The conditions of a strong counter reaction were always present. It was only necessary that some one assert clearly and forcibly the latent faith of the Church. This was done with great power by the Rev. John W. Nevin, D.D., several years after he had become, in 1840, professor of didactic theology in the seminary at Mercersburg.

For nearly twenty years the tendency to surrender her distinctive faith and customs had been gaining strength in the German Reformed Church, slowly indeed, but steadily, and the process of assimilation to a foreign form of Christian life was silently going forward. A powerful counteracting element, however, was developed as early as 1836 in the profound Anglo-German philosophy taught by the Rev. Frederick Augustus Rauch, D.P., the first president of Marshall College, who laid the foundation of the system of organic and objective thinking which has ever since characterized the leading educational institutions of the Church. There was accordingly at hand both a general and special preparation for the great Church movement of the last twenty-five years, of which Dr. Nevin has been the principal organ: general, in the slumbering spirit of the Heidelberg Catechism, which, living in the hearts of ministers and people, perpetuated a sense of dissatisfaction with a foreign religious habit, and constituted a general qualification to support, as by intuition, the protest against error, and the affirmation of fundamental truth pronounced by a great leader; and special, in the genetic method of thought which, in full sympathy with the spirit of the Catechism, had, through the teaching of Dr. Rauch, given character to the college, and moulded the philosophical thinking of the first ministers of the Church, who received a full literary and theological training in her own institutions.

This profound and comprehensive movement constitutes the leading characteristic of the Church in the last period of her American history. The bold criticism of Protestantism, and the unequivocal reassertion of the catholic truth contained in the Protestant confessions of the 16th century by Dr. Nevin, and the publication of the *Principle of Protestantism* by the Rev. Philip Schaff, D.D., in German and English, called forth earnest and sometimes very violent rejoinders from religious papers and quarterly reviews, and provoked a series of controversies concerning the new-measure system, the Lord's Supper, tradition and the rule of faith, the nature of the Church, the present attitude of Protestantism and its relation to Roman Catholicism, the person of Christ, the nature of Christianity, and, in the course of time, holy baptism and liturgical worship, with many other cognate fundamental doctrines; controversies which have been prosecuted vigorously, with short intervals of repose, down

to the present time, and have not only involved some of the principal denominations in this country, but of late have also extended to Germany.

The main positions, both negative and positive, affirmed by Dr. Nevin and his coadjutors, have from time to time been sustained by the Eastern Synod and by the General Synod, sometimes by direct and formal action, but generally in an indirect way, since the main questions have only occasionally been at issue before the judicatories in a formal manner. Indeed, instead of being merely the innovation of a party, the great movement has been only a life movement of the German Reformed Church herself, the men prominent in the controversies being rather the exponents and organs than leaders. Yet a portion of the Church has all along been opposing the prevailing theological views. The opposition has generally been conducted with moderation and sobriety, but sometimes it has been violent and disorderly, and has even indicated an inclination towards schism. Another effect of the controversies and of the theological attitude of the Church has been to provoke a large measure of opposition from some of the principal Protestant denominations. A disposition even shows itself to maintain that the German Reformed Church is no longer true to her origin and history as a branch of the Protestant Church.

Soon after the controversies began the *Mercersburg Review* was established, in order to serve as a medium for the development, defence, and progress of what came to be known among opponents as *Mercersburg Philosophy and Theology*. It was issued regularly from 1849 until 1861 inclusive. Suspended during the progress of the Civil War, it was resumed in January, 1867.

In 1820 the ministers and churches in Ohio organized themselves by the authority of synod into a classis, called the *Classis of Ohio*; but it stood in organic relation to synod only during the short period of four years. In 1824 it became an independent body, and assumed the title of the *Synod of Ohio*, having 11 ministers, 80 congregations, and 2500 members. In 1837 the Synod of Ohio became the *Synod of Ohio and Adjacent States*. In 1842 this synod subdivided its territory into six classes. Thus there came to exist two mutually independent synods, having the same organization, holding the same faith, governed by the same constitution, having the same usages and customs, and each one possessing supreme and final authority within its own bounds. The two bodies exchanged delegates annually, the delegate being admitted as a full member of the body to which he was commissioned. A sense of dissatisfaction with this incomplete and anomalous organization began to prevail, and a strong desire became general, both East and West, to effect a more perfect organization by creating a higher body that should have jurisdiction over the whole Church. The constitution was accordingly so changed by a vote of two thirds of all the classes of each synod as to make room for the organization of a triennial General Synod. This body, composed of delegates, ministers and elders, chosen by all the classes, represents the whole Church. It is the highest judicatory, and "the last resort in all cases respecting the government of the Church not finally adjudicated by the synod." The General Synod held its first session in Pittsburg in November, 1863.

During the same year the Church celebrated the three hundredth anniversary of the formation and adoption of the Heidelberg Catechism. This celebration was originally suggested by the Rev. Dr. Harbaugh, and the preparatory arrangements made by a committee of which he was chairman. Ministers, elders, and members from all parts of the Church met in General Convention in the German Reformed church, Race Street, Philadelphia, Jan. 17, 1863, and continued in session six days. Twenty essays and

discourses on the origin, history, doctrines, confessional relations, and the fortunes of the Heidelberg Catechism, prepared by distinguished theologians of Europe and America, were read and discussed. The jubilee was formally closed by a similar convention held at Reading May 21, 1864.

Though held during the darkest times of the war of the Rebellion, yet the celebration was in all respects a success. Profound and general interest was awakened in the origin, history, faith, and relations of the German Reformed Church among ministers and the laity. The Church came to a better apprehension of her historical character as an original branch of the Protestant Reformation, and acquired a clearer consciousness of her present relative position and vocation, and of her future mission. A new impulse was at the same time given to all her practical operations.

As the fruit of this celebration, two volumes possessing permanent historical value were published: the *Triglott Catechism* and the *Tercentenary Monument*. The first is a critical edition of the Catechism in the original German, in Latin, modern German, and in English, printed in parallel columns, and accompanied with an historical introduction. The English is a new translation. The *Monument* consists of the discourses and essays delivered at the Convention held in Philadelphia, and was published in English and German.

This tercentenary jubilee constitutes a most important epoch in the history of the Church, and may be regarded as the relative conclusion of the ethical forces at work for the previous twenty or thirty years.

The second General Synod, held at Dayton, 1866, authorized the organization of two additional synods: the one, consisting of the classes of St. Joseph, Indiana, Sheboygan, Heidelberg, and Erie, to be called the *North-western Synod*; and the other, consisting of the classes of Clarion, St. Paul's, West New York, and Westmoreland. The first was organized at Fort Wayne, Ind., May 28, 1867. The organization of the other body is still pending, but will probably be accomplished during the coming year (1870).

For the last ten years measures have been in progress to restore the original title *Reformed Church* by dropping the American prefix *German*. The change has finally been secured by a vote of two thirds of the classes, and only awaits the formal decision of the General Synod.

The Heidelberg Catechism is the symbol of faith, and the only standard of *doctrines*. The book may be said to embody two theological tendencies; the one Melancthonian, the other Calvinistic. We may designate them more correctly, perhaps, by saying that the one tendency, proceeding from faith in the divine-human Saviour, a concrete fact, as the fundamental principle, is christological, sacramental, churchly, and conservative; while the other, presupposing the sovereign will of God as the determining principle of Christianity, is in sympathy with intellectualistic, unsacramental, and unchurchly views, and renders the book susceptible of a construction which is apparently in full harmony with all the logical deductions which flow from the supralapsarian theory. Hence it is that the Catechism could be cordially indorsed by the Synod of Dort, 1618, which wrought out and affirmed with such logical consistency the celebrated Five Points of Calvinism; and that the Reformed (Protestant Dutch) Church, while it receives the Heidelberg Catechism as a correct and excellent exponent of revealed truth, nevertheless holds it only as construed according to the famous decrees of Dort and the Belgic Confession.

The German Reformed Church has never affirmed this supralapsarian element as a ruling principle. We mean the *German*, in distinction from the Swiss Reformed, French, Dutch, Scotch, and other branches of the Reformed Church. In the German branch the

Melanchthonian element has been predominant rather than the Calvinistic, though many of her theologians and ministers, and even Ursinus, one of the authors, interpret the Catechism in accordance with the Calvinistic theory of decrees.

The leading characteristic of the Catechism is the peculiar position which the Apostles' Creed occupies. The Creed is principal. It is not an element co-ordinate with the Decalogue and the Lord's Prayer, but the Decalogue and Lord's Prayer hold a place respectively which is demanded by the idea of the Creed. The Creed underlies and pervades the Catechism like a plastic power, and determines, prevailing, the nature and substance of what must be received as the true faith.

It determines the ruling theory of Christianity as being a new creation rather than a system of revealed doctrines; as being an objective and concrete order of life rather than subjective experience and abstract theory. It determines the relation in which the believer is held to the new creation as being immediate, direct, and personal. Like the earth before the natural eye, so do supernatural objects stand before the eye of the spirit as a reality—a reality which is the possession of the believer.

The Creed also determines the order in which the facts of supernatural revelation are developed. As the Creed, on the one hand, presupposes the fall and misery of man, and, on the other, involves and implies holy living as a necessary consequence of the new life, whilst it embraces only those facts which belong to the positive side of revelation, the Catechism, answering to this order, places the creation and fall of man, sin and depravity, in the first part; conversion, good works, and prayer, as the necessary fruit of the new life, in the third part, under the general head of Thankfulness, taking the Decalogue as the law of good works, and the Lord's Prayer as the model of devotion; whilst the second part gives the positive objective substance of redemption, and consists in setting forth the facts of revelation in the order in which the Creed affirms them; and, in immediate connection therewith, expounds the sacraments and the office of the keys; the sacraments as the means of grace by which, through faith, we have part in the one sacrifice of Christ on the cross, and are fed and nourished unto everlasting life; and the office of the keys as embracing the preaching of the Gospel and Christian discipline, by which two things the kingdom of heaven is opened to believers and shut against unbelievers. Holding this central position, the Creed informs the constitution of the Catechism, projects its peculiar structure, and breathes its animating spirit into the form of instruction. Not that the Catechism realizes the idea of the Creed perfectly at all points; but it acknowledges the original authority of the Creed, and realizes its fundamental characteristics. The Creed thus also holds the Catechism in organic connection with the undoubted faith of the one holy Catholic Church in all the ages of her history up to the apostolic period.

Though the peculiar organizing force of the Creed may not, at all times since the Reformation, or even at the time of its first publication, have been clearly or consciously apprehended, yet this principal element has always been felt, and has always had a correspondent moulding influence whenever and wherever the Catechism has been cordially received, and has, without prejudice and obstruction, been allowed freely to exert its educational power. Whatever is distinctive in the original character, or subsequent history, or the present attitude, as regards doctrine and worship, of the German as compared with other Reformed branches of the Protestant Church, is owing primarily and mainly to this fundamental and distinguishing element of her confession.

It is the peculiar genius of the Heidelberg Catechism

which has given impulse to the profound and comprehensive theological movement by which the Church is now apprehended, and has sustained it with increasing power; a movement that is progressively eliminating two classes of doctrinal views: those which follow logically from the Calvinistic theory of the divine sovereignty, and those which proceed from the Arminian conception of human freedom. Neither the sovereign will of God on the one hand, nor the free will of man on the other, is the principle of salvation; neither God apart from man, nor man apart from God. According to the general idea of the Catechism, this principle is found in a concrete fact, the person of the Redeemer, who, being true God and true man, unites in himself mysteriously the freedom of the human with the sovereignty of the divine will. Being by true faith a member of Christ through the power of the Holy Ghost, a Christian determines himself freely, and is at the same time determined by God, when he lives according to the will of God, actualized in the person and work of Christ.

The most important result, theologically, of the tercentenary celebration, 1863, was the advancing and maturing of a consciousness of this principal element of the Catechism, namely, the organic relation which the Creed bears to its structure and doctrines. For the first time in her American history did the Church formally recognize the Creed, in its proper historical sense, as possessing fundamental authority for the Reformed faith. The tercentenary convention held in Reading, May, 1864, appointed a committee to submit to the (Eastern) synod for adoption certain topics having reference to the theological and religious bearings of the tercentenary jubilee. The report of this committee was presented to the Synod of Lancaster in October of the same year. It sums up the theological and religious results in the following theses:

1. "Our tercentenary jubilee has served a wholesome purpose for renewing for our ecclesiastical consciousness a proper sense of what is comprehended in our confessional title *Reformed*, as related originally to Lutheranism in one direction, and to the Catholic Church of the olden times in another.

2. "It is an argument of sound and right historical feeling in this case, that the beginnings of our Church-life are referred, not simply to the epoch and crisis of the Reformation, but *through* that also to the original form of Christianity as it existed in the first ages.

3. "The true genius and spirit of our Church in this respect is shown by the place which is assigned to the Apostles' Creed in the Heidelberg Catechism, where it is plainly assumed that the Creed, in its proper historical sense, is to be considered of fundamental authority for the Reformed faith.

4. "It is a matter of congratulation that our growing sympathy with the Apostles' Creed is attended with a growing power of appreciation among us also for that christological way of looking at the doctrines of Christianity which has come to characterize all the evangelical theology of Germany in our time, and by which only, it would seem, the objective and subjective (in other words, the churchly and experimental) sides of the Gospel can be brought into true harmony with each other."

These theses were adopted without dissent. They show with what unanimity the mother synod stands, in doctrinal apprehension, upon an *historical and catholic* basis, and protests both against all the sectarian and rationalistic tendencies of Protestantism, and against the errors and corruptions of the Roman and Greek churches.

Taking as a general principle the idea enunciated in these theses, that the Church refers her life not only to the epoch of the Reformation, but through this also to the original form of Christianity as it existed in the first ages, and that the Apostles' Creed is to be considered of fundamental authority for the Reformed faith,

we proceed to state in few words some of the principal doctrinal views which the Palatinate Catechism, thus interpreted, teaches and involves:

1. Adam, created in the image of God, was endowed with capacity to resist temptation and abide in his original state of life-union with God; but he transgressed the command of God by a free act of his own will through the instigation of the devil, the head of the kingdom of darkness.

2. The fall of Adam was not that of an individual only, but the fall of the human race.

3. All men are born with the fallen nature of Adam, and are thus under the power of the kingdom of darkness, inclined to all evil, and unapt to any good; and are subject to the wrath of God, who is terribly displeased with their inborn as well as actual sins, and will punish them in just judgment in time and in eternity.

4. The eternal Son of God, incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, true God and true man in one person, is the principle and substance of the new creation.

5. In the mystery of the Word made flesh, the humanity which the Son of God assumed into organic and eternal union with himself is the most perfect form of supernatural revelation, and the only medium of divine grace.

6. All the acts of Christ are not those of God or of man separately taken, but the acts of the God-man.

7. His baptism, fasting, and temptation; his miracles and his word; his agony, passion, and death; his descent into Hades; his resurrection from the dead, ascension to heaven, and session at the right hand of God; the coming of the Holy Ghost, and his second advent—all derive their significance and saving virtue from the mysterious constitution of his person.

8. The atonement for the sin of man is the reconciliation of God and fallen humanity in the person and work of Jesus Christ. It is not simply the offering of himself on the cross, but the whole process of resuming human nature into life-union with God, and includes both perfect satisfaction to the law by suffering the penalty and all the consequences of sin, and complete victory over the devil. The full benefit of the atonement inures to the believer, because by faith he is a member of Christ and a partaker of his anointing, and thus stands before God in the life and righteousness of Christ.

9. The Church constituted by the coming of the Holy Ghost is the mystical body of Christ, a new, real, and objective order of existence, and is both supernatural and natural, divine and human, heavenly and earthly, the fulness of him that filleth all in all; in whose communion alone there is redemption from sin and all its consequences, fellowship with God in Christ, and the hope of complete victory over death and hell, and of eternal glory. The relation which the new, regenerated humanity, his mystical body, bears to Christ the head, the second Adam, is analogous to the organic relation which the old, fallen, accursed humanity bears to the first Adam.

10. The sacraments are visible, holy signs and seals, wherein God, by an objective transaction, confirms to sinners the promise of the Gospel. They are the means whereby men, through the power of the Holy Ghost, are made partakers of the substance of divine grace, that is, of Christ and all his benefits.

11. Holy baptism is a divine transaction, wherein the subject is washed with the blood and spirit of Christ from all the pollution of his sins as certainly as he is washed outwardly with water; that is, he is renewed by the Holy Ghost, and sanctified to be a member of Christ, that so he may more and more die unto sin, and lead a holy and unblamable life.

12. Baptized persons do not attain unto the resurrection of the dead and eternal life in virtue simply of holy baptism, but only on the condition that, improv-

ing the grace of baptism, they believe from the heart on Christ, die unto sin daily, and lead a holy life, and thus realize the full virtue of the incarnation and atonement.

13. The sacrament of the holy supper is the abiding memorial of the sacrifice of our blessed Saviour Jesus Christ for our sins upon the cross; the seal of his perpetual presence in the Church by the Holy Ghost; the mystical exhibition of his one offering of himself made once, but of force always to put away sin; the pledge of his undying love to his people, and the bond of his living union and fellowship with them to the end of time. In the use of this sacrament believing communicants do not only commemorate his precious death as the one all-sufficient vicarious sacrifice for their sins, but Christ himself also, with his crucified body and shed blood, feeds and nourishes their souls to everlasting life; that is, by this visible sign and pledge he assures them that they are really partakers of his true body and blood, through the working of the Holy Ghost, as they receive by the mouth of the body these holy tokens in remembrance of him.

14. The bread and wine of the holy supper are not transmuted into the very body and very blood of Christ, but continue to be natural bread and wine; nor is the body and blood of Christ consubstantial, that is, in, with, and under the natural bread and wine; but the sacramental transaction is a holy mystery, in which the full life-giving and saving virtue of Christ, mediated through his humanity, is really present by the supernatural power of the Holy Ghost, and communicated to those who, by true faith, eat and drink worthily, discerning the Lord's body.

15. At death the righteous pass into a state of joy and felicity, and abide in rest and peace until they reach their consummation of redemption and bliss in the glorious resurrection of the last day.

16. The second advent of Christ to judge the world in righteousness will complete the objective order of redemption, and also the subjective process of life and salvation in his body, the Church; when the last enemy, which is death, shall be destroyed; when the saints shall come forth from the dead in the full image of their risen Lord, and with him pass into heaven, the state of perfect blessedness; and the wicked shall rise to the resurrection of eternal damnation.

We add a brief summary of doctrine on points not directly included in the foregoing formal statements.

The German Reformed Church *denies* that the will of God or the will of man is the principle of theology; that Christianity is merely a system of doctrine or a rule of moral conduct; that the covenant is only a compact between God and man, or between the Father and the Son; that there is a twofold eternal decree, electing some unto salvation and others unto damnation; that the election of God unto eternal life in Christ becomes effectual outside of the economy of grace; that the humanity of Christ, or the incarnation, is an expedient in order to make an atonement for sin; that the Church is an association of converted individuals; that the Bible is the foundation of the Church; that the relation of the contents of the Bible to the individual is immediate; that the authority of the Church is subordinate to the private judgment of the individual Christian; that the unconverted and ungodly may observe the holy communion; that justification consists in a forensic act of God imputing the righteousness of Christ *ab extra*, or that it is realized by an act of faith in the imputed righteousness of Christ; that the faithful use of the ordinary means of grace is inadequate to the wants of the Church and the world; that the Church of Rome is a *total* apostasy; and that Protestantism has its ground *immediately* in the sacred Scriptures.

On the contrary, the Church *affirms* that the person of Christ is the true principle of sound theology; that Christianity is a new life; that the humanity of Christ

is an essential constituent of Christianity; that the Christian Church is an organic continuation in time and space of the life-powers of the new creation in Christ Jesus; that the covenant is an order or institution of grace, spiritual and real; that the Bible was written by members of the Church under plenary inspiration of the Holy Ghost; that private judgment is subordinate to the general judgment of the Church as expressed particularly in the œcumenical creeds; that the word of God is the only norm of faith and practice, and is superior to all creeds and confessions; that the individual comes to a right apprehension of the contents of the Bible through the teaching of the Church; that the election of grace unto life is effectual in and by the established economy of grace; that justification is by an act of faith in the person and work of Christ, and consists both in the imputation and impartation of Christ and his righteousness; that holy baptism is the sacrament of regeneration, regeneration being the transition from the state of nature to the state of grace, as natural birth is the transition to the natural world; that regeneration, succeeded by conversion and sanctification, completes itself in the resurrection from the dead, inasmuch as regeneration and salvation pertain to the entire man, the body no less than the soul; that believers only hold communion with Christ in the Lord's Supper; that the ordinary, divinely-ordained means of grace are adequate to all the needs of the Church and the world, and, if faithfully used, do not fail to promote a steady and vigorous growth of the Church; that, although the Church of Rome holds many articles of faith, and approves and perpetuates many customs which are not warranted by the Scriptures and are wrong, she is nevertheless a part of the Church of Christ; and that Protestantism is an historical continuation of the Church Catholic, in a new and higher form of faith, organization, and practice.

There is a respectable minority, located chiefly in the West, who dissent from many of the doctrines as given in this statement; a few even resist the whole system of thought as being subversive of the true Reformed faith. Some of them adopt the theory of salvation taught by the Methodist Church, and observe some of her measures and customs. Others hold the Calvinistic theory of decrees, and their teaching conforms to the Presbyterian or Puritan type of religion. But the prevailing faith, as held by the Eastern Synod, is gradually overcoming opposition, and extending; and from year to year the number of ministers and churches is increasing, both West and East, that stand firmly on the historical, churchly, and sacramental basis of the Palatinate Catechism.

As regards *worship*, the Church is in a state of transition. During the present century extemporaneous prayer has prevailed in the regular services of the Lord's day; but this is a departure from the original custom. Originally the worship was liturgical. The Palatinate Liturgy was issued one year after the Palatinate Catechism. It did not, however, like the Catechism, acquire an œcumenical character. Every state or province in Europe where the Reformed Church was established had its own liturgy. In Switzerland there were as many liturgies as Reformed cantons. In Scotland they were in use also for at least a century after the Reformation.

These liturgies contain offices for the regular service of the Lord's day; for the administration of the sacraments; for the ordination of ministers, elders, and deacons; for the solemnization of marriage, burial of the dead, etc.; and contain the creed, the Lord's prayer, confession and absolution, the Gloria in Excelsis, Te Deum, and the Litany and responses, although no one book unites all these elements. They are all a hand-book for the minister rather than an order of worship for the people.

The first ministers in America brought with them

the liturgies of those sections of Germany or Switzerland from which they emigrated. These continued in common use, particularly in the German congregations, though preference was generally given to the Palatinate liturgy, until partially superseded by the book prepared at the direction of the synod by the Rev. Dr. Mayer, and adopted in 1840. This work had no historical basis, and never took root.

General dissatisfaction prevailed with this state of things. The great christological movement deepened the sense of want; and there was an earnest demand for a liturgy answerable in spirit and character to the churchly and sacramental ideas which had been revived in the Church. A liturgical committee was accordingly appointed in 1849. Specific instructions were given in 1852. The book known as the Provisional Liturgy was reported to synod in 1857, and submitted to the churches for *trial*. This liturgy excited a controversy which continued until 1864, when the Eastern Synod, in compliance with an order of the General Synod of Pittsburg, referred the work for revision to a committee consisting of Rev. Drs. Schaff, Nevin, Wolff, Zacharias, Bomberger, Harbaugh, Porter, Fisher, Gerhart, and Apple; and Messrs. John Rodenmayer, George Shafer, George C. Welker, and Louis H. Steiner, M.D. This committee reported a book entitled *An Order of Worship for the Reformed Church* to the Synod of York, 1866. After a long and animated discussion, a resolution was passed by a vote of 53 to 14, authorizing the optional use of the "Order of Worship" within the limits of the Eastern Synod, and referring the book for action to the General Synod, which convened at Dayton, Ohio, Nov. 28, the same year. The General Synod devoted three days to a calm and full discussion of the questions relating to doctrine and cultus, when certain resolutions disappearing the book were lost by a vote of 55 to 66. Thereupon the book was approved "as an order of worship proper to be used in the congregations and families of the Reformed Church" by a vote of 64 to 57. The opposition arose chiefly from ministers and churches in the West. Of the ministers and churches East a very large majority supported the "Order of Worship."

This liturgy is not simply a hand-book for the minister, or a pulpit liturgy, but it is an order in which the people take part with the minister in the worship of God. Less complicated and shorter in many of its offices than the Book of Common Prayer, it unites all the historic elements of liturgical worship on the basis of the apostolic faith and the custom of the primitive Church, modified, however, by the faith, genius, and history of the Reformed Church, and adapted to the needs of the present age.

Though not yet formally adopted, many churches use the Order of Worship in full, many more use it in part, while it is held in high honor by nearly all those who do not yet feel prepared to use all its offices regularly. The book is daily gaining ground, and the probability is that in the course of one or two decades of years liturgical worship will become the established order of all the churches East, and to a large extent also of the churches in the West.

The *government* is Presbyterian. Every congregation is governed by a consistory, which is composed of the pastor, elders, and deacons; no congregation is without either elders or deacons. They are chosen by the communicant members for a term of two, three, or four years, generally only two years, and ordained by the laying on of hands, and installed. When the term expires, the administrative power ceases, but not the office. If re-elected, installation is repeated, but not ordination. The consistory is subject to the classis, which consists of the ministers and an elder from each parish within a given district. The classes are subject to the synod. The synod is a delegated body, and consists of a given number of ministers and elders,

chosen by four or more adjacent classes. The synods are subject to the General Synod. This body consists of ministers and elders chosen by *all the classes* of the Church. It is the highest judicatory, and the last resort in all cases respecting government not finally adjudicated by the synods. Every judicatory has legislative authority within its own sphere; every minister and member possesses the right of appeal from a lower to a higher court.

All the children and youth are carefully catechized by the pastor once in two weeks, or once or twice a week, for a period of from three to nine months in the year, the time being determined by the ability of the pastor. Some pastors, particularly those located in cities and larger towns, have each but one church; but the majority have parishes consisting of from two to four churches, and not a few of from five to eight. Catechumens possessing the requisite qualifications are, after examination in presence of the elders, received into the full communion of the Church by the rite of confirmation. The holy communion is commonly administered twice a year, and in many of the churches four times. The communicants receive the sacred emblems by companies, standing around the altar. In many of the churches it is still customary to administer the communion to the sexes separately; first the men come to the altar, and afterwards the women. But this old German custom is going into disuse. In the English churches men and women approach the altar in company; so also in some of the German churches. Services preparatory to the celebration of the holy communion are held on the Saturday or Friday previous.

The baptism of infants is faithfully and universally observed. Children are presented by their parents. Sponsors are allowed, but the parents themselves must also be present. Baptism may be administered at any time and in any suitable place, but an occasion of public worship in the church is held to be most appropriate.

The principal festivals, Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, and Whit-Sunday, are held in high honor, and observed with much solemnity. The liturgy has revived the idea of the church year. In many congregations, the pulpit teaching and the worship observes the concrete historic movement of revelation from Advent to Trinity Sunday, and from Trinity Sunday to Advent, as set forth in the catholic cycle of Lessons. As the liturgy becomes known and is appreciated, so does the observance of the church year gain favor. Acquiring greater practical power from month to month, it is gradually receiving more general confidence, and being observed in all its parts.

There are connected with the General Synod 4 synods: 1. The Synod of the German Reformed Church in the United States, with 16 classes, 290 ministers, 718 congregations, and 88,603 members; 2. The Synod of Ohio and adjacent States, with 8 classes, 130 ministers, 308 congregations, and 20,069 members; 3. The North-western Synod, with 7 classes, 92 ministers, 166 congregations, and 9811 members; 4. The Pittsburg Synod (in process of formation), which will have about 44 ministers, 126 congregations, and 9240 members. Its statistics are included in synod No. 1 (two thirds) and in synod No. 2 (one third). Total, 31 classes, 512 ministers, 1192 congregations, 118,483 members. Received by confirmation and certificate during the year, 11,337. Aggregate membership, including those who are baptized, but not confirmed, 192,000.

*Institutions of Learning.*—Two theological seminaries. Seminary at Mercersburg, Pa., founded in 1825: four professors, twenty-eight students. Seminary at Tiffin, Ohio; founded at Canton, O., 1838; suspended from the fall of 1839 to 1848; reopened at Columbus, O., Oct., 1848; removed and permanently located at Tiffin, O., 1851: two professors, twenty students. One mission-house, Sheboygan, Wis.: three professors, twenty-two students.

*Two fully-organized colleges*, (1.) Franklin and Marshall, at Lancaster, Pa. Franklin College, founded at Lancaster in 1787; and Marshall College, at Mercersburg, in 1836; Franklin and Marshall consolidated at Lancaster in 1853: seven professors, 116 students, 442 alumni. (2.) Heidelberg College, founded at Tiffin, O., in 1850: five professors, 182 students.

There are, besides, seven classical institutions: Catawba College, Newton, N. C.; Mercersburg College, Mercersburg, Pa.; Palatinate College, Myerstown, Pa.; Westmoreland College, Mount Pleasant, Pa.; Reimersburg Institute, Reimersburg, Pa.; Calvin Institute, Cleveland, O.; and Ursinus College, Montgomery Co., Pa. Mercersburg College is in process of organizing a full college course. It has 4 professors and 124 students. Two female seminaries; one at Allentown, Pa., the other at Tyrconnell, Md.

*Periodicals.*—Two reviews, four weekly papers, and one semi-monthly; one monthly magazine, and three Sunday-school papers.

There are two printing-establishments; one at Philadelphia, Pa., and one at Cleveland, O.

These statistics represent the condition of the German Reformed Church in America in 1869.

*Literature.*—*Mercersburg Review* (Phila. 16 vols.); *Heidelberg Catechism*, by Rev. J. W. Nevin, D.D. (Phila. 1847); *The Life of Rev. Michael Schlatter*, by the Rev. H. Harbaugh, D.D. (1857); *The Fathers of the Reformed Church* (2 vols.), by Rev. Dr. Harbaugh; *The Principle of Protestantism*, by Rev. Philip Schaff, D.D. (1845); *The Mystical Presence*, by Dr. Nevin (1846); *The Liturgical Question*, by Dr. Nevin (1862); *The German Reformed Church*, a monograph by Rev. E. V. Gerhart, D.D. (1863); *Tercentenary Monument* (1863, p. 574); *Der Heidelberger Catechismus*, by Rev. Dr. Schaff (1863); *A History and Criticism of the Ritualistic Movement in the German Reformed Church*, by the Rev. J. H. A. Bomberger, D.D. (1866); *Vindication of the Revised Liturgy*, by Dr. Nevin (1867). Comp. the Heidelberg Catechism in German, Latin, and English, with an historical introduction, prepared and published by the direction of the German Reformed Church in the U. S. of America (tercentenary edition, N. Y., Charles Scribner, 1863, p. 277). Also a Liturgy for the use of the Ger. Ref. Church in the U. S. of America (1858, p. 340); revised under the title *An Order of Worship for the Ref. Ch.* (Phila., S. R. Fisher & Co., 1867, p. 388). See also *Creed and Customs*, by Rev. George B. Russell, A.M. (Phila., S. R. Fisher & Co., p. 420). (E. V. G.)

**German Theology.** See THEOLOGY, GERMAN.

**Germanus**, the name of three patriarchs of Constantinople. (I.) The *first* was transferred from the see of Cyzicus to that of Constantinople in 715, and was a zealous defender of image-worship, for which he was degraded, in a council held at Constantinople in 730. He died in 740, and was anathematized by a council at Constantinople, fourteen years afterwards (754). A treatise of his, *περὶ τῶν ἁγίων οἰκονομικῶν συνόδων*, etc., may be found in H. Justel's *Bibliotheca Canonica*, and in Le Moine, *Varia Sacra*: there also remain some letters and homilies of his (*Bib. Max. Patr.* xvii, xx). His remains are all given in Migne, *Patrologia Græca*, tom. 98. See also Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Græca*, ed. Harles, xi, 155; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacrés* (Paris, 1862), xi, 36 sq.

(II.) Germanus the younger, a monk of the Propontis, who became patriarch in 1222; but as Constantinople was then in the hands of the Latins, he resided at Nicæa, in Bithynia. He corresponded with pope Gregory IX, in hope of bringing about a union between the Eastern and Roman churches, but in vain. He was deposed in 1240, restored again to his see in 1254, and died in 1255. His *Epistles and Homilies* are given by Migne, *Patrologia Græca*, tom. 140.

(III.) Germanus, bishop of Adrianople, became patriarch of Constantinople in 1267. He accepted the

honor with great reluctance, and resigned it in a few months, to retire to a monastery.—Neander, *Ch. Hist.* iii, 203; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, vii, 10; viii, 84; xi, 162; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i, 621; ii, 289; Hoefler, *Nouv. Bibliothèque Générale*, xx, 238.

**Germanus of Auxerre, St.**, one of the most striking figures in the period of the fall of the Roman empire, was born in Auxerre, in Roman Gaul, of illustrious parents, about A. D. 380. He was placed in the best schools of Gaul, and having finished his early education, he went to Rome, to pursue a course of civil law and study eloquence. His merit, and his marriage with a lady of high rank, brought him into notice at the court of the emperor Honorius, and procured for him, besides the government of Auxerre, the office of duke or general of the troops of several provinces. Although a Christian, he was a skillful hunter, and was in the habit of hanging on a large tree, in one of the public squares, the heads of the animals he had killed. This custom bearing some resemblance to pagan superstitions, St. Amatorius, bishop of Auxerre, one day, when the duke was absent, caused the tree to be cut down, and the monuments of his vanity to be removed. Germanus suffered this correction with impatience, and threatened to be revenged, but God ordered it otherwise. Amatorius was advanced in years, and discerning in Germanus such qualities as were calculated to make a great bishop, he convoked in his church an assembly of the faithful, and Germanus being present, he seized on him, and compelled him to assume the ecclesiastical habit, without giving him time to reflect, and informed him that he was to be his successor. On the death of Amatorius, May 1, 418, Germanus was elected bishop by the clergy and people. From that time he was completely changed. He practised his episcopal duties to their fullest extent. The Christians of Great Britain, frightened at the progress of Pelagianism in their island, had applied to pope Celestine and the bishop of Gaul to obtain aid, and they, in an assembly held in 428-9, sent them Germanus, with whom they joined Lupus, bishop of Troyes. Both set off instantly. This mission had great success at the time, but Pelagianism reappeared seventeen or eighteen years afterwards, and Germanus went again with Severus, bishop of Troyes, to extirpate it. To prevent its return, Germanus established schools in Britain, which afterwards became celebrated. He had scarcely arrived again at Auxerre, when the Armoricans entreated him to mediate for them with Evaricus, who had been sent by Ætius to chastise them for an imputed rebellion. Germanus set out immediately, saw the prince of the barbarians, and succeeded in arresting his march. As this affair could not end without the consent of the emperor, Germanus went to Ravenna, where the court was then held: he was received with great honor by Placidia, mother of Valentinian III. This work was the last which the holy bishop undertook. He died in Ravenna, on the 31st of July, 448, after having been thirty years bishop of Auxerre. He is commemorated as a saint on the 31st of July.—Hook, *Ecc. Biog.* v, 303; Smith, *Relig. of Anc. Britain*, p. 168; Neander, *Light in Dark Places*, p. 59-54; Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, July 3.

**Germanus, St.**, of Paris, was born at Autun, A. D. 496; was made deacon 533, presbyter 536, and bishop of Paris 555. He was noted for his strict asceticism, for his great charity to the poor, and especially for his zeal in the purchase and redemption of slaves. He died in 576. There is extant a letter of his to queen Brunehild (*Concil.* tom. v). He was buried in St. Vincent's church, which was burnt by the Normans in 881, and reconstructed in 1163, under the name of St. Germain des Prés. The monks of St. Germain, of the Benedictine rule, have their abbey here. Bouillart, *Benedictine of St. Maur*, published in 1724 a *Histoire de l'abbaye de St. Germain*, in which he gives a life of Germanus. The aristocratic quarter of St. Germain in Paris is named from the abbey and church.—Migne;

Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, May 28; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacrés* (Paris, 1862), xi, 306.

**German Versions of the Holy Scriptures.**  
 1. *Early Versions.*—There is no certain trace of any attempt to translate the Scriptures into the vernacular dialects of the German people previous to the latter half of the 9th century. Though Charlemagne enjoined upon his clergy the study of the Bible and the delivering of expositions of it to the people in the vulgar tongue, there is no evidence for the assertion hazarded by Usher (*De Script. Vernac.* p. 109) and others that German versions of the Bible were made by his order; nor is the statement that a Saxon poet had, by order of his son Lewis, versified the whole Bible (Flacius III. *Catal. Test.* p. 93) better supported. It is to the poetical narratives of the life of our Saviour which appeared after the middle of the 9th century, that the beginnings of Biblical translation among the Germans are to be traced. The *Krist* of Otfried of Weissenburg (in A. D. 860); the *Heliand*, by an unknown author, and perhaps about the same time, are the earliest documents of which anything certain can be said. Of both of these editions have been printed; the best are, of the *Krist*, that by E. G. Graff (Königsb. 1831); and of the *Heliand*, those of J. A. Schmeller, with a glossary (Münch. 1840), and J. R. Köne, with a translation (Münst. 1855). Some fragments of a very ancient translation of Matthew have been published by St. Endlicher and H. Hoffmann, 1834, and by J. F. Massmann, 1841, from a codex in the library at Vienna; the dialect in this version is very rude, and, if not provincial, would seem to point to an earlier date than the 9th century. Versions of the Psalter seem to have been executed in considerable numbers in the 10th century; one of these, by Notker Laabeo, abbot of St. Gall, is given by Schilter (*Thes.* vol. i), and others anonymous are to be found in Graff's *Deutsche Interlinear versionen der Psalmen* (Quad. 1839). A paraphrase of the Song of Songs, in Latin verse and German prose, by William of Ebersberg in Bavaria (cir. 1080), has been edited in Schilter's *Thes.* i, and separately by Merula (Leyd. 1598), Freher (Worms, 1631), and recently, with additional fragments of other parts of Scripture, by Hoffmann (Berl. 1827). This scholar has also edited, in the 2d vol. of his *Fundgraben*, a metrical translation of Genesis and part of Exodus, belonging to the same period or a little later. To the 13th century belongs the chronicle of Rudolf von Hohenems, which is a sort of poetical version of the historical parts of the O. T.; of this many MSS. exist, and an edition has been published, but from a bad text, by Schütze (Hamb. 1779). Several works of a similar kind, in which the Biblical narratives are set forth, sometimes with apocryphal additions, were produced about this time; of these, one, which exists in various dialects and in numerous codices, is a version of the historical parts of Scripture in prose, composed partly from the poetical versions already extant, partly translated from the Vulgate (Massmann, *Die Kaiserchronik*, iii, 54). Formal translations from the Vulgate began now to be multiplied; of these MSS. exist, though the names of the authors have for the most part perished (Reiske, *De Verss. Germ. ante Lutherum*, 1697; Schöber, *Bericht von alten Deutschen geschriebenen Bibeln*, 1763; Rosenmüller, *Hist. Interpr.* v, 174, etc.). Out of these, though by what process we are unable to describe, came the complete version of the Bible in German, which was in the possession of the people before the invention of printing, and of which copies were multiplied to a great extent as soon as that art came into operation. Before 1477 five undated editions, the four earlier at Mayence and Strasburg, as is believed, the fifth at Augsburg, as the book itself attests, had been printed; and between 1477 and 1522, nine editions, seven at Augsburg, one at Nürnberg, and one at Strasburg, were issued. Several editions of the Psalter also appeared, and one of the Gospels, with the



Pericopæ from the Epistles. Collectors tell also of a translation of Ruth by Böschentayn, 1525; of Malachi by Heltzer, 1526; of Hosea by Capito, 1527, and other similar attempts (Kiederer, *Nachrichten II.*, 8vo, sq.). An important place must be also assigned to the translation of the N. T. into Danish by Hans Mikkelsen (Leips. 1524); which, though avowedly "ret efter latinen vdsatthe," bears numerous traces of independence of the Vulgate, and of being made directly from the Greek (Henderson, *Dissertation on Hans Mikkelsen's N. T.*, Copenh. 1813). Of translations into Low German, one was printed at Cologne, 1480; another at Lübeck, 1498; and a third at Halberstadt, 1522.

2. *Luther's Version.*—The appearance of this constitutes an epoch, not only in the history of the Church, but also in that of German literature and of the German people. Luther's version is a permanent monument of the author's ability and indomitable perseverance. Luther had few helps in his arduous work. His exegetical aids were limited to the Septuagint, the Vulgate, a few Latin fathers, the N. T. of Erasmus, and such Hebrew as could be learned from the imperfect elementary books then extant. He had, however, valuable coadjutors in Melancthon, Bugenhagen, Jonas, Aurogallus, and Creuziger, whom he constantly consulted, especially when any difficulty occurred. He had access also to the Rabbinical expositions through some learned Jews. But the main burden of the work rested with himself, and it was to his own resources he had chiefly to trust for success. Of the patient toil he bestowed upon it some idea may be formed from what he himself says of his labors on the book of Job: "On Job, M. Philip, Aurogallus, and I, worked so that sometimes in four days we had hardly succeeded in accomplishing three lines." With what anxious care he sought to perfect his work may be seen from the MS. of the third part of his translation, containing Job, Psalms, and the writings of Solomon, still preserved in the Royal Library at Berlin, written in his own hand, and exhibiting the corrections which he made in the style and expression before sending it to press. Not unfrequently as many as three forms of expression, and sometimes more, occur, between which he hesitated before finally fixing on the one which he would print. He spent on the work in all twelve years. The N. T., completed by him in the Wartburg, appeared in 1522; the five books of Moses (*Das Alte Testament, Deutsch*, th. i) in 1523; the other historical books as far as Esther (*Das A. T. Deutsch*, th. ii) in the close of the same year; Job, Psalms, and the Solomonic writings (*Das A. T.*, th. iii) in 1524; between 1526 and 1531 several of the prophetic writings were issued, and in 1532 appeared the collective body of the Prophets as th. iv of *Das A. T. Deutsch*. The Book of Wisdom was issued in 1529, and the rest of the apocryphal books in 1533 and 1534. The whole Bible was thus completed, and appeared under the title "BIBLIA: d. i. die ganze heilige Schrift. Deutsch, Martin Luther, Wittenberg. Gedruckt durch Hans Luft, 1534," fol. (Pischon, *Die hohe Wichtigkeit der Uebersetz. der II. S. durch Dr. M. Luther*, Berl. 1834). Of this work thirty-eight editions were printed in Germany before 1580, besides seventy-two of the N. T., and innumerable reprints of other smaller portions (Panzer, p. 336).

3. *Zürich Bible.*—This is a combination of Luther's translation of the other books with a new translation of the prophetic writings by Con. Pellican, Leo Judä, Theod. Bibliander, etc. It appeared in 1524, and was reprinted in 1527, and twice in 1530. In 1531 another edition appeared, with a new translation of the poetical books (Panzer, p. 260). The *Worms Bible*, 1529, is a work of the same kind as the Zürich Bible.

4. *Versions from Luther's Bible in the other Teutonic Dialects.*—1. *Low German*, by J. Hoddersen, 1533 and often; 2. *Danish*, N. T., 1524, Bible, 1550: this is found also in Hutter's Polyglot; 3. *Swedish*, N. T., 1526, by Laurentius Andreä, Bible, 1541, by Laurent. and Olaus

Petri; 4. *Icelandic*, N. T. 1540, Bible 1584, by Gudd. Thorlakson, bishop of Holm; 5. *Dutch*, N. T. 1526, Antw., printed by Liesvelt, whence this is called the Liesvelt N. T.; the whole Bible was translated anew after Luther into Dutch by Ad. Vischer in 1648, and this is the existing authorized version for the Dutch Lutherans; 6. *Pomeranian*, 1588.

5. *Versions of the Reformed Church.*—Of these the first was the production of David Pareus, and appeared in 1579. It was superseded by that of J. Piscator in 1602, of which many editions have appeared. A translation of the N. T., by Amandus Polanus, appeared in 1603. In 1665 a new translation for the use of the Swiss churches appeared at Zürich, the authors of which were Hottinger, Suicer, Füßlin, and others. In Holland various attempts were made to produce versions direct from the originals. In 1556 J. Uitenhoven issued the N. T., and in 1562 the whole Bible; and in 1587 appeared the Bible translated by J. Hackius, which chiefly follows the Geneva [French] Bible.

6. *Authorized Versions.*—In the year 1618 the Synod of Dort appointed a commission of 22 members to prepare a new version; this appeared in 1637, and received the authorization of the States General. This is the authorized Dutch version. The Danish version was completed in 1607 by P. J. Resen, and in 1647 appeared with the royal sanction, after it had been carefully revised by Hans Svaning, archbishop of Zealand. The Icelandic version received its permanent form in 1644 from Thorlak Skuleson, the grandson of Thorlakson, and his successor in the episcopate. The authorized Swedish version was completed under the auspices of Gustavus III.; it consists of a revised edition of the work of Andreä and Petri, and appeared in 1618.

7. *Roman Catholic Versions.*—The earliest of these is the N. T. of Emser, "nach lawt der christliche Kirchen bewerten Text," etc., sine loc. 1527, fol., Leipz. 1529, 8vo, and often since. In 1534 the Bible of Dietsenberger (q. v.) appeared at Mayence; and in 1537, that of Eck (q. v.) at Ingolstadt. Previous to these, Casper Ulenberg had translated the Bible in accordance with the Sixtine text of the Vulgate, and this translation, revised by the Jesuits at Mayence in 1661, appeared as *Die Catholische Bibel*. Revised editions were issued by Ehrhard in 1722, and by Cartier in 1751; and it has been often reprinted both with and without the Latin text. More recent versions by Roman Catholics are those of Salzmann (Lux. 1770), Wittola (Vien. 1775), Weitenauer (Augs. 1777), Fleischutz (Fuld. 1778), Rosalino (Vien. 1781), Fischer (Prag. 1784), Braun (Vienna, 1786), Lauber (1786), Mutschelle (Munich, 1789), Weyl (May, 1789), Krach (Aug. 1790), Brentano, Dereser, and Scholz (1790-1833), Baber (1805), Van Ess (1807), Schnappfinger (1807), Widemann (1809), Kistemaker (1825), Scholz (1828), Allioli (1838), Loch and Reischl (1857). Of these, the majority are confined to the N. T. The translations of Van Ess, Scholz, and Allioli have been repeatedly issued. Gossner, pastor of the Bohemian Church in Berlin, published a translation of the N. T. from the Greek in 1815, which has often been reprinted.

8. *Other Versions.*—In 1630 J. Creil issued a German translation of the Bible in the interests of Socinianism; and in 1660 another, in the interests of Arminianism, was published by Jer. Felbinger. The Remonstrant party in Holland published a translation in Dutch, made by Chr. Hartsoecker, in 1680. In 1666 a Jewish translation of the O. T. into German was published by Joseph Athias; this, along with the versions of Luther, Piscator, Caspar Ulenberg, the Dutch A. V., and a version of the N. T. by J. H. Reitzen, printed in parallel columns, was published under the title of *Biblia Pentapla* (3 vols. 4to, Hamb. 1711). Of German versions of more recent date there are many. Those of Triller (1703), Reiz (1712), Junkherrot (1732), Heumann (1748), Bengel (1753), Michaelis (1769-85), Sillig (1778), Seiler (1783), Stolz (1795), the Berleburg

Bible (1726, etc.), belong to the Lutheran Church; those of Grynaeus (3 vols. 8vo, Basle, 1776), and Voegelin (Zürich, 1781) to the Reformed. Belonging to the present century are the translations of Preiss (1811), Schäfer (1816), Meyer (1829), [Richter and Pleissner] (1830), Böckel (1832), Alt (1837), Von der Heyd (1852), chiefly of the N. T. only. But all these yield in importance to the work of De Wette, prepared originally in conjunction with Augusti (6 vols., Heidelb. 1809-14), subsequently wholly by himself (3 vols., 1831-33, 4th ed. 1858). The Jewish version by Arnheim, Fürst, and Sachs, under the editorship of Zunz (Berlin, 1838), is also deserving of notice. Finally we notice the careful translations in Phillippon's *Israëlitische Bibel* (1858) and Bansen's *Bibelwerk* (1858 sq.).—Kitto, s. v.

**Germany.** I. *Ancient Religion of.*—The information we now possess concerning the religion of the tribes of *Germania Magna*, such as the Alemans, Saxons, Franks, etc., is very incomplete and disconnected. The Greek and Latin authors mention the names of but a few deities, who seem to have been to some extent similar in their attributes to their own gods. The Christian writers also mention them only in so far as is necessary for their purpose, and their views are naturally colored with their own opinions. The Scandinavian mythology must originally have been very closely connected with that of Germany; but we can get no light from that quarter, as we do not know the early period of the former. It is clear that at an early period the Celtic element was infused in the Aleman and the Frank, while among the northern tribes, the Slavonic, Lithuanic, and Finnic myths were introduced; while a tendency towards the Greek worship is also perceptible. As for the *vicinities* of the ancient Germans, Cæsar states that they worshipped only such as visibly exerted a decided influence over events; he particularly mentions three: the Sun, Vulcan, and the Moon. The domestic divinities were: *Wuotan* (Woden), the supreme god, and his wife *Freia*, the goddess of the household and of marriage; *Zio*, the god of war; *Fro*, who watched over the crops, and his wife *Frouwa*; afterwards came *Ihol* or *Paltar* (the Balder of the north), *Fosite*, and *Thunar* (Donar), god of the clouds and storms. The progenitor of the human race was *Tuisco*, who combined the attributes of the Greek Uranos and Zeus, and whose son Mannus is identical with the subsequent *Irmin*, or the Greek Hercules. Among the special divinities of different tribes were *Nerthus* (commonly *Iertho*), goddess of fertility and the chase; the *Aeces*, two brothers (a sort of Castor and Pollux); *Costra*, in Saxony, etc. Other goddesses appear to have been merely aliases of these: thus *Iludana* and *Eisa* were identical with *Freia*, etc. Among the inferior divinities (demons) were the *Riesen* (giants), physically resembling men, who were supposed to belong to a former period of creation, and dwelt in the mountains, where they erected gigantic fortifications, and defended themselves against intruders with stones and rocks. In direct contrast from these were the *Zwerge* (pigmyes), who appeared among men on special occasions, sometimes to impart gifts and blessings to them, at other times to do them evil and frustrate their plans. There were also *Bergegeister* (spirits of the mountains), called also *Elbe* or *Elfen* (elves); *Waldgeister* (spirits of the forests), especially the Wild Hunter, Schratz; and *Wassergeister* (spirits of the waters), or Nixen. There were also a quantity of lares, or favorable household gods of an inferior degree, while tormenting genii haunted the houses and their neighborhoods at night, disturbing slumberers and throwing stones at passers-by. Horses and bulls were considered sacred, and bears, wolves, and foxes were objects of respectful awe. The gods and goddesses often took the form of birds, and among these the eagle, raven, and woodpecker were regarded with the highest veneration. The cuckoo was supposed to possess the gift of prophecy. Serpents also were wor-

shipped, and the fear they inspired gave rise to the fable of the dragon. The cosmogony of Germany seems to have greatly varied with the times and in the different tribes; the general belief was that the gods originated out of chaos, created the world, and governed it. Belief in continued existence after death was shown by the idea of the great city of the dead, *Walhalla*. The mode of worship was very simple, if compared with that of the Greeks and Romans, or even of the Celts. The temples were not generally structures made by men, but often trees or groves which the deity was supposed to inhabit, revealing himself in the rustling of the leaves. Some of the gods dwelt in the mountains, caves, or streams. Yet there were also regular temples, of which vestiges are yet found, and which contained images of the gods; for, although Cæsar and Tacitus deny their existence, there is oft mention made in the early times of Christianity of the destruction of idols in Germany [see *IRMENSUL*], and images of the sun and the moon have been found (though these may also have belonged to Celtic or Slavonic tribes). The holy places were mountains or rocks; e. g. the *Blockberg*, the chain of mountains between Silesia and Bohemia, etc. The woods and trees, especially the oak, beech, and linden-tree, were objects of particular veneration. Unbelievers were not allowed to touch them, or to enter the groves. The worship consisted in prayer to the gods; the sacrifices were either propitiatory or thank-offerings; they also took place before consulting the omens, going to war, electing a king, or on any other special occasion. These sacrifices consisted generally in horses, bulls, goats, etc., and even human beings. The color of the animal was generally white. Besides this, on all festive occasions, a portion of the feast was offered to the household gods, and laid before their shrine. No mention is made of the general feasts of the Germans in the earlier times, yet it is considered likely that they had at least as principal ones the *Juel*, *Easter*, and the *Summer* feasts. The priests took part in legislation and the wars as well as in worship, and in war they carried the sacred images or symbols against the enemy. In the household the head of the family could act as its priest. Chosen women, called *Abrunes*, consecrated the horses, and prophesied by consulting the omens at the sacrifices. See Schedius, *De diis germanis* (Amst. 1648); G. Schütz, *Exercitationes ad Germaniam sacram gentilem facientes* (Lpz. 1748); Möser, *De vet. Germanorum et Gallorum theologia* (1749); Meyer, *Erörterung d. ehemaligen Religionswesens d. Deutschen* (Lpz. 1756); Hermann, *De prioribus Dei cultu naturalium veterum Germanorum* (Baireuth, 1761); Siebenkees, *Von der Religion der alten Deutschen* (Altdorf, 1771); Reinhold, *Beiträge einer Mythologie der alten D. Götter* (Münst. 1791); Loos, *D. Götterlehre der alt. Deutschen* (Col. 1804); Scheller, *Mythologie d. nordischen u. deutschen Völker* (Regens. 1816); Braum, *Der relig. der alt. Deutschen* (Mainz, 1819); Mone, *Gesch. d. Heidenthums im nordischen Europa* (Lpz. 1819-23, 2 vols.); Bönisch, *D. Götter Deutschlands* (Kamenz, 1830); Legis, *Handbuch d. altdeutschen u. nordisch. Götterlehre* (Lpz. 1831); Barth, *Altdeutsche Religion* (Leipzig, 1832); J. Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie* (Götting, 1835; 2d ed. 1844); Simrock, *Handbuch der D. Mythologie* (Munich, 1844-55, 2 vols.); J. W. Wolf, *Zeitschrift für D. Myth. u. Sittenkunde* (Gött. 1853-55, 2 vols.). (J. N. P.)

II. *History of Christianity in Germany.*—As some of the German tribes were under the rule of the Romans at the beginning of the Christian æra, Christianity became known to the Germans at a very early date. Some of the episcopal sees, as Cologne, even claim to have had disciples of the apostles as their first bishops. Peter is said (Baron. ad ann. 46) to have ordained the bishops Eucharius, Egistus, and Marcius for Germany. In 314, when the Council of Arles was held, we have trustworthy information of a bishopric in Cologne. In the south of Germany, on the other hand,

we find the first Christians at Augusta Vindelicorum (Augsburg), in Rhœtia, into which Christianity was introduced by the bishop Narcissus, in the time of Dioclesian (284-305). In the following centuries the number of bishoprics in Western Germany gradually increased, and at the beginning of the 6th century we find subject to the jurisdiction of the metropolitan of Treves, bishops at Cologne, Mentz, Martigny, Worms, Spire, besides a number of others whose sees now belong to France or Switzerland. Next to south-western Germany, it was the south-east in which Christianity made the greatest progress. At the beginning of the 7th century there were in the two Noricums, or modern Bavaria and Austria, proportionally almost as many Christian churches as in the other countries of the ancient Western empire, and Bavaria, in particular, became an entirely Christian state. Even before this time many of the German tribes which had invaded and conquered the western provinces of the Roman empire had either become Christian or were inclined to be so. The Goths received the first announcement of Christianity from prisoners taken in war, and a Gothic metropolitan had a seat in the Synod of Nicæa. Among the West Gothic princes, Frigiter was favorable to Christianity, but Athanarich cruelly persecuted it. When the Western Goths, conquered by the Huns, had to seek refuge in the Roman empire, they had to consent to be baptized. The form of Christianity which they then received from the emperor Valens was Arian. Other German tribes, like the Eastern Goths and the Vandals, likewise became Christians of the Arian faith, which was carried by the German conquerors into Spain, Italy, and Northern Africa. To an Arian bishop of the West Goths, Ulilas, Germany is indebted for the first German version of the Bible. The conversion of Clovis, the king of the Franks, to the Catholic Church, gave to the German tribes who had left the fatherland the first orthodox king; and the success of the Franks in their wars with the Arian kings, in which they were aided not a little by the Catholic subjects of the latter, soon led to the destruction of Arianism as a national religion in the Germanic world. Under the influence of the Franks, in the beginning of the 8th century, the Catholic Church pressed forward as far as the Saale and the Elbe, but it was under no ecclesiastical regulations, and was much corrupted by paganism. British monks carried the Gospel as far as the Main, and among the Alemanni, but they had no connection with Rome. See COLUMBANUS; GALL. Winfred, the Anglo-Saxon monk, better known under the name of Boniface (q. v.), was sent from Rome to undertake the conversion of Germany, and finally became the apostle of the Germans, and the founder of the German Church. He made the German Church dependent upon Rome, and, in consequence of the plenary powers given him by the Roman see, was looked upon as the general bishop of Germany. The last serious struggle in defence of German paganism was made by the Saxons; but, finally acknowledging their inability to resist Charlemagne, they resolved to adopt the religion of the conquerors, and become one nation with the Franks. The Christianization of Eastern Germany, which at that time was chiefly inhabited by Slavic tribes, was not completed until the 13th century.

When the Roman empire had been revived in the German nation by the Othos, the emperor was regarded as the political head of Christendom in the West, and the holy empire as a divine institution. The old legal principle that God has divided all power on earth between the emperor and the pope was frequently construed in Germany so as to mean that the emperor carried the secular sword as a feudal investiture from the pope. The efforts of mediæval popes to enlarge the papal power at the expense of the imperial, and even to establish the absolute superiority of the pope over all secular power and the whole world, led to continual

Wars between the emperors and the popes. The popes entirely failed to carry through their theocratic idea; but the authority of the emperors of Germany, as the first among the Christian rulers, likewise steadily declined.

In the 16th century Germany was the birthplace of the great reformation of the Church, which substituted the Lutheran and Reformed churches for that of Rome not only in a large portion of Germany, but in a number of other European countries. It seemed at one time probable that the whole of the German empire might be gained for the Reformation; but, after many wars, one of which, the Thirty Years' War, was one of the fiercest and longest religious wars on record, the activity of the Jesuits and the courts of Austria and Bavaria saved a large portion of Germany, especially in South Germany, for the old Church.

The old German empire was dissolved in 1806. In 1815 the German Confederation was established as a league of independent states. Another great change in the constitution of the German nation was effected by the war of 1866, which united most of the German states into the North-German Confederation, under the leadership of Prussia, while Austria was wholly excluded from Germany. Bavaria, Würtemberg, Baden, and part of Hesse-Darmstadt were recognised as independent South-German states. The Grand-duchy of Luxemburg was also released from all connection with Germany, and remained a semi-independent state, under the rule of the king of Holland. The little principality of Lichtenstein, in South Germany, was totally ignored at this reconstruction of Germany, and likewise formed henceforth an independent state. Our *Cyclopædia* devotes a special article to Austria, Prussia, and each of the smaller German states, in which a full statement of their Church history and ecclesiastical statistics is given.

In 1868, the number of Protestants, Roman Catholics, and Jews in the North-German Confederation and the South-German states was about as follows:

	Protestants.	Rom. Cath.	Jews.
North German Confederation.	20,682,000	7,875,000	349,200
South German States . . . . .	3,351,000	4,925,000	133,000
Total . . . . .	24,033,000	12,810,000	473,200

See Hausz, *Germania Sacra* (2 vols. Augsburg; 3d vol. Vienna, 1755); Holl, *Statistica Eccles. German.* (Manheim, 1788, 2 vols.); *Germania sacra* (St. Blasien, 1794 and 1797, 2 vols.); Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* (Götting, 1846; thus [1869] far 3 vols.); Friedrich, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* (Bamberg, 1867, vol. i; 1868, vol. ii). (A. J. S.)

**Gerobulus**, JOHANNES, a clergyman of the Reformed Church of Holland, was born at Utrecht. He was settled successively at Delft, Emden, Vlissingen, Ghent, Harlingen, Deventer, Harderwyk, and Utrecht. He died at Utrecht Feb. 14, 1606. He translated into Latin the East Friesland Catechism, and also wrote a defence of the Heidelberg Catechism against Dirk Volkertsz. Coornbert, a translation of Beza's Paraphrase of the Psalms, Advice to the Sick, and an Account of the Reformed Church in Utrecht. (J. P. W.)

**Geroch.** See GEROCII.

**Gerōda**, a place mentioned in the *Antonine Tables*, possibly the modern *Jerdul*, a large village on the great caravan road from Damascus to Palmyra (Porter, *Damascus*, i, 371).—Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 314.

**Gerthe'nian** (only in the plural, Γερθηναῖοι v. r. Γερθηνοί, Vulg. *Gerreni*), apparently the designation of the inhabitants of a town, which is named in 2 Macc. xiii, 24 only as one limit (ἕως τῶν Γ.) of the district committed by Antiochus Eupator to the government of Judas Maccabæus, the other limit being Ptolemais (Accho). To judge by the similar expression in defining the extent of Simon's government in 1 Macc. xi, 59, the specification has reference to the sea-coast

of Palestine, and, from the nature of the case, the Gerhonian, wherever they were, must have been south of Ptolemais. Grotius seems to have been the first to suggest that the town *Gerrhon* or *Gerrha* (Γέρρων, Ptolemy, iv, 5, p. 103; *Gerro*, Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* vi, 29; Γέρρα, Strabo, xvi, p. 760; Γέρα, Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* viii, 19) was intended, which lay between Pelusium and Rhinocolura (wady el-Arish). It has been pointed out by Ewald (*Geschichte*, iv, 365, note) that the coast as far north as the latter place was at that time in possession of Egypt, and he therefore conjectures that the inhabitants of the ancient city of GERAR, southeast of Gaza, the residence of Abraham and Isaac, are meant. In support of this, Grimm (*Kurzg. Hannöb.* ad loc.) mentions that at least one MS. reads Γεραρρών, which would without difficulty be corrupted to Γέρρων. The Syriac version (early, and entitled to much respect) has *Gozor*, by which may be intended either (a) the ancient GEZER, which was near the sea—somewhere about Joppa; or (b) GAZA, which appears sometimes to take that form in these books. But these are evidently conjectural emendations of the text; and the objection of Ewald is sufficiently met by observing that the place in question was not included in the Maccabean province of Judas, any more than Egypt of the parallel passages (1 Macc. xi, 59; Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 5, 4).—Smith, s. v.; Kitto, s. v. See MACCABEUS, JUDAS.

**Ger'shom** (Heb. *Gershomi'*, גֶרְשׁוֹם [in Chron. usually גֶרְשׁוֹם], *expulsion* [see GERSTON], an etymology alluded to in Exod. ii, 22, where there is a play upon the word, as if written גֶרְשׁוֹם, or *Ger-Sham*, q. d. a sojourner there; in which passage the Sept. preserves the form Γηροσάμ [comp. Josephus, Γηροσός = ἰαλεκτος, *Ant.* ii, 13, 1], but elsewhere Græcizes Γηροσάμ or Γηροσών), the name of three or four Levites.

1. The oldest son of Levi (1 Chron. vi, 16, 17, 20, 43 [in the Heb.], 62, 71; xv, 7), elsewhere distinctively written GERSUON (q. v.).

2. The elder of the two sons (the second being Eliezer) who were born to Moses in the land of Midian by Zipporah (Exod. ii, 22; xviii, 4). B.C. 1698. These sons of the great lawgiver held no other rank than that of simple Levites, while the sons of their uncle Aaron enjoyed all the privileges of the priesthood (1 Chron. xxiii, 1, 5, 16; xxvi, 24), a proof of the rare disinterestedness of Moses. Shubael, one of his descendants, was appointed ruler (שֹׁבְאֵל) of the treasury under David (1 Chron. xxvi, 24-28).

3. The son of one Manasseh (according to the text) and father of Jonathan, which last acted as priest to the Danites who captured Laish (Judg. xviii, 30); but, according to a more correct reading, he is not different from the son of Moses. See JONATHAN. The Talmud explains the substitution of "Manasseh" for "Moses" in the text by asserting that Jonathan did the works of Manasseh, and was therefore reckoned in his family (*Baba Bathra*, fol. 109, b). See MANASSEH.

4. A descendant of Phinehas, and chief of his house, who returned from Babylon with Ezra (Ezra viii, 2), B.C. 459.

**Ger'shon** (Heb. *Gershon'*, גֶרְשׁוֹן, *expulsion*, from גֶרְשׁוֹן, to drive out; Sept. in Gen. Γηροσών, elsewhere [and usually there also in the Cod. Alex.] Γέρσον; Joseph. *Γηροσώνης*, *Ant.* ii, 7, 4), the eldest of the three sons of Levi, apparently born before the migration of Jacob's family into Egypt (Gen. xli, 11; Exod. vi, 16). B.C. cir. 1895. But though the eldest born, the families of Gershon were outstripped in fame by their younger brethren of Kohath, from whom sprang Moses and the priestly line of Aaron (see 1 Chron. vi, 2-15). Ger'shon's sons were Libni and Shimi (Exod. vi, 17; Numb. iii, 18, 21; 1 Chron. vi, 17), and their families were duly recognised in the reign of David, when the per-

manent arrangements for the service of Jehovah were made (1 Chron. xxiii, 7-11). At this time Gershon was represented by the famous Asaph "the seer," whose genealogy is given in 1 Chron. vi, 39-43, and also, in part, 20, 21. The family is mentioned once again as taking part in the reforms of king Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxix, 12, where it should be observed that the sons of Asaph are reckoned as distinct from the Gershonites). At the census in the wilderness of Sinai the whole number of the males of the Bene-Gershon was 7500 (Numb. iii, 22), midway between the Kohathites and the Merarites. At the same date the efficient men were 2630 (iv, 40). On the occasion of the second census the numbers of the Levites are given only in gross (Numb. xxvi, 62). The sons of Gershon had charge of the fabrics of the tabernacle—the coverings, curtains, hangings, and cords (Numb. iii, 25, 26; iv, 25, 26); for the transport of these they had two covered wagons and four oxen (vii, 3, 7). In the encampment their station was behind (אֲחֵרִים) the tabernacle, on the west side (Numb. iii, 23). When on the march they went with the Merarites in the rear of the first body of three tribes—Judah, Issachar, Zebulun—with Reuben behind them. In the apportionment of the Levitical cities, thirteen fell to the lot of the Gershonites. These were in the northern tribes—two in Manasseh beyond Jordan, four in Issachar, four in Asher, and three in Naphtali. All of these are said to have possessed "suburbs," and two were cities of refuge (Josh. xxi, 27-33; 1 Chron. vi, 62, 71-86). It is not easy to see what special duties fell to the lot of the Gershonites in the service of the tabernacle after its erection at Jerusalem, or in the Temple. The sons of Jeduthun "prophesied with a harp," and the sons of Heman "lifted up the horn," but for the sons of Asaph no instrument is mentioned (1 Chron. xxv, 1-5). They were appointed to "prophesy" (that is, probably, to utter, or sing, inspired words, נִצְּנִים), perhaps after the special prompting of David himself (xxv, 2). Others of the Gershonites, sons of Laadan, had charge of the "treasures of the house of God, and over the treasures of the holy things" (xxvi, 20-22), among which precious stones are specially named (xxix, 8).

In Chronicles the name is, with two exceptions (1 Chron. vi, 1; xxiii, 6), given in the slightly different form of "Gershom."—Smith, s. v. See GERSHONITE.

**Ger'shonite** (Heb. *Gershunai'*, גֶרְשׁוֹנִים, Sept. Γερόσωνί, but often simply like *Gershon*, and so A.V. often "son of Gershon"), a designation, usually in the plur., of the descendants of GERSUON, one of the sons of Levi (Numb. iii, 21; iv, 24, 27; Josh. xxi, 33; 1 Chron. xxiii, 7; 2 Chron. xxix, 12). Their office, during the marches in the wilderness, was to carry the veils and curtains belonging to the tabernacle, on the western side of which they encamped (Numb. iii, 23-26; xxvi, 57). In the singular the term is applied to Laadan (1 Chron. xxvi, 21) and Jehiel (1 Chron. xxix, 8).

**Ger'son** (Γηροσών), the Greek form (1 Esdr. viii, 29) of the name GERSTON (q. v.).

**GERSON**, JEAN CHARLIER (*Doctor Christianissimus*), one of the greatest names in the history of France and of the Gallican Church. He was named Gerson from a village in the diocese of Rheims, where he was born, Dec. 14, 1363. He entered the college of Navarre in 1377, and passed through all the degrees. He then studied theology seven years under the grand master Pierre d'Ailly, whom he succeeded as chancellor of the university and prebendary of Notre Dame in 1396. Here he strenuously devoted himself to improving the course of theological study, on which his views may be seen in a letter to D'Ailly, dated April 1, 1400, *De reformatione Theologie* (*Opera*, vol. i). But the difficulties of his position were very great. The university was in disorder; the state was torn by contending

factions; the Church was divided by the great papal schism which began in 1378, when Urban VI was elected pope at Rome, and Clement VII at Avignon. Gerson found so much opposition in his efforts to reform theology, and to bring peace to the Church, that he decided to retire from Paris to the quiet charge of the cathedral at Bruges, a preferment given to him by Philip of Burgundy. At last he gave up this purpose, and gave up, with it, the tranquillity of his whole life. Gerson was more than once deputed to the popes during the schism. In a memoir, *De unitate ecclesiastica*, he defended the Council of Pisa (q. v.), and conducted himself in a firm though prudent manner when the council proceeded to depose Gregory XII and Benedict XIII, and to elect Alexander V. It was during the sitting of this council that he published his famous treatise *De auferibilitate Pape*, to prove that there are cases in which the assembled Church may command two rivals to desist from their strife, and has a right to depose them if they refuse, for the sake of peace and unity. The Council of Constance (q. v.) opened a new field for his talent; he took a place there as ambassador from king Charles VI, from the Church of France, and from the University of Paris, and he directed all the measures which were adopted respecting John XXIII, who had succeeded Alexander V, and whose licentious conduct had tended rather to increase than to allay the schism. In this council Gerson and D'Ailly were the chief leaders in the so-called reforming party. The discourses which Gerson on various occasions pronounced during the council, and the treatises which he published, were intended principally to show that the Church may reform itself, as well in its governors as in its members; and that it has the power of assembling, *without the consent of the pope*, when he refuses to convoke it; to prove the necessity of holding councils, as well general as special; to prescribe the payment of first-fruits, and to extirpate simony, which had become very common. He had established, as the basis of the decrees of the council, the doctrine of the supremacy of the Church in all which concerns faith and morals, and on this subject a discourse on the Immaculate Conception has been ascribed to him, but which was, in fact, pronounced at the Council of Basle after his death. It was principally through his efforts that the council "declared itself independent of all popes, and superior to them." The piety of Gerson, though strong and zealous, was neither superstitious nor credulous; he denounced, in his treatise *Contra sectam Flagellantium*, the abuse made of flagellation, of which Vincent Ferrier was the advocate. He also composed a book, *De probatione spirituum*, in which he gave rules for distinguishing false revelations from true ones. The pretended visions of St. Bridget would have been condemned at his instigation had they not found an apologist in the cardinal Torquemada; and though his theology was professedly mystical as opposed to scholasticism, he opposed the theories of John Rusbroeck, of the passive union of the soul in the Deity, which is similar to the pure love of the Quietists. He also wrote against D'Ailly on judicial astrology, which was then in high repute among the princes of Europe, and which he combated with great success, even in his old age, against the physicians of Lyons and Montpellier. Before that time, his treatise on this subject, *De astrologia reformata*, had procured for him the praise of the learned bishop of Cambrai. In another treatise, *De erroribus circa artem magicam*, he attacks the superstitious errors of magic and the prejudices of the empirics. With regard to toleration, Gerson was involved in all the errors of his times. At the trial of John Huss (q. v.), his writings and speeches contributed greatly to the condemnation of that eminent reformer, who was burnt by order of the Council of Constance, July 6, 1415. He took a similar share in the prosecution of Jerome of Prague (martyred May 30, 1416). "Cut off," said he, in a letter to the arch-

bishop of Prague, "the heresies, with their authors, and burn them." He called this terrible punishment a "merciful cruelty." Gerson's hopes for a reform of the Church at the Council of Constance were bitterly disappointed. The election of Martin V (Nov. 11, 1417) put an end to all hope of reform, and Gerson retired, fatigued and discouraged, from the scene of sterile disputes. He had contributed by his writings to the revocation of a bull of Alexander V in favor of the preaching friars, against the privileges of the clergy and of the universities. Gerson's zeal raised against him many enemies, and the fear of the dangers to which he would be exposed from the Burgundian faction induced him to take refuge in Germany, disguised as a pilgrim, about the time of the last sittings of the Council of Constance. In Bavaria he composed his *De Consolatione Theologicæ*, a mixture of prose and verse, containing an apology for his conduct at the Council of Constance. Soon after he retired into Austria, where the duke offered him an asylum at Vienna. In 1419 he returned to France, and took up his abode at the monastery of the Celestines at Lyons, of which his brother was prior. Here he spent his remaining years in catechising poor children, of whom he required no other reward than their simple prayer, "Lord, have mercy on thy poor servant Gerson." He died July 12, 1429.

We now state briefly the relations of Gerson to the Church, to theology, and to philosophy. (1.) As to the Church, his whole life was spent in mourning over its abuses and corruptions, and in struggles for reformation. Full of respect for the papacy, which he considered necessary to the existence of the Church, he nevertheless opposed both its spiritual and temporal encroachments. He looked upon the dogma of the infallibility and consequent inviolability of the popes as a remnant of superstition which could not be extirpated too soon. To the whole mass of the faithful, assembled in general council, he attributed alone infallibility, the power of binding and loosing, the right of deciding, without appeal, all matters pertaining to faith and discipline, and that of judging the pope himself, whom his high position does not render *impeccable*. "Let the ecclesiastical power," said he, "so restrict itself within its natural limits as to remember that secular authority, even among the heathen, has its distinct rights, its laws, its verdicts, on which the spiritual power must guard from encroaching, lest the secular power might also encroach on the faith and lawful rights of the Church." By his settled doctrine of the relation existing between the papacy and the general councils on the one hand, and between the spiritual authority and the temporal power on the other, Gerson may be considered as one of the originators of Gallicanism (q. v.), and the forerunner of Bossuet (q. v.). The spirit of the famous "four propositions" of 1682 breathes in every page of the writings of the chancellor of the university. (2.) There are two elements to be distinguished in Gerson's *philosophy*: the outward scholastic element, with its pedantic divisions and subtle distinctions, and the mystical element, which lifted his soul, thirsting for God, above the dry forms of the schools into the superior sphere of ineffable love. Gerson distinguishes in the nature of the soul a double set of faculties, whose highest degree is the simple understanding, and whose highest effort is the instructive perception of spiritual truths; and the affective faculties, which, in their highest flights, attain to a state of ecstatic enjoyment, whose proper object is God. (3.) His theology is that of love. Faith and penitence are the wings on which divine love rises and attains to the possession of the Infinite Being. This possession is naturally imperfect: here below none can see God face to face, "for there shall no man see it and live;" but it produces peace in the heart; the ignorant and the lowly can attain to it, and it is much superior to that which results from speculative theories, with their at-

tending abstractions and syllogism, and the uncertainty and the agonizing doubts which often accompany them. Gerson's is a mild form of mysticism, based on the nicest analysis: it does not lead to the absorption of the personality into the bosom of the Infinite Being, nor exclude the normal exercise of the function of the intellect and volition. Gerson was a determined enemy of scholasticism. He signalized, as the origin of all the evils of theology, that vain curiosity which leads to the disregard of the most reliable authorities, the dangerous taste for novelty in things and in words, the love of argument, and the mixing up of the different sciences. Revelation, with him, is the limit of theology, and to endeavor to carry it farther by human reasonings is to lead it astray. "If the Scriptures are insufficient as a means of arriving at God, where shall we find anything to lead us higher? Let us then guard against attempting to help theology by an admixture with other sciences, and against introducing into it the exercises of the schools." As to *practical* religion, as we have already said, Gerson was of the moderate mystical school. In his view all the moral and intellectual powers of man were originally in harmony with each other, and directed to God; but sin destroyed this harmony, and it is the object of mystic theology to restore it. But, in order to effect this, it must first know the nature of the powers of the mind, and the manner of acting upon them. Following Richard de St. Victor (*de Contemplatione*), Gerson distinguishes in the operations of the two orders of faculties three different degrees: in the *vis cognitiva*, 1. the *cogitatio*, involuntary tendency of the soul to moral consideration; 2. the *meditatio*, voluntary effort to learn the truth; 3. *contemplatio*, the voluntary inquiry into spiritual, and especially divine subjects; in the *vis affectiva*, 1. the desire, *libido*; 2. piety, *devotio*; 3. loving aspirations, *dilectio caritativa*, and *amagogica*, inseparably connected with the *contemplatio*: these are only separately or theoretically considered. In this union of love with contemplation resides the true essence of mystic theology, which is essentially a theology of love. Gerson designated it as *theologia affectiva*, in contradistinction from scholastic theology, which he called *theologia speculative*. Love consists only in an "*experimentalis Dei perceptio*," from which, however, Gerson abstracts all that is material or figurative. In his definition of it, he says: "By love is the eternal Word born in the soul, and the unity with God achieved." That wonderful book, *De Imitatione Christi*, is attributed by many of the best critics to Gerson. On this question, see KREMPIS.

There are several editions of Gerson's collected works, but the most complete is *Opera Omnia J. Gersonii, op. et stud. L. Ellies du Pin* (Antwerp, 1706, 5 vols. fol.). Vol. i contains a life of Gerson, an essay on the authorship of the *Imitation of Christ*, a critical catalogue of his writings, together with his dogmatical works. Vol. ii contains his treatises on ecclesiastical polity, etc.; vol. iii, his writings on moral theology; vol. iv, exegetical writings; vol. v, controversial writings, sermons, etc. Some works are included in this edition which do not belong to Gerson. See RIECHER, *Vie de Gerson*; L'Enfant, *Hist. of the Council of Constance*; LÉCNY, *Essai sur Gerson* (Paris, 1832, 2 vols. 8vo); SCHMIDT, *Essai sur Gerson* (Strasb. 1839); THOMASSY, *Jean Gerson* (Paris, 1843, 16mo); FAUGÈRE, *Eloge de Gerson* (Paris, 1837); ENGELHARDT, *de Gersonio Mystico* (Erlang. 1843, 4to); HILGEN's *Zeitschrift für d. hist. Theol.* (1833); *Studien u. Kritiken* (1835), p. 278; JOURDAIN, *Doctrina Gersonii de theolog. myst.* (Par. 1838, 8vo); MICHELET, *Hist. de France*, vol. iv; BONNECHOSE, *Reformateurs avant la Réforme*, i, 160; NEANDER, *Ch. Hist.* vol. v; NEANDER, *History of Christian Dogmas*, 519, 607, 612; MOSHEIM, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 443; DUPIN, *Hist. of Eccles. Writers*, cent. xy; HOEFER, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xx, 283 sq.; HASE, *Ch. Hist.* 250, 251; HOOK, *Eccles. Biog.* v, 306; SCHWAB, *J. Gerson, eine Monographie*

(Würzburg, 1858, 8vo); HERZOG, *Real-Encyclopädie*, v, 89 sq.

**Gertrude, St.**, born in 626, was the daughter of Pepin of Landen, majordomo of the king of Austrasia, France. She was religiously brought up, and finally entered the nunnery of Nivelles, nine miles from Brussels, of which she was elected abbess at the early age of twenty. She died there March 17, 659, and that day has since been kept in commemoration of her throughout Brabant.—*Acta Sanctorum*, March 17.

**Gertrude, St.**, was born at Eisleben, Germany, and became in 1294 abbess of a congregation of Benedictine nuns at Roberdorf. She was thoroughly versed in Latin and the holy Scriptures, but is particularly known for the visionary mysticism of her piety. A series of editions of her *Insinuationum divine pietatis exercitia* appeared during the 16th and 17th centuries. Mege published an edition in 1664, and in 1676 translated it, together with her biography, into French. She died in 1334. Her saint's day is Nov. 15.—Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* v, 300.

**Geruphina** (גֵּרֻפִּינָה), the name of a mountain not very far from Jerusalem, mentioned in the Talmud (*Rosh hash-Shanah*, ii, fol. 22, b) as the third summit distant, on which signal-fires were lighted; held by Schwarz to be a prominent peak near the centre of a mountain-chain called "*Arapun*, about three Eng. miles south of Kalat el-Itaba, or Ramoth Gilead" (*Palest.* p. 82); but we find no corresponding name in any other modern authority.

**Gervaise, FRANÇOIS-ARMAND**, a Trappist monk, was born at Paris in 1660. Having studied under the Jesuits, he then entered among the barefooted Carmelites; but, not finding this reform sufficiently austere to satisfy his love of asceticism, he took the habit of La Trappe in 1695, and insinuated himself so much into the favor of the celebrated abbé De Rancé that he was appointed abbot of La Trappe on the death of Zozimus Foisel in 1696. The abbé, however, soon repented of his choice, for the new abbot began, by his austerity and intriguing spirit, to foment divisions among the monks, and to undo all that De Rancé had done. He soon resigned, and in leaving La Trappe he drew up a long Apology. When his *Histoire générale de Cîteaux* (Avignon, 1746, 4to) appeared, the Bernardines, who were violently attacked in it, obtained an order from the court against him, and he was arrested at Paris and conveyed to the abbey of Notre Dame des Reclus, where he died in 1755. He wrote *La Vie de St. Cyprien* (Paris, 1717, 4to);—*La Vie d'Abailard et d'Héloïse* (Paris, 1720, 2 vols. 12mo);—*La Vie de St. Irenée* (Paris, 1723, 2 vols. 12mo);—*La Vie de l'Apôtre St. Paul* (Par. 1734, 3 vols. 12mo);—*La Vie de St. Epiphane* (Paris, 1738, 4to);—*L'honneur de l'église défendu contre P. Le Courayer* (1742, 2 vols. 12mo). See RICHARD, *Bibliothèque Sacrée*; HOOK, *Eccles. Biog.* vol. v; HOEFER, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xx, 330.

**Gervaise and Protase** (GERVASIUS et PROTASUS), two saints always named together in the Roman martyrology. Ambrose gives an account of them, and calls them the "first martyrs of Milan." They appear to have suffered martyrdom in the time of Dioclesian. Many stories are told of the miracles wrought by their "relics." Their commemoration day is June 19. See Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, June 19.

**Gervase of CANTERBURY**, a mediæval English chronicler, was born about 1150, and died in the early part of the 13th century. We know but little of his history. It appears that he was a monk of the priory of Christ's Church, Canterbury, and held the office of sacristan, was present at the burning in 1174 of Canterbury Cathedral, and watched the erection of the new cathedral, until the election of Baldwin as archbishop in 1184, when he wrote his account of the destruction and rebuilding thereof, entitled *Tractatus de combustione Dorobornensis ecclesie*. Another work,

*Imaginationes de discordiis inter monachos Cantuarienses et archiepiscopum Baldwin*, written, perhaps, after Hubert became archbishop in 1193, gives a full account of the dissensions between Baldwin and his monks. His next work, *Vita Dorobornensium archiepiscoporum*, contains lives of the archbishops of Canterbury, ending soon after Hubert's accession. His most valuable work, *Chronica de tempore regum Angliæ Stephani, Hen. II, et Ricardi II*, chronicles the reigns of these sovereigns, and contains in the conclusion an announcement of a second part, to be devoted to the reign of John, which was probably never written. In the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (No. 438), there is a MS. treatise of Gervase, entitled *Mappa Mundi*, the first part of which gives a topographical description of England by counties, with lists of the bishops' sees and monasteries in each, and the second part lists of the archbishops of the whole world and their suffragans, and added thereto a chronicle of England from the fabulous times to the death of Richard I. Bishop Nicolson (*Eng. Hist. Library*) characterizes Gervase as a diligent and judicious historian; and Wright (*Biog. Brit. Lit.*) says "his writings show great care in collecting information, and discrimination in using it; and his chronicle of the reigns of Stephen, Henry, and Richard is one of the most valuable of the historical memorials of the 12th century." His works, except the *Mappa Mundi*, were published in Twysden's *Historia Anglicanæ Scriptores Decem* (London, 1652, fol., Coll. 1285-1684), and an English translation of his *Tractatus de Combustione*, etc., is given in the *Report of the Proceedings of the British Archaeological Association, at the first General Meeting, held at Canterbury in the Month of September, 1844*, ed. by Alfred John Dunkin (Lond. 1845, 8vo), p. 194-240. —Wright, *Biographiæ Britannicæ Literariæ* (Anglo-Norman period, p. 419-421); Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xx, 326, 327; Rose, *New Gen. Biog. Dictionary*, viii, 12. (J. W. M.)

**Gerzite.** See GEZRITE.

**Gē'sem** (Γεσίμ), a Græcized form (Judith i, 9) of the name of the land of GOSHEN.

**Gesenius, Friedrich Heinrich Wilhelm**, a distinguished Oriental scholar, was born at Nordhausen February 3, 1785. After finishing his education at the universities of Helmstadt and Göttingen, he was for a short time teacher at the pedagogium at Helmstadt. In 1806 he became privat docent at the University of Göttingen, and in 1809 professor of ancient literature at the college of Heiligenstadt. In 1810 he became extraordinary, and in 1811 ordinary professor at Halle. In 1814 he received the degree of doctor of divinity; and in 1820 he made a scientific journey to Paris and Oxford, where he chiefly collected material for his projected Hebrew dictionary. He died Oct. 23, 1842. Gesenius was an outspoken adherent of the Rationalistic school. In the study of Oriental languages, his works, which had an almost unprecedented circulation, began a new era. The most important among them are: *Hebräisches und Chaldäisches Handwörterbuch* (Lpz. 1810-1812, 2 vols.; 7th ed. 1868; Latin ed. 1833; 2d ed. by Hoffmann, 1847; Eng. transl. by C. Leo, Cambridge, 1825; by J. W. Gibbs, Andover, 1824, and by Robinson, Boston, 1850); —*Hebräische Grammatik* (Halle, 1813; 20th edit. by Dr. Rödiger, 1866; English transl. by M. Stuart, Andover, 1826, and by Conant, Boston, 1839; also a French transl.); —*Hebräisches Lesebuch* (Halle, 1814; 7th edit. by De Wette; 9th edit. by Heiligstedt, 1858; transl. into English, N. Y.); —*Kritische Geschichte der hebr. Sprache u. Schrift* (Leipzig, 1815; 2d edit. 1827); —*De Pentateuchi Samaritanæ origine inole et auctoritate* (Halle, 1815); —*Grammatico-Krit. Lehrgründe der hebr. Sprache* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1817); —*Uebersetzung des Propheten Jesaias mit einem phil.-krit. u. hist. Commentar* (3 vols., Leipzig, 1820-1821; 2d edit. 1829); —*Thesaurus phil.*

*crit. ling. hebr. et chald.* (Leipzig, 1827-1853, 8 vols.; part of the 3d vol. by Rödiger); —*Scripturæ linguæ phœnicæ monumenta* (Leipzig, 1837, 3 vols.). He also wrote many valuable articles for the *Allgemeine Encycl. of Ersch und Gruber*, and translated Burckhardt's *Travels to Syria and Palestine* (Weimar, 1823, 2 vols.), with many valuable notes illustrating Biblical geography. See *Gesenius, eine Erinnerung an seine Freunde* (Berlin, 1843); Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* v, 121-3.

**Gesenius, Justus**, a German divine and scholar, was born at Esbeck, in Hanover, July 6, 1601, studied theology at Helmstadt and Jena, and became pastor in Brunswick in 1629. In 1636 he became court preacher at Hildesheim, and finally councillor and general superintendent of Hanover. He died Sept. 18, 1673. His principal works are, *Passionspredigten* (Hanov. 1660); —*Trostpredigten* (Hanov. 1661); and, under the name of Timotheus Fridlibius, *Warum willst du nicht Katholisch werden wie deine Vorfahren waren* (on the conversion of the duke John Frederick to Romanism) (Hanov. 1669-72, 4 parts). He wrote also a number of hymns, which have been incorporated in the Hanoverian Hymn-book.—Pierer, *Universal Lexikon*, s. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* v, 117. (J. N. P.)

**Gē'sham**, or rather GESHAN [as in the edit. of 1611] (Heb. *Geyshan'*, גֵּשָׁן, *filly*, Sept. Γησῶν v. r. Σωγῶν, Vulg. *Gesan*), the third named of the sons of Jahdai (q. v.) among the descendants of Caleb (1 Chron. ii, 47). B.C. post 1612.

**Gē'shem** (Heb. גֵּשֶׁם, a *shower*, if Heb.; Fürst, *firmness*; but more prob. the Arabic *Jasim* or *Jahum*, a historical name in Arabia Proper; Sept. Γησῶν, Vulg. *Gesan*), once (Neh. vi, 6) in the prolonged form GASH'MU (Heb. *Gashmu'*, גֵּשְׁמוּ), an Arabian (Neh. ii, 19; vi, 1), and one of the enemies of the Jews on the return from the exile, especially in the plots against the life of Nehemiah (Neh. vi, 2). B.C. 446. Geshem, we may conclude, was an inhabitant of Arabia Petraea, or of the Arabian Desert, and probably the chief of a tribe which, like most of the tribes on the eastern frontier of Palestine, was, in the time of the captivity and the subsequent period, allied with the Persians, or with any peoples threatening the Jewish nation. Geshem, like Sanballat and Tobiah, seems to have been one of the "governors beyond the river," to whom Nehemiah came, and whose mission "grieved them exceedingly, that there was come a man to seek the welfare of the children of Israel" (Neh. ii, 10); for the wandering inhabitants of the frontier doubtless availed themselves largely, in their predatory excursions, of the distracted state of Palestine, and dreaded the re-establishment of the kingdom; and the Arabians, Ammonites, and Ashdodites are recorded as having "conspired to fight against Jerusalem, and to hinder" its repairing. See NEHEMIAH.

**Gē'shur** (Heb. *Geshur'*, גֵּשׁוּר; Sept. Γεσούρ and Γεσουρ), the name of a district of Syria near Gilead (2 Sam. xv, 8; 1 Chron. ii, 23), which adjoined, on the east side of the Jordan, the northern border of the Hebrew territory, and lay between Mount Hermon, Machab, and Bashan (Deut. iii, 13, 14; Josh. xii, 5). It is plain from these notices that Geshur lay in that portion of Syria which was connected with or adjoining to the land of Gilead, and the Geshurites probably dwelt in the rocky fastnesses of Argob. This region is supposed to be the same with what is now called the *Lejah*, and is remarkable for its singularly wild and rugged scenery. Burckhardt says, "In the interior parts of the Lejah the rocks are in many places cleft asunder, so that the whole hill appears shivered, and in the act of falling down," etc. Porter adds, "No description can approach the reality. One cannot repress a shudder when he finds himself in such a den, surrounded by armed hordes on whose faces the country seems to have stamped its own savage aspect.

Ibrahim Pasha, flushed with victory, and maddened by the obstinacy of a handful of Druses, attempted to follow them into this stronghold; but scarcely a soldier who entered returned. Every nook concealed an enemy. . . . The Lejah has for ages been a sanctuary for outlaws, and not unfrequently a refuge for the oppressed" (*Handbook for Syria*, p. 504). See ARGOB.

Geshur is first associated with Aram or Syria among the conquests of Jair, the son of Manasseh. After stating that he had three and twenty cities in the land of Gilead, it is said, Jair took "Geshur and Aram, with the towns of Jair, from them, with Kenath, and the towns thereof, three-score cities" (1 Chron. ii, 23). While these places were taken, they were held only as subject territories, still to a great extent occupied by their original inhabitants. See HAVOTH-JAIR. According to the boundaries of the Holy Land, as defined by Moses, Geshur would have formed part of it; but in Josh. xiii, 2, 13, it is stated that the Israelites had expelled neither the Geshurites nor the Maachathites, but dwelt together with them. That the Hebrews did not afterwards permanently subdue Geshur appears from the circumstance that, in David's time, this district had a king of its own, called Talmi, whose daughter, Maachah, was one of the wives of David (2 Sam. iii, 3; 1 Chron. iii, 2). She was probably a person of superior beauty, as she became the mother of the two handsomest of David's children, Absalom and Tamar. How David should have thought of getting a wife from such a quarter, or what prior link of connection between him and the king of Geshur might have led to such a result, is left unnoticed in the history. But possibly the Geshurites, who are mentioned among the tribes against whom David made incursions while he dwelt in Ziklag (1 Sam. xxvii, 8), and who, from the name being once found in connection with the Philistines (Josh. xiii, 3), are generally supposed to have been a different tribe from the other, may, after all, have been the same. See GESHURITE. The Geshurites, very probably, from their fastnesses in Argob, were wont to sally forth, like the Amalekites, in occasional raids upon the districts to the south and east of Palestine, without having any settled habitations there; and David might justly regard them (though located at some distance), equally with the Amalekites who are mentioned along with them, as fair subjects for making reprisals upon. In that case he would be brought into close contact with Talmi, first, indeed, as occupying a hostile relation to him, but not unnaturally afterwards as wishing to form with him a bond of alliance. Amid the troubles and difficulties which encompassed David's access to the throne, a marriage into the family of the king of Geshur might seem to afford a prospect not to be slighted of strengthening his position. As it ultimately proved, this alliance became the source of one of his greatest dangers, in giving birth to the fascinating, but restless and aspiring Absalom. The wild acts of Absalom's life may have been to some extent the results of maternal training; they were at least characteristic of the stock from which he sprung. In fleeing, as Absalom did, after the assassination of his brother Amnon, to the court of his maternal grandfather at Geshur (2 Sam. xiii, 37, 38; xiv, 23, 32), one can easily understand how secure a refuge he might find there, while he required to be in concealment, but at the same time how unlikely it was his ambition could remain long satisfied with its dreary aspect and dreadful seclusion. See ABSALOM. The word *Geshur* signifies a *bridge*, and corresponds with the Arabic *Jisr*, Syriac *Glythairá*; and in the same region where, according to the above data, we must fix Geshur, between Mount Hermon and the Lake of Tiberias, there still exists an ancient stone bridge over the Upper Jordan, called *Jisr-Benáat-Jakub*, or "the bridge of the daughters of Jacob," i. e. the Israelites. "The ancient commercial route to and from Damascus and the East

seems to have lain in this direction in the most ancient times (Gen. xxxvii, 25), and hence the probability that there was even then a bridge over the river, which (in times when bridges were rare) gave its name to the adjacent district. The Jordan, however, is at a considerable distance from the region in question. Dr. Robinson, moreover, regards the bridge in question as a structure of the time of the Crusades, although he admits that it occupies the site of a traditionary Ford of Jacob (*Researches*, iii, 361).—Kitto, s. v.; Fairbairn, s. v. See BRIDGE.

**Gesh'uri** (Heb. *Geshuri'*, גֶּשׁוּרִי, Sept. Γαγγυρί v. r. Γεγγυρί, and Γεσουρί v. r. Γεσουρί; the sing. Deut. iii, 14; Josh. xii, 2), or GESHURITES (Heb. *Geshurim'*, גֶּשׁוּרִים, plur. Josh. xii, 5; xiii, 11, 13; 1 Sam. xxvii, 8; but in Josh. xiii, 13, second clause, where the Heb. has *Geshur* simply), the name of an aboriginal people of Palestine, who appear at opposite extremities of the country. See CANAAN, LAND OF.

1. The natives of a district geographically within Bashan, but politically reckoned to Aram (2 Sam. xv, 8). It seems, from the various references in Scripture, that the Geshurites occupied a territory of great natural strength, and that thus, though small in number, they were able to defend themselves against all assailants. Ireland thinks (*Palæst.* p. 77 sq.) that Geshur of Bashan (Josh. xii, 5) was distinct from the Geshur of Aram (2 Sam. xv, 8). For this, however, there is no authority, and the whole tenor of the Scripture narrative seems opposed to it. The view of Keil (on Josh. xii, 5), Rosenmüller (*Bib. Geogr.* ii, 227), and Gesenius (*Thesaurus*, s. v.), that Geshur lay along the east bank of the upper Jordan, is opposed to the topographical details of the Bible, in which it is closely connected with Argob. Their chief argument is that *Geshur* signifies "a bridge," and there is a bridge on the upper Jordan. Porter, after a careful survey of the whole country, was led to the conclusion that Geshur embraced the northern section of the wild and rocky provinces now called *Lejah*, and formerly Trachonitis and Argob. It probably also took in the neighboring plain to the north as far as the banks of the Pharpar, on which there are several important bridges; but on the approach of the Israelites, the people may have concentrated themselves in their rugged stronghold, where the Israelites deemed it more prudent to leave them than to attempt to expel them. The wild tribes that now occupy that region hold a somewhat similar position, being really independent, but nominally subject to the Porte (see *Journ. of Sac. Lit.* July, 1854, p. 300; Porter's *Damascus*, vol. ii; Burckhardt's *Travels in Syr.* p. 105 sq.). See GEZER. The Geshurites appear to have maintained friendly relations with the Israelites east of the Jordan; probably from mutual interest, both being extensive cattle owners. The community of occupation may have led to the alliance between David and the daughter of Talmi, king of Geshur (2 Sam. iii, 3). See TRACHONITIS.

2. A people who dwelt on the south-western border of Palestine, adjoining the Philistines (Josh. xiii, 2). They appear to have been nomads, and to have ranged over the neighboring desert, though occupying for a time at least a portion of Philistia. "David went up and invaded the Geshurites, and the Gezirites, and the Amalekites; for those nations were of old the inhabitants of the land as thou goest to Shur, even unto the land of Egypt" (1 Sam. xxvii, 8).—Kitto, s. v. These, however, appear to have been but a branch of the foregoing tribe, settled more or less permanently on the maritime outskirts of Judah. Schwarz finds the latter "in the modern village *Adshur*, one mile from Deir-Diban, on the road to Migdal" (*Palæst.* p. 113). Thénius (*Comment.* ad loc.) thinks that *Geshurites* should be read instead of "Ashurites" in 2 Sam. ii, 9. See GESHUR.



**Gesselius, TIMAN, M.D.**, was born at Amersfoort near the close of the 16th century. His father, Cornelius Gesselius, was rector of the Latin school of that place, but lost his situation in consequence of refusing to subscribe the canons of the Synod of Dort. His son Timan, associate rector, holding his father's sentiments, shared the same fate. Being a doctor of medicine, he established himself first at Nymegen, and subsequently at Utrecht as a practising physician. He deserves mention here chiefly on account of his labors in Church history. His principal works are, *Historia sacra et ecclesiastica ordine chronologica et in compendiarium digesta* (Traj. 1659, 4 vols.):—*Historia rerum memorabilium in orbe gestarum ab anno mundi usque ad annum Christi 1625* (Traj. 1661). See Gladius, *Godgeleerd Nederland*, 1 D. blz. 517 en verv. (J. P. W.)

**Gessner, SALOMON, D.D.**, a Lutheran divine, was born in Silesia in 1559, appointed professor of theology at Wittenberg in 1592, and died in 1605. He wrote *Commentationes in Psalmos Davidis* (Wittenb. 1629, fol.).—Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, s. v.; Melchior Adam, *Vita Theologorum*, etc., i, 352.

**Ge'ther** (Heb. *גֵּתֵר*, signif. unknown; Sept. *Γαίρη* v. r. *Γαζέρο*), the name of the third of the sons of Aram (Gen. x, 23). B. C. post. 2513. Josephus (*Ant.* i, 6, 4) makes him the ancestor of the *Bactrians* (but see Michaelis, *Spicileg.* ii, 138); and in the traditional legends of the Arabs one *Gathir* appears as the source of the Thamudites in Hejaz and the Jadesites in Jemama (Abulf. *Hist. Antæist.* p. 16). The Arab. vers. of the Polyglot has the *Gerumaku*, a tribe which in the time of Mohammed must have inhabited the district of Mosul. See ARABIA. Jerome (ad loc.) proposes the *Carians*. Bochart asks (*Phaleg.* ii, 10) whether the river *Centrites*, mentioned by Xenophon (*Anab.* iv, 3, 1) and Diodorus Sic. (xiv, 27), and which lay between the Carduchians and Armenians, may not have derived its name from Gether; and Le Clerc finds a trace of the name in *Cathara* (Καζάρα), a town on the Tigris (Ptol. v, 18). Kalisch (*Commentary*, ad loc.) thinks it may be but an Aramaean form of *Geshur*, an identification already proposed by Thomson (*Land and Book*, i, 386). (See Schulthess, *Parad.* p. 282.) See ARAM.

**Gethsem'auê** (Γεθσημανή v. r. Γεθσημανεί, prob. for Aramaean *ܓܝܬܫܡܢܝܐ*, oil-press, such being doubtless in the vicinity), the name of a small field (*χωρίον*, plot, A. V. "place," Matt. xxvi, 36) or olive-yard (comp. *κῆπος*, John xviii, 1), just out of Jerusalem, over the brook Kedron, and at the foot of the Mount of Olives, to which Jesus, as often before (comp. Luke xxii, 39), retired with his disciples on the night of his betrayal (Mark xiv, 32), and which was the scene of his agony (q. v.). The Kedron runs in the bottom of a deep glen, parallel with the eastern wall of Jerusalem, and about 200 yards distant. Immediately beyond it rises the steep side of Olivet, now, as formerly, cultivated in rude terraces. Somewhere on the slope of this mount Gethsemane must have been situated (see Nitzsch, *De horto Gethsemane*, Viteb. 1750). According to Josephus, the suburbs of Jerusalem abounded with gardens and pleasure-grounds (*παρὰ τῆς πόλεως*, *War.* vi, 1, 1; compare v. 3, 2); now, with the exception of those belonging to the Greek and Latin convents, hardly the vestige of a garden is to be seen. There is, indeed, a favorite paddock or close, half a mile or more to the north, on the same side of the continuation of the valley of the Kedron, the property of a wealthy Turk, where the Mohammedan ladies pass the day with their families, their bright, flowing costume forming a picturesque contrast to the stiff, sombre foliage of the olive-grove beneath which they cluster. But Gethsemane has not come down to us as a scene of mirth; its inexhaustible associations are the

offspring of a single event—the agony of the Son of God on the evening preceding his passion. Here emphatically, as Isaiah had foretold, and as the name imports, were fulfilled those dark words, "I have trodden the wine-press alone" (lxiii, 3; compare Rev. xiv, 20, "the wine-press . . . without the city"). "The period of the year," remarks Mr. Gresswell (*Harm. Diss.* xlii), "was the vernal equinox; the day of the month about two days before the fall of the moon—in which case the moon would not be now very far past her meridian, and the night would be enlightened until a late hour towards the morning;" the day of the week Thursday, or rather, according to the Jews, Friday, for the sun had set. The time, according to Mr. Gresswell, would be the last watch of the night, between our 11 and 12 o'clock. Any recapitulation of the circumstances of that ineffable event would be unnecessary, any comments upon it unseasonable. A modern garden, in which are eight venerable olive-trees, and a grotto to the north, detached from it, and in closer connection with the Church of the Sepulchre of the Virgin—in fact, with the road to the summit of the mountain running between them, as it did also in the days of the Crusaders (Sanuti, *Secret. Fidei. Cruc.* lib. iii, p. xiv, c. 9)—both securely enclosed, and under lock and key, are pointed out as making up the true Gethsemane. These may be the spots which Eusebius (*Onomast.* s. v. Γεθσημανή, "where the faithful still resort for prayer"), St. Jerome (*Liber de Situ et Nomini-bus*, s. v.), and Adamnanus mention as such; and from the 4th century downwards some such localities are spoken of as known, frequented, and even built upon. This spot was probably fixed upon at the wish of Helena, the mother of Constantine, in A. D. 326. The pilgrims of antiquity say nothing about those time-honored olive-trees, whose age the poetic minds of Lamartine and Stanley shrink from criticising—they were doubtless not so imposing in the 6th century; still, had they been noticed, they would have afforded undying testimony to the locality—while, on the other hand, few modern travellers would inquire for and adore, with Antoninus, the three precise spots where our Lord is said to have fallen upon his face. Against the contemporary antiquity of the olive-trees, it has been urged that Titus cut down all the trees round about Jerusalem; and certainly this is no more than Josephus states in express terms (see particularly *War.* vi, 1, 1, a passage which must have escaped Mr. Williams, *Holy City*, ii, 437, 2d edit., who only cites v, 3, 2, and vi, 8, 1). Besides, the tenth legion, arriving from Jericho, were posted about the Mount of Olives (v, 2, 3; and comp. vi, 2, 8), and in the course of the siege a wall was carried along the valley of the Kedron to the fountain of Siloam (v, 10, 2). The probability, therefore, would seem to be that they were planted by Christian hands to mark the spot; unless, like the sacred olive of the Acropolis (Bahr, ad *Herod.* viii, 55), they may have reproduced themselves as scions from the old roots, a supposition which their shape and position render not unlikely (Aiton, *Land of the Messiah*, p. 204). Maundrell (*Early Trav. in Palestine*,



Garden of Gethsemane as seen from the North.

by Wright, p. 471) and Quaresmius (*Elucid. T. S. lib. iv, per. v, ch. 7*) appear to have been the first to notice them, not more than three centuries ago; the former arguing against and the latter in favor of their reputed antiquity, but nobody reading their accounts would imagine that there were then no more than eight, the locality of Gethsemane being supposed the same. Parallel claims, to be sure, are not wanting in the cedars of Lebanon, which are still visited with so much enthusiasm; in the terebinth, or oak of Mamre, which was standing in the days of Constantine the Great, and even worshipped (Vales. ad Euseb. *l'it. Const.* iii, 53); and the fig-tree (*ficus elastica*) near Nerbudda, in India, which native historians assert to be 2500 years old (Patterson's *Journal of a Tour in Egypt*, p. 202, note). Still more appositely, there were olive-trees near Litemum 250 years old, according to Pliny, in his time, which are recorded to have survived to the middle of the 10th century (*Nouv. Dict. de Hist. Nat.* Paris, 1846, xxix, 61). There can, indeed, be no certainty as to the precise age of the trees; but it is admitted by all travellers that the eight which still stand upon the spot in question bear the marks of a venerable antiquity, having gnarled trunks and a thin foliage. Several young trees have been planted to supply the place of those which have disappeared (Olin's *Travels*, ii, 115). Some years ago the plot of ground was bought by the Latin Church; and, having been enclosed by a wall, the interior is laid out in walks and flower-beds after the fashion of a modern European garden; the guardian *padre*, however, still points out to pilgrims not only "the grotto of the agony," but also the spot where Judas betrayed Jesus, and that where the three disciples slept (Geramb, *Pilgrimage to Palestine*, i, 63 sq.). Mr. G. Robinson says: "The grot to which our Saviour retired, and where, 'falling to the ground' in the agony of his soul, and sweating 'as it were great drops of blood,' he was comforted by an angel (Luke xxii, 43, 44), is still shown and venerated as such. It is excavated in the rock, and the descent to it is by a flight of rudely-cut steps. The form of the interior is circular, about fifteen feet in diameter, and the roof, which is supported by pilasters, is perforated in the middle to admit light. There are some remains of sepulchres in the sides" (*Travels in Palestine*, Par. 1837, i, 128). The Armenian or Greek Church, however, denies that this is the actual site, and has fixed upon another as the proper one, at some little distance to the north of it. But both sites have been deemed by many writers as too public for the privacy of prayer (Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 284). The solemn quietude of the Latin site, however, is strongly commented upon by Bartlett (*Walks about Zion*, p. 98). Dr. Robinson remarks that there is nothing particular in the traditionary plot to mark it as the garden of Gethsemane, for adjacent to it are many similar enclosures, and many olive-trees equally old (*Researches*, i, 246). He admits, however, the probability that this is the site which Eusebius and Jerome had in view, and as no other site is suggested as entitled to superior credit, we may be content to receive the traditional indication (Tischendorf, *Reise in dem Orient*, i, 312). It has been visited and described by nearly every modern traveller in Palestine. Some have even heard the ancient name given in connection with this spot, but this was probably borrowed by the Arabs from the Christian traditions. — Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See JERUSALEM.

Geu'el (גֵּוּ'עַל, *elevation of God*; Sept. Γου'ε'λ), son of Machi of the tribe of Gad, and one of the commissioners sent by Moses to explore Canaan (Numb. xiii, 15). B.C. 1657.

Geulinx, ARNOLD, a Belgian philosopher, born about 1625 at Antwerp, died about 1668 as professor of philosophy at Leyden. He at first taught the classics and the Cartesian philosophy at Louvain, but sub-

sequently went to Leyden, where he abjured Catholicism, and finally obtained the chair of philosophy, which he retained until his death. He was the most remarkable disciple of Des Cartes prior to Spinoza and Malebranche, and his writings contain the germs of some of the doctrines of these later philosophers. He in particular developed the hypothesis of occasional causes. He wrote *Ethica* (Amsterdam, 1665); *Logica* (Amsterd. 1662); *Metaphysica* (Amsterd. 1691). (A. J. S.)

Gez. See LOCUST.

Ge'zer (Heb. גֵּזֵר, prob. a *precipice*, from גָּזַר, to cut off; Sept. Γαζ'ερ, but in Chron. vi, 67 and xx, 4 Γαζ'ε'ρ, in 1 Chron. xiv, 16 Γαζ'ηρα; in pause ΓΑ'ΖΕΡ, גֵּזֵר, which Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* ii, 427, note, deems the original form), an ancient city of Canaan, whose king, Horam, or Elam, coming to the assistance of Lachish, was defeated and probably killed, with all his people, by Joshua (Josh. x, 33; xii, 12). The town, however, is not said to have been destroyed; it formed one of the landmarks on the southern boundary of Ephraim, not far from the lower Beth-horon, towards the Mediterranean (xvi, 3), the western limit of the tribe (1 Chron. vii, 28). It was allotted, with its suburbs, to the Kohathite Levites (Josh. xxi, 21; 1 Chron. vi, 67); but the original inhabitants were not dispossessed (Judg. i, 29); so that in the time of David the Philistine territory seems to have included it (2 Sam. x, 25; 1 Chron. xx, 4); and even down to the reign of Solomon the Canaanites (or, according to the Sept. addition to Josh. xvi, 10, the Canaanites and Perizzites) were still dwelling there, and paying tribute to Israel (1 Kings ix, 16). At this time it must, in fact, have been independent of Israelitish rule, for Pharaoh had on some occasion burnt it to the ground and killed its inhabitants, and then presented the site to his daughter, Solomon's queen. But it was immediately rebuilt by the latter king (1 Kings ix, 15-21); and, though not heard of again till after the captivity, yet it played a somewhat prominent part in the later struggles of the nation, being the *Gazera* (Γαζ'ηρα, 1 Macc. iv, 15; vii, 45), or *Gazara* (Γαζ'αρα, 1 Macc. xv, 28, 35; xiii, 53; 2 Macc. x, 32), of the Apocrypha and Josephus (Γαζ'αρα, *Ant.* xiii, 9, 2), who once calls it *Gadara* (Γαδ'αρα, *Ant.* xiii, 9, 2). Strabo (xvi, 759) also mentions a town called *Gadaris* (Γαδα'ρίς). Ewald (*Gesch.* iii, 280), somewhat arbitrarily, takes Gezer and *Geshur* to be the same, and sees in the destruction of the former by Pharaoh, and the simultaneous expedition of Solomon to Hamath-zobah, in the neighborhood of the latter, indications of a revolt of the Canaanites, of whom the Geshurites formed the most powerful remnant, and whose attempt against the new monarch was thus frustrated. In one place *Gob* is given as identical with Gezer (1 Chron. xx, 4; comp. 2 Sam. xxi, 18). Gezer was perhaps the original seat of the *Gezrites* (q. v.) whom David attacked (1 Sam. xxvii, 8), in the vicinity of the Amalekites; and as they are mentioned in connection with the Geshurites, they may have lived a considerable distance north of Philistia. Finally, Mount *Gerizim* (q. v.) appears to have derived its name from the vicinity of this tribe (compare the name *Ar-Gerizim*, by Theodotus, in Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.* ix, 22).

Gezer must have been between the lower Beth-horon and the sea (Josh. xvi, 3; 1 Kings ix, 17), therefore on the edge of the great maritime plain which lies beneath the hills of which Beit-ur et-tahta is the last outpost, and forms the regular coast road of communication with Egypt (1 Kings ix, 16). It is therefore appropriately named as the last point to which David's pursuit of the Philistines extended (2 Sam. v, 25; 1 Chron. xiv, 16), and as the scene of at least one sharp encounter (1 Chron. xx, 4), this plain being their own peculiar territory (comp. Josephus, *Ant.*, viii, 6, 1, Γαζ'αρα τὴν τῆς Παλαιστίνων χώρας ὑπάρχουσαν); and

as commanding the communication between Egypt and the new capital, Jerusalem, it was an important point for Solomon to fortify. By Eusebius (*Onomast.* s. v. *Γαζέρι*) it is mentioned as four miles north of Nicopolis (Amwās), a position exactly occupied by the important town *Jimzu*, the ancient *Gimzo*, and corresponding well with the requirements of Joshua. But this hardly agrees with the indications of the first book of Maccabees, which speak of it as between Emmaus (Amwās) and Azotus and Jamnia; and again as on the confines of Azotus. In the neighborhood of the latter there is more than one site bearing the name *Yasur*; but whether this Arabic name can be derived from the Hebrew Gezer, and also whether so important a town as Gazara was in the time of the Maccabees can be represented by such insignificant villages as these, are doubtful questions.—Smith, s. v. Schwartz (*Palest.* p. 85) identifies it with *Yasur*, a little village two miles east of Jaffa; but this has long since been identified by the Hazor of Eusebius (see Robinson's *Res.* ii, 370, note). Van Senden proposes to identify it with *El-Kubab*, a place on a tell north-west of Amwās; but Van de Velde suggests that this would require the supposition of two Gezers (*Memoir*, p. 315). The site seems rather to be that of the modern *Um-Rush*, a village with ruins and a well on the Jaffa road (Robinson, *Researches*, iii, 57), a place which must, from its position (commanding the thoroughfare), have always been of great importance, like Gezer.

**Gezerite.** See GEZRITE.

**Gez'rite** (Heb. with the art. *haq-Gizri'*, גִּזְרִי, apparently from גִּזְרָה, a *section*, or גִּזְרָה, a *shorn*, i. e. *sterile tract*; the marginal reading at 1 Sam. xxvii, 5, erroneously adopted instead of the textual *haq-Gizri'*, גִּזְרִי, the GIZRITE; Sept. ὁ Γεζριτικός v. r. Γεζρι, Vulg. *Gezri*, A. V. "the Gezrites"), the designation of a tribe in the vicinity of the Amalekites, attacked and subdued by David while residing among the Philistines (1 Sam. xvii, 8), and hence probably Canaanitish nomades inhabiting the south-western wastes of Palestine. The twofold form of the name, *Gezerite* or *Gerizite*, seems to furnish a link between the city of GEZER and MOUNT GERIZIM. See also GESURITE. They were rich in Bedouin treasures—"sheep, oxen, asses, camels, and apparel" (ver. 9; comp. xv, 3; 1 Chron. vi, 21). They appear to have occupied Central Palestine at a very early period, and to have relinquished it in company with the Amalekites, who also left their name attached to a mountain in the same locality (Judg. xii, 15), when they abandoned that rich district for the less fertile but freer south. Other tribes, as the Avvim and the Zemarites, also left traces of their presence in the names of towns of the central district.—Smith, s. v. See CANAANITE.

**Gfrörer**, AUGUST FRIEDRICH, a German historian, was born March 5, 1803, at Calw. In 1826 he was for a time tutor in a private family at Geneva, made then a journey in Italy, and in 1828 was appointed lecturer (repetent) in the Evangelical "Stift" in Tübingen. In 1830 he became librarian in Stuttgart, and devoted henceforth his whole time to historical studies. Having at first been a Liberal Protestant of the Tübingen school, he gradually changed his views, and became partial to Roman Catholicism. In 1846 he accepted a call as professor of history to the University of Freiburg. In 1848 he was elected a member of the German Parliament, in which he belonged to the "Grossdeutsche" (Great German) party. In November, 1853, he joined the Roman Catholic Church. He died July 10, 1861. The most important of his works are: *Geschichte unserer Tage* (under the assumed name of Ernst Fregmund, 1830-1835).—*Philo u. die jüd. alexandria Theosophie* (Stuttg. 1831, 2 vols.).—*Gustav Adolf u. seine Zeit* (Stuttg. 1835-37, 2 vols.; 3d edit. 1852).—*Gesch. des Urchristenthums* (Stuttg. 1838, 3 vols.).—*Allgem.*

*Kirchengesch.* (Stuttg. 1841-46, 4 vols.):—*Geschichte der ost. u. westfränk. Karolinger vom Tode Ludwig des Frommen bis zum Ende Konrad I* (Freiburg, 1848, 2 vols.):—*Untersuchung über Alter, Ursprung, Zweck der Decretalen des falschen Isidorus* (Freiburg, 1848):—*Ursprung des menschlichen Geschlechts* (Schaffhausen, 1855, 2 vols.):—*Papst Gregorius u. sein Zeitalter* (Schaffhausen, 1859-61, 7 vols.):—*Geschichte des 18ten Jahrhunderts* (after his death edited by Weiss, Schaffhausen, 1862).—*Allgem. Encycl.* s. v. (A. J. S.)

**Ghazzali**, ABU HAMID MOHAMMED IBN AHMAD, "surnamed ZAINEDDIN (*glory of the law*), one of the most eminent Mohammedan philosophers and divines, and one of the warmest adherents of Sufism (q. v.), born in 450 H. (1058, A. D.), at Tus, in Khorassan, the birthplace also of Firdusi, and burial-place of Harun-al-Rashid. The surname of Ghazzali was given to him, according to some, because his father dealt in *ghazal* or spun cotton. Left an orphan at an early age, by the advice of his guardian, a Sufi, he went to Djorshan, with the intention of devoting himself to study and science as a means of support, and became the favorite pupil of Abu Nasr Ismail, an eminent teacher of the time. He afterwards betook himself to Nishapur, where he attended the lectures of the learned Imam of the two sanctuaries (Mecca and Medina) on law, polemics, philosophy, and theology, and remained till the death of his instructor. The grand vizier of Bagdad then appointed him (A. D. 1091) to a professorship at his *Nizamje* (university), which he left four years later in order to perform the holy pilgrimage to Mecca. On his return he visited Jerusalem and Damascus, and remained for ten years at the mosque of the latter place, leading a studious and ascetic life. He afterwards visited Cairo, Alexandria, and other places in Africa, everywhere teaching and lecturing on religion and science, and also returned for a short time to Nishapur; but he finally went back to Tus, his native place, where he died, 505 H. (A. D. 1111), having founded a monastery for Sufis and a college for the studious. Of the ninety-nine works written by him (mostly in Arabic, a few in Persian), the most famous is his *Itjâ' Olîm ad-Dîn* (Restoration of Religious Sciences), a work so remarkable and exhaustive, that it has been said, "If all the books of the Islam were lost, and we had only this one left, we should not miss the others" (*Itjâ' Kholîfah*). The academies of the West, however, Cordova, Morocco, Fez, etc., condemned it as contrary to the teachings of the Sunna (q. v.), and had it publicly burned. Next in importance stands his great philosophical work *Tahâfut Al-Filâsâfah* (The Overturning of the Philosophers), which has survived only in Hebrew translations, and which gave rise to a warmly contested controversy between him and Averroës (Ibn Roshd). We may mention also his commentary on the ninety-nine names of God, and an ethical treatise, *O Chibî!* published and translated into German by Hammer-Purgstall. About one third only of his works is known to have survived, and of this but a very small part has been published.—Chambers, *Encyclop.* s. v.

**Ghibellins** or **Ghibellines.** See GUELPHS.

**Ghislain**, or GUILLAIN, ST., called the apostle of Belgian Gaul, is said to have been a native of Athens. He came to Gaul in 633, and in 641, with the assistance of king Dagobert, he founded the convent of St. Ghislain (originally St. Peter's cell). The legend says that he was led to that spot by an eagle, who guided him in the search after his ecclesiastical vestments, which had been stolen by a she-bear. After Walde-trude's husband had retired from the world and founded the convent of Haumont, Ghislain induced Walde-trude to found one at Castrilocus: this was the first settlement of the present city of Mons, and the origin of its chapter. Ghislain died in 687, and was canonized in 925. Miracles were said to take place at his

tomb, especially the cure of epilepsy, which is still commonly called in Belgium St. Ghislain's Evil. His life was written in the 12th century by Philippe Deharveng, abbot of Bonne-Espérance. See *Acta Sanctorum Ord. Sancti Benedicti*; Baillet, *Vie des Saints*, 17th Oct.; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xx, 403 sq.

**Ghost**, an old English word of Saxon origin (Germ. *geist*), equivalent to *soul* or *spirit*, occurs as the translation of the Heb. רוּחַ, *ne' phesh*, and the Greek πνεῦμα, both signifying *breath, life, spirit, or living principle*, by which and similar terms they are elsewhere rendered (Job xi, 20; Jer. xv, 9; Matt. xxvii, 50; John xix, 30). It frequently occurs in the N. T. in the sacred name "Holy Ghost." See SPIRIT. Other phrases in which it occurs are those rendered to "give up the ghost," etc., all simply signifying to *die*, e. g. זָבַח, to *expire* (Lam. i, 19; Gen. xxv, 17; xxxv, 29; xlix, 33; Job iii, 11; x, 18; xiii, 19; xiv, 10); ἐκπνέω, to *breathe out*, etc., *one's life* (Mark xv, 37, 39; Luke xxiii, 46); ἐκψύχω, to *breathe out one's last* (Acts v, 5, 10; xii, 23). Many commentators suppose, from the original terms used in the Gospels (ἀφῆκε τὸ πνεῦμα, Matt. xxvii, 50; παρέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα, John xix, 30), something preternatural in Christ's death, as being the effect of his *volition*. But there is nothing in the words of Scripture to countenance such an opinion, though our Saviour's volition must be supposed to accompany his offering himself for the sins of the world. The Greek words rendered *yielded up*, and *gave up*, are no other than such as is frequently used, both in the Septuagint (Gen. xxxv, 18; comp. Ps. xxxi, 5; Eccles. xii, 7) and the classical writers, of *expiration*, either with the *spirit* or the *soul* (Josephus, *Ant.* v, 2, 8; vii, 13, 3; *Ælian*, II. *An.* ii, 1; Herod. iv, 190. See SPECTRE.

**Ghostly** (i. e. *spiritual*) occurs in the expressions "ghostly enemy" and "ghostly counsel," found in the Catechism and in the Communion-service of the Church of England, signifying the one our spiritual enemy Satan; the other, spiritual advice preparatory to partaking of the Eucharist (Eden, s. v.). See SPIRIT, HOLY.

**Gí'ah** (Heb. *Gí'ach*, גִּיאַח, a *breaking forth* sc. of a *fountain*; Sept. *Gé* v. r. *Gai*, Vulg. simply *valis*), a place (probably marked by a spring) opposite the hill Ammah, on the road to the "wilderness (east?) of Gibeon," where Joab and Abishai ceased at sun-down from the pursuit of Abner after the death of Asahel (1 Sam. ii, 24). It is perhaps identical with the "pool" mentioned in ver. 13, although in that case the parties must have become far separated in the rout, since they would thus have returned to the spot where the battle began. See GIBEON.

**Giant**. These beings of unusual height are found in the early history of all nations, sometimes of a purely human origin, but more frequently supposed to have partaken also, in some way, of the supernatural and the divine. The scriptural history is not without its giants, and the numerous theories and disputes which have arisen in consequence render it necessary to give a brief view of some of the main opinions and curious inferences to which the mention of them leads. The English word has several representatives in the original Hebrew.

1. In Gen. vi, 4, we have the first mention of *giants* (נְפִלִים, *nephilim'*, according to some from the Arabic, but better from נָפַל, to *fall*, q. d. *causing to fall*, i. e. *violent*; Sept. γίγαντες, Vulg. *gigantes*; but more discriminatingly Aquil. ἐπιπύροντες, Symm. βυαίον)—"There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men, which were of old men of renown." A somewhat similar intercourse is made mention of in the second verse of the same chapter—"The sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were

fair, and they took them wives of all which they chose" (see *Jour. Sac. Lit.* Oct. 1867). Wellbeloved (ad loc.) and others translate and interpret the passage so as to make it speak merely of "men of violence; men who beat down, oppress, and plundered the weak and defenceless." Doubtless this is an agreement with the meaning of the original word (which occurs also in Numb. xiii, 33, in connection with the Anakim). But these giants, as in other cases, would naturally be designated by a descriptive name, and great strength is generally accompanied by violence and oppression. In our judgment, the bearing of the passage obviously favors the common notion of giants, and that the rather because their origin is traced to some unexplained connection with "the sons of God," that is, with beings of high endowments, if not of a superior nature. We have here given, in all probability, the true basis of all those mythological heroes with which the history of ancient nations is found to begin, such as Hercules and others of a like stamp. It is also especially worthy of note that these are ascribed to a similar parentage, half human, half celestial. Their famous deeds have been immortalized by their dedication in every profane system of religion. This appears to us a more substantial interpretation of the Greek and Roman, and even of the Indian and Scandinavian systems of mythology, than the subtle resolution of these semi-fabulous characters into symbols of the various powers of nature, after the mythical theory of the German writers. It is simply the traditions of these cases of antediluvian prowess and fame that the early poets of each nation have wrought up into the divine personages of their heroic age. We merely add that, by the "sons of God" and the "daughters of men" in the above passage, we are doubtless to understand the descendants of Seth and Cain respectively (see Gesenius, *Heb. Thesaur.* p. 96); yet Kitto inclines to regard the former as angelic beings (*Daily Illust.* ad loc.). See NEPHILIM.

2. In Gen. xiv, 5, we meet with a race termed *Rephaim* (רִפְּאִים), as settled on the other side of the Jordan, in Asheroth-Karnaim, whom Chedorlaomer defeated. Of this race was Og, king of Bashan, who alone remained, in the days of Moses (Dent. iii, 10), of the remnant of the Rephaim. A passage, which is obviously from a later hand, goes on to say, "Behold, his bedstead (רִפְּאִי, *canopy*, others *coffin*; see Michaelis, Dathe, Rosenmüller) was a coffin of iron; is it not in Rabbath of the children of Ammon? nine cubits is its length and four cubits its breadth, according to the cubit of a man," or the natural length of the cubit. See CURB. It does not appear to us to be enough to say that Og was "no doubt a man of unusual stature, but we cannot decide with accuracy what his stature was from the length of the iron couch of state or coffin in which he was placed" (Wellbeloved, ad loc.). Whatever theory of explanation may be adopted, the writer of the passage clearly intended to speak of Og as a giant, and one of a race of giants (compare Josh. xii, 4; xiii, 12). See OG. This race gave their name to a valley near Jerusalem, termed by the Sept. ἡ κοιλίς τῶν ριφαιῶν. See REPHAIM.

The *rephaim* (A. V. "dead") of Job xxvi, 5; Prov. ii, 8, etc., are doubtless the *shades* of the departed. See DEAD.

3. The *Anakim* (אַנָּכִים or אֲנָכִים, *sons of Anak*). In Numb. xiii, the spies sent by Moses before his army to survey the promised land, report, among other things, "The people be strong that dwell in the land; and, moreover, we saw the children of Anak" (verse 28). This indirect mention of the children of Anak shows that they were a well-known gigantic race. In the 32d and 33d verses the statement is enhanced—"It is a land that eateth up the inhabitants; and all the people that we saw in it are men of great stature. And there we saw the giants, the sons of Anak which

came of the giants; and we were in our own sight as grasshoppers, and so we were in their sight." However much of exaggeration fear may have given to the description, the passage seems beyond a doubt to show the current belief in a race of giants (Deut. ix, 2). From Deut. ii, 10, it appears that the size of the Anakim became proverbial, and was used as a standard with which to compare others. In the time of Moses they dwelt in the environs of Hebron (Josh. xi, 22). They consisted of three branches or clans—"Ahiman, Sheshai, and Talmai—the children of Anak" (Numb. xiii, 22). They were destroyed by Joshua (Josh. xi, 21) "from the mountains, from Hebron, from Debir, from Anab, and from all the mountains of Judah, and from all the mountains of Israel: Joshua destroyed them utterly with their cities. There was none of the Anakim left in the land of the children of Israel: only in Gaza, in Gath, and in Ashdod, there remained" (Judg. i, 20; Josh. xiv, 12). See ANAKIM.

From this remnant of the Anakim thus left in Gath of the Philistines proceeded the famous Goliath (גִּלְיָת), 1 Sam. xvii, 4. This giant is said to have been in height six cubits and a span. He challenged the army of Israel, and put the soldiers in great alarm. The army of the Philistines and that of Israel were, however, on the point of engaging, when David, the youngest son of Jesse, came near, bringing, at the command of his father, a supply of provisions to his three eldest brothers, who had followed Saul to the battle; and, becoming aware of the defiance which had been again hurled at "the armies of the living God," he at once went and presented himself as a champion to the king; was offered, but refused, a coat of mail; and, arming himself solely with a sling, smote the Philistine in his forehead, so that he fell upon his face to the earth, and was decapitated by David with his own sword. A general victory ensued. This achievement is ascribed to the divine aid (xvii, 46, 47). In 2 Sam. xxi, 19, "Goliath the Gittite, the staff of whose spear was like a weaver's beam," is said to have been slain by Ellhanan, a chief in David's army. This apparent contradiction the common version tries to get over by inserting words to make this Goliath the brother of him whom David put to death. Some suppose that the former was a descendant of the latter, bearing the same, perhaps a family name. See, however, the parallel passage in 1 Chron. xx, 5. Other giants of the Philistines are mentioned in the passage before cited, 2 Sam. xxi, 16 sq., namely: 1. "Ishbi-benob, which was of the sons of the giant, the weight of whose spear weighed three hundred shekels of brass, he being girded with a new sword, thought to have slain David; but Abishai, the son of Zeruiah, scoured him, and smote the Philistine and killed him." 2. Saph, who was of the sons of the giant, and was slain by Sibbechai. 3. "A man of great stature, that had on every hand six fingers and on every foot six toes, four and twenty in number, and he also was born to the giant; and when he defied Israel, Jonathan, the son of Shimeah, the brother of David, slew him." These four were sons of the giant in Gath, that is, probably of the Goliath of Gath whom David slew (1 Kings xx, 8; 2 Sam. xx, 22; 1 Sam. xvii, 4). See each of these names in their alphabetical order.

4. Another race is mentioned in Deut. ii, 10, the *Emim* (אֱמִיטִים), who dwelt in the country of the Moabites. They are described as a people "great and many, and tall as the Anakims, which were also accounted giants" (Gen. xiv, 5). See EMIM.

5. The *Zamzumim* also (זַמְזָמִים) (Deut. xxi, 20), whose home was in the land of Ammon—"That also was accounted a land of giants: giants dwelt therein of old time, and the Ammonites called them Zamzumims, a people great and many, and tall as the Anakims; but the Lord destroyed them before them, and

they (the Israelites) succeeded them, and dwelt in their stead." See ZAMZUMIM.

6. The only other passage where the term "giant" occurs (except as a rendering of *gigas* in Judith vi, 6; Wisd. xiv, 7; Ecclus. xvi, 7; xlvii, 4; Bar. iii, 26; 1 Macc. iii, 3) is Job xvi, 14, where the original is גִּבּוֹרִים, elsewhere "a mighty man," i. e. champion or hero. See GIBBORIM.

All nations have had a dim fancy that the aborigines who preceded them, and the earliest men generally, were of immense stature. Berosus says that the ten antediluvian kings of Chaldaea were giants, and we find in all monkish historians a similar statement about the earliest possessors of Britain (comp. Homer, *Od.* x, 119; Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, xv, 9; Pliny, vii, 16; Varro, *ap. Aul. Gellius*, iii, 10; Jerome on Matt. xxvii). The great size decreased gradually after the Deluge (2 Esdr. v, 52-55). That we are dwarfs compared to our ancestors was a common belief among the Latin and Greek poets (*Il.* v, 302 sq.; Lucret. ii, 1151; Virg. *Æn.* xii, 900; Juv. xv, 69). On the origin of the mistaken supposition there are curious passages in Natalis Comes (*Mytholog.* vi, 21) and Macobius (*Saturn.* i, 20). See NIMROD. At an early period and under favorable circumstances, individuals, and even tribes, may have reached an unusual height and been of extraordinary strength. This was in great part, no doubt, owing to the simpler mode of life and more hardy habits that prevailed in early times. But many things concur to show that the size of the race did not differ materially from what it is at present. This is seen in the remains of human beings found in tombs, especially among the mummies of Egypt. To the same effect is the size of ancient armor, as well as architectural dimensions, and the measures of length which have been received from antiquity. Ancient writers who are free from the influence of fable are found to give a concurrent testimony. "Homer, when speaking of a fine man, gives him four cubits in height and one in breadth; Vitruvius fixes the usual standard of a man at six Roman feet; Aristotle's admeasurement of beds was six feet" (Millingen's *Curiosities of Medical Experience*, p. 14). No one has yet proved by experience the possibility of giant races, materially exceeding in size the average height of man. There is no great variation in the ordinary standard. The most stunted tribes of Esquimaux are at least four feet high, and the tallest races of America (e. g. the Guayaquilists and people of Paraguay) do not exceed six feet and a half. It was long thought that the Patagonians were men of enormous stature, and the assertions of the old voyagers on the point were positive. For instance, Pigafetta (*Voyage round the World*, Pinkerton, xi, 314) mentions an individual Patagonian so tall that they "hardly reached to his waist." Similar exaggerations are found in the voyages of Byron, Wallace, Carteret, Cook, and Forster; but it is now a matter of certainty, from the recent visits to Patagonia (by Winter, captain Snow, etc.), that there is nothing at all extraordinary in their size. The general belief (until very recent times) in the existence of fabulously enormous men arose from fancied giant-graves (see De la Valle's *Travels in Persia*, ii, 89), and, above all, from the discovery of huge bones, which were taken for those of men, in days when comparative anatomy was unknown. Even the ancient Jews were thus misled (Josephus, *Ant.* v, 2, 3). Augustine appeals triumphantly to this argument, and mentions a molar tooth which he had seen at Utica a hundred times larger than ordinary teeth (*De Civ. Dei*, xv, 9). No doubt it once belonged to an elephant. Vives, in his commentary on the place, mentions a tooth as big as a fist which was shown at St. Christopher's. In fact, this source of delusion has only very recently been dispelled (Martin's *West Islands*, in Pinkerton, ii, 691). Most bones which have been exhib-

ited have turned out to belong to whales or elephants, as was the case with the vertebra of a supposed giant examined by Sir Hans Sloane in Oxfordshire. On the other hand, isolated instances of monstrosity are sufficiently attested to prove that beings like Goliath and his kinsmen may have existed. Columella (*R. R.* iii, § 2) mentions Navius Pollio as one, and Pliny says that in the time of Claudius Cesar there was an Arab named Gabbaras nearly ten feet high, and that even he was not so tall as Pudio and Secundilla in the reign of Augustus, whose bodies were preserved (vii, 16). Josephus tells us that, among other hostages, Artabanus sent to Tiberius a certain Eleazar, a Jew, surnamed "the Giant," seven cubits in height (*Ant.* xviii, 4, 5). Porus, the Indian king, was five cubits in height (Arrian, *Exp. Al.* v, 19). Nor are well-authenticated instances wanting in modern times. Delrio says he saw in 1572 a man from Piedmont whose height exceeded nine feet (*Not. ad Senec. Ed.* p. 39). O'Brien, whose skeleton is preserved in the Museum of the College of Surgeons, must have been eight feet high, but his unnatural height made him weakly. On the other hand, the blacksmith Parsons, in Charles II's reign, was seven feet two inches high, and also remarkable for his strength (Fuller's *Worthies*, Staffordshire). The tallest person of whom we have a trustworthy record did not, according to Haller, exceed nine feet. Schreber, who has collected the description of the principal modern giants, found few above seven feet and a half, although he mentions a Swedish peasant of eight feet Swedish measure; and one of the guards of the duke of Brunswick was eight feet six inches Dutch. Such well-known instances as those of Daniel Lambert and others in modern museums probably come fully up to any of the measures of the Biblical giants. See art. Giant in the *Encyclopædia Metropolitana*; Whiston, "On the old Giants," *Auth. Records*, ii, 872-938; Prichard, *Researches into the Physical History of Mankind*, i, 358 (1836).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

**Gib, ADAM**, one of the founders of the anti-burgher secession in Scotland, was born in Perthshire in 1713, and educated in Edinburgh. He was a bitter opponent of private church patronage, and in 1733 was dismissed from his pastoral charge. He was made pastor of a secession church in Edinburgh in 1741, and when the dispute began in 1746 about the swearing of the oaths of burgesses, Mr. Gib was considered the ablest advocate of the anti-burgher party. He died in 1788. He published *A Display of the Secession Testimony* (1744, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Sacred Contemplations*, with an essay appended on Liberty and Necessity in reply to Lord Kames (1786).—Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 660; Rose, *New General Biographical Dictionary*, viii, 18.

**Gib'bar** (Chald. *Gibbar'*, גִּבְבָּר, for Heb. גִּבְיָר, a *hero*, as in Dan. iii, 20; Sept. Γαββάρ, Vulgate *Gebbar'*), given as the name of a man whose descendants to the number of 95 returned with Zerubbabel from Babylon (Ezra ii, 20), probably an error for the remnants of the natives of GIBEON (Neh. vii, 25).

**Gib'bethon** (Hebrew *Gibbethon'*, גִּבְתֹּן, a *height*; Sept. Γαβθών v. r. Γαβθών, Γαβθών, Γεθθών and Βεγεθών), a city of the Philistines, which was included in the territories of the tribe of Dan (Josh. xix, 44), and was assigned, with its "amburs," to the Kohathite Levites (Josh. xxi, 23). It was still in the hands of the Philistines in the time of Nadab, king of Israel, who besieged it, and was slain under its walls by Baasha, one of his own officers (1 Kings xv, 27). B.C. 950. The effort to expel the Philistines seems to have been continued by the forces of the northern kingdom, till the siege was finally raised by Omri in consequence of the necessity of pursuing the usurper Zimri (1 Kings xvi, 15). B.C. 926. It is said by Eusebius and Jerome (apparently even to their time) to be inhabited

by Gentiles (πῶν Ἀλλοφύλων Γαβαζών), but they expressly distinguish this from the Danite town, and they seem uncertain whether to identify it with a village (πολίτην) called *Gabe* (Γαβέ), about 16 R. miles from Cæsarea, near the great plain of *Legio*, or with one of two or three other places named *Gabbatha* (*Onomast.* s. v. Γαβαζών, *Gabathon*). Josephus (*Ant.* viii, 12, 5) calls it *Gabathone* (Γαβαζώνη). The signification of the name and the great strength of the place seem to fix it upon the hills west of Gibeah of Benjamin (with which M. D. Sauley confounds its locality, *Narrative*, i, 98). It is possibly the modern large village *Saidon*, a short distance beyond the well S.E. of Ramleh (Robinson, *Researches*, iii, 21). Van de Velde calls it also *Sheik Musu* (*Memoir*, p. 114).

**Gibbites**, THE, a small fanatical sect in Scotland about 1681, named from their leader, John Gib, a sailor. They never exceeded thirty persons. Their doctrines were a compound of Quaker ideas, with some of the extreme speculative views of the strict Covenanters. They were seized as a body, put into the House of Correction, and soon ceased to exist as a sect.—Hetherington, *Church of Scotland*, ii, 114.

**Gibbon, EDWARD**, historian, was born at Putney, in Surrey, April 27, 1737. He was sent to Oxford too young, and did not learn much there. At sixteen he embraced Romanism. He was immediately placed under the care of a Calvinist minister at Lausanne, whose instructions led him in a few months back to Protestantism. "The five years he spent at Lausanne, closing in 1758, when he was just of age, formed the real commencement of his education; and at their close, he was not only a ripe scholar in French and Latin, but possessed of an extraordinary amount of historical and other information. He found leisure, however, for falling in love, unsuccessfully, with a young lady, who afterwards became the wife of M. Necker, and the mother of Madame de Staël. For several years after Gibbon's return to England he lived chiefly at his father's house in Hampshire, and, failing in attempts to obtain diplomatic employment, he accepted a militia commission, attended zealously to his duties, and rose to be lieutenant colonel. But the studious habits and literary ambition which he had acquired never flagged. In 1761 he published, in French, a short essay *On the Study of Literature*. He extended his acquaintance with English authors, and, beginning to learn Greek thoroughly, pursued the study zealously, when, in 1763, he was allowed again to visit the Continent. In Rome, next year, he conceived the design of his great historical work. Returning home in 1765, he passed some years unsatisfactorily to himself, but not without much improvement both in knowledge and in skill of writing. In 1774 he entered the House of Commons, in which he sat for eight sessions; and he was rewarded for his silent votes in favor of Lord North's administration by holding for three years a seat at the Board of Trade. In 1770 he published, in answer to Warburton, his spirited *Dissertation on the Sixth Book of the Æneid*. In the same year, the death of his father placed him in possession of a fortune, which, though embarrassed, he was able to extricate so far that it afforded a handsome competence, and enabled him to devote himself exclusively to study and composition. In 1776 he published the first volume of *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, the first edition of which was sold in a few days, and was rapidly followed by others. The second and third volumes, appearing in 1781, brought down the narrative to the fall of the Western Empire; and for a while the author hesitated whether he should not here allow the work to drop" (Rich, *Biog.* s. v.). He resumed the design, however, in 1783, when he fixed his abode at Lausanne, and prepared the remaining volumes, the last of which appeared in 1788. He died January 16, 1794, during his last visit to England. His posthumous

works were published by his friend Lord Sheffield. The best editions of the "Decline and Fall" are that of Milman (Lond. 1846, 6 vols. 8vo, 2d edit.), and that by Dr. Wm. Smith (1855, 8 vols. 8vo). In a literary point of view, the merits of this history are very great; its style has a loftiness in harmony with the grandeur of the theme; its erudition is vast to a degree unknown before in English writers of history; its arrangement is luminous, and its execution is sustained at the same point of excellence throughout. But Gibbon was an infidel, and his unbelief lurks in every page of his work where Christianity is nearly or remotely touched on. His skepticism leads him into manifold displays of unfairness, and even into inaccuracies, many of which are corrected in Milman's notes. Dr. J. M. Macdonald wrote an able article in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* (July, 1868), defending Gibbon from the charge of infidelity, and seeking to account for the opposite opinion about him so generally adopted. The attempt is very ingenious, but will not shake the established opinion.—Milman, *Life of E. Gibbon* (Lond. 1839, 8vo); *Quarterly Review*, xii, 375; lxii, 196; *Literary and Theol. Review*, ii, 38; *Christian Review*, xiii, 34; *National Review*, Jan. 1856.

**Gibbons**, THOMAS, D.D., a pious and eminent English dissenter, was born at Reak, near Cambridge, in 1720. His father, who was pastor of a Congregational church at Olney, in Bucks, gave him the best education his circumstances would permit. In 1742 he became acquainted with Dr. Isaac Watts; and by showing him a volume of poems in manuscript, an intimate friendship was formed between them, which continued unabated to the close of Dr. Watts's life. In 1743 Dr. Gibbons was called to the pastoral charge of the Independent church meeting in Haberdashers' hall, Cheapside, which he held till his death, Feb. 22, 1785. He wrote *Memoirs of Dr. Watts* (1780, 8vo);—*Poems, on several Occasions* (1743);—*Rhetoric; or, a View of its principal Tropes and Figures, in their Origin and Powers* (1767, 8vo);—*Hymns* (1769);—*Hymns*, second series, entirely original (1784);—*Lives and Memoirs of eminently pious Women* (1777, 2 vols. 8vo). After Dr. Gibbons's death, three volumes of sermons by him were published in 8vo by subscription. Some of his hymns are still used, and will continue to hold their place in Christian song.—Jones, *Christian Biography*, p. 177; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliograph.* i, 1244.

**Gibborim**, plur. of גִּבּוֹרִים, *Gibbor'*, a warrior (Isa. iii, 2; Ezek. xxxix, 20); especially spoken of David's noted braves or "mighty men" (2 Sam. xxiii, 8; 1 Kings i, 8; 1 Chron. xi, 26; xxix, 24). See CHAMPIONS. The sons of the marriages mentioned in Gen. vi, 1-4, are called *Gibborim'* (גִּבּוֹרִים, from גָּבַר, *to be strong*), a general name meaning *powerful* (ὀβρισταὶ καὶ πάντος ὑπεροπταὶ καλοῦ, Josephus, *Ant.* i, 3, 1; γῆς παίδες τὸν νοῦν ἐκθίβασαντες τοῦ λογίζεσθαι κ. τ. λ., Philo, *De Gigant.* p. 270; comp. Isa. xlix, 24; Ezek. xxxii, 21). They were not necessarily *giants* in our sense of the word (Theodoret, *Quæst.* 48). Yet, as was natural, these powerful chiefs were almost universally represented as men of extraordinary stature. The Sept. renders the word γίγαντες, and call Nimrod a γίγας κενητός (1 Chron. i, 10); Augustine calls them *Staturosi* (*De Civ. Dei*, xv, 4); Chrysostom ἦρωες εὐμήκεις, Theodoret παρμεγέθεις (comp. Bar. iii, 26, εὐμεγέθεις, ἐπιστάμενοι πόδεμον).

These beings are chiefly interesting as connected with the question, Who were their parents, "the sons of God" (בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים)? The opinions respecting the import of this latter title are various: (1.) *Men of power* (οἱ ἐνασπενόνηρον, Symm., Jerome, *Quæst. Heb.* ad loc.; בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים, Onk.; בני שלטניה, Samar.; so too Selden, Vorst, etc.), (compare Psa. ii, 7; lxxii, 6; lxxxix, 27; Mic. v, 5, etc.). The expression will then exactly resemble Homer's Διογενεῖς Βασιλῆς, and the Chinese *Tián-tseï*, "son of heaven," as

a title of the emperor (Gesenius, s. v. 𐤓𐤁). But why should the union of the high-born and the low-born produce offspring unusual for their size and strength? (2.) *Men with great gifts*, "in the image of God" (Ritter, Schumann); (3.) *Cainites arrogantly assuming the title* (Paulus); or (4.) *the pious Sethites* (comp. Gen. iv, 26; Maimon. *Mor. Nebuch.* i, 14; Suidas, s. v. Σιθ and μαγαμίας; Cedren. *Hist. Comp.* p. 10; Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, xv, 23; Chrysost. *Hom.* 22, in Gen.; Theod. in Gen. *Quæst.* 47; Cyril, c. Jul. ix, etc.). A host of modern commentators catch at this explanation, but Gen. iv, 26 has probably no connection with the subject. Other texts quoted in favor of the view are Deut. xiv, 1, 2; Psa. lxxiii, 15; Prov. xiv, 26; Hos. i, 10; Rom. viii, 14, etc. Still the mere antithesis in the verse, as well as other considerations, tend strongly against this gloss, which indeed is built on a foregone conclusion. Compare, however, the Indian notion of the two races of men Suras and Asuras (children of the sun and of the moon, Nork, *Erasm. und Rabb.* p. 204 sq.), and the Persian belief in the marriage of Jemshid with a sister of a *der*, whence sprang black and impious men (Kaïsch, *Gen.* p. 175). 5. Worshipers of false gods (παίδες τῶν θεῶν, Aqu.) making אֲנָשִׁים = "servants" (comp. Deut. xiv, 1; Prov. xiv, 26; Exod. xxxii, 1; Deut. iv, 28, etc.). This view is ably supported by Poole in *Genesis of Earth and Man*, p. 39 sq. (6.) Devils, such as the Incubi and Succubi. Such was the belief of the Cabbalists (Valesius, *De S. Philosoph.* cap. 8). That these beings can have intercourse with women St. Augustine declares it would be folly to doubt, and it was the universal belief in the East. Mohammed makes one of the ancestors of Balkis, queen of Sheba, a demon, and Damir says he had heard a Mohammedan doctor openly boast of having married in succession four daemon wives (Bochart, *Hieroz.* i, p. 747). Indeed, the belief still exists (Lane's *Mod. Eg.* i, ch. x, ad in.). (7.) Closely allied to this is the oldest opinion, that they were *angels* (Sept. ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ, for such was the old reading, not οἰοί, August. *De Civ. Dei*, xv, 23; so too Josephus, *Ant.* i, 3, 1; Philo, *De Gig.* ii, 358; Clem. *Strom.* iii, 7, 69; Sulp. Sever. *Hist. Script.* in *Orthod.* i, 1, etc.; compare Job i, 6; ii, 1; Psa. xxix, 1; Job iv, 18). The rare expression "sons of God" certainly means angels in Job xxxviii, 7; i, 6; ii, 1; and that such is the meaning in Gen. vi, 4 also, was the most prevalent opinion both in the Jewish and early Christian Church. It seems, however, to be directly negated by Matt. xxii, 30. See SONS OF GOD.

It was probably this very ancient view which gave rise to the spurious book of Enoch, and the notion quoted from it by Jude (6), and alluded to by Peter (2 Pet. ii, 4; compare 1 Cor. xi, 10; Tertul. *De Virg. Vel.* 7). According to this book, certain angels, sent by God to guard the earth (Ἐρωήγοροι, φύλακτες), were perverted by the beauty of women, "went after strange flesh," taught sorcery, finery (*lumina lapillorum, circulos ex aure*, Tertullian, etc.), and, being banished from heaven, had sons 3000 cubits high, thus originating a celestial and terrestrial race of demons—"Unde modo vagi subvertunt corpora multa" (Commodian *Instruct.* III, *Cultus Demonum*), i. e. they are still the source of epilepsy, etc. Various names were given at a later time to these monsters. Their chief was Leuias, and of their number were Machsael, Aza, Shemchozai, and (the wickedest of them) a goat-like demon Azazel (compare Azazel, Lev. xvi, 8; and for the very curious questions connected with this name, see Bochart, *Hieroz.* i, 652 sq.; Rab. Eliezer, cap. 23, *Bereshith Rab.* ad Gen. vi, 2; Sennert, *De Gigantibus*, iii). See ASMODEUS.

Against this notion (which Hävernäck calls "the silliest whim of the Alexandrian Gnostics and Cabbalistic Rabbis," *Introd. to Pentateuch*, p. 345) Heidegger (*Hist. Patr.* l. c.) quotes Matt. xxii, 30; Luke xxiv, 39, and similar testimonies. Philastrius (*Adv. Hæres.*

cap. 108) characterizes it as a heresy, and Chrysostom (*Hom.* 22) even calls it τὸ βλάσφημον ἱκεῖνο. Yet Jude (ver. 6, 7) is explicit, and the question is not so much what *can* be, as what *was* believed. The fathers almost unanimously accepted these fables, and Tertullian argues warmly (partly on *expedient* grounds!) for the genuineness of the book of Enoch. The angels were called Ἐγγήγοροι, *watchers*, a word used by Aquil, and Symm. to render the Chaldee ܘܢܘܢ (Dan. iv, 13 sq.; Vulg. *Vigil*; Sept. εἰσ; Lex Cyrilli, ἀγγέλοι ἢ ἀγγονοί; Fabric. *Cod. Pseudepigr.* V. T. p. 180), and therefore used, as in the Zend-Avesta, of good guardian angels, and applied especially to archangels in the Syriac liturgies (compare ܘܢܘܢ, Isa. xxi, 11), but more often of evil angels (Castelli *Lex. Syr.* p. 649; Scaliger, *ad Euseb. Chron.* p. 403; Gesenius, *Theos. s. v.* ܘܢܘܢ). The story of the Egregori is given at length in Tertull. *De Cult. Fem. i.* 2; ii, 10; Commodianus, *Instruct.* iii.; Lactant. *Div. Inst.* ii, 14; *Testam. Patriarc.* c. v., etc. Every one will remember the allusions to the same interpretation in Milton, *Par. Reg.* ii, 179:

"Before the Flood, thou with thy lusty crew,  
False-titled sons of God, roaming the earth,  
Cast wanton eyes on the daughters of men,  
And coupled with them, and begat a race."

The use made of the legend in some modern poems deserves to be severely reprobated. See ANGEL.

We need hardly say how closely allied this is to the Greek legends which connected the ἄγρια ὄντα γιγάντων with the gods (Homer, *Od.* vii, 205; Pausan. viii, 29), and made *καίμονες* sons of the gods (Plato, *Apolog.* ἡμίθεοι; Cratylus, § 32). Indeed, the whole heathen tradition resembles the one before us (Cumberland's *Sanchoiathko*, p. 24; Homer, *Od.* xi, 306 sq.; Hesiod, *Theog.* 185, *Opp.* et *D.* 144; Plato, *Rep.* ii, § 17, 604 E.; *De Legg.* iii, § 16, 805 A.; Ovid, *Metam.* i, 151; Lucan, iv, 293; Lucian, *De Deā Syr.*, etc.; compare Grotius, *De Ver.* i, 6); and the Greek translators of the Bible make the resemblance still more close by introducing such words as θεόμαχοι, γιγάντες, and even Τιτῶνες, to which last Josephus (*l. c.*) expressly compares the giants of Genesis (Sept. at Prov. ii, 18; Psa. xlviii, 2; 1 Sam. v, 18; Judith xvi, 5). The fate, too, of these demon-chiefs is identical with that of heathen story (Job xxvi, 5; Sir. xvi, 7; Bar. iii, 26-28; Wisd. xiv, 6; 3 Macc. ii, 4; 1 Pet. iii, 19). See DÆMON.

These legends may therefore be regarded as distortions of the Biblical narrative, handed down by tradition, and embellished by the fancy and imagination of Eastern nations (Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 395 sq.). The belief of the Jews in later times is remarkably illustrated by the story of Asmodeus in the book of Tobit. It is deeply instructive to observe how wide and marked a contrast there is between the incidental allusion of the sacred narrative (Gen. vi, 4), and the minute frivolities or prurient follies which degrade the heathen mythology, and repeatedly appear in the groundless imaginings of the Rabbinic interpreters. If there were fallen angels whose lawless desires gave birth to a monstrous progeny, both they and their intolerable off-spring were destroyed by the deluge, which was the retribution on their wickedness, and they have no existence in the baptized and renovated earth.—Smith, s. v. Giants. See GIANT.

**Gibbs**, JOSIAH W., LL.D., professor in the theological department of Yale College, was born in Salem, Mass., April 30, 1790. He graduated at Yale College in 1809, and was tutor in the College from 1811 till 1815. He then spent some years at Andover, Mass., devoting himself to the study of Hebrew and Biblical literature. While there he published a translation of Storr on *The Historical Sense of the New Testament* (Boston, 1817, 12mo), and also prepared a translation of Gesenius's *Hebrew-Lexicon*, which appeared in 1824; also London, 1827, 2d edit. 1832; in abridged form, *Manual Hebrew and English Lexicon*, including

*Biblical Chaldee*, 1828; 2d edit. enlarged, New Haven, 1832, 8vo. In 1824 he was called to be lecturer of sacred literature in the theological school of Yale College. In 1826 a professorship in that branch was founded, to which Mr. Gibbs was called. He remained in this post until his death, March 25, 1861, at New Haven. Professor Gibbs was a constant contributor to periodicals, especially on the points of Biblical criticism, archaeology, and philological science. Many of his valuable papers appeared in newspapers, often anonymously. Others were published in the *Christian Spectator*, *Biblical Repository*, *New Englander*, and *American Journal of Science*. During his later years his attention was chiefly given to comparative grammar, and in this branch, as in every other which he touched, his work was that of a thorough scholar. For several years he was one of the publishing committee of the American Oriental Society. Some of his essays were collected, with additions, under the title *Philological Studies, with English Illustrations* (New Haven, 1856), and *Teutonic Etymology* (New Haven, 1860).—Fisher, in *New Englander*, July, 1861, art. ii,

**Gib'eä** (Heb. *Giba'*, גִּבְעָא, *hill*; Sept. Γαιβᾶ v. r. Γαιβᾶ), a place built or occupied in connection with Machbenai by Sheva, son of Caleb's concubine Maachah (1 Chron. ii, 49); hence probably the same with GIBEAH (q. v.) of Judah (Josh. xv, 57).

**Gib'eāh** (Heb. *Gibak'*, גִּבְעָא, *a hill*, as the word is sometimes rendered; likewise the Sept., which usually has Γαιβᾶ, but in Josh. xviii Γαιβαῖς; Josephus Γαιβᾶθ, *Ant.* vi, 4, 6), the name of three cities, all doubtless situated on hills. The term is derived, according to Gesenius (*Theos.* p. 259, 266), from a root, גִּבְעָ, signifying to be round or humped (compare the Latin *gibbus*, Eng. *gibbous*; the Arabic *jebel*, a mountain, and the German *gipfel*). It is employed in the Heb. Bible to denote a "hill," that is, an eminence of less considerable height and extent than a "mountain," the term for which is הַר, *har*. For the distinction between the two terms, see Psa. cxlviii, 9; Prov. viii, 25; Isa. ii, 2; xl, 4, etc. In the historical books *gibeah* is commonly applied to the bald, rounded hills of Central Palestine, especially in the neighborhood of Jerusalem (Stanley, *Palest. App.* § 25). There is no lack of the corresponding name among the villages of Central Palestine. Several of these are merely mentioned as appellatives:

(1.) The "hill of the foreskins" (Josh. v, 3), between the Jordan and Jericho; it derives its name from the circumcision which took place there, and the vicinity since afterwards to have received the name of GILGAL (q. v.).

(2.) "The hill" of Kirjath-jearim, a place in which the ark remained from the time of its return by the Philistines till its removal by David (2 Sam. vi, 3, 4; comp. 1 Sam. vii, 1, 2). See KIRJATH-JEARIM.

(3.) The hill of Moreh (Judg. vii, 1). See MOREH.

(4.) The hill of God—Gibeah ha-Elohim (1 Sam. x, 5); one of the places in the route of Saul, which is so difficult to trace. In verses 10 and 13 it is apparently called "the hill," and "the high place." See ELOHIM.

(5.) The hill of Hachilah (1 Sam. xxiii, 19; xxvi, 1). See HACHILAH.

(6.) The hill of Ammah (2 Sam. ii, 24). See AMMAH.

(7.) The hill of Gareb (Jer. xxxi, 39). See GAREB.—Smith, s. v.

**GIBEAH OF BENJAMIN** is historically the most important of the places bearing this name. It is called "Gibeah of Benjamin" (1 Sam. xiii, 15; 2 Sam. xxiii, 29) and "Gibeah of Saul" (1 Sam. xi, 4; Isa. x, 19; λόφος Σαούλ, Josephus, *War.* v, 2, 1); also "Gibeah of God," rendered hill of God (1 Sam. x, 5); and GIBEATH (Josh. xviii, 28, where it is enumerated



among the last group of the towns of Benjamin, next to Jerusalem). This last name (גִּבְעָה, which frequently appears elsewhere in the original), being the form of GIBEAH in the construct state, has been joined by some to the following name, i. e. "Gibeah of Kirjath-jearim" (Schwarz, *Phys. Descrip. of Palestine*, p. 132); but these two cities are evidently counted separately in the text. Others regard "Gibeah" here as a mere appellative denoting some hill near Kirjath-jearim (compare 1 Sam. vii, 1, 2). This city is often mentioned in Scripture (Hos. v, 8; ix, 9; x, 9; 1 Sam. x, 26). It was the scene of the atrocious crime which involved in its consequences almost the entire extirpation of the tribe of Benjamin (Judg. xix, 12-30; xx, 1-48). It soon recovered from that eventful siege and sack. It was the birth-place of Saul, and continued to be his residence after he became king (1 Sam. x, 26; xi, 4; xv, 33; xxiii, 19; xxvi, 1); and it was doubtless on account of this its intimate connection with Saul that the Gibeonites hanged up here his seven descendants (2 Sam. xxi, 6). An erroneous translation of the name has led to the misapprehension that this was the scene of Jonathan's romantic exploits against the Philistines (1 Sam. xiv). See GEBÄ. Like Bethel, it seems to have been reckoned among the ancient sanctuaries of Palestine (1 Sam. x, 5, 6; xv, 34; xxiii, 19; xxvi, 1; 2 Sam. xxi, 6-10). The inhabitants were called Gibeathites (1 Chron. xii, 3). Josephus locates it twenty (*Ant.* v, 2, 8) or thirty (*War.* v, 2, 1, Γαβαθασούλη) stadia north of Jerusalem. Jerome speaks of Gibeah as, in his time, level with the ground (*Ep.* 86, *ad Eustoch.*), and since then it does not appear to have been visited by travellers till recently. Dr. Robinson at first identified it with *Jeba*, a half-ruined place about five miles north by east of Jerusalem (*Researches*, ii, 114); but he afterwards retracted this position as being that of GEBÄ (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1844, p. 598); and he has finally fixed upon *Tell el-Ful*, about four miles north by west of Jerusalem, as the site of Gibeah of Saul (new ed. of *Researches*, iii, 286). *Tell el-Ful* ("hill of the bean") is a high knoll, with a curiously knobbed and double top, having a large heap of stones upon it. There seems to have originally been here a square tower, fifty-six feet by forty-eight, built of large unhewn stones, and apparently ancient; this has been thrown down, and the stones and rubbish, falling outside, have assumed the form of a large pyramidal mound. No trace of other foundations is to be seen. The spot is slightly, and commands a very extensive view of the country in all directions, especially towards the east. There are no other remains around the hill itself; but a few rods further west, directly upon the great road as it enters the lower plain or valley, there are seen a number of ancient substructions, consisting of large unhewn stones in low massive walls. Probably the ancient city extended down from the hill on this side and included this spot (Robinson, in *Researches* and *Biblioth. Sacra*, ut sup.; Stanley's *Palestine*, p. 210). The ancient road from Jerusalem to Bethel and Shechem passes close along its western base, and Ramah is in full view on another hill two miles further north (*Handbook of S. and P.* p. 325). The narrative of the Levite's journey is thus made remarkably graphic. He left Bethlehem in the afternoon to go home to Mount Ephraim. Two hours' travel (six miles) brought him alongside Jerusalem. Evening was now approaching. His servant advised him to lodge in Jebus, but he declined to stop with strangers, and said he would pass on to Gibeah or Ramah. The "sun went down upon them when they were by Gibeah," and they resolved to pass the night there (Judg. xix). The site of Gibeah was well adapted to form the capital of Israel during the troublous times of Saul, when the whole country was overrun by the hostile bands of the Philistines. It was naturally strong, it was on the very crest of the mountain range, and it commanded a wide

view, so that Saul's watchmen could give timely notice of the approach of the enemy.

2. GIBEAH OF JUDAH, situated in the mountains of that tribe (*Josh.* xv, 57, where it is named with Maon and the southern Carmel; compare 1 Chron. ii, 49), which, under the name of *Gabatha* (Γαβαθά), Eusebius and Jerome place twelve Roman miles from Eleutheropolis, and state that the grave of the prophet Habakkuk was there to be seen (*Onomasticon*, s. v. Γαβαθά, Gabaath; although they there confound it with the Gibeah of Phinehas in Ephraim, and elsewhere [s. v. Κελλά, Ceila] state that Habakkuk's tomb was shown in Keilab), or, more probably, one of those by a similar name (Γαβαά, Γαβαθά) lying in the Daroma or near Bethlehem (*ib.* s. v. Γαβαθών, Gabathon). Dr. Robinson (*Researches*, ii, 327) identifies it with the village of *Jebah*, which stands upon an isolated hill, in the midst of wady el-Mussur, about ten miles south-west of Jerusalem; but this is too far from the associated names in Joshua, which require a location south-east of Hebron (Keil, *Comment.* ad loc.), possibly at the ruins on a mound with caves marked as *Erfäijeh* on Van de Velde's *Map* east of tell Zif. See JUDAH.

3. GIBEAH OF PHINEHAS, in Mount Ephraim, where the high-priest Eleazar, son of Aaron, was buried by his son Phinehas (*Josh.* xxiv, 33, where the name is rendered "hill of Phinehas"). Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v. Γηβθά, Gebin) probably mention this place by the name of *Geba* (although they incorrectly identify this with the Gebim of Isa. x, 31) (s. v. "Gebim"), five Roman miles from Gophna, on the road to Neapolis (Shechem), which was itself fifteen Roman miles north of Jerusalem. Josephus appears also to allude to it (Γαβαθά, *Ant.* v, 1, 20). Dr. Robinson (*Researches*, iii, 80, note) finds it in a narrow valley called *wady el-Jib*, the *Geb* of Maundrell, lying just midway on the road between Jerusalem and Shechem; the indication of direction in the *Onomasticon* agrees with the position of the village *Jibea* (located on that wady), west of the Nablús road, half way between Bethel and Shiloh (Van de Velde, *Memoir.* p. 315), but the distance still better suits that of the Moslem ruined village *Jibá*, west of this (Robinson, *Researches*, iii, Append. p. 125; Van de Velde, *Map*).

Gib'eäth (*Josh.* xviii, 28). See GIBEAH 1.

Gib'eäthite (Heb. with the article *hag-Gibathi'*, גִּבְעָתִיתִי; Sept. ὁ Γαβαθίτης v. r. Γαβαθίτης, Γεβωθίτης), the designation of a native of Gibeah (1 Chron. xii, 3); in this case, Shemaah, or "the Shemaah," father of two Benjaminites, "Saul's brethren," who joined David. See GIBEAH 1.

Gib'eön (Heb. *Gibon'*, גִּבְעוֹן, *hill-city*; Sept. Γαβαών, Josephus Γαβαώ), one of the four cities of the Hivites, the others being Beeroth (omitted by Josephus, *Ant.* v, 2, 16), Clephirah, and Kirjath-jearim (*Josh.* ix, 17). See CANAANITE. Its inhabitants made a league with Joshua (ix, 3-15), and thus escaped the fate of Jericho and Ai (comp. xi, 19). See GIBEAONITE. It appears, as might be inferred from its taking the initiative in this matter, to have been the largest of the four—"a great city, like one of the royal cities"—larger than Ai (x, 2). Its men, too, were all practiced warriors (*Gibborim*, גִּבְרִים). Gibeon lay within the territory of Benjamin (xviii, 25), and with its "suburbs" was allotted to the priests (xxi, 17), of whom it afterwards became a principal station, where the tabernacle was set up for many years under David and Solomon (1 Chron. xvi, 39; xxi, 29; 2 Chron. i, 3), the ark being at the same time at Jerusalem (2 Chron. i, 4). For these and other notices in the historical books of Scripture, see below. From Jer. xli, 16, we may infer that after the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, Gibeon again became the seat of government. It produced prophets in the days of Jeremiah (*Jer.* xxviii, 1). After the captivity we find

the "men of Gibeon" returning with Zerubbabel (Neh. vii, 25; in the list of Ezra the name is altered to GIBBAR), and assisting Nehemiah in the repair of the wall of Jerusalem (iii, 7). In the post-Biblical times it was the scene of a victory by the Jews over the Roman troops under Cestius Gallus, which offers in many respects a close parallel with that of Joshua over the Canaanites (Josephus, *War*, ii, 19, 7; Stanley, *Palest.*, p. 212). In 2 Sam. v, 25 it would seem to be called GEBEA (where the error of the original has been followed by all the versions), as compared with 1 Chron. xiv, 16; but it is to be distinguished from both Geba and Gibeah. It is said (2 Sam. ii, 13) that there was a pool in Gibeon. Whether it were of any considerable extent does not appear from this passage; but there is little doubt that it is the same as "the great waters that are in Gibeon" (Jer. xli, 12). There was also a great stone or rock here (2 Sam. xx, 8), and also the great high place (1 Kings iii, 4). All this shows that Gibeon was situated on an eminence, as its name imports.

*Location.*—None of the scriptural passages mark the site of Gibeon; but there are indications of it in Josephus (*War*, ii, 19, 1), who places it 40 (*Ant.* vii, 11, 7) or 50 stadia north-west from Jerusalem, and in Jerome (*Ep.* 86, *ad Eustoch.*), which leave little doubt that Gibeon is to be identified with the place which still bears the name of *El-Jib*. The name *Gabaon* is indeed mentioned by writers of the time of the Crusades, as existing at this spot, and among the Arabs it then already bore the name of El-Jib, under which it is mentioned by Bohaedinn (*Vita Saladin*, p. 243). Afterwards it was overlooked by most travellers till the last century, when the attention of Pococke was again directed to it (*Description of the East*, ii, 49). The traveller who pursues the northern camel-road from Jerusalem, turning off to the left at Tuleil el-fül (Gibeah) on that branch of it which leads westward to Jaffa, finds himself, after crossing one or two stony and barren ridges, in a district of a more open character. The hills are rounder and more isolated than those through which he has been passing, and rise in well-defined mamelons from broad undulating valleys of tolerable extent and fertile soil. This is the central plateau of the country, the "land of Benjamin"; and these round hills are the Gibeahs, Gebas, Gibeons, and Ramahs, whose names occur so frequently in the records of this district. Retaining its ancient name almost intact, El-Jib stands on the northernmost of a couple of these mamelons, just at the place where the road to the sea parts into two branches, the one by the lower level of the wady Suleiman, the other by the heights of the Beth-horon, to Gimzo, Lydda, and Joppa. The road passes at a short distance to the north of the base of the hill of El-Jib. The strata of the hills in this district lie much more horizontal than those further south. With the hills of Gibeon this is peculiarly the case, and it imparts a remarkable precision to their appearance, especially when viewed from a height such as the neighboring eminence of neby Samwil. The houses stand very irregularly and unevenly, sometimes almost above one another. They seem to be chiefly rooms in old massive ruins, which have fallen down in every direction. One large building still remains, probably a former castle or tower of strength. The natural terraces are carried round the hill like contour lines: they are all dotted thick with olives and vines, and the ancient-looking houses are scattered over the flattish summit of the mound. On the east side of the hill is a copious spring, which issues in a cave excavated in the limestone rock, so as to form a large reservoir. In the trees farther down are the remains of a pool or tank of considerable size, probably, says Dr. Robinson, 120 feet by 700, i. e. of rather smaller dimensions than the lower pool at Hebron. This is doubtless the "pool of Gibeon," at which Abner and Joab met together with the troops of


Ishbosheth and David, and where that sharp conflict took place which ended in the death of Asahel, and led, at a later period, to the treacherous murder of Abner himself. Here or at the spring were the "great waters (or the many waters, מַיִם רַבִּים מַיִם)" of Gibeon" (both here and in 1 Kings iii, 4, Josephus substitutes Hebron for Gibeon, *Ant.* x, 9, 5; viii, 2, 1), at which Johanan, the son of Kareah, found the traitor Ishmael (Jer. xli, 12). Round this water also, according to the notice of Josephus (*ἐπι τῶν πηγῶν τῆς πόλεως οὐκ ἴστωθαι*, *Ant.* v, 1, 17), the five kings of the Amorites were encamped when Joshua burst upon them from Gilgal. The "wilderness of Gibeon" (2 Sam. ii, 24)—the *Midbar*, i. e. rather the waste pasture-grounds—must have been to the east, beyond the suburb of cultivated fields, and towards the neighboring swells, which bear the names of Jedireh and Bir Neballah. Such is the situation of Gibeon, fulfilling in position every requirement of the notices of the Bible, Josephus, Eusebius, and Jerome. Its distance from Jerusalem by the main road is as nearly as possible 6½ miles; but there is a more direct road reducing it to 5 miles (Robinson, *Res.* ii, 137, 138; Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 315; Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 546; Porter, *Handb. for Syria*, p. 225).

*Scriptural Incidents.*—Several of these are of such deep interest as to call for a detailed notice.

(1.) The name of Gibeon is most familiar to us in connection with the artifice by which its inhabitants obtained their safety at the hands of Joshua, and with the memorable battle which ultimately resulted therefrom. (See Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.) This is the first mention of the place in Scripture, and the battle is considered "one of the most important in the history of the world" by Stanley, whose graphic description (*Jewish Church*, i, 266 sq.) we condense, slightly modified and illustrated.

The kings of Palestine, each in his little fastness, were roused by the tidings that the approaches to their territory in the Jordan valley and in the passes leading from it were in the hands of the enemy. Those who occupied the south felt that the crisis was yet more imminent than when they heard of the capitulation of Gibeon. Jebus or Jerusalem, even in those ancient times, was recognised as their centre. Its chief took the lead of the hostile confederacy. The point of attack, however, was not the invading army, but the traitors at home. Gibeon, the recreant city, was besieged. The continuance or the raising of the siege became the turning question of the war. The summons of the Gibeonites to Joshua was as urgent as words can describe, and gives the key-note to the whole movement (*Josh.* x, 6). Not a moment was to be lost. On the former occasion of Joshua's visit to Gibeon (*Josh.* ix, 16, 17), it had been a three-days' journey from Gilgal, as according to the slow pace of eastern armies and caravans it might well be. But now, by a forced march, "Joshua came unto them suddenly, and went up from Gilgal all night." When the sun rose behind him, he was already in the open ground at the foot of the heights of Gibeon, where the kings were encamped (according to Josephus, *Ant.* v, 1, 17) by a spring in the neighborhood. The towering hill, at the foot of which Gibeon lay, rose before them on the west. The besieged and the besiegers alike were taken by surprise (in the Samaritan version of Joshua, the warcry is given, "God is mighty in battle," ch. xx, xxi).

As often before and after, so now "not a man could stand before" the awe and panic of the sudden sound of that terrible shout. The Canaanites fled down the western pass, and "the Lord discomfited them before Israel, and slew them with a great slaughter at Gibeon, and chased them along the way that *goeth up* to Beth-horon." This was the first stage of the flight. It is a long, rocky ascent, sinking and rising more than once before the summit is gained. From the summit, which is crowned by the village of Upper Beth-horon,



Map of the scene of Joshua's great Battle at Gibeon and Beth-horon.

a wide view opens over the valley of Ajalon, which runs in from the plain of Sharon.

"And it came to pass, as they fled before Israel, and were in the going down to Beth-horon, that the Lord cast down great stones from heaven upon them unto Azekah." This was the second stage of the flight. The fugitives had outstripped the pursuers; they had crossed the high ridge of Beth-horon the Upper; they were in full flight to Beth-horon the Nether. It is a rough, rocky road, sometimes over the upturned edges of the limestone strata, sometimes over sheets of smooth rock, sometimes over loose rectangular stones, sometimes over steps cut in the rock. It was as they fled down this slippery descent that a fearful tempest, "thunder, lightning, and a deluge of hail" (Josephus, *Ant.* v, 1, 17), broke over the disordered ranks; and "they were more which died of the hailstones than they whom the children of Israel slew with the sword."

Then follows the poetic version of the story, taken from the ancient legendary "Book of Jasher." On the summit of the pass, where is now the hamlet of the Upper Beth-horon, looking far down the deep descent of the western valleys, with the green vale of Ajalon stretched out in the distance, and the wide expanse of the Mediterranean Sea beyond, stood, as is intimated, the Israelitish chief. Below him was rushing down, in wild confusion, the Amoritish host. Around him were "all his people of war, and all his mighty men of valor." Behind him were the hills which hid the now rescued Gibeon from his sight. But the sun stood high above those hills, "in the midst of heaven" (it was the middle of the forenoon, or at most midday), for the day had now far advanced since he had emerged from his night-march through the passes of Ai; and in his front, over the western vale of Ajalon, may have been the faint crescent of the waning moon, visible above the hail-storm driving up from the sea in the black distance. Was the enemy to escape in safety, or was the speed with which Joshua had "come quickly, and saved and helped" his defenceless allies, to be rewarded, before the close of that day, by a signal victory? It is doubtless so standing on that lofty eminence, with outstretched hand and spear, that the hero appears in the ancient record: "Then might Joshua [be heard to] speak to Jehovah in the day of Jehovah's giving [up] the Amorite before the sons of Israel, when he said in the eyes of Israel:

'Sun, in Gibeon stand still;  
And, moon, in Ajalon's vale!'

So the sun stood still, and moon stayed until a people should take vengeance [upon] its enemies. [Is] not this written on [the] Book of the Upright?

'So the sun stayed in the midst of the heavens,  
And hastened not to go [down] as a whole day;  
And [there] was not like that day [another] before it or  
after it.  
For Jehovah's hearkening to a man's voice,  
For Jehovah [it was that] fought for Israel.'

So Joshua returned, and all Israel with him, to the camp at Gilgal" (Josh. x, 12-15). See JOSHUA.

(2) We next hear of Gibeon at the encounter between the men of David and of Ishbosheth, under their respective leaders Joab and Abner (2 Sam. ii, 12-17). The meeting has all the air of having been premeditated by both parties, unless we suppose that Joab had heard of the intention of the Benjamites to revisit from the distant Mahanaim their native villages, and had seized the opportunity to try his strength with Abner. See ABNER. The place where the struggle began received a name from the circumstance, and seems to have been long afterwards known as the "field of the strong men." See HELKATH-HAZZURIM.

(3) We again meet with Gibeon in connection with Joab; this time as the scene of the cruel and revolting death of Amasa by his hand (2 Sam. xx, 5-10). Joab was in pursuit of the rebellious Sheba, the son of Bichri, and his being so far out of the direct north road as Gibeon may be accounted for by supposing that he was making a search for this Benjamite among the towns of his tribe. The two rivals met at "the great stone which is in Gibeon"—some old landmark now no longer recognisable, at least not recognised—and then Joab repeated the treachery by which he had murdered Abner, but with circumstances of a still more revolting character. See AMASA.

It is remarkable that the retribution for this crowning act of perfidy should have overtaken Joab close to the very spot on which it had been committed. For it was to the tabernacle at Gibeon (1 Kings ii, 28, 29; comp. 1 Chron. xvi, 39) that Joab fled for sanctuary when his death was pronounced by Solomon, and it was while clinging to the horns of the brazen altar there that he received his death-blow from Benaiah, the son of Jehoiada (1 Kings ii, 28, 30, 34). See JOAB.

(4) Familiar as these events in connection with the history of Gibeon are to us, its reputation in Israel was due to a very different circumstance—the fact that the tabernacle of the congregation and the brazen altar of burnt-offering were for some time located on the "high place" attached to or near the town. We are not informed whether this "high place" had any fame for sanctity before the tabernacle came there; but if not, it would probably have been erected elsewhere. We only hear of it in connection with the tabernacle; nor is there any indication of its situation in regard to

the town. Stanley has suggested (*Sinai and Pal.* p. 212) that it was the remarkable hill of neby Samwîl, the most prominent and individual eminence in that part of the country, and to which the special appellation of "the great high-place" (1 Kings iii, 4; גִּבְעוֹן הַגָּדוֹל) would perfectly apply. Certainly, if "great" is to be understood as referring to height or size, there is no other hill which can so justly claim the distinction. But the word has not always that meaning, and may equally imply eminence in other respects, e. g. superior sanctity to the numerous other high places—Bethel, Ramah, Mizpeh, Gibeah—which surrounded it on every side. The main objection to this identification is the distance of neby Samwîl from Gibeon—more than a mile—and the absence of any closer connection therewith than with any other of the neighboring places. The most natural position for the high place of Gibeon is the twin mount immediately south of El-Jib—so close as to be all but a part of the town, and yet quite separate and distinct. The testimony of Epiphanius, by which Stanley supports his conjecture, viz. that the "Mount of Gabaon" was the highest round Jerusalem (*Adv. Hæreses*, i, 394), should be received with caution, standing as it does quite alone, and belonging to an age which, though early, was marked by ignorance, and by the most improbable conclusions.

To this high place, wherever situated, the "tabernacle of the congregation"—the sacred tent which had accompanied the children of Israel through the whole of their wanderings—had been transferred from its last station at Nob. The exact date of the transfer is left in uncertainty. It was either before or at the time when David brought up the ark from Kirjath-jearim to the new tent which he had pitched for it on Mount Zion, that the original tent was spread for the last time at Gibeon. The expression in 2 Chron. i, 5, "The brazen altar he put before the tabernacle of Jehovah," at first sight appears to refer to David. But the text of the passage is disputed, and the authorities are divided between גִּבְעוֹן, "he put," and בֵּית־עֵלֶיךָ, "was there." Whether king David transferred the tabernacle to Gibeon or not, he certainly appointed the staff of priests to offer the daily sacrifices there on the brazen altar of Moses, and to fulfill the other requirements of the law (1 Chron. xvi, 40), with no less a person at their head than Zadok the priest (ver. 39), assisted by the famous musicians Heman and Jeduthun (ver. 41).

One of the earliest acts of Solomon's reign—it must have been while the remembrance of the execution of Joab was still fresh—was to visit Gibeon. The ceremonial was truly magnificent: he went up with all the congregation, the great officers of the state—the captains of hundreds and thousands, the judges, the governors, and the chief of the fathers—and the sacrifice consisted of a thousand burnt-offerings (1 Kings iii, 4). This glimpse of Gibeon in all the splendor of its greatest prosperity—the smoke of the thousand animals rising from the venerable altar on the commanding height of "the great high place"—the clang of "trumpets, and cymbals, and musical instruments of God" (1 Chron. xvi, 42) resounding through the valleys far and near—is virtually the last we have of it. In a few years the Temple at Jerusalem was completed, and then the tabernacle was once more taken down and removed. Again "all the men of Israel assembled themselves" to king Solomon, with the "elders of Israel," and the priests and the Levites brought up both the tabernacle and the ark, and "all the holy vessels that were in the tabernacle" (1 Kings viii, 3; Joseph. *Ant.* viii, 4, 1), and placed the venerable relics in their new home, there to remain until the plunder of the city by Nebuchadnezzar. The introduction of the name of Gibeon in 1 Chron. ix, 35, which seems so abrupt, is probably due to the fact that the preceding verses of the chapter contain, as they appear to do, a

list of the staff attached to the "tabernacle of the congregation" which was erected there; or if these persons should prove to be the attendants on the "new tent" which David had pitched for the ark on its arrival in the city of David, the transition to the place where the old tent was still standing is both natural and easy.

It would be very satisfactory to believe, with Thomson (*Land and the Book*, ii, 547), that the present wady Suleiman, i. e. "Solomon's valley," which commences on the west side of Gibeon, and leads down to the Plain of Sharon, derived its name from this visit. But the modern names of places in Palestine often spring from very modern persons or circumstances, and, without confirmation or investigation, this cannot be received with certainty.—Smith, s. v.

**Gibeonite** (Heb. *Giboni*, גִּבְעוֹנִי; Sept. Γαβωνίτης), the designation of the people of the Canaanitish city GIBEON (q. v.), and perhaps also of the three cities associated with Gibeon (Josh. ix, 17)—Hivites; who, on the discovery of the stratagem by which they had obtained the protection of the Israelites, were condemned to be perpetual bondmen, hewers of wood and drawers of water for the congregation, and for the house of God and altar of Jehovah (Josh. ix, 23, 27). The compact, although the punishment of fraud, was faithfully observed on both sides (see Benzel, *Syntagm. dissert.* iii, 122 sq.). Saul, however, appears to have broken this covenant, and in a fit of enthusiasm or patriotism to have killed some, and devised a general massacre of the rest (2 Sam. xxi, 1, 2, 5). This was expiated many years after by David, at the suggestion of the priestly oracle, giving up seven men of Saul's descendants to the Gibeonites, who hung them or crucified them "before Jehovah"—as a kind of sacrifice—in Gibeah, Saul's own town (4, 6, 9). At this time, or, at any rate, at the time of the composition of the narrative, the Gibeonites were so identified with Israel that the historian is obliged to insert a note explaining their origin and their non-Israelite extraction (xxi, 2). The actual name "Gibeonites" appears only in this passage of 2 Sam.—Smith, s. v. There is not the slightest evidence for the allegation which has been sometimes made against David, that he purposely contrived or greedily fell in with this device, in order to weaken the house of Saul and place it under a darker stigma. On the contrary, David's conduct throughout to that house was in the highest degree generous and noble; and at the very time when this fresh public calamity befell it, he took occasion to have the bones of Saul and Jonathan, along with the bones of the seven now publicly hanged, gathered together and honorably buried in the sepulchre of Kish.—Fairbairn, s. v. See DAVID. From this time there is no mention of the Gibeonites as a distinct people; but most writers suppose they were included among the Nethinim, who were appointed for the service of the Temple (1 Chron. ix, 2). Those of the Canaanites who were afterwards subdued and had their lives spared were probably added to the Gibeonites. We see in Ezra viii, 20; ii, 58; 1 Kings ix, 20, 21, that David, Solomon, and the princes of Judah gave many such to the Lord; these Nethinim being carried into captivity with Judah and the Levites, many of them returned with Ezra, Zerubbabel, and Nehemiah, and continued, as before, in the service of the Temple, under the priests and Levites.—Calnet, s. v. (See De Platen, *De religione Gibeonitarum*, Rost. 1703; Fecht, *id.* ib. 1731.) See NETHINIM.

Individual Gibeonites named are (1) ISMAIAH, one of the Benjamites who joined David in his difficulties (1 Chron. xii, 4); (2) MELATIAH, one of those who assisted Nehemiah in repairing the wall of Jerusalem (Neh. iii, 7); (3) HANANIAH, the son of Azur, a false prophet from Gibeon, who opposed Jeremiah, and shortly afterwards died (Jer. xxviii, 1, 10, 13, 17).—Smith, s. v.

**Gib'lite** (Heb. with the art. in the sing. *gag-Gibbli'*, גַּבְבִּילִי, Josh. xiii, 5; Sept. Γαββί [y. r. Γαββιά?] Φυλιστίνης, Vulg. merely *confinia*; plural, *gag-Gibblim'*, גַּבְבִּילִים, 1 Kings v, 18; Sept. Alex. οἱ Γαββίλοι, other MSS. omit; Vulg. *Gibbli*, A. V. "stone-squarers"), a people whose land is coupled with "all Lebanon," as together belonging to the territory of the Israelites on the northern side, in the enumeration of the portions of the Promised Land remaining to be conquered by Joshua (Josh. xiii, 5). The ancient versions give no help, but there is no reason to doubt that the allusion is to the inhabitants of the city **GEBAL** (q. v.), which was on the sea-coast at the foot of the northern slopes of Lebanon, and from which the name is a regular derivative (see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 258 b). The whole passage is instructive, as showing how very far the limits of the country designed for the Israelites exceeded those which they actually occupied. The people in question, who plainly belonged to the Phœnician territory, are understood to have been the people of *Byblus*, a city of the Phœnicians between Tripoli and Berytus. The inhabitants of Gebal are mentioned in the cuneiform inscriptions (q. v.). The Giblites are again named (in the Heb.) in 1 Kings v, 18 as assisting Solomon's builders and Hiram's builders to prepare the trees and the stones for building the Temple. That they were clever artificers is evident from this passage; and in connection with the shipping and merchandise of Tyre, the prophet Ezekiel mentions "the ancients of Gebal" as furnishing calkers, or perhaps generally ship-carpenters (Ezek. xxvii, 9). The Giblites are not mentioned in immediate connection with the affairs of Israel; if they did come into direct contact with these, it must have been for evil, and not for good; for Byblus was the seat of the worship of the Syrian Tammuz or Adonis, a worship which certainly found its way, among other corruptions, into the later idolatries of the Jewish people (Ezek. viii, 14), but whether directly from Byblus, or from other parts of Phœnicia, we have no means of ascertaining.—Smith, s. v.; Fairbairn, s. v. See **PHŒNICIA**.

**Gibson, Edmund, D.D.**, bishop of London, was born at Bampton in 1669, and was educated at Queen's College, Oxford. He early devoted himself to the study of the languages of North Britain and of British antiquities. At twenty-two he prepared an edition of *The Saxon Chronicle*, with Latin translation and Indexes (Oxford, 1692, 4to). In 1694 he became M.A., and soon after was ordained, and made fellow of his college. In 1695 he published an English translation of Camden's *Britannia* (2 vols. fol.). In 1696 he was appointed librarian at Lambeth by Tenison, archbishop of Canterbury; and in 1697 he was appointed morning preacher at Lambeth church. In the same year he published *Vita Thomæ Bolleii*, together with *Historia Bibliothecæ Bodleianæ*, both prefixed to the *Catalogi Librorum Manuscriptorum, in Angliæ et Hiberniæ, in unum collecti* (2 vols. fol.). In 1698 he published *Reliquiæ Spelmanianæ*, together with the life of the author (fol.). He was now made domestic chaplain to the archbishop, through whose means he obtained, about the same time, the lectureship of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, and in 1700 he was presented to the rectory of Stisted, in Essex, a rectory still the seat of learning. In 1703 he was made rector of Lambeth, and residentiary of the cathedral of Chichester. He was soon after appointed master of the hospital of St. Mary, and in 1710 he was promoted to the archdeaconry of Surrey. While he was chaplain to archbishop Tenison he engaged in the controversy between the two houses of Convocation. See **ATTERBURY**. Gibson enlisted on the side of the upper house, and published ten pamphlets on the subject in three years, to which he added another in 1707. And to the interest he took in this controversy we may trace the origin of his great work, *Codex Juris Ecclesiastici Anglicani, or the Stat-*

*utes, Constitution, Canons, Rubrics, and Articles of the Church of England*, etc. (1713, fol.; reprinted at Oxford in 1761). In 1715 he succeeded Wake as bishop of Lincoln, and in 1723 he was translated to the see of London. He subsequently became chief adviser of Sir Robert Walpole in ecclesiastical affairs, and woefully disappointed his former Whig friends by his intolerant support of the Test Act, and of the severe measures adopted against the Quakers. His better qualities appeared in his opposition to the demoralizing masquerades of the time, by which he lost the favor of George II. Towards the close of his life he made a collection of the best treatises that were written against Popery during the reign of James II, and published them with a preface in 1738 (3 vols. fol.); recently republished under the title of *A Preservative against Popery*, etc., edited by Dr. Cumming (London, 1848-9, 18 vols. 8vo); there is also a *Supplement* (London, 1849, 8 vols. 8vo). He died at Bath in 1748.—Hook, *Ecl. Biog.* v, 314; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, i, 1250.

**Gibson, Robert**, a minister of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, was born at Ballymena, Ireland, Oct. 1, 1793. His parents migrated to the United States in 1797, and his father, the Rev. William Gibson, settled as pastor of the Reformed Presbyterian Church at Ryegate, Vt. He received his theological training at the Reformed Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, and was licensed to preach in 1818. On Sept. 6, 1819, he was ordained and installed as pastor of the church at Beaver Dam, where he labored with great success for twelve years. In 1831 he became pastor of the Second Reformed Presbyterian church in the city of New York, and occupied that position till his death. In this new and extensive field he labored with great diligence, and his influence grew rapidly. He bore a prominent part in the controversy which resulted in the disruption of the Church in 1833, and published three pamphlets vindicating the course of the Synod. In 1836 he showed symptoms of declining health. All efforts to arrest his disease were unavailing, and he died in the midst of his people, Dec. 22, 1837. We have from him only the three pamphlets above mentioned.—Sprague, *Annals* (Ref. Presb.), ix, 71.

**Gibson, Tobias**, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Liberty County, S. C., Nov. 10, 1771, entered the itinerant ministry in 1792, and died at Natchez, Miss., in April, 1804. He traveled and preached in the most important appointments of the Carolinas until the year 1800, and then went to Natchez as a missionary. The whole Louisiana purchase was then almost a wilderness. After penetrating the forest for six hundred miles to the Cumberland River, Mr. Gibson took a canoe, and alone navigated that stream to the Ohio, and thence down the Mississippi in a boat. He made four trips through the wilderness to the Cumberland while missionary at Natchez, and laid the foundations of Methodism in that vast and now so important region. His fellow-laborers in Carolina testify that "he did for many years preach, profess, possess, and practise Christian perfection; and that those who were acquainted with him must be impressed with his depth of piety;" and "that infidelity itself would stagger before the life of so holy, loving, and devoted a man of God."—*Minutes of Conferences*, i, 125.

**Gibson, William**, a Reformed Presbyterian minister, was born near Knockbracken, County Down, Ireland, in 1753. He studied at Glasgow, and was licensed by the Reformed Presbytery of Ireland in 1781. In the political ferment of Ireland towards the end of the century he joined the United Irishmen, and on the failure of the rebellion he fled to America, where he arrived in 1797. Finding a number of his own people there, he formed a congregation; and the Reformed Presbytery of North America was constituted

in 1798. In 1799 he became pastor at Ryegate, Vt., and remained there till 1817, when he accepted a call to Canonsburg, Pa. In 1830 his infirmities compelled him to resign his charge. His latter years were spent in Philadelphia, where he died, Oct. 15, 1838.—Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862, p. 274; Sprague, *Annals* (Ref. Presb.), ix, 6.

**Gichtel**, JOHANN GEORG, a German mystic, was born at Ilatison in 1638. He studied theology and law at the University of Strasburg, and was afterwards distinguished as a lawyer. He became a follower of Jacob Böhme, and prepared for publication the first edition of his works (Amsterdam, 1682). He finally devoted himself to the propagation of his theosophic and ascetic views. Gichtel considered his own announcements of divine commands as superior to the Scriptures in authority. He was imprisoned as a dangerous visionary, struck off the list of barristers, and finally exiled. He retired in 1667 to Holland, where he died poor in 1710. His opinions have found occasional adherents to this day at Amsterdam, Leyden, and even in Germany. They were called Gichtelians, or Brothers of the Angels (*Engelsbrüder*), and believed themselves equal to the inhabitants of heaven on account of their celibacy, peculiar mode of life, etc. One of the most zealous adherents of Gichtel was professor Alandt de Raadt, who, however, subsequently fell out with him, when a merchant, by the name of Ueberfeld, became intimate with Gichtel. Bands of adherents were found in Berlin, Halle, Magdeburg, Altona, where Glüsing (died 1728) was at their head, and other places, and partly maintained themselves to the 19th century. Gichtel's *Letters* were published by Gottfried Arnold (1701, 2 vols.; 1708, 3 vols.); and finally a complete collection of his writings, under the style *Practische Theosophie* (Leyden, 1722, 6 vols.). See Reinbeck, *Gichtel's Lebenslauf und Lehren* (Berl. 1732); Harless, *Gichtel's Leben u. Irrthümer, in Evang. Kirch-Zeit.* 1831, No. 77; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xx, 451; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* v, 145.

**Giddal'ti** (Heb. גִּדְדַלְתִּי, whom I [Jehovah] have made great; Sept. Γεῦδολλαζὶ and Γεῦδελαζὶ, Vulg. *Geddethi* and *Gedethi*), the ninth named of the fourteen musical sons of Heman, and head of the twenty-second course of Levitical musicians in the tabernacle under David (1 Chron. xxv, 4, 29). B.C. 1013. The office of these brothers was to sound the horn in the Levitical orchestra (verse 5, 7). Fürst (who reduces the sons of Heman to five) suggests (*Heb. Lex. s. v.*) that the appended "names probably formed together (גִּדְדַלְתִּי וְרַבְמַתָּר מִיָּד מִיָּדִי הַתִּרְרִי מִיָּדִי הַתִּרְרִי, *I have dealt out fame and victorious help; I have spoken oracles in fulness*) an old prophetic saying with which an oracle began, whose words were applied to the five [as soubriquets]: the tone itself [as a name it would regularly be *Giddal'ti*] pointing to this explanation." See HEMAN.

**Gid'del** (Heb. גִּדְדֵל, perhaps *giant*; Sept. Γεῦδὶλ, Γαῦδὶλ, Σαῦδὶλ), the name of two men whose descendants or relatives (*Bene-Gid'del*) returned from the captivity with Zerubbabel; perhaps Gibeonites (q. v.).

1. One of the NETHINIM (Ezra ii, 47; Neh. vii, 49). B.C. ante 536.

2. One of "Solomon's servants," i. e. perhaps of the Canaanitish tribes enslaved by Solomon (Ezra ii, 56; Neh. vii, 58; compare 1 Kings ix, 21). B.C. ante 536. See SOLOMON.

**Giddings**, ROCKWOOD, a Baptist minister, was born in Plymouth, N. H., Aug. 8, 1812, graduated at Waterville College in 1833, and then went to Virginia, where he commenced the study of medicine. He was about settling as a physician in Missouri when he felt called to preach the Gospel. He was shortly afterwards ordained, and in 1835 became pastor of the Bap-

tist church in Shelbyville, Ky., where his ministrations were very successful. In 1838 he was appointed president of the Baptist College of Georgetown, then in a most destitute condition. He accepted the nomination, and in less than eight months secured more than eighty thousand dollars towards an endowment. But the severe labor he imposed on himself undermined his health, and he died Oct. 29, 1839.—Sprague, *Annals*, vi, 818.

**Gid'eōn** (Heb. גִּדְעוֹן, *tree-feller*, i. e. warrior, comp. Isa. x, 33; Sept. and N. T. Γεῦεών), a Manassite, youngest son of Joash of the Abiezrites, an undistinguished family, who lived at Ophrah, a town probably on the western side of Jordan (Judg. vi, 15). He was the fifth recorded judge of Israel, and for many reasons the greatest of them all, being the first of them whose history is circumstantially narrated (Judg. vi-viii). B.C. 1362-1322.

1. When we first hear of him he was grown up and had sons (Judg. vi, 11; viii, 20), and from the apostrophe of the angel (vi, 12) we may conclude that he had already distinguished himself in war against the roving bands of nomadic robbers who had oppressed Israel for seven years, and whose countless multitudes (compared to locusts from their terrible devastations, vi, 5) annually destroyed all the produce of Canaan, except such as could be concealed in mountain-fastnesses (vi, 2). The Midianites, in conjunction with the Amalekites and other nomadic tribes, invaded the country every year, at the season of produce, in great numbers, with their flocks and herds, rioting in the country after the manner which the Bedonin Arabs practise at this day. It was probably during this disastrous period that the emigration of Elimelech took place (Ruth i, 1, 2; Jahn's *Hebr. Comm.* § XXI). Some have identified the angel who appeared to Gideon (φάπτασμα ρεανίσκου μορφή, Josephus, *Ant.* v, 6) with the prophet mentioned in vi, 8, which will remind the reader of the legends about Malachi in Origen and other commentators. Paulus (*Ereg. Conserv.* ii, 190 sq.) endeavors to give the narrative a subjective coloring, but rationalism is of little value in accounts like this. When the angel appeared, Gideon was threshing wheat with a flail (Sept. ἔκοπτε) in the wine-press, to conceal it from the predatory tyrants. Such was the position and such the employment in which he was found by the angel of the Lord, who appeared to him and said, "Jehovah is with thee, thou mighty man of valor." It was a startling address, and one that seemed rather like a bitter irony, when viewed in connection with the existing state of affairs, than the words of soberness and truth. Therefore Gideon replied, "Oh! my Lord, if Jehovah be with us, why then is all this befallen us? and where be all the miracles which our fathers told us of, saying, Did not Jehovah bring us up from Egypt? But now Jehovah hath forsaken us, and delivered us into the hands of the Midianites." The desponding tone of the reply was not unnatural in the circumstances, and what followed was designed to reassure his mind, and brace him with energy and fortitude for the occasion. Jehovah, it is said—for, instead of the angel of Jehovah, as formerly, it is now Jehovah himself—"Jehovah looked upon him, and said, Go in this thy might, and thou shalt save Israel from the hand of the Midianites; have not I sent thee?" Gideon still expressed his fear of the result, mentioning his own comparative insignificance, and that of his father's family, but was again met with a word of encouragement, "Surely I will be with thee, and thou shalt smite the Midianites as one man." Gideon's heart now began to take courage; and to make him sure that it really was a divine messenger he was dealing with, and that the commission he had received was from the Lord, he requested a sign from heaven; and it was given him in connection with an offering, which he was allowed to

present, of a kid and some unleavened cakes. These the angel touched with the tip of his staff, and a fire presently rose out of the rock and consumed them. Immediately the angel himself disappeared, though not till he had by a word of peace quieted the mind of Gideon, which had become agitated by the thought of having seen the face of the Lord (comp. Exod. xx, 19; Judg. xiii, 22).

The family of Joash had fallen into the prevalent idolatry of the times, which was characterized by backsliding from the true worship of Jehovah; and it was the first task of Gideon as a reformer to rebuke this irreligion, and his first sphere was at home. In a dream the same night he was ordered to throw down the altar of Baal and cut down the Asherah (A. Vers. "grove") upon it [see ASHERAH], which his father had caused, or at least suffered, to be erected on the family grounds; and with the wood of this he was to offer in sacrifice his father's "second bullock of seven years old," an expression in which some see an allusion to the seven years of servitude (vi, 26, 1). Perhaps that particular bullock is specified because it had been reserved by his father to sacrifice to Baal (Rosenmüller, *Schol.* ad loc.). For Joash seems to have been a priest of that worship. Bertheau can hardly be right in supposing that Gideon was to offer two bullocks (*Richt.* p. 115). At any rate, the minute touch is valuable as an indication of truth in the story (see Ewald, *Gesch.* ii, 498, and note). Gideon, assisted by ten faithful servants, obeyed the vision. He deemed it prudent, however, to do this under cover of the darkness. The same night, apparently, he built on the spot desecrated by the idolatrous shrine the altar Jehovah-shalom (q. v.), which existed when the book of Judges was written (vi, 24). As soon as the act was discovered, and the perpetrator suspected and identified, which was immediately on the following morning, he ran the risk of being stoned; but Joash appeased the popular indignation by using the common argument that Baal was capable of defending his own majesty (compare 1 Kings xviii, 27). This circumstance gave to Gideon the surname of *Jerubbaal* (יְרֻבְבַּאֵל, "Let Baal plead," vi, 32; Sept. Ἰερουβάαλ), a standing instance of national irony, expressive of Baal's impotence. Winer thinks that this irony was increased by the fact that יְרֻבְבַּאֵל was a surname of the Phœnician Hercules (comp. Movers, *Phöniz.* i, 434). We have similar cases of contempt in the names Sycar, Baal-zebul, etc. (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb. ad Matt.* xii, 24). In consequence of this name, some have identified Gideon with a certain priest, *Jerombalus* (Ἰερὸμβάλου), mentioned in Eusebius (*Præp. Evang.* i, 10) as having given much accurate information to Sanchoniatho the Berytian (Bochart, *Phaleg*, p. 776; Huetius, *Dem. Evang.* p. 84, etc.), but this opinion cannot be maintained (Ewald, *Gesch.* ii, 494). We also find the name in the form *Jerubbesheth* (2 Sam. xi, 21); probably indicative of contempt for the heathen deity (comp. Esbaal, 1 Chron. viii, 33, with Ishbosheth, 2 Sam. ii sq.). The mind of Joash, at all events, was confirmed by this bold act of his son, and he seems resolved to leave the solution of the controversy to divine Providence.

2. Gideon soon found occasion to act upon his high commission. The allied invaders were encamped in the great plain of Jezreel or Esdraelon, when, "clothed" by the Spirit of God (Judg. vi, 34; comp. 1 Chron. xii, 18; Luke xxiv, 49), he blew a trumpet, and thus gathered round him a daily increasing host, the summons to arms which it implied having been transmitted through the northern tribes by special messengers. Being joined by "Zebulun, Naphtali, and even the reluctant Asher" (which tribes were chiefly endangered by the Midianites), and possibly also by some of the original inhabitants, who would suffer from these predatory "sons of the East" no less than the Israelites

themselves, he encamped on one of the neighboring slopes, from which he overlooked the plains covered by the tents of Midian. Mount Gilead, indeed, is named in the movement of Gideon against Midian, but probably only as the first place of rendezvous for his army (Judg. vii, 3). For the sake of security, he might be obliged to assemble the people on the mountainous lands to the east of Jordan. Stanley (*Sinai and Palestine*, p. 342), after Le Clerc, without any authority from MSS., would substitute Gilboa for Gilead in the passage referred to. This is otherwise objectionable, as one does not see how thousands from Asher, Naphtali, about and beyond Esdraelon, could have been able to meet on Gilboa, with the Midianitish host lying between. Ewald is perhaps right in regarding the name as a sort of war-cry and general designation of the Manassites. (See, too, Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 804, n.)

The inquietude connected with great enterprises is more sensibly felt some days before than at the moment of action; and hence the two miraculous signs which, on the two nights preceding the march, were required and given as tokens of victory. The first night a fleece was laid out in the middle of an open threshing-floor, and in the morning it was quite wet, while the soil was dry all around. The next night the wonder was reversed, the soil being wet and the fleece perfectly dry. Strengthened by this double sign from God (to which Ewald gives a strange figurative meaning, *Gesch.* ii, 500), Gideon advanced to the brook Harod, in the valley of Jezreel. See HAROD. He was here at the head of 32,000 men; but, lest so large a host should assume the glory of the coming deliverance, which of right belonged to God only, two operations, remarkable both in motive and procedure, reduced this large host to a mere handful of men. First, by divine direction, the usual proclamation (Deut. xx, 8; comp. 1 Macc. iii, 56) was made that all the faint-hearted might withdraw; and no fewer than 22,000 availed themselves of the indulgence. The remaining 10,000 were still declared too numerous; they were therefore all taken down to the brook, when only those who lapped the water from their hands, like active men in haste, were reserved for the enterprise, while all those who lay down leisurely to drink were excluded. The former numbered no more than 300, and these were the appointed vanquishers of the huge host which covered the great plain. It was but a slight circumstance which marked the difference between them and the others, but still it indicated a specific quality; they were the persons that took the more expeditious method of quenching their thirst, and thereby gave proof of a nimbleness and alacrity which bespoke a fitness for executing quick movements in attacking or pursuing an enemy. This affords a perfectly sufficient and natural explanation, and there is no need for resorting, as many do, to peculiar usages in the East, and no one who knows anything of the manners of people in rural and highland districts can need to be told how common it is for them, when wishing to get a hasty refreshment at a running stream, to lift the water to their mouths in the palm of their hand, instead of leisurely bending down, or laying themselves along to get a fuller draught. Josephus, however, explains these men to have been the most cowardly in the army (*Ant.* v, 6, 3).

Finally, being encouraged by words fortuitously overheard (what the later Jews termed the *Bath-Kol*) (compare 1 Sam. xiv, 9, 10; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb. ad Matt.* iii, 14), in the relation of a significant dream, Gideon framed his plans, which were admirably adapted to strike a panic into the huge and undisciplined nomad host (Judg. viii, 15-18). We know from history that large and irregular Oriental armies are especially liable to sudden outbursts of uncontrollable terror; and when the stillness and darkness of the night were suddenly disturbed in three different directions by the flash of torches and by the reverberating

echoes which the trumpets and the shouting woke among the hills, we cannot be astonished at the complete rout into which the enemy were thrown. It must be remembered, too, that the sound of 300 trumpets would make them suppose that a corresponding number of *companies* were attacking them. It is curious to find "lumps and pitchers" in use for a similar purpose at this very day in the streets of Cairo. The *Zabit* or *Agha* of the police carries with him at night "a torch which burns soon after it is lighted, without a flame, excepting when it is waved through the air, when it suddenly blazes forth; it therefore answers the same purpose as our dark lantern. *The burning end is sometimes concealed in a small pot or jar, or covered with something else, when not required to give light*" (Lane's *Mol. Eg.* i, ch. iv). For specimens of similar stratagems, see Livy, xxii, 16; Polyænus, *Strateg.* ii, 37; Frontinus, ii, 4; Sallust, *Jug.* 99; Niebuhr, *Desc. de l'Arabie*, p. 304; *Journal As.* 1841, ii, 516. The custom of dividing an army into three seems to have been common (1 Sam. xi, 11; Gen. xiv, 15), and Gideon's war-cry is not unlike that adopted by Cyrus (Xenoph. *Cyr.* iii, 28). He adds his own name to the war-cry, as suited both to inspire confidence in his followers and strike terror in the enemy. His stratagem was eminently successful, and the Midianites, breaking into their wild peculiar cries, fled headlong "down the descent to the Jordan," to the "house of the Accia" (Beth-shitta), and the "meadow of the dance" (Abel-meholah), but were intercepted by the Ephraimites (to whom notice had been sent, Judg. vii, 24) at the fords of Beth-barah, where, after a second fight, the princes of Oreb and Zeeb ("the Raven" and "the Wolf") were detected and slain—the former at a rock, and the latter concealed in a wine-press, to which their names were afterwards given. The Ephraimites took their heads over to Gideon, which amounted to an acknowledgment of his leadership; but still the always haughty and jealous Ephraimites were greatly annoyed that they had not in the first instance been summoned to the field; and serious consequences might have followed but for the tact of Gideon in speaking in a lowly spirit of his own doings in comparison with theirs. Gideon's "soft answer," which pacified the Ephraimite warriors, became a proverb (Judg. viii, 1-3). Meanwhile the "higher sheiks, Zebah and Zalmunna, had already escaped," and Gideon resolved to pursue them into eastern Manassah, and burst upon them among the tents of their Bedouin countrymen. On that side the river, however, his victory was not believed or understood, and the people still trembled at the very name of the Midianites. Hence he could obtain no succor from the places which he passed, and town after town refused to supply even victuals to his fatigued and hungry, but still stout-hearted troop. He denounced vengeance upon them, but postponed its execution until his return. Continuing his pursuit of the Midianites southward, he learned that they had encamped with the remnant of their army in fancied security at Karkor, just without the limits of Palestine; he therefore resolved to surprise them by a rapid detour through the edge of the nomadic region of the Hauran, a measure which he accomplished so successfully that, falling suddenly upon them from the east by night, he utterly routed them, and by sunrise was on his way to the Jordan. In this his *third* victory he avenged on the Midianitish emirs the massacre of his kingly brethren whom they had slain at Tabor. In those days captives of distinction taken in war were almost invariably slain. Zebah and Zalmunna had made up their minds to this fate; and yet it was Gideon's humane intention to spare them till he learned that they had put to death his own brothers under the same circumstances; upon which, as the avenger of their blood, he slew the captives with his own hand. In these three battles only 15,000 out of 120,000 Midianites escaped alive. It is indeed stated in Judg.

viii, 10, that 120,000 Midianites had already *fallen*; but here, as elsewhere, it may merely be intended that such was the original number of the routed host. During his triumphal return Gideon took signal and appropriate vengeance on the coward and apostate towns of Succoth and Peniel. The memory of this splendid deliverance took deep root in the national traditions (1 Sam. xii, 11; Psa. lxxxiii, 11; Isa. ix, 4; x, 26; Heb. xi, 32).

3. After this there was a peace of 40 years, and we see Gideon in peaceful possession of his well-earned honors, and surrounded by the dignity of a numerous household (viii, 29-31). It is not improbable that, like Saul, he had owed a part of his popularity to his princely appearance (Judg. viii, 18). In this stage of his life occur alike his most noble and his most questionable acts. Gideon magnanimously rejected, on theoretic principles, the proffer of hereditary royalty which the rulers in the warmth of their gratitude made him. He would only accept the golden ear-rings (q. v.) which the victors had taken from the ears of their slaughtered foes, and with these he made an ephod, and put it in his city Ophrah (Judg. viii, 22-27). But whether Gideon intended it as a commemorative trophy, or had a Levitical priest in his house, as Micah on Mount Ephraim, and the Danites at Laish, it is difficult to determine (Judg. xvii, 5-13; xviii, 15-31). The probability is that the worship rendered there was in honor of Jehovah. It became, however, a snare to the Hebrews in the vicinity, who thus, having an ephod and worship in their own country, would not so readily go over to the tabernacle at Shiloh, and consequently fell into idolatry by worshipping the gods of the Phœnicians (Judg. viii, 23). Gesenius and others (*Thes.* p. 135; Bertheau, p. 123 sq.) follow the Peshito in making the word ephod here mean an idol, chiefly on account of the vast amount of gold (1700 shekels) and other rich material appropriated to it. But it is simpler to understand it as a significant symbol of an unauthorized worship. (See *Crit. Sacr. Thes.* i, 425.)—Smith, s. v.; Kitto, s. v.; Fairbairn, s. v. See EPHOD.

The evil consequences of this false step in religion were realized in the miserable sequel of Gideon's family. After his death his numerous sons were destroyed by Abimelech, their brother, who afterwards reigned at Shechem (Judg. viii, 35; ix, 5). (See Evans, *Script. Biog.* ii, 55; Kitto, *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.; Stanley, *Jewish Church*, i, 374; Duncan, *Gideon, son of Joash*, Lond. 1860.) See ABIMELECH.

**Gideō'nî** (Heb. *Gidonî'*, גִּדְיוֹןִי or גִּדְיוֹןִי, another form of GIDEON; Sept. *Γαζωρί*), the father of Abidan, which latter was a prominent man of the tribe of Benjamin at the Exode (Numb. i, 11; ii, 22; vii, 60, 65; x, 24). B. C. 1657.

**Gidgad.** See HOR-HAGIGDAD.

**Gi'dom** (Heb. *Gidom'*, גִּדּוֹם, a *falling*; Sept. *Γεῶν* v. r. *Γαλαδί*), a place east of Gibeath, towards the wilderness (of Bethel), where the routed Benjamites turned to escape to the rock Rimmon (Judg. xx, 45); hence probably in the plain lying north-east of Michmash, and perhaps so called from being a *clearing* in the woods that anciently covered this tract (2 Kings ii, 24; 1 Sam. xiv, 25). See MENEKAI.

**Gier-eagle** [i. e. vulture-eagle] (רַחַמַ' *raham'*, Lev. xi, 18, and [with ἵ paragogic] *racha' mah*, רַחַמַ' *rahama'*, Deut. xiv, 17, prob. so called from its *tenderness* to its young; Sept. *κίρκρος* and *πορφύριος*, Vulg. *porphyrio*), probably a smaller species of vulture, the *Vultur percnopterus* of Siam (Bochart, *Hierv.* iii, 56). It is about the size of a raven, has an almost triangular bald and wrinkled head, a strong pointed beak, black at the tip, large eyes and ears, the latter entirely on the outside, and long feet. The male is white, with black wings; the female has a brown body. It lives entirely upon



carion. It is called in Arabic zoology *racham*, the exact equivalent of the Heb. name (Freytag's *Selecta ex Hist. Haleli*, Paris, 1819, p. 87), and is found in Arabia and Syria (Burchardt, ii, 681, 864; Russel's *Aleppo*, ii, 195), and likewise in Egypt, the streets of Cairo being infested with this disgusting but useful bird (Hasselquist, *Trav.* p. 195). See EAGLE. As to the identity



Egyptian Vulture (*Percnopterus Neophron*).

of the bird in question, Gesner had already figured (*De Aquila quem Percnopterus vocant*, p. 199) the Barbary variety, and pointed out the *racham* of Scripture as the identical species; but Bruce first clearly established the fact of its agreement with the Egyptian variety, popularly called "Pharaoh's chicken." The *rachama* of the former writer is apparently the *Ak-Bobha* ("white father") of the Turks, and forms one of a small group of vulturide, sub-generically distinguished by the name of *Percnopterus* and *Neophron*, differing from the other vultures in the bill being longer, straight, more attenuated, and then uncinated, and in the back of the head and neck being furnished with longish, narrow, sub-erectile feathers, but, like true vultures, having the pouch on the breast exposed, and the sides of the head and throat bare and livid. The great wing-coverts are partly, and the quill-feathers entirely of a black and blackish ash-color; those of the head, nape, smaller wing-coverts, body, and tail, in general white, with tinges of buff and rufous; the legs are flesh-color, and rather long; and the toes are armed with sharp claws. The females are brownish. In size the species is little bulkier than a raven, but it stands high on the legs. Always soiled with blood and garbage, offensive to the eye and nose, it yet is protected in Egypt both by law and public opinion, for the services it renders in clearing the soil of dead carcases putrefying in the sun, and the cultivated fields of innumerable rats, mice, and other vermin. Pious Moslems at Cairo and other places bestow a daily portion of food upon them, and upon their associates the kites, who are seen hovering conjointly in great numbers about the city. The *racham* extends to Palestine in the summer season, but becomes scarce towards the north, where it is not specially protected; and it accompanies caravans, feasting on their leavings and on dead camels, etc. Mr. Tristram says it breeds in great numbers in the valley of the Kedron (*Ibis*, i, 23). Naturalists have referred this vulture to the *περικρύπτερος* or *ὀρεπέλαργος* of Aristotle (*Hist. An.* ix, 22, 2, ed. Schneid.). The species indicated in the Scriptures is now generally admitted to be the white carion vulture of Egypt, *Percnopterus Neophron Egyptianus*, which differs but slightly from the above description. With respect to the original imposition of the name *Racham*, as connected with any unusual affection for its young, there is no modern ornithologist who assigns such a quality to percnopteri more than to other birds, although it is likely that as the pelican empties its bag of fish, so this bird may void the crop to feed

her brood. For the Arabian fables of the bird *racham*, see Bochart, *Hieroz.* iii, 56. The *Percnopterus* is somewhat singularly classed, both in Lev. and Deut., along with aquatic birds; and it may be questioned whether any animal will eat it, since, in the parallel case of *Vultur aura*, the turkey-buzzard or carrion-crow of America, and even the ants, have been found abstaining from its carcase, and leaving it to dry up in the sun, though swarming around and greedy of every other animal substance.—Kitto, s. v. See VULTURE. The Rev. G. E. Post, M.D., of Tripoli, Syria, suggests (Am. ed. of Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v.) that the *racham* of Moses may rather be a kind of pelican (*Pelecanus onocratus*), found in great numbers in Egypt and about lake Huleh, and which he says is likewise called by the Arabs *racham*; but this needs confirmation. See PELICAN.

Gieseler, JOHANN KARL LUDWIG, one of the greatest of modern Church historians, was born at Petershagen, near Minden, March 3, 1793. His father and grandfather, from both of whom he received instruction in childhood, were Lutheran ministers, somewhat of the Pietistic school. In 1803 he went to study at the Latin school of the Orphan House at Halle, and was afterwards made one of the masters. In 1813 he entered the "liberating" army as a volunteer; at the peace in 1815 he returned to his mastership; in 1817 he became co-rector of the gymnasium at Minden; in 1818 rector of that in Cleves; and in 1819 professor ordinarius of theology in the newly-founded University of Bonn. For this rapid success he was indebted to his *Historisch-kritischer Versuch über die Entstehung und die frühesten Schicksale der schriftlichen Evangelien* (Historico-critical Essay on the Origin and earliest History of the written Gospels). In 1824 he began the publication of his *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte* (Text-book of Church History), a further account of which is given below; and his studies were thenceforward almost wholly devoted to this science. In 1831 he accepted a call to the University of Göttingen, where he spent the remainder of his life. The university repeatedly conferred on him the dignity of pro-rector, and he was almost uninterruptedly a member of one or more of the academical boards. He was devoted to the interests of the Göttingen Orphan House, of which he was curator, and which he visited almost daily. He also gave much time and labor to a masonic lodge of which he was a member. In these various offices his high administrative talent found full play. He died July 8, 1854. His *Church History* is the chief work on which his reputation rests. The 4th ed. of vol. i appeared in 1844 and 1845; the 4th ed. of vol. ii, carrying the history down to A. D. 1409, appeared in 1846-49; vol. iii, reaching to 1648, appeared in two parts in 1840 and 1853. The 1vth vol. (1648-1814), the vth (1814 to the present time), and the vith, containing *Dogmengeschichte* (History of Doctrines), were issued posthumously, 1855-1857. The history, as a whole, is, beyond question, the most learned, faithful, and impartial *compendium* of Church History that has ever appeared. Its most marked features are the judicious arrangement of the periods of history; the close, compact narrative in the text; and, most of all, the abundant *sources* of information given in the notes. In this last particular no other work resembles it; it does not merely give references, but on all difficult or controverted points the quotations bearing on the subject are given at length, thus enabling the reader who has not at command the treasures of a vast library, to consult, in no slight degree, the original sources for himself. It is true, however, that Gieseler moves through the field of Church History "with critical acumen and cold intellect" (Schaff), and not, like Neander, in the spirit of faith and devotion. The rationalism of the age in which he was educated leaves its traces, if not in his pages, at least between the lines. But his biographer, Redepenning,

denies that he ever was a Rationalist in the ordinary sense of the term, and affirms that from the beginning to the end of his career he held fast the fundamental Christian doctrine of justification by faith alone. A translation of the first three volumes of the *Church History*, by Cunningham (Philadel. 1836, 3 vols. 8vo), was made from the earlier editions, and has been superseded by a new one from the fourth edition by Davidson (Elinb. 1848-56), of which five volumes have appeared. A better edition still is the American one, edited by Dr. H. B. Smith, of which four volumes have appeared (N. Y., Harper and Brothers, 8vo). Of his other works, we mention those on the disturbances in the Dutch Reformed Church between 1833 and 1839 (*Unruhen in der nied.-ref. Kirche*, etc., Hamb. 1840); and on the Lehmin (q. v.) prophecy (*Ueber d. Lehminische Weissagung*, Götting, 1840; and *Die Lehminische Weissagung als ein Gedicht des Abts von Huysbruck nachgewiesen*, Ellerb. 1849); on the difficulty between the archbishop of Cologne and the Prussian government (*Ueber die köln. Angelegenheit*, Leipz. 1838). He was also one of the assistant editors of the *Studien und Kritiken*, one of the best theological journals of Germany.—Redepenning, in vol. v of the *Church History*, translated in the *Journal of Sacred Literature*, Jan. 1856; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* v, 152 sq.

**Giffen**, DAVID FLUD VAN, was born at Sneek. He belonged to an honorable family. Following the bent of his own mind, though in opposition to the wishes of his relatives, he devoted himself to the study of theology, which he pursued at the University of Harderwyk. In 1674 he became pastor of the Reformed church at Wykell. He fully embraced the views of Cocceius. The sentiments which he held he boldly proclaimed. He did not, however, blend the Cartesian philosophy with his Cocceian sentiments, but gave a practical direction and tendency to his interpretations of the Scriptures, and even to those of the prophecies, to whose elucidation he devoted special attention. To him, and his followers and successors of the same school, was applied the epithet *serious*, in distinction from those who were denominated Leyden Cocceians. His Cocceianism excited the prejudice and opposition of many to his preaching during the early part of his ministry, and involved him in unpleasant ecclesiastical proceedings. Finally, all further ecclesiastical and civil proceedings against him were prohibited by the States of Friesland, to which he had appealed. He died in 1701. An edition of his works was given to the public by professor A. Voget in 1735, under the title *Verzameling van alle de Werken, nagelaten en uitgegeven van den hooggeleerden en godvruchtigen heer David Flud van Giffen* (Groningen, 1735). See Glasius, *Godgeleerd Nederland*, i D., blz. 522 en verv.; H. Bouman, *Geschiedenis der Gedereche Hoogeschool*, ii D., blz. 45 (Utrecht, 1844, 1847); A. Ypeij en J. Dermout, *Geschiedenis der Nederlansche Heereorde Kerk*, ii D., blz. 516 en verv. (J. P. W.)

**Gift**, the rendering of seven Heb. and four Greek terms (with their variations from the same root) in the A. V., besides being the import of others differently rendered. Several of these have a distinct and special meaning, indicative of the relation of giver and receiver, or of the motive and object of the presentation. They are as follows:

1. Properly and simply מַתָּנָה, *matnan'*, a *gratuity* (Prov. xix, 6), to secure favor (Prov. xviii, 16; xxi, 14), in religious thankfulness (Numb. xviii, 11), or in dowry (Gen. iv, 12). From the same root (מָתַן, *mathan'*, to bestow, in the widest sense) are also מַתְּנֹתָי, *mattnoth'*, a *present*, e. g. a divine bestowal (Psa. lxxviii, 18), in charity (Esth. ix, 22), in religious consecration (Exod. xxviii, 38; Lev. xxiii, 38; Numb. xviii, 6, 7, 29; Deut. xvi, 17; Ezek. xx, 26, 31, 39), in inheritance (Gen. xxv, 6; 2 Chron. xxi, 3; Ezek. xlvi,

16, 17), or as a *bribe* (Prov. xv, 27; Eccles. vi, 7); with its corresponding Chald. מַתְנָה, *mattnah'*, e. g. a royal *bounty* (Dan. ii, 6, 48; v, 17); and the synonymous מַתְתָּה, *matthath'*, e. g. a *reward* (as rendered in 1 Kings xiii, 7) or *fee* (Prov. xxv, 14), or simple conferment (Eccles. iii, 13; v, 19) or contribution (Ezek. xlvi, 5, 11). From the same root likewise the *Nethinim* (sc. *given*, i. e. consecrated, Numb. viii, 19).

2. From the root נָסַח, *nasa'*, to raise, in the "Piel" sense of *aiding*, sc. by a gift, come מַסְתָּח, *maseth'*, *pecuniary assistance* (Esth. ii, 18; elsewhere in various altered significations, and with different renderings); and מַסְתָּח, *nisseth*, a *present* in token of respect (2 Sam. xix, 42). Perhaps the inherent idea of these terms, however, is rather that of *oblation* to a superior, i. e. honorary gift; hence the former is also used of a *dish of honor* sent to special guests ("mess," xliiii, 34; 2 Sam. xi, 8), and of a *tax* or fixed contribution towards the sanctuary ("collection," 2 Chron. xxiv, 6, 9), or voluntary first-fruits offered ("oblation," Ezek. xx, 40); like the cognate מַסָּח, *massa'* ("tribute," 2 Chron. xvii, 11).

3. More distinctly in the sense of a votive offering is מִנְחָה, *minchah'*, an *oblation* or propitiatory gift (2 Sam. viii, 2, 6; 1 Chron. xviii, 2, 6; 2 Chron. xxvi, 8; xxxii, 23; Psa. xlv, 12; "present," Gen. xxxii, 13, 18, 20, 21; xxxiii, 10; xliiii, 11, 15, 25, 26; Judg. iii, 15, 17, 18; vi, 18; 1 Sam. x, 27; 1 Kings iv, 21; 2 Kings viii, 8, 9; 2 Chron. ix, 24; xvii, 5, 11; Psa. lxxii, 10; in several of which passages the word has the accessory idea of *tribute*; elsewhere usually rendered "offering"). Kindred in meaning with the last, but from an entirely different root (שָׁרַח, *shur*, to travel about with a commodity offered in sale), is תְּשׁוּרָה, *teshurah'*, a *conciliatory* "present," e. g. to a scer=fee (1 Sam. ix, 7). Different still is תְּרומָה, *terumah'* (from רָמַח, *ram*, to be high), an *oblation* (Prov. xxix, 4), especially a *peace-offering* (as usually rendered). The word בְּרָכָה, *brakah*,  *blessing*, is sometimes used of a *present* (Gen. xxxiii, 11; 1 Sam. xxv, 27; 2 Kings v, 15), munificence (Prov. xi, 25), or benefaction (Gen. xlix, 25; Isa. xix, 24).

4. Mercenary in character are the following: שׂוֹחָד, *sho'chad*, a *bribe*, especially given to a judge to obtain a favorable verdict (Exod. xxiii, 8; Deut. xvi, 19; 2 Chron. xix, 7; Prov. vi, 35; xvii, 8, 23; Isa. i, 23; Ezek. xxii, 12; elsewhere rendered "bribe," "reward," "present"); עֶשְׂכָר, *eshkar'* (from עָשָׂה, *to hire*), *price*, i. e. *tribute* (Psa. lxxii, 10; "present," Ezek. xxvii, 15). So also שְׂכָרִים, *shilluchim'* (literally *sendings away*), dotal "presents" (1 Kings ix, 16) [see Downy]; but נְדָה, *ne'deh* (lit. *liberality*), signifies the prodigal wages of a harlot (Ezek. xvi, 35).

5. In Greek the usual terms are some derivative from δίδωμι, to give, namely δῶμα, a gift, simply, i. e. the thing given (Matt. vii, 11; Luke xi, 13; Eph. iv, 8; Phil. iv, 17), δῶσε, the act of giving (James i, 17); δῶσιν, a *conferment* in token of amity (Matt. ii, 11; Eph. ii, 8; Rev. xi, 10), or sacrificial (Matt. v, 23, 24; viii, 4; xxiii, 18, 19; Heb. v, 1; viii, 3, 4; ix, 9; xi, 4), or merely eleemosynary (Luke xxi, 1) or in consecration (Matt. xv, 5; Mark vii, 11) [see CORBAN]; whereas δωρεά, a *gratuity* (John iv, 10; Acts ii, 38; viii, 20; x, 45; xi, 17; Rom. v, 15, 17; 2 Cor. ix, 15; Eph. iii, 7; iv, 7; Heb. vi, 4), and δωρομα, *endowment* (Rom. v, 16; James i, 17), refer to spiritual bestowments, i. e. grace. These significations are distributed in ἀνάδωμα, a *votive offering* (Luke xxi, 5, as being *hung up*), and χάρις (2 Cor. viii, 4; "liberality," 1 Cor. xvi, 3; "benefit," 2 Cor. i, 15), *grace* (as elsewhere usually rendered), and its cognate χάρισμα, an *impartation* which is spoken of spiritual and unmerited

endowments (Rom. v, 15, 16; vi, 23), especially the miraculous or special powers granted to the early Christians (Rom. i, 11; xii, 6; 1 Cor. i, 7; vii, 7; xii, 4, 9, 28, 30, 31; 2 Cor. i, 11; 1 Tim. iv, 14; 2 Tim. i, 6; 1 Pet. iv, 10); while *μερισμός* (a *dividing*, as in Heb. iv, 12), points out the *distribution* of these among believers (Heb. ii, 4). Henderson has admirably analyzed the terms used in the above passage (1 Cor. xii, 4-6) for these various "operations" in his work on *Divine Inspiration* (Lond. 1847), lect. iv. See SPIRITUAL GIFTS.

"The giving and receiving of presents has in all ages been not only a more frequent, but also a more formal and significant proceeding in the East than among ourselves. It enters largely into the ordinary transactions of life: no negotiation, alliance, or contract of any kind can be entered into between states or sovereigns without a previous interchange of presents: none of the important events of private life, betrothal, marriage, coming of age, birth, take place without presents: even a visit, if of a formal nature, must be prefaced by a present. The extent to which the custom prevailed admits of some explanation from the peculiar usages of the East: it is clear that the term 'gift' is frequently used where we would substitute 'tribute' or 'fee.' The tribute of subject states was paid, not in a fixed sum of money, but in kind, each nation presenting its particular product—a custom which is frequently illustrated in the sculptures of Assyria and Egypt; hence the numerous instances in which the present was no voluntary act, but an exaction (Judg. iii, 15-18; 2 Sam. viii, 2, 6; 1 Kings iv, 21; 2 Kings xvii, 3; 2 Chron. xvii, 11; xxvi, 8); and hence the expression 'to bring presents' = to own submission (Psa. lxxviii, 29; lxxxvi, 11; Isa. xviii, 7). Again, the present taken to a prophet was viewed very much in the light of a consulting 'fee,' and conveyed no idea of bribery (1 Sam. ix, 7; comp. xii, 3; 2 Kings v, 5; viii, 9): it was only when false prophets and corrupt judges arose that the present was prostituted, and became, instead of a *minchah* (as in the instances quoted), a *shochad* or bribe (Isa. i, 23; v, 23; Ezek. xxii, 12; Mic. iii, 11). But even allowing for these cases, which are hardly 'gifts' in our sense of the term, there is still a large excess remaining in the practice of the East: friends brought presents to friends on any joyful occasion (Esth. ix, 19, 22), those who asked for information or advice to those who gave it (2 Kings viii, 8), the needy to the wealthy from whom any assistance was expected (Gen. xliii, 11; 2 Kings xv, 19; xvi, 8), rulers to their favorites (Gen. xlv, 22; 2 Sam. xi, 8), especially to their officers (Esth. ii, 18; Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 2, 15), or to the people generally on festive occasions (2 Sam. vi, 19): on the occasion of a marriage, the bridegroom not only paid the parents for his bride (A. V. 'dowry'), but also gave the bride certain presents (Gen. xxxiv, 12; comp. Gen. xxiv, 22), while the father of the bride gave her a present on *sending her away*, as is expressed in the term *shiluchim* (שִׁלְחִים) (1 Kings ix, 16); and again, the portions of the sons of concubines were paid in the form of presents (Gen. xxv, 6).

"The nature of the presents was as various as were the occasions: food (1 Sam. ix, 7; xvi, 20; xxv, 18), sheep, and cattle (Gen. xxxii, 13-15; Judg. xv, 1), gold (2 Sam. xviii, 11; Job xiii, 11; Matt. ii, 11), jewels (Gen. xxiv, 53), furniture, and vessels for eating and drinking (2 Sam. xvii, 28), delicacies, such as spices, honey, etc. (Gen. xxiv, 53; 1 Kings x, 25; 2 Kings v, 22), particularly in the case of persons inducted into high office (Esth. vi, 8; Dan. v, 16; comp. Herod. iii, 20). The mode of presentation was with as much parade as possible; the presents were conveyed by the hands of servants (Judg. iii, 18), or, still better, on the backs of beasts of burden (2 Kings viii, 9), even when such a mode of conveyance was unnecessary.

The refusal of a present was regarded as a high indignity, and this constituted the aggravated insult noticed in Matt. xxii, 11, the marriage robe having been offered and refused (Trench, *Parables*). No less an insult was it not to bring a present when the position of the parties demanded it (1 Sam. x, 27)" (Smith, s. v.). Comp. PRESENT.

**Gift of Tongues.** See TONGUES, GIFT OF.

**Gifts, Spiritual** (*χαρίσματα, charisms*). On this subject we make the following extract, by permission, from Schaff, *History of the Apostolic Church*, § 116:

"By the expression *spiritual gift* or *gift of grace, χάρισμα, ἐνέργημα*, the apostle means 'a revelation of the Spirit for the common good' (*Φαρέωσις τοῦ πνεύματος πρὸς τὸ σὺμφέρον*, 1 Cor. xii, 7; *πῶς τὴν οἰκονομίην τῆς ἐκκλησίας*, xiv, 12; compare Eph. iv, 12); that is, not faith in general, which constitutes the essence of the whole Christian disposition, but a particular energy and utterance of the believer's life, prompted and guided by the Holy Ghost, for the edification of the Church; the predominant religious qualification, the peculiar divine talent of the individual, by which he is to perform his function, as an organic member, in the vital action of the whole, and promote its growth. It is, therefore, as the name itself implies, something supernaturally wrought, and bestowed by free grace (comp. 1 Cor. xii, 11); yet it forms itself, like Christianity in general, upon the natural basis prepared for it in the native intellectual and moral capacities of the man, which are in fact themselves gifts of God. These natural qualities it baptizes with the Holy Ghost and with fire, and rouses to higher and freer activity. The charisms are many, corresponding to the various faculties of the soul and the needs of the body of Christ; and in this very abundance and diversity of gifts are revealed the riches of divine grace (*ποικίλη χάρις Θεοῦ*, 1 Pet. iv, 10). As, however, they all flow from the same source, are wrought by the Holy Ghost, and are gifts of free grace, so they all subserve the same end, the edification of the body of Christ. Hence the apostle applies to them the beautiful simile of the bodily organism, the harmonious co-operation of different members (Rom. xii, 4-6; 1 Cor. xii, 12 sq.). To this practical design the term *administrations* or *ministry* (*διακονία*, 1 Cor. xii, 5; comp. Eph. iv, 12; 1 Pet. iv, 10) no doubt refers. Every one has 'his proper gift,' which best corresponds to his natural peculiarity and is indispensable for his sphere of activity (1 Cor. vii, 7; xii, 11; Rom. xii, 6; 1 Pet. iv, 10). But several charisms may also be united in one individual. This was the case particularly with the apostles, whose office in fact originally included all other spiritual offices and their functions, even to the diaconate (comp. Acts iv, 35, 37; vi, 2). It is true they all had not these gifts in equal measure. John seems to have possessed especially the charisms of love, profound knowledge, and prophecy; Peter, those of Church government and discipline, miracles, and discernment of spirits (comp. Acts v, 1 sq.); James, those of the faithful episcopal superintendence of a congregation, and silent, patient service at the altar. Most variously endowed in this respect was St. Paul, eminent alike in knowing and in setting forth divine mysteries; fitted both for the labors of a pioneer, and for preserving and confirming established order; at home among visions and revelations; excelling all the Corinthians in the gift of tongues (1 Cor. xiv, 18); and accredited among them by signs and wonders (2 Cor. xii, 12). The greatest movements in the history of the world always proceed from individuals uncommonly gifted, in whom the scattered mental energies of their age are harmoniously concentrated. Of course, however, the number or strength of the charisms establishes no merit or preference as to the attainment of salvation. For this, living faith in Christ is sufficient. The charisms are free gifts of grace; and the man is responsible, not for

the possession, but for the use of them. Every spiritual gift is liable to abuse. Spiritual knowledge may puff up (1 Cor. viii, 1). The gift of tongues may foster vanity and the disposition to monopolize the benefit of worship in self-edifying rapture (xiv, 2 sq.). And every gift is attended with heavy responsibility. Hence the apostle's earnest commendation of love, which alone would prevent such abuse of other gifts, and make their exercise pleasing to God. The value of the gifts varied; not depending, however, as many of the Corinthians thought, on their splendor and outward effect, but on their practical utility for building up the kingdom of God (1 Cor. xii, 31; xiv, 3 sq.). This extraordinary operation of the Spirit showed itself first in the apostles on the day of Pentecost, the birthday of the Church. Some of these gifts, as those of prophecy and miracles, meet us, indeed, even in the Old Testament; and before the resurrection of Christ we find the disciples healing the sick and casting out devils (Matt. xi, 8; Mark vi, 13). But the permanent possession of the Holy Ghost as the Spirit of Christ was attached to his glorification and exaltation to the right hand of the Father (John vii, 39). Thence it followed the steps of the heralds of the Gospel as a holy energy, awakening in every susceptible soul a depth of knowledge, a power of will, and a jubilee of heavenly joy, which formed a glowing contrast with the surrounding paganism. For the Lord had promised (Mark xvi, 17, 18) that the gifts of speaking with tongues, casting out devils, and healing, should be not confined to a few, but bestowed on the mass of believers. This blooming glory of the infant Church unfolded itself most luxuriantly among the intellectual, excitable, gifted Greeks, especially in the Corinthian Church. But there, too, the dangers and abuses attending it most frequently appeared. The usual medium of communicating spiritual gifts was the laying on of the apostles' hands (Acts viii, 17; xix, 6; 1 Tim. iv, 11); yet on Cornelius and his company the Holy Ghost fell immediately after the simple preaching of the Gospel, and they began to speak with tongues and prophecy, to the great astonishment of the Jewish-Christian brethren, before Peter had baptized them (Acts x, 44, 46).

"It is the prevailing view that the charisms, some of them at least, as those of miracles and tongues, belong not essentially and permanently to the Church, but were merely a temporary adventitious efflorescence of the apostolic period, an ornamental appendage, like the wedding-dress of a youthful bride, and afterwards disappeared from history, giving place to the regular and natural kind of moral and religious activity. So, among the ancients, Chrysostom, who begins his twenty-ninth homily on the Epistle to the Corinthians with these words: *Τούτο ἄπαν τὸ χωρίον σφόδρα ἴσθιν ἀσάφεις, τὴν δὲ ἀσάφειαν ἢ τῶν πραγμάτων ἄγνοιά τε καὶ ἔλλειψις ποιῆι, τῶν τότε μὲν συμβανόντων, ἄνν δὲ οὐ γνωσμένων.* Among moderns compare, for example, Olshausen (*Comment.* iii, 683), who makes the charismatic form of the Spirit's operation cease with the third century. With special distinctness, this view is expressed by Trautmann as follows (*Die Apostol. Kirche*, 1848, p. 309): 'As, in the case of marriage, the festivity of the wedding-day cannot always last, any more than the inspiration of the first love when the seriousness and steady activity of the common pilgrimage just begun comes on; as, according to the universal order of nature, the blossom must fall away if the fruit is to thrive—though, on the other hand, the fruit does not appear without the preceding blossom—so that gush of heavenly powers on the day of Pentecost could not, must not continue in the Church. It could not—because the earthly human nature is not able constantly to bear the bliss of ecstasy and such mighty streams of power from above, as is shown by the example of the three chosen disciples on the Mount of Transfiguration. It must not—because

the continuance of the blossom would have hindered the development of the fruit. The splendor of these higher powers would unavoidably have fixed the eye and the heart too much on externals, and the proper object and work of faith, the inward conquest of the world, would have been neglected.' The Irvingites, on the contrary, like the Montanists of the second century, look upon these apostolic gifts and offices as the necessary conditions of a healthy state of the Church at any time; make their disappearance the fault of Christianity; and hold it impossible to remedy the defects of the Church without a revival of the charisms and the apostolate. They appeal to such passages as 1 Cor. xii, 27-31; Eph. iv, 11-13, where undue emphasis is laid on 'till;' and to 1 Thess. v, 19, 20; 1 Cor. xii, 31; xiv, 1, where the apostle not only warns Christians against quenching the holy fire of the Spirit, but also positively requires them to strive earnestly after his miraculous gifts. So Thiersch, the (only) scientific theologian of the Irvingite community, in his *Vorlesungen über Katholicismus und Protestantismus*, i, 80 (2d edit.); compare my articles on 'Irvingism and the Church Question' in the *Deutsche Kirchenfreund*, vol. iii, Nos. 2, 3, 5, and 6, particularly p. 223 sq. The Mormons, too, or 'Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints,' whose rise (April 6, 1830) was almost simultaneous with the appearance of Irvingism in England, notwithstanding their radical difference in spirit and conduct, likewise claim to possess all the offices and spiritual gifts of the apostolic Church. Their founder, Joseph Smith, lays down, among other articles of faith: 'We believe in the same organization that existed in the primitive Church, viz. apostles, prophets, pastors, teachers, evangelists, etc. We believe in the gift of tongues, prophecy, revelation, visions, healing, interpretation of tongues,' etc. (*Hist. of all the Relig. Denominations in the U. S.* p. 348, 2d edit.). There seems to us to be here a mixture of truth and error on both sides. In these charisms we must distinguish between the essence and the temporary form. The first is permanent; the second has disappeared, yet breaks out at times sporadically, though not with the same strength and purity as in the apostolic period. In the nature of the case, the Holy Ghost, when first entering into humanity, came with peculiar creative power, copiousness, and freshness; presented a striking contrast to the mass of the unchristian world; and by this very exhibition of what was extraordinary and miraculous, exerted a mighty attraction upon the world, without which it could never have been conquered. Christianity, however, aims to incorporate herself in the life of humanity, enter into all its conditions and spheres of activity as the ruling principle, and thus to become the second, higher nature. As it raises the natural more and more into the sphere of the Spirit, so in this very process it makes the supernatural more and more natural. These are but two aspects of one and the same operation. Accordingly we find, that as fast as the reigning power of heathenism is broken, those charisms which exhibited most of the miraculous become less frequent, and after the fourth century almost entirely disappear. This is not owing to a fault of Christianity, for at that very time the Church produced some of her greatest teachers, her Athanasius and her Ambrose, her Chrysostom and her Augustine. It is rather a result of its victory over the world. Spiritual gifts, however, did not then fully and forever disappear; for in times of great awakening, and of the powerful descent of the Spirit, in the creative epochs of the Church, we now and then observe phenomena quite similar to those of the first century, along with the corresponding dangers and abuses, and even Satanic imitations and caricatures. These manifestations then gradually cease again, according to the law of the development of a new principle as just stated. Such facts of experience may serve to confirm and illustrate the phenomena of the apostolic age. In judging of

them, moreover, particularly of the mass of legends of the Roman Church, which still lays claim to the perpetual possession of the gift of miracles, we must proceed with the greatest caution and critical discrimination. In view of the over-valuation of charisms by the Montanists and Irvingites, we must never forget that Paul puts those which most shun free inspection, and most rarely appear, as the gift of tongues, far beneath the others, which pertain to the regular vital action of the Church, and are at all times present in larger or smaller measure, as the gifts of wisdom, of knowledge, of teaching, of trying spirits, of government, and, above all, of love, that greatest, most valuable, most useful, and most enduring of all the fruits of the Spirit (1 Cor. xiii).

“Finally, as to the *classification* of the charisms. They have often been divided into extraordinary or supernatural in the strict sense, and ordinary or natural. (So by Neander; also by Conybeare and Howson, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul* [London, 1853], i, 459.) But this is improper, for, on the one hand, they all rest on a natural basis, even the gift of miracles (upon the dominion of mind over body, of will over matter); and, on the other, they are all supernatural. St. Paul derives them all from one and the same Spirit, and it is only their supernatural, divine element, that makes them charisms. Nor, according to what has been already said, can the division into permanent, or those which belong to the Church at all times, and transitory, or such as are confined to the apostolic period, be strictly carried out. We therefore propose a psychological classification, on the basis of the three *primary faculties of the soul*; they all being capable and in need of sanctification, and the Holy Ghost, in fact, leaving none of them untouched, but turning them all to the edification of the Church. With this corresponds also the classification according to the different *branches of the Church-life*, in which the activity of one or the other of these faculties thus supernaturally elevated predominates. This would give us three classes of charisms: 1. Those which relate especially to *feeling and worship*. 2. Those which relate to *knowledge and theology*. 3. Those which relate to *will and Church government*. To the gifts of feeling belong speaking with tongues, interpretation of tongues, and inspired prophetic discourse; to the theoretical class, or gifts of intellect, belong the charisms of wisdom and of knowledge, of teaching and of discerning spirits; to the practical class, or gifts of will, the charisms of ministration, of government, and of miracles. *Faith* lies back of all, as the motive power, taking up the whole man, and bringing all his faculties into contact with the divine Spirit, and under his influence and control.”

On the special gifts, see further in Schaff, *Hist. of the Apost. Church*, § 117–120. On the gift of tongues, see TONGUES, GIFT OF. See also Jortin, *Remarks on Ecclesiastical History*; Doddridge, *Lectures on Pneumatology*; Neander, *Planting and Training*, ch. i; Delitzsch, *Biblical Psychology*, part v; Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics*, § 233–235; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* iv, 735 sq.; and the art. CATHOLIC APOSTOLIC CHURCH; PLYMOUTH BRETHREN.

**Giftheil**, LUDWIG FRIEDRICH, a native of Suedia, made himself a name in the 17th century by his fanatical denunciations of the State Church and its ministers. The date of his birth is not known, but he began to write during the Thirty-Years' War. Giftheil not only opposed the religious institutions of his day, but also believed himself called to warn the governments against war and bloodshed. For this object he wrote to the king of England, in 1643–1644, *Zween Brieffe, gerichtet an die Mächtigen in England*, etc.; then, in 1647, his *Eine neue Declaration aus Orient*, etc. He continued his warnings also to Cromwell, and, among other things, called the protector “field-marshal of the devil, highwayman, thief, and murderer.”

After wandering over more than the half of Europe, he died at Amsterdam in 1611. See Arnold, *Kirchen-u. Ketzehist.* iii, 10; Böhme, *8 Bücher v. d. Reformation der Kirche in England* (Altona, 1734, p. 941 sq.); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* v, 155. (J. N. P.)

**Giger**, GEORGE MUSGRAVE, an eminent divine and scholar in the Presbyterian Church, was born in Philadelphia June 6, 1822. He graduated with high honor at Nassau Hall in 1841, and studied divinity in the Theological Seminary at Princeton in 1844. “Soon after finishing his college course he was chosen tutor in New Jersey College. This position he held till 1846, when he was elected adjunct professor of mathematics. In the following year he was elected adjunct professor of Greek, and in 1854 professor of the Latin language and literature. He held this chair till 1865, when failing health obliged him to resign. He died in Philadelphia Oct. 11, 1865. Dr. Giger was heartily attached to the interests of the college with which he was so long connected. He bequeathed to it his library, and it is also a residuary legatee to the extent of thirty thousand dollars.” He also left legacies to “Clio Hall,” one of the college societies, and to the order of Masons.—Wilson's *Presbyterian Historical Almanac*, ix, 146.

**Gihon** (Heb. *Gichon*, גִּיחֹן, in 1 Kings גִּיחֹן, a stream, as breaking forth from a fountain; Sept. in Gen. ii, 13 Γεῶν v. r. Γῆων, in 1 Kings i, 33, 38 Γῆων, in 2 Chron. xxxii, 30 Γεῶν, undistinguishable in 2 Chron. xxxiii, 14; Vulg. *Gihon*), the name of two water-courses. Gesenius compares Job xl, 23, and the Arabic *jayhama* and *jayhunu*, spoken of several larger Asiatic streams, as the Ganges, Araxes, etc.

1. The second of the four rivers of Eden, said to flow around the land of *Cush* or Ethiopia (1 Gen. ii, 13). What river is actually denoted here is a matter of great dispute and uncertainty; perhaps the face of the country in question has been so greatly changed since that time (although the present tense is used by Moses in the description) as to efface the distinctive marks given. See PARADISE. We may here remark, however, that the usual interpretation, and the one adopted by Gesenius, is that of Josephus (Γηών, *Ant.* i, 1, 3), which identifies the Gihon with the Nile; so also the Sept., which in Jer. ii, 18, for *Sutor* or the Nile, has Γηών, and in Eccles. xxiv, 27 puts Γηών (A. V. “Geon”) for the Nile. The Mohammedans likewise reckon the Nile as one of the rivers of Paradise (*Fundgrub. des Orients*, i, 304). Others regard the Oxus as meant (Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* i, 1, p. 184; Ritter, *Erdk.* ii, 480), others the Araxes (Ireland); others still the Ganges (Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* i, 335).—Winer, i, 428.

The second river of Paradise presents difficulties not less insurmountable than the first, or Pison. Those who maintained that the Pison is the Ganges held also that the Gihon was the Nile. One great objection to this theory is, that although in the books of the Old Testament frequent allusion is made to this river, it nowhere appears to have been known to the Hebrews by the name Gihon. The idea seems to have originated with the Sept. rendering of גִּיחֹן by Γηών in Jer. ii, 18; but it is clear, from the manner in which the translators have given the latter clause of the same passage, that they had no conception of the true meaning. Among modern writers, Bertheau (quoted by Delitzsch, *Genesis*) and Kalisch (*Genesis*) have not hesitated to support this interpretation, in accordance with the principle they adopt, that the description of the garden of Eden is to be explained according to the most ancient notions of the earth's surface, without reference to the advances made in later times in geographical knowledge. If this hypothesis be adopted, it certainly explains some features of the narrative, but, so far from removing the difficulty, it introduces another equally great. It has yet to be proved that the opinions of the Hebrews on these points were as

contradictory to the now well-known relations of land and water as the recorded impressions of other nations at a much later period. At present we have nothing but categorical assertion. Pausanias (ii, 5), indeed, records a legend that the Euphrates, after disappearing in a marsh, rises again beyond Ethiopia, and flows through Egypt as the Nile. Arrian (*Exp. Alex.* vi, 1) relates that Alexander, on finding crocodiles in the Indus, and beans like those of Egypt on the banks of the Acesines, imagined that he had discovered the sources of the Nile; but he adds, what those who make use of this passage do not find it convenient to quote, that on receiving more accurate information Alexander abandoned his theory, and cancelled the letter he had written to his mother Olympias on the subject. It is but fair to say that there was at one time a theory afloat that the Nile rose in a mountain of Lower Mauretania (Pliny, *H. N.* v, 10).

The etymology of Gihon (גִּיחֹן, *to burst forth*) seems to indicate that it was a swiftly-flowing, impetuous stream. According to Golius (*Lex. Arab.*), *Jichûn* is the name given to the Oxus, which has, on this account, been assumed by Rosenmüller, Hartmann, and Michaelis to be the Gihon of Scripture. But the Araxes, too, is called by the Persians *Jichûn ar-Rus*, and from this circumstance it has been adopted by Reland, Calmet, and colonel Chesney as the modern representative of the Gihon. It is clear, therefore, that the question is not to be decided by etymology alone, as the name might be appropriately applied to many rivers. That the Gihon should be one of the channels by which the united stream of the Tigris and Euphrates falls into the Persian Gulf, was essential to the theory which places the garden of Eden on the Shat el-Arab. Bochart and Huet contended that it was the easternmost of these channels, while Calvin considered it to be the most westerly. Hopkinson and Junius, conceiving that Eden was to be found in the region of Auranitis (= *Audanitis, quasi Edenitis*), on the Euphrates, were compelled to make the Gihon coincide with the Naharsar, the Marses of Amm. Marc. (xxiii, 6, § 25). That it should be the Orontes (Leclerc), the Ganges (Buttmann and Ewald), the Kur, or Cyrus, which rises from the side of the Sughanlou mountain, a few miles northward of the sources of the Araxes (Link), necessarily followed from the exigencies of the several theories. Rask and Verbrugge are in favor of the Gyndes of the ancients (Herod. i, 189), now called the Diyâlah, one of the tributaries of the Tigris. Abraham Peritsol (Ugolino, vol. vii) was of opinion that the garden of Eden was situated in the region of the Mountains of the Moon. Identifying the Pison with the Nile, and the Gihon with a river which his editor, Hyde, explains to be the Niger, he avoids the difficulty which is presented by the fact that the Hiddekel and P'raih are rivers of Asia, by conceiving it possible that these rivers actually take their rise in the Mountains of the Moon, and then run under ground till they make their appearance in Assyria. Equally unsatisfactory is the explanation of Ephraem Syrus that the four rivers have their source in Paradise, which is situated in a very lofty place, but are swallowed up by the surrounding districts, and, after passing underneath the sea, come to light again in different quarters of the globe.—Smith, s. v. Eden.

Inasmuch as the sacred narrative makes it evident that all the rivers in question took their origin from the head waters of the Euphrates and the Tigris, we must refer the Gihon to one of the streams of the same region, namely, the lake system of Central Armenia, in the vicinity of Lake Van. As the Euphrates and Tigris flow southerly, so we may naturally conclude that by the Pison and Gihon are intended rivers flowing northerly, probably one towards the Caspian, and the other towards the Euxine. No better representative of the Gihon can be found in this region than the *Araxes* (Ἀράξης) of antiquity, which, as we have seen,

to this day bears the same name among the Arabs. This is a large river in Armenia Major, which takes its rise from a number of sources in Mount Abus (the present Bin-Gol), nearly in the centre of the space between the east and west branches of the Euphrates (Strabo, p. 531; Pliny, vi, 10; Ptolemy, v, 13; § 3, 6, 9). The general course may be described as east, then south-east, and, after flowing in a north-easterly direction, it resumes its south-east course, and, after its junction with the Cyrus (Kur), it discharges itself into the Caspian Sea (Col. Monteith, in the *London Geogr. Journ.* vol. iii). It is the modern *Arras* (Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geogr.* s. v.). See EDEX.

2. A fountain near Jerusalem, to which the young Solomon was taken to be anointed king (1 Kings i, 33, 38), out of sight, but within hearing of En-rogel, with the city between (ver. 9, 41), but its direction is not indicated. Subsequently Hezekiah "stopped the upper water-course [or upper outflow of the waters] of Gihon, and brought it straight down to the west side of the city of David" (2 Chron. xxxii, 30; xxxiii, 14). This was, perhaps, on occasion of the approach of the Assyrian army under Sennacherib, when, to prevent the besiegers from finding water, great numbers of the people labored with much diligence in stopping the water of the fountains without the city, and in particular of "the brook that ran through the midst of the land" (2 Chron. xxxii, 3, 4). The author of the book of Sirach (xlviii, 17) also states that "Hezekiah brought water into the midst of the city; he dug with iron into the rock, and built fountains for the waters." The fountain of Gihon is also mentioned by Josephus as lying outside the city (Γῶν, *Ant.* vii, 14, 5). From a comparison of these passages, the editor of the *Pictorial Bible* (on 2 Chron. xxxii) arrived at the conclusion, since confirmed by Dr. Robinson (*Researches*, i, 313), that there existed anciently a fountain of Gihon on the west side of the city, which was "stopped" or covered over by Hezekiah, and its waters brought by subterranean channels into the city. Before that time it would naturally have flowed down through the valley of the Gihon, and probably formed the brook which was stopped at the same time. "The fountain may have been stopped, and its waters thus secured very easily by digging deep and erecting over it one or more vaulted subterranean chambers. Something of the very same kind is still seen in the fountains near Solomon's Pools beyond Bethlehem, where the water rises in subterranean chambers, to which there is no access except down a narrow shaft like a well. In this way the waters of Gihon would be withdrawn from the enemy and preserved in the city, in which they would seem to have been distributed among various reservoirs and fountains." From all these circumstances there seems little room to doubt that an open fountain, called "the fountain of Gihon," did anciently exist on the west side of the city, the waters of which may still continue to flow by subterranean channels down to the ancient Temple, and perhaps to Siloam. This fountain was probably near the present Upper Pool, in the valley west of Jerusalem. This Upper Pool is a large tank, which is dry in summer, but in the rainy season becomes full, when its waters are conducted by a small, rude aqueduct or channel to the vicinity of the Jaffa Gate, and so to the Pool of Hezekiah within the city (Robinson's *Researches*, i, 352, 512-514). Mr. Williams (*Holy City*, ii, 480) suggests another route for the water in question, namely, that the upper spring of Gihon once had its issue on the north side of the city, not far from the tombs of the kings, where its waters were originally received into a basin called the Serpent's Pool, and thence flowed down the valley of Jehoshaphat. This upper outflow Hezekiah stopped, and brought the water by an aqueduct down the Tyropæon to the Temple, whence the surplus flowed off by an old channel to the fountain of the Virgin, and was continued through

a new bore to the Pool of Siloam, which Mr. Williams thinks was the Lower Pool of Isa. xxii, 9, 11. Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 266) likewise confounds the lower spring of Gihon with Siloam. This latter, he says, has the same peculiar qualities as the water of a cistern found between the castle of David and the Temple Mount, showing the course of the now closed upper fount of Gihon. From the terms of the first passage in which Gihon is mentioned (1 Kings i, 33, 38, 45), it is evident it was at a lower level than the city—"Bring him down (גִּיְהוֹן) upon (גִּיְהוֹן) Gihon"—"They are come up (גִּיְהוֹן) from thence." With this agrees a later mention (2 Chron. xxxiii, 14), where it is called "Gihon-in-the-valley," the word rendered valley being *nachal* (נַחַל). In this latter place Gihon is named to designate the direction of the wall built by Manasseh—"outside the city of David, on the west of [rather to  $\frac{1}{2}$ ] Gihon-in-the-valley to the entrance of the fish-gate." It is not stated in any of the above passages that Gihon was a spring; but the only remaining place in which it is mentioned suggests that idea, or at least that it had given its name to some water—"Hezekiah also stopped the upper source or issue (נִצְּרָה, from נִצַּר, to rush forth; incorrectly 'water-course' in A. V.) of the waters of Gihon" (2 Chron. xxxii, 30). If the place to which Solomon was brought down on the king's mule was Gihon-in-the-valley—and from the terms above noticed it seems probable that it was—then the "upper source" would be some distance away, and at a higher level. Josephus also speaks of water brought to the tower of Hippicus (*War*, v, 7, 3), which could only have come from the west. The following are therefore the views propounded as to its real import and locality: (1) Some affirm that Gihon was the ancient name of the valley of Jehoshaphat, and that it is compounded of the words נָחַל, "a valley," and יָפָה, "beauty." The fountain of the Virgin, which rises at the bottom of the valley, had originally flowed into the brook Kidron, but was artificially carried by a conduit across the ridge of Zion (?) to the Pool of Siloam. This was the lower water-course of Gihon. More to the north was anciently another spring, called the upper water-course of Gihon, which was stopped or sealed in the time of Hezekiah, and conveyed to the west side of the city of David (Lewin, *Jerusalem*, p. 11 sq.). It will be seen that in this theory the "city of David" is identified with Moriah. (2) Others think that Gihon was the old name of the Tyropæan valley; that the Pool of Siloam was the "lower Gihon;" and that the "upper Gihon" was only the table-land north of the Damascus gate (Williams, *Holy City*, i, 124, supplement). (3) Others hold that Gihon was a name sometimes given to the valley of Hinnom, and that the "upper outflow" was at the head of that valley west of the city (Robinson, *B. R.* i, 346). (4) An English engineer, recently sent out to survey the waters of Jerusalem, has reported that there is not, and from the position of the city and the character of the strata there could not be, any perennial fountain in or around Jerusalem. The so-called Fountain of the Virgin, he says, is supplied by the leakage from the great cisterns under the Temple area; and the peculiar taste of its water is occasioned by stagnation and filth (MS. Report). If this be so, then Gihon could neither be a fountain nor a perennial stream. The results of this examination of authorities may be thus stated. The upper fountain of Gihon was in the head of the valley of Hinnom, and a stream from it ran down through that valley. The fountain was covered by Hezekiah, and the water brought into the city of David by a concealed channel, partly hewn in the rock. There was an "upper" and a "lower" pool in this valley. A close examination of the place tends to confirm these views. No fountain has yet been discovered, nor could

it be without extensive excavations; but a section of an old aqueduct was laid bare when sinking the foundations of the new church on the northern summit of Zion. It was twenty feet beneath the surface, in places excavated in the rock, and its direction was from west to east (Bartlett, *Walks about Jerusalem*, p. 84). This may be a portion of Hezekiah's aqueduct from Gihon; and it may have carried the water to the Temple area as well as to Zion. In the valley of Hinnom are still two great "pools;" one at its head, called *Birket el-Mamilla*; another west of the present Sion gate in the bottom of the glen, called *Birket es-Sultan*. The fountain or rivulet in question is doubtless a part of the aqueduct system of Jerusalem, all of it probably traceable to the supply from the pools of Solomon at Bethlehem.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See JERUSALEM.

**Gil**, JUAN, commonly called Dr. Egidius, was one of the early converts to the Reformation in Spain. He was born at Olivera, in Aragon, and was educated at the University of Alcala, where he devoted himself especially to the Scholastic theology. After his ordination he became canon-preacher at the cathedral of Seville, and professor of theology at Sigüenza. Under the influence of Rodrigo de Valer (q. v.) he was led to the careful study of the Bible, and the effect appeared in the life and power of his preaching, which was soon noised abroad. He united with Vargas (q. v.) and Ponce de la Fuente in a plan for diffusing practical religious life. In 1550 he was nominated by the emperor to the bishopric of Tortosa, and this preferment excited the anger of his enemies. He was seized and imprisoned by the Inquisition on a charge of heresy. The emperor and the chapter of Seville interfered in his behalf; but, after a singular trial (for details, see M'Crie), he was condemned to imprisonment (1551), from which he was released in 1555. He died soon after. His remains were taken from the grave by order of the Inquisition, and burnt, as those of a Lutheran heretic.—M'Crie, *Reformation in Spain*, ch. iv.

**Gil'alai** (Heb. *Gilalay'*, גִּילְאֵי, perhaps *dungy* [Gesenius], or *weighty* [Fürst]; Sept. Γελλώλ), one of the priests appointed by Nehemiah to aid Zechariah in the musical services under Ezra at the dedication of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. xii, 36). B. C. 446.

**Gilbert de la Porrée** (*Gislebertus Porretanus*), a Scholastic theologian and follower of Abelard, was born at Poitiers in 1070. He studied philosophy under Bernard of Chartres, and theology under Anselm and Radulfus of Laon. He began to lecture at Chartres, and both there and at Paris achieved great distinction as a profound logician and an original teacher. In 1142 he was made bishop of Poitiers, but did not give up his metaphysical pursuits. He treated theology more as a metaphysician than as a divine, making more use of Aristotle than of Scripture or of the fathers. His style was very obscure. He was a thorough Realist in philosophy. For his theories with regard to the divine nature he was accused at the Council of Rheims in 1148, where Bernard of Clairvaux headed the prosecution against him. The charges were founded on the following propositions of Gilbert: 1. That the divine nature, the substance of God, is not God. 2. The properties of the divine persons are not the persons themselves; and the persons of the Trinity are one only in virtue of their divinity. 3. It was not the divine nature, but only the person of the Word, that became incarnate. 4. There is no merit possible but the merit of Christ. Gilbert was condemned, though some of the cardinals voted with him. He submitted to the decision of the council, and remained afterwards unmolested in his diocese. He died in 1154. Gilbert wrote many books, part of which are yet in MS. Among those printed are *Commentarius in quatuor libros de Trinitate* of Boethius, published in

Boethii Opera (Bâle, 1570, fol.)—*Liber sex Principiorum*, pub. in Hermolaus Barbarus's edition of Aristotle. See Lauréau, *Philosophie Scolastique*, i, 296 sq.; Cousin, *Introd. aux Ouvrages inédits d'Abeillard*; Baur, *Dreiebnigkeit*, ii, 509 sq.; Neander, *Ch. History*, iv, 410, 461; Neander, *History of Dogmas*, p. 489, 497; Hoefler, *Nov. Biog. Générale*, xx, 484.

**Gilbert, Eliphalet Wheeler**, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, and president of Delaware College, was born at Lebanon, Columbia Co., N. Y., Dec. 19, 1793, and graduated at Union College in 1813. After completing his theological course at Princeton, he was licensed in 1817, went on a mission to the West, and on his return was elected pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church in Wilmington, Del. He was frequently engaged in missionary labors; and, on being released from his charge at Wilmington in 1834, he became agent for the American Education Society, but resigned on being chosen president of Delaware College. In 1835 he returned to Wilmington, where he remained till 1841, when he was recalled to the presidency of Delaware College. After a second resignation of this office in 1847, he was installed pastor of the Western Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, and died July 31, 1853. He published *The Letters of Paul and Amicus*; two tracts, viz. *Regeneration and Perseverance*; three articles in the *Presb. Review*, viz. *Geology, The Apocalypse*, and *Millenarianism*.—Sprague, *Annals*, iv, 596.

**Gilbert, Gad Smith**, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in New Haven, Connecticut, September 22, 1814. He studied at the Wesleyan University with a view to the ministry, but for several years he turned his attention to secular pursuits. In 1842 he joined the New York Conference, and was stationed at New Milford, Connecticut. Subsequently he was stationed at Woodbury and Wolcottville. In 1847 he located, and removed to Louisiana on account of the sickness of his wife, who died during the same year. While at the South, however, he had charge of the Methodist Church at Opelousas, La. In 1848 he returned and joined the New York East Conference, and was stationed at Greenport, L. I. After that he was stationed at Southport, Conn., First Place, Brooklyn, and Rye, N. Y. In 1855 he was agent for the Wesleyan University. In 1856 he was stationed at Port Chester, N. Y., and afterwards at Second Avenue, New York City, Sag Harbor, L. I., De Kalb Avenue, Brooklyn, Tompkins Avenue, Brooklyn, which society he organized. His last appointment was Southport, Conn. He died in New Haven, August 1, 1866. Shortly before his death he praised God, saying, "This house is as that of Obed-Edom, where the ark of the Lord rested; it is the gate of heaven; heaven has come down to earth; the angels are here. This disease is drawing my body down to earth, but Jesus is drawing my soul up to heaven; I shall soon be there." And just before he ceased to live on earth he said, "Is this dying? it is felicity! O how precious Jesus is! Glory, halleluiah!"—*Minutes of Conferences*, 1867, p. 77.

**Gilbert, Joseph**, an English Independent minister, was born in 1778, and was for many years pastor at Nottingham; died in 1852. He wrote *The Christian Attonement* (Cong. Lecture, London, 1836, 8vo; 2d edit. 1852). See *British Critic*, xxi, 450; *Life of Gilbert*, by his widow (Lond. 1853, 12mo); Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, i, 1254; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 668.

**Gilbert of Sempringham** (GILBERT), St., founder of the order of Gilbertines, was the son of Joscelin, lord of Sempringham and Tirington, and was born in 1083. After completing his studies at Paris, he was ordained priest by the bishop of Lincoln, and received from his father the stewardship of two estates. He then founded a house for seven poor maidens who had resolved to lead a life of chastity, and who made vows of absolute seclusion. They were attended only

by a few servants, from whom they received all they required through a window. The property with which he had endowed this institution was attended to by poor laborers, whom he also subjected to certain rules and observances. As similar institutions were soon erected in other places, Gilbert requested pope Eugene III to incorporate his foundation with the Cistercians. Eugene not complying with the request, he was obliged to provide in some other way for the guidance of his congregations, and in that view attached a convent of canons to each nunnery, framing at the same time



Regular Canon of the Order of St. Gilbert.

Nun of the Order of St. Gilbert.

very strict rules to keep them each separate: he placed the nuns under the rule of St. Benedict, and the canons under that of St. Augustine. The institution counted some 2200 men and several thousand women among its members, and hospitals for the poor, the sick, widows, and orphans were connected with their regular establishments. Gilbert died in 1180, aged 106 years. The strictness of his life had not protected him from calumny. He was, however, canonized by pope Innocent III in 1202. At the time of the Reformation the order possessed 21 houses, and 11 double convents inhabited by both nuns and monks, but they were so strictly divided that the nuns received even communion through a window, and the canons administered the extreme unction to dying nuns without seeing them. Whenever it became absolutely necessary that a nun and monk should hold communication with each other, a witness was obliged to attend; hence a body of ten canons was appointed, together with a number of lay brethren, subject to the rule of Cîteaux. The order was never propagated outside of England. The rule of the order is given in full by Holstenius (tom. ii). See Hurter, *Innocenz III u. s. Zeugenossen*, iv, 230; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* v, 413 sq.; Hoefler, *Nov. Biog. Gén.* xx, 488.

**Gilbertines.** See GILBERT OF SEMPRINGHAM.

**Gilbo'á** [many *Gil'boá*] (Heb. *Gilbo'á*, גִּלְבּוֹאִי, *boiling spring*, prob. from a neighboring fountain; Sept. and Joseph. *Ant.* vi, 14, 2, also Euseb. *Onom.* Γελβωά), usually called *Mount Gilboa* (גִּלְבּוֹאִי הַר), a mountain near which (according to some) Gideon pitched on the eve of his overthrow with the Midianites (Judg. vii, 1 [see GILEAD, 2]); but especially memorable for the defeat of Saul by the Philistines, where his three sons were slain, and where he himself died by his own hand (1 Sam. xxviii, 4; xxxi, 1-8; 2 Sam. i, 6-21; xxi, 12; 1 Chron. x, 1, 8). When the tidings were carried to David, he broke out into this pathetic strain: "Ye mountains of Gilboa, let there be no rain upon you, neither dew, nor field of offering" (2 Sam. i, 21). The circumstances of the narrative would alone suffice to



direct our attention to the mountains which bound the great plain of Esdraelon on the south-east, and are interposed between it and the Jordan valley. (See Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 337.) Here there are a number of ridges, with a general direction from north-west to south-east, separated by valleys running in the same direction. The largest of these valleys is the southernmost: it is a broad, deep plain, about two miles and a half wide, and leading direct into the Jordan valley. This is supposed to be distinctively (for the plain of Esdraelon is sometimes so called) the Valley of Jezreel. The higher mountains which bound it on the south undoubtedly form Mount Gilboa. Eusebius mentions the mountains of Gilboa as lying six miles from Scythopolis, with a large village upon them called *Gelbus* (Γελβούρι). There is still, indeed, an inhabited village, in whose name of *Jelbon* that of Gilboa may be recognised (Robinson's *Researches*, iii, 157, 170). The fountain implied in the name Gilboa may be that mentioned by William of Tyre (xxii, 26) under the name of Tubania (טובניא), being the large fountain still found at the north-eastern base, half a mile from the ruins, called in Scripture both the "Well of Harod" (Judg. vii, 1) and "The fountain of Jezreel" (1 Sam. xxix, 1), and now called Ain-Jalud. See HAROD.

A knowledge of the topography of this region gives great vividness to several of the Scripture narratives, but especially to that of the fatal battle in which Saul fell. The range about six miles north of Gilboa, and of nearly equal elevation and length, was anciently called the "hill of Moreh" (Judg. vii, 1), but now Jebel ed-Duhly (and by travellers "Little Hermon"). The intervening valley, named from the city of Jezreel at the western extremity of Gilboa, has at its eastern end, overlooking the Jordan, the mound and ruins of Bethshean. On the other side of the valley, and near the base of Moreh, stands Shunem; and away behind the latter hill, hidden from view, is the village of Endor. The Philistines encamped on the north side of the valley at Shunem; and Saul took up a position by the fountain of Jezreel, at the base of Gilboa (1 Sam. xxviii, 4; xxix, 1). From the brow of the hill above the camp Saul had a full view of the enemy, and he was struck with terror at their numbers (xxviii, 5). The position he had chosen was a bad one. There is a gradual descent in the valley from Shunem to the base of Gilboa at the fountain, while immediately behind it the hill rises steep and rocky. The Philistines had all the advantage of the gentle descent for their attack, and both front and flanks of the Israelites were exposed, and retreat almost impossible up the steep hill side. On the night before the battle Saul went to Endor. The battle seems to have begun early in the morning, when the king was wearied and dispirited (xxviii, 19). The Israelites were broken at once by the fierce onset of the enemy, and the slaughter was terrible as they attempted to flee up the sides of Gilboa. While the terror-stricken masses were clambering up the rugged slopes, they were completely exposed to the arrows of the Philistine archers. "They fell down slain in Mount Gilboa" (xxxi, 1); "The Philistines followed hard upon Saul and upon his sons," probably when they tried to rally their troops. The three sons fell beside their father; "and the battle went sore against Saul, and the archers hit him; and he was sore wounded of the archers" (ver. 3). David has caught the peculiarity of the position in his ode: "The beauty of Israel is slain upon the high places;" and, "Jonathan, thou wast slain upon thine high places" (2 Sam. i, 19, 25). The stripping and mutilating of the slain is characteristic of the Arab tribes to this day, and Porter witnessed some fearful instances of it in 1858 near this same spot (*Hand-book for S. and P.* p. 355). The Philistines took the body of Saul and fastened it to the wall of the neighboring fortress of Bethshean, from whence it was snatched by a few

brave men from Jabesh-Gilead, on the opposite side of the Jordan (Stanley, *Jewish Church*, ii, 39 sq.). See SAUL.

The ridge of Gilboa is bleak and bare (Wilson, *Lands of Bible*, ii, 85; First derives from this fact the name of the mountain, q. d. *bare land*, from גִּלְבּוֹא, Heb. Lex. s. v.). The soil is scanty, and the gray limestone rocks crop out in jagged cliffs and naked crowns, giving the whole a look of painful barrenness. One would almost think, on looking at it, that David's words were prophetic (Van de Velde, *Narrative*, ii, 369). The highest point of Gilboa is said to have an elevation of about 2200 feet above the sea, and 1200 above the valley of Jezreel (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 178). The range of Gilboa extends in length some ten miles from W. to E. The modern local name is *Jebel Fukiuh*, and the highest point is crowned by a village and wely called *Wezar* (Porter, *Hand-book*, p. 353).—Kitto, s. v.

**GILDAS THE WISE**, the first British historian, was born in the year 511 (according to Bede, 493), became scholar to Htutus, abbot of Morgan, and was made afterwards abbot of Bangor. The time of his death is uncertain. The legendary accounts of him differ so much that Bale and Usher suppose there were two of the same name, while others doubt the existence of any such person. "In truth, as Mr. Stevenson observes, in his introduction to the Latin text of *Gildas de Excidio Britannie*: 'We are unable to speak with certainty as to the parentage of Gildas, his country, or even his name, the period when he lived, or the works of which he was the author.' Mr. T. Wright attempts to show that Gildas is a fabulous person, and his history the forgery of 'some Anglo-Saxon or foreign priest of the 7th century' (*Biog. Brit. Lit.* Anglo-Saxon period, p. 115-134). But Stevenson, Lappenberg, and others, while admitting the fabulous character of the common accounts, are inclined to believe that Gildas really lived somewhere near the time usually stated" (*English Cyclop.* s. v.). The writings which pass under his name are valuable for their antiquity, and as containing the only information we have of the times in which he wrote; although Gibbon describes him as "a monk who, in the profound ignorance of human life, has presumed to exercise the office of historian, and strangely disfigures the state of Britain at the time of its separation from the Roman empire." They are, (1) *Liber Querulus de excidio Britannie*, etc., a picture of the evils of the times and of the previous ages of British history;—(2) *Castigatio Ordin. Eccles.* (Reproach on the Clergy), a sad account of abominations and vices imputed to the clergy. They are given in Gale's *Hist. Brit.*, etc., *Scriptores xv* (Oxon. 1691, fol.), and in the *Works of Gildas and Nonnus*, translated by J. A. Giles (Lond. 1841, 8vo); also in Gale, *Rerum Angl. Script. Veteres* (1684-87, 3 vols. fol.); but the best edition is that published in 1838 by the Historical Society, and edited by Mr. Joseph Stevenson. There are three English translations of it: one by Habington (Lond. 1638, 8vo); another, entitled *A Description of the State of Great Britain, written eleven hundred years since* (London, 1652, 12mo); and a third by Dr. Giles, but based on that of Habington, and published in Bohn's *Antiquarian Library* (1848). See Wright, l. c.; Poste, *British Researches*; *English Cyclopædia*; Clarke, *Succ. of Sacral Literature*, vol. i.

**GILDER, WILLIAM H.**, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Philadelphia Sept. 17, 1812, and was educated at the Wesleyan University. He entered the Philadelphia Conference in 1833, and after three years' preaching was compelled by ill health to retire from active service. About 1840 he established at Philadelphia the *Pearl and Repository*, an independent Methodist paper. For some years he was principal of the Female Institute at Bordentown, N. J. He afterwards became president of Flushing Female College, at St. Thomas's Hall, Flushing, L. I. While

at Bordertown he established the *Literary Register*, which he edited for several years. In 1862 he became chaplain of the 40th New-York Regiment, and shared in all its campaigns, following his charge into every battle. In 1863 he was taken with typhoid fever, which greatly impaired his strength. He returned to his post before he was in fit physical condition to do so, and while attending to his duties in the regimental hospital, he contracted small-pox, of which he died at Culpepper, Va., April 13, 1864. No chaplain in the army had a stronger hold upon the affection and confidence of the men than Mr. Gilder. Shortly before his death he said to his son, "I am in the hands of one whom I can trust; I feel that I am perfectly safe;" and when he could no longer speak, he intimated by signs that all was well.—*Minutes of Conferences*, 1863, p. 81.

Gil'eād (Heb. *Gilad'*, גִּלְעָד, generally with the article prefixed, when applied to the region or mountain; properly a stony district, hence, according to Gen. xxxi, 41, *heap* or *hill of testimony*; Sept. Γαλα-*ād*), the name of several men, also of a region and mountain, and perhaps a city. The name Gilead, as is usual in Palestine, describes the physical aspect of the country. It signifies "a hard, rocky region;" and it may be regarded as standing in contrast with Bashan, the other great trans-Jordanic province, which is, as the name implies, a "level, fertile tract." The statements in Gen. xxxi, 48, are not opposed to this etymology. The old name of the district was גִּלְעָד (Gilead), but, by a slight change in the pronunciation, the radical letters being retained, the meaning was made beautifully applicable to the "heap of stones" Jacob and Laban had built up—"and Laban said, this *heap* (גִּלְעָד) is a *witness* (עֵד) between me and thee this day. Therefore was the name of it called *Gilead*" (גִּלְעָד, "the heap of witness"). Those acquainted with the modern Arabs and their literature will see how intensely such a play upon the word would be appreciated by them. This *Gilead* could not have been far from Mahanaim, and was doubtless one of those rounded eminences to the northward which overlook the broad plateau of Bashan (Gen. xxxi, 25; xxxii, 1, 2). See GALEED.

1. A mountainous region east of the Jordan; bounded on the north by Bashan, on the east by the Arabian plateau, and on the south by Moab and Ammon (Gen. xxxi, 21; Deut. iii, 12-17), properly extending from the parallel of Rabbath-Ammon on the south to the river Hieromax on the north. The same name, however, was given to the *ridge* extending between these parallels. With the exception of the narrow strip of plain along the bank of the Jordan, the mountains, in fact, cover the whole region; hence it is sometimes called "Mount Gilead" (Gen. xxxi, 25), גִּלְעָד הַרְיָבָת; comp. Deut. iii, 12; Jer. i, 19, sometimes "the land of Gilead" (Numb. xxxii, 1, גִּלְעָד הָאֲרָצָה; compare Deut. xxxiv, 1; Numb. xxxiv, 29; Zech. x, 10), and sometimes simply "Gilead" (Psa. lx, 7; Gen. xxxvii, 25; Numb. xxxii, 40; Josh. xvii, 1; Amos i, 3); but a comparison of the several passages shows that they all mean the same thing. There is no evidence, in fact, that any particular mountain was meant by Mount Gilead more than by Mount Lebanon (Judg. iii, 3)—they both comprehend the whole range, and the range of Gilead embraced the whole province, or group of mountains vaguely stated by Eusebius (*Onomast. s. v. Γαλαάδ*) to be connected with Lebanon by means of Mount Hermon. It begins not far from the latter, and extends southward to the sources of the brooks Jabbok and Arnon, thus enclosing the whole eastern part of the land beyond the Jordan (Gen. xxxi, 21; Cant. iv, 1). According to Michaelis (*Mos. Recht*, i, 86), this mountain, which gave its name to the country so called, must even be situated beyond the region

sketched in our maps, and somewhere about the Euphrates. But this is fanciful. Strictly, the name comprehends the mountainous region south of the river Jabbok, where is the highest part of the mountains east of the Jordan; and one ridge is still named *Jebel Jelad* or *Jelud*, from the ruined towns so called upon it (Burckhardt, *Travels in Syria*, p. 348; Robinson's *Researches*, ii, 243, 206; App. p. 167). The inhabitants were called *Gileadites* (Judg. x, 3; 2 Kings xv, 25).

1. *Divisions of the Territory.*—(a.) Gilead is usually, therefore, the name of a large district beyond the Jordan, continually mentioned in the Scriptures in contradistinction to, or apart from, Bashan (Deut. iii, 13; Josh. xii, 5; xiii, 11; xvii, 1; 2 Kings x, 33; 1 Chron. v, 16; Micah vii, 14); though, to judge from its geographical position (as given Numb. xxxii, 26; Deut. iii, 12), it must have comprised the entire possessions of the two tribes of Gad and Reuben, and even the southern part of Manasseh (Deut. iii, 13; Numb. xxxii, 40; Josh. xvii, 2-6); corresponding to the region now called *el-Beka* and *Jebel-Ajha*. Sometimes it is put for the territory of Gad and Reuben alone (Psa. lx, 9; cviii, 9); at others for the tribe of Gad only (Judg. v, 17; comp. v, 16), although this usage is not constant, and in 1 Sam. xiii, 7, the land of Gad and Gilead are joined. The cities Ramoth, Jabesh, and Jazer are usually designated as lying in Gilead.

There is a special descriptive term, which may almost be regarded as a proper name, used to denote the great plateau which borders Gilead on the south and east. The refuge-city Bezer is said to be "in the country of the *Mishor*" (Deut. iv, 43); and Jeremiah (xlviii, 21) says, "judgment is come upon the country of the *Mishor*" (see also Josh. xiii, 9, 16, 17, 21; xx, 8). *Mishor* (מִשׁוֹר) and מִשְׁוֹר signifies a "level plain" or "table-land;" and no word could be more applicable. This is one among many examples of the minute accuracy of Bible topography. See MISHOR.

The extent of Gilead in this general sense we can ascertain with tolerable exactness from incidental notices in the Holy Scriptures. The Jordan was its western border (1 Sam. xiii, 7; 2 Kings x, 33). A comparison of a number of passages shows that the river Hieromax, the modern Sheriat el-Mandhūr, separated it from Bashan on the north. "Half Gilead" is said to have been possessed by Sihon, king of the Amorites, and the other half by Ōg, king of Bashan; and the river Jabbok was the division between the two kingdoms (Deut. iii, 12; Josh. xii, 1-5). The half of Gilead possessed by Ōg must therefore have been north of the Jabbok. It is also stated that the territory of the tribe of Gad extended along the Jordan valley to the Sea of Galilee (Josh. xii, 27); and yet "all Bashan" was given to Manasseh (ver. 30). We therefore conclude that the deep glen of the Hieromax, which runs eastward, on the parallel of the south end of the Sea of Galilee, was the dividing line between Bashan and Gilead. North of that glen stretches out a flat, fertile plateau, such as the name *Bashan* (בָּשָׁן), like the Arabic *bashukh*, signifies "soft and level soil") would suggest; while on the south we have the rough and rugged, yet picturesque hill country, for which Gilead is the fit name. (See Porter, in *Journal of Sac. Lit.* July, 1854, p. 284 sq.; compare *Ib.* Jan. 1852, p. 364.) On the east the mountain range melts away gradually into the high plateau of Arabia. The boundary of Gilead is here not so clearly defined, but it may be regarded as running along the foot of the range. The southern boundary is less certain. The tribe of Reuben occupied the country as far south as the river Arnon, which was the border of Moab (Deut. ii, 36; iii, 12). It seems, however, that the southern section of their territory was not included in Gilead. In Josh. xiii, 9-11, it is intimated that the "plain of Medeba" ("the Mishor" it is called), north of the Arnon, is not

in Gilead; and when speaking of the cities of refuge, Moses describes Bezer, which was given out of the tribe of Reuben, as being "in the wilderness, in the plain country" (i. e. "in the country of the *Mishor*," גִּלְעָד מִשׁוֹר), while Ramoth is said to be in Gilead (Deut. iv, 43). This southern plateau was also called "the land of Zazer" (Numb. xxxii, 1; 2 Sam. xxiv, 5; comp. also Josh. xiii, 16-25). The valley of Heshbon may therefore, in all probability, be the southern boundary of Gilead. Gilead thus extended from the parallel of the south end of the Sea of Galilee to that of the north end of the Dead Sea—about 60 miles; and its average breadth scarcely exceeded 20.

(b.) While such were the usual limits of Gilead, the name is used in a wider sense in two or three parts of Scripture. Moses, for example, is said to have seen, from the top of Pisgah, "all the land of Gilead unto Dan" (Deut. xxxiv, 1); and in Judg. xx, 1, and Josh. xxii, 9, the name seems to comprehend the whole territory of the Israelites beyond the Jordan. A little attention shows that this is only a vague way of speaking, in common use everywhere.

(c.) The district corresponding to Gilead is now divided into two provinces, separated by the Jabbok. The section lying between the Jabbok and the Hieromax is now called *Jebel Ajlun*; while that to the south of the Jabbok constitutes the modern province of *Belka*. One of the most conspicuous peaks in the mountain range still retains the ancient name, being called *Jebel Jil'al*, "Mount Gilead." It is about seven miles south of the Jabbok, and commands a magnificent view over the whole Jordan valley, and the mountains of Judah and Ephraim. It is probably the site of Ramath-Mizpeh of Josh. xiii, 26; and the "Mizpeh of Gilead," from which Jephthah "passed over unto the children of Ammon" (Judg. xi, 29). The spot is admirably adapted for a gathering-place in time of invasion or aggressive war. The neighboring village of es-Salt occupies the site of the old "city of refuge" in Gad, Ramoth-Gilead (q. v.).

II. *History*.—The first notice we have of Gilead is in connection with the history of Jacob (Gen. xxxi, 21 sq.). That patriarch, having passed the Euphrates, "set his face towards Mount Gilead;" he struck across the desert by the great fountain at Palmryra; then traversed the eastern part of the plain of Damascus, and the plateau of Bashan, and entered Gilead from the north-east. "In the Mount Gilead Laban overtook him"—apparently soon after he entered the district; for when they separated again, Jacob went on his way and arrived at Mahanaim, which must have been considerably north of the river Jabbok (Gen. xxxii, 1, 2, 22). See JACOB.

Gilead is not mentioned again in the patriarchal history; but it is possibly this same region which is referred to under the name *Hum* (q. v.), and was inhabited by the gigantic Zuzim. The kings of the East who came to punish the rebellious "cities of the plain," first attacked the Rephaim in Ashteroth Karnaim—i. e. in the country now called *Hauran*; then they advanced southwards against the "Zuzims in Ham;" and next against the Emim in Shaveh-Kiriathim, which was subsequently possessed by the Moabites (Gen. xiv, 5; Deut. ii, 9-19). See EMIM; REPHAIM.

We hear nothing more of Gilead till the invasion of the country by the Israelites. One half of it was then in the hands of Sihon, king of the Amorites, who had a short time previously driven out the Moabites. Og, king of Bashan, had the other section north of the Jabbok. The Israelites defeated the former at Jahaz, and the latter at Edrei, and took possession of Gilead and Bashan (Numb. xxi, 23 sq.). The rich pasture-land of Gilead, with its shady forests and copious streams, attracted the attention of Reuben and Gad, who "had a very great multitude of cattle," and was allotted to them. The future history and habits of the tribes that occupied Gilead were greatly affected by the character

of the country. Rich in flocks and herds, and now the lords of a fitting region, they retained, almost unchanged, the nomad pastoral habits of their patriarchal ancestors. Like all Bedawin, they lived in a constant state of warfare, just as Jacob had predicted of Gad—"a troop shall plunder him, but he shall plunder at the last" (Gen. xlix, 19). The sons of Ishmael were subdued and plundered in the time of Saul (1 Chron. v, 9 sq.), and the children of Ammon in the days of Jephthah and David (Judg. xi, 32 sq.; 2 Sam. x, 12 sq.). Their wandering tent life, and their almost inaccessible country, made them in ancient times what the Bedawi tribes are now—the protectors of the refugee and the outlaw. In Gilead the sons of Saul found a home while they vainly attempted to re-establish the authority of their house (2 Sam. ii, 8 sq.). Here, too, David found a sanctuary during the unnatural rebellion of a beloved son; and the surrounding tribes, with a characteristic hospitality, carried presents of the best they possessed to the fallen monarch (2 Sam. xvii, 22 sq.). Elijah the Tishbite was a Gileadite (1 Kings xvii, 1); and in his simple garb, wild aspect, abrupt address, wonderfully active habits, and movements so rapid as to evade the search of his watchful and bitter foes, we see all the characteristics of the genuine Bedawi, ennobled by a high prophetic mission. See GAD.

Gilead was a frontier land, exposed to the first attacks of the Syrian and Assyrian invaders, and to the unceasing raids of the desert tribes—"Because Machbir, the first-born of Manasseh, was a man of war, therefore he had Bashan and Gilead" (Josh. xvii, 1). Under the wild and wayward Jephthah, Mizpeh of Gilead became the gathering-place of the trans-Jordanic tribes (Judg. xi, 29); and in subsequent times the neighboring stronghold of Ramoth-Gilead appears to have been considered the key of Palestine on the east (1 Kings xxii, 3, 4, 6; 2 Kings viii, 28; ix, 1).

The name *Galaad* (Γαλααδ) occurs several times in the history of the Maccabees (1 Macc. v, 9 sq.), and also in Josephus, but generally with the Greek termination—Γαλααδίτης or Γαλααδηνός (*Ant.* xiii, 14, 2; *War.* i, 4, 3). Under the Roman dominion the country became more settled and civilized; and the great cities of Gadara, Pella, and Gerasa, with Philadelpia on its south-eastern border, speedily rose to opulence and splendor. In one of these (Pella) the Christians of Jerusalem found a sanctuary when the armies of Titus gathered round the devoted city (Eusebius, *H. E.* iii, 5). Under Mohammedan rule the country has again lapsed into semi-barbarism. Some scattered villages amid the fastnesses of Jebel Ajlun, and a few fierce wandering tribes, constitute the whole population of Gilead. They are nominally subject to the Porte, but their allegiance sits lightly upon them. The inhabitants, like the old Gadites, are semi-nomads, whose wealth consists in flocks and herds. Like them, too, they are harassed by the desert tribes; they are inured to arms, and they are noted for their hospitality. The capital of the whole country is es-Salt (Burekhardt, *Trav. in Syria*, p. 270; Buckingham, *Arab Tribes*, p. 21 sq.; Lord Lindsay's *Travels*, ii, 108 sq.).

III. *Description of modern Country*.—The great body of the range of Gilead is Jura limestone, but there are occasional veins of sandstone. The oak and the terebinth flourish on the former, and the pine on the latter. The mountains of Gilead have a real elevation of from two to three thousand feet, but their apparent elevation on the western side is much greater, owing to the depression of the Jordan valley, which averages about 1000 feet. Their outline is singularly uniform, resembling a massive wall running along the horizon. From the distant east they seem very low, for on that side they meet the plateau of Arabia, 2000 feet or more in height. Though the range appears bleak from the distance, yet, on ascending it, we find the scenery rich, picturesque, and in places even grand. The summit is broad, almost like table-land "tossed into wild

confusion of undulating downs" (Stanley, *Sinai and Pal.* p. 314). It is everywhere covered with luxuriant herbage. In the extreme north and south there are no trees, but as we advance towards the centre they soon begin to appear, at first singly, then in groups, and at length, on each side of the Jabbok, in fine forests, chiefly of prickly oak and terebinth. The rich pasture-land of Gilead presents a striking contrast to the nakedness of Western Palestine. Except among the hills of Galilee and along the heights of Carmel, there is nothing to be compared with it as "a place for cattle" (Numb. xxxii, 1). "In passing through the country, one can hardly get over the impression that he is roaming through an English park. The graceful hills, the rich vales, the luxuriant herbage, the bright wild flowers, the plantations of evergreen oak, pine, and arbutus; now a tangled thicket, and now a grove scattered over the gentle slope, as if intended to reveal its beauty; the little rivulets fringed with oleander, at one place running lazily between alluvial banks, at another dashing madly down rocky ravines. Such are the features of the mountains of Gilead. Here, too, we have the cooing of the wood-pigeon, the hoarse call of the partridge, the incessant hum of myriads of insects, and the cheerful chirp of grasshoppers to give life to the scene. Add to all the crumbling ruins of town, village, and fortress, clinging to the mountain-side or crowning its summit, and you have a picture of the country between es-Salt and Gerasa" (Porter, *Handbook for S. and P.* p. 310). Such a picture, too, illustrates at once the fertility ascribed to it by Jeremiah (xxii, 6; i, 19), and the judgments pronounced against it by Amos (i, 3, 13).

Gilead anciently abounded in spices and aromatic gums, which were exported to Egypt (Gen. xxxvii, 25; Jer. viii, 22; xlvi, 11). The balm of Gilead seems to have been valued for its medicinal properties from the earliest times. The Midianitish merchants to whom Joseph was sold were passing through the valley of Jezreel on their way from Gilead to Egypt (Gen. xxxvii, 17). Josephus often mentions this balm or balsam, but generally as the product of the rich plain of Jericho, for example (*Ant.* xiv, 4): "Now when Pompey had pitched his camp at Jericho (where the palm-tree grows, and that balsam which is an ointment of all the most precious, which upon any incision being made in the wood with a sharp stone distils out thence like a juice), he marched in the morning to Jerusalem." Dr. Thomson found in the plain of Jericho some thorn-bushes called the *zukum*, "which is like the crab apple-tree, and bears a small nut, from which a kind of liquid balsam is made, and sold by the monks as balm of Gilead, so famous in ancient times," and he supposes "that the balm which Jacob sent to Joseph (Gen. xlvii, 11), and that which Jeremiah (viii, 22) refers to for its medicinal qualities, were the same which the trading Ishmaelites were transporting to Egypt, and that it was some resinous extract from the forest trees of Gilead" (*Land and Book*, ii, 193, 194).—Smith, s. v.; Kitto, s. v.; Fairbairn, s. v. See below.

**GILEAD, BALM OF.** Our English word *balm*, and its French equivalent *baume*, are the contracted forms of *balsam*, a word (*βάλσαμον*) which the Greeks have adopted from the Hebrew words *בַּשְׂמָן* and *יִסְרִי*, *lord* or *chief of oils*. In ordinary language the word is used very loosely, but here we are only concerned with the substance to which the English translation of the Bible has given this name. As early as the days of Jacob the district of Gilead yielded aromatic substances which were in great request. After casting Joseph into a pit, we are told that his brothers espied a caravan on its way from Gilead, to Egypt, "with their camels bearing spicery, and *balm*, and myrrh" (Gen. xxxvii, 25). Afterwards, when Jacob dispatched his embassy into Egypt, his present to the unknown ruler included "a little balm" (Gen. xlii,

11); and at an interval of more than 1000 years later we find that the same region was celebrated for the same production, for we find Jeremiah asking, "Is there no balm in Gilead?" and from an expression in the prophet Ezekiel we find still later that balm was one of the commodities which Hebrew merchants carried to the market of Tyre (Ezek. xxvii, 17). In all these passages the original word is *יִסְרִי, tsori*. During the interval, however, between Jacob and Jeremiah, we are told by Josephus that the queen of Sheba brought "the root of the balsam" as a present to Solomon (*Ant.* viii, 6, 6); and there can be no doubt that, in the later days of Jewish history, the neighborhood of Jericho was believed to be the only spot where the true balsam grew, and even there its culture was confined to two gardens, the one twenty acres in extent, the other much smaller (Theophrastus).

Many attempts have been made by different writers to identify the *tsori*, not one of which, however, can be considered altogether conclusive. The Syriac version in Jer. viii, 22, and the Samaritan in Gen. xxxvii, 25, suppose *cera*, "wax," to be meant; others, as the Arabic version in the passages cited in Genesis, conjecture *theriaca*, a medical compound of great supposed virtue in serpent bites. Of the same opinion is Castell (*Lex. Hept.* s. v. *יִסְרִי*). Luther and the Swedish version have "salve," "ointment," in the passages in Jeremiah; but in Ezek. xxvii, 17 they read "mastic." The Jewish Rabbis, Junius and Tremellius, Deodatus, etc., have "balm" or "balsam," as the A. V.; Celsius (*Hierob.* ii, 180) identifies the *tsori* with the mastic-tree (*Pistacia lentiscus*). Rosenmüller (*Bibl. Bot.* p. 169) believes that the pressed juice of the fruit of the *zukum*-tree (*Eleagnus angustifolius*, Lin. [?]), or narrow-leaved oleaster, is the substance denoted; but the same author, in another place (*Schol. in Gen.* xxxvii, 25), mentions the balsam of Mecca (*Amyris opobalsamum*, Lin.), referred to by Strabo (xvi, p. 778) and Dioscorus Siculus (ii, 132) as being probably the *tsori* (see Kitto, *Phys. Hist. of Pal.* p. 273; Hasselquist, *Travels*, p. 293).

Hasselquist has given a description of the true balsam-tree of Mecca. He says that the exudation from the plant "is of a yellow color, and pellucid. It has a most fragrant smell, which is resinous, balsamic, and very agreeable. It is very tenacious or glutinous, sticking to the fingers, and may be drawn into long threads. I have seen it at a Turkish surgeon's, who had it immediately from Mecca, described it, and was informed of its virtues: which are, first, that it is the best stomachic they know, if taken to three grains, to strengthen a weak stomach; secondly, that it is a most excellent and capital remedy for curing wounds, for if a few drops are applied to the fresh wound it cures it in a very short time" (*Travels*, p. 293).

The trees which certainly appear to have the best claim for representing the scriptural *tsori*—supposing, that is, that any one particular tree is denoted by the term—are the *Pistacia lentiscus* (mastic) and the *Amyris opobalsamum*, Linnaeus, the *Balsamodendron opobalsamum*, or *Gileadense* of modern botanists (Balm of Gilead). One argument in favor of the first-named tree rests upon the fact that its name in Arabic (*dseri, dseru*) is identical with the Hebrew; and the Arabian naturalists have attributed great medicinal virtues to the resin afforded by this tree (Dioscorides, i, 10, 91; Pliny, xxiv, 7; Avicenna, edit. Arab. p. 204 and 277, in Celsius). The *Pistacia lentiscus* has been recorded to occur at Joppa both by Rauwolf and Pöecke (*Strand. Flor. Palest.* No. 561). The derivation of the word from a root, "to flow forth," is opposed to the theory which identifies the pressed oil of the *zukum* with the *tsori*, although this oil is in very high esteem among the Arabs, who even prefer it to the balm of Mecca, as being more efficacious in wounds and bruises (see Mariti, ii, 353, ed. London). Maundrell (*Journey*

from *Alep. to Jerus.* p. 86), when near the Dead Sea, saw the *zukum*-tree. He says it is a thorny bush with small leaves, and that "the fruit, both in shape and color, resembles a small unripe walnut. The kernels of this fruit the Arabs bray in a mortar, and then, putting the pulp into scalding water, they skim off the oyl which rises to the top: this oyl they take inwardly for bruises, and apply it outwardly to green wounds. . . . I procured a bottle of it, and have found it upon some small tryals a very healing medicine." "This," says Dr. Robinson (*B.b. Res.* ii, 291), "is the modern balsam or oil of Jericho." From Maundrell's description of the *zukum* Dr. Hooker unhesitatingly identifies it with *Balanites Egyptiaca*, which he saw abundantly at Jericho (*Kew Garden Misc.* i, 257).

In the region of Gilead, the only production now which has any affinity to balm or balsam is a species of *Eleagnus*, from the kernels of which a balsamic oil is extracted (*Journal of Deputation of Malta Protestant College*, p. 406); and even the balsam gardens of Jericho have perished and left no trace. There is little reason, however, to doubt that the plants with which they were stocked were the *Amyris Gileadensis*, or *A. opobalsamum*, which was found by Bruce in Abyssinia, the fragrant resin of which is known in commerce as the "balsam of Mecca." Like most plants yielding gum or gum-resin, the *amyris* requires a high temperature to elaborate its peculiar principle in perfection; and in the deeply depressed and sultry valley of the Jordan it would find a climate almost as congenial as that of Yemen, where we find it now. Nor is it impossible that there may have existed in Gilead at an early period a plantation of the self-same *amyris*; but, yielding to the superior qualities of the queen of Sheba's newly-imported specimens, the growth of Gilead may have become obsolete, and bequeathed its name and honors to its more favored rival. The *Amyris Gileadensis* is an evergreen shrub or tree, belonging to the natural order *Amyridaceae*. Its height is about fourteen feet, with a trunk eight or ten inches in diameter. The wood is light and open, and the small



"Balm of Gilead" (*Amyris Gileadensis*), with enlarged view of the Flower and Pericarp, and section of the latter.

and scanty leaves resemble rice. After the dog-days, when the circulation of the sap is most vigorous, incisions are made into the bark, and the balsam is received in small earthen bottles. The supply is very scanty. Three or four drops exude in a day through a single orifice, and the entire amount yielded by the gardens of Jericho did not exceed six or seven gallons a year. When first exuded the balsam is of a whitish tinge, inclining to yellow, and somewhat turbid, and its odor is almost as pungent as volatile salts; but, af-

ter standing some time, it becomes pellucid, and deepens to an almost golden color. With its gem-like appearance, its aromatic odor, and its great rarity—being worth twice its weight in silver—it has always been highly valued in the East as a remedy. It is considered very efficacious in the cure of wounds, and the Egyptians esteem it as a preventive of the plague. As a vulnerary it appears to have been valued in the days of Jeremiah (ch. viii, 22); and, could it be procured as easily as the balsams of Peru and Tolu, it is likely that it would find a place in European pharmacy. In describing Palestine, Tacitus says that in all its productions it equals Italy, besides possessing the palm and the balsam (*Hist.* v, 6); and the far-famed tree excited the cupidity of successive invaders. By Pompey it was exhibited in the streets of Rome as one of the spoils of the newly-conquered province, B.C. 65; and one of the wonderful trees graced the triumph of Vespasian, A.D. 79. During the invasion of Titus, two battles took place at the balsam groves of Jericho, the last being to prevent the Jews in their despairing frenzy from destroying the trees. They then became public property, and were placed under the protection of an imperial guard; but history does not record how long the two plantations survived.—Smith, s. v.; Fairbairn, s. v. Balm. See BALM.

2. Possibly the name of a mountain west of the Jordan, near Jezreel (*Judg.* vii, 3). Michaelis and others are inclined to agree with the suggestion of Clericus (*ad loc.*), that the true reading in this place should be גִּלְבּוֹא, *Gilboa*, instead of גִּלְעָד. Gideon was encamped at the "spring of Harod," which is at the base of Mount Gilboa. Gesenius, however, thinks (*Thesaur. Heb.* p. 804) that the passage merely implies that all those who should not feel inclined to prosecute the war against the Midianites farther than the mountain from which the latter had emerged, were at liberty to return home (גִּלְעָד, "per montem"). A better solution, however, is that suggested by Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 164, note), that the northernmost spur of Mt. *Gilboa* was also called Gilead; and this is confirmed by the actual existence of the name *Jalud* to this day in this spot. See HAROD.

3. A city of this name is apparently mentioned *Ios.* vi, 8 (*comp. Sept. Judg.* xii, 7); so, at least, it is given in most of the ancient and modern versions, though the meaning may only be that Gilead is (like) a city full of iniquity, i. e. a union of iniquitous people. This city (if one be meant) is perhaps the same with RAMOTH-GILEAD.

4. The son of Machir (apparently by Maachah), and grandson of Manasseh; his descendants bore his name as a patronymic (*Numb.* xxvi, 29, 30). B.C. prob. between 1874 and 1658.

5. The father of Jephthah the judge, a descendant of the above (*Judg.* xi, 1, 2). B.C. ante 1256. It is not clear, however (*comp. ver.* 7, 8), whether this Gilead was an individual, or a personification of the community.


6. The son of Jaroah, and father of Michael, of the tribe of Gad (*1 Chron.* v, 14). B.C. considerably ante 781.

**Gil'eädite** (Hebrew prop. *Giladi'*, גִּלְעָדִי; Sept. Γαλααδί or Γαλααδίτις; but often the same as *Gilead* simply), a descendant of one of the men, or an inhabitant of the region called GILEAD (*Numb.* xxvi, 29; *Judg.* x, 3; xi, 1, 40; xii, 7; 2 Sam. xvii, 27; xix, 31; 1 Kings ii, 7; 2 Kings xv, 25; Ezra ii, 61; Neh. vii, 63), or perhaps rather a branch of the tribe of Manasseh, descended from Gilead. There appears to have been an old standing feud between them and the Ephraimites, who taunted them with being deserters. See *Judg.* xii, 4, which may be rendered, "And the men of Gilead smote Ephraim, because they said, Run-agates of Ephraim are ye (Gilead is between Ephraim and Manasseh)." —Smith, s. v.

**Giles, Sr.** (Lat. *Ægilius*; Fr. *Gilles*; Span. *Gib*), patron saint of woodlands, also of Edinburgh. The Roman Catholic Church has set apart Sept. 1 for the commemoration of a saint of this name, though it is doubtful whether such a person ever lived. The hagiographers describe two such persons: the first an Athenian of the 6th century, who wrought various miracles, and finally took up his abode in a cave near the mouth of the Rhone, living upon the milk of a hind, and upon herbs and fruits. The king's hunters once wounded the hind, and the arrow also passed through the hand of St. Giles (whose attribute, in legendary art, is a wounded hind). He died in his cave, and the noble monastery of St. Giles was erected near the spot. The other claimant to the name of St. Giles was abbot of a monastery near Arles in the 6th century. The first legend, as the more striking and poetical one, is naturally the most popular. St. Giles has been especially venerated in England and Scotland. In spite of the Reformation, the name of this legendary saint is still retained in the English calendar.—A. Butler, *Lives of Saints*, Sept. 1; Mrs. Jamieson, *Legends of the Monastic Orders*, p. 28.

**Gil'gal** (Heb. *Gilgal'*, גִּלְגָּל, a wheel, as in Isa. xxviii, 28; according to Josh. v, 9, a rolling away; with the article a prop. name, Sept. τὰ Γάλαλα, but Γαλγῶλ v. r. Γαλγῶλ in Dent. xi, 20 and Josh. xiv, 6), the name of at least two places in Palestine.

1. The site of the first camp of the Israelites on the west of the Jordan, the place at which they passed the first night after crossing the river, and where the twelve stones were set up which had been taken from the bed of the stream (Josh. iv, 19, 20; comp. 3) [see



Druidical Circle of (memorial) Stones.

STONE]; where also they kept their first passover in the land of Canaan (v, 10). It was in the "end of the east of Jericho" (גִּלְגָּל עֵדֶיךָ בְּעֵדֶיךָ; A. V. "in the east border of Jericho"), apparently on a hillock or rising ground (v, 3; compare 9) in the Arboth-Jericho (A. V. "the plains"), that is, the hot, depressed district of the Ghor which lay between the town and the Jordan (v, 10). Here the Israelites who had been born on the march through the wilderness were circumcised, an occurrence from which the sacred historian derives the name: "This day I have rolled away (*gallo'thi*) the reproach of Egypt from off you." Therefore the name of the place is called Gilgal to this day." The meaning does not seem to be that a new name was given, but rather that a new meaning and significance were attached to the old name. The word *Gilgal* means a "circle," and also a "rolling away." A similar play upon a word was noticed in the case of GILEAD; and Bethel is an example of an old name having attached to it a new significance (Gen. xxxviii, 19; xxxv, 15). By Josephus (*Ant. v, 1, 11*) it is said to signify "freedom" (ἐλευθεριον). It would appear that Gilgal was the name of the place before the Exodus, for Moses describes the Canaanites as dwelling "over against Gilgal" (Deut. xi, 30). The difficulties connected with this passage have already been explained under EBAL. Keil supposes that this Gil-

gal was near Shechem (*Comm. on Josh. p. 219, 232*). The camp thus established at Gilgal remained there during the early part of the conquest (Josh. ix, 6; x, 6, 7, 9, 15, 43); and we may probably infer from one narrative that Joshua retired thither at the conclusion of his labors (xiv, 6; comp. 15). Saul, when driven from the highlands by the Philistines, collected his feeble force at the site of the old camp (1 Sam. xiii, 4, 7). The tabernacle appears to have remained there at least until its removal to Shiloh (Judg. xviii, 1). It was one of the places to which Samuel regularly resorted, where he administered justice (1 Sam. vii, 16), and where burnt-offerings and peace-offerings were accustomed to be offered "before Jehovah" (x, 8; xi, 15; xiii, 8, 9, 12; xv, 21); and on one occasion a sacrifice of a more terrible description than either (xv, 33). The air of the narrative all through leads to the conclusion that at the time of these occurrences it was the chief sanctuary of the central portion of the nation (see x, 8; xi, 14; xv, 12, 21). But there is no sign of its being a town; no mention of building, or of its being allotted to the priests or Levites, as was the case with other sacred towns, Bethel, Shechem, etc. In the history of David's return to Jerusalem (2 Sam. xix), the men of Judah came down to Gilgal to meet the king to conduct him over Jordan, as if it was close to the river (xix, 15), and David arrived there immediately on crossing the stream after his parting with Barzillai the Gileadite (xix, 40). After the erection of the Temple, Gilgal appears to have been utterly neglected. Perhaps, when Jericho was rebuilt, the traditional sanctity of Gilgal was transferred to it, and there a school of the prophets was established and remained until a late period (2 Kings ii, 5). See JERICHO. How Gilgal became appropriated to a false worship we are not told, but certainly, as far as the obscure allusions of Hosea and Amos can be understood (provided that they refer to this Gilgal), it was so appropriated by the kingdom of Israel in the middle period of its existence (Hos. iv, 15; ix, 15; xii, 11; Amos iv, 1; v, 5). These idolatrous practices are specially mentioned by Epiphanius and others (Reiland, *Palæst.* p. 782 sq.). The utter desolation of its site, and the whole surrounding region, shows how fearfully the prophecies have been fulfilled.

The place is not mentioned in the Apocrypha nor the N. T. Later authorities are more precise, but unfortunately discordant among themselves. By Josephus (*Ant. v, 1, 4*) the encampment is given as fifty stadia, rather under six miles, from the river, and ten from Jericho. In the time of Jerome the site of the camp and the twelve memorial stones were still distinguishable, if we are to take literally the expression of the *Épît. Paulæ* (§ 12). The distance from Jericho was then two miles. According to Eusebius, the spot (Γαλγῶλ) was left uncultivated, but regarded with great veneration by the residents (*Onomast. s. v. Γαλγῶλα*). When Arculf was there at the end of the 7th century, the place was shown at five miles from Jericho. A large church covered the site, in which the twelve stones were ranged (*Early Travels in Pal. p. 7*). It is probable, however, that the ecclesiastical architects had not been very particular about topography (Robinson, *Research. ii, 287*). The church and stones were seen by Willibald thirty years later, but he gives the distance as five miles from the Jordan, which again he states correctly as seven from Jericho. The stones are mentioned also by Thietmar, A. D. 1217 (according to whom it was to these that John the Baptist pointed when he said that God was "able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham," *Peregr. 31*); and, lastly, by Ludolf de Suchem a century later. These specifications show that Gilgal must have been near the site of the modern village of Riha (Porter, *Handb. for S. and P. p. 196*). In Van de Velde's *Map* (1858), a spot named *Moharfer*, a little south-east of er-Riha, is marked as probable.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

Schwarz (*Phys. Descr. of Palest.* p. 128) asserts that there is at present found near the Jordan in this vicinity a hill, which appears like a heap of stones, and is called by the Arabs *Galgala*; but this lacks confirmation. It is probably this Gilgal that is called GELI-LORH in Josh. xviii, 17, where, as well as in the parallel passage, xv, 7, the position is given with more minuteness than elsewhere.

2. A royal city of the Canaanites, whose sovereign ("king of the nations of Gilgal," or, rather, perhaps the "king of Goin-at-Gilgal," גִּלְגַּל בְּנֵי הַגּוֹיִם) is mentioned in the catalogue of the chiefs overthrown by Joshua (Josh. xii, 23), appears to have been situated on the western plain, as it is connected with the "region of Dor" (verse 22). Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v. Γεγάλα, Gelgel) say that it was in their time a village called *Galgulis* (Γαλγούλις), about six Roman miles north of Antipatris (Kefer Saba); and this is probably the present ruined village *Iljilieh* of the same neighborhood (Robinson, *Researches*, iii, 47; Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 92), although this is only two miles from Kefer Saba, and east-south-east (E. Smith, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1843, p. 492), rather than the *Kilkilieh*, about two miles east of Kefer Saba (Robinson, *Later Researches*, p. 136, 138).

The *Goin*, or original inhabitants of this place, evidently were in some distinctive sense *heathen* (q. v.). "By that word (Judg. iv, 2) or 'nations' (Gen. xiv, 1) the name is usually rendered in the A. Vers. as in the well-known phrase, 'Galilee of the nations' (Isa. ix, 1; comp. Matt. iv, 15). Possibly they were a tribe of the early inhabitants of the country, who, like the Gerizites, the Avim, the Zemarites, and others, have left only this faint, casual trace of their existence there" (Smith, s. v.). See GALILEE.

3. A town, evidently in the mountainous interior, whence Elijah and Elisha are said to have gone down to Bethel (2 Kings ii, 2), which is itself 3000 feet above the Gilgal in the Jordan valley. It was perhaps here that Elisha rendered the pottage harmless (2 Kings iv, 38); he may even have resided here (2 Kings ii, 1; iv, 38). It lay in the vicinity of Baal-shalisha (2 Kings iv, 42). This is probably the BETH-GILGAL (A. V. "house of Gilgal") mentioned (Neh. iii, 29) as occupied by the Levitical singers after the exile; and it is evidently also the *Galgala* (Γαλγάλα) on the route of the victorious Bacchides (1 Macc. ix, 3). See GALGALA. Keil (*Comment. on Josh.* p. 219, 232) and Van de Velde (*Memoir*, p. 316), after Winer (s. v.), unnecessarily identify this with the Gilgal of Joshua's camp, etc. It is doubtless the *Galgala* (Γαλγάλα) stated by Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v.) to be located near Bethel; and is the large village *Iljilila*, one hour west of Sinjil, on the road from Jerusalem to Nablús, situated so high on the brow of the central mountain tract as to afford an extensive view of the great lower plain and the sea, and even a view of Mount Hermon (Robinson, *Researches*, iii, 81).

Gill, Alexander, an English philologist and theologian, was born in Lincolnshire Feb. 27, 1564. He studied and graduated in Corpus Christi College, Oxford. In 1608 he became principal of St. Paul's school, which post he filled until his death, Nov. 17, 1635. He gained much reputation as a philologist and theological critic by his *Treatise concerning the Trinity* (1601, 8vo);—*Logonomia Anglica* (1621, 4to);—*Sacred Philosophy of Holy Scripture, or a Commentary on the Creed* (1635, 8vo). See Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, vol. i (London, 1691, 2 vols. fol.); Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xx, 523; Knight, *Life of Colet*; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 671.

Gill, John, an eminent theologian and Biblical scholar, was born at Kettering, England, in 1697. He received his education at the grammar-school in his native town. But the tuition of the school was only one of the means of education that he availed himself

of. "As sure as that John Gill is in the bookseller's shop," became a proverbial expression. He left school and began preaching at the age of nineteen, and was pastor successively of the Baptist churches in Higham-Ferrers and Kettering. In 1719 he was settled at Horsleydown, Southwark, where he ministered for fifty-one years. He died in 1771. Short as was his term of preparatory study, he must have laid a good foundation, and have been diligent in his subsequent studies. He made himself an excellent Latin and Greek scholar, and a learned Orientalist. His Rabbinical studies were extensive and profound. The fruits of his learning are chiefly deposited in his commentary, a work valuable to consult, but so heavy and prolix in style as to repel any but very courageous readers. He was a voluminous author. For a time he exerted a commanding influence in his own denomination, and enjoyed high consideration with the religious public generally. In theology he was a Calvinist of the Supralapsarian type, and his peculiar doctrine concerning the relation of Christians to the law of God occasioned, though it scarcely justified, the charge of Antinomianism. His principal writings are, 1. *Exposition of the Song of Solomon*:—2. *Prophecies respecting the Messiah fulfilled in Jesus*:—3. *The Cause of God and Truth*, being an examination of the several passages of Scripture made use of by Arminians (4 vols. 8vo, 1735; new ed. Lond. 1838, 8vo):—4. *Exposition of the New Testament* (3 vols.):—5. *Exposition of the Old Testament* (6 vols.):—6. *Dissertation on the Antiquity of the Hebrew Language, Letters, Vowel Points, and Accents*:—7. *A Body of Doctrinal and Practical Divinity*:—8. *Sermons and Tracts*. He also wrote several treatises on Baptism, one of which, entitled *Infant Baptism a Part and Pillar of Popery*, has been republished in America. His *Body of Divinity* has also had some circulation in this country, and has been abridged. He received the degree of doctor of divinity from the University of Glasgow. (L. E. S.)

Gill, William, one of the early Methodist ministers in America, was born in Delaware (date unknown). He entered the itinerant ministry in 1777, filled a number of important stations successfully, and died in 1789. He was a man "of very quick and solid parts," and, although he had not enjoyed great advantages of early education, he became so skilled in theology that Dr. Rush, of Philadelphia, pronounced him "the greatest divine he ever heard."—*Minutes of Conferences*, i, 33; Wakeley, *Heroes of Methodism*, p. 199.

Gilles (COLONNA). See ÆGIIDIUS, vol. i, p. 89.

Gilles of Viterbo. See EGIPIO ANTONINI.

Gilles, Pierre, a pastor of the Vaudois Church at La Tour, was born in one of the valleys of Piedmont in 1571. He was appointed to collect and arrange all the documents he could find on the origin, history, beliefs, and religious customs of the Vaudois. He devoted his entire life to this work, which he published at the age of seventy-two. The title is *Histoire ecclésiastique des églises réformées recueillies en quelques vallées du Piémont et circonvoisines, autrefois appelées églises Vaudoises* (Genève, 1644, 4to).—Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xx, 544.

Gillespie, GEORGE, minister at Edinburgh, a learned Presbyterian divine. He was one of the four sent as commissioners from the Church of Scotland to the Westminster Assembly in 1643. He died in 1648. He wrote (1) *Aaron's Rod blossoming, or the divine Ordinance of Church Government vindicated* (Lond. 1646, 4to):—(2) *The Ark of the Testament opened; a Treatise of the Covenant of Grace* (Lond. 1661-77, 2 vols. 4to); besides other smaller treatises. A new edition of his entire works, edited by Hetherington, was published at Edinburgh in 1846 (2 vols. 8vo), with a memoir of his life.—Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* i, 1258; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 671.

**Gillies, John**, a Scotch divine, was born in 1712, ordained minister of the New College Church, Glasgow, in 1742, and continued to labor there until his death in 1796. His works are, *Historical Collections relating to remarkable Periods of the Success of the Gospel*, etc. (Glasg. 1754, 2 vols. 8vo):—*The N. T., with devotional Reflections* (London, new ed. 1810, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Life of Whitefield* (1772, 8vo; often reprinted):—*Essay on the Messianic Prophecies* (Lond. 1773, 8vo). Two supplements to the *Historical Collections* appeared in 1761 and 1796; and a new edition of the original work, with the two supplements and an additional one by H. Bonar, appeared at Kelso, 1845, 8vo.—Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* i, 1260; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 672.

**Gillies, John, LL.D.**, was born at Brechin, Scotland, Jan. 18, 1747, and was educated at the University of Glasgow. In 1793 he became historiographer royal for Scotland; in 1830 he removed to Clapham, near London, where he died, Feb. 15, 1836. He wrote several historical works, now of little value, and translated several Greek authors, among them Aristotle (Ethics, Politics, Rhetoric), very badly.

**Gilly, David**, a Protestant divine who became a Roman Catholic, was born at Nismes in 1648. He studied at Nismes, Montauban, and Saumur, and was appointed pastor at Baugé. His life there was quiet and studious until the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, when, to save himself from the dragonades, he abjured his faith, and allied himself with the Roman Catholics. The Protestants ordered public fasts to avert the wrath of God on account of this apostasy, but the king gave Gilly a pension of 1000 livres, which was increased by the clergy 400 livres more. He was sent to Languedoc by the court to preach against his old faith, and afterwards was brought to Paris to confirm the newly-converted in their faith. He died at Angers Dec. 27, 1711.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Bing. Générale*, xx, 557.

**Gilly, William Stephen, D.D.**, a pious and exemplary English clergyman, and patron of the Vaudois Christians. He was born in 1789, and educated at Cambridge, where he passed A.B. in 1812, A.M. in 1817, and D.D. in 1833. In 1817 he became rector of North Farnbridge, Essex. In 1825 he became a canon of Durham and rector of St. Margaret's in that city. He died Sept. 10, 1855. In the year 1823 Dr. Gilly paid his first visit to the Vaudois Christians, which has been attended with such important results, not only to himself, but likewise to that interesting people, who for so many centuries have maintained their independence against all the power and persecution of papal Rome. The following year he published a volume entitled *A Narrative of an Excursion to the Mountains of Piedmont in the Year 1823, and Researches among the Vaudois, or Waldenses, Protestant Inhabitants of the Cottian Alps*. This work immediately attracted great attention, and the interest it produced was shown by its reaching a fourth edition in less than three years. A fund of over £7000 was raised, and devoted, in part to the maintenance of a college and library at La Tour, in Piedmont. Dr. Gilly ceased his labors on behalf of the Vaudois only with his life. See VAUDOIS. Besides the work above-named, he published *The Spirit of the Gospel, or the four Evangelists elucidated* (Lond. 1818, 8vo):—*Home Catechism, or an Exposition of the Duty and Advantages of public Catechising in the Church* (Lond. 1828, 8vo):—*Waldensian Researches, a second Visit to the Vaudois* (Lond. 1831, 8vo):—*A Memoir of Felix Neff, Pastor of the High Alps, and of his Labors among the French Protestants of Dauphiné* (Lond. 1832, 8vo):—*Our Protestant Forefathers* (London, 1835, 12mo; twelve editions before 1844):—*Vigilantius and his Times* (London, 1844, 8vo).—*Gentleman's Magazine*, Oct. 1855; *Quart. Rev.* xxxiii, 134.

**Gilman, SAMUEL, D.D.**, an eminent Unitarian minister, was born in Gloucester, Mass., Feb. 16, 1791,

and graduated at Harvard College in 1811. From 1817 to 1819 he was connected with the university as tutor. In the year last named he accepted an invitation from the Unitarian church at Charleston, S. C., and was soon afterwards ordained. He continued to serve that church with great popularity up to the year of his death, which took place Feb. 9, 1858. He was a frequent contributor to the *North American Review*, and his papers showed a wide range of scholarship, as well as great skill in execution. A number of his essays, etc., are collected in his *Contributions to Literature* (Bost. 1856, 12mo). See *Monthly Religious Magazine* (Bost. 1858); Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 674; *New American Cyclopædia*, viii, 256.

**Gi'loh** (Heb. *Giloh*, גִּלּוֹחַ, exile [Gesenius] or *circle* [Fürst]; Sept. in Josh. Γαλώ v. r. Γαλώρι and Γαλώρι, in Sam. Γελώ v. r. Γωλά), the last named (after Goshen and Holon) in the first group of eleven cities in the south-western part (Keil, *Josh.* p. 384) of the hill-country of the tribe of Judah (*Josh.* xv, 51); and afterwards the native place or residence of Ahithophel (hence called "the Gilonite" [q. v.], 2 Sam. xv, 12; xxiii, 34), whence Absalom, on his way from Jerusalem to Hebron, summoned him (perhaps from a temporary banishment or disgrace at court) to join his rebellious standard (2 Sam. xv, 12; and whither he returned to commit suicide on the failure of his colleagues to adopt his crafty counsel (2 Sam. xvii, 23). Josephus calls it *Gelmon* (Γελμών, *Ant.* vii, 9, 8). De Sauley (*Dead Sea*, i, 453) and Schwarz (*Palæst.* p. 105) both make it to be the modern *Beit-Jab*, near Bethlehem; but this is rather the ancient Zelah or Zelzah (q. v.), and the scriptural notices require a different position, perhaps at *Rafid*, a village with extensive ruins one hour twenty minutes south of Hebron (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 252).

**Gi'lonite** (Heb. with the art. *haq-Giloni'*, הַגִּילוֹנִי, Sept. ὁ Γελωνίτης, 2 Sam. xv, 12, or ἡ Γελωνίτις, Sept. ὁ Γελωνίτης, 2 Sam. xxiii, 34), an epithet of the traitor Ahithophel (q. v.), doubtless from his city GILOI (q. v.).

**Gilpin, Bernard**, called the apostle of the North, an eminent English reformer and itinerant preacher, was born at Kentmere, in Westmoreland, in 1517. At sixteen he was sent to Queen's College, Oxford, where, stimulated by the works of Erasmus, he made the Scriptures in Hebrew and Greek his chief study. In 1541 he became M.A., and about the same time was elected fellow of his college, and ordained. His reputation for learning soon after led to his being solicited by cardinal Wolsey's agents to accept an establishment in his new foundation at Christ's Church, whither he removed from Queen's College. The university was divided between those who asserted the necessity of a reformation and those who resisted it. Gilpin was for some time opposed to the reformers, maintaining the Romish side in a dispute with Hooper, afterwards bishop of Worcester. But his mind was open to conversion, and in preparing himself for this dispute, he began to suspect that the peculiarities of Romanism were not supported by Scripture or by the fathers. This truth was still further forced upon him when, on the accession of Edward VI, Peter Martyr was sent to Oxford, and Bernard Gilpin was selected as one of the champions on the Romish side to oppose him. The result was that he embraced the Reformation. In 1552 he was made vicar of Norton, and in the same year obtained from Edward VI a license as "general preacher," which authorized him to preach in any diocese. He resigned his living soon after, and went to Louvain, where the priests sought in vain to reclaim him to Romanism. He returned to England in 1556, and found the Church oppressed and persecuted by queen Mary with blood and fire. His uncle, bishop Tonstall, gave him the living of Easingdon, and



afterwards the rectory of Houghton-le-Spring; and although his Protestant views were well known, the bishop protected him. His enemies now accused him before bishop Bonner, and he was on his way to trial, and probably to the scaffold, but was detained by breaking his leg on the journey, till news arrived of Mary's death, and he returned in peace to his rectory. The remainder of his life was spent in the assiduous discharge of his parish duties, and in preaching through the country as an itinerant. "The parts of Redesdale and Tynedale, debatable land on the Marches, are particularly named as the scenes of his labors. The people there, living on the borders of the two counties, had long led a lawless life, subsisting mostly on plunder. Gilpin went fearlessly amongst them, holding forth the commands and the sanctions of Christianity, and did much to change the character of the country. Hence it was that he was commonly called the Northern apostle, and his name for generations was repeated with reverence. His own parish of Houghton, which included within it fourteen villages, however, was the chief scene of his labors. It yielded him an ample income, for Houghton was then, as now, one of the richest benefices in the North. He was himself a bachelor. In hospitality he was like what is said or fabled of the primitive bishops. Every fortnight, we are told, forty bushels of corn, twenty bushels of malt, and a whole ox, were consumed in his house, besides ample supplies of provisions of many other kinds. A good portion of this hospitable provision was no doubt consumed by his parishioners, it being his custom, having a large and wide parish and a great multitude of people, to keep a table for them every Sunday from Michaelmas to Easter.' But the rectory-house was also open to all travellers, and so great was the reverence which surrounded the master that his liberality was rarely abused, even the most wicked being awed by it. His skill in according differences was scarcely less famed than his hospitality and his preaching; and when to this we add that his benevolence took the wise direction of providing instruction for the young, and that he was assiduous in his attention to the sick and to the poor, we have touched upon all the points which can be prominent in the life of a good pastor. His zeal for education was manifested at once in the education of the poor children in his parish in homely learning, and in patronizing promising youth in their studies in the universities. Of these, his scholars, 'he kept full four-and-twenty in his own house, the greater number being poor men's sons, upon whom he bestowed meat, drink, and cloth, and education in learning;' and out of these scholars, and from the grammar-school which he founded, we are told that 'he supplied the Church of England with great store of learned men.' Of his scholars he always maintained at his own expense at least six at the universities, and when they had completed their studies charged himself with the care of their settlement' (*English Cyclopædia*, s. v.). His *Life*, by bishop Carleton, is one of the most interesting of Christian biographies. He died March 4, 1583. See Wordsworth, *Eccles. Biog.* iv, 367; *Life*, by W. Gilpin (Glasg. 1824, 12mo); Jamieson, *Cyclop. Relig. Biog.* p. 222; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vol. v; *English Cyclopædia*, s. v. See FAITH, RULE OF.

**Gilpin, Richard, M.D.**, a Nonconformist divine, was born in Cumberland, England; studied at Queen's College, Oxford, and became minister of Greystock, but was ejected for nonconformity in 1662, and afterwards practised physic. He died in 1697. While in the Church, he was very popular as a preacher. He published *Demonologia sacra; or, a Treatise of Satan's Temptations* (in three parts, London, 1677, 4to);—*The Temple Rebuilt* (Lond. 1658);—*Sermons* (Lond. 1700).—Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 674; Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, i, 1260.

**Gilpin, William**, a descendant of Bernard Gil-

pin, was born at Carlisle, 1724. He became master of the school at Cheam, in Surrey; afterwards vicar of Boldre, and prebendary of Salisbury. He died at Boldre, April 5, 1804. Among his numerous publications are, *An Exposition of the N. T. intended as an Introduction to the reading of the Scriptures* (Lond. 1811, 2 vols. 8vo, 4th edit.);—*Lives of the Reformers* (Lond. 1809, 2 vols. 8vo);—*Sermons to a Country Congregation* (Lond. 1802-5, 4 vols. 8vo);—*Life of Bernard Gilpin* (Glasg. 1824, 12mo, new ed.);—*Lectures on the Church Catholicism* (Lond. 1779, 2 vols. 8vo);—*Observations on Picturesque Beauty* (1790, 2 vols. 8vo);—*Moral Contrasts* (Lond. 1798, 12mo);—Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s. v.; Rose, *New Gen. Biog. Dict.* viii, 30.

**Gils, ANTONIUS VAN, D.D.**, was born July 29, 1758, at Tilburg. His parents were Roman Catholics. He graduated at Louvain with high honor. In 1783 he received spiritual consecration at Antwerp. After this he was appointed to give instructions in theology, and in 1785 he received his licentiate in theology. Not approving the changes made in the University of Louvain by order of the emperor Joseph II, he resigned his position there, and in 1786 was made chaplain at Eindhoven. From December, 1786, to April, 1790, he labored zealously among the Romanists at 's Hertogenbosch. He returned in 1790 to Louvain, where he was made president of the College of Malder and canon of St. Peter. In November of the same year he was taken prisoner by the Austrian troops, and conveyed to Mechlin. Released from confinement, he defended the university before the Congress, assembled for the regulation of Belgian affairs. In 1791 he was appointed professor, and in 1794 was promoted to the degree of doctor of theology. The French, making themselves masters of Louvain soon after, conveyed him and other professors as prisoners to Peronne. On his return to Louvain he composed the reply to the magistrates of the city, declining, on the part of himself and his colleagues, to attend the opening of the *temple of reason*. From 1795 to 1813 he experienced various fortunes, being sometimes imprisoned, and for most of the time an exile. After the overthrow of Napoleon he again stood at the head of the University of Louvain. He died at the university June 10, 1834. His principal works are, *De twee cosyns:—Eerwondige samenpraken over de religieuzen van dezen tyd* (Leuv. 1796, 12mo);—*Motifs de conscience qui empêchent les ministres de culte catholique de faire la déclaration exigée par la loi du 7 Vend. an. II* (Leuv. 1797; this was also translated into Flemish);—*De growlen van het Christen-cath. geloof, tegenover de growden der filosofie* (s Hertogenb. 1800);—*Analysis epistolærum B. Pauli apostoli ad usum seminarii Sylva-Ducensis* (Lov. 1816, 3 vols. 12mo). See Glasius, *Godgeleerd Nederland, D. i*, blz. 527 en verv.; also F. V. Goethals, *Lectures relatives à l'histoire des sciences, des arts, des mœurs, et de la politique en Belgique*, etc., ii, 298 suiv. (J. P. W.)

**Gim'zo** (Heb. *Gimzō'*, גִּמְזוֹ, a place fertile in *sycamores*; Sept. Γῆμζώ v. r. Γαμαζαῖα), a city in the plain of the kingdom of Judah, mentioned in connection with Timnah, and taken with its dependent villages (Heb. *daughters*), by the Philistines in the time of Ahaz (2 Chron. xxviii, 18); now *Jimzu*, a common and rather large village, on an eminence, on the south side of the road, about an hour south-east of Ludd (Lydda or Ramleh); with many threshing-floors and ancient cisterns used as magazines for grain (Robinson's *Researches*, iii, 56). It is mentioned in the Talmud (Schwarz, *Paest.* p. 136).

**GIN**, an old English word for *trap*, stands as the rendering of two Hebrew words in certain passages: גִּמְזוֹ, *mokesh'*, a *noose* or "snare" (as elsewhere rendered), Psa. cxl, 5; cxli, 9; Amos iii, 5; and גִּינָה, *paeh*, lit. a *plate* or thin layer, hence a *net* or *trap*, Sept.

παγίς, Job xviii, 9; Isa. viii, 14; elsewhere "snare." See HUNTING; FOWLER, etc.

**Gina** (גִּינָה), a brook or winter-stream (גִּינָה-mentioned in the Talmud as being not far from En) Gannim (q. v.) (Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 52).

**Ginath** (Heb. *Ginath'*, גִּינָתַי, a garden [Gesén.] or protection [Fürst]; Sept. Γινῆθ v. r. Γωνῆθ), the father of Tibni (q. v.), king of the northern tribes of Israel (1 Kings xvi, 21, 22). B. C. ante 926.

**Gin' metho** (Heb. *Ginmethof'*, גִּינֶמֶת, Sept. Γεναθών, Vulg. *Genthon*), a corrupt reading (Neh. xii, 4) for the name GINETHON (q. v.).

**Gin' nethon** (Heb. *Ginnethon'*, גִּינֶנֶת, *gardener* or *great garden*; Sept. Γαργαναζών and Γαναζώζ, Vulg. *Genthon*), one of the "chief" priests that returned from the captivity with Zerubbabel (Neh. xii, 4, where the reading is "Gennetho"), and subscribed the covenant with Nehemiah (x, 6); his son Meshullam is mentioned as contemporary with the high-priest Joiakim (xii, 16). B. C. 536-410.

**Gioberti**, VINCENZO, a distinguished Italian philosopher and statesman, was born at Turin, April 5, 1801. He studied theology in the university of his native city, was received doctor in 1823, and in 1825 was ordained priest and appointed professor of theology in the university. He acquired great reputation, and became court chaplain in 1831. Soon afterwards he was implicated in a republican conspiracy (said to have been instigated by the Jesuits, in order to destroy the liberal sympathies of the king), was thrown into prison, and then exiled without trial. He went first to Paris, thence to Brussels, where he remained until 1843, in the humble position of tutor in a private school. Some time after he declined a professorship of philosophy offered him by cardinal Wiseman, preferring to devote all his time to his literary labors. His first publication was the *Teoria del Sovranaturale* (Capolago, 1838). In 1839 he published his *Introduzione allo studio della Filosofia*. This remarkable work was followed in 1841 by his *Del Bello*, in which the author analyzes Christian epos, and especially Dante's *Divina Comedia*. Gioberti next employed himself against the modern German philosophers and the French encyclopedists, whose ideas outlived the Revolution. He wrote successively the *Lettres polémiques contre La Mennais* (Paris, 1840); *Del Eunoio*; and *Errori filosofici di Antonio Rosmini* (Capolago, 1842). In opposing the pantheistic tendencies of La Mennais and Rosmini, Gioberti evinces great argumentative talent, and a vivid imagination. He aimed at making Italy throw off the yoke of foreign doctrines, with the ultimate view of enabling her subsequently to expel foreign political interference. He was careful always to profess orthodox opinions, so as not to give either the Italian princes or the pope any hold against him. His new catholic system found many adherents. In order to raise the clergy in the popular esteem, he advocated such reforms as the spirit of the times required, and advised the priests to head the social movement and to disseminate instruction among the people. He also called on the learned men of Italy, inviting them to regain their former ascendancy by uniting faith with science and art. In this view he wrote his *Il Primato civile e morale degli Ital.* (Paris, 1843). This remarkable work, which proposed the plan of a Roman confederacy headed by the pope, and which has had great influence on the recent history of Italy, was not at the time in harmony with public opinion. The substance of the book is as follows: "Italy has been twice at the head of European civilization; once in antiquity, and again in the Middle Ages. In the latter period Italy owed its supremacy to the popes, who were then the natural arbiters of princes and the spiritual sovereigns of the nations. The downfall of Italy is due to the downfall of the papacy. The problem now is to restore the papal

power, as a moral dominion based on religion and public opinion." Gioberti aims at "restoring the papal arbitration between the sovereign and the people; he wishes to lead it back to the time of Gregory VII and of Alexander III, and in this restoration of the past finds the best means of repulsing foreign oppression by the unaided efforts of Italy alone. As for the form of government, he inclines to a constitutional monarchy, and, like Alfieri, considers Piedmont as the most compact, best organized, and most vital state of Italy; calls it to closer union with the other provinces, and by showing to it the perspective of a united Italy, invites it to become the champion of national independence." The work was published under the most unfavorable circumstances, during the last years of the pontificate of Gregory XVI. The Jesuits, despite a few compliments to their order, which the author had skillfully introduced in his book, were alarmed at its tendencies. Gioberti, however, answered their objections in *I Prolegomeni* (1845); *Il Gesuita moderno* (Capolago, 1847, 8 vols.; German transl. by Cornet, Lpz. 1849, 3 vols.). This work, written *ab irato*, had an immense effect; the Jesuits were expelled from Piedmont, and from all the other states of Peninsular Italy.

After the events of 1848 Gioberti was recalled from exile, and his return was a triumph. He went to Milan, started the project of union between Lombardy and Piedmont, and traversed Central Italy, inviting all parties to unite for the good of the country. He declined the office of senator which was offered him by Charles Albert, but was elected to the House of Representatives by the inhabitants of Turin, and at once chosen for its president. In 1848 he was minister of public instruction, and president of the so-called *Democratic council*. Austrian intrigues defeated Gioberti's plans, and he was obliged to withdraw from the cabinet. He then advocated his views in a newspaper entitled *Il Saggiatore*. The misfortunes of Italy and the abdication of Charles Albert rendered it necessary for him to take again an active part in state affairs. Victor Emmanuel appointed him in the Delaunay-Piellin cabinet, without any special department; yet the conservative party managed soon after to have him appointed ambassador to Paris, as a means of getting rid of him. He understood it so, sent in his resignation, and on the arrival of his successor, count Gallina, returned to private life. He afterwards published his *Del Rinascimento civile dell' Italia* (Paris and Turin, 1851, 2 vols.). In this work he examines with great impartiality into the causes of the present position of Italy. Among the chief obstacles to its independence he signalizes, on the one hand, the exaggeration of the principles of municipal and ecclesiastical power, and, on the other, the dangerous influence of Mazzinianism. Sympathizing with the loyalty and liberalism of Victor Emmanuel, he, so to say, traces out for him the line to be followed to arrive at the regeneration of Italy. Gioberti was preparing a philosophical work, entitled *Protologia*, when he died suddenly at Paris, Oct. 25, 1851. His most important work is the *Introduzione*, which has been translated into French under the title *Introduction à l'étude de la Philosophie* (Paris, 1847, 3 vols. 8vo). The *Christian Remembrancer* (July, 1853, art. i) remarks upon it as follows: "With regard to the *Introduction to Philosophy*, it is extremely difficult to express an opinion, because (speaking with the utmost seriousness) we have a great difficulty in deciding, upon internal evidence alone, whether it was the product of a sane mind. The excitement visible throughout; the lofty tone in which he passes judgment upon others, and pours forth his own utterances; the virulence with which he treats some who differ from him, combined with the obscurity and dreaminess of the opinions expressed; the extraordinary nature of the premises he assumes, and his dogmatism, not the less arrogant from his entire unconsciousness—all these things on

the one hand, and, on the other, his acuteness, depth, information, and power of argument, leave us much at a loss to discover whether the author was in his sober senses or not. We give a brief abstract of his views, so far as we have been enabled to comprehend them. He conceives that the source of all human knowledge is in God, and that it is one whole, and in a manner identical with God himself; and the name which he gives it is 'L' Idéa,' or Thought. This divine thought is communicated to man in proportion as he is capable of receiving it; and it is 'the light which enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world.' Man receives it by means of his reason, which is capable of directly beholding it; and this direct beholding (or intuition) of the 'Idéa' is the origin and first cause of all the knowledge of natural things which the mind of man possesses. It is innate, inasmuch as it rises to the mind at the same moment as the thought which apprehends it; but it does not rise within the mind, but enters it from without. It is the principle of knowledge to the human mind, from the very first exercise of its powers as a thinking being. The similarity of this view to that of Plato, revived and modified by Malebranche and Leibnitz, is sufficiently evident. But this direct intuition of the divine thought by the reason, although the origin of all thoughts in the soul, is by itself but inchoate and imperfect. In order to render it available, it requires that this intuition should be reflected on; and this can be done only by means of language, for man cannot reflect on and (so to speak) repeat the original intuition except by means of language, which renders determinate what was before imperfect. For this purpose language was given to man, and by means of language God originally reveals to man that which he has caused him to behold by internal and direct intuition; and by means of language this same revelation is repeated and carried on from generation to generation; and by the same medium, employed analogically, the knowledge of the divine thought is more and more revealed. Yet language is not the cause of human knowledge, nor is it, in the case of ordinary knowledge, the medium of the exhibition of the divine thought to the mind (for that shines immediately upon the mind), but it is the occasion of its being completely revealed. For the purposes of ordinary and natural knowledge this combination of intuition with language is the method ordained; but supernatural knowledge can be conveyed only by means of language; and divine truths are not seen by intuition, but believed. Yet all knowledge of every kind has its source in the divine thought, and consists of such views of it as the individual is capable of. Besides reason, which is capable of beholding the divine thought, man has likewise *internal and spiritual feelings* or emotions, which are modifications of the mind, and preserved by feeling; and, in addition, he possesses *material and external feelings*, having reference to the properties of bodies, and perceived by sensation and the outward senses. The ordinary range of modern metaphysics is confined to these internal and external feelings; and it is a common error to substitute the internal feeling as a first principle, instead of that which is apprehended by the reason through direct intuition, and revealed to the soul by language and reflection. It is likewise an equally common error to substitute reflection on these internal and external feelings for reason, as the initiatory instrument of that knowledge which is the basis of philosophy. (Here he is evidently alluding to Locke and his followers.) But it is by the view or intuition of the divine thought that meaning is given to these various feelings, external and internal, and to the various sensible objects by which they are surrounded. The basis of all knowledge is the knowledge of *being*; yet not of an abstract idea, but of the concrete personal Being, God himself, acting as a cause and producing *existences*, who is, in fact, the only *being*, because

he alone has being in himself. The knowledge of this being is gained by revelation, by means of the written word, where-in he declares himself, 'I am that I am;' and the mind beholds him, and has him made known to it internally, through the reason, independently of all external sensations. God being the only being, all other things are only existences; and man learns from the revealed word that the one being created existences; not that he extends himself into these various manifestations (as Hegel teaches); not that he causes these existences to emanate from himself, as other Pantheists teach, but that he *creates* them. Man thus learns their proper nature, viz. that they are distinct, individual, real things, having a kind of personality; that it is the act of creation which gives them this reality and individuality; and that it is only by the fact of their being created that their reality is assured to us; that, in short, nothing but the act of creation could assure to us the reality of external things. Gioberti holds, moreover, that all our knowledge of philosophy must begin with a knowledge of being and existences, and their relation to each other; and that not of abstract being or abstract existence, but of one concrete Being, and of many concrete individual existences; and he thinks that the divine thought gives us a knowledge of the latter by a direct view of them, which gives life and meaning to all our sensations and feelings in connection with them. He likewise teaches that principles of knowledge are objective, eternal, and absolute; that they are not the creation of the mind, nor sought out by it, but that they present themselves to the mind unsought, and are first truths—the foundation of other truths. He teaches that the permanent possession of the divine thought depends in a degree on man himself; that he may rebel against it, and thus fail to receive it, and fall into error. He teaches that it is by the participation of it that individuals possess a moral personality; that it is the vital principle, and that if it were entirely withdrawn the consequence would be annihilation; that inasmuch as the divine thought creates and governs the universe, it is the soul of the world; inasmuch as it dwells in men's minds, it is knowledge; inasmuch as it actuates, produces, determines, and classifies the powers of nature, it is the generic and specific essence of things; that the basis of generality is the Divine Being himself, having in himself the ideas of all possible things, and the power of giving effect to those ideas." He left a number of MSS., which were edited and published by G. Massari, under the title *Opere inedite di Vincenzo Gioberti* (Torino, 1856-60, 6 vols. 8vo). There is an excellent article on the life and writings of Gioberti in the *Christian Examiner*, 1861, p. 287. See also Massari, *Vita e Morte di Gioberti* (Flor. 1848), and *Etudes sur Gioberti*; Cruger, *Esquisses Italiennes*; Spaventa, *La filosofia di Gioberti* (Naples, 1864); *Risorgimento* (Oct. 1851); Hoefer, *Nour. Biog. Générale*, xx, 585 sq.; *New American Cyclopædia*, viii, 259 sq.; *North British Review*, vol. xi; *Brownson's Review*, iv, 409 sq.

**Giordano Bruno.** See BRUNO.


**Gir.** See CHALK.

**Giraldus Cambrensis** (SYLVESTER), archdeacon of Brecon and titular bishop of Menavia or St. David's, was born at Pembroke, Wales, in 1146. He finished his education in Paris, and in 1175 was appointed by Richard, archbishop of Canterbury, as his legate for Wales, and was soon after made archdeacon of Brecon. In the following year he was elected bishop of Menavia, but king Henry II refused to confirm the election. He then returned to Paris, where, as he says himself, in his *De rebus a se gestis*, he passed for the most learned person in jurisprudence, and was offered the professorship of canon law, which he declined. He afterwards administered for a while the affairs of the bishopric of Menavia, and in 1184 be-

came court preacher of Henry II. He accompanied Henry's son John as adviser in the expedition against Ireland, and in 1188 accompanied archbishop Baldwin of Canterbury on a tour through Wales, for the purpose of organizing a crusade. Richard I appointed him legate of Wales, but at the fall of the latter he returned to his studies. He was again elected bishop of St. David's, but failed again to be recognised as such. He "passed the last seventeen years of his life in study, revising his former literary works and composing others, of which he has himself given a copious index. In the midst of these occupations he received once more an offer of the bishopric of St. David's, and would have met with no opposition from the court; but, from the dishonourable terms on which it was offered, he refused the ecclesiastical dignity which had so long been the object of his earnest wishes. He died at St. David's in the seventy-fourth year of his age, and was buried in the cathedral church, where his effigy still remains upon an altar-tomb beneath an ornamental arch. Giraldus appears to have been an upright and able man. As an ecclesiastic he was zealous, active, and fearless in maintaining the rights and dignities of his Church; but he was, at the same time, honest and disinterested. As a scholar he was learned, and as a collector of historical materials diligent, far beyond the measure of his age. As a historian, however, he was full of credulity, and as a man, as his works prove, one of the vainest upon record. Giraldus has himself given a catalogue of his works, as well as a long history of his actions, both printed by Wharton. Other lists will be found in Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Med. et Inf. Latinitatis* (edit. Patav. 4to, 1754), iii, 62, and in the notes to his life in the *Biogr. Britan.* (ed. 1778), i, 640; 642, 644. Sir Richard Colt Hoare has given a full account of such MSS. of his works as exist in the several libraries in the British Museum, in the Archbishopal Library at Lambeth, at Bene't (Corpus Christi) College, in the public library at Cambridge, and in the Bodleian. Those printed are, *Itinerarium Cambrie* (Lond. 1585, 8vo), and in Camden's *Angl. Norm., etc., Script.* (Francof. 1602, fol.), p. 818-878:—*Topographia Hibernie* (Camden, ut sup.), p. 692-754:—*Expugnatione Hibernie* (ibidem), p. 755-813:—*Descriptio Cambrie* (ibid.), p. 879-892. Several short pieces by Giraldus are printed in the second volume of Wharton's *Anglia Sacra*. The *Gemma Ecclesiastica*, published at Mentz in 1549, without the author's name, under the title of *Gemma Anima*, is ascribed to Giraldus. Sir Richard Colt Hoare, in 1806, published the *Itinerary of Archbishop Baldwin through Wales*, translated into English, and illustrated with views, annotations, and a life of Giraldus (2 vols. 4to). A new edition, *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera*, is now publishing, under the direction of the master of the rolls, edited by J. F. Dimock; 5 vols. were issued up to 1868. See Wharton, *Anglia Sacra*, ii, 457-513; Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Med. et Inf. Latinitatis*; *Engl. Cyclopaedia*, s. v. Barry; *Biogr. Britannica*, s. v. Barri; Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, v, 164; Wright, *Biogr. Brit. Literaria*, Anglo-Norman Period, p. 380-97.

**Girdle**, an essential article of dress in the East, and worn both by men and women. The corresponding Hebrew and Greek words are: 1. חַגוֹר, *chagor'*, or חַגְוֹרָה (fem.), *chagorah'*, girdler (Prov. xxxi, 24; Ezek. xxiii, 15; Gen. iii, 7; 2 Sam. xviii, 11; Isa. xxxii, 11), which is the general term for a girdle of any kind, whether worn by soldiers (1 Sam. xviii, 4; 2 Sam. xx, 8; 1 Kings ii, 5; 2 Kings iii, 21), or by women (Isa. iii, 24). 2. עֶזֶר, *ezor'*, something bound (Isa. xi, 5), especially used of the girdles worn by men: whether by prophets (2 Kings i, 8; Jer. xiii, 1), soldiers (Isa. v, 27; Ezek. xxiii, 15), or kings in their military capacity (Job xii, 18). 3. מַעֲזָח, *mezach'*, or מַזִּיחַ, *mazi'ach*, a band ("strength," Job xii, 21), used

of the girdle worn by men alone (Psa. cix, 19; Isa. xxiii, 10). 4. These, as well as the general term *חַגוֹר*, a *belt*, Matt. iii, 4; x, 9; Mark i, 6; vi, 8; Acts xxi, 11; Rev. i, 13; xv, 6, require no special elucidation. Besides these were the following peculiar terms: 5. *אַבְנֵי*, *abnet'* (from the Sanscrit *bantha*, a *band*), the girdle of sacerdotal and state officers (Exod. xxviii, 4, 9, 40; xxix, 9; xxxix, 29; Lev. viii, 7, 13; xvi, 4; Isa. xxii, 21). See **PRIEST**. It was especially worn by the priests about the close-fitting tunic (Exod. xxviii, 39; xxxix, 29), and is described by Josephus (*Ant.* iii, 7, 2) as made of linen so fine of texture as to look like the slough of a snake, and embroidered with flowers of scarlet, purple, blue, and fine linen. It was of about four fingers' breadth, and was wrapped several times round the priest's body, the ends hanging down to the feet. When engaged in sacrifice, the priest threw the ends over his left shoulder. According to Maimonides (*De Vas. Sanct.* c. 8), the girdle worn both by the high-priest and the common priests was of white linen embroidered with wool; but that worn by the high-priest on the day of atonement was entirely of white linen. The length of it was thirty-two cubits, and the breadth about three fingers. It was worn just below the arm-pits to avoid perspiration (comp. Ezek. xliv, 18). Jerome (*Ep. ad Fabiolam, de Vest. Sac.*) follows Josephus. With regard to the manner in which the girdle was embroidered, the "needlework" (חַגְוֹרָה עֵבֶר, Exod. xxviii, 39) is distinguished in the Mishna from the "cunning-work" (חַגְוֹרָה מְעִיבָה, Exod. xxvi, 31) as being worked by the needle with figures on one side only, whereas the latter was woven-work with figures on both sides (Cod. *Yoma* c. 8). So also Maimonides (*De Vas. Sanct.* viii, 15). But Jarchi, on Exod. xxvi, 31, 36, explains the difference as consisting in this, that in the former case the figures on the two sides are the same, whereas in the latter they are different. See **EMBROIDER**. This *abnet* may be considered as fairly represented by those girdles which we observe on such persons in the Egyptian paintings.



Ancient Egyptian Sacred Girdles.


In all passages, except Isa. xxii, 21, *חַגוֹר* is used of the girdle of the priests only, but in that instance it appears to have been worn by Shebna, the treasurer, as part of the insignia of his office; unless it be supposed that he was of priestly rank, and wore it in his priestly capacity. He is called "high-priest" in the

*Chronicon Paschale*, p. 115 a, and in the Jewish tradition quoted by Jarchi ad loc. 6. The "curious girdle" (צִפְרָיִם, *che'sheb*, something requiring *inventive* art, Exod. xxviii, 8) attached to the ephod was made of the same materials and colors as the ephod, that is, of "gold, blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen." Josephus describes it as sewed to the breast-plate. After passing once round it was tied in front upon the seam, the ends hanging down (*Ant.* iii, 7, 5). According to Maimonides, it was of woven work. See ERUOT. 7. In addition to these, פֶּתִיגִיל, *pethigil*, a covering or festive mantle ("stomacher," Isa. iii, 24), is a costly girdle worn by women. The Vulgate renders it *fascia pectoralis*. It would thus seem to correspond with the Latin *strophium*, a belt worn by women about the breast. In the Sept., however, it is translated χιτών μεσοπόρφυρος, "a tunic shot with purple," and Gesenius has "buntes Feyskleid" (compare Schröder, *De Vest. Mul.* p. 137, 404). 8. The כִּישְׁרוֹת, *kishurim*, closely-tied articles, mentioned in Isa. iii, 20 ("head-bands"); Jer. ii, 32 ("attire"), were probably girdles, although both Kimchi and Jarchi consider them as fillets for the hair. In the latter passage the Vulgate has again *fascia pectoralis*, and the Sept. στήθο-δῆσιμη, an appropriate bridal ornament. See each of the above renderings in their place.

The common girdle was made of leather (2 Kings i, 8; Matt. iii, 4), like that worn by the Bedouins of the present day, whom Curzon describes as "armed with a long crooked knife, and a pistol or two stuck in a red leathern girdle" (*Monist. of the Levant*, p. 7). In the time of Chardin the nobles of Mingrelia wore girdles of leather, four fingers broad, and embossed with silver. A finer girdle was made of linen (Jer. xiii, 1; Ezek. xvi, 10), embroidered with silk, and sometimes with gold and silver thread (Dan. x, 5; Rev. i, 13; xv, 6), and frequently studded with gold and precious stones or pearls (Le Bruyn, *Voy.* iv, 170; comp. Virgil, *Aeneid*, ix, 350). Morier (*Second Journey*, p. 150), describing the dress of the Armenian women, says, "They wear a silver girdle which rests on the hips, and is generally curiously wrought." The manufacture of girdles formed part of the employment of women (Prov. xxxi, 24).

The girdle was fastened by a clasp or buckle (2 Kings i, 8; Matt. iii, 4; Mark i, 4) of gold or silver, or tied in a knot (Jer. xiii, 1; Ezek. xvi, 10), so that the ends hung down in front, as in the figures on the ruins of Persepolis. It was worn by men about the loins, hence the expressions "girdle of the loins" or "of the reins" (אָזְנֵי הַקֶּלְבָּיִם, Isa. xi, 5; אָזְנֵי הַקֶּלְבָּיִם, Isa. v, 27). The girdle of women was generally looser than that of the men, and was worn about the hips, except when they were actively engaged (Prov. xxxi, 17). Curzon (p. 58), describing the dress of the Egyptian women, says, "Not round the waist, but round the hips a large and heavy Cashmere shawl is worn over the yelek, and the whole gracefulness of an Egyptian dress consists in the way in which this is put on." The military girdle was worn about the waist; the sword or dagger was suspended from it (Judg. iii, 16; 2 Sam. xx, 8; Psa. xlv, 3). In the Nineveh sculptures the soldiers are represented with broad girdles, to which the sword is attached, and through which two or even three daggers in a sheath are passed (comp. Q. Curtius, iii, 3). Hence girding up the loins denotes preparation for battle or for active exertion (1 Kings xviii, 46; 2 Kings iv, 29; Job xxxviii, 3; Prov. xxxi, 17; Jer. i, 17; Luke xii, 35; 1 Pet. i, 13); and to "loose the girdle" was to give way to repose and indolence (Isa. v, 27). To loose the girdle and give it to another was a token of great confidence and affection (1 Sam. xviii, 4). In times of mourning, girdles of sackcloth were worn as marks of humiliation and sorrow (Isa. iii, 24; xxii, 12).

In consequence of the costly materials of which girdles were made, they were frequently given as presents (1 Sam. xviii, 4; 2 Sam. xviii, 11), or in token of honor (Rev. i, 15), as is still the custom in Persia (comp. Morier, p. 93). Villages were given to the queens of Persia to supply them with girdles (Xenoph. *Anab.* i, 4, 9; Plato, *Alc.* i, 123).



Ancient Girdles: 1, 3, Egyptian; 2, Persepolitan; 4, 5, 6, Assyrian.

They were used as pockets, as among the Arabs still (Niebuhr, *Deser.* p. 56), and as purses, one end of the girdle being folded back for the purpose (Matt. x, 9; Mark vi, 8). Hence "zonam perdere," "to lose one's purse" (Hor. *Epist.* ii, 2, 40; compare Juv. xiv, 297). Lighthorns were also carried in the girdle (Ezek. ix, 2).

"Girdle" is often used figuratively in the Scriptures (see Psa. cix, 19; compare 1 Sam. ii, 4; Psa. xxx, 11; lxxv, 12; Eph. vi, 14).—Smith, s. v. "The girdle was a symbol of strength, activity, and power (Job xii, 18, 21; xxx, 11; Isa. xxiii, 10; xlv, 15; xi, 5; xxii, 21; 1 Kings xx, 11). The perfect adherence of the people of God to his service is figuratively illustrated by the "cleaving of the girdle to a man's loins" (Jer. xiii, 11). In the same view, "righteousness and faithfulness" are called the girdle of the Messiah (Isa. xi, 5). See ATTIRE.

**Gir'gashite** (Hebrew invariably in the sing. and with the art. *h-g-Girgashi'*, גִּרְגָשִׁי, in a collective sense; dwelling in a *clayey* soil; Sept. Γεργασαῖοι and Γεργασαῖος, Vulg. *Gergesari* and *Gergesavus*; A. V. "Girgashite" in 1 Chron. i, 14; "Girgashite" in Gen. x, 16; elsewhere "Girgashites"), a designation of one of the nations who were in possession of Canaan before the entrance thither of the children of Israel. In Gen. x, 16, they are mentioned as the descendants of the fifth son of Canaan; in other passages the tribe is merely referred to, and that but occasionally, in the formula expressing the doomed country (Gen. xv, 21; Deut. vii, 1 [and xx, 17 in Samarit. and Sept.]; Josh. iii, 10; xxiv, 11; 1 Chron. i, 14; Neh. ix, 8). The Girgashites are conjectured to have been a part of the large family of the Hivites, as they are omitted in nine out of ten places in which the nations or families of Canaan are mentioned, while in the tenth they are mentioned, and the Hivites omitted. Josephus states that nothing but the name of the Girgashites (Γεργασαῖοι) remained in his time (*Ant.* i, 6, 2). In the Jewish commentaries of R. Nachman and elsewhere, the Girgashites are described as having retired into Africa, fearing the power of God; and Procopius, in his *History of the Vandals*, mentions an ancient but doubtful inscription in Mauritania Tingitana, stating that the inhabitants had fled thither from the face of Joshua, the son of Nun. A city *Girgis* (גִּרְגִּישׁ) existed among the Phœnician tribes in Northern Africa at the Syrtis Minor (Fürst, *Heb. Lex.* p. 298). The notion that the Girgashites did migrate seems to have been founded on the circumstance that, although they are included in the list of the seven devoted nations either to be

driven out or destroyed by the Israelites (Gen. xv, 20, 21; Deut. vii, 1; Josh. iii, 10; xxiv, 11; Neh. ix, 8), yet they are omitted in the list of those to be utterly destroyed (Deut. xx, 17), and are mentioned among those with whom, contrary to the divine decree, the Israelites lived and intermarried (Judg. iii, 1-6). See CANAAN. The expression in Josh. xxiv, 11 would seem to indicate that the district of the Girgashites was on the west of Jordan. By most writers, however, they are supposed to have been settled in that part of the country which lay to the east of the lake of Gennesareth (*Jour. Sac. Lit.*, Oct. 1851, p. 167). This conclusion is founded on the identity between the word Γεργασῖοι, which the Septuagint gives for Girgashites, and that by which Matthew (viii, 28) indicates the land of the Gergesenes (Γεργεσηνοί). But as this last reading rests on a conjecture of Origen, on which little reliance is now placed, the conclusion drawn from it has no great weight, although the fact is possible on other grounds, especially the probability that some actual city of this name must have been the foundation of the reading in question. Indeed, the older reading, "Gerasenes," has sufficient resemblance to direct the attention to the country beyond the Jordan; where Eusebius also (*Onom.* s. v. Γεργασί) affirms that the Girgashites dwelt.—Kitto, s. v. See GERASA.

**Gir'gasite** (Gen. x, 16). See GIRGASHITE.

**Girl** (גַּרְלָהּ, *yallah'*, fem. of גַּרְלָהּ, a boy), lit. one born, i. e. a female child (Joel iii, 3; Zech. xiii, 5), spoken of a marriageable "damsel" (Gen. xxxiv, 4). See CHILD.

**Girzite**. See GEZRITE.

**Gisborne**, THOMAS, A.M., prebendary of Durham, a distinguished divine and author, was born at Derby in 1758, entered at Harrow School in 1773, and at St. John's College, Cambridge, in 1776; was made perpetual curate of Barton-under-Needwood, Staffordshire, in 1783, and removed in the same year to Yoxall Lodge, near Barton, where he ever after resided. He obtained the prebend of Durham in 1826, and died in 1846. His works are written in a clear and nervous style; his sermons have been recommended as models for young students in divinity. He strongly opposed Paley's Ethics, of which he published an *Examination* (2d edit. 1790). Among his works are. *A familiar Survey of the Christian Religion as connected with the Introduction of Christianity* (London, 1799, 2d ed. 8vo):—*The Principles of Moral Philosophy investigated and applied to the Constitution of civil Society* (Lond. 1798, 4th ed. 8vo):—*The Testimony of Natural Theology to Christianity* (London, 1818, 12mo):—*An Inquiry respecting Love as one of the divine Attributes* (Lond. 1828, sm. 8vo):—*Sermons* (Lond. 1808, 1809, and 1810, 3 vols. 8vo):—*A familiar Exposition of Colossians, in eight Sermons* (London, 1816, 12mo).—Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, i, 1267; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 675; Whewell, *History of Moral Philosophy in England*, lect. xi; *Gen. Magazine*, June, 1846.

**Gischälā** (גִּשְׁחָלָא) a small city (πολιχνία) often mentioned by Josephus in his account of the last struggle of the Jews with the Romans, especially as being the scene of the operations of the famous "John (q. v.) of Gischala" (*War*, iv, 1, 5). It was situated in Galilee (*ib.* ii, 1); and, after having been destroyed by the Jewish zealots, it was rebuilt by John (*ib.*, 10), and further fortified by the advice of Josephus himself (*War*, ii, 20, 6), and was the last stronghold of Galilee captured by Titus (*ib.* iv, 2). It is doubtless the *Gush Chalab* (גִּשְׁחָלָא) of the Talmud (*Menach.* viii, 3), famed for its oil (*Erach.* ix, 6), named in connection with Meron and Capernaum (Gemara, *Pesachim*, fol. 33, a), and also by Peter Apolloniarius (*De exciv. Hierosol.* p. 63). Jerome, on several occasions, states a tradition that the parents of the apostle Paul emigrated thence to Tarsus (Reland, *Palæst.* p. 813).

The same Hebrew name likewise occurs in Hottinger (*Cippi Hebræici*, p. 56) and in Benjamin of Tudela (p. 108). Schwarz erroneously identifies it (*Palæst.* p. 198) with the AHLAB (q. v.) of the tribe of Asher (Judg. i, 31). Dr. Robinson found the site in the modern *El-Jish*, on a hill about two hours north-west of Safed; the village had recently been totally destroyed by an earthquake, but was then partly rebuilt (*Researches*, iii, 368 sq.).

**Gislebert**. See GILBERT.

**Gislebertus Porretanus**. See GILBERT.

**Gis'pa** (Heb. *Gishpa'*, גִּשְׁפָּא, *flattery or hearkening*; Sept. Γεσπάς, Vulg. *Gaspā*), one of the two overseers of the Nethinim in Ophel at Jerusalem, after the captivity (Neh. xi, 21); but whether he was himself also of that class is not stated, although this is probable from the fact that his associate Ziba was (Ezra ii, 43). B.C. 446.

**Gitta** (גִּתָּא), a town of Samaria, mentioned by Justin Martyr (*Apol.* ii), Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* i, 13), Zonarus (from Justin, xi, p. 567), Theodoret (*Compend. heret. fab.* i), and by Epiphanius (*adv. Har.* p. 55) and Athanasius (*Hist. Eccles.* p. 15), as the birth-place of Simon Magus; thought by some to be the GATH (q. v.) of Scripture (Reland, *Palæst.* p. 813, 814), but discovered by Robinson (*Researches*, iii, 144) in the modern *Kuryet-Jit*, a village rather more than two hours west of Nablus (comp. Schwarz, *Palæst.* p. 134).

Another Gitta (Γιτῶ) is mentioned by Josephus (*War*, i, 17, 2) as a fortress at Machærus (q. v.).

**Git'tah-he'pher** (Heb. *Gittah'-Ché'pher*, גִּתְּתָהּ פֶּהֶר, Sept. Γετῆαίηρο, Vulg. *Gethhepher*), a prolonged form (Josh. xix, 13) of the name GATH-HEPHER (q. v.).

**Gitta'im** (Heb. *Gittā'im*, גִּתְּתַיִם, *two wine-presses*; Sept. Γετῆαίρη and Γετῆαίρη), a place incidentally mentioned in 2 Sam. iv, 3, where the meaning appears to be that the inhabitants of Beeroth, which was allotted to Benjamin, had been compelled to fly from that place, and had taken refuge at Gittaim. Beeroth was one of the towns of the Gibeonites (Josh. ix, 17); and the cause of the flight of its people may have been Saul's persecution of the Gibeonites alluded to in 2 Sam. xxi, 2; although the above text seems to intimate that the flight was through consternation at the death of Abner, and fear of vengeance for the murder of Ishboeth. See BEER. The inhabitants, doubtless, soon returned. Gittaim is again mentioned in the list of places inhabited by the Benjamites after their return from the captivity, with Ramah, Neballat, Lod, and other known towns of Benjamin to the north-west of Jerusalem (Neh. xi, 33).—Smith, s. v. Schwartz (*Phys. Descr. of Palæst.* p. 134) identifies Gittaim with *Rameh* (ARIMATHÆA) on the strength of certain Jewish traditions; which is not impossible, since Lydda was occupied by the Benjamites, and other associated cities seem to have been located in this neighborhood. See LOD; HADID.

"Gittaim occurs in the Sept. version of 1 Sam. xiv, 35.—'Out of Gethaim roll me a great stone.' But this is not supported by any other of the ancient versions, which unanimously adhere to the Hebrew text, and probably proceeds from a mistake or corruption of the Heb. word גִּתְּתַיִם; A. V. 'ye have transgressed.' It further occurs in the Sept. in Gen. xxxvi, 35, and 1 Chron. i, 46, as the representative of AVTH, a change not so intelligible as the other, and equally unsupported by the other old versions" (Smith, s. v.).

**Gittin**. See TALMUD.

**Git'tite** (Heb. *Giti'*, גִּתִּי; Sept. Γεθαίος), an inhabitant or native properly of the Philistine city GATH (Josh. xiii, 3). Obed-Edom, in whose house the ark was for a time placed (2 Sam. vi, 10), and who afterwards served in Jerusalem (1 Chron. xvi, 8), although

a Levite (1 Chron. xxvi, 4), is called a Gittite (2 Sam. vi, 10), possibly because he had been with David when at Gath, but much more probably from his being a native of GATH-RIMMON, which was a city of that family of the Levites to which he belonged (Josh. xxi, 24). There seems to be no reason for extending this interpretation to Ittai (2 Sam. xv, 19), seeing that David expressly calls him "a stranger" (foreigner), and, what is more, "an exile." He was at the head of 600 men, who were also Gittites, for they are called (ver. 20) his "brethren." They appear to have formed a foreign troop of experienced warriors, chiefly from Gath, in the pay and service of David, which they had perhaps entered in the first instance for the sake of sharing in the booty obtainable in his wars.—Kitto, s. v. See CHERETHITE.

**Git'tith** (Heb. *Gittith'*, גִּתִּיתִּי, prob. for גִּתִּיתִּי, and so kindred with NEGOTHI), a stringed instrument of music (Psa. viii, 1; lxxxii, 1; lxxxiv, 1). The term is not to be derived (with the Targums) from the city GATH, nor (with the Sept. *ὑπερ τῶν Ἀφῶν*) from a wine-press (as a *vintage-song*, Michael. *Suppl.* p. 382); but from the root גִּת, to strike (Redslob, *De præcepto Mus.*, etc., Lips. 1831, p. 24), Gesenius, *Thest. Hebr.* p. 849. On the other hand, Fürst (*Concord.* p. 256) derives it from גִּתִּי, to depen, and calls it "a musical instrument curved and hollow (syn. גִּתִּי);" whereas in his *Heb. Lex.* p. 304, he says it is the name of "a musical body of Levites who had their chief seat in the Levitical city of Gath-rimmon, the word in the titles of Psalms not being capable of an interpretation referring to instruments or airs." See PSALMS.

**Gizoh.** See GIZONITE.

**Gi'zonite** (Heb. with the art. *hag-Gizoni'*, הַגִּזּוֹנִי; Sept. ὁ Γίζωνίτης v. r. Γωζίνι, Vulg. *Gezonites*), an inhabitant of GIZOH (Heb. *Gzoh'*, גִּזּוֹה, perhaps *quarry*), a place unknown except as the residence of Hashem, the ancestor of two of the sons of David's warriors (1 Chron. xi, 34). As these are called *Hararites* (i. e. "mountaineers") in this as well as the parallel passage (2 Sam. xxiii, 32, 34), we may perhaps infer that the city in question was situated somewhere in the mountains of Judah. The conclusion of Kennicott, who examines the passage at length, is that the name should be *Gomai*, a proper name, and not an appellative (*Dissert.* p. 199-203). See GUNI.

**Gizrite.** See GEZRITE.

**Glagolita, Glagolitz, Glagolites** (derived from the Slavonic *Glagol*, a word), "an ancient Slavonic alphabet, principally used in several Roman Catholic dioceses of Istria and Dalmatia, in the psalms, liturgies, and offices of the Church. The use of this liturgy was confirmed to the priesthood by a bull of pope Innocent IV, 1248. Of the antiquity of this alphabet the savans have maintained a great variety of opinions. Dobrowsky laid the foundation of a critical investigation of the subject, and has been followed by Kopitar, Jacob Grimm, Ivan Preis, Schafarik, etc. In former times the invention was sometimes ascribed to St. Jerome; while the Orientals, according to Neale, consider it as a mere corruption and Latinization of the Cyrillic alphabet. According to the recent researches of Schafarik, it was invented by Cyril, and is, consequently, older than what is now called the Cyrillic alphabet (Kyrillischer), the author of which was bishop Clement of Welitza (died 916). Grimm found in some Glagolitic letters Runic characters. The *Glagolitic literature* embraces all South Slavonic works which are written in the Glagolitic alphabet. According to language and form of the letters, two periods may be distinguished—an earlier and a later one. Among the important documents of the earlier period which are still extant are a Glagolitic manuscript of the 11th

century, belonging to count Kloz, published by Kopitar under the title *Glagoliti Clozianus* (956 lines, Vienna, 1836); a gospel which in 1736 was brought by J. S. Assemani from Jerusalem to Rome, is preserved there in the Vatican, but is not yet printed; the *Abecedarium Bulgaricum*, at Paris (published in the *Nouveau traité de diplomatique* [Paris, 1750], and more fully by Kopitar in the *Glagolita Clozianus*); a gospel which Victor Gregorovich, of Kasan, purchased on Mount Athos (fragments in Miklosich's *Slavic Library* [Vienna, 1857, vol. i]). The resemblance between the language of these documents and the language of the Old-Slavonic documents written in the Cyrillic alphabet, is the greater the more ancient the latter are. The younger period of the Glagolitic literature embraces the translations into the South Slavonic dialects of the New Testament by Primus Truber (about the middle of the 16th century), of the whole Bible by Dalmatin (Witten. 1584), of the Augsburg Confession, of the Catechisms of Luther, etc. In some of these works partly the Glagolitic and partly the Cyrillic alphabet was used." (See Dobrowsky, *Glagolitica* [Prague, 1807]—who puts the origin of the Glagolitic alphabet erroneously in the 13th century; Höfler and Schafarik, *Glagolitische Fragmente* [Prague, 1856]; Schafarik, *Ueber Ursprung u. Heimath des Glagolitismus* [Prague, 1858]; Sillem, *Primus Truber* [Erlangen, 1861]. The Glagolitic alphabet is given in Bagster's *Bible of Every Land*, p. liv).—*Allym. Real-Encyclop.* s. v.: Neale, *Holy Eastern Church, Introduction*, ii, 823. (A. J. S.)

**Glanvil, Joseph**, an eminent English divine and philosopher, was born at Plymouth in 1636. He graduated at Exeter College, Oxford, in 1655, and in 1656 he removed to Lincoln College, where he took his degree of M.A. in 1658. Although a friend of Baxter, at the Restoration he conformed to the Church; he also became a convert to the principles of the Baconian philosophy; and when he had just entered his twenty-fifth year he wrote a treatise in defense of them, under the title of *The Vanity of Dogmatizing, or Confidence in Opinions*, with *An Apology for Philosophy* (1661, 12mo). About this time he entered into orders, and was presented to the rectory of Wimbish and to the vicarage of Frome-Selwood. In 1662 he published *Lux Orientalis, or an Inquiry into the Opinion of the Eastern Sages concerning the Pre-existence of Souls* (12mo). In 1665 he published *Sceptis Scientifica, or Confessed Ignorance the Way to Science*, a modified edition of *The Vanity of Dogmatizing* (4to). It was dedicated to the Royal Society, of which he was now chosen a member. Tennemann remarks that in this treatise Glanvil enlarged with ability on the causes of doubt, and applied them to the different departments of science, more particularly the discoveries in physics effected in his own time. His remarks on Causality, in which he coincides with those of Algazel, and appears to have forestalled Hume, deserve especial attention. "We do not," says he, "detect the existence of any cause immediately by sensational or intuitional perception, but only by mediate representations, and therefore by inference, which may be erroneous." The credit which he had acquired by his writings encouraged him in 1666 to deliver his sentiments upon the subject of witchcraft, the existence of which he endeavored to defend in *Some Philosophical Considerations touching the Being of Witches and Witchcraft* (Lond. 1666, 4to), an enlarged edition of which was published by Henry More under the title *Sudducismus Triumphans* (Lond. 1682, 8vo). He wrote also *Essays on Subjects in Philosophy and Religion* (Lond. 1676, 4to):—*Essay concerning Preaching* (London, 1678, 12mo), and other smaller works. About this time he was presented to the rectory of the Abbey Church at Bath. He died of fever Nov. 4, 1680. After his death a volume of his *Discourses, Sermons, and Remains* appeared, edited by Dr. Horneck, who wrote a eulogy upon him.—Hook, *Ecol. Biog.* v, 325; Tennemann, *Manual Hist. Philos.* § 343;

Bayle, *General Dict.* v, 435; Lecky, *History of Rationalism*, i, 121 sq.

**Glaphyra** (Γλαφύρα, *elegant*), daughter of Archelaus, king of Cappadocia; married to Alexander, son of Herod the Great (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 1, 2). She quarrelled with Salome (*ib.* xvii, 7, 2), who, in revenge, fomented Herod's jealousy against Alexander (*War*, i, 24, 2, 3), which eventuated in the death of the latter. See ALEXANDER 9. She remained faithful to her husband (*Ant.* xvi, 10, 7), and after his execution she returned to her father (17, 1), although her two sons by Alexander were brought up by Herod (*ib.* 2). She afterwards married Juba, king of Lydia, and at his death again returned to her father, but subsequently married Herod Archelaus, who divorced for her sake his former wife Mariamne, but she soon died, in accordance with a dream in which her first husband reproached her for her repeated inconstancy (*ib.* xvii, 13, 4).

**Glareanus**, HEINRICH LORITI, was born at Molis, in the canton of Glarus (hence his name), in Switzerland, June, 1488; studied philosophy, belles-lettres, and theology at Rottweil and Cologne, and in 1512 became poet laureate of the emperor Maximilian I. He took part in the controversies between Reuchlin and the old-school systems; went to Basel in 1514, to Italy in 1515, and in 1517 visited Paris, where he gave private instruction in the classics; returning afterwards to Basel, he opened a school there. He showed himself at first favorable to the principles of the Reformation, but abandoned them afterwards; and when Protestantism gained Basel, he retired with Erasmus to Freiburg, where he became professor of literature and history. He gave up this situation in 1560, and died March 27, 1563. Glareanus was a very learned man, and especially in the theory and history of music. His *Dodecachordon* (Basel, 1547) is valuable as a picture of the state of music in his age.—H. Schreiber, *Lebensbeschreibung* (Freib. 1837); Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, s. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, v, 165. (J. N. P.)


**Glas or Glass**, JOHN, founder of the sect of Glassites, was born at Auchtermutty, Sept. 21, 1695. He was educated at St. Andrew's, and in 1719 became minister of Tealing. In 1727 he published a book to prove that Church establishments are inconsistent with the Gospel, for which he was deposed by the General Assembly. He imbibed a number of other peculiar opinions and gathered followers, who were called by his name in Scotland, but in England and America they were denominated Sandemanians. Glas died at Dundee in 1773. His works were published at Edinburgh in 4 vols. 8vo, and in a second edition at Perth (1782, 5 vols. 8vo). Among the most celebrated members of the sect was Michael Faraday. For the peculiar opinions of the sect, see SANDEMANIANS.

**Glass** (the material is perhaps denoted by זְכֵקִיתִי, *zekukithi*, rock "crystal," Job xxviii, 17; ἱάλαος, *crystal*, "glass," Rev. xxi, 18, 21; and hence the adj. βάλαρος, *crystalline*, "of glass," Rev. iv, 6; xv, 2 [see CRYSTAL]; the instrument or looking-glass by ἱγύλα, *gillayal*, a tablet, "roll," Isa. vii, 1; "glass," i. e. *mirror*, Isa. iii, 23; מַרְאֵה, *marah'*, a "vision," as usually rendered; "looking-glass," Exod. xxxviii, 8; ἑσπαστρον, a *mirror*, "glass," 1 Cor. xii, 12; Jas. i, 23 [see MIRROR]), according to Pliny (*H. Nat.* xxxvi, 26), was discovered by what is termed accident. Some merchants kindled a fire on that part of the coast of Phœnicia which lies near Ptolemais, between the foot of Carmel and Tyre, at a spot where the river Belus casts the fine sand which it brings down; but, as they were without the usual means of suspending their cooking vessels, they employed for that purpose logs of nitre, their vessel being filled with that substance: the fire fusing the nitre and the sand produced glass.

He proceeds to state that the Sidonians, in whose vicinity the discovery was made, took it up, and, having in process of time carried the art to a high degree of excellence, gained thereby both wealth and fame; other nations became their pupils; the Romans especially attained to very high skill in the art of fusing, blowing, and coloring glass; finally, even glass mirrors were invented by the Sidonians. This account of Pliny is in substance corroborated by Strabo (xvi, 15) and by Josephus (*War*, ii, 9). But this account is less likely than the supposition that vitreous matter first attracted observation from the custom of lighting fires on the sand "in a country producing natron or subcarbonate of soda" (Rawlinson's *Herod.* ii, 82). It has been pointed out that Pliny's story may have originated in the fact that the sand of the Syrian river Belus, at the mouth of which the incident is supposed to have occurred, "was esteemed peculiarly suitable for glass-making, and exported in great quantities to the workshops of Sidon and Alexandria, long the most famous in the ancient world" (Smith, *Dict. of Class. Ant.* s. v. Vitrum, where everything requisite to the illustration of the classical allusions to glass may be found). Some find a remarkable reference to this little river (respecting which, see Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* v, 17; xxxvi, 65; Josephus, *War*, ii, 10, 2; Tacitus, *Hist.* v, 7) in the blessing to the tribe of Zebulun, "they shall suck of the abundance of the seas, and of treasures hid in the sand" (Deut. xxxiii, 19). Both the name Belus (Reland, *Palast.* p. 267) and the Hebrew word בִּלְיָהוּ, "sand," have been suggested as derivations for the Greek ἱάλαος, which is, however, in all probability, from an Egyptian root. See BELUS. Some suppose that the proper name בִּרְיָהוּ:בִּרְיָהוּ (—"burnings by the waters'") contains an allusion to Sidonian glass-factories (Meier on Jos. xi, 8; xiii, 6), but it is much more probable that it was so called from the burning of Jabin's chariots at that place (Lord A. Hervey, *On the Genealogies*, p. 228), or from hot springs. See MISREPHOTH-MAIM.

Yet, notwithstanding the above explicit statement, it was long denied that the ancients were acquainted with glass properly so called; nor did the denial entirely disappear even when Pompeii offered evidences of its want of foundation. Our knowledge of Egypt has, however, set the matter at rest. Wilkinson, in his *Ancient Egyptians* (iii, 88 sq.), has adduced the fullest evidence that glass was known to and made by that ingenious people at a very early period of their national existence. Upwards of 3500 years ago, in the reign of the first Osirtasen, they appear to have practised the art of blowing glass. The process is represented in the paintings of Beni-Hassan, executed in the reign of that monarch. In the same age images of glazed pottery were common. Ornaments of glass were made by them about 1500 years B.C.; for a bead of that date has been found, being of the same specific gravity as that of our crown glass. Many glass bottles, etc., have been met with in the tombs, some of very remote antiquity. Glass vases were used for holding wine as early as the Exode. In Egypt they had the advantage not only of an earlier application to the art, but also of a peculiar earth, which appears to have been necessary to the production of some of the more valuable and brilliant kinds of glass (Beckman, *History of Inventions*, "Colored Glass," i, 195 sq., Eng. transl.; also iii, 208 sq.; iv, 54). Yet the perfectly clear and transparent glass was considered the most valuable (Pliny, xxxvi, 26). Indeed, a great part of the glass-ware used at Rome about the Christian æra and subsequently came from Alexandria; and the emperor Hadrian was presented by an Egyptian priest with some vases which were reckoned so fine that they were produced only on grand occasions (Strabo, l. xvii; Vopiscus in *Vita Saturnini*, c. 8). Wilkinson states respecting the Egyptians, "Such was their skill





Ancient Egyptian Glass-blowers: 1, from the monuments at Beni-Hassan; 2, from Thebes. The glass at the end of the blow-pipe *b b* is colored green; *a* is the fire; *d*, a glass bottle.

in the manufacture of glass, and in the mode of staining it of various hues, that they counterfeited with success the amethyst and other precious stones, and even arrived at an excellence in the art which their successors have been unable to retain, and which our European workmen, in spite of their improvements in other branches of this manufacture, are still unable to imitate. For not only do the colors of some Egyptian opaque glass offer the most varied devices on the exterior, distributed with the regularity of a studied design, but the same hue and the same devices pass in right lines directly through the substance; so that in whatever part it is broken, or wherever a section may chance to be made of it, the same appearance, the same colors, and the same device present themselves, without being found ever to deviate from the direction of a straight line, from the external surface to the interior" (*Ancient Egypt*, iii, 193). Winkelmann is of opinion that glass was employed more frequently in ancient than in modern times. It was sometimes used by the Egyptians even for coffins, and in wainscoting ("vitrea camera," *Hist. Nat.* xxxvi, 64; *Stat. Sylv.* i, v,




Glass Bottles and Jugs. From the Tombs of Egypt.  
"III.—K κ κ

42). They also employed it not only for drinking utensils and ornaments of the person, but for mosaic work, the figures of deities, and sacred emblems, attaining to exquisite workmanship and a surprising brilliancy of color. Their imitation of precious stones in a manner which often defied detection (Pliny, *Hist. Naturalis*, xxxvii, 26, 33, 75) is probably the explanation of the incredibly large gems which we find mentioned in ancient authors; e. g. Larcher considers that the emerald column alluded to by Herodotus (ii, 44) was "du verre coloré, dont l'intérieur était éclairé par des lampes." The art, too, of cutting glass was known to them at the most remote periods; for which purpose, as we learn from Pliny (*Hist. Naturalis*, xxxvii, 4), the diamond was used. See EX-GRAVE.

The art of manufacturing glass was also known to the ancient Assyrians (Layard, *Ninur.* ii, 42), and a glass bottle was found in the north-west palace of Nimrūd which has on it the name of Sargon, and is therefore probably older than B.C. 702 (*id. Nin. and Bab.* p. 167). This is the earliest known specimen of transparent glass. Opaque colored glass was manufactured by the Assyrians at a much earlier period, and some specimens exist of the 15th century B.C. The Sargon vase had been blown in one piece, and turned and hollowed out afterwards. In the mounds of Babylon were likewise found small glass bottles, some colored, others ribbed and otherwise ornamented, and vases of earthen-ware of various forms and sizes, sometimes glazed with a rich blue color (*ib.* p. 429).



Glass Bottle from Nimrūd.



Glass Bottles and glazed Earthen-ware Vessel from the Mound of Bab. J.

Other glass vessels of the Roman period were elsewhere discovered (*ib.* p. 504). With the glass bowls was discovered a rock-crystal lens, which must have been used as a magnifying or burning-glass (*ib.* p. 167). In later times glass was abundant for similar purposes among the Romans, as is evident from the specimens disinterred from the ruins of Pompeii. See BOTTLE.

That glass was known to the Hebrews appears beyond a doubt; but whether they brought a knowledge of its manufacture with them out of Egypt, or learned it from their Sidonian neighbors, is uncertain. Whether they used it for mirrors is doubtful. In Job xxviii, 17, *זַכְּזִיקִים* is believed to mean glass, though it is ren-



Glass Vases from Pompeii.

dered "crystal" in the English version. It comes from  $\text{קָרִישׁ}$  (*to be pure*), and, according to the best authorities, means a kind of glass which in ancient days was held in high esteem (J. D. Michaelis, *Hist. Vitri apud Hebr.*; and Hamberger, *Hist. Vitri ex antiquitate eruta*, quoted by Gesenius, s. v.). Symmachus renders it  $\text{κρῶσταλλος}$ , but that is rather intended by  $\text{קָרִישׁ}$  (Job xxviii, 18, A. V. "pearls," Sept.  $\text{γάβρις}$ , a word which also means "ice;" comp. Pliny, *H. N.* xxxvii, 2) and  $\text{קָרִישׁ}$  (Ezek. i, 22). It seems, then, that Job xxviii, 17 contains the only allusion to glass found in the O. T., and even this reference is disputed. Besides Symmachus, others also render it  $\text{διαγῆ κρῶσταλλον}$  (Schleusner, *Thesaur.* s. v.  $\text{ἄλαος}$ ), and it is argued that the word  $\text{ἄλαος}$  frequently means crystal. Thus the Schol. on Aristoph. *Nub.* 764, defines  $\text{ἄλαος}$  (when it occurs in old writers) as  $\text{ἰαφανῆς λίθος ἰοικῶς ἄλαφι}$ , and Hesychius gives as its equivalent  $\text{λίθος τήριος}$ . In Herodotus (iii, 24) it is clear that  $\text{ἄλαος}$  must mean crystal, for he says,  $\text{ἢ ἔτι σφι πολλῆ καὶ ἐνέργος ὀρύσσεια}$ , and Achilles Tatius speaks of crystal as  $\text{ἄλαος ὀρωρυμένη}$  (ii, 3; Bähr, *On Herod.* ii, 44; Heeren, *Ideen*, II, i, 335). Others consider  $\text{קָרִישׁ}$  to be amber, or electrum, or alabaster (Bochart, *Hieroz.* II, vi, 872). In the New Testament the word employed is  $\text{ἄλαος}$  (compare Aristoph. *Nubes*, 768). In Rev. xxi, 18 we read, "The city was pure gold, like unto clear glass;" ver. 21, "as it were transparent glass" (compare iv, 6). Mention is made in Rev. iv, 6, and xv, 2, of a sea of glass like unto crystal, concerning the meaning of which interpreters vary; but it is probably an allusion to the *brazen sea* spoken of in 1 Kings vii, 23, and elsewhere, containing water for the priests to wash with, that they might not minister before God under any pollution. "Molten looking-glass" also occurs in Job xxxvii, 18; but the original  $\text{סֵפֶר}$ , *speculum*, and its corresponding word in Exod. xxxviii, 8, authorize the translation "mirror"—that is, of some metal. Indeed, Beekman (*Beiträge zur Gesch. der Erfindung*, iii, 319) erroneously denies that glass mirrors were known till the 13th century, adding that they are still seldom seen in the East. It is certain, however, that glass was not applied in ancient times to windows; when these were not, as they commonly were in the East, simply open apertures by day, with wooden doors placed on them by night, a kind of semi-transparent stone, a sort of talc, called *lapis specularis*, was generally used, and continued to be so for centuries after the Christian era. See WINDOW.

It is a singular fact, that although the ancients were aware of the reflective power of glass, and although the Sidonians used it for mirrors (Pliny, *H. N.* xxxvi, 66), yet for some unexplained reason mirrors of glass must have proved unsuccessful, since even under the Roman empire they were universally made of metal, which is at once less perfect, more expensive, and more difficult to preserve. See Smith, *Diet. of Class. Ant.* s. v. *Speculum*. Accordingly, the mirrors found in Egypt are made of mixed metal, chiefly copper. So

admirably did the skill of the Egyptians succeed in the composition of metals, that their mirrors were susceptible of a polish which has been but partially revived at the present day. The mirror was nearly round, having a handle of wood, stone, or metal. The form varied with the taste of the owner. The same kind of metal mirror was used by the Israelites, who doubtless brought it from Egypt. In Exod. xxxviii, 8, it is expressly said that Moses "made the laver of brass of the looking-glasses (brazen mirrors) of the women." In the East mirrors had a connection with the observances of religion; females held them before the images of the goddesses, thereby manifesting their own humility as servants of the divinities, and betokening the prevalence in private life of a similar custom (Callimach. *Hymn. in Pallad.* 21; Senec. *Ep.* 95; Cyril, *De Adorat. in Spir.* ii, 64). That in the New Testament a mirror is intended in James i, 23, "beholding his natural face in a glass," appears certain; but the other passage, in which the word  $\text{ἑσπῆρον}$  occurs (1 Cor. xiii, 12), seems to require an imperfectly transparent medium, through which objects are beheld. What the precise substance was which the apostle thought of when he used the words it may not be easy to determine. It could not well be ordinary glass, for that was transparent. It may have been the *lapis specularis*, or a kind of talc, of which the ancients made their windows. This opinion is confirmed by Schleusner, who says that the Jews used a similar mode of expression to describe a dim and imperfect view of mental objects (Schöttgen, *Hor. Heb.* ad loc.). (See Michaelis, *Hist. Vitri ap. Heb.* in *Comment. Soc. Goetting.* iv, 57; also Dr. Falconer on "the Knowledge of the Ancients respecting Glass," in the *Memoirs of the Lit. and Phil. Soc. of Manchester*, ii, 96; Becker's *Charicles*, i, 132; Michaelis, *Suppl.* p. 613; Pareau, *Comment. on Job xxviii*, p. 316; Hamberger, *Vitri Hist.*, in the *Comment. Soc. Gott.* 1754; Hirsch, *Geschichte d. Baukunst*, iii, 66.)—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See LOOKING-GLASS.

**Glass-painting** is of three kinds: (1) the *mosaic*, in which pieces of differently-colored glass are so cut out and arranged as to represent figures or scenes, the pieces being joined together with lead; (2) the *enamel*, in which the colors are laid on a plate of glass and then burnt in; and (3) the *mosaic-enamel*, which is a union of the two others, and is by far the most effective kind of glass-painting. The art probably had its origin in France or Germany during the tenth century. The mosaic style prevailed till the fourteenth century. Glass-painting reached its highest state in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. After the rise of the Renaissance architecture in the sixteenth century, glass-painting fell into decadence. It has been quite successfully revived during the last thirty years in Germany.—Warrington, *History of Stained Glass* (London, 1830); Wackernagel, *Geschichte der deutschen Glasmalerei* (Leipzig, 1855). (G. F. C.)

**Glass** or **Glassius**, SALOMO, a German theologian, eminent both for piety and learning, was born at Sondershausen, Thuringia, in 1593. He was educated at the universities of Wittenberg and Jena, and devoted himself at an early period specially to the study of Hebrew and its cognate languages. He became in 1637 professor of theology at Jena, and in 1640 was made superintendent of the churches and schools in Saxe-Gotha. In this office he acquitted himself with great zeal and success, laboring for the spiritual as well as intellectual well-being of the churches of the duchy. He died at Gotha July 27, 1656. His works are, *Philologia Sacra* (4to);—*Onomologia Messia Prophectica* (Jena, 1624, 4to);—*Disputationes in Augustanum Confessionem*;—*Eregetis Evangeliorum et Epistolatorum* (Gotha, 1647, 4to; Nuremberg, 1664, fol.);—*Christologia Mosaica* (Jena, 1649, 4to);—*Christologia Davidica* (Jena, 1638, 4to);—*Loci Theologici* (posthumous, Go-

tha, 1661, 8vo, and Jena, 1731, 8vo, with a preface on the Life and Writings of Glassius). The best edition of the *Philologia Sacra*, as Glass left it, is that of Leipzig, 1725, 4to; the edition of Dathe and Bauer (Lips. 1776-1797, 3 vols. 8vo) contains valuable additions by the editors, but is tainted with the vices of the low rationalistic period in which it appeared.—Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* v, 167 sq.; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xx, 795-6.

**Glastonbury**, "an ancient municipal burg and market-town in the county of Somerset, twenty-five miles south-west of Bath, is built in the form of a cross, and occupies a peninsula formed by the river Brue or Brent, called the Isle of Avalon. Pop. (1861) 3593. The town owes its origin to its celebrated abbey, which, according to tradition, was founded in A.D. 60, and was one of the earliest seats of Christianity in Britain. Its traditionary founder was Joseph of Arimathea, and the 'miraculous thorn,' which flowered on Christmas-day, was, till the time of the Puritans, believed by the common people to be the veritable staff with which Joseph aided his steps from the Holy Land. The tree was destroyed during the civil wars, but grafts from it still flourish in the neighboring gardens. In A.D. 605 the monks adopted the dress and rules of the Benedictine order. This magnificent pile at one time covered sixty acres; but as most of the houses in Glastonbury, and also a causeway across Sedgemoor, have been constructed of the materials, the extent of the ruins is now much diminished. The most interesting remains are the Abbey Church, with St. Joseph's Chapel, St. Mary's Chapel, and the Abbot's Kitchen. St. Joseph's Chapel is one of the most elegant specimens in existence of the transition from Norman to early English architecture, and is supposed to have been erected during the reigns of Henry II and Richard I. It is now roofless, and the vaulting of the crypt is nearly destroyed. The entrance is adorned with sculpture. Below the floor is a Norman crypt, within which is St. Joseph's Well. Of the Abbey Church few fragments remain. The Chapel of St. Mary is roofless, but the remains of its pointed windows and arches are exceedingly elegant. The Abbot's Kitchen, now separate from the rest of the ruins, is a square massive structure, the walls strongly buttressed, and dates from about the 15th century. Glastonbury has the honor of ranking St. Patrick (A.D. 415) and St. Dunstan among its abbots. In 1539 Henry VIII summoned abbot Whiting to surrender Glastonbury and all its treasures; and on his refusal, condemned him to be hanged and quartered, and the monastery confiscated to the king's use, which sentence was immediately carried into execution. According to tradition, king Arthur and his queen Guinever were buried in the cemetery of the abbey; and Giraldus Cambrensis states that 'a leaden cross, bearing the following inscription, "Hic jacet sepultus inclytus Rex Arthurus in insula Avallonia," was found under a stone seven feet below the surface, and nine feet below this was found an oaken coffin, containing dust and bones.' This disinterment took place by order of Henry II. The only other objects of interest at Glastonbury are the Church of St. Benedict; the Church of St. John the Baptist, with a tower 140 feet high; the Weary-all Hill, where Joseph of Arimathea rested from his weary pilgrimage; and the Tor Hill, where the last abbot of Glastonbury was put to death, 500 feet above the sea-level, crowned by a beautiful tower, the ruin of a pilgrimage chapel of St. Michael."—Chambers, *Encyclopædia*, s. v.

**Glatz**, JACOB, a Protestant clergyman of Hungary, was born in 1776 at Poprad, studied theology at the university of Jena, became in 1797 professor at Schepfenthal, in 1804 professor at the Protestant school of Vienna, in 1805 minister of the Lutheran congregation in the same city, resigned in 1826, and died in 1831 at Pressburg. He wrote numerous ju-

venile books, which appeared in many editions; also several pedagogical works. He edited the *Annalen der östreich. Literatur*, the *Evangelisch-christliche Gesangbuch*, and an agenda (*Kirchenagenda*) which was introduced into the Protestant congregations of Austria.—Wenrich, *J. Glatz, eine biograph. Skizze* (Vienna, 1834). (A. J. S.)

**Glean** (prop. גִּלְעָן, *lakal'*, spoken of grain, Ruth ii, elsewhere for "gather" field crops generally, Lev. xix, 9; xxiii, 22; also גִּלְעָן, *alal'*, Lev. xix, 10; Deut. xxiv, 21; Judg. xx, 45; Jer. vi, 9; properly spoken of grape gleanings, Judg. viii, 2; Isa. xvii, 6; xxiv, 13, etc.; and figur. of a small remnant, Jer. xlix, 9; Obad. i, 5; Mic. vii, 1). See CORNER. The law of Moses directed a liberal treatment of the poor at the seasons of harvest and ingathering. See HARVEST. The corners of the field were not to be reaped—the owner was not to glean his own fields—and a sheaf accidentally left behind in the field was not to be fetched away, but left for the poor. There are equally liberal regulations respecting vineyards and olive-yards (Lev. xix, 9, 10; Deut. xxiv, 19, 21). Hence the proverb of Gideon (Judg. viii, 2). The privilege of gleaning after the reapers was conceded not as a matter of right, but as a favor granted to particular persons whom the owner wished to befriend. It did not, however, require any special interest to obtain this favor, for Naomi could scarcely have suggested it in the first instance, and Ruth might hence have hesitated to apply for it to a stranger, "the servant that was set over the reapers." On two occasions Dr. Robinson speaks of witnessing interesting illustrations of harvest scenes similar to those in Ruth (*Researches*, ii, 371, 384), and in the latter he says he frequently saw the process of women beating out with a stick handfuls of grain which they seem to have gleaned (*ib.* note). In the case of Boaz, young women, recognised as being "his maidens," were gleaning in his field, and on her claim upon him by near affinity being made known, she was bidden to join them and not go to any other field; but for this, the reapers, it seems, would have driven her away (Ruth ii, 6, 8, 9). Maimonides lays down the principle (*Constitutions de donis pauperum*, cap. ii, 1) that whatever crop or growth is fit for food, is kept, and gathered all at once, and carried into store, is liable to that law. (See also Maimon. *Constitutions de donis pauperum*, cap. iv.) With regard to the vintage, what fell to the ground (גִּלְעָן, Lev. xix, 10), or was left after the general gathering, belonged to the poor (*Peah*, vii, 3); hence any one placing a vessel under the tree to catch what might accidentally fall was held to defraud the poor (Surenhusius, *Mishna*, i, 56). See POOR.

**Glebe**, in England the soil ("gleba," clod), meadow, or pasture belonging to a parsonage besides the tithes. Glebe-house is the common designation in Ireland of the parsonage.

**Glede**, the old English name for the common kite (*milvus ater*), occurs only in Deut. xiv, 13 (רָאֵךְ, *raah'*) among the unclean birds of prey. But in the parallel passage, Lev. xi, 14, we find דָּאֵךְ, *daah'*, "vulture." That this difference has arisen from a permutation of the ר and the ד is evident, but which is the original form of the word is not certain. Bochart decides (*Hieroz.* ii, 191) for *daah* on the ground that, assuming the bird to be the kite or glede, it is more probable that it would receive its name from דָּאֵךְ, to fly swiftly than from רָאֵךְ, to see; while others, presuming that it is the vulture, prefer the latter derivation, and the reading, consequently, *raah*, on account of the sharp sikt of these birds. But both these qualities are marked traits of the vulture as well as the kite. Thus far the evidence is therefore equal, nor do the versions help us to a decision; for while the Sept. gives in

both passages  $\gamma\psi\psi$ , vulture, the Vulg. has *milvus*, kite, in both. The Codex Samar., however, reads  $\text{מִלְוִן}$  in Deut. xiv, 13, which favors the supposition that this is the proper reading; but it still remains uncertain whether by this term we are to understand the glede or the vulture. The A. V. makes it the one in the one passage and the other in the other. As the  $\text{מִלְוִן}$  is distinguished from the  $\text{כַּיִת}$  (Deut. xiv, 13), and as the latter is probably one of the vulture genus (comp. Isa. xxxiv, 14), it is probable that the former belongs to the kites. The kite has, in comparison with its bulk, very long wings, and a forked tail extending beyond them.<sup>6</sup> It is a species that rises to a towering height, hangs apparently motionless in the sky, and darts down with immense velocity; but the legs and claws being weak, it is cowardly, and feeds upon carrion, fish, insects, mice, and small birds. About Cairo kites are particularly abundant, mixing with the carrion vultures in their wheeling flight, and coming in numbers to the daily distribution of food awarded them. But the question whether the kite of Europe and that of Egypt are the same species is not decided, though there is no want of scientific names for both species found in the valley of the Nile, one of which is certainly distinct from the European, and the other, if not so, is a strongly-marked variety. We find it no-



Egyptian Kite (*Milvus Egyptianus*).

tioned in various stages of plumage as *Milvus Ictinus*, *Milvus Eolius*, Savigny; *Falco Egyptianus* and *Falco Forskahl'i*, Gmelin; *Falco cinereo-ferrugineus*, Forskahl; *Falco Arda*, Savigny; probably, also, *Falco parasiticus*, Lath. The bill of this species is dark; head and throat whitish, with brown streaks; body above dark gray brown, pale ferruginous below; tail but slightly forked; legs yellow. It is found in hieroglyphic paintings, colored with sufficient accuracy not to be mistaken. The other species, which we figure below as *Milvus ater*, is the black kite, *Falco melanop-*



Common Kite (*Milvus Ater*).

*terus*, Daudin; *Elanus Cesius*, Savigny; *Falco Sowniensis*, Lath.; *Le Blac*, Le Vaill., and the *Kouhich* of the Arabs. It has the head, neck, and back dark rusty gray; scapulars bordered with rusty; wing-coverts and primaries black, the last-mentioned tipped with white; tail rusty gray above, white beneath; bill dark; legs yellow. The manners of both species are much the same: it is likely that they are equally abundant at Cairo, and spread into Palestine.—Kiito, s. v. Daah. See Hawk.

**Glendy, JOHN, D.D.**, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Derry, Ireland, June 4, 1755, and was educated in the University of Glasgow, where, after devoting some time to the study of theology, he was licensed and ordained. He subsequently accepted a call from the Church in Londonderry, where he remained till the Irish insurrection of 1798 obliged him to leave his native land. He arrived in Norfolk, Va., in 1799, and shortly after supplied the congregations of Staunton and Bethel, in Augusta Co., for nearly two years. He made the acquaintance of Washington and Jefferson, and was held in high estimation as a minister. In 1803 he was inducted as pastor of the Second Presbyterian congregation at Baltimore, and served the House of Representatives and the Senate as chaplain. He died Oct. 4, 1832. He published *An Oration in Commemoration of Washington, 1800:—A Prayer offered on the 4th of July, 1821.*—Sprague, *Annals*, iv, 229.

**Glenorchy, LADY WILHELMINA MAXWELL**, distinguished for her benevolence and piety, was born at Preston, Scotland, Sept. 2, 1741. Her early years, though sedulously watched over by her kind and intelligent mother, were nevertheless too much devoted to the follies and gayety of fashionable life. When she had attained the age of twenty-three years, her mind was aroused by a serious illness to reflections on her present character and future prospects; and musing on the first question in the Assembly's Catechism, "What is the chief end of man?"—"It is to glorify God, and enjoy him forever," she asked herself, Have I answered the design of my being? Have I glorified God? Shall I enjoy him forever? Thus reflecting, she gradually felt the sinfulness of her nature, perceived the total alienation of her heart from God, and applied to her heavenly Father through Christ for pardon and grace. The remainder of her life was distinguished by the consistency of her deportment. She employed much of her time in acts of benevolence; in wise and pious conversation; in an extensive, judicious, and profitable correspondence; and in every other means for promoting the conversion of sinners and the edification of saints. For such benevolent actions, she was called a Methodist, and represented as a wild enthusiast; but such opposition her principles enabled her patiently to endure, and, through evil and good report, to pursue her work of faith and labor of love. She was an intimate friend of Darcy Lady Maxwell, and, like her, a friend to Mr. Wesley and his preachers. In 1774 she opened a chapel in Edinburgh called "Lady Glenorchy's chapel," where Mr. Jones, of Plymouth, preached for over fifty years. She built also several places of worship in the country. Though her health declined, her activity and usefulness were unabated, till, on the 17th of July, 1786, she was summoned to her reward. She bequeathed, by her will, five thousand pounds for the education of young men for the ministry in England; five thousand pounds to the society in Scotland for the propagation of Christian knowledge; and the greatest part of the residue of her property to charitable and pious purposes. See *Memoirs of Lady Glenorchy*, in Burder's *Pious Women.*—Jones, *Christian Biography*; Jamieson, *Religious Biography*, p. 228; Stevens, *History of Methodism*.

**Gloria in Excelsis** ("Glory be [to God] on high"), the name of one of the most ancient doxologies of the Church. It is called *doxologia major*, to distinguish it

from the *Gloria Patri*; and is also called *hymnus angelicus* (the angelic hymn), because the first part of it was sung by the angels at Bethlehem. The latter portion is ascribed to Telesphorus, about A.D. 139; but this is doubtful. The whole hymn, with very little difference, is to be found in the Apostolical Constitutions, and was established to be used in the church service by the fourth Council of Toledo. It is used by both the Greek and Latin churches. "In the Eastern Church," says Palmer, "this hymn is more than 1500 years old, and the Church of England has used it, either at the beginning or end of the liturgy, for above 1200 years." In the Roman Missal it stands at the beginning of the Office for the Communion, as it does also in the first Common Prayer of king Edward VI, where it immediately follows the Collect for Purity. In the present prayer-book of the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church it stands after the communion, as it does also in the *Ritual* of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The Greek form of the hymn, as restored by Bunsen (*Analecta Antenicena*, iii, 87), is as follows: "Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις θεῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη, ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία. Αἰνούμεν σε, εὐλογοῦμέν σε, προσκυνούμεν σε· ἐχαραστούμεν σοὶ διὰ τὴν μεγάλην σου δόξαν. Κύριε βασιλεῦ ἐπουράνιε, θεὸς πατὴρ παντοκράτωρ· Κύριε ὁ θεός· Κύριε υἱὲ μονογενῆ· Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ· Ὁ ἀμὸς τοῦ θεοῦ· ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ πατρὸς· Ὁ αἶρον τὰς ἀμαρτίας τοῦ κόσμου· ἔλεησον ἡμᾶς· Ὁ αἶρον τὰς ἀμαρτίας τοῦ κόσμου· ἔλεησον ἡμᾶς, προσδέξαι τὴν δέησιν ἡμῶν· Ὁ καθήμενος ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ πατρὸς· ἔλεησον ἡμᾶς. Ὅτι σὺ εἶ μόνος ἅγιος· σὺ εἶ μόνος κύριος· Ἰησοῦς Χριστός· εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς. Ἀμήν." The English form: "Glory be to God on high, and on earth peace, good-will towards men. We praise thee, we bless thee, we worship thee, we glorify thee, we give thanks to thee for thy great glory, O Lord God, heavenly King, God the Father Almighty, O Lord, the only-begotten Son Jesus Christ; O Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us. Thou that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us. Thou that takest away the sins of the world, receive our prayer. Thou that sittest at the right hand of God the Father, have mercy upon us. For thou only art holy; thou only art the Lord; thou only, O Christ, with the Holy Ghost, art most high in the glory of God the Father. Amen."—Hook; Wheatly, *Common Prayer*, ch. vi, § 27; Palmer, *Orig. Liturg.* ii, 158; Procter, *On Common Prayer*, p. 353; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. xv, chap. iii; Daniel, *Thesaurus Hymnologicus*, ii, 267; *Evangelical Quar. Rev.* April, 1869, p. 250. See ANGELICAL HYMN; DOXOLOGY.

**Gloria Patri, Glory be to the Father**, one of the primitive doxologies of the Church, the *doxologia minor*. At first almost all the fathers had their own doxologies, which they expressed, as they had occasion, in their own language, ascribing "glory and honor" sometimes to the Father only, sometimes to the Son only, and sometimes to the Father through the Son. At the rise of the Arian heresy, "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost," became the standing form; to which the Western Church soon added, "As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen."—Wheatly, *Com. Prayer*, chap. iii, § 7; Palmer, *Orig. Liturg.* i, 219; Procter, *On Common Prayer*, p. 212, 215. See DOXOLOGY.

**Glorify**, (1.) to make glorious or honorable, or to cause to appear so, John xlii, 28; xliii, 31, 32; xv, 8; xvii, 4, 5; xxi, 19; Acts iii, 13. In this view it particularly refers to the resurrection of Christ, and his ascension to the right hand of God, John vii, 30; xii, 16. (2.) It also expresses that change which shall pass upon believers at the general resurrection, and their admission into heaven. (3.) To glorify God (1 Cor. vi, 20) is to "show forth his praise" by obedience to his law. Thus the "heavens declare the glory of

God" in obedience to the law of creation, and much more do moral and intellectual beings glorify him by willing obedience to the moral law (1 Cor. x, 31; John xvii, 4). See GLORY OF GOD.

**Glory**, in the English Version, usually represents the words כְּבוֹד, *kabod*, and δόξα. The Hebrew, from כָּבֵד, "to be heavy," is susceptible of the various *analogical* meanings which are derived from its root, viz. "to be hard," "honored," "rich," etc. The above Heb. and Gr. terms have the following applications: (1.) *Abundance, wealth, treasures*, rendered "honor" in Psa. xlviii, 12, and "glory" in Gen. xxxi, 1; Isa. x, 3; Matt. iv, 8; Luke iv, 6; Rev. xxi, 24, 26. (2.) *Honor, glory, dignity*, as in 1 Kings iii, 13; 2 Chron. i, 11, 12; Prov. viii, 18; Heb. ii, 7; 1 Pet. i, 24; 1 Cor. xi, 7. Spoken of God, as in Psa. xix, 1; xxxix, 1; Isa. xliii, 8; of persons in high honor (Isa. v, 13; 2 Pet. ii, 10; Jude 8). Also the *honor, glory*, of any one; poetically for the *mind, the heart*, as the noblest part of man (Gen. xlix, 6; Psa. vii, 5; xvi, 9; xxx, 12; lvii, 8; cviii, 1; Acts ii, 26). Some here assign the signification of "liver," but the liver is never (like the heart and reins) assumed as the seat of the mind and affections. (3.) *Splendor, brightness, glory, majesty*—"of all my glory," i. e. *splendor* (Gen. xlv, 13; Isa. iv, 5; xi, 10; xxii, 18; 1 Sam. ii, 8; Acts xxii, 11; 1 Pet. v, 4); "the glory of Lebanon," its magnificence, beauty (Isa. xxxv, 2; lx, 13). So of the sun, stars, etc. (1 Cor. xv, 40, 41); of Moses's face (2 Cor. iii, 7); also of the celestial light which surrounds angels (Rev. xviii, 1), or glorified saints (Luke ix, 31, 32; 1 Cor. xv, 43; Col. iii, 4). Spoken especially of the *glory, majesty, of Jehovah* (Isa. lix, 19; lx, 1; 2 Thess. i, 9; 2 Pet. i, 17; Rev. xxi, 11, 23), that *fiery* glory surrounded with dark clouds in which Jehovah is represented as appearing, or God himself as surrounded by this effulgence, from which lightnings proceed (Lev. ix, 23, 24; Numb. xvi, 35; Psa. xviii, 12), such as he manifested when he showed himself at Sinai to Moses and the people (Exod. xvi, 7, 10; xxiv, 17; xxxiii, 18; Lev. ix, 6, 23), or appeared in the tabernacle (Exod. xl, 34), or in the Temple (1 Kings viii, 11; 2 Chron. vii, 1, 2; compare Luke ii, 9; ix, 32; Acts vii, 55; xxii, 11), or was seen in prophetic visions (Isa. vi, 3; John xii, 41; Ezek. i, 28; viii, 4; x, 4, 18; xliii, 2, 4; xlv, 4; Rev. xv, 8; xxi, 11, 23). To this corresponds the SIEKINAH of the later Jews (Buxtorf's *Lexicon Chald. Talmud. et Rabbinicum*, col. 2394). God appears, too, in glory to punish transgressors (Lev. x, 2); and sinners are said to "provoke the eyes of his glory," i. e. of him as thus appearing in his glory for their punishment (Isa. iii, 8). Spoken also of the expected temporal reign of the Messiah (Mark x, 37; comp. Matt. xx, 21); and also of the glory of his second coming (Matt. xvi, 27; xix, 28; xxiv, 30; Mark xiii, 26; viii, 38; Luke ix, 26; xxi, 27; Titus ii, 13). (4.) Of internal character, i. e. glorious moral attributes. Spoken of God, *infinite perfection, divine majesty and holiness* (Psa. xix, 1; Isa. xl, 5; Acts vii, 2; Rom. i, 23; Eph. i, 17); so of the divine perfections as manifested in the *power of God* (John xi, 40; Rom. vi, 4; Col. i, 11), or in his *benevolence and beneficence* (Rom. ix, 23; Eph. i, 12, 14, 18; iii, 16). So of Jesus, as the *fulfillment of the divine perfections* (Heb. i, 3; John i, 14; ii, 11); also of the Spirit (1 Pet. iv, 14). (5.) Of that exalted state of blissful perfection which is the portion of those who dwell with God in heaven; e. g. spoken of Christ, and including also the idea of his regal majesty as Messiah (Luke xxiv, 26; John xvii, 5, 22, 24; 2 Thess. ii, 14; 1 Tim. iii, 16; 1 Pet. i, 11). Spoken of glorified saints, i. e. salvation, eternal life, etc. (Rom. ii, 7, 10; v, 2; viii, 18; 1 Cor. ii, 7; 2 Cor. iv, 17; 1 Thess. ii, 12; 2 Tim. ii, 10; Heb. ii, 10; 1 Pet. v, 1, 10). So to glorify, when spoken of God and Christ, is to render conspicuous and glorious the divine character and attributes of God as glorified by

the Son (John xii, 28; xiii, 31, 32; xiv, 13; xv, 8; xvii, 1, 4); of Christ as glorified by the Father (John viii, 54; xiii, 32; xvii, 1, 5; Acts iii, 13), or by the Spirit (John xvi, 14), or by Christians (John xvii, 10), or generally (Lev. x, 3; John xi, 4; xiii, 31).—Bastow, s. v. See GLORIFY.

Other terms less frequently rendered "glory," "glorious," etc., are: *גָּדְלוֹ*, *large*; *נִפְלְאוֹת*, *to swell*; *כְּבוֹד*, *honor*; *יְפִיאוֹת*, *beauty*, etc.; *κλέος*, *renown*; *καυχῆσθαι*, *to boast*. On these and the above, consult the Heb. and Gr. Lexicons.

We may be said to give glory to God when we confess our sins, when we love him supremely, when we commit ourselves to him, are zealous in his service, walk humbly, thankfully, and cheerfully before him, and recommend, proclaim, or set forth his excellencies to others (Matt. v, 16; John xv, 8; Gal. ii, 20). In Exod. viii, 9 we read, "And Moses said unto Pharaoh, Glory over me." The margin has for "glory" "honor," and for "over me" "against me." Pharaoh had besought Moses to pray that the Lord might take away the frogs, and Moses wished the king to have the honor and glory (in preference to himself) of appointing a time when he should thus pray to the Lord to take them away. This was not only complimentary to Pharaoh, but it would have a strong tendency to convince him that the Lord had heard the prayer of Moses, because he himself had appointed the time.

As man's real glory on earth consists in submitting to the will of God, and in doing it, so will his glory in heaven consist in being eternally pleasing to God, and in finding in him his perfect happiness. There can be no real glory, either in this world or in the next, aside from virtue. The glory we seek here consists in the esteem of our fellow-men, and it would never be a false or a dangerous glory if men were wise enough not to esteem anything but what is virtuous. Christ commands us to practice virtue, not in view of gaining the approbation of men, but to please God. At the first glance his instructions on this point may appear somewhat contradictory. He says: "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven (Matt. v, 16); then: Take heed that ye do not your alms before men, to be seen of them; otherwise ye have no reward of your Father which is in heaven. Therefore, when thou doest thine alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, that they may have glory of men. Verily I say unto you, they have their reward," etc. (Matt. vi, 1 sq.). But these passages are really not contradictory. Christ means that he does not want the desire of being admired and praised by men to be the motive of our good actions; but he wants us to do those good actions in order to edify our neighbors, to lead them by our example to the practice of virtue, so that they may glorify God, and not us. There is a great difference between these two motives: the first is very wrong, the second right and praiseworthy. We are consequently to keep secret our good actions, whenever an opposite course is not necessary for public edification; but when it is, then we are to let them be seen. St. Paul says: "Our rejoicing (or glory) is this, the testimony of our conscience that in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God, we have had our conversation in the world, and more abundantly to you-ward" (2 Cor. i, 12).

The word glory, in St. Paul's writings, has often been misunderstood. In speaking of the destiny of the Jews and Gentiles with regard to faith (Rom. ix, 22, 23), he says: "What if God, willing to show his wrath, and to make his power known, endued with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction; and that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory," etc. We do not think that

the word glory here refers to eternal glory, but rather to God's glory here below and to the glory of his Church; for God has really showed its riches in the virtues of those who have been called to faith. St. Paul uses the expression again in the same sense when he speaks (1 Cor. ii, 7) of "the hidden wisdom which God ordained before the world unto our glory," and when he says (Eph. i, 5, 6) that God predestined us for adoption "to the praise of the glory of his grace." So Augustine (*Enarr. in Psa. xxvii*, 3, and in *Psa. xxxix*, 4) understands these passages.—Bergier, *Dict. de Théologie* (Paris, 1854), iii, 139.

GLORY OF GOD. In numerous passages of Scripture it is said that God has done certain acts *for His own glory* (e. g. Isa. xlii) that man should glorify God (1 Sam. vi, 5; 1 Cor. vi, 20; x, 31, etc.). But how can man "glorify" the Supreme Being, who is absolutely glorious in holiness and perfection? To this question infidels answer that it is "absurd to suppose that God is a 'vain' being; that so insignificant a creature as man can bring to God any kind of pleasure or satisfaction; or that God would demand from man a fictitious 'glory' which he does not require, and by which he could not feel flattered without exhibiting weakness, and consequently imperfection." All this argument is based on the misconception of a word. It is in the nature of an intellectual and free being, like God, to act in view of a certain aim and motive. But God can have no higher aim, no object more worthy of himself, than to exert his perfections, his power, his wisdom, and especially his benevolence. Hence the creation of beings endowed with sense, intellect, and freedom, and susceptible of feeling affection, esteem, thankfulness, and obedience. God willed, as says St. Augustine, the existence of beings to whom he could manifest his love. Hence, also, God has established physical and moral laws, and made the happiness of reasonable beings to depend from their submission to these. President Edwards treats this point with profound insight. "It is," he says, "a thing infinitely good in itself that God's glory should be known by a glorious society of created beings. And that there should be in them an increasing knowledge of God to all eternity, is an existence, a reality infinitely worthy to be, and worthy to be valued and regarded by him to whom it belongs to order that to be which, of all things possible, is the fittest and best. If existence is more worthy than defect and nonentity, and if any created existence is in itself worthy to be, then knowledge or understanding is a thing worthy to be; and if any knowledge, then the most excellent sort of knowledge, viz. that of God and his glory. The existence of the created universe consists as much in it as in any thing; yea, this knowledge is one of the highest, most real, and substantial parts of all created existence, most remote from nonentity and defect. As there is an infinite fulness of all possible good in God, a fulness of every perfection, of all excellency and beauty, and of infinite happiness, and as this fulness is capable of communication or emanation *ad extra*, so it seems a thing amiable and valuable in itself that it should be communicated or flow forth, that this infinite fountain of good should send forth abundant streams, that this infinite fountain of light should, diffusing its excellent fulness, pour forth light all around—and as this is in itself excellent, so a disposition to this, in the Divine Being, must be looked upon as a perfection or an excellent disposition, such an emanation of good is, in some sense, a multiplication of it; so far as the communication or external stream may be looked upon as any thing besides the fountain, so far it may be looked upon as an increase of good. And if the fulness of good that is in the fountain is in itself excellent and worthy to exist, then the emanation, or that which is as it were an increase, repetition, or multiplication of it, is excellent and worthy to exist. Thus it is fit, since there is an infinite fountain of light

and knowledge, that this light should shine forth in beams of communicated knowledge and understanding; and as there is an infinite fountain of holiness, moral excellence, and beauty, so it should flow out in communicated holiness. And as there is an infinite fulness of joy and happiness, so these should have an emanation, and become a fountain flowing out in abundant streams, as beams from the sun. From this view it appears in another way to be a thing in itself valuable that there should be such things as the knowledge of God's glory in other beings, and a high esteem of it, love to it, and delight and complacency in it; this appears, I say, in another way, viz. as these things are but the emanations of God's own knowledge, holiness, and joy. Thus it appears reasonable to suppose that it was what God had respect to as an ultimate end of his creating the world, to communicate of his own infinite fulness of good; or, rather, it was his last end, that there might be a glorious and abundant emanation of his infinite fulness of good *al extra*, or without himself; and the disposition to communicate himself, or diffuse his own fulness, which we must conceive of as being originally in God as a perfection of his nature, was what moved him to create the world" (p. 219).

... "God and the creature, in this affair of the emanation of the divine fulness, are not properly set in opposition, or made the opposite parts of a disjunction. Nor ought God's glory and the creature's good to be spoken of as if they were properly and entirely distinct. This supposeth that God's having respect to his glory, and the communication of good to his creatures, are things altogether different; that God's communicating his fulness for himself, and his doing it for them, are things standing in a proper disjunction and opposition; whereas, if we were capable of having more full and perfect views of God and divine things, which are so much above us, it is probable it would appear very clear to us that the matter is quite otherwise, and that these things, instead of appearing entirely distinct, are implied one in the other—that God, in seeking his glory, therein seeks the good of his creatures. Because the emanation of his glory (which he seeks and delights in, as he delights in himself and his own eternal glory) implies the communicated excellency and happiness of his creatures. And in communicating his fulness for them, he does it for himself; because their good, which he seeks, is so much in union and communion with himself. God is their good. Their excellency and happiness is nothing but the emanation and expression of God's glory. God, in seeking their glory and happiness, seeks himself, and in seeking himself, i. e. himself diffused and expressed (which he delights in, as he delights in his own beauty and fulness), he seeks their glory and happiness" (*Dissertation on the End of God in Creation*, § 2, 3).

In thus manifesting his power, wisdom, holiness, and goodness, we say that God has established his "glory;" and so, also, when men acknowledge and worship these divine perfections, they "glorify" God. In this language there is nothing absurd or injurious to the divine majesty. In Scripture the object of divine revelation is stated sometimes to be the sanctification of man, sometimes the glory of God, as these are identical, whether considered from the divine or the human point of view. Moreover, it is an effect of the divine wisdom, holiness, and goodness, that man should find happiness in virtue, not in vice; in submission to the physical and moral laws established by God, not in violating them. And when man submits to these laws he glorifies God, since he renders homage to the divine perfections. Hence it cannot be wrong to say that the glory of God consists in the submission of all creatures to his law, and that the glory of all reasonable creatures consists in absolute submission to God. If we are to recognise the glory of God as one of his rights, as one of his regal prerogatives, it

takes *eo ipso* the form of a duty, which becomes obligatory for us. The heavens declare the glory of God, but they only declare it to reasonable beings, for the glory of God is only realized when its revelation is understood by moral beings, willingly received by them, and independently reflected. "*The Lord hath made all things for himself*" (Prov. xvi, 4). Not that he made "all things" for his own use, to supply his own wants, or to increase his own essential happiness, but that he made all in accordance with the requirements of his divine perfections, and so as better to manifest his glory. When the adversaries of Christianity reproach it with making God like unto man, supposing him vain, thirsting for praise and incense, they fall themselves into the very error which they denounce. They say: "If man seeks for glory, it is because he needs it; because he is weak; hence, if God seeks his own glory, it is also from need and weakness." This is pure sophistry: man is weak and poor because finite; God is self-sufficient because essentially happy and perfect; and it is on account of this very perfection that he acts for his glory, because he could not have any higher or more worthy aim.

"But," it is said, "to speak of 'glory' accruing from man to God is as if a nest of ants should imagine themselves working for the glory of some great king." This comparison is absurd. God did not need to create man, to give him laws, to promise him rewards and punishments, yet he has done so. No king could do this towards insects. It was not unworthy of God to create reasonable beings, neither is it any less worthy of him to take care of his creatures, to take an interest in their actions; the one is no more difficult for him than the other; it is all done by a simple act of his will. Philosophers may do their utmost to degrade man under pretence of rendering him independent, but there is implanted in man a feeling stronger than all their sophisms which assures him that he is the child of God, and that the grandeur of the supreme Being does not consist in a sort of philosophical pride and absolute indifference, but in the power and will to do good to all his creatures. It is one of God's great gifts to man that the creature finds his highest happiness, both for this world and the next, in working for the "glory" of his Maker. St. Paul says, 1 Cor. x, 31, "Whether, therefore, ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all for the glory of God." In this passage (compared with 1 Pet. iv, 11) we find the broad ethical law laid down, viz. all our actions should tend to the greater glory of God, which is done when every action does not merely conform to his commandment, but is really inspired by God the Holy Ghost. Chrysostom, in his New-Year sermon at Antioch (A.D. 387, on 1 Cor. x, 31), by a series of isolated examples, shows that the most insignificant things can be made to glorify God. This ethical doctrine has been distorted by the Roman Catholic Church, which substantially puts the glory of the Church in place of the glory of God.—President Edwards, *Works* (N. Y. 4 vols.), ii, 204 sq.; Farinon, *Sermons*, ii, 502; Beveridge, *Works*, v, 349; Tillotson, *Sermons*, xi, 29; Sharp (Abp.), *Works*, iii, 211; Dwight, *Theology*, i, 393; Bergier, *Dictionnaire de Théologie*, iii, 138; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* iii, 707 sq.

**Glory, Aureole, or Nimbus**, are names applied to rays, circles, or bodies of light placed around the heads (or the entire bodies) of Christ, angels, and saints in Christian art. The glory was first used in Egyptian art. From this it passed to the Grecian, and especially to the Roman. In both of these branches of classic art, it was used in both sculpture and painting to adorn the heads of deities, kings, and apotheosized emperors. In classic art the glory was mostly composed of gilded rays. (The disc used to protect the heads of statues from rain has been improperly considered by some to be the original, from which the glory of Christian art was copied.) In Christian art the glory was first used, as far as we know, in the glasses or

*patere* of the Catacombs, about the 3d century, being in them applied to the head of Christ. About the close of the 6th century it was first applied to angels, and to the apostles and saints.

The glory was used in ancient art to signify power and dominion. In this sense it was occasionally used in Christian art, as when it was placed around the head of Constantine, of the empress Theodora, around six heads of the beast of the Apocalypse, and even around that of Satan. But usually it signified holiness and purity. The oblong glory, or the "vesica piscis," envelops the whole person only in representations of Christ, the Virgin Mary, or other saints who are represented as ascending to heaven. The glory had many forms; thus it was a simple circle of light, or it contained a cross in the monogram A Ω or X P. It was sometimes applied to the head of a dove, a lamb, or other symbol of the Saviour.—Mrs. Jameson, *Sacred and Legendary Art*; Martigny, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités Chrétiennes*. (G. F. C.)

**Gloss, Glossary.** A *gloss* is a note appended to any word or phrase for the purpose of interpretation or illustration. "Sacred glosses" are such notes appended to words or phrases occurring in the Scriptures. A *glossary* is a collection of such explanatory notes properly arranged.

The word *gloss* is borrowed from the Greek γλῶσσα. But in the sense above explained it has no support from classical usage. The process, however, by which the word passed from its original meaning to that in which it was used by mediæval writers, and in which it is now used, may be traced. The Greek word γλῶσσα, meaning *tongue* or *speech*, came to be used by the Greek grammarians in the sense of a word requiring to be explained. In process of time words often become obsolete, or come to be used in senses different from those in which they were originally used; new words are introduced; and words frequently have special meanings attached to them of a professional or technical character, familiar only to a portion of the community. To the multitude such words need to be explained; and such words the Greek grammarians called γλῶσσαι. Thus Plutarch speaks of certain expressions in the poets which were not commonly understood, and which belonged to the idiotisms of particular regions or tribes, as τὰς λεγομένας γλῶσσας (*De audient. poet.* c. 6). Galen applies the same name to the antiquated words of Hippocrates, and explains the term thus: ὅσα τοίνυν τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐν μὲν τοῖς πάλαι χρόνος συνήθη ἢν νῦν δὲ οὐκ ἔτι ἴσται, τὰ μὲν τοιαῦτα γλῶσσαι καλοῦσι (*Exeg. Gloss. Hippocrat. Proem.*). Aristotle applies the same term to provincialisms (*De arte poet.* c. xxi, § 4-6; xxii, 3, 4, etc.). And, not to multiply quotations, a scholiast on Dion. Halicarn., quoted by Wetstein on 1 Cor. xii, 10, expressly says γλῶσσα· φωνὰ ἀρχαία καὶ ἀποξενισμενὰ ἢ ἐπιχωριζόμενα. Quintilian also says of the synonymous word *glossemata*, "Id est voces minus usitatas" (*Inst. Orat.* i, 8, 15; comp. also i, 1, 35).

The next step was from calling a word needing explanation a *gloss*, to apply this term to the explanation itself. These explanations at first consisted merely in adhibiting the word in common use (ὄνομα κίριον, Aristot.) to the obsolete and peculiar word; and thus the two viewed as one whole came to be called a gloss; and ultimately this name came to be given to that part which was of most interest to the reader, viz. the explanation.

These explanations constituted the beginnings of Greek Lexicography. They did not continue, however, to be merely lexical; they often embraced historical, geographical, biographical, and such like notices. Nor were they arranged at first in an alphabetical order; nor did they embrace the whole range of the language, but only such parts of it as the glossographer was interested in (hence such works as the Ἀπτικά Γλῶσσαι of Theodorus, etc.); nor were the words pre-

sented in their uninflected forms, but in the form in which they occurred in the course of the glossographer's reading. More methodical collections of these explanations began to be made in the Middle Ages, and such as have been preserved to us in the works of Hesychius, Suidas, Phavorinus, Zonaras, Photius, and in the *Etymologicum Magnum*.

I. The first class of extant scriptural glosses consists of explanations drawn from the Greek glossarists, a large number of the notes collected by whom are on words occurring in Scripture. Their works thus become valuable as exegetical aids, especially as they convey not the individual opinion of the collector so much as opinions which he had gathered from older writers. A *Glossarium Græcum in N. T.*, collected from these works, was published by Alberti in 1735. Valckenaer collected from Hesychius the explanations of scriptural words (*Opp.* i, 173 sq.); but this has been best done by J. Ch. Gottl. Ernesti, in his *Glossæ Sacræ Hesychii Græcæ*, etc. (Lips. 1785), which was followed by a similar collection from Suidas and Phavorinus, with specimens from the *Etymologicum Magnum* (Lips. 1786). These are extremely convenient books of reference. Comp. Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, iv, 540 sq.; Rosenmüller, *Histor. Interpr.* iv, 356 sq. Suicer's *Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus* (Amst. 1682, 1728, 2 vols. fol.) contains nearly all these explanatory words or glosses, and the most important of them are also usually in the best modern Greek Lexicons of the N. T.

II. The second class of glosses is due to the habit, as old perhaps as the art of writing itself, of readers inscribing on the margin of MSS. or books observations of their own, explanatory or otherwise of the text. This was especially the case with the sacred books, partly because after the establishment of Christianity they were more read than other books, partly because their contents gave abundant occasion for theological, historical, or philological annotation. Hence, from an early period, marginal notes intended to illustrate in some way the text came to have a place in the codices containing the sacred books. At first very brief, often confined to a single word, these glosses grew into more extended remarks, written in a smaller hand on the margin, and sometimes between the lines of the codex. In the ancient Hebrew codices these marginal notes were the source of not a few of the *Keri* readings; and the glosses on the margins of the codices of the Sept, and the N. T. have given rise to many of the various readings which exist in both of these. It is believed also, as marginal notes are apt to be transferred, by ignorant or careless copyists, into the text, that some such interpolations are to be found in the received text of the N. T., and it is considered to be one of the problems which criticism has to solve to detect these, and eliminate them. The exercise of a sound and cautious judgment, however, is required to preside over this, lest rash and unauthorized alterations be made (Valckenaer, *Dissert. de Glossis Sacris* [Franeq. 1737]; J. A. Ernesti, *De vero usu et indole Glossariorum Gr.* [Lug. Bat. 1742]; Tittmann, *De Glossis N. T. æstimandis et judicandis* [Wittenb. 1782]; Wassenb. *De Glossis N. T.*, prefixed to Valckenaer's *Scholia in Libros quosdam N. T.* [Amst. 1795]; Bornemann, *De Glossemat. N. T. caute diducendis*, in his *Scholia ad Luc. Evang.* 1830). It has been proposed to restrict the term *gloss* to the marginal annotations as such, and to use *glossemæ* to designate those which are supposed to have been introduced into the text; but the usage of writers is not uniform in this respect.

The longer marginal annotations (*Glossæ Marginales*) were made principally on the text of the Vulgate. These were of various kinds; some grammatical, some historical, some theological, some allegorical and mystical. The most famous collection of these is that made in the 9th century by Walafrid Strabo from the writings of Augustine, Ambrose, Jerome, Gregory, Isidore, Bede, Alcuin, and Rabanus Maurus, with addi-



tions by himself. This became the great exegetical thesaurus of the Middle Ages, and was known as the *Glossa Ordinaria*. Of notes written between the lines (*Glossa Interlineares*), a collection was made by Anselm of Laon in the beginning of the 12th century. Both these works were printed together about the end of the 15th century, 4 vols. fol.; they have often been reprinted since, with the commentary of Lyra. Other glossaries are those of Peter the Lombard on the Psalms (Par. 1535); of Hugo and S. Caro (*Postille in universa Biblia*, Ven. 1487, fol.)—Kitto, s. v.; Davidson in Horne's *Introd.* ii, 252; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* v, 188.

**Glosses and Glossatores** of the Roman and canon law. In the 12th century the Roman law, which after the downfall of the Western Roman empire had retained but little of its former importance, was again brought into notice, and studied with great zeal. The law school of Bologna, founded towards the end of the 11th century or the beginning of the 12th by Irnerius (Warnerius, Guarnerius), was the centre of this new movement. The reputation of the school and of its professors brought students from all parts of Europe to Bologna. The activity of the teachers did not confine itself to the expounding of the sources of the law, but also made these researches the foundation of a literary activity, and created a body of *Glossatores* (Glossarists), so called. The written interpretation of the *Corpus juris* appeared in the form of glosses, consisting sometimes in the explanation of some particular word or expression, sometimes in full and complete elucidations, and this sometimes between the lines of the text (*interlinear* glosses), sometimes on the margin (*marginal* glosses). Besides these the glossatores also wrote *summe*, reviews of the contents of some particular chapter of law; *casus*, real or imaginary cases intended as illustrations of particular points in connection with *questiones* and *distinctiones*; and also *brocarda* or *brocardica*, etc. (see Savigny, *Gesch. des Röm. R. i. Mittelalter*, iii, 537-574, 2d ed.). This literary activity of the glossatores of Roman law was an example for scientific treatment of canon law, which afterwards (in the 12th century) gave rise in Bologna and in Paris to lectures on the subject, and thus by the side of the legists rose the schools of the canonists, the decretists, and the decretalists. A number of the pupils and disciples of Gratian (q. v.) composed glosses (probably interlinear) on his *Decretum*. Among the oldest of these glossatores was Sicardus of Cremona, who was made bishop of Cremona in 1185. When the number of glosses in different MSS. became very great, it was naturally found expedient to collect and arrange them. This labor was undertaken by John Teutonicus, who wrote in 1212 a commentary on the *Decretum*, compiled from the glosses of his predecessors, and this *Apparatus*, augmented and improved by Bartholomew of Brescia about 1236, became the *Glossa ordinaria*; i. e. was indorsed by the school, appended to the MS. copies of the *Decretum*, and subsequently printed with it. Glosses on the collection of decretals of Gregory IX were written by Vincentius Hispanus (about 1240), Goffredus Tranensis († 1245), and Simbaldus Flisens, who afterwards sat on the pontifical throne (1243-54) under the name of Innocent IV. From these glosses Bernhard de Botono of Parma († 1266) compiled his *Apparatus*, which was also recognised as *glossa ordinaria*. Among the glossatores of the *Liber sextus* are to be named Johannes Monachus († 1313), Guido de Baysio, and Johannes Andrea († 1348). The glosses of the latter were originally written in his youth; he afterwards improved them, and they have been copied and printed as *glossæ ordinariæ*. He also wrote the first glosses on the *Clementines*, and they were also recognised as *glossæ ordinariæ*. Among the other glossatores of the same collection we remark Zenzelinus de Cassanis, a teacher of Toulouse, Johannes de Lignano, Petrus de Ancharano, Franciscus Zabarella († 1417), etc. The glosses on

the *Extravagantes* were the work partly of Gulielmus de monte Lauduno, and partly of Johannes Monachus. Those on the collection of John XXII were chiefly by Zenzelinus de Cassanis. The glosses have to this day great scientific value for the history of law. They have also exerted an important influence in the practice of the law. See Sarti, *De claris archigymnasiis Bonon. profess. vribus*, t. i, p. i, ii (Bonon. 1769, folio); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* v, 191. (J. N. P.)

**Gloucester**, a cathedral city of England, on the Severn, 107 miles northwest of London. The cathedral is of several different eras of ecclesiastical architecture, 427 feet in length, and 154 in width; the height of the central tower, its greatest external ornament, is 223 feet; the cloisters, also of great beauty, form a large square. Formerly the church of a Benedictine abbey, it was converted into a cathedral in 1541. Gloucester is the official residence of the bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, whose diocese embraces Gloucestershire, and parts of Somersetshire and Wiltshire. The diocese belongs to the province of Canterbury, and in 1869 had 13 deaneries, 459 benefices, 188 curates, and about 210,000 church sittings. The incumbent (1869) is Charles John Ellicott, D.D. (consecrated in 1863).

**Gloves**, part of the insignia of a bishop. See BISHOP.

**Glutton** (גִּלְטוֹן, *zolel'*, Deut. xxi, 20; Prov. xxiii, 21; a "riotous" person, Prov. xxiii, 20; xxviii, 7, i. e. prodigal, voluptuous debauchee; φαίλος, given to eating, "gluttonous," Matt. xi, 19; Luke vii, 34).

**Gnapheus** (or FULLONICUS), WILHELMUS, was born at the Hague in 1493. He was one of the earliest reformers in the Netherlands. He was rector of the school in his native place, and afterwards counsellor of the Margrave Albert of Brandenburg. He was a man of learning, and specially versed in Latin literature. He shared in the afflictions of his friends, Jan de Bakker or Pistorius, and Cornelis Hoon or Hoen, who became victims to Roman Catholic intolerance and persecution. Released from captivity, he was again seized and condemned to spend three months in a monastery on bread and water. He was permitted to see the cause of the Reformation prosper, and to enjoy the esteem and confidence of his countrymen. He died in 1568, at Norden, of which he was burgo-master. He wrote several works in Latin, which bear evidence of his familiarity with the writings of Erasmus. His most important work is his *Life of Johannes Pistorius*. It was probably written in 1526, and was published at Prasburg in 1529. Its title is *Joh. Pistorii Woerdensis, ob evangelicæ veritatis assertionem, apud Hollandos primò omnium exusti martyrium*. A new edition was brought out in 1649 by Prof. Reuis of Leyden. See Glasius, *Godegeleerd Nederland*, 1 D. blz. 531, 532; Ypeij en Dermot, *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk*, 1 D. blz. 104, Aanteek. blz. 40 (79); also, Harckenrothii *vite Gnaphei descriptio*, in *Bibl. Bremens. class.* viii, fasc. i, p. 111 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* xix, 566. (J. P. W.)

**Gnash** (גָּרַשׁ, *charak'*, to grate the teeth; βρῖχω, Acts vii, 54; τριζω, Mark ix, 18). "To gnash with the teeth," and "gnashing of teeth," are expressions that occur in several parts of Scripture, denoting rage or sorrow (Job xvi, 9; Psa. cxii, 10; Lam. ii, 16; Matt. viii, 12). See TOOTH.

**Gnat** (κίωνωψ, Vulgate *culex*, occurs only in Matt. xxiii, 24), a small two-winged stinging fly, belonging to the genus *culex* (Linn. *diptera*, Latroune *culicidae*), which includes the mosquitoes. The common gnat scarcely yields to any insect in regard to the interesting facts which it presents to the naturalist. The following outline will recall the chief of them to the reader: The boat-shaped *raft of eggs*, which the parent gnat forms and leaves upon the water, so admirably constructed that, though hollow, it neither becomes

filled with water, nor sinks even under the torrents of a thunder-shower; the aquatic larva, breathing, head downwards, through its *tufted spiracle*; its *hook* with which it seizes the animalcules on which it feeds; the variations and even *reverses of structure* it undergoes in the *pupa* state, now swimming, head upwards, by means of its finlike tail, and breathing through spiracles placed behind the *head*; the amazing transformation it undergoes when raising its shoulders out of the water, and upon the bursting of the skin which had enveloped them, the *perfect insect* emerges, its former covering now serving as a life-boat during those few critical moments while it disengages and trims its wings for flight, and commences its existence a winged creature in a new element, and instantly begins to suck the juices of animals or vegetables, while "its shrill horn its fearful larum rings;" the complicated mechanism of its *tube*, which serves the purposes both of lancet and cupping-glass, and of inserting a fluid for liquefying the blood, and making it flow more freely. The various organs, comprehended in so small a structure, excited the wonder of Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* xi, 2), and attracted the notice of Socrates, as we learn from his poetical adversary Aristophanes (*Nubes*, 158); but the further discoveries of the microscope raise our wonder into a still higher principle. "I dare boldly affirm," says Swammerdam, "th it the incomprehensible greatness of Deity manifests itself in these mysterious operations in a particular manner, and affords an opportunity of examining, as it were with our senses, the divine nature" (p. 2, 51). The word *κῶνωψ* seems to be the *generic* term for the gnat among the ancient Greek writers, under which they included several *species*, as we use the word "fly;" and "the fly;" though they give distinct names to *some* species, as the word *σείρφορ*, etc. Rosenmüller observes that the *κῶνωπες* of the Greeks seem to be the *ephemeræ* of Linnaeus (apud Bochart, iii, 44, 4to, Lips. 1793-6). Aristotle gives the name to a species whose larvæ are bred in the lees of wine, which is thence called the *culex vinarius* (*Hist. An.* 5, 19). Pliny also refers to various species of gnats (*Hist. Nat.* xi, 35; xvii, 27). We ourselves recognise several kinds under the common name, as gall-gnats, horse, wheat, winter (see Kirby and Spence, *Introduct. to Entomology*). See FLY.

Our Saviour's allusion to the gnat is a kind of proverb, either in use in his time, or invented by himself, "Blind guides, who strain out a gnat, and swallow down [bold, as we say] a camel." He adopts the antithesis of the *smallest insect* to the *largest animal*, and applies it to those who are superstitiously anxious in avoiding small faults, yet do not scruple to commit the greatest sins. The typographical error, "strain at a gnat," first found its way into King James's translation, 1611 (Trench, *Auth. Vers.* p. 131). It is "strain out" in the previous translations. The custom of filtering wine, among the Jews, for this purpose, was founded on the prohibition of "all flying, creeping things" being used for food, excepting the *saltatorii* (Lev. xi, 23). The custom seems alluded to by the Sept., which in Amos vi, 6 reads *ἠλωσιμῆνος οἶνος*, "filtered wine"—a passage having a similar scope. According to the Talmud, eating a gnat incurred scourging or excommunication (Vorstinus, *De Adagiis*, N. T., p. 771, ed. Fischer; Grief, *Oraculum Christi contra percolantes culicem*, etc., Lips. 1749).—Kitto, s. v.

The species referred to in the N. T. is thought by Bochart (*Hieroz.* iii, 444) to be the *Culex vinarius*, the *יבבכושׁ*, *yabchush'*, of the Talmud (Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* p. 927, a). The Heb. *כִּנְמִי*, *kinmim'* (sing. *כִּנְמִי*, Isa. li, 6), which constituted one of the plagues upon Egypt (Exod. viii, 16 sq.; comp. *Psa.* cv, 31), are thought to have been a species of *culex* or *gnat* (comp. Herod. ii, 95), as these insects are very numerous in Egypt (Hasselquist, *Trav.* p. 69; Maillet, *Descr. de l'Égypte*, ii, 134, ed. Mascrier).—Winer, ii, 118. See LICE.


The weapon with which the gnat or mosquito makes its attack is a long and slender proboscis, projecting from the mouth like a very fine bristle, and appearing to the naked eye quite simple. Under the magnifying power of the microscope, however, it is seen to be a flexible sheath (*b*) inclosing six distinct pieces, two of which are cutting blades or lancets (*g*), two notched like a saw with reverted teeth (*f*), a tubular canal (*e*), and the central one an exceedingly acute point, which is also tubular (*b*). When the attack is made, the gnat brings the tip of the organ within its sheath to press upon the skin, into which it presently enters, the sheath remaining without and bending into an angle as the lancets descend. When the weapon has penetrated to its base—a distance of one sixth of an inch or more—the lancets move laterally, and thus cut the flesh on either side, promoting the flow of blood from the superficial vessels; at the same moment a highly irritable fluid is poured into the wound, which has the effect of diluting the blood, and thus of rendering it more capable of flowing up the slender central tube into the throat of the insect. It then sucks, if undisturbed, till its stomach is filled to repletion, leaving a painful tumor accompanied with an intolerable itching. It is the female gnat alone which is noxious; the male, whose proboscis is feathered, has no power of sucking blood.—Fairbairn, s. v.

**Gnesen**, a town in the Prussian province of Posen, with (in 1865) 8950 inhabitants. It is believed to be the most ancient town of the former Polish empire. The cathedral church contains the relics of St. Adalbert, the apostle of the Prussians, which were purchased and deposited there by duke Boleslav I. Soon after, at the beginning of the 11th century, Gnesen was made the see of an archbishop, Gaudentius, the brother and companion of St. Adalbert, being the first incumbent of that dignity. The archbishops of Gnesen were primates of the Polish empire, the first after the king, and the regents of the empire during the vacancy of the throne. In 1821 the united archbishopric of Posen and Gnesen was organized, the archbishop residing at Posen, but Gnesen retaining the seat of a chapter. See Neher, *Kirchl. Statistik*, vol. ii. (A. J. S.)

**Gnosimachi** (γνώσις and μάχονται), a name given to those in the 4th century who were the avowed enemies of the Gnostics. A certain Rhetorius is said to have formed a sect on the principle that matters of doctrine are indifferent, as no certainty can be obtained as to doctrine; but that a good life is all that is essential to Christianity. "It may be a question whether there was ever a regularly constituted sect professing such indifference to doctrines; whether the fact ever amounted to anything more than this, that individuals at different times and in different places were led by the same opposition and the same tendency of mind to entertain these views, of which individuals the above-mentioned Rhetorius may have been one."—Neander, *Church History* (Torrey's), ii, 702.

**Gnosis**. See GNOSTICISM.

**Gnosticism**. A. *Gnosis*.—The New-Testament writers were occasionally determined in their choice of prominent words by the expressions which were current among the people they addressed. Such words as *logos* and *gnosis*, having acquired a peculiar signification in the schools, were recognised by them, and



Organs and Mouth of a Gnat.

appropriated to a sacred use. We concede, indeed, that the latter word (*γνώσις*) usually denotes in their writings simply what its etymology implies, the mere act of knowing, or the objective knowledge thus acquired. In those primitive times it was seldom that any systematic or scientific exposition of Christian truth was demanded. The contest was with reference to the simple facts of the Gospel, and Christianity was fain to secure an existence in the world before it had leisure to speculate upon abstract points. Not only was it unwise to divert men's minds from practical religion, but many true believers were too carnal to be intrusted with a higher wisdom. Paul, therefore, and his fellow-laborers determined to confine their apostolic ministrations to such a historical presentation of Jesus Christ and him crucified as might be called the simplest milk of the world. He declares, however (1 Cor. ii, 6), that he sometimes made known a higher wisdom among such as were perfect, though a wisdom, he is careful to say, very different from that which some heathen and Jewish philosophers had claimed. In other passages he applies the word *gnosis* to this kind of wisdom. He specifies "the word of knowledge" among those peculiar gifts of the Spirit which were possessed by the more eminent teachers (1 Cor. xii, 8), and commends a knowledge through which the more discerning believers rose above the fear of the heathen gods, and ate of the things offered to idols as of things in themselves indifferent (1 Cor. viii, 7). He speaks also of a *gnosis* falsely so called, and thus implies that there was another which truly deserved the name (1 Tim. vi, 20). In subsequent times this use of the word became common, and great pains were taken to make obvious the distinction between the true (*γνώσις ἀληθινή*) and the false *gnosis* (*γνώσις ψευδώνυμος*). A lately (1715) discovered treatise of Irenæus (entitled *γνώσις ἀληθ.*), and an extended description of the true Gnostic at the close of the Stromata of Clement of Alexandria, have preserved to us the views of the Church on this subject near the close of the 2d century.

It was admitted on all sides that there was a knowledge of divine things superior to that of the multitude, not in its importance to the salvation of the soul, but in its intellectual power. It belonged not so much to the pulpit as to the schools, and was important not so much to the personal salvation as to the comfort and growth of believers, and to the acceptance of the Gospel among the more educated classes. It took up those facts which were objects of the common faith, and made them subjects of speculation and profound thought. It arranged them, drew from them logical conclusions, reconciled their apparent discrepancies with each other and with the conclusions of science, and applied them to long-agitated questions which were only hinted at, but not solved, in the Christian Scriptures. At this point, however, the true and the false *gnosis* separated, and took different directions. The former submitted itself without reserve to the authority of the Scriptures, and professed never to venture beyond what was written. It presented itself to all men without discrimination of natural talents or social condition. The latter claimed to be above the reach of the vulgar, and to be derived from sources superior to the written word. Clement describes the true Gnostic as one who grows gray in the study of the Scriptures. A scientific culture may be indispensable to the higher departments of that study, and a true spiritual discernment can be acquired only by divine grace, but the natural talents which must be used in its acquisition have been given to all, and each one's success will be proportioned to his prayerful diligence. The sources of knowledge, too, were the same for the humblest believer and the most eminent Gnostic, for all had access to the Scriptures and the common tradition (*παράδοσις*) which had been transmitted in all the churches. The *gnosis* was simply a faith

made perfect, an expansion of what faith had received, a building constructed wholly of materials supplied by faith. Its advocates made much use of a passage in Isa. vii, 9 (Septuagint): "If ye believe not, neither shall ye understand;" from which they inferred not only that faith is indispensable to knowledge, but that knowledge should spring from faith. And yet it cannot be denied that many, especially of the Alexandrian school, gave an undue prominence to this higher knowledge, as if it were indispensable to all religion, and disparaged the great body of believers (*πιστικοί*) as incapable of a true spiritual life, as in communion only with the Christ of an earthly and sensuous life, and as actuated only by a fear of punishment and a desire of personal benefits. The true Gnostic, on the other hand, they believed to be favored with such an intuitional faculty for the discernment of truth, and such a perpetual tuition under the divine Logos, that he could dispense, in a great degree, with outward demonstrations; and they claimed that his love of knowledge was so intense and disinterested, that if it could even be separated from his eternal salvation he would not hesitate still to choose it. The subjects on which they delighted to expatiate were chiefly: God, as he must be conceived of in his absolute being, the incarnation and redeeming work of Christ, the influence of these upon our race and upon other beings, the vast chain of existence between man and God, the fall of some links in this chain and their probable recovery, the origin of this world, the source of moral evil and its elimination from the universe, and the future history and destiny of all things. In the discussion of such themes, we need not be surprised to find that they not unfrequently transcended the province both of reason and of faith, and that some of their speculations were condemned by their more temperate brethren (Neander, *Hist.* i, 544-52; Hase, *Hist.* § 85; Schaff, *Hist. Christ. Church*, vol. i, ch. iv).

B. *Heretical Gnosticism.*—I. *General Character.*—The name Gnosticism has been applied to a variety of schools which had sometimes little in common except the assumption of a knowledge higher than that of ordinary believers. Most of them claimed a place in the Church, and complained bitterly when this was denied them; and yet they generally spoke of Christianity as insufficient to afford absolute truth, and not unfrequently they assumed a hostile attitude towards it. They seldom pretended to demonstrate the principles on which their systems were founded by historical evidence or logical reasonings, since they rather boasted that these were discovered by the intuitional powers of more highly endowed minds, and that the materials thus obtained, whether through faith or divine revelation, were then worked up into a scientific form according to each one's natural power and culture. Their aim was to construct not merely a theory of redemption, but of the universe—a cosmogony. No subject was beyond their investigations. Whatever God could reveal to the finite intellect, they looked upon as within their range. What to others seemed only speculative ideas, were by them hypostatized or personified into real beings or historical facts. It was in this way that they constructed systems of speculation on subjects entirely beyond the range of human knowledge, which startle us by their boldness and their apparent consciousness of reality.

II. *External Origin.*—And yet we have reason to believe that Gnosticism originated no speculations which were essentially new. It only recognised and selected what seemed to it true in earlier systems, and then combined these fragments in new relations—not in the way of a crude syncretism, but with mutual affinities and living power. No question, however, has more perplexed historians than that which refers to the direct origin of Gnosticism. We are in possession of scarcely any authenticated documents which have come down to us from persons living at the time and

in countries in which it had its birth. We are dependent for our information respecting it almost entirely upon the representations of opponents, who knew almost nothing of Oriental systems, and were acquainted with it only in its maturity. Unfortunately, too, the question of the origin of Gnosticism has recently become complicated with others on which violent party feelings have been exercised. Those who have denied the apostolic origin of the epistles in which traces of Gnosticism have been discovered, have felt an interest in removing both the epistles and Gnosticism to as late a period as possible. From the discussion of this subject, however, there are some facts which may now be regarded as incontrovertible. 1. Ever since the conquests of Alexander the Great, an intense interest had been felt throughout Asia Minor and Egypt in Hellenistic philosophy and Oriental theosophy; and while the old mythologic fables and professed systems of positive revelation had lost their authority, many thoughtful persons had discovered under these what they looked upon as a uniting bond of truth and the elements of a universal religion. 2. The result was that, near the time of the first promulgation of Christianity, a number of new systems of religious philosophy sprung up independently in different countries, and exhibited similar characteristics. They were usually formed by incorporating with the national religion what seemed attractive elements in foreign systems, and softening down what was harsh and incredible in the popular faith and worship. In this way we discover a nearly simultaneous origin of the Judaistic philosophy at Alexandria, of Essenism and Therapeutism in Egypt and southern Palestine, of the Cabalistic literature in Syria and the East, and of New Platonism among the Hellenistic nations. These were all offshoots from the same general root, and not necessarily deriving anything original, but unquestionably drawing much assistance from one another. Similar circumstances everywhere called forth similar phenomena with no conscious interdependence. 3. We thus account for the origin of Gnosticism, and easily reconcile the conflicting views of different writers respecting it. As the early ecclesiastical writers were themselves acquainted almost exclusively with Occidental literature, they were in the habit of ascribing the rise of Gnosticism to the study of Grecian philosophy, and especially of Platonism, and they appeal to the cosmogonies of Hesiod and others for the exemplars of the Gnostic speculations. Modern historians, however, have found in most of the Gnostic systems such a predominance of Oriental elements, that they have been led to infer a direct influence not merely from Alexandrian Judaism, but dualistic Parsism, and even from pantheistic Buddhism. There can, in fact, be no question regarding the influence of all these systems. The Platonic doctrines of a God, without distinctions in his nature, withdrawn entirely within himself, intelligible only to the initiated, and that only through the mediation of the Nous, a higher ideal sphere reflecting itself in a lower phenomenal world, a hyle (ἔϋ) and an undefined dualism between it and God, a fall of spiritual beings from the divine to the sensuous sphere, the derivation of sin from a contact with the material element; the Pythagorean doctrine of numbers; the Brahminic doctrine of emanation and hypostatizing of the divine attributes; the Parsic representation of the divine essence as light, of a dualism in which God is subject to the continual aggression of a world of matter, and of a good principle in eternal conflict with the prince of darkness; and the Buddhist notions of a God in process of development, of souls longing to be freed from the bonds of matter, and to be raised above all sensible things, and reunited with the divine source of life, are all unmistakable, and indicative of their respective sources. We need not, however, suppose that these elements were derived directly from their original sources. The Alexandrian

literature, in which most of these elements had found a place, was diffused among the educated classes in all those countries in which Gnosticism flourished, and might have been the mediating agency through which the mind of the East was brought into communication with that of the West. From the heterogeneous commingling of such diverse systems, and especially from their contact with the young energies of Christianity, the Gnostic spirit might easily draw forth such materials as suited its purpose. The sources of Gnosticism, however, like those of the Nile, are to a great extent concealed, and those who imagine they have discovered its principal head not unfrequently learn that another remains far beyond. As its friends boasted, there were secret agencies by which truth was conveyed to the elect race under symbols and an outward letter which only they could understand. (See Baxmann, in the *Amer. Theol. Review* for 1862, p. 666-76).

III. *Classification.*—It has been found very difficult to arrange the several Gnostic sects according to any principle of classification. They have been grouped together by different writers according to their origin, their geographical position, and their speculative views. Neander (*Hist. Christ. Religion*, i, 379-86) divides them into Judaizing and anti-Judaizing Gnostics, according to their agreement or opposition to ancient Judaism. Gieseler (*Ecl. Hist.* vol. i, § 44) arranges them according to their geographical order, as Alexandrian, Syriac, and miscellaneous. Hase (*Hist. Chr. Ch.* § 76) makes four classes, Syrian, Hellenistic, Judaizing, and specially Christian. Similar to this is Matter's division into those of Syria, Asia Minor, Egypt, and the rest of the Roman world (*Hist. crit. du Gnost.*). Baur (*Chr. Gnosis*, 1835) arranges the several sects into three principal classes, according to their relation to the three earlier religions with which they came in contact: 1. Those who combined Christianity with Judaism and heathenism; 2. Those who entirely separated it from them, and opposed it to them; and, 3. Those who identified it with Judaism, but opposed it to heathenism. This ingenious, and, in many respects, satisfactory division, fails to bring out the historical progress and internal development of the Gnostic systems, and offers no suitable place for Manichæism. It has, however, found much favor on account of its simplicity, and has been adopted with some modifications by Niedner, Marheineke (*Weltalter*, th. ii, p. 246), Tennemann (*Manual of the Hist. of Phil.* § 200), and others. Dr. Schaff proposes a classification, according to an ethical point of view, into the speculative and theosophic, the practical and ascetic, and the Antinomian and libertine (*Hist. of the Chr. Ch.* i, 234). It is evident that no classification can combine together a chronological, local, and logical distribution, and hence we shall probably gain something by presenting these separately.

IV. *History.*—In attempting to give a historical outline of the course of Gnosticism, our object is not so much to present particular details of the several schools, since these will be found, as far as possible, under their several heads in this work, but to indicate in general the order and position of each. Lipsius, in a recent work (*Gnosticism, its Essence, Origin, and Development*, 1860), endeavors to show that this course of development was a curve which commenced with only a slight departure from orthodoxy, and, after diverging more and more from it, finally comes back again gradually to the true path. Another writer (Hilgenfeld) has attempted a distinct definition of the three stadia of this development. It is difficult to discover in the actual history the regularity of departure and return implied in such a figure, and yet we may derive from it a correct notion of the general direction. In the first stadium we have the Judaizing Gnostics, and then the several classes who, in their opposition to Judaism, deify nearly all the godless characters of the Old Testament. In the second we have not merely

Old-Testament history, but Greek philosophy, a contempt of the common faith, the opposition of the psychic and pneumatic natures, and mythical personifications of speculative ideas. In the third and last stadium this opposition between the pneumatic and psychic natures begins to be modified, and finally, under the Marcionites, the Gnostic speculation approximates very nearly that of the more liberal Catholic teachers. It is in this last stadium that we find the greatest difficulty in seeing how the curve approximates with much uniformity the orthodox highway, for some classes of the later Marcionites, and, above all, the Manichees, seem rather to have been the extreme consummation of Gnosticism.

As there were strong tendencies towards Gnosticism both in Judaism and heathenism, we might reasonably infer that the Gnostics must have been powerfully attracted by Christianity. It was, however, more consistent with the essential spirit of that movement to attempt to mould the new system to its fancy than to submit with docility to the exclusive authority of the Gospel. Among the remnants of Oriental tribes in Samaria we are not surprised to find such a man as Simon, who succeeded in making the multitude believe that he was the great power of God. It is said that he called himself the creative world-spirit, and his female companion the receptive world-soul. We have here a likeness of the Gnostic doctrine of æons and syzygies. In the tradition of the subsequent Church, this half-mythical personage became the patriarch of all heretics, but especially of heathen Gnostics (Irenæus, *Adv. hæc.* lib. i, c. xxvii, § 4; Hippol. i, 62 sq.). During the twenty years which intervened between the first Christian Pentecost and the later epistles of Paul, we know that theosophic speculations were everywhere prevalent in Syria and Asia Minor, and that these were strangely mingled with Christian doctrines. Great freedom was allowed to religious thought, even among the early Christians, as long as the moral and religious life of the people was not perverted. But Paul very soon discovered dangerous tendencies in the churches which he had recently established in Asia Minor. Josephus tells us that Alexander the Great had sent into the provinces of Lydia and Phrygia 2000 Mesopotamian and Babylonian Jews to garrison the disaffected towns there, and we are informed that the inhabitants of that region have always since been prone to mystical and Oriental superstitions (Alford, *How to use the Epistles*, Epistle to the Colossians, *Sunday Mag.* 1867, p. 829). The errors which he reproved at Colossæ were doubtless a curious commixture of Jewish and heathen speculations. The ancient historian Hegesippus informs us (Euseb. *Ecl. Hist.* iii, 32) that the heretical head did not make its appearance with an uncovered head until after the death of the apostles, but that it previously worked in secret. After all the contentions of various writers on the question how far this error prevailed in apostolic times, there is a general agreement that, while most of the heresies of that period were Judaistic, there was an obvious difference between those reproved in the Galatian churches and those noticed in the epistles to the Colossians and Timothy. The latter are treated much more mildly, and we readily perceive that they must have been much less developed and less subversive of the Christian system. They are expressly called (1 Tim. vi. 20) a false gnosis, and were characterized by empty sounds without sense and subtle oppositions to the truth, a depreciation of the body, and a worship of angels (Col. ii, 18, 23), and interminable genealogies and myths (1 Tim. i, 4). These seem more akin to Jewish than to heathen speculations, and imply not the completed Gnosticism of the second century, but the manifest germs of Docetic emanations and Gnostic dualism. Irenæus, on the authority of Polycarp, relates (*Adv. hæc.* i, 26) that John was acquainted with Cerinthus, and wrote the fourth gospel to refute his errors. Both

he and Epiphanius (*Hæc.* p. 28) say that Cerinthus taught that the world was not made by the Most High God, but by a lower power; or by angels, and that Jesus was an ordinary man, whom the supreme Logos became united with at his baptism, but forsook during his last sufferings, to reunite with him in the future kingdom of Messianic glory. See CERINTHUS. Here the Gnosticism becomes plainly perceptible, and we can certainly understand a number of passages in John's Gospel and Epistles better if we suppose a reference in them to these and similar errors. The Nicolaitans of the Apocalypse and the false teachers of the Epistle of Jude despised Judaism as the work of evil angels, ridiculed and trampled upon the law that they might insult these limited powers, and thus fell into a strange complication of gross licentiousness and bodily mortifications (Burton, *Heresies of the Apost. Age*; Potter in the old and W. L. Alexander in the new edition of Kitto's *Cyclop.*; Conybeare, in Conybeare and Howson's *Life of St. Paul*, note at the end of vol. i. Comp. C. C. Tittmann, *De vestigiis Gnosticor. in N. T. frustra questis*, Leips. 1773; transl. and publ. in *Contributions to Foreign Literature*, New York, 1827). No sooner had the direct influence of the apostles and their immediate successors ceased than the speculative interest and numbers of the Gnostics began to increase mightily. Near the commencement of the 2d century, flourished about the same time Basilides in Alexandria and his son Isidore [see BASILIDES], the dualistic and ascetic Saturninus in Antioch, Carpocrates of Alexandria, and his son Epiphaneus. The last two maintained that every one who could soar to the same height of contemplation might attain the same powers with Christ, and that Christ differed in no respect from the wise and good of all nations. About the same time we first become acquainted with the party commonly called Ophites, though Origen says that it was founded by a certain Euphrates, who must have lived as early as the time of Christ. Their common appellation (Ophites, Heb. Naasenes) was given them by their opponents (for they always called themselves simply Gnostics), because they were said to pay great honor to the serpent as the instrument of the temptation in Eden. As the prohibition then transgressed was designed to keep man back from knowledge, what is commonly called the Fall was, in fact, a transition to a higher state. When first known they resided principally in Egypt and in Phrygia. They afterwards became numerous, and branched off into various subdivisions. See OPHITES. Great differences, however, are discoverable between those who bear the same name. In the next generation (A. D. 140-160) belongs Valentinus, who flourished first in Egypt and then in Rome, and finally died in the island of Cyprus (about A. D. 160). The school named after him was the most influential of all the Gnostic parties, and contained a large number of talented and eminent teachers. It was divided into an Oriental and an Italian branch, in both of which was inculcated a highly exalted style of religion. Among its most esteemed writers may be mentioned Heracleon of Alexandria, who wrote a commentary on John's Gospel, some extracts from which, preserved in Origen, admirably bring out the profound spirit of this evangelist; Ptolemy, whose epistle to Flora has come down to us in Epiphanius, and endeavors to show that his system was not inconsistent with the Catholic faith; Marcus, probably a Jew of Palestine, in whose poetic and symbolical work divine æons discourse in liturgical forms; and Bardesanes, an Armenian of Edessa (about 170), who, with his son Harmonius, was immensely popular as a writer of hymns and imitations of David's Psalms. (See the articles under these names.) Contemporary with Valentinus lived Cerdon, a Syrian, and his pupil Marcion of Sinope, in Pontus, who carried their zeal for Pauline and primitive Christianity to such an extreme that they rejected not only all secret traditions, but large portions of the

New Testament. They opposed heathen religions as the work of the devil, and Judaism as the product of an inferior and wrathful deity, who was to be put down by Christ and the revelation through him of the supreme God. Kindred with him were Apelles of Alexandria, and his pupils Lucas and Marcus, who approximated still nearer a Christian orthodoxy, though with singular inconsistencies. Tatian, a Syrian, a rhetorician in Rome, during the latter part of his life is said to have fallen into Gnostic errors, and to have prescribed a system of extreme abstinence as the only means of disengaging ourselves from the world. A party of Encratites, calling themselves by his name or by that of his pupil Severus, continued as late as the 4th century. A class of persons represented by the Clementine Homilies at Rome, and sometimes reckoned among the Gnostics, ought rather to be classed with the Ebionites. See CLEMENTINES. We now come in contact with several classes of the Ophites, many of whom, according to Origen, went so far in their opposition to ordinary views that they admitted none to their assemblies who did not curse Christ (Nehander, i, 446 sq.). The whole system of the God of the Jews was looked upon by this sect as oppressive to man, and whoever is represented in the scriptural history as rebelling against it were regarded as saints. Hence some of the worst characters of the Old and New Testament were held in the highest honor. Even Jesus was reckoned among agents of the Jewish Jehovah, and his betrayal by Judas Iscariot was extolled as done with the best of motives and results. Those who maintained this position were called Cainites, while such as dissented from such extravagances were distinguished as Sethites. The Perates, who have recently become known to us through the Philosophoumena, appear to have approximated much nearer the Catholic doctrine. During the 3d century Gnosticism appears to have lost its power, for the orthodox party had now attained more scientific precision of thought, and their formulas of faith presented scriptural doctrine in a style consistent with the highest culture of the age. Towards the close of that century, however, arose in the distant East one more attempt to combine Christianity with Oriental theosophy. Manichæism sprang up in a region where neither Hellenism nor Judaism was familiar; and its object appears to have been to reform the corrupted Parsism of that day by incorporating with the original system of Zoroaster numerous elements taken from a gnosticized Christianity and Buddhism. To Christianity, however, it seems to have been indebted more for its names and symbols than for its essential history or characters. Personages and facts taken from scriptural records find in that system an entirely new significance. Its founder (Mani or Manes, a Magian banished from Persia) discovered many points of agreement between the doctrines of Parsism, Buddhism, and Gnostic Christianity, and endeavored to combine these three systems into one universal religion. He accounted for all things on dualistic principles. His followers were soon driven by persecution from their earliest seats, but were numerous during the fourth century in every part of the East, and in Africa, Sicily, and Italy. Many persons of noble spirit were attracted by it, but it soon fell into gross licentiousness by its professed exaltation above outward things, and of course lost its place in common esteem, and fell into contempt. Some vestiges, however, both of Marcionism and Manichæism, remained even into the Middle Ages, and by means of the Priscillianists, the Paulicians, the Bogomiles, and the Cathari, transmitted the leading features of Gnosticism to distant ages and countries.

Many of these sects can hardly be recognised as within the pale of Christianity. While some of them claimed a place within the Church, and refused to leave it when they were disowned by its authorities, others openly abjured the Christian name. Certainly such

complete subverters of the essentials of the Gospel as the Carpoerians, Perates, Sethites, Cainites, and Manichæans deserve to be called rather gnosticized heathen than Christian Gnostics. In the history of the Church they deserve a place only because they, like other heathen, influenced it from without. In a history of Gnosticism even these must have no unimportant position. Indeed, no history of this system is quite complete without embracing some still more remote systems — Cabalistic Judaism, Neo-Platonism, etc., which had their origin under Gnostic influences.

V. *General Principles.*—The ultimate aim of Gnosticism was to present a perfect solution of the great problem of the origin and destiny of the universe, and especially of the origin of evil, *πολυζούλιγον ζήτημα, πόθεν ἡ κακία*. The three ideas which were fundamental to all its speculations were: 1. A supreme being, unconnected with matter, and incapable of being affected by it; 2. Matter, *ἄλη*, eternal, the source of evil, and opposed to God; and, 3. A series of beings intermediate between these two. The primary source of all spiritual existence was an eternal abyss (*βυζύς*), so utterly beyond human representation that no one should venture to name him, or even to conceive of him. He was the absolute one, and virtually and logically non-existent (*οὐκ ὄν*). In his nature, however, there was some inconceivable ground of self-evolution (*προβολή*), in consequence of which his infinite powers became revealed in a series of æons, or hypostatized divine attributes. It is only through these that he can have communication with finite natures. They are called æons (*αἰώνες*) because they are *eternal ones*, representing the eternal Source of all (*αἰών*). According to Valentinus, they emanated in pairs (*syzygies*) of different sexes. Basilides and Marcion ascribed their existence to an act of love and to a creative word, but the more pantheistic sects to a necessary process of emanation which is usually spoken of as by generation. Their number varies in different systems; sometimes it is determined by planetary relations (12), sometimes by the days of the year (365), sometimes by the years in the life of Christ (32), but not unfrequently it is left indefinite. The first æons were Nous, Logos, Sophia, Dunamis, Aletheia, Zoe, etc., generated either by the original being or by one another in ever-increasing imperfection as they recede from their source. Together they constitute the Pleroma, the world of light and divine fulness, but far removed from the infinite abyss with which none can directly communicate. 2. Over against this Pleroma and this eternal abyss stands the world of matter (*ἕλη*), sometimes contradistinguished as the Kenoma, or the world of emptiness or darkness. This was usually spoken of as eternal, but chaotic, and disordered by internal strifes. It was generally described as far removed from the kingdom of light, but sometimes as very near, and even on the confines of that kingdom. Some conceived of it as dead and powerless until it became animated by influences from the Pleroma, but others, and especially Manes and his followers, represented it as active and aggressive. According to the former, one of the lowest and feeblest of the divine æons (called by Valentinus Sophia, the lower wisdom or Achamoth, the *κάτω* in distinction from the *ἄνω σοφία*) fell from the abode of light and came under the power of matter. Though Valentinus makes this, to some extent, a free act of apostasy on the part of the divine æon, as she was wandering beyond the bounds of the Pleroma, and agitated by her intense desire to get out of her proper sphere and enter into more direct communication with the infinite Source, it was usually described as the result of an incapacity to retain a hold upon the superior world, and a consequent precipitation into the darkness of the Kenoma. 3. At this point we meet with the idea of the Demiurge. The name signifies a public worker (*δημιουργός*), and he is the same with the Avelion of Basilides and the Jaldabaoth (גַּלְדַּבְּאֹוּת), the chaos-

born) of the Ophites. He came into being from the commingling of the light-nature in the *Sophia* (the *πνευματικόν σπέρμα*) with matter. As the fruit of such a parentage, he was possessed of a nature neither pneumatic nor material, but psychical, and he occupies an intermediate position between the supreme God and the material world. He is not, of course, an evil, but only a limited and imperfect being, and yet evil springs from the defects of his work and of his plans. He acts in general with sincerity according to his power and light. By him the chaos of matter was transformed into an organized universe. The planetary heavens, and the sidereal spirits who are over them, and the whole course of the world, are under his control. In all this, however, he is the unconscious instrument of higher powers in the world of light, who secretly influence all his movements. Of this control he finally and gradually became aware, and by some teachers he is said to have become vexed and goaded into opposition by the discovery, and by others to have gladly welcomed and submitted to it. He was the author of Judaism, and to some extent of Christianity; and hence by many Gnostics the former system was looked upon as defective, if not false, and even the latter, especially in its mere letter, as incapable of imparting the highest wisdom. Only by Marcion was he regarded as entirely independent of the supreme God in the work of creation and providence, since he was here in a department which belonged wholly to him. He remained the God of this world until the coming of Christ, who vanquished him at the crucifixion. 4. With respect to anthropology, the Gnostics held that the whole kingdom of the Demiurge was fallen. He was himself the creature of a fallen æon, and the world he created and rules is subject to imperfection. From his connection with matter there was produced a human race, which in its totality is a microcosm, representing within itself the three principles of the great universe, the supreme God, the Demiurge, and matter. This was in consequence of the creation of three classes of men, higher or lower in proportion to their freedom from matter. Marcion alone made this distinction dependent upon the will of man himself; the other Gnostics made it a result of creation, or of a divine communication of the spark of light and life from the upper world. The highest of these, i. e. the *spiritual* (*πνευματικοί*), share largely in the nature of the lowest æon (*σοφία*), who originally fell from the Pleroma, and hence they are the only ones who can attain perfection. They alone are capable of recognising and receiving the light which is communicated from above. The second class, the *psychical* (*ψυχικοί*), have the nature of the Demiurge himself, who has power to raise them to some extent above the debasement of matter, and, by giving them legal forms, to impart to them a legal righteousness, but not to afford them a recognition of those divine mysteries which are beyond his own reach. The third class are the *fleshy or hylic* (*σαρκικοί, ἡλικοί*) natures, in whom matter has usurped human form and passion (*πάθος*), has entire control, and who are therefore destined to share the fortunes of matter alone. Historically, the spiritual predominated under the Christian dispensation, the psychical under the Jewish, and the fleshy among the heathen of all ages. Individuals, however, of each class are numerous under all these dispensations. In the aristocratic spirit of ancient Platonism, many Gnostics allowed of no transition from the one to the other of these classes, while others looked upon it as possible for the lower to rise to the higher in consequence of a divine communication of special powers. 5. The Gnostic idea of redemption was simply that of a liberation of the light-spirit from its connection with matter. Of course it is confined to the two higher classes of our race in whom that spirit is found. In every condition of humanity, some favored individuals are represented as sighing for deliverance. In this way

were explained some glimpses of a higher knowledge, which break forth at intervals in the prophecies and psalms of the Jewish Scriptures, and in the writings of pagan philosophers. Some sparks of light were supposed to have been thrown into the breasts of nobler persons, and the rational creation, as a whole (*κτίσις*), is represented as sighing for redemption (Rom. viii, 22). A recently discovered work (*Pistis Sophia*) contains the penitential sighings and longings of the æon (*σοφία*) when she had herself fallen from her original condition of divine intuition to that of mere faith. In pity for this sighing spirit, Christ, one of the highest of all the æons, descends, and brings her, after innumerable sufferings, back to the Pleroma, and undertakes the deliverance of all pneumatic natures. To accomplish this, he assumes, not a material form, since he can have no contact with matter, but only the appearance of one. In answer to the longings of the Jews, the Demiurge had promised and actually sent among them a Messiah with only psychical powers. Most of the Gnostics suppose that the heavenly Christ (*Soter*) took possession of this Messiah, who had proved himself unable to accomplish what had been promised in his behalf, and that from the baptism by John until the crucifixion this true Redeemer acted through this personage. Some, however, held that the man Jesus, with whom the æon Christ then became connected, combined in his own nature all human elements with the powers of an ætherial spirit. As this Christ cannot suffer, everything in him which seemed like it, or like any imperfection, was either a doctetic illusion, or wholly in the human personage with which he was united. This work of Christ, however, commenced not wholly with the life of Jesus, but, to some extent, with creation itself, in which the Redeemer inspired the unconscious Demiurge with many divine ideas, and during the whole process of the world's government he is drawing congenial spirits to himself, and correcting many errors of the world-ruler. His redeeming work, however, is effected entirely by the communication of the Gnosis, and especially the revelation of the true God. In the end, all pneumatic and psychical natures capable of redemption will be gathered and raised to the Pleroma. Valentinus supposes that all psychical natures are exalted only to a lower degree of blessedness in a peculiar kingdom of the Demiurge. Matter with all fleshy natures will either be consumed by its own powers, or sink back into its original condition of utter deadness and absolute separation from the light, or of internal confusion. 6. The sources from which the Gnostics professed to derive their knowledge were, (a.) Tradition, not so much that of the Church, which they generally looked upon as unphilosophical, and fit only for the multitude, but that which was said to have been communicated by Christ to a narrow circle of congenial spirits, and by them transmitted to others. Marcion alone made this tradition accessible to all. (b.) The ordinary Christian Scriptures were only partially received among them. Marcion and the more strenuous Judaistic Gnostics entirely rejected the Old Testament, and the more moderate recognised a distinction between its pneumatic, psychic, and hylic elements. Many of them disparaged portions of the New Testament also, while others accepted only of Paul's writings and an expurgated gospel of Luke. (c.) Other writings of highly enlightened persons belonging to particular sects. Thus Manes's writings were much venerated among his followers, and the prophecies of Cain and of a pretended seer named Parchor among the followers of Basilides, and the apocryphal books of Adam, Enoch, Moses, Elias, Isaiah, Baruch, and others. (d.) Even the writings of the heathen poets and philosophers were much used by some, who, by a course of allegorical explanations, like those which they applied to the Scriptures, discovered ineffable mysteries under the most unpromising outward letter. 7. With the

exception of the followers of Manes, we have no evidence that the Gnostics ever attempted a distinct ecclesiastical organization. Many of them were never excluded from the orthodox churches, within which they only sought to form schools and social circles. They practised baptism, and believed that in this rite, as in the baptism of Christ, the higher spirit was more abundantly imparted, and the human spirit was emancipated from the power of the Demiurge. Most of them were inclined by their poetic fancies and their love of symbols to a gorgeous style of worship, but the more common ordinances and observances of the Church were neglected as useful only to such as were on the ground of mere faith. 8. Their ethics and practical morality were usually dependent upon dualistic principles. Among the Hellenistic Gnostics it took the form of a struggle against matter, which not unfrequently ran into asceticism, and sometimes into the use of charms and astrological practices. The Oriental Gnostics, on the other hand, are said in many instances to have plunged into immoralities, sometimes with the view of showing their contempt for the Demiurge and his laws, or because they regarded the body as an indifferent thing to a spirit united with the supreme God, and subject to no inferior law. Saturninus, Marcion, and Manes rejected marriage; but many Gnostics not only submitted to it, but looked upon it as the highest law of pneumatic natures. We have no evidence that the standard of morality was lower among the Gnostics generally than among orthodox Christians in general.

One is amazed at the boldness, the fanciful nature, and the high pretensions of Gnosticism. In the course of a century and a half it comes and goes before us like a splendid vision. And yet its influence upon Christianity was profound and permanent. It gave occasion to a great expansion of Christian thought, to a clearer idea of the historical relation of Christianity to earlier and surrounding religions, and to a better definition of the basis of true faith. It deserves a more careful study than it has usually received.

VI. *Literature*.—The original authorities are the ecclesiastical writers of the period generally, but especially Irenæus and Epiphanius, *Adv. hereses*; Tertullian, *De prescript. her.*, *contra Gnost. scorp.*, *adv. Valentinianos*, *adv. Marcianum*; Hippolytus, *Karà παρ. αἰρ.* *ἐλεγχος*, and the *Philosophumena* usually ascribed to him; Theodoret, *Har. Fabb.* Also Clemens Alex. and Origen in many passages; Gnostic fragments in Grabe's *Spicilegium*; Münter's *Ode Gnostica* (Kopenh. 1812); *Pistis Sophia* (a Gnostic work translated from a Copt. Codex by Schwartz and edited by Petermann, Berlin, 1851); *Cerdus Nazareus* (ed. by Norberg, and sometimes called the Bible of Gnosticism); *Bardanes Gnosticus Syrorum primus Hymnologus*, and *Antitheses Marcionis Gnostici* (two Gnostic works published by Aug. Hahn, Leips. 1819, 1823); also the Neo-Platonist work of Plotinus, *Ἠθὸς τ. γνωστικῶν* (Emend. ii, lib. ix). The English reader can gain access to many of these ecclesiastical writers by means of the *Ante-Nicene Chr. Lib.*, edited by Drs. Roberts and Donaldson, now in course of publication at Edinburgh.

The modern literature of Gnosticism is very abundant. Besides the general ecclesiastical histories of Gieseler, Neander, Hase, and Schaff, the doctrinal histories of Hagenbach, F. K. Meier, F. C. Baur, A. Neander, L. Noack, and Shedd, and the histories of philosophy by H. Ritter, Tennemann, F. D. Maurice, and the French history translated by C. S. Henry, the more important special works on the subject are, A. Neander, *Genet. Entwickl. d. vorn. gnost. Syst.* (Berl. 1818); J. Matter, *Histoire crit. du Gnosticisme* (Par. 1828 [1843], 2 vols.); Dr. Edward Burton, *Bampton Lectures on the Heresies of the Apost. Age* (1829; Oxford, 1830); F. C. Baur, *Die chr. St. Gnosis* (Tub. 1835), and *Das Christenthum* (Tub. 1853), p. 159-213; J. A. Mœhler, *Versuch ü. d. Urspr. d. Gnost.* (Tub. 1837); Möller, *Gesch. der*

*Kosmologie d. Griech. Kirche* (1862); R. A. Lipsius, *Gnosticismus*, etc. (Leips. 1860); Norton's *Hist. of the Gnostics* (1845); C. A. Lewald, *De doctrina Gnost.* (1818); H. Roscell, *Gesch. d. Untersuch. ü. d. Gnost. in Theol. Nachl.* (Berl. 1847). Articles on Gnosticism have been published by F. R. Lücke in *Berl. theol. Zeitschr.* (1819); J. C. L. Gieseler, in *Hal. lit. Zeit.* (1823) and *Stud. u. Krit.* (1830); F. C. Baur, *Stud. u. Krit.* (1837); H. T. Cheever, in *Amer. Bibl. Repository*, Oct. 1840; R. Baxmann, in *Deutsche Zeitschr.* (1861), and transl. in *Amer. Theol. Rev.* Oct. 1862; and on the later history of the Nazoreans, or Mandai Jahia, in the *Christian Review*, Jan. 1855; an excellent article by J. L. Jacobi may be found in Herzog's *Real-Encyclop. für prot. Theol.* See also Appleton's, Brande's, and Chambers's *Cyclopedias*. (C. P. W.)

**Goa**, the largest of the Portuguese possessions in India, embracing the provinces of Salfette and Kan-kara and six islands. Its population was, in 1869, about 364,000, of whom two thirds were connected with the Roman Catholic Church. The city of Goa, the capital of Portuguese India, is the seat of an archbishop. The jurisdiction of the archbishop of Goa has been in modern times the subject of a violent dispute between the popes and the kings of Portugal. See PORTUGAL. (A. J. S.)

**Goad** (𐤀𐤒𐤁𐤀, *malmaʿ*, an instrument for guiding; the Greeks used the term *βοδολῆξ*, *Iliað*, vi. 135, also *βοδονητρον*, or simply *κέντρον*; see *Schöten, De stimulo boum*, Francof. 1717; Hager, *De pōtōn κέντρον λακτιζέον*, Lips. 1738). "Shamgar, the son of Anath, slew of the Philistines six hundred men with an ox-goad" (Judg. iii, 31). Maundrell gives us the best account of the ox-goad, which is no doubt the same as that used in the days of Shamgar. "At Khan Leban the country people were now everywhere at plough in the fields in order to sow cotton. 'Twas observable that in ploughing they used goads of an extraordinary size; upon measuring of several I found them to be about eight feet long, and at the bigger end six inches in circumference. They are armed at the lesser end with a sharp prickle for driving the oxen, and at the other end with a small spade or paddle of iron, strong and massy, to clear the plough from the clay that encumbers it in working" (*Journal of a Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem*, p. 110). This was in the north of Syria. Prof. Hackett says, "The ox-goads that I saw in the south I should judge to be quite as large. It is manifest that such an instrument, wielded by a strong arm, would do no mean execution. It is easy, therefore, to credit the account of Shamgar's achievement. We may suppose, however (so fragmentary is the notice), that he was not entirely alone; that some others rallied to his aid with such instruments of labor as they could snatch at the moment" (*Illustrations of Scripture*, p. 155). See AGRICULTURE.

In the other passages where the word "goad" occurs it is the representative of a different term in the original; 𐤁𐤒𐤁𐤀, *doban'*, something pointed (1 Sam. xiii, 21), or 𐤁𐤒𐤁𐤀, *dobon'* (Eccles. xii, 11), which is, perhaps, properly the iron point to which the rod or handle, denoted by the previous term, was fixed. This, at least, is the explanation adopted by Jahn (*Archæol.* i. 4, § 9) from Rabbinical writers (Gesenius, *Theos.* p. 349). According to others, it may refer to anything pointed, and the tenor of Eccles. xii allows the sense of a peg or nail—anything, in short, which can be fastened; while in 1 Sam. xiii the point of the ploughshare is possibly intended (which is likewise understood by the Sept. and Vulg. as Judg. *ἐν τῷ ἀποσπῶστί, vomere*). There are undoubted references to the use of the





goad in driving oxen in *Eclus.* xxxviii, 25, and *Acts* xxvi, 14. The expression "to kick against the goads" (*Acts* ix, 5; *A.V.* "the prick's") was proverbially used by the Greeks for unavailing resistance to superior power (comp. *Æschyl. Agam.* 1633; *Prom.* 323; *Eurip. Bacch.* 791). The same means of inciting animals to greater speed is probably alluded to in *2 Kings* iv, 24. (See generally Buckingham, *Travels in Palestine*, i, 91; *Kitto, Daily Bible Illustr.* ii, 341; Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 501.) See **OX**.

**Goad**, THOMAS, D.D., a learned English divine, was elected to King's College, Cambridge, in 1592. He became rector of Milton, Cambridgeshire, and afterwards, successively, prebendary of Winchester and Canterbury, precentor of St. Paul's, rector of Notley, Essex, and of Hadley, Suffolk. He died in 1638. He was one of the deputies to the Synod of Dort in 1618, as a Calvinist, but he afterwards altered his opinions. His principal works are, *A Disputation concerning the Contingency of Events in respect of God's eternal Decrees* (to be found in the *Cambridge Tracts* and in Womack, *Result of False Principles*).—Darling, *Cycl. Bibliographica*, i, 1276.

**Goadby**, ROBERT, a printer and publisher of Sherborne, Dorsetshire, who died in 1778. He compiled and published a commentary under the title *An Illustration of the Holy Scriptures by Notes and Explications on the O. and N. T.*, etc. (Lond. 1759-70, 6th ed. 3 vols. fol.). Dr. A. Clarke says of it that, "while it seems to be orthodox, it is written entirely on the Arian hypothesis." Sellon wrote a reply to it (London, 1765, 12mo).—Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 680; Horne, *Bibliographical Appendix*.

**Goar**, JACQUES, a French Dominican monk, was born at Paris in 1601. He entered into the order of Preaching Friars in 1619, and taught rhetoric in several houses of the Dominicans for some years. He was then sent on a mission into the Levant, and lived eight years at Chios, where he made the doctrines and ceremonies of the Greek Church the subjects of his investigation, and then came to Rome with many collections of MSS., etc. In 1647 he published at Paris, in Greek and Latin, his *Εἰρηολόγιον, Euchologium sive Rituale Græcorum* (Paris, 1647, folio; Venice, 1780). For the history of liturgies, this is a very valuable and useful work. Goar died at Amiens in 1653. See Échard, *Script. Ord. Præd.* vol. ii; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xx, 860.

**Goar**, ST., a French anchorite, was born in Aquitaine about the year 885. The legend says that, after being ordained priest, he devoted himself to the propagation of Christianity, and left his family to retire to the neighborhood of Oberwesel (Germany), where he erected a small chapel (at the place since called St. Goar), beside his cell, to receive pilgrims, and succeeded in converting a large number of heathen. Some of his enemies, having accused him as "an impostor and a man fond of good living" to Rusticus, bishop of Treves, he cleared himself by performing several miracles. Sigebert III offered to appoint him bishop in the place of Rusticus, but Goar preferred remaining in his humble position. He died July 6, 649, and was buried in the chapel he had erected by Agrippin and Eusebins, two of Sigebert's priests. The Church of St. Goar, on the Rhine, was dedicated to him in 1768. See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xx, 859. (J. N. P.)

**Goat**, an animal of the genus *Capra*, found in every part of the world, and easily domesticated. There are various names or appellations given to the goat in the original text of the Scriptures. See **CATTLE**.

1. Most frequently  $\text{זֵּב}$ , *ez*, generally said to denote the *she-goat* (as it is rendered in *Gen.* xv, 9; xxx, 35; xxxi, 38; xxxii, 14; *Numb.* xv, 27), and in several passages undoubtedly so used (*Gen.* xxxi, 38; xxxii, 14; *Numb.* xv, 27; *Prov.* xxvii, 27); but it is equally certain that it is used also to denote the *he-goat* (*Exod.*

xii, 5; *Lev.* iv, 23; *Numb.* xxviii, 15; *2 Chron.* xxix, 21; *Dan.* vii, 5, 8, etc.), which the etymology would seem to show was the original sense. In most of the passages in which it occurs it may denote either the male or the female animal (*Gen.* xxvii, 16; xxx, 32, 33; xxxvii, 31; *Lev.* i, 10; iii, 12; vii, 23; xxii, 19; *1 Sam.* xxv, 2; *1 Kings* xx, 27). It is used also to designate a *kid* (as rendered in *Gen.* xxxviii, 17, 20; *Numb.* xv, 11; *Judg.* vi, 19; xiii, 15, 19; xv, 1; *1 Sam.* xvi, 20 [*1 Kings* xx, 27; *2 Chron.* xxxv, 7]). From this we are led to conclude that properly it is the generic designation of the animal in its domestic state, a conclusion which seems to be fully established by such usages as  $\text{זֵּבֵי הָרִים}$ , *a kid of the goats*,  $\text{זֵּבֵי הָרִים}$ , *a flock of "goats,"* i. e. any of the goat species (*Gen.* xxvii, 9; *Deut.* xiv, 4). Bochart (*Hieroz.* bk. ii, c. 51) derives the word  $\text{זֵּב}$  from  $\text{זָב}$ , *oz*, *strength*; Gesenius and Fürst prefer tracing it up to  $\text{זָבַע}$ , *azaz'*, *to become strong*; in either case the ground-idea is the superior strength of the goat as compared with the sheep; *Syr. ozo*; *Arab. onaz* (where the *n* represents the rejected  $\text{נ}$  of  $\text{זָבַע}$ ); *Phen. oz*, of which *ozza* or *azza* is the feminine form. Whether there is any affinity between this and the Sansc. *ága*, fem. *agá*, Gr. *αἴζ*, *αἴζος*, Goth. *gaitan*, and our *goat*, may be doubted. In the Sept.  $\text{זֵּב}$  is usually represented by *αἴζ*, in a few instances by *εἰρηός*; and when  $\text{זֵּבֵי הָרִים}$  is used elliptically to denote *goat's hair* (as in *Exod.* xxvi, 7; xxxvi, 14; *Numb.* xxxi, 20), the Sept. renders *σκήτινος, τρίχινος*, or *αἰγίως*; in *1 Sam.* xix, 13 it gives the strange rendering *ἦπαρ τῶν αἰγῶν*, reading  $\text{בְּבֵרִי}$  (comp. *Joseph. Ant.* vi, 11, 4). See **BOLSTER**.

2. The next most frequent term is  $\text{אַתּוּד'$ , which is used only in the plur.  $\text{אַתּוּדִים}$ . In the *A.V.* it is translated sometimes "rams" (*Gen.* xxxi, 10, 12), often "he-goats" (*Numb.* vii, 17-18; *Psa.* l, 9; *Isa.* i, 11; *Jer.* li, 40; *Ezek.* xxxiv, 17), but usually simply "goats" (*Deut.* xxii, 14; *Psa.* l, 13; *Isa.* i, 15; *Prov.* xxvii, 26; *Isa.* xxxiv, 6; *Ezek.* xxvii, 21; xxxix, 18; *Zech.* x, 3). The singular occurs frequently in Arabic *atud*, and is defined in the *Kanús* as a young goat of a year old (Bochart, *Hieroz.* bk. ii, ch. 53, p. 646, where other authorities are adduced). The name is derived from  $\text{אַתּוּד'$ , *atud'*, *to set, place, prepare*, and hence Bochart infers it describes the animal as fully grown, and so prepared for all its functions and uses; Gesenius, a goat four months old; while others think no more is implied by the name than that this animal was strong and vigorous. The *attudim* were used in sacrifice (*Psa.* lxxvi, 15), and formed an article of commerce (*Ezek.* xxxvii, 21; *Prov.* xxvii, 26). In *Jer.* i, 8, the word is employed for the leaders of a flock ("chief ones"); and in *Isa.* xiv, 9, and *Zech.* x, 3, it is used metaphorically for princes or chiefs. See **HE-GOAT**.

3.  $\text{גִּדִּי}$ , *gadi'*, is the young of the goat, a *kid*. The name is derived by Fürst from the obsolete verb  $\text{גָּדַח}$ , *gadach'*, *to cast forth*, so that it is equivalent to the Latin *fatus*, but was afterwards restricted to one kind, that of the goat. Gesenius traces it to  $\text{גָּדַח}$ , *gadach'*, *to crop*, and supposes the name was given to it from its cropping the herbage. Both etymologies are purely conjectural. The phrase  $\text{הַגִּדִּים הַזֵּבִים}$ , *gadi' kid of the goats*, is frequently used. See above. The reason of this Kinchi finds in the generic sense of  $\text{גִּרִּי}$ , as applicable originally to the young either of the sheep or goat, so that it required the addition of  $\text{הַזֵּבִים}$  to specialize its meaning, until it came by usage to denote only the latter. Ibn-Ezra thinks the addition was made because the *gadi'*, being yet tender, could not be separated from its mother. The flesh of the kid was esteemed a delicacy by the Hebrews (*Gen.* xxvii, 9, 14, 17; *Judg.* vi, 19; xiii, 15, etc.).—Kitto. See **KID**.

4. שַׁיִר, *sa'ir'*, signifies properly a *he-goat*, being derived from שָׁרַף, *to bristle*, i. e. the *shaggy* ("he-goat," only 2 Chron. xxix, 23; "goat," in Lev. iv, 24; ix, 15; x, 16; xvi, 7-27; Numb. xxviii, 22; xxix, 22-38; Ezek. xlili, 25; "satyr," in Isa. xlii, 21; xxxiv, 14; "devil," in Lev. xvii, 7; elsewhere "kid"). It occurs frequently in Leviticus and Numbers (שַׁיִר הַחַטָּאת), and is the goat of the sin-offering (Lev. ix, 3, 15; x, 16). The word is used as an adjective with שַׁיִר in Dan. viii, 21, "—and the goat, the rough one, is the king of Javan," and also in Gen. xxvii, 11, 23, "a hairy man." See SATYR. The fem. שַׁיִרָה, *se'irah'*, a *she-goat*, likewise occurs ("kid," Lev. iv, 28; v, 6). See SACRIFICE.

5. צִפְּרִי, *tsaphir'*, occurs in 2 Chron. xxix, 21, and in Dan. viii, 5, 8; it is followed by צִפְּרִיִּים, and signifies a "*he-goat*" of the goats. Gesenius derives it from צָפַר, *tsaphar'*, *to leap*, indicative of the sex. It is a word found only in the later books of the O. T. In Ezra vi, 17, we find the Chald. form of the word, *tsaphir'*.

6. יָגִישׁ, *ta'gish*, a *buck*, is from a root יָרַשׁ, *to strike*. It is invariably rendered "he-goat" (Gen. xxx, 35; xxxii, 15; Prov. xxx, 31; 2 Chron. xvii, 11).

7. In the N. T. the words rendered *goat* in Matt. xxv, 32, 33, are *ἔρμφος* and *ἐρίφων* = a young goat or *kid*; and in Heb. ix, 12, 13, 19, and x, 4, *τράγος* = *he-goat*. *Goat-skins*, in Heb. xi, 37, are in the Greek *αἴγια ἄφρατα*; and in Judg. ii, 17, *αἴγες* is rendered *goats*.

8. For the undomesticated species several Heb. terms are employed: (1.) צִבְּרִי, *ya'al'*, only in the plur. צִבְּרִים, *will* or *mountain goats*, rendered "wild goats" in the passages of Scripture in which the word occurs, viz. 1 Sam. xxiv, 2; Job xxxix, 1; and Psa. civ, 18.

The word is from a root צָבַר, *to ascend* or *climb*, and is the Heb. name of the *ibex*, which abounds in the mountainous parts of the ancient territory of Moab. In Job xxxix, 1, the Sept. have *τραγελάφου πέρραι*. In Prov. v, 19, the fem. צִבְּרָה, *yaalah'*, "roe" occurs. See ROE. (2.) אֶקֶז, *akko'*, rendered *wild goat* in Deut. xiv, 5, and occurs only in this passage. It is a contracted form of אֶנְקִיָּה, according to Lee, who renders it *gazelle*, but it is probably larger, more nearly approaching the *tragelaphus* or *goat-deer* (Shaw, *Supplement*, p. 76).—Smith, s. v. See WILD GOAT.

9. Other terms less directly significant of this animal are, (1.) שִׁפְיָה, *chasiph'*, a *flock*, i. e. little flock: "two little flocks of kids" (1 Kings xx, 27); and (2.) שֵׁה, *seh*, one of the *flock* of sheep and goats mixed (Lev. xxii, 28, and frequently "goat" or "kid" in the margin). See FLOCK.

10. For the אֶזְזֵל, *Azazel* ("scape-goat," Lev. xvi, 8, 10, 26), see AZAZEL.

The races either known to or kept by the Hebrew people were probably, 1. The domestic Syrian long-eared breed, with horns rather small and variously bent; the ears longer than the head, and pendulous; hair long, often black. 2. The Angora, or rather Anadoli breed of Asia Minor, with long hair, more or less fine. 3. The Egyptian breed, with small spiral horns, long brown hair, very long ears. 4. A breed from Upper Egypt, without horns, having the nasal bones singularly elevated, the nose contracted, with the lower jaw protruding the incisors, and the female with udder very low, and purse-shaped.—Kitto.

There appear to be two or three varieties of the



Long-eared Syrian Goat.

common goat (*Hircus agagrus*) at present bred in Palestine and Syria, but whether they are identical with those which were reared by the ancient Hebrews it is not possible to say. The most marked varieties are the Syrian goat (*Capra Mambrica*, Linn.), with long, thick, pendent ears, which are, says Russell (*Nat. Hist. of Aleppo*, ii, 150, 2d edit.), a foot long, and the Angora goat (*Capra Angorensis*, Linn.), with fine long hair. The Syrian goat is mentioned by Aristotle (*Hist. An.* ix, 27, § 3). There is also a variety that differs but little from British specimens. Goats have from the earliest ages been considered important animals in ru-



Common Syrian Goat.

ral economy, both on account of the milk they afford and the excellency of the flesh of the young animals. The goat is figured on the Egyptian monuments (see Wilkinson's *Ancient Egypt*, i, 223). Col. Ham. Smith (Griffiths, *An. King*, iv, 308) describes three Egyptian breeds: one with long hair, depressed horns, ears small and pendent; another with horns very spiral, and ears longer than the head; and a third, which occurs in Upper Egypt, without horns.—Smith.

Besides the domestic goats, Western Asia is possessed of one or more wild species—all large and vigorous mountain animals, resembling the ibex or bouquetin of the Alps. Of these, Southern Syria, Arabia, Sinai, and the borders of the Red Sea contain at least one species, known to the Arabs by the name of *Beden* or *Beddan*, and *Taytal*—the *Capra Jela* of Ham. Smith, and *Capra Sinaïtica* of Ehrenberg. We take this animal

to be that noticed under the name of *בָּזָז*, *yaal* or *jaal* (1 Sam. xxiv, 2; Job xxxix, 1; Psa. civ, 18; Prov. v, 19). The male is considerably taller and more robust than the larger he-goats, the horns forming regular curves backwards, and with from 15 to 24 transverse elevated cross-ridges, being sometimes near three feet long, and exceedingly ponderous: there is a beard under the chin, and the fur is dark brown; but the limbs are white, with regular black marks down the front of the legs, with rings of the same color above the knees and on the pasterns. The females are smaller than the males, more slenderly made, brighter rufous, and with the white and black markings on the legs not so distinctly visible. This species live in troops of 15 or 20, and plunge down precipices with the same fearless impetuosity that distinguishes the ibex. Their horns are sold by the Arabs for knife handles, etc.; but the animals themselves are fast diminishing in number. See **IBEX**.



Wild Goat of Sinai.


In Deut. xiv, 5, *בָּזָז*, *akko* is translated "wild goat." Schultens (*Origines Hebraice*) conjectures that the name arose from its shyness, and Dr. Harris points out what he takes to be a confirmation of this conjecture in Shaw's travels, who, from the translations of the Sept. and Vulgate, makes it a goat-deer or tragelaphus, under a mistaken view of the classification and habitat of that animal. *Akko*, therefore, if it be not a second name of the zemer, which we refer to the kebsch, or wild sheep [see **CHAMOIS**], as the species must be sought among ruminants that were accessible for food to the Hebrews, we should be inclined to view as the name of one of the gazelles, probably the alu (*Ant. Subgutturosa*), unless the Abyssinian ibex (*Capra Walie*) had formerly extended into Arabia, and it could be shown that it is a distinct species.—Kitto. See **WILD GOAT**.

From very remote antiquity goats have formed an important part of pastoral wealth in the East. They are not mentioned by name in the enumeration of Abram's possessions (Gen. xii, 16), nor in those of Job (Job i, 3; xlii, 12); but perhaps they are included under the generic term of "flocks," which Lot (Gen. xiii, 5), and, *à fortiori*, Abram possessed; and a she-goat formed part of the sacrifice offered by Abram on the occasion of the promise of Isaac (Gen. xv, 9). In the account of the miraculous increase of Jacob's cattle (Gen. xxxi, 10, 12) we find goats conspicuously mentioned. Their milk has always constituted an important article of food in Palestine (Kitto, *Pict. Palestine*, ii, 304).—Fairbairn. Goats were extensively reared among the Israelites (Lev. iii, 12; ix, 15; Exod. xii, 5, etc.); their milk was used as food (Prov. xxvii, 27); their flesh was eaten (Deut. xiv, 4; Gen. xxvii, 9); their hair was used for the curtains of the tabernacle (Exod. xxvi, 7; xxxvi, 14) and for stuffing bolsters (1 Sam. xix, 13); their skins were sometimes used as clothing (Heb. xi, 37).—Smith. Notwithstanding the offensive lasciviousness which causes it to be significantly sep-

arated from sheep, the goat was employed by the people of Israel in many respects as their representative. It was a pure animal for sacrifice (Exod. xii, 5), and a kid might be substituted as equivalent to a lamb: it formed a principal part of the Hebrew flocks, and both the milk and the young kids were daily articles of food. Among the poorer and more sober shepherd families, the slaughter of a kid was a token of hospitality to strangers, or of unusual festivity; and the prohibition, thrice repeated in the Mosaic law, "not to seethe a kid in its mother's milk" (Exod. xxiii, 19; xxxiv, 26; and Dent. xiv, 21), may have originated partly in a desire to recommend abstemiousness, which the legislators and moralists of the East have since invariably enforced with success, and partly with a view to discountenance a practice which was connected with idolatrous festivals, and the rites they involved. It is from goatskins that the leathern bottles to contain wine and other liquids are made in the Levant. For this purpose, after the head and feet are cut away, the case or hide is drawn off the carcass over the neck, without opening the belly; and the extremities being secured, it is dried with the hair in or outside, according to the use it is intended for. The old worn-out skins are liable to burst: hence the obvious propriety of putting new wine into new bottles (Matt. ix, 17). Harmer (*Obs.* iv, 162) appears to have rightly referred the allusion in Amos iii, 12 to the long-eared race of goats: "As the shepherd taketh out of the mouth of the lion two legs or a piece of ear, so shall the children of Israel be taken out that dwell in Samaria and Damascus."—Kitto. The passage in Cant. iv, 1, which compares the hair of the beloved to "a flock of goats that eat of Mount Gilead," probably alludes to the fine hair of the Angora breed. In Prov. xxx, 31, a he-goat is mentioned as one of the "four things which are comely in going;" in allusion, probably, to the stately march of the leader of the flock, which was always associated in the minds of the Hebrews with the notion of dignity. Hence the metaphor in Isa. xiv, 9, "all the chief ones (margin, "great goats") of the earth." So the Alexandrine version of the Sept. understands the allusion *καὶ τράγος ἠγορήμενος αἰπόλιον* (comp. Theoc. *Id.* viii, 49; Virgil, *Ecl.* vii, 7).—Smith. Goats, from their offensiveness, mischievous and libidinous disposition, etc., are symbols of the wicked, who are, at the day of judgment, to be finally separated from the good (Matt. xxv, 23).—Weniyss. See **SHEEP**.

From Lev. xvii, 7, it appears that the rebellious Hebrews, while in the desert, fell into the idolatrous worship of the *he-goat* (rendered "*dev's*," comp. 2 Chron. xi, 15), after the example of the Egyptians, under whose influences they had grown up. Herodotus says (i, 46) that at Mendes, in Lower Egypt, both the male and female goat were worshipped; that the god Pan had the face and thighs of a goat; not that they believed him to be of this figure, but because it had been customary to represent him thus. They paid divine honors, also, to real goats, as appears in the table of Isis. The *Sairim* ("wild beasts") of Isa. xiii, 21 were, according to the popular notion, supposed to be wild men [see **APE**] in the form of he-goats, living in unfrequented, solitary places, and represented as dancing and calling to each other.—Calmet. See **SPECTRE**.

A he-goat was the symbol of the Macedonian empire in the prophetic vision of Daniel (chap. viii, 5)—a



Coin of Archelaus, king of Macedon.

goat that had a notable horn between his eyes. It is interesting to know that this was the recognised symbol of their nation by the Macedonians themselves.

There are coins of Archelaus, king of Macedonia (B.C. 413), having as their reverse a one-horned goat; and there is a gem in the Florentine collection, on which are engraved two heads united at their occiputs, the one that of a ram, the other that of a one-horned goat. By this is expressed the union of the Persian and



Perso-Macedonian Gem.

Macedonian kingdoms, and Mr. T. Combe, who gives us the information, thinks that "it is extremely probable that the gem was engraved after the conquest of Persia by Alexander the Great" (Taylor's *Cabinet*, ii, 83 sq.). See MACEDONIA.

GOATS' HAIR (Heb. *goats* simply; see above) was used by Moses in making the curtains of the tabernacle (Exod. xxv, 4), and, from what we now know of it, seems to have been particularly suitable. The hair of the goats of Asia, Phrygia, and Cilicia, especially of the Angora breed, which is at the present day manufactured into stuffs, is very bright and fine, and hangs to the ground; in beauty it almost equals silk, and is never sheared, but combed off. The shepherds carefully and frequently wash these goats in rivers, and the women of the country spin the hair; it is then worked and dyed. The natives attribute the quality of the hair to the soil of the country. (See a treatise on the *Pastoral Life and Manufactures of the Ancients*, N. Y. 1845, chap. iv.) "The Cashmere breed has long been celebrated as the source from which are obtained those elegant Indian shawls which fetch so high a price in Europe. It is carried on men's backs over the ridges of the Himalayas, across frightful precipices, along narrow ledges over sharp, snow-covered peaks climbed by wooden ladders, across rattling canebidges over foaming torrents, until it arrives, loaded with extortionate taxes, at Cashmere, where the shawls are woven. Thence they are sent by mountain roads similarly beset with dangers and difficulties, and subject at every step to extortionate tribute, into Europe, either through Turkey, or over the Caucasus through Russia" (Fairhairn). See TENT.

GOAT, SCAPE. See SCAPE-GOAT.

GOAT, WILD. See WILD GOAT.


Go'ath (or, rather, GOAH', גֹּאֵה, a *lowing*; the final ה being local in גֹּאֵה־הַ, "to Goath," Sept. ἡ ἐκλεκτὴν λίθων; Vulg. *Goutha*), a place in the vicinity of Jerusalem, mentioned only in Jer. xxxi, 39 as lying beyond "the hill Gareb," in the compass of the city from between the corner-tower (on the north-west) and the valley of Tophet (on the south); hence, perhaps, some eminence on the western bank of the valley of Gihon. See JERUSALEM. In accordance with the etymology is the rendering of the Targum, which has for Goah גֹּאֵה־הַ = the heifer's pool. The Syriac, on the other hand, has *leromto*, "to the eminence," perhaps reading גֹּאֵה (Fürst, *Handb.* p. 269 b). Barclay (*City of Great King*, p. 118) essentially agrees with the above location, although he seeks to identify the name with *Golgotha* (p. 78), which is forbidden by the presence of the ך in *Goah*, and other philological considerations. See GOLGOTHA.

Gob (Heb. גֹּב, גֹּבִי, a *pit*; Sept. Γόβ v. r. Γέβ and Γόμ, Vulg. *Gob*), the scene of two of David's encounters with the Philistines, in the former of which Sibbechai slew the giant Saph, and in the latter Elhanan slew the brother of Goliath (2 Sam. xxi, 18, 19). In the parallel passage (1 Chron. xx, 4) it is called by its more usual name GEZER (see Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 131); and this, as well as the omission of any locality for the second event, is supported by Josephus (*Ant.* vii, 12, 2). On the other hand, some copies of the Sept. and the Syriac have *Gath* in the first case, a name which in Hebrew much resembles Gob; and this appears to be borne out by the account of a third and subsequent fight, which all agree happened at Gath (2 Sam. xxi, 20; 1 Chron. xx, 6), and which, from the terms of the narrative, seems to have occurred at the same place as the others. The suggestion of Nob—which Davidson (*Hebr. Text.*) reports as in many MSS., and which is also found in the Compl. ed. of the Sept.—is not admissible, on account of the situation of that place. See DAVID.

Gob. See LOCUST.

Gobel, JEAN BAPTISTE JOSEPH, a Roman Catholic bishop of France, was born in 1727 at Thann, in Upper Alsace. He was educated in the Collegium Germanicum in Rome, became canon at Porentruy, Switzerland, and in 1772 bishop in part. of Lydda, and coadjutor of the bishop of Basle. In 1789 he went as a delegate of the clergy to the *États Généraux*, allied himself with the Jacobins, became constitutional bishop of Paris, Upper Marne and Upper Rhine, voted on November 7, 1793, for the abolition of Christianity, and laid down his ecclesiastical dignities in the hands of the Convention. Having fallen into disfavor with Robespierre, he was executed April 13, 1794. (A. J. S.)

Goblet (גֹּבֵל, *aggul*, prop. a *trough* for washing garments, hence a *laver*; Cant. vii, 2, where it is described as being round; elsewhere a sacrificial "basin," Exod. xxiv, 6, or pensile drinking-"cup," Isa. xxii, 24). In form and material these utensils were probably like those found in the Egyptian ruins, some being of gold or silver, others of bronze, porcelain, and even wood. See BOWL; BASIN, etc.



Ancient Egyptian Goblets and Vases.

Gobolitis. See GEBAL.

Goch, JOHN OF, more properly *John Pupper*, was born in the little city of Goch in the beginning of the 15th century. Dissatisfied with the Church of Rome, he, like some others at that time, wished for a reformation, and insisted on the free use of the Scriptures. There is no accurate history of his life; all that is known is that he established an order of canonesses at Mechlin in 1451, attempted to introduce reform in the convents of that place, and for twenty-four years acted as father confessor of the deaconesses at Thabor. He died March 28, 1475. He was a man of great piety, and, though less vigorous than his friend Wessel, he was a better theologian than Thomas à Kempis. His principal works are, *De libertate christiana*, edited by Corn. Grapheus (Antw. 1521), and *Dialogus de quatuor erroribus circa legem evangelicam exortis*, in Walch's *Monumenta mediæ ævi*. The writings of Goch contain many reformatory ideas. He demanded that the Bi-

ble should chiefly be explained by itself, and laid great stress on love, on living piety, and especially on evangelical freedom. As an obstacle to the latter, he regarded the episcopal dignity, with its hierarchical elevation, above the priestly, which, in his opinion, was the highest in the Church. An excellent sketch of Goch, and of his relations to theology and Church reform, is given by Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation*, i, 17-157; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* v, 220 sq.

**God**, from the same Saxon root as *good*, thus beautifully expressing the divine benignity as the leading attribute of the most general term for the Deity, and corresponding almost invariably to two Hebrew words, both from a common root (עָזַר, *ul*, to be strong). Hengstenberg, however, regards the simpler of these words (אֱלֹהִים, *El*) as a primitive (*Auth. of Pent.* i, 251), while some consider the extended form (אֱלֹהֵינוּ, *Elo'üh*) as derived from a different root (the obsolete אֱלֹהִים, found in Arabic = to worship). The corresponding Shemitic terms are: Arabic, *Al* or *Allah* (q. v.); Syriac, *Ilo* or *Eloho*; Samar. *El* or *Chilah* (=powerful; Castell, in Walton's Polyglot Bible, vi, s. v.); Phœnician *El* (עֵל or אֵל), as in En-el (Ἐνυλος, Γαγελ (Gagilus, Γαγίμ), Ἐνοεῖμ (Sanchon.). See ALMIGHTY.

The only other Hebrew word generally employed in naming the Supreme Being is *Jehovah*, יְהוָה, which some (so Hävernick, *Historische-critische Einleitung ins alte Testament*, Berlin, 1839) propose to point יְהוֹה, *Jahveh*, meaning "the Existing One," holding that *Elohim* is used merely to indicate the abundance and super-richness contained in the Divine Being. With such, therefore, *Jehovah* is not of the same origin as the heathen *Jove*, but of a strictly peculiar and Hebrew origin. Both names are used by Moses discriminately, in strict conformity with the theological idea he wished to express in the immediate context; and, pursuing the Pentateuch nearly line by line, it is astonishing to see that Moses never uses any of the names at mere random or arbitrarily, but is throughout consistent in the application of the respective terms. *Elohim* is the abstract expression for absolute Deity apart from the special notions of unity, holiness, substance, etc. It is more a philosophical than devotional term, and corresponds with our term *Deity*, in the same way as *state* or *government* is abstractly expressive of a king or monarch. *Jehovah*, however, seems to be the revealed *Elohim*, the Manifest, Only, Personal, and Holy *Elohim*: *Elohim* is the Creator, *Jehovah* the Redeemer, etc. See **Jehovah**.

The translators of the Eng. A. V. have invariably translated this last Hebrew word by "Lord," which is printed in those passages in small capitals in our common Bibles, but whenever the two words which they thus render occur together, *Adonai-Jehovah*, the latter is rendered "God," in order to prevent the repetition of "Lord." The Greek has θεός (either with or without the art.). Jerome and the Rabbins enumerate ten Heb. words as meaning *God*; but they relate rather to his attributes. See **Lord**.

I. *Usage of the Hebrew terms properly rendered "God."*

1. אֱלֹהִים, *El*. This term is used in the most general way as a designation of Deity, whether of the true God or of the false gods, even the idols, of the heathen. In the latter reference it occurs Isa. xlv, 10, 15; xlv, 20; xlv, 6; and in the plur. אֱלֹהִים, *E'im'*, Exod. xv, 11; Dan. xi, 36; though in both these last instances it may be questioned whether the word is not used in the sense of *mighty ones*. To render the application of the term in this reference more specific, such epithets as אֲחֵרִים, *other, foreign* (Exod. xxxiv, 14), קָדְוִים, *strange, hostile* (Psa. lxxx, 10), קְדָוִים, *strange* (Deut. xxxii, 12), are used. When used of the true God, אֱלֹהִים is

usually preceded by the article (אֱלֹהֵינוּ, Gen. xxxi, 13; Deut. vii, 9), or followed by such distinctive epithets as אֱלֹהֵינוּ, *Almighty* (Exod. vi, 3); אֱלֹהֵינוּ, *eternal* (Gen. xxi, 33; Isa. xl, 28); אֱלֹהֵינוּ, *Supreme* (Gen. xv, 18); אֱלֹהֵינוּ, *living* (Josh. iii, 10); אֱלֹהֵינוּ, *mighty* (Isa. ix, 5); or such qualifying adjuncts as קְבוֹדוֹ, *of glory* (Psa. xxxix, 3); אֱמֶתוֹ, *of truth* (Psa. xxxi, 6); נִקְמָתוֹ, *of retributions* (Jer. li, 56); אֱלֹהֵינוּ, *of Bethel* (Gen. xxxi, 13). אֱלֹהֵינוּ, *of Israel* (Gen. xxxiii, 20); אֱלֹהֵינוּ (Deut. xxxiii, 26). In poetry אֱלֹהֵינוּ sometimes occurs as a sign of the superlative; as אֱלֹהֵינוּ, *hills of God, very high hills* (Psa. xxxvi, 7); אֱלֹהֵינוּ, *cedars of God* (lxxx, 11). The phrase אֱלֹהֵינוּ occurs Psa. xxix, 1; lxxxix, 7; and is supposed by some to refer to *angels*; but others take אֱלֹהֵינוּ here for אֱלֹהֵינוּ, and translate *Sons of the mighty* (see Rosenmüller, ad loc.). There is no instance of אֱלֹהֵינוּ in the singular being used in the sense of *mighty one* or *hero*; for even if we retain that reading in Ezek. xxxi, 11 (though thirty of Kennicott's codices have the reading אֱלֹהֵינוּ, and the probability is that in those which present אֱלֹהֵינוּ the ה is implied), the rendering "God of the nations" may be accepted as conveying a strong but just description of the power of Nebuchadnezzar, and the submission rendered to him; compare 2 Cor. iv, 4. In proper names אֱלֹהֵינוּ is often found sometimes in the first member of the compound word, e. g. אֱלֹהֵינוּ, *Elijah*, אֱלֹהֵינוּ, *Eldad*, etc., and sometimes as the last member, e. g. אֱלֹהֵינוּ, *Samuel*; אֱלֹהֵינוּ, *Lemuel*; אֱלֹהֵינוּ, *Tabeel*, etc. See **El**.

2. אֱלֹהֵינוּ, *Elo'üh*, plur. אֱלֹהֵינוּ, *Elohim'*. The singular form occurs only in poetry, especially in Job, and in the later books, such as Daniel, Nehemiah, and Chronicles. It is used as well of idol deities as of the true God (Dan. xi, 37, 38; Habak. i, 11; Deut. xxxii, 15; Psa. l, 22; Habak. iii, 3, etc.); once in the former case with the addition of אֱלֹהֵינוּ (Dan. xi, 39), and in the latter with that of אֱלֹהֵינוּ (Psa. cxiv, 7). The more common usage is that of the plural. This pervades all the books of the Old Test., from the earliest to the latest. Thus it is used principally of the true God, and in this case frequently with the article prefixed (Gen. v, 22; vi, 9, 11; xvii, 18), as well as with such adjuncts as אֱלֹהֵינוּ (Neh. i, 4), or with the addition of אֱלֹהֵינוּ (Gen. xxiv, 3); אֱלֹהֵינוּ (Isa. lxxv, 16); אֱלֹהֵינוּ (Psa. iv, 2); אֱלֹהֵינוּ (Amos iii, 13), etc. When the relation of Israel to God is to be indicated, the phrases *God of Israel, Jacob, Abraham* are used (Ezek. v, 1; Psa. xx, 2; xlvii, 10, etc.); and in this case, as the term *Elohim* is equivalent in effect to *Jehovah*, it is often used interchangeably with that term; thus Moses, who is designated אֱלֹהֵינוּ, *Ebed-Jehovah* (Deut. xxxiv, 5), is called in the same sense אֱלֹהֵינוּ, *Ebed-Elohim* (Dan. ix, 11); and the same object is designated indifferently אֱלֹהֵינוּ, *Ruach-Jehovah*, and אֱלֹהֵינוּ, *Ruach-Elohim* (comp. Judg. iii, 10, and Exod. xxxi, 3, etc.). Not unfrequently the two terms are combined (Lev. xviii, 2, 4, etc.; xix, 2, etc.; 2 Sam. v, 10; 1 Kings i, 36; xiv, 13; Psa. xviii, 29, etc.). Most commonly, however, they are used distinctively, with respect, probably, to the difference between their primary meanings (see Hengstenberg, *Auth. d. Pent.* i, 181 sq.). In the Pentateuch this discriminative usage has given ground for certain hypotheses as to the composition of that work. See **Pentateuch**. In the earlier historical books, *Jehovah* is more frequently used than *Elohim*; in Job, *Jehovah* is more frequently used in the poetical, *Eloah* or *Elohim* in the prosaic portions; in the Psalms, sometimes the one,

sometimes the other predominates, and this has been thought to afford some criterion by which to judge of the age of the psalm, the older psalms being those in which Elohim is used; in Proverbs it was chiefly Jehovah; in Ecclesiastes, Daniel, and Jonah, almost exclusively Elohim, and in the other prophets chiefly Jehovah. Elohim is also used of idol deities or false gods, because these are worshipped as if they were God (Exod. xix, 20; xxxii, 31; Josh. xxiv, 20; Jer. ii, 11; Jonah i, 5, etc.); and, like El, it is used as a superlative (Psa. lxxviii, 16; lxx, 10, etc.). Kings and judges, as the vicegerents of Deity, or as possessing a sort of representative majesty, are sometimes called *Elohim* (Psa. lxxxii, 1, 6; Exod. xxi, 6; xxii, 8). Whether the term is used of *angels* may be made matter of question. This is the rendering given to אֲלֹהִים by the Sept., Vulg., Targ., Syr., etc., in Gen. iii, 5; Psa. viii, 6; lxxxii, 1, 6; xxvii, 7; and cxxxviii, 1; but in the majority of these instances there can be little doubt that the translators were swayed by mere dogmatical considerations in adopting that rendering; they preferred it because they avoided thus the strongly anthropomorphic representation which a literal rendering would have preserved. In all these passages the proper signification of אֲלֹהִים may be retained, and in some of them, such as Gen. iii, 5; Psa. lxxxii, 1, 6, this seems imperatively required. In Psa. viii, 6 also the rendering "angels" seems excluded by the consideration that the subject of the writer is the grace of God to man in giving him *dominion over the works of his hands*, in which respect there can be no comparison between man and the angels, of whom nothing of this sort is affirmed. In Psa. xxvii, 7, the connection of the last clause with what precedes affords sufficient reason for our giving Elohim its proper rendering, as in the A. V. That the author of the epistle to the Hebrews should have adopted the Sept. rendering in citing these two passages (ii, 7; i, 6), cannot be held as establishing that rendering, for, as his argument is not affected by it, he was under no call to depart from the rendering given in the version from which he quotes. But, though there be no clear evidence that Elohim is ever used in the sense of angels, it is sometimes used vaguely to describe unseen powers or superhuman beings that are not properly thought of as divine. Thus the witch of Endor saw "Elohim ascending out of the earth" (1 Sam. xxviii, 13), meaning thereby some beings of an unearthly, superhuman character. So also in Zech. xii, 8 it is said, "The house of David shall be as Elohim, as the angel of the Lord," where, as the transition from Elohim to the angel of the Lord is a *minori ad majus*, we must regard the former as a vague designation of supernatural powers. Henzenberg would explain Psa. viii, 6 in accordance with this; but the legitimacy of this may be doubted.—Kitto, s. v. See ELOHIM.

On the use or absence of the article with אֱלֹהִים, see Quarry (*Genesis*, p. 270 sq.), who, after an elaborate examination of the subject, sums up the results as the following: "The dispelling of the supposition that any essential difference existed, at least in the earlier books, between Elohim with and without the article—any difference at all, but such as the exigencies of each occasion with respect to sense or grammar would have made in the case of any common appellation; the illustration of the use of the article with particles and prepositions, elucidating many passages of Scripture, and explaining many seeming causes of perplexity; and the establishment of an important characteristic difference as regards the usage in the case of Elohim with or without the article, between the earlier and later books of the sacred canon." See ARTICLE (IN GRAMMAR).

II. The attributes ascribed to God by Moses are systematically enumerated in Exod. xxxiv, 6, 7, though we find in isolated passages in the Pentateuch and

elsewhere additional properties specified, which bear more directly upon the dogmas and principles of religion, such as, e. g. that he is not the author of sin (Gen. i, 31), although since the fall man is prone to sin (Gen. vi, 5; viii, 21, etc.). But, as it was the avowed design of Moses to teach the Jews the unity of God in opposition to the polytheism of the other nations with whom they were to come in contact, he dwelt particularly and most prominently on that point, which he hardly ever omitted when he had an opportunity of bringing forward the attributes of God (Deut. vi, 4; x, 17; iv, 39; ix, 16, etc.; Numb. xvi, 22; xxxiii, 19, etc.; Exod. xv, 11; xxxiv, 6, 7, etc.).

In the prophets and other sacred writers of the Old Testament these attributes are still more fully developed and explained by the declarations that God is the first and the last (Isa. xlv, 6); that he changes not (Hab. iii, 6); that the earth and heaven shall perish, but he shall endure (Psa. cii, 26)—a distinct allusion to the last doomsday—and that he is omnipresent (Prov. xv, 3; Job xxxiv, 22, etc.).

In the New Testament also we find the attributes of God systematically classified (Rev. v, 12, and vii, 12), while the peculiar tenets of Christianity embrace, if not a further, still a more developed idea, as presented by the apostles and the primitive teachers of the Church (compare Semisch's Justin Martyr, ii, 151 sq., translated by J. E. Ryland, 1843).

The expression "to see God" (Job xix, 26; xlii, 5; Isa. xxxviii, 11) sometimes signifies merely to experience his help; but in the Old-Testament Scriptures it more usually denotes the approach of death (Gen. xxxii, 30; Judg. vi, 23; xiii, 22; Isa. vi, 5). See DEATH.

The term אֱלֹהֵי מֶלֶךְ, "son of God," applies to kings (Psa. ii, 7; lxxxii, 6, 27). The usual notion of the ancients that the royal dignity was derived from God may here be traced to its source: hence the Homeric *εὐωγήμενος βασιλεύς*. This notion, entertained by the Oriental nations with regard to kings, made the latter style themselves *gods* (Psa. lxxxii, 6). אֱלֹהִים בְּנֵי, "sons of God," in the plural, implies inferior gods, angels (Gen. vi, 2; Job i, 6); as also faithful adherents, worshippers of God (Deut. xiv, 1; Psa. lxxxiii, 15; Prov. xiv, 26). אֱלֹהֵי אֱדָוָה, "man of God," is sometimes applied to an angel (Judg. xiii, 6, 8), as also to a prophet (1 Sam. ii, 27; ix, 6; 1 Kings xiii, 1).

When, in the Middle Ages, scholastic theology began to speculate on the divine attributes as the basis of systematic and dogmatic Christianity, the Jews, it appears, did not wish to remain behind on that head, and, collecting a few passages from the Old Testament, and more especially from Isa. xi, 2, and 1 Chron. xxix, 11, where the divine attributes are more amply developed and enumerated, they strung them together in a sort of cabalistic tree, but in reality representing a human figure.—Kitto, s. v. See CABBALA.

III. The Scriptures contain frequent notices of *false gods* as objects of idolatrous worship: 1. *By the Hebrews.* These were of two kinds: a. Adoration of other beings than Jehovah, held as divine (Ehrlen, *De diis et deab. Gentil. in S. S. memoratis*, Argent. 1750; Leusden, *De idolis V. T.* in his *Philolog. Hebr. mixt.* p. 291 sq.; Kalkar, *Udsigt over den idolatr. Cultus som omtales i bibelen*, Odense, 1838 sq.). Such false deities (which are generally identified with their images, Deut. iv, 28 sq.; Psa. cxv, 4 sq.; cxxxv, 15 sq.; 2 Macc. ii, 2; comp. also אֱלֹהֵי אֱדָוָה, *idols*, in passages like 1 Sam. xxxi, 9; Hos. iv, 17) are called אֱלֹהֵי אֱדָוָה, *nothing's* (perhaps a play upon אֱלֹהֵי אֱדָוָה), in the Jewish Church phraseology (Lev. xix, 4; xxvi, 1; comp. Hab. ii, 18), or אֱלֹהֵי אֱדָוָה, *breaths*, i. e. vanities (Jer. ii, 5; viii, 19; xv, 22), אֱלֹהֵי אֱדָוָה, *utter vanities* (Jon. ii, 9; comp. *ἄ μάρανα*, Acts xiv, 15), אֱלֹהֵי אֱדָוָה, *abominations* (1 Kings xi, 5;

2 Kings xxiii, 13); derisively גִּלְגָּלִים, *logs* (Ezek. vi, 4; xiv, 3); their sacred rites גִּלְגָּלִים, *frivolity* (1 Sam. xv, 23; Isa. lxvi, 3), and their whole worship harlotry (Ezek. xxiii; compare גִּלְגָּלִים, and derivatives, in Wiener, *Simonis Lex.* p. 286 sq.), in contrast with which Jehovah is called the *true God* (אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה, Jer. x, 10 sq.; Dan. vi, 20, 26 [compare גִּלְגָּלִים, Psa. cxvi, 28]; Acts xiv, 15; 2 Cor. vi, 16), the *God of Heaven* (Judith v, 7; compare Jer. x, 11, etc.). Indeed idolatry was reprobated as a capital offence in the Mosaic law, under penalty of extirpation and destruction in the case of the whole people (Lev. xix, 4; Deut. vi, 15; vii, 19; xi, 16 sq.; xxviii, 15 sq.; xxx, 17 sq.; xxxi, 16 sq.; comp. Josh. xxiii, 16; 1 Kings ix, 6 sq.), and stoning for individuals (Exod. xxii, 20; Deut. xvii, 2 sq.; comp. vi, 14 sq.; vii, 16; viii, 19; xiii, 2 sq.; Exod. xx, 3, 23); and the Israelites were admonished in their campaigns utterly to demolish idolatrous images (Exod. xxiii, 24; xxxiv, 13; Deut. vii, 5, 25; xii, 2 sq.; comp. 1 Chron. xiv, 12; 1 Macc. x, 84), and not to tolerate any heathen whatever in their land (Exod. xxiii, 33; Deut. xx, 17), and, furthermore, to shun all connection (even civil and political) with idolatrous nations (Exod. xxiii, 32; xxxiv, 15 sq.; Deut. vii, 1 sq.). Even instigation to idolatry was liable to punishment by death (Deut. xiii, 6 sq.). In spite, however, of these severe statutes, we find the Israelites, not only during the passage through the wilderness and the unsettled period of their polity (Numb. xxv, 2; Deut. xiii, 13; Josh. xxiv, 23; comp. Amos v, 25 sq.), but also under the monarchy, sadly departing from the worship of Jehovah, and addicting themselves to the adoration of Phœnicæo-Philistine-Syrian and Arabico-Sabeæan (in the time of the Maccæes also to Græco-Syrian) deities (see Gramberg, *Religionszûdenk.* i, 436), such as Baal, Ashtaroth, Moloch, Chemosh, Thammuz, etc., and connecting therewith soothsaying and sorcery (Deut. xviii, 10 sq.; comp. Dale, *De divinationib. idolol.* V, T. in his work *De origine et progr. idolol.* p. 363 sq.). See each of these names in its place.

The service rendered to foreign deities was very multiform (Mishna, *Sanhedrim*, vii, 6), but consisted principally of vows (Hos. ix, 10), incense (1 Kings xi 8; 2 Kings xxii, 17; xxiii, 5; Jer. i, 16; vii, 9; xi, 12; xiii, 15; xxxii, 29), bloodless (Jer. vii, 18) and bloody offerings (2 Kings v, 17), including even human beings. See **MOLOCH**. The incense and offerings were presented on high places and hills (Isa. lvii, 7; Jer. ii, 20; iii, 6; xiii, 27; Hos. iv, 13; 1 Kings xi, 7; 2 Kings xxiii, 5; comp. Philostr. *Apoll.* ii, 4; Spanheim, *ad Callim. Del.* 70; see **HIGH PLACE**), on roofs (Jer. xix, 13; xxxii, 29; Isa. lxx, 3), under shady trees (1 Kings xiv, 23; 2 Kings xvi, 4; xvii, 10; Hos. iv, 13; Isa. i, 29; Jer. ii, 20; iii, 13; xvii, 2; 2 Chron. xxviii, 4; Ezek. vi, 13; xx, 28; see **Movers, Phœnic.** p. 577 sq.), also in valleys (Jer. ii, 23; 2 Chron. xxviii, 3) and gardens (Isa. i, 29; lxx, 3). See **GROVE**. The votaries of many of these deities made an offering of their own chastity to them, and illicit commingling of the sexes was a chief element of such cultus. See **BAAL**; **ASTARTE**. Sitting upon graves formed also a part of idolatry, either as a propitiation to the manes or in necromancy (Isa. lxx, 4). Lustration even was not wanting (Isa. lxxi, 17). The priestly castes of these idolatrous systems were numerous (1 Kings xviii, 22; 2 Kings x, 21) and in good station (Hos. x, 5). One kind of them was called *Kemarim* (קִמְרִים), *Zeph.* i, 4; 2 Kings xxiii, 5; a Syriac word, Gesen. *Thes.* p. 693; Mishna, *Megil.* iv, 9). See **IDOLATRY**.

b. The worship of Jehovah, under the form of any image whatever, was strictly forbidden (Exod. xx, 4; Deut. iv, 16; v, 8; xxvii, 15; comp. Tacit. *Hist.* v, 5). Such symbols as the Golden Calf (q. v.) were borrowed from Egypt (Josh. xxiv, 14; Ezek. xx, 7 sq.). See Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* ii, 109 sq.; Gerritsen, *Cur Hebræi*

*ante exil. Babyl.* se ad *idolorum et plurium deor. cultum valde pronos ostenderint*, in the *Annal. Acad. Rheno-Traject.* 1822-3, p. 120 sq.; Michaelis, *Mos. Rech.* v, 98 sq.; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 286 sq. See **IMAGE**.

2. *Idolatry of non-Israelitish Nations.*—See each in its place. This was frequently portrayed by the prophets in all its grossness (1 Kings xviii, 27; comp. Deyling's *Observ.* i, 136 sq.), especially by exhibitions of the (mechanical) construction of these gods (images, Isa. ii, 8, 20; xlv, 10 sq.; Jer. x, 3 sq.; Hos. xiii, 2; Psa. cxv, 4; Baruch vi, 3 sq.; Wisd. xiii, 11 sq.; xv, 7 sq.; compare Philo, ii, 472; Horace, *Sat.* i, 81 sq.; Arnob. iii, 12; vi, 13 sq.; Augustine, *Cir. Del.* vi, 10), and their powerlessness (Isa. xli, 29; xlii, 17; xlv, 1, 2; Jer. ii, 28; compare Deut. iv, 28; xxviii, 36; Psa. cxv, 5 sq.; Hab. ii, 18). The images of the gods (מַצֵּבֹת) were sometimes *cast* (metallic, Judg. xvii, 4; Isa. ii, 20; xl, 19; Hos. xiii, 2), מִצֵּבֹת, *cast*; sometimes *carved* (of wood, Isa. xliv, 13; Jer. x, 3; comp. Pliny, xii, 2; xiii, 17; Pausan. ii, 19, 3), מַצֵּבֹת, *carved* [see **DIANA**], or even moulded of clay (Wisd. xv, 8; Pliny distinguishes "*lignea* et *ficilia* simulacra," xxxiv, 16). They were fastened with chains, so as not to fall down or be carried away (Isa. xli, 7; Jer. x, 4; comp. Pausan. iii, 15, 5; viii, 41, 4; Arnob. vi, 13), and were usually overlaid with gold or silver, and were, besides, richly decked with apparel (Isa. ii, 20; xxx, 22; xxxi, 7; xl, 19; Jer. x, 4; Hos. viii, 4; Baruch xii, 16; compare Douglæi *Analect.* ii, 179 sq.; Bähr, *Symbol.* i, 277 sq.). They were also painted with red (vermillion) color (Wisd. xiii, 14; compare Pliny, xxxiii, 7, 36; xxxv, 12, 45; Virgil, *Ecol.* vi, 22; x, 26 sq.; Plutarch, *Quest. Rom.* 98; Arnob. vi, 10; Bähr, *Symbol.* i, 334). They were taken by armies with them into battle (2 Sam. v, 21; comp. Curtius, viii, 14, 11; Polyæn. vii, 4). Victors were accustomed to carry them about in triumph, in order to despoil the subject nations of their divinities (Isa. x, 10; xxxvi, 19; xxxvii, 12), or to bind them to greater fidelity (Isa. xlv, 1 sq.; Jer. xlviii, 7; xlix, 3; Hos. x, 5; Dan. xi, 8; compare Pausan. viii, 46, 1; see Borchart, *Hieroz.* i, 372; Withof, *Opusc.* p. 143 sq.). The weapons of slain enemies were hung as trophies in the temples of the gods (1 Sam. xxxi, 10; Pausan. i, 13, 3; Xenoph. *Anab.* v, 3, 4; Euseb. *Chron. Arm.* i, 67). Soothsaying and sorcery ever stand in connection with this cultus (Isa. xix, 3).—Wiener, i, 433. See also **MARK IN THE FLESH**.

IV. *The Christian Doctrine of God.*—1. *Source.*—The Christian idea of God is derived from the Scriptures. The statement **GOD IS GOD** suffices for the wants of theology in itself, and is given as a complete proposition in the Scriptures (Exod. iii, 14; Isa. xliii, 12). But the Scriptures afford many indications, not merely as to the character of God, but also as to his nature. The substance of these teachings may be summed up in the statements, God is a Spirit, God is Love, God is Lord. These statements include the idea of an immaterial, intelligent, and free personal Being, of perfect goodness, wisdom, and power, who made the universe and continues to support it, as well as to govern and direct it, by his providence. Dr. Adam Clarke gives the following general statement of the doctrine of the Great First Cause: "The eternal, independent, and self-existent Being; the Being whose purposes and actions spring from himself, without foreign motive or influence; he who is absolute in dominion; the most pure, the most simple, the most spiritual of all essences; infinitely benevolent, beneficent, true, and holy; the cause of all being, the upholder of all things; infinitely happy, because infinitely perfect; and eternally self-sufficient, needing nothing that he has made; illimitable in his immensity, inconceivable in his mode of existence, and indescribable in his essence; known fully only to himself, because an infinite mind can only be fully comprehended by

itself. In a word, a Being who, from his infinite wisdom, can not err or be deceived, and, from his infinite goodness, can do nothing but what is eternally just, and right, and kind." The Christian doctrine of God, in its development, involves the idea of the Trinity: God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. See TRINITY.

2. *Connotation of the term God.*—The word *Θεός*, *God*, taken to signify "an object of religious veneration," was formerly applied to the pretended deities of the heathen, and accordingly *Θεός* and *Deus* were employed by the promulgators of the Gospel when calling on the heathen to transfer their *worship* from their idols to Jehovah. But the word "God" has come to signify in Christian use the Maker and Ruler of the world, and is absolutely and exclusively applied to him. There is "one God" in the Christian sense, and there can be but one. "It is not meant merely that we believe this as a *fact*, but that it is moreover implied in the very meaning we attach to the *word*. And this is a distinction which should always be carefully attended to. The word 'Mohammedan' means nothing more or less than a believer in Mohammed, though the Christian regards Mohammed as having been in fact an impostor, and the Mohammedans regard him as a true prophet; but neither of these is implied (or connoted) by the word 'Mohammedan' when used by a Christian. On the contrary, the word 'God' does imply what has been above stated, as is evident from this: that any one who should deny that there *exists* any such being as a Maker and Governor of the world, would be considered by Christians not only as in error, but as an *Atheist*—as holding that there is *no* God (while whoever should affirm the existence of more than one God would be held to be an idolater); and this not the less though he should admit the existence of some being superior to man, such as the fairies, demons, nixes, etc., which are still feared by the vulgar in almost all parts of Christendom; the genii of the Eastern nations, and the gods and goddesses of the ancient heathens, which were all of this description. None of them was accounted the 'Creator,' and the births of most of them are recorded in their mythology; and altogether the notions entertained of them seem to have been very nearly the same as the vulgar superstitions still prevailing in most parts of Europe relative to the fairies, etc., these being doubtless no other than the ancient heathen deities of those parts, the belief in their existence and dread of their power having survived the introduction of Christianity, though the title of 'gods' has been dropped, as well as the words 'sacrifice' and 'worship' in reference to the offerings, invocations, and other tokens of reverence with which they are still in several places honored. It appears, therefore, that as the ancient heathens denounced the early Christians as Atheists for contemning the heathen deities, so they may be considered as being, in the Christian sense of the word, themselves Atheists (as indeed they are called in Ephes. ii, 12), and that consequently the word 'God,' in the Christian sense and in the heathen, must be regarded as having two meanings. Wide, therefore, of the truth is the notion conveyed in Pope's 'Universal Prayer,' the Pantheism, as it is called, of the ancient heathen philosophers and the Brahmins of the present day, who applied the word God to a supposed soul of the universe:

"Mens agitat molena, et toto se corpore miscet,"

a spirit pervading all things (but not an *agent* or a *person*), and of which the souls of man and brutes are portions. In the Book of Revelation, 'Jehovah, the self-existent and all-perfect Being, with the world which he created and which he is ever ruling, alone meets our view. Though intimately present with all his works, he is yet entirely distinct from them. In him we live, and move, and have our being. He is infinitely high to us, and he is intimately present with us,

while we remain infinitely distant from his all-perfect and incommunicable essence' (Eden).

3. *Can God be known?*—The Scriptures declare that God is invisible (Exod. xxxiii, 20; John i, 18; 1 John iv, 12; 1 Tim. vi, 16, etc.) and unsearchable (Job xi, 7; xxxvii, 23). But the very existence of the idea of God, and even the use of the name God, with its connotation as given above, imply, not indeed that it is possible for man to *comprehend* God, but that it is not impossible to *know* God. And so the Scriptures make it man's duty to become "acquainted with God" (1 Chron. xxviii, 9; Jer. ix, 24; 2 Pet. i, 2; John xvii, 3, etc.). Even Atheists are bound to explain the *res in intellectu* manifested in the thought and language of men. To deny absolutely that God can be known is to deny that he exists; and, on the other hand, the proof, or even the admission that God exists, implies that it can not be absolutely unknown *what* or *how* he is: the knowledge of his existence implies as a necessary condition some knowledge of the mode of his existence, i. e. his power, wisdom, justice, etc. The passages cited above, declaring that God is invisible, etc., are not to be tortured to favor the idea that the human mind is absolutely incapable of knowing God. On the contrary, their purpose is to vindicate the claims of revelation as the source of knowledge of God. The Scriptures teach that God is made known in Christ (1) by his works (Rom. i, 20; 1 Sa. xix, 1, 2); (2) through his Son, which is, in part, his essence. True, God revealed his "glory" to Moses (Exod. xxxiii, 18-23), but the manifestation was given through a medium, or, rather, reflection, making "the goodness" of God to "pass before" Moses. Not sight, but faith, is the condition and means of our knowledge of God in this life (2 Cor. v, 7). God, then, can be known, but only so far as he *gives the knowledge of himself*, and so far as the capacity of man can reach. Johannes Damascenus said truly, "It is not possible to know God altogether; neither is it altogether impossible to know God." To see him with the bodily eyes would be fatal to a sinful creature (see citations above). But there is a dead "knowledge of God" (Rom. i, 21; James ii, 19); and, in contrast with it, there is a living knowledge of God, which includes a spiritual *seeing* of the invisible, the privilege of all who are in vital union with God through faith in his Son (Heb. xi, 27).

*Science* trusts to the functions and laws of the human mind as its instruments for the discovery of truth. But to know the truth, and to recognise the ground and object of phenomena in their connection and unity, is a process which leads invariably to the knowledge of the original and perfect Being; for every science which recognises truth and goodness in the world, in nature and in reason, recognises therewith a power of wisdom and goodness. But as we cannot recognise such a power abstractly, in recognising it at all we recognise the eternal God (Suabedissen, *Metaphysik*, 1836, p. 143). Yet as man, by science, can know the works of God only very imperfectly and incompletely, criticism and skepticism are always the companions of science; and she can be, at best, only the pioneer of true religious knowledge, or its servant. For the true religious knowledge of God is not founded upon science, but upon life—the life of communion with God. In the religious life the consciousness of God is before and apart from all reflection, all speculation; the soul, in its rapid dialectics, under the pressure of religious needs, has no need of syllogism to prove the existence of God. So Tertullian declares (in his *Testimonium Animæ*) that even the common heathen mind, apart from philosophy, reached a truer knowledge of God and of divine things than the heathen mythology and philosophy could teach. Even the Platonic philosophy taught that the longing of the soul for the truth and beauty of goodness leads to a renunciation of the outward and visible in behalf of an apprehension of the spiritual and real. Spiritual Christianity transforms



this teaching into a higher one, viz. that the longing of the soul for God, the search for God in Christ, is always rewarded, and that the "pure in heart" see God with the spiritual eyes of faith. Luther's doctrine that God may be taught, named, and apprehended in Christ, and in Christ *alone*, is quite in harmony with the early theology of the Church (e. g. Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, ii). Not that a mere intellectual faith in Christ brings this knowledge of God. With the conversion of the soul begins its new, spiritual capacity to receive and apprehend God; and as the soul is emptied of self and purged from sin by the Holy Spirit, it grows in knowledge of God, in light and love, until the "life of God" becomes the "life of the soul." Dr. Nevin (*Reply to Dornier*, 1869) has the following striking passage as to the specifically Christian conception of God: "There is a sense in which the absolute being of God, as related immediately and directly to our created being, must be considered the necessary ground of our *knowing* him and coming into union with him in the way of religion. The whole possibility of religion for us starts in the God-consciousness, or direct sense of Deity, which is as much a part of our original nature as the sense we have of the world around us or of our own existence. It is not put into us by any outward evidence or argument. It authenticates and necessitates itself as a fundamental fact in our life; and in doing this it certifies, to the same extent, the truth of the object on which it is exercised. Or, rather, we must say, the truth of the object on which it is exercised, which is the Divine Being, or the existence of the Absolute, certifies itself, makes itself sure in and through the consciousness into which it enters. In this sense, the idea of God comes before Christianity, as it comes before religion in every other form. But who will say that this general idea of God can be for us, therefore, the actual root of Christianity, so that any among us, starting with that alone, could ever by means of it come to a full construction of what God is for true Christian faith? It lies at the ground of pantheism, dualism, polytheism, deism, and all false religions, no less than at the ground of Christianity. For the distinctive knowledge of Christianity, then, we need some other specific principle or root, which, however it may be comprehended in the general principle of all religion, must be regarded at the same time nevertheless as the ground and beginning, exclusively and entirely, of religion under this its highest and only absolutely complete form. Where, now, is that principle to be found? Where does the whole world of Christianity, the new creation of the Gospel (life, power, doctrine, and all), take its rise and start? Where do we come to the source of its perennial revelation, the ground of its indestructible life? Where, save in the presence of the Word Incarnate, the glorious Person of him who is the Root and the Offspring of David, the bright and morning Star—the faithful and true Witness, the BEGINNING of the creation of God!"

But *Religion* has had her errors and excesses as well as Science. As the latter seeks in its pride, by purely intellectual effort, to apprehend the absolute, so the former has at certain periods allowed mysticism to take the place of the simple revealed truth as to the life of God in the soul, and, in the spirit of the Oriental theosophy, has called the "redeemed soul but a drop in the ocean of God" (see MYSTICISM). The orthodox Christian doctrine keeps the golden mean between these extremes. It asserts, and has asserted from the beginning, that a real and objective knowledge of God comes only from God's revelation, and that only *κατὰ τὸ ἐκπέπαιον*, *pro virili* (Arist. *De Mund.*), according to the best capacity of man. It teaches not only that God is "incomprehensible," but also that every step taken in the true knowledge of God by the soul makes his "incomprehensibility" more obvious. It does not pretend that the scriptural doctrine of one God in three persons

is perfectly within the scope of the human intellect to comprehend as well as to apprehend; but all Church history shows that a genuine and even scientific knowledge of God has been better maintained *with* the doctrine of the Trinity than without it. When the Arians attacked the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity on the ground that it transcended human reason, the orthodox replied that it was easier to know God by receiving the doctrine of the Trinity than by rejecting it. Naked monotheism, whether in Judaism, Islamism, or elsewhere, has always ended in bald pantheism (q. v.), while on the other hand the Christian doctrine of the Trinity, though stigmatized by infidel and rationalistic opponents as Tritheism, has, from the beginning, preserved in the Church the idea of God as the eternal, spiritual, and personal Being, and has kept up, also, a pure and spiritual worship of the Great Supreme. See Ritter, *Ueber die Erkenntniss Gottes in der Welt*, 1856; Nitzsch, *Syst. d. Christlichen Lehre*, § 7, 60-80; Nitzsch, in Herzog's *Real-Encyclop.* s. v. Gott.

V. *Substance and Mode of the Scripture Teaching.*—"In the Scriptures no attempt is made to *prove* the *existence of a God*. The error of men consisted not in denying a God, but in admitting too many; and one great object of the Bible is to demonstrate that there is but one. No metaphysical arguments, however, are employed in it for this purpose. The proof rests on facts recorded in the history of the Jews, from which it appears that they were always victorious and prosperous so long as they served the only living and true God, Jehovah (the name by which the Almighty made himself known to them), and uniformly unsuccessful when they revolted from him to serve other gods. What argument could be so effectual to convince them that there was no god in all the earth but the God of Israel? The sovereignty and universal providence of the Lord Jehovah are proved by predictions delivered by the Jewish prophets, pointing out the fate of nations and of empires, specifying distinctly their rise, the duration of their power, and the causes of their decline; thus demonstrating that one God ruled among the nations, and made them the unconscious instruments of promoting the purposes of his will. In the same manner, none of the attributes of God are demonstrated in Scripture by reasoning: they are simply affirmed and illustrated by facts; and instead of a regular deduction of doctrines and conclusions from a few admitted principles, we are left to gather them from the recorded feelings and devotional expressions of persons whose hearts were influenced by the fear of God. These circumstances point out a marked singularity in the Scriptures, considered as a repository of religious doctrines. The writers, generally speaking, do not reason, but exhort and remonstrate; they do not attempt to fetter the judgment by the subtleties of argument, but to rouse the feelings by an appeal to palpable facts. This is exactly what might have been expected from teachers acting under a divine commission, and armed with undeniable facts to enforce their admonitions. The sacred writers furnish us with information on the existence and the character of God (1) from the *names* by which he is designated; (2) from the *actions* ascribed to him; and (3) from the *attributes* with which he is invested.

"1. The *names of God* as recorded in Scripture convey at once ideas of overwhelming greatness and glory, mingled with that awful mysteriousness with which, to all finite minds, and especially to the minds of mortals, the divine essence and mode of existence must ever be invested. Though ONE, he is אֱלֹהִים, EL-OHIM, GODS, *persons adorable*. He is יְהוָה, JEHOVAH, *self-existing*; אֱלֹהֵי, EL, *the Mighty, Almighty*; שֵׁנַי, SHADDAI, *omnipotent, all-sufficient*; אֲדֹנָי, ADONAI, *Lord, Ruler, Judge*. These are among the adorable appellatives of God which are scattered throughout the

revelation that he has been pleased to make of himself. But on one occasion he was pleased more particularly to declare his *name*, that is, such of the qualities and attributes of the divine nature as mortals are the most interested in knowing, and to unfold not only his natural, but also those of his moral attributes by which his conduct towards his creatures is regulated: 'And the Lord passed by and proclaimed, The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children and upon the children's children unto the third and fourth generation' (Exod. xxxiv). This is the most ample and particular description of the character of God, as given by himself in the Old Testament" (Watson). The name "which is above every name" (Phil. ii, 9), is the name *JESUS* (Col. iii, 17). The name in Exod. iii, 14 is peculiar in denoting God as the "God who reveals himself." The declaration "*I am that I am*," or "*I will be that I will be*," does not so much include a predicate of God as a declaration of the eternal being of God, as *revealing* himself and his kingdom in time; it involves not merely the sense of existence (to which it is limited by the Septuagint version  $\delta\ \acute{\omicron}\nu\varsigma$ ), but also the idea of the continual self-revealing of God, and thus *unifies*, so to speak, all the successive steps and epochs of revelation. He is "*the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, which is, and which was, and which is to come—the Almighty*" (Rev. i, 8). The name *Jehovah* was too holy to be uttered, and others were substituted for it by the Jews; the fearful penalty for blaspheming it was death (Lev. xxiv, 16; see Clarke's note *ad loc.*). In the names *Father* and *Redeemer* (Isa. lxiii, 16), new elements of the character of the self-revealing *Jehovah* are set forth; he shows himself as the God of grace and love to his people who turn unto him.—Watson, *Institutes*, pt. ii, c. i; Nitzsch, in Herzog's *Real-Encyclop.* s. v. Gott; Hengstenberg, *Die Gottsnamen des Pentateuch*; Knapp, *Theology* (Wood's ed. p. 84); Lange, *On Genesis*, *Introd.* § 7.

2. *Actions*.—The second means by which the Scriptures convey to us the knowledge of God is by the *actions* which they ascribe to him. They contain, indeed, the important record of his dealings with men in every age which is comprehended within the limit of the sacred history, and by prophetic declaration they also exhibit the principles on which he will govern the world to the end of time; so that the whole course of the divine administration may be considered as exhibiting a singularly illustrative comment upon those attributes of his nature which, in their abstract form, are contained in such declarations as those which have been just quoted. (1.) The first act ascribed to God is that of *creation*. By this were manifested: his *eternity* and *self-existence*, as he who creates must be before all creatures, and he who gives being to others can himself derive it from none; his *almighty power*, shown both in the act of creation and in the number and vastness of the objects so produced; his *wisdom*, in their arrangement and in their fitness to their respective ends; and his *goodness*, as the whole tended to the happiness of *sentient* beings. The foundations of his natural and moral government are also made manifest by his creative acts. In what he made out of nothing he had an absolute right and prerogative; it awaited his ordering, and was completely at his disposal; so that to alter or destroy his own work, and to prescribe the laws by which the intelligent and rational part of his creatures should be governed, are rights which none can question. Thus, on the one hand, his character of *Lord* or *Governor* is established, and, on the other, our duty of *lowly homage* and *absolute obedience*. (2.) *Providence*.—Agreeably to this, as soon as man was created he was placed under a rule of conduct. Obedience was to be followed with the continuance of the

divine favor; transgression, with death. The event called forth new manifestations of the character of God. His tender *mercy*, in the compassion showed to the fallen pair; his *justice*, in forgiving them only in the view of a satisfaction to be hereafter offered to his justice by an innocent representative of the sinning race; his *love* to that race, in giving his own Son to become this Redeemer, and in the fulness of time to die for the sins of the whole world; and his *holiness*, in connecting with this provision for the pardon of man the means of restoring him to a sinless state, and to the obliterated image of God in which he had been created. Exemplifications of the divine *mercy* are traced from age to age in his establishing his own worship among men, and remitting the punishment of individual and national offences in answer to prayer offered from penitent hearts, and in dependence upon the typified or actually offered universal sacrifice; of his *condescension*, in stooping to the cases of individuals, in his dispensations both of providence and grace, by showing respect to the poor and humble, and principally by the incarnation of God in the form of a servant, admitting men into familiar and friendly intercourse with himself, and then entering into heaven to be their patron and advocate until they should be received into the same glory, 'and so be forever with the Lord,' of his strictly *righteous government*, in the destruction of the old world, the cities of the plain, the nations of Canaan, and all ancient states, upon their 'filling up the measure of their iniquities,' and, to show that 'he will by no means clear the guilty,' in the numerous and severe punishments inflicted even upon the chosen seed of Abraham because of their transgressions; of his *long-suffering*, in frequent warnings, delays, and corrective judgments inflicted upon individuals and nations before sentence of utter excision and destruction; of *faithfulness* and *truth*, in the fulfilment of promises, often many ages after they were given, as in the promises to Abraham respecting the possession of the land of Canaan by his seed, and in all the 'promises made to the fathers' respecting the advent, vicarious death, and illustrious offices of the 'Christ,' the Saviour of the world; of his *immutability*, in the constant and unchanging laws and principles of his government, which remain to this day precisely the same in every thing universal as when first promulgated, and have been the rule of his conduct in all places as well as through all time; of his *prescience* of future events, manifested by the predictions of Scripture; and of the depth and stability of his *counsel*, as illustrated in that plan and purpose of bringing back a revolted world to obedience and felicity which we find steadily kept in view in the scriptural history of the acts of God in former ages—which is still the end towards which all his dispensations bend, however wide and mysterious their sweep, and which they will finally accomplish, as we learn from the prophetic history of the future contained in the Old and New Testaments. Thus the course of divine operation in the world has from age to age been a manifestation of the divine character, continually receiving new and stronger illustrations until the completion of the Christian revelation by the ministry of Christ and his inspired followers, and still placing itself in brighter light and more impressive aspects as the scheme of human redemption runs on to its consummation. From all the acts of God as recorded in the Scriptures we are taught that he alone is God; that he is present every where to sustain and govern all things; that his wisdom is infinite, his counsel settled, and his power irresistible; that he is holy, just, and good—the Lord and the Judge, but the Father and the Friend, of man.

3. *Nature and Attributes*.—"More at large do we learn what God is from the declarations of the inspired writings. As to his *substance*, that 'God is a Spirit.' As to his *duration*, that 'from everlasting to everlasting he is God;' 'the King, eternal, immortal, invis-

ble.' That, after all the manifestations he has made of himself, he is, from the infinite perfection and glory of his nature, *incomprehensible*: 'Lo, these are but parts of his ways, and how little a portion is heard of him!' 'Touching the Almighty, we cannot find him out.' That he is *unchangeable*: 'The Father of Lights, with whom there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.' That 'he is the fountain of life,' and the only independent Being in the universe: 'Who only hath immortality.' That every other being, however exalted, has its existence from him: 'For by him were all things created which are in heaven and in earth, whether they are visible or invisible.' That the existence of every thing is upheld by him, no creature being for a moment independent of his support: 'By him all things consist;' 'upholding all things by the word of his power.' That he is *omnipresent*: 'Do not I fill heaven and earth with my presence? saith the Lord.' That he is *omniscient*: 'All things are naked and open before the eyes of him with whom we have to do.' That he is the absolute Lord and *Owner* of all things: 'The heavens, even the heaven of heavens, are thine, and all the parts of them;' 'The earth is thine, and the fullness thereof, the world and them that dwell therein;' 'He doeth according to his will in the armies of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth.' That his *providence* extends to the minutest objects: 'The hairs of your head are all numbered;' 'Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father.' That he is a Being of unspotted *purity* and perfect *rectitude*: 'Holy, holy, holy Lord God of hosts!' 'A God of truth, and in whom there is no iniquity;' 'Of purer eyes than to behold iniquity.' That he is *just* in the administration of his government: 'Shall not the Judge of the whole earth do right?' 'Clouds and darkness are round about him; judgment and justice are the habitation of his throne.' That his *wisdom* is unsearchable: 'O the depth of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!' And, finally, that he is *good* and *merciful*: 'Thou art good, and thy mercy endureth forever;' 'His tender mercy is over all his works;' 'God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ;' 'God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them;' 'God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son.' See **ATTRIBUTES**; also VI below.

"Under these deeply awful but consolatory views do the Scriptures present to us the supreme object of our worship and trust; and they dwell upon each of the above particulars with inimitable sublimity and beauty of language, and with an inexhaustible variety of illustration. Nor can we compare these views of the divine nature with the conceptions of the most enlightened of pagans without feeling how much reason we have for everlasting gratitude that a revelation so explicit and so comprehensive should have been made to us on a subject which only a revelation from God himself could have made known. It is thus that Christian philosophers, even when they do not use the language of the Scriptures, are able to speak on this great and mysterious doctrine in language so clear and with conceptions so noble; in a manner, too, so equitable, so different from the sages of antiquity, who, if on any time they approach the truth when speaking of the divine nature, never fail to mingle with it some essentially erroneous or groveling conception. 'By the word God,' says Dr. Barrow, 'we mean a Being of infinite wisdom, goodness, and power, the Creator and the Governor of all things, to whom the great attributes of eternity and independency, omniscience and immensity, perfect holiness and purity, perfect justice and veracity, complete happiness, glorious majesty, and supreme right of dominion belong, and to whom

the highest veneration and most profound submission and obedience are due' (Barrow, *On the Creed*). 'Our notion of Deity,' says Bishop Pearson, 'doth expressly signify a Being or Nature of infinite perfection; and the infinite perfection of a being or nature consists in this, that it be absolutely and essentially necessarily, an actual being of itself, and potential or causative of all beings beside itself; independent from any other, upon which all things else depend, and by which all things else are governed' (Pearson, *On the Creed*). 'God is a Being,' says Lawson, 'and not any kind of being, but a substance which is the foundation of other beings; and not only a substance, but perfect. Yet many beings are perfect in their kind, yet limited and finite; but God is absolutely, fully, and every way infinitely perfect, and therefore above spirits, above angels, who are perfect comparatively. God's infinite perfection includes all the attributes, even the most excellent. It excludes all dependency, borrowed existence, composition, corruption, mortality, contingency, ignorance, unrighteousness, weakness, misery, and all imperfections whatever. It includes necessity of being, independency, perfect unity, simplicity, immensity, eternity, immortality; the most perfect life, knowledge, wisdom, integrity, power, glory, bliss, and all these in the highest degree. We can not pierce into the secrets of this eternal Being. Our reason comprehends but little of him, and when it can proceed no farther faith comes in, and we believe far more than we can understand; and this our belief is not contrary to reason, but reason itself dictates unto us that we must believe far more of God than it can inform us of' (Lawson, *Theo-Politica*). To these we may add an admirable passage from Sir Isaac Newton: 'The word God frequently signifies *Lord*, but every Lord is not God: it is the dominion of a spiritual Being or Lord that constitutes God; true dominion, true God; supreme, the Supreme; feigned, the false god. From such true dominion it follows that the true God is living, intelligent, and powerful, and from his other perfections that he is supreme, or supremely perfect; he is eternal and infinite, omnipotent and omniscient; that is, he endures from eternity to eternity, and is present from infinity to infinity. He governs all things that exist, and knows all things that are to be known; he is not eternity or infinity, but eternal and infinite; he is not duration or space, but he endures and is present—he endures always and is present every where; he is omnipresent, not only virtually, but also substantially, for power without substance can not subsist. All things are contained and move in him, but without any mutual passion; he suffers nothing from the motions of bodies, nor do they undergo any resistance from his omnipresence. It is confessed that God exists necessarily, and by the same necessity he exists always and every where: hence also he must be perfectly similar, all eye, all ear, all arm, all the power of perceiving, understanding, and acting; but after a manner not at all corporeal, after a manner not like that of men, after a manner wholly to us unknown. He is destitute of all body and all bodily shape, and therefore can not be seen, heard, or touched, nor ought he to be worshipped under the representation of any thing corporeal. We have ideas of the attributes of God, but do not know the substance of even any thing; we see only the figures and colors of bodies, hear only sounds, touch only the outward surfaces, smell only odors, and taste tastes, and do not, cannot, by any sense or reflex act, know their inward substances, and much less can we have any notion of the substance of God. We know him by his properties and attributes.'—Newton, *Principia*, ii, 311, ed. 1803; Watson, *Instit.* pt. ii, c. i.

VI. *Dogmatical Treatment of the Doctrine of God.*  
—1. The exposition of the doctrine of God is the province of *Theology* proper, as distinguished from *Anthropology*, *Soteriology*, etc. See **THEOLOGY**. The doctrine is set forth by writers on systematic theology

according to their views of the relations of the subject to the other branches, but in general it constitutes the first topic treated, and is divided very much as follows:

2. *Division*.—1. The NATURE OF GOD: 1. As the original and unoriginated personal *Being*: (a) One; (b) self-existent; (c) infinite. 2. As the original *Word* and *Will*: (a) Creator; (b) preserver; (c) governor of the world. 3. As the original *Spirit*: (a) Essential Spirit; (b) origin of all moral and spiritual laws and existences. And hence, II, the TRINITY of three persons in the one Godhead: Father, Son, Holy Ghost. See MONOTHEISM; TRINITY. III. The ATTRIBUTES of God. These are not parts of the divine essence, but conceptions of the idea of God in his relations to the world and to human thought (Suabedissen, p. 150). *Perfectiones Dei, que essentiam divinum nostro concipiunt modo per se consequuntur, et de Deo paronymice predicantur* (Hollaz, p. 234). So Aquinas: "The name of God does not express the divine essence as it is, as the name of man expresses in its signification the essence of man as it is; that is to say, by signifying the definition which declares the essence" (*Summa*, pt. i, q. xiii, art. i). The ground of this distinction was the conviction that finite things cannot indicate the nature of the infinite God otherwise than by imperfect analogies. "The attributes of God must be represented to our minds, so far as they can be represented at all, under the similitude of the corresponding attributes of man. Yet we cannot conceive them as existing in God in the same manner as they exist in man. In man they are many, in God they must be one. In man they are related to and limit each other; in God there can be no relation and no limitation. In man they exist only as capacities at times carried into action; in God, who is *purus actus*, there can be no distinction between faculty and operation. Hence the divine attributes may properly be called mysterious; for, though we believe in their coexistence, we are unable to conceive the manner of their co-existence" (*Quarterly Review*, July, 1864, art. iii). There have been many divisions of the attributes of God. The scholastic theology set forth the attributes in three ways: 1. by causality (*via causalitatis*), in which all the perfections we observe in creation, and especially in man, are necessarily to be attributed to their Creator; 2. by negation (*via negationis*), under which the imperfections of created beings are kept out of the conception of God; 3. by analogy or eminence (*via analogie, via eminentiæ*), by which the highest degree of all known perfections is attributed to God. Accordingly, the attributes of God were classed as *negative* and *positive*, the negative being such as remove from him whatever is imperfect in creatures—such as infinity, immutability, immortality, etc.; while the positive assert some perfection in God which is in and of himself, and which in the creatures, in any measure, is from him. This distinction is now mostly discarded. Among modern writers, Dr. Samuel Clarke sums up the attributes as ultimately referable to these three leading ones: omnipotence, omniscience, and perfect goodness. Others distinguish them into *absolute* and *relative*: absolute are such as belong to the essence of God, as Jehovah, Jah, etc.; relative ones are such as may be ascribed to him in time, with relation to his creatures, as creator, governor, preserver, redeemer, etc. Others, again, divide them into *communicable* and *incommunicable* attributes. The communicable are those which can be imparted to the creature, as goodness, holiness, wisdom, etc.; the incommunicable are such as cannot be so imparted, as independence, immutability, immensity, and eternity. Another division makes one class of *natural* attributes, e. g. eternity, immensity, etc., and another of *moral*, e. g. holiness, goodness, etc. The later German theologians attempt more scientific discriminations; e. g. Böhme (*Lehre v. d. Göttl. Eigenschaften*, 1821; last ed.

Altenburg, 1842) distinguishes the attributes into those which refer to the *world in general*, and those which refer to the *moral world* in particular. Schleiermacher makes two classes: (1.) attributes which refer to the *universal* sense of dependence on God, viz. omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence; (2.) attributes which refer to the *Christian* sense of redemption and of dependence on God, viz. holiness, justice, wisdom, love. Pelt (*Theolog. Encycl.* § 74) classes them as (1.) attributes of God as absolute *cause* (a) in *himself*—eternal, infinite, self-sufficient; (b) in relation to the *world*—omnipotent, omnipresent; (2.) attributes of God as the original and *self-revealing will*—good, holy, just, benevolent, etc. Rothe's scheme of the attributes is thus set forth by Babut in the *Bulletin of the Revue Chrétienne* (1868, No. 3, Juillet): 1. *Absolute or immanent Attributes*: 1. self-sufficiency of God as a pure and absolute Being; 2. majesty; the divine will; 3. blessedness. II. *Relative Attributes*, implied in God's relation to the universe; the *love* of God is the source of creation and being, while the *essence* of God is expressed in infinity, immensity, immutability. The *personality* of God is manifested to the world in goodness, wrath, grace; the *intelligence* of God in omniscience, holiness, truth. The *will* of God is manifested in omnipotence, justice, faithfulness; and the *divine nature* is manifested in the one attribute of omnipotence. See Bates, *Harmony of the Divine Attributes*, Charnock, *Existence and Attributes of God* (Lond. 1845, 8vo, last edit.); Elwert, in *Tüb. Zeitschrift*, 1830; Blasche, *göttl. Eigenschaften* (Erfurd, 1831); Andree, *De Attrib. Divin.*, etc. (Lugdun. 1824); Bruch, *Lehre v. d. göttl. Eigenschaften* (Hamb. 1842); Moll, *De justo attributorum Dei discrimine* (Hal. 1855); Shedd, *History of Doctrine*, i, 240; Hase, *Evang. Dogmatik*, § 102 sq., and writers on systematic theology generally. See CREATION; TRINITY; PROVIDENCE.

VII. *History of the Doctrine of God*.—The history of the argument for the being of God will be found under NATURAL THEOLOGY. We treat here briefly the history of the doctrine of the nature and attributes of God. The first office of Christianity was to vindicate the spirituality of God against the material and anthropomorphic ideas of paganism, and even of corrupted Judaism. The proposition "God is a Spirit" was therefore a fundamental one; yet at an early period *anthropomorphic* ideas were developed in the Church. Melito, bishop of Sardis, in his treatise *Ἐπεὶ ἐναοπά-  
του Θεοῦ* (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iv, 26), taught a corporeal representation of God. Tertullian (*adv. Praxeam*, c. vii) declares *Deum corpus esse, etiam Spiritus est; nihil enim incorporate nisi quod non est*; and thus plainly shows that he could not distinguish reality from corporeity, even in God. The Anthropomorphites took the phrase "image of God" in a material sense, and taught that God is man per *eminentiam*. (2.) The second error was *Dualism* (q. v.), brought in by the Gnostic distinction between the supreme God and the Demiurge. See GNOSTICISM. (3.) Opposed to both these was the *philosophical* mode of conceiving God, including the idea of immateriality, proved negatively, e. g. Minucius Felix: *Hic nec rideri potest—visu clarior est; nec comprehendi potest—tactu purior est; nec estimari—sensus major est: infinitus, immensus, et soli sibi tantus quantum est notus*. "The Alexandrians opposed all crude anthropomorphisms, but they were not successful in correctly separating the real and the sensuous view, and hence were led into a subtilizing of the divine attributes. Clement attributes all errors in the apprehension of the Old Testament to the sensuous and liberal mode of understanding it, which led men to represent, after human fashion, the nature of God, who is exalted above all human passions. The prophets could represent God to us, not as he is, but only as we sensuous men can understand it (*Strom.* p. 391). Origen also sees in the Old Testament a condescension of God to the weakness of man,

In fact, there is no wrath in God, but he must appear as if wrathful to the bad, on account of the sufferings which their own evil conduct entails upon them (*Hom.* 18, in *Jerem.*). The Alexandrians disputed the self-subsistence of God's primitive justice, and merged it in the idea of a *καταστροφή σωτηρίας*, a disciplining reformatory love." Augustine speaks of God as the *ipsa incommutabilis veritas* . . . illud solum quod non tantum non mutatur, verum etiam mutari non potest, etc. But he declares that no complete definition of God can be given: *Deus ineffabilis est: factibus dicimus quod Deus non sit, quam quid sit* (Comm. in *Psal.* lxxxv). In the period of the Arian controversy, all questions as to the nature of God were bound up with the discussion of the Trinity (q. v.); and in the period from Gregory I to the scholastic age (11th century), with that of the doctrines of the Holy Spirit and the Person of Christ. See *CHRISTOLOGY*. In the scholastic period Anselm supposed an analogy (before used by Augustine) between the divine mind and the human. "We cannot know," he says, "the supreme Being in himself, but only after a certain analogy with created beings, therefore most of all with the rational spirit. The more this spirit enters into itself and observes itself, the more will it succeed in raising itself to the knowledge of the absolute Spirit. The human spirit is a mirror in which we may see the image of that which we do not directly behold. The supreme Spirit presupposes his own existence, knows himself; the Word begotten from himself is one with his own essence. Thus the supreme Being expressed himself. As everything which is produced by human art was before in the idea of the formative spirit, and as this idea remains even when the work perishes, and is, in this respect, one with the art of the formative spirit itself, so it is not another, but the same word by which God knows himself and all creatures. In the divine Word creatures have a higher being than in themselves; the ideal being rests in the divine thoughts. The relation of the Son to the Father is something elevated above all language. The expression *generation* is best suited to represent the relation, but yet it is symbolical. Further, as God knows himself, he loves himself; his love to himself presupposes his being and knowing. This is also denoted by the procession of the Holy Spirit from both; all three pass completely into one another, and thus constitute the unity of the Supreme Being" (*Monologium*, c. 64). The view of God taught by Scotus Erigena—*In deo immutabiliter et essentialiter sunt omnia*—led, in the hands of David Dinanto and Amalrich of Bena, to a pantheistic theory, which was opposed by Aquinas and the later schoolmen, especially by Albertus Magnus. As to the attributes of God, the principal discussions of the scholastic period related to his omnipotence and omnipresence. The confessions of faith of the *Reformation* period generally agree as to the doctrine of the nature, attributes, and works of God: the discussions that have arisen in the bosom of Protestantism on this subject refer chiefly to the doctrines of the Trinity (q. v.) and predestination (q. v.). The later theories of the *philosophical* period, on the sceptical side, are those of Idealism, Materialism, and Pantheism (see the several heads). Some later Christian writers, in opposing the extremes of German Rationalism, have denied the possibility of any scientific knowledge of God. Mansell (*Limits of Religious Thought*, Bampton Lectures for 1859) maintains that only a *regulative* (as distinguished from a *speculative*) knowledge of God is possible. "To conceive," says he, "the Deity as he is, we must conceive him as first cause, as absolute, and as infinite. But do not these three conceptions imply contradiction to each other, when viewed in conjunction, as attributes of one and the same being? A cause cannot, as such, be absolute: the absolute cannot, as such, be a cause. How can the infinite become that which it was not from the first?" Mr. Mansell here

pushes his opposition to the use of reason too far; and finding the words "absolute" and "infinite" used in transcendental senses by the Germans, he adopts those senses, and reasons as if no other definitions were possible. For criticisms of his work, see *London Review*, July, 1860, p. 390 sq.; Young, *The Province of Reason* (London, 1860); McCosh, *Method of the Divine Government* (Edinb. 1859, 6th edit.). The Christian conception of God over against the modern speculative idea is well set forth in the following passage: "The problem in regard to God is simply this: The human mind is compelled to think a unity or synthesis of all things. But how is this to be thought? Are we to think it inside nature, or outside and above it? Here it is that the Christian idea breaks off from the speculative. The Christian, realizing his own personality, feeling intensely that he himself in his inmost being is numerically different from and above nature, is compelled to think of the divine as in like manner supernatural. Having attained to this stage, the next question that arises is, How are we to image forth the divine Being? and the answer is, not surely by the lowest kind of natural existence, but by the highest. The human personality itself, not the immutabilities of the material world, which are lower in the scale of being, must be the image which shall shadow forth the divine Being. That which comprehends all things must, at least, equal in perfection the highest of these things. Thus the human personality becomes in the Christian system the image and likeness of God. God may, indeed, be far higher than man—so high that to call him a person may be as inadequate as to call the human soul a power. But, at least, we are sure of this, that whatever he is in himself, all that we mean by personality is comprehended in him. Just as man is a power and something more, so God is a person and perhaps something more. There is an indestructible belief in man, that all the pure feelings of the soul find a response in the infinite Author of all things. Under the impress of this universal conviction, men fall on their knees and worship. Such is the pure Christian idea, and it involves this consequence, that each individual soul stands in a *special and personal* relation to the infinite Author of all. There is an eye which is ever over us; a fatherly heart which yearns for us. There is One whose wisdom never fails, who is ever about our path and about our bed, and provides for us in all things. In like manner as he is all this to us, so we in turn are his children; we are responsible to him as to a father, and must be judged by him. Intellectually, too, the same Christian idea involves this consequence—that it is a grander and worthier conception of his providence to think him as dealing with and disciplining individual souls, than as contriving and arranging a world of dead laws. The one reveals heart and soul, the grandeur of personality and kingly might; the other, if taken by itself, only ingenuity, not necessarily personality at all. The speculative idea of God is the antithesis of this. It, too, recognises a central unity; but, looking away from the world of mind and soul, it concentrates its attention on the world of matter. It takes the laws of the material world as the image of the divine. God is revealed in the evolutions of nature. His attributes consequently are such as these: perfect wisdom, infinite power, absolute invariability of purpose. He has neither heart nor soul, nor even consciousness, as we understand it. He is impersonal, and can have no personal relation to us. He has neither knowledge nor care of the individual, but acts purely by general law. We need not, however, pursue the consequences, which are sufficiently apparent. It will be enough if we point out their bearing on practical life. Here are two opposing systems which hold a very different language to the human soul. The one says in the fine language of St. Augustine, *O homo, agnosce dignitatem tuam*; the other, *O man, rejoice in thy degradation*. The one digni-

fies and ennobles the soul, and, supplying it with a lofty ideal and immortal hopes, raises it from the depth of selfishness; the other degrades it to the level of the brute, and, depriving it alike of hope and fear, bids it snatch what enjoyment it can from the passing hour. That lofty conception of God, which has done so much for modern Europe, is purely the creation of Christianity. Were this latter taken away, it would instantly collapse, and there would only remain, for the upper classes, hopeless, selfish atheism; for the lower, degrading superstition" (*Christian Remembrancer*, July, 1866, art. xiii). On the *history of the doctrine of God* in general, see a series of able articles by Ritschl, in the *Jahrbücher f. deutsche Theologie*, vols. x, xiii.—Nander, *History of Dogmas*, p. 102, 285, 485, 460; Beck, *Dogmengeschichte*, p. 104-138; Hagenbach, *Dogmengeschichte*; Hase, *Evangelische Dogmatik*, p. 93-111; Meiners, *Hist. doct. de vero deo* (Lemgo, 1780, 8vo); Perrone, *Prælect. Theol.* i, 296-500; Gieseler, *Dogmengeschichte*, p. 107, 299, 486; Guericke, *Christliche Symbolik*, § 34; Storr and Flatt, *Biblical Theol.* bk. ii, pt. i; Knapp, *Theology*, § 83-85; Rothe, *Ethik*, i; Weisse, *Die Idee der Gottheit* (1833); Ritter, *Ueber d. Erkenntniss Gottes in d. Welt* (1836); Sengler, *Die Idee Gottes* (1848-1852); Späth, *Gott u. d. Welt* (1867). See also PANTHEISM; PROVIDENCE.

GOD, FRIENDS OF. See FRIENDS OF GOD.

GOD, PEACE OF. See PAX DEI.

**Goddard, JOSIAH**, a Baptist minister, missionary, and translator of the Scriptures, was born at Wendell, Mass., in 1813; graduated at Brown University in 1835, and at Newton Theological Seminary in 1838. He was appointed a missionary to the Chinese in Siam, China being not yet open to the residence of foreigners. There he labored with success as a preacher, translated the Gospel of John, and prepared tracts and an Anglo-Chinese vocabulary. Being taken with bleeding from the lungs, he removed to Ningpo, one of the treaty ports then recently assigned for foreign trade and residence. Here he continued, with conscious and growing weakness, holding upon life by a peculiarly uncertain tenure, yet with courage and patience, to labor on for six years—preaching, journeying, preparing and circulating tracts, and carrying to completion his version of the New Testament. This is a valuable contribution to the difficult work of Biblical translation in the Chinese language. He was an excellent scholar, and made high attainments in the study of that language. He proved himself a sensible and cautious, but brave and earnest worker. The disease against which he had borne up so long proved fatal in 1854. (L. E. S.)

**Godeau, ANTOINE**, a Roman Catholic bishop, was born at Dreux in 1605. He was destined by his parents for public life, but, having been disappointed in love, entered the ministry. He was one of the ornaments of the Hotel Rambouillet at Paris, where his talent for verse gained him distinction. Richelieu made him bishop of Grasse in 1636. After his consecration he retired to his diocese, and devoted himself to its duties. He subsequently quitted the see of Grasse for that of Vence, where he died April 21, 1672. He wrote *Morale Chrétienne* (1705, 3 vols. 12mo);—*Paraphrases des Epîtres de St. Paul et des Epîtres Canoniques* (1640, 1641, 4to);—*Psaumes de David, traduits en vers Français*;—*Nouveau Testament traduit et expliq.* (1668, 2 vols. 8vo), besides other smaller works, chiefly biographical. The most important of his productions is the *Histoire de l'Eglise*, from the commencement of the world to the end of the 9th century (Paris, 1653-1678, 5 vols. fol.). He left MSS. continuing the work. The first volume exposed the author to a charge of heresy, and the threats of a powerful ecclesiastic induced him to write the rest of his work with less impartiality.—Dupin, *Eccles. Writers*, 17th cent.;

Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vol. v; Nicéron, *Mémoires*, xviii-xx; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xx, 885.

**Godeschalus.** See GOTTSCHALK.

**Godfathers; Godmothers.** See SPONSORS.

**Godfrey of Bouillon**, duke of Lorraine, was born at Bézy, in Brabant, probably about A. D. 1060. He served with high distinction in the armies of the emperor Henry IV. When, near the end of the 11th century, the first crusade was set on foot, he entered into the movement, and was the first in rank among the Crusaders. "He not only signalized himself by valor among the valorous, and by enthusiasm among the enthusiastic, but he showed also disinterestedness, probity, skill, and prudence, which were of a higher and rarer order. He maintained the most complete discipline among his division of the Christian army, which he brought safely to the appointed muster-place beneath the walls of Constantinople in the winter of 1096. By his sagacity and firmness he prevented hostilities breaking out between the host of the Crusaders and the Greek emperor, Alexius Comnenus, and in the spring of 1097 Godfrey led the Frankish nations into Asia Minor, to the siege of the capital of the Turkish sultan of Nice. This city was captured after a siege, in which the personal valor of Godfrey, as well as his generalship, was frequently displayed. He was tall, well-proportioned, and of such remarkable strength and dexterity in the use of his weapons that he is said, in more than one encounter, to have cloven his foe by a single sword-stroke from skull to centre. After Nice was captured, the Crusaders marched forward and defeated a Turkish army in the great battle of Dorylaeum. They reached Antioch, in Syria, late in the winter of 1097. The city was captured after an obstinate resistance, and the weakened army of the victors was in turn besieged in its walls by an innumerable host of the Mohammedans. After enduring much suffering and loss, Godfrey led the Crusaders in a sudden sortie upon their enemies, which was completely victorious. The enthusiasm caused among the Christian army by the supposed discovery of the relic of the holy lance was one great cause of this success. It was not till 1099 that the Crusaders reached Jerusalem, and their numbers were then reduced by the sword and by disease to only 1500 horse and 20,000 foot fit for service. The Mohammedan garrison was far more numerous, and the city was formidably strong. But the zeal of the Crusaders was indomitable" (Rich, s. v.), and the Holy City was carried by storm July 15, 1099. Godfrey was proclaimed first Latin king of Jerusalem, but he rejected the title, and assumed the style of "Defender and Baron of the Holy Sepulchre." He defeated the sultan of Egypt at Ascalon, August 12, 1099. Godfrey compiled and promulgated a code named *Les Assises de Jerusalem*, which, as finally revised towards the close of the 14th century for the use of the Latin kingdom of Cyprus, is printed in old law French in Beaumanoir's *Coutumes de Beauvaisis* (Bourges and Paris, 1630). He died in 1100. See Creasy, in Rich's *Cyclop. of Biography*; *English Cyclopaedia*; Michaud, *Histoire des Croisades*.

**Godhead**, the nature or essential being of God (Acts xvii, 29; Rom. i, 20; Col. ii, 9).

**Godliness**, strictly taken, is right worship or devotion, but in general it imports the whole of practical religion (1 Tim. iv, 8; 2 Pet. i, 6). It is difficult, as Saurin observes, to include an adequate idea of it in what is called a definition. "It supposes knowledge, veneration, affection, dependence, submission, gratitude, and obedience; or it may be reduced to these four ideas: *knowledge* in the mind, by which it is distinguished from the visions of the superstitions; *rectitude* in the conscience, that distinguishes it from hypocrisy; *sacrifice* in the life, or renunciation of the world, by which it is distinguished from the unmeaning obedience of him who goes as a happy constitution

leads him; and, lastly, *zeal* in the heart, which differs from the languishing emotions of the lukewarm." The advantages of this disposition are honor, peace, safety, usefulness, support in death, and prospect of glory; or, as the apostle sums up all in a few words, "It is profitable unto *all things*, having the promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come" (1 Tim. iv. 8). In 1 Tim. iii. 16, it means the substance of revealed religion as furnished in the various particulars enumerated.—Barrow, *Works*, i, 9; Scott, *Christ, Life*; Scougal, *Life of God in the Soul of Man*; Saurin, *Sermons*, Engl. trans. v, serm. 3; Buck, *Theol. Dictionary*, s. v.

**Godman, JOHN D.**, an American naturalist and physician, was born at Annapolis, Maryland, in 1794, and, being early left an orphan, was bound apprentice to a printer, and afterwards entered the navy as a sailor-boy. At nineteen he commenced the study of medicine, and on completing his studies he settled in Philadelphia as a physician and private teacher of anatomy, and for some time was an assistant editor of the *Medical Journal*. In 1826 he was elected to the professorship of anatomy in Rutgers' Medical College, and removed to New York, where he soon acquired extensive practice as a surgeon. Ill health, however, obliged him to relinquish his practice, and spend a winter in the West Indies. He died of consumption at Germantown, Pa., April 17, 1830. He wrote a number of professional works of value; but he is mentioned here because of the fact that, having at one time adopted the infidelity and atheism of the French naturalists of the last century, the death of a friend in 1827 led him to reflection and to the reading of the Scriptures, and he became eminent for Christian piety. An account of him by Dr. T. Sewall is published by the American Tract Society.—Davenport, *Biogr. Dictionary*; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 681.

**God-man.** See INCARNATION.

**Godwin, Francis**, an eminent English prelate and Church historian, was born at Havington, Northamptonshire, in 1561. In 1578 he entered the college of Christ Church, Oxford, of which his father, Thomas Godwin, was dean. Here he took successively the degrees of B.A. in 1580, M.A. in 1583, B.D. in 1593, and D.D. in 1595. He held divers ecclesiastical offices until his publication of the *Catalogue of the Bishops of England* caused him to be appointed bishop of Llandaff. A Latin translation of this work, dedicated to James I, secured him the bishopric of Hereford. He died April, 1633. His works are, *A Catalogue of the Bishops of England since the first planting of Christianity in the Island, with a history of their lives and memorable actions* (1601, 4to; 2d ed. with additions, and Latin translation, 1615. This translation, with a continuation, was republished by Richardson, under the title *De Prasulibus Angliæ Commentarius*, Cambridge, 1743, folio);—*Rerum Anglicarum Henrico VIII, Edwardo VI, et Maria regnantibus, Annales* (1616, fol.; London, 1628, 4to; English, by his son Morgan, 1630, fol.);—*Nuncius inanimatus in Utopia* (1629, 8vo);—*A Computation of the Value of the Roman Sesterce and Attic Talent* (1630);—*The Man in the Moon, or a Discourse of a Voyage thither by Domingo Gonzales* (1638, 8vo; another edit. of 1657 contains a translation of the *Nuncius inanimatus*). See *Biographia Britannica*; Chalmers, *General Biog. Dictionary*.

**Godwin, Thomas, D.D.**, an English theologian, was born in Somersetshire in 1587. He entered Magdalen Hall, Oxford, in 1602, became head master of the free school of Abingdon in 1609, and afterwards rector of Brightwell, Berkshire. He died in 1643, leaving a great reputation both as a teacher and as an author. He wrote *Moses and Aaron; or the civil and ecclesiastical Rites used by the ancient Hebrews, observed and at large opened for the clearing of many obscure Texts throughout the whole Scripture*, etc. (London, 1685, 4to, 12th ed.); translated into Latin, *Moses et Aaron, cum Hottingeri*

*Notis* (Ultraj. 1690; often reprinted);—*Romanæ historicæ Antiquologia*, an English Exposition of the Roman Antiquities (Lond. 1686, 4to, 16th ed.);—*Dissertatio de theocratia Israelitarum:—Three Arguments to prove Election upon Foresight by Faith*, a work which brought him into a controversy with the ultra-Calvinist, Dr. Twiss (q. v.). See Horne, *Bibliographical Appendix*; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* i, 1279; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 682.

**Goël** (גוֹעַל, *goel*, part. of גָּאַל, *gaal*, to redeem; in full, עֲדָרָה לְגוֹעַל, *avenger of blood*, rendered "kinsman," "redeemer," "avenger," etc., in the A. Vers.). Among the Hebrews, the right of repurchasing and redeeming, as well as that of avenging blood, appertained only to the next relative; hence *goel*, simply, is used for the next relative (Lev. xxv, 25). Similar usages prevail universally among the modern Arabs. See BLOOD-REVENGE. Connected with the duties of the *Goel* was, according to custom, also that of marrying the childless widow of the deceased relative (Deut. xx, 5-10). See LEVIRATE LAW.

The fact of the close consanguinity renders the *Goel* an eminent type of the Redeemer of mankind, as is especially evinced in that famous passage in the Oriental epic of Job. The afflicted man, by a striking anticipation of the incarnate Mediator, standing in immortal self-existence over the sleeping ashes of his kindred saint, who was misunderstood and maligned even by his best earthly friends, thus touchingly exults in the prospect that his disembodied spirit should survive to witness the posthumous vindication of his fame (Job xix, 25-27):

[Be this my dying testimony.]

That I have known my living *Goël*;  
And last upon [the] dust he will arise:  
Yes, after my skin has decayed, [even] thus;  
Yet without my flesh shall I behold Deity!

Whom I shall behold [as] mine;  
(Yes, my eyes, they have [already] seen [him],  
Nor has he been strange [to me]),  
[Though] they have failed, my reins within me.

The sentiment was well worthy to be "engraved with an iron style, and set with lead in the rock forever," as the epitaph of the noble patriarch (ver. 24). Although it does not (as erroneously rendered in the A. V.) contain any allusion to the resurrection of the body, yet it distinctly recognises the doctrines of a fellow-feeling on the part of God towards man, and of the immortality of the soul; and it shows how these tenets, which lie at the basis of all true religion, whether natural or revealed, are alone adequate to support the human spirit under the sorrows of life, and in view of death. (See Stör, *De vindice sanguinis*, Lips. 1694; Stickel, *De Goële*, Jen. 1832; and the dissertations on the passage by Rosshirt [Herbip. 1791] and Kosegarten [Griefsw. 1815].) See REDEEMER.

**Goëpp, JEAN JACQUES**, a French Protestant theologian, was born at Heiligenstein, Alsace, April 6, 1771. He studied at the University of Strasburg under Oberlin and Schweighaeuser, and had already begun his career as a preacher when the French Revolution broke out. Appointed secretary of the Central Committee of Strasburg, he opposed the cruelty of Schneider, the Republican commissioner, and would perhaps have paid dear for his courage but that he was drafted into the army, in which he served until 1796, when he returned to finish his theological studies at Strasburg. In 1802 he was appointed pastor of the French Protestant congregation at Strasburg, almoner of the Lyceum of that city in 1803, director of St. Thomas's Seminary in 1808, and, finally, pastor of the Lutheran Church in Paris in 1805. There, together with Boissard, he opened the church called the *Billetes*, took care of over 14,000 souls dispersed all over Paris, attended to the poor, the schools, and all the other details of his charge. He was one of the founders of the *Missions Évangéliques*, of the *Société Biblique*,

the *Société protestante de Provoyance et de Secours mutuels*, and the *Société de la Morale Chrétienne*. In 1815, at the time of the massacre of the Protestants at Nîmes, a London society had made proposals to the French Protestants to help them. Had the proposal been accepted, the position of Protestantism in France would have become even much worse than it had been. Goëpp, while gratefully acknowledging the offer, declined, in the name of the French Protestants, accepting the protection of any foreign power. The French government acknowledged the service thus rendered by Goëpp by creating him a member of the Legion of Honor. Goëpp died at Paris June 21, 1855. Besides his immense pastoral work, Goëpp did a great deal of literary labor. He wrote, besides numerous pamphlets and funeral discourses, *Précis de la doctrine chrétienne exposée par le texte de l'Écriture Sainte* (in collaboration with Boissard, Paris, 1815, 8vo).—*Prières à l'usage du culte domestique, suivies des exercices et préparation à la sainte Cène* (same, Paris, 1821, 12mo).—*Principes de la Religion chrétienne, à l'usage des écoles élémentaires* (Paris, 1826, 12mo).—*Discours sur le nom et le but de la Société de la Morale chrétienne* (Par. 1834, 8vo), etc. See Villenave, *Notice sur J.-J. Goëpp*.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xx, 949 sq.

**Goering**, JACOB, a Lutheran minister, was born in York County, Pa., Jan. 17, 1755. His father was a farmer, and had designed his son for the same occupation, but, as the youth showed promising talents and hopeful piety, his father consented to his becoming a minister of the Gospel. He studied theology with Dr. Helmuth, and in 1786 became pastor of the Lutheran Church at York, Pa. Here he continued to labor until his death in 1807. Mr. Goering was regarded as an extraordinary man, a profound scholar, and an eloquent preacher. Nothing could check his ardor in the prosecution of his studies, or divert him from his purpose. In the pulpit he would often electrify his audience, and sway them at his will. It was his practice to present to his people systematic doctrinal instruction, always accompanied with a pointed application and an earnest appeal. On the afternoon of the Lord's day, in connection with the catechetical exercise, he examined the whole congregation on the subject of the morning's discourse. Although he wrote much, he published very little—only two small works on *Baptism* and one on *Methodism*. His MSS. contained discussions of theological questions, inquiries into the Oriental languages, and translations from the Arabic poets, but these valuable papers, with all his letters, in compliance with his directions in his last illness, were committed to the flames. (M. L. S.)

**Goerres**, JOHANN JOSEPH VON, an eminent German Roman Catholic writer, was born Jan. 25, 1776, at Coblenz, and educated at the gymnasium at that place. In early life he was involved in politics, and in 1798 he set up a Republican newspaper, the "*Rothe Blatt*." Being sent on a deputation to Paris in 1799, he saw French "freedom" under Bonaparte, and became disgusted with it. In that year he gave up his journal, and devoted himself to the study of medicine, and afterwards to philosophy and natural science. In 1802 appeared his *Aphorismen über Kunst* (Aphorisms on Art); in 1805, *Exposition der Physiologie* (Physiology) and *Glaube und Wissen* (Faith and Knowledge). In 1806 he went to Heidelberg, and lectured on Physics there till 1808, when he returned to Coblenz. 1810 he published *Mythengeschichte der Asiatischen Welt* (Mythology of the Asiatic World, Heidelberg, 8vo). In 1814 he again entered the political field against the French as editor of the *Rheinischer Merkur* (The Rhenish Mercury), a journal which stirred the whole public mind of Germany. It was prohibited by the Prussian government in 1816—a strange reward for the services it had rendered. In 1819 he had to take refuge in Strasburg, in consequence of

publishing *Deutschland und die Revolution*, in which he pleaded for the liberal party of Germany. He afterwards published a number of political works of the same vein, and tinged with mysticism. In Strasburg he was surrounded with Roman Catholic influences, and began to despair of reforming society by politics. In 1825 he accepted the professorship of history in the new University of Munich, and there he spent the remainder of his days. In 1836-42 appeared his *Christliche Mystik* (Christian Mysticism, Ratisbon, 4 vols. 8vo). During the conflict of the Prussian government and the archbishop of Cologne he wrote, in the interest of the ultramontane party, *Athanasius* (Ratisbon, 1837, 4 editions), and *Triarier* (Ratisbon, 1838). He wrote several other works in the interest of Roman Catholicism, and died January 27, 1848. Goerres was a prominent adherent of the first philosophic system of Schelling, but he found in the abstruse speculations of German philosophy no elements adequate to content his restless spirit of investigation. He was then swept away by that current of conservative Roman-Catholic restorationism, which, in the early part of the present century, carried a number of German politicians, historians, and poets into the bosom of the Church of Rome. Like most of them, Goerres never regarded Romanism as it appears in the light of history, but invested it with all the brilliant features and colors of the ideal religio-political society which he had previously conceived in his own mind. Still, under the influence of his former studies, he went down to the deep grounds of mysticism to discover there a light in the darkness, which he had found besetting the sources of all sciences. He persuaded himself that he had made there a great discovery in finding new and wonderful relations between the fables and myths of paganism as a shadow, and Roman-Catholic Christianity as the full truth; between the myriads of mysteries in all sciences, and the Roman-Catholic doctrine as a key to disclose them. At the beginning and end of every science he posted a Roman Catholic dogma as a watchman; by it he measured all the manifold inventions of our age, boldly pretending that everything true in them came from and pointed to a "Catholic" truth; and then he called upon the youths of his Church to rewrite from this stand-point the history of every science, since it had been too long monopolized and disfigured by Protestant erudition. All this, set forth in mystic, self-confident, and passionate language, could not fail to attract general attention on the part of his coreligionists. The influence of Goerres was so much the greater, as he made himself, at a critical moment, also the political champion of the Roman Catholic interests, principally through the "*Historische-politische Blätter*" of Munich, a periodical edited, although not under his name, yet under his guidance and controlling superintendence. In one thing, however, Goerres was greatly disappointed. He found many readers, hearers, and admirers, but only a very few disciples. They could not master the sense of their teacher's words; a bad omen, indeed, for his anticipated dominion over the literature of the world. The first volume of his collected works (*Gesammelte Werke, herausg. von Marie Goerres*) appeared at Ratisbon in 1854. See *Meth. Quart. Rev.* Jan. 1855, p. 146; Sepp, *Joseph von Goerres, eine Skizze*, etc. (Ratisbon, 1848); Haneberg, *Zur Erinnerung an J. v. G.* (Munich, 1848); Heinrich, *J. v. G., ein Lebensbild* (Frankf. 1867); *Hist. Polit. Blätter*, t. xxvii; Brühl, *Geschichte d. kath. Literatur Deutschlands* (Leips. 1854); Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xx, 957; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* v. 224 sq.

**Goertner**, JOHN PETER, a minister of the Lutheran Church, was born April 26, 1797, at Canajoharie, N. Y. He was graduated at Union College in 1822, the *Reformation of Luther* being his commencement exercise. For a time he prosecuted his studies at Hartwick Seminary under the direction of professor Hagelius, and then received private instruction from



Dr. Christian Schaeffer, of New York City, whom he aided in his pastoral work. He was licensed to preach by the New York Ministerium in 1824, and, after performing extensive missionary labor among the destitute Lutherans in the northern and western countries of the state and in Canada, he accepted a call to Johnstown, N. Y. He was loved and venerated not only by his own people, but by all who witnessed the results of his earnest labors, and the salutary influence he was exercising. His career was a brief one. He died when only thirty-two years of age of pulmonary disease. The impress of his life and efforts in the sanctified members of believing and loving hearts will descend to children and children's children. He left a valuable MS. *Journal of six Months' Residence at Rome, and Visit to interesting Cities in Europe.* (M. L. S.)

**Goeschel, Karl Friedrich**, a German writer on philosophy, was born in 1784 at Langensalza. After studying law at Leipzig he became judge in Langensalza, and in 1818 published a history of that town. In 1844 he received an appointment in the ministry of justice as "Geheimer Oberregierungs-rath," from 1845 to 1848 he was president of the consistory of Magdeburg. In 1848 he withdrew from the public service and lived in retirement at Naumburg, where he died, Sept. 22, 1862. He at first endeavored (*Aphorismen über Nichtwissen und absolut. Wissen*, 1829) to show the agreement of the Hegelian philosophy with Christianity, also to refute Strauss from this stand-point (*Beiträge zur specul. Philosophie*, 1838); but gradually he joined more and more the party of the Confessional Lutherans. He conducted the judicial proceedings against Wislicenus, Uhlich, and the Friends of Light (q. v.), and in 1848 had to leave Magdeburg in consequence of the excitement of the people against him. He had previously tendered his resignation because the government had allowed the Free Congregation of Magdeburg the use of one of the Protestant churches of the city. Goeschel wrote several works on Dante which are highly valued.—Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, xix, 567. (A. J. S.)

**Goettingen**, a town of Prussia, with 12,674 inhabitants (in 1864). It is the seat of a celebrated German university (Georgia Augusta), which was founded in 1737 by king George II. of England, and opened in 1737, and which numbered, in 1868, 106 teachers and 805 students. The library of the university contains over 360,000 volumes and 5000 MSS. Among the best-known theological professors of the university belong Gieseler (q. v.), Lücke (q. v.), and Ewald. See Pütter, *Versuch einer akadem. Gelehrten-gesch. der Universität Göttingen* (2 vols. Goett. 1765-88; continued by Saalfeld, Hamb. 1820; and by Osterley, Goett. 1838). (A. J. S.)

**Goetze, Georg Heinrich**, a German writer, was born at Leipzig, Aug. 11, 1667. In 1687 he passed M. A. at the University of Leipzig, and in 1690 became Protestant pastor of Bury, in the duchy of Magdeburg. In 1702 he became superintendent of the churches of Lubeck, in which office he continued until his death, March 29, 1729 (according to others, April 25, 1728). He left over one hundred and fifty works, mostly on literary or historical questions. The most important are, *De Virgilitis paschalibus veterum christianorum* (Lpz. 1687, 4to);—*De Archilochonis reteris Ecclesie* (Leipzig, 1687, 4to);—*De dubiis Athanasii Scriptis* (Lpz. 1689, 4to);—*De Lutheranismi D. Bernardi* (Dresden, 1701, 4to), in which he attempts to prove that St. Bernard preached the same doctrines as Luther;—*Parallelismus Jude proditoris et Romane Ecclesie* (Lubeck, 1706, 4to);—*Elogia Germanorum quorundam Theologorum* (Lub. 1709, 4to); this work contains eighty-four biographical sketches; etc.—Hoefler, *Nov. Biog. Gén.* xxi, 62 sq.

**Goetze, Johann Melchior**, a German divine, was born in Halberstadt Oct. 16, 1717, and studied at Jena and Halle. He was for nine years (1741-50) as-

sistant preacher at Aschersleben, was then called to Magdeburg, and finally became pastor of St. Catharine, at Haamburg, in 1755. He was an orthodox Lutheran, and attacked especially the semi-infidel writings of such men as Lessing, Goethe, Semler, etc. He died May 19, 1786, leaving behind him more than sixty works, the most remarkable among which are, *Von des Herrn Christi hochwürdigem Abendmahl* (1757);—*Theol. Untersuch. d. Sittlichk. der Deut. Schaubühne* (2d edit. 1770), against the latent neologism of Schlosser and Alberti;—*Exercitatio historico-theologica de patrum primitivæ Ecclesie feliciori successu in profliganda gentium superstitione quam in confirmanda doctrina christiana* (Halle, 1738, 4to);—*Gedanken ü. d. Betrachtung von der Bestimmung des Menschen* (Halle, 1748, 8vo);—*Vertheidigung des richtigen Begriffs v. d. Auferstehung der Todten, gegen Bascdow* (Hamburg, 1764, 4to), etc. His autobiography was published in 1786 (8vo). See F. L. Hoffmann, *Hamb. Biblioph.* iv; *Serapeum*, 1852, No. 21 a, 22; Thies, *Gelehr. Hamb. Deutsch. Bibliotheca*, xvii, 615-629; Lessing, *Mendelssohn, Rischek und Goetze* (Offenbach, 1787, 8vo); *Wartakte Nachrichten v. d. Leben des M. Götz* (Hamb. 1786, 8vo).—Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* v, 226; Hoefler, *Nov. Biog. Gén.* xxi, 64 sq.

**Goffine, Leonard**, a Roman Catholic priest, was born at Cologne in 1648, joined in 1669 the order of the Premonstratenses in the abbey of Steinfeld, labored many years as a priest at Oberstein and Coerfeld in Westphalia, and died August 11, 1719. He is the author of a devotional work (*Christkathol. Unterrichts und Erbauungsbuch*) which has passed through a very large number of editions and is still in common use. There are new revised editions of the work by Steck (Tubingen, 9th ed. 1869), and by Diez (2 vols. Würzburg, 1864). (A. J. S.)

**Gog** (Heb. גֹּג גֹּג; Sept. and N. T. Γῳγ, but Γῳβ in 1 Chron. v, 4; Vulg. *Gog*), the name of two men, but whether they have any connection is doubtful. It also occurs in the Samaritan and Sept. for AGAG, in Numb. xxiv, 7, apparently for the sake of specialty, tradition (Mishna, *Shabb.* 118) making the Messianic time to be distinguished by an antecedent struggle with Gog, as the Apocalypse does the millennium. See also HANON-GOG.

As to the significance of Gog, it appears to mean *mountain*, i. e. Caucasus (Persic *koh*, Ossetic *ghogh*, i. e. mountain; and even the classical name "Caucasus" originated in *Koh-Kaf*), since Caucasus was the chief seat of the Scythian people. The hardening of the last sound (*h*) into *g* (*gog* from *kch*) seems to have taken place early, and when the name had already become that of a people, the other names, Magog, Agog (Samaritan *Agog*, gentile *Agagi*, Phenic. *Agog*) also arose. Another explanation from the Pehliv *koka*, "moon" (see *Grabschrift des Darius*, p. 64), because they prayed to the moon, is improbable. A Shemitic etymology is also possible. From the reduplicated form גֹּגֹג (from the root גֹּג, whence גֹּג, a roof), in the sense of "to be high or overtopping," גֹּגֹג might signify a *mountain* or summit (compare Arabic *juju*, *breast* of a ship, i. e. something heightened). Figuratively, this stem would mean *gigantic*, great of stature, *powerful*, warlike (cognate with גֹּגֹג of Isa. xviii, 2); comp. Sanskrit *kū*, to be mighty, *kavī* (in the Vedas, Persic *kav*), *king*, modern Persian *kav*, *warlike* or *valiant*; in which sense the Amalekite name Agag or Agog, the Heb. name Gog, and the Phoen. Agog in the story of Ogyges, may be taken. In Gen. xiv, 1 Symmachus has taken גֹּג, *Goy*, i. e. heathen, for גֹּג, *Gog*, and therefore translates it by "Scythians."—Fürst, *Heb. Lex.* s. v.

1. Son of Shemaiah, and father of Shimei, and one of the descendants (apparently great-great-grandson) of Reuben (1 Chron. v, 4). B. C. post 1856. Most copies of the Sept., however, read, very different names here.

2. In Ezekiel Gog is (1.) the name of a mixed race dwelling in the extreme north, comprehended by the Greeks under the name of the *Scythians*; thence transferred (2.) to the centre and representative of their race, i. e. their king (chap. xxxviii, 39). Gog comes forth from the distant north (xxxviii, 15; xxxix, 2), the prince of Rosh, Meshech, and Tubal (apparently also of Siras), with his army of cavalry (xxxviii, 15), marching against the people of Israel, where he is miraculously encountered (xxxviii, 17-23) and annihilated (xxxix, 1-8). In the later tradition which sprang from Ezekiel's description, Gog along with Magog represents the mixed population of the north, the Scythians, Caucasians, etc. (3.) Gog is the name of the country of the people Gog, i. e. of the Scythians; but this only in the somewhat modified language of the Apocalyptic seer (Rev. xx, 8, Γῶγ, together with Μαγῶγ), as it has become a geographical name in Arabic likewise; and this corresponds with the assertions of other Oriental authors, in whose traditions this people occupy an important place, as the name of a country (see D'Herbelot, *Bibl. Or.* p. 528).—Fürst, s. v.

Interpreters have given very different explanations of the terms Gog and Magog; but they have generally understood them as symbolical expressions for the heathen nations of Asia, or more particularly for the Scythians, a vague knowledge of whom seems to have reached the Jews in Palestine about that period. Thus Josephus (*Ant.* i, 6, 3) has dropped the Hebrew word *Magog*, and rendered it by Σκόθα; and so does Jerome, while Suidas renders it by Ηίρρα;—a difference that matters but little in the main question, since Σκόθα, in the ancient authors, is but a collective name for the northern but partially-known tribes (Cellarius, *Notit.* ii, 753 sq.); and, indeed, as such a collective name, *Magog* seems also to indicate in the Hebrew the tribes about the Caucasian mountains (comp. Jerome on Ezek. *ibid.*). Bochart (*Phal.* iii, 13) supports the opinion of Josephus, though by very precarious etymologies. According to Reinegge (*Descrip. of the Caucasus*, ii, 79), some of the Caucasian people call their mountains *Gog*, and the highest northern points *Magog*. The Arabians are of opinion that the descendants of Gog and Magog inhabit the northern parts of Asia, beyond the Tartars and Selavonians, and they put *Yajuj* and *Majuj* always in conjunction, thereby indicating the extreme points of north and north-east of Asia (Bayer, in *Comment. Acad. Petrop.* i). Nor are there wanting interpreters who understand by the Gog of Revelations the anti-Christ, and by the Gog of Ezekiel the Goths, who invaded the Roman empire in the 5th century of the Christian era. (See Danderstad, *Gog et Magog*, Lips. 1663; *Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1862, p. 111.) In the Apocalypse these names appear to symbolize some future barbarian or infidel enemy that is to arise against Christianity (Stuart's *Comment.* ad loc.).—Kitto, s. v. See MAGOG.

**Gogerly**, DANIEL JOHN, a Wesleyan Methodist missionary and scholar, was born in London in August, 1792, and at fourteen united with the Wesleyan Methodist Society. He showed signs of remarkable talent, and at an early age became a local preacher. In 1818 he was sent to Ceylon to take charge of the Wesleyan mission press at Colombo. In 1822 he entered the regular missionary service, and was one of the first missionaries to preach extempore in Cingalese. He devoted himself earnestly to the study of the languages of the country, especially the Páli, which is, to the Buddhist, what Sanscrit is to the Brahmin. He was the first European who gave any critical or scientific study to this dialect. In 1834 he was stationed at Madura, where he had special opportunities to study Páli under learned native priests. He arranged about 15,000 words for a dictionary, and succeeded in having copies made of all the sacred books, with their glosses. This copy is now in the possession of the Wesleyan mission. In 1838 Mr. Gogerly became chair-

man of the mission, and afterwards general superintendent. The government appointed him one of the Central School Commission of Ceylon. In 1822 he had become one of the translators for the British and Foreign Bible Society, and the Cingalese version is largely due to his labors. Every word of all the editions of the Bible printed by the society passed under his eye as editor and corrector. Among his most important literary labors were contributions to the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, and to other periodicals, in illustration of the Páli literature of Buddhism. He was vice-president of the Ceylon branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. As a polemic work against Buddhism, he published *Christiáni Pragnyapiti; the Evéidences and Doctrines of the Christian Religion*: in Cingalese (Colombo, Wesleyan Mission Press, 1862). A native gentleman offered fifty dollars for a Buddhist refutation of this work, but it never has appeared. Mr. Gogerly died September 6, 1862. Both in England and France, he was recognised as the master of Páli literature. His writings on the subject are to be collected, it is said, and published in Paris.—*London Quarterly Review*, April, 1863, art. v.

**Goguet**, ANTOINE-YVES, a French juriconsult, was born at Paris Jan. 18, 1716, and became counselor to the parliament of Paris. He applied himself closely to literature, and especially to historical studies. His name is chiefly preserved by his great work *Origine des Lois, des Arts, et des Sciences, chez les Anciens Peuples* (3 vols. 4to, Paris, 1758, in which he was assisted by his friend Fugère). It treats the history of civilization among the Assyrians, Babylonians, Egyptians, Phœnicians, and the early Greeks, in vol. i; and in vol. ii, the period from the death of Jacob to the establishment of monarchy among the Hebrews, with the usages, etc. of the Lydians and Phrygians, with the states of Greece and the people of Crete. The third volume carries the subject down to the time of Cyrus, and upon the same plan as the other two. Goguet adds also dissertations on ancient coins; on the astronomical periods of the Chaldeans; on the antiquities of the Babylonians, Egyptians, and Chinese; on Sanchoniatho; and on the authenticity and antiquity of the book of Job. Goguet died in 1758. His work has passed through several editions in France, of which the last is that of Paris, 1809, 3 vols. 8vo. There is an English translation, *Origin of Laws, etc.* (Lond. 1775, 3 vols. 8vo).—*English Cyclopædia*; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxi, 75.

**Goim** is thought to be the proper name of a people in northern Palestine (גויים, *Goyim'*, Josh. xii, 23; Sept. Γοιμ, Vulg. *gentes*, A.V. "nations"), whose king lived at Gilgal (q. v.). A similar designation is employed also in Gen. xiv, 1 respecting Tidal (q. v.), "king of nations" (Sept. ἔθνη, Vulg. *gentes*). It is, however, the universal term for GENTILES (q. v.).

**Going**, JONATHAN, D.D., an influential Baptist minister, was born in 1786, and graduated at Brown University in 1809. He was licensed to preach while a member of college, and pursued the study of theology under the direction of Dr. Messer, then president of the college. Dr. Messer's orthodoxy was not above suspicion, and Mr. Going became unsettled in his doctrinal views for a time, but afterwards and finally became solidly grounded in "the doctrines of the Reformation." He was ordained in 1811, and settled at Cavendish, Vt. At this time, out of forty-five Baptist ministers in that state, he was the only one who had been liberally educated, and had an extensive influence. He was called in 1815 to Worcester, Mass. Here his labors were the means of building up a large and efficient church. He took an active interest in public education, and aided in founding the Newton Theological Institution. A journey, in 1831, into what was then "the West," awakened his interest in home missionary enterprises. The American Baptist Home

Missionary Society was formed the following year, and Dr. Goings was appointed corresponding secretary. After five years' successful service, he accepted a call to the presidency of Granville College, Ohio, now Denison University. His administration of the college did much to give it a substantial foundation and to insure its healthful growth. He died in 1844. He was strong, active, indefatigable, and his whole energy was kindled by a passion for usefulness. (L. E. S.)

**Golan** (Heb. *Golan'*, גֹּלָן, *exile accord.* to Gesen., but *circle accord.* to Fürst; Sept. Γαὺλαν; once *Galon'*, גֹּלָן, "keri" at Josh. xxi, 27, Sept. Γολάν), a city of Bashan (Deut. iv, 23) allotted out of the half tribe of Manasse east to the Gershonite Levites (Josh. xxi, 27; 1 Chron. vi, 71), and one of the three cities of refuge east of the Jordan (xx, 8). We find no further notice of it in Scripture; and though Eusebius and Jerome say it was still an important place in their time (*Onomast.* s. v. Γαὺλαν, Gaulon; Reland, *Palest.* p. 815), its very site is now unknown. The word is recognised in the present *Jaulán*, mentioned by Burckhardt (*Syria*, p. 286) as giving name to a district lying east of the lake of Tiberias, and composed of the ancient Gaulonitis, with part of Bashan and Argob (see also Robinson's *Researches*, iii, 308, 312; Append. p. 149, 162). It is indeed clear that the Gaulonitis of the later Jewish history must have included part of the more ancient Bashan, if Golan gave name to the province, seeing that Golan was certainly in Bashan. The city itself may have been situated on *tell el-Feras*, which, although destitute of ruins, is the most prominent part of the Jebel Heish that principally constitutes the modern district. Some have supposed that the village of *Nawa*, on the eastern border of *Jaulán*, around which are extensive ruins (see Porter, *Handb. for Syr. and Palest.*), is identical with the ancient Golan; but for this there is not a shadow of evidence; and *Nawa*, besides, is much too far to the eastward.

Some difficulty has been suggested as arising from the fact that the Judas whom Josephus (*Ant.* xviii, 1, 1) calls a Gaulonite is called by Luke (Acts v, 37) a Galilean. This is the more remarkable, as Josephus elsewhere (*War.* ii, 20, 4) carefully distinguishes Galilee and Gaulonitis. Yet he himself elsewhere calls this very Judas a Galilean (*Ant.* xviii, 1, 6; xx, 5, 2; *War.* ii, 9, 1). It is, from this, probable that Judas had a double cognomen, perhaps because he had been born in Gaulonitis, but had been brought up or dwelt in Galilee; as Apollonius, although an Egyptian, yet was, from his place of residence, called Rhodius (see *Kühnöl.* in *Act.* v, 37). See **JUDAS (THE GALILEAN)**.

The city of Golan is several times referred to by Josephus (Γαὺλαν, *War.* i, 4, 4, and 8); he, however, more frequently speaks of the province which took its name from it, *Gaulonitis* (Γαυλανίτις). When the kingdom of Israel was overthrown by the Assyrians, and the dominion of the Jews in Bashan ceased, it appears that the aboriginal tribes, before kept in subjection, but never annihilated, rose again to some power, and rent the country into provinces. Two of these provinces at least were of ancient origin [see **TRACHONITIS** and **HAURAN**], and had been distinct principalities previous to the time when Og or his predecessors united them under one sceptre. Before the Babylonish captivity Bashan appears in Jewish history as one kingdom; but subsequent to that period it is spoken of as divided into four provinces—Gaulonitis, Trachonitis, Auronitis, and Batanaea (Josephus, *Ant.* iv, 5, 3, and 7, 4; i, 6, 4; xvi, 9, 1; *War.* i, 20, 4; iii, 3, 1; iv, 1, 1). It seems that when the city of Golan rose to power it became the head of a large province, the extent of which is pretty accurately given by Josephus, especially when his statements are compared with the modern divisions of Bashan. It lay east of Galilee and north of Gadarithis (Gadara, Josephus, *War.* iii, 3, 1). Gamala, an important town on the

eastern bank of the Sea of Galilee, now called El-Husn, and the province attached to it, were included in Gaulonitis (*War.* iv, 1, 1). But the boundary of the provinces of Gadara and Gamala must evidently have been the river Hieromax, which may therefore be regarded as the south border of Gaulonitis. The Jordan, from the Sea of Galilee to its fountains at Dan and Cæsarea-Philippi, formed the western boundary (*War.* iii, 3, 5). It is important to observe that the boundaries of the modern province of *Jaulán* (the Arabic form of the Hebrew גֹּלָן, from which is derived the Greek Γαυλανίτις) correspond so far with those of Gaulonitis; we may therefore safely assume that their northern and eastern boundaries are also identical. *Jaulán* is bounded on the north by Jedúr (the ancient Ituræa), and on the west by the Haurán [q. v.]. The principal cities of Gaulonitis were Golan, Hippos, Gamala, Julias or Bethsaida (Mark viii, 22), Seleucia, and Sogane (Josephus, *War.* iii, 3, 1, and 5; iv, 1, 1).

The greater part of Gaulonitis is a flat and fertile table-land, well watered, and clothed with luxuriant grass. It is probably to this region the name *Mishor* (מִשׁוֹר) is given in 1 Kings xx, 23, 25—"the plain" in which the Syrians were overthrown by the Israelites, near Aphek, which perhaps stood upon the site of the modern Fik (Stanley, App. § 6; Porter, *Handbook for Syr. and Pal.* p. 425). The western side of Gaulonitis, along the sea of Galilee, is steep, rugged, and bare. It is upwards of 2500 feet in height, and when seen from the city of Tiberias resembles a mountain range, though in reality it is only the supporting wall of the plateau. It was this remarkable feature which led the ancient geographers to suppose that the mountain range of Gilead was joined to Lebanon (Reland, p. 342). Further north, along the bank of the Upper Jordan, the plateau breaks down in a series of terraces, which, though somewhat rocky, are covered with rich soil, and clothed in spring with the most luxuriant herbage, spangled with multitudes of bright and beautiful flowers. A range of low, round-topped, picturesque hills extends southward for nearly twenty miles from the base of Hermon along the western edge of the plateau. These are in places covered with noble forests of prickly oak and terebinth. Gaulonitis was once densely populated, but it is now almost completely deserted. Among the towns and villages which it once contained are still left the names of 127 places, all of which, with the exception of about *eleven*, are now uninhabited. Only a few patches of its soil are cultivated; and the very best of its pasture is lost—the tender grass of early spring. The flocks of the Turkmáns and el-Fudhl Arabs—the only tribes that remain permanently in this region—are not able to consume it; and the 'Anazeh, those "children of the East" who spread over the land like locusts, and "whose camels are without number" (*Judg.* vii, 12), only arrive about the beginning of May. At that season the whole country is covered with them—their black tents pitched in circles near the fountains, their cattle thickly dotting the vast plain, and their fierce cavaliers roaming far and wide, "their hand against every man, and every man's hand against them."

For fuller accounts of the scenery, antiquities, and history of Gaulonitis, see Porter's *Handbook for Syria and Palest.* p. 295, 424, 461, 531; *Five Years in Damascus*, ii, 250; *Journal of Sac. Lit.* vi, 292; Burckhardt's *Trav. in Syria*, p. 277; Wilson, *Lands of Bible*, ii, 319; Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 12 sq.; Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 220.—Smith, s. v.; Kitto, s. v. See **BASHAN**.

**Gold** (Gr. χρυσός or χρυσίον, the last being prob. a diminutive of the former and more general term, and therefore expressing gold in a small piece or quantity, especially as wrought, e. g. a golden ornament, 1 Pet. iii, 3; Rev. xvii, 4; [xviii, 16;] or gold coin, Acts iii, 6; xx, 33; 1 Pet. i, 18; but also used of the metal generally, Heb. ix, 4; 1 Pet. i, 7; Rev. iii, 18; xxi,

18, 21), the most valuable of metals, from its color, lustre, weight, ductility, and other useful properties (Pliny, *H. N.* xxxiii, 19). As it is only procured in small quantities, its value is less liable to change than that of other metals, and this, with its other qualities, has in all ages rendered it peculiarly available for coin. There are six Hebrew words used to denote it, and four of them occur in Job xxviii, 15, 16, 17. These are:

1. צהב, *zahab'*, the common name, connected with צהב, *tzahab'* (to be yellow), as Germ. *geld*, from *gelb*, yellow. Various epithets are applied to it, as "fine" (2 Chron. iii, 5), "refined" (1 Chron. xxviii, 18), "pure" (Exod. xxv, 11). In opposition to these, "beaten gold" (צהב י) is probably *mixed* gold; Sept. *δαράς*; used of Solomon's shields (1 Kings x, 16). In Job xxxvii, 22 it is rendered in the A.V. "fair weather;" Sept. *πέψη χρυσανγούρα* (comp. Zech. iv, 12). The corresponding Chald. word is צהב, *dehab'* (Dan. ii, 32; iii. i, 5, 7).

2. סגור, *segor'* (Job xxviii, 15), elsewhere as an epithet, סגור, *segur'* (Sept. *κειμελιον*), either from its *compactness*, or as being *inclosed* or *treasured*, i. e. fine gold (1 Kings vi, 20; vii, 49, etc.). Many names of precious substances in Hebrew come from roots signifying concealment, as סגור (Gen. xliiii, 23, A. V. "treasure").

3. פז, *gaz'*, pure or native gold (Job xxviii, 17; Psa. xix, 10; xx. 3; ex, 127; Prov. viii, 19; Cant. v, 11, 15; Isa. xiii, 12; Lam. iv, 2; invariably "fine" [once "pure"] gold), probably from פז, *gazaz'*, to separate. Rosenmüller (*Alterthumsk.* iv, 49) makes it come from a Syriac root meaning *solid* or *massy*; but צהב (2 Chron. ix, 17) corresponds to צהב (1 Kings x, 18). The Sept. render it by *λιθος τιμος, χρυσιον απυρον* (Isa. xiii, 12; Theodot. *απεθρον*; comp. Thuc. ii, 13; Pliny, xxxiii, 19, *obrusit*). In Psa. cxix, 127, the Sept. render it *τοπαζιον* (A. V. "fine gold"); but Schleusner happily conjectures *το παζιον*, the Hebrew word being adopted to avoid the repetition of *χρυσος* (Thes. s. v. *τοπαζ*; Hesych. s. v. *παζιον*).

4. פז, *betzar'* (Job xxxvi, 19, fig. of riches), or פז, *betzar'*, gold earth, or a mass of raw ore (Job xxii, 24; Sept. *απυρον*; A. V. "gold as dust").

The poetical names for gold are:

5. צהב, *ke'them* (also implying something *concealed* or *separated*, Job xxviii, 16, 19; xxxi, 24; Psa. xlv, 9; Prov. xxv, 12; Cant. v, 11; Lam. iv, 1; Dan. x, 5; Sept. *χρυσιον*; and in Isa. xiii, 12 *λιθος πολυτιμης*).

6. חרות, *churats'* = "dug out" (Prov. viii, 10, 18), a general name (Prov. iii, 14; xvi, 16; Zech. ix, 3) which has become special (Psa. lxxviii, 13, where it cannot mean gems, as some suppose, Bochart, *Hieroz.* ii, 9). Michaelis connects the word with the Greek *χρυσος*.

Gold was known from the very earliest times (Gen. ii, 11). Pliny attributes the discovery of it (at Mount Pangæus), and the art of working it to Cadmus (*H. N.* vii, 57); and his statement is adopted by Clemens Alexandrinus (*Stromat.* i, 363, ed. Pott.). It was at first chiefly used for ornaments, etc. (Gen. xxiv, 22); and although Abraham is said to have been "very rich in cattle, in silver, and in gold" (Gen. xiii, 2), yet no mention of it, as used in *purchases*, is made till after his return from Egypt. Coined money was not known to the ancients (e. g. Homer, *I.* vii, 473) till a comparatively late period; and on the Egyptian tombs gold is represented as being weighed in rings for commercial purposes (comp. Gen. xliiii, 21). No coins are found in the ruins of Egypt or Assyria (Layard's *Nin.* ii, 418). "Even so late as the time of David gold was not used as a standard of value, but was considered

merely as a very precious article of commerce, and was weighed like other articles" (Jahn, *Bibl. Arch.* § 115; comp. 1 Chron. xxi, 25).

Gold was extremely abundant in ancient times (2 Chron. xxii, 11; Nah. ii, 9; Dan. iii, 1); but this did not depreciate its value, because of the enormous quantities consumed by the wealthy in furniture, etc. (1 Kings vi, 22; x, passim; Cant. iii, 9, 10; Esth. i, 6; Jer. x, 9; comp. Homer, *Od.* xix, 55; Herod. ix, 82). Probably, too, the art of gilding was known extensively, being applied even to the trappings of a city (Herod. i, 98; and other authorities quoted by Layard, ii, 264). Many tons of gold were spent in the building of the Temple alone, though the expression *plentiful as stones* (2 Chron. i, 15) may be considered as hyperbolic. It is, however, confirmed by the history of the other Asiatic nations, and more especially of the Persians, that the period referred to really abounded in gold, which was imported in vast masses from Africa and the Indies (Heeren, *Ideen*, i, 1, 37 sq.). The queen of Sheba brought with her (from Arabia Felix), among other presents, 120 talents of gold (2 Chron. ix, 9).

The chief countries mentioned as producing gold are Arabia, Sheba, and Ophir (1 Kings ix, 28; x, 1; Job xxviii, 16; in Job xxii, 24 the word *Ophir* is used for gold). Gold is not found in Arabia now (Niebuhr's *Travels*, p. 141), but it used to be (Artemidor. ap. Strabo, xvi, 3, 18, where he speaks of an Arabian river *ψηγμα χρυσου καταφειων*). Diodorus also says that it was found there native (*απυρον*) in good-sized nuggets (*βολαιμα*). Some suppose that Ophir was an Arabian port to which gold was brought (compare 2 Chron. ii, 7; ix, 10). Other gold-bearing countries were Uphaz (Jer. x, 9; Dan. x, 5), Parvaim (2 Chron. iii, 6), and (at least primævally) Havilah (Gen. ii, 11). No traveller in Palestine makes any mention of gold except Dr. Edward D. Clarke. At the lake of Tiberias, he observes, "Native gold was found here formerly. We noticed an appearance of this kind, but, on account of its trivial nature, neglected to pay proper attention to it, notwithstanding the hints given by more than one writer upon the subject." However, for every practical purpose, it may be said that Palestine has no gold. It is always spoken of by the Jewish writers as a foreign product. As gold was very common, relatively, in Egypt at a very early date, much of that in the hands of the early Hebrews was probably obtained thence (Exod. xii, 33; xxxii, 2, 4; xxxviii, 24).

Metallurgic processes are mentioned in Psa. lxxvi, 10; Prov. xvii, 3; xxvii, 21; and in Isa. xlvii, 6 the trade of goldsmith (compare Judg. xvii, 4, *סגור*) is alluded to in connection with the overlaying of idols with gold-leaf (Rosenmüller's *Minerals of Scripture*, p. 46-51).—Smith, s. v. See GOLDSMITH.

Gold, in the Scriptures, is the symbol of great value, duration, incorruptibility, and strength (Isa. xiii, 12; Lam. iv, 2; 2 Tim. ii, 20; Prov. xviii, 11; Job xxxvi, 19). In Dan. ii, 38, the Babylonian empire is a "head of gold," so called on account of its great riches; and Babylon was called by Isaiah, as in our version, "the golden city" (xiv, 4), but more properly "the exactness of gold." In Eccles. xii, 6, some explain the expression "or the golden bowl be broken" of the human head or skull, which resembles a bowl in form. In Rev. iv, 4, "the elders," and ix, 7, "the locusts, had on their heads crowns of gold." In the costume of the East, a linen turban with a gold ornament was reckoned a crown of gold, and is so called in the language of Scripture (Lev. viii, 9). Gold denotes spiritually the redeeming merits of Christ (Rev. iii, 18; "I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire, that thou mayst be rich"), though others interpret it of being rich in good works before God. In 1 Cor. iii, 12, it seems to denote sincere believers, built into the

Christian Church, who will stand the fiery trial.—Wemyss, *Symbol. Dict.* s. v. See METAL.

**Golden Calf** (הַגִּזְיָה, *e'gel massekah'*, a *steering image*, Exod. xxxii, 4, 8; Deut. ix, 16; Neh. ix, 19, lit. a *calf*; a *moltten image*, and therefore massive, not a mere wooden idol plated with gold), an idolatrous representation of a young bullock, which the Israelites formed at Mount Sinai (Exod. xxxii, 3 sq.; compare Psa. cvi, 19; Acts vii, 39 sq.), interdicted by Jehovah (Hengstenberg, *Pentat.* i, 159); and eventually, in the time of Jeroboam I of the kingdom of Israel, erected into a national object of worship (1 Kings xii, 28 sq.; 2 Kings x, 29; comp. xvii, 16; Hos. viii, 5 sq.; x, 5; Tobit i, 5) at Bethel and Dan (q. v.). See IMAGE. The symbol was undoubtedly borrowed from Egypt (comp. Ezek. xx, 7, 8; Acts vi, 39; see Philo, ii, 159; Hengstenberg, *Pentat.* i, 156 sq.), where living bullocks, *Apis* (q. v.), as a living symbol of sins (Plutarch, *Isid.* 33) in Memphis (Herod. iii, 25; Diod. Sic. i, 21; Strabo, xvii, 805), and *Mnevis* (q. v.) as a representation of the sun-god [see EGYPT] at Heliopolis (Diod. Sic. i, 21; Strabo, xvii, 903), were objects of worship (see Jablonsky, *Panth. Ægypt.* i, 122 sq.; 258 sq.; Creuzer, *Symbol.* i, 480 sq.). One of these two, possibly *Apis* (Lactant. *Instit.* iv, 10; Jerome, in *Hos.* iv, 15; comp. Spencer, *Leg. Rit. Heb.* i, i, 1, p. 32 sq.; Witsii *Ægypt.* II, ii, p. 61 sq.; Selden, *De diis Syr.* I, iv, p. 125 sq.; Lengerke, *Ken.* p. 464), but more probably *Mnevis* (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* 2d ser. ii, 97), was the model of the golden calf which the Israelites in the desert, and perhaps Jeroboam afterwards, set up. On the contrary, Philo (*Opp.* i, 371), with whom Mill (*Dissert. Sacr.* p. 309 sq.) agrees, asserts that the Israelitish calf was an imitation of the Egyptian *Typhon*; but this view was dictated rather by theological prejudices than historical considerations. Nevertheless, the bovine symbol is found in the ornamentation of the Temple (Ezek. i, 10; 1 Kings vii, 29), and is one of wide prevalence in antiquity (Movers, *Phönice.* p. 373 sq.). See CHERUBIM.

How Moses was able to consume the golden calf with fire (שָׂרַף), and reduce it to powder (פָּרַח, pulverize), as stated in Exod. xxxii, 20, is difficult to say; for although gold readily becomes weak and to some extent friable under the action of fire, yet it is by no means thus burnt to such a degree as to be reducible to dust, and be susceptible of dissolution in drink. Most interpreters, e. g. Rosenmüller (*Schol.* ad loc.), think of some chemical process (which Moses may have learned in Egypt, see Wilkinson, *Ancient Egypt.* abridgm. ii, 136 sq.), by which gold may have been calcined, and so have been triturated as a metallic salt. Others (Ludwig, *De modo quo comminatus est a Moses vitulus aureus*, Altdorf, 1745) believe that Moses beat the fire-checked gold into leaves, and then ground these into fine particles in a mill, or filed the melted gold into dust (*scobis aurea*; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 7, 3; see Bochart, *Hieroz.* i, 363). The difficulty lies in the double procedure, and in the expression "burned with fire" (שָׂרַף), which does not seem applicable to a chemical, but rather to a mechanical process.—Winer, i, 644. See CALF, GOLDEN.

**Golden City** (מַדְבְּהָב, *madhebah'*; Sept. *ἐπισημοσύνη*, *tributum*), a term applied as an epithet of Babylon (Isa. xiv, 4), and occurring nowhere else. Some derive it from the Aramaic מַדְבְּהָב, *gold*, as a verb-form (in the Hip. part. fem.) = *gold-making*, i. e. exactress of gold, a not inapt emblem of the imperial mart (parallel hemistich מַדְבְּהָב, *grinding*); or else = a heap or *treasury* of gold (בַּיִת pref. formative of place). So Gesenius prefers with hesitation (*Thes. Heb.* p. 322 b), after Kimchi, Aben-Ezra, etc. Others (so Fürst, *Heb. Lex.* s. v.), following the Targums, Sept., Aquila, Syriac, and Arab. of Sadias, prefer to read מַדְבְּהָב, *marhebah'*,

in the sense of *oppression*, from מַדְבְּהָב, *rahab'*, to *scare* (compare Isa. iii, 5, where מַדְבְּהָב occurs in parallelism with מַדְבְּהָב). See BABYLON.

**Golden Legend** (Lat. *Aurea Legenda*), a collection of legendary accounts of saints, long very popular, in almost all the European languages. It was compiled by a Dominican, James de Voragine, also written Vragine and Varagine, about A.D. 1230. It has 177 sections, each giving an account of a particular saint or festival. It is of no historical value.


**Golden Number**, the number in the ecclesiastical calendar by which the age of the moon, and consequently the time of Easter, is determined. Easter-day being the first Sunday after the full moon, which happens upon or next after the 21st of March, to determine the time of Easter, it is only necessary to find out the precise time of the above full moon. As at the end of nineteen years the moon returns to have her changes on the same days of the solar year and of the month on which they happened nineteen years before, it follows that by the use of a cycle consisting of nineteen numbers, the various changes of the moon for every year may be found out without the use of astronomical tables. The numbers of this cycle, from their great usefulness, were usually written in the calendar in *letters of gold*: hence the name, golden number. Another account of the origin of the name is that the metonic cycle of nineteen years [see CHRONOLOGY] was originally engraved in letters of gold on marble columns. The rule for finding the golden number for any particular year is, "Add 1 to the number of years, and divide by 19; the quotient gives the number of cycles, and the remainder gives the golden number for that year; and if there be no remainder, then 19 is the golden number, and that year is the last of the cycle."—Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.

**Golden Rose**, a rose set in precious stones, consecrated by the pope, and sent to crowned heads and others whom the pope delights to honor. This rose was first sent in 1366 by Urban V to Joan, queen of Sicily. The pope consecrates one every year on the 4th Sunday in Lent. The golden rose was sent to the queen of Spain just before her downfall in 1868.

**Golden Wedge** (כֶּתֶם, *kethem'*, Isa. xiii, 12; a poetical term, fine *gold*, as elsewhere rendered). See GOLD.

**Goldsmith** (מַטְרֵפִי, *tsoref'*, Neh. iii, 8, 32; Isa. xl, 19; xli, 7; xlvi, 6; a *founder* or *finer*, as elsewhere rendered), a *melter of gold* (i. q. מַטְרֵפִי, *matsref'*, "refiner," Mal. iii, 2, 3). See GOLD. In Neh. iii, 31, the word so rendered (מַטְרֵפִי) is rather a proper name, ZORPHEI (q. v.). "The use of gold for jewelry and various articles of luxury dates from the most remote ages. Pharaoh having 'arrayed' Joseph 'in vestures of fine linen, put a gold chain about his neck;' and the jewels of silver and gold borrowed from the Egyptians by the Israelites at the time of their leaving Egypt (out of which the golden calf was afterwards made), suffice to prove the great quantity of precious metals wrought at that time into female ornaments. It is not from the Scriptures alone that the skill of the Egyptian goldsmiths may be inferred; the sculptures of Thebes and Beni-Hassan afford their additional testimony, and the numerous gold and silver vases, inlaid work, and jewelry, represented in common use, show the great advancement they had made in this branch of art. At Beni-Hassan, the process of washing the ore, smelting or fusing the metal with the help of the blow-pipe, and fashioning it for ornamental purposes, weighing it, and taking an account of the quantity so made up, and other occupations of the goldsmith, are represented; but, as might be supposed, these subjects merely suffice, as they were intended, to give a general indication of the goldsmith's trade, without attempting to

describe the means employed" (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt*, *Atlas*, abridgment, ii, 138 sq.). See METALLURGY. | however, that neither Eusebius, nor Cyril, nor Jerome, nor any of the earliest historical writers ever speak of



Ancient Egyptian Goldsmiths.

1, 2, and 3, 4, are wringing out the water from the gold in a bag, *b, d*; *a, c*, frames supporting the bag while draining; *f, g*, are articles of jewelry on a frame, *e*; *h*, a box containing implements, *i*, and perhaps a crucible, *k*. The hieroglyphics (consisting of the bowl in which the metal was washed, the cloth through which it was strained, and the dropping of the water, united) read "goldsmith" or "worker in gold."

**Gol'gotha** (Γολγοθᾶ, for Aram. ܩܘܠܓܘܬܐ, *Gulgaltā'* [comp. Heb. ܩܘܠܓܘܬܐ, 2 Kings ix, 35], the skull, as being globular; the Syr. version has *gogultā'*, the vulgar name of the spot where Jesus was crucified, and interpreted by the evangelists as meaning "the place of a skull," and hence interpreted by the equivalent term CALVARY (Matt. xxvii, 33; Mark xv, 22; John xix, 17).

Three explanations of this name have been given: (1.) A tradition at one time prevailed (see Jerome *in Ephes.* v, 14; *Epist.* xlixi; *De Sanct. Locis*) that Adam was buried on Golgotha, that from his skull it derived its name, and that at the crucifixion the drops of Christ's blood fell on the skull and raised Adam to life, whereby the ancient prophecy quoted by Paul in *Eph.* v, 14 received its fulfilment—"Awake, thou Adam that sleepest"—so the old versions appear to have run—"and arise from the dead, for Christ shalt touch thee" (ἐπιψύσει for ἐπιφάσει). See the quotation in *Reland, Palest.* p. 869; also *Kaewulf, in Early Travellers*, p. 39. The skull commonly introduced in early pictures of the crucifixion refers to this. (2.) Jerome says elsewhere (*in Matt.* xxvii, 33) that it was a spot where executions ordinarily took place, and therefore abounded in skulls; but, according to the Jewish law, these must have been buried, and therefore were no more likely to confer a name on the spot than any other part of the skeleton. In this case, too, the Greek should be *τόπος κρανίου*, "of skulls," instead of *κρανίον*, "of a skull," still less a "skull," as in the Aramaic, and in the Greek of Luke. If this had been the usual place of execution, there is no reason why all the evangelists should have been so explicit in the name. That it was a well-known spot, however, has been inferred by many from the way in which it is mentioned in the gospels, each except Matthew having the definite article—"the place Golgotha"—"the place which is called a skull"—"the place (A. V. omits the article) called of, or after, a skull." That it was the ordinary spot for such purposes has been argued from the fact that, to those at least who carried the sentence into effect, Christ was but an ordinary criminal; and there is not a word to indicate that the soldiers in "leading him away" went to any other than the usual place for what must have been a common operation. But the act of crucifixion was so common a punishment among the Romans, especially upon Jews, that it seems to have been performed almost anywhere. See CRUCIFIXION. (3.) The name has been held to come from the look or form of the spot itself, bald, round, and skull-like, and therefore a mound or hillock, in accordance with the common phrase "Mount Calvary." It must be remembered,

city" (John xix, 20), at a place called Golgotha (Matt. xxvii, 33), and apparently beside some public thoroughfare (xxvii, 39) leading to the country (Mark xxv, 21). The tomb in which he was lain was hewn out of the rock (Mark xv, 46), in a garden or orchard (κῆπος), at the place of crucifixion (John xix, 41, 42). Neither Golgotha nor the tomb is ever afterwards mentioned by any of the sacred writers. No honor seems to have been paid to them, no sanctity attached to them during the apostolic age, or that which immediately succeeded it. It is not till the beginning of the 4th century that we find any attempt made to fix the position of, or attach sanctity to Golgotha. Eusebius then informs us that the emperor Constantine, "not without divine admonition," resolved to uncover the holy tomb. He states that wicked men had covered it over with earth and rubbish, and had erected on the spot a temple of Venus. These were removed, and the tomb and Golgotha laid bare. A magnificent church was built over them, and consecrated in A.D. 335 (*It. Constantin.* iii, 26-33). There can be little doubt that the present Church of the Sepulchre occupies the site of that built by Constantine. The only writer who seriously impugns their identity is Mr. Fergusson (*Essay on the ancient Topography of Jerusalem*, London, 1847), who asserts that Golgotha was on Mount Moriah, and that the building now called the Mosque of Omar, or Dome of the Rock, is the church erected by Constantine over the Holy Sepulchre. Beneath its dome is a projecting rock with a cave in it; this, he says, is the real tomb. The arguments on which his theory rests are mainly architectural, and are unquestionably forcible; but his topographical and historical argument is a complete failure. He says the site was transferred at the time of the Crusaders; but for this there is not a shadow of evidence. Any one who has examined on the spot the topography of Mount Moriah, and who has closely inspected the masonry of the massive wall which surrounds the whole of the Haram area, must see that this theory is untenable. The only point to be settled is, whether the church of Constantine stood on the real Golgotha. Eusebius is our first witness, and he lived 300 years after the crucifixion. His story is repeated with some changes, and numerous embellishments, by subsequent writers (Socrates, *H. E.* i, 17; Sozom. *H. E.* ii, 1; Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* i, 18). That the spot is now marked by the Church of the Sepulchre was the almost universally accredited tradition down to the last century; for though many were struck by the singular position of the church, yet they got over that difficulty by various means (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* i, 408). The first who openly opposed the tradition was Korte, a

Golgotha as a hill. Yet the expression must have become current at a very early period, for the Bordeaux pilgrim describes it in A.D. 333 as *Monticulus Golgotha* (*Itinerarium Hierosol.*, ed. Wessel., p. 593). Dr. Robinson suggests that the idea of a mound originated in the fact that a rounded rock or monticule existed on the place where, in the beginning of the 4th century, tradition located the scene of the crucifixion (*Bib. Res.* ii, 376).

All the information the Bible gives us regarding the site of Golgotha may be stated in a few words. Christ was crucified "without the gate" (Heb. xiii, 12), "nigh to the

German traveller who visited Jerusalem in 1738. He was followed by Dr. Clarke (*Travels*), Scholz (*Reise, and De Golgotha Säu*), Robinson, Tobler (*Golgotha*), and others. The identity of Golgotha has been maintained by Von Raumer (*Palästina*), Krafft (*die Topographie Jerusalems*), Tischendorf (*Reise*, ii, 17 sq.), Schulz (*Jerusalem*, p. 59 sq., 96 sq.), and especially Williams in his *Holy City*. The tradition that fixes the site of Golgotha upon that of the present Church of the Holy Sepulchre is not older than the 4th century, being first mentioned by Eusebius, and attributed to the miraculous discovery of the holy cross by the empress Helena. Yet, in the absence of any other tradition respecting a site which could not well have been forgotten, and in the difficulty of finding any other position answering to the requirements of the case, we may well coincide in the belief that it represents the true locality (see Strong's *Harm. and Expos. of the Gosp.* Append. i, p. 4, etc.). The question mostly depends upon the course of Josephus's second wall, and the position of Aera as determined by that of the valley of the Tyropeon. Dr. Robinson's views of the relative position of these leading portions of Jerusalem seems to be unnatural and untenable, being apparently influenced by an excessive jealousy of all traditional evidence. He therefore decides against the identity of the site of Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre (*Bib. Researches*, i, 408-516). His arguments, however, are vehemently combated by Mr. Williams (*Holy City*, ii, 13-64), and a long and bitter controversy has ensued (see the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for 1843, p. 154-202; 1846, p. 413-460, 605-652; 1848, p. 92-96). Dr. Robinson to the last maintained his former opinion (new ed. of *Researches*, i, 407-418; iii, 254-263). Other travellers are equally divided as respects the identity of these places, but it may be remarked that Dr. Robinson's reasoning has failed to satisfy even German scholars of the impossibility of this position of Golgotha. The evidence of locality to be gathered from the Gospel statements as to the scene of the tomb of our Lord is as follows: The palace of Pilate and the judgment hall stood at the north-west angle of the Haram area, where the house of the pasha still stands. There Jesus was condemned, scourged, and mocked. Thence the soldiers "led him out" (Mark xv, 20) to crucify him. They met a man called Simon "coming out of the country," and compelled him to bear the cross. They brought him unto Golgotha, and there they crucified him. The passers by reviled him. His mother and some others stood by the cross (John xix, 25). "All his acquaintance stood afar off beholding these things" (Luke xxiii, 49). A combination of these statements of the evangelists shows that it lay just outside the walls of the city, opposite the tower of Antonia, and therefore probably at the north-west. See JERUSALEM. The traditional Golgotha is now a little chapel in the side of the Church of the Sepulchre, gorgeously decorated with marble, and gold, and silver. The monks profess to show the hole in which the cross was planted, and a rent in the rock made by the earthquake! (Porter, *Hand-book for Syr. and Pal.* p. 166; Williams, *Holy City*, ii, 226 sq.)—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See Plessing, *Ueb. Golgotha u. Christi Grab* (Hilf. 1789); Scholz, *De Golgotha et J. C. sepulcri situ* (Bonn, 1825); Schultze, *De vera causa nominis Golgotha* (Nurnb. 1732); Themis, *Golgotha et sanctum sepulchrum* (in Illgen's *Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol.* 1842, iv, 3-34); Zorin, *De Christi extra portam supplicio* (in his *Opusc.* ii, 193-7); Finlay, *Site of the Holy Sepulchre* (Lond. 1847); Berggren, *Bibel und Josephus u. Jerusalem u. des Heilige Grab, wider Robinson und neuer Zionspülger* (Lund, 1862); Tobler, *Golgotha, seiner Kirchen u. Klöster* (Berl. 1850). See CALVARY.

**Goli'ath** (Heb. *Golyath'*, גִּלְיָת; Sept. Γολιάθ, Josephus Γολιάζος), a famous giant of Gath, who "morning and evening for forty days" defied the armies of Israel; but was eventually slain by David, in the re-

markable encounter, with a sling (1 Sam. xvii). B. C. 1063. Although repeatedly called a Philistine, he was possibly descended from the old Rephaim, of whom a scattered remnant took refuge with the Philistines after their dispersion by the Ammonites (Dent, ii, 20, 21; 2 Sam. xxi, 22). Some trace of this condition may be preserved in the giant's name, if it be connected with גִּלְיָת, an exile, as thought by Gesenius (*Thes. Heb.* p. 285). Simonis, however, derives it from an Arabic word meaning stout (*Onom.* s. v.); while Fürst merely indicates it as of Philistian etymology (*Heb. Lex.* s. v.). Hitzig (*Gesch. u. Mythol. der Philist.* p. 7) regards it as merely = Γαυλείτης, i. e. sorcerer. His height was "six cubits and a span," which, taking the cubit at 21 inches, would make him 10½ feet high. But the Sept. (at 1 Sam. xvii, 4) and Josephus (*Ant.* vi, 9, 1) read "four cubits and a span." This will make him about the same size as the royal champion slain by Antimenidas, brother of Alcæus (*ἀπολείποντα μίαν μόνον παχέων ἀπὸ πέμπων*, ap. Strabo, xiii, p. 617, with Müller's emendation). Even on this computation Goliath would be, as Josephus calls him, ἀνὴρ παρμεγέθιστατος—a truly enormous man. (See Wichmannshausen, *De armatura Gol.* Viteb. 1711.) After the victory David cut off Goliath's head (1 Sam. xvii, 51; compare Herod. iv, 6; Xenoph. *Anab.* v, 4, 17; Niebuhr mentions a similar custom among the Arabs, *Beschr.* p. 304), which he brought (ver. 54) to Jerusalem (probably after his accession to the throne, Ewald, *Gesch.* iii, 94), while he hung the armor in his tent. See FIGURE. His sword was afterwards received by David in a great emergency from the hands of Abimelech at Nob, where it had been preserved as a religious trophy (1 Sam. xxi, 9). See GIANT.

The scene of this famous combat (see Trendelenburg, *De pugna Dav. cum Goliatho*, Gedan. 1792) was the Valley of the Terebinth, between Shochoh and Azekah, probably among the western passes of Benjamin, although a confused modern tradition has given the name of *Ain-Jahlad* (spring of Goliath) to the spring of Harod, or "trembling" (Stanley, *Palest.* p. 342; see Judg. vii, 1). See ELAH, VALLEY OF. This modern name, however, may rather be (= the spring of Gilead) a reminiscence of Gideon's exploit (Judg. vii, 3). See GILEAD. The circumstances of the combat (q. v.) are in all respects Homeric, free from any of the puerile legends which Oriental imagination subsequently introduced into it; as, for instance, that the stones used by David called out to him from the brook, "By our means you shall slay the giant," etc. (Hottinger, *Hist. Orient.* i, 3, p. 111 sq.). The fancies of the Rabbis are yet more extraordinary. By the Mohammedans Saul and Goliath are called Taluth and Kaluth (*Jabul* in Koran, ii, 131 sq.), perhaps for the sake of the homoioteleuton, of which they are so fond (Hottinger, *Hist. Orient.* i, 3, p. 28). Abulfeda mentions a Canaanite king of the name Jalut (*Hist. AnteiSam.* p. 176); and, according to Ahmed al-Fassi, *Gialout* was a dynastic name of the old giant-chiefs of the Philistines (D'Herbelot, *Bibl. Or.* s. v. Gialont). In the title of the psalm added to the psalter in the Sept. we find τῷ Δαυὶδ πρὸς τὸν Γολιάθ; and although the allusions are vague, it is thought by some that this psalm may have been written after the victory. This psalm is given at length under DAVID, p. 687 (see Hilscher, *Psa. centes. quinquages. prim. illustr.*, acced. vita Goliathi, Bautzen, 1716). It is strange that we find no more definite allusions to this combat in Hebrew poetry; but it is the opinion of some that the song now attributed to Hannah (1 Sam. ii, 1-10) was originally written really in commemoration of David's triumph on this occasion (Thenius, *Die Bücher Sam.* p. 8; comp. Bertholdt, *Eind.* iii, 915; Ewald, *Poet. Bücher des A. B.* i, 111). See PSALMS.

In 2 Sam. xxi, 19, we find that another Goliath of Gath, of whom it is also said that "the staff of his

spear was like a weaver's beam," was slain by Elhanan, also a Bethlehemite. St. Jerome (*Quest. Heb. ad loc.*) makes the unlikely conjecture that Elhanan was another name of David. The A.V. here interpolates the words "the brother of," from 1 Chron. xx, 5, where this giant is called "Lahmi." See Stiebritz, *Die Davidische Erlegung des Goliath's* (Halle, 1742).—Smith, s. v. See ELHANAN.

**Golius, Jacobus**, was born at the Hague in 1596. After finishing his studies at the University of Leyden, he was called to give instruction in the Greek language at Rochelle. In 1624 he became professor of the Arabic language, and in 1629 also of mathematics at the University of Leyden. He died Sept. 28, 1667. He brought out an edition of the New Testament in modern Greek. He also had the Confession of Faith of the Reformed Church of Holland, the Heidelberg Catechism, and the Liturgy translated into modern Arabic by an Armenian for circulation in the Levant. His principal work is his *Lexicon Arab.-Latinum cum ind. Lat.* It was first published in London, and subsequently at Leyden, 1653, in fol. See Glasius, *Godgeleerd Nederland*, i, 534; Bayle, *Dict. hist. et Crit.* (J. P. W.).

**Golius, Petrus**, brother of J. Golius, was brought up by his maternal uncle, Jan Hemelaar, canon at Antwerp, in the Roman Catholic Church, in which he remained through life. He shared his brother's fondness for Oriental studies. After spending several years in Palestine, he was appointed professor of Oriental languages at Rome. He translated Thomas à Kempis's work, *De Imitatione Christi*, into Arabic, and labored on an edition of the Bible in the same language. At the age of seventy-four he went to convert the heathen on the coasts of Malabar. He died at Surat. See Glasius, *Godgeleerd Nederland*, i, 536; Bayle, art. Hemelar. (J. P. W.).

**Gomar, Francis**, an eminent Calvinistic divine and polemic, was born Jan. 30, 1563, at Bruges, and educated at Strasburg under John Sturmius, and at Neustadt, where the professors of Heidelberg found a refuge when Louis, the elector palatine, had banished them. In 1582 he came to England, and attended at Oxford the divinity lectures of Dr. John Rainolds, and at Cambridge those of Dr. William Whittaker, and at this latter university he was admitted to the degree of B. D. in 1584. The elector Louis dying in 1583, prince Casimir, his brother, restored the professors of Heidelberg, to which place Gomar returned from Cambridge, and spent two years there. In 1587 he became pastor of the Flemish church at Frankfurt, and exercised the functions of that office until 1593. In 1594 he was appointed professor of divinity at Leyden. Here he remained teaching quietly until 1603, when he became the zealous opponent of his new colleague Arminius. Arminius, as is well known, opposed, and Gomar defended, the peculiarities of Calvin, and in this controversy Gomar displayed a most violent, virulent, and intolerant spirit, and endeavored by various publications to excite the indignation of the States of Holland against his rival. The combatants disputed before the States in 1608. See ARMINIUS. On one of these occasions Barneveldt, in a short address to them, declared that he thanked God their contentions did not affect the fundamental articles of the Christian religion; Gomar replied that he "would not appear before the throne of God with Arminius's errors." On the death of Arminius, Gomar, 1609, retired to Middleburg, whence he was invited by the University of Saumur to be professor of divinity, and four years after he exchanged this office for the professorship of divinity and Hebrew at Groningen. He attended the Synod of Dort in 1618, where he took an active part in the condemnation of the Arminians. See DORT. He visited Leyden in 1633 to revise the translation of the Old Testament, and died at Groningen Jan. 16, 1641.

His works were published at Amsterdam in 1645 (fol.); also in 1664, *Opera omnia theologica* (Amsterd. fol.). See Bayle; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* v, 332; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. xvii, pt. ii. ch. ii, § 11; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxi, 136; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* v, 231.

**Gomè.** See BULRUSH.

**Go'mer** (Heb. *id.* גֹּמֶר, *vanishing*, or perh. *heat*, i. e. passion; Sept. Γαμῆρ and Γομῆρ or Γόμερ), the name of a man and of a race descended from him, also of a woman.

**I.** The eldest son of Japheth (B.C. post 2514), son of Noah, and father of Ashkenaz, Riphath, and Togarmah (Gen. x, 2), whose descendants seem to have formed a great branch of the south-eastern population of Europe (Gen. x, 3; compare 1 Chron. i, 5). In the Scriptures, however, the people named Gomer (mentioned with Togarmah in the armies of Magog, Ezek. xxxviii, 6) imply rather an obscure and but vaguely-known nation of the barbarous north (Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* 1, i, 235 sq.). The Jerusalem Targum renders Gen. x, 3 by גֹּמֶר אֲפִרְכָּי, *African*; Arab. *ġ-ġ-r*, *Turk*. Bochart (*Phaleg*, iii, 81) identifies the name, on etymological grounds, with *Phrygia* (from *ῥῆμα*, to consume, and *φούρια*, from *φούριον*, to roast); Phrygia being, according to ancient testimony, a χώρα ἐπιπέδωτος, and part of it bearing the name of κατακλιναμένη, or burnt (Strabo, xiii, 628; Diod. iii, 138). But to this it seems a fatal objection that the Phrygians formed only a branch of the Togarmians (Josephus, *Ant.* i, 6, 1; Jerome, *Quest. in Gen.* x, 3), and therefore cannot be regarded as the stem whence the Togarmians themselves sprang. The same objection applies to the suggestion that Gomer is the German race (Talm. *Yoma*, 10 a); for this comes under Ashkenaz, a branch of Gomer. Wahl (*Asien*, i, 274) compares *Gamir*, the ancient name for Cappadocia, and Kalisch (*Comm. in Gen.*) seeks to identify it with the *Chomari*, a nation in Bactriana, noticed by Ptolemy (vi, 11, § 6). Most of the interpreters take Gomer to be the ancestor of the Celts, and more especially of the *Cimmerii*, *Κυμῆριοι* (Herodotus, i, 6, 15, 103), who were already known in the time of Homer (*Odys.* xi, 14). To judge from the ancient historians (Herodotus, Strabo, Plutarch, etc.), they had in early times settled to the north of the Black Sea, and gave their name to the Crimea (from the Arab. *krim*, by transposition from the Heb.), the ancient *Chersonesus Taurica*, where they left traces of their presence in the ancient names, Cimmerian Bosphorus, Cimmerian Isthmus, Mount Cimmerium, the district Cimmeria, and particularly the Cimmerian walls (Herod. iv, 12, 45, 100; Æsch. *Prom. Vinct.* 729), and in the modern name *Crimea*. They forsook this abode under the pressure of the Scythian tribes, and during the early part of the 7th century B.C. they poured over the western part of Asia Minor, committing immense devastation, and defying for more than half a century the power of the Lydian kings. They were finally expelled by Alyattes, with the exception of a few who settled at Sinope and Antandrus. It was about the same period that Ezekiel noticed them as acting in conjunction with Armenia (Togarmah) and Magog (Scythia). The connection between Gomer and Armenia is supported by the tradition, preserved by Moses of Chorene (i, 11), that Gamir was the ancestor of the Haichian kings of the latter country. After the expulsion of the Cimmerians from Asia Minor their name disappears in its original form; but there can be little reasonable doubt that both the name and the people are to be recognised in the *Cimbri* of the north of Europe, described by the classical writers sometimes as a German, sometimes as a Celtic race. The preponderance of authority is in favor of the latter (Sallust, *Jug.* 114; Florus, iii, 3; Appian, *De Reb. Ill.* 4; *Bell. Cirtli.* i, 29; iv, 2; Diodor. v, 32; xiv, 114; Plutarch, *Cam.* 15; *Mar.* 25, 27; Dion. Cass.



xliv, 42; Justin, xxiv, 8; xxxviii, 3, 4); and the probability is that the Cimbrri were Celtic, and of the same tribe as the Cymry of Britain (Prichard, *Eastern Origin of the Celtic Nations*, by Latham, p. 142; Latham, *Germania of Tacitus*, Epilegom. p. clxv sq.). By the ancients the Cimmerii and the Cimbrri were held to be one people; and the abodes of the latter were fixed during the Roman empire in the north and west of Europe, particularly in the Cimbric Chersonese (Denmark), on the coast between the Elbe and Rhine, and in Belgium, whence they had crossed to Britain, and occupied at one period the whole of the British isles, but were ultimately driven back to the western and northern districts, which their descendants still occupy in two great divisions, the Gael in Ireland and Scotland, the Cymry in Wales. The latter name preserves a greater similarity to the original Gomer than either of the classical forms, the consonants being identical. The link to connect "Cymry" with "Cimbrri" is furnished by the forms *Cambria* and *Cumberland*. The whole Celtic race may therefore be regarded as descended from Gomer, and thus the opinion of Josephus (*Ant.* i, 6, 1), that the Galatians were sprung from him, may be reconciled with the view propounded (Michaelis, *Supplem.* p. 335 sq.). From the place Gomer occupies in the roll of nations in Genesis, it may be presumed that the people descended from him was one of the oldest, and this would fall in with the half-mythic character of the Cimmerii as they appear in Homer. It is plain also from Ezek. xxxviii, 6 that the race of Gomer was regarded by the Hebrews as living to the far north of Palestine, and this accords exactly with the site assigned to the Cimmerii by Herodotus, who places them on the Caucasus, and represents them as skirting the Euxine and coming down on Asia Minor by way of Colchis, and across the river Halys. If the Cimmerii and the Cimbrri are identified, and the latter be regarded as a Celtic-speaking people, the statement of Jerome that the Galatæ spoke a language not greatly differing from that of the Treveri (*Proleg. Lib. ii, ad Ep. ad Galatas*) may have an important bearing on the subject of the migrations of the original Gomerian stock.—Smith, s. v.; Kitto, s. v. See ETNOLOGY.

2. The name of the daughter of Diblaim, a harlot who became the wife or concubine (according to some, in vision only) of the prophet Hosea (Hos. i, 3). B.C. cir. 725.

**Gomor'rah** (Heb. *Amorah'*, גֹּמֹרְרָה, prob. *submer-sion*; Sept. ἡ or τὰ Γόμορρα, N. T. "Gomorrha"), one of the four cities in or near the vale of Siddim (Gen. x, 19; xiii, 10), apparently overwhelmed by the destruction which caused the Dead Sea (Gen. xix, 24, 28). B.C. 2064. See SIDDIM. Its king, Birsha, was one of those that joined battle with the forces of Chedorlaomer, and in the rout Lot's family became involved until rescued by Abraham (Gen. xiv, 2, 8-11). B.C. cir. 2080. The allusions in Scripture to the "cities of the plain" appear to indicate that they stood close together (Gen. xiii, 10; xiv, 8-11), and that they lay near the southern extremity of the present lake, for Abraham, on going to the brow of the mountain near Hebron, "looked toward Sodom and Gomorrah, and all the plain" (Gen. xix, 28), and this he could not have done had they been situated further north. The battle between the eastern kings and the people of the plain took place "in the vale of Siddim, which is the Salt Sea" (Gen. xiv, 3). The phrase, however, is not quite decisive as to the precise position; for, as Reland observes (*Palæst.* p. 254), it is not stated that the five cities stood in the vale of Siddim, although this perhaps may be inferred, and seems to be implied in the name of Gomorrah. This city appears to have been next in importance to Sodom, as it is always mentioned second, and often these two of the four cities alone are named, as types of impiety and wicked-

ness (Gen. xviii, 20; Rom. ix, 29). What that atrocity was may be gathered from Gen. xix, 4-8. Their miserable fate is held up as a warning to the children of Israel (Deut. xxix, 23); as a precedent for the destruction of Babylon (Isa. xiii, 19, and Jer. i, 40), of Edom (Jer. xlix, 18), of Moab (Zeph. ii, 9), and even of Israel (Amos iv, 11). By Peter in the N. T., and by Jude (2 Pet. ii, 6; Jude ver. 4-7), it is made "an ensample unto those that after should live ungodly," or "deny Christ." Similarly, their wickedness rings as a proverb throughout the prophecies (see Deut. xxxiii, 32; Isa. i, 9, 10; Jer. xxiii, 14). Jerusalem herself is there unequivocally called Sodom, and her people Gomorrah, for their enormities; just in the same way that the corruptions of the Church of Rome have caused her to be called Babylon. On the other hand, according to the N. T., there is a sin which exceeds even that of Sodom and Gomorrah, that, namely, of which Tyre and Sidon, Capernaum, Chorazin, and Bethsaida, were guilty when they "repented not," in spite of "the mighty works" which they had witnessed (Matt. x, 15); and Mark has ranged under the same category all those who would not receive the preaching of the apostles (vi, 11). See SODOM.

To turn to their geographical position, one passage of Scripture seems expressly to assert that the vale of Siddim had become the "salt," or dead, "sea" (Gen. xiv, 3), called elsewhere too the "sea of the plain" (Josh. xii, 3); the expression, however, occurs antecedently to their overthrow. Josephus (*Ant.* i, 9) says that the late Asphaltites, or Dead Sea, was formed out of what used to be the valley where Sodom stood; but elsewhere he declares that the territory of Sodom was not submerged in the lake (*Jar.* iv, 8, 4), but still existed parched and burnt up, as is the appearance of that region still; and certainly nothing in Scripture would lead to the idea that they were destroyed by submersion (though they may have been submerged afterwards when destroyed), for their destruction is expressly attributed to the brimstone and fire rained upon them from heaven (Gen. xix, 24; see also Deut. xxix, 22, and Zeph. ii, 9; also Peter and Jude before cited). St. Jerome, in the *Onomasticon*, merely says of Sodom, "civitas impiorum divino igne consumpta juxta mare mortuum" (s. v. Σόδομα, Sodom; comp. s. v. Γόμορρα, Gomorra). The whole subject is ably handled by Cellarius (ap. Ugol. *Thesaur.* vii, dcxxxix-lxxviii), though it is not always necessary to agree with his conclusions. Among modern travellers, Dr. Robinson shows that the Jordan could not have ever flowed into the gulf of Akal ah; on the contrary, that the rivers of the desert themselves flow northwards into the Dead Sea. See ARABAH. This, added to the configuration and deep depression of the valley, serves in his opinion to prove that there must have always been a lake there, into which the Jordan flowed; though he admits it to have been of far less extent than it now is, and even the whole southern part of it to have been added subsequently to the overthrow of the four cities, which stood, according to him, at the original south end of it, Zoar probably being situated in the mouth of wady Kerah, as it opens upon the isthmus of the peninsula. In the same plain, he remarks, were slime-pits, or wells of bitumen (Gen. xiv, 10); "salt-pits" also (Zeph. ii, 9); while the enlargement of the lake he considers to have been caused by some convulsion or catastrophe of nature connected with the miraculous destruction of the cities—volcanic agency, that of earthquakes, and the like (*Bibl. Res.* ii, 187-192, 2d ed.). He might have adduced the great earthquake at Lisbon as a case in point. The great difference of level between the bottoms of the northern and southern ends of the lake, the former 1300, the latter only 13 feet below the surface, singularly confirms the above view (Stanley, *S. & P.* p. 287, 2d ed.). Pilgrims of Palestine formerly saw, or fancied that they saw, ruins of towns at the bottom of the sea, not

far from the shore (see Maundrell, *Early Travellers*, p. 451).—Smith, s. v.; Kitto, s. v. M. de Sauley is confident he has discovered the remains of Gomorrah in certain ruins which he reports in a valley by the name of *Gumrar*, on the N. W. shore of the Dead Sea, just north of Ain el-Feshkah (*Dead Sea*, ii, 49); but Van de Velde makes light of this account (*Narrative*, ii, 115 sq.), which, indeed, lacks confirmation, especially as it is generally believed that the sites of these cities are all buried under the southern shallows of the lake. See DEAD SEA.

**Gomorrha**, the manner in which the name GOMORRAH (q. v.) is written in the A. V. of the apocryphal books and the N. T., following the Greek form of the word Γομόρρα (2 Esd. ii, 8; Matt. x, 15; Mark vi, 11; Rom. ix, 29; Jude 7; 2 Pet. ii, 6).—Smith, s. v.

**Gondulf**, or **Gundulf**, a Norman priest, was born in the neighborhood of Rouen in 1023. After entering the Church, he made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem in company with the archdeacon William, afterwards archbishop of Rouen. On his return, being in danger of shipwreck, he vowed to become a monk, and in 1059 he entered the convent of Bec, where he became intimate with Anselm. Lanfranc, prior of Bec, being in 1063 appointed abbot of St. Stephen of Caen, chose Gondulf for his coadjutor, and still retained him when called in 1070 to the archbishopric of Canterbury. Through his influence Gondulf was created archbishop of Rochester March 19, 1077, and restored that see to its former importance. After the death of Lanfranc he administered for four years the archbishopric of Canterbury, to which Anselm was then appointed. The pleasure of their meeting was soon disturbed by difficulties occurring between the new archbishop, William Rufus, and Henry I. Gondulf, while faithful to his Church and to his friend, managed, however, to remain on good terms with both parties, and after king William's death exerted himself to prevent civil war, and to secure the crown for Henry. The services gave him great influence, which he used for the benefit of his diocese. He died at Rochester in 1108. Gondulf enjoyed great reputation for learning; he devoted his time largely to the correction of the text of the Vulgate version. He was also renowned for his eloquence, but none of his sermons are extant now. Of his correspondence with Anselm there remains but one letter, which, with an epistle to the monks of Bec, is all we have of his writings. See *Vita Gondulphi* (in Wharton, *Anglia sacra*); *Hist. littéraire de la France* (vol. ix); Rémusat, *Hist. de St. Anselme*; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, cxxi, 196.

**Gonesius**, PETER (*Conyza*, *Goniuszki*, *Gonionizki*), one of the early Unitarians of Poland, was born in Goniadz in 1525. His opposition to the doctrines of the Reformation in the early part of his public career won him the support of the Roman Catholics; but having in 1554 undertaken a journey through Germany and Switzerland, he became imbued with the doctrines of Servetus, and on his return to Poland he rejected all creeds except the Apostles', and openly advocated Unitarianism. He declared himself against infant baptism also. Chiefly through his influence, the Reformed Church of Poland was divided in 1565 into two parties, Trinitarians and Unitarians. See Sandii *Bibliotheca Antitritin.* p. 40; Fock, *Der Socinianismus* (Kiel, 1847); Lukaszewicz, *Geschichte d. reformirten Kirche in Lithauen*, ii, 69 (Lips. 1848-50); Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* iii, 228, note 12; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* v, 245; Krasinski, *Reformation in Poland* (Lps. 1841).

**Gonfalon**, a large colored banner, cut at the bottom so as to leave pendant points. The name is applied principally to ecclesiastical banners, carried around to raise the vassals of a church fief to defend church property. The color was varied according to the character of the patron saint of the church or monastery, e. g. red for a martyr, green for a bishop, etc. The

bearers were called *gonfaloniers*. Some writers ascribe to these the origin of the practice of carrying banners in the Roman Catholic processions.

**Gonorrhœa**. See ISSUE.

**Gonsalvi**. See CONSALVI.

**Gonzaga**. See ALOYSIUS OF GONZAGA.

**Gonzalez** (**GONZALO**) **de Berceo**, JUAN, the most ancient Spanish poet, was born in 1196 at Avila, in Castile, entered the Benedictine order, and died in 1266. He is the author of poetical works on the Mass, on Doomsday, on the Virgin Mary, on the Life of St. Dominic, etc. They are printed in Sanchez's *Colleccion de poesias castellanas anteriores al siglo xv* (Madrid, 1775-90, 3 vols.). Some writers on Spanish literature attribute to his works a decisive influence on the peculiar development of Spanish poetry. (A. J. S.)

**Gonzalez**, TIRSO, a Spanish Roman Catholic theologian of the 17th century. Having entered the order of Jesuits, he became professor at the University of Salamanca, and was elected general of his order about 1685. He opposed the doctrine of *probabilism* (q. v.), which was upheld by the casuists of the order, and affirmed that it originated not among the Jesuits, but among the Augustinians, one of whom, Michael Saloniis (1592), was its author. According to Gonzalez, it was only in the year after it was promulgated by Saloniis that it was adopted by the Jesuit Valentinia, and developed in 1698 by Vasquez. While admitting that the doctrine was held by the majority of the Jesuits, he pointed at Fernand Rebello, Paolo Comitelo, and Andrea Le Blanc (*Candidus Philoletes*), who had opposed it in their writings. Yet Gonzalez did not consider it obligatory for all the members of his order to adopt his views; he permitted each one to follow his opinions and *his interest*. The work he wrote on the subject encountered so much opposition that it remained twenty-five years in MS. before being printed, and afterwards appears to have found but few partisans among the Jesuits. Father Oliva, director of the Index, greatly opposed the book, notwithstanding the approbation given to it by pope Innocent IX. The first edition bore the title *Fundamentum Theologie moralis, id est tractatus theologicus de recto uso opinionum probabilium* (Dillingen, 1689; Naples, Rome, Lyons, Antwerp, 1694, 4to). The text of the latter editions has been altered in several passages, and the earlier ones have been destroyed. Gonzalez wrote also *De Infallibilitate Romani Pontificis in definiendis fidei et morum controversiis extra concilium generale* (Rome, 1689, 4to; printed by order of Innocent IX, and suppressed by Alexander VIII); — *Manuductio ad conversionem Mahometanorum* (Dillingen, 1680, 4to); — *Veritas Religiois catholice demonstrata* (Lille, 1696, 12mo). See Dupin, *Bibli. des Auteurs ecclés. du 17<sup>me</sup> siècle* (pt. iv); *Jour. des Savants* (1695, 1698); Richard et Giraud, *Bibl. sacrée*; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, cxxi, 252.

**Good** (Lat. *bonum*) is variously defined by moralists, according to the nature of their ethical theories. The Stoic would define it to be that which is according to nature; the Epicurean, that which increases pleasure or diminishes pain; the Idealist, that which accords with the fitness of things; the Christian theologian, that which accords with the revealed will of God. So the philosophical schools give various and even contradictory definitions of the highest good (*summum bonum*). Thus Aristippus placed it in pleasure in activity; Epicurus, in pleasure in repose; Zeno, in tranquillity of mind; Kant, in well being conditioned on morality; the Materialists, in self-love.

Schleiermacher states his views of the subject as follows: In ethics there are three fundamental conceptions—duty, virtue, good. Duty is the obligation of moral action; virtue is the moral power of the agent; the highest good is the objective aim of both. In the systems of Kant and Fichte, ethics is the doc-

trine of *duty*, and its development becomes simply a treatment of individual virtues. In opposing this view, Schleiermacher maintains that a system of moral precepts, or *formulas of duty*, even though it might embrace the whole life of man, could only be applied in isolated cases and single acts, leaving the moral life as a whole still unexplained. It is only in a very limited sphere that a moral agent acts *alone*, and without reference to other agents; and his *virtue* has relation to a general state of things, to produce which other agents co-operate. Schleiermacher charges the existing ethical systems with making an unnatural schism between the law of action (*duty*) and the active power (*virtue*) on the one hand, and the resulting *actions* on the other hand; and also with leaving entire spheres of human action, of unquestionably moral character, in the domain of *adiaphora* (things indifferent), instead of bringing them under the authority of moral law. To remedy these alleged confusions, Schleiermacher seeks for an *organic principle* of ethics, which shall be at once objective, systematic, and comprehensive. He finds it in the *highest good*, which can be completely apprehended, not in its relations to the individual merely, but with reference to the human race as a whole. From this principle the whole sphere of ethics may be mapped, placing universal nature on the one hand, and the organizing reason (the universal reason of humanity) on the other. In this theory Schleiermacher expressly recognises the authority of Plato, who, in his *Philebus* investigated the "highest good." Aristotle, in whom the idea of *virtue* was the highest, places the highest good in *εὐδαιμονία*, individual happiness—not, however, in the Epicurean sense, but in the sense of *ζωῆς τελείας ἐνέργεια κατ' ἀρετὴν τελείαν*, the working out or realization of a perfect life through perfect virtue.

In the further development of the history of ethics, so far as relates to the definition of the "highest good," we must particularly notice the distinction (1) between the individual and the general, indicated in Plato and Aristotle, and carried to the greatest extent by Epicurus and the Stoics; (2) the resulting distinction between the objective and subjective, according to which the "highest good" is, on the one hand, a *condition* of man (e. g. Epicurean enjoyment, Stoical endurance); or, on the other hand, a *product* of human activity, the end of humanity as a whole; (3) the consequent moral theories of *pleasure* or of *activity*, according to the former of which the "highest good" lies in enjoyment, while according to the latter it lies in moral activity. In the language of Christian theology, "the highest good" is the *kingdom of God*, which includes within itself all ethical elements, the individual and the general, activity and happiness, theory and practice, means and end. The *means* of securing the "highest good" is to promote the advancement of that kingdom; the *end*, the "highest good" itself, is the coming of that kingdom, to the individual, in his personal salvation; to the universal race, in the realization of the promise "God shall be all in all!" See Schleiermacher, *Ethische Abhandlungen*, in his *Phil. Nachlassen*, ii, 12, 13; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* s. v. Ethik, Tugend.

**Good**, JOHN MASON, M. D., a physician and general scholar, was born at Epping, England, May 25, 1764, and commenced practice as a physician in London, 1820. He was an indefatigable student and writer, and his learning was multifarious rather than profound. Besides a number of medical works, he published *The Song of Solomon, in English verse, with notes, etc.* (Lond. 1803, 8vo).—*Memoirs of Alex. Geddes, LL.D.* (Lond. 1803, 8vo) [see GEDDES]:—*Lucretius, translated, with notes* (Lond. 1805-7, 2 vols. 4to):—*The Book of Job, newly translated, with notes* (Lond. 1812, 8vo):—*The Book of Proverbs, translated* (Lond. 1822, 8vo):—*The Book of Psalms, translated, just finished at the time of his death, Jan. 2, 1827.* Dr. Good also contributed largely to several periodicals, not only in medi-

cal science, but in almost every branch of literature, "The extent and variety of Dr. Good's works are sufficient to indicate their character; they evince great industry, with a retentive and orderly mind, and every mark of sincerity and piety; but they show that he was deficient in judgment, critical acumen, and personal observation; and his medical writings especially are hence of far less value than the labor that must have been bestowed upon them might have given them, had it been better directed. But he seemed to have no suspicion of his unfitness for any literary task, and hence never hesitated to undertake any project, though most unsuited to his habits and requirements. Thus, although wanting every requisite qualification for such a duty, his overweening self-confidence led him not only to consent to edit the letters of Junius, but to select, merely from his own opinion of resemblance of style, other letters which had been published, under a great variety of names, in Woodfall's *Advertiser*, and without scruple assign them to the great unknown, to the utter confusion, as it has proved, of almost all subsequent investigations respecting the author of the Junius letters, and judgment of his character and conduct. Dr. Good's principal faculty seems to have been a facility of acquiring languages; he had learned Latin, Greek, and French in his father's school; while an apprentice he acquired Italian, and soon after commenced Hebrew. While engaged in the translation of Lucretius he studied German, Spanish, and Portuguese; and afterwards, at different times, Arabic, Persian, Russian, Sanscrit, and Chinese. Of his knowledge of all these, evidence is presented in unpublished translations, in reviews of their literature, and in the constant references made to their works in his medical and other writings. A biography of Dr. Good was published by his friend, Dr. Olinthus Gregory, in 1 vol. 8vo." In early life Dr. Good was a Socinian, but about 1817 he embraced fully the doctrine of the Trinity. He led an earnest, religious life, "seen and known of all men." See Jamieson, *Cyclop. of Biography*, p. 229; *English Cyclopædia*; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 698.

**Good Friday**, the sixth day of the week before Easter, called Good Friday in acknowledgment of the benefit derived from the death of Christ. Among the Saxons it was denominated Long Friday, perhaps in allusion to the length of the fast.

(1.) In the earliest ages of the Church the day of our Lord's crucifixion was religiously observed, not independently, but as a part of the sacred season of Easter, which was celebrated by Christians instead of the Jewish passover, in commemoration at once of the death and resurrection of Christ. Two terms were used to designate Good Friday and Easter-day, which had reference, in name at least, to the passover: *πάσχα σταυρώσιμον*, and *πάσχα αναστάσιμον*, *passover of the crucifixion*, and *passover of the resurrection*. The day was observed as a strict fast. The usual acclamations and doxologies were omitted, and nothing but the most plaintive strains of music, such as the *Κίριε ἔλεησον*, etc., were allowed to be sung. No bell was rung. None bowed the knee in prayer, because thus the Jews reviled Christ. The kiss of charity was omitted, for Judas betrayed his Master with a kiss. The Lord's supper was celebrated; but the elements were not consecrated on this day, but on the day before. Communion-tables and reading-desks were stripped of ornaments; and the gospel of St. John was read, because he was a faithful and true witness of our Lord's passion. In reference to the Jewish ritual, the day was sometimes called *παρασκευή*, *the preparation*.

(2.) In the Roman Church the day is celebrated with great care. "The Church in her whole office expresses the deepest mourning and compunction. The altars are naked, except at the priest's communion, when the ornaments are black, and the crucifix is covered with a black veil till the prostration, after which it is left uncovered." Instead of the ordinary mass, the "Mass

of the Presanctified" is said, without the consecration of the Host. The sacrament, reserved the day before, is received in one kind only by the priest, who recites the Lord's prayer and a small part of the prayers of the mass. "No others receive the holy communion except the priest who celebrates the divine office, and the sick in mortal danger of death, to whom it is administered by way of viaticum."

(3.) Among the Protestant churches Good Friday is observed as a fast, and by special services and prayers by the Church of England, the Lutherans, German Reformed, and many Methodists.—*Coleman, Ancient Christianity*, p. 516; *Wheatly, Common Prayer*, ch. v, § 15; *Butler, Feasts and Fasts*, tr. vi, ch. v.

**Good Tidings.** See GOSPEL.

**Good Works.** See WORKS.

**Goode, WILLIAM**, a clergyman of the Church of England, rector of Allhallows the Great and Less, London, and later dean of Ripon, died in 1868. He was a prominent and prolific writer of the Low-Church school. Among the best known of his works are: *The Extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit* (London, 1834);—*The Established Church* (1834);—*Traacts on Church-rates* (1840);—*The Divine Rule of Faith and Practice* (1842, 2 vols.; 2d ed. 1853, 3 vols.), directed against the views of Dr. Pusey concerning the value of tradition as a rule of faith;—*Tract XC historically refuted* (1845);—*Doctrine of the Church of England as to the Effects of Baptism in the case of Infants* (1849);—*Vindication of the Church of England on the Validity of the Orders in the Scotch and Foreign non-Episcopal Churches* (3 pamphlets, 3d ed. 1852).

**Goodell, WILLIAM, D. D.**, a Congregational minister and eminent missionary, was born at Templeton, Mass., Feb. 14, 1792. In early youth he manifested great energy of character. At fifteen he went sixty miles on foot, carrying his trunk, to Phillips Academy, in Andover; and there, and afterwards in Dartmouth College, he overcame all difficulties until he graduated in 1817. He spent three years in Andover Theological Seminary, and in 1820 was accepted as a missionary of the American Board. He travelled for some time as agent for raising funds for the society from New England as far as Alabama, and also visited the Cherokee and Choctaw missions east of the Mississippi. In Dec., 1822, he sailed for Malta. After preaching in English and studying other languages during nine months, he left Malta for Beirut, where he arrived Nov. 16, 1823. "By the residence there of Messrs. Goodell and Bird, Beirut became a regular station of the Board. After some attention to the Arabic, Mr. Goodell went, in June, 1824, to Sidon, to study the Armeno-Turkish language with an Armenian ex-bishop, Yakob Aga, where he became acquainted with another Armenian bishop, Dionysius Carabet, who, a year and a half later, was received into the mission church at Beirut. Thus singularly did the 'Mission to Syria and the Holy Land,' at the very outset, take hold of a people who were not thought of in its establishment, and of whom but a few individuals were found by it except as pilgrims to the sacred places. In March, 1826, after the repulse of the Greeks in an attack on Beirut, Mr. Goodell's house was plundered and his life endangered by Arab soldiers. In May, 1828, war being imminent between Turkey and England, the missionaries were obliged to flee to Malta. There Mr. Goodell labored in connection with the press until the summer of 1831, when he repaired to Constantinople, and commenced the mission to Turkey, with special reference to the Armenians, in which he was joined a few months later by the Rev. H. G. O. Dwight. From that time on his work lay specially among the Armenians. Mr. Goodell's early experience and natural temperament combined, with divine grace, to fit him eminently to meet them with a cheer-

ful patience. With a true Christian heroism, in which his wife had an equal share, he encountered such incidents of life as being obliged, by conflagrations, visitations of pestilence, convulsions and war, the extortions of landlords, hierarchial persecutions, interference of government, etc., 'to pack up and move' his residence 'some thirty times in twenty-nine years,' and battled with the opposition and obstacles that were ever before him as a missionary. Indomitable in his purpose to do good, affable and courteous in manner, of ready tact, and abounding in resistless pleasantries, he gained access wherever he chose to go, and exercised a magnetic attraction that never left him without subjects on whom to pour, in some form, the light of truth. He commanded the respect of foreign ambassadors and travellers, of dignitaries of the Oriental churches, bankers, and the highest in society, with whom, at different periods, he had no little intercourse, as well as the common people; and even enemies to his work were constrained to honor him. Few possess in so high degree as he did the admirable faculty of doing good without offence, and of recommending personal religion to the world." One of his most important labors was the translation of the Bible into Armeno-Turkish, commenced in 1843, and finished (the last revision) in 1863. In 1855 he returned to America, worn out with labor, and died in Philadelphia Feb. 18, 1867. "In the future history of the kingdom of Christ in the lands which include the site of the garden that was planted in Eden, and the scenes of events most sacred to Christian hearts, the name of William Goodell will be precious to successive generations of sanctified souls, even to the end of the world."—*Missionary Herald*, May, 1867.

**Goodly Trees** is the rendering of *עֵץ יָפֵה*, *ets hadar*, 'tree of splendor, the fruit (*פֵּרוֹת*, "boughs") of which (Sept. *καρπὸς ἕδων ἰσραήλ*, Vulg. *fructus arboris pulcherrime*), the Israelites were directed to take (i. e. carry about in festive procession) on the first day of the Feast of Tabernacles, in memory of the inhabiting dwelt in booths in the wilderness (Lev. xxiii, 40). The tree generally conceded to be meant is the *citron* (Celsius, *Hierobot.* i, 252), the fruit of which Josephus states was that in the hands of the Jews on the day of the festival of the *Scenopogia*, when they pelted king Janneus with it (*Ant.* xiii, 13, 5). See CITRON. Others regard the *olive* as meant, this being the tree mentioned in the parallel account of Neh. viii, 15. It would seem, however, that no specific tree is intended, but any one of sufficient size and beauty to be suitable to the occasion (Ursini *Arboret. Bibl.* p. 577. See TREE.

**Goodman OF THE HOUSE**, *οἰκοδεσπότης*, Matt. xx, 11; xxiv, 43; Mark xiv, 14; Luke xxii, 11, *master of the house*, as usually elsewhere rendered (Matt. x, 25; Luke xiii, 25; xiv, 21); "householder," Matt. xiii, 27, 52; xx, 1; xxi, 33). In Prov. vii, 19, "goodman" is the rendering of *אִישׁ*, *ish*, *man*, i. e. husband.

**Goodman, Christopher**, an English divine, was born at Chester in 1520. He studied at Brazenose College, Oxford, and afterwards held offices in that university during the reign of Henry VIII and Edward VI. When queen Mary ascended the throne he withdrew to Frankfort and thence to Geneva, where, with Knox, he became pastor of the English church. After Mary's death he went to Scotland, and became rector of St. Andrews in 1560. About 1565 he returned to England, and accompanied Sir Henry Sidney in his expedition against Ireland. He was afterwards rector of Chester, and died there in 1602. He wrote, *How far superior Powers are to be obeyed of their Subjects* (Geneva, 1558, 16mo), against queen Mary;—*A Commentary upon Amos*. Wood erroneously attributes to him Knox's *The First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women*. See WOOD, *Athenæ Oxonienses* (vol. i); Scott, *Lives of the Scotch Reform-*

ers; Peck, *Desiderata* (vol. i); Hoefler, *Now. Biogr. Générale*, xxi, 261; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, s. v.

**Goodman, Godfrey**, was born at Ruthven, in Denbighshire, 1583, and educated at Westminster School, and at Trinity College, Cambridge. In 1607 he got the living of Stapleford Abbots, in Essex; in 1617, a canonry of Windsor; in 1620, the deanery of Rochester; and in 1625, the bishopric of Gloucester. Bishop Goodman was a Romanizer, even beyond Laud's tolerance. In 1640 the new canons were set forth, which he refused to subscribe, "and it appeared afterwards," says Fuller, "that he scrupled about some passages on the corporeal presence, but whether upon popish or Lutheran principles he best knoweth." Laud, then archbishop, after the clergy had subscribed, advised him "to avoid obstinacy and irregularity therein, but he refused." It was in Henry VII's chapel, and being greatly offended, Laud said to him, "My Lord of Gloucester, I admonish you to subscribe." Goodman remained silent, and Laud again said, "My Lord of Gloucester, I do admonish you a second time to subscribe," and immediately after, "I do admonish you a third time to subscribe." Goodman "pleaded conscience," and was in consequence suspended. He was committed to the Gatehouse, "where," says Fuller, "he got by this restraint what he could never have got by his liberty, namely, of one reputed a papist, to become for a short time popular, as the only consequent suffering for not subscribing to the new canons." He died January 19, 1655, in open profession of popery. He wrote, 1. *The Fall of Man, and Corruption of Nature, proved by Reason* (London, 1624, 4to).—2. *Arguments and Animadversions on Dr. George Hakewill's apology for Divine Providence*.—3. *The two Mysteries of the Christian Religion, viz. the Trinity and the Incarnation explicated* (Lond. 1653, 4to).—*The Court of King James*, by Sir Anthony Weldon (edited by Breuer, Lond. 1839, 2 vols, 8vo).—Hook, *Ecol. Biography*, v, 335; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, s. v.; *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. lxxviii; Fuller, *Church History*, bk. xi.

**Goodness of God** denotes "both the absolute perfection of his own nature, and his kindness manifested to his creatures. Goodness, says Dr. Gill, is essential to God, without which he would not be God (Exod. xxxiii, 19; xxxiv, 6, 7). Goodness belongs only to God; he is solely good (Matt. xix, 17), and all the goodness found in creatures is only an emanation of the divine goodness. He is the chief good, the sum and substance of all felicity (Psa. cxliv, 2, 15; xxv, 7; lxxiii, 25; iv, 6, 7). There is nothing but goodness in God, and nothing but goodness comes from him (1 John i, 5; James i, 13, 14). He is infinitely good; finite minds cannot comprehend his goodness (Rom. xi, 35, 36). He is immutably and unchangeably good (Zeph. iii, 17). The goodness of God is communicative and diffusive (Psa. cxix, 68; xxxiii, 5). With respect to the objects of it, it may be considered as general and special. His general goodness is seen in all his creatures; yea, in the inanimate creation, the sun, the earth, and all his works; and in the government, support, and protection of the world at large (Psa. xxxvi, 6; cxlv). His special goodness relates to angels and saints; to angels, in creating, confirming, and making them what they are; to saints, in election, calling, justification, adoption, sanctification, perseverance, and eternal glorification." See Charnock, *Works*, v, i, 574; Paley, *Nat. Theol.* ch. xxvi; South, *Sermons*, vol. viii, serm. iii; Tillotson, *Sermons*, p. 143-146; Watson, *Institutes*, i, 420; Henderson's *Buck*, s. v. See God.

**Goodrich, Chauncey Allan**, D.D., was born in New Haven, Conn., Oct. 23, 1790. He graduated at Yale in 1810; was tutor in Yale College from 1812 to 1814; and in 1816, having completed a course of theological study, was installed as pastor of the First Church in Middletown, Conn. On the accession of Dr. Day to the presidency of Yale College in 1817,

Mr. Goodrich was elected professor of rhetoric and oratory in that institution, but relinquished the office in 1839, to accept the chair of pastoral theology in the theological seminary, a position which he occupied until his death—a period of twenty years. In 1820 he was elected president of Williams College, but declined to accept that honor. In 1835 he received the degree of doctor of divinity from Brown University. "In 1814 he prepared a Greek grammar, which passed through several editions. In 1827 he superintended the abridgment of *Webster's Quarto American Dictionary*. In 1829 he established the *Quarterly Christian Spectator*, which he edited for nearly ten years. In 1846 and '47 he prepared revised editions of *Webster's Dictionary*, and in 1856, the university edition of the same work. In 1852 he published his admirable work on *British Eloquence*, which has been extensively circulated, both in England and America. Besides performing the literary labor involved in preparing and editing these various works, Prof. Goodrich was prominently connected with many of the most important benevolent societies of the country. At the time of his death he was laboriously engaged, as one of the 'Committee on Versions' of the American Bible Society, in preparing a new edition of the English text. As an instructor, Prof. Goodrich was enthusiastic, untiring, and effective, always impressing himself upon his pupils, inspiring them to the highest effort. He guided them to imitate models of clear and eloquent thinking, and taught them to express their own thoughts in a chaste and manly style. As an officer of the college, he was singularly active and energetic, never shrinking from any duty or responsibility, and always making the interests of the institution the object of his own personal care and anxious solicitude." He died at New Haven, Feb. 25, 1860.—*New York Observer*, March 1, 1860; *New Haven Journal*; *Congregational Quarterly*, 1860, p. 241.

**Goodrich, Elizur**, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born in Wethersfield, Conn., Oct. 26, 1784. He graduated at Yale College in 1752. He now studied theology, but was called to be tutor at Yale College in 1755. In 1756 he was invited to the Congregational church in Durham, Conn. In 1766, to aid in the support of his growing family, he began to prepare students for college. His thorough scholarship made him a highly successful teacher, and during the next twenty years more than three hundred young men passed under his instructions. He was repeatedly sent by the General Association of Connecticut as a delegate to a convention held by that association, and the synods of New York and Philadelphia, from 1766 to 1776. He received the degree of doctor of divinity from Princeton College. In 1776 he was elected to the corporation of Yale College, and, as a member of the Prudential Committee, his labors in behalf of the college for twenty years were among the most useful of his life. He died of apoplexy at Norfolk, Conn., Nov. 22, 1797. He published a number of occasional discourses.—Sprague, *Annals*, i, 506.

**Goodrich, Thomas**, an eminent English divine, was born at East Kirby, Lincolnshire, about 1480. He studied at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, graduated at Jesus College in 1510, and became proctor of the university in 1515. In 1529 he gained great favor with Henry VIII by pronouncing himself against the validity of that prince's marriage with Catharine. He was successively appointed rector of St. Peter's, London, canon of St. Stephen's, Westminster, and chaplain of the king. In 1534 he was elected bishop of Ely, and showed himself a zealous supporter of the Reformation. He took an active part in the organization of the English Church, was one of the theologians commissioned to examine the translation of the N. T., to compile the Common Prayer-book of 1548, and the Institution of a Christian Man, called also the Bishops'

Book, with the collaboration of Cranmer, Stokesley, Gardiner, Sampson, Latimer, etc. Goodrich was a member of the privy council under Henry VIII and Edward VI, who also employed him several times as ambassador. In 1551 he was appointed lord chancellor of England. This office he lost when queen Mary ascended the throne, but he retained his bishopric, and died May 10, 1554.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxi, 261; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* v, 338; Burnet, *Hist. of Engl. Reformation*, ii, 214, 291, 427.

**Goodwin, John**, an eminent Arminian divine, was born in 1593, and was educated at Queen's College, Cambridge, where he became fellow in 1617. In 1633 he became vicar of St. Stephen's, Coleman Street, London, from which he was ejected in 1645 for refusing to administer baptism and the Lord's supper promiscuously. He was a man of great courage, eloquence, and energy; and, though an Independent in Church government, he was a zealous Arminian in doctrine. At the Restoration he was exempted from pardon; but no measures were taken against him, and he died in 1665. He wrote *The divine Authority of the Scriptures asserted* (Lond. 1648, 4to).—*Redemption redeemed, wherein the most glorious Work of the Redemption of the World by Jesus Christ is vindicated against the Encroachments of latter Times* (Lond. 1651, fol.; new ed. 1840, 8vo).—*Exposition of Romans in* (new ed. by T. Jackson, London, 1835, 8vo).—*Imputatio Fidei, a Treatise of Justification* (Lond. 1642, 4to). This last treatise was published in an abridged form (12mo) by Mr. Wesley, who held Goodwin's works in high esteem. A summary of *Christian Theology selected from Goodwin* was published by S. Dunn (Lond. 1836, 12mo); and Goodwin's *Life* has also been written by Rev. T. Jackson (Lond. 1839, 8vo). John Goodwin was in advance of his age, not only in his theology, but also in his broad views of the nature of the Church and of toleration. His writings contributed greatly to the diffusion of sound doctrines on religious liberty. "Had *Redemption Redeemed* been his only publication, it should have been enough of itself to perpetuate his fame. Its great learning, clear reasoning, sound judgment, and admirable spirit, render it worthy of the study of all lovers of this glorious doctrine, and the name of its author one which all Arminians should delight to honor. A volume so ably written, and going to the bottom of the controversy, could not, in that polemic age, fail of creating a storm. The pulpits rang with charges of heresy. The press groaned with sermons, pamphlets, and books. Some were bitterly scurrilous. Dr. Hill, master of Trinity College, Cambridge, charged him with falsifying his quotations, and with the errors of Pelagius. Resbury wrote very much in the spirit of Edwards. Robert Baillie seems to have taken Prynne for his model. Barlow, afterwards bishop of Lincoln, alone among the crowd addressed him in a style of manliness and Christian candor, speaking of his learning and talents with compliment and respect. George Kendall filled two folios, and actually removed to London that he might watch Goodwin and the better oppose him and his doctrine. He says of himself that though he sometimes sneers, he never snarls or bites. He doubtless tells the truth about the sneering and the biting. Toplady thought the '*Redemption Redeemed* was effectually answered' by Kendall. 'If it was,' says Sellon, 'I will eat it, as tough a morsel as it is.' Dr. John Owen, then vice-chancellor at Oxford, and overwhelmed with labors, deemed it necessary to employ eight hundred and fifty octavo pages in a reply to the seven chapters on the Perseverance of the Saints" (D. A. Whedon, in *Methodist Quart. Rev.* July, 1863, p. 371; *Meth. Q. Rev.* Oct. 1869, art. 1).—Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* v, 339; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 704; Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*.

**Goodwin, Thomas, D.D.**, a nonconformist Calvinistic divine of the 17th century, was born at Rolles-

by, Norfolk, Oct. 5, 1600. He was educated at Christ Church College and Catharine Hall, Cambridge, of which he afterwards became fellow. In 1628 he became lecturer of Trinity Church, Cambridge, and four years afterwards was presented by the king to the vicarage of the same church. Refusing the terms of conformity, he relinquished his preferments, and in 1634 quitted the university. During the subsequent persecution of the Puritans he fled to Holland, where he became minister of a congregation at Arnheim. At the beginning of the Long Parliament he returned to London, and was one of the Assembly of Divines, with whom, however, he did not always agree. He became a great favorite with Cromwell, through whose influence, in 1649, he was made one of the commissioners for licensing preachers, and appointed president of Magdalen College, Oxford. He was ejected at the Restoration. Anthony Wood styles him and Dr. Owen "the two Atlases and patriarchs of Independency." He died Feb. 23, 1679. A portion of his works were published in five vols. folio (Lond. 1681); and besides those to be found there he wrote *Certain select Cases resolved, specially tending to the Comfort of Believers in Temptation* (Lond. 1647, 4to). The following have been recently reprinted, viz. *Child of Light* (Lond. 1840, 12mo).—*Ephesians and Revelations* (Lond. 1842, 8vo).—*Christ the Mediator* (Lond. 1846, 8vo).—*Glories of Christ* (1847, 8vo).—*Government of the Church* (1848, 8vo).—*Justifying Faith* (1848, 8vo).—*Divine Decrees* (1844, 8vo).—*Works*, condensed by J. Babb (Lond. 1847-49, 4 vols. 8vo). A new and complete edition of Goodwin's works has just been completed in Nicholls's *Series of standard Divines*, making 12 vols. 8vo (Edinb. 1861-66), containing (vol. ii) a *Memoir of Goodwin*, by Robert Halley, D.D.—Jones, *Christian Biography*, p. 187; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, i, 1289; Calamy, *Nonconformists' Memorial*; Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*.

**Gopatata.** See JOTAPATA.

**Gō'pher** (Heb. גֹּפֶר; according to Gesenius, i. q. גֹּפֶר, pitch; acc. to Fürst, connected with גֹּפֶרֶת, brimstone, i. e. resin; Sept. *τεργύρονος*, Vulg. *levigatus*), a kind of tree, the wood of which is mentioned only once in Scripture, as the material of which Noah was directed to build the ark (Gen. vi, 14): "Make thee an ark of gopher wood; rooms shalt thou make in the ark, and shalt pitch it within and without with pitch" (probably *bitumen*). In endeavoring to ascertain the particular kind of wood which is mentioned in the above passage, we can get assistance only from the name, the country where the wood was supposed to have been procured, or the traditional interpretations. The Sept. renders it "squared timbers," and the Vulgate "*planed wood*" (apparently understanding גֹּפֶר). Some have adopted the opinion that a kind of pine-tree is intended; and others that several species may be included, as they all yield resin, tar, and pitch. The Persian translator has also adopted the *pine*; but Celsius objects that this was never common in Assyria and Babylonia. The Chaldee version and others give the *cedar*, because it was always plentiful in Asia, and was distinguished by the incorruptible nature of its wood. But cedar is a very general term, and correctly applied only to different kinds of juniper. These, though yielding excellent wood, remarkable for its fragrance, never grow to a large size in any warm country. Eutychius, patriarch of Alexandria, relates in his *Annals* (p. 31), as quoted by Celsius (*Hierobot.* i, 331), that the ark (q. v.) was made of a wood called *sag* or *saj*, which is the *teak*, and not likely to have been the wood employed. The Chaldee Samaritan translator, for *gopher*, gives, as a synonym, *sissam*, of which Celsius says (*Hierobot.* i, 332), "Vocein obscuream, sive referas ad *ἑβλα ἀναφύρα*, quæ ex Indiis adferri scribit Arrianus (*Peripl. Mar. Erythr.* p. 162), et *Ebano similia* perhibent alii (Salmasius, in *Solun.* p. 727)." The *sissam* is probably the *sissu*, mentioned by Forskål as import-

ed in his time into Arabia, and is a highly-valued, dark-colored wood, of which one kind is called black-wood (*Dalbergia latifolia*). The greatest number of writers have been of opinion that by the gopher wood we are to understand the cypress; and this opinion is supported by such authorities as Fuller (*Sacred Miscellanies*, iv, 5), Bochart (*Geogr. Sacra*, i, 4), as well as by Celsius (*Hierobot.* i, 328). It has been stated that gopher is the Greek *κνπάρσσοσ*, with a mere addition to the root. It is argued, further, that the wood of the cypress, being almost incorruptible, was likely to be preferred; that it was frequently employed in later ages in the construction of temples, bridges, and even ships; and that it was very abundant in the countries where, according to these authors, the ark is supposed to have been built, that is, in Assyria, where other woods are scarce.—Kitto, s. v. Ets-Gopher. See TREE.

**Gophna** (Γόφνα in Josephus; Γούφνα in Ptolemy; see Reland, *Palest.* p. 461), a town of Palestine, which gave its name to one of the ten toparchies, *Gophnitica* (ἡ Γοφνιτικὴ τοπαρχία, Josephus, *War*, iii, 3, 5; "toparchia Gophnitica," Pliny, v, 14). Josephus reckons it second in importance to Jerusalem, and usually joins it with Arcaballa. It was one of the four cities taken by Cassius (*War*, i, 11, 2) and reduced to slavery (*Ant.* xiv, 11, 2), but restored to freedom by a decree of Marc Antony after the battle of Philippi (*ib.* 12, 2 and 3). It was taken by Vespasian in his last campaign in Palestine (*War*, iv, 9, 9), and, as Titus marched on Jerusalem by way of Casarea and Samaria, he passed through Gophna (*ib.* v, 2, 1). It was to this place that the latter allowed certain important Jewish refugees to retire temporarily during the siege of Jerusalem (vi, 2, 2, 3). Eusebius probably gives the true origin of the name (from *ג'פן*, *ge'phen*, a vine, from the vineyards in the vicinity), although he errs (or is, rather, himself uncertain) in identifying it with the Eschol of the spies (*Onomast.* p. 157, ed. Clericus); and he states that it lay (ἡ Γόφνα) fifteen miles from Jerusalem towards Neapolis, in near agreement with the Peutinger Table, which makes it sixteen miles. It was identified by Dr. Robinson with *Jufna*, a small Christian village, rather more than one hour north-west of Beitina (Bethel), with many ruins of the Middle Ages, and situated in a very fertile valley (*Bib. Res.* iii, 77-9). It is probably the *OPHNI* (q. v.) of Benjamin (*Josh.* xviii, 24).

**Gophrith.** See BRIMSTONE.

**Gor.** See WHELP.

**Gordianus**, the name of three Roman emperors. Marcus Antonius Gordianus I, descended from a noble family, and distinguished for his literary education, was twice consul, under Caracalla and Severus. By the latter he was appointed proconsul of the province of Africa, in which position he gained the affection of the people of the province to so high a degree, that on the assassination of the emperor Maximinus, he was, at the age of 80 years, proclaimed emperor in 238, together with his son, who assumed the name of Marcus Antonius Gordianus II. The Roman Senate recognised them; but after a reign of only a few weeks Gordianus II fell in a battle at Carthage against Capellianus, the governor of Mauritania, and Gordianus I, on learning the news, killed himself. At the demand of the Roman people, a minor grandson of Gordianus I was placed as Cæsar by the side of Pupienus Maximus and Balbinus, who had been elected emperors against Maximinus; and when all these three emperors were killed by their own soldiers, he was still in the same year (238) proclaimed as Augustus by the Prætorians. He carried on a successful war against the Persians, and had an excellent adviser in his father-in-law Misithenus. He reigned until 244, when Philip the Arabian, who for some time had been his colleague, caused him to be assassinated. The Christian Church during the reign of Gordianus was undisturbed. (A. J. S.)

**Gordon, George N.**, a Presbyterian minister and missionary, was born in Prince Edward Island in 1821. He studied at the Free-Church College, Halifax, N. S., and was sent by the Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia to the New Hebrides, and settled at Enomanga, in 1857, with his wife, whom he married in England. On the 20th of May, 1861, he and his wife were killed by the natives.—Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Atlantic*, 1862, p. 330.

**Gordon, James Huntley**, an eminent Scotch Jesuit, was born in 1543. He was educated at Rome, and entered the order of Jesuits Sept. 20, 1563. For nearly fifty years he taught Hebrew and theology at Rome, Paris, and Bordeaux. He travelled also, as missionary, through England and Scotland, where his zeal for making converts to the Roman Catholic Church caused him to be twice put in prison. He died at Paris, April 16, 1620. Gordon was a learned and skillful man, and very zealous for his order. He wrote *Controversiarum christianæ fidei Epitome*, 3 parts (i, Limoges, 1612; ii, Paris; iii, reprinted with the two others, Cologne, 1620, 8vo). See Alegambe, *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Societatis Jesu*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxi, 280.

**Gordon, James Lesmore**, a Scotch Jesuit, was born at Aberdeen in 1553. He became a member of the Society of Jesus, and taught theology in the colleges of his order, at Toulouse and Bordeaux. Later in life he was appointed confessor to Louis XIII. He died at Paris, Nov. 17, 1641. We have from him *Diatriba de catholica veritate* (Bord. 1623, 12mo):—*Biblia Sacra, cum commentariis ad sensum litteræ et explicatione locorum omnium que in sacris litteris obscuritatem habent* (Paris, 1632, fol.):—*Theologia moralis univ. viii libris comprehensum* (Paris, 1634, fol.). Dupin highly commends his commentary.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxi, 280.

**Gordon, Robert, D.D.**, a Scotch divine, was born in Dumfries. "His first settlement in the ministry was at Kinfauns, 1816; in 1820 he was translated to the old Chapel of Ease, Edinburgh. In 1825 he became one of the ministers of the High Church. In 1843 he joined the 'Free-Church movement' and resigned his preferment. Most of his people went with him, and formed the 'Free High Church,' of which he remained minister to the time of his death, October, 1853. He published *Sermons* (3d ed. Edinburgh, 1826, 8vo):—*Christ as made known to the Ancient Church:—An exposition of the revelation of Divine Grace, as unfolded in the O. T. Scriptures* (posthumous; Edinburgh, 1854, 4 vols. 8vo)." —Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, i, 1292; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1854, p. 631.

**Gorgias** (Γοργίας, a frequent name among the Oriental Greeks), one of the generals of Antiochus Epiphanes, was chosen by Lysias, the general and minister of Antiochus Epiphanes and at this time in sole command of the provinces from the Euphrates to the sea, to undertake an expedition in company with Ptolemy, the son of Dorymenes, and with Nicanor, against Judæa, B.C. 166 (1 Macc. iii, 38; Joseph. *Ant.* xii, 7, 2, 3, where he is styled "a mighty man of the king's friends"). These generals were, however, totally defeated near Emmans by Judas Maccabæus (1 Macc. iv, 1 sq.; Joseph. *Ant.* l. c.). In B.C. 165, Joseph, the son of Zacharias, and Azarias, two captains in the service of Judas Maccabæus, anxious to get themselves a name, and acting without the orders of Judas, attacked the garrison of Jamnia. Gorgias, the governor of the forces at Jamnia, defeated them with great loss (1 Macc. v, 56 sq.; Joseph. *Ant.* xii, 7, 6).

The account of Gorgias in 2 Macc. is very confused. In one passage he is described simply as "a captain, who in matters of war had great experience," and therefore sent with Nicanor, the son of Patroclus, one of the special friends of Ptolemaus, the governor of Cæle-Syria and Phœnicæ (comp. 1 Macc. iii, 38; Jo-

seph. *Ant.* xii, 7, 3), to root out the whole nation of the Jews (2 Macc. viii, 9). In another passage he is represented as "governor of the holds" (στρατηγός τῶν τόπων [Alex. MS. τρώπων], 2 Macc. x, 14), and apparently of the holds of the Idumæans (?) (Acrabittene [?], comp. 1 Macc. v, 3; Joseph. *Ant.* xii, 8, 1; see Ewald, *Geschichte*, iv, 91, 358). He is afterwards, according to the present text, described as "governor of Idumæa" (2 Macc. xii, 32).

Grotius (see Wernsdorff, *De fid. Libr. Macc.*, § 73) suggests that the reading "governor of Idumæa" is an error for "governor of Jamnia" (as at 1 Macc. v, 58). Josephus warrants this correction (ὁ τῆς Ἰαμνίας στρατηγός, *Ant.* xii, 8, 6). From the epithet applied to Gorgias, he seems to have been held in the highest detestation by the Jews (A. V., "that cursed man," τὸν κατάρατον, 2 Macc. xii, 35). The description of his flight to Marisa and his defeat by Dositheus, one of Judas's generals, is given at some length, though in an obscure and confused manner (2 Macc. xii, 34-38; comp. Joseph. *Ant.* xii, 8, 6).—Kitto, s. v.

**Gorham Case**, a case in law involving the doctrine of the Church of England as to baptismal regeneration. In August, 1847, the lord chancellor (lord Cottenham) offered to present Mr. Gorham to the vicarage of Bramford-Speke. The bishop, on being requested to countersign his testimonials, stated on the paper his doubts as to Mr. Gorham's views, both of discipline and doctrine. The lord chancellor, however, presented Mr. Gorham, who applied for institution. The bishop then intimated his intention of examining Mr. Gorham before he instituted him. The examination took place, and continued for several days. The result was, that the bishop of Exeter declined to institute Mr. Gorham to the vicarage of Bramford-Speke. "The alleged ground of this refusal was, that after examination the bishop found Mr. Gorham to be of unsound doctrine as to the efficacy of the sacrament of baptism, inasmuch as he held that spiritual regeneration is not given or conferred in that sacrament in particular, that infants are not made therein 'members of Christ and the children of God,' as the catechism and formularies of the Church declare them to be. The case was brought before the Arches Court of Canterbury, which decided (1849) that baptismal regeneration is the doctrine of the Church of England, and that Mr. Gorham maintained doctrines on the point opposed to those of the Church, and that consequently the bishop had shown sufficient cause for his refusal to institute, and that the appeal must be dismissed with costs. From this decision Mr. Gorham appealed to the judicial committee of privy council. The committee complained that the bishop's questions were intricate and entangling, and that the answers were not given plainly and directly. Their decision was in substance as follows, and it must be noted what points they undertook to decide, and what not. The court declared that it had no jurisdiction to settle matters of faith, or to determine what ought, in any particular, to be the doctrine of the Church of England, its duty being only to consider what is by law established to be her doctrine upon the legal construction of her articles and formularies. It appeared that very different opinions as to the sacrament of baptism were held by the promoters of the Reformation; that differences of opinion on various points left open were always thought consistent with subscription to the articles; and also, that opinions in no important particular to be distinguished from Mr. Gorham's had been maintained without censure by many eminent prelates and divines. Without expressing any opinion as to the theological accuracy of Mr. Gorham's opinions, the court decided that the judgment of the Arches Court should be reversed. Mr. Gorham was accordingly instituted to Bramford-Speke. During the two years that the suit was pending, the theological question was discussed with all degrees of ability and acrimony in

sermons and pamphlets."—*History of Christian Church* (Encyc. Metrop., Glasgow, 1858, p. 387 sq.); Chambers, *Encyclopædia*, s. v.; *Theological Critic*, April, 1852, art. iii; *English Review*, vols. xiii, xiv; Marsden, *Churches and Sects*, i, 42; Cunningham, *Discussion of Church Principles* (Edinburgh, 1863), chap. vi.

**Gorion** (Γωρίων), son of Josephus (? Caiaphus), and one of those of eminent family who incited the Jewish populace to resist the anarchy of the Zealots (Josephus, *War*, iv, 3, 9), but was eventually slain by them (*ib.* 6, 1).

**Gorion**, surnamed SKANTCHELI (*the Admirable One*), an Armenian theologian, lived in the 5th century of the Christian era. After studying philosophy, theology, and the Syriac and Greek languages under St. Mesrop (q. v.) and patriarch Isaac I, he was sent to Constantinople to complete his studies. On returning to his country, he engaged with Esnig (q. v.) and four others in a translation of the Bible, and of several works of the Greek fathers, into the Armenian. He subsequently became bishop of a diocese bordering upon Georgia. He is the author of a work on *The Life of Mesrop*, which is of importance for the early history of the Armenian Church, and was published by the Mekhitarists at Venice in *Opere di antichi Scrittori Armeni del quinto secolo* (Ven. 1833). See De Welte, *Gorion's Lebensbeschreib. d. heil. Mesrop* (Tüb. 1844). (A. J. S.)

**Gorkum, the Martyrs of**, the name given in the Roman Catholic Church to nineteen monks and priests of Dordrecht who had fled to Gorkum, were captured at the conquest of that town by the Guenx in 1572, and hung. On account of pretended miracles wrought by their relics, Pope Clement X, in 1674, allowed them to be venerated in Holland. In 1867 they were canonized by Pius IX. (A. J. S.)

**Görres**. See GOERRES.

**Gorski**, THEOPHYLACT, a Russian theologian, died bishop of Kolonna in 1788. He wrote *Orthodoxe orientalis Ecclesie Dogmata* (Lpz. 1784), and a *Compendium of Christian Dogmas*, in Latin and Russian, which has since been translated into German and French (St. Petersburg, 1792). These books, although in general use in the Russian seminaries, openly advocate Protestant views, and are opposed both to the Roman Catholic and to the orthodox Greek dogmas. See *Dict. hist. des Ecrivains de l'Eglise greco-russe*; P. Gagarin, *De la Théologie dans l'Eglise russe* (Paris, 1837); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, cxxi, 309.

**Gorton**, SAMUEL, founder of a sect called *Gortonians*, was born at Gorton, England, about 1600. He says himself, in one of his letters, "I have never studied in the schools of human learning, and I bless God for it." He was first in the employ of a linen-draper in London, but left that city in 1636 and went to Boston, U. S., in the hope of enjoying religious liberty; but the Church there not being disposed to put up with his extravagant ideas, he went to Plymouth, where he fared still worse, being fined, imprisoned, and finally expelled in the midst of winter. In June, 1639, he became an inhabitant of Aquidneck, or Rhode Island, where fresh persecution befel him. Driven from place to place, he finally bought some land at Pawtuxet, R. I., where he settled. Complained of by his neighbors as encroaching on their property, he refused to appear before the court of Massachusetts, and in 1642 settled at Shawmut, where he had bought land of the sachem Miantonomoh. His claims under this purchase were, however, contested by two inferior sachems, who appealed to the general court of Massachusetts for assistance. Gorton and ten of his disciples were captured soon after and taken before the court, where the land question soon gave place to a trial for their lives as "damnable heretics," and they were condemned to hard labor at Charlestown for an unlimited time. In 1644 the sentence was



changed into banishment. Gorton then returned with his partisans to Rhode Island, where he persuaded the Indians to put themselves under the protection of England, and to abandon to that country a part of their territory. He then proceeded to England, where, in consideration of this service, he received letters patent guaranteeing to him the peaceful possession of his property at Shawmut. He called the place Warwick, in remembrance of services rendered him by the earl of Warwick. Gorton died about 1677. His sect became soon extinct. He wrote, *Simplicities' Defence against seven-headed Policy* (1646, 4to):—*An incorruptible Key, composed of the ex Psalme, wherewith you may open the rest of the holy Scriptures* (1647, 4to):—*Saltmarsh returned from the Dead* (1655, 4to):—*An Antidote against the common Plague of the World*. See Mackie's *Life of Gorton* in "Sparks's *Amer. Biography*;" Duyckinck, *Cyclop. of American Literature*, i, 78; *New American Cyclopædia*, viii, 384; Bartlett, *Bibliog. of Rhode Island*, 134 sq.; Hutchinson, *History of Massachusetts*, i, 117. (J. W. M.)

**Gortyna** (Γόρτυνα; in classical writers, Γόρτυν or Γόρτυνα; on a coin, Κόρτυνα [Κορτυνίον]), a city of Crete, mentioned in the Apocrypha in the list of cities to which the Romans sent letters on behalf of the Jews, when Simon the Maccabee renewed the treaty which his brothers Judas and Jonathan had made with Rome (1 Macc. xv, 23; comp. 1 Macc. viii, 1 sq.; xii, 1 sq.). There is no doubt that the Jews were settled in great numbers in Crete (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 12, 1; *War*, ii, 7; Philo, *Leg. at Caium*, sec. 36), and Gortyna may have been their chief residence. Ptolemy Philometor, who treated the Jews kindly, and who had received a numerous body in Egypt when they were driven out of Judæa by the opposite party (Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 3; *War*, i, 1, 1), rebuilt part of Gortyna (Strabo, x, Didot. ed., p. 411). When Paul, as a prisoner, was on his voyage from Caesarea to Rome, the ship, on account of a storm, was obliged to run under the lee of Crete, in the direction of Cape Salmone, and soon after came to a place called Fair Havens, which was near a city called Lasea (Acts xxvii, 8). Lasea is probably the Lasia of the Pentingerian Tables, and is there stated to be sixteen miles east of Gortyna. It is very uncertain how long the vessel was detained at Fair Havens, though "much time had been spent" (Acts xxvii, 9), not since they had sailed from Caesarea, but at the anchorage (Alford, ad loc.). Doubtless the sailors, soldiers, and prisoners had frequent intercourse with Lasæa, and perhaps Gortyna. Paul may then have preached the Gospel at one or both of these places, but of this there is not the slightest proof (comp. Conybeare and Howson, *Life of St. Paul*, ii, 394-396). See PAUL.

Gortyna, according to Ptolemy (iii, 17, 10), was situated in 54° 15' and 34° 50'. Simon proposes a Shemitic etymology for the name (*Onom.*, p. 50; but see Sickler, *Hawlbuch*, p. 470). Next to Cnossus, it was the most important city in the island for power and magnificence. At one time Gortyna and Cnossus in union held the whole of Crete in their power except Lyttus (Polyb. iv, 53, 54). In later times they were in a continual state of warfare (Strabo, x, Didot. ed., p. 410). Gortyna was founded by a colony from Gortys of Arcadia (Plato, *Leges*, iv, Didot. ed., p. 320). It was of very considerable size, its walls being fifty stadia in circuit, whilst those of its rival, Cnossus, were not more than thirty (Strabo, x, Didot. ed., p. 409-411). Homer bestows upon it the epithet "walled" (τεύχιδεσσα, *Il.* ii, 646). It was situate on the south side of the island, on the river Lethæus (Messara), and at a distance of ninety stadia from the Libyan Sea (Strabo, *l. c.*). In the Peloponnesian war Gortyna seems to have had some relations with Athens (Thuc. ii, 85). Its connection with Philopœmen in B.C. 201 is shown by the Gortynians having invited him to take the command of their army (Plutarch, *Philop.* 13). When the Achæ-

III.—N X

an League was in alliance with the Romans, B.C. 197, against Philip V of Macedon, 500 Gortynians joined Quinctius Flaminius when on his march to Thessaly, previous to the battle of Cynoscephalæ (Livy, xxxiii, 3). It is only recently that a coin bearing the well-known types of the League has been found, struck at Gortyna. The late Col. Leake has shown that the coin with the legend ΚΟΡΤΥΝΙΩΝ ΑΝΑΙΩΝ, which had previously been assigned to Gortys in Arcadia by the late Mr. Burgon (*Num. Chron.* xix, 235-36), certainly belongs to the Cretan Gortyna (*Supp. Num.*



Coin of Gortyna.

*Hell.* p. 110), thus proving that cities beyond the continent were admitted into the League (R. S. Poole, *Num. Chron.*, new ser., i, 173). About the same period there are evidences of an alliance, political or commercial, between Athens and several of the Cretan towns. Some of the coins of six of these—Cnossus, Cydonia, Gortyna, Hierapytna, Polyrrenium, and Priansus—are tetradrachms, with exactly the types of those of Athens of the same age, but distinguished by having the distinctive badges of the Cretan towns. They were probably struck by the Cretan cities of the great alliance against Philip V of Macedon about B.C. 188 (Pausan. i, 36, 5, 6; comp. Eckhel, *Doct. Num. Vet.* ii, 221; Leake, *Num. Hell. Insular Greece*, p. 19; Poole, *l. c.*). As Cnossus declined, Gortyna rose to eminence, and became the metropolis of Crete. About A.D. 200 a brother of Septimius Severus held at Gortyna the office of proconsul and quaestor of the united provinces of Crete and Cyrene (Böckh, No. 2591). In the arrangement of the provinces by Constantine, Gortyna was still the metropolis of Crete (Hieroc. *Synecd.* p. 649; comp. Leake, *Supp. Num. Hell.* p. 157).

The remains of Gortyna near Aghius Dhæka (the ten Saints), and the cavern in the mountain, have been described by Tournefort (*Relation d'un Voyage du Levant*) and Pococke (*Description of the East*), and the cavern, more recently, by Mr. Cockerell (Walpole, ii, 402). The modern Gortynians hold this cavern to be the Labyrinth, thus claiming for themselves the honors of the myth of the Minotaur; but it does not appear from the Gortynian coins, which date from the time of the Persian war to that of Hadrian (and there are none later), that their ancestors ever entertained such an idea (Leake, *Num. Hell. Insular Greece*, p. 18). The famous Labyrinth is represented on the coins of Cnossus, and Col. Leake says that "it is difficult to reconcile this fact with the existence of the Labyrinth near Gortyna, for that the excavation near Aghius Dhæka, at the foot of Mount Ida, is the renowned Cretan labyrinth, cannot be doubted after the description of Tournefort, Pococke, and Cockerell" (*Supp. Num. Hell.* p. 156). This opinion is given notwithstanding the assertion of Pausanias (ὁ ἐν Κνωσσίῳ λαβύρινθος, i, 27, 9). One of the coins of Cnossus bears, besides the Labyrinth on its reverse, the Minotaur on the obverse. It cannot be much later than the expedition of Xerxes, and thus affords evidence of the antiquity of the tradition of the Labyrinth, if not of its real existence; whereas Höck (*Kreta*, i, 56 sq.), relying on the silence of Hesiod and Herodotus, and the assumed silence of Homer—though the *Iliad* contains what looks very like an allusion to the Cretan wonder (*Il.* xviii, 590 sq.)—has supposed it to have been an invention of the later poets borrowed from Egypt (Poole, *ut sup.* i, 171-72). A full account of the remains of the old site and the modern place is given in the *Museum of Clas-*

sical Antiquities (ii, 277-286). Mr. Falkener here describes the cavern near Gortyna from Sieber, who spent three days in examining it, and says that certainly it had been nothing more than a quarry, which probably supplied the stone for building the city (*Reise nach der Insel Kreta*, i, 511-520). Höck seems to hold similar views (*Kreta*, i, 447-454).—Kitto, s. v. See CRETE.


**Goshen** (Heb. *id.* גֹּשֶׁן, prob. of Egyptian origin, but unknown signif.), the name of at least two places.

1. (Sept. usually Γέσην or Γεσίμ.) A province or district of Egypt in which Jacob and his family settled through the instrumentality of his son Joseph, and in which they and their descendants remained for a long period (Gen. xlv, 10; xlvii, 28, 29, 34; xlvii, 1, 4, 6, 27; 1, 8; Exod. viii, 22; ix, 26). (B.C. 1874-1658.) It is usually called the "land of Goshen" (גֹּשֶׁן מִצְרָיִם, "country of Goshen," Gen. xlvii, 27), but also "Goshen" simply (Gen. xlv, 28, first clause, 29). It appears to have borne another name, "the land of Rameses" (רַעֲמֵסִים מִצְרָיִם, Gen. xlvii, 11), unless this be the name of a district of Goshen. (See below.) That Goshen lay on the eastern side of the Nile may be justifiably inferred from the fact that Jacob is not reported to have crossed that river; nor does it appear that the Israelites did so in their flight out of Egypt. The various opinions that have been held on the subject may be found classified and considered by Beller-mann in his *Handb. der Bibl. Lit.* iv, 191-220. Lake-macher (*Obs. Phil.* vi, 297 sq.) locates Goshen in the vicinity of Bubastis, not far from Tanis; but this is too far from Palestine. Bryant (*Obs. upon the ancient Hist. of Egypt*, p. 75 sq.) prefers the Saitic name, which likewise is too far west (comp. Eiechhorn, *Bibl.* vi, 854 sq.). Jablonsky (*De terra Gosen*, Freft. a. V. 1756; also in his *Opusc.* ii, 73) holds it to be the Heraeotic name; but this lay even west of the Nile (Michaelis, *Suppl.* i, 379 sq.). By comparing Exod. xiii, 17 and 1 Chron. vii, 21, it appears that Goshen bordered on Arabia (see Gen. xlv, 10, Sept. Γεσίμ 'Αραβίας) as well as Palestine, and the passage of the Israelites out of Egypt shows that the land was not far removed from the Red Sea. It appears probable that we may fix the locality of Goshen in Lower Egypt, on the east side of the Pelusiac branch of the Nile, in the district around Heroöpolis. The Sept. renders the words "land of Goshen" (Gen. xlvii, 28), καθ' Ἡρώων πόλιν, εἰς γῆν Παρμεσῶν, thus identifying Goshen with Rameses, or the district of Pithom or Heroöpolis. See, however, RAMESES. This would make Goshen correspond with one of the divisions of what was anciently termed the Præfectura Arabica, Ti-Arabia, the eastern district, lying, that is, on the eastern or Arabian side of the Nile. This division was that of Heliopolis or On, Matriyyeh, or Ain-Sheems. An attempt has been made to define it accurately, so as to identify Goshen (Rosenmüller, *Altertham.* iii, 245) with the Nomos Arabia (Ptol. iv, 5), or the country of Esh-shar Kijah (the eastern land), which stretches south from Pelusium as far as Belbeis (north-east from Cairo), and to the north-east borders of the desert El-Jefar. Traces are found here, it is thought, of the residence of the Israelites, in large heaps of ruins, a few hours' journey to the north-east of Cairo, which the Arabs call Tell el-Jehud (Jews' hills), or Turbeh el-Jehud (Jews' graves) (Niebuhr, i, 100; comp. Setzen, in Zach's *Corresp.* xx, 460; Hurlmann, *Eribschr.* d. *Aeg.* p. 880 sq.). Robinson (*Researches*, i, 37) makes light of the evidence supposed to be supplied by "the mounds of the Jews" just mentioned. He says, "If there is any historical foundation for this name, which is doubtful, these mounds can only be referred back to the period of the Ptolemies, in the centuries immediately before the Christian era, when great numbers of Jews resorted to Egypt and erected a temple at Leontöpolis." This opinion, however, appears to us somewhat arbitrary.

Whatever the actual origin of these mounds, the ordinary account of them may be the transmission or echo of a very ancient tradition. Robinson, however, does not deny that Goshen is to be found about where the best authorities ordinarily place it (*Researches*, i, 76). The district east of the Pelusiac Nile was suitable for a nomadic people, who would have been misplaced in the narrow limits of the valley of the Nile (Hackett's *Illust. of Script.* p. 27). "The water of the Nile soaks through the earth for some distance under the sandy tract (the neighborhood of Heliopolis), and is everywhere found on digging wells eighteen or twenty feet deep. Such wells are very frequent in parts which the inundation does not reach. The water is raised from them by wheels turned by oxen, and applied to the irrigation of the fields. Whenever this takes place the desert is turned into a fruitful field. In passing to Heliopolis we saw several such fields in the different stages of being reclaimed from the desert; some just laid out, others already fertile. In returning by another way more eastward, we passed a succession of beautiful plantations wholly dependent on this mode of irrigation" (Robinson, *Researches*, i, 36). J. D. Michaelis was of opinion (*Syriac.* p. 371) that Goshen extended from Palestine along the Mediterranean as far as the Tanitic mouth of the Nile, and thence inland up to Heliopolis, embracing a sweep of country so as to take in a part of Arabia bordering on Egypt. According to Bois Aymé (*Descrip. de l'Égypte*, viii, 111) Goshen was the valley Sabal-yar, which begins in the vicinity of Belbeis, and embraces the district of Heroöpolis. Laborde (*Arabia Petraea*, p. 58) fixes Goshen in the country around Belbeis, on the eastern side of the Nile. M. Quatremère has endeavored to define the locality, and, by comparing several passages collected from different writers, he infers that the wady Tumilat (wady Tomlate in Laborde), in which the canal of Cairo terminates, is the land of Goshen: such, at least, seems to have been the opinion of Saadias and Abu Saïd, the authors of the earliest Arabic versions of the Old Testament—the one for the use of the Jews, and the other for that of the Samaritans (*Mém. Géogr. sur l'Égypte*, i, 61). This position is confirmed by the Biblical notices. The first mention of Goshen is in Joseph's message to his father (Gen. xlv, 10), which shows that the territory was near the usual royal residence, or the residence of Joseph's Pharaoh. The dynasty to which this king belonged appears to have resided part of the year at Memphis, and part of the year, at harvest-time, at Avaris, on the Bubastite or Pelusiac branch of the Nile: this, Manetho tells us, was the custom of the first Shepherd king (Josephus, *c. Ap.* i, 14). From the account of the arrival of Jacob (Gen. xlvii, 28, 29) it is evident that Goshen was between Joseph's residence at the time and the frontier of Palestine, and apparently the extreme province towards that frontier. The advice that Joseph gave his brethren as to their conduct to Pharaoh further characterizes the territory as a grazing one (Gen. xlvii, 33, 34). (It is remarkable that in Coptic *shis* signifies both "a shepherd" and "disgrace," and the like, Rossellini, *Monumenti Storici*, i, 177.) This passage shows that Goshen was scarcely regarded as a part of Egypt Proper, and was not peopled by Egyptians—characteristics that would positively indicate a frontier province. But it is not to be inferred that Goshen had no Egyptian inhabitants at this period: at the time of the ten plagues such are distinctly mentioned. That there was, moreover, a foreign population besides the Israelites seems evident from the account of the calamity of Ephraim's house (1 Chron. vii, 20-30) [see BETHAN], and the mention of the "mixed multitude" (מִצְרַיִם וְעַמֵּי מִצְרָיִם) who went out at the Exodus (Exod. xii, 38), notices referring to the earlier and the later period of the sojourn. The name Goshen may possibly be Hebrew, or Shemitic—although we do not venture with Jerome

to derive it from **גושן**—for it also occurs as the name of a district and of a town in the south of Palestine (see below, No. 2), where we could scarcely expect an appellation of Egyptian origin unless given after the Exodus, which in this case does not seem likely. It is also noticeable that some of the names of places in Goshen or its neighborhood, as certainly Migdol and Baal-zephon (q. v.), are Shemitic, the only positive exceptions being the cities Pithom and Rameses, built during the oppression. The next mention of Goshen confirms the previous inference that its position was between Canaan and the Delta (Gen. xlvii, 1). The nature of the country is indicated still more clearly than in the passage last quoted in the answer of Pharaoh to the request of Joseph's brethren, and in the account of their settling (Gen. xlvii, 5, 6, 11). Goshen was thus a pastoral country where some of Pharaoh's cattle were kept. The expression "in the best of the land" (**בְּטֵיבֵי הָאָרֶץ**) must, we think, be relative, the best of the land for a pastoral people (although we do not accept Michaelis's reading "pastures" by comparison with the Arabic, *Suppl.* p. 1072; see Gesen. *Thes.* s. v. **בְּטֵיבֵי**), for in the matter of fertility the richest parts of Egypt are those nearest to the Nile, a position which, as has been seen, we cannot assign to Goshen. The sufficiency of this tract for

the Israelites, their prosperity there, and their virtual separation, as is evident from the account of the plagues, from the great body of the Egyptians, must also be borne in mind. The clearest indications of the exact position of Goshen are those afforded by the narrative of the Exodus. The Israelites set out from the town of Rameses, in the land of Goshen, made two days' journey to the "edge of the wilderness," and in one day more reached the Red Sea. At the starting-point two routes lay before them, "the way of the land of the Philistines . . . that [was] near," and "the way of the wilderness of the Red Sea" (Exod. xiii, 17, 18). It is also represented, in conformity with this position, at the last great struggle, as comparatively near to Palestine, by the route that lay through the land of the Philistines (Exod. xiii, 17). Then, while the Israelites do not appear to have had any considerable settlements on the further side of the Nile, yet it is clear they were in a position that admitted of ready access to it: it was on the river (whether the main stream or one of the branches) that the infant Moses was exposed; in connection with it also that several of the miracles wrought by Moses were performed; and the fish of which they had been wont to partake, and the modes of irrigation with which they were familiar, bespoke a residence somewhere in its neighborhood (Exod. ii, 5; vii, 19; viii, 5; Numb.



Map of the Land of Goshen and its Vicinity.

vi, 5; Deut. xi, 10). Yet the locality occupied by the Israelites could not have been very near the Nile, since three days were sufficient for their going into the wilderness to keep a feast to the Lord (Exod. v, 3). From these indications we infer that the land of Goshen must in part have been near the eastern side of the ancient Delta, Ramesses lying within the valley now called the wady et-Tumeylat, about thirty miles in a direct course from the ancient western shore of the Arabian Gulf. See EXODE. The superficial extent of this wady, if we include the whole cultivable part of the natural valley, which may somewhat exceed that of the tract bearing this appellation, is probably under sixty square geographical miles. If we suppose the entire Israelitish population at the time of the Exodus to have been 1,800,000, and the whole population, including Egyptians and foreigners other than the Israelites, about 2,000,000, this would give no less than between 50,000 and 40,000 inhabitants to the square mile, which would be half as dense as the ordinary population of an Eastern city. It must be remembered, however, that we need not suppose the Israelites to have been limited to the valley for pasture, but, like the Arabs, to have led their flocks into fertile tracts of the deserts around, and that we have taken for our estimate an extreme sum, that of the people at the Exodus. For the greater part of the sojourn their numbers must have been far lower, and before the Exodus they seem to have been partly spread about the territory of the oppressor, although collected at Ramesses at the time of their departure. One very large place, like the Shepherd stronghold of Avaris, which Manetho relates to have had at the first a garrison of 240,000 men, would also greatly diminish the disproportion of population to superficies. The very small superficial extent of Egypt in relation to the population necessary to the construction of the vast monuments, and the maintenance of the great armies of the Pharaohs, requires a different proportion to that of other countries—a condition fully explained by the extraordinary fertility of the soil. Even now, when the population is almost at the lowest point it has reached in history, when villages have replaced towns, and hamlets villages, it is still denser than that of many parts of England. It is not necessary, however, to suppose that during the whole period of the sojourn in Egypt the Israelites continued to dwell altogether within the same region: as they multiplied in number, and in process of time began to devote themselves to other occupations, they would naturally extend their settlements, and, at various points, become more intermingled with the population of Egypt. It is quite possible that certain of their number crossed the Pelusiac arm of the Nile, and acquired dwellings or possessions in the tract lying between it and the Tanitic (Robinson, *Researches*, i, 76; Hengstenberg, *Egypt and Books of Moses*, p. 45). Particular families may have also shot out in other directions; and in this way would naturally arise that freer intercourse between them and the families of Egypt which appears to be implied in some of the later notices (Exod. xi, 2; xii, 12-23). Still, what we have indicated above as the land of Goshen, the district in which the original settlers from Canaan were assigned a home, continued to the last the head-quarters of the covenant people (see Geiger, *De regno Ebraeorum in Egypto*, Marb. 1759). From the field of Zoan being mentioned in connection with the wonders of Moses (Psa. lxxviii, 12, 43), some have supposed that the town of that name, situated in the Tanitic nome, must have been the capital of Pharaoh at the time. Borchart and Hengstenberg, among others, have advocated this view, and said nearly all that is possible for it, but they have not been able to establish the point altogether satisfactorily; and it is quite probable that Zoan, in the passage referred to, is used in a general sense, as a kind of representative city in the land of

Egypt for the land itself (see Kurtz, *Hist. of Old Cor.* § 41).—Smith, s. v.; Kitto, s. v.; Fairbairn, s. v. See EGYPT.

2. (Sept. Γοσόμ; Vulg. *Gessen, Gozen*), the "land" or the "country" [both גֹּשֶׁן of Goshen," twice named as a district in southern Palestine, included in the conquests of Joshua (Josh. x, 41; xi, 16). From the first of these it would seem to have lain between Gaza and Gibeon, and therefore to be some part of the maritime plain of Judah; but in the latter passage that plain, the *Shefelah*, is expressly specified (here with the article) in addition to Goshen. In this place, too, the situation of Goshen—if the order of the statement be any indication—would seem to be between the "south" and the *Shefelah* (A. V. "valley"). If Goshen was any portion of this rich plain, is it not possible that its fertility may have suggested the name to the Israelites? On the other hand, the name may be far older, and may retain a trace of early intercourse between Egypt and the south of the promised land. For such intercourse comp. 1 Chron. vii, 21.—Smith, s. v. The name may even have been extended from No. 3 below (see Keil, *on Josh.* p. 280).

3. (Sept. Γόσομ, Vulg. *Gosen*.) A town of the same name is once mentioned (between Anin and Holon) in company with Delir, Socoh, and others, as in the mountains of Judah (Josh. xv, 51), in the group on the south-western part of the hills (see Keil, *Josh.* p. 384). It is probably the origin of the application to an adjacent region (No. 2, above), for it is not likely that two entirely different places would be called by the same name, both in the southern quarter of Judah. From the mention of Gaza (Josh. x, 41) and the route of Joshua (ver. 10), the locality in question would seem to be situated in the gore of Judah, running up between the territories of Benjamin and Dan, now occupied by the Beni-Malik, south of Kirjath-Jearim (comp. Robinson's *Researches*, ii, 337). See JUDAH, TRIBE OF.

**Gospel.** This word, "conformably to its etymological meaning of *Good-tidings*, is used to signify. (1.) *The welcome intelligence of salvation to man, as preached by our Lord and his followers.* (2.) It was afterwards transitively applied to each of the four *histories of our Lord's life*, published by those who are" therefore called "Evangelists," writers of the history of the Gospel (εὐαγγέλιον). (3.) "The term is often used to express collectively the *Gospel-doctrines*; and 'preaching the Gospel' is accordingly often used to include not only the 'proclaiming' of the good tidings, but the 'teaching' men how to avail themselves of the offer of salvation;" the declaring of all the truths, precepts, promises, and threatenings of Christianity. It is termed "the Gospel of the grace of God," because it flows from God's free love and goodness (Acts xx, 24); and, when truly and faithfully preached, is accompanied with the influences of the divine Spirit. It is called "the Gospel of the kingdom," because it treats of the kingdom of grace, and shows the way to the kingdom of glory. It is styled "the Gospel of Christ" because he is the author and great subject of it (Rom. i, 16); and "the Gospel of peace and salvation," because it publishes peace with God to the penitent and believing, gives, to such, peace of conscience and tranquillity of mind, and is the means of their salvation, present and eternal. As it displays the glory of God and of Christ, and ensures to his true followers eternal glory, it is entitled "the glorious Gospel" and "the everlasting Gospel," because it commenced from the fall of man, is permanent throughout all time, and produces effects which are everlasting. This use of the word "gospel" has led some to suppose that Gospel-truth is to be found exclusively or chiefly in the "Gospels," to the neglect of the other sacred writings; and others, to conclude that the discourses of our Lord and the apostolic epistles must exactly coin-

cide; and that in case of any apparent difference, the former must be the standard, and the latter must be taken to bear no other sense than what is implied by the other. Whereas, it is very conceivable, that though both might be, in a certain sense, "good tidings," yet one may contain a much more full development of the Christian scheme than the other (Eden; Watson). It has been disputed whether the Gospel consists merely of promises, or whether it can in any sense be called a law. The answer plainly depends upon adjusting the meaning of the words *gospel* and *law*. If the gospel be taken for the declaration God has made to men by Christ, concerning the manner in which he will treat them, and the conduct he expects from them, it is plain that this includes commands, and even threatenings, as well as promises; but to define the Gospel so as only to express the favorable part of that declaration, is indeed taking the question for granted, and confining the word to a sense much less extensive than it often has in Scripture (comp. Rom. ii, 16; 2 Thess. i, 8; 1 Tim. i, 9-11); and it is certain that, if the Gospel be put for all the parts of the dispensation taken in connection one with another, it may well be called, on the whole, a good message. In like manner the question, whether the Gospel be a law or not, is to be determined by the definition of the law and of the Gospel, as above. If *law* signifies, as it generally does, the discovery of the will of a superior, teaching what he requires of those under his government, with the intimation of his intention of dispensing rewards and punishments, as this rule of their conduct is observed or neglected; in this latitude of expression it is plain, from the proposition, that the Gospel, taken for the declaration made to men by Christ, is a *law*, as in Scripture it is sometimes called (James i, 25; Rom. iv, 15; viii, 2). But if law be taken, in the greatest rigor of the expression, for such a discovery of the will of God and our duty, as to contain in it no intimation of our obtaining the divine favor otherwise than by a perfect and universal conformity to it, in that sense the Gospel is not a law. See Witsius, *On the Covenants*, vol. iii, ch. i; Doddridge, *Lectures*, lect. clxxii; Watts, *Orthodoxy and Charity*, Essay ii; Buck, s. v.

**GOSPEL SIDE OF THE ALTAR**, the right side of the altar or communion-table, looking from it, at which, in the English Church service, the Gospel appointed for the day is read. It is of higher distinction than the epistle side, and is occupied by the clergyman of highest ecclesiastical rank who happens to be present. In some cathedrals, one of the clergy has this special duty to perform, and is designated the Gospeller.

**Gospeller.** (1.) A term of reproach, though really an honorable epithet, applied by the Romanists to those who advocate the circulation of the Scriptures. It was first given in England to the followers of Wickliffe, when that eminent reformer translated the New Testament (Eden). (2.) A term applied in the Reformation period to certain Antinomians. "I do not find anything objected to them as to their belief, save only that the doctrine of predestination having been generally taught by the reformers, many of this sect began to make strange inferences from it, reckoning that since everything is decreed, and the decrees of God could not be frustrated, therefore men were to leave themselves to be carried by these decrees. This drew some into great impiety of life, and others into desperation. The Germans soon saw the ill effects of this doctrine. Luther changed his mind about it, and Melancthon openly writ against it; and since that time the whole stream of the Lutheran churches has run the other way. But both Calvin and Bucer were still for maintaining the doctrine of these decrees; only they warned the people not to think much of them, since they were secrets which men could not penetrate into; but they did not so clearly show how these consequences did not flow from such opinions. Hooper,

and many other good writers, did often dehort people from entering into these curiosities; and a caveat to that same purpose was put afterwards into the article of the Church about predestination" (Burnet, *History of Reformation*, pt. ii, bk. i, p. 180). (3.) It is customary in the Church of England for the ministers to read the gospel and epistle for the day at the communion-table. He who read the gospel, standing at the north side of the altar, was formerly called the *Gospeller*; and he who read the epistle at the opposite side, was called the *Epistoler*. In the canons of queen Elizabeth, we find that a special reader, entitled an Epistoler, is to read the epistle in collegiate churches, vested in a cope (Farrar).

**Gospels**, a term evidently of Anglo-Saxon origin (according to some, i. q. *God's Spell*, i. e. Word of God; but according to most and better authorities, i. q. *good spell*, i. e. glad news) is the rendering of εὐαγγέλιον, lit. *good message* (originally spoken of a *revival for good news*, Homer, *Odyssey*, xiv, 152, 166; Plutarch, *Ages*, 33; then of glad tidings itself, and so Sept. for מְבִרָה, 2 Sam. xviii, 20, 22), constantly used in the N. T. (but not in Luke nor by John, and only twice in Acts, once in Peter, and once in Rev.) to denote, 1. The announcement of the kingdom of the Messiah, as ushered in by the coming and life of Christ; 2. The Gospel scheme or plan of salvation thus inaugurated, especially in its promulgations; and, 3. The records or histories which constitute the original documents of this system of faith and practice. Justin Martyr employs for the last the less appropriate term ἀπομνημόματα, *memoirs*; and other ancient writers occasionally style them βίαι, *lives*; but they were not so much designed as biographical sketches, whether complete or otherwise, but rather as outlines of the divine economy introduced in the New Dispensation. The central point of Christian preaching was the joyful intelligence that the Saviour had come into the world (Matt. iv, 23; Rom. x, 15); and the first Christian preachers, who characterized their account of the person and mission of Christ by the term εὐαγγέλιον, were themselves called εὐαγγελιστῆαι (Ephes. iv, 11; Acts xxi, 8). The former name was also prefixed to the written accounts of Christ; and as this intelligence was noted down by various writers in various forms, the particle κατά, "according to" (e. g. εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαίου) was inserted. We possess four such accounts; the first by Matthew, announcing the Redeemer as the promised King of the kingdom of God; the second by Mark, declaring him "a prophet mighty in deed and word" (Luke xxiv, 19); the third by Luke, of whom it might be said that he represented Christ in the special character of the Saviour of sinners (Luke vii, 36 sq.; xv, 18-9 sq.); the fourth by John, who represents Christ as the Son of God, in whom deity and humanity became one. The ancient Church gave to Matthew the symbol of the ox, to Mark that of the lion, to Luke that of the man, and to John that of the eagle; these were the four faces of the cherubim. The cloud in which the Lord revealed himself was borne by the cherubim, and the four evangelists were also the bearers of that glory of God which appeared in the form of man.

**I. Relative Position.**—Concerning the order which they occupy in the Scriptures, the oldest Latin and Gothic versions, as also the Codex Cantabrigiensis, place Matthew and John first, and after them Mark and Luke, while the other MSS. and old versions follow the order given to them in our Bibles. As dogmatical reasons render a different order more natural, there is much in favor of the opinion that their usual position arose from regard to the chronological dates of the respective composition of the four gospels (see Seiler, *De tempore et ordine quibus tria Evang. priora scripta sunt*, Erlang. 1805 sq.): this is the opinion of Origen, Irenæus, and Eusebius. All ancient testimonies agree that Matthew was the earliest and John the

latest evangelist.—Kitto, s. v. For the dates, see each gospel. See also Tischendorf's tract, *Wann wurden unsere Evangelien verfasst?* (2d ed. Lpz. 1865).

II. *Authenticity.*—It may fairly be said that the genuineness of these four narratives rests upon better evidence than that of any other ancient writings. They were all composed during the latter half of the 1st century. Before the end of the 2d century there is abundant evidence that the four gospels, as one collection, were generally used and accepted. Irenæus, who suffered martyrdom about A.D. 202, the disciple of Polycarp and Papias, who, from having been in Asia, in Gaul, and in Rome, had ample means of knowing the belief of various churches, says that the authority of the four gospels was so confirmed that even the heretics of his time could not reject them, but were obliged to attempt to prove their tenets out of one or other of them (*Contr. Har.* iii, 11, § 7). Tertullian, in a work written about A.D. 208, mentions the four gospels, two of them as the work of apostles, and two as that of the disciples of apostles (*apostolici*); and rests their authority on their apostolic origin (*Adv. Marcion.* iv, ch. ii). Origen, who was born about A.D. 185, and died A.D. 253, describes the gospels in a characteristic strain of metaphor as "the [four] elements of the Church's faith, of which the whole world, reconciled to God in Christ, is composed" (*In Johann.*). Elsewhere, in commenting on the opening words of Luke, he draws a line between the inspired Gospels and such productions as "the Gospel according to the Egyptians," "the Gospel of the Twelve," and the like (*Homil. in Luc.* iii, p. 932 sq.). Although Theophilus, who became sixth (seventh?) bishop of Antioch about A.D. 168, speaks only of "the gospels," without adding, at least in that connection, the names of the authors (*Ad Autol.* iii, p. 124, 125), we might fairly conclude with Gieseler that he refers to the collection of four, already known in his time. But from Jerome we know that Theophilus arranged the records of the four evangelists into one work (*Epist. ad Algas.* iv, p. 197). Tatian, who died about A.D. 170 (?), compiled a *Diatessaron*, or Harmony of the Gospels. The Muratorian fragment (Murator, *Antiq. It.* iii, 854; Routh, *Relig. S.* vol. iv), which, even if it be not by Caius and of the 2d century, is at least a very old monument of the Roman Church, describes the gospels of Luke and John; but time and carelessness seem to have destroyed the sentences relating to Matthew and Mark. Another source of evidence is open to us in the citations from the gospels found in the earliest writers. Barnabas, Clemens Romanus, and Polycarp quote passages from them, but not with verbal exactness. The testimony of Jun-fun Martyr (born about A.D. 99, martyred A.D. 165) is much fuller; many of his quotations are substantially found in the gospels of Matthew, Luke, probably of John, and possibly of Mark also, whose words it is more difficult to separate. The quotations from Matthew are the most numerous. In historical references, the mode of quotation is more free, and the narrative occasionally unites those of Matthew and Luke: in a very few cases he alludes to matters not mentioned in the canonical gospels (see *Sernisch, Apost. Denkwürdigk. d. M. Justin.* Hamb. 1848). Besides these, Matthew appears to be quoted by the author of the epistle to Diognetus, by Hegesippus, Irenæus, Tatian, Athenagoras, and Theophilus. Eusebius records that Pantænus found in India (the south of Arabia?) Christians who used the gospel of Matthew. All this shows that long before the end of the 2d century the gospel of Matthew was in general use. From the fact that Mark's gospel has few places peculiar to it, it is more difficult to identify citations not expressly assigned to him; but Justin Martyr and Athenagoras appear to quote his gospel, and Irenæus does so by name. Luke is quoted by Justin, Irenæus, Tatian, Athenagoras, and Theophilus; and John by all of these, with the addition of Ignatius, the epistle to Di-

ognetus, and Polycrates. From these we may conclude that before the end of the second century the Gospel collection was well known and in general use. There is yet another line of evidence. The heretical sects, as well as the fathers of the Church, knew the gospels; and as there was the greatest hostility between them, if the gospels had become known in the Church after the dissension arose, the heretics would never have accepted them as genuine from such a quarter. Both the Gnostics and Marcionites arose early in the 2d century; and therefore it is probable that the gospels were then accepted, and thus they are traced back almost to the times of the apostles (Ols-hausen). Upon a review of all the witnesses, from the apostolic fathers down to the Canon of the Laodicean Council in 364, and that of the third Council of Carthage in 397, in both of which the four gospels are numbered in the Canon of Scripture, there can hardly be room for any candid person to doubt that from the first the four gospels were recognised as genuine and as inspired; that a sharp line of distinction was drawn between them and the so-called apocryphal gospels, of which the number was very great; that, from the citations of passages, the gospels bearing these four names were the same as those which we possess in our Bibles under the same names; that unbelievers, like Celsus, did not deny the genuineness of the gospels, even when rejecting their contents; and, lastly, that heretics thought it necessary to plead some kind of sanction out of the gospels for their doctrines: nor could they venture on the easier path of an entire rejection, because the gospels were everywhere known to be genuine. As a matter of literary history, nothing can be better established than the genuineness of the gospels; and if in these latest times they have been assailed, it is plain that theological doubts have been concerned in the attack. The authority of the books has been denied from a wish to set aside their contents. Out of a mass of authorities the following may be selected: Norton, *Genuineness of the Gospels* (Bost. 1846-8, 3 vols.); Kirchofer, *Quellenammlung zur Geschichte des N.-T. Canons* (Zurich, 1844); De Wette, *Lehrbuch der hist.-krit. Einleitung*, etc. (6th ed., Berlin, 1860; tr. Bost. 1858); Hug's *Einleitung* (tr. with notes, Andover, 1836); Ols-hausen, *Biblischer Commentar*. Introduction, and his *Echtheit der 4 Canon. Evangelien* (Königsb. 1823); Jones, *Method of settling the canonical Authority of the N. T.* (Oxf. 1798, 2 vols.); Baur, *Krit. Untersuchungen über die Canon. Evangelien* (Tüb. 1847); Reuss, *Gesch. des N. T.* (4th ed., Brunswick, 1864); Alford's *Greek Testament*, Prolegomena, vol. i; Westcott's *History of N.-T. Canon* (2d ed. Lond. 1866); Gieseler, *Historisch-kritischer Versuch über die Entstehung, etc., der schriftlichen Evangelien* (Lpz. 1818).—Smith, s. v.

III. *Mutual Relation and Origin.*—"Many portions of the history of Jesus" (remarks Mr. Norton, who has minutely investigated the subject) "are found in common in the first three gospels, others are common to two of their number, but not found in the third. In the passages referred to, there is generally a similarity, sometimes a very great similarity, in the selection of particular circumstances, in the aspect under which the event is viewed, and the style in which it is related. Sometimes the language found in different gospels, though not identical, is equivalent or nearly equivalent; and not unfrequently, the same series of words, with or without slight variations, occurs throughout the whole or a great part of a sentence, and even in larger portions" (*Genuineness of the Gospels*, i, 240). Mr. Westcott exhibits the proportion of correspondences and peculiarities in several numerical tables: "If the extent of all the coincidences be represented by 100, their proportionate distribution will be, Matthew, Mark, and Luke, 53; Matthew and Luke, 21; Matthew and Mark, 20; Mark and Luke, 6. . . . Looking only at the general result, it may be said that of the

contents of the synoptic gospels, about two fifths are common to the three, and that the parts peculiar to one or other of them are little more than one third of the whole." He adds, "in the distribution of the verbal coincidences a very simple law is observable; they occur most commonly in the recital of the words of our Lord or of others, and are comparatively rare in the simple narrative. Thus, of the verbal coincidences in Matthew, about seven eighths; of those in Mark, about four fifths; and of those in Luke, about nineteen twentieths, occur in the record of the words of others" (*Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, p. 179). The following instances may be referred to for illustration, Matt. viii, 2, 3 = Mark i, 40, 42 = Luke v, 12, 13; Matt. ix, 5, 6 = Mark ii, 9, 11 = Luke v, 23, 24; Matt. xix, 23, 24 = Mark x, 23-25 = Luke xviii, 24, 25. The amount of agreement, however remarkable, ought not to be overrated; it occurs chiefly in reporting the words of Christ. Norton gives, as the most striking instance of verbal coincidence in the case of narrative, Luke ix, 16 (comp. Matt. xiv, 19; Mark vi, 41). Along with the instances of correspondence, there are also many instances of difference. This renders the problem difficult of solution. No explanation can be satisfactory which does not account for both the correspondences and differences. Such is the phenomenon which has provoked so many attempts at explanation. The literature of the subject is of vast extent, and the question is regarded as still unsettled. Our aim in the present article is to inquire how near the principal hypotheses which have been proposed approach to a solution of the difficulty.

1. In order to account for this singular relationship between the synoptic gospels, the first supposition is that the evangelists copied from one another, or that one evangelist used the gospels of his predecessors, making such extracts as he thought necessary, with alterations and additions of his own. It is a curious circumstance, however, that the supposition of any one of the evangelists copying from the others is attended with insuperable difficulty. Whichever of them we suppose to be the original evangelist, and whichever we suppose to be the last, having one or both the others before him, we are unable in this way to explain the phenomenon. There are six possible ways of putting the case, every one of which has had learned advocates, and this variety of opinion itself is a strong argument against the hypothesis. Griesbach thought that Mark copied from Matthew and Luke, and this opinion is still held by some; but an opinion in favor of the originality of Mark has of late been gaining ground (Thiersch, Meyer, Weiss). It must, we think, be evident to any one who attentively compares the gospels of Matthew and Mark, that the latter cannot with any propriety be called a copy or abridgment of the former. There is an air of originality and freshness in Mark's narrative which proves the work to be anything but a compilation; and besides, in several important particulars, Mark differs from Matthew. No explanation can be satisfactory which does not account for the want of agreement as well as the agreement between the gospels. Indeed, it is not easy to see what object Mark or any other of the evangelists could have in compiling a new gospel out of one or more which were acknowledged to be the works of apostles or their companions. "In its simple form, the 'supplemental' or 'dependent' theory is at once inadequate for the solution of the difficulties of the relation of the synoptic gospels, and inconsistent with many of its details; and, as a natural consequence of a deeper study of the gospels, it is now generally abandoned, except in combination with other principles of solution" (Westcott, *On the Gospels*, p. 184).

2. We are thus brought to consider Eichhorn's famous hypothesis of a so-called *original gospel*, now lost. A brief written narrative of the life of Christ is supposed to have been in existence, and to have had addi-

tions made to it at different periods. Various copies of this original gospel, with these additions, being extant in the time of the evangelists, each of the evangelists is supposed to have used a different copy as the basis of his gospel. In the hands of bishop Marsh, who adopted and modified the hypothesis of Eichhorn, this original gospel becomes a very complex thing. He supposed that there was a Greek translation of the Aramaean original gospel, and various transcripts with alterations and additions. But when it is considered that all these suppositions are entirely gratuitous, that they are made only to meet the emergencies of the case as they arise, one cannot help feeling that the license of hypothesis is carried beyond just bounds. The grand objection to this original gospel is the entire want of historical evidence for its existence. If such an original gospel ever had existed, it must have been of the very highest authority, and, instead of being tampered with, would have been carefully preserved in its original form, or at least in its Greek translation. The alterations and additions supposed to have been made in it are not only inconsistent with its sacred and authoritative character as the original gospel, but also with the habits of the Jews. Even if this hypothesis did adequately explain the phenomena presented in the first three gospels, it is far too artificially contrived to be true; but it fails of its aim. The original work, supposed to consist of the sections common to the three gospels, cannot be made out; and the individuality of character belonging to each of the evangelists is irreconcilable with the supposition that several different writers contributed materials. Notwithstanding the identity of subject among the three gospels, each writer is distinguished by his own characteristic style. It is remarkable that Dr. Weiss, of Königsberg, has quite recently (*Stud. u. Kritik*, 1861, i, iv) propounded a theory of explanation very much akin to that of Marsh. He supposes that the first evangelist, the writer of Matthew's Gospel, as well as Luke, used a copy of Mark's Gospel, and, along with this, a second more ancient, perhaps immediately apostolic written source, which Mark also had already made use of in the composition of his gospel. In this way he thinks all the phenomena are simply and easily explained. He endeavors to establish his view by a detailed examination and comparison of the three synoptic gospels, and holds that these results of criticism are confirmed by the ancient tradition that Matthew wrote his gospel in Hebrew, while there is no trace of the Hebrew gospel itself. The conclusion is that the Hebrew gospel of Matthew must have been displaced at an early period by another containing its essential contents, but richer and more generally accessible in its Greek form. Hence the later Greek gospel was held to be the work of Matthew the apostle, the more ancient Hebrew one having been really the apostle's work. This revival in the present day of what is substantially the hypothesis of Eichhorn and Marsh is significant of the still unsettled state of the question.

3. That our present gospels are to be traced mainly to the oral teaching of the apostles as their source, was the opinion of Herder and Gieseler, and more recently of De Wette, Guericke, Norton, Westcott, and others. "They have correctly apprehended" (says De Wette) "the spirit of Christian antiquity who regard the *oral tradition* of the gospel (the *oral original gospel*) as the basis and source of all the Christian gospels, and who endeavor to apprehend the history of the origin of the latter in a definite relation to the former" (*Introd. to N. T.*, sec. 87). The gospel was published orally before it was committed to writing, and the preaching of the apostles must, from the nature of the case, have consisted chiefly of a narration of the facts recorded in our present gospels. It is naturally supposed that very soon a certain agreement or uniformity of narrative would be the result, and that we have a transcript, as it were, of this type or form of narrative in the first

three gospels. The verbal coincidences in the gospels are found especially in those cases in which it might have been expected that the first preachers of the gospel would be exact, namely, the recital of the words of Christ, and quotations from the O. T. This account of the probable origin of the gospels is not only in accordance with the character of the period as an age of oral tradition rather than of writing, but is also substantially the same as that which Luke gives in the preface to his gospel (Luke i, 1-4). While Luke refers to written accounts of the ministry of Christ in the possession of some Christians at that time, he mentions that these accounts were founded directly or indirectly upon the oral accounts of the apostles (*καθὼς παρέδουσαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρεταὶ γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου*). The statement of Papias respecting the origin of Mark's Gospel is, that it was derived from the preaching of Peter, and we have already quoted the important testimony of Irenæus to the same effect. To prevent misapprehension, however, it ought to be observed that our written gospels date from the latter half of the first century, and that, "so long as the first witnesses survived, so long the tradition was confined within the bounds of their testimony; when they passed away it was already fixed in writing" (Westcott, p. 192). The theory of the oral origin of the gospels, while it has much evidence in its favor, cannot be accepted as a complete solution of the problem. It does not explain the striking instances of verbal coincidence in the narrative portions common to the three synoptists, or to two of them; nor the instances in which either two or all the three evangelists agree with each other in their quotations from the Sept., and at the same time differ from the Sept. itself (Matt. iii, 3; Mark i, 3; Luke iii, 4; compared with Isa. xl, 3, Sept., and Matt. iv, 10; Luke iv, 8, compared with Deut. vi, 13, Sept.). De Wette would combine "the two hypotheses of a common oral source, and of the influence through writing of one evangelist on another."

There is a striking difference between the fourth gospel and the synoptic gospels in respect both to contents and form; but, with all this difference, there is a general and essential agreement. John relates in part the same things as the synoptists, and in a similar manner, but not with the verbal agreement. The following are parallel: The purification of the Temple, ii, 13-22 = Matt. xxi, 11 sq.; the feeding of the multitude, vi, 1-15 = Matt. xiv, 13-21; the walking upon the sea, vi, 16-21 = Matt. xiv, 22-36; the anointing, xii, 1-8 = Matt. xxvi, 6-13; the entry into Jerusalem, xii, 9-19 = Matt. xxi, 1-11; the prediction of the denial of Peter, xiii, 36-38 = Matt. xxvi, 33-35. In some of these instances the expressions are verbally parallel; also in the following: xii, 25 = Matt. x, 39; xiii, 20 = Matt. x, 40; xiv, 31 = Matt. xxvi, 46. There is a similarity between iv, 44, and Matt. xiii, 57; between xiii, 16 and Matt. x, 24, and Luke vi, 40 (De Wette, *Evangel. Handb.*, zum N. Test.). On the other hand, however, much important matter has been omitted and much added by John, while his manner of narration also differs from that of the synoptists. In the first three gospels, the scene of our Lord's ministry is chiefly laid in Galilee, but in the fourth gospel it is chiefly in Judæa and Jerusalem. This may partly account for the different style of our Lord's discourses in the synoptic gospels, as compared with the Gospel of John (Hug, p. 433). In the former, Christ often makes use of parables and proverbial sayings; in the latter, John records long and mystical discourses. Yet we find proverbial maxims and parables also in John xii, 24-26; xiii, 16, 20; x, 1 sq.; xv, 1 sq. Many points of difference between the fourth gospel and the others may be satisfactorily accounted for from the fragmentary character of the narratives. None of them professes to be a complete biography, and, therefore, one may contain what others omit. Besides, the fourth gospel was

composed after the others, and designed to be in some respects supplemental. This was the opinion of Eusebius, and of the still more ancient writers whose testimony he cites, Clement of Alexandria and Origen; and the opinion appears to be well founded. Whether John was acquainted with the works of his predecessors or not is uncertain, but he was no doubt acquainted with the evangelical tradition out of which they originated. We have, then, in this circumstance, a very natural explanation of the omission of many important facts, such as the institution of the supper, the baptism of Jesus by John, the history of his temptation and transfiguration, and the internal conflict at Gethsemane. These his narrative assumes as already known. In several passages he presupposes in his readers an acquaintance with the evangelical tradition (i, 32, 45; ii, 1; iii, 24; xi, 2). It is not easy to reconcile the apparent discrepancy between John and the synoptists with reference to the day on which Christ observed the last passover with his disciples. Lücke decides in favor of John, but thereby admits the discrepancy to be real. Again, in the synoptic gospels, the duration of our Lord's ministry appears to be only one year, whereas John mentions three passovers which our Saviour attended; but neither the synoptists nor John determine the duration of the Saviour's ministry, and, therefore, there is no contradiction between them on this point. It has been alleged that there is an irreconcilable difference between the synoptic and the Johannæan representation of Christ, so that, assuming the historical reality of the former, the latter must be regarded as ideal and subjective; particularly, that the long discourses attributed to Christ in the fourth gospel could hardly have been retained in John's remembrance, and that they are so unlike the sayings of Christ in the other gospels, and so like John's own style in his epistles, that they appear to have been composed by John himself. If the allegation could be made good that the Christ of John is essentially different from the Christ of the synoptists, the objection would be fatal. On the contrary, however, we are persuaded that, on this all-important point, there is an essential agreement among all the evangelists. We must remember that the full and many-sided character of Christ himself might be represented under aspects which, although different, were not inconsistent with each other. It is by no means correct to say that the fourth gospel represents Christ as God, while the others describe him as a mere man. Yet we may find in the fact of his wondrous person as the God-man an explanation of the apparent difference in their respective representations. That the synoptists do not differ essentially from John in their view of Christ is shown by Dorner in an admirable comparison (Dorner, *Entwickelungsgeschichte*, i, 81 sq.; E. tr. i, 50 sq.). Lücke and Frommann, as well as De Wette, greatly incline to the view that John has mingled his own subjectivity with the discourses of Christ, which he professes to relate. That the evangelist does not transfer his own subjective views to Christ appears from the fact that while he speaks of Christ as the Logos, he never represents Christ as applying this term to himself. We may also refer to those passages in which, after quoting obscure sayings of the Redeemer or remarkable occurrences, he either adds an explanation or openly confesses his ignorance of their meaning at the time (ii, 19-22; vi, 70; vii, 37-39; xi, 11; xii, 16, 32; xiii, 27; xx, 9).

The susceptible disposition of John himself, and the intimate relation in which he stood to Christ, make the supposition reasonable that he drank so deeply into the spirit of his master, and retained so vivid a recollection of his very words, as to reproduce them with accuracy. Instead of transferring his own thoughts and expressions to Christ, John received and reproduced those of Christ himself. In this way the similarity between John's language and that of Christ is



accounted for. It is acknowledged, even by Strauss and De Wette, that the most characteristic expressions in John were really used by Christ himself. When it is objected that John could not retain in remembrance, or hand down with accuracy, such long discourses of Christ as he records in his gospel, far too little regard is paid to the assistance of the Holy Spirit, to be expected especially in such a case as this, according to the Saviour's promise, "He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you" (John xiv, 26).—Kitto, s. v.

See Bp. Marsh's *Translation of Michaelis's Introd. to N. T.* iii, 2 (1803) for an account of Eichhorn's earlier theory and of his own. Veyssie's *Examination of Mr. Marsh's Hypothesis* (1808) has suggested many of the objections. In Bp. Thirlwall's *Translation of Schleiermacher on St. Luke* (1825, Introduction) is an account of the whole question. Other principal works are, an essay of Eichhorn, in the 5th vol. *Allgemeine Bibliothek der Biblischen Literatur* (1794); the Essay of Bp. Marsh, just quoted; Eichhorn, *Eiuleitung in das N. T.* (1804); Gratz, *Neuer Versuch die Entstehung der drei ersten Evang. zu erklären* (1812); Bertholdt, *Histor.-kritische Einleitung in sämtliche kanon. und apok. Schriften des A. und N. T.* (1812-1819); and the work of Gieseler quoted above. See also De Wette, *Lehrbuch*, and Westcott, *Introd.*, already quoted; also Weiss, *Evangelienfrage* (Lpz. 1856); Schlichthorst, *Verhältn. d. synopt. Evang. zu einander* (Götting, 1835); Wilke, *Der Urangelig* (Dresden and Leipzig, 1838); Lücke, *Komment. üb. d. Ev. Joh.*; Frommann, *Der Johannische Lehrbegriff*; Schwarz, *Untersuchungen über d. synopt. Evangelien* (Tüb. 1844); Anon. *Die Evangelien, ihr Geist, Verfasser und Verhältnis zu einander* (Leipzig, 1845); Rietsch, in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1851; Köstlin, *Ursprung und Kompos. d. synopt. Evangelien* (Stuttg. 1853); Smith (of Jordanhill), *Origin and Connection of the Gospels* (Edinb. 1853). For the mythical theory of the origin of the gospels, as developed by Strauss and others, see RATIONALISM, and the art. JESUS. For dissertations on the Gospels, see HARMONIES OF THE GOSPELS.

IV. *Commentaries*, expressly on the whole of the four gospels alone, have been numerous; the most important are here designated by an asterisk (\*) prefixed: Theophilus, *Commentariorum fragmenta* (in Grabe, *Spicilegium*, ii, 223 sq.); Athanasius, *Questiones* (in *Opp.* [Spur.], ii, 253 sq.); Jerome, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* [Supp.] xi, 733 sq.); Augustine, *Questionum lib. ii* (in *Opp.* iv, 311 sq.); Juvenius, *Carmina* (in *Bibl. Patr.* Gallandii iv); Sedulius, *Expositiones* [on Matt., Mark, and Luke] (in *Maii Script. Vet.* ix, 159 sq.); Arnobius, *Annotationuula* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* viii); Theophylact, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* i); Anselm, *Explanations* (in *Opp.* ed. Picard); Rupert, *In Evang. lib. i* (in *Opp.* i, 534 sq.); Euthymius, *Commentarius* (Gr. and Lat., Lips. 1792, 3 vols. in 4, 8vo); Aquinas, in *Aurea Catena* (Paris, 1637, fol.); also in *Opp.* iv, 5; in *Bibl. Patr.* Gall. xiv, 297, et al.; *Catena from the Fathers*, by Pusey, etc., Oxf. 1841-5, 4 vols. in 8, 8vo); Gorraun, *Commentaria* (Colon. 1472, 1537, Hag. 1502, Antw. 1617, Lugd. 1693, fol.); Zuingli, *Adnotationes* [ed. Leo Juda] (in *Opp.* iv); Faber, *Commentarii* (Meld. 1522, Basil. 1523, Col. 1541, fol.); Bucer, *Enarrationes* (Argent. 1527, 1528, 2 vols. 8vo; Basil. 1537, Geneva, 1553, fol.); Arboreus, *Commentarius* (Paris, 1529, 1551, fol.); Cajetan, *Commentarii* (Venice, 1530, Paris, 1532, 1536, 1540, 1543, fol.; ib. 1542, Lugd. 1558, 1574, 8vo); Sarcer, *Scholia* (on the gospels successively, Freft. and Basel, 1538-50, 4 vols. 8vo); Broeckweg, *Enarrationes* (Par. 1543, 8vo; Ven. 1648, 4to); Herboren, *Enarrationes* (Colon. 1546, 4to); Brunfeld, *Adnotationes* [including Acts] (Argent. 1553, fol.); Delreio, *Commentarii* (Hispal. 1554, fol.); Lessii *Adnotationes* (Francft. 1559, 2 vols. fol.); Bullinger, *Commentarius* (on successive gospels; together, Tigurini, 1561, fol.); Aretius,

*Commentarii* (Lausanne, 1578, 2 vols. 8vo; also in his *Comment.* on the N. T.); Rande, *Erklärung* (Francfort, 1597, fol.); Biniot, *Commentaria* (Paris, 1581); Sa, *Scholia* [compiled] (Antwerp, 1591, Lugd. 1602, Colon. 1612, 4to); Bulliond, extracts of old and new comments (in French, Lyons, 1596, 1628, 4to); \*Maldonatus [Rom. Catholic], *Commentarius* (Mussipont. 1596, 2 vols. fol.; and often later in various forms; his own last. ed. Lugd. 1615, fol.; lately, Mogunt. 1841-55, 5 vols. fol.); Gualtha, *Homiliæ* [including Acts] (Tigur. 1601, fol.); Lucas, *Commentarius* (Antw. 1606, 2 vols. fol., with a supplement in two vols. fol. on ib., 1612-16; complete, ib. 1712, 5 vols. in 2, fol.); Scultetus, *Exercitationes* (Amst. 1624, 4to; also in the *Critici Sacri*, vi); Heraeus, *Scholia* [founded on Aquinas] (Antw. 1625, 12mo); Coutzen, *Commentaria* (Colon. et Mog. 1626, 2 vols. fol.); Munster and others, *Annotationes* (in the *Critici Sacri*, vi); Masius, *Note* (ib. vi); Jansen, *Commentarius* (1631); Crell, *Explicatio* (in *Opp.* iii, 1 sq.); Ebert, *Tetrasticha Hebræa* (in Ugolini, xxxi, 117 sq.); De Rance, *Réflexions* (Paris, 1639, 4 vols. 12mo); De Dieu, *Animadversiones* (L. B. 1633, 4to); Spanheim, *Dubia Evangelica* [polemic] (Geneva, 1634-9, and later, 3 vols. 4to); Bounet's *Commentary* (in French, Par. 1634, 4to); Panonus, *Commentarius* (Naples, 1636, fol.); De Sylveria, *Commentarii* (in 6 successive vols., some of them often, chiefly at Lyons, 1642-75); Trapp, *Commentary* [including Acts] (London, 1647, 4to; 1748, 1668, 8vo); Walaus, *Commentarius* [from Beza and others] (L. B. 1653, 4to); Boys, *Collatio* [chiefly in favor of the Vulgate] (Lond. 1655, 8vo); Ferrerus, *Commentarius* (Lugd. 1661, fol.); Wolzogen, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* [Amst. 1668, fol.] p. 1-1038); Sandys, *Interpretationes* (Amst. 1669, 8vo); Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebræicæ* [valuable for Talmudical comparisons] (ed. Carpzov, Lips. 1675, 4to); Keuchen, *Adnotata* [including Acts] (Amst. 1689, and later, 4to); \*Alex. Natalis [Roman Cath.] *Expositio* [chiefly extracted] (Paris, 1703, fol.); \*Dorsche, *Commentarius* (Hamb. 1706, 4to); Ulric, *Bibelübung* [compiled by Wirz] (Tigur. 1713-39, 4 vols. 8vo); S. Clarke, *Paraphrase* (first in parts, Lond. 1721-2, and later, 2 vols. 8vo; also in *Works*, iii; transl. in Germ. by Wilmsen, Berl. 1763, 3 vols. 4to); Hagiophilus, *Observationes* [incomplete] (Gardeleg, 1741, 4to); Hoehler, *Analecæ* (ed. Wolfii, Altenb. 1766, 4to); Lynnar, *Erklär.* (Halle, 1775, 8vo); Bp. Pearce, *Commentary* [including Acts] (London, 1777, 2 vols. 4to); Thalemann, *Version* [including Acts] (Berlin, 1781, 8vo); Bp. Mann, *Notes* [including Acts] (2d ed. London, 1783, 12mo); Campbell, *Notes* (Aberdeen, 1789, 2 vols. 8vo; 3d ed. ib. 1814, 4 vols. 8vo; Andover, 1837, 2 vols. 8vo); Quesnel, *Comment* (Bath, 1790, 2 vols. 8vo; London, 1830, 3 vols. 12mo); Bossuet, *Réflexions* (in *Œuvres*, xiv, 117 sq.); Erskine, *Songs* (in *Works*, x, 627 sq.); Schulz, *Anmerk.* (Halle, 1794, 4to); Elsley, *Annotations* [including Acts] (Lond. 1799, 1821, 1827, 3 vols.; 1841, 2 vols.; 1844, 1 vol. 8vo); Brameld, *Notes* (Lond. 1803, 8vo); \*Kuimol, *Commentarius* [including Acts] (Lips. 1807-12, and since, 4 vols. 8vo; London, 1835, 3 vols. 8vo); Jones, *Illustrations* (Lond. 1808, 8vo); Staback, *Annotations* [including Acts] (Falmouth, 1809, 2 vols. 8vo); St. Gilly, *Observations* (Lond. 1818, 8vo); Kistemaker, *Erklärung* (Münst. 1818-20, 4 vols. 8vo); Möller, *Ansichten* (Gotha, 1819, 8vo); \*Fritzsche, *Commentarii* [Matt., Mark, and Luke] (Lips. 1825-30, 2 vols. 8vo); Sumner, *Exposition* (Lond. 1832, 8vo); Barnes, *Notes* (New York, 1832, 1847, 2 vols. 8vo); \*Watson, *Exposition* [Matthew and Mark] (London, 1833, 8vo; New York, 1841); Page, *Notes* (London, 1834, 12mo); Glöckler, *Erklärung* [Matt., Mark, and Luke] (Frankfort, 1834, 8vo); Slade, *Remarks* (Lond. 1835, 12mo); Lingard, *Notes* (London, 1836, 8vo); Adam, *Exposition* (ed. Westoby, London, 1837, 2 vols. 8vo); Ripley, *Notes* (Boston, 1837-8, 2 vols. 8vo); Rule, *Notes* (Gibraltar, 1841, 4to); Longking, *Notes* (N. Y. 1841-4, 4 vols. 16mo); Kenney, *Commentary* [including epistles] (Lond. 1842, 2 vols. 12mo); Paulus, *Exec. Handbk.*

[first 3 gospels] (Heidelb, 1842, 3 vols. 8vo); Baumgarten-Crusius, *Commentar* [Matt., Mark, and Luke] (Leipzig, 1844, 2 vols. 8vo); Livermore, *Commentary* (Lond. 1844, 8vo; Boston, 1850, 12mo); Paige, *Notes* (Boston, 1844-5, 2 vols. 12mo); Mackenzie, *Commentary* [including Acts] (London, 1847, 8vo); \*Ewald, *Erklärung* (first 3 gospels, Göttingen, 1850, 3 vols. 8vo; John, ib. 1861-2, 2 vols. 8vo); Brown, *Discourses of Christ* (Edinburgh, 1850, 3 vols. 8vo; New York, 1864, 2 vols. 8vo); also *Commentary* (ib. 1854-5, 4 vols. in 7, 8vo); Girdlestone, *Lectures* (new ed. Lond. 1853, 4 vols. 8vo); \*Stier, *Reden Jesu* [on Christ's words only] (Barmen, 1853-5, 7 vols. 8vo; tr. Edinb. 1855 sq., 8 vols. 8vo; N. Y. 1864-8, 2 vols. in 3, 8vo); Stebbing, *Hebels* (Lond. 1855, 8vo); \*Norton, *Notes* (Boston, 1855, 2 vols. 8vo); Lyttleton, *Notes* [including Acts] (Lond. 1856, 8vo); Ryle, *Expos. Thoughts* (London and N. Y. 1856-66, 6 vols. 8vo); Hall, *Notes* (N. Y. 1857, 2 vols. 12mo); Owen, *Notes* (N. York, 1857-60, 3 vols. 12mo); Whedon, *Commentary* (N. Y. 1860-6, vols. i, ii, 12mo); \*Bleek, *Erklärung* [first 3 gosp.] (Lpz. 1861-2, 2 vols. 8vo); Jacobus, *Notes* (N. York, 1848-56; Edinb. 1863, 3 vols. 8vo); Burger, *Erklärung* [Matthew, Mark, and Luke] (Nördlingen, 1863, 8vo); Burgon, *Commentary* (new ed. London, 1865, 5 vols. 12mo); Bisping, *Ereg. Handb.* (Münster, 1865, 8vo); Warren, *Notes* (Boston, 1867, vol. i, 12mo). See NEW TESTAMENT.

GOSPEL, SPURIOUS (PSEUDEPIGRAPHAL). The canon of the New Testament, as we have already seen, having been finally settled before the close of the 4th century, the rejected writings which bore the names of the apostles and evangelists soon sank into oblivion, and few, if any, have descended to our times in their original shape. From the decree of Gelasius and a few other sources we have the names and a few detached notices of a good many of these productions.

I. Of those still extant the following claim special notice:

1. THE HISTORY OF JOSEPH THE CARPENTER, which has been preserved in the East in an Arabic translation, was first made known in Europe in the commencement of the 16th century by Isidore de Isolanis in his *Summa de donis Sti. Josephi*. He observes that the "Catholics of the East" commemorate St. Joseph on the 19th of March, and read the legend of the saint, omitting certain parts which are not approved in the Roman Church. This work was first published by Wallin, at Leipsic, in 1722, from an Arabic MS. of the 13th century, in the *Bibliothèque du Roi*, accompanied with a Latin translation. It was divided by Wallin into chapters and verses. It is also found in Coptic, Sahidic, and Memphic. It is highly esteemed by the Copts. The former part, to chap. ix, appears to have been derived from an ancient Gospel of the Infancy. The Latin was republished by Fabricius.

THE GOSPEL OF THE INFANCY was first published by Henry Sike, at Utrecht, in 1697, from an Arabic MS. Sike's Latin version was republished by Fabricius, who divided it into chapters. The Arabic was divided into corresponding chapters by Thilo in 1852.

There are several MSS. of this gospel extant, the oldest of which known is that in the Medicean Library, written in 1299. The narratives which it contains were current in the 2d century, and the account contained in this gospel respecting Christ's learning the alphabet is mentioned by Irenæus (*Adv. Hæres.* i, 20) as a fabrication of the Marcosians. The Gospel of the Infancy is found in the catalogue of Gelasius, and it is especially remarkable from the fact that it was most probably this gospel which was known to Mohammed, who seems to have been unacquainted with any of the canonical Scriptures, and who has inserted some of its narrations in the Koran. The *Sepher Tobloth. Jesu*, a well-known publication of the Jews, contains similar fables with those in this gospel (Wagenseil's *Sota*). This gospel was received as genuine by many of the

Eastern Christians, especially the Nestorians and Monophysites. It was found to have been universally read by the Syrians of St. Thomas, in Travancore, and was condemned by the Synod of Diamper, in 1599, by archbishop Menezes, who describes it as "the book called the *Gospel of the Infancy*, already condemned by the ancients for its many blasphemous heresies and fabulous histories." Wherever the name Jesus occurs in this gospel he is universally entitled *el-Rab*, while Christ is called *el-Sheik*. This was a distinction introduced by the Nestorians. The blessed Virgin is also entitled the Lady Mary. The Persians and Copts also received this gospel (De la Brosse's *Lexic. Pers.* s. v. *Tinetoria Ars*). The original language was probably Syriac. It is sometimes called the Gospel of Peter, or of Thomas.

2. THE GOSPEL OF THOMAS THE ISRAELITE (Gr.), a work which has flowed from the same source with the former, was first published by Cotelierius (*Notes on the Constitutions of the Apostles*, l. vi, c. xvii, tom. i, p. 348), from an imperfect MS. of the 15th century. It was republished and divided into chapters by Fabricius. The most perfect edition was that of Mingarelli, in the *Nuova Raccolta d'Opuscoli scientifiche e filosofice* (Venet. 1764), from a Bologna MS. of the 15th century. Mingarelli (who believed it to have been a forgery of the Manichees) accompanied his text with a Latin translation. Thilo has given a complete edition from a collation of Mingarelli's work with two MSS. preserved at Bonn and Dresden. This gospel relates the fable of Christ's learning the Greek alphabet, in which it agrees with the account in Irenæus. In other Gospels of the Infancy (as in that published by Sike) he is represented as learning the Hebrew letters. It has been questioned whether this is the same work which is called the Gospel of Thomas, by Origen, Ambrose, Bede, and others. This gospel probably had its origin among the Gnostics, and found its way from them, through the Manichees, into the Church; but, having been more generally received among the heretics, it was seldom copied by the monks, which accounts for the paucity of MSS. Nicephorus says that the Gospel of Thomas contained 1300 *στίχοι*. This pseudepigraphal work is probably the foundation of all the histories of Christ's infancy, but it is supposed to have been recast and interpolated.

3. THE PROTEVANGELION OF JAMES has descended to us in the original Greek, and was first published by Bibliander at Basel in 1552, in a Latin version by William Postell, who asserted that it was publicly read in the Greek churches, and maintained that it was a genuine work of the apostle James, and intended to be placed at the head of St. Mark's Gospel. These commendations provoked the wrath of the learned Henry Stephens, who insinuated that it was fabricated by Postell himself, whom he calls "a detestable monster" (*Introduction au Traité de la Conformité des Merveilles Anciennes avec les Modernes*, 1566). It was reprinted in the *Orthodoxographia* of J. Herold (Basel, 1555), and again in the *Orthodoxographia*, vol. i (1569), of Jacob Grynæus, who entertained a very favorable opinion of it. Subsequent discoveries have proved that, notwithstanding the absurdity of Postell's high pretensions in favor of the authenticity of this gospel, Stephens's accusations against him were all ill founded. There had, even at the time when Stephens wrote, been already a Greek translation published by Neander, of which Stephens was not aware: it appeared among the Apocrypha annexed by Oporin to his edition of Luther's Catechism (Basel, 1564). It was republished by Fabricius (who divided it into chapters), and subsequently by Birch, Thilo, and Tischeidorf. Thilo collated for his edition six Paris MSS., the oldest of which is of the 10th century. From the circumstance of these MSS. containing a Greek calendar or martyrology, and from other internal evidences, there seems little doubt that this gospel was formerly read in the

Greek Church (Montfaucon, *Paleogr. Græc.* p. 304). There are also extant versions of the Gospel of the Infancy in the Arabic and other languages of the Eastern churches, among which they appear to have possessed a high degree of authority.

Although this work is styled by Postell the *Protevangeliom*, there is no MS. authority for this title, nor for the fact of its being ascribed to James the apostle. It only appears that the author's name is James. The narrations of this gospel were known to Tertullian (*Advers. Gnost. c. viii*), Origen (*Com. in Matt.* p. 223), Gregory Nyssen (*Orat. in diem Nat. Christ. : Opp.* iii, 346), Epiphanius (*Hæc.* 79, § 5), the author of the *Imperfect Work on Matt.*, Chrysostom (*Opp.* vi, 24), and many others among the ancients. (See Suckow, *De arg. et inl. Protev. Jacobi*, Bresl. 1830.)

4. THE GOSPEL OF THE NATIVITY OF MARY (Latin). Although the Latins never evinced the same degree of credulity which was shown by the Greeks and Orientals in regard to these fabulous productions, and although they were generally rejected by the fathers, they were again revived about the 6th century. Notwithstanding their contemptuous rejection by Augustine and Jerome, and their condemnation by popes Innocent and Gelasius, they still found readers in abundance. Gelasius expressly condemns the book concerning the *Nativity of St. Mary and the Midwife*.

The Gospel of the Nativity of Mary, which most probably, in its present form, dates its origin from the 6th century, has even been recommended by the pretended authority of St. Jerome. There is a letter extant, said to be written by the bishops Chromatius and Heliodorus to Jerome, requesting him to translate out of Hebrew into Latin the history of the *Birth of Mary*, and of the *Birth and Infancy of Christ*, in order to oppose the fabulous and heretical accounts of the same contained in the apocryphal books. To this Jerome accedes, observing, at the same time, that the real author of the book was not, as they supposed, the evangelist Matthew, but Seleucus the Manichee. Jerome observes that there is some truth in the accounts, of which he furnishes a translation from the original Hebrew. These pretended letters of Jerome are now universally acknowledged to be fabrications; but the apocryphal gospel itself, which is the same in substance with the *Protevangeliom of James*, is still extant in Jerome's pretended Latin version. This gospel was republished by Mr. Jones from Jerome's works. It is from these Gospels of the Infancy that we have learned the names of the parents of the blessed Virgin, Joachim (although Bede reads Eli) and Anna. The narratives contained in these gospels were incorporated in the *Golden Legend*, a work of the 13th century, which was translated into all the languages of Europe, and frequently printed. There are extant some metrical accounts of the same in German, which were popular in the era of romance. These legends were, however, severely censured by some eminent divines of the Latin Church, of whom it will be sufficient to name Alcuin, in his *Homilies*, in the 9th, and Fulbert and Petrus Damianus (bishop of Ostia) in the 11th century. "Some," says the latter, "boast of being wiser than they should be when, with superfluous curiosity, they inquire into the names of the parents of the blessed Virgin, for the evangelist would surely not have failed to have named them if it were profitable to mankind" (*Sermon on the Nativity*). Eadmer, the monk, in his book on the *Excellence of the Virgin*, writes in a similar strain (cap. ii, Anselm. *Opp.* p. 435, Paris, 1721). Luther also inveighs against the readers of these books (*Homil.* ed. Walch, tom. xi; and *Table-Talk*, ch. vii, tom. xxii, p. 396).

There were several editions of Jerome's pretended translation published in the fifteenth century, one of them by Caxton. It is printed by Thilo from a Paris MS. of the 14th century, and divided by him into twenty-four chapters, after a MS. of the 15th century

in the same library. One of the chief objects of the writer of these gospels seems to be to assert the Davidical origin of the Virgin, in opposition to the Manichees.

Mr. Jones conceives that the first author of these ancient legends was a Hellenistic Jew, who lived in the second century, but that they were added to and interpolated by Seleucus at the end of the third, who became their reputed author; and that still further additions were made by the Nestorians, or some late Christians in India. Lardner (*Credibility*, vol. viii) so far differs from Mr. Jones as to believe the author not to have been a Jew. That these legendary accounts have not altogether lost their authority appears from the *Life of St. Joseph*, in the *Catholic Magazine* for December, 1843).

The Gospel of the Nativity of Mary was received by many of the ancient heretics, and is mentioned by Epiphanius, St. Augustine, and Gelasius. The Gnostics and Manichees endeavored to found on its authority some of their peculiar opinions (such as that Christ was not the Son of God before his baptism, and that he was not of the tribe of Judah, but of that of Levi); as did also the Collyridians, who maintained that too much honor could not be paid to the blessed Virgin, and that she was herself born of a virgin, and ought to be worshipped with sacrifices.

5. Although the GOSPEL OF MARCON, or rather that of Luke, as corrupted by that heretic in the second century, is no longer extant, professor Hahn has endeavored to restore it from the extracts found in ancient writers, especially Tertullian and Epiphanius. See MARCON. This work has been published by Thilo.

6. Thilo has also published a collation of a corrupted Greek GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN, found in the archives of the Knights Templars in Paris. This work was first noticed (in 1828) by the Danish bishop Mueuter, as well as by abbé Grégoire, ex-bishop of Blois. It is a vellum manuscript in large 4to, said by persons skilled in palæography to have been executed in the 12th or 14th century, and to have been copied from a Mount Athos MS. of the 12th. The writing is in gold letters. It is divided into nineteen sections, which are called *gospels*, and is on this account supposed to have been designed for liturgical use. These sections, corresponding in most instances with our chapters (of which, however, the twentieth and twenty-first are omitted), are subdivided into verses, the same as those now in use, and said to have been first invented by Robert Stephens. See VERSES. The omissions and interpolations (which latter are in barbarous Greek) represent the heresies and mysteries of the Knights Templars. Notwithstanding all this, Thilo considers it to be modern, and fabricated since the commencement of the 18th century.

7. One of the most curious of the apocryphal gospels is the GOSPEL OF NICODEMUS, or ACTS OF PILATE. It is a kind of theological romance, partly founded on the canonical gospels. The first part, to the end of ch. xv, is little more than a paraphrastic account of the trial and death of Christ, embellished with fabulous additions. From that to the end (ch. xxviii) is a detailed account of Christ's descent into hell to liberate the spirits in prison, the history of which is said to have been obtained from Lenthius and Charinus, sons of Simeon, who were two of those "saints who slept," but were raised from the dead, and came into the holy city after the resurrection. This part of the history is so far valuable, that it throws some light upon the ancient ideas current among Christians on this subject. It is therefore considered by Birch (*Anctarium*, Proleg. p. vi) to be as valuable in this respect as the writings of the fathers.

The subscription to this book states that it was found by the emperor Theodosius among the public records in Jerusalem, in the hall of Pontius Pilate (A. D. 380). We read in ch. xxvii that Pilate himself wrote all the

transactions from the relation of Nicodemus, who had taken them down in Hebrew; and we are informed by Epiphanius that the Quartodecimans appealed to the *Acts of Pilate* in favor of their opinions as to the proper time of keeping Easter. It was written in these Acts that our Saviour suffered on the eighth Kal. of April, a circumstance which is stated in the subscription to the present *Acts*. It is uncertain, however, when this work was first called by the name of Nicodemus.

The two ancient apologists, Justin Martyr and Tertullian, both appeal in confirmation of our Saviour's miracles and crucifixion to the *Acts of Pilate* (Justin Martyr, *Apol.* p. 76, 84; Tertullian, *Apol.* c. 21, or English transl. by Chevallier, 1833). From this circumstance it has generally been held that such documents must have existed, although this fact has been called in question by Tanaquil Faber and Le Clerc (Jones, *On the Canon*, vol. ii, p. 282, pt. iii, ch. 29). These appeals, however, in all probability first furnished the idea of the present pious fraud. Mr. Jones supposes that this may have been done in order to silence those pagans who denied the existence of such Acts. The citations of those fathers are all found in the present work. (See Henke, *De Pontii Pilati actis in causa J. C. ad Tiber. missis*, 1784.)

We have already seen that a book entitled the *Acts of Pilate* existed among the Quartodecimans, a sect which originated at the close of the third century. We are informed by Eusebius that the heathens forged certain Acts of Pilate, full of all sorts of blasphemy against Christ, which they procured (A.D. 303) to be dispersed through the empire; and that it was enjoined on schoolmasters to put them into the hands of children, who were to learn them by heart instead of their lessons. But the character of the Gospel of Nicodemus, which contains no blasphemy of the kind, forbids us to identify it with those *Acts*. This gospel probably had its origin in a later age. From the circumstance of its containing the names of Lenthinus and Charinus, Mr. Jones conceives it to have been the work of the celebrated fabricator of gospels, Lucius Charinus, who flourished in the beginning of the 4th century. It is certainly not later than the 5th or 6th. "During the persecution under Maximin," says Gieseler (*Eccles. Hist.* vol. i, § 24, note), "the heathens first brought forward certain calumnious *Acts of Pilate* (Euseb. ix, 5), to which the Christians opposed others (Epiph. *Her.* 79, § 1), which were afterwards in various ways amended. One of these improved versions was afterwards called the Gospel of Nicodemus." See ACTS OF PILATE.

Beausobre suspected that the latter part of the book (the descent into hell) was taken from the *Gospel of Peter*, a work of Lucius Charinus now lost. Thilo (*Codex Apocryphus*) thinks that it is the work of a Jewish Christian, but it is uncertain whether it was originally written in Hebrew, Greek, or Latin. The only Greek writer who cites it is the author of the *Synaxarion*, and the first of the Latins who uses it is the celebrated Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* i, 20, 23).

The Gospel of Nicodemus (in Latin) was one of the earliest books printed, and there are subsequent editions in 1490, 1516, 1522, and 1538, and in 1569 in the *Orthodoxographia* of Grynaeus. It was afterwards published by Fabricius (*Cod. Apoc.*), who divided it into chapters. Fabricius gives us no information respecting the age or character of his MS., which is extremely defective and inaccurate. Mr. Jones republished this, with an English version.

The Greek Gospel of Nicodemus was first published from an incorrect Paris MS. by Birch (*Auctarium*), and subsequently from a collation of several valuable manuscripts, the most ancient of which are of the 13th century, by Thilo, with the Latin text of the very ancient MS. at Einsiedel, described by Gerbert in his *Iter Alemanniense*. It has been shown by Smidt (*Bibl. für Critik und Exegese*) that the present MSS. exhibit in their citations from the canonical books a text of the

6th century, and consequently that this gospel is extremely useful in a critical point of view.

The esteem in which this work was held in the Middle Ages may be seen from the number of early versions which were in popular use, of which innumerable MSS. have descended to our times. The earliest of these is the Anglo-Saxon translation, printed at Oxford in 1698, from a Cambridge MS. (Thwaites's *Herpetuchus*). This is a translation from the Latin, as none of the Greek MSS. contain Pilate's letter to Claudius. There are also MSS. of the same in the Bodleian and Canterbury libraries. That in the Bodleian is divided into thirty-four chapters. There are several MSS. of the English version in the Bodleian, one in Sion College, and one in English verse in Pepys's collection. It was also translated by Wickliffe; and there were versions printed in London, in 1507 and 1509, by Julian Notary and Wynkyn de Woide, which ran through several editions (Panzi's *Annals*). The latest published before Mr. Jones's work was by Joseph Wilson in 1767. He says nothing of the age of his MS., but the following specimen from the prologue may not prove uninteresting: "It befel in the 18th year of the signiory of Tiberius Cæsar, emperor of Rome, and in the signiory of Herod, who was king of Galilee, the 8th kalend of April, which is the 25th day of March, the fourth year of the son of Vellum, who was counselor of Rome, and *Olympius had been afore two hundred years and tuo*; at this time Joseph and Annas were lords above all justices of peace, mayors, and Jews. Nicodemus, who was a worthy prince, did write this blessed history in Hebrew, and Theodosius the emperor did translate it out of Hebrew into Latin, and bishop Turpin did translate it out of Latin into French, and hereafter did ensue the blessed history called the Gospel of Nicodemus." The regard, indeed, in which this book was held in England will be understood from the fact that, in 1524, Erasmus acquaints us that he saw the Gospel of Nicodemus affixed to one of the columns of the cathedral of Canterbury.

Translations were also common in French, Italian, German, and Swedish. In the French MSS. and editions it is united with the old romance of *Perceforest, King of Great Britain*. There was also a Welsh translation (Lhuys's *Archæologia*, p. 256), and the work was known to the Eastern Christians, and has been even supposed to be cited in the Coptic liturgy; but this has been shown by Ludolf to be a mistake, as the lesson is from the history of Nicodemus, in John iii (see Brunn, *De indol. atate et usu Evang. Nicod.* Berl. 1794; Tischendorf, *Pilati circa Chr. judicio quid lucis afferat ex Actis Pilati*, Lips. 1855). See NICODEMUS.

II. Of the gospels no longer extant, we know little more than that they once existed. We read in Irenæus, Epiphanius, Origen, Eusebius, and other ecclesiastical writers, of the Gospels of Eve or of Perfection, of Barnabas (ancient and modern), of Bartholomew, of Basilides, of Hesyclus, of Judas Iscariot, of the Valentinians, of Apollon, of Cerinthus, of the Twelve Apostles, and several others. Some of these were derived from the Gnostics and other heretics; others, as the Gospel of Matthias, are supposed by Mill, Grabe, and most learned men to have been genuine gospels, now lost. Those of which we have the fullest details are the following:

1. THE GOSPEL OF THE NAZARENES. This is most probably the same with that of the Hebrews, which was used by the Ebionites. It was supposed by St. Jerome to have been a genuine Gospel of Matthew, who, he says, wrote it in the Hebrew language and letters. He copied it himself from the original in the library of Casarea, translated it into Greek and Latin, and has given many extracts from it. Grabe conceived this gospel to have been composed by Jewish converts soon after our Lord's ascension, before the composition of the canonical Gospel of Matthew. Baronius, Grotius, father Simon, and Du Pin look upon

it as the Gospel of Matthew—interpolated, however, by the Nazarenes. Baronius and Grabe think that it was cited by Ignatius, or the author of the epistles ascribed to him. Others look upon it as a translation altered from the Greek of Matthew. Mr. Jones thinks that this gospel was referred to by Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians. It is referred to by Hegesippus (Eusebius, *Eccles. Hist.* iv, 22), Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* ii, p. 280), Origen, *Comm. on John*; *Hom. viii in Matthew*, and Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* iii, 25, 27, 39). Epiphanius (*Hær.* § 29, 30) informs us that it was held in great repute by the ancient Judaizing Christians, and that it began thus: "It came to pass in the days of Herod, king of Judæa, that John came baptizing with the baptism of repentance in the river Jordan," etc. It consequently wanted the genealogy and the first two chapters.

2. The GOSPEL OF THE EGYPTIANS is cited by Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* iii, p. 445, 452, 453, 465), Origen (*Hom. in Luc.* p. 1), Ambrose, Jerome (*Prof. to his Comm. on Matt.*), and Epiphanius (*Hær.* lxii, § 2). Grabe, Mill, Du Pin, and father Simon, who thought highly of this gospel, looked upon it as one of the works referred to by Luke in the commencement of his gospel. Mill ascribes its origin to the Essenes, and supposes this and the former gospel to have been composed in or a little before A.D. 58. It is cited by the Pseudo-Clement (*Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, Chevallier's translation, 1835), who is generally supposed to have written not before the 3d century.—Kitto, s. v.

III. *Literature.*—See Car. Chr. Schmidt's *Corpus omnium vet. Apocr. extra Biblia*; Klenker, *De Apocr. N. Test.* (Hamburg, 1798); Birch's *Actuarium*, fasc. 1 (Hafn. 1804); Cave, *Hist. Lit.*; Oudin, *Script. Eccl.*; Ant. v. Dale, *De Orig. idolor.* p. 253 sq.; Pritius, *Introduct.* in *N. Test.* p. 6, 58; Mosheim, *Dissert. ad Hist. Eccl. spect.* i, 217; Nitzsch, *De apocr. Evang.* (Viteb. 1808); Tischendorf, *De Ev. apocr. origine et usu* (Hag. 1851); Reuss, *Gesch. der H. S. neuen Test.* § 258 sq.; Hofmann, *Das Leben Jesu nach den Apocryphen* (Lpz. 1851). A list of most of these apocryphal addenda to the N. Test. may be seen in Toland's *Amygdon* (1699); and a fuller list in Toland's reply to Dr. Blackhall's (bishop of Exeter) attack on the *Amygdon*, found in Des Maizeaux's edition of Toland's *Miscellaneous* (posthumous) *Works* (London, 1747, 2 vols. 8vo), i, 350–403. Most of these spurious fragments were collected and published by Fabricius in his *Coder Apocryphus Novi Testamenti* (3 vols. 8vo, Hamb. 1719–43). This work, with additions by Thilo and others, was republished by Dr. Giles (London, 1852). English translations of some of these early forgeries will be found in the works of Jones, Lardner, Whiston, Cotton, and Laurence. Hone's *Apocryphal N. T.* (London, 1820) contains a translation of many of them. Other collections (in the original languages), more or less complete, have been made by Grabe (*Spicileg. Patrum et Hæret. sect.* i–iii, Oxon. 1698), Schmid (*Corpus Apocryph. extra Biblia*, Had. 1804), and especially Thilo (*Cod. Apocr. N. Test. coll. et illustr.* Lips. 1832, vol. i). Still later, Tischendorf has edited (in some cases for the first time published) the following apocryphal gospels (*Evangelia Apocrypha*, Lips. 1843, 8vo): "Protevangel of James" (Gr.); "Pseudo-Matthew's Gospel" (Lat.); "Gospel of the Nativity of Mary" (Lat.); "History of Joseph the Carpenter" (Latin, from the Arabic); "Gospel of Thomas" (Greek A); "Gospel of Thomas" (Greek B); "Gospel of Thomas" (Lat.); "Gospel of the Infancy of Christ" (Lat. from the Arab.); "Deeds of Pilate" (Greek A); "Deeds of Pilate" (Gr. B); "Descent of Christ into hell" (Latin A); "First Epistle of Pilate" (Lat.); "Descent of Christ into hell" (Lat. B); "Second Epistle of Pilate" (Lat.); "Anaphora of Pilate" (Gr. A); "Anaphora of Pilate" (Gr. B); "Paradosis of Pilate" (Gr.); "Death of Pilate" (Lat.); "Narrative of Joseph of Arimathea" (Gr.); "Defence of the

Saviour" (Lat.). See also H. Cowper, *The Apocryphal Gospels*, etc., translated, with notes, etc. (London, 1867, 8vo); A. Hilgenfeld, *Nor. Testam. extra canonem*, embracing the apocryphal gospels, epistles, etc., with notes, etc. (Lips. 1866 sq.). See APOCRYPHA.

Gösschel. See GOESCHEL.

**Gossip** (from "God" and "sib," a Saxon word signifying "kindred"), a name given in England to sponsors as bearing a spiritual relationship to the children for whom they stand.—Procter, *On Common Prayer*, p. 361.

**Gossner**, JOHANNES EVANGELISTA, a prominent divine of the Evangelical Church of Germany, was born in 1773, of Roman Catholic parents, at Hausen, near Augsburg. He studied at Dillingen under Sailer (q. v.) and Zimmer, entered in 1793 the College of Ingolstadt, and, having been ordained priest, was in 1797 appointed chaplain. The profoundly evangelical convictions which he had already had for several years were strengthened by personal intercourse and correspondence with Martin Boos (q. v.), and they were certainly not weakened by persecutions from ultramontane zealots. In 1804 he was appointed parish priest at Dirlwang, which position he resigned in 1811 in order to accept a small benefice at Munich, which allowed him greater liberty in his evangelistic and literary labors. Having been deposed in 1817 on account of his evangelical views, he was in 1819 appointed professor at the gymnasium of Dusseldorf. From 1820 to 1824 he was pastor of a German congregation in St. Petersburg; in 1826 he openly joined the Evangelical Church; in 1827 he became pastor of the Bethlehem church at Berlin. He died March 20, 1858. He wrote a great deal to the last. At seventy he learned English, and translated some of Ryle's tracts when he was upwards of eighty. His writings, numbering (exclusive of many posthumous works) forty-six, occupy the presses of a separate book and tract society. They enjoy unusual popularity, some having run through annual or semi-annual editions for many years. Among the best known of his works are the *Schatzkästlein* (1824) and *Goldkörner* (1859). Up to the spring of 1858 he corrected proofs and continued his correspondence. The summer previous he was still able to train his vines. He established a missionary society, which during his lifetime sent out more than 140 missionaries. His life was, like the life of Abraham, one of wonderful faith. From humble little Hausen and the unnoticed struggles of a country priest, he rose to be the *Father Gossner* of a reverent, religious Germany. The story of his life is well told in a little volume published by the Carters, of New York.—Bethmann-Hollweg, *J. Gossner* (Berlin, 1858); see also Prochnow, *J. Gossner, Biographie aus Tagebüchern u. Briefen* (Berl. 1863–4, 2 vols.); Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, xix, 572. (A. J. S.)

**Gotama**, a Hindoo philosopher, the exact time of whose life is not known. The Indians consider him as the author of the philosophical system which, under the name of *Nyaya* (logic), is still in use among them. All we know of him is derived from the mythical tradition contained in the *Ramayana* and the *Puranas*. According to this legend, Gotama was born in Mount Himalaya, and for a long time lived as a hermit in the woods; he then married Ahalya, one of the daughters of Brahma, but subsequently divorced her for having been led astray by Indra. He spent the remainder of his life in prayer and ascetic practices, and when he died he left his disciples precepts which they commented on, and which together form the *Nyaya*. The work in which his system is expounded has been published, for the use of the Indian schools, under the title *Nyaya sutra vritti* (*The logical Aphorisms of Gotama*), with a Commentary by Vishvanath Battacharya, published under the authority of the Committee of Public Instruction, Calcutta, 1828, 8vo. The book is

divided into five parts: the first and most important contains the dogmatic exposition of the doctrine of the *Nyaya*. The author proceeds by axioms, of which there are sixty in his first part. He distinguishes sixteen points in the art of reasoning, the first nine teaching to demonstrate truth, and the seven others to defend it against objections. He begins by pointing out the general sources of certainty, of which he recognises four: perception, induction, comparison, and divine or human testimony. He next inquires into the objects of certainty, i. e. the objects presented to human investigation, and recognises twelve. Each of these objects can be considered in different ways, and they can all be brought down to one—the knowledge of man and of his destiny. After having thus established his general dialectic principles, Gotama proceeds to their application. His third point is doubt: when anything has been presented to our knowledge by one of the above-named sources of certainty, we must first doubt it, and only affirm its truth after thorough investigation. Affirmation is the fourth point. After a thing is affirmed it has yet to be proved, and first of all exemplified: this forms the fifth point. When once the illustrative example is found, the object of the demonstration has to be stated: this is the sixth point. The seventh is the enumeration of the five members of the demonstration. Colebrooke gives the following illustration of this process of argumentation, in which some think they recognise Greek syllogism: 1. *proposition*, This mountain is burning; 2. *reason*, for it smokes; 3. *explanation*, whatever smokes is burning, as, for instance, a kitchen fire; 4. *application*, and the mountain smokes; 5. *conclusion*, hence it is burning. The eighth point, which is called *reductio ad absurdum* by Colebrooke, and *raisonnement supplétif* by Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire, is a sort of confirmation of the argument. Finally, the ninth point is the definitive conclusion, the absolute affirmation which closes the argument. The last seven points treat of all the objections which can be opposed to a demonstrated fact. These objections are sophisms, and he who uses them will necessarily be overcome by his opponent if the latter follows strictly the rules laid down in the *Nyaya*. As for the defender of truth, Gotama promises him not only the pleasure of defeating his adversary, but also everlasting happiness. This brief account of the first part of the *Nyaya* will suffice to show how inadequate the system of the Indian philosopher is as an analysis of the operations of the human mind. Still there is much to be admired in the doctrine of the *Nyaya*. The method was an immense progress for India, and as such deserves a high place in the history of philosophy. It would deserve a still higher one if it had, as was advanced by Sir William Jones, served as a model for the *Organon*, and if the fifth point of Gotama had been the origin of Aristotle's syllogism. Jones maintained, on the strength of a more than doubtful tradition, that Callisthenes gathered during Alexander's expedition a number of details on Indian doctrines, and afterwards transmitted them to Aristotle. According to him the logic of the latter would be but a development of Gotama's system. This strange assertion is completely disproved by Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire, who has shown that there is no relation between the *Nyaya* and the *Organon*, and that those who spoke of their resemblance must have been unacquainted with either. His conclusion is that the Greek system owed nothing to the Indian. But might not the question be reversed so as to inquire whether the Indian system may not to some extent be derived from the Greek? Greek civilization hovered for centuries near the Indus and Himalaya. The Greek kingdoms of Bactria appear to have exerted great influence over the poetry of India: may they not also have had some influence over its philosophical systems? And may not the *Nyaya* in particular, which differs so much in its analytical process from the other Indian system,

owe its peculiarities to the influence of Greece? These are questions which it has so far been impossible to solve, since none has yet been able to find out the dates of the various Indian systems. Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire believes the *Nyaya* older than the *Organon*, but admits that it is only authentically named in works posterior to the Christian era. See Sir William Jones, *Asiat. Research.*; Ward, *View of the History, Literature, and Mythology of the Hindoos*; Colebrooke, in the *Transact. of the As. Soc. of Gt. Britain and Ireland*, 1823, i, 76, and *Miscel. Essays*, vol. i; Windischmann, *Die Philosophie, im Fortgang d. Weltgesch.*, pt. i, p. 1904; Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire, in the *Mém. l'Académie des Sciences morales et politiques*, iii, 241; *Journ. des Savants*, April and June, 1855; *Diet. des Sciences philosoph. art.* Gotama, *Nyaya*, Philosophie indienne; Ritter, *Gesch. der Philosophie*; Hoefer, *Nov. Biog. Gén.* xxi, 336; Bigandet (Rom. Cath. bishop), *The Life or Legend of Gaudama* (Rangoon, 1866, 8vo).

**Gothic Architecture**, the style of architecture that prevailed in central and western Europe from the middle of the 12th till the 16th century, being preceded by the Romanesque (q. v.), and followed by the Renaissance style (q. v.). Under the influence of the revival of taste for classic art, the Renaissance architects applied the name *Gothic*, meaning thereby *barbaric*, to the styles of architecture that were developed north of the Alps during the Middle Ages. The name Gothic is now limited by critics of all nations to the architecture of the period above indicated.

In the extraordinary activity that pervaded every department of social, industrial, intellectual, and religious life during the 12th century, many churches were founded upon a scale of grandeur and magnificence which, with the exception of a few isolated cases (as the Santa Sophia, q. v.), was entirely unprecedented in the history of Christianity. These churches embodied, in the style and spirit of their architecture, and the grand scale upon which they were projected, more of the sublime aspiration of the Christian faith, of confidence in its endurance, and love and sacrifice in its behalf, than do the churches of any other period. Many elements of the Gothic architecture had been developed during the classic, Byzantine, and Romanesque periods; others were taken from the Sarcenic architecture; and others still were developed within the Gothic itself. The typical features of the Gothic architecture are: the universal use of the pointed arch (Fig. 1); a general tendency to vertical lines;



Fig. 1. Pointed Arches (from Lübke's *Geschichte der Baukunst*).




Fig. 2. Section of an Arch in the Cathedral at Nevers (ibid.).




Fig. 3. a, b, Capital and Base, and c, Section of a Pillar in the Cathedral at Cologne (ibid.).





Fig. 4. Window in St. Lambert's Church in Münster (ibid.).

all mouldings are traced by mathematical lines (Fig. 2), whereas in the Greek architecture they were drawn with a free hand; the mouldings, capitals, pillars, etc., have lost all traditional classical forms and proportions, the pillars being often many times their diameter in height; the pillars have their outlines cut by numerous and often deep upright mouldings (Fig. 3), or are composed of a round nucleus surrounded by many smaller columns; the windows are greatly enlarged, and the walls are proportionally diminished; paintings, being thus crowded away from the walls, are replaced by paintings upon the windows [see GLASS PAINTING]; the windows are ornamented with delicate and complicated tracery (Fig. 4); the walls

are sustained against lateral thrust by prominent buttresses and by flying-buttresses (Fig. 5); the ornamen-




Fig. 5. Flying-buttress of the Cathedral at Cologne (ibid.).

tation is conventionalized from various forms of foliage, and is distributed freely over all prominent parts of the building, being thrown in great profusion over the façades, and especially around the main entrances; the towers are square at the base, octagonal above, and terminate in lofty spires, which are richly decorated with ornament; the plan is cruciform, the apsis being replaced by a choir, which is surrounded by a row of chapels (Fig. 6).




Fig. 6. Plan of the Cathedral at Cologne (ibid.).

While these are the typical features of the Gothic architecture, great variety prevailed in their adaptation in the different periods of the style, and in the various lands where it was employed.

Gothic architecture owes its character mainly to the adoption of the pointed arch. There is no longer a



Fig. 7. Interior of the Cathedral of Cologne (ibid.).

discussion as to the origin or the invention of the pointed arch, as it is to be found occasionally in all the most ancient styles of architecture, as the Egyptian, the early Greek, the Etruscan, and the Roman. It is found in the court of a monastery in Sicily, which was built in the 6th century after Christ. It was adopted in Saracenic edifices in Cairo as early as the 9th century. Probably a knowledge of its effects in architecture was brought to Europe from the Orient by the Crusaders, though the production of the pointed arch by the crossing of round arches in the external ornamentation of Romanesque churches could not have escaped the notice of architects. The contest for supremacy of the pointed over the round arch lasted a long time, the two being often employed in different parts of the same edifice. The earliest church in which the pointed arch only was adopted is the cathedral of St. Denis, founded 1144. The Gothic style, being thus fully developed, spread rapidly over the Isle de France, Normandy, England, Spain, and the countries bordering on the Rhine. A large number of the most magnificent churches in the world were founded between 1150 and 1300, and thus the new style had immediate opportunity for full development. (Fig. 7.)

Three chief periods are usually marked in the history of Gothic architecture. During the first (1144-1280), called by English writers the "early English" period, the general effect of the style was very grand, though rather severe. The ornamentation was rather meagre, and sculpture was used rather sparingly on ex-

teriors. During the second period (1280-1380), termed by many writers the "decorated" or "complete Gothic" period, greater freedom and lightness were introduced into all the ornamentation, without diminishing the boldness of the general effect. The windows were enlarged and filled with rich flowing tracery. The third, usually termed the "perpendicular" period (1380-1550), and extending till the revival of classic architecture, was marked by a general decadence of style, and finally by a loss of all true Gothic spirit. The arches were depressed; beauty of outline disappeared from the mouldings; a minuteness, and finally a triviality, was introduced into all the ornamentation. The rapid decadence of the style was contemporaneous with the revival of taste for ancient classic art. In less than a century it was banished from all the countries where it had held sole dominion for nearly four centuries.

The Gothic churches in France are distinguished for the magnificence of their façades and the grandeur of their interiors. As the true object of a church is to have a good interior, the French Gothic churches are to be esteemed superior to those of any other land. The cathedral at Rheims (Fig. 8) is esteemed the finest Gothic church in existence. The other most important churches are the cathedrals of Paris, Amiens, Rouen, Dijon, Chartres, Beauvais, etc. In the cathedral at Paris (Notre Dame), and in some other French Gothic churches, there is a greater tendency to horizontalness in the lines of the exterior than is found in the English or German Gothic.






Fig. 8. Façade of the Cathedral of Rheims (ibid.).

The English Gothic cathedrals surpass those of all other lands in the varied combinations of striking effects in the exteriors. The windows often overpower the doors and other features of the façade, and the nave is usually too long and narrow for fine effect. The plan is frequently rectangular, and is sometimes crossed by two transepts. The finest examples of English Gothic are the cathedrals of York (Fig. 9), Salisbury, Canterbury, Lincoln, Peterborough, and the Westminster Abbey. The richest interior in English churches is that of Henry's chapel in the Westminster Abbey. The grandeur of the effect of this interior is diminished, however, by the minuteness of the ornamentation.

In the German Gothic churches the spires are more beautifully wrought, and are more harmoniously joined to the towers than in the churches of any other country. The spires of the cathedrals of Freiburg and of Vienna are considered the finest in the world. The

round choir, with a row of chapels, that prevails in the plans of most French Gothic churches, is generally adopted. The cathedral of Cologne (founded 1248) is the largest Gothic church ever erected. Its towers are now (1869) being finished. When they are completed, this edifice will be the most glorious work of ecclesiastical architecture ever erected. The style is somewhat affected by the too great minuteness of the detail. The harmonious perpendicular tendency of the lines is unexampled in any other edifice (Fig. 10). The other chief Gothic churches of Germany are the cathedrals of Strasburg, Freiburg, Ulm, Vienna, Magdeburg, Meissen.

The Spanish surpassed the French, English, or German Gothic in the varied richness of outline; but there were frequently too many horizontal lines in the interior as well as the exterior, and the ornament was often overlaid. The cathedral of Burgos (Fig. 11), begun in 1224 and finished in 1567, is marked by a




Fig. 10. Cathedral of Cologne (Gut.).




Fig. 9. Facade of the Cathedral of York (Gut.).




Fig. 11. Cathedral of Burgos (ibid.).

prodigality of external ornamentation. But, with all this richness, there is a lack of repose and of lightness in the general effect. Other important Gothic churches in Spain are the cathedrals of Orvieto, Toledo, Barcelona, Oviedo, Leon, and Valencia. The influence of the Moorish architecture is visible in many of the Gothic churches in Spain. There are several excellent examples of the Gothic architecture in Portugal, as the cloister church in Batalha and the church in Belem. The entrance to the mausoleum of Manoel, in the church of Batalha, is one of the most gorgeous specimens of Moro-Gothic architecture.

In Scotland, Belgium, and Holland, Gothic architecture took the general characteristics of this style in the adjacent countries of England, France, and Germany. The cathedral of Antwerp is remarkable for the beauty of some of the details of the interior. On the other hand, the violations of constructive and aesthetic laws, both in the interior and in the exterior,

are striking proofs of the decadence of artistic feeling, during the latter part of the history of Gothic architecture. In Scandinavia, also, Gothic architecture is marked by the development of few, if any, native elements. The cathedral of Upsala is essentially a French, and that of Drontheim an English edifice. The interior of the latter is marked by a number of exceedingly picturesque effects.

Gothic architecture was never fully naturalized in Italy. The traditions of classical and basilican architecture in favor of round arches and horizontal lines overpowered the Gothic tendency to perpendicular lines. The predilection for paintings on walls prevented the adoption of glass-painting in the windows. Towers surmounted by spires were replaced by campaniles adjacent to the church. Marble of two colors is usually employed in the exteriors, and mosaic paintings frequently replace sculpture in the façades. The fronts, though very impressive in themselves, are




Fig. 12. Cathedral of Siena (ibid.).

often false, not representing the true size of the church. The finest examples are the cathedrals of Siena (Fig. 12), Orvieto, Florence, Perugia, and Milan. The cathedral at Milan has a magnificent interior, and its roof is covered by a forest of statuary and turrets. The tower of the cathedral of Florence, designed by Giotto, is the most beautiful ever erected. Its cost was over \$5,000,000.

It is a mistake to consider Gothic architecture to be adapted only to ecclesiastical edifices. During the Middle Ages this style was applied with marked effect to edifices of all kinds—to castles and fortified gates of cities, as well as to city halls, courts of justice, and palatial residences.

As to the material employed in the erection of Gothic edifices, stone was generally used. In Italy especially, the finest marbles were often employed. With marble of two colors very pleasant variations of surface effects were produced, many of which were inconsistent with the extensive use of buttresses and flying buttresses that were so generally introduced in the Gothic edifices north of the Alps. Brick was also employed with excellent success in the erection of Gothic edifices, both ecclesiastical, civil, and domestic; this was especially the case in North Germany. Fine contrasts of surface color also were produced in North Italy by the alternation of brick and colored marble.

But few Gothic churches have been completed, and in fewer yet has the original design been carried out. At least one, and sometimes both spires are generally lacking. This incompleteness or defect in design is

often copied in modern Gothic churches, frequently producing very absurd effects.

With all its beauty and even grandeur, Gothic architecture has some features that make its adoption in modern, and especially in Protestant church edifices, a most dangerous experiment. The pillars are apt to obstruct the view and sound. The clerestory is so high that it often detracts from the harmony of the interior, while its ornamentation is also lost to the view; high pointed ceiling is apt to produce an echo; and the churches are very difficult to heat. But the great error in modern Gothic edifices is the indiscriminate copying of unfinished churches, built in the age of decadence of Gothic architecture. See Kugler, *Geschichte der Baukunst*; Lübke, *Geschichte der Baukunst*; Ferguson, *Styles of Architecture*; Huggins, *Course and Current of Architecture*; Pugin, *Gothic Ornaments*; Viollet-le-Duc, *Dictionnaire de l'Architecture Française*; Street, *Gothic Architecture in Spain*. G. F. C.

**Gothic Version of the Bible.** The Mæso-Goths were a German tribe which settled on the borders of the Greek empire, and their language is essentially a German dialect. Their version of the Bible was made by Ulphilas, in the fourth century, after Greek MSS. in the N. T., and after the Septuagint in the Old. The author is generally regarded as an Arian; but his peculiar doctrinal sentiments do not seem to have influenced his translation. Of the O.-T. portion, nothing but a fragment of Nehemiah has been printed, although parts of other books have been discovered. A great part of the New has been published at different times in fragments. The four gospels ex-

ist in the very celebrated MS. called the *Codex Argenteus*, now preserved in the library of the university at Upsal, and minutely described by Dr. E. D. Clarke and Zahn. See ARGENTEUS CODEx. This MS., however, has considerable chasms. The gospels have been several times printed from it, but not very correctly. The ed. of Uppström is the most exact and beautiful (1854). Bosworth has lately published the Gothic and Anglo-Saxon Gospels together (Lond. 1865). Knittel discovered fragments of Paul's Epistle to the Romans in a *codex rescriptus* belonging to the Wolfenbüttel library, which he published in 1762, 4to, and which were republished by Zahn in the complete edition of the Gospels issued in 1808, 4to. In 1817, Angelo Mai discovered important parts of the Gothic version among five *codices rescripti* in the Ambrosian library at Milan. They contain, for the most part, the Pauline Epistles, with the exception of that to the Hebrews, and two fragments of Matthew. Various portions were printed by Mai, in conjunction with Castillionægus, in 1819. In 1829 the latter published the fragments of Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians. In 1834 fragments of the Epistle to the Romans, the First to the Corinthians, and that to the Ephesians; and in 1835, the fragments of the Pauline Epistles to the Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, and the First to the Thessalonians. In 1839 the same scholar published the fragments of the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon. These were all combined in the edition by Gabelentz and Loebe, 2 vols. 1836, 1847.—Kitto, s. v. See VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE.

**Gothólías** (Γοθολίας), father of Josias, which latter was one of the "sons of Elam" who returned from Babylon with Esdras (1 Esd. viii, 33); the same as ATHALIAH (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra viii, 7).

**Gothóniel** (Γοθονίη), i. e. Othniel, father of Charbris, who was one of the governors (ἀρχοντες) of the city of Bethulia (Judith vi, 15).

**Goths**, THE, appeared in the countries of the Lower Danube, the former seat of the Getæ, in the 3d century A. D. Yet from this we are not to infer that the former drove away and replaced the latter, but, on the contrary, they are to be considered as one and the same people, as has been shown by J. Grimm (*Gesch. d. deutsch. Sprache*, 2 vols. 2d ed. Leipz. 1853). This consideration sheds an important light on a period in the religious history of the Goths which had before been involved in deep obscurity, and gives us an insight into their deeply-rooted predisposition to embrace Christianity. The mighty confederacy of the Getæ, founded by Borebistes, was dissolved even before the emperor Augustus took up arms against them. Some of the dispersed tribes entered the Roman empire in the provinces of the Lower Danube about the first century A. D., and from them sprung a new nation, composed of these different tribes again united, which, under the name of Goths, appeared during the reign of Caracalla, in the beginning of the 3d century A. D. Their unity emboldened them to attack the Roman empire; and in the reign of Alex. Severus we already find them receiving tribute to preserve the peace, and the issue of the struggle with Decius led to new invasions. Commodian, the Christian apologist of the times, regarded them as instruments of divine justice, and precursors of the anti-Christ: according to his statement, the seventh persecution of the Christians ended on their approach. Three of their armies again invaded the Roman empire during the reign of Valerian and Gallienus, and, among the monuments of antiquity, destroyed the splendid temple of Diana at Ephesus. Finally, after a fierce conflict, Constantine the Great concluded with them a peace, which lasted so long as his family reigned. Some Christians, carried away as prisoners by the Goths during the invasion above spoken of, became the instruments of their conversion. Sozomen says (ii, 6): "The priests

taken captives healed the sick and cast out devils by calling on the name of Christ, the Son of God; and they, besides, overcame all the prejudices existing against the name of Christian by the purity of their life and by their virtues. The barbarians, full of admiration of the life and deeds of these men, saw that it would be well to gain the favor of the Christian God; and when they sought for it, they were instructed, baptized, and organized into congregations." The Arian historian, Philostorgius, gives a similar account of the propagation of Christianity among them. In the reign of Constantine, Athanasius speaks of the triumphs of the Gospel over the barbarians, and especially the Goths, now civilized. At the Council of Nice in 325, Theophilus, a Gothic bishop, subscribed the decrees. Ulphilas (see the article), having become bishop in 348, labored with great zeal for the propagation of Christianity among the Goths, even in the tribes beyond the Danube, notwithstanding the persecutions of Athanaric, the heathen king of the Visigoths, who commanded Christians to worship idols he caused to be drawn up in front of their houses, under penalty of being burned in their dwellings (*Acta S. S.*, Sept. 15). In the middle of the 4th century, Eutyches and Audius, which latter had separated from the Syrian Church, both labored among the Goths beyond the Danube, and the result was the erection of several monasteries for the converts, which, however, disappeared in the persecution of 370. These persecutions ceased only when Fritigern, rival of Athanaric, took the Christians under his protection, and embraced Arianism, the general form of Christianity among the Goths. In 370 Ulphilas translated the Scriptures into Gothic; but soon after, the hordes of Huns crowding from Asia upon the Ostrogoths, whose king, Hermanrich, was unable to resist them, drove part of the Visigoths south of the Danube into the Roman territory, while others followed Fritigern into Thrace, where war, and the persecutions of the Roman prefects, interrupted the missions for a time. Finally, Fritigern, victorious in 378, marched with his troops on Constantinople, but died; and Theodosius, the new emperor, concluded a peace with Athanaric, who had once more joined the Goths, and who died also soon after. Theodosius then induced them to become *federati* of Rome; and, in order to unite them still more to the empire, the council of Constantinople (A. D. 383), attempted, but unsuccessfully, to frame a creed acceptable to both the Arians and the Nicene party; the latter also prevented the assembling of another council promised to the former for 388. Religious divisions among the Goths afterwards permitted Chrysostom to attempt uniting the secessionists from Arianism with the Catholic Church, and he ordained presbyters, deacons, and lectors who spoke the Gothic language; he also sent bishop Unila to the Goths in the Crimea. Gothia, along the Cimmerian Bosphorus, was, during the whole of the Middle Ages, a see of the Byzantine Church, and the bishop of Capha was also named bishop of Gothia as late as the 18th century. The Catholic Goths of the Crimea, mentioned in the 16th century by Busbek, disappeared with the surname of the bishop. The *Gothi minores* near Nicopolis seem to have disappeared among the nations which invaded the Danubian countries in the 7th century, and the two principal Gothic tribes returned West. The Visigoths, under Alaric, invaded the countries south of the Danube to the Peloponnesus, destroying the temples and altars of the heathen gods; the sacking of Eleusis put an end to the famed mysteries of Ceres; pagan priests and philosophers were put to death; and finally, in 408, after the death of Stilicho, Alaric appeared before Rome, demanding tribute. To satisfy him, the statues of the gods—among them the *Virtus Romana*—were melted. Alaric came again in 410, when he made the Christian prefect Attalus emperor of Rome; yet, finding that his end was not accomplished, he returned a third time and lay waste

the city, with the exception of the Christian churches, sparing only such of the inhabitants as had taken refuge in them. After Alaric's death, his brother-in-law Athaulf succeeded him; and, having married Galla Placidia, daughter of Theodosius the Great (in which marriage some saw a fulfilment of Dan. ii, 32), he attempted to reanimate the decaying Roman empire by Gothic help. Finally, the Visigoths were rewarded for conquering Spain to Rome by permanent possessions in Gaul, where they founded an independent empire. See VISIGOTHS. The Ostrogoths settled for a while in Pannonia, then some of them united with the Visigoths in Gaul, where the greater part followed Theodoric into the Eastern empire. The emperor Zeno finally induced them to remove to Italy, where Theodoric, in 489, founded the Ostrogoth kingdom (see that art.). —Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* v, 251 sq.; Dr. J. Aschbach, *Geschichte der Westgothen* (Frank. a. M. 1827); Krafft, *Kirchenesch. d. germ. Völker* (Berlin, 1854); Helfferich, *Der westgotische Arianismus* (Leipz. 1860).

**Gotthardt.** See GODEHARD.

**Gottschalk** (GOTTESCHALC, GODESCHALC, GOTHESCHALC, surnamed Fulgentius from his scholarship), a theologian of the 9th century, celebrated for his share in the controversy on the subject of predestination and grace. He was born about 806 at or near Mentz, and was intrusted to the monks at Fulda (q. v.) at an early age. Growing up, he wished to abandon the monastic life, and obtained an ecclesiastical release from his vow, but the abbot, Rabanus Maurus, retained him against his will, on the ground that no human power could annul the contract entered into by his parents. After studying at Paris he entered the Benedictine convent at Orbais, and was ordained. He was soon distinguished in the cloister for his paradoxes, his love of novelty, his zeal for science, his bold opinions, and, above all, for the warmth with which he supported them. At this period Augustine's works were the favorite study of all ecclesiastics; the learned young men occupied their time in copying them out, the professors in expounding, and the old men in recommending them. Gottschalk passed his life in endeavoring to understand them, and lost himself in the field of metaphysics and mystery. He wished to explain, understand, and penetrate everything. He believed that he found in Augustine the twofold predestination, viz. of some to everlasting life, and of others to eternal death. He visited Rome, Casarea, Alexandria, and Constantinople, everywhere sowing his opinions, and only reaping disappointment. On his return to Italy in 847, he had several conversations with Nothingus, bishop of Verona, on the subject of his doctrines; and this prelate, alarmed at his principles, thought it his duty to combat them; and, after having vainly endeavored to convince Gottschalk of his danger, he referred him to Rabanus, now archbishop of Mentz. He judged, as Nothingus had done, that Gottschalk taught a dangerous and fatal predestinarianism, that is to say, the doctrine that "God had, from all eternity, predestinated men to their salvation or damnation; which doctrine takes away a man's liberty, destroys all idea of good and evil, and reduces the human will to a kind of automaton." In Gottschalk's system, foreknowledge was identified completely with predestination; and predestination was arbitrary, both with regard to the saved and to the lost: the one infallibly attaining eternal life, "the other being so necessitated to continue in his sins that he can only be in name a subject of God's grace, and only in appearance a partaker of the sacrament." See PREDESTINATION. Gottschalk, hearing that Rabanus had declared against him, went to Mentz hoping to undeceive or convert him, but he was unsuccessful. After several useless conferences, they wrote against each other; and in one of his writings Gottschalk accuses his adversary

of Semi-pelagianism. The bishop, offended by this recrimination, assembled a council at Mentz, A. D. 848, to which he cited Gottschalk, condemned him as a heretic, and sent him for justice to the archbishop of Rheims, Hincmar, his proper judge, to whom he wrote a synodal letter, concluding with these words: "We send to you this vagabond monk, in order that you may shut him up in his convent, and prevent him from propagating his false, heretical, and scandalous doctrine." Hincmar was one of the most learned men of his time, but he was also the vainest of his knowledge, and the most fiery. He was delighted to have an occasion for showing his talent for controversy and his zeal for the Church. Having ordered Gottschalk to appear before him, he questioned him, and found him to be firm to his principles; from that time he became his irreconcilable enemy. He assembled a council of thirteen bishops at the castle of Quiercy, in Picardy, A. D. 849, to which he invited Charles the Bald, and had the doctrine of Gottschalk examined before that prince. The unfortunate, but intrepid monk was condemned as a heretic, suspended from the sacerdotal office, declared incapable of teaching, and unworthy of liberty, cruelly flogged before the king and bishops, and shut up for the remainder of his life in the abbey of Hautvillers. Such barbarous treatment, far from restoring Gottschalk to the Church, only revolted his proud and independent spirit, and confirmed him in his opinions. He died in prison, in the monastery of Hautvillers, Oct. 30, 867. When he was at the point of death, the monks who had the care of him gave notice of it to Hincmar, and asked him how they were to treat him. Hincmar had the cruelty to send to Gottschalk a formulary of faith, with an order to sign it, on pain of being deprived of the last sacraments, and of ecclesiastical burial. Gottschalk rejected it with indignation, and Hincmar's order was executed in all its rigor: nevertheless, the treatment he had undergone was censured by a large portion of the clergy of France. Lupus, abbot of Ferrières, Fulgentius, bishop of Troyes, and Remi, bishop of Lyons, highly disapproved of it. Remi, among others, said, and repeated many times, that heretics had formerly been censured, not by blows, but by reasoning. Rattramus of Corby published an apology for Gottschalk, and proved, as far as it could be proved, that the doctrine he had professed was that of St. Augustine, and had always been that of the Catholic Church. John Scotus Erigena wrote against Gottschalk in his treatise *De divina predestinatione contra Gottschalcum Monachum*. The creed of the opponents of Gottschalk may be found set forth in four articles in Harduin, *Concilia*, v, 18, 19. Archbishop Usher published a life of Gottschalk (Dublin, 1631, 4to, and Usher's *Works*, iv, 1) which was reprinted at Hanau in 1662 (8vo). Full accounts of the controversy may be found in Vossius, *Historia Pelagiana*, lib. vii; Manguin, *Œt. auctorum, qui sœc. ix. de predestinatione et gratia scripserunt Opera et Fragmenta* (forming the first part of his *Œt. de predestinatione et Gratia*, Paris, 1650, 2 vols. 4to); Natalis Alexander, *Hist. Eccles. sœc. ix. x.* See also Hook, *Ecc. Biogr.* v, 341; Gieseler, *Ch. History*, per. iii, div. i, § 16; Mosheim, *Ch. History*, cent. ix, pt. ii, ch. iii, § 22-25; Hase, *Church Hist.* § 214; especially Neander, *Church History*, iii, 472-480; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, § 183; Dupin, *History of Eccles. Writers*, cent. ix; Monnier, *De Godescalci et J. Scoti Erigenæ Controversia* (1833); Hofer, *Novæ Biograph. Générale*, xxi, 242; Arnold, *Theological Critic*, March, 1852, art. iii; Borrach, *Gottschalk, sein Leben u. seine Lehre* (Thorn, 1868, 8vo); *Methodist Quarterly*, July, 1857, p. 352; Ilgen, *Zeitschrift f. d. h'ist. Theol.* 1859, Heft 4.

**Gouge, Thomas**, son of William, was born at Bow, Middlesex, in 1605, was educated at Cambridge, and settled at St. Spulchre's, London. He was a learned divine, an earnest preacher, most exemplary

in attending to all the duties of his pastoral charge, and, by the excellent qualities and accomplishments that distinguished and adorned his character, he possessed great and extensive influence among his clerical brethren, as well as in general society. "The virtue, however, which above all others shone brightest in him," says archbishop Tillotson, "and was his reigning attribute, was his cheerful and unwearied diligence in acts of pious charity. In this he left behind him all that ever I knew, and had a singular sagacity and prudence in devising the most effectual ways of doing good. For the last nine or ten years of his life, he did almost wholly apply his charity to Wales, because there he judged there was most occasion for it; he did not only lay out whatever he could spare out of his own estate, but employed his whole time and pains to excite and engage the charity of others for assisting him in it. By the large and bountiful contributions thus obtained, to which he constantly added two thirds of his own income (amounting to £200 a year), there were every year 800, and sometimes 1000 poor children educated by his means; and by this example several of the most considerable towns in Wales were excited to bring up, at their own charge, the like number of poor children in the like manner, and under his care and instruction. But which was the greatest work of all, and amounted indeed to a mighty charge, he procured a new and very fair impression of the Bible, and the liturgy of the Church of England, in the Welsh tongue, to the number of 8000; the former impression being spent, and not twenty of them to be had in all London. This was a work of such a charge that it was not likely to have been done in any other way. And always, but usually twice a year, he travelled over a great part of Wales, none of the easiest countries to travel in; but for the love of God, and all things cheerfully endured all privations; so that, all things considered, there have not, since the primitive times of Christianity, been any among the sons of men to whom that glorious character of the Son of God might be better applied, that he *'went about doing good.'*" He died October, 29, 1681. Among his writings are *The Principles of Religion* (1679);—*Young Man's Guide to Heaven* (1681), and other practical treatises. His *Works* are collected in one vol. 8vo, with a sketch of his life and Tillotson's funeral sermon at his burial (Lond. 1706). His sermon on *The Surest and Safest Way of Thriving* was reprinted in 1856, with a sketch of his life by T. Binney (Lond. 12mo).—Jamieson, *Cyclop. of Biography*, p. 230; Tillotson, *Works*, i, 265 sq.; Neal, *History of the Puritans*, iii, 233; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 710.

**Gouge, William, D.D.**, an eminent Puritan divine, was born in Bow in 1575, and educated at Eton and Cambridge. He entered the ministry at the age of thirty-one, and was minister of St. Ann's, Blackfriars, London, for forty-five years. He was esteemed as the father of the London ministers, and the spiritual oracle of his time. In 1643 he was called to be a member of the Assembly of Divines, and was in such reputation that in the moderator's absence he frequently filled the chair. He was appointed one of the annotators on the Scriptures, and performed, as his part, from the beginning of 1 Kings to the book of Job, in a manner that gained high approbation. He also published several works, the principal of which are: *Domestic Duties*, and *The Whole Armor of God*;—*The Lord's Prayer Explained*; all to be found in his *Works*, revised and enlarged (Lond. 1626, fol.);—a learned and very useful *Commentary on the Hebrews* (Lond. 1655, 2 vols. fol.), containing a thousand of his Wednesday lectures. He died December 12, 1653.—Neal, *History of the Puritans*, ii, 611; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s. v.; Middleton, *Evangelical Biography*, iii, 267; *Life*, by his Son, prefixed to his *Works* (1665).

**Goulart, Simon**, a French Protestant theologian,

was born at Senlis, October 20, 1543. He embraced the Reformation in 1565, went to study theology at Geneva in 1566, and was consecrated pastor on the 20th of October of the same year. He obtained at once charge of a rural congregation, and in 1571 became pastor of the parish of St. Jervais, Geneva. Here his plain speaking brought him repeatedly into trouble with the civil authorities, yet he remained at Geneva, notwithstanding numerous calls from other places. After the death of Beza (January 2, 1607), the pastors chose him for their president, but he resigned that office December 18, 1612. He died at Geneva, February 3, 1628. Goulart was a very prolific writer, both of original works and of translations and compilations.

Among his scores of publications we name: *Imitations chrestiennes*, etc. (1574, 8vo);—*Expositio verissima et succincta de rebus nuper bello gestis inter Allobrogum regulum et Helveticos regis Galliarum auxiliares copias* (1589, 4to);—*Vingt-huit Discours chrétiens touchant l'estat du monde et de l'Eglise de Dieu* (1591, 16mo);—*Apophtegmatum sacrorum Loci communes, ex sacris, ecclesiasticis et secularibus libris collecti* (Geneva, 1592, 8vo); French transl. Gen. 1604, 12mo);—*Vrai Discours de la miraculeuse déliurance envoyée de Dieu à la ville de Genève, le 12 dec. 1602* (Gen. 1603, 8vo);—*Le sage Vieillard* (Lyon, 1605, 12mo); English, London, 1621, 4to);—*Quarante-deux Tableaux de la mort représentés* (last ed. Lyon, 1606, 12mo); German, Cassel, 1605);—*Considérations de la Conscience humaine* (Gen. 1607, 8vo);—*Considérations sur divers articles de la doctrine chrétienne* (Saumur, 1608, 8vo); this may have been written by his eldest son, also called Simon, see next art.);—*Traité de l'Assurance chrétienne; plus un autre Traité de l'Assurance prophane* (Genève, 1609, 8vo);—*Vingt-cinq Méditations chrétiennes*, etc. (Gen. 1610, 16mo);—*Considérations de la mort et de la vie heureuse* (Gen. 1621, 8vo);—*Considérations de la sagesse de Dieu au gouvernement du monde* (Gen. 1623, 8vo);—*Recueil des choses mémorables advenues sous la Ligue*, etc. (Gen. 1537-40, 3 vols. 8vo); last ed. by ablé Goujet, under the title *Mémoires de la Ligue sous Henri III et IV*, etc. (Amst. [Paris], 1758, 6 vols. 4to). He also edited a number of authors, ancient and modern, with annotations, and translated numerous works on history and theology. Some of his letters were published in the *Epistres françaises des personages illustres et doctes à J. J. de la Scala, mises en lumière par Jacques de Rives* (Hardenwyck, 1624, 8vo).—See Tronchin, *Oratio funebris S. Goulartii Sylvaectini, in Ecclesia Genevensi pastoris*, etc. (Gen. 1628, 4to); Bayle, *Dict. Hist.*; Nieéron, *Mémoires*, xxix, 363-374; Senebier, *Hist. littér. de Genève*; Haag, *La France Protestante*; Hoefter, *Novæ Biog. Générale*, xxi, 409 sq.

**Goulart, Simon**, a Swiss Protestant theologian (son of the preceding), was born at Geneva about 1576. He was at first pastor of the French Protestant church at Wesel, and in 1601 was called to Amst. dam to take charge of the Walloon church. Being a zealous Arminian, he engaged in a controversy with his colleagues, who as zealously defended Calvinism, and he was finally ejected. He wrote two works in defence of his views, which attracted great attention, and in 1618 the Remonstrants chose him as one of their defenders at the Synod of Dort. He was, however, forbidden to appear, as being under interdict. When the Arminian ministers were banished in 1619, he followed Episcopius to Antwerp. When hostilities were renewed between Holland and Spain he went to Calais. In 1623 he was accused of conspiring against the prince of Orange, but proved his innocence, and the next year removed to Frederickstadt, where a large number of Remonstrants had sought refuge. He died there March 19, 1628. He wrote, *Brief Traité de la grâce de Dieu envers les hommes et de l'éternelle élection des fidèles et réprobation des infidèles* (Amst. 1616, 8vo);—*Examen des opinions de M. Fulrice Dussacourt contenues en un livre de disputes intitulé L'élection éternelle et ses dé-*

pendences (Amst. 1618, 8vo):—*Épître aux Remonstrants Wallons* (1620, 8vo):—*Traité de la providence de Dieu et autres points indépendans, avec une Réfutation du sermon de Jos. Ponjade contre les cinq articles des Remonstrants* (1627, 12mo); and eight letters, two in Latin and six in French, in the *Epistole Remonstrantium ecclesiastica et theologica* (Amst. 1684, fol.). See Nicéron, *Mémoires*; *Bibl. remonstrantium*; Bayle, *Dict. Hist.*; Senebier, *Histoire litt. de Genève*; Haag, *La France Protestante*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Liog. Gén.* xxi, 414.

**Goulding**, THOMAS, D. D., a Presbyterian minister, was born at Midway, Liberty County, Ga., March 14, 1786. He was educated at Walcott, Conn., studied law for a time, and was licensed in 1813. He supplied the church at White Bluff soon after, and labored successfully there for about six years. In 1822 he removed to Lexington, Oglethorpe County, and was subsequently elected professor in the Theological Seminary of the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia. After many years of laborious service in the departments of ecclesiastical history and Church government, he resigned, and was called in 1835 to his last charge in Columbus. He was for several years in succession elected president of the board of trustees of Oglethorpe University, and died June 26, 1848.—Sprague, *Annals*, iv, 491.

**Gourd** is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of two Heb. words.

1. JONAH'S GOURD (גִּיבֹרִית, *kikayon'*, Sept. κολοκύνθη, Vulg. *hedera*), the name of a plant that occurs only in Jon. iv, 6-10; according to the Sept. and Peshito, a gourd; but according to Jerome (who underwent much obloquy for substituting "ivy" for the "gourd" of the old Italic vers.; see Davidson's *Lib. Crit.* i, 267), the Talmud, and the Hebrew interpreters generally, a species of *ricinus*, the *palma Christi*, Arabic *el-kherwa*, Egyptian *kis* or *koiki* (Diod. Siculus, i, 3). From the statements of the text, it appears that the growth of the *kikayon* was miraculous, but that it was probably a plant of the country, being named specifically; also that it was capable of affording shade, and might easily be destroyed. There does not appear anything in this account to warrant us in considering it to be the ivy, which is a plant of slow growth, cannot support itself, and is, moreover, not likely to be found in the hot and arid country of ancient Nineveh, but which was adduced by Jerome probably only as a conjecture from the resemblance of its Greek name κισσός to *kikayon*. That the *kikayon* was thought to be a gourd seems to have arisen from the *kiki* of the Egyptians being the *kherwa* of the Arabs, often incorrectly written *kerwa*, that is, without the aspirate, which makes it very similar to *kura* when written in Roman characters, which last in the East is applied to the gourd or pumpkin (Avicenna, c. 622), and is probably the *Lagenaria vulgaris*. To this plant, no doubt, the following passages refer: "The Christians and Jews of Mosul (Nineveh) say it was not the *kerwa* whose shadow refreshed Jonah, but a sort of gourd, *el-khera*, which has very large leaves, very large fruit, and lasts but about four months" (Niebuhr, *Arabia*, p. 148). So Volney: "Whoever has travelled to Cairo or Rosetta knows that the species of gourd called *kerwa* will, in twenty-four hours, send out shoots near four inches long" (*Travels*, i, 71). In Jerome's own description of the plant, however (Comment, ad loc.), called in Syr. *kara*, and Punic *el-kerwa*, Celsius recognises the castor-oil plant (*Hiobot.* ii, 273 sq.; Bochart, *Hierez.* ii, 293, 623). The *Ricinus* was seen by Rauwolf (*Trac.* p. 52) in great abundance near Tripoli, where the Arabs called it *el-kherwa*, while both Hasselquist and Robinson observed very large specimens of it in the neighbor-

hood of Jericho ("Ricinus in altitudinem arboris insignis," Hasselquist, *Trac.* p. 555; see also Robinson, *Res.* i, 553). The Hebrew name *kikayon* is so similar to the *kiki* of Dioscorides, that it was early thought to indicate the same plant. Dioscorides (iv, 164, περὶ κικωνῶν) states that the *kiki*, or *eroton*, is called *will sesamum* by some; and proceeds to give in a few words a graphic description of the *Ricinus communis*, or castor-oil plant.



Castor-oil Plant (*Ricinus Communis*).

It has also been called *Pentactylus* and *Palma Christi*, from the palmate division of its leaves. It was known at much earlier times, as Hippocrates employed it in medicine; and Herodotus mentions it by the name of σαλλακίριον (ii, 94) when speaking of Egypt: "The inhabitants of the marshy grounds make use of an oil which they term *kiki*, expressed from the Silycyprian plant." That it has been known there from the earliest times is evident from Caillaud having found castor-oil seeds in some very ancient sarcophagi. That the Arabs considered their *kherwa* to be the same plant is evident from Avicenna on this article, or *kherwa* of the translation of Plempius (p. 301); so Serapion (iii, c. 79). But most decisive of all seems the derivation of the Hebrew word from the Egyptian *kiki* (Herodot. ii, 94; comp. Bähr, ad loc.; and Jablonsky, *Opusc.* pt. i, p. 110), established by Celsius, with whose arguments Michaelis declares himself entirely satisfied (J. D. Mich. *Supplem.*); and confirmed by the Talmudical קִיבֹרִית קִיבֹרִית, *kik-oil*, prepared from the seeds of the *ricinus* (Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald. Talmud.* col. 2029), and Dioscorides, iv, 164, where κρότων (= *Palma Christi*) is described under the name of *kika*, and the oil made from its seeds is called *kikivon elaton* (Rosenmüller, p. 127). Lady Calcott states that the modern Jews of London use this oil, by the name of oil of *kik*, for their Sabbath lamps, it being one of the five kinds of oil which their traditions allow them to employ. The castor-oil plant attains a considerable size in one season; and though in Europe it is only known as an herb, in India it frequently may be seen, especially at the margins of fields, of the size of a tree. So at Busra, Niebuhr saw an *el-kerwa* which had the form and appearance of a tree. From the erect habit, and the breadth of its foliage, this plant throws an ample shade, especially when young. From the softness and little substance of its stem, it may easily be destroyed by insects, which Rumphius describes as sometimes being the case. It would then necessarily dry up rapidly. As it is well suited to the country, and to the purpose indicated in the text, and as its name *kiki* is so similar to *kikayon*, it is generally thought by interpreters to be the plant which the sacred penman had in view.—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

This opinion, however, that the first-named plant



above is the true representative of Jonah's gourd, is reviewed by the Rev. H. Loddell, M.D., missionary in Assyria, in a letter published in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April 6, 1855, p. 395 sq., who says, "The Mohammedans, Christians, and Jews all agree in referring the plant to the *kerā*, a kind of pumpkin peculiar to the East. The leaves are large, and the rapidity of growth astonishing. Its fruit is for the most part eaten in a fresh state, and is somewhat like the squash. It has no more than a generic resemblance to the gourd of the United States, though I suppose that both are a species of the *cucurbita*. It is grown in great abundance on the alluvial banks of the Tigris, and on the plain between the river and the ruins of Nineveh, which is about a mile wide. . . . The castor-oil plant is cultivated, indeed, to some extent here, but is never trained, like the *kerā*, to run over structures of mud and brush to form booths in which the gardeners may protect themselves from the terrible heats of the Asiatic sun. I have seen at a single glance dozens of these booths—these lodges in the fields of melons and cucumbers around the old walls of Nineveh (Isa. i, 8)—covered with the vines of the *kerā*, of which there are numerous species, the fruit of which weighs from one to fifty pounds. One species, growing in Kurdistan, a few days' distant from Mosul, is a genuine gourd; but there is no probability that it ever flourished on the hot plains of Mosul." The same view is taken by Thomson (*Land and Book*, i, 96 sq.), who says that "Orientals never dream of training a castor-oil plant over a booth, or planting it for shade; and they would have but small respect for any one who did. It is in no way adapted for that purpose, while thousands of arbors are covered with various creepers of the gourd family. . . . The gourd grows with extraordinary rapidity. In a few days after it has begun to run the whole arbor is covered. It forms a shade absolutely impenetrable to the sun's rays even at noonday. It flourishes best in the very hottest part of summer. Lastly, when injured or cut, it withers away with equal rapidity." See JONAH.



Oriental Arbor covered with a Gourd-vine.

2. WILD GOURDS (כִּרְבָּבִים, *pakkuṭh*; Sept.  $\tau\omicron\delta\acute{\nu}\iota\pi\eta$ , Vulg. *colocynthis*). It is related in 2 Kings iv, 38-40 that Elisha, having come again to Gilgal, when there was a famine in the land, and many sons of the prophets were assembled there, he ordered his servant to prepare for them a dish of vegetables: "One went out into the field to gather herbs (*oroth*), and found a wild vine (כִּרְבָּבִים, *field-vine*), and gathered thereof wild gourds (כִּרְבָּבִים, *field pakkuṭh*) his lap-full, and came and shred them into the pot of pottage, for they knew them not." "So they poured out for the men to eat; but as they were eating of the pottage, they cried out, O thou man of God, there is death in the pot; and they could not eat thereof." Though a few other plants have been indicated, the *pakkuṭh* has almost universally been supposed to be one of the family of the gourd or cucumber-like plants, several of which are conspicuous for their bitterness, and a few poisonous, while others, it is well-known, are edi-

ble. The reasons are given in detail by Celsius (*Hierobot.*, i, 393). (1.) The name is supposed to be derived from כִּרְבָּבִים, *pakū'*, "to split," or "to burst," from the exploding of the fruit, and scattering the seeds on being touched; and this is the characteristic of the species called the wild cucumber by the ancients. (2.) The form of the fruit appears to have been ovoid, as the name is essentially the same with that of the "knops," or כִּרְבָּבִים, *pekain'*, of 1 Kings vi, 18; vii, 24, rendered "eggs" in the Chaldaic version of Jonathan, to whom the form of the fruit could not have been unknown. (3.) The seeds of the *pakkuṭh*, moreover, yielded oil, as appears from the tract *Shabbath* (ii, § 2). The seeds of the different gourd and cucumber-like plants are well known to yield oil, which was employed by the ancients, and still is in the East, both as medicine and in the arts. (4.) The bitterness which was probably perceived on eating of the pottage, and which disappeared on the addition of meal, is found in many of the cucumber tribe, and conspicuously in the species which have usually been selected as the *pakkuṭh*, that is, the Colocynth (*Cucumis Colocynthis*), the Squirting Cucumber (*Momordica elaterium*), and *Cucumis prophetarum*; all of which are found in Syria, as related by various travellers. The first, or *Coloquintida*, is essentially a desert plant. Kitto says: "In the desert parts of Syria, Egypt, and Arabia, and on the banks of the rivers Tigris and Euphrates, its tendrils run over vast tracts of ground, offering a prodigious number of gourds, which are crushed under foot by camels, horses, and men. In winter we have seen the extent of many miles covered with the connecting tendrils and dry gourds of the preceding season, the latter exhibiting precisely the same appearance as in our shops, and when crushed, with a crackling noise, beneath the feet, discharging, in the form of a light powder, the valuable drug which it contains" (*Pict. Bible*, note ad loc.). In the Arabic version, *hunzal* (which is the Colocynth) is used as the synonyme for *pakkuṭh* in 2 Kings iv, 39. The third, or Globe Cucumber, "derives its specific name (*Cucumis prophetarum*) from the notion that it afforded the gourd which 'the sons of the prophets' shred by mistake into their pottage, and which made them declare, when they came to taste it, that there was 'death in the pot.' This plant is smaller in every part than the common melon, and has a nauseous odor, while its fruit is to the full as bitter as the *Coloquintida*. The fruit has a rather singular appearance,

from the manner in which its surface is armed with prickles, which are, however, soft and harmless" (Kitto, *Pict. Palestine; Physical Geog.* p. cclxxxix). But this plant, the fruit not being bigger than a cherry, does not appear likely to have been that which was shred into the pot. Celsius, however, is of opinion that the second of the above-named species, the *Cucumis agrestis* of the ancients, and which was found by Belon in descending from Mount Sinai, was the plant, being the *Cucumis asinus* of the druggists. This plant is a well-known drastic purgative, violent enough in its action to be considered even a poison. Its fruit is ovate, obtuse, and scabrous, and likely to have been the plant mistaken for *oroth*, as it might certainly be mistaken for young gherkins.—Kitto, s. v. The wild cucumber bursts at the touch of the finger, and scatters its seeds, which the colocynth does not (Rosenmüller, *Alterthumsk.* iv, pt. i, etc.). The etymology of the word from כִּרְבָּבִים has been thought to favor the identification of the



Colocynthis (*Citrullus Colocynthus*), with Fruit and Section of the latter.

plant with the *Ecbalium elaterium*, or "squirting cucumber," so called from the elasticity with which the fruit, when ripe, opens and scatters the seeds when touched. This is the *ἀγριοὺς σίκυος* of Dioscorides (iv, 152) and Theophrastus (vii, 6, § 4, etc.), and the *Cucumis sylestris* of Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* xx, 2). Celsius (*Lib. i*, 393), Rosenmüller (*Bib. Bot.* p. 128), and Gesenius (*Thes.* p. 1122) are in favor of this explanation, and, it must be confessed, not without some reason. The old versions, however, understand the colocynthis, the fruit of which is about the size of an orange. The drastic medicine in such general use is a preparation from this plant. Michaelis (*Suppl. Lex. Heb.* p. 344) and Oedmann (*Vern. Samml.* iv, 88) adopt this explanation.—Smith, s. v.

**Gousset, Jacques** (Lat. *Gussetius*), a French Protestant theologian, and distinguished Hebrew scholar, was born at Blois Oct. 7, 1635. He studied theology at Saumur, and acquired Greek under Lefèvre, and Hebrew under Louis Cappel. Having become pastor of the church at Poitiers in 1662, he remained in that office until the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, refusing on three several occasions the professorship of theology at Saumur. In 1665 he went to England, and soon after to Holland, where he became pastor of the Walloon church of Dort in 1687. In 1692 he went to the University of Groningen as professor of Greek and of theology, and remained there until his death, Nov. 4, 1704. Gousset advocated a very different system of Hebrew grammar from the one generally followed in Holland. While the Dutch scholars considered, like Erpenius, a knowledge of Arab and Syriac as of the utmost importance for the correct understanding of Hebrew, Gousset held that error must inevitably result from attempts to find out the meaning of words and the grammatical construction of sentences in Hebrew by comparing it with the other Semitic dialects which are but derivatives from it, and have often undergone changes to which the original language remains a stranger. He considered the old versions and the writings of the Rabbins as of little use in the interpretation of the O. T. Schultens, who, at the age of eighteen, had a public discussion with Gousset on that subject, refutes his views in his *Origines Hebraeae* and *Vetus et regia via hebraizandi*. Gousset wrote largely. We name, out of his numerous works, the following: *Examen des endroits de l'accomplissement des prophéties de M. Jurieu qui concernent la supputation des temps* (Anon. 1687, 12mo);—*Jesu Christi Evangelique Veritas salutariter demonstrata in confutatione libri Chizzuk Emounu* (Amst. 1712, 4to);—*Considérations théologiques et critiques sur le projet d'une nouvelle version française de la Bible, publiée l'an 1696, sous le nom de M. Ch. Lecene, etc.* (Amst. 1698, 12mo), a violent Calvinistic attack, accusing Lecene's translation of favoring Arminianism at the expense of correctness;—*Commentarii Linguae Ebraicae*, etc. (Amst. 1702, fol.; Lpz. 1743, 4to);—*Disputationes in Epistolam Pauli ad Hebraeos et ad Leviticum xviij, 4* (Amst. 1712, fol.);—*Vesperae Groninganae, sive amicae de rebus sacris colloquia. ubi varia sacrae Scripturae loca selecta explicantur* (Amst. 1698, 8vo; 2d edit. 1711, 8vo);—*De vita deque mortua Fide, doctrina Jacobi apostoli evoluta* (Amst. 1693, 8vo);—*Theses theologicae de typorum intrinsecorum methodo apostolica* (at the end of the *Schediasma Theologiae practicae* of Herm. Witsius, Groning. 1729, 8vo). See Bayle, *Oeuvres diverses*, iii, 629; iv, 766, 773, and 837; Nicéron, *Mémoires*, vols. ii and x; *Journal des Savants*, 1702, No. 40; Meyer, *Gesch. d. Schriftklärung*, vol. iv; Haag, *La France Protestante*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxi, 465 sq.

**Gouttes, Jean Louis**, a French Roman Catholic priest and political economist, was born at Tulle in 1740. He first entered the army, and soon after the Church. He was for a time curate of a place near Bordeaux, then of Argilliers (Languedoc), where he remained until the beginning of the French Revolution. He had acquired great influence over the clergy of the diocese of Béziers, and was in 1789 sent as their representative to the States General. Here, on Oct. 3, 1789, he advocated the abolition of the usury laws. He also seconded the motion of Talleyrand-Perigord, bishop of Autun, proposing the sale of the property of the clergy. In February, 1791, he succeeded Talleyrand as bishop of Autun. But afterwards, opposing the excesses of the Republican party, he was accused of reactionary sympathies, arrested, judged, condemned, and executed, all in one day, March 26, 1794. He wrote *Théorie de l'intérêt de l'argent*, etc. (Paris, 1780, 12mo; 2d edit., with a *Défense*, etc., 1782);—*Projet de Réforme, ou réflexions soumises à l'Assemblée nationale* (1790, 8vo);—*Discours sur la vente des biens du clergé* (April 12, 1790, 8vo);—*Exposé des Principes de la Constitution civile du Clergé, par les évêques députés à l'Assemblée nationale* (1790, 8vo); this latter work is under a collective name, but Gouttes was its principal author. See *Moniteur universel* (1789, 1790); Quéraud, *La France littéraire*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxi, 470. (J. N. P.)

**Government of God.** See THEODICY.

**Government of the Hebrews.** This we shall here treat in its secular or political relations, so far as these can be severed from the divine ordinances which underlie them all. See MONARCHY.

1. *Constitutional Form.*—This varied materially in different ages. With the Israelites, as with all other nations, unquestionably the earliest form of government was the patriarchal, and it subsisted among them long after many of the neighboring countries had exchanged it for the rule of kings. The patriarchs, that is, the heads or founders of families, exercised the chief power and command over their families, children, and domestics, without being responsible to any superior authority. Such was the government of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. So long as they resided in the land of Canaan they were subject to no foreign power, but tended their flocks and herds wherever they chose to go (Gen. xiii, 6-12), and vindicated their wrongs by arms whenever they had sustained any injury (Gen. xiv). They treated with the petty kings who reigned in different parts of Palestine as their equals in dignity, and concluded treaties with them in their own right (Gen. xiv, 13, 18-21; xxi, 22-32; xxvi, 16, 27-33; xxxi, 44-54). See PATRIARCHY.

The Hebrews having greatly increased in numbers in Egypt, it appeared very evident that they could not live among nations given to idolatry without running

the hazard of becoming infected with the same evil. They were, therefore, in the providence of God, assigned to a particular country, the extent of which was so small, that they were obliged, if they would live independently of other nations, to give up, in a great measure, the life of shepherds, and devote themselves to agriculture. Besides, very many of the Hebrews, during their residence in Egypt, had fallen into idolatrous habits. These were to be brought back again to the knowledge of the true God, and all were to be excited to engage in those undertakings which should be found necessary for the support of the true religion. All the Mosaic institutions aim at the accomplishment of these objects, and the fundamental principle was this—that the true God, the creator and governor of the universe, and none other, ought to be worshipped. To secure this end the more certainly, God became king to the Hebrews. Accordingly, the land of Canaan, which was destined to be occupied by them, was declared to be the land of Jehovah, of which he was to be the king, and the Hebrews merely the hereditary occupants. God promulgated, from the summit of Mount Sinai, the prominent laws for the government of his people, considered as a religious community (Exod. xx); and these laws were afterwards more fully illustrated and developed by Moses. The rewards which should accompany the obedient, and the punishments which should be the lot of the transgressor, were at the same time announced, and the Hebrews promised by a solemn oath to obey (Exod. xx-xiv; Deut. xxvii-xxx). See LAW.

In order to preserve the true religion, God governed the whole people by a striking and peculiar providence, which has rightly been termed a theocracy. But, although the government of the Jews was a theocracy, it was not destitute of the usual forms which exist in civil governments among men. God, it is true, was the king, and the high-priest, if we may be allowed so to speak, was his minister of state; but still the political affairs were, in a great measure, under the disposal of the elders, princes, etc. It was to them that Moses gave the divine commands; he determined their powers, and submitted their requests to the divine decision (Num. xiv, 5; xvi, 4; xxvii, 5). Josephus pronounced the government to be aristocratical, but Lowman and Michaëlis are in favor of considering it a democracy, and in support of their opinion such passages are exhibited as the following: Exod. xix, 7, 8; xxiv, 3-8; Deut. xxix, 9-14. The Hebrew government, however, putting aside its theocratical feature, was of a mixed form, in some respects approaching to a democracy, in others assuming more of an aristocratical character. See THEOCRACY.

In the time of Samuel, the government, in point of form, was changed into a monarchy. The election of a king, however, was committed to God, who chose one by lot; so that God was still the ruler, and the king the vicegerent. The terms of the government, as respected God, were the same as before, and the same duties and principles were inculcated on the Israelites as had been originally (1 Sam. viii, 7; x, 17-23). In consequence of the fact that Saul did not choose at all times to obey the commands of God, the kingdom was taken from him and given to another (1 Sam. xiii, 5-14; xv, 1-31). David, through the medium of Samuel, was selected by Jehovah for king, who thus gave a proof that he still retained, and was disposed to exercise, the right of appointing the ruler under him (1 Sam. xvi, 1-3). David was first made king over Judah; but as he received his appointment from God, and acted under his authority, the eleven other tribes submitted to him (2 Sam. v, 1-3). The paramount authority of God as the king of the nation, and his right to appoint one who should act in the capacity of his vicegerent, are expressly recognised in the books of Kings and Chronicles. See KING.

The rebuilding of Jerusalem was accomplished, and

the reformation of their ecclesiastical and civil polity was effected, by the two divinely-inspired and pious governors, Ezra and Nehemiah; but the theocratic government does not appear to have been restored. The new temple was not, as formerly, God's palace; and the cloud of his presence did not take possession of it. After the deaths of Ezra and Nehemiah, the Jews were governed by their high-priests, in subjection, however, to the Persian kings, to whom they paid tribute (Ezra iv, 13), but were ruled by their own magistrates, and were in the full enjoyment of their liberties, civil and religious. Nearly three centuries of uninterrupted prosperity ensued, although during that time they had passed to the rule of the Greeks, until the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, king of Syria, when they were most cruelly oppressed, and compelled to take up arms in their own defence. Under the able conduct of Judas, surnamed Maccabæus, and his valiant brothers, the Jews maintained a religious war for twenty-six years with five successive kings of Syria; and after destroying upwards of two hundred thousand of their best troops, the Maccabees finally established the independence of their country, and the royal station of their own family. This illustrious house, whose princes united the regal and pontifical dignity in their own persons, administered the affairs of the Jews during a period of one hundred and twenty-six years; until disputes arising between Hyrcanus II and his brother Aristobolus, the latter was defeated by the Romans under Pompey, who captured Jerusalem, and reduced Judæa to the rank of a dependent kingdom, B.C. 59.—*Pict. Dict.* s. v. See JEWS.

2. *Executive Despotism.*—The organs through which these various forms of administration were exhibited always partook of that absolute and arbitrary character, both in their appointment and their exercise, which prevails among Eastern nations. The government of the Israelitish state under the monarchy was, so far as we can understand its political organization, very simple, and in its principal features analogous to modern Oriental forms (see Paulsen, *Die Regierung Morganiänder*, Altona, 1755, vol. i). The king, not simply the central figure, but more properly the embodiment of civil power, had around him as advisers and supreme executors of his commands several "counsellors," or סֹפְרֵי (2 Sam. xv, 12; 1 Chron. xxvii, 32; 1 Kings xii, 2), at whose head stands almost always the chancellor, סֹפֵר, "recorder," whose chief duty, however, was that of historiographer (comp. 2 Kings xix, 18, 37), and who is immediately recognised as the prime minister, such as is to this day the organ of royal communication in Persia (see Chaudin, *Voyage*, v, 258). Co-ordinate with him probably stood the "scribe," סֹפֵר, or state (cabinet) secretary (2 Sam. viii, 17; xx, 25; 2 Kings xviii, 18; xix, 2; xxii, 3, 10 sq.; Jer. xxxvi, 10). Sometimes we find several of these officers mentioned as existing at the same time (1 Kings iv, 3); their bureau is called "the scribe's chamber," סֹפֵר הַסֵּפֶר (Jer. xxxviii, 12). By the side of this officer was also the prefect of the palace, שֹׁרֵט הַבַּיִת, whose functions, however, were not entirely confined to the royal household (such as commissions and messages, 2 Kings xviii, 19 sq.; xix, 4, 8; Neh. i, 11), but who was also employed on state business (1 Kings xviii, 3; 2 Kings xviii, 18; Jer. xxxvi, 3), and often assumed a high degree of importance (Isa. xxiii, 15 sq.), as he then became an officer of marked rank (like the modern *major-domo*). Sometimes a prophet enjoyed the confidence of the king as extraordinary civil counsellor, and grew influential as "the king's friend," חֵן הַמֶּלֶךְ (a title of most trusty minister or prime vizier in the modern East; see Gesenius, *Comment.* on Isa. xxii, 15; Paulsen, *Regier.* p. 286), such as Nathan under David and Solomon, and Isaiah under Hezekiah. The superior

functionaries appear under the kings to have conducted the civil administration. It was the duty of the priests and Levites to care for the maintenance of justice (Deut. xvii, 8 sq.). The king himself rendered decisions in the highest cases, not seldom in less weighty causes, or even altogether. See TRIAL. As officers of the exchequer, at least so far as to provide for the wants of the royal kitchen, under Solomon, twelve commissioners were appointed (1 Kings iv, 7 sq.). Besides, each branch of the royal household or establishment, the domains and manors, had their particular superintendent. See PURVEYOR. All these constitute together, as we may say, the regal board or court. On the other hand, under the 550 officials of Solomon alluded to in 1 Kings ix, 23 must be reckoned under-officers, of whose department of service we know nothing further. Among these intermediate jurisdictions are, at all events, included the lieutenants of provinces, מְשָׁרְטֵי הַמְּדִינֹת ("princes of the provinces," 1 Kings xx, 14 sq., i. q. district-superintendents), who are first mentioned under Ahab of Israel. In conjunction with them may be classified the municipal officers, the elders and magnates of cities, to whom were addressed and who executed the royal behests (1 Kings xxi, 8; 2 Kings x, 1). See OLD MEN. The oldest and leading men of the tribes (q. v.) also formed a kind of national representatives. The scribes (q. v.) further had a certain official position. See GOVERNOR.

Under the Chaldaean rule, Gedaliah (q. v.) appears as governor (שָׂרֵי) of desolated and depopulated Judaea (2 Kings xxv, 22), which after this time became, in connection with Egypt, Cælo-Syria, and Phœnicia, a mere satrapy of the Babylonian empire (Berosus, in Josephus, *Ant.* x, 11, 1). The Persian court committed all the provinces lying west of the Euphrates to satraps, שַׂרְטָאִי (Ezra viii, 36; Neh. ii, 9), associated with whom for civil administration was a governmental chamber, with chancellor, secretary, and assessors (Ezra iv, 8, 9). Yet the same title, שַׂרְטָאִי (i. q. *pasha*), was also borne by the (Jewish) prefects of the new Israelitish colony (Ezra vi, 7; Neh. vii, 14, 18; comp. Hag. i, 1, 14; ii, 2, 21), which it had over its own people, exclusive of the circuit or ministerial officers (Neh. iii, 9, 14, 15, etc.), municipal officials, or שַׂרְטָאִי (Neh. ii, 16; iv, 19; v, 7, etc.), and judges (Ezra vii, 25). See TIRSHATHAI. Besides the Persian civil functionaries, there were likewise in the subject territories tax-commissioners or treasury-officers appointed, שַׂרְטָאִי (Ezra vii, 21), and under them a general forest-keeper (Neh. ii, 8). During the Seleucid-Syrian rule Judaea belonged, while their relations were peaceful, to the precinct of a general or *στρατηγός* of Phœnicia and Cæle-Syria (2 Macc. iii, 5; iv, 4; viii, 8), who was a provincial officer endowed with civil and military jurisdiction. The administration of the revenue was intrusted to special functionaries (2 Macc. iii, 3; 1 Macc. x, 41; xiii, 37). The chief management of the finances, however, was in the hands of the royal chamberlain (2 Macc. iii, 7 sq.). During the government of Antiochus Epiphanes we find military appointees (1 Macc. vii, 8) and extraordinary commissioners (1 Macc. i, 53; ii, 15; 2 Macc. v, 22) in Judaea. During the contests for the throne between Demetrius Soter and Alexander, the Jewish high-priests still retained the dignity of vassal-chiefs over Judaea (1 Macc. x), and Jews were intrusted with executive authority, even beyond the limits of that territory (1 Macc. xi, 59). Simon was absolute hereditary prince over Judaea, and held also the right of coinage (1 Macc. xv). In all this period, as well as earlier under the Egyptian dominion, the imposts were not unfrequently farmed out to the high-priests, or to wealthy Jews (1 Macc. xi, 28; xiii, 15; Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 4, 4 sq., 16), which brought them into close connection with the royal functionaries, and even conferred upon them a

certain executive authority.—Winer, ii, 205. See ASSESSMENT.

For the government of Judaea under the Romans, see ROMAN EMPIRE.

3. *Democratic Powers.*—Notwithstanding the apparently unlimited and independent authority of these different kinds of rulers, the Hebrew people, especially during the earlier and purer ages of the commonwealth, reserved to themselves a large measure of directive or vetatory and magisterial influence, which enabled the popular will to express itself on all great emergencies, and even in minor points, in a clear and decided manner, through regularly constituted channels, the general assembly or the select committee.

The supreme political body of the Hebrew nation, duly met in congress, is designated in the original by two words of nearly equal frequency in the sacred writings, קָהָל, *edah*, from קָהַל, to appoint, also to bring together; and קַהָל, *kahal*, from קָהַל, i. q. *καλείν*, to convoke (Sept. *ἐκκλησία, συναγωγή*; Vulgate, *Congregatio, Cænis, Ecclesia*). The phrase "tabernacle of the Congregation," however, which so frequently occurs as indicating the place of meeting, is described by neither of these words, but by מִדְבַּר [מִדְבָּר]; the versions consistently mark the difference also, the Sept. invariably translating this phrase by *ἡ σκηνή τοῦ μαρτυρίου*, and the Vulg. by *tabernaculum testimonii*; although when the word מִדְבַּר occurs without the מִדְבָּר (as in Numb. xvi, 2), it has somewhat of the ambiguity of the Latin *Curia*, which equally well signifies the *Senate* and the *Senate-house*. In this passage מִדְבַּר is translated by *Βουλή* and *Tempus Concilii*; in many other passages the word is variously rendered, but generally bears reference to a set time or place, e. g. in Lam. i, 15, A. V. renders it *assembly*; but in ii, 6, *place of assembly* and *solenn feast*; the Sept. and Vulgate are equally capricious—*καρπός* and *tempus* standing in Lam. i, 15, and *ἐοσθή, tabernaculum* and *festivitas* in ii, 6. This word מִדְבַּר is the most frequent original equivalent of our noun "congregation." Apart from מִדְבָּר (tabernacle), it has a highly generic sense, including all the holy assemblies of the Jews.

There is good reason to believe that, not unlike the Servian constitution of the Roman people (Arnold's *History of Rome*, i, 70), the Hebrew nation from the first received a twofold organization, *mi'itary* as well as political (comp. Exod. xii, 51; Numb. i, 3, and throughout; Numb. xxvi, 3; and 1 Chron. vii, 4 and 40. See also Lowman's *Dissertation on the Civil Government of the Hebrews*, p. 159, 186, etc.). The classification of the people is very clearly indicated in Josh. vii, 14–18. (1.) The *Tribe* (שֵׁבֵט or שֵׁבֵט) was divided into clans, *gates*, A. V. "families," בָּיִת (בָּיִת). (2.) Each *Mishpachah* comprised a number of *familie*, Auth. Vers. "houses," בֵּית. (3.) Each בֵּית or "house" was made up of qualified "men," fit for military as well as political service, being twenty years old and upward (Numb. i, 3). The word which describes the individual member of the body politic, אִישׁ (*flur.* אִישׁ), is very significant; for it means *vir* a *robore dictus* (Gesenius, *Thes.* i, 262), "a man of valor," from אָזַק, to be strong (Fürst, *Heb. Wörteb.* i, 239; Meier, *Hebr. Wurz. W.-b.* p. 251). Now it was the organic union of the twelve tribes which constituted in the highest and truest sense the קָהָל, or קַהָל, i. e. "Congregation," convened duly for a competent purpose (Kurtz, *Hist. Old Test.* i, 163). As with the Greeks there was an *ἀγμία*, and with the Latins a *Deminitio Capitis*, so there were sundry faults which deprived a *home-born* Israelite (יִשְׂרָאֵלִי, Sept. *αἰ-τόξων*, Vulg. *inhiligna*; or אִישׁ, *ἀέλωός, civis*, in Deut. i, 16) of his privilege as a member of the national assembly (see Deut. xxiii, 1–8 [comp. with Neh. xiii, 1-

3]; also Exod. xii, 17, 19; xxx, 33, 38; xxxi, 14; Lev. vii, 20, 21, 25, 27; xvii, 4, 9, 10, 14; xviii, 29; xix, 8; xx, 3, 6, 17, 18; xxx, 3, 6, 17, 18; xxii, 3; xxiii, 29; Numb. ix, 13; xv, 31; xix, 20). On the other hand, the franchise or *civitas* was conferred (with certain exceptions, such as are mentioned in Deut. xxiii, 3) on foreigners, עֲרָבִים (A. V. "strangers;" Sept. προσήλυται; Vulg. peregrini), after they had qualified themselves by circumcision (Exod. xii, 19; Lev. xix, 34; Deut. xxix, 11, comp. with Isa. lvi, 6, 7).

The above words, expressive of the national congregation, sometimes imply (1) a meeting of the whole mass of the people; sometimes (2) a congress of deputies (Jahn's *Hebrew Republic*, p. 243). (1.) At first, when the whole nation dwelt in tents, in their migration from Egypt to Canaan under the immediate command of the great legislator, the Congregation seems to have comprised every qualified Israelite who had the right of a personal presence and vote in the congress. In Exod. xxxv, 1, this ample assembly is designated עֲבֹדֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ, *the entire Congregation of the Sons of Israel* (πᾶσα συναγωγή υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ, *omnis turba filiorum Israel*). Similarly in Num. xxvii, 19, the phrase is כָּל־עַמְּךָ, *all the Congregation* (πᾶσα ἡ συναγωγή, *omnis multitudo*), while in Lev. xvi, 17 we have כָּל־עַמְּיִשְׂרָאֵל, *the entire assembly of Israel* (πᾶσα συναγωγή Ἰσραὴλ, *universus catus Israel*). We would have no difficulty in supposing that every member of the *Edah* was present at such meetings as these, in the lifetime of Moses and before the nation was dispersed throughout its settlements in Canaan, were it not that we occasionally find, in later times, an equally ample designation used, when it is impossible to believe that the nation could have assembled at one place of meeting; e. g. in Josh. xxii, 12, where "the whole congregation of the children of Israel" is mentioned; and again still later, as at the dedication of Solomon's Temple in 1 Kings viii, 14; 2 Chron. i, 5. (2.) From this impossibility of personal attendance in the national congregation, we should expect to find a *representative* constitution provided. Accordingly, in Num. i, 16, we read of persons called זְבָנֵי הָעָם, not, as in the A. V., "renowned of the Congregation," but *went to be called to the Congregation* (Michaelis, *Lives of Moses*, i, 250). In xvi, 2, they are still more explicitly styled זְבָנֵי הָעָם, *i. e. chiefs of the Congregation who are called to the Convention* (στέφανοι βουλευτῆς, *qui tempore consilia vocabantur*). While in Exod. xxxviii, 25 occurs the phrase זְבָנֵי הָעָם, *those deputed to the assembly*, which exactly describes delegated persons. From Josh. xxiii, 2, and xxiv, 1, it would appear that these deputies were—(1) "The elders" (called זְבָנֵי הָעָם, "elders of the Congregation," in Lev. iv, 15), as if deputed thereto; and "elders of Israel," or "of the people," as if representing them and nominated by them (Deut. i, 13). (2) "The heads," זְבָנֵי הָעָם, *i. e. "the princes of the tribes"* (Numb. i, 4, 16), and the chiefs of the *Mishpachoth*, or "families" (xxvi, *passim*). (3) "The judges;" not, of course, the extraordinary rulers, beginning with Othniel, but the זְבָנֵי הָעָם, referred as in Deut. xvi, 18, stationed in every great city, and summoned probably as *ex-officio* members to the congregation. (4) "The officers" (זְבָנֵי הָעָם, γαρμαστῆς, *magistri*; whom Jahn calls *genealogists*, and Gesenius *magistrates*), whether central, as in Numb. xi, 16, or provincial, as in Deut. xvi, 18. These four classes of men, in addition to official duties, seem to have had attached to their offices the prerogative of representing their countrymen at the national convention or *Edah*. We have not classed among these delegates either the "Jethronian prefects" (Exod. xviii, 15; Deut. i, 13-15) or the seventy elders (Numb. xi, 16), for they were undoubtedly included already in one or other of the

normal classes (comp. Numb. xi, 16, and Deut. i, 15). The members of the Congregation were convened by the ruler, or judge, or king, for the time being; e. g. by Moses, *passim*; by Joshua (xxiii, 1, 2); probably by the high-priest (Judges xx, 27, 28); frequently by the kings—by David (1 Chron. xiii, 2), by Solomon (1 Kings viii, 5, etc.), by Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xx, 4, 5), by Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxx, 2), probably by the Tirshathahs afterwards (see Ezra x, 8, 9, 12), and by Judas Maccabæus (1 Macc. iii, 42-46). The place of meeting was at the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation; sometimes, however, some other place of celebrity was selected, as Shechem by Joshua (xxiv, i); Mizpeh (Judg. xx, i); Bezek by Saul; and Gilgal by Samuel (1 Sam. xi, 8, 15).

As long as the Israelites were encamped in the wilderness, the *Edahs* were convened by the sound of silver trumpets. From Numb. x, 2-4, it appears that the blowing of one trumpet only was the signal for a more select convention, composed only of the heads of the *Mishpachoth* and the princes of the tribes; whereas when both trumpets sounded the larger congregations met. But after the occupation of Canaan, when this mode of summons would be clearly ineffectual, the congregations seem to have been convened by messengers (Judg. xx, 1, 12; 1 Sam. xi, 7, 8).

As to the powers and authority of the congregation—it was not a *legislative* body (Conringius, *D. Rep. Hebr.* sec 10, p. 246). The divine law of Moses had already foreclosed all *legislation*, properly so-called; there was only room for by-laws (Sherlock, *Dissert.* iii, 317). Nor was the *tating* power within the competency of the Israelite *Edah*: "the national revenues of the state were so settled in the tithes and other offerings, and there being no soldiery in pay, all holding their estates by military service, there was no room for new or occasional taxes; so that the Hebrew parliament could have no business either to make new laws or to raise money" (Lowman, *Dissert.* p. 135). But there was, for all that, a large residue of authority, which sufficiently guaranteed the national autonomy. (1) The divine law itself was deliberately submitted to the *Edah* for acceptance or rejection (Exod. xix, 3, 9, and xxiv, 3). (2) Their chiefs were submitted to this body on appointment for its approval; e. g. Joshua (Numb. xxvii, 19); Saul (1 Sam. x, 24); Saul again; on the renewal of the kingdom (1 Sam. xi, 15); David (2 Sam. v, 1-3); Solomon (1 Chron. xxix, 22); so the later kings—we take as an instance Joash (2 Chron. xxiii, 3). (3) The *Edah* seems to have the power of staying the execution of a king's sentence (as in Jonathan's case, where "the rescue" was not by force or violence, but by constitutional power [צִדְקָה] carries with it the idea of authority), 1 Sam. xiv, 44, 45). (4) As in parliament, if it had not actually the prerogative of making peace and war, it possessed the power of checking, by disapprobation, the executive authority (see Josh. ix, 15; comp. with ver. 18). In later times, indeed, the prince seems to have laid questions of foreign alliance, etc., before the congregation, either for deliberation or approbation, or both (see the case of Simon Maccabæus in 1 Macc. xiv, 18-28). (5) But in the absence of a ruler, the *Edah* itself apparently decided on war or peace (Judg. xx, 1, 11-14; also xxi, 13-20). (6) The congregation was a high court of appeal in cases of life and death (Numb. xxxv, 12, 24, 25). (7) Capital punishment was not inflicted without the cognizance of the *Edah*, and the execution of the sentence was one of its functions (Lev. xxiv, 10-14; Numb. xv, 32-36). Lastly, the congregation was consulted by Hezekiah and Josiah in their pious endeavors to restore religion (2 Chron. xxx, 2-4; xxxiv, 29). When David mentions his "praises in the great congregation" (הַקְּהִלָּה, Psal. xxii, 26, etc.), it is probably in reference to his "composition of Psalms for the use of the Israelitish Church, and the establishment

in its full splendor of the choral Levitical service" (Thrupp, *Psal.* i, 141), in all which he would require and obtain the co-operation and sanction of the *Edah*. After the rejection of the theocratic constitution by Jeroboam, the congregation sometimes receives a more limited designation, e. g. כְּלֵי־הַקֹּדֶשׁ בְּרֵאשִׁית־הַיָּמִים, "All the Congregation of Jerusalem" (2 Chron. xxx, 2), and כְּלֵי־הַקֹּדֶשׁ בְּרֵאשִׁית־הַיָּמִים, "All the Congregation of Judah," πᾶσα ἡ ἐκκλησία Ἰουδα (ver. 25). The phrase "Congregation of Israel" is used, indeed, twice in this later period (see 2 Chron. xxiv, 6, and xxx, 25); but in the former passage the expression directly refers to the original institution of Moses, and in the latter to the company whom Hezekiah invited out of the neighboring kingdom to attend his passover.—Kitto, s. v. Congregation. See CONGREGATION.

4. *Literature*.—See the *Crítica Biblica*, vol. i: Couring, *De politica Hebræorum* (Helmstadt, 1648); Cungens, *De republica Hebræorum* (Leyden, 1617; Cur. 1666; with notes by Nicolai, Leyd. 1705); Dietrich, *De jure et statu Judæorum* (Marb. 1648, 1661); Hüllmann, *Staatsverfassung der Israeliten* (Lpz. 1834); Leidekker, *Antiquitates Judæorum* (Amst. 1704); id. *De varia republica Hebræor.* (ib. 1710); Lowman, *Civil Government of the Hebrews* (Lond. 1740, with an appendix, ib. 1741); Menoche, *De republica Hebræorum* (Par. 1648); Paalzow, *De civitate Judæorum* (Berlin, 1803); Reimer, *De republica Hebræorum* (Havn. 1657); Reiske, *Theocratia* (Jena, 1670); Sigonius, *De republica Hebræorum* (F. a. M. 1585; also in his *Annotat. et Antiq.* Leyden, 1701); Waleh, *Monarchie der Hebræer* (from the Spanish of Vinc. Marques de S. Philippe, Nürnberg. n. d. s. l. vol. i); Welner, *De republica Hebræorum* (Vitemb. 1657).

**Governor**, a term used by the A. V. to denote various degrees of authority and power: absolute and limited, acquired by birth or by election, military and civil. The numerous and mostly vague original terms are found in other passages translated by "ruler," "chief," "prince," "captain," etc.

1. נָגִיד, *nagid'* (Phen. נָגִיד; Ar. *najid*; Syr. *ngida*; from נָגַד, a verb only used in Hiph. and Hoph. in the signification of *to tell*). The original meaning of this root is *to rise*, to become conspicuous, visible, to be in front (comp. נָגַד, *presto, vorstehen*, to lead, to be first (compare Germ. *Fürst*=prince). The noun נָגִיד, therefore, denotes a prominent personage, whatever his capacity, and is used of a chief or prefect, "governor" of the royal palace, Azrikam (2 Chron. xxviii, 7; compare 1 Kings iv, 6; Isa. xxii, 15; οὐκράτορας, chamberlain, secretary of state), whose power (נָגִיד־הַמֶּלֶךְ) seems to have been very considerable (compare Isa. xxii, 21 sq. "Shelnah . . . a nail to the throne"), and who, it would appear, was distinguished from the other court officers by a particularly brilliant uniform (girdle and robe), and to whose insignia belonged a key worn over the shoulder. In a wider sense the word is applied to the chief of the Temple: Azariah, the high-priest, "ruler of the house of God" (1 Chron. ix, 11; comp. 2 Chron. xxxi, 13); Pashur, "chief governor of the house of God" (Jer. xx, 1); further, to the "leader of the Aaronites," Jehoiadab (1 Chron. xii, 27). Again, it is used of the keeper of the sacred treasury, "Shebuel, ruler of the treasures" (1 Chron. xxvi, 24); of the chieftains of a tribe, "Zebadiah, the ruler of the house of Judah" (2 Chron. xix, 11); of the "captains" of the army (1 Chron. xiii, 1; 2 Chron. xxxii, 21); of the oldest son of the king, the heir-apparent, "Abijah, the son of Maachah [the chief], to be ruler among his brethren" (2 Chron. xi, 22). It is finally applied to the king himself: to Saul (A. Vers. "anoint him to be captain," 1 Sam. ix, 16, etc.), to "Messiah [the Anointed], the Prince" (Dan. ix, 25, etc.). In the plural the word occurs in the more general sense of aristocracy, "Nobles" (Prov. viii, 16),

The Targum renders נָגִידִים, "their judges," by בניגדיהון; and in the Talmud נָגִיד is used parabolically for "leader of a flock." "When the shepherd is angry with his flock he gives it a blind leader" (*Baba K.* 52)—a corrupt generation to which God appoints a bad king. How far the Talmudical use of נָגִיד, in the sense of "flagellate" (*Pes.* 52) and of "extend" (*Baba Mez.* 74), may be connected with the notion of supremacy, reign, we cannot decide here.

2. נָסִי, *nasí'* (from נָסַף, *to carry, lift up*; lit. *raised*, exalted, elected; Sept. ἡγούμενος, ἀρχων), a word applied to the chiefs of the families of which a tribe was composed (Numb. iii, 24, 30, 32, 35; xvi, 2, etc.; as many as 250 on one occasion, Numb. xvi, 2); and who, as deputies (commoners) at the National Assembly, are also called *Nasís* of the congregation, or *Nasís* of Israel (elected, called to the assembly). But it was also used of the twelve supreme chiefs of the tribes themselves (Numb. ii, 3 sq.; vii, 2 sq.; iii, 32, etc.). Both these dignities, the chiefdom of a family as well as that of a tribe, would appear to have been elective—corresponding to the word נָסִי—*not* hereditary, as Michaelis and Winer hold. The *Nasí* of Judah, e. g. Nathson ben-Aminadab, does not descend from the first line of the tribe (Numb. ii; compare 1 Chron. ii, 9, 10). The *Nasí* of Issachar, again, is called Nathaniel ben-Shuar, a name not found among the eldest sons of this tribe (1 Chron. vii, 1-3). Finally, in the table of the *Nasís*—no doubt the chiefs of the tribes—to whom the division of the Promised Land was intrusted by Moses at his death, no son of the *Nasís* of the desert occurs (Munk, *Palest.* p. 194). נָסִי is further employed for generals, under a head (נָסִי), 1 Chron. vii, 40; of Abraham, a *Nasí* of God, a mighty sheik; for non-Israelitish "princes:" of the Midianites (Josh. xiii, 21), and of the Hivites (Shechem) (Gen. xxxiv, 2). On the Macebaean coins Simeon is called "*Nasí* of Israel." *Nasí* was also the official name of the president of the Sanhedrim (under whom stood the "father of the tribunal, or vice-president"), whose seat was in the middle of the seventy-one members (Maim. *Jed. Chaz.* xiv, *Syn.* i).

3. פָּקִיד, *pakid'* (from פָּקַד, *to appoint*), an *officer*, official, magistrate, applied to the ecclesiastical delegate of the high-priest, who, together with the king's scribe, had to empty the chest containing the contribution to the Temple (2 Chron. xxiv, 11); to the Levites (Neh. xi, 22); to the "chief" of the Temple (Jer. xx, i, 2); to "officers in the house of the Lord" (Jer. xxix, 26); to a military commander (2 Kings xxv, 19; Jer. liii, 25), and to his adjutant or principal manager (Judg. ix, 28). Further, to the officers whom Joseph suggested that Pharaoh should put over Egypt during the years of the famine (Gen. xli, 34); to those who were to gather all the virgins unto Shushan for Ahasuerus (Esth. ii, 3); to prefects, "overscers," etc. (Neh. xi, 9; xii, 42); and, finally, to the nobles or "princes" of the king (Jer. xx, 1; 2 Chron. xxxv, 8).

4. שָׁלִיט, *Shallit'*, Heb. and Aram. (from שָׁלַט, *to rule*, have power, Arab. id. comp. Sultán); "one who hath power" (Eccles. viii, 8); "Arioch, the king's captain" (Dan. ii, 15); "Joseph, the governor over the land" (Gen. xlii, 6); a "mighty man" or hero (Eccles. vii, 19); a "king" or satrap (Ezra iv, 20); Daniel, the third "ruler" (Dan. v, 29), etc. The verb שָׁלַט is also used in later Hebrew in the sense "to have power," of evil hours, evil spirits, etc.

5. מֵאֵלֶּפֶת, *Alliph'* (from מָלַף; Arab. id. *to join*, etc.); originally, one who is put over a "thousand," or מֵאֵלֶּפֶת, viz. the round number of families which constitute a clan or subdivision of a tribe (comp. old Saxon "Hundred"). It is first used of the chiefs, "dukes," of Edom (Gen. xxxvi; 1 Chron. i, 51); we find it at a

later period also applied to Jewish chiefs (Zech. ix, 7; xii, 5, 6). This word is not to be confounded either with the captain of a body of a thousand men, or with the "rulers of thousands," a kind of magistrates selected by Moses, on the advice of Jethro, for the purpose of judging the smaller matters during the sojourn of the Israelites in the desert; and who were, at a later period, superseded by the regular institution of the judges. The further use of the word in the sense of "friend" (parallel with עֵתָר, companion, Mic. vii, 5; Prov. xvi, 28, or יְרֵדָה, acquaintance, Psa. lv, 14) must be traced directly to the root (עָטַר, to accustom one's self). It may further be noticed here that Matt. ii, 6 seems to have read the passage in Mic. v, 2, בְּצֵלְפָחַר הַהִרָה, "among the thousands [clans] of Judah," as בְּצֵלְפָחַר הַהִרָה, "among the princes of Judah."

Derived from the partic. act. (Kal and Piel) are the following four: 6. חֲכֵקֵק, חֲכֵקֵק, חֲכֵקֵק, *Chakékék, Mechvékék'* (from חָקַק, lit. an engraver, a writer—scil. of laws (חָקַק, חֲכֵקֵק, law, decree); a lawgiver (Gen. xlix, 10; Deut. xxxiii, 21); one who decides by the law: a judge (Isa. x, 1, parallel with "they that write;" with "they that handle the pen of the writer," Judg. v, 14); "the Lord is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver, the Lord is our king" (Isa. xxxiii, 22); "princes decree justice" (Prov. viii, 15), etc. The Talmud has retained the original meaning of engraving, painting, writing, e. g. יִיבְנוּ הַקִּיְקָה (Gem. Pes. 1, a), is explained by "of the engravers, scribes" (*Aruch*, s. v.), and the imitation implied in the notion of "drawing" has become fixed in the word חֲכֵקֵק (Talm. *Chul.* 41, b, "that he shall not imitate the Sadducees").

7. מִשְׁחֵל, *Moshel'* (מָשַׁל, to be strong), one who reigns, holds dominion, "rules;" used for nearly all degrees of power: of the taskmaster of the ant (Prov. vi, 7), the husband who rules his wife (Gen. iii, 16), Eliezer, who had the management of Abraham's house (Gen. xxiv, 2), Joseph, the second in command over a country (Gen. xlv, 8), an absolute king (Psa. cv, 20; Isa. xvi, 1); also in the bad sense of despot (Isa. xiv, 5); of the Messiah (Mic. v, 1); of God (1 Chron. xxix, 12; Psa. ciii, 19), etc. No less is the word applied to the sway which the sun and moon hold over day and night (Gen. i, 18 ["omnium moderator et dux sol," Cic. *Tusc.* i, 68; "sol cæli rector," Pliny, ii, 4]). In the Talmudical tract *Jal.* 76, מִשְׁחֵל is used for Pharaoh.

8. שָׂר, *Sar* (from שָׁרַר, to rule, reign; comp. Phœn. סַרְגַר, סַרְגַר; Assy. סַר, king, e. g. "Nabukudur-rusur Sar Babilu," Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, Inscr. Borsippa, etc.), a word used of nearly all degrees of chiefdom or wardenship. It is applied to the chief baker of Pharaoh (Gen. xl, 16), to the chief butler (xl, 2), to the "ruler over the cattle" (xlvii, 6), to the keeper of the prison (xxxix, 21), to the taskmaster of the Israelites (Exod. i, 11), to the "prince of the eunuchs" (Dan. i, 7), to the "master of the song," Chenaniah (1 Chron. xv, 27); further, to præfects, civil or military, of very limited or very extensive authority: Zebul, the "ruler of Shechem" (Judg. x, 30); "Amon, the governor of the city" (1 Kings xxii, 26); præfects of the provinces (1 Kings xx, 15); "decurion" (Exod. xviii, 21); "a captain of fifty," *πεντηκωνταρχος* (2 Kings i, 19); captains (judges) over hundreds (Deut. i, 15); over a thousand (1 Sam. xviii, 3); over many thousands (1 Chron. xv, 25); "captain over half of the chariots of war" (1 Kings xvi, 9); "captain of the host" (2 Sam. xxiv, 2); general-in-chief (Gen. xxi, 22; 1 Sam. xii, 9); hence used—after God of hosts—of God himself (Dan. vii, 11). It occurs by itself in the absolute state as a parallel to "judge;" "who has made thee a prince and a judge over us?" (Exod. ii, 14); to "elder" (Ezra x, 8), to

"counsellor" (Ezra viii, 25), to "king" (Hos. iii, 4). The merchants of Tyre are called מַרְכָּלִים, merchant-princes (Isa. xxiii, 9); the same term is applied to noblemen and courtiers, "the princes of Pharaoh" (Gen. xii, 15); "princes of Zoan" (Isa. xix, 11, 13). The priests are called chiefs or princes of the sanctuary (Isa. xliii, 28; 1 Chron. xxv, 5), and the chief-priests again are called *princes of the priests*. Gradually the word came to be used of angels, as patrons and representatives of special nations (guardian angels): of Persia (Dan. x, 13, 20); of Greece (Dan. x, 20); of Israel (x, 21); Michael, "the great prince" (xii, 1); the chief princes (x, 13); "the Prince of princes"—God (viii, 25; comp. Sept. in Deut. xxxii, 8). The use of שָׂר as guardian angel is retained in the Midrash, but the word is also applied in the Talmud to "a hero at the table, a mighty drinker" (*Nidd.* 16, etc.). See CAPTAIN.

Of foreign origin is, פֶּחָה, *Pechah'*, פֶּחָה, פֶּחָה; Josephus, *ἐπαρχος*, of Tatnai (*Ant.* xi, 4, 4). This word has been variously derived from the Persian for "magrates" (Bohler); Persic "to cook" (Ewald); Persic for "Satelles," "Pedisequus" (Gesenius); from the Turkish for "general" (Frähn); from the Assyrian *Pakha* (Sanscr. *Pakshah*); whence *pasha*—friend [of the king], adjutant, governor of a province (Benfey, Stern); from the Arab. *Pé*, "the lower," and *gáh*, "royal office" = Pégáh, sub-king (Först); from "the Arab. verb *فاح*, *wallat*" (Jahn); and, finally, from the Hebrew פֶּחָה = חָקַק, *rayéto*. It is applied to a sub-præfect of a province, who is subject to the authority of the præfect or real governor, in contradistinction from מִשְׁחֵל הַשָּׂרָה, a satrap (Esth. viii, 9); from שָׂר (ib.); from שָׂרָה, "sagan," municipal officer (Jer. li, 28); and from מֶלֶךְ, "king" or sub-king (2 Chron. ix, 14). It is used of the "chiefs" of provinces in the Assyrian (2 Kings xviii, 24; Isa. xxxvi, 9), Babylonian [Chaldee] (Jer. li, 57; Ezek. xxiii, 6, 23; Dan. iii, 2), Median, and Persian empires (Jer. li, 28; Esth. iii, 12; viii, 9). Palestine stood, while under Persian dominion, under such officers, called "præfects over the river" (Euphrates), whose official residence [בֵּיתֵם] was in Jerusalem (Neh. iii, 7; Ezra v, 3; vi, 6; Neh. ii, 7, 9). They were also called *præfects* of Judah (Hagg. i, 1); e. g. Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 63; Hagg. ii, 21, etc.); Nehemiah, who succeeded Sheshbazzar (Neh. v, 14, 15; xviii, 12). The word seems to have been adopted into the Hebrew idiom at an early period, since we find it used in 1 Kings x, 15 (2 Chron. ix, 14) of the tributary chieftains "of the country"—together with the "kings of Arabia;" further, of Syrian captains to be put in the room of the (vice-) kings at the time of Benhadad (1 Kings xx, 24); and, finally, it passed current for any person in high authority who was to be propitiated by gifts (Mal. i, 8). With respect to the שָׂר of Judæa, introduced by Persian rule, it would appear that their remuneration ("bread of the governor," Ezra iv, 14) consisted partly in kind, partly in money ("bread, wine, and forty shekels of silver," Neh. v, 15), chargeable upon the people (Neh. v, 18: "One ox and six choice sheep, also fowls, and once in ten days store of all sorts of wine"). Their office seems chiefly to have consisted in collecting the taxes of the province (Ezra vi, 8); an office at a later period in the hands of the high-priest, and still later let out on lease.—Kitto, s. v. See PAMATI-MOAB.

10. The Chaldee term שָׂגַן, *Segan'* (in the plur. שָׂגָנִים) is applied (Dan. iii, 2, 27; vi, 8) to the governors of the Babylonian satrapies, in a general way, in connection with other official terms, from which it is not clearly distinguishable, except that it appears to designate the provincial præfects or viceroys; and elsewhere (Dan. ii, 48) it is applied to the præfects

over the Magi, of whom one is especially entitled as chief or supreme (𐤇) over his colleagues. The corresponding Heb. term *שָׂגָן*, *sagan'*, is spoken of the provincial rulers under the Chaldee supremacy (Jer. li, 23, 28, 57, where it distinguished by *שָׂגָן אֲבוּיָהוּ*, above; Ezek. xxiii, 6, 12, 23; comp. Isa. xli, 25); also to the chiefs and rulers of the people of Jerusalem under the Persian supremacy (Ezra ix, 2; Neh. ii, 16; iv, 8, 13; v, 7, 17; vii, 5; xii, 40; xiii, 11; in many of which passages it is associated with other titles of office or honor); and in the Targums it is used of the *vicar* of the high-priest, or the presiding officer of the Temple. Corresponding to this term are the modern Persian, Arabic, and Syriac words for satrap. It is apparently of Sanscrit origin.—Gesenius, s. v.; Fürst, s. v.

The Greek terms rendered in the N. T. "governor" are the following, of which the first two relate to public or military officers, and the last two to domestic usages:

11. *Ἐθνάρχης*, *Ethnarch* (2 Cor. xi, 32), an officer of rank under Aretas, the Arabian king of Damascus. It is not easy to determine the capacity in which he acted. The term is applied in 1 Macc. xiv, 47; xv, 1, to Simon the high-priest, who was made general and *ethnarch* of the Jews as a vassal of Demetrius. From this the office would appear to be distinct from a military command. The jurisdiction of Archelaus, called by Josephus (*War*, ii, 6, 3) an ethnarchy, extended over Idumæa and all Judæa, the half of his father's kingdom, which he held as the emperor's vassal. But, on the other hand, Strabo (xvii, 13), in enumerating the officers who formed part of the machinery of the Roman government in Egypt, mentions ethnarchs apparently as inferior both to the military commanders, and to the monarchs, or governors of districts. Again, the præfect of the colony of Jews in Alexandria (called by Philo *γενάρχη*, *lib. in Flacc.* § 10) is designated by this title in the edict of Claudius given by Josephus (*Ant.* xix, 5, 2). According to Strabo (*Joseph. Ant.* xiv, 7, 2), he exercised the prerogatives of an ordinary independent ruler. It has therefore been conjectured that the ethnarch of Damascus was merely the governor of the resident Jews, and this conjecture receives some support from the parallel narrative in Acts ix, 24, where the Jews alone are said to have taken part in the conspiracy against the apostle. But it does not seem probable that an officer of such limited jurisdiction would be styled "the ethnarch of Aretas the king; and as the term is clearly capable of a wide range of meaning, it was most likely intended to denote one who held the city and district of Damascus as the king's vassal or representative. See ETHNARCH.

12. *Ἡγεμών*, the *Procurator* of Judæa under the Romans (Matt. xxvii, 2, etc.). The verb is employed (Luke ii, 2, etc.) to denote the nature of the jurisdiction of Quirinus over the imperial province of Syria (see Gerlach, *Die römischen Statthalter in Syrien und Judæa*, Berl. 1865). See PROCURATOR.

13. *Οικονομός* (Gal. iv, 2), a *steward*, apparently intrusted with the management of a minor's property. See STEWARD.

14. *Ἀρχιτρικλινός* (John ii, 9), "the *governor* of the feast." It has been conjectured, but without much show of probability, that this officer corresponded to the *συνεπιτάρχος* of the Greeks, whose duties are described by Plutarch (*Sympos. Quest.* 4), and to the *arbiter bibendi* of the Romans. Lightfoot supposes him to have been a kind of chaplain, who pronounced the blessings upon the wine that was drunk during the seven days of the marriage feast. Again, some have taken him to be equivalent to the *τραπέζοποιός*, who is defined by Pollux (*Onom.* vi, 1) as one who had the charge of all the servants at a feast, the carvers, cup-bearers, cooks, etc. But there is nothing in the narrative of the marriage feast at Cana which would lead to the supposition that the *ἀρχιτρικλινός* held the rank of a

servant. He appears rather to have been on intimate terms with the bridegroom, and to have presided at the banquet in his stead. The duties of the master of a feast are given at full length in Ecclus. xxxv (xxxii). See ARCHITRICLINUS.

In the apocryphal books, in addition to the common words *ἄρχων*, *ὑεσπότης*, *στρατηγός*, which are rendered "governor," we find *ἑπιστάτης* (1 Esdr. i, 8; Judith ii, 14), which closely corresponds to *ἐπαρχος* used of Zerubbabel and Tatnai (1 Esdr. vi, 3, 29; vii, 1), and *προστάτης*, applied to Sheshbazzar (1 Esdr. ii, 12), both of which represent *ἑπιστάτης*; *ἑπιστάτης* (1 Esdr. vii, 2) and *προστάτης τοῦ ἱεροῦ* (2 Macc. iii, 4), "the governor of the temple" = *ἑπιστάτης* (comp. 2 Chron. xxxv, 8); and *σατράπης* (1 Esdr. iii, 2, 21), "a satrap," not always used in its strict sense, but as the equivalent of *στρατηγός* (Judith v, 2; vii, 8).—Smith, s. v. See PRINCE.

15. In James iii, 4, the Greek term rendered "governor" is *ἐξέτινος*, a guide or *director*, i. e. helmsman (prop. *κυβερνήτης*, whence Lat. *gubernator*, Eng. *governor*, the last in a different sense). See SHIP.

The following list (modified from the *Biblical Repository*, 1832, p. 381, 382) of the presiding officers of Judæa (q. v.) will be found useful in comparing the history of those times. See each name in its place. For those of Syria, see SYRIA.

PROCURATORS OF JUDEA.	A. D.
(1) Coponius .....	6-9
(2) Marcus Ambivivus .....	9-12
(3) Annus Rufus. These three were appointed by Augustus; the two following by Tiberius .....	12-15
(4) Valerius Gratus .....	15-16
(5) Pontius Pilatus .....	16-36
(6) Marcellus, sent by Vitellius, the governor of Syria, in place of Pilate .....	36-37
(7) Marullus, sent by Caligula .....	37-40
(8) Publius Ieronius, who was at the same time governor of Syria, managed the affairs of the Jews himself. Under his successor Mar-us 41-0, there seems to have been no distinct procurator of Judæa for two or three years .....	40-42
(9) Cuspius Fadus, sent by Claudius .....	42-46
(10) Tiberius Alexander .....	47-49
(11) Ventidius Cimmanus .....	49-53
(12) A. Claudius Felix .....	53-55
(13) Portius Festus, under Nero .....	55-62
(14) Albinus .....	62-64
(15) Gessius Florus, the last procurator of Judæa .....	65
(16) Josephus, however, speaks ( <i>War</i> , vi, 4, 3) of a Marcus Antonius Julianus as being (or having been) procurator ( <i>ἑπιστάτης</i> ) of Judæa in the last struggle with the Romans, A. D. 70.	

**Govinda**, SIXTH, the tenth and last *guru* (teacher) of the sect of the Sikhs, was born at Patnah, in Behar, in 1661. He was a son of Tegh Bahadur, the ninth *guru*. He was educated at Madra Des, in the Punjab, where the Sikhs have always been very numerous. His father, whose power was offensive to the Great Mogul Aurungzebe, was put to death by order of the latter in 1675. Govinda himself had to retire to the mountains surrounding Djemnah, where he passed twenty-five years, devoting his time to religious meditation, to the study of the Koran, of the religious books of the Hindoos, and the Persian language. He then undertook a religious reformation of the Sikhs (q. v.). He claimed to be a special envoy of God, though he at the same time always declared that he was only a mortal man. He sanctioned the abolition of caste; all the Sikhs are to be equal. They must only adore the one God. The worship of saints and of images of the Deity are regarded as acts of superstition. The precepts contained in the Koran and the Puranas cannot procure salvation. The faithful, on the contrary, must totally separate from the Mussulmans and the Hindoos. They are permitted to kill animals and to use their flesh. Govinda declared all to be infamous, who would kill female children; but to exterminate the Mongols was, on the other hand, declared to be a meritorious act. War was to be the occupation of all his followers, to every one of whom



he gave the title *singh* (lion or soldier), and threatened with excommunication and everlasting damnation all who would abandon the chief in a battle at the moment of danger. For admission into the sect a kind of baptism was prescribed, and it was declared to be a meritorious act to bathe from time to time in the lake of Amritsir. Govinda declared that he would be everywhere where five of his disciples would be assembled; and he introduced a kind of council, at which the prominent chiefs met to discuss public affairs. Govinda gained many converts for the sect of the Sikhs. His relative, Ram Rae, who disputed with him the title guru, was put to death by his order. Having become involved in a war with the Mongols, he twice defeated them; but finally, as all his allies abandoned him, he had to withdraw into the interior of his states. While he endeavored to defend his strongholds, all his children perished. When the last stronghold, Tehamkor, fell, he made good his escape in the disguise of a dervish, and safely reached the desert of Bhutinda. Having been joined by many of his adherents, he was able to repulse his enemies. He finally accepted an invitation to the court of the Great Mogul Aurungzebe; but, before he reached Delhi, Aurungzebe died; but the successor of the latter, Bahadur Shah, received him with marked honor, and is said to have made him governor of a province in the valley of the Godavery. There he died soon after. The Sikhs regard Govinda as superior to the preceding gurus, and none of his successors has been deemed worthy to bear the title. Govinda is the author of a part of *Desven Padshah ka Greuth* (Book of the Tenth King), one of the sacred books of the Sikhs, which is written in Hindoo verses, with a conclusion in the Persian language. Of the sixteen parts of this work, the five first and a portion of the sixth are from Govinda. He also made additions to the other sacred book of the Sikhs, the *Greuth* (Book), a collection of sentences of several gurus. Besides these works, he wrote *Rehet nameh* (Book of Rules) and *Tenka nameh* (Book of Restrictions).—Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxi, 596 sq.; McGregor, *History of the Sikhs*, vol. i. (A. J. S.)

**Gozal.** See FLEDGLING.

**Go'zan** (Heb. *Gozan'*, גֹּזָן, according to Gesenius, *quarry*; according to Fürst, *ford*; Sept. Γωζάν [v. r. Γωζάν and Νοζάν]), the tract to which the Israelites were carried away captive by Pul, Tiglath-Pileser, and Salmanser, or possibly Sargon (2 Kings xvii, 6; 1 Chron. v, 26). It is also mentioned as a region of Central Asia, subject to the Assyrians (2 Kings xix, 12; Isa. xxxvii, 12), situated on the Habor (2 Kings xvii, 6; xviii, 11). Ptolemy, in his description of Media, mentions a town called *Gauzania* (*Geogr.* vi, 2, 10), situated between the Zagros mountains and the Caspian Sea. Bochart (*Opp.* i, 194) and others (so Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Geogr.* I, ii, 102) have attempted to identify this town with Gozan. Rennell further states that the river Gozan (1 Chron. v, 26) is the modern *Kizil Ozm*, which rises near Sinna, in the eastern part of the Zagros chain, and, after a winding course, joins the Sefid-rud, which flows into the Caspian (*Geography of Herodotus*, i, 521, 2d ed.; see also Ritter, *Erdkunde*, viii, 615; Ker Porter, *Travels*, i, 267; Kinnier, *Memoir on the Persian Empire*, p. 121; Morier's *Second Journey*, i, 267). This theory, however, places Gozan too far east for the requirements of the Scripture narrative. Dr. Grant supposes that the word *Gozan* signifies "pasture," and is the same as the modern *Gozan*, the name given by the Nestorians to all the highlands of Assyria which afford pasturage to their flocks. He thinks that the ancient province of Gozan embraced the mountainous region east of the Tigris, through which the Khabûr and the Zab flow (*Nestorian Christians*, p. 125 sq.). A close examination of the notices in Scripture, and a comparison of them with the Geography of Ptolemy and modern researches, enable us to fix, with a high

degree of probability, the true position of Gozan. It appears from 2 Kings xvii, 6 (also xviii, 11), that Gozan was in Assyria, which is there distinguished from Media; and that Habor was a "river of Gozan." There can be little doubt that the Habor is identical with the Khabûr of Mesopotamia. See HABOR. Gozan must, therefore, have been in Mesopotamia. The words of 2 Kings xix, 12 appear to confirm this view, for there Gozan and Haran are grouped together, and we know that Haran is in Mesopotamia. The conjunction of Gozan with Haran or Harran in Isaiah (xxxvii, 12) is in entire agreement with the position here assigned to the former. As Gozan was the district on the Khabour, so Haran was that upon the Bilik, the next affluent of the Euphrates. See CHARRAN. The Assyrian kings, having conquered the one, would naturally go on to the other. In 1 Chron. v, 26, Gozan is, by an erroneous rendering in the A. V., called a *river*, and is distinguished from Habor. The true explanation seems to be, that in this passage Habor is the name of a district, probably that watered by the lower Khabûr; while the upper part of the same river, flowing through the province of Gozan, is called גֹּזָן הַיָּבֵיט, *the river of Gozan*. Gozan seems to be mentioned on the cuneiform inscriptions (q. v.). Ptolemy states that *Gauzanitis* (Γαυζανίτις) was one of the provinces of Mesopotamia adjoining Chalcedis (*Geograph.* v, 18, 4). The same province Strabo calls *Mygdonia* (xvi, 1, 27), which may probably be, as suggested by Rawlinson, another form of the same name (*Ancient Monarchies*, i, 245), ζ being prefixed and ι rendered into δ. As we find Halah, Habor, and Haran grouped together in Mesopotamia; as we find beside them a province called Gauzanitis; and as in Scripture Gozan is always mentioned in connection with the above places, we may safely conclude that Gozan and Gauzanitis are identical. Gauzanitis lay along the southern declivities of Mons Masius, and extended over the region watered by the upper Khabûr and Jeruher rivers to the ranges of Sinjar and Hamma. The greater part of it is an undulating plain, having a poor soil and scanty vegetation (Layard, *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 275). On the other hand, Mr. Layard describes the tract immediately along the Khabûr as one of remarkable fertility (*ib.* p. 227).—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v. See CAPTIVITY.

**Graal** (Grâl, from the old French, but originally Celtic word *Gréal*, Provençal *grazal*, and in mediæval Latin *gradatis*) signified originally a "bowl-shaped vessel." The poetry of the Middle Ages makes numerous mention of the Saint Grâl (in old French *San grâl*), a vessel said to have been made of a precious stone, and endowed with wonderful virtues. According to the legend, the vessel was brought to the earth by angels, and kept first by them, then by a company of knights commanded by a king, in a temple built expressly for it, at the summit of the unapproachable mountain Montsalvage. The legend was developed in the early part of the 12th century by the addition of Arabic, Jewish, and Christian elements during the wars between the Moors and Christians, and especially in the wars of the Templars in Spain and Southern France. In these countries it became a favorite theme for poets. In 1170 it had become confounded with the legends of Arthur and of the Round Table, by Chrétien de Troyes and other Troubadours of Northern France. In the legend of the Round Table the Saint Graal is considered as the vessel used by Christ at the last supper, and in which Joseph of Arimathea caught the blood that fell from the side of Christ (hence the erroneous meaning attached to the word, as *Sang réal*, i. e. royal blood, blood of the Lord). The legend was made the subject of a poem in old French by Guiot de Provins, which has been lost. This tale furnished Wolfram von Eschenbach the materials for his *Parzival* and *Titurel*, but he gave the subject a deeply allegorical meaning of his own. The subject was more

thoroughly treated by the author of the second *Tituel* in 1270; yet he connects it with the legends of Lohengrin and of Prester John.

The legend of the Saint Graal is of some importance in the history of the Church. Attempts have been made to show the derivation of the word itself, *graal*, from Garalah (גַּרְלָה), i. e. *foreskin*, in allusion to the blood shed in circumcision as the type of the blood of Christ. But it appears certain that it means a vessel, cup, or shell. A costly cup was really found by the first crusaders at Caesarea. It was allotted to the Genoese, who brought it to Genoa, where it remained for several centuries in the chapel of John the Baptist in the Church of St. Lorenzo, from whence it was transported to Paris. There appears to be some connection between the legend of Prester John, as joined with the *San Graal*, and the still existing remains of the Gnostic sect known by the appellation of *Disciples of John* (Sabians, Zabians, Nazareans, Mendeanes, Baptists). Not only the name *John*, but the *locality* assigned in the legend (viz. the interior of Asia, on the southern frontier of the Turkish empire), as well as the fact that in this Gnostic sect the king is at the same time high-priest, seems to favor the idea of a connection. The *use* of the Graal, according to the tradition, is as follows: It is claimed on every Good Friday there comes into it, from heaven, a holy wafer, which is intended as the food for many; thus the Graal is a sort of continuation of the miracle of feeding the multitude (Matt. xv, 32). It provides food and drink in abundance for the *initiated*, but to them *alone* it is visible. It cannot be obtained by violence, but is to be received by faith. At the bottom of the legend we find the doctrine of the real presence in the Lord's Supper. The *wanderings* of the Saint Graal, which came from the East to the West, afterwards to return again to the East, points the Church to the duty of missionary enterprise, etc. In all these poetical legends one point is especially deserving of notice: it is the evidence they afford of the tendencies of the Christian mind in all ages to fathom the unfathomable, and to cling to the memory of past events, and to reproduce them. But for this very reason it becomes the more necessary for us to distinguish between the original and the image, between the real facts and the errors which have grown up around them. By a just criticism, the poetry of the Middle Ages, which in latter times has been much studied, can be made very useful for the history of theology.—See Büsching, *Der heil. Gral u. seine Hüter* (*Altd. Museum*, Berl. 1809, vol. i.); Boissiercé, *Ueber d. Beschreibung d. heil. Grals* (Mun. 1834); C. Lachmann, *Wolfram von Eschenbach* (Berlin, 1833, 2d ed. 1854); San Marte (Schultz), *Die Sage v. heil. Gral* (*Leben u. Dichten W's v. Eschenbach*, 1841, vol. ii.); K. Sinrock, *Parcival und Tituel* (Stuttg. and Tubing, 1842); C. F. Göschel, *Die Sage v. Parcival u. v. Gral*, etc. (Berlin, 1855); Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* v. 314; Dunlop, *History of Fiction*, p. 73 sq. (London, 1845, 1 vol. 8vo); Bullfinch, *Age of Chivalry*, p. 185–226 (Boston, 1865, 8vo).

**Grā'ba** (Γραβά v. r. Ἀργαβά, Vulg. *Armacha*), given (1 Esdras v, 29) as the name of one of the Nethinim ("servants of the Temple") whose "sons" returned from the captivity; evidently the HAGABAII (q. v.) or HAGABA of the Heb. texts (Ezra ii, 45; Neh. vii, 48).

**Grabe**, JOHANN ERNST, a Protestant theologian, was born at Königsberg, Prussia, July 10, 1666. He studied theology in order to enter the ministry in the Lutheran Church, but, having imbibed the High-church theory of apostolical succession, he thought of joining the Roman Catholic Church, but, by the advice of Spener, he went in 1697 to England, where he was well received by William III, who settled upon him a pension of £100 a year. In 1700 he was ordained a deacon, and was presented to a chaplaincy of Christ Church, Oxford, which was the only ecclesiastical appointment he ever held. Upon the accession of Queen

Anne his pension was continued, and in 1706 the University of Oxford conferred upon him the degree of D.D. He now devoted himself to literary labors, in which he was industriously occupied until his death, Nov. 14, 1711.

Of his numerous works the most celebrated is his edition of the *Septuagint*, the text of which is founded upon the Alexandrian MS, then in St. James's Library, but now in the British Museum. Vol. I (Oxford, 1707) contains the Pentateuch and the three following books. Vol. II was to contain all the historical books of the Old Testament; vol. III all the prophetic books; and vol. IV the Psalms, the Books of Solomon, etc. But after Grabe had begun to print the second volume, he was induced to postpone the appearance of that, and also of the third volume, by the expectation of being furnished with important MSS. and other materials, which would enable him to render them more complete. That no time might be lost, however, in expediting the whole work, he published in 1709 vol. IV, *Continens Psalmorum, Jobi, ac tres Salomonis Libros, cum Apocrypha ejusdem, necnon Syriacæ Sapientia* (fol., and 8vo). In the following year he published a Latin dissertation, giving a particular account of the reasons why he had departed from his original order of publication, and of the materials which he expected to receive in order to perfect his plan. These were, a Syriac MS. of the original books of the Old Testament, with Origen's remarks upon them; and two MSS., one belonging to Cardinal Chigi, and the other to the college of Louis XIV. Afterwards he received these MSS., and made collations from them; in the mean while he had prepared a volume of annotations upon the whole work, and also collected the materials for the *Prolegomena*. It required, however, so much time to digest the whole into proper method, that the second and third volumes were not published until after his death, the former in 1719 and the latter in 1720. He also published *Spicilegium SS. Patrum et hæreticorum sæc. i, ii* (Oxon. 1714, 2 vols. 8vo); *Justinus Apologia Prima; Irenæi adversus Hæreses Libri V; Epistola ad Millium* (to show that the Alexandrian MS. of the Septuagint contains the best version of the Book of Judges, and that the version of the Vatican MS. is almost a new one, made in the third century); *An Essay upon two Arabic MSS. of the Eodæian Library; De Formâ Consecrationis Eucharistiæ, hoc est, Defensio Ecclesiæ Græcæ contra Romanam*. He had also published in 1705 a beautiful edition of *Bishop Bull's* works (fol.), with notes, for which he received the author's thanks.—Hook, *Ecc. Biog.* v, 347; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* v, 310.

**Grace** (Lat. *gratia*; Gr. χάρις; Heb. חַסֵּד and חֶסֶד), a word of various import in Scripture and in theology.

1. *Scriptural Uses*.—(1.) Physical beauty (*grace* of form and person) (Prov. i, 9; iii, 22; xxxi, 30; Psa. xlv, 2, etc.). (2.) Favor, kindness, goodness, benevolence, friendship of God towards men, or of men towards one another (Gen. vi, 8; xviii, 3; xix, 19; 2 Sam. x, 2; 2 Tim. i, 9). (3.) God's forgiving mercy, as gratuitous and opposed to merit (Rom. xi, 6; Ephes. ii, 5; Colos. i, 6, etc.). (4.) The Gospel generally, as contradistinguished from the law (John i, 17; Rom. vi, 14; 1 Pet. v, 12, etc.). (5.) Certain gifts of God, freely bestowed; e. g. miracles, prophecy, tongues, etc. (Rom. xv, 15; 1 Cor. xv, 10; Ephes. iii, 8, etc.). (6.) Christian virtues; e. g. charity, liberality, holiness, etc. (2 Cor. viii, 7; 2 Pet. iii, 18). (7.) The glory to be revealed, or eternal life (1 Pet. i, 13). Wilson (*Bampton Lecture on the Communion of Saints*, Oxford, 1851, 8vo) remarks as follows on the scriptural use of the word: "Χάρις occurs in the Sept. version sixty-six times, of which number it stands sixty-one times for חֶסֶד, and its signification in the New Test. cannot be fairly estimated without reference to the idea expressed by that Hebrew word. This is drawn alto-

gether from Oriental life, and implies properly the good will and inclination of a superior towards an inferior, so much below him as to seek only for a spontaneous and gratuitous favor, or to invite the favor only by his needs, humility, and supplications. The favorable inclination is manifested in a kind of condescending aspect. Hence constantly the phrase 'find favor in the sight of' (רָצוֹן רָצוֹן): compare particularly Numb. vi, 25, 'The Lord make his face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee' (רָצוֹן רָצוֹן). Upon an examination of the use of the words רָצוֹן and רָצוֹן in the Old Test. it will appear that a quality is sometimes implied in the object which has invited the favor of the superior; sometimes the favor is altogether gratuitous; a few instances are subjoined. 1. A quality or antecedent merit is supposed: Gen. xxxii, 5; xxxix, 4, 21; xlvii, 29; 1, 4; 1 Sam. xvi, 22; xxv, 8; 2 Sam. xvi, 4; Esth. ii, 15, 17; v. 2; Prov. i, 9; iii, 22; iv, 9 (in these three places χάρις, *spiritual graces*); Prov. v, 19, *hinnuli gratie*; xiii, 15, *bona mens dat gratium*; xi, 16, *mulier gratie* (ἐὺνοητος); in Nah. iii, 4, *pulchritudo meretricis*. 2. On the other hand, the idea of merit or pleasing quality is excluded in Gen. xxxiv, 11; Exod. iii, 21; xi, 3; xii, 36; Numb. xxxii, 5; Ruth ii, 2; 1 Sam. i, 18; xxvii, 5; Jer. xxxi, 2; but particularly in Exod. xxxiii, 19, where רָצוֹן רָצוֹן רָצוֹן is translated by εὐχαισῶ ὑν ἂν ἐλθῶ; and Psa. li, 3, where, and in other places, רָצוֹן has nearly the meaning of רָצוֹן, to pity and commiserate. רָצוֹן stands for a gift of free love in Psa. lxxxiv, 12; Prov. iii, 34. A merit or pleasing quality in the object is neither excluded nor necessarily implied in Psa. lxxvii, 2, and elsewhere. But some exciting cause of the favor is supposed in Deut. xxvii, 50; 2 Kings xiii, 23; Job xix, 21 (*Have pity on me*); Psa. exxxiii, 6; Prov. xiv, 35; xix, 17 (*He that hath pity on the poor*); xxi, 10; Isa. xxx, 18, 19; xxxiii, 2; Lam. iv, 16; Amos v, 15; Mal. i, 9. But the best illustration of the Hebrew idea of 'grace' will be derived from observing that רָצוֹן רָצוֹן, the form of which implies to make one's self an object of grace, means not to deserve, but to pray; and רָצוֹן רָצוֹן are not merits, but supplications; the humility and abject condition of the suppliant is thus the exciting cause of the favor (1 Kings viii, 33, 47, 59; ix, 3; 2 Chron. vi, 24, 37; Job ix, 15; xix, 16; Esth. iv, 8). רָצוֹן רָצוֹן is sometimes prayer and sometimes the favor gained by it." The word *grace* occurs 128 times in the New Test. (Cruden). Wilson presents all these passages in a tabular form, with explanations, and remarks that a comparison of them will show that "there is not one text in which the word *grace* occurs in any connection with either of the sacraments." See SACRAMENTS.

II. *Theological*.—The word "grace" is the hinge of three great theological controversies: (1) that of the nature of depravity and regeneration, between the orthodox doctrine of the Church and Pelagianism; (2) that of the relation between grace and free will, between the Calvinists and the Arminians; (3) that of means (*media*) of grace, between the Romanists and Puseyites on the one hand and Protestants on the other. For the treatment of the first, see PELAGIANISM; on the second, see ARMINIANISM; ELECTION; PREDESTINATION; WILL. On the third, see SACRAMENTS.

**Grace, LETTERS OF, gratia, gratiosa rescripta**, is the name given to particular rescripts, by which the pope sometimes grants especial privileges, indulgences, exemptions, etc. to all who have participated in extraordinary processions; when a prebend or the reversion of an office is the reward, then the letter of grace constitutes a *gratia expectativa* (see EXPECTANTIE). For the canon law on the subject, see WETZER u. WELTE, *Kirchen-Lex.*

**Grace, MEANS OF.** See MEANS OF GRACE; SACRAMENTS.

**Grace AT MEALS**, a short prayer at table, imploring the divine blessing, and expressing thanks to God for the food he has provided. The propriety of such an act is evident both from the scriptural injunction (1 Cor. x, 31) and from the example of our Lord (Mark viii, 6, 7).

**Gradmontains.** See GRANDMOUNTAINS.

**Gradual**, an anthem, psalm, or part of a psalm chanted in the mass between the epistle and the gospel. So called because the chanter stood on the pulpit steps. The name is also given to the book containing the psalms chanted at mass, which was called *gradale*, or *graduale*.—Palmer, *Orig. Liturg.* ii, 46; Procter, *On Common Prayer*, p. 8, 317.

**Graduate**, one who has obtained a degree in a university: the name is usually given to those who have obtained merely the lowest degree, that of A. B. See DEGREES.

**Græcia.** See GRECIA.

**Graeffe, JOHANN FRIEDRICH CHRISTOPH**, a German philosophical and theological writer, was born at Göttingen Feb. 15, 1754. He studied in the university of that city, became pastor of Oberjesa in 1784, and in 1792 became pastor of a parish and professor of catechetics and of philosophy at Göttingen. He died at Göttingen Oct. 27, 1816. He wrote several works on philosophy and theology, all more or less on the system of Kant. Among them are *Vollständiges Lehrbuch d. allgemeinen Katechetik nach Kantischen Grundsätzen* (Gott. 1795-1799, 3 vols. 8vo);—*Grundsätze d. allgen. Katech. nach Kantisch. Grundsätzen* (Gött. 1799);—*De Miraculorum Natura, philosophie principis non contradicente* (Helmstadt, 1797);—*Commentar über eine der schwersten Stellen in Kants metaphysischen Anfangsgründen d. Naturwissenschaft* (Celle, 1798);—*Die Pastoralthologie nach ihrem ganzen Umfange* (Celle, 1803, 2 vols.).—See Beyer, *Allg. Mag. für Predig.* vol. xii; Doering, *Gel. Theol.* i, 525; Hofer, *Now. Biog. Générale*, xxi, 584.

**Graft** (ἐγκεντρίζω, to prick in or spur on, Wisd. xvi, 11; hence to insert by an incision, Rom. xi, 23, A. V. "graft in"), the process of inoculating fruit-trees, often resorted to in order to preserve the quality of the fruit; by taking shoots or buds from approved trees and inserting them on others, where, with proper precautions, they continue to grow (Rom. xi. 17-24). By this process particular sorts of fruit may be kept from degenerating, which they are very apt to do when raised from the seed; for the grafts, though they receive their nourishment from the stocks, always produce fruit of the same sort as the tree from which they were taken. This process is peculiarly appropriate to the olive-tree (Stuart, *Comment.* ad loc.). An insect of the gnat species is said to breed in the male fig-tree, and, being covered with the pollen of the male flowers, impregnates with it the stigma of the female tree. The flowers of the palm-tree yield fruit only on the female tree, when its stigmata have been fecundated by pollen from the male; and as it is precarious to leave this process to be effected by insects or the wind, it is commonly done by manual labor. See FIG. The Hebrews appear to have pinched off the blossoms of the fruit-trees during the three first years of their growth, in order to improve their fruitfulness (Numb. xviii, 12, 13). See TREE.

**Grafton, JOSEPH**, a highly respected and useful Baptist minister, was born at Newport, R. I., in 1757. His father was a sailor, but abandoned the sea to set up the business of sail-making in Providence. Joseph, at the age of fourteen, began working at his father's trade. He was hopefully converted in 1775, and joined the Congregational Church, which included Baptists dissatisfied with strict communion. He began

preaching in 1776. While preaching to a congregation of "Separates" in Plainfield, Conn., he reconsidered his views on communion, and joined in 1787 the Baptist Church. He was ordained a pastor of the First Baptist Church in Newton, Mass., in 1788, where for nearly fifty years he continued his studies and labors in a successful pastorate and in habitual activity on behalf of missionary and benevolent undertakings. He was actively engaged in founding the theological seminary at Newton, and was for many years one of its trustees. He died in 1836. He published four sermons and some occasional addresses. (L. E. S.)

**Graham, Isabella**, a woman noted for piety and intelligence, one of the "saints" of modern times. She was born in Lanarkshire, Scotland, and was piously educated by her parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Marshall. At seventeen she was admitted by Dr. Witherspoon (afterwards president of Princeton College) to the Lord's Supper. In 1765 she was married to Dr. Graham, and accompanied him to Canada, where his regiment was stationed. Her husband died at Antigua in 1774. She returned to Scotland, and supported her father and her four children by opening a school for young ladies. In 1789 she returned to New York, and opened a seminary. In 1799 a society was instituted at New York for the relief of poor widows with small children. The original plan of the society was formed at the house of Mrs. Graham, and a school for the instruction of orphans was opened, and taught by Mrs. Graham's former pupils. Besides establishing this school, Mrs. Graham selected some of the widows best qualified for the task, and engaged them for a small compensation to open day schools for the instruction of the children in distant parts of the city. She also established two Sunday-schools. In 1806 a society of ladies was organized to procure or build an asylum for orphan children. Mrs. Graham remained in the office of directress of the Widows' Society, but felt also much interest in the success of the Orphan Asylum Society, and herself, or one of her family, taught the orphans daily until the friends of the institution were sufficient to provide a teacher and superintendent. In 1811 some gentlemen of New York established a Magdalen Society, and Mrs. Graham became its president until her death. In 1814 she united with some ladies in forming a society for the promotion of industry among the poor. For some weeks previous to her last illness she was favored with unusual health, and much enjoyment of religion. She died on the 24th of July, 1814. Few books have been more widely circulated than her *Life and Letters* (last ed. London, 1838, 8vo). In America, Dr. Mason's sketch of her has been widely scattered by the Tract Society. See Mason, *Life of Isabella Graham* (N. York, 12mo); Bethune (Mrs.), *Letters and Correspondence of Mrs. Graham* (1838, 8vo); Jones, *Christian Biography*, p. 189.


**Graham, Mary Jane**, was born in London in 1803, and was so carefully educated, and so industrious in study, that she acquired a knowledge of nearly all the modern languages, as also of Latin, Greek, and mathematics. In her eighteenth year she fell into infidel doubts, but soon emerged from them into Christian light and hope. To save others from a like experience, she wrote the *Test of Truth* (London, 12mo, 7th ed. 1852), giving an account of her mental exercises, her infidelity, and her conversion. She also wrote a treatise on *The Freedom and Sovereignty of God's Grace*, published after her death (12mo). Her last years were full of suffering, but she died in great peace and joy at Stoke Fleming, Devonshire, in Dec. 1830. See Bridges, *Life of Mary Jane Graham* (London, 1832, 12mo 1833, 1840, and 1853, 12mo).

**Grain** (occurs only as a rendering of תְּרֹר, *terror*, a small stone or kernel, Amos ix, 9; κόκκος, a berry or individual seed, e. g. of mustard, Matt. xiii, 31, etc.; or wheat, John xii, 24; 1 Cor. xv, 37) is not used in the A. V. in our American collective sense of corn (q. v.) in general, which is the signification of תְּרֵבֶה, or תְּרֵבֶה. The Hebrews planted only wheat, barley, and spelt (comp. Isa. xxviii, 25; Ezek. iv, 9); rye and oats are not mentioned in the Bible (in the Talmud five species of grain are named, Mishna, *Nedar*, vii, 2; and some find even rye and oats in the שְׂבֵלַת שֵׁיטֵל וְהַשֵּׁיטֵל *Menach*, x, 7). On the other hand, some (e. g. Michaelis) think that rice is referred to by תְּרֵבֶה (Isa. xxviii, 25), in opposition to Rosenmüller and Gesenius. As diseases of seed-grain, תְּרֵבֶה קָלִין, *paleness* ("mildew"), and תְּרֵבֶה בִּישָׁן, *blight* ("blasting"), are mentioned. See CEREALS.

**Grál or Grail.** See GRAAL.

**Gramma, Graphè** (γράμμα, γραφή), terms ordinarily used in the ancient Church to signify the Holy Scriptures. They were also occasionally employed as names of the Apostles' Creed, perhaps because it was gathered entirely from Scripture; or else because it was used in reference to the learning of the Creed by the catechumens, just as the word μάθημα, *the lesson*, was used to designate the Creed, because the catechumens were bound to commit it to memory.—Valesius, *Not. in Socrat.* i, 8; Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. x, ch. iii, § 4.

**Granary.** Originally corn was kept in subterranean storehouses, and even in caverns; but in progress of time granaries were erected, both in Egypt and Palestine. In the former country granaries were often of an extensive character. They were laid out in a very regular manner, and varied of course in plan as much as the houses, to which there is every reason to believe they were frequently attached, even in the towns; and they were sometimes only separated from the house by an avenue of trees (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* abridgment, i, 13). They had vaulted roofs, and complete arrangements for depositing and removing the grain. Dr. Robinson, when visiting Huj, a village not



Ancient Egyptian Granary, showing how the grain was put in through the top of the bin, c, from a ladder, d, by sacks borne upon the shoulder, c, and the small sliding doors, a, b, intended for taking it out.

far from Gaza, says, "Here were several subterranean magazines for grain, like cisterns, with a mouth like a well, such as we have seen in several villages" (*Eib. Res.* ii, 385). The peasantry in the East generally prefer these subterranean storehouses, not so much for the preservation of the corn as for the greater security against marauding parties, while erected barns are generally confined to more populous districts (Deut. xxviii, 8; Prov. iii, 10; Gen. xli, 35; Exod. i, 11; 1 Chron. xxvii, 25; Luke xii, 18). See GARNER.

**Grandier, URBAIN**, a French priest of the 17th century of unhappy memory. He was educated among the Jesuits, entered the order, and became curé of St. Peter's, and canon of the Holy Cross in Loudun. His preaching became very popular, and not the less so because of his attacks upon the vices of the clergy. Bitter enmities were excited, and he was charged with favoring Protestantism. A manuscript essay against the celibacy of the clergy was found among his papers. He was condemned by the bishop of Poitiers in 1630 to do penance, and interdicted from service as a priest for five years. From this penalty he was freed, on appeal, by the archbishop of Bordeaux. This triumph increased his boldness; he returned to Loudun, and soon got into new trouble. In 1632 the nuns of the Ursuline convent of Loudun became, as they said, possessed with devils; hysterical convulsions and all sorts of extravagances abounded among them. Grandier was charged with "bewitching" them, and sending "legions of devils into their bodies." A libel on cardinal Richelieu, published in 1632, was charged upon Grandier, with no ground whatever. He was arrested and conducted to Angers Dec. 7, 1633. The charges against him were sacrilege, adultery with the wife of a magistrate of Loudun, and with bewitching the Ursuline nuns. The records of the trial are very curious. One of the necessary signs of "possession," according to the Romish law, is the knowledge of languages not acquired in the ordinary way. The exorcist who was appointed to test the nuns asked one of them in Latin "Quem adoras?" She answered, with convulsive contortions, "Jesus Christus." One of the judges could not help remarking, "This devil, at least, does not know syntax." The trial lasted a long time, and ended in the condemnation of Grandier, who was burnt alive Aug. 18, 1634. But the devils still kept possession of the nuns; it was not till Nov. 5, 1635, that "Leviathan" was dislodged from the head of the superior of the convent; and "Behemoth," the strongest of all the demons, stubbornly kept his place till Aug. 15, 1637. The affair, of course, caused immense scandal, and a small library of pamphlets and books was written upon the subject. Alfred de Vigny recounts the story of Grandier at length in his *Cinq-Mars*. A similar trial took place in 1647 with regard to certain cases of possession (or of crime) in the convent of Louviers. See Michelet, *Louis Quatorze*, p. 455 sq.; *Journal des Savans*, Mai, 1689; Audin, *Hist. des Diables de Loudun* (Amst. 1693, 12mo); Bayle, *Dictionnaire*; Hoefcr, *Novæ Biog. Générale*, xxi, 644 sq.

**Grandmont** or **Grammont**, ORDER OF. This religious order was founded by Stephen of Thiers, who in 1076 withdrew to the mountains of Muret, near Limoges, France, to lead an ascetic life. He wore a penitent's shirt made of meshes of steel, and slept in a bed made of boards in the shape of a coffin. His extravagant asceticism found many imitators, who joined him in his retreat. Unwilling to take the title of prior or of abbot, he only called himself their *corrector*. To avert the evils which had ruined so many other monkish orders, he required his followers to make vows of poverty as well as of obedience and humility; and would not even permit them to possess a church or a piece of land. Gregory VII, however, recognised the order only on the express condition of its submitting to the rule of Benedict. It is evident, however, that the founder had more in view than a mere return to the original strictness of the rules. St. Stephen said to his disciples, "When you are asked to what order you belong, answer, to Christianity, which is the mother and the model of all the other orders." Two cardinals who were going to France as nuncios went to visit Stephen in his retreat, and while there happened to ask him whether he considered himself a canon, a monk, or a hermit. "I am none of these," answered Stephen. Being pressed to define more clearly his position and

that of his followers, he said, "We are poor sinners whom God has mercifully called to the wilderness to do penance; and the pope, in compliance with our request, has himself appointed the duties we fulfil here. We are too imperfect and too weak to emulate the example of the saint hermits who were so absorbed in their divine contemplations as to make them forget the natural wants of the body. You see, besides, that we do not wear the habit either of canons or of monks; and we do not desire to be called either, as we are far from having the merits of the one or the sanctity of the others." After the death of their founder (1124) the order withdrew to the wilderness of Grandmont, near Muret, whence they derive their name. Stephen had given them no written code of rules; they were transmitted verbally from one to another, until Stephen of Lisiac, fourth prior of Grandmont, caused to be collected and written all that could be ascertained of the words and acts of their founder. He even represents himself in several instances as the author of the rules. The order of the Grandmontains spread only in France. In 1170 there were sixty convents following their rule, and so great was the respect they had gained that they were generally known under the name of Good Men (*boni homines*). The relaxations which were subsequently introduced in the observance of their rules are to be attributed to the popes. The later history of the order is chiefly a record of quarrels and contentions. It was extinguished in the time of the French Revolution.—Joseph Fehr, *Allgemeine Geschichte d. Mönchsorden*; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* v, 315; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, Feb. 8. (A. J. S.)

**Grange**, a farming establishment, especially such as belonged to ancient monasteries. Most monasteries had farm-houses on their estates, to which were attached chapels, as well as barns and other offices. Many of these buildings, as well as the chapels, were built in fine architectural taste. (G. F. C.)

**Grant, Asahel**, M.D., an American missionary, was born in Marshall, N. Y., August 17, 1807. He early commenced the study of medicine, and at the age of twenty he married and settled in Braintrim, on the Susquehanna; but, losing his wife four years after, he removed to Utica, where he acquired a large and lucrative practice as a physician. The meeting of the American board at this place in 1834 wrought an entire change in his destiny. His attention was strongly directed to foreign missions, and, after carefully considering the subject, he made an offer of his services to Dr. Anderson. Having expressed a preference for the mission contemplated among the Nestorians, he was directed to join Dr. Perkins, who was already on his way to Persia. Accompanied by his second wife, he sailed from Boston May 11, 1835, and on the 27th of October they arrived at Oroomiah, their future home. "The district of Oroomiah is in the western part of Azerbaijan, the ancient Atropatane, and forms the frontier line of Persia in the direction of the Turkish empire. The scenery is unrivalled even beneath a Persian sky." To the missionary the scene was endeared by the most sacred associations. "In the city of Oroomiah, and amid the three hundred villages of the plain, there still lingered the scattered remnant of a once illustrious church—a church which had disputed with Rome herself the spiritual dominion of half the world." See NESTORIANS. When they were first visited by American missionaries, the vast jurisdiction which had once comprehended twenty-five metropolitan provinces had shrunk to a petty sect, hardly able to maintain itself against Mohammedan oppression. The checkered history of the Nestorians had made a deep impression on the mind of Dr. Grant; and being, moreover, buoyed up for the belief that the Nestorians were treasured up for final restoration as remnants of the lost tribes of Israel, he entered upon his work with the utmost zeal. Dr. Perkins was already in the field, and

Mr. Merrick had joined him at Constantinople. Together they commenced the work of establishing the mission. Dr. Grant's character as a physician secured the favor of the Persian governor, and the Nestorian bishops and priests gave him a hearty welcome. A school was at once commenced, and the work soon extended in every direction. (For details, see NESTORIANS.) In 1839 Dr. Grant visited the almost inaccessible region in which the Nestorian patriarch, Mar Shimon, resided. On the sides of the rugged hills of Koordistan, and within their deep ravines, dwelt the "Waldenses of the East—the Protestants of Asia." Among those hills were thousands who had preserved, with few corruptions, an apostolic faith. The difficulties in the way of missionary labor among them were numerous and formidable; but Mr. Grant was not to be deterred, and finally received an invitation from the patriarch, with the promise of a guard through the Koord villages. His fame as a physician had been carried to the mountain districts, and, indeed, his professional character not only gave him many opportunities of doing good, but often saved his life. Dr. Grant remained among them five weeks, gaining all the information he could, and, soon after, his wife's death and the failure of his own health compelled his return to America (1840). In consequence of his report, the board decided at once to establish a mission among the mountains. Being appointed to that work, he returned to his labors in April, 1841. In company with the patriarch, Mar Shimon, he now made an extensive tour through the different villages and districts (1842). A school was opened at Ashita in April, 1843, and Mr. and Mrs. Laurie took charge of the station. Soon after, Dr. Grant ascertained that the barbarous Mohammed, pacha of Mosul, was forming an alliance with the Koords against the Nestorians, who had always before maintained their independence. Dr. Grant was convinced that this independence was now at an end, and tried to persuade them to make terms with the Turks. This the infatuated Nestorians refused to do; but Dr. Grant did not relinquish his hopes of sustaining the mission; and, though abandoned by all his native assistants, when hostilities commenced he hastened with Mr. Stocking to the Persian emir, and gained the promise of his protection. They then proceeded to the patriarch, but all their efforts were unavailing to induce him to unite with the Persians against the Turks and Koords. The infatuated patriarch had entered into correspondence with Mohammed of Mosul. The wily Turk deceived him with promises, and the unsuspecting Nestorians allowed the enemy to close against them without resistance. At last the storm burst, and there ensued such a massacre as has few parallels in history. The bodies filled the valleys and choked the mountain streams. All the efforts of Dr. Grant to avert the catastrophe were useless, though for some time the protection of the emir was observed, and the missionary buildings were left undisturbed. Soon, however, they too were destroyed, and the missionaries fled for their lives. After Dr. Grant reached Mosul, "all his energies were devoted to the work of relieving the wretched fugitives who crowded the city." In the spring he looked forward to a return home, but early in April his health began to fail, and on the 25th he died at Mosul. Dr. Grant published *The Nestorians, or the Lost Tribes, with Sketches of Travel in Assyria, Armenia, Media, and Mesopotamia* (Lond. 1841; Bost. 1843, 2d ed.).—See Lothrop, *Memoir of Asahel Grant, M.D.* (N.Y. 1847, 18mo); Laurie, *Grant and the Mountain Nestorians* (Bost. 1853; 3d ed. 1856, 12mo); Dismar, in *New Englander*, August, 1853, art. vii; Newcomb, *Cyclop. of Missions*, p. 561 sq.

**Grant, Johnson**, an English divine, and an author of some merit, was born in Edinburg in 1773, and was educated at St. John's College, Oxford, where he passed A.M. in 1805. He became rector of Binbrook in 1818; minister of Kentish Town Chapel in

1822; and died in 1845. He was a faithful, and, at the same time, a popular preacher. Among his writings are a *History of the Church of England, and of the Sects which have departed from her* (Lond. 1811-25, 4 vols., 8vo);—*Lectures and Sermons* in six vols. (Lond. 1821-43);—*Sketches in Divinity* (Lond. 1840, 8vo).—Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, i, 1302.


**Grantham**, THOMAS, an English Baptist minister of distinction, was born in 1633. He was selected to deliver to Charles II the confession of faith drawn up by the Baptists, and also at a later period to present a remonstrance against persecution, both of which were kindly received by the king, and redress of grievances promised. He was often engaged in public disputations, in which he displayed great logical skill. He also had a long controversy with the Rev. John Cennolund, vicar of Norwich, who yet remained his friend through life. Among his writings is *Christianismus Primæivus, or the Christian Religion in its nature, certainty, excellency*, etc., vindicated (Lond. 1678, fol.).—Benedict, *History of the Baptists*, vol. i; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, i, 1305.

**Granvelle**, ANTOINE PERRENOT, cardinal, one of the most eminent politicians and diplomatists of the 16th century, was born at Ornans, Burgundy, Aug. 20, 1517. He studied law at Padua, and afterwards theology at Louvain. He became canon of Liege, then bishop of Arras, and was often employed by the emperor Charles V in diplomatic missions. He went with his father to the diets of Worms and Augsburg, and was also present at the Council of Trent, where he defended the rights of the emperor, but vainly endeavored to array the Council against France. After the battle of Mühlberg he managed the capitulation of the electors John Frederick of Saxony and Philip of Hesse, and is said to have altered the articles so that the latter, instead of being free from imprisonment, was rendered liable to it. He was also very active in upholding the Augsburg Interim. In 1550 he became counsellor of state and keeper of the great seal; he accompanied the emperor to Innsbruck, drew up the treaty of Passau in 1552, and in 1553 negotiated underhand for the marriage of queen Mary of England and Philip II of Spain. When Charles V resigned the crown, Granvelle entered the service of his son, Philip II; in 1559 he signed the treaty of Château-Cambresis with France, and afterwards remained in the Netherlands as prime minister and counsellor of Margaret of Parma. Here he shared largely in the persecution of the Protestants, and was very active in strengthening Romanism. He founded 12 new bishoprics. The School of Baius (q. v.) found an earnest and persevering opponent in Granvelle. For these services he was created archbishop of Mechlin by the king, and cardinal by the pope. Being subsequently accused by his enemies of too great leniency towards the Protestants, he left the Netherlands in 1564. He was finally appointed archbishop of Besançon in 1584, and died at Madrid Sept. 21, 1586. His letters and memoirs were collected by abbot Boisot; they form 80 vols. under the title of *Trésor de Granvelle*, in the Archives of Besançon. The most interesting of them are published in the *Documents inédits pour l'hist. de la France*. See Gerlach, *Philip II et Granvelle* (Brussels, 1842); Motley, *History of the Dutch Republic* (N. Y. 1855, 3 vols., 8vo); Prescott, *Hist. of Philip II* (Bost. 1855, 2 vols.). (J. N. P.)

**Grape** is the representative in the A. V. of the following Heb. and Greek words: properly גָּרַב, *gab'*, grapes in the berry (Gen. xl, 10, 11; xlix. 11; Lev. xxv, 5; Numb. vi, 3; xiii, 20, 23; Deut. xxiii, 24; xxxiii, 11, 32; Neh. xiii, 15; Isa. v, 2, 4; Jer. viii, 13; Hos. ix, 10; Amos ix, 13; "wine," Hos. iii, 1); not in the bunch, σάραφλι ("grapes," Matt. vii, 16; Luke vi, 44; Rev. xiv, 18); improperly for σάραφλι, *pe'ret* (lit. *scattering*); grapes that drop off spontaneously (Lev. xix, 10);

grape -gleanings, עֲלֵלוֹת, *olecloth*, (Judg. viii, 2; Isa. xvii, 6; xxiv, 13; Jer. xlix, 9; Obad. 5; Mic. vii, 1); "tender grape," סֵמָדָר, *semadar*, prob. a *vine-blossom* (Cant. ii, 13, 15; vii, 12); *warlike grape*, בֶּ'סֵר, *be'ser* (Job xv, 33), and *sour grape*, בֹּסֵר, *bo ser* (Isa. xviii, 5; Jer. xxxi, 29, 30; Ezek. xviii, 2); *wild grapes*, בְּשִׁימ', *be'shim'* [see COCKLE], a worthless species (French *lambrusques*, so Jerome and Jarchi); not poisonous (Gesenius, in his *Comment. on Isa.* i, 230; ii, 364, has shown that the common sense of *aconitum* or *wolf's-bane*, monk's-hood, rests upon an error of Celsus, *Hiërobot.* ii, 199), Isa. v, 2, 4. See RAISINS; KERNELS; BITTER.

In more than one passage of Scripture grapes are used in a figurative sense, as in Rev. xiv, 18: "Gather the clusters of the vine of the earth; for her grapes are fully ripe;" i. e. the appointed time for the execution of divine vengeance has come, and the iniquities of the inhabitants of the earth have made them fully ripe for destruction. In Mic. vii, 1, the figure is well expressed by Newcome: "As the early fig of excellent flavor cannot be found in the advanced season of the summer, or the choice cluster of grapes after vintage, so neither can the good and upright man be discovered by diligent searching in Israel." So in Jer. vi, 9, an address to the Chaldeans, exhorting them to return and pick up those few inhabitants that were left before, like the grape-gleanings, and to carry them also into captivity. The Chaldeans did so, as may be seen (lii, 28, 29, 30). In Jer. xlix, 9, the meaning is, that when the enemy came to spoil they should meet with no interruption,



Palastine Grapes (of natural size).

but should glean quite clean, and leave nothing behind through haste. (See Blayney.) Ezek. xviii, 2: "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge;" a proverbial expression, explained by the Chaldee, "The fathers have sinned, and the sons are smitten." In the second commandment it is expressly declared that the children should be punished in this life for the idolatry of the fathers. In the destruction by the Babylonians the good were to escape (Ezek. vi, 4, 5); but they were only to deliver themselves (xiv, 14, 20, 21). Whenever the children had suffered temporal evils for the idolatry of their fathers, they had justly incurred a punishment solemnly denounced. With respect to the impending calamity from Nebuchadnezzar, God's purpose was to observe another rule of conduct (Newcome). See VINE.

**Grapheus**, CORNELIUS, was born in 1482 at Aalst, in Flanders. He was secretary of the city of Antwerp, and in 1520 published a translation of Goch's *De libertate christiana*, with a Preface, in which he severely censured the condition of the Roman Catholic Church.

He was consequently arrested (1521), imprisoned at Brussels, compelled to recant, and deposed from his office. The later years of his life he spent in literary retirement at Antwerp, sympathizing with reformatory movements, without, however, daring to be their avowed champion. He died at Antwerp Dec. 19, 1558.—*Herzog, Real-Encycl.* xix, 577. (A. J. S.)

**Grass** is the somewhat indistinct rendering in the Eng. Vers. of several Heb. terms:

1. It is the ordinary rendering of the Hebrew word חֲסִיר, *chetsir'*, which signifies properly an *inclosed spot*, from the root חָסַר, *to inclose*; but this root also has the second meaning *to flourish*, and hence the noun frequently signifies "fodder," "food of cattle." It designates *ripe grass* fit for mowing and for feed, and in this sense it occurs in 1 Kings xviii, 5; Job xl, 5; Psa. civ, 14; Isa. xv, 6, etc. As the herbage rapidly fades under the parching heat of the sun of Palestine, it has afforded to the sacred writers an image of the fleeting nature of human fortunes (Job viii, 12; Psa. xxxvii, 2), and also of the brevity of human life (Isa. xl, 6, 7; Psa. xc, 5). The Sept. renders חֲסִיר by βοτάνη and πῶα, but most frequently by χόσρος, a word which in Greek has passed through the very same modifications of meaning as its Hebrew representative: χόσρος = *gramen*, "fodder," is properly a *court* or *inclosed space* for cattle to feed in (Homer, *Il.* xi, 774), and then any feeding-place, whether inclosed or not (Eurip. *Iph. T.* 134, χόσροι εὐδένχοροι). Gesenius questions whether חֲסִיר, χόσρος, and the Sansc. *harit* = green, may not be traceable to the same root. See LECK.

In the N. T., wherever the word grass occurs, it is the representative of the Greek χόσρος. The dry stalks of grass, etc. were often used as fuel for the oven (Matt. vi, 30; xiii, 30; Luke xii, 28). See FUEL.

2. The next most usual, and, indeed, more appropriate word, is אֲשֵׁר, *de'she'*, green grass, from the root אָשַׁר, *to germinate*. This is the word rendered *grass* in Gen. i, 11, 12, where it is distinguished from עֵשֶׂב, *e'seb*, the latter signifying *herbs* suitable for human food, while the former is *herbage* for cattle. Gesenius says it is used chiefly concerning grass, which has no seed (at least none obvious to general observers), and the smaller weeds which spring up spontaneously from the soil. It properly signifies the first shoots from the earth, *tender grass*, young *herbage*, as clothing the meadows, and as affording the choice food of beasts (Gen. i, 11; Isa. lxvi, 14; Deut. xxxii, 2; 2 Sam. xxiii, 4; Job vi, 5; Psa. xxxvii, 2, etc.). The sickly and forced blades of grass which spring up on the flat plastered roofs of houses in the East are used as an emblem of speedy destruction, because they are small and weak, and, being in an elevated part, with little earth, exposed to the scorching rays of the sun, they soon wither away (2 Kings xix, 26; Psa. cxxix, 6; Isa. xxxvii, 27). (See Hackett's *Illustra. of Scrip.* p. 125.) The Sept. renders it by χλόη, as well as by χόσρος, βοτάνη, and πῶα. In Dan. iv, 15, 20, the corresponding Chaldee אֲשֵׁר, *de'the'*, is used. See HERB.

In Jer. i, 11, the A. V. renders אֲשֵׁר as the *heifer at grass*, and the Sept. ὡς βοῦδία ἐν βοτάνῃ. It should be taken as "as the heifer treading out corn" (comp. Hos. x, 11). אֲשֵׁר, *dasha'*, the word here employed, comes from אָשַׁר, *to triturate*, and has been confounded with the preceding term. See FODDER.

3. אֲשֵׁר, *e'seb*, is used in Deut., in the Psalms, and in the Prophets, and as distinguished from the foregoing אֲשֵׁר, signifies *herbs* for human food (Gen. i, 30; Psa. civ, 14), but also fodder for cattle (Deut. xi, 15; Jer. xiv, 6). It is the grass of the field (Gen. ii, 5; Exod. ix, 22) and of the mountain (Isa. xlii, 15; Prov. xxvii, 25). See HAY.

4. In Numb. xxii, 4, where mention is made of the ox licking up the grass of the field, the Heb. word is קֶרֶךְ, *ye' rek*, which elsewhere is rendered *green* when followed by אֲשֶׁר or אֲשֶׁר־עָשָׂה, as in Gen. i, 30, and Psa. xxxvii, 2. It answers to the German *das Gr ne*, and comes from the root קֶרַךְ, to flourish like grass.—Smith, s. v. See GREEN.

תֶּרֶםֶּ, *le' kesh* (from תֶּרַםֶּ, to be late ripe), in the "after-math" or "rowen" that springs up on meadows after being once mown ("latter growth," Amos vii, 1). See MEADOW.

"Mown grass" is מֶזֶז, *gez*, a mowing or mown meadow (Psa. lxxii, 6; Amos vii, 1). See MOWER.

Dry grass or self-made hay is called חֶשֶׁת, *chash-ash*, "chaff" (Isa. v, 24; xxxiii, 11). See STUBBLE.

As in Matt. vi, 30, where a lily is called "the grass of the field," it is evident that, like the Latin *gramen* and the English "grass," the Hebrew equivalent had a very extensive range, and was not restricted to the "grasses" (*Gramineae*) of the botanist. These are themselves a very ample order, ranging from diminutive plants like our own mouse-ear barley to the bamboo which shoots up to a height of fifty or sixty feet in an Indian jungle, and including productions as various as the *Arundo donax* of Southern Europe, which furnishes the fisherman with his rod and the weaver with his "reed," the cereals which supply to all mankind the staff of life, and the sugar-cane which, on the table of the humblest artisan in Europe or America, places luxuries unknown to a Roman emperor. See REED.

But when we speak of grass we are usually thinking of the narrow blades, so thickset and tender, which form the sward on a meadow, or the matchless turf on an English lawn. Or, if we are thinking of a separate plant, it is a hollow glossy stem rising up from the midst of these spiry blades, and throwing out similar leaves from its joints, till it ends in blossoming spikelets, loose or more compact, which, when the flowering time is over, show the taper corn-like seeds inclosed in the chaffy glumes, and which we destine as food for the cattle, even as we reserve the fruit of the cereal grasses as food for ourselves. The fescues, darnels, and peas, which clothe the meadows and build up the hay-ricks at home, are pigmies, however, when compared with the grass "which grows for the cattle" of other lands; with the "tussac," for instance, whose enormous tufts form an inexhaustible supply to the herds both amphibious and terrestrial of the Falkland Isles, and the beautiful pampas-grass, under which the huntsman can ride and see high overhead its "plume of silvery feathers."

The imperfect enumeration which we possess of grasses native to Palestine is of less importance, as the scriptural allusions may very well be understood without being able to identify the species. The psalmist wishes (Psa. cxxix, 6) that the haters of Zion may be "as the grass upon the house-tops, which withereth afore it groweth up," or, as it should be rendered, "before it is plucked up" (see Hengstenberg, Walford, etc.); and Isaiah (xxxvii, 27) speaks of vanquished populations "as the grass of the field, as the grass on the house-tops, blasted before it be grown up." On the flat roofs at the present day any one may see grass which has sprung up in the rainy season, withered away by the first weeks of sunshine. "When I first came to reside in Jerusalem," says Dr. Thomson, "my house was connected with an ancient church, the roof of which was covered with a thick coat of grass. This being in the way of a man employed to repair my house, he actually set fire to it and burned it off; and I have seen others do the same thing without the slightest hesitation. Nor is there any danger; for it would require a large expense for fuel sufficient to burn the present city of Jerusalem" (*Land and Book*,

ii, 574). Indeed nearer home we may often see grass and even oats springing up on the roof of a thatched cottage, and a goat peradventure nibbling the herbage before it is withered. The dew "distilling" on the grass, and the rain descending on the mown grass, or rather on the grass which has been close-browsed by the cattle, furnish the sacred poetry with a frequent and exquisite image (Deut. xxxii, 2; Psa. lxxii, 6; Prov. xix, 12; Micah v, 7); and still more frequently does that emblem occur in which our fleeting generations are compared to the grass "which in the morning groweth up, and which in the evening is cut down and withereth" (Psa. xc, 6; xxxvii, 2; xcii, 7; cii, 11; ciii, 15; Isa. xl, 6; James i, 10; 1 Pet. i, 24).—Fairbairn, s. v.

Grasshopper is the rendering in certain passages of the Auth. Vers. of three Heb. words: אֲרֶבֶךְ, *arbeh* (Judg. vi, 5; vii, 12; Job xxxix, 20; Jer. xli, 26), a locust (as elsewhere rendered), sometimes a particular species, the migratory kind (Lev. xi, 22; Joel i, 4); גֹּב, *gob* (Amos vii, 1; Nah. iii, 17), a locust in general; חַגָּב, *chagab* (Lev. xi, 22; Num. xiii, 33; Eccles. xii, 5; Isa. xl, 22), a locust (2 Chron. vii, 13), winged and edible (Lev. xl, 22), and therefore evidently not a proper grasshopper. See LOCUST. In Numb. xiii, 33; Isa. xl, 22, this insect is used to express comparative insignificance. In Eccl. xii, 5 reference is probably made to that degree of weakness and infirmity in old age which makes the weight, or even the chirping of this insect, to be burdensome. For the curious illustration of this passage from the fable of Tithonus, see Kitto's *Daily Bible Illustr.* ad loc. See OLD AGE.

The true grasshopper (*Gryllus grossus*) belongs to a tribe of neuropterous insects styled Gryllidæ, and it appears from modern travellers that it is not unknown in Palestine. Its habits greatly resemble those of its congener, the Oriental locust: it has mandibles or jaws peculiarly fitted for devouring green vegetables, and in many parts even of America its ravages often become quite formidable. See INSECT.

Grate (מִקְבָּרִים, *mikbar*'), something twined, from קָבַר, to braid; Sept. ἰσχυρά), a network of brass for the bottom of the great altar of sacrifice (Exod. xxvii, 4; xxxv, 16; xxxviii, 4, 5, 30; xxxix, 39), placed horizontally in the fire-bed so as to allow the cinders, ashes, etc. to pass through, and a draught of air to supply the fire upon it. See ALTAR.

Gratiæ. See GRACE.

Gratian or Gratianus, an Italian Benedictine and distinguished canonist, was born towards the close of the 11th century. He appears to have first entered the convent of Classe, near Ravenna, from whence he removed to that of St. Felix de Bologna, where he wrote his *Decretum*. According to his contemporary, Robert of Mont St. Michel, he became subsequently bishop of Chiusi, which fact is also asserted by an Italian biographer in the 14th century. The latter adds that Gratian, having sent his *Decretum* to the pope by a priest, the latter claimed to be the author of it, but the fraud having been detected, the pope indemnified



Antique representation of an Old Man under the form of a Grasshopper, presenting an offering at the shrine of Venus. From the Florentine collection of Gems.



Gratian by creating him bishop of Chiusi. Many others, before Gratian, had attempted to make a comprehensive collection of the canons issued by the popes and councils. See CANONS AND DECREALS, COLLECTIONS OF. Making special use of the works of Burchard of Worms and of Anselm of Luca, Gratian classified the canons and commented on them. He called his works *Discordantia concordantia Canonum*, but his contemporaries, and especially Alexander III, called it *Decreta*, which was afterwards changed into *Decretum*. The *Decretum* is composed of three parts, called in Gratian's time *De Ministeriis*, *De Negotiis*, and *De Sacramentis*, and subsequently *Distinctiones*, *Causa*, and *De Consecratione*. The first part was divided into 101 *distinctiones* by Paucapalea, disciple of Gratian. The first 20 treat on the subjects and authority of law, the remaining 71 on the details of canonical legislation as regards the appointment, ordination, etc. of the clergy. The second part, divided by Gratian himself into 36 *causae*, treats of the practical application of the law, and is the distinguishing feature of the *Decretum*. In the *Causa*, Gratian was the first to apply the scholastic method to canon law. The third part, treating chiefly on some points of liturgy, was divided into five *distinctiones* by Paucapalea. Gratian's plan, as can be seen, was very inferior; yet the *Decretum* was vastly superior to the collections which preceded it. "Fleury, in his *Troisième Discours sur l'Hist. Ecclesiastique*, says that Gratianus, besides so consolidating the authority of the false decretals that for three centuries after no other canons were referred to but those of his collection, went even further in extending the authority of the pope by maintaining that he was not himself subject to the canons; an arbitrary assertion destitute of evidence, but which contributed to establish in the Latin, or Western Church, a confused notion that the authority of the pope was without bounds. Gratianus also maintained, upon apocryphal or mutilated authority, that clergymen are not subject to secular jurisdiction. This principle is illustrated in a celebrated answer of Innocent III to the Eastern emperor, in which that pope contends that the temporal sovereign has the jurisdiction of the sword over those who bear a sword, that is to say, over laymen only, as no one can be the judge of the servants of another. The grosser errors and the apocrypha of the *Decretum* were corrected and expurgated in the improved edition executed by order of Gregory XIII, 1582; but still many assertions favorable to the absolute supremacy, as well as to the temporal authority of the popes, were allowed to remain in it, as being sanctioned by ages, though contrary to the ancient discipline of the Church. These are what are styled in France, and other countries north of the Alps, the ultramontane doctrines of the Roman Curia." The true reason of its success was its adoption by the school of Bologna as the most comprehensive and systematic collection, and its subsequent adoption in all the schools. This was but right, for Gratian is the real author of the science of canon law, which before him was only incidentally taught in the theological schools. The *Decretum* soon found hosts of commentators. Towards the end of the Middle Ages there were as many glosses and commentaries on the *Decretum* as on the *Pandects*, yet no one had ever thought of verifying the text of Gratian in the original sources from whence they were taken until Pius IV instituted the *Correctores Romani* for that purpose. The work was completed in 1580, under Gregory XIII, and two years after the corrected *Decretum* was published at Rome (fol.) as the first part of the *Corpus Juris canonici*. It is to be found in all the editions of the latter, and has also been often printed separately, sometimes with glosses and sometimes without. The first edit. is Strasburg, 1471, fol. There have been seventy-six others in the space of a century and a half. The best text is in Richter's *Corpus Juris canonici* (Lpz. 1833-39, 4to). Among the commentaries we remark those of Joan. a Turrecre-

mata, *Commentarii super toto Decreto* (Lyons, 1519 and 1520, 3 vols. fol.; Venice, 1578, 4 vols. fol.); Bellemera, *Renissarius, seu commentarii in Gratiani Decretum* (Lyons, 1550, 3 vols. fol.); Berardus, *Gratiani Canones genuini ab apocryphis discreti, corrupti, ad emendatorem collicum julian eacati, difficultiores commoda interpretatione illustrati* (Turin, 1752, 4 vols. 4to). See Sarti, *De claris Archigymnasii Boniensis Professoribus*, i, 247; J. A. Riegger, *Beiträge zu Gratian's auctore Decreti* (Riegger's *Opuscula academica*) and *De Gratiani Collectione Canonum illiusque methodo ac mendis*; Florens, *Dissertatio de methodo atque auctoritate Collectionis Gratiani*; J. B. Böhmmer, *De varia Decreti Gratiani fortuna* (Böhmmer's *Corpus Juris canon.*); Spittler, *Beiträge z. Geschichte Gratians* (*Mogazin f. Kirchenrecht*, Lpz. 1778); Ant. Augustinus, *De emendatione Gratiani Dialogorum libri duo*; Le Plat, *De spuris in Gratiano canonibus*; A. L. Richter, *Beiträge z. Kenntniss d. Quellen d. canonischen Rechts*; A. Theiner, *Disquisitiones criticae in principibus canonum et decretalium collectiones*; Philipps, *Le Droit canonique dans ses sources.*—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxi, 724 sq. See CANONS.

**Gratiānus**, emperor of Rome, son of Valentinian I, was born in 359, and on the death of his father, A. D. 375, succeeded to a share of the Western Empire. On the death of his uncle Valens, A. D. 378, he obtained control of the whole empire; but in 379 he appointed Theodosius his colleague, giving him the Eastern provinces. He was killed A. D. 383, in a revolt in Gaul. Gratian was tolerant towards the various sects which divided Christianity, but he displayed a stern determination against the remains of the heathen worship. At Rome he overthrew the altar of Victory, which continued to exist; he confiscated the property attached to it, as well as the property belonging to the other priests and the Vestals. He also refused to assume the title and the insignia of Pontifex Maximus, a dignity till then considered as annexed to that of emperor. These measures gave a final blow to the old worship of the empire; and although the senators, who for the most part were still attached to it, sent him a deputation, at the head of which was Symmachus, they could not obtain any mitigation of his decrees.—*Engl. Cyclopædia*; Mosheim, *Church Hist.* cent. iv, pt. ii, ch. v, § 15.

**Gratus** (*pleasing*, Græcized Γράτος), VALERIUS, procurator of Judæa from A. D. 15 to 26, being the first appointed by Tiberius, and the immediate predecessor of Pilate (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 6, 5). The government of Gratus is chiefly remarkable for the frequent changes which he made in the Jewish high-priests. He deposed Ananus and substituted Ishmael, son of Fabi; next Eleazar, son of Ananus; then Simon, son of Camithus; and lastly Joseph Caiaphas, son-in-law of Ananus (*ib.* 2, 2). He put down two formidable bands of robbers that infested Judæa during his procuratorship, and killed with his own hand the captain of one of them, Simon, formerly a slave of Herod the Great (*ib.* xvii, 10, 6, 7; *War*, ii, 4, 2, 3). Gratus assisted the proconsul Quintilius Varus in quelling an insurrection of the Jews (*War*, ii, 5, 2).—Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s. v. See JUDÆA.

**Graul**, KARL, D. D., a German theologian, was born Feb. 6, 1814, at Wörlitz, near Dessau. After studying theology at Leipzig, he was for a time tutor in an English family residing in Italy. On his return he was appointed teacher in a school at Dessau, and in 1844 director of the missionary society of Dresden. During his management, which lasted for 18 years, this society had an almost tenfold increase of its annual revenue, and from being a society merely of the little kingdom of Saxony, became a general Lutheran missionary society of Continental Europe. In order to give to the pupils of the missionary seminary an opportunity to attend the lectures of a university, Graul caused, in 1848, its transfer from Dresden to Leipzig. He concentrated

all the efforts of the Church upon the missionary work among the Tamuls in South India, and from 1849 to 1853 made himself a journey through Palestine and Egypt to India, to examine the condition and the prospects of the mission. While in India he devoted a special attention to the study of the language and literature of the Tamuls, as the result of which he published the *Bibliotheca Tamilica* (Leipz. 1854-56, 3 vols.). He also published an account of his journey in 5 vols. (*Reise nach Ostindien*, Leipz. 1854-56). In the question of caste, Graul was opposed to the practice of all the English and American missionary societies, and in favor of tolerating the differences of caste among the Christian converts. He published, in defense of his views, in 1852, a pamphlet in the English language at Madras, and in 1861 another in the German language at Leipzig (*Die Stellung der evangel.-luther. Mission in Leipzig zur ostind. Kastenfrage*, 1861). He resigned his place as director of the missionary seminary at Leipzig, and in 1862 went to Erlangen with a view of connecting himself with the university, but a serious sickness prevented him from carrying out this design. He died Nov. 10, 1861. Of the numerous works of Graul, that which had the greatest circulation was a small treatise on the differences of doctrine between the Christian denominations (*Die Unterscheidungslehren der verschiedenen kirchl. Bekenntnisse*, Lpz. 1845; revised by Harnack, 1867), in which he shows an extreme unfairness in his remarks on Pietists and Methodists. The most noteworthy among his other works is one on Irenaeus (*Die christl. Kirche an der Schwelle des 2ten. Zeitalters*, Lpz. 1860).—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xix, 578. (A. J. S.)

**Grave** (properly קֶבֶר, *ke'ber*, a *sepulchre*; Greek *μνημα* or *μνηματιον*, a *tomb*, as a *monument* [see **TRIAL**]) is also in some passages of the common version the rendering of שְׂדֵה, *sheol'*, ᾠδης, *hadēs* [see **SHEOL**; **HADēs**]; once of שַׁח'אֵת, *shach'ath* (Job xxxiii, 22), the *pit* or open sepulchre, as elsewhere rendered; and once erroneously of בַּיְת, *bei'*, *prayer* (Job xxx, 24). See **TOMB**.

Sepulchres among the ancient Hebrews were, as still among all Orientals (Schweigger, *Reisen*, p. 199; Shaw, *Travels*, p. 192; Hasselquist, p. 35 sq.), outside of cities (see Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* p. 167; according to the Talmud, *Baba Bathra*, ii, 9, at least fifty yards distant from the city walls), in the open field (Luke vii, 12; John xi, 39; compare Cicero, *Leg.* ii, 23; *ad famul.* iv, 12, 9; Plutarch, *Arot.* 53; Theocrit. vii, 10; Homer, *Il.* vii, 435 sq.; Michaelis, *Mos. Recht.* iv, 307). Only kings (1 Kings ii, 10; xvi, 6, 28; 2 Kings x, 35; xiii, 9; 2 Chron. xvi, 14; xxviii, 27) and prophets (1 Sam. xxi, 1; xxviii, 3) were allowed to be buried within cities (Harmer, *Obs.* ii, 129 sq.; compare Theuyl. v, 11; Potter, *Gr. Ant.* ii, 427 sq.; when it is said that any one was interred in his house [1 Kings ii, 34; 2 Chron. xxxiii, 20], we must understand the grounds or environs of the house to be meant, i. e. the garden [comp. Numb. xix, 16]; it was otherwise among the ancient Romans, Isidore, *Orig.* x, 2). Generally the graves were pits or grottoes (Gen. xxiii, 17; xxxv, 8; 1 Sam. xxxi, 13; 2 Kings xxi, 18, 26; John xix, 41; comp. Strabo, xiv, 636; Virgil, *Æn.* xi, 851), shady spots under trees or in gardens being preferred (Eck, *De sepulchris in hortis*, Meining, 1738 sq.; Walch, *Observ. in Matt. ex inscript.* p. 89); and these excavations were either natural, with which Palestine abounds [see **CAVE**], or often artificial, dug for this purpose (and walled up; see Knobel, *Jesa.* p. 99), or hewn in rocks (Isa. xxii, 16; 2 Chron. xvi, 14; Matt. xxvii, 60; John xi, 38; Luke xxiii, 53), sometimes very spacious and with numerous side-passages and chambers (*Baba Bathra*, vi, 8); there are also instances of graves sunk perpendicularly in the ground (Luke xi, 44), and such were occasionally situated on hills (2 Kings xxiii, 16; comp. Isidore, *Orig.* ii, 11). Not only in the case of

kings and nobles (2 Kings ix, 28; 2 Chron. xxxii, 33; xxxv, 24; 1 Macc. ii, 70; ix, 19; xiii, 25, etc.), but in every good family (Gen. xxiii, 20; Judg. viii, 32; 2 Sam. ii, 32; 1 Kings xiii, 22; Tobit xiv, 12; 1 Macc. ii, 70), were there hereditary vaults (it was a deep disgrace to the remains of persons of distinction to be buried among those of the populace, Jer. xxvi, 23); and it appears the very natural desire of those dying abroad to repose in such family cemeteries (Gen. xlvii, 29; 1, 5; 2 Sam. xix, 37; 1 Kings xiii, 22, 31; Neh. ii, 3; comp. Sophocles, *Electra*, 1131 sq.; *Anthol. Gr.* ii, 25, 75; Justin. iii, 5; see Zeibich, *De sepultura in terra sancta a Jacobo et Josepho expetita*, Viteb. 1742; Semler, *De patriarcharum ut in Palest. spelæventur desiderio*, Halle, 1756; Carpozov, in Ugolini *Thesaur.* xxxiii). But whoever had not such a hereditary sepulchre wished none the less to rest in the land of his fathers (2 Macc. v, 10), in the sacred soil (Josephus, *Ant.* x, 4, 3). For the poor were (later) public burial-places assigned (Jer. xxvi, 23; 2 Kings xxiii, 6; comp. Matt. xxvii, 7). As a protection chiefly against the carnivorous jackals (Pliny, viii, 44), the graves were closed with doors or large stones (Matt. xxvii, 60; xxviii, 2; John xi, 38); and in the month Adar (March), after the rainy season (*Shekal.* i, 1), they were (in the post-exilic period) whitewashed afresh (*Maaser Shenit*, v, 1), in order to warn the great multitudes of strangers visiting the Passover against contact (Matt. xxiii, 27; see Lightfoot and Schöttgen, *ad loc.*; comp. Walch, *Observ. in Mt. ex inscr.* p. 65 sq.; and Reusstech, *De sepulchris calce notatis*, in Ugolini *Thesaur.* xxxiii), which caused pollution (Numb. xix, 16; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 2, 3). There are still many such sepulchral grottoes in Palestine, Syria, and Idumea generally (see Pococke, *East*, ii, 70, 100, etc.; Burekhardt, i, 220 sq.; Robinson, i, 78 sq.; ii, 175 sq., 663; iii, 317, 692). They descend sometimes vertically, sometimes horizontally in the earth, the former by steps. Within are usually found several chambers or apartments, of which one sometimes lies deeper than another. Most of them have on the side-walls cells, six to seven feet long, in which the bodies are deposited. Among those found at Jerusalem, for which tradition assigns special names and origin, are the *Sepulchres of the Kings* (perhaps derived from 2 Chron. xxi, 20; xxviii, 27; compare Neh. iii, 16; Acts ii, 29; see Niebuhr, *Travels*, iii, 63; Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* II, ii, 269 sq.; Robinson, i, 398 sq.; ii, 183; compare Hottinger, *Cippi Hebraici*, Heidelb. 1659 [also in Ugolini *Thesaur.* xxxiii]). They consist of an anteroom and seven chambers, lying on the north of the city, east of the main road to Nablus, and seem to have belonged to the nobility, and not merely, if at all, to the ancient Jewish kings. See **JERUSALEM**. Far more imposing are the sepulchres of Egypt, and especially celebrated by the ancients is the tomb of king Osymandyas (Diod. Sic. i, 47 sq.), of which the ruins are still extant (Pococke, i, 159). Above the tombs were from the earliest times erected monuments (Gen. xxxv, 20. קֶבֶר וְזָכָר, as often on the Phœnician grave-stones), originally of rough stone or earth (Job xxi, 32; comp. Homer, *Il.* xxiii, 255 sq.; Virgil, *Æn.* vi, 365), later in the form of splendid mansions (1 Macc. xiii, 27 sq.; Josephus, *Ant.* vii, 10, 3; xx, 4, 3; comp. Pausanias, viii, 16, 3; see Salmasius, *ad Solin.* p. 851; Zorn, in the *Nov. Miscell. Lips.* v, 218 sq.) with various devices (? 2 Sam. xviii, 18). To open a grave forcibly in order to abstract the ornaments (Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 3, 4; xiii, 8, 4), weapons (Ezek. xxxii, 27; 1 Macc. xiii, 29; Curtius, x, 1, 31), or other articles deposited with the body (comp. Sept. Vat. at Josh. xxiv, 30; Jerome, *ad Jer.* vii; Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* iii, 10), or even the bones of the interred, was in all antiquity regarded as a shameful piece of barbarity (Jer. viii, 1; Baruch, ii, 24; comp. Diod. Sic. iii, 86; xv, 63; see Wächter, *Ueber Ehescheid. bei d. Röm.* p. 209 sq.; Abegg, *Straf-*

*rechtsweßs.* p. 726 sq.). That the relics of the dead were thus pillaged for magical purposes (Apul. *Metam.* ii, p. 38, Bip.; Horace, *Epod.* xiv, 47 sq.; Lucan, vi, 533; comp. Brouckhus. *ad Tibull.* i, 2, 47 sq.) does not appear very clearly from Isa. lxxv, 4. There are scriptural traces of the popular idea that graves were the residence of demons (comp. Matt. viii, 28), who were perhaps connected with soothsaying (Acts xvi, 16); others, however, refer such allusions to the superstitious notions respecting offering to the manes of the departed (*inferie, februationes*; compare Athen. iii, 98; Macrobi. *Sat.* i, 13, p. 263, Bip.; Barhebr. *Chron.* p. 256), or a species of necromancy practised in such spots (see Gregor. Nazianz. *Or. in Julian.* p. 91; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 171). The graves of the prophets and holy persons were (in post-exilian times) sedulously repaired and adorned (Matt. xxiii, 29; see Schöttgen, *Hor. Hebr.* i, 205; Eckhard, *De adificatione et exornatione sepulcrorum*, Jena, 1746), a tribute of reverence (and eventually of grateful reparation, Matt. xxiii, 30 sq.), which was not unknown likewise in Greek antiquity (Elian, *Var. Hist.* xii, 7; Diod. Siculus, xi, 33; Athen. xiii, 593; Suetonius, *Octav.* xviii; the Greeks even anointed the tombs of honored men, Plutarch, *Alex. c.* 15), and still general in the East (Kämpfer, *Amen.* p. 109 sq.; Robinson, ii, 708). See generally Nicolai, *De sepulcris Hebr.* (L. B. 1706; also in Ugolino, xxxiii); Fuhrmann, *Hist. Untersuch. üb. der Begräbnisplätze der Alten* (Halle, 1800).—Winer, i, 443. See SEPULCHRE.

**Gravel** (גַּרְבֵּל, *chatsats'*, something broken off small; gravel-stone, Prov. xx, 17; Lam. iii, 16. In Psa. lxxvii, 7, גַּרְבֵּלֵי אֵשׁ, "thine arrows," is regarded by Fürst as a reduplicative form from גַּרְבֵּל; in Isa. xlviii, 19, גַּרְבֵּלֵי אֵשׁ, erroneously "the gravel thereof," is undoubtedly the same as in גַּרְבֵּלֵי אֵשׁ preceding, and stands elliptically for "[the issue of] its bowels," sc. the sea's, i. e. the fish that spawn so numerously), comminuted rock, coarser than sand, but smaller than stones, forming a large part of what is known geologically as "drift" or diluvium over the surface of the earth. See LAND.

**Graven Image** (פֶּסֶל, *pe'sel*, plur. פְּסֵלִים, *a carrying*). From the passage in Deut. xxvii, 15, "Cursed be the man that maketh any graven or molten image, an abomination unto the Lord, the work of the hands of the craftsman, and putteth it in a secret place; and all the people shall answer and say, Amen," we may fairly infer with Michaelis, in his *Commentaries on the Laws of Moses*, that there was a marked distinction between idols and images, or rather between idolatry and image-worship, which appears to have prevailed from the earliest times. See IDOL. *Pesel*, or graven image, seems to refer to the household gods; an idol is termed פֶּסֶלֵי, *elil'*, and in some places פֶּסֶלֵי, *he'bel*, both words having a similar signification, that of "vain, null, void." The distinction is particularly marked in Psa. xc, 7: "Confounded be all they that serve graven images, that boast themselves of idols." Jahn says (*Archæol.* § 400), "Every nation and city had its own gods, which at first had acquired some celebrity by the worship of some particular family merely, but were at length worshipped by the other families of that town or nation, yet every family had its separate household or tutelary god. No one felt himself bound to worship every god, but paid his honors, as he chose, to those he deemed most propitious or most powerful. But still he did not think it advisable wholly to neglect other gods, lest perchance, thinking themselves contemned by such neglect, they should revenge themselves by sending some evil retribution." (See Keinecius, *De non faciendis sculptilibus*, Weissenfels, 1724.) See TERAPHIM.

"There has been a good deal of discussion as to the

extent of the prohibition contained in the second commandment; some (including early Jewish commentators) have contended that all imitative art was forbidden: against this extreme view Michaelis protests (*Laws of Moses*, art. 250), on the reasonable ground that certain figures were in fact made by God's own command. Both in the Tabernacle and the Temple many objects were provided which would put under contribution largely the arts of carving and engraving, e. g. the two cherubim in the holy of holies (Exod. xxv, 18, 20); the floral ornaments of the golden candlestick (xxv, 34); the various embroidered hangings of the sanctuary (ch. xxvi); and the brazen serpent (Numb. xxi, 8, 9). So again in the Temple, besides the cherubim, there were on the walls various figures of all kinds, as well as the brazen sea, as it was called, which rested on twelve brazen oxen. Ezekiel's temple, in like manner, has cherubim with the heads of men and lions. Even after the return from Babylon, when men severely interpreted the prohibition of the commandment, there were figures of animals on the golden candlestick (Reland, *De Spoliis Templi Hier. in Arcu Titiano*), and vines with pendent clusters on the roof of the second Temple, and the golden symbolic vine over the large gate. Not the making of images as works of art, but the worship of them, was excluded by the Decalogue. Among the Mohammedans, the more liberal Persians (followers of Ali) allow themselves the fullest latitude, and paint and mould the human figure, while their stricter rivals confine their art to representations of trees and fruits, or inanimate objects; but all alike abhor all attempts to represent God, or even their saints (Kitto, *Pictorial Bible*, Deut. v, 8, 9). There were, however, from whatever cause, limitations in fact, which the artisans who ornamented the Tabernacle and the Temple observed. In the former, nothing is mentioned as fabricated of iron; nor is skill in manipulating this metal included among the qualifications of the artificer Bezaleel; while 'in the Temple there is no mention made of sculptured stones in any part of the building. All the decorations were either carved in wood and then overlaid with metal, or wholly cast in metal. Even the famous pillars of Jaclin and Boaz were entirely of brass' (Kitto on 2 Chron. iii, 6). The qualifications of the accomplished men who built the Tabernacle (Bezaleel and Aholiab) and the Temple (Hiram) are carefully indicated; to the former, especially Bezaleel, is attributed skill in 'carving' and 'sculpture' (Exod. xxxi, 5), whereas the latter seems to have rather executed his decorative works by fusile processes (comp. 1 Kings vii, 14, 15 with 46; Müller's *Ancient Art*, by Leitch, p. 216; and De Wette's *Archæol.* § 106") (Kitto, s. v. Carved Work). See GRAVING.

**Graverol**, JEAN, a French Protestant theologian, was born at Nismes, July 28, 1647 (Sept. 11, 1636, according to Graverol de Floghrevat). After studying theology at Geneva, he was appointed minister of Pradel (Vivarais) in 1671. In 1672 he removed to Lyons. After the revocation of the edict of Nantes he went to Holland, remained a while in Amsterdam, and finally went to take charge of a French congregation in London. He died there in 1730, according to Menard; in 1718, according to Watt. He wrote *De Religionum Conciliatoribus* (Lansanne, 1674, 12mo, under the pseudonym of J. Rolegravius):—*L'Église protestante justifiée par l'Église romaine sur quelques points de controverse* (Geneva, 1682, 12mo, Anon.):—*Projet de réunion entre les protestants de la Grande-Bretagne* (Lond. 1689, 8vo):—*Moses vindicatus adv. Th. Burnetii archeologias philosophicas* (Amst. 1694, 12mo):—*Des Points fondamentaux de la Religion chrétienne* (Amst. 1697, 8vo). See Moréri, *Dict. hist.*; Bayle, *Œuvres diverses*, iv, 605 and 610; Michel Nicholas, *Hist. littér. de Nismes*, vol. ii; Haag, *La France Protestante*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxi, 746.

**Graves**, Hiram Atwill, a Baptist pastor and

writer, was born at Wendell, Mass., in 1813. In boyhood he was a precocious student. He graduated at Middlebury College, Vt., in 1834. On account of impaired health he did not pursue a regular course of study for the ministry, but was ordained in 1837 at Springfield, Mass. He became in 1840 pastor of a church in Lynn, and in 1842 editor of the *Christian Reflector*, a paper which has since, in conjunction with another, become a journal of extensive influence. Infirm health sent him to Cuba in 1845, and to reside in Jamaica in 1846-49. He returned without essential benefit, and died in 1850. He was author of *The Family Circle:—The Attractions of Heaven*. (L. E. S.)

**Graves, Richard, D.D.**, a learned Irish divine, was born at Kilfinnan, Limerick, Oct. 1, 1763, and was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, of which he became fellow in 1786. In 1813 he became dean of Ardagh, and regius professor of divinity. He died Mar. 29, 1829. Horne pronounces his *Lectures on the Pentateuch* (1807, 2 vols. 8vo) "indispensably necessary to the Biblical student." Besides that learned work, which passed through several editions, he wrote *The Apostles and Evangelists not Enthusiasts* (1798)—*Scriptural Proofs of the Trinity* (four discourses)—*Absolute Predestination compared with the Scripture statement of the Justice of God:—Predestination repugnant to the general tenor of Scripture* (Lond. 1825, 8vo). These, with a number of *Sermons*, are given in his *Whole Works now first collected* (London, 1840, 4 vols. 8vo), of which vol. i contains a memoir of his *Life and Writings* by his son, R. H. Graves, D.D.

**Graving.** There is much indistinctness in the terms of this ancient art of the Jews, arising from the fact that one and the same artisan combined, in skill and practice, many branches, which the modern principle of "division of labor" has now assigned to different pursuits. Thus Aholiab was not only "an engraver," but also "a cunning workman" in general art, "and an embroiderer in blue, and in purple, and in scarlet and fine linen" (Exod. xxxviii, 23). In like manner Bezaleel is described as accomplished "in all manner of workmanship; and to devise curious works, to work in gold, and in silver, and in brass, and in the cutting of stones to set them, and in carving of wood, to make any manner of cunning work" (Exod. xxxv, 31-33). These numerous gifts they both possessed and practiced themselves, and imparted to others; so that they formed an early school of art to supply the demand created by the institution of the Mosaic ritual, the members of which school were as comprehensive in their attainments as their great teachers (Exod. xxxv, 34; xxxvi, i, 2). The same combination of arts seems to have characterized the later school, which was formed under the auspices of David, when preparing for the erection of the Temple (1 Chron. xxii, 15; xxviii, 21). Many of these artificers were Phœnicians, whom the king had invited to his new capital (2 Sam. v, 11; 1 Chron. xiv, 1). In the next reign, Hiram, to whose genius the Temple of Solomon owed much of the beauty of its architectural details, as well as its sacred vessels (1 Kings vii, 15-45), was a native of Tyre, the son of a Tyrian artificer by an Israelitish mother. This man's skill was again as comprehensive as that of his great predecessors (v, 14).

1. חֲטָטָב, *chatsab*, although once in the A. V. (Job xix, 24) translated "graven" (with an undoubted reference to the ancient art of engraving), is generally used to indicate the rougher work of *hewing* stone or wood, in quarry or forest. In Prov. ix, 1, indeed, it is applied to the finer art of *hewing* or fashioning pillars; but its usual objectives of חֲטָט (cistern, Jer. ii, 13), סֶפֶלֶת (sepulchre, Isa. xxii, 16), כֶּסֶף (wine-press, Isa. v, 2), prove that חֲטָט has to do with rougher operations than those which fall under our idea of "engraving."

(But see below, under חֲטָט.) This word is *contrasted* with

2. חֲרָשׁ, *charash'* (or, as it once occurs, חֲרָשׁ, *charath'*, in Exod. xxxii, 16), which is used to describe "engraving" in Jer. xvii, 1. In Gen. iv, 22 the participial derivative of this root is employed in the description of Tubal-cain, the Biblical progenitor of all artificers of the kind indicated in this article. But it is less in the verbal forms than in the noun חֲרָשׁ that this word expresses the art before us. As a noun it occurs more than thirty times, and is rendered variously in A. V. ("engraver," "craftsman," "smith," "artificer," etc.). Though it indicates artistic work by *fine* instruments, in metal, wood, and stone, and is thus opposed to the rougher operations of חֲטָט, it yet includes other usages, which remove it from the specific sense of our art. (Thus, while with חֲרָשׁ alone, Exod. xxviii, 11, it may well refer to the fine work of the *engraver in stone*, yet in the phrase חֲרָשׁ חֲרָשׁ, literally, *hewer of the stone of the wall*, 2 Sam. v, 11; or more simply חֲרָשׁ חֲרָשׁ [workers of wall], 1 Chron. xiv, 1, it can hardly describe a higher art than what is attributed to it in A. V.—that of the ordinary "mason;" similarly with חֲרָשׁ חֲרָשׁ, timber, it points to the work of the "carpenter," 1 Chron. xiv, 1, etc.; and with חֲרָשׁ חֲרָשׁ, iron, to that of the "smith" or iron-founder.) The prevalent idea, however, of חֲרָשׁ is the subtle work of the finer arts; and with this well agree such passages as Prov. vi, 18, where the word describes the "heart that deviseth wicked imaginations," and 1 Sam. xxii, 9, where it is predicated of Saul, "secretly practising mischief" (Hiiph. part. חֲרָשׁ חֲרָשׁ). Gesenius (*Theol. Heb.* p. 529) has collected instances of the like meaning of the word in the other Shemitic languages, and compares it with the "doli fabricator" of Virgil, *Æneid*, ii, 264; and the cognate phrases, "fabricare quidvis," Plautus, *Asin.* i, 1, 89; and εὐδολον τέλειον, κακὰ τέλειον, of Hesiod and Homer, and τεκταίνεσθαι μίτην, *Iliad*, x, 19. In connection with the word חֲרָשׁ, we have in 1 Chron. xiv, 14, an indication that, even in early times, encouragement was given to associations of art among the ancient Jews, by providing for their members a local habitation in which to pursue their calling, which is proved to have been an *honorable* one from the illustrious names that are associated with its pursuit (ver. 13, 14). From this passage (of ver. 14, compared with ver. 21 and 23), we further learn that the various arts were *hereditary* in certain families. (The word "stone-squarers," in 1 Kings v, 18, is a different term. See GIBLITE.)

3. חֲכָלֵךְ, *chakal'*, describes a branch of art which more literally coincides with our idea of engraving. In Ezek. iv, 1 the word is used of engraving a *plan* or *map*; in Job xix, 23, of inscribing upon tablets (of stone or metal), a very early instance of art; similarly in Isa. xxx, 8; while in Ezek. xxiii, 14 (חֲכָלֵךְ חֲכָלֵךְ) the word seems to indicate painting, *portraying in colors* (חֲכָלֵךְ חֲכָלֵךְ); and the addition of חֲכָלֵךְ חֲכָלֵךְ, upon the wall, raises the suspicion that *fresco* art, which was known to very ancient nations, including the Egyptians, was practiced by the Babylonians, and admired, if not imitated by the Jews; comp. ver. 14, 15, 16. (On the art of coloring as known to the Assyrians, Egyptians, Greeks, etc., see Sir G. Wilkinson, *On Color and Taste*, p. 153.) The Sept. renders the remarkable phrase before us, ἰσχυροῦς ἐν γραφῆτι, without specifying color; but Symmachus, the Vulgate, the Peshito, and the Chaldee paraphrase all include in their versions the express idea of color. The idea of *careful* and *accurate art* which is implied in the term under consideration imparts

much beauty to the passage in Isa. xl, 16, "Behold, I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands," where the same word is used. (There is here an allusion to the Eastern custom of tracing out on the hands the sketches of eminent cities or places, and then rubbing them with the powder of the *hemah* or cypress, and so making the marks perpetual. Maundrell (*Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem*, p. 100 [London, 1810]) describes the process of "pilgrims having their arms and hands marked with the usual ensigns of Jerusalem." See also Rosenmüller, ad loc., and J. D. Michaelis, *Nota in Loethii Prælect.* [Oxford, 1821], p. 501, 502; and Burder's *Oriental Customs* [Lond. 1840], p. 149.) The second clause of this passage, "Thy walls are continually before me," may be compared with Isa. xxii, 16, where our verb קָרַח is also employed to describe the engraved plan or sketch of a house for architectural purposes. Among other applications of the art indicated by this word may be mentioned monumental stones, such as the קָרַח־בְּרֵיחַ of 1 Sam. vii, 12, with suitable inscriptions; see especially Deut. xxvii, 2-8.

4. In קָרַח, *pasal'*, and its noun קָרַח־פֶּסֶל (*pasel'* (always rendered in A. V. "graven image"), we have the operation rather of the sculptor's or the carver's art than the engraver's. In several passages of Isaiah (xxx, 22; xl, 19; xli, 7; xlv, 12-15) curious details are given of the fabrication of idols, which afforded much employment to the various artificers engaged in the complicated labor of image-manufacture (see also Jer. x, 3-9, from which it would seem that the wrought and prepared metal for covering the idol was imported, and put on by Jewish artisans). Working in ivory was common to the ancient Egyptians (Wilkinson's *Anc. Egyptians*, iii, 169), the Assyrians (Layard's *Nineveh*, ii, 420), the ancient Greeks (Grote's *Greece*, vi, 30-32), and the artificers of Jerusalem (Solomon's ivory throne, 1 Kings x, 18; ivory palaces, Psa. xlv, 8; ivory beds, Amos vi, 4) and of Samaria (Ahab's ivory house, 1 Kings xxii, 39; which was not an uncommon luxury, Amos iii, 15). No doubt the alliance of the royal houses of Israel and (indirectly) of Judah with the Phœnician monarch (1 Kings xvi, 31) was the means of attracting many of the artificers of Tyre, and Sidon, and Gebal to the metropolis of each of the Jewish kingdoms; both in Solomon's time and in Ahab's, ivory-sculpture was probably a Phœnician art. The neighboring idolators, whose example was so disastrous to Israel, were skilled in image-manufacture. From Deut. vii, 25 it appears that the body of the idol was of sculptured wood, overlaid with one or other of the precious metals. The passage, 1 Sam. vi, 2-12, seems to prove that the Philistines had artificers in the precious metals capable of forming the figures of small animals; and their idols that were taken from the spoils of the great battle of Baal-perazim were probably graven of wood (1 Chron. xiv, 12).

5. קָרַח־בְּרֵיחַ, *pathach'* (in Piel and Pual), is perhaps distinguished from the term we have just considered (קָרַח) by being used to describe figures in relief rather than statues, such as the cherubic figures on the walls of the Temple (see 1 Chron. iii, 7). Compare the cognate noun קָרַח־בְּרֵיחַ, *pitlu'ach*, engraved figure, in 1 Kings vi, 29, which passage informs us that the Temple walls were lavishly adorned with these figures, standing out probably in various degrees of relief (see also other but similar work, described by this verb, 1 Kings vii, 36). The chief application, however, of the word is to the cutting and engraving of precious stones and metals (*intaglio* work, as distinguished from the raised work of *cameos*, etc.), such as the breastplate of the high-priest (Exod. xxviii, 9-11, 21), and the plate of his mitre (ver. 36, 37). The mystic engraving of Zech. iii, 9 is likewise described in the same terms. The splendid jewelry of Solomon's time, as referred to in

the Canticles, i, 10, 11, is best classed under the art indicated by קָרַח and its derivatives. From Isa. iii, 18, 24, it appears that this art of the goldsmith continued rife in later reigns, and was not unknown even after the captivity (see Zech. vi, 11). The neighboring nations were no less skilled in this branch of art; for instance, the *Egyptians*, Exod. xii, 35, compared with xxxii, 2, 3; the *Canaanites*, Josh. vi, 19; the *Midianites*, Numb. xxxi, 50, and (afterwards) Judg. viii, 24-26; the *Ammonites*, 1 Chron. xx, 2; the *Syrians* of Zobab and Hamath, 2 Sam. viii, 7-11.

6. קָרַח־בְּרֵיחַ, *miklu'ath*, like our last term of art, describes sculpture in relief (First, *Hebr. Wörterb.* i, 780); it occurs 1 Kings vi, 18, 29 ("carved figures" of cherubims), 32; vii, 31 ("gravings").

7. קָרַח־בְּרֵיחַ, *che'ret*, occurs only in Exod. xxxii, 4 (A. V. "a graving tool"), and in Isa. viii, 1 (A. V. "a pen"). This was rather the *scalpurn fabrilis* of the Romans (Livy xxvii, 49) than the *stylus* (see Smith's *Dict. of G. and R. Antiq.* s. v. *Sculptura*). For two other opinions as to the meaning of קָרַח־בְּרֵיחַ in Exod. xxxii, 4, see Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 520.

קָרַח־בְּרֵיחַ, *et* (which in Psa. xlv, 2 and Jer. viii, 8, means a writer's style or reed), has the same meaning as the previous word in the other places of its occurrence (Job xix, 24; Jer. xvii, 1); here it has the epithet קָרַח־בְּרֵיחַ, i. q. "pen of iron." The occurrence of קָרַח־בְּרֵיחַ in Job xix, 24, imparts to the קָרַח־בְּרֵיחַ the idea of a finer art than is usually expressed by that verb (see De Sauley's *Hist. de l'art Judaique*, Paris, 1858).—Kitto, s. v. *Engraving*. See CARVE.

**Gray** (some form of the root קָרַח־בְּרֵיחַ, *sib*), applied to the hair as an indication of *old age* (q. v.), which in the East is universally respected (Prov. xx, 29). See HAIR.

**Gray Friars.** One of the mendicant orders, otherwise called Franciscans, Minorites, etc. The name was given from the color of the dress which they wore. See FRANCISCANS.

**Gray, James, D.D.**, a minister of the Associated Reformed Church, was born at Corvoam, Ireland, Dec. 25, 1770. He entered the college of Glasgow in 1790; graduated in 1793; afterward studied theology under the Rev. John Rogers, and was licensed by the Presbytery of Monaghan. In 1797 he sailed for America. After laboring with great acceptance at Washington, N. Y., until 1803, he accepted a unanimous call to the Spruce-street Church, in connection with the Associate Reformed Synod, Philadelphia. In 1805 he received the degree of D. D. from the University of Pennsylvania. He was one of the most important agents in establishing the theological seminary of the Associated Reformed Church in the city of New York. In 1808 he took an active part in the organization of the Philadelphia Bible Society, and was for a long time its corresponding secretary. At this time, in connection with Dr. S. B. Wylie, he opened a classical academy, which soon obtained great repute. After several years of this labor he resigned the school, and also his pastoral charge, and removed to Baltimore, where he devoted himself especially to the study of certain points in theology until his death, which occurred at Gettysburg, Pa., Sept. 20, 1824. His literary reputation rests chiefly on his *Mediatorial Reign of the Son of God*. He also edited for one year a *Theological Review*, and published several *Occasional Sermons*.—Sprague, *Annals* (Associate Ref.), ix, 94.

**Gray, Robert, D.D.**, bishop of Bristol, was born at London in 1762. He studied at Eton and Oxford, took orders, and became successively vicar of Farrington (Berkshire), rector of Craik (Yorkshire) in 1802, and canon of Durham in 1804. His benevolence, and the talents evinced in his works, caused him to be appoint-

ed by lord Liverpool's cabinet to the bishopric of Bristol in 1827. He was very popular in this position, and the duke of Wellington offered him the see of Bangor. He declined, and died soon after at Rodney House, Sept. 28, 1834. He wrote: *Key to the O. T. and Apocrypha*, or an account of their several books, their contents, and authors, and of the times in which they were respectively written (Lond. 1790, 8vo; 9th ed. 1829, 8vo):—*Discourses illustrative of the Evidence, Influence, and Doctrines of Christianity* (Lond. 1793, 8vo):—*Sermons on the Principles of the Reformation of the Church of England* (Baumton Lecture, 1796, 8vo):—*The Theory of Dreams* (Lond. 1808, 8vo):—*The Connection between the sacred Writings and the Literature of Jewish and heathen Authors, etc., with a View to Evidence in Conformation of the Truth and revealed Religion* (Lond. 1819, 2d ed. 2 vols, 8vo).—Rose, *New General Biograph. Dict.*; Hoefel, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxi, 760; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, i, 1309.

**Grease** (גֶּרֶס, *che'leb*, Psa. cxix, 70, fat [q. v.], as elsewhere rendered).

**Great Britain** AND IRELAND, THE UNITED KINGDOM OF, is, since the union of Ireland, the full official designation of the country more generally known as Great Britain, Britain, or the United Kingdom. It includes the two large islands of Great Britain (England and Scotland) and Ireland, and the adjacent smaller islands, together with the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man. The island of Great Britain—so called to distinguish it from Britannia Minor, or Little Britain [see BRETAGNE], in France—lies between lat. 49° 57' 30" and 58° 40' 24" N., and between long. 1° 46' E. and 6° 13' W., and is the largest island in Europe. It is bounded on the N. by the Atlantic, on the E. by the North Sea, on the S. by the English Channel, and on the W. by the Atlantic, the Irish Sea, and St. George's Channel. The most northerly point is Dunnet Head, in Caithness; the most southerly, Lizard Point, in Cornwall; the most easterly, Lowestoft Ness, in Norfolk; and the most westerly, Ardnamurchan Point, in Argyshire. Its greatest length is about 608 miles, and its greatest breadth (from Land's End to the east coast of Kent) about 320 miles, while its surface contains about 89,600 square miles. In addition to the home territories composing the kingdom, Great Britain possesses a multitude of dependencies, some of them of vast extent, scattered over every part of the globe, and constituting "an empire over which the sun never sets." According to the official census held in 1861 in the United Kingdom, and nearly all the colonies except British India, the extent and population of all the British dominions were in that year as follows:

	Sq. Miles.	Inhabitants.
United Kingdom (inclusive of soldiers and sailors) .....	121,115	29,321,288
Colonies and possessions (exclusive of soldiers, 47,514 men) .....	3,364,722	9,264,243
British India (exclusive of British army, 62,593 men) .....	933,722	135,571,351
European Possessions .....	122	165,317
North American Colonies .....	512,193	3,323,507
West Indian Possessions .....	106,449	1,114,508
African Possessions .....	130,756	1,004,595
Islands in the South Atlantic Ocean .....	7,647	7,426
Possessions in the Indian Ocean .....	25,485	2,363,767
Australia and New Zealand .....	2,582,070	1,322,937
Total .....	4,419,559	174,156,882

Not included in this enumeration is the vast territory in North America which heretofore belonged to the Hudson's Bay Company, which in 1869 ceded its right of sovereignty. Added to the above total of square miles, this territory would increase the total extent of the British dominions to about seven millions of square miles, and make it, in point of extent, the first empire of the world. The total population was estimated in 1869 at 200,000,000; and in this respect the British empire was the second of the world, being exceeded only by the Chinese empire.

In England and Wales the Anglican Church is recognised as the state Church [see ENGLAND, CHURCH OF], and the sovereign must belong to it. In Ireland the Anglican Church was also the established Church until 1869, when, after a long and violent struggle between the Conservative and Liberal parties, it was disestablished. See IRELAND. In Scotland the established Church is Presbyterian. See SCOTLAND. According to the census returns of 1851 (in the census returns of 1861 religious statistics were not included), the number of places of worship, together with the sittings provided in England and Wales, and the estimated number of attendants on a particular day, were as follows:

ENGLAND AND WALES.	Places of Worship.	Sittings Provided.	Estimated Number of Attendants.
Established Church .....	14,977	5,317,915	3,773,474
Wesleyan Methodists (comprising seven distinct sects) .....	11,207	2,194,298	1,385,382
Independents or Congregationalists .....	3,244	1,067,760	793,142
Baptists (comprising six distinct sects) .....	2,789	751,343	587,978
Calvinistic Methodists .....	937	250,678	180,725
Scottish and Irish Presbyterians .....	161	86,812	60,131
Isolated Congregations .....	539	104,481	63,572
Roman Catholics .....	570	186,111	305,393
Society of Friends .....	371	91,599	18,172
Unitarians .....	229	68,554	37,156
Latter-day Saints, or Mormons .....	222	30,753	18,800
Sandemanians .....	6	956	587
Jews .....	53	3,438	4,150
Brethren .....	132	18,529	10,414
Moravians .....	32	9,305	7,364
New Church .....	50	12,107	7,082
Apostolic Church .....	32	7,437	4,908
Foreign Protestant, Catholic, and Greek churches .....	16	4,457	2,612
Established Church .....	14,077	5,317,915	3,773,474
Other Denominations .....	20,390	4,894,720	3,487,568
Total .....	34,467	10,212,635	7,261,032

SCOTLAND.	Places of Worship.	Sittings Provided.	Estimated Number of Attendants.
Established Church .....	1183	767,088	713,567
Free Church .....	889	495,325	433,363
United Presbyterians .....	465	288,100	273,554
Reformed Presbyterians .....	39	16,769	15,055
Original Seceders .....	36	16,424	15,781
Scotch Episcopalians .....	134	40,022	35,769
Independents or Congregationalists .....	192	76,342	70,851
Evangelical Union .....	28	10,310	10,789
Baptists .....	119	26,086	24,330
Wesleyan Methodists .....	82	22,441	21,768
Glasites or Sandemanians .....	6	1,068	890
New Church .....	5	710	630
Society of Friends .....	7	2,152	2,133
Roman Catholics .....	117	52,766	48,771
Unitarians .....	5	2,437	2,438
Isolated Congregations .....	61	11,402	9,401
Moravians .....	1	200	200
Jews .....	1	67	67
Mormons .....	20	3,182	3,171
Apostolic Church .....	3	675	675
Established Church .....	1183	767,088	713,567
Other Denominations .....	2212	1,067,717	975,482
Total .....	3395	1,834,805	1,689,049

"In England the chief institutions for education are the ancient national universities of Oxford and Cambridge; the more recent institutions of London, Durham, and Lampeter in Wales; the classical schools of Eton, Westminster, Winchester, Harrow, Charterhouse, and Rugby; the various military schools; the colleges of the dissenting denominations; the middle-class schools, either started by individual teachers, and hence called 'adventure' schools, or by associated bodies, acting as directors, to whom the teachers are responsible; the schools of design, and the various elementary schools and training-colleges in connection with the different religious denominations. The number of day-schools in England and Wales in 1851 was 46,042, of which 15,518 were public—i. e. schools deriving a portion of their income from some source besides

the scholars—and 30,524 private—i. e. sustained entirely by the payments of scholars. The total number of scholars was 2,144,378, of whom 1,422,982 attended the public, and 721,396 the private schools. As the population then amounted to 17,927,609, this gives a proportion of one scholar to every 8½ of the inhabitants.

“Scotland possesses four universities for the higher branches of education, viz. those of Edinburgh, Glasgow, St. Andrew’s, and Aberdeen, besides a variety of minor colleges connected with the Episcopalian, Free Church, and other non-established churches; a complete system of parish schools, grammar-schools, or academies in the chief towns, which serve as preparatory gymnasia for the universities, and a large number of ‘denominational schools.’ In 1851 the number of day-schools was 5242, of which 3349 were public, and 1893 private. The number of scholars was 368,517, of whom 280,045 belonged to the public, and 88,472 to the private schools. Out of a population of 2,888,742, this gives a percentage of 12.76, or 1 scholar to every 7½ of the inhabitants. According to the education statistics of 1861, the number of children from 5 to 15 years of age attending school in Scotland were 441,166, which, out of a population of 3,061,251, gives 1 scholar to every 6⅘ of the inhabitants” (Chambers, *Cyclop.*).

For the Church History of Great Britain, see ENGLAND, CHURCH OF; SCOTLAND, CHURCH OF; IRELAND, and the articles on the several dissenting denominations. The most important works on the Church History of Great Britain have been referred to in the art. on ENGLAND, CHURCH OF; besides them must be mentioned Bogue and Bennett, *History of Dissenters* (Lond. 1808-14, 4 vols.); J. Bennett, *History of Dissent during the last thirty Years* (Lond. 1849). (A. J. S.)

**Greathead.** See GROSSESTESTE.

**Great Owl.** See OWL.

**Great Sea.** See SEA.

**Greaves** (הַצִּנְחָה, *mitschah*’, lit. a facing; Sept. *κρημῖνες*, Vulg. *ocreee*) occurs in the A. V. only in 1 Sam. xvii, 6, in the description of the equipment of Goliath—“He had greaves of brass (הַצִּנְחָה, *copper*) upon his legs” (רַגְלָיו רַבְּצִינִי, lit. on his feet, whence some have supposed only a kind of boot to be meant). Its ordinary meaning is a piece of defensive armor reaching from the foot to the knee, and thus protecting the shin of the wearer. This was the case with the *κρημῖνις* of the Greeks, which derived its name from its covering the *κρημῖνον*, i. e. the lower part of the leg, and was a highly esteemed piece of defensive armor (see Smith, *Dict. of Class. Ant.* s. v. *Ocrea*). The Heb. term is de-

they appear to have extended over the whole thigh (Layard, *Nineveh*, ii, 261). See ARMOR.




Ancient Assyrian Greaves.

**Gre’cia** (Heb. *Yavan*’, יָוָן, i. e. *Javan* [q. v.], as usually rendered), the Latin form (Dan. viii, 21; x, 20; xi, 2) of the country elsewhere termed GREECE (q. v.).

**Gre’cian** (Heb. in the plur. *Beney hay-Yevanim*’, בְּנֵי הַיָּוָנִים, *sons of the Ionians*, Joel iii, 6; in the Apocr. Ἑλλημ, 1 Macc. vi, 2; viii, 9, 18; 2 Macc. iv, 15; xiii, 2; in the N. T. Ἑλληνιστής, a *Hellenist*, Acts vi, 1; ix, 29; xi, 20), the name of the people elsewhere called Greeks (q. v.).

**Greecian Architecture.** Greecian architecture differs from other styles of ancient architecture in this, that it was devoted almost solely to religious uses. Its chief aim was to supply permanent and worthy temples, as residences of the deities, as, during the early history of Greece, the images and statues of the deities were placed in the hollow trunks of trees and under canopies for protection.

Most of the elements from which the Ionic order of architecture was developed are easily traced to an Assyrian origin, as is seen in the ornamentation of the



Ancient Grecian Greaves.

rived from הַצִּנְחָה, the fore part of anything. Hence all the ancient versions and Josephus (*Ant.* vi, 9, 1) agree in regarding it as designating a defensive armor for the leg. It is to be distinguished from הַצִּנְחָה, *scin*’ (Isa. ix, 4), which Gesenius thinks was a sort of military shoe like the Roman *caliga*; and it probably was similar to the greaves of the Assyrians, as represented in their sculptures, which not only protected the leg, but covered the upper part of the foot like our gaiters, and seem to have been laced up in front; in other cases




Fig. 1. Plan of the Treasury of Atreus (from Lübke's *Geschichte der Architektur*).




Fig. 2. Section of the Treasury of Atreus.

columns and walls of the Treasury of Atreus at Mycenæ. On the other hand, the elements of the Doric order were mostly adopted from the more severe and stately temple architecture of Egypt. Under the extraordinary æsthetic feeling and culture of the Greeks, these elements, though of foreign origin, were developed and modified until, with the addition of certain native elements, there was produced a degree of perfection of architectural form, and of symmetrical and harmonious combination of parts into a unique whole, that has never been surpassed in the whole history of architecture.



Fig. 3. Pillar at the Entrance of the Treasury of Atreus.

The tendency to Oriental luxury and individual power that characterized the treasure-houses of the *ródavvoi* was checked by the overthrow of their chiefs and the establishment of democracy. From the time of the *ródavvoi* till the accession of Alexander the Great, Grecian architecture (as well as sculpture and painting) was devoted almost solely to the service of religion.

In addition to the Ionic and Doric orders, a third order, the Corinthian, was developed in Greece. It was, however, but little used until after the time of Alexander, when true religious feeling and patriotic sentiment had given way, throughout Greece and its colonies, to Oriental sensuous enjoyment and luxury.

The greatest variety and artistic freedom pervaded the Grecian architecture, both in the development of the individual members and in the general planning of the temples. All of the mouldings and the ornamentation were drawn with a free hand, and not by mathematical instruments, as was the case in Roman and Gothic architecture. With all of this variety and freedom, the typical character of the Grecian architecture was well preserved. The Doric order was the favorite, as the best adapted to the spirit of temple architecture. More than one order was frequently introduced, however, into the same edifice. From the erection of the earliest Doric temple, that of Neptune at Corinth, there was a gradual progress in the development of elegance of form in the single members of the edifice, and in the development of symmetry and harmony in the entire structure. During the earlier history of Grecian architecture, polychromy was used to a great extent. Later, the ornamentation became more sculptural. But color was used to develop




Fig. 4. Ionic Order; from the Erechtheum in Athens (Lübke).

the relief of the architectural forms of the capitals, the cornices, and the panels of the ceilings, until the period of decadence of the Grecian architecture.

Great care was taken to select the best sites for these temples. Oracles were consulted for their location. The temples of tutelary deities were usually placed on the highest ground in the city. They thus commanded, in many cases, most magnificent prospects. They were also thus seen at a great distance. The temples were sometimes surrounded by sacred groves, or by groves of olive and orange trees. The temples were often surrounded also by sacred inclosures, within which were frequently erected altars, and even temples to other deities. The temples of Mercury were usually placed on lower grounds; those of Mars, Venus, Vulcan, and Esculapius outside of and near the gates of the city. The front was always adorned with an equal number of columns—of four, six, eight, or ten. On the sides the number of columns was usually unequal. As the length of the temple was usually double the breadth, the number of columns at the side was thirteen for six on the front; seventeen for eight on the front. The proportion between the diameter and the height of the columns and of the space be-






Fig. 5. Ionic Order; from the monument of Lycierates in Athens (Lübke).

tween the columns varied in different temples and in different periods. Some temples had a portico on the front only; others on the front and rear, and others still on all four sides. Some had two rows of columns on the front and rear, and one on the side; and others had four rows on the front and rear, and two rows on the side. In some temples the cella required no pillars for the support of the roof; in others the cella was so large as to require a row, and sometimes two rows of pillars. Sometimes a gallery ran around the cella. The entire cella of some temples was covered with a roof, the central part being open to the sky. By this means only could the paintings of the celebrated artists which adorned the walls of the cella be distinctly seen.

Windows were occasionally introduced, as in the Erechtheum at Athens. It is supposed that these were closed by very thin slabs of alabaster or gypsum, thus giving a tranquil and mysterious light to the interior.

The base of the temple was raised several steps above the ground upon which it rested. The interior usually consisted of a room (cella) to contain the statue

of the deity. This cella opened to the east, that the first light of the morning might fall upon the image of the deity. Sometimes there was another room in the rear of the cella (as the treasury in the Parthenon




Fig. 6. Plan of the Parthenon.

at Athens). The gables contained groups of sculpture illustrative of some event connected with the mythology of the deity to whom the temple was dedicated. The metopes of the friezes frequently contained also smaller groups of sculpture. Upon the walls of the portico were frequently long series of sculptures.

The entire temple was erected primarily as a residence for the deity. It could contain but few persons at a time. Sacrifices, ceremonies, and processions were performed without the temple. Beside the statue of the deity, to whose service the temple was erected, were often placed smaller statues of friendly deities. Statues of priests were sometimes placed in the vestibule of the cella. Thank-offerings, sometimes of great value, were often placed upon the walls both of the cella and of the portico. An altar upon which offerings were placed often stood before the deity. But sacrifices were performed upon an altar placed before the entrance, but within the view of the image of the deity.

The other edifices of Grecian architecture were, like the temples, for the benefit and use of the entire population. They consisted mostly of fortifications, fortified entrances (propylea), and halls of justice (basilica). These partook of the general style of architecture in which the temples were built.

So different in principles of construction, and in the object for which they were designed, were the edifices of ancient Greece, that only with the greatest modification of detail can their style, and much less their plan, be adapted to the wants of modern life. Least

of all is the Grecian temple adapted to the purposes of a Christian church.

The history of Grecian architecture extends from the 7th century B.C. till the conquest of the Orient by Rome. The greater part of the earlier monuments of this architecture are found in the western colonies of Sicily and Grecia Magna. Most of the ancient temples in Greece itself were destroyed by the Persians. Most of the temples in Ionia and the further Orient were built during or after the reign of Alexander the Great. The Doric style prevailed mostly in Sicily, Grecia Magna, the Peloponnesus, and the northern part of Greece. The Ionic and Corinthian styles prevailed mostly in Asia Minor, while all three styles were found in Attica, and especially in Athens.

In Sicily there were over twenty temples that were famous for their size and splendor. They were mostly built in the 5th and 6th centuries B.C. The largest of these was the temple of Jupiter at Selinus, which was 350 feet long and 170 feet wide. The temple of Diana at Syracuse is remarkable for the indications of the influence of Egyptian architecture in its style and construction. The temple of Minerva at Syracuse was famous for its costly ornamentation. Hiero II built also at Syracuse a colossal altar, which rested on a lofty base 625 feet long and 73 feet wide, and was remarkable for the elegance of its architectural proportions. In Agrigentum were three imposing temples, the largest of them, that of Jupiter Olympus, being 344 feet long and 176 wide. At Paestum, in Italy, are the remains of two temples and of a basilica, that rank among the finest ruins of Grecian architecture. They show still the heavy influence of Egyptian architecture upon the Doric style, but yet they are marked by great freedom of treatment and harmony of proportion.

One of the most remarkable temples in the Peloponnesus was that of Neptune at Corinth, of which but seven columns and the architrave above them remain. As the earliest ruins of Grecian architecture extant, these are characterized by a heaviness of proportion that is not found in any later edifices. This temple dates from 650 B.C. The temple of Minerva, on the island of Egina, is remarkable for the traces of coloring yet remaining in the architectural ornamentation, and for the archaic character of the sculpture of the pediments, now in the Glyptothek at Munich. Among the most famous temples in Greece itself was that of Jupiter Olympus at Olympia. It was 205 feet long and 93 feet wide, and was adorned with most choice works of Grecian sculpture.

The glory of Grecian architecture is, however, to be seen in Athens. This city, with all of its temples, was utterly destroyed by the Persians 480 B.C. First among the temples of the newly rebuilt city was that of Theseus. This is to-day the best preserved of all ancient Grecian temples. In symmetry of proportion it surpassed all other temples that were built before it. The second temple in the new city was that of Victoria Aptera. This temple was taken down by the Turks in the 17th century to build a battery with. All of its parts were found in 1835, and the temple was completely restored. It is one of the most graceful monuments of Grecian architecture. The Parthenon at Athens is, however, the crowning glory of Grecian architecture. It was erected 448 B.C. Its length was 230 feet, and its breadth 102 feet. In the perfection of proportion of all the parts, and in the harmony of their union in an entire edifice, the Parthenon equals or surpasses all other edifices ever erected by the hand of man. It was also adorned with statues and other works of sculpture by the best sculptors that Greece or the world has ever produced. The Erechtheum and the Propylæum also showed the freedom with which the Greek architects varied the plans and construction of their edifices, without losing the character of the architecture, or grace of proportion and unity of effect. Nearly equal to the Parthenon was the temple of Diana at Eleusis, in which the mysteries were performed. There are but few ruins of the famous temple of Apollo at Delphi, which was burnt in the 6th century B.C., and the rebuilding of which was hardly completed at the time of the Roman conquest.

In size and costly magnificence, the temple of Diana at Ephesus exceeded all other temples of Grecian art. This magnificent edifice was completed in B.C. 400. It was 425 feet long and 220 feet wide. Erostratus set fire to it in B.C. 355, but it was rebuilt with renewed magnificence by Alexander the Great. It was plundered by the Goths, and later overthrown by an earthquake. It furnished much of the material for building the church of Santa Sophia (q. v.), and still its colossal ruins are the wonder of the antiquarian. The temple of Apollo at Didymus, near Miletus, destroyed by the Persians B.C. 496, and rebuilt B.C. 390, was one of the edifices in which the Oriental origin of the Ionic order is most plainly seen. It was also one of the largest and most elegant temples of antiquity. The Mausoleum at Halicarnassus was so large and costly as to be reckoned among the wonders of the world. It was 410 feet long, had nearly the




Fig. 7. The Parthenon restored.

shape of an arc of a circle, and was 140 feet high. Though built in a period when noble inspiration had left Grecian art, it was marked by an elegance of execution that was not surpassed in any edifice erected during the history of Greek architecture. The chief works of Greek architecture in Africa were in Cyrene, and especially in Alexandria. In this city all the resources of a luxuriant architecture were called into requisition in the erection of every class of edifices that should adorn a new and gorgeous capital city.

(For the literature upon Grecian architecture, see the article ARCHITECTURE.) G. F. C.

**Greece** (Ελλάς), properly the country in Europe inhabited by the Greek race (1 Macc. i. 1); but in Acts xx, 2, apparently designating only that part of it comprising the Roman province of MACEDONIA (q. v.). See Wetstein, *Nov. Test.* ii, 590; Kruse, *Hellas*, i, 557. Compare ACHAIA.

1. Greece is sometimes described as a country containing the four provinces of Macedonia, Epirus, Achaia or Hellas, and Peloponnesus, but more commonly the two latter alone are understood to be comprised in it. We will consider it as composed of Hellas and Peloponnesus, though there seems to be no question that the four provinces were originally inhabited by people of similar language and origin, and whose religion and manners were alike. Except upon its northern boundary it is surrounded on all sides by the sea, which intersects it in every direction, and naturally gives to its population seafaring habits. It is also a very mountainous country, abounding in eminences of great height, which branch out and intersect the land from its northern to its southern extremity, and form the natural limits of many of the provinces into which it is divided. At the isthmus of Corinth it is separated into its two great divisions, of which the northern was called *Grecia intra Peloponnesum*, and the southern the Peloponnesus, now called the Morea. The mountain and sea are thus the grand natural characteristics of Greece, and had a very considerable influence on the character of its inhabitants, as is evidenced in the religion, poetry, history, and manners of the people. The country has always been famous for the temperature of its climate, the salubrity of its air, and the fertility of its soil.

The Greek nation had a broad division into two races, Dorians and Ionians, of whom the former seem to have long lain hid in continental parts, or on the western side of the country, and had a temperament and institutions more approaching the Italic. The Ionians, on the contrary, retained many Asiatic usages and tendencies, witnessing that they had never been so thoroughly cut off as the Dorians from Oriental connection. When afterwards the Ionic colonies in Asia Minor rose to eminence, the Ionian race, in spite of the competition of the half Doric Æolians, continued to attract most attention in Asia.

Of the history of Greece before the first recorded Olympiad, B.C. 776, little that can be depended upon is known. There is no doubt that from very remote periods of antiquity, long prior to this date, the country had been inhabited, but facts are so intermingled with legend and fable in the traditions which have come down to us of these ancient times, that it is impossible with certainty to distinguish the false from the true (Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pref. to vol. i). After its conquest by the Romans, B.C. 146, Greece continued for one thousand three hundred and fifty years to be either really or nominally a portion of the Roman empire. Literature and the arts, long on the decline, were at length destroyed by Justinian, who closed the schools of Athens. Alaric the Goth invaded the country in the year 400, followed by Genseric and Zaber Khan in the sixth and seventh, and by the Normans in the eleventh century. After the Latin conquest of Constantinople in 1204, Greece was divided into feudal principalities, and governed by a variety of Roman,

Venetian, and Frankish nobles; but in 1261, with the exception of the dukedoms of Athens and Nauplia, and some portions of the Archipelago, it was reunited to the Constantinopolitan empire by Michael Palaeologus. In 1438 it was invaded by the Turks, who completed its conquest in 1481. The Venetians, however, were not disposed to allow its new masters quiet possession, and the country during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was the theatre of obstinate wars, which continued till the treaty of Passarowitz in 1718 confirmed the Turks in their conquest. With the exception of Maina, the whole country remained under their despotic sway till 1821, when the Greeks once more aroused from their lethargy, and asserted their claim to a national existence. The revolutionary struggle was continued with varied success and much bloodshed till the great European powers interfered, and the battle of Navarino, in 1827, secured the independence of Greece, which was reluctantly acknowledged by the Porte in 1829. In 1831 Greece was erected into an independent monarchy: it retains its classic name, and nearly its ancient limits, comprehending the Morea, or ancient Peloponnesus, south of the Gulf of Corinth, now Gulf of Lepanto, and the province of Livadia, or the ancient *Grecia propria*, with part of Thessaly and Epirus, north of that gulf; besides the Island of Negropont, the ancient Eubœa, and other smaller islands in the Archipelago. The *Republic* of the Ionian Islands, Cephalonia, Zante, Corfu, and others on the western coast of Greece, is under the protection of Great Britain.—Fairbairn, s. v.; Bastow, s. v.

2. The relations of the Hebrews with the Greeks were always of a distant kind until the Macedonian conquest of the East: hence in the Old Testament the mention of the Greeks is naturally rare. See JAVAN. It is possible that Moses may have derived some geographical outlines from the Egyptians, but he does not use them in Gen. x, 2-5, where he mentions the descendants of Javan as peopling the isles of the Gentiles. This is merely the vaguest possible indication of a geographical locality; and yet it is not improbable that his Egyptian teachers were almost equally in the dark as to the position of a country which had not at that time arrived at a unity sufficiently imposing to arrest the attention of its neighbors. The amount and precision of the information possessed by Moses must be measured by the nature of the relation which we can conceive as existing in his time between Greece and Egypt. Now it appears from Herodotus that prior to the Trojan War the current of tradition, sacred and mythological, set from Egypt towards Greece; and the first quasi-historical event which awakened the curiosity and stimulated the imagination of the Egyptian priests was the story of Paris and Helen (Herodotus, ii, 43, 51, 52, and 112). At the time of the Exodus, therefore, it is not likely that Greece had entered into any definite relation whatever with Egypt. Withdrawn from the sea-coast, and only gradually fighting their way to it during the period of the Judges, the Hebrews could have had no opportunity of forming connections with the Greeks. From the time of Moses to that of Joel we have no notice of the Greeks in the Hebrew writings, except that which was contained in the word Javan (Gen. x, 2); and it does not seem probable that during this period the word had any peculiar significance for a Jew, except in so far as it was associated with the idea of islanders. When, indeed, they came into contact with the Ionians of Asia Minor, and recognised them as the long-lost islanders of the Western migration, it was natural that they should mark the similarity of sound between יָוָן = יָוֶן and *Jones*, and the application of that name to the Asiatic Greeks would tend to satisfy in some measure a longing to realize the Mosaic ethnography. Accordingly, the O.-T. word, which in the A. Vers. is *Greece, Greeks*, etc., is in Hebrew יָוָן, *Javan* (Joel iii,



Map of Ancient Greece.

6; Dan. viii, 21): the Hebrew, however, is sometimes retained (Isa. lxvi, 19; Ezek. xxvii, 13). In Gen. x, 2 the Sept. has *Ἴωναν καὶ Ἑλλᾶς*, with which Rosenmüller compares Herod. i, 56-58, and professes to discover the two elements of the Greek race. From Ἴωναν he gets the Ionian or Pelasgian, from Ἑλλᾶς (for which he supposes the Heb. original *עֲלִיָּהוּ*), the Hellenic element. This is excessively fanciful. See ELISHAI.

The Greeks and Hebrews met for the first time in the slave-market. The medium of communication seems to have been the Tyrian slave-merchant. About B.C. 800 Joel speaks of the Tyrians as selling the children of Judah to the Grecians (Joel iii, 6); and in Ezek. xxvii, 13 the Greeks are mentioned as bartering their brazen vessels for slaves. On the other hand, Bochart says that the Greek slaves were highly valued throughout the East (*Geogr. Sac.* pt. i, lib. iii, c. 3, p. 175); and it is probable that the Tyrians took advantage of the calamities which befell either nation to sell them as slaves to the other. Abundant opportunities would be afforded by the attacks of the Lydian

monarchy on the one people, and the Syrian on the other; and it is certain that Tyre would let slip no occasion of replenishing her slave-market. See TYRE.

Prophetic notice of Greece occurs in Dan. viii, 21, etc., where the history of Alexander and his successors is rapidly sketched. See GOAT. Zechariah (ix, 13) foretells the triumphs of the Maccabees against the Græco-Syrian empire, while Isaiah looks forward to the conversion of the Greeks, among other Gentiles, through the instrumentality of Jewish missionaries (lxvi, 19). For the connection between the Jews and the quasi-Greek kingdoms which sprang out of the divided empire of Alexander, see ANTIOCHUS; PTOLEMY.

The presence of Alexander (q. v.) himself at Jerusalem, and his respectful demeanor, are described by Josephus (*Ant.* xi, 8, 3); and some Jews are even said to have joined him in his expedition against Persia (Ilecat. ap. Joseph. c. *Apion*, ii, 4), as the Samaritans had already done in the siege of Tyre (Josephus, *Ant.* xi, 8, 4-6). In 1 Macc. xii, 5-23 (about B.C. 180), and Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 4, 10, we have an account of

an embassy and letter sent by the Lacedæmonians to the Jews. The most remarkable feature in the transaction is the claim which the Lacedæmonians prefer to kindred with the Jews, and which Areus professes to establish by reference to a book. It is by no means unlikely that two declining nations, the one crouching beneath a Græco-Syrian invader, and the other beneath a Roman yoke, should draw together in face of the common calamity; or we may with Jahn (*Heb. Comm.* ix, 91, note) regard the affair as a piece of pompous trifling or idle curiosity, at a period when "all nations were curious to ascertain their origin, and their relationship to other nations." See ONIAS.

The notices of the Jewish people which occur in Greek writers have been collected by Josephus (*contra Apion*, i, 22). The chief are Pythagoras, Herodotus, Chærilus, Aristotle, Theophrastus, and Hecateus. The main drift of the argument of Josephus is to show that the Greek authors derived their materials from Jewish sources, or with more or less distinctness referred to Jewish history. For Pythagoras, he cites Hermippus's life; for Aristotle, Clearchus; but it should be remembered that the Neo-Platonism of these authorities makes them comparatively worthless; that Hermippus, in particular, belongs to that Alexandrian school which made it its business to fuse the Hebrew traditions with the philosophy of Greece, and propitiate the genius of Orientalism by denying the merit of originality to the great and independent thinkers of the West. This style of thought was further developed by Iamblichus; and a very good specimen of it may be seen in Le Clerc's notes on Grotius, *De Verit.* It has been ably and vehemently assailed by Ritter, *Hist. Phil.* b. i, c. 3. Herodotus mentions the *Syrians of Palestine* as confessing that they derived the rite of circumcision from the Egyptians (ii, 104). Bähr, however, does not think it likely that Herodotus visited the interior of Palestine, though he was acquainted with the sea-coast. (On the other hand, see Dahlman, p. 55, 56, Engl. transl.) It is almost impossible to suppose that Herodotus could have visited Jerusalem without giving us some more detailed account of it than the merely incidental notices in ii, 159, and iii, 5, not to mention that the site of *Kάκρυς*, or Cadytis, is still a disputed question. The victory of Pharaoh-Necho over Josiah at Megiddo is recorded by Herodotus (comp. Herod. ii, 159 with 2 Kings xxiii, 29 sq.; 2 Chron. xxxv, 20 sq.). It is singular that Josephus should have omitted these references, and cited Herodotus only as mentioning the rite of circumcision. The work of Theophrastus cited is not extant; he enumerates among other oaths that of *Corban*. Chærilus is supposed by Josephus to describe the Jews in a by no means flattering portrait of a people who accompanied Xerxes in his expedition against Greece. The chief points of identification are their speaking the Phœnician language, and dwelling in the *Solymean mountains, near a broad lake*, which, according to Josephus, was the Dead Sea. The Hecateus of Josephus is Hecateus of Abdera, a contemporary of Alexander the Great, and of Ptolemy son of Lagus. The authenticity of the History of the Jews attributed to him by Josephus has been called in question by Origen and others.

After the complete subjugation of the Greeks by the Romans, and the absorption into the Roman empire of the kingdoms which were formed out of the dominions of Alexander, the political connection between the Greeks and Jews as two independent nations no longer existed.—Smith, s. v.

When a beginning had been made of preaching Christianity to the Gentiles, Greece immediately became a principal sphere for missionary exertion. The vernacular tongue of the Hellenistic Christians was understood over so large an extent of country as almost of itself to point out in what direction they should exert themselves. The Grecian cities, whether in Eu-

rope or Asia, were the peculiar field for Paul, for whose labors a superintending Providence had long before been providing in the large number of devout Greeks who attended the Jewish synagogues. Greece Proper was divided by the Romans into two provinces, of which the northern was called Macedonia, and the southern Achaia (as in 2 Cor ix, 2, etc.); and we learn incidentally from Acts xviii that the proconsul of the latter resided at Corinth. To determine the exact division between the provinces is difficult, nor is the question of any importance to a Biblical student. Achaia, however, had probably very nearly the same frontier as the kingdom of modern Greece, which is limited by a line reaching from the gulf of Volo to that of Arta, in great part along the chain of Mount Othrys. Of the cities celebrated in Greek history, none are prominent in the early Christian times except Corinth. Laconia, and its chief town Sparta, had ceased to be of any importance: Athens was never eminent as a Christian church. In Macedonia were the two great cities of Philippi and Thessalonica (formerly called Therme); yet of these the former was rather recent, being founded by Philip the Great; the latter was not distinguished above the other Grecian cities on the same coast. Nicopolis, on the gulf of Ambracia (or Arta), had been built by Augustus in memory of his victory at Actium, and was, perhaps, the limit of Achaia on the western coast (Tacitus, *Annal.* ii, 53). It had risen into some importance in Paul's days, and, as many suppose, it is to this Nicopolis that he alludes in his epistle to Titus. See NICOPOLIS.

3. Among the Greeks the arts of war and peace were carried to greater perfection than among any earlier people. In navigation they were little behind the Tyrians and Carthaginians; in political foresight they equalled them; in military science, both by sea and land, they were decidedly their superiors; while in the power of reconciling subject-foreigners to the conquerors and to their institutions, they perhaps surpassed all other nations of the world. Their copious, cultivated, and flexible tongue carried with it no small mental education to all who learned it thoroughly; and so sagacious were the arrangements of the great Alexander throughout his rapidly acquired Asiatic empire, that in the twenty years of dreadful war between his generals which followed his death, no rising of the natives against Greek influence appears to have been thought of. Without any change of population adequate under other circumstances to effect it, the Greek tongue and Greek feeling spread far and sank deep through the Macedonian dominions. Half of Asia Minor became a new Greece, and the cities of Syria, North Palestine, and Egypt were deeply imbued with the same influence. See GREEK LANGUAGE.

The Greeks were eminent for their appreciation of beauty in all its varieties; indeed, their religious creed owed its shape mainly to this peculiarity of their mind, for their logical acuteness was not exercised on such subjects until quite a later period. The puerile or indecent fables of the old mythology may seem to a modern reader to have been the very soul of their religion; but to the Greek himself these were a mere accident, or a vehicle for some embodiment of beauty. Whatever the other varieties of Greek religious ceremonies, no violent or frenzied exhibitions arose out of the national mind; but all such *orgies* (as they were called) were imported from the East, and had much difficulty in establishing themselves on Greek soil. At quite a late period the managers of orgies were evidently regarded as mere jugglers of not a very reputable kind (see Demosthenes, *De Coronâ*, § 79, p. 313); nor do the Greek states, as such, appear to have patronized them. On the contrary, the solemn religious processions, the sacred games and dances, formed a serious item in the public expenditure; and to be permanently exiled from such spectacles would have been a moral death to the Greeks. Wherever they settled they introduced their

native institutions, and reared temples, gymnasia, baths, porticoes, sepulchres, of characteristic simple elegance. The morality and the religion of such a people naturally were alike superficial; nor did the two stand in any close union. Bloody and cruel rites could find no place in their creed, because faith was not earnest enough to endure much self-abandonment. Religion was with them a sentiment and a taste rather than a deep-seated conviction. On the loss of beloved relatives they felt a tender and natural sorrow, but unclouded with a shade of anxiety concerning a future life. Through the whole of their later history, during Christian times, it is evident that they had little power of remorse, and little natural firmness of conscientious principle; and, in fact, at an earlier and critical time, when the intellect of the nation was ripening, an atrocious civil war, that lasted for twenty-seven years, inflicted a political and social demoralization, from the effects of which they could never recover. Besides this, their very admiration of beauty, coupled with the degraded state of the female intellect, proved a frightful source of corruption, such as no philosophy could have adequately checked.—Kitto, s. v. (Works expressly on Grecian mythology have been written by Le Clerc, 1787; Kanne, 1805; Lünmer, 1806; Hug, 1812; Völcker, 1824; Buttman, 1828; Studer, 1830; Kriche, 1840; Stühr, 1838; Limburg-Brouwer, 1833.) See GREEK.

**Greece, Kingdom of**, a country in south-eastern Europe, established in 1832 by a successful rising of the people against the rule of the Turks, to which they had been subject since the fall of the Byzantine empire. The kingdom was enlarged in 1863 by the annexation of the Ionian Islands, which until then had been subject to the sovereignty of Great Britain. The total area in 1869 amounted to 19,353 square miles, the total population in 1861 to 1,348,412, and in 1864 to about 1,400,000.

The great majority of the people of Greece belong to the Greek Church (q. v.), which is in Greece (since 1833) independent of the patriarch of Constantinople, and constitutes a national Church, which the patriarch recognised in 1850 by the so-called Tomos. The supreme management of ecclesiastical affairs is in the hands of a Holy Synod, consisting of five bishops and an officer of the government. At the beginning of the revolution the higher clergy consisted of 20 metropolitans, 2 archbishops, and 19 bishops; in 1869 there were 11 archbishops, 4 metropolitans, and 16 bishops. The number of male monasteries was, on the advent of the regency which was established after the expulsion of the Turks, about 400, and the number of nunneries from 30 to 40, together with about 800 inmates; in 1869 there were 128 monasteries of monks and 4 nunneries, the former with 1500, the latter with 150 inhabitants. There are about 2905 parish churches, with 3200 priests. The secular clergy and the monks are generally but little educated, but enjoy, nevertheless, great respect among the people, the majority of whom are firmly attached to their Church. For the orthodox Greek Church there are 4 archbishops in Livadia (Chalcis and Eubœa, Ætolia and Acarnania, Phthiotis, the metropolitan see of Athens, Megara and Ægina), with 4 bishops; in the Morea, 6 archbishops (Argolis, Corinth, Patras and Elis, Mantinea and Cynuria, Messenia, Sparta and Monembasia) and 6 bishops; in the Archipelago, 1 archbishop (Syros and Tynos) and 3 bishops; in the Ionian Islands, 4 metropolitans and 3 bishops. The Roman Catholics, who are mostly the descendants of families which immigrated at the time of the Crusades and during the rule of the Venetians, number about 25,000, chiefly in the islands, and have two archbishops—at Naxos and Corfu—and 4 bishops. There are a few thousand Mohammedans in Eubœa, and a few hundred Protestants and Jews in the commercial towns.

The labors of Protestant missionaries began in 1828,

and have ever since been carried on without intermission. The American Board of Missions, the Episcopal Board, and Baptist Board were all concerned in the work. The Episcopal Board began its operations in 1829, when it sent out Messrs. Robertson and Hill. These gentlemen, in the outset, started out upon the conciliatory course, under the impression that the Greek Church would be freed from its evils by liberal education. On this account they devoted themselves entirely to education, allowing a priest in their schools to teach the Greek Catechism. The American Board of Missions sent out the Rev. Dr. King in 1828, and he, too, opened schools for boys and girls at Athens, and also paid great attention to education, but only used it as a means to the preaching of the Gospel. In 1835 the representative of the American Board assisted in the establishment of the first college in Greece which was started under government assistance. Soon after this three other missionaries arrived in Greece, who opened schools in the mountains. In 1841, suddenly, and without any apparent provocation, the Church party made war against missionary operations, and attempted to extinguish the Gospel light. These persecutions ended in the banishment of Dr. King from the country. This action became the means of introducing the native element into the work. Dr. Kalopothakes, who had become acquainted with Protestantism in one of the schools of Dr. King, and who had subsequently spent four years in the United States to prepare for missionary work in his country, started in Athens a religious newspaper, the *Star of the East*. In 1864, when Dr. King (who had helped Dr. Kalopothakes in all his troubles) returned to America, the paper passed entirely into the hands of Dr. Kalopothakes and his companion, a Mr. Constantine; and when, in 1868, Dr. King again went to Greece, he found the paper prospering, and two regular Church services carried on every Sabbath at Athens. In 1869, Dr. Kalopothakes and Mr. Constantine published a daily paper, a weekly paper, and a children's paper, and also a number of cheap religious books. One of the chief results of the Protestant mission has been the increased circulation of the Bible, which is proved by the fact that in 1859, when Dr. Kalopothakes first opened the Bible dépôt at Athens, he did not sell 100 copies of the New Testament, whereas in 1868 he disposed of 3000.

Popular education has made considerable progress since the establishment of independence. There were 750 primary schools in 1856; 93 pro-gymnasia or Hellenic schools, with 165 teachers and 4990 pupils; 11 gymnasia (organized after the model of those of Germany), with 67 teachers and 1180 pupils; an ecclesiastical ("Rhisari") seminary, and a national university established in 1837, with a library of more than 80,000 volumes, an observatory, and botanical garden. See Wiggers, *Kirchl. Statistik*, i, 179 sq., 207 sq. (A. J. S.)

**Greek**, a term not found in the A. V. of the O. T., where either *Javan* is retained, or, as in Joel iii, 6, the word is rendered by *Grecian*. In Maccabees *Greeks* and *Grecians* seem to be used indifferently (comp. 1 Macc. i, 10; vi, 2; also 2 Macc. iv, 10, *Greekish*). In the N. T., on the other hand, a distinction is observed, "Ἕλλην being rendered "Greek," and Ἑλληνιστὴς "Grecian." The difference of the English terminations, however, is not sufficient to convey the difference of meanings. (See Overkamp, *De distinctione inter Judæos et Græcos, et inter Græc. et barbaros*, Gryj h. 1782; Amnell, *Hellas e N. T. illustrata*, Upsal. 1752.) "Ἕλλην in the N. T. is either a Greek by race, as in Acts xvi, 1-3; xviii, 17; Rom. i, 14; or more frequently a *Gentile*, as opposed to a Jew (Rom. ii, 9, 10, etc.); so fem. Ἑλληνίς, Mark vii, 26; Acts xvii, 12. Ἑλληνιστὴς (properly "one who speaks Greek") is a foreign Jew; opposed, therefore, not to Ἰουδαῖος, but to Ἑβραῖος, a home-Jew, one who dwelt in Palestine. So Schleusner, etc.: according to Salmasius, however,

the Hellenists were Greek proselytes, who had become Christians; so Wolf, Parkhurst, etc., arguing from Acts xi, 20, where Ἑλληστῆται are contrasted with Ἰουδαῖοι in 19. The question resolves itself partly into a textual one, Griesbach having adopted the reading Ἑλληνας, and so also Lachmann, Tischendorf, and others.—Smith, s. v. See HELLENIST.

**Greek Church**, the name usually given to the largest branch of the Oriental or Eastern churches (q. v.). It comprehends all those Christians following the Greek or the Græco-Slavonian rite, who receive the first seven general councils, with the authority of the Roman pontiff and the later councils of the Western Church. See COUNCILS. The title "Greek Church" is hardly an appropriate one. A "communio embracing several other nations and languages besides the Greek, each performing divine worship in its own tongue, and in which, out of sixty-six millions of Christians, perhaps fifty-nine millions are Slavonians, and pray in the Slavonic tongue, cannot properly be called *Greek* merely because its ritual is derived in great measure (by no means exclusively) from Greek sources, and because it was once united with the Græco-Roman empire" (Palmer, *Dissertations*, p. 5). The Church calls itself the "Holy Orthodox Catholic and Apostolic Church." The Greek Church has not, like the Roman Catholic Church, one head, but consists of eleven different groups, which, in point of administration, are independent of each other (see below, *Statistics*), though they fully agree in point of doctrine.

I. *History*.—The proper history of the Greek Church as a separate body begins with the interruption of ecclesiastical communion between the pope and the patriarch of Constantinople. After the establishment of the imperial residence at Constantinople, it was the natural ambition of both the bishops of Constantinople and the emperors to enlarge the authority and prerogatives of the see of Constantinople (q. v.). In 381 the first Œcumenical Council of Constantinople gave to the bishops of Constantinople, because it was the New Rome (ὡς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὴν νέαν Ῥώμην), the "precedence of honor" next after those of ancient Rome. The canon was not recognised by the churches of Rome and Alexandria, but the authority of the bishop of the imperial residence naturally rose, and in 451 the Council of Chalcedon not only confirmed the precedence already given, but placed under his jurisdiction the dioceses of Thrace, Asia, and Pontus, and grounded these ecclesiastical privileges, in the case of the new as well as the old Rome, upon the political distinction of the two cities. The Roman legates protested against this canon, and pope Leo the Great did not recognise it, but when the empire was divided, the patriarch gradually acquired a kind of superiority over the other three patriarchs of the East, and assumed the title of Œcumenical Patriarch. The support given by patriarch Acacius of Constantinople (471-489) to the *Henoticon* (q. v.) led in 484 to the excommunication of Acacius, together with the emperor and the patriarch of Alexandria, by pope Felix III, who also charged him with encroaching upon the rights of the patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem. For thirty-five years (484-519) the communion between Constantinople and Rome remained interrupted, most of the Eastern bishops siding with Acacius, while those of Illyria, bishop Kalandion of Antioch, and the convents in the vicinity of Constantinople, ranged themselves on the side of the pope. The withdrawal of the excommunication by pope Hormisdas involved a complete acknowledgment of the supremacy of the Roman pontiff, but the rivalry of the patriarchs of Constantinople continued, and pope Gregory the Great in vain endeavored to prevail upon the pious John the Faster of Constantinople to relinquish the title Œcumenical Patriarch. The antagonism of the two churches was increased by the support which several of the patriarchs of Constantinople gave to the iconoclast emperors, and by the complete political

separation between the East and the West. When Photius, after ascending the patriarchal see, could not obtain the recognition of pope Nicholas, he excommunicated the pope, and arraigned the whole Latin Church for her doctrine of the twofold procession of the Holy Ghost and the addition of "*Filioque*" (q. v.) to the creed, for the practice of clerical celibacy, and for denying to priests the power of administering confirmation. As the rival of Photius for the see of Constantinople, Ignatius, was a declared partisan of the pope and the Latins, the struggle for the possession of the see greatly added to the animosity of the party of Photius against the whole Latin Church. After the death of the emperor Michael III, Ignatius was restored to the see, and a council at Constantinople under his presidency, which by the Latins is accounted as the eighth Œcumenical council, established in 869 the union between the two churches. After the death of Ignatius in 877, Photius again became patriarch. A council held by him in 879 repealed the decisions of the Council of 869. The papal legates were induced by Photius to approve the acts of this council, which the Greek Church numbers among the Œcumenical, but pope John rejected it, and excommunicated Photius anew. In 886 Photius was exiled by the emperor Leo IV, and his successor, Stephen, accepted the demands of the pope. Peace between the two churches was preserved until the middle of the 11th century, when Michael Cerularius (q. v.) was, though a layman, elected patriarch, contrary to the canons of the Council of 869, which forbade the election of laymen to this dignity. Cerularius, in union with bishop Leo of Achrida, the metropolitan of Bulgaria, wrote a letter to bishop John of Trani, in Apulia, who was asked to communicate it to the bishops and priests of the Franks and to the pope. Besides the points of difference alleged by Photius, the letter of Cerularius reproached the Latins for the use of unglavened bread in the Eucharist, for fasting on Saturday, and for not singing Hallelujah during Lent. Cardinal Humbert gave a Latin translation of the letter to pope Leo IX. The pope wrote two letters against Cerularius, which in 1054 were taken to Constantinople by archbishop Petrus of Amalfi, the chancellor Frederick, and Cardinal Humbert. They charged Cerularius especially with the design to establish a jurisdiction over the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, and to make himself the Œcumenical patriarch of the entire Greek Church. Cardinal Humbert added a third letter, in which he charged the Greeks with rebaptizing the Latins, with allowing to the priests the use of marriage during the days of their service at the altar, with not baptizing their children until the eighth day after their birth, and other similar points. The emperor Constantine Monomachos, who, from political reasons, was opposed to a schism, had the letter of Humbert translated into Greek. The monk Niketas (Pectoratus), who wrote a violent refutation of Humbert, was compelled to retract, but Cerularius remained firm in his opposition, and in July, 1054, was solemnly excommunicated by the papal legates. With the support of the emperor, whom he gained over to his side, Cerularius maintained his authority until, in 1059, he was exiled by the emperor Isaac Comnenus. He died soon after.

But the exile of Cerularius did not restore the union of the churches. On the contrary, from this time the separation struck deeper root among the people of the East. Some of the emperors were favorable to a reunion in order to procure political aid from the pope and the Latin princes; but their efforts met only with temporary success. Thus, in 1095, ambassadors of the emperor Alexius Comnenus appeared, suppliant for aid, at the Council of Piacenza, and pope Urban, to restore a union, held in 1097 a council at Bari, in Apulia. In 1201 pope Innocent III induced the Greek emperor Alexius and the patriarch of Constantinople,

John Lomaterus, to enter into a union with Rome. At the Council of Lyons, 1217, delegates from the Greek Church were present, and they, as well as the emperor Michael Palaeologus, declared in favor of union. But the son and successor of Michael, Andronicus, was a decided opponent of the union, and imprisoned the patriarch, who supported it. The emperor John Palaeologus II, and the patriarchs Philotheos of Constantinople (1363-1376), Niphon of Alexandria, and Lazar of Jerusalem, also re-entered into communion with Rome, and sent to pope Clement VI their profession of faith. At the Œcumenical Council of Ferrara, which began in January, 1438, the emperor John Palaeologus VI, his brother, the patriarch of Constantinople, representatives of the three other patriarchs, many bishops, priests, and officers, and altogether some 700 Greeks and Orientals, were present. After a long discussion of the points of difference, the decree of union was, on July 5, 1439, signed by the pope, the Greek emperor, the cardinals, the patriarchs and bishops of both churches, with the sole exception of the bishop Markos Eugenikos of Ephesus. See FERRARA; FLORENCE. But this union was short-lived. On the return of the Eastern bishops to their homes, their action was repudiated by the large body of the priests, monks, and people. The great majority of the bishops themselves yielded to the public pressure and renounced the union, and soon after, in 1453, the fall of Constantinople obliterated every trace of the attempted reconciliation. The patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem declared in 1460 their readiness to accept the union, but, as usual, this declaration bore no practical fruit. Many attempts to effect a general union have since been made, but without effect. Only small bodies of Greeks, especially through the influence of the Catholic government of Poland, have entered into and remained in union with Rome, receiving from the popes permission to retain the use of the Greek language at divine service, and some other peculiarities of the Greek Church. See UNITED GREEK CHURCH. Pope Pius IX, on ascending the papal see, invited the bishops of the Greek Church, in a circular letter addressed to them, to re-enter into the union with Rome. The Greek bishops replied by a letter, setting forth their reasons for not complying with the invitation. In 1868 the pope invited the Greek bishops individually to attend the coming council, but this invitation also was declined by every bishop.

The Greek Church comprised within its ancient limits, anterior to the Mohammedan conquests, Greece properly so called, the Peloponnesus, Eastern Illyricum, the Islands, and Asia Minor, as also Syria and Palestine, Arabia, Egypt, and parts of Mesopotamia and Persia. Her territory in Asia and Africa was in the course of time almost wholly lost in consequence of the advance of the Mohammedans, and with the fall of Constantinople in the 15th century nearly all the ancient sees of the Church in Europe came likewise under the rule of a Mohammedan government. Other portions became subject to the Catholic governments of Austria and Poland, leaving only one single government, that of Russia, as the protector of the interests of the Greek Church. In Austria and Poland the Greek Church suffered some losses in consequence of the efforts of the governments of those two countries to induce the Greek bishops to accept the supremacy of the pope. In European Turkey the Church maintained, on the whole, her ground, as the Turks, though oppressing them in many ways, did not deny them religious toleration. More than from the Turkish government, the Greek Church in Turkey suffered from internal corruption, especially from the simony prevailing in the appointments to episcopal sees and other ecclesiastical positions. See TURKEY.

While the territory of the Greek Church in Africa, Asia, and South-eastern Europe was greatly reduced by the advance of Mohammedanism, it received a most

important increase by the conversion of the Russians. The first missionaries were sent to this people from Constantinople in the 9th century. In 955, princess Olga, the saint, was baptized at Constantinople, and in 956 the first Christian church was built at Kief. Vladimir, at the close of the 10th century, was especially eager for the suppression and destruction of paganism. The first attempt to sever the connection of the Russian Church with the patriarch of Constantinople was made by Yaroslav I, who, in 1051, commanded the Russian bishops to elect the new metropolitan of Kief without the co-operation of the patriarch. His successors, however, again conceded to the patriarch the right of appointing the metropolitan of Kief. In 1164 the patriarch of Constantinople sent a new metropolitan to Kief without even asking for the consent of the prince; but prince Rostislav, though willing to accept the metropolitan for once, declared that in future the election of the metropolitan would require the sanction at least of the government. Negotiations of the princes of Russia and the metropolitans of Kief with the pope for a union of the Russian Church with Rome began in the 11th century. Some of them, in particular several princes of the Rurians and Ruthenians in Galicia, and the metropolitan Isidore, who took part in the Council of Florence, really joined the union, but among the mass of the people and clergy it never gained ground. In 1588 the metropolitan Job of Moscow was consecrated by the patriarch of Constantinople the first patriarch of Russia, and was recognised by the other Oriental patriarchs as the fifth patriarch of the orthodox Church. At the close of the 16th century an attempt was made to establish a union between the Russian Church and those of Georgia and Armenia, but it failed in consequence of the intolerance of the Russian patriarch. The attitude of the patriarch towards the metropolitan of Kief induced the latter, with a number of other bishops of South Russia, and a population of about ten millions, to enter in 1594, at the Council of Brzesk, into communion with Rome. The breach between the Russians and the Church of Rome was greatly widened by the elevation of the house of Romanoff to the throne and by the consolidation of the Russian nationality in its hereditary struggle against Catholic Poland. In 1657 and the three following years the Russian ambassador in Constantinople obtained from the patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem an official recognition of the right of Russia to have the patriarchs of Russia elected by the Russian clergy, without obtaining the previous sanction of the Oriental patriarchs. After the death of the eleventh Russian patriarch in 1702, Peter the Great left the patriarchal see vacant, and in 1721 put the administration of the Church in the hands of a board of bishops called the Holy Synod. Since then the Church of Russia has been eminently a state church. Though in doctrinal union with the other branches of the Greek Church, it is, in point of ecclesiastical administration, entirely unconnected with them. At home it has been unable to prevent the growth of numerous dissenting sects; but the rapid growth of the Russian empire has made it not only by far the most numerous and important branch of the Greek Church in the present age, but the largest state church in the Christian world. (For a fuller account of the inner history of the Church, see RUSSIA.)

The establishment of the independence of the Hellenic kingdom at the beginning of the present century created another independent Greek state church. In 1833, the regency of Greece, at the request of thirty-six metropolitans, declared the orthodox Oriental Church of Greece independent of every foreign ecclesiastical authority, and, after the model of the Russian Church, organized for the administration of the Church a "Holy Synod." This independent constitution was recognised by the patriarch of Constantinople in 1850.



(For a fuller account of this branch of the Greek Church, see GREECE.)

The Reformed Churches which arose in the 16th century made also several attempts to establish an understanding with the Greek Church. The Augsburg Confession and Luther's Smaller Catechism were translated into Greek, and, very early after the Reformation, a letter was addressed by Melancthon to the patriarch Joseph of Constantinople through a deacon Demetrius Mysus, who visited Germany in 1558. Another Lutheran embassy of a more imposing character, headed by the well-known Tübingen divines Andree and Crusius, visited Constantinople during the patriarchate of Jeremias (1576 to 1581). But both missions remained without result. Negotiations with the Reformed Churches were opened by the patriarch Cyril Lukaris, who in 1629 issued a decidedly Calvinistic confession of faith. But he was not only unable to carry his Church with him, but was himself deposed and imprisoned; and, to cut off future attempts of this kind, a doctrinal declaration was signed by the patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, and many metropolitans and bishops, which, by clear and decided definitions, draws a marked line between the Greek and the Reformed Church. See CYRIL LUCAR. This exposition was generally adopted by the churches, and in a synod held in Jerusalem in 1672 it was adopted as the creed of the Greek Church. (See below.)

Several efforts have also been made by the Anglican churches to enter into intercommunion with the Greek Church, which during the last ten years have received the official indorsement of the English convocations and of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. The plan has found many friends even among bishops of the Greek Church, some of whom are members and patrons of a Society for Promoting the Unity of Christendom [see ENGLAND], which comprises Anglicans, Roman Catholics, and Oriental Christians among its members.

11. *Doctrine.*—The Greek Church, in common with the Roman Catholic, recognises the infallible authority of the first seven councils. Its particular doctrines are laid down in a number of confessions of faith, among which the most important are, the Confession of patriarch Gennadius (q. v.), and the *Confessio orthodoxa catholice atque apostolice ecclesie orientalis* of Petrus Mogilas, metropolitan of Kiev, which in 1642 was sanctioned by a synod at Yassy, in 1643 signed by all the patriarchs, and in 1672 again sanctioned by a synod at Jerusalem, and declared to be an authentic exhibition of the doctrine of the Church.

The Greeks agree with the Roman Catholics in accepting as the rule of faith not alone the Bible, including the Deutero-canonical books, but also the traditions (q. v.) of the Church. They deny the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son [see FILIOQUE], and reject the papal claim to supremacy and doctrinal authority. They admit the seven sacraments of the Roman Catholic Church, but differ in some of the rites used at their administration. They administer baptism by trine immersion, and confirmation in immediate connection with baptism, even in the case of infants. The right of administering confirmation is conceded to priests as well as to bishops. They administer the communion in both kinds, and even to children. (For their peculiarities in the sacraments of extreme unction and priestly orders, see EXTREME UNCTION and ORDERS.) They forbid marriage altogether to bishops; priests and deacons are forbidden to contract marriage after ordination, and must not have been married more than once, nor to a widow. Married priests must live separate from their wives during the time when they are actually engaged in Church service. They regard marriage as dissoluble in case of adultery, and regard fourth marriages as utterly unlawful. They do not permit the use of graven images, with the exception of that of the cross. They observe four

great fasts: the forty days of Lent, from Pentecost to the Feast of Sts. Peter and Paul, the fifteen days before Assumption Day, and the six weeks before Christmas; and, besides, the Wednesdays and Fridays throughout the year are fast days. At divine service they generally use the liturgy of St. Chrysostom, and on certain Sundays and festivals that of St. Basil. The liturgy of the Russian Church is in the Old Slavonic language; that of the Church in the kingdom of Greece, in modern Greek; that of the Church of Georgia, in the Old Georgian language. Instrumental music is forbidden, but singing is universally in use. The ordinary posture in public prayer is standing, the body being turned towards the east; only at Pentecost is kneeling in use. The sign of the cross is in more frequent use among them than in the Roman Catholic Church, but in a different form. The preaching of sermons is not common; generally a homily is read from ancient collections. Corresponding to the breviary of the Latin Church is the Horologion, which contains prayers for different hours of divine worship, a complete calendar (Menologion), and different appendixes for worship. Festivals peculiar to the Greek Church are the consecration of water on January 6 (Old Style) in commemoration of the baptism of Jesus in the Jordan, and the orthodox Sunday (*Estomihli*), with a litany anathematizing heretics and in honor of the imperial patrons, the prelates, and martyrs of the Church.

111. *Constitution and Statistics.*—The constitution of the Greek Church is, in many respects, similar to that of the Roman Catholic Church. They reject the claims of the pope to a supremacy over the whole Church, and are only willing to recognise him as the patriarch of one great section of the Church. The *higher* clergy (Archiereis) are the patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops, who have to live in celibacy; the *lower* clergy are divided into the regular clergy (monks; also called, from the color of their dress, the *black clergy*) and the secular clergy (also called, in opposition to the regulars, the *white clergy*, although their dress is, in fact, often of a brown, violet, or other color).

In point of ecclesiastical organization, the Greek Church consisted in 1869 of eleven groups, which were more or less independent of each other, namely, 1. The patriarchate of Jerusalem, which has 13 sees (metropolitan and 1 archiepiscopal). 2. The patriarchate of Antioch, with 6 metropolitan sees. 3. The patriarchate of Alexandria; it has 4 metropolitan sees. 4. The patriarchate of Constantinople, which has 135 sees (90 metropolitan and 4 archiepiscopal). 5. The patriarchate of Russia, which has 65 sees (5 metropolitan, 25 archiepiscopal). 6. Cyprus, 4 sees (of which 1 is archiepiscopal). 7. Austria, 11 sees (2 metropolitan). 8. Mount Sinai, 1 see. 9. Montenegro, 1 metropolitan see. 10. Greece, 31 sees (the archbishop of Athens is *ex officio* president of the Holy Synod). 11. Rumania, 4 bishops in Wallachia and 3 in Moldavia. The people of Servia and those of Bulgaria desire for their bishops a similar independence of Constantinople.

The statistics of the Greek Church, reported in 1867, were as follows:

Russia (in Europe, 51,000,000; Siberia, 2,600,000; Caucasus [total population, 4,257,000] not reported); total about.....	55,000,000
Turkey (inclusive of the dependencies in Europe and Egypt), about.....	11,500,000
Austria.....	2,921,000
Greece (inclusive of Ionian Islands).....	1,220,000
United States of America (chiefly in the territory purchased in 1867 from Russia).....	5,000
Prussia.....	1,500
China.....	200
Total.....	69,692,700

For fuller information on the several branches of the Church, see the articles RUSSIA; TURKEY; GREECE; AUSTRIA.

See Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, v. 368; Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus* (Paris, 1740, 3 vols.); Heineccius

*Abbildung der alten und neuen griech. Kirche* (Leipsic, 1711); Ricaut, *Hist. de l'état présent de l'église grecque et de l'église arménienne* (Mittelnb. 1692); Schmitt, *Geschichte der neu-griech. und der russischen Kirche* (Meutz, 1840); Strahl, *Geschichte d. russ. Kirche* (Halle, 1830); Wimmer, *Die griech. Kirche in Russland* (Leips. 1848); Piehler, *Geschichte der kirchl. Trennung zwischen dem Orient und dem Occident von den ersten Anfängen bis zur jüngsten Gegenwart* (Munich, 1864-8, 2 vols.), and *Die oriental. Kirchenfrage* (Munich, 1862); Stanley, *The Eastern Church* (Lond. 1867); King, *The Rites of the Greek Church in Russia* (Lond. 1722); Stourdza, *Considérations sur la doctrine et l'esprit de l'église orthodoxe* (Weimar, 1816); Mouraviet, *Briefe über den Gottesdienst der Morgenländ. Kirche* (Germ. transl. by Muralt, Lpz. 1838); Dolgorukof, *La vérité sur la Russie* (Par. 1860); *The Black and the White Clergy in Russia* (in the Russian language, Lpz. 1867; extracts in *Preussische Jahrbücher*, Sept. and Oct. 1867); Ffoulkes, *Christendom's Divisions* (London, 1867, 2 vols.); *L'Eglise Orthodoxe d'Orient* (Athens, 1853); Neale, *Hist. of the Holy Eastern Church* (London, 1857 sq.); *Stud. u. Krit.* 1864, i.; *Am. Presb. Rev.* Oct. 1868, and Jan. 1869; *Wesleyan M. Mag.* July, 1855; *Christ. Rememb.* 1861; *Princeton Rev.* Oct. 1866; *Meth. Quart. Rev.* July, 1867; *Journal Sacred Lit.* xxi; *Bibl. Sacra*, Oct. 1864; Schem, *American Eccles. Almanac for 1869* (N. Y. 1869). (A. J. S.)

**Greek Church, United.** This is the name of those Christians who, while following the Greek rite, observing the general discipline of the Greek Church, and making use of the Greek liturgy, are yet united with the Church of Rome, admitting the double procession of the Spirit and the supremacy of the Roman pontiff, and accepting all the doctrinal decisions subsequent to the Greek schism which have force as articles of faith in the Roman Church. They have been allowed by the pope the same law of celibacy as among the other Greeks. They are also permitted to administer communion under both kinds. The United Greeks are found chiefly in Southern Italy, in the Austrian dominion, in Poland, in the Russian empire, and in Turkey. In Italy they are computed at 80,000, in Austria at about 4,000,000; and in Poland about 250,000. In Russia it is difficult to ascertain what their number is. As regards nationalities in Austria, they are divided into Rumanians and Ruthenians—the former being settled in Wallachia, Transylvania, and Eastern Hungary, the latter in Little Russia, Galicia, and North-eastern Hungary. The union of the Greek Christians of Wallachia and Transylvania dates from the end of the 12th century. The union of the Galician Greeks or Ruthenians is of much later date, about the close of the 17th century. The United Greeks, in 1868, had in Austria two archbishops, one for the Rumanian rite at Fogaras (with suffragan bishops at Szamos-Ujvar, Gran Wardein, and Lajos), and one for the Ruthenian rite at Lemberg (with bishops at Premizl, Kreuz, Eperies, and Mankacz). In Russia there is one bishop at Chelm. In European Turkey there is one bishop in Bulgaria; a patriarch in Antioch; three archbishops at Damascus, Emesa, and Tyre, and bishops at Aleppo, Beyroot, Bosra, Balbeck, Farzul, Jerusalem, Hauran, and Sidon. See *Annuario Pontificio* for 1869. (A. J. S.)

**Greekish** (Ἑλληνικός, *Hellenic*), another term (2 Macc. iv, 10) for GREEK (q. v.).

**Greek Language, BIBLICAL RELATIONS OF THE.** In treating of the peculiarities of the Greek found in the Sept. and N. T., we here substantially adopt Dr. Donaldson's article in Kitto's *Cyclopaedia*, s. v. The affinities between the Greek and the other branches of the Indo-Germanic family are copiously drawn out by Bopp, *Comparative Grammar*, etc. (Lond. 1860, 3 vols. 8vo, 2d edit. trans. by Eastwick from the Germ.). For its coincidences with the Hebrew, see PHIL. LOGY, COMPARATIVE.

1. *Historical Character.*—There has been much discussion as to the peculiar nature of the language used by the Septuagint translators and by the writers of the N. T. It would be useless to attempt to give an account of these discussions in this article. We shall simply indicate the main facts which have come out in the course of investigation, stating at the same time the theory which seems to account most satisfactorily for the peculiarities of Greek which these writings present.

In the earliest stages of a language the dialects are exceedingly numerous, every small district having peculiar variations of its own. Such we find to have been the case with Greek; for, though its dialects have generally been reckoned as four, we know that each of these was variously modified in various places. In course of time, however, one of these dialects, the Attic, drove the rest from the field of literary composition, and almost all Greeks who wrote books wrote in that dialect, wherever they might have been born. The Attic which they used underwent some changes, and then received the name of the κοινή or common dialect. This dialect has been used by Greeks for literary purposes from the time of Alexander the Great down to the present age.

While Attic thus became the literary language, the various communities spoke Greek as they had learned it from their parents and teachers. This spoken Greek would necessarily differ in different places, and it would gradually become very different from the stationary language which was used in writings. Now it seems that the language used by the Sept. and N.-T. writers was the language used in common conversation, learned by them, not through books, but most likely in childhood from household talk, or if not, through subsequent oral instruction. If this be the case, then the Sept. is the first translation which was made for the great masses of the people in their own language, and the N.-T. writers are the first to appeal to men through the common vulgar language intelligible to all who spoke Greek. The common Greek thus used was, however, considerably modified by the circumstances of the writers; and hence some have, but rather unnecessarily, termed the Greek in question the *Hebraistic* or Hellenistic dialect. See HELLENIST.

II. *Inflections.*—Max Müller justly affirms that the grammar of a language is “the most essential element, and therefore the ground of classification in all languages which have produced a definite grammatical articulation” (*Lectures on the Science of Language*, p. 74). Now the grammar of the Sept. and N. T., in very many of its departures from the common dialect, approximates to the mediæval Greek of Ptochoprodromus in the 12th century, and to the modern Greek of the present day, both of which are simply the language of the common people, as debased by time and vulgar usage. Thus the N. T. and modern Greek have no dual. In their declension of nouns we find a mixture of dialects, such as, for instance, *a* in the genitive singular of proper names in *ας*; and *ης* in the genitive, and *η* in the dative, of nouns in *ρα* (σπείρης, Acts xxvii, 1; μαχαίρη, Rev. xiii, 10, etc.). There is in both a change from the second to the third declension in the words νοῦς, σκότος, ἔλεος, and πλοῦτος. The N. T., however, declines some of them occasionally as of the second declension. Both display great peculiarities in the forms for the comparative and superlative of adjectives, such, for instance, as μείζοντα, 3 John 4. In modern Greek the optative mood is rare, and occurs only in wishes. It is rare also in the N. T., and in some of the books it does not occur at all. The modern Greek declines the second aorist as the first. This is the case frequently in the N. T. also, as ἔπεισα for ἔπεισον. The N. T. sometimes forms the imperative by means of ἀφήμι, as ἀφες ἐκβάλω, ἀφες ἰδωμεν. This is now the common form in modern Greek, ἀφες being contracted into ἀε. The second

person singular in the present passive or middle ends in modern Greek in the regular *σαι*; so in the N. T. *καυχᾶσαι* and *ἐβῆσαι*. The third person plural of the imperfect active of contracted verbs in modern Greek ends in *σαν*; so in Sept. and N. T. *ἔδουσαν*. There is a striking similarity in the conjugation of verbs in both. Both have a tendency to form all the parts regularly. Both also deal arbitrarily with augment. Both avoid the use of verbs in *μι*, and both generally strengthen pure verbs by the insertion of a *ν*. Sometimes they change the vowel *ε* into *α*, as *ἐλαῖτε*, in Jude 23 (see Cremer, s. v. *ἐλαία*). Instances of several of these peculiarities may be found in our texts of the classical writers, and a still larger number in our manuscripts of them; but it is to be noted that in them they appear as rarities; in the New Testament their occurrence is more frequent, and in modern Greek they have passed into customary forms. Some of these forms have been set down as Alexandrian or Macedonian, but Sturz (*De Dialecto Macedonica et Alexandrina*, Lipsiæ, 1808) has entirely failed to prove that there was either a Macedonian or an Alexandrian dialect. The Macedonian words which he has adduced indicate that the Macedonians were non-Hellenic. There are no forms adduced as Alexandrian which are not to be found in some earlier dialect. In fact, there is nothing in any of the statements to which he appeals to contradict the opinion that Alexandrians, like other Greek-speaking people, mixed up various dialects in their spoken language. The written language of the Alexandrians, as we know from the works of Philo and other residents in Alexandria, was the so-called "common dialect." Moreover, the Greek of the New Testament is to be found not in writings of any special locality, but in writings which made no pretensions to literary excellence, such as the fragments of Hegeſippus, some of the apocryphal gospels, the apostolical constitutions, the liturgies, the Chronicon Paschale, and Malalas.

III. *Syntax*.—Here the peculiar elements that mixed themselves with the common spoken language in the N.-T. writings make their appearance. The Hebrew element especially is noteworthy. The translators of the Septuagint went on the principle of translating as literally as possible, and consequently the form of the sentences is essentially Hebrew. Some of the writers of the N. T. were themselves Jews, or derived part of their information from Jews, and accordingly the form of portions of their writings, particularly in narrative, is influenced by Hebrew modes. At the same time, too much stress is not to be laid on this Hebrew influence, for the writers appear sometimes to differ from the classical types, not because they were Jews, but because they were simple plain-speaking (*τινὲς γλωτταν ἰδιωτέοντες*, Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iii, 24) men, who cared little about rounded sentences. The Hebrew element shows itself in particular phrases and constructions, as in *ποιεῖν ἔλεος μετὰ τινος*; but the amount of this Hebrew element is not so great as it has often been supposed to be, and in some of the N.-T. writers it is scarcely noticeable at all. Generally speaking, the syntax, like the grammar, has a tendency towards modern Greek. It has, like it, frequent recourse to the use of prepositions, and we find such expressions even as *δόντα εἰς ἡμᾶς* (1 Thess. iv, 8). After the comparative *παρὰ* is frequently used instead of *ἤ* in the N. T.; in modern Greek it is always employed. On account of the rareness of the optative, and an avoidance of the infinitive by some of the writers, both the N. T. and modern Greek abound in the use of *ἴνα* with the subjunctive, and sometimes even with the indicative, as in Revelations. The neuter plural is more regularly joined with a plural verb in N.-T. Greek; it is always joined with it in modern Greek. Many other peculiarities in which the syntax and inflections of the N. T. and those of mod-

ern Greek agree might be noted. For the use of the Greek article, see ARTICLE.

IV. *Vocabulary*.—The words used by the N.-T. writers show a still greater variety of elements.

1. Here we notice distinctly, also, the tendency towards the modern language, as, for instance, in the use of *χορτάζω*, *to feed men*, in the frequent employment of diminutives, in attaching a weakened sense to words like *βάλλω*, which had originally the idea of vigor in them, and in a variety of adverbs and conjunctions rarely used by the classical writers. Some of these peculiar uses have been assigned to the supposed Alexandrian dialect; but in the discussions no attempt has been made to distinguish between what may have been pure Alexandrianisms, and what may have been common in Greek conversation, though not in Greek writings.

2. In the words we find a Latin element, as might be expected. The Latin words used in the N. T. are not very numerous, but they show plainly that the writers had no other desire than to call things by their common names. They do not translate them into Greek, as a scholar of those days or an imitator of Attic writings would have done. We find a few Greek phrases in the N. T. which have evidently been translated from Latin, such as *συμβούλιον λαβεῖν*—*consilium capere*.

3. There are also several Aramaic words used in the N. T., especially by Christ. Most of these words and expressions are of a peculiar nature. They are almost all of them utterances employed on some solemn occasion. They were at one time appealed to as proof that Jesus regularly used the Aramaic in his addresses to the people; but they have recently been adduced, and with considerable force, to prove exactly the contrary, that Jesus frequently used the Greek language in his public conversations as being more intelligible to all, but that, when powerfully moved or deeply touched, he employed Aramaic words, as being more expressive from their associations (Roberts, *Discussions on the Gospels*, pt. i, ch. iv). Besides this, the Hebrew or Aramaic has exercised an influence on the meanings of some Greek words, as, for instance, in the use of *ἁρεῖλημα* for a *sin*. In several instances, however, where this Hebrew influence has been set down as existing, a more satisfactory explanation is given in another way. Thus *δικαιοσύνη* is taken by some to mean *liberality* in 2 Cor. ix, 9, 10, because they suppose that *חַסְדִּים* has this meaning in Psa. cxii, 9, where the Sept. translates *δικαιοσύνη*. In both cases it may be doubted whether *δικαιοσύνη* ought to receive this meaning, and unquestionably in the second Epistle to the Corinthians it is much simpler to suppose that Paul looks on liberality as an essential part of righteousness, and righteousness therefore as including liberality.

4. There is also another element in the vocabulary of a peculiar nature. This arises from the novelty of the teachings combined with their exalted morality. The new thoughts demanded new modes of expression, and hence the writers did not hesitate to use words in senses rare, if not entirely unknown to the classical writers. This fact could not be fully illustrated without exhibiting the results of investigation into various characteristic words, such as *μυστήριον*, *δικαίος*, *δικαιοσύνη*, *δικαίω*, *πίστις*, *ζωή*, *θάνατος*, *δόξα*, *δοξάζω*, *δρόγη*, etc. These results seem to us to form no inconsiderable addition to the proof of the divinity of Christianity, for the grand moral ideas that were expressed by some of them are unique in the age in which they were uttered. Thus the word *ζωή* is frequently used to denote an entire and absolute consecration of soul, body, and spirit to God, for it is this entire consecration which they look upon as the life-principle of man. Living, with them, if it be not living to God in Christ, is not living at all, but death; and a death which works not merely in the soul, but also in the body. Plato and the Stoics had something

like this notion of ζῳή, but with them it was a speculation. They are continually reasoning about it. The writers of the N. T. treat it as an unquestionable realized fact. So, again, δόξα means glory; but the writers of the N. T. separate from it every notion of material splendor or earthly renown, and use it to denote that spiritual irradiation of the whole man which takes place when God reigns in him, when the image of God is realized in him. Thus we come short of God's glory when we fail to present the purity and holiness of his character and image in our characters. Thus the δόξα of the N. T. is purely spiritual and moral. Then, again, it is remarkable how, in the case of words like ἴσσο, λουτρού, and βαπτίζω, the material meaning often vanishes entirely out of sight, and the writers express by them the spiritually purifying power of Christ, which really and entirely cleanses both soul and body (Alexander, *Anglo-Catholicism not Apostolical*, p. 293). The moral fervor of the writers is also seen in their omission of certain words. Thus the sensuous ἑρᾶν is never used to express the idea which they had of love. The words εὐδαιμων and εὐτυχής are also unknown to the N. T., and, indeed, the writers do not use any word to express mere happiness: μακάριος is used several times to denote something more than mere earthly felicity. They avoid all words connected with mythology, such as the compounds of δαίμων, which, with its diminutive, is used in a peculiarly Jewish and Christian sense. The writers of the N. T. are also remarkable for confining a word to one meaning. Thus μέναινα is a turning of the whole soul from evil to good, and no other compound with μετά is used in the same sense, while Justin Martyr uses μέναινα as a change from good to evil as well as from evil to good, and he employs μεταγυνώσκω and μετατίθεσθαι, as well as μετανοέω, for the same idea.

V. *Literature*.—The works on the subject of this article are very numerous. Many of them are enumerated and criticised in Winer's *Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms* (5th ed. Leipzig, 1844, 8vo); and Schirlitz's *Grundzüge der Neutestamentlichen Gräcität* (Giessen, 1861, 8vo); see also Lipsius, *Biblische Gräcität* (Lpz. 1863, 8vo). Much information will be found in works that discuss later Greek, such as Lobeck's *Phrynichus*, and Jacobs's *Achilles Tutiuis*, and especially in a *Glossary of Later and Byzantine Greek*, by E. A. Sophocles, published as vol. ii, new series, of the *Memoirs of the American Academy* (Cambridge and Boston, 1860, 4to). Much interesting and instructive matter is also to be found in the glossaries and articles given in the *Pandora*, a fortnightly periodical published in Athens.

The best GRAMMARS of the N. T., next the above work of Winer (of which the fourth ed., Leipzig, 1836, was translated by Agnew and Ebbecke, Philadel. 1840, 8vo; and the 6th ed., Lpz. 1855, by Masson, London, 1853, 8vo; revised and compared with the 7th ed. by Thayer, Andover, 1869, 8vo), are those of Stuart (Andover, 1841, 8vo), and Trollope (Lond. 1841, 8vo). The doctrine of the *article* has been especially discussed by Sharp (1st ed. Lond. 1798, 12mo) and Middleton (1st ed. Lond. 1808, 8vo). The *synonymes* have been well treated by Tittmann (Lips. 1829-32, 2 vols. 8vo; tr. in the *Bibl. Cabinet*, Edinb. 1833-37, 2 vols. 12mo), Trench (London, 1854, N. Y. 1857, 12mo), and Webster (Lond. 1864, 8vo). Grinfield's *Nov. Test. Hellenisticum* (Lond. 1843, 2 vols. 8vo) contains an ample collation of the N.-T. phraseology with that of the Sept., which his *Scholæ Hellenistica* (Lond. 1848, 2 vols. 8vo) extends to a comparison with Josephus, Philo, the fathers, and apocryphal works. The best LEXICONS of the N.-T. Greek are those of Parkhurst (ed. Rose, London, 1829, 8vo), Pasor (ed. Fischer, Lips. 1774, 8vo), Schöttgen (ed. Krebs et Spohn, Hal. 1819, 8vo), Simonis (including the Sept., Hal. 1762, 4to), Schleussner (4th ed. Lips. 1819, 4 vols. 8vo), Bretschneider (2d ed. Lips. 1829, 2 vols. 8vo), and Wahl (2d ed. Lipz. 1829, 2 vols. 8vo),

especially the completely remodelled issue of the last by Dr. Robinson (N. Y. 1850, 8vo). The latest are Wilkii *Clavis N. T.* (Lips. 1863, 8vo), and Cremer, *Bibl. theol. Wörterbuch der N. T. Gräcität* (Gotha, 1866, 8vo).

#### Greek Versions of the Holy Scriptures.

These, of course, except the modern Greek version of the N. T., are confined to the Old Testament, including the Apocrypha (q. v.).

I. THE SEPTUAGINT.—This is the most important of all the ancient versions, whether in the Greek or any other language. See SEPTUAGINT.

II. AQUILA.—It is a remarkable fact that in the 2d century after Christ there were three versions executed of the Old-Testament Scriptures into Greek. The first of these was made by Aquila (אֲקִילָא or אֲקִילָא, Ἀκυλάς), a native of Sinope, in Pontus, who had become a proselyte to Judaism. The Jerusalem Talmud (see Bartolucci, *Bibliotheca Rabbin.* iv, 281) describes him as a disciple of Rabbi Akiba; and this would place him in some part of the reign of the emperor Hadrian (A. D. 117-138). It is supposed that the object of his version was to aid the Jews in their controversies with the Christians; and that, as the latter were in the habit of employing the Sept., they wished to have a version of their own on which they could rely. It is very probable that the Jews in many Greek-speaking countries were not sufficiently acquainted with Hebrew to refer for themselves to the original, and thus they wished to have such a Greek translation as they might use with confidence in their discussions. Such controversies were (it must be remembered) a new thing. Prior to the preaching of the Gospel, there were none besides the Jews who used the Jewish Scriptures as a means of learning God's revealed truth, except those who either partially or wholly became proselytes to Judaism. But now the Jews saw to their grief that their Scriptures were made the instruments for teaching the principles of a religion which they regarded as nothing less than an apostasy from Moses.

This, then, is a probable account of the origin of this version. Extreme literality and an occasional polemical bias appear to be its chief characteristics. The idiom of the Greek language is very often violated in order to produce what was intended should be a very literal version; and thus not only sense, but grammar even, was disregarded: a sufficient instance of this is found in the rendering of the Heb. participle פָּנָה by σύν, as in Gen. i, 1, σύν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ σύν τὴν γῆν, "quod Græca et Latina lingua omnino non recipit," as Jerome says. Another instance is furnished by Gen. v, 5, καὶ ἔζησεν Ἀδὰμ τριάκοντα ἔτος καὶ ἑννακῶσια ἔτος.

It is sufficiently attested that this version was formed for controversial purposes; a proof of which may be found in the rendering of particular passages, such as Isa. vii, 14, where פָּרְזָה, in the Sept. παρθένος, is by Aquila translated *ῥαίνας*; such renderings might be regarded perhaps rather as modes of avoiding an argument than as direct falsification. There certainly was room for a version which should express the Hebrew more accurately than was done by the Sept.; but if this had been thoroughly carried out it would have been found that in many important points of doctrine—such, for instance, as in the divinity of the Messiah and the rejection of Israel, the true rendering of the Hebrew text would have been in far closer conformity with the teaching of the New Testament than was the Sept. itself. It is probable, therefore, that one polemical object was to make the citations in the New Testament from the Old appear to be inconclusive, by producing other renderings (often probably more literally exact) differing from the Sept., or even contradicting it. Thus Christianity might seem to the Jewish mind to rest on a false basis. But a really

critical examiner would have found that in many points of important doctrine the New Testament definitely rejects the reading of the Sept. (when utterly unsuited to the matter in hand), and adopts the reading of the Hebrew. The very circumstance that Aquila's version was adopted and valued by the Jews would tend to create a prejudice against it among the fathers, independently of all perversion of Messianic passages. Irenæus, the earliest writer who mentions Aquila, pronounces an unfavorable opinion respecting his translation (*Adv. Hæres.* iii, 24, p. 253, ed. Grabe). So also Eusebius (*Ad Psalm.* xc, 4) and Philastrius. Jerome speaks of him in various parts of his writings, sometimes disparagingly, and again in terms of commendation: the former in allusion to his doctrinal prepossessions, the latter in reference to his knowledge of the Hebrew language and exceeding carefulness in rendering. That this version was employed for centuries by the Jews themselves is proved indirectly by the 146th Novella of Justinian.

It is mentioned (Jerome, *in Ezek.* iii) that Aquila put forth a second edition (i. e. revision) of his version, in which the Hebrew was yet more servilely followed, but it is not known if this extended to the whole or only to three books, namely, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel, of which there are fragments.

Aquila often appears to have so closely sought to follow the etymology of the Hebrew words that not only does his version produce no definite idea, but it does not even suggest any meaning at all. If we possessed it perfect it would have been of great value as to the criticism of the Hebrew text, though often it would be of no service as to its real understanding. (See Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, i, 29.) See AQUILA.

III. THEODOTIŌN.—The second version, of which we have information as executed in the 2d century, is that of Theodotion. He is stated to have been an Ephesian, and a Jewish proselyte; and he seems to be most generally described as an Ebionite (Irenæus, *Adv. Hæres.* iii, 24): if this is correct, his work was probably intended for those semi-Christians who may have desired to use a version of their own instead of employing the Sept. with the Christians, or that of Aquila with the Jews. But it may be doubted if the name of translation can be rightly applied to the work of Theodotion: it is rather a revision of the Sept. with the Hebrew text, so as to bring some of the copies then in use into more conformity with the original. This he was able to do (with the aid probably of some instructors), so as to eliminate portions which had been introduced into the Sept. without really being an integral part of the version, and also so as to bring much into accordance with the Hebrew in other respects. But his own knowledge of Hebrew was evidently very limited; and thus words and parts of sentences were left untranslated, the Hebrew being merely written with Greek letters.

Theodotion, as well as Aquila, was quoted by Irenæus, and against both there is the common charge laid of corrupting texts which relate to the Messiah: some polemical intention in such passages can hardly be doubted. The statement of Epiphanius that he made his translation in the reign of Commodus accords well with its having been quoted by Irenæus; but it cannot be correct if it is one of the translations referred to by Justin Martyr as giving interpretations contrary to the Christian doctrine of the New Testament. It appears from Jerome (*in Jer.* xxix, 17) that there were two editions of Theodotion's version.

There can be no doubt that this version was much used by Christians: probably many changes in the text of the Sept. were adopted from Theodotion: this may have begun before the Biblical labors of Origen brought the various versions into one conspectus. The translation of the book of Daniel by Theodotion was substituted for that of the Sept. in ecclesiastical use as early at least as the first part of the 3d century. Hence

Daniel, as rendered or revised by Theodotion, has so long taken the place of the true Sept. that the latter version of this book was supposed not to be extant, and it has only been found in one MS. In most editions of the Sept. Theodotion's version of Daniel is still substituted for that which really belongs to that translation. By the Jews Theodotion's version seems never to have been much esteemed. For literature, see Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, iii, 420 sq. See THEODOTIŌN.

IV. SYMMACHUS is stated by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* vi, 17; *Demonstr. Evang.* vii, 1) and Jerome (*Pref. in Ezram*) to have been an Ebionite; so, too, in the Syrian accounts given by Assemani (*Bibl. Orient.* ii, 278; iii, 1, 17); Epiphanius, however, and others style him a Samaritan. There may have been Ebionites from among the Samaritans who constituted a kind of separate sect, and these may have desired a version of their own; or it may be that, as a Samaritan, he made this version for some of that people who employed Greek, and who had learned to receive more than the Pentateuch. But perhaps to such motives was added (if, indeed, this were not the only cause of the version) a desire for a Greek translation not so unintelligibly bald as that of Aquila, and not displaying such a want of Hebrew learning as that of Theodotion. It is probable that if this translation of Symmachus had appeared prior to the time of Irenæus, it would have been mentioned by him; and this agrees with what Epiphanius says, namely, that he lived under the emperor Severus.

The style of the work is good, and the diction perspicuous, pure, and elegant (Thieme, *De puritate Symmachi*, Lips. 1755; Hody, *De Bibl. text. original.*). It is of less benefit in criticism than that of Aquila, but of greater advantage in interpretation. It would seem from Jerome that there was a second edition of it (*Comment. in Jerem.* xxxii; *in Nah.* iii). For literature, see Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 399 sq. See SYMMACHUS.

V. THE FIFTH, SIXTH, AND SEVENTH VERSIONS.—Besides the translations of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, the great critical work of Origen comprised as to portions of the Old Test. three other versions, placed for comparison with the Sept., which, from their being anonymous, are only known as the fifth, sixth, and seventh, designations taken from the places which they respectively occupied in Origen's columnar arrangement. Ancient writers seem not to have been uniform in the notation which they applied to these versions, and thus what is cited from one by its number of reference is quoted by others under a different numeral.

These three partial translations were discovered by Origen in the course of his travels in connection with his great work of Biblical criticism. Eusebius says that two of these versions (but without designating precisely which) were found, the one at Jericho, and the other at Nicopolis, on the gulf of Actium. Epiphanius says that what he terms the fifth was found at Jericho, and the sixth at Nicopolis, while Jerome speaks of the fifth as having been found at the latter place.

The contents of the fifth version appear to have been the Pentateuch, Psalms, Canticles, and the minor prophets: it seems also to have been referred to in the Syro-Hexaplar text of the second book of Kings: it may be doubted if in all these books it was complete, or at least if so much were adopted by Origen. The existing fragments prove that the translator used the Hebrew original; but it is also certain that he was aided by the work of former translators.

The sixth version seems to have been just the same in its contents as the fifth (except 2 Kings), and thus the two may have been confused: this translator also seems to have had the other versions before him. Jerome calls the authors of the fifth and sixth "Judæicos translatōres," probably meaning Jewish Christians, for the translator of this must have been a Christian

when he executed his work, or else the hand of a Christian reviser must have meddled with it before it was employed by Origen, which seems, from the small interval of time, to be hardly probable. For in Hab. iii, 15, the translation runs, *ἐξήλθε τοῦ πᾶσι τῶν λαῶν σου εὐὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ χριστοῦ σου*.

Of the seventh version very few fragments remain. It seems to have contained the Psalms and minor prophets, and the translator was probably a Jew.

From the references given by Origen, or by those who copied from his columnar arrangement and its results (or who added to such extracts), it has been thought that other Greek versions were spoken of. Of these, ὁ Ἐβραϊὸς probably refers to the Hebrew text, or to something drawn from it; ὁ Σύρος, to the Old Syriac version; τὸ Σαμαρειτικόν, probably a reference to the Samaritan text, or some Samaritan gloss; ὁ Ἑλληνικός ὁ Ἄλλος, ὁ ἀνεπιγραφός, some unspecified version or versions.

The existing fragments of these varied versions are mostly to be found in the editions of the relics of Origen's Hexapla, by Montfaucou and by Bardh. (See Eriphanius, *De Ponderibus et Mensuris*, cap. 17; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vi, 16; Jerome, *Comment in Tit.* cap. 3; *Apolog. contra Rufin.* ii, 34; Hody, p. 530, sq.) See ORIGEN.

VI. THE GRECO-VENETA VERSION.—A MS. of the 14th century, in the library of St. Mark at Venice, contains a peculiar version of the Pentateuch, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, and Daniel. All of these books, except the Pentateuch, were published by Villoison at Strasburg in 1784; the Pentateuch was edited by Ammon at Erlangen in 1790-91. The version itself is thought to be four or five hundred years older than the one MS. in which it has been transmitted; this, however, is so thoroughly a matter of opinion, that there seems no absolute reason for determining that this one MS. may not be the original, as well as the only one in existence. In any case, the MS. cannot be considered earlier than the 14th century, or the version earlier than the 9th. It is written in one very narrow column on each page; the leaves follow each other in the Hebrew order, so that the book begins at what we should call the end. An examination of the MS. suggested the opinion that it may have been written on the broad inner margin of a Hebrew MS., and that for some reason the Hebrew portion had been cut away, leaving thus a Greek MS. probably unique as to its form and arrangement. As to the translation itself, it is on any supposition too recent to be of importance in criticism. It may be said briefly that the translation was made from the Hebrew, although the present punctuation and accentuation is often not followed, and the translator was no doubt acquainted with some other Greek versions. The language of the translation is a most strange mixture of astonishing and capricious barbarism with attempts at Attic elegance and refinement. The Doric, which is employed to answer to the Chaldee portions of Daniel, seems to be an indication of remarkable affectation. The author was probably a Christian of Byzantine, but of Jewish extraction. (See Eichhorn, *Allg. Bibl.* iii, 371; v, 743; vii, 193; Dabler, *Vers. Græc. Argent.* 1786.)—Smith, s. v. Versions; Kitto, s. v. See VENETO-GREEK.

**Green** is the rendering in the A. V. of the following terms in the original [see COLOR]: prop. some form of the root *קָרַח*, *yarak'*, to be pale green, as grass or an affrighted person, *χλωρός*; also *נֶזֶדֶן*, *de'shè*, early vegetation; other less appropriate or less usual words so rendered are *לֶחֶךְ*, *lach*, Gen. xxx, 37; Judg. xvi, 7, 8; Ezek. xvii, 24; xx, 47, moist with sap (as in Numb. vi, 3), like *ὑγρός*. Luke xxiii, 21, and like *רֹחֵף*, *ratob'*, juicy, Job viii, 16; *רֹחֵף*, *ruanan'*, verdant with foliage (in connection with "tree," etc., "fresh" in *Psa.* xcii, 10; "flourishing" in ver. 19); but in *Esth.*

i, 6, the word is *כַּרְפָּס*, *karpas'*, fine linen (q. v.). i. e. *κάρπασος*, *carbasus*. See also EAR (OF CORN); FIG.

**Green, Ashbel**, D. D., an eminent Presbyterian divine, was born at Hanover, Morris Co., N. J., July 6, 1762. He taught school for a while, and in his leisure hours studied to prepare himself for college. When the Revolution broke out he enlisted, and was for a time carried away by the infidel notions which prevailed among his new associates. He soon resolved, however, to make the divinity of the Bible the subject of thorough investigation, and, while seeking for proofs in the Bible itself, he had not gone far before he was cured of his skepticism. He entered the College of New Jersey in the spring of 1782, and graduated with high honors in 1784. He was immediately appointed tutor in the college, and two years after professor of mathematics and natural philosophy. He was licensed to preach by the presbytery of New Brunswick in Feb. 1786, and, after declining a call from the Independent congregation of Charleston, S. C., accepted one from the Second Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, where he was installed in May, 1787, as colleague of the Rev. Dr. Sprout. In 1787 he was elected a member of the American Philosophical Society, and in 1790 of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, where he moved for a renewal of communications with the Congregational Church. He was made D. D. by the University of Pennsylvania in 1792, and in the same year was appointed chaplain to Congress, which office he held until 1800. In 1802 the College of New Jersey was destroyed by fire, and Dr. Green, who had been one of the trustees since 1790, was appointed to fill the place of the president, Dr. Smith, while the latter went on a collecting tour through the States. The establishment of a Presbyterian Theological Seminary was first proposed in the General Assembly of May, 1809, and a board of directors having been appointed in May, 1812, the latter chose Dr. Green for their president: he held this office until his death. Being elected president of the College of New Jersey in August, 1812, he accepted the appointment, and resigned his pastoral charge. In the same year he was made LL. D. by the University of North Carolina. At the college he delivered a series of *Lectures on the Assembly's Catechism*, which were afterwards published by the General Assembly's Board of Publication (2 vols. 12mo) and in the *Christian Advocate*. Resigning the presidency of the college in September, 1822, he took up his residence at Philadelphia, where he published for twelve years the *Christian Advocate*, a religious monthly, writing the greater part of it himself, besides preaching to an African congregation for two years and a half, and often supplying the pulpits of other ministers. He died May 19, 1848. He was a very abundant writer; his principal works, in addition to those already named, are, *Ten occasional Sermons* (1790-1836);—*Six Addresses, Reports, etc.* (1793-1836);—*History of Presbyterian Missions* (1 vol.);—*Discourses on the College of New Jersey, together with a History of the College* (1822); etc. He also superintended an edition of *Dr. Witherspoon's Works* (1802), and left in MS. a biography of that great man. For several years, beginning with 1804, he was the responsible editor of the *General Assembly's Magazine*. See *Life of Ashbel Green, V. D. M., prepared for the Press at the Author's request by J. H. Jones* (N. Y. 1849, 8vo); Sprague, *Annals*, iii, 79 sq.; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 731; *Princeton Review*, 1849, p. 563.

**Green, William**, a divine of the Church of England, was a fellow of Clare Hall, Cambridge, and afterwards rector of Hardingham, Norfolk. He wrote a *New Translation of the Psalms, with Notes* (Lond. 1763, 8vo);—*A New Translation of Isaiah, with Notes* (ch. vii-iii; 1776, 8vo);—and *Poetical Parts of the Old Testament, translated from the Hebrew, with Notes* (Camb. 1781, 4to). He died in 1794.—*Europ. Mag.*

**Greene, Thomas**, bishop of Ely, was born at Norwich in 1658, and educated at Benedict College, Cambridge, of which he obtained a scholarship, and in 1680 a fellowship. After numerous preferments he obtained the vicarage of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, Westminster, in 1716. This he held in *commendam* with the bishopric of Norwich, to which he was consecrated October 8, 1721, but was thence translated to Ely, September 24, 1723. George I, soon after his accession, appointed him one of his domestic chaplains. He died in 1738. He wrote, 1. *The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper explained to the meanest capacities* (Lond. 1710, 12mo);—2. *The Principles of Religion explained for the Instruction of the Weak* (id. 1726, 12mo);—3. *Four Discourses on the four Last Things* (Lond. 1734, 12mo).—Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vol. v.

**Greenfield, William**, a celebrated linguist, was born in London April 1, 1799. In his thirteenth year he was apprenticed to a London bookseller. His love of the study of languages was so great that, while laboring all day in his master's service, he acquired successively Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and several modern languages. In 1822 he submitted to Mr. Bagster, a publisher in London, the prospectus of a Polyglot Grammar of nearly thirty languages, on the principles of comparative grammar. He was employed to edit the Comprehensive Bible issued by Bagster in 1826. In 1828-9 he edited an edition of the Syriac New Testament, and in 1830 he prepared a revised translation of the N. T. into Hebrew, both for Bagster's Polyglot. He prepared a *Lexicon of the Greek N. T.*, followed by an abridgment of Schmidt's Greek Concordance. In 1830 he was appointed editor of foreign versions to the British and Foreign Bible Society. His excessive labor overmastered his strength, and he died Nov. 5, 1831.—Kitto, *Cyclop.* p. 178; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 734; *Imperial Magazine*, Jan. and Feb. 1834.

**Greenham, Richard**, an English Puritan divine, was born in 1531, and was educated at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge. He was for many years pastor of Drayton, near Cambridge, where he died in 1591. He published a number of sermons, treatises, etc., which, after his death, were collected and published under the title *The Works of the Rev. Richard Greenham, revised and published by H. H.* (7th ed. Lond. 1681, fol.).—Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, i, 1312.

**Greenhill, William, M.A.**, a learned and pious Nonconformist divine, was born in Oxfordshire. He entered Magdalen College, Oxford, in 1604, and obtained the living of Stepney in 1656. Having joined the Independents during the Commonwealth, he was ejected at the Restoration, and died about 1677. His principal work is *An Exposition of the Prophet Ezekiel, with useful Observations thereupon* (Lond. 1645, 5 vols. 4to). A new edition, revised and corrected by Sherman, was published in 1839 (Lond. imperial 8vo).—Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, s. v.

**Greenland**, a region in North-eastern America of unknown extent northwards, stretches from its southern extremity, Cape Farewell, along the Atlantic and Arctic Oceans on the east, and Davis's Strait, Baffin's Bay, and Smith's Sound on the west. It obtained its name from an Icelander, Eric Rauoi (the Red), who led thither an expedition in 985 or 986, and founded two settlements on the west coast, called the Oestre and Westre Bygd (the east and west colonies). About four centuries afterwards, the Westre Bygd was destroyed by the pestilence called the "black death," combined with the attacks of the aborigines; and a century after this, the Oestre Bygd suffered the same fate. Greenland was visited, and its west coast explored, successively by Frobisher, Davis, and Baffin, the latter having advanced as far as lat. 78° N. (the limit of the inhabited country). More recently Dr. Kane has extended his explorations as far as lat. 82° 0'. or within 52½ miles of the north pole. In 1868 and 1869 new ex-

peditions to explore the coast were sent out from Germany. The most important incident in connection with this bleak region is the settlement, in 1721, of Hans Egede (q. v.), a Norwegian clergyman, at Godthaab (lat. 64° N.), and with him a colony of 43 men. The colony was supported by the Danish government till 1731, when the supplies were stopped; but a few years afterwards a pension of 2000 rix dollars a year was granted to the mission. Since that time the Danes have established thirteen different colonies or factoris along the west coast, seven in North Greenland (north of lat. 67° N.), and six in South Greenland; the total population of the colonies being about 10,000, inclusive of 250 Danes. The Danish (Lutheran) Missionary Society seeks to sustain various institutions formed in Greenland in eight different places. The Moravians, in 1866, supported in Greenland 6 stations, 25 missionaries, 56 native assistants, and their congregations had a total membership of 1801. See Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v.; Newcomb, *Cyclop. of Missions*; Schem, *American Eccles. Almanac* for 1869. (A. J. S.)

**Greensky, Peter**, an Indian of the Lake Superior country, one of the first converts under the missionary labors of John Sunday (q. v.), was born in 1807, and became a Christian in 1830. He received license Sept. 21, 1844. Subsequently he was employed as an interpreter to Rev. Mr. Daugherty, of the Presbyterian Board, for several years. June 18, 1859, he was again licensed as a local preacher in the Methodist Episcopal Church; and in 1862 he was admitted into full connection in the Conference, and ordained deacon. For the two years following he was in charge of the Oceana Indian Mission. In 1864 he was again appointed in charge of the Pine River Indian Mission. In 1865 he was ordained elder, and returned to Pine River. He died of quick consumption, April 8, 1866. Among his own people he had extraordinary influence. He was a laborious student, a good theologian, and a powerful preacher. The Indians in Northern Michigan are greatly indebted to him for their civilization and piety.—*Minutes of Conferences*, 1866, p. 170.

**Greenwood, Francis William Pitt**, a Unitarian minister, was born in Boston in 1797. He graduated at Harvard in 1814, and then pursued his theological studies. He became pastor of the New South Church, Boston, in 1818, but was soon compelled, on account of his health, to go to Europe. He returned in 1821, and passed several years in Baltimore, where he became editor of the *Unitarian Miscellany*. In 1824 he was made associate minister of King's Chapel, Boston, and, after 1827, pastor. In 1837-38 he was associate editor of the *Christian Examiner*, to which he was an able and frequent contributor for many years. He died August 2, 1843. Dr. Greenwood was a man of rare gifts; an eloquent preacher, and a very accomplished writer. "He gladly acknowledged as Christian brethren those who led a Christian life, though their theological opinions might lead them to exclude him from the fellowship of the saints." He published *Chapel Liturgy* (Boston, 1827, 12mo);—*Psalms and Hymns* (1830);—*History of King's Chapel* (Boston, 1833, 12mo);—*Sermons to Children*;—*Lives of the Twelve Apostles* (1838);—*Sermons of Consolation* (1842);—*Sermons on various Subjects* (1844, 2 vols. 12mo).—Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 736; *Christ. Examiner*, xxxvi, 227.

**Greeting** (prop. שָׁלוֹם, *shalom'*, peace; χαίρω, to wish joy; also שְׁאַל, *shaal'*, to ask after one's health). See SALUTATION.

**Grégoire, Henri**, constitutional bishop of Blois, was born at Vého, near Luneville, Dec. 4, 1750. He was educated at the Jesuits' College of Nancy, entered the Church, and became teacher in the school at Pont-à-Mousson. When the French Revolution broke out he embraced its principles, and in 1789 he was elected a member of the States-general. He soon became distinguished for the boldness of his opinions on civil and

religious liberty; his eloquent efforts in favor of the Jews and the blacks placed him high among the friends of humanity. It was on his motion that the Convention in 1794 abolished negro slavery. He was the first among the clergy to take the constitutional oath. In Sept. 1792, he advocated the abolition of royalty in the Convention, yet proposed also the abolition of capital punishment, intending thus to save the king's life. In the Reign of Terror he had the courage to resist in the Convention the storm of invectives from the tribunes, and the threats from the Mountain. "Are sacrifices demanded for the country?" he said; "I am accustomed to make them. Are the revenues of my bishopric demanded? I abandon them without regret. Is religion the subject of your deliberations? It is a matter beyond your jurisdiction; I demand the freedom of religious worship." Later, he was one of five who opposed the accession of the first consul to the throne. In 1814 he signed the act deposing the emperor, and the next year, as member of the Institute, declined signing the *additional act*, which led, in the Restoration, to his expulsion both from that body and from the bishopric. He then devoted himself to literary and benevolent labors until his death, April 28, 1831. He had a large share in the foundation of some of the greatest institutions of that period, such as the *Bureau des Longitudes*, the *Conservatoire des Arts et M<sup>ét</sup>iers*, and the *Institut National*. Notwithstanding his great services to religion and humanity, and his repeated refusals, in the worst periods of the Revolution, to abandon the Roman Catholic Church, he was treated by the authorities of that Church, on their return to power, not merely with neglect, but with cruelty. The archbishop of Paris refused him the last sacraments, except on condition of retracting the constitutional oath taken forty years before, and also refused him Catholic burial! His principal publications are *Essai sur la régénération morale, physique et politique des Juifs* (Metz, 1789);—*Mémoire en faveur des gens de sang mêlé de St. Domingue*, etc. (1789);—*De la littérature des Nègres; recherches sur leurs facultés intellectuelles et morales*;—*Libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane* (1826, 2d edit.);—*Histoire des sectes religieuses dans les quatre parties du monde* (2d ed. 1828, 6 vols. 8vo);—*Chronique religieuse* (6 vols. 8vo);—*Recueil de lettres encycliques*;—*Annales de la religion* (18 vols. 8vo).—Herzog, v, 319; Migne; Carnot, *Mémoires de Grégoire* (1837, 2 vols. 8vo); Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxi, 882.

zum Gebrauch der Evangelischen Brudergemeinden) he was pre-eminent, furnishing more than three hundred hymns of his own. He published, besides, a valuable collection of chorals and anthems, and composed a number of the liturgical services which are still in use. (E. de S.)

**Gregorian**, a title of the *Armenian Church* (q. v.), taken from *Gregory of Armenia* (q. v.).

**Gregorian Calendar**. See CALENDAR.

**Gregorian Chant, RITE, LITURGY**. Pope Gregory the Great established a form for the administration of the sacraments (after that of Gelasius, which may be found in the "*Sacramentary of Gregory*"), collected, arranged, and improved the chants which had already been used for centuries before his time, and established a musical school to teach chanting at Rome, in which he took great interest up to the time of his death. The collection of chants compiled by Gregory forms the basis of modern cathedral music in the Church of Rome, and also in the Church of England.—Palmer, *Origines Liturgice*, vol. i, § 6. See LITURGY.

"The foundation of the system of the Gregorian tones may be explained thus: As there are seven notes from *a* to *g*, there should be at least seven different modes, or tone-systems, varying from each other according to the position of the semitones; but as the final or key-note of each mode might be the first note or might be in the middle, the same scale could therefore, as it were, be viewed from two sides, which gave rise to the fourteen system of tones. It was, however, found that two of those were at variance with a fundamental rule of church song, viz. that every mode or scale must possess a perfect fifth or perfect fourth; and that the modes containing a false fifth from *b* natural to *f* natural, or a false fourth from *b* to *f*, could not be used, and, on account of the dissonant character of these intervals, must be rejected. This reduced the number of the tones to twelve. It was further found, that as four of the twelve were merely transpositions of some of the others, there were really only eight, and that they were in every respect sufficient for all the purposes of church song. The eight Gregorian tones, as they are handed down to us, were in time fixed by a royal mandate of Charlemagne—*octo toni sufficere videntur*. The following example in modern notation in the G clef will show the position of the eight Gregorian tones:

**Gregor, CHRISTIAN**, an eminent bishop and hymnologist of the Moravian Church, was born Jan. 1, 1723, at Diersdorf, in Silesia, and died Nov. 6, 1801, at Berthelsdorf, in Saxony. He spent a year and a half (1770-1772) in America, on an official visit to the churches of the Brethren. Among the compilers of the large German Moravian Hymn-book (*Gesangbuch*

The different character of the Gregorian tones depends entirely on the places of the semitones, which in the above example are marked with a  $\frown$ . Several of the tones have various endings, some as many as four, while the second, fifth, and sixth tones have each only one ending. For a full and interesting account of the Gregorian church music, see N. A. Janssen's *Grundre-*



*gels des Gregorianischen Kirchengesanges*, published by Schott in Mainz, 1846."—Chambers, *Encyclop.* s. v.

**Gregorian Mass.** See MASS.

**Gregorian Year.** See YEAR.

**Gregorius** (Γρηγόριος) **Agrigentinus**, or *St. Gregory of Agrigentum*, a Greek theologian, was born near Agrigentum about A.D. 524. Destined for the priesthood by his pious parents, he studied at Jerusalem for five years, and was there ordained deacon. Thence he went to Antioch and Constantinople, and gained high repute in both places for learning, eloquence, and sanctity. From Constantinople he went to Rome, and the pope named him bishop of Agrigentum in Sicily. Two disappointed aspirants for the see hired a prostitute to charge him with fornication. He went to Constantinople, and was pronounced innocent by Justinian. Returning to Agrigentum, he died there, Nov. 23, 562. He wrote *Orationes* and *Conciones*; also a *Commentarius in Ecclesiasten*. This last is lost; the others are given in the life of Gregory, by Leontius, to be found in Cajetanus, *Sancti Siculi*, vol. i.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxi, 856; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* anno 940; Clarke, *Succession of Sacred Literature*, ii, 512.

**Gregorius Alexandrinus** (*Gregory of Alexandria*), patriarch from A.D. 341 to 348. He was chosen by the Arian prelates at the Council of Antioch, A.D. 341, though the see really belonged to Athanasius, then in exile. He is said to have been a Cappadocian, but his early history is not known. The orthodox party charge him with very violent and oppressive conduct. The Council of Sardica (A.D. 347) declared that he was "not only not a bishop, but not a Christian." The precise date of his death is uncertain, but it seems to have been shortly before the return of Athanasius from his second exile, A.D. 349. Socrates and Sozomen, however, say that he was deposed by his own party because he did not act with sufficient zeal against their enemies (A.D. 354).—Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* ii, 10, 14; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* iii, 5, 7; Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* ii, 4, 12; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, t. viii; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxi, 875.

**Gregorius Antiochensis** (*Gregory of Antioch*), a Greek theologian of the 6th century. First a monk at Constantinople, he became afterwards abbot of a monastery on Mt. Sinai. The Arabs besieged the convent, but he succeeded in making peace with them and in keeping it. He was appointed patriarch of Antioch on the deposition of Anastasius, A.D. 570 or 571 (Baronius makes it A.D. 573). One of his friends, Anatolius, was put to death with severe tortures on a charge of magic, and the people of Antioch accused Gregory of complicity with him, but he was acquitted. His enemies then charged him with incest with his own sister: of this, too, he was acquitted. Weary of contentment, Gregory gave up his see to Anastasius, and soon after died (about A.D. 594). He distinguished himself by his hostility to the *Acephali* (q. v.). When the imperial troops rebelled in Persia, Gregory brought them back by an oration, which is preserved by Evagrius, under the title *Δημοτορία πρὸς τὸν στρατὸν*: he wrote also *Λόγος εἰς τὰς μυροφόρους* (*oratio in mulieres unguentiferas*); and both are given in Gallandii *Bibl. Patrum*, t. xii. See Evagrius, *Hist. Eccl.* v, 6, 18; vi, 4, 11, 18, 24; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Myth.* ii, 308; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxi, 875.

**Gregorius Cæsariensis** (*Gregory of Cæsarea*), a presbyter of the city of that name in Cappadocia in the 10th century. He wrote a life of Gregory of Nazianzus, which is given in a Latin version by Billens, in his edition of Gregory of Nazianzus. It is also in Surius, *Vit. Sanct.* May, 121. We have also of Gregory a panegyric in *Patres Nicænos*, in Combefis, *Novum Auctarium*, ii, 547.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxi, 878; Clarke, *Succession of Sac. Lit.* ii, 565.

**Gregorius Monachus** (*Gregory the Monk*), a

Greek writer of the first part of the 10th century. Though always called "the monk," he was not such, as he did not live in a convent, but practised an ascetic life at his own home. His spiritual guide was St. Basil the Younger, after whose death he wrote two memoirs of him, one of which survives in the *Acta Sanctorum*, March, iii, 667. With many absurd stories, it gives a good deal of valuable historical matter.—Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, x, 206; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* anno 940; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxi, 877.

**Gregorius Nazianzenus** (*Gregory of Nazianzus*, or *Nazianzum*), one of the greatest of the Greek Church fathers, was born either at Arianzus, a small village in Cappadocia, near the town of Nazianzus (or Nazianum), from which he derives his surname, and of which his father was bishop, or else in the town of Nazianzum itself. The date of his birth has never been precisely settled, but it was probably about A.D. 330 (see Ullmann, *Life of Gregory*, Appendix i). His pious mother, Nonna, devoted him when an infant to Christ and the Church. His education, which commenced at Cæsarea in Cappadocia, was prosecuted next at Cæsarea Philippi, and at Alexandria, and was finished at Athens, where he began a life-long intimacy with Basil the Great. See BASIL. He was also a fellow-student with Julian, afterwards the apostate emperor. Gregory, with a quick instinct, discerned the character of Julian even then, and said to one of his friends, "How great a scourge is here in training for the Roman empire!" He remained at Athens nearly ten years, part of which he employed in teaching rhetoric with great success. About A.D. 356 he returned to Nazianzum, where he intended to enter upon civil life. Shortly after he was baptized, and consecrated himself anew to the service of God, resolving that his gift of eloquence should serve no interests but those of God and the Church. But for his aged father, he would probably at this time have gone into the desert to lead an ascetic life, at least for some years. At home he remained, and devoted himself to the study of the Scriptures, living by rule a life of the strictest self-denial. About A.D. 359 he visited Basil in his retreat, and remained a short time with him in the practice of ascetic and devotional acts. Returning home at the request of his father, probably to aid in the settlement of a difficulty into which the aged bishop had fallen by signing the Armenian formula, which favored Arianism (Ullmann, *Life of Gregory*, ch. iv, § 2), he was soon after (perhaps), at Christmas, A.D. 361, ordained suddenly, and without forewarning, by his father, before the congregation. These "violent" ordinations were not uncommon in the early Church. Gregory was, however, greatly displeased, and pronounced the transaction "an act of spiritual tyranny." Either to calm his feelings, or to prepare himself thoroughly for his new functions, he again retired to his friend Basil in Pontus early in A.D. 362. The commands of his father and the calls of the Church brought him back to Nazianzum towards Easter, and on that festival he delivered his first oration.

The next six or seven years were spent in pastoral labor at Nazianzum; happily, it seems, on the part of Gregory, though with some mortification to his pride, from a change of feeling towards him on the part of the fickle populace, who, after almost forcing him to serve them, afterwards neglected his ministry (*Orat. iii*, Bened. ed. p. 69). His brother Caesarius, who practiced medicine, had become a favorite of Julian, and this prince endeavored, by his favors, to bring him back to paganism. The Christians murmured at seeing the son of a bishop living openly at the court of their enemy. Gregory succeeded in inducing Caesarius to return to Cappadocia (A.D. 362). Julian's edict forbidding Christians to read the pagan authors was a severe blow to the Christians, and none felt it more than Gregory. His two discourses against Julian (prepared after his death, A.D. 363) are written as

if against a personal enemy. "He takes eloquence away from us," he says, "as though we were thieves who had stolen it." Elsewhere, addressing the hearer, he writes: "Every thing else, riches, birth, glory, power, and all the vain pomps of earth whose brilliancy vanishes like a dream, I willingly abandon to you; but I will not abandon *eloquence*. I do not complain of the fatigues I have undergone by land and by sea to attain it. Please God that my friends and I may possess its power! Among the things I care for it stands foremost—that is, foremost after those which are above all, faith, and the hope which rises up above things visible." And again: "It is our duty to render thanks unto God that eloquence has again become free." These two discourses, it must be admitted, are really nothing but pamphlets, exhibiting little of the charity and mildness which one would expect from a Christian pastor speaking of a deceased enemy. There is, nevertheless, a certain grandeur in the indignation which Gregory pours out against Julian. At the close of the second discourse the orator grows calmer, and endeavors to prevent revenge being taken on the partisans of Julian: he says: "Let not the facility of avenging ourselves lead us to forget the duty of moderation. Let us leave to God's judgment the chastisement of those who have offended us . . . and be satisfied with seeing the people openly hissing our persecutors in the public places and in the theatres." Gregory's friendly relations with Basil came near being sadly interrupted. Gregory had, in 365, brought about a reconciliation between his friend and Eusebius of Caesarea. The latter dying in 370, Basil succeeded him as archbishop, and Gregory came to visit him in the year following. There was a contest between Basil and Anthimus, bishop of Tyana in Cappadocia, who pretended to be metropolitan of the province. Basil, in order to secure a useful ally, offered Gregory the bishopric of Sasima, a small unhealthy place on the frontier of the two provinces which divided Cappadocia. Gregory, after declining for some time, finally accepted, and was ordained bishop in 372; but when pressed by Basil to take his part actively, he answered "that he would not take up arms in his quarrel with Anthimus, as he did not wish to play the part either of battle-field or of prey." Retiring to Nazianzum a bishop without a bishopric, he remained with his father, whom he assisted in the government of his church. "He taught the people, defended the Church against the vexations of the Roman governors, and by his eloquence and virtue exerted that kind of religious supremacy which, in the early ages, formed part of ecclesiastical power" (Villemain, *Tableau de l'Eloquence chrétienne au quatrième siècle*, p. 133). Losing his father and mother almost at the same time (A.D. 374), he retired to a convent of Seleucia. He was still there, living in a calm which, as he said himself, "the hisses of heretics" could not disturb, when he heard of the death of Basil in 379. It affected him deeply, and he wrote a letter of encouragement and consolation to Gregory of Nyssa, the brother of his deceased friend. The Church of Constantinople had been for forty years a prey to Arianism, when Gregory was chosen as the most proper person to bring it back to orthodoxy. Though unwilling to be drawn out from the calm retirement he so much enjoyed, Gregory permitted himself to be led by the advice of his friends and the interests of the Church. His emaciated appearance, the marks of severe penance and of sickness, and his strange speech, made him at first a butt for the laughter and irony of the heretics at Constantinople. The orthodox had not a single church of their own in Constantinople; Gregory was therefore obliged to preach at first in a private house, which gave place to a church named *Anastasia*, in remembrance of the *revival* of faith. He taught and defended the Nicene Creed before crowded audiences attracted by his eloquence. It is then he was surnamed the *Theologian*,

on account of the profundity of his learning. His success excited his enemies still more against him, and his life was several times in danger. Peter, patriarch of Alexandria, who had appointed him bishop of Constantinople, sided afterwards against him, and favored the pretensions of a cynic philosopher called Maximus, who caused himself to be elected bishop of Constantinople (A.D. 380). Vainly did Theodosius cause St. Gregory to take possession of the church of St. Sophia at the head of a large troop of soldiers, assuring him of his protection, and causing a council assembled at Constantinople to confirm Gregory's election as bishop, and annul that of Maximus. He could not put an end to the intrigues and calumnies which pursued Gregory. Some bishops of Egypt and of Macedonia attacked the validity of his election on the plea that he was already bishop of Sasima, and that the canons forbade the transfer of a bishop from one see to another. Gregory offered to resign, saying, "If my election is the cause of trouble, throw me into the sea like Jonas, to allay the storm, though it was not I who raised it." This proposal was accepted with a haste which could not but wound the susceptibilities of Gregory. Before leaving Constantinople he assembled the clergy and the people in the church of St. Sophia, and delivered his farewell address—the grandest of all his orations. "Farewell," said he at the close; "farewell, church of Anastasia, so called in remembrance of our pious trust; farewell, monument of our late victory, thou new Siloa, where, after forty years' wandering in the desert, we had for the first time settled the ark of the covenant; farewell, too, thou grand and famous temple, our last trophy . . . farewell to you all, holy abodes of faith . . . farewell, holy apostles, celestial colony, my models in the combats I have sustained; farewell, episcopal chair, post at once so envied and so full of perils; farewell, ministers of God at his holy table . . . farewell, choir of the Nazarenes, harmony of psalms, pious watches, holiness of virgins, modesty of women, assemblies of widows and of orphans, glances of the poor turned to God and to me; farewell, hospitable houses, friends of Christ who have succored me in mine infirmities. . . . Farewell, kings of the earth, palaces, retinue, and courtiers of kings, faithful, I trust, to your master, but for the most part, I fear, faithless towards God . . . applaud, exalt unto heaven your new orator; the troublesome voice which displeased you is hushed. . . . Farewell, sovereign city, the friend of Christ, yet open to correction and repentance; farewell, Eastern and Western world, for whose sake I have striven, and for whose sake I am now slighted. Most of all, farewell, guardian angels of this church, who protected me in my presence, and who will protect me in my exile; and thou, holy Trinity, my thought and my glory, may they hold fast to thee, and mayest thou save them, save my people! and may I hear daily that they are increasing in knowledge and in virtue." On his way to exile Gregory stopped at Caesarea, where he delivered a funeral oration on St. Basil. In the year 382 he retired to Ariazus for quiet and repose. In 383 Theodorus invited him to take part in a council held at Constantinople. He declined, saying, "To tell the truth, I will always avoid these assemblies of bishops; I have never seen them lead to any good result, but rather increase evils instead of diminishing them. They serve only as fields for tournaments of words and the play of ambition." He added that, at all events, his health would prevent him from attending. He remained in retirement until his death in 389. A garden which he cultivated, a fountain, and the shade of a few trees, composed all his enjoyments. He divided his time between prayer and the writing of poems, in which he expressed the thoughts, hopes, and longings of a mind naturally inclined to dreaminess and melancholy. He is one of the most polished among the sacred writers of the 4th century, and

ranks first after Chrysostom and Basil. The richness of his imagination, developed in the solitude in which a great part of his life was spent, gives to his writings a charming freshness of tone which is seldom met with in the writers of that age. His letters are full of playful sprightliness, sometimes tinged with a slight under-current of harmless irony. A severe critic might show some passages bordering on declamation and bombast. But these faults were general at the time in which he lived; and a writer, however great, always bears more or less the imprint of his day. He is commemorated as a saint in the Roman Catholic Church on May 9, in the Greek Church on the 25th and 30th of January.

St. Gregory left a large number of *poetical* pieces. During the reign of Julian, when profane literature was a forbidden pursuit for Christians, Gregory, considering it as a powerful aid to piety, attempted to supply the wants of his brethren by means of religious poems on the plan of the classics. He accused of stupidity and ignorance (*σκαυοὶ καὶ ἀπαιδευτοὶ*) those who attempted to prevent the study of literature. "Most of his poetical works are religious meditations, which, in spite of the differences of time and manners, have still many points of affinity with the poetical reveries of our days of sceptical satiety and social progress" (Villemain, *Tableau de l'Eloquence chrétienne au IV<sup>me</sup> siècle*, p. 139). Gregory wrote also a large number of *discourses* or *orations*, both while administering the diocese of Nazianzum for his father and while defending orthodoxy at Constantinople. Among these discourses are *funeral addresses* and *panegyrics*, e. g. those of Athanasius and Basil; *invectives*, the two discourses against Julian; *sermons* on questions of morals, discipline, and dogmas. Most of those written in Constantinople, while he was opposing the Arians and Macedonians, are of the latter kind. These discourses are fifty-three in number. Some critics claim that the 45th, 47th, 49th, 50th, and 53d cannot be genuine. The *Letters* of Gregory amount to 242, on all subjects; some of them are quite uninteresting except as they contribute to throw light on the character of Gregory and of his age. Gregory of Nazianzus has often been named as the author of a *Paraphrase on Ecclesiastes*, which is now generally attributed to Gregory Thaumaturgus. The *Poems* of Gregory number 156, differing very much from each other in length, subject, and metre; we find among them religious meditations, descriptions, acrostics, epigrams, etc. He also wrote 228 small pieces, which were collected and published by Muratori in 1709. In some collections of his works is included a tragedy entitled *Christ suffering* (*Χριστὸς πάσχων* [ed. by Ellissen, Leipz. 1855]), which is probably not his.

As a *theologian*, Gregory shows marks of the powerful influence of Origen. As to the Trinity, he earnestly defended the Nicene doctrines (*Orations*, 27-31), and vindicated, against the Apollinarians, the humanity of Christ. In common with nearly all theologians before Augustine, he maintained side by side the doctrines of the necessity of grace and the freedom of the human will.

The first edition of the *Works of Gregory* is that of Basle (1550, fol.): it contains the Greek text, a Latin version, and the life of Gregory by Suidas and by Gregory the Presbyter. This edition is not much esteemed. A better is that of Billius (Paris, 1609-11, 2 vols. fol.; reprinted *cum notis Prunovi Morelli*, etc., Paris, 1630, 2 vols. fol.; and again at Cologne, 1690, 2 vols. fol.), badly edited, and abounding in errors. The best edition is that of the Benedictines (Paris, vol. i, fol. edited by Clemençet, 1778; vol. ii, edited by Cail- lau, fol. 1840). It is also given in Migne's *Patrologiæ Curs. Complet.*, vols. xxxv-xxxviii (Paris, fol., v. y.). Many of his writings have been published separately. His *Oration on the Nativity*, and a number of his poems, are given in English by H. S. Boyd, *The Fathers*

*not Papists* (new ed. Lond. 1834, 8vo). A selection of his works was published by Goldhorn (Leips. 1854). The best view of the life and theology of Gregory is to be found in Ullmann, *Gregorius von Nazianz* (Darmst. 1825, 8vo); translated, but, unfortunately, without the dogmatical part, by G. V. Cox (Lond. 1857, 18mo). See Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, viii, 383-389; Tillemont, *Mém. pour servir*, etc., t. ix; Neander, *Ch. History*, ii, 420; Neander, *History of Dogmas*, p. 262, 403; Lardner, *Works*, iv, 285 sq.; Clarke, *Succession of Sacred Literature*, i, 308 (where the *Orations* are analyzed); Baur, *Lehre von d. Dreieinigkeit*, i, 648; Schaff, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, iii, 908 sq.; Böhlinger, *Kirche Christi in Biographien*, i, 2, 369; Hoeter, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxi, 837-846.

**Gregorius Neo-Cæsariensis, or Thaumaturgus**, received the latter surname from the miracles ascribed to him. His proper name was Theodorus. He was born in the 3d century, of rich and noble parents, at Neo-Cæsarea, in Pontus. He was educated very carefully in the learning and religion of Paganism by his father, who was a warm zealot; but losing this parent at fourteen years of age, his inclinations led him to Christianity. Having studied the law for some time at Alexandria and Athens, he accompanied his sister to Cæsarea, and there became the pupil of Origen, about A.D. 234. He continued five years under his tuition, during which he learned logic, physics, geometry, astronomy, and ethics, and, what was of infinitely greater consequence, the knowledge of the true God and the Christian Scriptures. When Gregory returned to his native country he devoted himself to a private and retired life, but Phedimus, bishop of Amasea, ordained him bishop of Neo-Cæsarea, in which, and the whole neighborhood, there were only seventeen Christians. Gregory Nyssen, who has written an account of his life, says he was more perfectly instructed in the Christian doctrine by a vision from heaven, in which he heard and saw the Virgin Mary and St. John discoursing together of the Christian faith! When they disappeared, he wrote down carefully all they spoke, which, as Nyssen says, was preserved in Gregory's own handwriting in the church of Neo-Cæsarea in his time. There are other legends of miracles wrought by him, among them the following: On his way to take possession of his unpromising bishopric he was benighted, and obliged, through the inclemency of the weather, to take up his lodging in a heathen temple, the daemon of which had been very remarkable for his frequent appearances to the priest, and for the oracles which he delivered. Gregory and his companions departed from this place early in the morning, after which the priest performed the usual rites, but the daemon answered that "he could appear no more in that place, because of him who had lodged there the preceding night." The pagan priest besought Gregory to bring the daemon back. The saint laid on the altar a piece of paper, on which he had written, "Gregory to Satan—enter." The devils returned, and the pagan, astonished, was converted to Christianity. When Gregory arrived at the city a vast crowd of people came together, to whom he preached the gospel, and numbers were converted. As the number of believers increased daily, he formed the design of building a church, which was soon effected, all cheerfully contributing both by labor and money. This was probably the first church ever erected for the sole purpose of Christian worship. After having converted all the Neo-Cæsareans except seventeen persons, he died full of faith and the Holy Spirit, rejoicing that he left no more unbelievers in the city than he found Christians at the commencement of his ministry. In the year 264 he attended at the synod at Antioch, where Paul of Samosata made a feigned recantation of his heretical opinions. Gregory died most probably in the following year, certainly between A.D. 265 and 270. The many accounts of miracles ascribed to him do not rest upon the authority of

his contemporaries. We are chiefly indebted for an account of them to Gregory of Nyssa, who flourished a hundred years after Thaumaturgus, who wrote a panegyric of him rather than a life, and who evidently recorded every wonder of which he received a report without examination. Lardner, however, says that he will not assert that Gregory worked no miracles. The age of miracles was not entirely concluded, and had there been no foundation in truth, the wonderful stories relating to Gregory would not have been believed. He is commemorated in the Roman Catholic Church on the 17th of November.

The *creed* of Gregory is very important, as showing us how clearly defined was at this time the faith of the orthodox. Its authenticity has been disputed, but it is received as genuine by Bishop Bull and Dr. Waterland: it is as follows: "There is one God, Father of the living Word, the substantial wisdom and power and eternal express image: perfect Parent of one perfect, Father of the only begotten Son. There is one Lord, One of One, God of God, the express character and image of the Godhead, the effective word, the wisdom that grasps the system of the universe, and the power that made every creature, true Son of the true Father, invisible of invisible, incorruptible of incorruptible, immortal of immortal, and eternal of eternal. And there is one Holy Ghost, having his subsistence from God, and shining forth by the Son (viz. to mankind), perfect image of the perfect Son, life causal of all living, the holy fountain, essential sanctity, author of all sanctification, in whom God the Father is manifested, who is above all and in all, and God the Son who is through all. A perfect Trinity undivided, unseparated in glory, eternity, and dominion. There is, therefore, nothing created or servile in this Trinity, nothing adventitious that once was not, and came in after; for the Father was never without the Son, nor the Son without the Spirit, but this Trinity abides the same unchangeable and invariable forever." Gregory's works, so far as we know anything of them, are these: 1. *A Panegyric Oration in praise of Origen*, pronounced in 239, still extant, and unquestionably his. Dupin says of it "that it is very eloquent, and that it may be reckoned one of the finest pieces of rhetoric in all antiquity." It is the more admirable, because perhaps it is the first thing of the kind among Christians. 2. *A Paraphrase of the Book of Ecclesiastes*, mentioned by Jerome in his catalogue, and quoted by him in his Commentary upon that book, and still extant. 3. Jerome afterwards adds in his catalogue that Gregory wrote several epistles, of which, however, we have now only one remaining, called a Canonical Epistle to an anonymous bishop, written in 258 or 262, consisting, as we now have it, of eleven canons, all allowed to be genuine except the last, which is doubted of, or plainly rejected, as no part of the original epistle, but since added to it. The editions of his works are, 1. That of Vossius (Mayence, 1604, 4to, with a *Life of Gregory*); 2. *Opera omnia Gregor. Neocæs. Macariv et Basilii, Græc. et Lat.* (Paris, 1622, fol.); 3. Migne's edition, *Patrol. Coursus Complet.*, vol. x. This is the best edition. A life of Gregory has been published by Nic. Mar. Pallavicini (Rome, 1614). His writings are also given in *Bib. Max. Patrum*, vol. iii. See Lardner, *Works*, ii. 608-642; Hook, *Ecclesiastical Biography*, v. 390; Dupin, *Ecl. Writers*, cent. iii.; Neander, *Ch. History*, i. 716-720; Eusebius, *Ecl. Hist.* bks. vi, vii; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* anno 254; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, vii. 249; Boye, *Diss. de Greg. Thaum.* (Jena, 1703, 4to); Greg. Nyssenus, *Vita Greg. Thaum.* Opp. t. iii, p. 536; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* i. 170.

**Gregorius Nyssenus** (*Gregory of Nyssa*), one of the fathers of the Eastern Church, was born at Caesarea in Cappadocia about 332. He was a younger brother of Basil, enjoyed a liberal education under able masters, and distinguished himself by his proficiency in literature and science. He excelled in rhetoric, and

was successful both as a professor and pleader. He married a woman of virtue and piety, named Theosebia, of whom Gregory of Nazianzus speaks in high commendation. He appears to have officiated as a reader in a church, and to have been originally intended for the ecclesiastical life, but his passion for rhetoric, to the study of which he had devoted his youth, haunted him so incessantly that, unable to withstand its continual allurements, he, for a time, forsook his clerical duties, and gave lessons to youth in this his favorite art. Gregory of Nazianzus heard with grief of this dereliction in the brother of his friend, and wrote him a letter, still preserved (*Epist.* 43), which recalled him to duty. No sooner was Basil elevated to the episcopal chair of Caesarea in 370, than he summoned his brother Gregory to assist him in the duties of his new diocese; but the bishopric of Nyssa, a city of Cappadocia, near Lesser Armenia, becoming vacant the following year, Basil gave up the pleasure of his brother's aid and society, and consecrated him to it against his will in 372. In this see he signalized his zeal in defence of the orthodox faith, in opposition to the Arians. He drew upon himself the vengeance of that party, and was banished from his see by the emperor Valens about 374. On the death of Valens in 378, he was recalled by Gratian, and restored to the possession of his see. A council, probably that of Antioch, having ordered Gregory of Nyssa to reform the Church of Arabia, and Palestine bordering upon it, he visited Jerusalem and the holy places, as well to perform a vow as to settle peace and tranquillity among them who governed the Church of Jerusalem. For his greater convenience in this journey the emperor allowed him the use of the public carriages, so that, having a wagon at his own disposal, it served him and those who accompanied him both as a church and a monastery; they sang psalms, and observed their fasts as they travelled. He visited Bethlehem, Mount Calvary, the holy Sepulchre, and the Mount of Olives; however, he was not much edified by the inhabitants of the country, who, he says, were very corrupt in their manners, and notoriously guilty of all sorts of crimes, especially murder. Therefore, being afterwards consulted by a monk of Cappadocia concerning the pilgrimage to Jerusalem, he declares "that he does not think it proper for such as have renounced the world, and have resolved to arrive at Christian perfection, to undertake these journeys. Advise your brethren, therefore, rather to leave the body to go to the Lord, than to leave Cappadocia to go to Palestine." This was the opinion of Gregory of Nyssa concerning pilgrimages. In 381 and the subsequent years, Gregory attended the Council of Constantinople. In this city he pronounced the funeral oration of his sister Macrina, and three years afterwards he was deprived by death of his wife, a woman of many virtues, who, in her later years, devoted herself to religious duties, and has been supposed by some to have become a deaconess. His own death took place in the beginning of the year 400.

As a *theologian*, Gregory had great reputation in his age. His theology shows independent and original thought, but contains many of the ideas of Origen. He maintained the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity, the doctrine of Redemption, the freedom of the will, faith as the subjective, and the sacraments as the objective means of grace. His style is very uneven. He was an abundant writer, but his abundance too often degenerated into diffuseness; his style drags; his illustrations are often in questionable taste, and, being too fully developed, fatigue the reader. When attempting to be refined, he becomes subtle, and his grander passages border on bombast; yet his works contain many passages full of elevated views and true beauty, and animated by a warmth of feeling reaching even to enthusiasm. An analysis of his writings may be found in Clarke, *Succession of Sac. Lit.* i. 354 sq.; and in Dupin, *Hist. of Ecl. Writers*, cent. iv. They may be di-

vided into, 1. *Doctrinal* (chiefly relating to the Arian controversy), 2. *Exegetical*; 3. *Practical* treatises; 4. *Discourses*; 5. *Epistles and Panegyrics*. Many of these have been published in separate editions. The first edition of his *collected Works* appeared at Cologne (1537, fol.), then at Basle (1562, 1571), and at Paris (1573 and 1603). Fronton le Duc gave the first Greek and Latin edition (Paris, 1615, 2 vols. fol.; an *Appendix* in 1 vol. fol. appeared in 1618). This edition was reprinted in 1638 (edited by Gretzer, 3 vols. fol.). It is handier, but not so neat and correct as that of 1615. New editions in Migne's *Patrol. Græc.* vols. xlv–xlvii (Par. 1846); also by Oehler (Hal. Sax. 1865 sq.). The oration against Arius and Sabellius, and that against the Macedonians, is in Mai's *Script. Vet. nova coll.* vol. viii, and in vol. iv of the *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca* (Rom. 1847). Ceillier gives a long catalogue of the separate editions of Gregory's writings in *Hist. Générale des Auteurs Sacrés*, vi, 119 sq. (Paris, 1860). Recent issues are, Gregorius Nyssenus, *Dial. de anima et resurrectione*, ed. Krabinger (Leips. 1837, 8vo); *Orationes Catechet.* ed. Krabinger (Munich, 1838, 8vo); *Orationes de Precatione*, edit. Krabinger (Landshut, 1840, 8vo). See Dupin, *Eccl. Writers*, cent. iii; Hook, *Eccl. Biog.* vol. v; Neander, *Ch. History*, ii, 413 sq.; Lardner, *Works*, v, 295 sq.; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i, 249; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, t. ix; Rupp, *Gregor's von Nyssa Leben und Meinungen* (Leips. 1834, 8vo); Ileyns, *Disputatio de Gregorio Nysseno* (Leyden, 1835, 4to); Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxi, 846; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, edit. Harles, ix, 98; Böhringer, *Kirche Christi in Biograph.* i, 2, 275; Möller, *Greg. Nyss. doctrinam de hominis natura*, etc. (Halle, 1854).

**Gregorius Syracusanus** (*Gregory of Sicily*, and surnamed ASBESTAS), was born about 820, and became bishop of Syracuse about 845. In consequence, it is said, of the invasion of the Arabs, he went to Constantinople soon after his appointment, for he was there in 847, when Ignatius was chosen patriarch. Gregory had strenuously opposed this election, and he then retired with some other prelates, who, taking his part, created a schism against Ignatius. The latter, in return, deposed Gregory in a council held at Constantinople in 854, under the plea of profligacy. The deposition was confirmed by pope Benedict III. When Photius took the place of Ignatius, who was deposed in 858, he caused himself to be consecrated by Gregory, thus openly recognising his ecclesiastical character in spite of his deposition. They were both anathematized by the council held at Rome in 863, and thus the schism between the two churches was completed. Under these circumstances, the accusation of immorality preferred against Gregory by Roman Catholic writers is to be received with great caution. Photius appointed him bishop of Nicea in Bithynia in 878. He died about 880. Some have considered him as the "*Gregorius archiepiscopus Siciliæ*" mentioned by Allatius (*De Methodiorum Scriptis*, in the *Convirium decem Virginum Sti Methodii Martyris*, Rome, 1656) as having written an "*Oratio longa in S. Methodium*." See Mongitor, *Bibliotheca Sicula*, i, 263; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* ii, 40, 76; Jäger, *Histoire de Photius*, i, 1; ii; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Myth.* ii, 310; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxi, 877.

**Gregorius Turonensis** (*Gregory of Tours*), an eminent prelate and scholar of the 6th century, called "the father of French history," was born of a noble family in Auvergne, A.D. 540, educated by his uncle, the bishop of Clermont. He was ordained deacon in 569, and bishop of Tours 573. He was strenuous in upholding the orthodox faith, and, though twenty-two years a bishop, he was only fifty-five years old when he died, A.D. 595. He was a man of active mind and habits, and much engaged in the theological disputes of the time. His great work, *Annales Francorum* (*History of the French*), is as barbarous in style

as it is full of credulity in narration: it begins at the creation, and comes down to his own times (Paris, 1552; Basil. 8vo, 1568; Paris, 1610, 8vo; but the best edition is that edited by Du Chesne in his *Script. Franc. tom. i*, Paris, 1636). He wrote also *Miraculorum libri vii* (*Seven Books of Miracles*), of which the first contains an account of the miracles of some of the primitive Christians as well as of Christ; the second, the miracles of St. Justin; the four next, the miracles of St. Martin of Tours; the seventh, the lives of some monks, and an account of the Seven Sleepers. While these writings show an honest simplicity on the part of Gregory, they manifest also his excessive credulity. The best edition of his collected works is *Greg. Opera*, ed. Ruinart (Paris, 1699, fol.). The *Historia Francorum* is given in the *Bib. Mar. Patrol.* vol. xi, in Pertz, *Monumenta Germanie historica*, in a new German version, *Kirchh. Geschichte d. Franken* (Würzburg, 1853, 18mo), and by Giesebrecht (Berl. 1851, 2 vols.). See Löbell, *Gregor. v. Tours und seine Zeit* (Leips. 1835, 8vo; 2d edit. 1867); Kries, *de Greg. Turon. vita et scriptis* (Vrat. 1839, 8vo); Mosheim, *Church History*, cent. vi, pt. ii, ch. ii, note 42; Clarke, *Success. Sacred Literature*, ii, 344; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* vol. iii; Dupin, *Eccl. Writers*, t. v.; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii, 372; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxi, 856.

**Gregorius of ARMENIA** (*Gregory Illuminator*; Greek *Photistes*, Armenian *Lusaworich*), first bishop of Armenia and apostle of Christianity in that country (3d century). Others had preached there before him, but he was the first to organize Christianity thoroughly. Accurate information about him is wanting. The Bollandists (*Acta Sanctorum*, September, vol. viii) give a life of him professedly written by his contemporary, Agathangelus, but it is clearly spurious. He is the author of several Homilies, which have been published by the Mekhitarists (Venice, 1837). His name is held in just veneration in the Eastern churches, and he is also a saint in the Roman Calendar, Sept. 30. The United Armenians in Constantinople claim to possess his relics, which in August, 1869, were transferred from one church to another.—Hoefler, *Nouvelle Biogr. Générale*, xxi, 863 (where the traditional account is fully given); Mosheim, *Church History*, ii, 225; Malan, *Life and Times of Gregory Illuminator* (London, 1868). See ARMENIA.

**Gregorius of BÆTICA**, bishop of Illiberis (Elvira in the ancient Bætica, now Andalusia), 4th century. He is mentioned by Jerome (*Chronicon*, anno 371) as a vigorous opponent of the Arians, who persecuted him, and strove, but without success, to drive him from his see. Gregory wrote several works, and among them a treatise *de Fide*, which Jerome styles *elegans libellus*. The treatise *de Fide contra Arianos*, which is given as Gregory's in some editions of the fathers, is by Faustinus (q. v.).—Tillemont, *Mémoires*, x, 727.

**Gregory of HEMBURG**, one of the boldest opponents of papal encroachments in his time, was born at Würzburg in the early part of the 15th century. He studied in the University of Würzburg, and took the degree of LL.D. about 1430. We next find him at the Council of Basle in company with Æneas Sylvius (afterwards pope Pius II), who, as appears from his letter to Heimburg in Goldast's *Monarchia S. Rom. Imperii* (vol. ii, p. 1632 sq.), fully appreciated the character and talents of his colleague. Æneas took Gregory as his secretary, and the two opposed very successfully the papal encroachments on the domain of the temporal power. Heimburg, however, soon retired to Nuremberg, where he was elected syndic, and acquired such reputation that all important questions in civil or ecclesiastical law were referred to his arbitration. His relations with Æneas Sylvius changed in proportion as the latter rose in the Church, and when he was finally raised to the see of Rome, the friends found themselves in complete opposition to

each other. When pope Eugene IV deposed Theodor, archbishop of Cologne, and Jacob, archbishop of Treves, on account of the firmness with which they carried out the principles of the Council of Basle, the German electors sent Heimburg, at the head of a deputation to the pope. He spoke courageously against the usurpations of the Roman see. Eugene answered that he would send an answer "worthy of himself." This answer did not satisfy the deputation, and, on their return to Frankfort, they gave an unfavorable account of their mission, while Gregory, about the same time, wrote his most remarkable works against the papacy, entitled *Admonitio de injustis usurpationibus Paparum Rom. ad Imperatores, reges et principes Christianos, sive Confulatio Primatus Papae* (in Goldast, *Monarchia S. Rom. Imperii*, i, 557). In this work he censures the usurpations of the papacy in the strongest terms, substantiating his reproofs by Scripture and history. Gregory then entered the service of the grand duke Sigismund of Austria, and in this position continued to urge war against the papacy, soon after represented by Pius II. The latter, when ascending the papal chair, had formed the plan of engaging Germany in a crusade, and in this view convoked a meeting of the German princes at Mantua. Heimburg appeared at it as representative of Sigismund, and successfully opposed the project of Pius, who never forgave him for it. He soon found an opportunity for revenge. Cardinal Nicholas, of Cusa, also a former friend of Heimburg, was appointed bishop of Brixen, against the wishes of Sigismund. Difficulties arose between them, and Sigismund took the bishop prisoner. Pius II immediately (June 1, 1460) excommunicated the grand duke, who appealed to a general council by the intermediation of Gregory, Aug. 13, 1460 (see Goldast, as above, ii, 1576), and caused the appeal to be posted on the door of a number of churches throughout Italy. Gregory of Heimburg posted it himself on the doors of the church in Florence, and was immediately excommunicated also. Pius II even sent a brief to the magistrates of Nuremberg, Oct. 18, 1460, demanding that Gregory should be secured at any cost. The latter appealed to a future council (see Goldast, as above, p. 1592), showing how the pope abused his power, and strongly defending the proposition that a council is superior to the pope, and that therefore an appeal to a general council is legal. The apostolic referendary, Theodorus Lällius, bishop of Feltri, wrote a refutation of Gregory's appeal (Goldast, p. 1595), but the latter answered him triumphantly in his *Apologia contra detractationes et blasphemias Theod. Lallii* (Goldast, p. 1461). Against Nicholas of Cusa, whom he accused of having deserted his former principles, he wrote a vigorous attack in his *Invectiva in Rever. Patrem, Dom. Nicolovm de Cusa* (Goldast, p. 1626). In the mean time, Diether, archbishop of Mentz, had also been arbitrarily deposed by Pius II in 1461, when hardly installed in office; Gregory of Heimburg immediately took up his defence, but he soon found himself entirely unsupported. Sigismund made his peace with Pius by the mediation of the emperor Frederick, and obtained absolution in 1464; Diether submitted to the pope, and renounced his archbishopric. Gregory then retired to Bohemia, where he continued to make war against the pope under the protection of George Podiehrad, for whom he wrote several controversial essays (in Erscheulör, *Gesch. von Breslau*, pub. by Kunisch, Breslau, 1827). After the death of his protector he fixed his residence at Dresden, and, by the mediation of duke Albert, obtained absolution from pope Sixtus IV in 1472. He soon afterwards died (Aug. 1472), and was buried in the Church of Sophia, in Dresden. His collected works were published under the title *Scripta nervosa justitiaeque plena, ex manuscriptis utque primò eruta* (Pref. 1608).—See Hagen, in the *Zeitschrift Bragu* (Heidelberg, 1839, ii, 414 sq.); Ullmann, *Reformatoren vor d. Reformation* (Hamburg,

1841, i, 212 sq.).—Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, v, 347; Brockhaus, *Gregor von Heimburg* (Leipzig, 1861).

**Gregory**, the patriarch of the Bohemian Brethren. Among the earnest-minded Hussites of the Calixtine party, which began, about 1453, to form around Rokycan, elected but never consecrated archbishop of Prague, and to listen with enthusiasm to his sermons on the necessity of a reformation, the most prominent was Gregory, surnamed "the Patriarch." The time and place of his birth are unknown. He was the son of a Bohemian knight, and the nephew of Rokycan, whose sister was his mother. Disappointed in his uncle, who was not willing to be a reformer practically, however much he theorized on the subject, he retired, with a number of his friends, to the barony of Litz, and there founded in 1457 the Church of the Bohemian Brethren, or *Unitus Fratrum*. Accepting no ecclesiastical office in the same, he remained merely a lay elder, but was the life and soul of the organization. In its interests he wrote and published many letters, doctrinal treatises, and apologetic works, nearly all of which have perished. His doctrinal tendencies were derived mainly from Peter Chelcicky, a Bohemian writer, who inveighed with stern rigor, from out of an isolated retreat, against the corruptness of that age. (For particulars about Chelcicky, see Gillette's article on the *Taborites and the Germ of the Moravian Church*, in the *Presbyterian Review* of July, 1864.) In consequence, his views of Christian discipline grew to be extreme, and more than puritanical. These he impressed upon the Church. Some of their most salient points were the following: men of rank must strip themselves of the same, and lay down every worldly office, before they can be received into the Church; no member is allowed to go to law, or to testify before a civil court; judicial oaths are forbidden; no member may keep an inn, or engage in any trade calculated to advance luxury. His object was to preserve the Church unspotted from the world, amid the fearful degeneracy which prevailed. At the time of his death, which occurred in 1473, at Brandeis, on the Adler, in Bohemia, these and other similar regulations were in full force. Twenty-one years later, however, in 1494, they were formally abrogated, and a more liberal policy was introduced. In the first persecution (1461) which came upon the Brethren, Gregory was frightfully tortured on the rack.—Palaeky's *Geschichte von Böhmen*, vol. vi, ch. vii, which work denies that Gregory was the nephew of Rokycan; Gindely's *Geschichte der Böhmischn Brüder*, vol. i, ch. i-iii; Cröger's *Geschichte der alten Brüderkirche*, vol. i, ch. i-iii; Benham's *Notes on the Origin and Episcopate of the Bohemian Brethren*, p. 1-120. (E. de S.)

**Gregory**, patriarch of Constantinople, was born at Calavrita (Arcadia) about 1740. He studied in the schools of Dimitzana (Morea), Athos, Patmos, and Smyrna; entered the Church, and, after being successively ordained deacon and priest, was, while yet quite a young man, appointed metropolitan of Smyrna. Most of the churches of the diocese were in ruins, and the Turks opposed their restoration, yet he succeeded in fitting some for divine worship, and endeared himself greatly to the Greek population by his zeal and virtues. In 1795 he was appointed patriarch of Constantinople. When the expedition of Napoleon I against Egypt took place, the Turks accused Gregory of favoring the French, and deposed him. He withdrew to a convent on Mount Athos, where he busied himself not only in writing religious books, but in learning the art of printing. Being soon after reappointed patriarch, he established a printing-office in the episcopal palace. His duties were interrupted by the political revolutions of 1808, when he was deposed on a charge of favoring Russia. He had finally been reappointed a third time patriarch, when the invasion of the Danubian provinces by Ypsilanti in 1821 led

to the rising of the Greeks. Constantinople was their supposed aim, and it was rumored that the Greeks of that city would rise, murder the sultan, and restore the throne of Constantine. The Turkish soldiery were daily killing the Greeks in the streets of Constantinople, and the patriarch's palace was pointed at as the arsenal where Christians kept their ammunition. The position of the Greek clergy, in view of this revolution, which announced itself as a religious one, became daily more critical. Gregory, following the traditions of his Church, which had always enjoined obedience to the temporal powers, excommunicated the leaders of the insurrection. He was intrusted with the custody of the Morousi family, the head of which had been killed as an insurgent. The priest to whose charge Gregory committed them allowed them to escape, and from that moment Gregory foresaw the fate which awaited him. Pressed to fly by his friends, he refused to leave his post, and on Easter celebrated public worship with all the splendor and solemnity habitual on that occasion among Eastern Christians. He was arrested on leaving the church, thrown into prison, and a few hours later hanged in front of the church as an originator of the insurrection. The chief members of the synod shared his fate, or were thrown into prison. After remaining on the gallows for three days the body of the patriarch was thrown into the sea by the Jews, but was taken out, put on board of a vessel, and sent to Odessa, where it was buried with great pomp, June 28. He compiled a Greek Lexicon, of which, however, only two volumes have appeared (Constantinople, 1819). See Constantin (Economos, *Oraison funèbre du patriarche Grégoire*; Pouqueville, *Hist. de la Régénération de la Grèce.*—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxi, 880 sq.

**Gregory I**, Pope, commonly called GREGORY THE GREAT, great-grandchild of pope Felix II, was born at Rome about 541. Having received an education suitable to his rank, he became a member of the senate, and filled other employments in the state. The emperor Justin II appointed him prefect or governor of Rome (A.D. 573). This office he quitted soon after the death of his father, when he came into the possession of immense wealth, the greater part of which he devoted to the establishment of monasteries, six of which he founded in Sicily, and one at Rome, dedicated to St. Andrew, into which he retired himself, and was soon after ordained a deacon. Pelagius II sent him (about A.D. 578) as his nuncio to Constantinople to secure the favor of the emperor, who had been alienated by the ordination of the pope without the imperial consent. He succeeded in his mission. On his return he assumed the government of his own monastery of St. Andrew, and at the same time was secretary to the pope. On the death of Pelagius, Gregory was chosen pope by the clergy and the people, and, much against his will, this election was confirmed by the emperor Maurice (A.D. 590). He was installed as pope Sept. 3, 595.

No sooner was the ordination completed than, according to custom, the new pope drew up his confession of faith, and sent it to the other patriarchs, viz. to the patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. In this confession he professed to receive the four Gospels, the first four Councils, to reverence the fifth, and to condemn the Three Chapters. He adds, "Whoever presumes to loosen the persons whom the councils have bound, or to bind those whom the councils have loosened, destroys himself and not them." Thus it is apparent that even in the 6th century the authority of the councils was equal to that of the holy Scriptures. His first object after his promotion was the better regulation of his own see and household, and especially of the Sicilian churches, which the Council of Nice had placed more immediately under the see of Rome than any others; the African Donatists and Manichæans also claimed his attention, and

the Jews experienced some degree of favor from him. He assisted Theodolinda, queen of the Longobards, in converting that people to the Catholic faith. He likewise sent missionaries into Sardinia, and zealously supported the mission to England to bring the British into relations with Rome. It was previous to his exaltation to the pontifical chair that, seeing one day in the slave-market at Rome some Anglo-Saxon children exposed for sale, and being struck by their comely appearance, he is said to have exclaimed, "They would be indeed not Angli, but angeli, if they were Christians," and from that time he engaged his predecessor, Pelagius, to send missionaries to England. See ENGLAND, CHURCH OF. At home he exerted himself strenuously for the restoration of clerical discipline. The celibacy of the clergy was riveted upon the Romish system by the measures taken by Gregory. His course of action invariably was directed to strengthen the power of the Roman see; and, in fact, he was the father of the mediæval Roman system. He held monastic institutions in great favor, made strict rules concerning them, and granted them special privileges. This feature of his career gained him the title of *pater monachorum*. One of the marked events of his pontificate was his contest with John, patriarch of Constantinople, who had assumed the title of (Ecumenical, or universal Bishop (A.D. 595), which Gregory called "proud, heretical, blasphemous, antichristian, and diabolical" (*Epist.* 5, 18), and assumed to himself, in opposition, the title of "Servant of Servants" (*Servus servorum Domini*). "Whom do you imitate," says he, addressing the patriarch, "in assuming that arrogant title? Whom but him who, swelled with pride, exalted himself above so many legions of angels, his equals, that he might be subject to none, and all might be subject to him?" It was then, in the opinion of Gregory, imitating Lucifer for any bishop to exalt himself above his brethren, and to pretend that all other bishops were subject to him, himself being subject to none. And has not this been for many ages the avowed pretension and claim of the popes? "We declare, say, define, and pronounce it to be of necessity to salvation for every human creature to be subject to the Roman pontiff," is a decree issued by Boniface VIII in the fourteenth century. "The apostle Peter," continues Gregory, "was the first member of the universal Church. As for Paul, Andrew, and John, they were only the heads of particular congregations; but all were members of the Church under one head, and none would ever be called universal." The meaning of Gregory is obvious, viz. that the apostles themselves, though heads of particular congregations or churches, were nevertheless members of the Church universal, and none of them ever pretended to be the head of the whole Church, or to have power and authority over the whole Church, that being peculiar to Christ alone. This agrees with what he had said before, addressing himself to the patriarch, viz. "If none of the apostles would be called universal, what will you answer on the last day to Christ, the head of the Church universal? You who, by arrogating that name, strive to subject all his members to yourself?" For it was not the bare title of universal bishop that thus alarmed Gregory, but the universal power and authority which he apprehended his rival aimed at in assuming that title. Gregory adds: "But this is the time which Christ himself foretold; the earth is now laid waste and destroyed with the plague and the sword; all things that have been predicted are now accomplished; the king of pride, that is Antichrist, is at hand; and what I dread to say, an army of priests is ready to receive him; for they who were chosen to point out to others the way of humility and meekness are themselves now become the slaves of pride and ambition." Here Gregory treats the bishop of Constantinople as the forerunner of Antichrist for taking upon him the title of universal bishop.

In the year 596, Gregory sent Augustine, abbot of his own monastery of St. Andrew at Rome, to convert those of the English who yet remained heathens, and under his auspices Christianity was established in the northern parts of the island. See AUGUSTINE; and ENGLAND, CHURCH OF.

In several contests with the emperor Maurice, Gregory avowed his obligation to submit in temporal questions to the imperial commands. There was a long step to take between Gregory I and Gregory VII. See PAPACY. In the year 601 the centurion Phocas rebelled against Maurice, slew him and his family atrociously, and usurped the throne. "Never," says Maimbourg, "was there a more infamous tyrant than this wicked man" (*Hist. du Pontif. de St. Grégoire*, p. 179, 181). The greatest stain upon the pontificate of Gregory is that, instead of hurling his papal anathemas against Phocas, he flattered the murderer, and praised God for his accession to the throne. "The Almighty has chosen you and put you on the throne to banish by your merciful disposition all our griefs. . . . Let the heavens rejoice; let the earth leap for joy. . . ." It is poor excuse given by some of the Roman writers in Gregory's behalf that Maurice had sided against the pope in his disputes with the patriarch of Constantinople. Phocas, in return, established the supremacy of the see of Rome over all other sees.

The last years of Gregory's life were passed in great suffering from gout and other diseases, but he retained his vigor of mind and will to the end. He died March 12, A.D. 604. Gregory's career presents many contradictions. He was a man of great natural kindness, of indomitable energy, and determined will. His life was entirely devoted to the interests of the papal see, which, in his mind, were identical with the interests of the kingdom of Christ. If he did not, as has been charged, burn the Palatine library, he despised and discontenanced classical learning. His special attention was given to the Roman liturgy: he reformed the *Sacramentary* of Gelasius, and put the order of the mass (*Canon missæ*) very nearly into the shape in which it now exists. See MASS. Besides other less important ceremonies, added to the public forms of prayer, he made it his chief care to reform the psalmody, being excessively fond of sacred music. He arranged and improved the chants in use, and composed others for the psalms, the hymns, the prayers, the verses, the canticles, the lessons, the epistles, the gospels, the prefaces, and the Lord's prayer. He likewise instituted an academy for chanters, for all the clerks, as far as the deacons exclusively; he gave them lessons himself; and the bed in which he continued to chant in the midst of his last illness was preserved with great veneration in the palace of St. John Lateran for a long time, together with the whip with which he used to threaten the young clerks and singing-boys when they sang out of tune. See GREGORIAN CHANT.

In *theology* Gregory was a moderate Augustinian: he held to predestination, but not an unconditional predestination. He held also to the value of good works and penance as restoratives; and, in fact, he furnished a basis for the later system of works of supererogation, etc. He may be called the inventor of the doctrine of Purgatory, and of the modern Romish doctrines of Masses and Transubstantiation. The better side of his life and character is set forth strikingly by Neander in his *D. n. a. w. d. i. g. k. e. i. t. e. n.* The following extract will show how far later bishops of Rome have wandered from the spirit of the earlier ones as to the use of the Scriptures: "It was Gregory's strenuous endeavor to extend the study of the Scriptures among the clergy and the laity. He says in a sermon, 'As we see the face of strangers, and know not their hearts until these are opened to us by confidential intercourse, so, if only the history be regarded in the divine word, nothing else appears to us but the outward coun-

tenance. But when, by continual intercourse, we let it pass into our being, the confidence engendered by such communion enables us to penetrate into its spirit.' 'Often,' he observes elsewhere, 'when we do something, we believe it to be meritorious. But if we return to the word of God, and understand its sublime teaching, we perceive how far behind perfection we stand.' A bishop whom Gregory advised to study the Scriptures had excused himself on the plea that the troubles of the times would not permit him to read. Gregory showed him the barrenness of this excuse, referring him to Rom. xv, 4. 'If,' he replied, 'the holy Scripture is written for our consolation, we should read it more the more we feel oppressed by the burden of the times'" (Neander, *Light in Dark Places*, N. Y. p. 127).

Gregory was a very voluminous writer. His *letters* amount to eight hundred and forty; and besides them he wrote a *Comment on the Book of Job*, comprised in thirty-six books; a *Pastoral*, or a treatise on the duties of a pastor, consisting of four parts, and it was, of four different treatises; twenty-two *Homilies* on the prophet Ezekiel; forty *Homilies* on the Gospels, and four books of *Dialogues*. The *Comment on the Book of Job* is commonly styled Gregory's *Morals of Job* (*Moralia*), being rather a collection of moral principles than an exposition of the text. It is translated into English in the *Library of the Fathers* (Oxford, 4 vols. 8vo). That work and the *Pastoral* were anciently, and still are, reckoned among the best writings of the later fathers. "The *Pastoral*, in particular, was held in such high esteem by the Gallican Church that all bishops were obliged by the canons of that Church to be thoroughly acquainted with it, and punctually to observe the rules it contained; nay, to remind them of that obligation, it was delivered into their hands at the time of their ordination. As for the dialogues, they are filled with alleged miracles and stories so grossly absurd and fabulous that it would be a reflection on the understanding and good sense of this great pope to think that he really believed them; the rather as for many of them he had no better vouchers than old, dotting, and ignorant people. He was the first, as has been said, who discovered *purgatory*, and it was by means of the apparitions and visions which he relates in his dialogues that he first discovered it; so that the Church of Rome is probably indebted to some old man or old woman for one of the most lucrative articles of her whole creed. In this work Gregory observes that greater discoveries were made in his time concerning the state of departed souls than in all the preceding ages together, because the end of this world was at hand, and the nearer we came to the other the more we discovered it!" His liturgical works are (1) *Liber Sacramentorum*; (2) *Benedictionale*; (3) *Liber Antiphonarum*; (4) *Liber Responsalis*. There have been more than twenty editions of his collected works. The best editions are the Benedictine (Paris, 1705, 4 vols. fol., and also Venice, 1768-76, 17 vols. 4to), and in Migne's *Patrol.* (Paris, 1819, 5 vols. 4to). A recent edition of his *Pastoral* has been published by Westhof (*De pastoralis cura*, Münster, 1860). Fuller accounts of Gregory and his times are given in Lau, *Gregor I, nach seinem Leben und seiner Lehre* (Lips. 1845); Margraff, *De Greg. I. vita, dissert. historica* (Berl. 1845); Pfahler, *Greg. d. Grosse* (Frankf. 1852, 2 vols.). See also Maimbourg, *Hist. de Saint G. le Grand* (Par. 1686); Wiggers, *De Gregorio Magno* (Rostock, 1838 sq., 2 parts); Neander, *Church History*, vol. iii passim; Mosheim, *Church Hist.* cent. vi, part ii, ch. ii, note 29; Hase, *Church History*, § 130; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* v, 497; Clarke, *Succession of Sac. Lit.* ii, 354; Bayle, *Dictionary*, s. v.; Dupin, *Ecclesiastical Writers* (7th century); Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxi, 789; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, i, 429-432; Bower, *Lives of the Popes*, vol. ii; Neander, *Hist. of Dogmas*, p. 385, 413, 418; *Methodist Quarterly Review*, 1845, p. 524.



**II,** Pope, was a Roman by birth, and of a patrician family. He was early set apart for the clerical life, and educated under the eye of Sergius I, in whose time he was librarian to the Roman see. Afterwards he went with Constantine as deacon to Constantinople, and succeeded to the pontificate on Constantine's death, A.D. 715. He was a strenuous supporter of the powers of the papal see, and did much to establish its supremacy. Himself a Benedictine, he restored the monastery at Monte Cassino, under the severest rule of St. Benedict, as an example to other monasteries. In the year 727 began the famous contest between the emperor Leo Isauricus with the *Iconoclasts*, or Image-breakers, on one side, and Gregory II, with the *Iconoduli*, or Image-worshippers, on the other; the pope anathematized the emperor, and condemned the council he had held (to abolish the worship of images), abused his name, vilified his actions, and summoned the French to attack his authority in Italy. He died A.D. 731. His writings are of no great account: fifteen *Letters*, a *Memorial*, and a *Liturgy* are preserved in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, vol. ix. See Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. viii, pt. ii, ch. ii; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i, 620; Gieseler, *Church Hist.* per. iii, div. i, ch. ii, § 4; Dupin, *Eccles. Writers*, cent. viii.

**III,** Pope, a native of Syria, succeeded Gregory II in 731. He was as great a favorer of image-worship as his predecessor, and contended, with all weapons, against the Iconoclasts (q. v.), and against the Byzantine court. He found considerable difficulty in maintaining his ground against the warlike prince Luitprand, and had recourse to the stratagem of fomenting discords among the Lombards themselves. His reign was an epoch in the temporal power of the popes: he was the first to rule the exarchate of Ravenna as sovereign, and he obtained by his legates (the first sent to France) the homage of Charles Martel, who, however, could not aid him with material force. He died Nov. 28, 741. Some of his *Epistles* remain. See Dupin, *Eccles. Writers*, cent. viii.

**IV,** Pope, a native of Rome, made pope A.D. 827. By taking, in 833, the part of the three rebellious sons of Louis le Débonnaire against their father, this prelate embroiled himself much with his clergy, especially those of France, who, favoring the cause of Louis, refused to receive either him or his decrees. Gregory wrote a *Letter* to them, which is among Agobard's *Works*, which shows him to be arbitrary and tyrannical, claiming obedience to him, though against the commands of their prince. There are *three* other *Letters* in Labbe, *Concil.* vol. vii, and Baluze, *Miscell.*, which evince the same spirit of grasping dominion. It was this pope who made the feast of *All Saints* general throughout the Western Church. He died A.D. 844.—*Clarke, Succession of Sacred Lit.* vol. ii; Baronius, *Annales*, t. xiv.

**V (BRUNO).** Pope, was a native of Germany, son of the duke Otho of Carinthia, and nephew of Otho III, king of Germany. The latter caused him to be elected pope May 17, 996, when he was only 24 years of age. Eight days after, Gregory, in return, crowned his uncle Emperor of the West. As soon, however, as Otho had recrossed the Alps, Crescentius, a powerful senator, noted for his opposition to the previous pope (John XV), fomented a revolution, took the title of consul, drove out Gregory, and appointed in his place a Greek of low birth, Philagathos, bishop of Piacenza, who took the name of John XVI. The Council of Pavia (997) excommunicated both Crescentius and the anti-pope. Otho marched against Rome, and John XVI was made prisoner while attempting to escape. The servants of the emperor tore out his tongue, his nose, and his eyes, and Gregory caused him to be paraded through the streets of Rome covered with the insignia of his office torn into tatters, and sitting backward upon an ass. Crescentius, who had taken refuge in the castle of St. An-

gelo, was beheaded, in spite of the articles of capitulation, which guaranteed his life. Otho took his widow for a mistress. Robert, king of France, having married his cousin Bertha without dispensation, Gregory condemned him to do penance for seven years, deposed the archbishop who had officiated at the marriage, and demanded that Bertha should be discarded. Robert, refusing to comply, was excommunicated; and so great was at that time the fear inspired by this ecclesiastical punishment, that only two persons dared remain in the king's service, and even they threw into the fire everything he had made use of, for fear of being contaminated by contact with it (P. Damien, *Opera*, Paris, 1663, fol., *Epist.* v). At the end of three years Robert gave up the contest, and discarded Bertha, to whom he was much attached. Gregory died Feb. 11 (or 18), 999, not without suspicion of poison. Several letters and patents of Gregory are contained in Baluze, *Miscell.* vol. vi; five bulls in Ughelli, *Italia sacra*, ii, 352-354; iii, 618; iv, 98; two in D'Achery, *Spicilegium*, vol. vi; one in De Marca, *Marca hispanica*, p. 952; and four letters in Labbe, *Concil.* ix, 752. See Baronius, *Annales*, xvi, 345 sq.; F. Pagi, ii, 262; J. B. de Glen, p. 143; A. Duchesne, i, 938; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxi, 799; Hoefler, *Die deutschen Päpste*, i, 195.

**VI,** Anti-pope, was elevated, in June, 1012, to the papal see by a party of the Roman nobility in opposition to Benedict VIII. As he was not recognised by the emperor, Henry IV, he seems to have resigned, and to have ended his life in retirement.

**VI,** Pope, a Roman, whose original name was JOHANNES GRATIANUS, and who had great repute for sanctity as a priest, obtained (A.D. 1044) the papal chair by *purchase* from Benedict IX, who abdicated to marry a girl of noble family. Failing in this, he claimed the seat again, and there were three claimants at once—Benedict IX, Gregory VI, and Sylvester III. Rome was filled with brawls and murders, and Gregory himself wielded the sword with effect! In 1046 Henry III came to Rome, deposed all three of the rival popes, and seated Clement II in the apostolic chair. Gregory died in Cologne A.D. 1048. See Baronius, *Annales*, t. xvii; Hoefler, *Die deutschen Päpste*, i, 224.

**VII. (HILDEBRAND),** the greatest man that ever occupied the papal throne. The exact place and year of his birth are not known, yet he is generally supposed to have been born between 1010 and 1020 at Siena in Tuscany, where, it is said, his father was a carpenter. He spent part of his youth at Rome in the service of pope Gregory VI, whom he accompanied in exile after he left Rome by order of the emperor. They went together to the convent of Cluny (France), where Hildebrand's austerity and asceticism soon gave him such ascendancy that he was made prior of the convent, though still quite young. He was not destined to remain long in seclusion. Henry III, after having regained the exclusive right of appointing popes, had made three in rapid succession, the latter of whom, Leo IX (Bruno, bishop of Toul), stopped at Cluny on his way to Italy. Hildebrand's influence over him became so great that, laying aside the insignia of his office, he went to Rome in the garb of a pilgrim, and declared that his appointment could only be considered as valid if confirmed by the clergy and the people of Rome. His election being confirmed (in 1049), he called Hildebrand to Rome, and created him cardinal. Guided by Hildebrand's advice, Leo IX attempted many reforms in the Church. Councils were assembled at Rome, Rheims, and Mayence, at which the pope himself presided, and in which all important questions arising from the state of the Church were discussed. The encroachments of lay authority, the laxity of the convents, the immorality of priests, the practice of selling ecclesiastical charges, and their consequent engrossment by the civil authorities, which resulted in filling the Church with persons devoted to the tempo-

ral powers—such were a few of the evils the Church was suffering under. Hildebrand directed all the measures of reform, under the authority of the pope. Leo IX died April 19, 1054. Hildebrand was then sent to the emperor by the clergy and the people of Rome to obtain his assent to the appointment of a new pope. Hildebrand proposed bishop Gebhard; the emperor proposed other candidates; but Hildebrand finally prevailed, and the new pope was elected in 1055, under the name of Victor II, in the old Roman way, thus rendering the consent of the emperor a mere matter of form. Victor II, urged by Hildebrand, continued the reforms commenced by Leo IX. He assembled councils, and sent Hildebrand to France, where the Church was in great disorder, and still disturbed by the doctrines of Berengar (q. v.). Both the pope and the emperor dying soon after, Stephen IX, an enemy of the new emperor Henry IV, was made pope. Hildebrand was not consulted about the election. This appointment, which resembled a challenge to the emperor, threatened to cause serious difficulties, and to overthrow the plans of Hildebrand, who wished to withdraw from the emperor the power of appointing popes in a more slow but surer manner. Stephen, however, died soon after his election in 1058, recommending, it is said, the clergy and the people to await Hildebrand's return before proceeding to another election. This advice was disregarded, and the powerful counts of Tusculum appointed a bishop of Velletri entirely devoted to their interests as successor of Stephen IX, under the name of Benedict X. This election caused great trouble in Rome, and Hildebrand returned in haste from Germany. Backed by the power of Germany, he caused the bishop of Florence to be elected pope, under the name of Nicholas II, by an assembly held in Tuscany, and submitted the appointment to the approbation of the emperor in order to secure his protection. At the same time, to avoid the recurrence of irregular elections by means of bribery, as had been the case in that of Benedict, he contrived a new method of election, according to which the choice should first be made by the cardinal bishops, and afterwards submitted successively to the other cardinals, the clergy, and the people, all "saving the respect which is due to our beloved son Henry, at present king. . . ." Nicholas II dying in 1061, after a reign of two years, new troubles arose concerning the new mode of election. The cardinals chose Anselm, bishop of Lucca, under the name of Alexander II, but the Roman nobility and part of the population refused to recognise him, and appealed to the emperor, who assembled at Basle a synod of bishops devoted to his cause, which elected Cadalous, bishop of Parma, for pope, under the name of Honorius II. Cadalous, like the other bishops of Lombardy, had been at open war with the see of Rome. Had Rome yielded to his election, all the ground gained by Hildebrand would have been lost. Without any hesitancy, Hildebrand recognised the validity of Alexander II's election, and the latter wisely chose the powerful monk for his chancellor. Cadalous, at the same time, advanced against Rome at the head of a German army, and the two popes, after duly excommunicating each other, fought at the doors of Rome. The Germans were defeated, and Cadalous fled. The young emperor was taken away from his mother's influence and put under the care of the archbishop of Cologne (Anno or Hanno), who caused Alexander's election to be confirmed by the Synod of Goslar. Hildebrand, more powerful now than ever, continued to work with all his might for the reformation of the Church and the suppression of simony. About that time an occurrence took place which throws some light upon Hildebrand's character, viz. his quarrel with one of the most virtuous and most austere men of that period, Peter Damien (q. v.). After being long united by similarity of views and unity of aim, they disagreed on some point not known, and after that time the writings of the eloquent

bishop are full of proofs of his resentment. At the death of Alexander II, Hildebrand himself was chosen pope in 1073. He expelled the nomination with reluctance; contemporary writers say that the day of his election was one of great trial to him. This can readily be believed, for none knew better than he the dangers and difficulties of his new position, where he would be obliged to act openly and to meet at once all emergencies. The history of his reign is the political and religious history of Europe in those times.

Hildebrand did not assume his title until he had received the approbation of the emperor Henry IV, to whom he dispatched messengers for the purpose. The emperor, pleased with this act of deference, readily confirmed his election, and Hildebrand assumed the name of Gregory VII. The great object of Gregory's ambition was, as he expressed himself in a letter to Hugo, abbot of Cluny, to effect a total reform of the Church in the points already named, as having employed his energies under the preceding popes. Gregory determined to remove the root of many of the existing evils by taking away from the secular princes the right which they assumed of disposing of the sees within their dominions. He aimed at nothing less than a concentration of all the ecclesiastical power of the world in the hands of the pope; and his whole reign was a struggle to secure this supreme dominion, which included, in his ideas, the absolute subordination of the temporal powers of the world to the spiritual power—that is, to the pope. The emperor Henry IV, licentious, ambitious, and at war with his revolted vassals, and therefore continually in want of money, was one of the most culpable in respect of simony. He disposed of sees and benefices in favor of vicious or incapable men, and the bishops of Germany readily entered into his views of making the Church a sort of feudal dependant on the imperial will. Gregory began by admonishing Henry; he sent legates to Germany, but to little purpose. His next step was to assemble a council at Rome in 1074, which anathematized persons guilty of simony, and ordered the deposition of those priests who lived in concubinage, under which name, however, were also included those who lived in a state of matrimony, and it was decreed also that no one should be admitted to holy orders unless he made a vow of celibacy. This last regulation created great excitement, especially at Milan, where the custom of priests being married was still prevalent, as in the Eastern Church. "Gregory summoned another council at Rome in 1075, in which, for the first time, kings and other lay princes were forbidden, under pain of excommunication, from giving the investiture of sees and abbeys by conferring the ring and the crossier. This was the beginning of the quarrel about the investiture which distracted Europe for many years after, and which may here require some explanation. In the early ages of the Christian Church, it would appear that the body of the clergy, or presbyters of a town or district, together with the municipal council or notables, elected their bishop or chief pastor, and the Christian emperors did not interfere with the choice except in the case of the great patriarchal sees, such as Rome and Constantinople, the candidate to which, after being elected by the clergy and people, was required to wait for the imperial confirmation. The Gothic kings of Italy followed the same system, as well as the exarchs of Ravenna after them, in the name of the Byzantine emperors. At Rome, and probably in the rest of Italy also, the laity participated in the election of their bishops till the 10th century; in the East they appear to have been excluded from it sooner. Charlemagne is said by some to have introduced the custom of putting the ring and crossier into the hands of new-elected bishops, while he required from them the oath of fealty to himself. There seems no doubt at least that the custom was prevalent under his successors of the Carolingian dynasty. The rea-

son of this was, that the churches having been richly endowed by various sovereigns with lands and other temporalities, the incumbents were considered in the light of feudal tenants. By thus keeping at their own disposal the temporalities of the sees, the sovereigns came gradually to appoint the bishops, either by direct nomination, or by recommending a candidate to the electors. Gregory, making no distinction between spiritualities and temporalities, considered the investiture as a spiritual act, insisting that the crossier was emblematic of the spiritual authority of bishops over their flocks, and the ring was the symbol of their mystical marriage with the Church; although Sarpi observes, in his *Treatise upon Benefices*, there was another ceremony, namely, the consecration of the bishop elect by imposition of hands by the metropolitan, which was the real spiritual investiture. But Gregory's object was to take away from laymen all ecclesiastical patronage, and to make the Church, with all its temporalities, independent of the state. He would not admit of any symbols of allegiance to the state; and he contended that the estates of sees had become inseparably connected with the spiritual office, and could no longer be distinguished; and yet he himself had waited for the confirmation of the emperor before he was consecrated. See INVESTITURE. The emperor Henry IV paid no regard to Gregory's councils and their decrees, and he continued to nominate not only to German, but also Italian bishoprics. Among others, he appointed a certain Tedaldo archbishop of Milan, in opposition to Azzo, a mere youth, who had been consecrated by Gregory's legate. But the quarrel of the investiture, which had opened the breach between the pope and the emperor, was lost sight of in the more extraordinary discussions which followed between them. Gregory had been for some time tampering with Henry's disaffected vassals of Saxony, Thuringia, and other countries, and he now publicly summoned the emperor to Rome to vindicate himself from the charges preferred by his subjects against him. This was a further and most unwarrantable stretch of that temporal supremacy over kings and principalities which the see of Rome had already begun to assume. Henry, indignant at this assumption of power, assembled a diet of the empire at Worms, at which many bishops and abbots were present, and which, upon various charges preferred against Gregory, deposed him, and dispatched a messenger to Rome to signify this decision to the Roman clergy, requesting them to send a mission to the emperor for a new pope. Upon this, Gregory, in a council assembled at the Lateran Palace in 1076, solemnly excommunicated Henry, and in the name of St. Peter, prince of the apostles, declared him *ipso facto* deposed from the thrones of Germany and Italy, and his subjects released from their oath of allegiance. Gregory, observes Platina, in his *Lives of the Popes*, was the first who assumed the right of deposing the emperors, whose vassals he and his predecessors had been considered till then, and who had even exercised the power of deposing several popes for illegal election or abuse of their authority. This bold act of Gregory produced for a time the effect which he had calculated upon. Most of Henry's subjects, already ripe for rebellion, readily availed themselves of the papal sanction, and a diet was assembled to elect a new emperor. Henry, however, obtained a delay, and, the matter being referred to the pope, he set off for Italy in the winter of 1077, and, passing the Alps of Susa, met Gregory at the castle of Canossa, near Reggio, in Lombardy, which belonged to the countess Mathilda, a great friend and supporter of the pope. Gregory would not see Henry at first, but insisted upon his laying aside all the insignia of royalty, and appearing in the garb of a penitent in a coarse woollen garment and barefooted. In this plight Henry remained for three days, from morning till sunset, in an outer court of the castle, in very severe weather. On the fourth day he was admitted into

Gregory's presence, and, on confessing his errors, received absolution, but was not restored to his kingdom, the pope referring him to the general diet. Henry soon after resumed the insignia of royalty, and, being supported by his Lombard vassals, and indignant at the humiliating scene of Canossa, recrossed the Alps, fought several battles in Germany, and at last defeated and mortally wounded Rudolf of Suabia, who had been elected emperor in his stead, and was supported by Gregory. Having now retrieved his affairs in Germany, he marched with an army into Italy in 1081 to avenge himself on the pope, whom he again deposed in another diet, having appointed Guibert, archbishop of Ravenna, as his successor, under the name of Clement III. Gregory had meantime drawn to his party by timely concessions Robert Guiscard, the Norman conqueror of Apulia and Sicily, who, however, could not prevent Henry from advancing to the walls of Rome; but the city was well defended, and the summer heats obliged Henry to retrace his steps towards North Italy, where his soldiers ravaged the territories of the countess Mathilda. He repeated the attempt against Rome in 1083, but without success. It was finally agreed that a general council should decide the questions between the emperor and the pope. The council assembled at Rome in 1083, and Gregory did not again excommunicate the emperor, but negotiated with him without coming to any definitive result. In fact, Gregory's personal successes were at an end, though the principles of papal supremacy for which he contended took root and grew up in after times. In 1084 Henry was invited by some ambassadors from the Roman people, who were dissatisfied with the pope, to enter the city, which he did on the 21st of March, and immediately took possession of the Lateran, the bridges, and other important positions. Gregory escaped into the castle of St. Angelo, and the anti-pope Guibert was publicly consecrated on Palm Sunday by several bishops. On the following Easter Sunday Henry IV was crowned by him as emperor in St. Peter's church. After the ceremony Henry ascended the capitol and was publicly proclaimed, and acknowledged by the Romans with acclamations. Hearing, however, that Robert Guiscard was approaching Rome with troops, he left the city and withdrew towards Tuscany. Robert came soon after with his Norman and Saracen soldiers, who, under the pretence of delivering Gregory, who was still shut up in the castle of St. Angelo, plundered Rome, and committed all kinds of atrocities. Gregory, having come out of his stronghold, assembled another council, in which, for the fourth time, he excommunicated Henry and the anti-pope Guibert. When Robert left the city to return to his own dominions, the pope, not thinking himself safe in Rome, withdrew with him to Salerno, where, after consecrating a magnificent church built by Robert, he died, May 25, 1085. His last words were, 'I have loved justice and hated iniquity, and therefore I die in exile.' He probably believed what he said. Gregory's character was in many respects a grand and noble one. But impartial history decides that the good he accomplished was far more than counterbalanced by his fanatical enforcement of celibacy (q. v.), which has continued to this day to demoralize the Romanist clergy, and by his semi-blasphemous assertions of almost divine power for the papacy. His earlier efforts for ecclesiastical reform were, no doubt, sincere and earnest; but at a later period he was led astray by the ambition of exalting his see over all the dignities and powers of the earth, spiritual as well as temporal. Not content with making, as far as in him lay, the Church independent of the empire, and at the same time establishing the control of the papal authority over the princes of the earth, objects which he left to be completed by his successor [see INNOCENT III.], Gregory determined to destroy the independence of the various national churches. His object was to raise the pope to supreme pow-

er over Church and State throughout Christendom. By a constitution of his predecessor Alexander II, which he dictated, and which he afterwards confirmed, it was enacted for the first time that no bishop elect should exercise his functions until he had received his confirmation from the pope. The Roman see had already, in the 9th century, subverted the authority of the metropolitans, under pretence of affording protection to the bishops; but now it assumed the right of citing the bishops, without distinction, before its tribunal at Rome to receive its dictates, and Gregory obliged the metropolitan to attend in person to receive the pallium. The quarrel of Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, with William Rufus, was owing to that monarch not choosing to let him go to Rome, whither he had been summoned. The practice of sending apostolic legates to different kingdoms as special commissioners of the pope, with discretionary power over the national hierarchy, originated also with Gregory, and completed the establishment of absolute monarchy in the Church in lieu of its original popular or representative form. This doctrine of papal absolutism in matters of discipline was by prescription and usage so intermixed with the more essential doctrines of faith, that it came to be considered as a dogma itself, and has defied all the skill of subsequent theologians and statesmen to disentangle it from the rest, while at the same time it has probably been, though at a fearful cost, the means of preserving the unity of the Western or Roman Church" (*English Cyclopædia*). The measures accomplished and attempted by Gregory were (1) the abolition of the influence of the Roman nobility in the election of the pope; (2) the removal of all authority in the election of the popes from the emperors of Germany; (3) the establishment of the celibacy of the clergy; (4) the freedom of the Church in the matter of investitures. Great attention has been given to the history of Gregory VII, both by ecclesiastical and political writers, especially within the present century. See Dupin, *Eccles. Writers* (11th century); Mosheim, *Ch. History*, ch. xi, pt. ii, ch. ii; Neander, *Ch. History*, vol. iv; Ranke, *History of the Papacy*, i, 29 sq.; Hase, *Ch. History*, § 181; Sir James Stephen, *Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography*, i, 1; also in *Edinburgh Review*, lxxxi, 143; Guizot, *Hist. of Modern Civilization*; Bowden, *Life and Pontificate of Gregory VII* (Lond. 1840, 2 vols. 8vo); Voigt, *Hildebrand als Pabst Gregor VII* (Weimar, 1813, 8vo; 2d ed. 1846, 8vo); Spittler, *Gregor VII* (Hamb. 1827, 4to); Gresley, *Life and Pontificate of Gregory VII* (Lond. 1829, 12mo); Madelaine, *Pontificat de Grégoire VII* (Paris, 1837, 2 vols. 8vo); Cassander, *Zeitalter Hildebrand's* (Darmstadt, 1842, 8vo); Soeltl, *Gregor VII* (Leipzig, 1847, 8vo); Milman, *Latin Christianity*, iii, 140 sq.; Helfenstein, *Gregor's VII Bestrebungen* (Frankf., 1856, 8vo); Gröner, *Papst Gregor VII u. sein Zeitalter* (ultramontane view; Schaffhausen, 1859-1861, 7 vols. 8vo); *English Cyclopædia*; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* v, 334 sq.; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxi, 801.

**VIII** (ALBERO DE MORA), Pope, was a native of Benevento. He succeeded Urban III, Oct. 21, 1187, and died at Pisa Dec. 16, 1187. His short reign was unimportant. He has generally been considered as a learned, eloquent, and virtuous man. He attempted a crusade to the Holy Land, and the cardinals themselves promised to join him, and to contribute their riches towards the undertaking, but these promises were only given to be evaded. Gregory's last act was to attempt a reconciliation between the inhabitants of Pisa and those of Genoa.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxi, 814.

**IX** (UGOLINO, COUNT OF Segni), Pope, was a native of Anagni, and a relative of Innocent III. He succeeded Honorius III, March 19, 1227. He followed carefully in the footsteps of Gregory VII and of Innocent III, upholding the see of Rome as the master of all empires and superior to all kings. His consecration took place

with unusual magnificence: he celebrated mass at St. John Lateran in vestments covered with gold and precious stones; then, mounting a richly-harnessed horse, and surrounded by cardinals clothed in purple and gold, he made a triumphant procession through the streets of Rome, which were decked with carpets and flowers for the occasion. The emperor Frederick II had a powerful party devoted to him in Rome; it became desirable to remove him from too close proximity with that city, and in order to achieve this, Gregory reminded him of his vow of visiting the Holy Land, and commanded him to go at once. At the moment of embarking Frederick fell sick at Otranto, but Gregory, who believed his illness to be feigned, excommunicated him, and notified all the churches of it. Frederick, on the other hand, wrote to all the princes complaining of the pope's proceedings. Gregory, in return, excommunicated him again, and threatened to take the empire from him. Frederick, disregarding this absurd threat, excited the Romans to revolt against Gregory, who, insulted even when saying mass, was obliged to retire first to Rieta, then to Spoleto, and finally to Perugia. Frederick, leaving Raynald at Rome to treat with the pope, embarked now for Palestine against the orders of Gregory. Raynald, in the mean time, having organized an army, invaded the papal states. Gregory put his forces under the orders of Roger of Aquila, and war began in earnest in 1228. Such, it is said, is the origin of the two factions, afterwards so celebrated, of the *Guelphs* and *Ghibellines*, the former acting for the pope, the latter for the emperor. Frederick, forestalled in Palestine by the emissaries of Gregory, badly seconded by the Christians of Syria, and, besides, being desirous of returning to Italy, where Raynald had been defeated by the papal troops, concluded a ten years' truce with the sultan of Egypt, and, though excommunicated, caused himself to be crowned king of Jerusalem, after which he returned to Europe. The pope, on hearing of his arrival, excommunicated him anew, and released his subjects from their allegiance. Frederick offered to submit, and asked for absolution; peace was in consequence concluded Aug. 28, 1230. The Romans again drove away the pope (July 20, 1232). He succeeded in going back to Rome in 1235. War soon broke out again. Frederick, having taken Sardinia, gave it to his natural son, Henry; the pope claimed it for himself. Neither had any right to it, and neither would give it up to the other. Frederick was excommunicated a fourth time in 1239. Frederick marched against Rome, but Gregory died before he reached it, Aug. 20, 1241. The principal traits of Gregory's character were pride and haughtiness; he aimed at extending the privileges of the Church at any cost. In this he received no help except from the king of England, who gave tithes to the see of Rome in exchange for the deposition of a bishop. St. Louis, even when threatened with excommunication, refused to free the clergy from their responsibility to civil jurisdiction. Gregory was well acquainted with civil and canon law, and in 1234 published a collection of decretals which were often reprinted: *Nova Compilatio Decretalium, cum glossa* (1st ed. Mentz, 1473, fol.). There are also 31 letters and 191 fragments of his writings in Labbe, *Concil.* xi, 310; 56 letters in Ughelli, *Italia Sacra*; 9 in Vossius; 1 bull in Duchesne, *Historiæ*, v, 861; and 1 in Mabillon, p. 421, No. 106.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxi, 814 sq.

**X**, Pope, previously known as TERBALDO DE' VISCONTI, was born at Piacenza, of the illustrious family of Visconti. He was chosen pope while absent with the prince of Wales in the Holy Land. The see had been vacant nearly three years after the death of Clement IV. Gregory greatly encouraged the Crusades. In 1271 he summoned the Council of Lyons, which convened in 1274. See LYONS. He died at Arezzo, Jan. 19, 1276. This pope instituted the regulations of the conclave nearly as they exist at the present time.

There are twenty-five epistles of Gregory in Labbe, *Council*, vol. xi. Gerard Vossius published his *Vita et Epistolæ* (Grk. and Lat. Rome, 1587). See Bower, *Hist. of Popes*, vol. viii; Bonacci, *Pontif. Gregorio X* (Rome, 1711, 4to).

**XI** (PIERRE ROGER), Pope, born in 1329 at Maumont, in France, was nephew to Clement VI, who made him cardinal at eighteen years of age, and gave him many rich benefices. He was elected pope December 30, 1370, and removed the papal court from Avignon to Rome in 1377. Wicliffe visited this pope at Avignon, and went back to England disgusted with the vices of the priesthood. Gregory opposed all "heresies" violently; he condemned Raymond Lull (q. v.) and his doctrines by a bull dated January 25, 1376, caused the burning of Jeanne Daubenton, and condemned the writings of Wicliffe. His pontificate was marked by gross nepotism. He died suddenly, March 28, 1378.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxi, 817.

**XII** (ANGELO CORRARO), Pope, a Venetian, was elected pope Nov. 30, 1406, by the Roman cardinals, during the Western strife, while his rival Benedict XIII occupied the chair at Avignon. After long quarrels, both popes were deposed by the Council of Pisa, 1409, but Gregory did not yield until the assembling of the Council of Constance, when he formally resigned (1415). He was made dean of the cardinals, and died Oct. 18, 1417, aged 92.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxi, 821.

**XIII** (UGO BUONCOMPAGNO), Pope, born in 1502 at Bologna, succeeded Pius V May 13, 1572. He was one of the most learned priests of his time, especially in civil and canonical law. He was a man of mild temper and jovial habits, yet his pontificate is stained by his relations to the bloody massacre of St. Bartholomew (which he openly approved by a solemn *Te Deum*, and by striking medals in honor of it), and by his participation in a treasonable plot against queen Elizabeth. His reign was agitated and unquiet throughout, and amid the confusions caused by his attempts to confiscate many of the estates of the Italian nobles, he died, April 10, 1585. His reform of the calendar, however, will carry his name down to the latest posterity.—Mosheim, *Church Hist.* cent. xvi, sec. iii, pt. i, ch. i, n. 28; Ranke, *History of Papacy*, i, 307 sq. See CALENDAR.

**XIV** (NICOLÒ SFONDRATI), Pope, was elected by the influence of the Jesuit party, Dec. 5, 1590. His short reign was taken up chiefly in efforts to sustain the league in France against Henry IV. He died Oct. 15, 1591.—Ranke, *Hist. of Papacy*, i, 536.

**XV** (ALESSANDRO LUDOVISI), Pope, was born at Bologna, 1553, made pope Feb. 9, 1621, and died July 18, 1623. With the aid of his nephew, cardinal Ludovico, he signalized his brief reign by several measures of great importance to the Roman Church. He urged on emperor Ferdinand to exterminate Protestantism from the empire; he established the *College of the Propaganda* [see PROPAGANDA]; and he greatly increased the missionary enterprises of Rome in South America, Abyssinia, China, and India. The dominion of the Church was more widely extended in his reign than at any former period of her history.—Ranke, *Hist. of Papacy*, ii, 64 sq.

**XVI** (BARTOLOMEO ALBERTO CAPELLARI), Pope, was born at Belluno, Sept. 18, 1765. He became a Camaldolite Benedictine under the name of *Mauro*, and at twenty-five years was made professor of theology. In 1799 he published the *Triumph of the Holy See and of the Church* (Rome, 4to), a treatise vindicating the absolute power of the popes. In 1801 he became abbot of his monastery, and in 1803 general of his order. He was made cardinal and prefect of the propaganda in 1826. On the death of Leo XII he was elected pope, Feb. 2, 1831. His reign fell in a stormy time. Immediately after his accession revolts occurred in several

of the papal provinces. Bologna took the lead; the commotion spread swiftly from Bologna throughout Romagna, and soon reached all parts of the pope's dominions except the metropolitan city. The intention of the insurgents was to put an end forever to the temporal sovereignty of the pope, and to unite the states of Italy. But the movement was not well contrived; it was simply a spontaneous burst of enthusiasm, excited by the French Revolution of 1830. Yet so utterly powerless and detested was the pontifical government, that, left to itself, it could not have survived the shock of even this unorganized insurrection. Austria poured troops into the disaffected provinces, and quickly silenced the tumult. It was evident, however, that agitations like these could only be prevented by timely concessions, and the powers of Europe united to recommend this course to the pope, in order that a "new era" (as cardinal Bernetti, the papal secretary, said) might commence with the pope of Gregory XVI. The *new era* was slow in arriving. The papal government, as usual, forgot its promises as soon as the danger was past. Indignant remonstrances, and partial attempts at revolt, rapidly followed by confiscations, imprisonments, and exiles, rapidly led the way to a complete relapse into the old system of misgovernment and steady suppression of free thought. The Papal States were now the only part of civilized Europe in which municipal institutions were unknown, and where the laity were wholly excluded from the conduct of public affairs. For many years the people were busy in plotting revolutions, and the government in practicing *espionage* on the largest scale, suddenly searching suspected houses, punishing the suspected without trial, and every way embittering the spirit of hostility. Plans were formed by the exiled patriots to unite all Italy in a confederation for freedom, but these plans were discovered and destroyed by the Austrian police before they were ripe for execution. All Europe looked on with pity, but no state offered to interfere, lest commotions in Italy should lead to disturbances elsewhere. The banished Italians themselves, in a manifesto which they published in 1845, declared that the enormities of Gregory's government had risen to such a height "that each one of them more than sufficed to give the right of loudly protesting against his breach of faith, his trampling upon justice, his torturing human nature, and all the excesses of his tyranny." In fact, the whole pontificate of Gregory was one long oppression of his subjects. At its termination there were between two and three thousand political prisoners in the papal dungeons!

Gregory was not less active in strengthening the power of Rome abroad than in crushing out liberty and happiness at home. He erected, in various countries, twenty-seven new bishoprics and thirty-two apostolic vicariates. In 1836 he gave the *College De Propaganda* into the care of the Jesuits, and he trusted and favored that order in every way. He opposed the Bible Societies and the general diffusion of the Bible, uttering violent encyclicals on these points. A better feature was his opposition to the slave-trade and to slavery. He put down the Hermesians (q. v.) in Germany with the strong hand, and greatly enlarged the bulk of the Index Expurgatorius. The Jesuit missions were greatly fostered by Gregory, and societies to raise funds, such as the *Feurre de la Foi* (Society for the Propagation of Faith) in France, grew rapidly in extent and productiveness. Romanism increased under his pontificate in every country in Europe, partly in consequence of a natural reaction against previous depression, but largely, also, through the energetic activity of the pope. He died of cancer, June 1, 1846. Gregory wrote several *Encyclical Epistles*, which are of value as showing the unchanged character of the papacy; among them are translated *A Letter to the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland* (Lond. 1836, p. 71, 8vo):—*Encyclical to all Patriarchs, Pri-*

*mates*, etc. (London, 1845, p. 40, 8vo). See Farini, *Lo Stato Romano dell'anno 1815* (Turin, 1841, 3 vols.); La Farina, *Storia d'Italia*; *Revue des deux Mondes*, June, 1847; Moroni, *Dizionario di erudizione ecclesiast.* vol. xxxii.

**Gregory, George, D. D.**, an English divine, son of the prebendary of Ferns, in Ireland, was born in 1754, and was educated at the University of Edinburgh. In 1778 he took orders, and became a curate at Liverpool; in 1782 he removed to London, where he obtained the curacy of St. Giles, Cripplegate, and was chosen evening preacher of the Foundling Hospital. Lord Sidmouth in 1804 procured for him the living of Westham, in Essex, which Dr. Gregory held till his death in 1808. Among his works are *Essays, historical and moral:—History of the Christian Church* (Lond. 1790, 2 vols. 12mo);—*Sermons, with a Treatise on the Composition of a Sermon* (Lond. 1787, 8vo);—a translation of *Louth's Lectures on Hebrew Poetry* (Lond. 1787, 2 vols. 8vo).—Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* i, 1323.

**Gregory, John**, a learned English divine, was born at Amersham, in Buckinghamshire, in 1607. In 1624 he was sent in, the capacity of servitor to Christ Church, Oxford, where he was placed under the tuition of Dr. George Morley, afterwards bishop of Winchester. Having been admitted into orders, he was appointed one of the chaplains of his college by the dean, Dr. Brian Duppa. In 1634 he published a second edition of Sir Thomas Ridley's *View of the Civil and Ecclesiastical Law, with Notes* (4to), by which he acquired much reputation on account of the civil, historical, ecclesiastical, and ritual learning, and the skill in ancient and modern languages, Oriental as well as European, displayed in it. In 1641 he obtained the prebend of Salisbury, but was deprived of it at the Rebellion. In 1646 he published *Notes and Observations on some Passages of Scripture* (4to), which were reprinted at different periods, and afterwards translated into Latin and inserted in the *Critici Sacri*. He died in 1646. An account of his life will be found in his *Works* (4th edit. Lond. 1684, 4to). Anthony Wood calls him the miracle of his age for critical and curious learning.—Fuller, *Worthies of England*; Hook, *Ecol. Biog.* vol. v; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* i, 1322.

**Gregory, Olinthus Gilbert, LL.D.**, was born at Xaxley, in Huntingdonshire, Jan. 29, 1774. He was educated under Mr. Weston, a celebrated mathematician, and published, at 19, a text-book called *Lessons Astronomical and Philosophical*. Through the interest of Dr. Hutton, he was appointed in 1802 mathematical master at the Royal Military Academy, Woolwich, where he obtained the professor's chair. He published a large number of mathematical treatises, of which it is not our place to give an account. But Dr. Gregory possessed qualities of a still nobler and better kind than those of a scientific philosopher. He was a decided Christian—a man who had not only studied the literature of the sacred volume, but made it the rule of his life, as well as the source of his inward peace and hope. On what firm and enlightened grounds his own faith was established in the truth and fundamental principles of the Gospel, appears from his *Letters to a Friend on the Evidences, Doctrines, and Duties of the Christian Religion* (Lond. 1812, 2 vols. 8vo); a treatise which has long maintained a high reputation. He also wrote *Memoirs of John Mason Good, M. D.* (Lond. 1828, 8vo);—*Memoirs of the Rev. Robert Hall* (prefixed to the editions of Hall's collected Works); and a number of articles in the *Eclectic Review* and other journals. He died Feb. 2, 1841.—Jamieson, *Relig. Biog.* 233; *English Cyclopædia*.

**Grellet, STEPHEN** (*Étienne de Grellet du Mabilier*), the fifth child of Gabriel Marc Antoine de Grellet, was born at Limoges, in France, Nov. 2, 1773. His parents were wealthy, and ranked high among the nobility. His father was comptroller of the mint, the friend and counsellor of Louis XVI, and was proprie-

tor of iron-works and of extensive porcelain manufactories. Etienne was trained in the Roman Catholic faith, but at the early age of six years, by a remarkable visitation of the Holy Spirit, was brought to experience the efficacy of private prayer. At the age of seventeen he was chosen one of the king's body-guard. During the horrors of the Revolution the family estates were confiscated. Etienne and his brothers became prisoners of war, and were sentenced to be shot, but escaped to America. In the year 1795, at Newtown, L. I., whilst walking in the evening twilight, he heard a voice pronouncing thrice the word ETERNITY, and he was overwhelmed with powerful convictions of sin. He was not at that time a Christian believer, and had never seen a Bible. Waiting patiently upon the Lord, the divine Spirit opened to his mind the scheme of salvation by Christ, and the truth as it is in him, and, uniting himself to the religious Society of Friends, he became one of the most illustrious ministers and missionaries of that Church. In 1798, during the prevalence of yellow fever in Philadelphia, he devoted himself to ministrations to the sick, the dying, and the afflicted, and, taking the disease, his name was one day reported in the death-list. His wife was Rebecca, daughter of Isaac Collins, a lady of extraordinary loveliness and virtues. He engaged in mercantile business, in which he was remarkably blessed, always winding up his temporal concerns when required to go forth to proclaim the gospel of salvation, and carefully defraying his own expenses in his long and arduous journeys, being very jealous that the ministry should not be blamed, and feeling conscientiously bound to bestow without charge what he had freely received. He visited Europe four times. Alexander, the czar of Russia, received him to his friendship and to his warm embrace, and at his suggestion adopted various governmental measures, and introduced into the schools of the empire comprehensive Biblical selections prepared by Grellet and his friend, W. Allen. He penetrated the secret archives of the Inquisition at Rome, and in an audience granted him by the pope, he preached boldly to him as a fellow-sinner, and exposed various outrages which he had witnessed. These the pope condemned, and at parting gave him his benediction. His missionary labors embraced also Great Britain, North America, Hayti, etc., and were attended with memorable experiences and success. For a full account thereof, see an interesting biography written by Benjamin Seebohm, one of his converts. See also the memorial issued by the Society of Friends, and *The Fight, Faith, and Crown*, by Dr. Van Rensselaer, of the Presbyterian Church; also a memoir published in London, called *Etienne de Grellet, the French Evangelist*. During his last illness, which was one of great suffering, he glorified God in a wonderful manner, and his seasons of exercising agony only drew from him expressions of thanksgiving and praise. He died at Burlington, N. J., Nov. 16, 1855.—See *London Quarterly Review*, April, 1862, art. vi. (W. J. A.)

**Greslon, ADRIAN**, a French Jesuit missionary, was born at Perigueux in 1618. He joined the Jesuits at Bordeaux in Nov. 1635, and was for a while professor of literature and theology in several schools of his order. In 1655 he was sent as missionary to China, and landed at Hian in 1657. China being at that time in revolution, Greslon remained for a while at Hian, learning Chinese in the mean time. After the revolution had ended in favor of Chun-Tchi, Greslon went to the province of Kian-si, near Peking, of which he has given a very flattering description. In 1670 he returned to France, where he resumed his former employments, and died in 1697. He wrote *Les Vies des saints Patriarches de l'Ancien Testament* (with notes in Chinese);—*Histoire de la Chine sous la domination des Tartares*, etc. (Paris, 1661, 8vo). See *Lettres édifiantes*; Moréri, *Grand Dict. hist.*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxi, 955.

**Gretser, Jakob**, a distinguished German Jesuit, theologian, and historian, was born at Markdorf (Sua-bia) in 1561. He joined the Jesuits at seventeen, and became successively professor of philosophy at Ingolstadt in 1589, of moral theology in 1592, and of scholastic theology in 1599. He continued in this office until his death, Jan. 29, 1625. He was distinguished for literary activity, and wrote over one hundred and fifty works, mostly against the Protestants. He possessed much learning, yet was only an indifferent critic; and his style, which is flowing, is bitter and full of invectives against his adversaries. His principal works are, *Disputatio philosophica de Topica et locis* (Ingolstadt, 1589, 4to).—*Integra Refutatio Historiæ Ordinis Jesuiticæ ab Elia Hasenmillero conscriptæ* (Ingol. 1594, 4to).—*De Sancta Cruce* (Ingol. 1598, 4to; last ed. 1616, fol.).—*Locorum quorundam Tertulianicorum a perversis Fr. Junii Calviniste depravationibus Vindicatio* (Ingol. 1600, 4to).—*De Jure et More prohibendi, expurgandi et abolendi libros hæreticos et noxiis* (Ingol. 1603, 4to).—*Exercitationum theologiarum Libri sex* (1604, 4to).—*De Spontanea disciplinarum seu flagellorum Cruce* (1606, 4to; German by Vetter, 1612).—*De Ecclesiæ catholicæ sacris Processionibus* (1606, 4to).—*Defensionis Bellarminianæ* (1st vol. 1607, fol.; 2d vol. 1609, fol.).—*De funere christiano* (1611, 4to). The catalogue of all his writings was published by himself in 1610 and 1612. A complete collection of his works was published at Ratisbon, 1734-1741, 17 vols. fol. See Bayle, *Dictionary*; Baillet, *Jugemens des Savants*, vol. vi; Nicéron, *Mémoires*, vol. xxvii; Alegambe, *Bibl. Script. Soc. Jesu*; *Vita Gretseri* (at the beginning of his *Opera omnia*); Sotwel, *Bibl. Soc. Jesu*; August. et Alois de Backer, *Bibl. des Ecrivains de la Compagnie de Jésus*; Dupin, *Nouvelle Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccles.* xvii, 63; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxi, 955.

**Greve or Greeve, Egbert Jan**, a Dutch theologian and Hebrew scholar, was born at Deventer Sept. 4, 1754. He studied theology at Leyden, but refused in 1783 to sign the formula of union except as a human contrivance. He was elected representative in 1796, and became professor of Oriental languages and Hebrew antiquities at the University of Franeker in 1800. He wrote *Ultima Capita Jobi* (38-42) *ad græcam versionem recensita* (part i, Deventer, 1788; ii, Burg-Steinfort, 1791, 4to).—A Dutch translation of most of the Epistles of St. Paul (1790, 8vo).—*Vaticinium Nahumi et Habacuci* (Amsterdam, 1798, 8vo).—*Vaticinium Jesajæ hebraica ad numeros recensuit, versionem et notas adjecit E. J. Greve; accedit interpretatio belgica* (Amst. 1800, 2 vols. 8vo); etc. His posthumous works (in Dutch) have been published by Rhynvis Feith (Amst. 1813, 8vo). See Saxius, *Onomasticon litterarium*, part viii, p. 450; A. A. Lotze, *Laudatio E. J. Grevi* (Leyden, 1815, 8vo); Hoefler, *Nouv. Biograph. Générale*, xxi, 960.

**Greve, Jan**, a Dutch Remonstrant divine, was born in the duchy of Cleves about 1580. He was established first at Arnheim, then at Campen, and finally at Heusden. In 1619 he was expelled from the country for refusing to sign the confession of Dort. Returning again, he preached privately for a while, but was discovered, arrested, and condemned to remain for life in the prison of Amsterdam in 1619. His friends, however, liberated him in 1621, after he had remained 18 months in prison. This time he had improved by writing his most important work: *Tribunal reformatum, in quo sanctoris et tutoris justitia vni judicii christiano in processu criminali demonstratur, rejectæ et fugatæ tortura, cujus iniquitatem duplicem, fallaciam atque illicitum inter christianos usum, libera et necessaria dissertatione aperuit* (Hamb. 1624-35, 4to). He also published some letters in the *Limburgii Epistol. Remonstr. eccles.*, among which there is one addressed to Vorstius, in which he gives an account of his liberation.—See Bayle, *Dictionary*, s. v.; Moller, *Cimbria litterata*; Jö-

cher, *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexik.*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxi, 960.

**Grey.** See GRAY.

**Grey, Richard, D.D.**, an English divine, was born at Newcastle, 1694, and was educated at Lincoln College, Oxford. In 1721 he became rector of Hinton; afterwards rector of Kincote and prebendary of St. Paul's. He died in 1771. He published *A System of English Ecclesiastical Law* (London, 1743, 8vo), for which the University of Oxford gave him the degree of D.D.—*Memoria Technica, a new Method of Artificial Memory* (London, 1730, and often reprinted; last ed. London, 1851, 12mo).—*New Method of learning Hebrew without the Points* (London, 1738, 8vo).—*Liber Jobi, in Versiculos dicitus* (1742, 8vo). This work was criticised by Warburton, to whom Grey replied in *An Answer to Mr. Warburton* (London, 1744, 8vo).—Darling, *Cyclop. Bibl.* i, 1383; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s. v.

**Grey, Zachary, LL.D.**, an English divine and laborious writer, was born of a Yorkshire family in 1687, and educated at Jesus College, Cambridge. He afterwards removed to Trinity Hall, where he took the degree of LL.D. in 1720. He was rector of Houghton Conquest, Bedfordshire, and vicar of St. Giles's and St. Peter's in Cambridge, and died in 1766. He was author of nearly thirty publications, many of which are violent diatribes against Dissenters. The best known of his publications is his edition of *Hudibras, with Annotations and a Preface* (1744, 2 vols. 8vo); to this he published a supplement in 1752 (8vo). He also wrote *An impartial Examination of Neal's History of the Puritans* (London, 1736-44, 3 vols. 8vo). This is a really valuable work in spite of its bitterness.—*A Defense of our Ancient and Modern Historians* (London, 2 vols. 1725-30).—*The Ministry of the Dissenters proved to be Null and Void* (London, 1725, 8vo).—Hook, *Ecl. Biog.* v, 412.

**Greyhound** is the rendering given by our translators of זָרְזִיר (or rather זָרְזִירִי, זָרְזִירִי, *zarzir' moth-na'yim*, girded as to the loins, as the marg. renders; Sept. ἀλέκτωρ ἐμπροσπαθῶν Σηλαίας ἐψύχως, a cock strutting about proudly among his hens; Vulg. *galus succinctus lumbos*), given in Prov. xxx, 31, as an instance of gracefulness in gait. Gesenius (*Heb. Thes.* p. 435) inclines to the opinion of Bochart (*Hieroz.* i, 103), Schultens (*Comment.* ad loc.), and others, that it denotes a war-horse, as ornamented with girths and buckles about the loins. This is a more noble comparison than the cock (with the Sept., Vulg., Aquila, Theodotion, the Targums, the Syr. and Arab. versions, Joseph Kimchi, and others), the greyhound (with the Venetian-Greek, the other Kimchis, Gershon, Luther, and others), or other more fanciful conjectures, e. g. the eagle, the zebra, etc., which may be seen in Fuller (*Miscell. Sacr.* v, 12), Simonis (*Exercitatio critica de זָרְזִירִי*, Hal. 1735), and others. Maurer, however (*Comment.* ad loc.), thinks a *wrestler* is intended as girded for a contest, and he refers to Buxtorf (*Lex. Talm.* col. 692) as confirming the signification of athlete thus assigned to *zarzir*. The hound was evidently known in ancient times, as appears from the Egyptian monuments. See Dog.

**Grief** (represented by numerous Heb. words, Gr. λύπη). The Oriental exhibits affliction over public or private misfortune, especially the death of a beloved relative or friend, by much more demonstrative signs than the European, although the degree of connection between the deceased and the mourner, and the greater or more moderate vehemence of character of the bereaved individual, naturally cause a certain modification of his grief, which is too apt to be lost sight of by archaeologists. The customs of the ancient Hebrews were in this respect little different from those of modern Orientals, and therefore derive ready elucidation from the accounts of modern travellers. In the most

vicious outburst of sorrow, in the instantaneous overflow of lamentation, they wrung their hands above the head (2 Sam. xiii, 19), or beat the breast with them (Nah. ii, 8; Luke xviii, 13; comp. Joseph. *Ant.* xvi, 7, 5;  $\text{קָרַע}$ ,  $\text{κόττεσθαι}$ ; see Homer, *Il.* ii, 700; Herodotus, ii, 85; Lucian, *Luct.* 12; Appian, *Pun.* 43; Virgil, *Æn.* iv, 673; xii, 871; Martial, ii, 11, 5; Petron. 111), or smote them upon the thigh (Jer. xxxi, 19; comp. Polyb. xv, 27, 11; Hom. *Odys.* xiii, 198; Plaut. *Trucul.* ii, 7, 42; see Douglaci *Analect.* i, 274) or on



An ancient Egyptian woman embracing and weeping before her husband's mummy.

the head (Josephus, *Ant.* xvi, 10, 7), tore the beard and hair (Ezra ix, 3; Job i, 20; comp. Joseph. *Ant.* xv, 3, 9; xvi, 7, 5; Barhebr. *Chron.* p. 256; Virgil, *Æn.* xii, 870; Ovid, *Met.* xi, 746; Apul. *Met.* ix, p. 212, Bip.; Curtius, iii, 11, 25; Petron. 111, 113; Martial, ii, 11, 5), strewed ashes (see Carpzov, *De cinerum ap. Hebr. usu, maroris atque luctus τεκμήριον*, Rost. 1739) on the head (1 Sam. iv, 12; 2 Sam. i, 2; xiii, 19; xv, 32; Neh. ix, 1; Ezek. xxvii, 30; Lam. ii, 10; Job ii, 11; 1 Macc. iii, 47; iv, 39; xi, 71; 2 Macc. x, 26; xiv, 15; Judith ix, 1; 3 Macc. iv, 6; Rev. xviii, 19; Josephus, *War.* ii, 12, 5; 15, 4; *Ant.* xx, 6, 1; comp. Homer, *Il.* xviii, 23 sq.; xxiv, 164; Eurip. *Suppl.* 827; *Hecub.* 496; Diod. Sic. i, 72, 91; Lucian, *Luct.* 12; Apulej. *Metam.* ix, p. 212, Bip.; see Burekhardt, *Nubia*, p. 475; Irwin, *Trav.* p. 303, 307; Kirchmann, *De fuer. Rom.* ii, 12; Mishna, *Taanith*, ii, 1), or rolled themselves in dust and ashes (Ezek. xxvii, 30; comp. Homer, *Il.* xxii, 414; xxiv, 640; Lucian, *Luct.* 12), tore the garments (see Hedenus, *De scissione vest. Ebraicæ ac gentibus usitata*, Jen. 1663; also in Ugolini *Thes.* xxix; Wichmannshausen, *De laceratione vestium ap. Hebr.* Viteb. 1716; also in Ugolino, xxxiii: this rending, however, had certain restrictions, Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 360; see also Ugolino, *De sacerdotio*, ch. vi, in his *Thesaur.* xiii) from their breast (Gen. xxxvii, 29; xlv, 13; Judges xi, 36; 1 Sam. iv, 12; 2 Sam. i, 2, 11; iii, 31; 1 Kings xi, 27; 2 Kings iv, 8; vi, 30; xi, 14; xix, 1; xxii, 11, 19; Ezra ix, 3; Esth. iv, 1; 1 Macc. ii, 14; iii, 47; iv, 39; v, 14; xi, 71; xiii, 45; Judith xiv, 13, 15; Jer. xli, 5; Ep. Jer. 30; Joseph. *War.* ii, 15, 2 and 4; Acts xiv, 14; Mishna, *Moed Katon*, iii, 7; *Shab.* xiii, 3; comp. Barhebr. *Chron.* p. 256; Herod. iii, 66; viii, 99; Lucian, *Luct.* 12; Achil. *Tat.* iv, 6; Curtius, iii, 11, 25; iv, 10, 23; v, 12, 13, 31; x, 5, 17; Sueton. *Cæs.* 33; *Nero.* 42; Douglaci *Analect.* i, 118; Arvieux, iii, 282), lacerated even their face and body (Jer. xvi, 6; xli, 5; xlvii, 5; Ezek. xxiv, 17; comp. Appian, *Pun.* 46; Virgil, *Æn.* iv, 673; xii, 871; Cicero, *Leg.* ii, 23, 59; Petron. xvi, 111; Ruppell, *Abys.* ii, 57), though this last (see Wichmannshausen, *De corpore scissuris figurisque non cruetando*, Viteb.); Michaelis, *De incisura propter mortuos*, in his *Observ. sacr.* Arnhem. 1752, p. 131 sq.) was forbidden by the Mosaic law (Lev. xiv, 28; Deut. xiv, 1 sq.), as it was in the twelve Roman tables (Cic. *Leg.* ii, 23 sq.). These marks of deep grief were usually combined together. At protracted and regularly appointed seasons of mourning (for the deceased), persons were accustomed to fast (q. v.), put on mourning-weeds [see SACKCLOTH], cover up the lower part of the countenance (Ezek. xxiv, 17, 22; Micah. iii, 7; comp. Esth. vii, 8) or the entire head (2 Sam. xv, 30; xix, 4; Jer. xiv, 3, 4; Homer, *Od.* iv, 154; viii, 92), neglect to wash and anoint themselves (comp. Diod. Sic. i, 72 and 91), or cleanse their clothes (2 Sam. xiv,

2; xix, 24; comp. 2 Sam. xii, 20; Dan. x, 3; Judith x, 2 sq.), and abstain from all ornament (Ezek. xxvi, 16 [compare xxiv, 17]; Jonah iii, 6; Judith x, 3; comp. Homer, *Il.* xxii, 468; Lycophron, *Cassand.* 862; Livy, ix, 7; xxxiv, 7; Sueton. *Octav.* 100), even laying aside their shoes (2 Sam. xv, 30; Ezek. xxiv, 17, 23), and, as a special token of humiliation, shearing off the beard and hair, the pride of an Oriental (Isa. xv, 2; Jer. vii, 29; xvi, 6; xli, 5; xlviii, 37; Ep. Jer. 12; Amos viii, 10; Micah i, 16; Ezek. vii, 18; xxvii, 31; comp. Homer, *Il.* xxiii, 46 sq.; *Od.* iv, 197; xxiv, 45 sq.; Euripid. *Orest.* 458; *Alcest.* 427; Diod. Sic. i, 84; Ælian, V. H. vii, 8; Herod. iv, 71; ix, 24; Curtius, x, 5, 17; Sueton. *Calig.* 5; Ovid, *Ars. Am.* iii, 38). In deep grief they also seated or lay themselves on the ground (2 Sam. xii, 16; xiii, 31; Isa. iii, 20; xlvii, 1 [Ezek. viii, 14]; Jonah iii, 6; Neh. i, 4; Job ii, 8; xvi, 15; Matt. xi, 21, etc.; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* xix, 8, 2; Philo, *Opp.* ii, 519; Homer, *Il.* xviii, 26; see Kype, *Observ.* i, 261). Mourning usually lasted seven days (1 Sam. xxxi, 13; 1 Chron. x, 12; Judith xvi, 29; Sirach xxii, 12; Joseph. *Ant.* xvii, 8, 4; comp. Helioid. vii, 11; Lucian, *Dea Syr.* 52 sq.; see Movers, *Phönice.* p. 200); in extraordinary cases, longer (Numb. xx, 29; Deut. xxi, 18; Joseph. *War.* iii, 9, 5). Wealthy persons were accustomed to hire professional mourning women ( $\text{מְבַרְכֵי בְרִייתֵי}$ , *præfice*, Jer. ix, 16), who uttered loud wailing cries in the house and at the grave during the days of mourning (2 Chron. xxxv, 25), often in responsive chants (*Moed Katon*, iii, 8), and with instrumental accompaniment (*Chel.* xvi, 7). The same custom is well known to have prevailed among the Greeks (see Potter, *Antiq.* ii, 407 sq.) and Romans. On the usages of the modern East, see Mayr, *Schicksale*, ii, 87. Public mourning was instituted upon general calamities; the Jews were also obliged to take part in lamentation for the death of (heathen) rulers (Philo, *Opp.* ii, 525; comp. Livy, ix, 7). It was a peculiarity of Persian usage that no mourner could enter the royal palace (Esth. iv, 2), such probably being regarded as uncleanly by the Zend religion (Creuzer, *Symbol.* i, 712). See generally Geier, *De Ebraeorum luctu lugentiamque ritibus* (Lips. 1656; ed. by Kall, Hafn. 1745; also in Ugolini *Thesaur.* xxxiii); Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 290; on the Grecian usages, Nicolai, *De luctu Græcorum* (Marb. 1698), and Lange, *Observat. sacr.* p. 346 sq.; on modern Persian, Chardin, *Voyage*, vi, 485 sq.—Winer, i, 630. See MOURNING; FUNERAL.

**Griesbach**, JOHANN JAKOB, an eminent German Protestant theologian, was born at Butzbach, in Hesse Darmstadt, Jan. 4, 1745. He received his early education at Frankfurt-on-the-Main, where his father was pastor, and afterwards visited successively the universities of Tübingen, Halle, and Leipzig, where he studied theology under the leaders of the different schools. He staid longest at Tübingen, where the old dogmatic system and method were still prevalent; but, having gone to Halle, Semler's teachings exerted a lasting influence on his mind, and led the way to his subsequent career. He became tutor in the university in 1771, but, before entering on his duties, he made a journey through part of Germany and Holland, and visited London, Oxford, Cambridge, and Paris. Critical examination of the text of the Bible was then much in favor, and young Griesbach followed the current in the line in which he was soon to surpass all competitors, both in the opinion of posterity, and even in that of his contemporaries. However unimportant such critical researches may appear, on account of their mechanical minuteness, in view of the higher interests of religion and of science, we must remember that they were then not only useful, but necessary, even apart from their immediate and manifest object. On his return Griesbach settled at Halle, where he became professor in 1773; in 1775 he removed to Jena in the same capacity, and afterwards remained permanently attached to that university. His services were fully



appreciated, and rewarded with honors and appointments even of a civic nature; thus he was appointed to represent the state and the university at the diets and on other public occasions. He died March 24, 1812.

Griesbach's name is inseparably connected with the criticism of the text of the N. T., so much so, indeed, as to throw all his works on other subjects entirely in the shade, and to form an epoch in that special department. In order to form a just estimate of his services, it is necessary to be thoroughly acquainted with the state of this science at the time. See CRITICISM, BRITANNICAL. Griesbach's studies in regard to the text were first directed to the collecting and appreciation of various readings. This field had often been gone over before, and it was thought that much less would be discovered in it than was found afterwards by paying greater attention to the quotations of the Greek fathers, and to some versions heretofore but little noticed, such as the Philoxenian, the Armenian, and the Gothic. Next he attempted to establish, on the basis of the ideas of Bengel and Semler, a history of the ancient text as a necessary basis for every improvement of it. On this history, all the details of which have not, however, proved correct, but have given a great impulse to researches, Griesbach founded a new theory of criticism, the rules of which were to regulate the choice and value of the various readings in individual passages, and which was based essentially on a combination of historical facts and logical principles. Finally, Griesbach undertook the task on which his reputation chiefly rests, viz. the publication of a *critically amended* edition of the text of the New Testament. Till then, among nearly 360 editions, there had been but two forms of text, both originating in the 16th century, when criticism was yet in its infancy. They were the so-called *Textus receptus*, which the Lutheran Church considered as unimpeachable; and the *Complutensian*, which circulated among the Roman Catholics. Bengel alone had dared to depart somewhat from the former, and that only by introducing a few readings of the latter. Griesbach's innovation excited great alarm among the partisans of the existing texts. Joachim Hartmann, professor at Rostock, attacked him in a pamphlet in 1775; but this, as well as other similar attacks, were answered by the preface of Griesbach's second edition. His editions of the N. T. appeared in the following order: 1. *Libri N. T. historici* (Halle, 1774, pt. i, ii), containing the first three gospels arranged synoptically. To this belongs as vol. ii (1775), the first edition of the Epistles and of Revelation, and to the latter, again as vol. i, a second (non-synoptical) edition of the historical books. The synopsis was afterwards reprinted, sometimes separately. 2. The principal edition (Halle, and London, 1796, 1806, 2 pts. 8vo), very complete, and with important prolegomena. 3. A costly edition (Leipzig, 4 vols. small 4to, or small folio, 1803-1807, in copper types; 4th and 5th pocket editions, Leipzig, 1805, 1825), like the preceding, but with the principal variations only. A new edition of the principal critical work of Griesbach was commenced in 1827 by David Schulz, but the first part only has appeared. The text of Griesbach has not remained intact in all these editions. It has often been used or referred to by others, and its peculiar readings, at least, are always introduced in the new critical editions. The other critical works of Griesbach are, *De codicibus ev. orientianis* (1771);—*Curæ in historiam textus epp. paul.* (1777);—*Symbolæ criticae ad supplendas et corrigendas varias N. T. lectiones* (pt. i, 1785; ii, 1793);—*Commentarius criticus in textum Gr. N. T.* (1794 sq.). Little need he said of his other works. They are mostly academical essays on exegesis, history, and dogmatics, and were published by Gabler in 2 parts (*Kleinere Schriften*, 1825). Some of them, however, possess yet a certain interest, as serving to show the progress made by science under the influence of the-

ologians, conservative at heart, but advancing nevertheless more or less with the times. Such was Griesbach, who may, perhaps, not unjustly be called a middle-party man, in view of his *Theopneustie* (1784), his *Christologie d. Hebräerbriefs* (1791), and especially of his *Aufleitung z. Studium d. populären Dogmatik* (1779, 1789, several ed.), a work considered at first as retrograde and inconsequent by the so-called friends of progress. His *Vorlesungen ü. Hermeneutik d. N. T.*, printed after his death (in 1815), belongs to the so-called school of *grammatico-historical* interpretation which prevailed during the author's life, and is such a work as would naturally be expected from a pupil of Semler and Ernesti.

"The peculiar principle of Griesbach's system consists in a division of the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament into three classes, each of which is considered as an independent witness for the various readings of the manuscripts which it comprises. He thus contemplates the existence of three distinct species of texts, which, with respect to their relationship or affinity, are called by Bengel, 'families,' and by Semler, Griesbach, and Michaelis 'recensions' or 'codices,' namely: 1. The 'Alexandrian' recension or codex, comprehending manuscripts which, in peculiar readings, agree with the citations found in the early Greek-Egyptian fathers, particularly Origen and Clemens of Alexandria. 2. The 'Western' recension, which is identified with the citations of the Latin fathers, especially Cyprrian and Tertullian, and was used by the Christians of Carthage, Rome, and the west of Europe. 3. The 'Byzantine' or Asiatic recension, comprising numerous manuscripts which were used especially in the see of Constantinople and the adjacent Oriental provinces, and have furnished the received text, called the Greek Vulgate. Each of these recensions has characteristics peculiar to itself, yet no individual manuscript exhibits any recension in a pure state, but is assigned to the Alexandrian or Western class, as the peculiar reading of each of those classes preponderate. Though Griesbach considers departures from the received Greek Vulgate as various readings, he does not allow the existence of any standard text as a criterion for determining which are genuine or spurious readings, his object being to show, not the character of particular deviations from any individual recension, but the general coincidence of manuscripts with one recension or codex more than with another. The authorized text does not regulate, but is regulated by his critical opinion of its comparative value; and the immense number of various readings form a floating medium in which the genuine text is considered to be in all instances discoverable. However, although he professes to determine the value of readings by the number of classes by which they are supported, he constantly displays a very decided preference for the Alexandrian class, which he places far above the two others in the rank of authority, a few manuscripts of this recension being supposed to outweigh a multitude of such as belong to the Byzantine recension, which he regards as certainly the most untrustworthy of all (*Prolog.* lxxii). The reason assigned by Griesbach for this decision is the fact that the Greek transcripts of this class contain a remarkably large number of suspected readings, owing to the very great liberties taken by learned copyists in making successive alterations; and finding the coincidence of the numerous scriptural quotations of Origen of Alexandria with the celebrated Greek manuscript of the New Testament from that city to be very striking, he thence concludes that the passages now extant in this father's writings, of the commencement of the 3d century, discover the earliest, and therefore the purest text of which we have any knowledge to be that of the Alexandrian manuscripts. His ultimate choice of readings is consequently determined by the testimony of Origen, in confirmation of which he often adduces much collateral evidence from the primitive

fathers and versions; and of the readings thus proved to be genuine is formed his corrected text of the New Testament. Against the complicated hypothesis on which Griesbach has based his system of recensions many very important objections were urged by learned Biblical critics of Germany (as by Hartmann, mentioned above), and in England, especially by archbishop Lawrence and Dr. Frederick Nolan. The primary fact enforced by Griesbach, that the Alexandrian readings which are supported by the quotations of Origen possess the highest authority of all, is disputed by professor Matthiæ, of Moscow, in his critical edition of the New Testament, and with greater confidence by professor Martin Scholz, of Bonn, in the prolegomena to his very learned and elaborate edition, founded on a system wholly at variance with that of Griesbach. The Alexandrian manuscripts are acknowledged by Scholz to be more ancient, but he asserts them to be more corrupt than any others, and contends that in Alexandria the alterations of the text principally originated. He divides all the manuscripts, not, as Griesbach, into three, but into two classes, the Byzantine and the Alexandrian, in which latter he includes the Western; and he gives a decided superiority to the authority of the Byzantine recensions, which, in opposition to Griesbach, he strenuously maintains to be directly derived from the autographs of the evangelists and apostles themselves. The work by archbishop Lawrence on this subject is entitled *Remarks upon the Systematical Classification of Manuscripts adopted by Dr. Griesbach* (1814, 8vo). The learned author states that he considers Griesbach to be what bishop Marsh denominated him, 'the most consummate critic that ever undertook an edition of the New Testament;' but in the course of his critical strictures on the origin and execution of his plan of appreciating manuscripts, he employs the severest terms of censure, observing that 'Griesbach's mode of investigation is unsatisfactory, his classification fallacious, and his statement of the number of readings inaccurate; that no such classification of the manuscripts of the New Testament is possible; the existence of three distinct species of texts being a fact only synthetically presumed, and not capable of any analytical demonstration; so that the student finds he is treading, not on solid ground, but on a critical quicksand.' Griesbach was long and severely attacked by Trinitarian writers as an opposer of the doctrine of Christ's divinity, chiefly in consequence of his having rejected from his text the celebrated passage respecting the three that bare witness (1 John v, 7), and also for inserting *ὁς* for *Θεός* in 1 Tim. iii, 16, and *Kypion* for *Θεῶν* in Acts xx, 28. In consequence of these and other points in his critical works, the commendation and patronage of the Unitarians were bestowed upon him; but in the preface to his treatise on the apostolical writings, he makes the following solemn declaration: 'Ut iniquas suspiciones omnes, quantum in me est, amolari, et hominibus malevolis calumniandi ansam præcipiam, publice profiteor, atque Deum testor, neutiquam me de veritate istius dogmatis dubitare;' and to this may be added a statement from his *Prolegomena*, namely, that 'nulla emendatio a recentioribus editoribus tentata ullam Scripturæ Sacræ doctrinam immutat, aut evertit,' though 'paucæ sensum sententiarum afficiunt.' The laborious and minutely learned work by the Rev. Dr. Nolan, entitled *An Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate, or Received Text of the New Testament*, published in 1815, is chiefly occupied in presenting evidence to subvert the critical system of Griesbach, and to establish the position since taken by professor Scholz and others, that the Byzantine, and not the Alexandrian, codices are the most worthy of reliance. 'Griesbach's theory,' says Dr. Nolan, 'is one of the most elaborate of those that have unsettled the foundation on which rests the entire canon. His corrected text can be received only as a proof of the general corruption of the sacred Scriptures, and

of the faithlessness of the traditionary testimony by which it is supported, since he states that the two principal classes of text, the Alexandrian and the Western, have been interpolated in every part; that the authorized Greek version exhibits 150,000 various readings, and has remained 1400 years in its present state of corruption; that there appears, therefore, to be no reservation by which the doctrinal integrity of the sacred Scriptures can be saved; for if, in the apostolic and primitive ages, corruption was prevalent, whatever be the text gathered out of the immense number of various readings, it may be as well any other as that originally delivered by the inspired writers.' Griesbach indeed declares, in his *Symbolæ Criticæ*, that the manuscripts of the Alexandrian and Western recensions, on which his system is founded, were grossly corrupted in the age succeeding that of the apostles; that those which he held in the highest esteem were corrupted in every page by marginal scholia and interpretations of the fathers, and contained innumerable and very serious errors ('innumeros gravissimosque errores'). He further states in the same treatise that no reliance can be placed on the printed editions of the works of Origen, on the fidelity of his different transcribers, on the accuracy of his quotations, or, finally, on the copies of the Scriptures from which he quoted; so that, as observed by Dr. Nolan, we have only to take his own account of the state in which he finds the best part of his materials to discover the extreme insecurity of the fabric which he has raised on such a foundation. 'His innovations,' continues the same learned divine, 'are formidable in number and nature; his corrections proscribe three important passages (already named) affecting the doctrinal integrity of the inspired text; for a proof once established of its partial corruption in important matters must involve its character for general fidelity; and the deservedly high character and singular merit of this learned edition must heighten apprehension and alarm at the attempts thus made to undermine the authority of the received text, for the scrupulous accuracy of its execution must always command respect'" (*English Cyclop.*). See Herzog, *Real-Encyclopædie*, v, 389; *English Cyclopædia*, s. v.: Hofer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxii, 25; Köthe, *Griesbach's Lebensbeschreibung* (Jena, 1812); Seiler, *Hermeneutics*, p. 340 sq.; Horne, *Introduction to the Scriptures*, vol. ii.

**Griffen, BENJAMIN**, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Mamaroneck, New York, June 6, 1792. When about nineteen years of age he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. Soon after his conversion he was received into the New York Conference, and remained a member of that body (except for a short interval) for fifty years. In 1853 he was elected secretary of his Conference, and continued in that office until his death, which occurred at Rye, N. Y., Jan. 20, 1861. Among the members of his Conference he was the youngest man of his age; his cheeks had the freshness of youth; his step was firm and elastic; his voice retained its clearness and compass to the last; "his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated." His activity, his vigor, his sprightly humor, and his flow of spirits seemed as perfect at the last Conference he attended as they had ever been. He grew more and more genial as life advanced, and his Christian graces shone out more clearly. He was remarkable for his punctuality as well as for his patient labor. Few men have performed more unrequited toil for the Church than he. He was treasurer for many years of the Board of Conference Trustees, and also of the Ministers' Mutual Assistance Society. He rendered his services with the strictest fidelity, and without any compensation. He had been appointed for the third time to Kingston, but never reached his field of labor. God had prepared for him a mansion in heaven, and he entered it suddenly. His Master kindly brought the season of earthly labor and eternal repose close to each

other.—*Methodist*, No. 52; *Minutes of Conferences*, 1862, p. 71. (G. B. D.)

**Griffin, Edmund Dorr**, A. M., a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born at Wyoming, Pa., Sept. 18, 1804. Early in life he gave proofs of classical proficiency in the composition of some Latin poems and poetic versions, which were considered to possess rare excellence. In 1823 he passed A. B. in Columbia College with distinguished honor; and having studied theology two years in the New York Theological Seminary, he was admitted to deacon's orders in 1826. After supplying for a time a church at Utica, he returned to New York, and was appointed agent to the Gen. Theolog. Seminary; he became rector of St. James's, New York, and the Associate Church of Bloomingdale, officiating also temporarily in Christ's Church, New York, as assistant to Dr. Lyell. In 1828, his health failing, he sailed for Europe, and visited England, France, and Italy. On his return he commenced lecturing at Columbia College, April 13, 1830, on the History of Literature, continuing the series which his friend, Prof. McVickar, had been obliged to suspend on account of ill health. Griffin's lectures had great success; and measures were in progress for the formation of a new chair of history in the college expressly for him, when, during the vacation, he was seized with inflammation of the bowels, and died Aug. 31, 1830. His MSS. were published after his death by his friend McVickar under the title *Remains of Rev. E. D. Griffin* (N. Y., 2 vols. 8vo). They contain several pieces of poetry, some of which are in Latin; an account of travels through Italy and Switzerland in 1829; notes on France, England, and Scotland in 1828, 1829, and 1830; extracts from his lectures, and some essays written while a student. See McVickar, *Notice* (in the Preface of the *Remains of R. E. G.*); *Cyclop. of American Literature*, ii, 391; *Christian Review*, iv, 356; Sprague, *Annals*, v, 671.

**Griffin, Edward Dorr**, D. D., a Presbyterian minister, was born at East Haddam, Conn., Jan. 6, 1770, and graduated at Yale College in 1790 with distinguished honor. After teaching for a time at Derby, he studied theology under the guidance of Jonathan Edwards, and was licensed in 1792. He commenced his labors at New Salem, supplied at Farmington, and then was called to the Congregational Church at New Hartford, of which he was ordained pastor in 1795. In 1800 he visited New Jersey, and supplied in Orange for a short time, when he accepted a call from Newark, where he was installed pastor in 1801, as colleague to Dr. M<sup>o</sup>Whorter, whom he succeeded as pastor in 1807. In 1808 he received the degree of D. D. from Union College. In 1809 he was appointed to the Bartlett professorship in Andover, and in 1811 was installed in Park-street Church, Boston. In 1812-13 he delivered his celebrated Park-street lectures. On resigning his charge in Boston he returned to Newark, and was installed in the Second Presbyterian Church in 1815. He interested himself warmly in the cause of the Africans, the American Bible and United Foreign Mission Societies. In 1821 he was appointed president of Williams College, and filled that office most ably and acceptably for fifteen years, resigning it in 1836, and retiring to Newark, N. J., where he died, Nov. 8, 1837. His ministry was marked by numerous revivals. Dr. Griffin was a man of large intellectual proportions. "The peculiar cast of his preaching and other religious instructions and appeals was formed, more perhaps than that of many other great minds, by his cherished habit of precise discrimination on the leading points of the prevalent theology. In his course of teaching in mental philosophy he drew the current distinctions with great accuracy and decision. His theological writings are distinguished by lucid and energetic statements of the main points belonging to the theological views of the time, and in such statements his ability

was not surpassed by any man of the age. His taste for those theological distinctions, his high sense of their value, and his facility and satisfaction in using them, gave his most rhetorical pulpit discourses remarkable internal coherence and compactness, and enabled him to command the judgments of his hearers by the force of a very stringent logic. The great prominence and intense light in which he placed some leading points of religious truth constitute the striking feature of his theological discussions. This trait is conspicuous in his Park-street lectures, his work on the Atonement, and some smaller publications on particular points of Christian doctrine. On the whole, the position and influence of Dr. Griffin are widely attested by the profound and general respect for his memory, and by the evident fruits of his labors. His power of clear, penetrating, and, at the same time, of lofty and comprehensive thought—his skill and force in argument, his rhetorical genius and culture, his eloquence, his majestic person and manner, all pervaded and controlled by his enlightened religious devotion, performed efficient service for the Church, and placed him among the greater lights of his age" (J. W. Yeomans, cited by Sprague). He published *The Extent of the Atonement* (1819, 12mo);—*Divine Efficiency* (1833, 12mo);—*Causal Power of Regeneration*, etc. (1834), and numerous *Sermons Addresses, Orations, and Lectures*, from 1805 to 1833.—Sprague, *Annals*, iv, 26; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Jan. 1858; *Princeton Review*, xi, 404; *Am. Bib. Rep.* iii, 623; *N. A. Rev.* xxxiv, 119; Cooke, *Recollections of E. D. Griffin* (Boston, 1866, 8vo).

**Griffith, Benjamin**, a minister prominent among the early Baptists in America. He was born in County Cardigan, South Wales, in 1688, and came to this country in 1710, settling in Montgomery township, Penn. He was baptized in 1711, called to the ministry in 1722, and ordained in 1725. He enjoyed a successful ministry, labored extensively, and churches still exist that were formed in the field of his itinerant labors. He published—1. *A Treatise of Church Discipline*:—2. *Vindication of the Doctrine of the Resurrection*:—3. *Answer to "The Divine Right of Infant Baptism,"* printed by B. Franklin, 1747. He also wrote *An Essay on the Power and Duty of an Association*, and left it in MS. It was published in 1832. He died in 1768. (L. E. S.)

**Grimshaw, William**, a minister of the Church of England, was born in Lancashire, Eng., in 1708, educated at Cambridge, and entered into holy orders in 1731. After spending some years as minister of Todmorden, near Rochdale, he was appointed in 1742 to the perpetual curacy of Haworth, in Yorkshire. In 1745 he entered into a close union with the Methodists, acted as Mr. Wesley's assistant in what was known as the Haworth circuit, and until his death, which occurred in 1763, was the mainstay of the connection in that part of the country. Mr. Grimshaw was the author of a *Sermon in Defence of the Methodists*, printed in 1749, and republished with his biography. "He was of a cheerful, generous turn of mind, very courteous, and open as the day in his conversation with the people wherever he went. He was a natural orator, spoke with great fluency, and preached the Gospel with great ability and approbation." Wesley said of him, "He carries fire wherever he goes."—Myles, *Life of Grimshaw*; Crowther, *Portraiture of Methodism*; Newton, *Memoirs of Grimshaw* (Lond. 1799, 12mo); Stevens, *History of Methodism*, i, 258; Wesley, *Works*, iv, 117; vi, 750.

**Grind** (גרינד, *tachan'*, to crush small, Exod. xxxii, 20; Dent. ix, 21; specially with a hand-mill, Judg. xvi, 21; Num. xi, 8; also tropically, to oppress the poor by exaction, Isa. iii, 15. In the expression "let my wife grind for another," Job xxi, 10, it is put for the picture of abject poverty and degradation, i. e. let her become his mill-wench or menial; comp. Exod. xi, 5; Isa. xlvi, 2). See GRITS. In the earliest *poes* men

took the pains to roast the kernels of grain (Serv. *ad Æn.* i, 184), and to pound them (Pliny, xviii, 23) in a mortar (מַדְרָה, מַדְרָה) with a pestle (comp. Numb. xi, 8), and this method of preparing it is still common (in small encampments) among the modern Arabs (Burckhardt, *Wahaby*, p. 36). Yet the hand-mill (מַחְרָה, מַחְרָה, χειρομύλη) is an ancient invention (see Virgil. *Moret.* 19), for it was early employed by the Hebrews (Numb. xi, 8), and continued in use by them to the latest age (being often alluded to in the Talmud under the name קַדְרָה קַדְרָה, or קַדְרָה קַדְרָה), and is still in common use (in villages) among the Orientals (Niebuhr, *Beschr.* p. 51; *Trav.* i, 150; comp. Laborde, *Commentaire*, p. 58). It consisted of two millstones (Plaut. *Asinar.* ii, 1, 16); the upper one (רִידָה, the rider, Deut. xxiv, 6; 2 Sam. xi, 21; or, fully, פְּלֶחֶת רִידָה, the rider-piece, Judg. ix, 53; in Greek, ὄνος or ἐπιμόλιον, Lat. *catillus*) was movable and slightly concave, so as to fit the surface of the stationary lower one (פְּלֶחֶת פְּתִיחִית), Job xli, 16; Gr. μύλη, Lat. *meta*). It was (in poor families) worked by the women (Shaw, *Trav.* p. 202;

(see Herod. iv, 2, and compare the tradition that king Zedekiah was thus treated, Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* iii, 445). An allusion to the noise of these mills, as being somewhat pleasing to the domestic ear (like that of a modern coffee-mill, which conveys an intimation of home comforts), seems to be contained in Jer. xxv, 10; Eecl. xii, 4; Rev. xviii, 22; others, however, consider these passages to refer to the singing, or rather screaming, of the females employed, as a means of diversion during their toil, or to drown the grating of the millstones (Hackett, *Illustra. of Script.* p. 80). It was not lawful to distract the family hand-mill for debt (Deut. xxiv, 6). In later times large mills, worked by asses, were used (רִידָה שֶׁל חֲמֹר), Buxtorf, *Lexicon Chald.* 2252), as by the Greeks (μύλος ὄνικός, Matt. xviii, 6) and Romans (*asinus molaris*, Varro, *R. R.* i, 19, 5; Colum. vii, 1; Cato, *R. R.* x, 4; Ovid, *Fast.* vi, 318; Lucian, *Asin.* xxxviii, 42; Apulej. *Metam.* vii, p. 153, Bip.; *Digest.* xxxiii, 7, 18), and as are still found in the East (Burckhardt, *Spürchw.* p. 41; Robinson, i, 161; Russel, *Aleppo*, i, 100). (On the subject generally, see F. L. Goetze, *De pistrinis vet.* Cygn. 1730; also in Ugolini *Thesaur.* xxix; Hoheisel, *De molis manualibus vet.* Gedani, 1728; also in Ugolini, *ib.*; Beckmann, *Erfind.* ii, 1 sq.; Mongoz, in the *Mémoires de l'Institut Royal, class. d'hist.* iii, 441 sq.). —Winer, ii, 119. See MILL.



Women grinding at a Mill.

The GRINDERS (מַחְרָה, *tochanoth'*, fem. *ons grinding*, by allusion to females so employed) of Eccles. xiii, 3, are evidently the *teeth*, whose decay is an evidence of old age (comp. מַחְרָה, *tachanah'*, mill, "grinding," ver. 4). See CAPEER-PLANT.

Grindal, EDMUND, D.D., archbishop of Canterbury, was born in the year 1519, in Cumberland. He was educated at Magdalen College, Cambridge, and was on all occasions distinguished as a learned man at the university. In 1550 he was selected by Ridley, bishop of London, as his chaplain. In 1553, on the death of king Edward VI, apprehending the persecution of the Protestants, he fled to Strasburg, in Germany, where he was well received. During his residence abroad he devoted much time to the duties of religion, to his studies, to the matter of the controversies at Frankfort, and to assisting Mr. John Fox in his *Martyrology*. In 1558, Grindal, on the accession of queen Elizabeth to the crown, returned to England; was diligently employed in the reformation of religion; assisted in public disputations; preached at the court and at St. Paul's with great zeal and piety; and in 1559, on the removal of bonner, bishop of London, the queen thought none so fit to succeed him as Grindal. He reluctantly accepted the office, but nobly discharged its duties. In 1575 he was nominated and appointed for the see of Canterbury, but in 1576, opposing the queen in some of her arbitrary proceedings concerning ecclesiastical affairs, he was sequestered from his office. In 1582 he offered his resignation, but, before the measure was completed, he died on the 6th of July, 1583, at Croydon. Grindal was a man of sincere personal piety, and of great firmness and resolution, though of a mild and affable temper and friendly disposition. In the time in which he lived, he was cele-

Joliffe, *Trav.* p. 37; Burckhardt, *Arab.* p. 187; Robinson, ii, 405, 650; Wellsted, *Trav.* i, 249; Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 295; see Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* ii, 223; comp. Mishna, *Tohor.* vii, 4), but in large households, where it was severe toil (Artemid. ii, 42), by slaves (Arvieux, *Voy.* iii, 204; Burckhardt, *Arab.* p. 187), as a female employment (Matt. xxiv, 41; Luke xvii, 35), and that of the most menial kind (Exod. xi, 5; Isa. xlvii, 2; Job xxxi, 10; comp. Eccl. xii, 3; see *Odys.* vii, 103 sq.; Simonid, *Iamb.* 85 sq.; Plaut. *Merc.* ii, 3, 62; Theophr. *Char.* 5; Aristoph. *Nub.* 1358; Callimach. in *Del.* 242), but also as a male task, especially in punishment (Judg. xvi, 21; Lam. v, 13; compare Terent. *Andr.* i, 2, 29; Plaut. *Pæn.* v, 3, 33; *Asinar.* i, 1, 16; *Epitit.* i, 2, 42; *Mostell.* i, i, 16; Polluc. *Onom.* iii, 8; Cic. *Quint.* i, 2, 4; see *Cod. Theodos.* xiv, 3, 7), such culprits being closely fettered (Terent. *Phorm.* ii, 3, 19; Plaut. *Pers.* i, 1, 21 sq.), and even blinded (Judg. xvi, 21), by which means the giddiness arising from perpetually going round was at the same time avoided

brated for his episcopal abilities and admirable endowments for spiritual government, as well as his singular learning. The High-churchmen call him an ultra-Protestant, from the favor he showed to the Puritans, and from his abhorrence of Romanizing tendencies. His *Remains*, edited for the Parker Society, appeared in Cambridge, 1843 (8vo).—Jones, *Christian Biog.* p. 199; Neal, *History of the Puritans*, vol. i; Burnet, *History of the Reformation*, vols. ii, iii; Strype, *Life and Acts of Abp. Grindal* (Oxford, 1821, 8vo).

**Griswold**, ALEXANDER VIETS, D.D., a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born April 22, 1766, in Simsbury, Conn., and died in Boston Feb. 15, 1843. He early evinced great capacity, and attained considerable proficiency in Greek and Latin, but untoward circumstances thwarted his desire of taking a collegiate course. After studying law for several years, he decided to enter the ministry, and became a candidate for orders in 1794, officiating in the parishes of Plymouth, Harwinton, and Litchfield; was ordained in 1795, and continued in charge of the three parishes named until 1804, when he accepted Bristol parish, R. I. In 1809 he was chosen rector of St. Michael's, Litchfield, and had accepted the call, but, being elected in May, 1810, bishop of the Eastern diocese, then embracing Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, and Maine, the proposed change was not consummated. He was consecrated in May, 1811, and for some years discharged the double duty of bishop and parish priest. "The year 1812 was signalized by an extensive revival of religion under his ministry," and "again and again his flock was visited with similar seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord." In reply to objections made against such "awakenings or reformations," he published some papers on "Prayer-meetings and Revivals," in which he ably and zealously vindicates them from "the exaggerated charges of disorder, fanaticism, and delusion," and maintains that under proper guidance they promote the religious life and power of the Church. Yielding to the general desire that his residence should be more centrally located for his diocese, in 1829 he accepted the rectorship of St. Peter's, Salem, Mass., and removed thither in 1830. He remained in Salem until 1835, when provision having been made for his independent episcopal support, he removed to Boston, and devoted the remainder of his life exclusively to his episcopal duties. In 1842 he was relieved by the appointment of an assistant bishop, whose consecration was his last ordaining act. He died suddenly of heart disease. Bishop Griswold was eminently distinguished among the clergy of his Church for his evangelical spirit and earnest religious life. His chief works are, *On the Reformation and the Apostolic Office* (Boston, 12mo);—*Sermons* (Phila. 1830, 8vo);—*Prayers* (N. Y.);—*Remarks on Social Prayer-meetings* (Boston, 1858, 12mo). See Stone, *Life of Bishop Griswold* (Phila. 1844, 8vo); Sprague, *Annals*, v, 415-425; *Christian Observer*, July, 1843; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 744. (J. W. M.)

**Grits** from wheat appears from the Sept. in 2 Sam. xvii, 19; Prov. xxvii, 22, to be designated by the Heb. כֹּמֶת, *ripthot*' (Vulg. *ptisance*, A. V. "ground corn," "wheat"). This kind of meal food is still very common in the East, and the Turks especially employ it in time of war (Faber, in Harmer, ii, 26). On the contrary, the כָּלִי, *kali*, or "parched corn," of 2 Sam. xvii, 28, appears to be the roasted kernels of the newly-ripe grain, which is still eaten in that manner in Palestine (Robinson, ii, 668). See CORN.

**Grizzled** (בָּרֵד, *barod*', *spotted*), party-colored or variegated, as goats (Gen. xxxi, 10, 12) or horses (Zech. vi, 3, 6).

**Groin**. The edge formed by an intersection of two vaults (or curved ceilings). During the early part of the Romanesque period the groins were left perfectly

plain, but later, and especially through the Gothic period, they were invariably covered with ribs (or mouldings).—Parker, *Dict. of Architecture* (Oxford, 1864). (G. F. C.)

**Groningen School**. See HOFSTEDE.

**Groningenists**, a sect of Anabaptists (q. v.), who met at certain stated periods in the city of Groningen.—Mosheim, *Ch. History*, cent. xvii, div. ii, pt. ii, ch. v, § 3.

**Groot, Geert** (Lat. *Gerhardus Magnus*), was born at Deventer in 1340, studied in Paris, and subsequently taught philosophy and theology in Cologne. Being possessed of a considerable property and of several prebends, he abandoned himself to a luxurious life, from which he was recalled by a serious sickness and the impressive exhortations of a friend, the Carthusian Henry Aeger. Thoroughly reformed, he entered the monastery of Monkhuysen, near Antwerp; but he left it again after three years, in order to become a travelling preacher. In union with Florence Radwyn, he established at Deventer the Society of the Brethren of Common Life, which was sanctioned in 1376 by Gregory XI. He died at Deventer of the plague, August 20, 1384. He wrote *De Veridica Predicatione Evangelii*:—*De Sacris Libris Studendis* (both in Kemps, *Opera*, t. iii). Thirty-three treatises of his remain in MS. See Ullmann, *Reforms before the Reformation*, vol. i; Böhlinger, *Kirche Christi*, vol. ii, pt. iii, p. 612-64; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v. Groot. See BRETHREN OF THE COMMON LIFE.

**Groot, De**. See GROTIUS; HOFSTEDE.

**Groppe**, JOHANN, a German Romanist divine, was born at Soest in 1501, became successively canon of Cologne, provost of Bonn, and archdeacon and provost of St. Gereon of Cologne. He convoked a provincial synod in 1536 with the intention of effecting some reforms, and was afterwards sent by Charles V to the religious assembly of 1541 at Regensburg; he is even said to have framed the Interim which was there decided on. In 1548 he went to Soest, to reform the churches of that place agreeably to the Interim. In 1551, on the occasion of the reopening of the Council of Trent, the pope called him to Rome for the purpose of consulting with him. Here he died, March 12, 1558. Groppe belonged to the class of milder Romanists who, at the time of the Reformation, sought to reunite the Protestants to the Church of Rome by means of conciliatory measures. His principal works are, *Antididagma* (against the archbishop Hermann, Cologne, 1544):—*Institutio catholica* (1550):—*Von wahrer u. bleibender Gegenwart d. Leibes u. Blutes Christi* (1556):—*Capita institutionis ad pietatem* (1557), etc.—Herzog, *Real-Encycl.* s. v.; Dieringer, *Kathol. Zeitschrift* (vol. ii, 1844).

**Grosseteste**, **Groce-teste**, **Grotest**, **Grost-head**, **Groshead** (CAPITO, "Qui cognominatus est a pluribus GROSSUM-CAPUT," *Trivet*), ROBERT, bishop of Lincoln, a celebrated ecclesiastic, theologian, statesman, mathematician, astronomer, natural philosopher, poet, moralist, and teacher, in the first half of the thirteenth century. The various forms of the name indicate that it was a descriptive epithet, *agnomen*, or by-name, rather than a family designation, which was still no common appendage. The nickname has been rendered historical by the career of its bearer, who contended with pope and king, was the early counsellor of Simon De Montfort, the teacher, patron, and friend of Roger Bacon and Adam De Marisco, the colleague of the scarcely less eminent Robert Bacon and Richard Fitzacre. He has often been regarded as the first translator of the Scriptures into English, and as the precursor of the Protestant Reformation, and his continued reputation is mainly due to his strenuous and bold resistance to the corruptions of the Church at home, and to the vices of the papal court. The thirteenth century is one of the most active, bustling, eventful, and important in the whole series of the ages.

It is crowded with great personages. It is full of mighty events attendant on

The spirit of the years to come,  
Yearning to mix himself with life.

Not the least notable of these mutations occurred in England in the reign of Henry III, and laid, in the midst of anarchy and strife, the foundations of the English Church, the English jurisprudence, the English liberties, the English language, literature, philosophy, and science. In all of these movements Robert Grosseteste was concerned, and on all these forms of national development he left the impress of his genius and character.

*Life.*—Robert Grosseteste was born, about 1175, at Stradbroke, in the county of Suffolk, England. His origin was extremely humble, and little is known of his early career except that he studied at Oxford, and that law, physic, and divinity all received his attention. He is supposed to have extended his education at Paris, and to have held a chair in its university. He owed his first ecclesiastical appointment apparently to the bishop of Hereford, to whom he had been commended by a letter of Giraldus Cambrensis. His superior died in 1199, but his character and talents secured promotion. Between 1214 and 1232 he held successively the archdeaconries of Wilts, Northampton, and Leicester, and various other livings, including the prebend of Clifton in Lincoln. In 1224, at the request of Agnellus, provincial of the Franciscans, he became reader in the recently founded Franciscan school at Oxford, and inaugurated the brilliant career of that university (Eccleston, *De Adventu Fratrum Minorum*, c. v.). This function he discharged till his elevation to the episcopate. It was probably during these years that he was *rector scholarum*, or *chancellor* of the university, and was associated with Robert Bacon, the head of the Dominican school there. In January, 1232, he contemplated a visit to Rome, but was retained by his bishop. Towards the end of this year he had a violent attack of fever, and resigned all his preferments in the Church except his prebendal stall in Lincoln. His own feelings on this occasion are perpetuated in his letters to his sister and to his friend (*Epp.* viii, ix). During this year he had undertaken the defence of the Jews against the outrageous persecutions and crinations to which they had been exposed since the Jewish massacre at the accession of Richard I. He further manifested his solicitude for them by laboring for their conversion. His zeal is illustrated by his V Letter and his treatise *De Cessatione Legalium*. His acquisition of Hebrew may have been the cause or the consequence of this intervention. In 1235 he was elected to the bishopric of Lincoln. His promotion is commemorated by our earliest English poet, Robert of Gloucester:

Maister Robert Groce teste thulke zer was al so  
Isaerel bissop of Lincoln at Seinte Edmunde at Redinge.

His duties were onerous; the diocese was the largest and the most populous in the realm (*Ep.* xli). His new cares did not diminish at any time his active interest in the University of Oxford, which owned his jurisdiction.

When he accepted the mitre there was general disorder among the ecclesiastics subjected to him; there was a total want of settled discipline; there was constant recalcitration against authority; there was refractoriness in his own chapter, which eventuated in protracted contention; ignorance, licentiousness, simony, and greed were prevalent. There was twofold and simultaneous danger from royal rapacity and papal exaction. His position was full of annoyance and hazard, but he addressed himself at once to the correction of abuses, to the resistance to encroachment, and to the earnest performance of his solemn functions. He first set his own house in order, and reformed the episcopal establishment. A detailed and interesting ordinance

was prepared for the governance of his household (*Mon. Francisc.* Append. ix). The sons of the highest nobles, among them those of Simon de Montfort, were intrusted to him for training. He is supposed to have composed for these *élèves* his manual *De Moribus Pueri ad Mensam*, which is an early type of the popular *Stans Puer ad Mensam*, of which so many variations have been published by Mr. Furnivall in *The Babees' Boke*. In the first year of his episcopacy he commenced the visitation of the parishes, deaneries, archdeaconries, etc., under his rule. He frequently encountered disobedience, but he proceeded with energy and firmness. The enmity thus provoked stimulated an attempt to poison him. His life was saved by his friend and leech, John de S. Giles. One of his reformatory measures has a special interest for the student of mediæval literature and antiquities. He suppressed the celebration of the "Feast of Fools" in his cathedral, designating it as "*vanitate plenum et voluptatibus spurcum, Deo odibile et demoni amabile*" (*Ep.* xxxii). The character of this festival is copiously illustrated in the additions to Du Cange (tit. *Kalenæ*). Warton has founded it with the *Festum Asinorum*, which took place on the Nativity, not on the Circumcision. The bishop also prohibited Scot-Ales in chapters, synods, and on holy days. His earnestness for the spiritual improvement of his diocese, for the maintenance of religious purity, and for the advancement of knowledge, is shown by his Pastoral Letter or Constitutions in 1238 (*Ep.* lii); by his refusal to confer benefices on unworthy persons, even when powerfully connected and sustained (*Epp.* xlix, lii, lxxiv); by his opposition to the king's appointment of clerks as justices in eyre (*Epp.* xxvii, xxviii, lxxii); by his anxiety to purchase from John de Foxton his copies of the sacred Scriptures (*Ep.* xxxiii); by his interference in behalf of the scholars of Oxford after their riotous attack on cardinal Otho, and by his consideration for them on other occasions. To Grosseteste is due the special jurisdiction conceded to the university in 1244, a privilege obtained by Cambridge only sixty years later. His rigorous episcopal visitations induced expostulations from Adam de Marisco, and furnished a text for the censures of Matthew Paris. They culminated in the great contention of 1239 with his canons, which was only settled six years later by pontifical decree. Its commencement is marked by an elaborate epistle or essay, which asserts the episcopal rights through all the ponderous forms of scholastic reasoning (*Ep.* cxxvii). The question of the limits of authority and obedience, and of the respective boundaries of concurrent or conflicting authorities, was indeed the main root of discord in all the great debates of Church and State, of the papacy and the empire, in the thirteenth century.

While this controversy was in progress Grosseteste displayed his accustomed energy in manifold directions. He maintains an intimate correspondence with the king, with the queen, with the archbishop of Canterbury, with the legate, with the cardinals, with the chiefs of the Franciscans and the Dominicans, to both of which orders he was warmly attached. He gives constant advice to De Montfort in his oscillating fortunes; he constantly seeks it for himself from Adam de Marisco. He keeps up and extends his studies in many ways. With the assistance of a Greek monk from St. Alban's and other scholars, he translated the spurious *Testaments of the XII Patriarchs*, and other Greek works. This version of the Testaments may have originated the tradition that he translated the Bible. He resisted the scandalous appointment of Italians, Poitevins, Provençals, and Savoyards to the rich benefices as they fell vacant. He opposed the extravagance and favoritism of the king, and in 1244 secured the united-reply of the "Committee of XII on royal expenditures" that they would not grant the aids demanded without a pledge of the reformation of abuses and the expenditure of the money by the com-

mission for the king's benefit. This was the prelude to the Provisions of Oxford and the Barons' War. In November of this year, bishop Grosseteste, with his friend and habitual adviser, brother Adam, proceeds to the papal court to look after the appeal of his chapter on the subject of visitation. He is thus present at the General Council of Lyons in 1245, which had been summoned for the condemnation, excommunication, and deposition of the emperor Frederick II. He does not appear prominent in the proceedings of the grand assemblage. His remote diocese, his resistance to papal aggression, the connection of Frederick with Henry III of England and with the earl of Leicester, may have precluded any ardent sympathy with the furious arrogance of Innocent IV. But his own letters and his subsequent conduct show that he sustained the general action of the pontiff, whose cause was assuredly that of national liberty and independence against the menace of universal imperialism. In the autumn of this ominous year Grosseteste returned to England, having obtained a satisfactory decision in regard to his authority. His right of visitation was acknowledged, but a comparison of his letters with the statements of Matthew Paris demonstrates that he did not obtain all that he demanded from the pope. It is equally erroneous to suppose that he sacrificed any principle in urging the collection of the ecclesiastical subsidy granted to Boniface, the new archbishop of Canterbury. There is no abatement of his principle or of his resolution. He resumes his visitations, and extends them to the rich monasteries. They provoke fresh opposition, and occasion fresh complications. At the king's request, he writes upon the reciprocal relations of the sacerdotal and kingly powers. Despite of all obstacles, he sturdily maintains his course. He contends in Parliament against the exactions of the king and the intrusion of foreigners into English benefices. He continues his anxious supervision of the University of Oxford; is sedulous in offices of prudence and charity, especially in ministering to the wants of poor scholars. He is indefatigable in his own pursuits. To this period must be referred the affectionate letter of Adam de Marisco dissuading him from excessive study: "*Numquid non est temperandus labor litteralis studii quod indubitanter nostis quia vitales spiritus exhaurit et attenuat corporis habitudinem, exasperat affectionem et rationem obnubilat?*" . . . . (Ep. xxxix.) The renewed resistance to his visitations, particularly by the monasteries, the dissensions thus engendered, and his differences with Boniface of Savoy, his archbishop, and the uncle of the queen, compelled him to make another visit to Lyons in 1250. He was coolly received by Innocent, and, at the close of an excited conversation, exclaimed, "Oh, money, money, how powerful you are, especially at the court of Rome!" He had anticipated the denunciations of Dante and Petrarch. He gave larger development to his honest indignation in the celebrated sermon on papal abuses which he preached on the 13th of May before the pope and three of the cardinals. This daring rebuke was not calculated to conciliate favor at court, and he turned his face homeward in December "*tristis et vacuus.*" He came back wounded in spirit, and burdened with age, care, and anxiety for the future. He contemplated the resignation of his bishopric—no unusual procedure at that time—and seclusion with his books; but he was induced to renounce this purpose by the representations of Adam de Marisco and other friends—perhaps by the authority of the archbishop—and the fear that the temporalities would be despoiled by the king during the vacancy. The determination to retain his high office was marked by increased vigor in the repression of scandals. Matthew Paris censures with great bitterness his severity in putting down monastic luxury, but admits the righteousness of his purpose. His first open breach with the pope occurred at this time. He had refused the pontifical request to

induct an Italian, ignorant of English, into a rich cure. He was suspended for a short time in consequence. This did not arrest his reforming ardor. He communicated an unworthy nominee of the king's, and placed an interdict on the church to which he had been presented. In the great Parliament of London, October 13, 1252, he opposed the king's demands, fortified by the pope's bull, and induced his brethren to join in a firm refusal of the application for a new subsidy. On this occasion he had a computation made of the incomes of the Italians benefited in England by Innocent, and found that they reached 70,000 marks, or thrice the clear revenue of the crown. He addressed a formal appeal to the lords and commonalty of England to suppress this disastrous spoliation (Ep. cxxxi). It was the first direct claim of popular support in ecclesiastical and political dissensions, and indicated the course to Simon de Montfort as a popular leader. His conduct was still more decided and menacing at the Parliament of May, 1253. In this year, the last of his long and useful life, Grosseteste gave the final affront to Innocent IV, and by one notable act, in strict accordance with his whole previous career, secured the highest public favor, and won the renown by which he is chiefly remembered. He rejected the pope's demand of a canonry at Lincoln for his nephew, Frederick di Lavagna, conveying his refusal in a letter of strong argument and striking condemnation of the pernicious "*non-obstantes*" and "*provisions*" of the papal procedure. It was a note of preparation for Edward III's celebrated "*Statute of Provisors*" nearly a hundred years afterwards (1344). This sharp letter concludes with the declaration "*filialiter et obedienter non obedio, contradico, et rebello*" (Ep. cxxviii). The pope was thrown into uncontrollable rage by this letter, but his rage was exchanged for equally unseemly joy when he heard of the death of Grosseteste within the year. This event occurred at Buckden on the 9th of Oct., 1253. His remains were buried in Lincoln Cathedral, where they were joined about four years later by those of his friend, Adam de Marisco, "God so providing that, as they were lovely and amiable in their lives, so in death they should not be divided" (*Lanercost Chronicle*).

The contemporaneous and posthumous fame of Grosseteste insured a copious crop of legends. He was supposed to have prophesied the ensuing civil war, which he might have done without any extraordinary illumination. On the night of his death, bells ringing in the sky were heard by Mr. Bishop, of London, and by some Franciscan friars in the neighborhood. He appeared in a portentous dream to Innocent IV in his last illness. Miracles were attributed to him, and in 1307 the king requested his canonization. To him was also ascribed the talking head of brass, which has been sometimes assigned to Friar Bacon, and sometimes to Friar Bungay; but this arose from his reputation as a magician, and not as a saint. His books he bequeathed to the Franciscans at Oxford, out of friendship for Adam de Marisco, or out of regard for the school which he had taught, governed, cherished, and organized. The services rendered by Robert Grosseteste to the University of Oxford have been too little appreciated.

*Character, Acquirements, and Influence.*—There was no one in the age in which he lived who led a more blameless life, or displayed higher excellences than Grosseteste: Matthew Paris, whose temperament and associations bred prejudice, attests his pre-eminent virtues. The elegance of his manners attracted admiring comment; the placidity and placability of his disposition equalled his unyielding resolution. The eulogy pronounced upon him after his death by the University of Oxford was entirely just: "No one knew him to neglect any good action appropriate to his office or his charge from fear of any man; he was ever ready for martyrdom if the sword of the executioner should pre-

sent itself." This testimony is re-echoed by Adam de Marisco. He was essentially a reformer without being an innovator. He "stood upon the ancient ways" to restore, preserve, or improve what was good and old. In this sense he was a reformer in Church and State, in education, in letters, and in philosophy. He is not to be regarded as a reformer before the Reformation—as a herald of either Lollardism or Lutheranism. His career tended to that result, but it was unforeseen and undesigned. He is devoted to the order of the Church, solicitous for Catholic orthodoxy, imbued with the spirit, sentiments, and doctrines of his communion. These points are abundantly confirmed by his letters (*Epp.* lxxii, cxxii). Notwithstanding the sternness and severity of his ministry, there was great gentleness in his demeanor, with moderation and prudence in his private and public counsels. He seems to have had withal a very moderate opinion of his own judgment, and habitually sought aid from others whom he deemed wiser than himself. He was easily charmed with simple amusements, enjoyed a jest, and had a rich vein of native humor, as numerous anecdotes attest. This lofty character was sustained and irradiated by transcendent genius and splendid accomplishments. These can be only imperfectly appreciated from his remains published or preserved. They must be estimated from the commendations of his own and of immediately succeeding times. His pupil, Roger Bacon, calls him "*sapientissimus Latinorum*," and "*sapientissimus theologus et optimus homo*" (*Opus Minus*, p. 317, 320), and remarks that "Grosseteste alone knew the sciences" (*Opus Tert.* c. x; *Compend. Stud.* c. viii); that "Robert, bishop of Lincoln, and Brother Adam de Marisco, were perfect in all wisdom, and that no more were perfect in philosophy" than these two, and Avicenna, and Aristotle, and Solomon (*Op. Tert.* c. xxxi); that the said Robert and Adam were "the greatest clerks in the world, perfect in divine and human knowledge" (*Ibid.* c. xxiii). Tyssington speaks of him, "*cujus comparatio ad omnes doctores modernos est rebus comparatio solis ad lunam quando eclipsatur*." The range of his acquirements will be partially illustrated by the number and variety of his writings. He is credited with a consummate mastery of all existing science, and with a knowledge of the three learned professions. Roger Bacon distinctly assigns to him the adoption or the inauguration of the Experimental Method (*Comp. Stud.* c. viii). Several poems, Latin, French, and even English, are attributed to him; and he certainly encouraged the use of the English tongue in preaching, and it may have been, from his employment of the still rude vernacular, that he became the most popular as well as powerful preacher of his day. He is reputed to have been familiar with Greek and Hebrew, but we are assured that he attained only in advanced life a sufficient mastery of the former to translate Greek books (*Rog. Bacon, Op. Tert.* c. xxv), and then not without more competent assistance (*Comp. Stud.* c. viii). The vast influence which he exercised over his contemporaries and our succeeding times is ably presented by Luard (*Pref.* p. lxxxv, ix): "No one," says he, "had a greater influence upon English thought and English literature for the two centuries which followed his time; few books will be found that do not contain some quotations from Lincolnensis, 'the great clerk Grossetest.'"

*Writings.*—The works of Grosseteste have been diversely reported at 200 and 300. The difference of estimation, as well as the magnitude of the sum, may be explained by loose modes of enumeration, as indicated by the comparison of the lists of Roger Bacon's treatises with his actual remains. Divisions or chapters were frequently accounted separate productions. The same works were circulated under different titles. Many of Grosseteste's alleged books were only elaborate epistles or occasional essays, which would now pass as tracts. Many compositions were assigned to

him of which he was guiltless; many fathered upon him to secure the favor of his name. But, after all such rectifications, the multitude and multiplicity of his writings must have been amazing, especially when regarded as the leisure fruitage of an active life. Most of them have been lost, destroyed, or forgotten. Leland humorously reports the disappointment attending his own eager exploration of the Franciscan treasures at Oxford at the time of the dissolution of the monasteries: "*Summe Jupiter! quid ego illic invenni! Pulverem autem invenni, telus arcanarum, tineas, blattas, situm denique et squalorem. Inveni etiam et libros, sed quos tribus obolis non emerem*" (*Script. Brit.* p. 286). Much, however, remains, the greater part of which is still unpublished. In Pegge's *Life of Grosseteste*—"the scarcest of modern books"—the list of his writings fills twenty-three quarto pages, closely printed. Similar catalogues are given by Leland, Tanner, Oudin, etc. These it were unreasonable to repeat or to review. He was the reputed author of a religious romance in verse, *Chateau d'Amour*, and of the didactic poem *Manuel Peche*, translated by Robert de Brunne. Richard Hampole's *Prikke of Conscience* has also been referred to him. He may have composed or compiled the rude draft of these noted productions, or may have provided the crude materials with which they were constructed. We know from many sources that the venerable bishop was devoted to music, and "smit with the love of sacred song." Polycarp Leyser ascribes to him the metrical *Dialogue under Corpus et Animam*, of which many versions exist in Anglo-Norman, English, Greek, Provençal, French, German, Walloon, Spanish, Italian, Danish, and Swedish (*Latin Poems of Walter Mapes*, ed. Wright, p. 95-106, 321, 349), and whose echoes may have occasioned Tennyson's *Two Voices*. Grosseteste left behind him many moral and theological treatises, and a copious collection of sermons. He wrote commentaries on Aristotle and Boethius, and translated several works from the Greek. He wrote on agriculture, digested according to the calendar, *The Buke of Husbandry*, and of *Plantynge and Graffynge Trees and Vynes*, according to Wynkyn de Worde's title of the version printed by him. This was probably compiled from Palladius and the *Geoponica*. We trace in the letters of Adam de Marisco his untiring interest in all physical research and contemporaneous history; and from Roger Bacon we learn that he wrote *De Iride, de Cometis, et de aliis* (*Comp. Stud.* c. viii), including probably a discussion of tides. Other works have been alluded to already. But the most interesting of his remains, for the knowledge of the man and of his age, is the large volume of his letters, from which, and from the instructive preface by Mr. Luard, this notice has been principally drawn.

*Authorities.*—The fascination of Grosseteste's name has in successive centuries excited the enthusiasm of biographers, but has rarely resulted in the accomplishment of their designs. Bishop Barlow, of Lincoln; Samuel Knight, the biographer of dean Colet and Erasmus, and Anthony à Wood, collected materials for his life. Williams, archbishop of York, previously bishop of Lincoln, the successor of lord Bacon in the custody of the seals, meditated the publication of Grosseteste's life and writings in three volumes folio, but was prevented by the outburst of the Great Rebellion. Edward Brown, of Clare Hall, designed a life of the great bishop, but was anticipated by death in 1699. Dr. Samuel Pegge achieved his biography, which is valuable, but unattainable. Other authorities, some of which have been previously referred to, are Leland, *Script. Hist. Brit.*; Ball, *Script. Ill. Maj. Brit.*; Tanner, *Bibliotheca*; Wharton, *Anglia Sacra*; Oudin, *Script. Eccl.*; Pope Blount, *Cens. Celebr. Auct.*; Godwin, *De Præsulibus Angliæ*; Cave, *Script. Eccl. Hist.*; Warton, *Hist. English Poetry*; *Epistola Roberti Grosseteste*, edit. Luard; *Monumenta Franciscana*, ed. Brewer, containing Eccleston, *De Adventu Fratrum Minorum*, and Ada-



*mi de Marisco Epistole*, with valuable appendixes; *Rogeri Baconis Opera Anecdota*, edit. Brewer; *Royal and Historical Letters regn. Henry III.* The last four works are published by the British Treasury, in continuation of the task of the Record Commission. To these authorities should be added the *Chronicles of Matthew of Paris*, *Matthew of Westminster*, *Roger of Wendover*, *Capgrave*, *Trivet*, *Rishanger*, and *Lanercost*. See also *Lechler*, *Robert Grosseteste* (Leipsig, 1867). (G. F. II.)

**Grostète**, CLAUDE, a French Protestant theologian, was born at Orleans in 1647. He studied law, and was admitted to the bar by the Parliament of Paris in 1665, but afterwards devoted himself to theology, and in 1675 became pastor of Lisy. In 1682 he accepted a call to Rouen, but soon after returned to Lisy, where he remained until the revocation of the edict of Nantes in 1685. Obligated to leave France, he went to England, and died at London in 1713. He wrote *Traité de l'Inspiration des livres sacrez du N. T.* (Amst. 1635, 8vo):—*Entretiens sur la correspondance fraternelle de l'Eglise anglicane avec les autres Eglises réformées* (Hague, 1708, 12mo):—*Relation de la Société établie pour la propagation de l'Evangile dans les pays étrangers, avec trois sermons* (Rotterd. 1708):—*Nouveau Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des trois Camarads où l'on voit les déclarations de M. le colonel Cavalier* (London, 1708, 8vo):—*La Pratique de l'Humilité* (Amst. 1710, 12mo):—*Charitas Anglicana* (about 1712):—*Le Devoir du chrétien concubescant, en quatre sermons sur le Psa. cxvi. 8, 9, et les quatre sentimens du roi Zéchias sur sa maladie, sa convalescence et sur sa chute après sa convalescence* (Hague, 1713, 8vo):—*Sermons sur divers textes* (Amsterdam, 1715, 8vo). See *Vie de Claude Grosstète* (prefixed to his *Sermons sur divers textes*); Haag, *La France Protestante*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxii, 190.

**Grosvenor**, BENJAMIN, D.D., an eminent Dissenting minister, was born in London Jan. 1, 1675, and educated at the academy at Attercliffe, Yorkshire. Mr. Grosvenor entered upon his public ministry in the year 1699 as a Baptist. Soon after this he was chosen to succeed Mr. Slater as pastor of the Presbyterian congregation in Crosby Square. To this charge he was ordained July 11, 1704. His popularity as a preacher, his solid judgment, added to a lively imagination, his graceful elocution, and fervent devotion, occasioned his being appointed to take a part in several important lectures which were then carrying on in the metropolis. In 1730 the University of Edinburgh presented him with the degree of D.D. He continued at Crosby Square till the year 1749, when age compelled him to relinquish his pastoral office. He died October 27, 1758. A catalogue of his published pieces, chiefly occasional sermons, amounting to about thirty in number, may be found in Wilson, *History of Dissenting Churches*. A volume of his *Sermons, with a Memoir by J. Davies*, was published in 1808 (Newport, 8vo).—*Jones, Christian Biography*; Skeats, *Free Churches of England*.

**Grotius**, HUGO (Dutch name DE GROOT), one of the most illustrious names in literature, politics, and theology. He was born at Delft April 10, 1583, and in his boyhood gave signs of extraordinary ability. At eleven he was sent to the University of Leyden, where he remained three years, devoting himself especially to theology, law, and mathematics. In 1597 he maintained two theses on philosophy, and wrote in praise of Henri IV., in Latin, a poem entitled *Triumphus Gallicus*, which he dedicated to M. de Buzenval, the French ambassador in Holland. In 1598 he accompanied a Dutch embassy to Paris, where he was introduced to the king, who gave him a brilliant reception. On his return home, 1599, he entered on the practice of law, but devoted himself also to literature. Each year was marked by a new book, or by a new

edition of some important work from his hand. In 1607 he married Mary of Reigersberg, a lady of excellent family, and of high moral and intellectual qualities. In 1609 he published his celebrated treatise *Mare Liberum*, his first essay in treating the law of nations. Appointed pensioner of Rotterdam in 1613, he foresaw the difficulties in which the country would soon become involved, and only accepted office on condition that it should be made permanent. He thus obtained the right of entering the States-general, where he was thrown into close relations with Barneveldt the elder, with whom he formed a lasting friendship. In 1615 he was sent to represent Holland in a conference held in England on the subject of the Greenland fisheries. During his stay in England, Grotius had several conferences with Casaubon on the means of uniting the Roman Catholics and the Protestants, a problem to which he devoted a great deal of thought and labor throughout his life. After his return to Holland he took an active part in the religious discussions which were soon to divide the country, and in which he was always found on the side of freedom. He had at all times favored the views of Arminius, whose enlogy he published in 1609. Though not then, as he afterwards became, a skilled theologian, he was especially attracted by the doctrine of Arminius, and the predilection was afterwards strengthened by study and reflection. And, indeed, the Arminian doctrine, which, discarding the Calvinistic dogma of absolute predestination, teaches that man is free to accept or to refuse grace, could not fail to suit a mind such as that of Grotius. It was held by the majority of the Dutch states; and when Gomar (q. v.) and his party attempted to obtain the proscription of the Arminians, the states did their utmost to prevent it, and enjoined on both parties to tolerate each other. The Gomarists then incited the people to disobey the states; revolts took place in various towns, and some Arminian ministers were driven out of their churches. Grotius, who had previously helped his friend Uytenbogaert with his advice when framing the *Acta Remonstrantium*, in which the Arminian principles are laid out, framed, together with Barneveldt, a new edict of toleration which was voted by the states. But fresh disturbances occurred every day, and the states, by a decree dated Aug. 4, 1617, gave to the town magistrates the power of raising troops to put down insurgents. This decree was passed without the participation of the stadtholder Maurice of Nassau, who had for a long time been seeking occasion to break with Barneveldt and the Republican party. He therefore availed himself of the opportunity offered him by this decree, which, he asserted, disregarded his rights as captain general. He at once sided with the Gomarists, approved all their plans, and forbade the soldiers to obey the civil authorities. Shortly before these events, Grotius had been sent to conciliate the authorities of Amsterdam, who were opposed to the Arminians. His failure in this mission, with the increasing troubles and perils of the country, caused him an illness. During the disturbances, he wrote several works in defence of his party, in which, in order to justify the measures taken by the Dutch States, he attempted to prove that the state has the right to regulate all that relates to the discipline and even the dogmas of the Church. He also applied himself to show that the Arminian doctrine was upheld by the fathers and the councils. The Gomarists, beaten in argument, employed violence to overcome their adversaries. In 1618, Maurice, backed by the States, undertook to coerce the towns, which, on the ground of the sovereignty guaranteed to them by the constitution, had disregarded as illegal the order of the prince forbidding their raising troops. Holland was invaded by the troops of the stadtholder, who gave free vent to his anger. Assembling eight members of the States, he made them decree the arrest of Barneveldt, Grotius, and Hogenbeets, under the accusation of being "ene-

mies of their country for having attempted to resist at Utrecht the army of the prince." The magistrates of Rotterdam and of some other cities of Holland protested against this open violation of their rights, but were deposed. The Synod of Dort, which the Gomarists, sure of having the majority of the clergy on their side, had for a long time demanded, in order to obtain a condemnation of the doctrines of their adversaries, was then assembled. See DORT. In consequence of the decisions of Dort, some of the Arminian ministers were exiled, others put in prison. See ARMINIANISM. The Gomarists, with the partisans of Maurice, commenced in Nov. 1618, the trial of the three prisoners. Twenty-six commissioners, chosen from their avowed enemies, were appointed to judge them. After having, under appearance of legality, murdered Barneveldt in spite of the remonstrances of Du Maurier, ambassador of France, and a friend of Grotius, they began the trial of the latter. He declined to recognise their competence, claiming that he could only be judged by the States of Holland. His remonstrances were of no avail; five hours' time and one sheet of paper were all the facilities afforded him for his defense. "He was condemned on the 18th of May, 1619, to perpetual imprisonment, and his property confiscated. Pursuant to this sentence, he was conveyed on the 6th of June in the same year to the fortress of Loevestein, situated at the extremity of an island formed by the Maas and the Waal. His wife was allowed to share her husband's imprisonment, but Grotius's father was refused permission to see his son. During the imprisonment of Grotius, study became his consolation and the business of his life. In several of his letters addressed from Loevestein to Vossius, he gives an account of his studies, informing him that he was occupied with law and moral philosophy. He devoted his Sundays to reading works on religious subjects, and he employed in the same way the time which remained after his ordinary labors were over. He wrote during his imprisonment his treatise on the truth of the Christian religion, in Dutch verse (which he subsequently translated into Latin prose, under the title *De Veritate Religionis Christianæ*); translated the *Phœnissæ* of Euripides into Latin verse, wrote the institutions of the laws of Holland in Dutch, and drew up for his daughter Cornelia a kind of catechism in 185 questions and answers, written in Flemish verse. After eighteen months' confinement, Grotius was at last released by the ingenuity of his wife, who had obtained permission to go out of the prison twice a week. He constantly received books, which were brought in and taken out in a large chest together with his linen. For some time this chest was strictly examined by the guards, but finding only books and foul linen, they at last grew tired of the search, and gave it up. Grotius's wife, having observed this, persuaded her husband to get into the chest, which he did, and in this manner escaped from the fortress on the 21st of March, 1621. He made his way through Antwerp to France, where his wife, who had been detained for about a fortnight in prison, joined him a few months afterwards. Louis XIII received Grotius very favorably, and granted him a pension of 3000 livres, but it was paid with great irregularity. He was harshly treated by the Protestant ministers of Charenton, who, having assented to the doctrines of the Synod of Dort, refused to admit Grotius into their communion, and he was obliged to have divine service performed at home. At Paris (1622) he published his *Apologétiqueum* (often reprinted), which was prohibited in Holland under severe penalties. Having spent a year at Paris, he retired to a country-seat of the president De Mesmes, near Senlis, where he spent the spring and summer of 1623. It was in that retreat that he commenced his work *De Jure Belli et Pacis*, which was published in the next year. During his residence in France he was constantly annoyed with importunities to pass over to the Roman Catholic religion. But,

though he was tired of the country, and received invitations from the duke of Holstein and the king of Denmark, he declined them. Gustavus Adolphus also made him offers, which, after his death, were repeated by Oxenstiern in the name of queen Christina. In the mean time the stadtholder Maurice died, and his successor seeming less hostile to Grotius, he was induced by the entreaties of his Dutch friends to venture to return. He arrived at Rotterdam in September, 1631, and the news of his return excited a great sensation throughout all Holland. But, in spite of all the efforts of his friends, he was again obliged to leave the country, and went (1632) to Hamburg, where he lived till 1634, when he joined the chancellor Oxenstiern at Frankfort-on-the-Main, who appointed him councillor to the queen of Sweden, and her ambassador at the court of France. The object of the embassy was to obtain the assistance of France against the emperor. Grotius arrived at Paris in March, 1635; and although he had many difficulties to encounter from Richelieu, and afterwards from Mazarin, he maintained the rights and promoted the interests of his adopted sovereign with great firmness. He continued in his post till 1644, when he was recalled at his own request. Having obtained a passport through Holland, he embarked on his return at Dieppe, and on his landing at Amsterdam (1645) was received with great distinction, and entertained at the public expense. From Amsterdam he proceeded by Hamburg and Lübeck to Stockholm, where he was received in the most flattering manner by the queen. Grotius, however, was not pleased with the learned flippancy of Christina's court, and resolved on quitting Sweden. The climate, also, did not agree with him. The queen, having in vain tried to retain him in her service, made him a present of a large sum of money, and of some costly objects; she also gave him a vessel, in which he embarked for Lübeck on the 12th of August; but a violent storm, by which his ship was tossed about during three days, obliged him to land on the 17th in Pomerania, about 15 leagues from Dantzic, whence he proceeded towards Lübeck. He arrived at Rostock on the 26th, very ill from the fatigues of the journey, and from exposure to wind and rain in an open carriage; he died on the 28th of August, 1645, in the sixty-third year of his age. His last moments were spent in religious preparation, and he died expressing the sentiments of a true Christian. His body was carried to Delft and deposited in the grave of his ancestors, where a monument was erected to him in 1781" (*English Cyclopædia*).

Of the many claims on posterity of this distinguished man, we have only to consider those which relate to theology. Grotius applied himself to various branches of theology. We notice, first, his *exegetical* writings. His "Annotations on the O. and N. T." (*Annotat. in libros evangeliorum et varia loca S. Scripturæ* [Amst. 1641]), *Annotat. in Epist. ad Philemonem* (ib. 1642, 8vo; 1646, 8vo), *Annot. in vet. Test.* (Paris, 1664, 3 vols. fol., with Vogel's and Döderlein's additions, Hal. 1775-1776, 3 vols. 4to), *Annot. in N. T.* (Par. 1644, 2 vols., often reprinted; late ed. Gröning. 1827-1829, 7 vols. 8vo) remained for a long time unknown almost to all except Arminian divines, and some Calvinists even spoke of them as dangerous works; for instance, Abr. Calov in *Bibl. V. et N. T. illustrat.* The chief cause of the present popularity of Grotius's exegesis is its purely philological and historical character. In this respect Grotius may be considered as the forerunner of Ernesti. Valuable, however, as these writings are in this respect, they have many defects. As to form they are mere *comments* (as is indicated by the title *Annotationes*), and do not constitute a complete exposition of biblical doctrine. Grotius fails to get at the connection of the thought in his elucidations, and often approaches to a rationalistic mode of treating Scripture. It was well enough in Grotius to compile classical parallels to the maxims given by Jesus in the Sermon on

the Mount, but this should only have been the preparatory step to a full elucidation of the points wherein the morality of Christ differs from that of antiquity. Thus, also, it was quite correct in the elucidation of the O.-T. prophecies to reject the practice of an arbitrary typology of separate passages taken without regard to their original historical connection. But Grotius went towards the other extreme, and gave at least a show of ground for the remark that "Coccejus found Christ everywhere in the O. T., while Grotius found him nowhere." On Grotius's merits as an interpreter, see Segaar, *Oratio de Hugone Grotio, illustri humanorum et divinorum N. T. scriptorum interprete* (Ultraj. 1785, 8vo); Meier, *Gesch. d. Schriftklärung* (iii, p. 434 sq.). His canon for the interpretation of the prophecies of the O. T. is contained in his exposition of the *ἰνα πληροφορῶ* in the *Annotations on Matt. i, 22*, which is worthy of being studied.

In the field of *Apologetics* Grotius achieved a great and enduring success by the publication of his treatise *De veritate religionis christiane* (1627; often reprinted). The best editions are those of Clericus (1709, 1717, 1724, 8vo) and of J. C. Köcher (Jena, 1727, 8vo; Halle, 1734-39, 3 vols. 8vo). It was translated into German by Höhl (Chemnitz, 1768, etc.); French, by Le Jeune (1724), Goujet (1724); English, by Patrick (1667), by Clarke (1793), by Middleton (Lond. 1849, 12mo); Arabic, by Pocock (1660), etc.; and even into Chinese and Malay. The first plan of it was drawn up by Grotius in 1622 while a prisoner at Loevestein. The original object of this prison work, which was written in verse, was to furnish seafaring men, who should come in contact with the heathen, arguments in defense of their faith. But when translated into Latin prose it found its way into the highest circles of educated men, and was, until very recently, a standard text-book on the Evidences of Christianity. In this work Grotius may be said to have erected apologetics into a science, and thus rendered immense service, even though his treatment of the subject does not meet all the wants of the present age. It is divided into six books, of which the first treats of the existence and attributes of God; the second, of the excellence of the doctrine and ethics of Christianity; the third, of the authenticity of the books of the New Testament; the last three, of objections supposed to be made on the part of pagans, Mohammedans, and Jews.

In *Doctrinal Theology* Grotius accepted the Arminian system as regards the doctrine of predestination. He pronounced clearly for the universality of divine grace, without, however, falling into Pelagianism, an accusation often brought against him, but which he vigorously repelled. See his *Conciliatio Dissidentium de re Predestinaria et gratia opinio* (1613), and his *Disquisitio an Pelagiana sint ea dogmata que nunc sub eo nomine traduntur*. Both treatises are given in his *Opera Theologica*, vol. iii. He also refuted in his *Christology* the accusation of inclining to Socinianism in his views of the doctrine of redemption. He defended the doctrine of the expiatory nature of the death of Christ against the Socinians in his *Defensio fidei catholice de satisfactione Christi adversus F. Socinum* (Leyden, 1617; often reprinted). The Socinians answered in the person of Crell by the *Responsio ad Librum Grotii de Satisfactione*, which was refuted by Stillingfleet, etc. But the orthodox, on the other hand, attacked Grotius on account of his theory of the atonement; and it is certainly true that he differs as well from the theory of satisfaction of Anselm as from the orthodox system both of the Lutheran and Reformed churches. In place of a real satisfaction (*satisfactio*), Grotius substitutes a *solutio* on the part of God for the sake of Christ; he saw in the death of Christ more a *substitutory* than a *satisfactory* act; it was a *penal example*, by which, on the one hand, the majesty of God's law was vindicated, and, on the other, his horror of the sin of the world was exempli-

fied in a most striking manner. Baur (*Versöhnungslehre*) gives a clear, and, in the main, fair account of the Grotian theory of atonement, from a translation of part of which, by the Rev. L. Swain, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for April, 1852, we extract the following: "The fundamental error of the Socinian view was found by Grotius to be this: that Socinus regarded God in the work of redemption as holding the place merely of a creditor, or master, whose simple will was a sufficient discharge from the existing obligation. But, as we have in the subject before us to deal with punishment and the remission of punishment, God cannot be looked upon as a creditor, or an injured party, since the act of inflicting punishment does not belong to an injured party as such. The right to punish is not one of the rights of an absolute master or of a creditor, these being merely personal in their character; it is the right of a ruler only. Hence God must be considered as a ruler, and the right to punish belongs to the ruler as such, since it exists, not for the punisher's sake, but for the commonwealth, to maintain its order, and to promote the public good. The act of atonement itself is defined in general as a judicial act, in accordance with which one person is punished in order that another may be freed from punishment, or as an act of dispensation, by which the binding force of an existing law is suspended in respect to certain persons or things. The first question to be asked, therefore, is, whether such a dispensation or relaxing is possible in respect to the law of punishment. Grotius does not hesitate to answer this question in the affirmative, on the ground that all positive laws are relaxable. The threat of punishment in Gen. ii, 17, contains in itself, therefore, the implied right to dispense with the infliction of that punishment, and that, too, without supposing any essential change in God himself, since a law in relation to God and the divine will is not something having an internal force and authority of its own (nichts Inneres), but is merely an operation or effect of the divine will. The objection that none but the guilty person himself can receive the punishment which is due to his crime is answered by the distinction that although every sinner, as such, does, in accordance with the very idea of sin, deserve punishment, still it is not a matter of absolute necessity that this punishment should be actually inflicted. As, therefore, the remission of punishment is a thing which is not in its own nature impossible, it must be left to the circumstances of each particular case to decide how far such remission shall really be admitted. If the authority of law is not to be dangerously weakened, it should be admitted only in cases of the greatest exigency. Such a case clearly is that which is offered in the very instance which we are now contemplating, where, by the actual infliction of the punishment, the entire race of man becomes devoted to death; and as, on the one side, the possibility of the remission of punishment cannot be denied, so, on the other, it cannot be shown to be absolutely unjust that one person should be punished for another's sin. The essential thing in punishment is that it should be inflicted in consequence of sin, not that it should be inflicted upon the person who committed the sin. If, now, it admits of no doubt that a superior may properly inflict upon a subject, as the punishment of another's sin, whatever he might properly inflict upon him respectively of another's sin, then may God, without incurring the charge of injustice, permit Christ to suffer and die for the sins of men. This course, then, being in itself a permissible one, the only question is why God actually determined to adopt it. As the Scripture says that Christ suffered and died for our sins, we are to infer that God purposed not to forgive sins so numerous and so great without a striking penal example, in order to show his displeasure at sin by some act which should in strictest propriety be termed a penal act. And besides this inward reason, lying in the very nature of

the Deity, and called in Scripture the wrath of God, there was the additional consideration that the less sin is punished the more lightly it will be regarded. Prudence itself, therefore, must lead the Deity to exact the punishment, especially where such punishment has been expressly threatened beforehand. Thus, in the penal example furnished by the death of Christ, there is exhibited at once the divine grace and the divine severity, the hatred of God against sin and his care for the maintenance of the law. And this is the mode of relaxing the laws which jurists themselves pronounce the best, viz. by commutation or compensation; because thereby the least injury is done to the authority of the law, and the design with which the law was made is effectually secured, as when one who is charged with the delivery of a thing is free from his liability on paying its full value; for the same thing and the same value are terms very nearly related. Such a commutation may take place not only with respect to things, but also with respect to persons, where it can be done without injury to another.

"In these few statements is contained the entire theory of Hugo Grotius. What is essential to it lies in this main proposition: God neither would nor could forgive the sins of men without the setting up of a penal example. This is done by the death of Christ. Hence the death of Christ is the necessary condition of the forgiveness of sin, and what it always actually presupposes. The theory, therefore, hangs upon the idea of a penal example and of its presupposed necessity, and the question for us now to consider is how, by means of that idea, it stands related, on the one hand, to the theory of the Church which it would defend, and, on the other, to the Socinian theory which it would confute.

"As to its relation to the satisfaction-theory held by the Church, it will be seen at once that it asserts the necessity of the death of Christ in order to the forgiveness of sin, in a sense wholly different from that which the Church intends. If the death of Christ is necessary only as a penal example, then its necessity is grounded, not in the very nature of God himself, not in the idea of absolute justice, by which sin, guilt, and punishment are inseparably bound together, but merely in that outward relation which God holds to men as a ruler. The real object of consideration is not past sin, but future. The guilt of past sin may be removed immediately, for God has the absolute right to remit punishment; and a penal example is necessary only for the purpose of maintaining the honor of the law, and guarding against sin in time to come. The connection, therefore, between sin and punishment is not an inherent, internal connection, founded in the very nature of sin; the design of punishment is merely to prevent sin; or, in other words, it is connected with sin only in consequence of a positive law emanating from God as the supreme Ruler. Hence the final ground upon which Grotius goes back to prove the necessity of instituting a penal example is merely the penal sanction contained in Gen. ii, 17. The advocates of the satisfaction-theory, indeed, go back to the same sentence, but only to remark in it a necessary outflowing of the divine justice. Grotius, on the contrary, takes the absolute idea of divine justice entirely away; for if he affirms, in opposition to Socinus, that justice is an attribute which belongs of itself to the very nature of God, but at the same time asserts that the actual exercise of the attribute depends on the will of God, it is precisely the same as the assertion of Socinus himself, that penal justice is the effect of the divine will; and if he further says that God does what he does not without a cause, still the ultimate ground is not God's absolute nature, but his absolute will, which is in itself equally competent to punish or not to punish.

"Here, then, is an important distinction between the theory of Grotius and that of the Church. The main

point in the Church's theory of satisfaction is that, if Christ had not made a strict and perfect satisfaction for men, they could not have been released from sin. Socinus objected to this that satisfaction and forgiveness were contradictory ideas. This assertion Grotius, as the defender of the Church's doctrine of satisfaction, could not admit. He therefore replied that satisfaction and forgiveness were not strictly simultaneous; that, according to the conditions established by God, the latter then first follows the former when a man by faith in Christ turns to God and prays him for the forgiveness of his sins. This distinction must certainly be made if the objection of Socinus is to be successfully met, and the two ideas are to be permitted to stand side by side. But Grotius could not stop here. If it is only a penal example that is furnished by the death of Christ, then the idea of satisfaction, strictly speaking, has no further relevancy. As, however, Grotius wished to retain this idea, he brought to his assistance a peculiar distinction which is made in law between the two ideas denoted respectively by the terms *solutio* and *satisfactio*. If, said Grotius, the very thing which is owed be paid either by the debtor himself, or, which is in this case the same thing, by another in the debtor's name, then the discharge of the debt takes place by that very act; but it is to be called a discharge, not a remission (*remissio*). Not so, however, when something else is paid than the specific thing which was due. In this case there must be added, on the part of the creditor or ruler, an act of remission as a personal act; and it is this kind of payment, that may be either accepted or refused by the creditor, which is properly called, in the technical language of the law, satisfaction. While, therefore, it was the original design of Grotius, in all this, merely to prove, in opposition to Socinus, that the idea of satisfaction did not exclude that of remission, what he really did was to substitute in place of the common idea of satisfaction a totally different one; for the common idea of satisfaction rests essentially on the supposition that Christ has rendered precisely the same thing which men themselves were to have rendered. If, now, such a payment (*solutio*) be, as Grotius asserts, no remission (*remissio*), but only a discharge (*liberatio*), then it must be conceded to Socinus, which was the thing contested by Grotius, that the ideas of satisfaction and remission mutually contradict and exclude each other, or, in other words, that the satisfaction which was made by Christ does not deserve the name of satisfaction in the sense which the common theory of the Church connected with that expression. But if Christ has not made satisfaction in this sense, if he has not truly and perfectly rendered for men what they were to have rendered for themselves, then the idea of satisfaction can be applied only so far as he has given to God something, whatever that something may be, in place of that which was to have been rendered by men themselves in their relation to God. This, then, is the precise meaning of the theory of Grotius, and the difference between it and the satisfaction-theory of the Church. The idea of satisfaction is let down from its full and real import to the idea of a mere rendering of something; Christ has made satisfaction so far as he has fulfilled a condition, of whatever kind it may be, upon which God has suspended the forgiveness of the sins of men—so far as he has given to God a something with reference to that end. This something is that penal example without the setting forth of which God could not have forgiven the sins of men."

Many of the writings of Grotius are important in the sphere of Church History: such are, for instance, his *Hist. Gothorum, Vandalorum et Longobardorum* (1655); and his *Annales et hist. de rebus Belgicis ab obitu Philippi regis usque ad inducias anni 1609*. He also treated several questions of ecclesiastical jurisprudence in his *De imperio summarum potestatum circa sacra* (*Opp.* theol. iii, p. 201), in which he sides with Arminius in

favor of the territorial system against the opinion of Gomar.

The theological writings of Grotius are collected under the title *Opera omnia theologica* (Lond. 1679, fol. 3 vols.). The first vol. contains a *Life of Grotius*, with his *Annot. in V. T.*; vol. ii contains the *Annot. in N. T.*; vol. iii includes his miscellaneous theological writings. There have been many lives of Grotius, none of them adequate except Brandt, *Hist. van het leven des Heeren Huig de Groot* (Amst. 1727, 2 vols. fol.). See also Lehmann, *Grotii Manes ab iniquis ostrectationibus vindicati* (Delft, 1727); Burigny, *Vie de Grotius* (Paris, 1752, 2 vols. 8vo), translated into English (Lond. 1754, 8vo); Butler, *Life of Grotius* (Lond. 1827, 8vo); Creuzer, *Luther and Grotius* (Heidelb. 1816, 8vo); Cras, *Laudatio H. Grotii* (Amst. 1796, 8vo); Luden, *H. Grotius nach seinen Schicksalen und Schriften dargestellt* (Berlin, 1806, 8vo); Seegar, *Orat. de Grotio* (Utrecht, 1785, 4to); Bayle, *Dictionary*, s. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, v, 395 sq.; Nicéron, *Mémoires pour servir*, vol. xix.; Schröckh, *Kirchengeschichte*, v, 246; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxii, 197 sq.; Piper, *Kalender*, 1867; Nichols, *Calvinism and Arminianism*, ii, 582-641; Shedd, *Hist. of Doctrines*, ii, 347 sq.

**Grove**, the representative in the A. V. in certain passages of two Heb. words.

1. אֲשֶׁרֶת (or אֲשֶׁרֶת), *asherah* (from אָשַׁר, *to be upright*). Selden was the first who endeavored to show that this word—which in the Sept. and Vulg. is generally rendered *grove*, in which our authorized version has followed them—must in some places, for the sake of the sense, be taken to mean a *wooden image* of Ash-toreth (*De Diis Syris*, ii, 2). Not long after, Spencer made the same assertion (*De Leg. Hebreor.* ii, 16). Vitringa then followed out the same argument in his note on Isa. xvii, 8. Gesenius, at length, has treated the whole question so elaborately in his *Thesaurus* (p. 162) as to leave little to be desired, and has evinced that *Asherah* is a *name*, and also denotes an image of this goddess. Some of the arguments which support this partial, or, in Gesenius's case, total rejection of the signification *grove* for *asherah* are briefly as follows: It is argued that it almost always occurs with words which denote *idols* and *statues of idols*; that the verbs which are employed to express the making an *Asherah* are incompatible with the idea of a *grove*, as they are such as *to build, to shape, to erect* (except in one passage, where, however, Gesenius still maintains that the verb there used means *to erect*); that the words used to denote the destruction of an *Asherah* are those of *breaking to pieces, subverting*: that the *image* of *Asherah* is placed in the Temple (2 Kings xxi, 7); and that *Asherah* is coupled with *Baal* in precisely the same way as *Ashtoreth* is (comp. Judg. ii, 13; x, 6; 1 Kings xviii, 19; 2 Kings xxiii, 4; and particularly Judg. iii, 7, and ii, 13, where the plural form of both words is explained as of itself denoting *images* of this goddess; see also 2 Chron. xxxiii, 19; xxxiv, 3, 4). Besides, Selden objects that the signification *grove* is even incongruous in 2 Kings xvii, 10, where we read of "setting up groves under every green tree." Moreover, the Sept. has rendered *Asherah* by *Astarte* in 2 Chron. xv, 16 (and the Vulg. has done the same in Judg. iii, 7), and, conversely, has rendered *Ashtoreth* by *groves* in 1 Sam. vii, 3. See ASHTORETH; HIGH-PLACE.

On the strength of these arguments most modern

scholars assume that *Asherah* is a *name* for *Ashtoreth*, and that it denotes more especially the relation of that goddess to the planet Venus, as the lesser star of good fortune. It appears, namely, to be an indisputable fact that both *Baal* and *Ashtoreth*, although their primary relation was to the sun and moon, came in process of time to be connected, in the religious conceptions of the Syro-Arabbians, with the planets Jupiter and Venus, as the two stars of good fortune. See MENI. We may instance the connection between *Artemis* and *Selene*; that between *Juno* and the planet Venus, mentioned in *Creuzer*, ii, 566; the fact that *astro* is also the name of the same planet in the religious books of the Tsalians (*Norberg's Onomast. Cod. Nasarai*, p. 20). It is in reference to this connection, too, that a *star* is so often found among the emblems with which *Ashtoreth* is represented on ancient coins. Lastly, while the word *Asherah* cannot, in the sense of *grove*, be legitimately deduced from the primitive or secondary signification of any Syro-Arabian root, as a name of the goddess of good fortune it admits of a derivation as natural in a philological point of view as it is appropriate in signification. The verb אָשַׁר means *to prosper*; and *Asherah* is the feminine of an adjective signifying *fortunate, happy*.—Kitto, s. v. *Ashtoreth*. See ASHERAH.

We must not omit to notice a probable connection between this symbol or image—whatever it was—and the sacred symbolic tree, the representation of which occurs so frequently on Assyrian sculptures, and is shown in the subjoined woodcut. The connection is ingeniously maintained by Mr. Fergusson in his *Nineveh and Persepolis restored* (p. 299-304), to which the reader is referred.—Smith, s. v.



Sacred Symbolic Tree of the Assyrians. From Lord Aberdeen's Black Stone.

2. אֶשֶׁל, *e'shel* (Sept. ἄρορα, Vulg. *nemus*). The first notice of this tree is in Gen. xxi, 33, "And Abraham planted a *grove (eshel)* in Beersheba, and called there on the name of the Lord." The second passage where it occurs is 1 Sam. xxii, 6: "Now Saul abode in Gibeah under a *tree (eshel)* in Ramah, having his spear in his hand, and all his servants were standing about him." Under such a tree also he and his sons were buried, for in the only other notice of this word it is said (1 Sam. xxxi, 13), "And they took their bones, and buried them under a *tree (eshel)* at Jabesh, and fasted seven days. In the parallel passage of 1 Chron. x, 12, the word *alah* is employed, which perhaps signifies a *terebinth tree*, but is translated "oak" in the A. V.

Celsius (*Hierobot.* i, 535) maintains that *eshel* has always a general, and not a specific signification, and that it is properly translated *tree*. This, as stated by Rosenmüller, has been satisfactorily refuted by Michaelis in his *Supplem.* p. 134. In Royle's *Illustrated HIMAL. Bot.* p. 214, it is stated, "The Arabic name *asul* or *atul* is applied to *furus* (an arboreous species of tamarisk) in India, as to *T. orientalis* in Arabia and Egypt." So in the *Ulfuz Udrieh*, translated by Mr. Gladwin, we have at No. 36 *ussel*, the tamarisk bush, with 'jkaou as

the Hindec, and *guz* as the Persian synonym. The tamarisk and its products were highly valued by the Arabs for their medicinal properties, and are described in several places under different names in Avicenna. If we refer to travellers in Eastern countries, we shall find that most of them mention the *atul*. Thus Prosper Alpinus (*De Plantis Egypti*, c. ix, *De Tamarisco atle vocata*) gives a figure which sufficiently shows that it must grow to the size of a large tree, and says that he had heard of its attaining, in another place, to the size of a large oak; that its wood was employed for making a variety of vessels, and its charcoal used throughout Egypt and Arabia; and that different parts of it were employed in medicines. So Forskal, who calls the species *Tamariscus orientalis*, gives *at* as its



*Tamarix Orientalis.*

Arabic name, and identifies it with *eshel*. So Belon (*Observ.* ii, 28). In Arabia Burckhardt found the tree called *atul* in the neighborhood of Medina, and observes that the Arabs cultivated it on account of the hardness of its wood. If we endeavor to trace a species of tamarisk in Syria, we shall find some difficulty from the want of precision in the information supplied by travellers on subjects of Natural History. But a French naturalist, M. Bové, who travelled from Cairo to Mount Sinai, and from thence into Syria, has given ample proofs of the existence of species of tamarisk in these regions. A minute description of the tree under its Arabic name is given by L. E. Faber, in *Pub. and Reishü Opusc. med. ex mon. Ar.* p. 137. It is very remarkable that the only tree which is found growing among the ruins of Babylon is a tamarisk. "The one in question is in appearance like the weeping-willow, but the trunk is hollow through age, and partly shattered. The Arabs venerate it as sacred, in consequence of the calif Ali having reposed under its shade after the battle of Hilla" (Rosemüller, *Bibl. Geog.* ii, p. 26, from Ker Porter; comp. Ainsworth's *Researches*, p. 125). From the characteristics of the tamarisk-tree of the East, it certainly appears as likely as any to have been planted in Beersheba by Abraham, because it is one of the few trees which will flourish and grow to a great size even in the arid desert. Besides the advantage of affording shade in a hot country, it is also esteemed on account of the excellence of its wood, which is converted into charcoal. It is no less valuable on account of the galls with which its branches are often loaded, and which are nearly as astringent as oak-galls.—Kitto, s. v. See TAMARISK.

3. It is now generally recognised (see Gesén. *Thes.* 50 b; Stanley, *S. and P.* § 76; 3; p. 142 note, 220 note) that the word *Elon*, עֵלֹן, which is uniformly rendered by the A. V. "plain," signifies a *grove* or plantation.

Such were the *Elon* of Mamre (Gen. xiii, 18; xiv, 13; xviii, 1); of Moreh (Gen. xii, 6; Deut. xi, 30; of Zaananiah (Josh. xix, 33); of the pillar (Judg. ix, 6); of Meonenim (Judg. ix, 37); and of Tabor (1 Sam. x, 3). In all these cases the Sept. has *ἑῖν* or *βάλανος*; the Vulgate—which the A. V. probably followed—*Vallis* or *Convallis*; in the last three, however, *Quercus*. See *ELOX*.

In the religions of the ancient heathen world groves play a prominent part. In old times altars only were erected to the gods. It was thought wrong to shut up the gods within walls, and hence, as Pliny expressly tells us (*H. N.* xii, 2), trees were the first temples (Tacit. *Germ.* 9; Lucian, *de Sacrific.* 10; see Carpzov, *App. Crit.* p. 332), and from the earliest times groves are mentioned in connection with religious worship (Gen. xii, 6, 7; xiii, 18; Deut. xi, 30; A. V. "plain;" see above). Their high antiquity, refreshing shade, solemn silence, and awe-inspiring solitude, as well as the striking illustration they afford of natural life, marked them out as the fit localities, or even the actual objects of worship ("Lucos et in iis silentia ipsa adoramus," Pliny, xii, 1; "Secretum luci . . . et admiratio umbræ fidem tibi numinis facit," Senec. *Ep.* xli; "Quo posses vobis dicere Numen habet," Ovid, *Fast.* iii, 295; "Sacra nemus accubet umbrâ," Virgil, *Georg.* iii, 334; comp. Ovid, *Met.* viii, 743; see Ezek. vi, 13; Isa. lvii, 5; Hos. iv, 13). This last passage hints at another and darker reason why groves were opportune for the degraded services of idolatry; their shadow hid the atrocities and obscenities of heathen worship. The groves were generally found connected with temples, and often had the right of affording an asylum (Tacit. *Germ.* 9, 40; Herod. ii, 138; Virgil, *Æn.* i, 441; ii, 512; Sil. Ital. i, 81). Some have supposed that even the Jewish Temple had a *τίμωρον* planted with palm, and cedar (Psa. xcii, 12, 13), and olive (Psa. lii, 8), as the mosque which stands on its site now has. This is more than doubtful; but we know that a celebrated oak stood by the sanctuary at Shechem (Josh. xxiv, 26; Judg. ix, 6; Stanley, *Sinai and Pal.* p. 142). We find repeated mention of groves consecrated with deep superstition to particular gods (Livy, vii, 25; xxiv, 3; xxxv, 51; Tacit. *Ann.* ii, 12, 51, etc.; iv, 73, etc.). For this reason they were stringently forbidden to the Jews (Exod. xxxiv, 13; Jer. xvii, 2; Ezek. xx, 28), and Maimonides even says that it is forbidden to sit under the shade of any green tree where an idol-statue was (Fabric. *Bibl. Antiq.* p. 290). Yet we find abundant indications that the Hebrews felt the influence of groves on the mind ("the spirit in the woods," Wordsworth), and therefore selected them for solemn purposes, such as great national meetings (Judg. ix, 6, 37) and the burial of the dead (Gen. xxxv, 8; 1 Sam. xxxi, 14). Those connected with patriarchal history were peculiarly liable to superstitious reverence (Amos v, 5; viii, 13); and we find that the groves of Mamre were long a place of worship (Sozomen, *H. E.* ii, 4; Euseb. *Vit. Const.* p. 81; Reland, *Palæst.* p. 714). There are in Scripture many memorable trees; e. g. Allonbachuth (Gen. xxxv, 8), the tamarisk (see above) in Gibeah (1 Sam. xxii, 6), the terebinth in Shechem (Josh. xxiv, 26, under which the law was set up), the palm-tree of Deborah (Judg. iv, 5), the terebinth of enchantments (Judg. ix, 37), the terebinth of wanderers (Judg. iv, 11), and others (1 Sam. xiv, 2; x, 3; sometimes "plain" in A. V., Vulg. "convallis").

This observation of particular trees was among the heathen extended to a regular worship of them. "Tree-worship may be traced from the interior of Africa not only into Egypt and Arabia, but also onward uninterruptedly into Palestine and Syria, Assyria, Persia, India, Thibet, Siam, the Philippine Islands, China, Japan, and Siberia; also westward into Asia Minor, Greece, Italy, and other countries; and in most of the countries here named it obtains in the present day, combined as it has been in other parts with various forms

of idolatry" (Poole, *Gen. of Earth and Man*, p. 139). "The worship of trees even goes back among the Trau-nians to the rules of Hom, called in the Zend-Avesta the promulgator of the old law. We know from Herodotus the delight which Xerxes took in the great plane-tree in Lydia, in which he bestowed golden ornaments, and appointed for it a sentinel in the person of one of the 'immortal Ten Thousand.' The early veneration of trees was associated, by the moist and refreshing canopy of foliage, with that of sacred fountains. In similar connection with the early worship of nature were among the Hellenic nations the fame of the great palm-tree of Delos, and of an aged platanus in Arcadia. The Buddhists of Ceylon venerate the colossal Indian fig-tree of Anurah-depara. . . . As single trees thus became objects of veneration from the beauty of their form, so did also groups of trees, under the name of 'groves of gods.' Pausanias (i, 21, § 9) is full of the praise of a grove belonging to the temple of Apollo at Grynion in Æolis; and the grove of Colone is celebrated in the renowned chorus of Sophocles" (Humboldt, *Cosmos*, ii, 96, Eng. ed.). The custom of adorning trees "with jewels and mantles" was very ancient and universal (Herod. vii, 31; Ælian, *V. H.* ii, 14; Theocr. *id.* xviii; Ovid, *Met.* viii, 723, 745; Arnob. *adv. Gentes*, i, 39), and even still exists in the East.

The *arucular* trees of antiquity are well known (Homer, *Il.* xvi, 233; *Od.* v, 237; Soph. *Trach.* 754; Virgil, *Georg.* i, 16; Sil. Ital. iii, 11). Each god had some sacred tree (Virgil, *Ecl.* vii, 61 sq.). The Etrurians are said to have worshipped a palm, and the Celts an oak (Max. Tyr. *Dissert.* 38, in Godwyn's *Mos. and Aar.* ii, 4). On the Druidic veneration of oak-groves, see Pliny, *H. N.* xvi, 44; Tacit. *Ann.* xiv, 30. In the same way, according to the missionary Oldendorp, the negroes "have sacred groves, the abodes of a deity, which no negro ventures to enter except the priests" (Prichard, *Nat. Hist. of Man*, p. 525-539, 3d ed.; Park's *Travels*, p. 65). So, too, the ancient Egyptians (Rawlinson's *Herod.* ii, 298). Long after the introduction of Christianity it was found necessary to forbid all abuse of trees and groves to the purposes of superstition (Harduin, *Act. Concil.* i, 988; see Orelli, *ad Tac. Germ.* 9).—Smith, s. v. See Pehnen, *De arbore non plantanda ad altare Dei* (Lips. 1725); Dresler, *De lucis religioni gentili destinatis* (Lips. 1740); Lakemacher, *Antiq. Græc. sacræ*, p. 138 sq. See TREE.

**Grove, Henry**, a Presbyterian divine of distinction, was born at Taunton, Somersetshire, Jan. 4, 1683. He received his academical training under Mr. Warren at Taunton, whose school was in excellent repute. At 22 he began to preach; at 23 he succeeded Mr. Warren as head of the Taunton Academy. At first he taught ethics, but in 1725 he began to teach theology also. He at the same time succeeded Mr. James in his pastoral charge at Fullwood, near Taunton, in which he continued till his death. In 1730 he published *The Evidence of our Saviour's Redemption considered*, and the same year, *Some Thoughts concerning the Proof of a Future State, from Reason*. In 1732 he printed *A Discourse concerning the Nature and Design of the Lord's Supper*, where he set that institution in the same light as bishop Hoadly. In 1734 he published, without his name, *Wisdom the First Spring of Action in the Deity*, which was animadverted on by Balguy. In 1736 he published *A Discourse on Saving Faith*. He died February 27, 1737-8. After his death came out by subscription his *Posthumous Works* (1740, 4 vols. 8vo); also *Sermons* (Lond. 1742, 2 vols. 8vo); *Works published in his lifetime* (Lond. 1747, 4 vols. 8vo); *System of Moral Philos.* (Lond. 1749, 2d ed. 2 vols. 8vo). See Amory, *Life of Grove, prefixed to his Posthumous Works* (1745, vol. i); Jones, *Christian Biog.*; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.*, i, 134.

**Gruber, Jacob**, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Lancaster County, Pa., Feb. 3, 1778, of German Lutheran parents. He was converted at four-

teen or fifteen; entered the travelling ministry, in the Philadelphia Conference, in 1800; labored fifty years, chiefly in Pennsylvania and Maryland, with abundant usefulness, and died May 25, 1850. Mr. Gruber was "a singular and extraordinary man." He was alike remarkable for "strength and originality of mind, energy of character, depth of piety, prodigious labors, power of endurance, extensive usefulness, and simplicity and regularity of life." His conversion was powerful, and, although driven from his home in youth for his religious course, he kept his faith. Through his long life his vigor and industry were untiring, and he never ceased labor for any four consecutive weeks until the year of his death. Although eccentric, and often rude in style, he was nevertheless a sound theologian and an able defender of Methodism. In the pulpit he was sometimes grand and overwhelming. "He spent thirty-two years on circuits, seven in stations, and eleven as presiding elder. Many anecdotes are on record of his eccentric wit and sarcasm, and of his great control over men."—*Minutes of Conferences*, iv, 549; Wakeley, *Heroes of Methodism*, p. 407; Strickland, *Life of Gruber* (N. Y. 1860, 12mo).

**Gruner, Johann Friedrich**, a German theologian and philologist, was born at Coburg in 1723. He studied at the university of that city, and afterwards at Jena. In 1747 he became professor of Latin and of Roman archaeology in Jena, afterwards professor of eloquence at Coburg, and in 1764 professor of theology at Halle. He died March 29, 1778. His principal works, so far as they relate to theology, are, *Miscellanea sacra* (Jena, 1750);—*De Odii Romanorum adversus Christianos Causis* (Coburg, 1750);—*De Origine Episcoporum eorumque in Ecclesia præcipua Jure* (Halle, 1764);—*Anweisung z. geistlichen Beredsamkeit* (Halle, 1765);—*Versuch eines pragmatischen Auszugs aus d. Kirchengesch. d. Christen* (Halle, 1766);—*Praktische Einleitung in d. Religion d. Heiligen Schrift* (Halle, 1773);—*Institutionum Theologicæ dogmaticæ Libri tres* (Halle, 1777);—*Observationum criticarum Libri ii* (Jena, 1777). See Harlesius, *Vite Philologorum* (i, 234-243).—Hoefler, *Novv. Biog. Générale*, xxii, 253; Doering, *Gel. Theol. Deutschlands*.

**Grynæus, Johann**, a Swiss Protestant theologian, was born at Leufelingen (Basle) in 1705. He acquired great proficiency in theology and the Oriental languages, and was for seven years professor in the theological faculty of Basle. He died in that city April 11, 1744. He wrote *Opusculi Theol. miscell.* (Basle, 1746, 8vo), a learned and valuable work.—Hoefler, *Novv. Biog. Générale*, xxii, 275.

**Grynæus, Johann Jacob, D.D.**, a Swiss Protestant theologian, third son of Thomas Grynæus (q. v.), was born at Berne Oct. 1, 1540. He studied at Basle, was ordained deacon in 1559, and in 1565 succeeded his father as pastor. In 1577 he became professor of theology at Basle, and remained there until 1584, when he removed to Heidelberg. In 1586 he returned to Basle, where he died head pastor (*amitistes*) of the city, Aug. 30, 1617 (Aug. 31, 1618, according to Michaud). He published *Variorum Patrum Græcorum et Latino-rum Monumenta orthodoxygrapha* (Basle, 1569, 2 vols. fol.);—*Ecclesiastica Historia Eusebii Pamphili, Rufini, Socratis, Theodoret, Sozomeni, Theodori, Evagrii, et Dorothei*, etc. (Basle, 1571, 1588, 1611, fol.);—*Epitome Sacrorum Bibliorum, pars I* (Basle, 1577, 8vo);—*Character Christianorum, seu de fidei, spei et charitatis doctrina*, etc. (Basle, 1578, 8vo);—*Synopsis Historiæ Homi-nis, seu de prima hominis origine, ejusque corruptione, reconciliatione*, etc. (Basle, 1576, 8vo);—*Chronologia brevis Historiæ Evangelicæ* (Basle, 1580);—*Sciographia Sacre Theologiæ* (Basle, 1577, 4to);—*Censura theologica de prima Antichristianorum errorum origine* (Heideld. 1484);—*Theorematia et Problematia theologica* (Basle, 1590, 3 vols.);—*De viris illustribus quorum opere Deus in reformandis ecclesiis usus est* (1602); and a large

number of essays and discourses. See Jo. Fabricius, *Historia Bibliothec.* pt. vi, p. 418-421; Dan. Gerdes, *Florileg. Lib. rar.* p. 153; Adami, *Vita Theologorum Germanorum*; Nicéron, *Mémoires*, xxxvii, 307-315; Uhse, *Leben d. berühmtesten Kirchen-Schribenten*, p. 196; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxii, 274; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* v, 404; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, i, 1347; Middleton, *Evangelical Biography*.

**Grynæus** or **Grnæus**, **Simon**, surnamed **Major**, a German Protestant theologian, was born at Vehringeren (Hohenzollern) in 1493. He studied at Pfortzheim and Vienna, and early embraced the Reformation. He taught Greek at Heidelberg from 1524 to 1529. In 1534 he went to Tübingen, commissioned by duke Ulrich of Württemberg to reform the churches of that place. In 1536 he settled at Basle, where he died of the plague Aug. 1, 1541. Intimately connected with Melancthon, Luther, Calvin, Thomas More, and others, Grynæus was a zealous promoter of the Reformation, and, as such, was exposed to great dangers, but always managed to get out of them unharmed, thanks to his powerful protectors. He was present at the diets of Spire and of Worms, and went to England in 1531 to confer with Henry VIII about his divorce. He was employed to collect the opinions of the Reformed theologians on that subject. A great admirer of the classics, he did much to promote the interests of sound education in the German universities. He discovered in a convent on the Rhine the last five books of Livy (published by Erasmus, Basle, 1531, fol.). Grynæus published Latin translations of the works of Plutarch, Aristotle, and Chrysostom, the first Greek edition of the *Veterinaria medici* (Basle, 1537, 4to) and of the *Almagest* of Ptolemy (Basle, 1538, fol.). He was also the author of *Novus Orbis regionum ac insularum veteribus incognitarum*, etc. (Basle, 1532-1555, fol.). See Brucker, *Historia critica Philosoph.* vol. iv, period iii, p. 105 sq.; Freytag, *Adparatus Litterarius*, iii, 497; Melch. Adam, *Vita Theolog.* p. 56; *Athenæ Raurice*, ii, 69-72; Reimann, *Hist. Litterar.* iv, 207; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxii, 272; Burnet, *History of Reformation*, pt. i, bk. ii; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* v, 402; Middleton, *Evangelical Biography*, i, 149.

**Grynæus**, **Simon**, a Swiss Protestant theologian and philologist (last of the eminent family of Grynæus) was born at Basle in 1725, and died in that city in 1799. He was a thorough theological and classical scholar, and well acquainted with French, English, and Latin literature. He published a translation of the Bible (Basle, 1776), and also versions of *Juvenal*, *Thomas à Kempis*, and Erasmus's *Enchiridion Moricæ*. He also translated into German several English works against Deism. See M. Lutz, *Nekrol. denkw. Schweiz. a. d. xviii<sup>ten</sup> Jahrh.*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biograph. Générale*, xxii, 275.

**Grynæus**, **Thomas**, nephew of Simon Grynæus major, and an eminent Protestant divine, was born at Vehringeren in 1512. He was brought up by his uncle Simon, and became professor of the dead languages at Basle and Berne. He was a zealous promoter of the Reformation. The margrave Charles of Baden appointed him pastor and ecclesiastical superintendent at Röteln, where he remained until his death, Aug. 2, 1564. See Melch. Adam, *Vita Theolog.* p. 191; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxii, 273; Middleton, *Evangelical Biography*.

**Gualbert**, GIOVANNI (*St. Johannes*), founder of the Cœnobia order of Vallombrosa (*vallis umbrosa*), in the Apennines, seven leagues from Florence. He died July 12, 1073, and was canonized by pope Celestine III in 1193. His life is in the *Acta Sanctorum*.—Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. xi, pt. ii, ch. ii, § 24; Jamieson, *Legends of the Monastic Orders*, p. 116 sq.; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 441; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* v, 406.

**Gualfrid**. See GEOFFREY.

**Gualter**, RODOLPHUS, son-in-law of Zwingle, and one of the first Swiss Reformers, was born at Zurich Nov. 9, 1519, succeeded Bullinger as pastor, became superintendent at Zurich in 1575, and died Nov. 25, 1586. His commentaries are highly esteemed and rare, viz. *Honilia cœci in Mattheum* (Zurich, 1590-96, 2 vols. fol.);—*Homil. clxxv in Acta* (Zurich, 1577, fol.). He wrote also a strong anti-papal treatise, *Antichristus* (Zurich, 1546, 8vo). A complete edition of his works appeared at Zurich in 1585 (15 vols, 8vo).—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxii, 810; Winer, *Theol. Literatur.* ii, 555; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, i, 1350.

**Guard**. The Scripture terms used in this connection mostly have reference to the special duties which the body-guard of a monarch had to perform. See KING.

1. *Tabbach'*, תבבצ, originally signified a "cook;" and as butchering fell to the lot of the cook in Eastern countries, it gained the secondary sense of "executioner," and is applied to the body-guard of the kings of Egypt (Gen. xxxvii, 36) and Babylon (2 Kings xxx, 8; Jer. xxxix, 9; xl, 1; Dan. ii, 14). So Potiphar, the master of Joseph, was captain of Pharaoh's *body-guard*, i. e. chief executioner (Gen. xxxix, 1; lxi, 10, 12). In Egypt he had a public prison in his house (Gen. lx, 3-4). It is evident from Herodotus (ii, 165 sq.) that the kings of Egypt had a *guard* who, in addition to the regular income of the soldier, also received a separate salary. In the paintings of marches and battles on the monuments, these royal guards are commonly seen to be employed in protecting the person of the king, and are distinguished by peculiar dresses and weapons (Wilkinson, i, 337, 406). During the reign of the Ptolemies, who in general adhered to the usages of the ancient Egyptians, the office of the commander of the body-guard was a very important one. They possessed the confidence of the king, and were often employed in the most important business transactions. Finally, the superintendence of the executions belonged to the most distinguished caste. In Babylon, Nebuzaradan, who held this office, commanded also a part of the royal army (Jer. xxxix, 13; lii, 15). See EXECUTIONER.



Ancient Egyptian Sentry.

2. *Rîts*, ריץ, properly means a *courier*, and is the ordinary term employed for the attendants of the Jewish kings, whose office it was to run before the chariot (2 Sam. xv, 1; 1 Kings i, 5), like the *cursores* of the Roman emperors (Seneca, *Epist.* 87, 126). That the Jewish "runners" superadded the ordinary duties of a military guard appears from several passages (1 Sam. xxii, 17; 2 Kings x, 25; xi, 6; 2 Chron. xii, 10). It was their office also to carry dispatches (2 Chron. xxx, 6). They had a guard-room set apart for their use in the king's palace, in which their arms were kept ready for use (1 Kings xiv, 28; 2 Chron. xii, 11). See FOOTMAN. They were perhaps the same who, under David, were called *Peletites* (1 Kings i, 5; xiv, 27; 2 Sam. xiv, 1). See PELETHITE.

3. The terms *mishme' reth*, מִשְׁמֵרֵת, and *mishmar'*, מִשְׁמָר, express properly the *act of watching*, or else a *watch-station*, but are occasionally transferred to the persons who kept watch (Neh. iv, 9, 22; vii, 3; xii, 9; Job vii, 12). The A. V. is probably correct in substituting *mishmarto*' (מִשְׁמָרְתוֹ) for the present reading in 2 Sam. xxiii, 23, Benaiah being appointed "captain of the guard," as Josephus (*Ant.* vii, 14, 4) relates, and not privy councillor: the same error has crept into the text in 1 Sam. xxii, 14, where the words



"which goeth at thy bidding" may originally have been "captain of the body-guard." See CAPTAIN.

In New-Test. times we find the *σπουδαίωτος*, for the Latin *spiculator* (rendered "executioner," margin *guard*, Mark vi, 27), properly a *pike-man*, *halberdier*, a kind of soldiers forming the body-guard of kings and princes, who also, according to Oriental custom, acted as executioners. The term *κουστωδία*, for the Latin *custodia*, i. e. *custody*, a "watch" or *guard*, is spoken of the Roman soldiers at the sepulchre of Jesus (Matt. xxvii, 65, 66; xxviii, 11). The ordinary Roman guard consisted of four soldiers (*τετραδίον*, "quaternion"), of which there were four, corresponding to the four watches of the night, who relieved each other every three hours (Acts xii, 4; comp. John xix, 23; Polyb. vi, 33, 7). When in charge of a prisoner, two watched outside of the cell while the other two were inside (Acts xii, 6). The officer mentioned in Acts xxviii, 16 (*στρατοπεδάρχης*, "captain of the guard") was perhaps the commander of the Prætorian troops, to whose care prisoners from the provinces were usually consigned (Pliny, *Ep.* x, 65). See WATCH.

**Guardian Angel**, a term which represents a theory prevalent from antiquity, that human beings are accompanied through life by a special supernatural being (sometimes termed their "attendant genius"), who watches over them for guidance and protection. Such has been thought to be the meaning of Socrates when he claimed a particular *δαίμων* as his spiritual counsellor. See DEMON. Among Christian writers the theory has been thought to derive confirmation from the statement of our Saviour respecting children, that "in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven" (Matt. xviii, 10); and from the declaration that angels "are all ministering spirits sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation" (Heb. i, 14). A more cautious criticism, however, has usually held that these passages only indicate a special care of divine Providence over the young and believers; and the peculiar form of the doctrine referred to appears to savor rather of a pagan than an evangelical origin. Monographs are named in Walch, *Bibliotheca Theologica*, i, 178, and Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 116. See ANGEL.

**Guardian of the Spiritualities**, in England, the person in whom is vested the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of a diocese upon the death or translation of the bishop, or in cases of infirmity of the incumbent or bishop.—Eden, *Churchman's Dictionary*.

**Guarin**, PIERRE, a French Hebraist, was born at Tronquay (Normandy) in 1678. He entered the order of the Benedictines of St. Maur Oct. 21, 1696, became subsequently professor of Greek and Hebrew, and died librarian of the abbey of St. Germain des Prés, Dec. 29, 1729. He had a lively literary controversy with canon Masclef, and wrote *Grammatica Hebraica et Chaldaica*, etc. (Paris, 1724-8, 2 vols. 4to);—*Lexicon Hebraicum et Chaldeobiblicum* (Par. 1746, 2 vols. 4to). Guarin only completed this dictionary to *Memo* inclusively; the following letters were the work of other Benedictines. See Le Cerf, *Bibl. Hist. et crit. des Auteurs de la Cong. de St. Maur*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxii, 318.

**Guastallines**, a monastic order in the Roman Catholic Church, founded in 1534 by countess Torelli, of Guastalla. They were at first connected with the Barnabites, whom they assisted in their missions; but, as this led to disorders, they were ordered to take the vow of seclusion. They were also called the *Angelic order* (*Angelici*), which name was to remind them that they should be as pure in their lives as angels.

**Guatemala**. See CENTRAL AMERICA.

**Gude**, GOTTLÖB FRIEDRICH, a German theologian, was born at Lauban Aug. 26, 1701. He studied theology in the universities of Halle and Leipzig, and taught for some time in the latter. Having returned

to his native city in 1727, he was made chief deacon in 1743, and archdeacon in 1753. He died at Lauban June 20, 1756. Among his numerous publications are *De Causis Dissensuum inter Scripturam Interpretes* (Lpz. 1724);—*Der Christen Reise nach dem rechten Vaterland* (Hal. 1726, fol.);—*De Jurisconsultorum Meritis in Scripturam* (Lauban. 1728);—*De mystica Miraculorum et factorum Christi Interpretatione* (Lpz. 1729);—*Gründliche Erläuterung des Briefes Pauli an die Epheser* (Lauban, 1735).—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxii, 340.

**Gudg'adah** [some *Gud'adah*] (Heb. with the art. and ה directive, *hag-Gudgād'ah*, *הַגְּדָדָה*, *rent*, or perh. *thunder*; Sept. Γαγγὰδ; Vulg. *Gadgad*), the fortieth station of the Israelites during their wanderings in the desert, between Mount Hor and Jotbath (Deut. x, 7); doubtless the same with HOR-HAGIDGAD, through which they had previously passed between Benc-jaakan and Jotbath (Numb. xxxiii, 32). The name appears to be preserved in the present wady *Ghudhaghah* ("diminutions"), mentioned by Robinson (*Res.* i, 267) as "a broad sandy valley which drains the remainder of the region between the Jerafeh and el-Mukrah, and carries its waters eastward to the former." See EXODE. In this identification two late travellers agree (Schwartz, p. 213; Bonar, p. 286, 295). See HOR-HAGIDGAD. Dr. Robinson suggests that Gudgadah and Jotbathah may be in the Arabah, near the junction of wady Ghurundel with wady el-Jeib (Res. ii, 583). See JOTBATH.

**Gudule**, **Goule**, or **Ergoule**, ST., a Belgian virgin, patroness of Brussels, is said, according to tradition, to have been born in Brabant about 650. She was the daughter of St. Amalberge, and was educated by her godmother, St. Gertrude, abbess of the convent of Nivelles. In 664, Gertrude having died, Gudule went to reside with count Witger, the second husband of her mother. While there she led a life of extravagant asceticism, and, according to the Romish legend, accumulated such a stock of good works that God gave her the power to work miracles both during her life and after her death! She died Jan. 8, 712, and was buried in the church of St. Michael, Brussels, which was subsequently called after her, and is now the cathedral of St. Gudule. She is commemorated on the 8th of January, and is the object of special veneration throughout Belgium. See Ruth d'Ans, *Vie de St. Gudule* (Brussels, 1703, 12mo); Baillet, *Vies des Saints* (vol. i, Jan. 8); Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxii, 352; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, Jan. 8.

**Guebres**. See PARSEES.

**Guédier de Saint-Aubin**, HENRI MICHEL, a French theologian, was born at Gournay-en-Bray June 17, 1695. He studied at Paris, and received the doctor's degree from the Sorbonne Oct. 29, 1723. He became professor in that institution in 1730, and its librarian in 1736. Some time after he obtained the abbey of St. Vulmer. He was acquainted with Hebrew, Greek, Latin, French, English, and Italian, besides history, theology, and kindred sciences. For fourteen years he decided all cases of conscience presented to the Sorbonne. He died at Paris Sept. 27, 1742. He wrote, *Histoire sainte des deux Alliances* (Paris, Didot, 1741, 7 vols. 12mo), which Moréri considers as a good concordance of the O. and N. T. At the end of every part are remarks and arguments on the designs of the sacred writers, and on the authenticity and inspiration of their writings.—Ladvozat, *Dict. historique*; Moréri, *Dict. hist.* (edit. 1759); Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxii, 358.

**Guelpherbytanus**, **Codex**. See WOLFENBÜTTEL MANUSCRIPT.

**Guelphs and Ghibellines**, the names given to two great mediæval parties which acquired a pre-eminent celebrity especially in Germany and Italy, inasmuch as their contests made up a great portion of the history of those countries from the 11th to the 14th centuries, and which claim notice here because of the close

connection of their party strifes with the ecclesiastical history of that period, and the use which the papacy made of them to increase its power and authority. According to the most reliable authorities, the word Guelph, or Gueif, is derived from "Welf," a baptismal name in several Italo-German families, which may be traced even up to the 9th century in a line of princes who migrated from Italy to Germany in the 11th century, when it appears there as the name of several chiefs of the ducal house of Saxony. Ghibelline is referred to "Waiblingen" (anciently *Wibelingen*), a town of Würtemberg, and the patrimonial seat of the Hohenstauffen family. The party conflicts originating in the rivalry of the ducal houses above mentioned, and probably also the party names, are of earlier date, but the first recorded use of these terms to designate the opposing parties occurred A.D. 1140, in the great battle of Weinsberg, in Suabia, fought between the partisans of Conrad of Hohenstauffen and those of Henry the Lion, of the house of Welf, rival claimants of the imperial throne. In this battle the followers of Conrad rallied to the cry of "He Waiblingen!" and those of Henry to the cry of "He Welf!" These party cries, transferred to Italy, subsequently the chief theatre of these party contests, became Ghibellini and Guelphi or Guelfi, in the Italian language, the former designating the supporters, and the latter the opponents of the imperial authority, which generally vested in the Hohenstauffen house. The opposition to this authority arose from two sources, viz. (1) from the cities and smaller principalities seeking to maintain their local rights and liberties, and (2) from the popes, who, jealous of the power of the German emperors, and irritated by their exercise of authority in ecclesiastical matters, especially in regard to investitures (q. v.), favored the party of the Guelphs, and, indeed, became the representative leaders thereof. Hence the term Guelph came to signify in general those who favored the Church's independence of the State, and the maintenance of municipal liberty as against the partisans of a supreme and centralized civil authority represented in the emperor. This statement, however, seems not to hold good always, since in the multiplied and complicated conflicts of these parties an interchange of the distinctive principles and objects of each appears to have taken place in certain instances, and the interests of the hierarchy by no means always coincided with the aspirations for municipal and personal freedom, however freely it evoked them to advance its own ends. The contest of the papacy for supremacy over the civil power, organized and definitely directed to its object by Gregory VII (q. v.), culminated in the pontificate of Innocent III (q. v.), when, "under that young and ambitious priest, the successors of St. Peter attained the full meridian of their greatness" (Gibbon, vi, 36, Harper's ed.), and "the imperial authority at Rome breathed its last sigh" (Muratori, *Annal. Ital.* anno 1198).

In the contests of the Ghibelline and Guelph parties historians note "five great crises," viz. (1) in 1055, under Henry IV; (2) in 1127, under Henry the Proud; (3) in 1140, under Henry the Lion; (4) in 1159, under Frederick Barbarossa; and (5) the pontificate of Innocent III. After the decline of the imperial authority in Italy, in the conflicts between opposing parties among the nobility and in the cities, Ghibelline was used to designate the aristocratic party, and Guelph those professedly favoring popular government. But the party name, as thus defined, did not always represent the real principles and objects of the party. In the course of time the contest "degenerated into a mere struggle of rival factions, availing themselves of the prestige of ancient names and traditional or hereditary prejudices" (Chambers), so that in 1273 pope Gregory X used the following language: "Guelphus aut Ghibellinus, nomina ne illis quidem, qui illa proferunt, nota; inane nomen, quod significat, nemo intelligit" (Muratori,

*Scriptt. rerum Italicarum*, xi, 178); and in 1334 pope Benedict XII forbade the further use of the terms, and "we read little more of Guelphs and Ghibellines as actually existing parties." The conflict of principles in ecclesiastical as well as civil polity which these terms once served to represent may be traced through every subsequent age, and has not, even in this 19th century, ceased to exist.—Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, s. v.; *English Cyclop.* s. v.; *New American Cyclop.* viii, 547-8; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxii, 360 sq.; Sismondi, *Hist. Des Français* (see Index); Ranke, *Hist. of Papacy* (see Index); Herzog, *Real-Encycl.* xvii, 659 sq. (J. W. M.)

**Guénéé**, ANTOINE, a French abbot, was born at Etampes Nov. 23, 1717. He studied at Paris, entered the Church, and attained high degrees in the university. For twenty years professor of rhetoric at the college of Plessis, he travelled through Italy, Germany, and England to acquire a knowledge of their languages, and on his return published several translations. He afterwards wrote the *Lettres de quelques Juifs* against Voltaire, for which he was made canon of the cathedral of Amiens, and afterwards attached to the chapel of Versailles by cardinal de la Roche-Aymon. During the Revolution he was imprisoned for ten months at Fontainebleau, and after his liberation lived in retirement with his brother. He died at Fontainebleau Nov. 27, 1803. Among his publications are: *Les Témoins de la Résurrection de Jesus Christ examinés suivant les règles du barreau* (from the Engl. of Sherlock, against Woolston, Paris, 1753, 12mo):—*La Religion chrétienne démontrée par la conversion et l'apostolat de Saint Paul* (from the Engl. of Lyttleton, with the addition of two discourses by Secd):—*Sur l'Excellence intrinsèque de l'Écriture* (Paris, 1754, 12mo):—*Observations sur l'histoire et sur les preuves de la Résurrection de Jesus Christ* (from the Engl. of West, against Woolston) (Paris, 1757, 12mo):—*Lettres de quelques Juifs portugais, allemands et polonois à M. de Voltaire* (Paris, 1769, 8vo); often reprinted, with additions, as 6th ed. Paris, 1805, 3 vols. 8vo and 12mo; 7th ed. Paris, 1815, 4 vols. 8vo; 8th ed. Paris, 1817, 8vo; Lyon and Paris, 1857, 3 vols. 12mo; transl. into English by Lefanu under the title *Lettres of certain Jews to Voltaire* (Dublin, 1777, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Recherches sur la Judée considérée principalement par rapport à la fertilité de son terroir, depuis la captivité de Babylone jusqu'à nos temps, in Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, vol. 1 (1808), composed of papers read by him before this society, of which he had been elected member in 1778.—Dacier, *Notice sur l'abbé Guénéé* (at the head of the 7th ed. of *Lettres de quelques Juifs*, etc., Paris, 1815); Quéraud, *La France littéraire*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxii, 381; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, i, 1351.

**Guertler**, NICOLAUS, D.D., a learned Protestant divine, was born at Basel in 1654. He studied at the university of that city, and in 1685 became professor of philosophy and rhetoric at Herborn. He afterwards became professor of theology at Hanau, and in 1696 at Bremen. From thence he removed to Deventer in 1699, and to Franeker in 1707. He died in 1711. His principal work is *Systema theologiæ propheticae, cum indicibus necessariis* (Utrecht, editio secunda emendata, 1724, 4to).—Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* ii, 1256; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxii, 855. (J. H. P.)

**Guest.** See HOSPITALITY.

**Guest-chamber** (κατάλυμα, a lodging-place, i. e. properly inn, as rendered in Luke ii, 7; hence any room of entertainment, and so used by the Sept. at 1 Sam. ix, 22; Neh. iii, 5; Ezek. xl, 44), the ἰπεριώρον, *canaculum*, or spare apartment in an Oriental dwelling (Mark xiv, 14; Luke xxii, 11). See HOUSE. At the public festivals these may naturally be supposed to have been placed at the service of strangers attending Jerusalem for that purpose. See PASSOVER.

**Gui.** See GUIDO.

**Guibert de Nogent**, a French scholastic theo-

gian and historian, of noble and wealthy parentage, was born in 1053 near Clermont, and died in 1124. He lost his father while quite young, but the diligent care and zeal of his pious mother gave to his early training a strongly religious tendency. He was educated at the abbey of St. Germer, which he entered at 12 years of age, and where he enjoyed the instructions of Anselm (q. v.), then prior in the neighboring abbey of Bec. At first he found his chief delight in poetry and the reading of classic poets; but a severe illness gave a more serious direction and higher development to his inner life, and he devoted himself to the study of the Scriptures and ecclesiastical writers. At the age of fifty he became abbot of Notre-Dame de Nogent, where he composed most of his works. Though not exempt from the credulity and monkish devotion to hierarchical ideas which belong to his age, Guibert was for his time a man of more than ordinary learning and independence of spirit, to which he gave expression in his severe condemnation of the prevailing superstitions and errors in regard to relics and false miracles. The best edition of his writings is that published by D'Achéry under the title *Venerabilis Guiberti Abbatis B. Marie de Norwigeno Opera Omnia producta*, etc. (Paris, 1651, fol.). In this edition are found (p. 1-525) the following works of Guibert (the list and sketch of which, given here, are based on Herzog, viz.: 1. *Libro quo ordine sermo fieri debeat*; written while he was a monk at St. Germer, and especially interesting as being one of the few works on Homiletics coming to us from the Middle Ages;—2. *Moralium Genesios Libri x*; a figurative exposition of Genesis after the style of Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Jobum*;—3. *Tropologiarum in Prophetas Osea et Amos et Lamentationes Jeremie libri v*; with a preface and epilogue addressed to Norbert, founder of the Premonstrants (q. v.);—4. *Tractatus de incarnatione contra Judæos*; an apologetic treatise in vindication of the divinity and virgin-birth of Christ;—5. *Epistola de buccella Jude datu et de veritate dominici corporis*; in answer to the question whether Judas received the Eucharist or not, with a defence of Lanfranc's doctrine of the Eucharist against that of Berengarius (q. v.);—6. *De laude S. Marie liber*; wherein, though a zealous worshipper of the Virgin Mary, he makes no mention of her immaculate conception;—7. *Opusculum de Virginitate*;—8. *De pignorum Sanctorum libri iv*; a work on the worship of saints and relics, in which many abuses and errors connected therewith are boldly criticised and condemned, and the monks of St. Médard at Soissons are severely censured for pretending to possess a genuine tooth of Christ. Guibert will not allow that the miraculous virtues claimed for relics are a proof of genuineness or sanctity;—9. *Historia que dicitur gesta Dei per Francos sive Historia Hierosolymitana*; a valuable account of the first Crusade, founded on an earlier narrative by a crusader, perhaps a Norman knight, entitled *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitanorum*, which is complemented by materials obtained of other eye-witnesses;—10. *De vita sua sive Monodiarum libri iii*; an autobiography after the plan of St. Augustine's *Confessions*, and containing also much material valuable for the history of the Church and of the social life of the period. Besides the works above enumerated, Guibert wrote some commentaries on the minor prophets (the MSS. of which were formerly preserved in the libraries of Vauchair and Pontigny), as also another exegetical work, mentioned by himself (*De vita sua*, i, 16), but now lost, bearing the title *Capitularis libellus de diversis evangeliorum et prophetarum voluminum*. He was also probably the author of a sermon delivered at the feast of St. Magdalena, found in Mabillon's edition of the works of St. Bernard of Clairvaux, ii, 701. Another work, *Elucidarium sive dialogus summam totius Christiane religionis complectens*, has been erroneously ascribed to him.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xix, 584 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxii, 515; Clarke, *Success. of Sac.*

*Lit.* ii, 647; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* c. xii, pt. ii, ch. ii, n. 71; *Hist. littér. de la France*, vii, 80, 92, 118, 124, 146; ix, 433. (J. W. M.)

**Guibert**, Anti-pope, was born at Parma in the 11th century. His family name was Correggia, and he was said to be descended from the counts of Augsburg. Made archbishop of Ravenna through the influence of the emperor Henry IV, he was elected pope by a council held at Brescia (hostile to Gregory VII) in 1080, and took the name of Clement III. His first act of authority was to excommunicate Gregory VII, who, in turn, put him under the ban, and never consented to grant him absolution. Guibert took Rome by force, but in 1089 was compelled to leave the city. He died at Ravenna in 1100. His election gave rise to the sect of the *Henricians*, who claimed that the emperor alone possessed the right of appointing popes. The sect was condemned by several councils, and finally disappeared towards the end of the 12th century.—See Artaud, *Hist. des souverains Pontifes*, vol. ii; *Art de Vérifier les Dates*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxii, 514; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* v, 408 sq.

**Guibert of Ravenna**. See **GUIBERT** (Anti-pope).

**Guide** (the rendering; more or less proper, of various Heb. words; Gr. *ὄδηγός*). Such was Hobab invited by Moses to become to the Israelites in the wilderness (Numb. x, 31, "that thou mayest be to us instead of eyes"). See **EXODE**.

**Guido de Arezzo**, or **Gui**, a Benedictine monk of the abbey of Pomposa, noted in the history of music. He was born at Arezzo about 990, and early distinguished himself by his talent for music, which he taught in his convent. Numerous inventions (e. g. counter-point) have been attributed to Guido without good ground; but he did render great service to music by his ingenious simplification of the existing methods of notation. He wrote *Micrologus de Disciplina Artis Musicae*, "or Brief Discourses on Music, in which most of his inventions are described, as well as his method of instruction." His doctrine of solmisation is, however, not found in that work, but set forth in a small tract under the title of *Argumentum novi Cantus inventendi*. He died about the middle of the 11th century, but the exact date of his death is unknown. See Burney, *History of Music*; Gerbert, *Scriptores Eccl. de Musica Sacra*; Hoefer, *Nouvelle Biog. Générale*, xxii, 551; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* v, 411.

**Guido de Bres**, an evangelist and martyr of the Walloon Church, was born at Mons in 1540. He was brought up in the Church of Rome, but by searching the Scriptures arrived at the knowledge of evangelical truth, and was compelled by persecution to escape to London, where he joined the Walloon Church organized under Edward VI, and prepared himself for the ministry. He afterwards returned to his native country as evangelist and travelling preacher, in which capacity he showed great zeal, first at Lille, where there was a large secret Protestant community, which was dispersed by force in 1566. Guido then retired to Ghent, where he published a polemic tract out of the fathers entitled *Le bâton de la foi*. He then went to prosecute his studies at Geneva, where he became a determined adherent of Calvin. Returning to his country, he resumed his evangelical labors, reorganized the three principal communities of Lille, Tournay, and Valenciennes, and made the whole of southern Belgium and northern France, from Dieppe to Sedan and from Valenciennes to Antwerp, the field of his indefatigable activity. Valenciennes, which had become almost entirely Protestant, was stormed by Noircarmes in 1567. Guido was caught while attempting to escape, and was thrown into prison. After seven weeks of imprisonment he was hanged, with the young La Grange, on the last day of May, 1567. Guido, though in the prime of life, leaving behind him a wife and several

young children, met death not only calmly, but cheerfully. While in prison he had written letters of consolation both to his mother, to whom he was much attached, and to his congregation; the latter epistle, containing a thorough refutation of the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, is to be found in the *Histoire des Martyrs* (Geneva, 1617), together with a life of Guido and La Grange (p. 731-759).

Guido's prediction that the seeds of Protestantism he had so carefully sowed would grow with greater strength after being watered with his blood, has been fulfilled. To him the Dutch Church owes the fact that, instead of becoming a mere branch of the French (Calvinistic) or the German Reformed Church, it has remained between the two, a shield and a blessing for both. Guido drew up in 1559 a confession of faith, after the model of the French Confession drawn up in 1559 at Paris. This confession he submitted to Calvin, by whose advice he changed it in some particulars, and, after obtaining the assent of the principal Reformed churches in the Netherlands, he published it in 1562 as the *Confession of Faith of the Reformed Church in the Netherlands*, sending a copy of it, with an appropriate and remarkable introduction, to king Philip II. The theologians of Geneva believed that the Netherland churches might adopt the French Confession as it stood; but Guido probably foresaw that the adoption of a confession exclusively their own, in French and Low-Dutch, was the only means to form a united church in that country, inhabited by people of two nations and speaking two languages. See Le Long, *Kort historisch verhaal van den oorsprong der nederlandschen gereformeerden kerken onder Kruys*, etc. (Amsterd., 1741, 4to); G. Brandt, *Histoire der reformatie in en ontrent de Nederlanden* (Amsterd., 1671); Ypema Dermout, *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk* (Breda, 1818 sq.); and especially Van der Kemp, *de Eere der nederlandsche hervormde Kerk* (Rotterdam, 1830).—Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* v, 412; Motley, *Rise of the Dutch Republic*, vol. i; *Christian Intelligencer*, March 14, 1861.

**Guignard, JEAN**, surnamed *Briquard*, a French Jesuit of the 16th century, and, during the League, rector and librarian of the college of Clermont at Paris. After the attempt of Jean Châtel against the life of king Henry IV, the Jesuits were charged with being implicated in the affair, as the would-be assassin was one of their pupils. Their houses were searched, and some violent writings of Guignard against the king were discovered. He defended himself by saying they had been written before the king's conversion to Roman Catholicism, and that since that time he had always taught obedience to the royal authority and remembered the king in his prayers. He was condemned of high treason, sentenced to be hung, and his body burnt. The execution took place on the same day, Jan. 7, 1595. He persisted to the last in asserting his innocence. The next day all the Jesuits were banished from Paris. Some Jesuit writers—father Jouvency, for instance—in writing the history of the order, have represented Guignard as a martyr. See Sully, *Economies royales*; L'Etoile, *Journal de Henri III*; De Thou, *Hist.* lib. cxi; Sismondi, *Hist. des Français* (see Index); Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxii, 566. (J. N. P.)

**Guignes, CHRÉTIEN LOUIS JOSEPH DE**, a French Orientalist, was born at Paris Aug. 25, 1759, and died in the same city March 9, 1845. He was instructed by his father, Joseph de Guignes, in the Oriental languages, making Chinese a special study. In 1784 he was appointed French resident in China and consul at Canton, and before his departure thither was also appointed correspondent to the Academy of Sciences and the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres. After spending 17 years in China he returned to France, having mean while communicated to the academies sev-

eral interesting and useful papers, which were published in their *Mémoires*. In 1808 there issued from the imperial press his *Voyages à Peking, Manille, et l'Île de France, faits dans l'Intervalle des Armées 1784 à 1801* (3 vols. 4to, with fol. atlas of maps and plates). Among the grand literary projects of the reign of Louis XIV was the publication of a dictionary of the Chinese language, but the project has not been realized, and was apparently abandoned. The imperial government of Napoleon I determined to revive and complete the enterprise, and De Guignes, by a decree dated Oct. 22, 1808, was selected to compile such a work. In 1813 it appeared from the imperial press, bearing the title of *Dictionnaire Chinois-Français et Latin, publié d'après l'ordre de S. M. l'empereur et roi Napoléon le Grand*, etc. (Paris, fol.). This work proved to be, in the main, only an adaptation of the *Hán-tz-si-yih* (i. e. Occidental interpretation of Chinese characters), a Chinese-Latin vocabulary by a Franciscan missionary to China, Basil de Glemona, whose modest but valuable labors De Guignes had appropriated without acknowledgment. The plagiarism was discovered, and severely but justly censured by the critics of the time, and the effect was undoubtedly to diminish the appreciation of any additions or improvements made by De Guignes.—Hoefler, *Nouvelle Biog. Générale*, xxii, 569; *New American Cyclopaedia*, viii, 555. (J. W. M.)

**Guilbert.** See **GUIBERT** and **GILBERT**.

**Gulbertines.** See **GILBERTINES**.

**Guild, WILLIAM**, a divine of the Church of Scotland, was born at Aberdeen in 1586, and educated at Marischal College, then recently founded, with a view to holy orders. Before he entered the ministry, however, he published a treatise entitled *The New Sacrifice of Christian Incense; and The only Way to Salvation*. He was very soon after called to the pastoral charge of the parish of king Edward, in the presbytery of Turriff and synod of Aberdeen. In 1617, when James I visited Scotland with a view to establish episcopacy, and brought bishop Andrewes, of Ely, with him, to assist in the management of that affair, the latter paid great regard to Guild; and the following year, when Andrewes was promoted to the see of Winchester, Guild dedicated to him his *Moses Unveiled*, pointing out those figures in the Old Testament which allude to the Messiah (new ed. Edinb. 1839, royal 8vo). He wrote several works against Popery; an *Exposition of Solomon's Song* (Lond. 1658, 8vo);—an *Explanation of the Apocalypse* (Aberdeen, 1656);—*Exposition of Second Samuel* (Oxford, 1659, 4to). He was a man of great learning. In 1640 he was made principal of King's College, Aberdeen, but, taking part with the monarchy, was deposed by the Parliamentary commissioners in 1651, and died in 1657. See Shirreffs, *Life of Guild* (Aberdeen, 1799, 2d edit. 8vo); Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 748; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, i, 1352.

**Guilds.** In the Middle Ages, religious clubs or mutual benefit societies, embracing men and women, were established in nearly every parish church. They kept yearly feasts, supported annals for the repose of deceased members, sometimes also hospitals for the relief of decayed members, and always collected alms for their sick and poor. On certain anniversaries they met at a common altar, wearing livery gowns and hoods, usually of two colors, and the badge of their patron saint. In the monasteries, kings, nobles, and benefactors were admitted as lay members, and in the parish societies as honorary members. "The members promised fidelity to the guild rules and obedience to the superiors." Of late, the Ritualists in the Anglican Church are endeavoring to revive the guilds, and quite a number had been re-established up to the year 1869. A list of them is given in the *Church Union Almanac for 1869* (Lond. 1869).—Walcott, *Sacred Archaeology*, s. v. (J. W. M.)

**Guillain.** See **GUILLAIN**.

**Guillelmus.** See WILLIAM.

**Guillemine or Guillemette**, a Bohemian enthusiast of the 13th century. She went from Bohemia to Milan, where she gave herself out as the daughter of the queen of Bohemia (Constantia), pretending to have been conceived in a miraculous manner, like Christ. She professed to have the mission of saving bad Christians, Jews, and Mohammedans. Her pretended visions and semblance of asceticism gained her many adherents. The *mysteries* of her system are said to have been grossly immoral. Guillemine died in 1280, according to Moréri (1300 according to Bossi), and was buried with great honors in the monastery of Chiaravalle, near Milan, founded by St. Bernard. The sect continued under the management of a priest, Andrew Saramita, and of a nun of the order of Humiliati, whom Guillemine had herself pointed out for her successor. Six years after, however, their secret practices were revealed, and the women were imprisoned and punished. Saramita and Provana were burnt after being condemned by the Inquisition, as was also the body of Guillemine, disinterred for the purpose. The house where the sect met was razed, and a hermitage erected in its place; it became afterwards part of a convent of Carmelites. Some writers have attempted to refute the accusation of immorality made against the sect. See Bossi, *Chron.*; Mabillon, *Museum Ital.* vol. i; Bayle, *Dict. Hist.*; Hoefler, *Nouvelle Biog. Générale*, xxii, 714 sq. (J. N. P.)

**Guillon**, MARIE NICHOLAS SILVESTRE, a French priest and distinguished humanist, was born at Paris Jan. 1, 1760. He studied at the colleges of Du Plessis and Louis-le-Grand, and acquired great proficiency not only in theology, but in medicine, natural sciences, and mathematics. Received as professor in the university in 1789, he entered the Church, and became soon distinguished as a preacher. He was afterwards almoner and librarian of the princess of Lamballe until her murder, Sept. 1792. He then fled to Seeaux, where, under the name of *Pastel*, he practiced medicine for some time to avoid persecution. He afterwards removed to Meaux, and in 1798 to Paris. Some time after he became connected with the abbot de Fontenay in the publication of the *Journal général de Littérature, des Sciences et des Arts*. After the restoration of Roman Catholic worship he became honorary canon and librarian of the cathedral of Paris, then professor of rhetoric and homiletics in the theological faculty, and almoner of the college of Louis-le-Grand. He was afterward successively appointed almoner of the duchess of Orleans in 1818, and inspector of the academy. His ready acquiescence in the Revolution of 1830 excited the displeasure of the clergy, and it was with great difficulty the king succeeded in obtaining his appointment as bishop of Beauvais. In this position he attended the last moments of the abbé Gregoire (q. v.), to whom he administered the sacraments. Severely censured for this, he referred the matter to the pope, resigning his bishopric in the mean time. Thanks to the interference of the court, the matter was settled, and Guillon was appointed bishop of Morocco in *partibus infidelium*, July 7, 1833. In 1837 he was appointed dean of the faculty of theology; but, when the French government and the clergy entered into closer union, Guillon was sacrificed by being sent to Dreux to keep the chapel which had successively received the remains of several children of the king. He died in Montfermeil Oct. 16, 1847. He was a most prolific writer. Among his theological works we notice the following: *Qu'est-ce donc que le pape? par un prêtre* (Paris, 1789, 8vo):—*Collection eccles., ou recueil complet des ouvrages faits depuis l'ouverture des états généraux relativement au clergé* (Paris, 1791–1792, 7 vols. 8vo, under the name of Barneul):—*Parallèle des Révolutions sous le rapport des hérésies qui ont désolé l'Église* (Paris, 1791, 8vo; often reprinted):—*Brefs et instructions du*

*saint-siège relatifs à la Revolution française*, etc. (Paris, 1799, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Discours prononcé dans l'Église de St. Sulpice sur l'autorité de l'Église romaine* (Paris, 1802, 8vo):—*Hist. générale de la Philosophie ancienne et moderne*, etc.; ou *supplément à la Bibliothèque choisie des Pères grecs et latins* (Paris, 1835, 2 vols. 8vo, and 4 vols. 12mo; 1848, 4 vols. 12mo); *Hist. de la nouvelle Hérésie du xix<sup>me</sup> siècle, ou refutation des ouvrages de M. l'abbé de La Mennais* (Paris, 1835, 3 vols. 8vo):—*Comparaison de la méthode des Pères avec celle des prédicateurs du xix<sup>me</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1837, 8vo):—*Ouvres complètes de St. Cyprien* (transl., with a life of the saint, and notes; Paris, 1837, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Examen critique des doctrines de Gibbon, du docteur Strauss et de M. Salvador*, etc. (Paris, 1841, 8vo). See Léon Laya, *Notice biog.* (*Moniteur* of Dec. 15, 1847); Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxii, 736 sq.

**Guilt.** See SIX.

**Guilty**, besides its proper signification, occurs in the A. V. in the sense of *liable* as a rendering of רָשָׁע, Numb. xxxv, 31; ἔνοχος, Matt. xxvi, 66; Mark xiv, 64; and ὀφίλω, Matt. xxiii, 18, like the Lat. *reus*.

**Guion.** See GUYON.

**Guiscard or Guichard de Beaulieu**, an Anglo-Norman poet, who flourished probably in the reign of Stephen, and died in the beginning of the reign of Henry II of England. He is known by a poem of some length bearing the title of *Sermon of Guiscard de Beaulieu* (*le sermoun Guischart de Beaulieu* in the Harleian MS.), which is a satire against the vices of his day. According to this poem, Guiscard, disgusted with the follies and vanities in which he had passed his youth, retired to a monastery. Walter Mapes, a contemporary, or nearly contemporary writer, states (*De Nugis Curial.* dist. i, c. 13) that Guiscard was a man distinguished for his wealth and valor, who in his old age surrendered his estates to his son, and, entering a Cluniac monastery, became so eminent a poet in his vernacular (Anglo-Norman) as to be styled the "Hommer of the laity" (*laicorum Homerus*). Of the *Sermon*, which is all now known of his writings, there is a MS. of the 12th century in the British Museum (MS. Harl. No. 4388), and an imperfect one in the Bibliothèque Impériale of France (No. 1856—given by De la Rue as No. 2560). From this last MS. an edition of the *Sermon* was published by Jubinal (Paris, 1834, 8vo). This poem is written in the versification of the earlier metrical romances, and exhibits considerable poetical talent, and frequently elegance and energy of expression.—Wright, *Biog. Brit. Lit.* Anglo-Norman Period, p. 131; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxii, 771. (J. W. M.)

**Guise**, HOUSE OF, the name of a branch of the ducal family of Lorraine, which, during the reign of Francis I, established itself in France, where it was conspicuous in its hostility to the Protestant cause, and played a leading part in the religious wars of the 16th century. The three following members of this family were the most prominent for their abilities, and for bigoted and unscrupulous antagonism to the Reformed party, viz.

I. CHARLES, cardinal of Guise, better known as cardinal of Lorraine, was born at Joinville Feb. 17, 1524, and died Dec. 26, 1574. He was made archbishop of Rheims in 1538, created a cardinal in 1547, and was employed on several important embassies. In 1558, at an interview with the cardinal Granville at Péronne, he laid the foundations of the alliance between the Guises and Spain, which continued through, and exerted an important influence on, the civil wars in France. He was present at the Council of Trent (1562), where at first he favored the demand for reform and the superiority of councils to the pope, but was too ambitious to adhere to such principles throughout. Under Francis II he was made, or, rather, made himself, the administrator of the finances. His char-

acter is thus portrayed by De Felice (p. 71): "The cardinal Charles de Lorraine, archbishop of Rheims, and the possessor, in ecclesiastical benefices, of a revenue of three hundred thousand crowns (many millions of our present money), had some learning, affable manners, great facility of speech, and much dexterity in the management of men and affairs, a deep policy, and a vast ambition. He aspired to nothing less than the crown of France for his brother, and to the tiara for himself. So Pius V, somewhat anxious concerning the part he was playing in the Church, habitually called him the pope on the other side of the mountains. For the rest, he was a priest without settled convictions, and half preached the Confession of Augsburg to please my good masters the Germans, as says Brantôme; he was derided for his evil habits, which he did not even care to hide, and raised the hooting of the populace on quitting the dwelling of a courtesan; lastly, he was as pusillanimous in the face of danger as he was arrogant in prosperity." He was, however, a protector of letters, and Rheims owes to him its university. He left some letters and sermons.

II. FRANÇOIS OF LORRAINE, brother of the preceding, and second duke of Guise, was born Feb. 17, 1519, at the castle of Bar, and died Feb. 24, 1563, of wounds inflicted by an assassin named Poltrot de Méré. He served with marked distinction and success in the army, and gained a European reputation as a general. His good fortune and abilities were seconded by the potent influence of his niece, Mary Stuart, the wife of the weak Francis II, in whose reign Guise rose to the height of power in the state, and became the head of the Romanist party. He was able to foil the powerful combination (known in history as the conspiracy of Amboise) formed by the malcontent nobles and the Protestants to hurl him and his brother, the cardinal of Lorraine, from power. The death of Francis II compelled him to yield for a time to the opposition which his foreign origin, his rapacity, cruelty, and ambition had aroused against him, and he left the court. Soon, however, he formed a league with Montmorenci and St. André to control the government and oppose the Protestants, and having been invited to return to Paris by the king of Navarre (Antoine de Bourbon) then lieutenant general of the kingdom, and who had been won over to the Roman Catholic side, Guise was on his way to the capital, when, on Sunday, March 1, 1562, a bloody butchery of Huguenots, peaceably assembled for worship, was perpetrated by his followers, if not with his approbation, at least with his knowledge and sufferance. This atrocious act, called the Massacre of Vassy (q. v.), was the signal for the long and desolating religious wars between the Protestants and Romanists of France. At the head of the Catholics Guise retook Rouen, gained a victory at Dreux (though he lost his colleagues, Montmorenci by capture and St. André by death), and was besieging, with the prospect of speedy capture, the Protestant stronghold of Orleans, when he was assassinated. He left a sort of diary, which may be found in Michaud and Poujoulat's *Nouvelle Collection de Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de France* (Paris, 1839, 4to, 1st series, iv, 1-539).

III. HENRY OF LORRAINE, son of the preceding and third duke of Guise, was born Dec. 31, 1550, and assassinated Dec. 23, 1588, by the orders of Henry III of France, against whose authority and throne he was treasonably plotting. Inheriting his father's valor, ability, and hatred of the Reformation, a hatred intensified by the false charge that the Protestant chief, Coligni, was the instigator of his father's murder, he fought the Huguenots at Jarnac and Moncontour, and in the same year (1569) forced Coligni to raise the siege of Poitiers. He was an ardent abettor of and active participant in the "Massacre of St. Bartholomew" (q. v.), and gave expression to the spirit of a base revenge by kicking the dead body of the venera-

ble Coligni, which had been thrown by his orders into the court-yard, where he was awaiting the consummation of the murder of this most prominent victim of that sad day. In 1575 he received, in an encounter with the Calvinists, a face-wound, which gave him the name of Balaféré (the scarred), an epithet also applied for a like reason to his father. In 1576 he was active in the formation of the famous Romanist league, called the "Holy Union," for the suppression of Protestantism, and "was, until his death, the head and soul of it." Supported by the pope and Philip II of Spain, he, after the death of the duke of Anjou in 1584, secretly aspired to the throne of France, and sought to excite the nation against its king, Henry III, and the heir apparent, Henry of Navarre. Though forbidden by royal order to enter Paris, Guise made a triumphal entry into, and, during the popular rebellion known as "the day of barricades," was virtually master of the capital, and, had his courage equalled his ambition, might have been proclaimed king. In the same year he attended a meeting of the States General at Blois, where he demanded the appointment of high constable and general in chief of the kingdom. Henry, satisfied that his own life and throne were endangered by Guise's ambition, caused him and his brother, cardinal de Guise, to be slain by his guards.—Hoefler, *Nouvelle Biog. Générale*, xxii, 776-9, and 784-6; De Felice, *History of the Protestants of France* (London, 1853, 12mo); Wright, *History of France*, i, 680-718; Sismondi, *Histoire des Français* (see Index); Rose, *New Gen. Biog. Dict.* viii, 155, 156; Ranke, *History of the Papacy* (see Index); *New Amer. Cyclopædia*, viii, 563, 564; *English Cyclopædia*, s. v.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v. (J. W. M.)

**Gulf** (γάσμα, a *chasm*), an opening or impassable space, such as is represented to exist between Elysium and Tartarus (Luke xvi, 26). See HADES.

**Gulich** or **Gulichius**, ABRAHAM VAN, was born at Heusden about 1642. After studying at Nimeguen and the University of Leyden, he was appointed professor extraordinary of theology at Nimeguen, Jan. 17, 1667. Near the close of the same year he became ordinary professor of philosophy and eloquence, and extraordinary of theology, in the gymnasium of that place. In 1679 he was appointed professor of the Cartesian philosophy in the University of Franeker. He died Dec. 31 of the same year. While at Ham he published a philosophical work entitled *Disputationes philosophicæ*. His theological works are, (1) *Theologia Prophetica* (Amsterd. 1675-94, 2 vols.); to the first volume is appended a treatise on Hermeneutics, entitled *Hermeneutica Sacra bipartita*;—(2) *Librorum Propheticonum Vt. et N. Test. compendium et analysis* (Amst. 1694). See *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk door A. Ypeij en J. Dermont*, D. ii; *Gladius, Godgeleerd Nederland*, D. i; also J. Schotanus Sterringa, *Oratio fanebris in obitum A. Gulichii*. (J. P. W.)

**Gulielmus**. See WILLIAM.

**Gulloth** (גולות, *fountains*; Sept. Γωλάθ and λύτρωσις, Vulg. *irriguum*; Eng. Vers. "springs"), the name of two plots given by Caleb to his daughter, at her special request, in addition to her dower (Josh. xv, 18; Judg. i, 15); from which passages it may be inferred that they were situated in the "south land" of Judah, and were so called from the copious supply of water in their vicinity. See ACHSAH. The springs were "upper" and "lower"—possibly one at the top and the other at the bottom of a ravine or glen; and they may have derived their unusual name from their appearance being different to that of the ordinary springs of the country. The root (גולת) has the force of *rolling* or *tumbling over*, and perhaps this may imply that they welled up in that bubbling manner which is not uncommon here, though apparently most rare in Palestine (Stanley, *Palestine*, Append. § 55). Dr. Rosen (*Zeitschr. der Deutsch. Morg. Gesellsch.* 1857, p. 50 sq.)

identifies these springs with the *Ain Nunkur* and *De-wir-Ban*, spots along a beautiful green valley about one hour south-west of Hebron; and in this Stanley coincides (*Jewish Church*, i, 293, n.). See DEBR.

**Gundulf**, founder of a sect in Arras and Liege in the 11th century. In the year 1025, Gerhard, bishop of Cambrai and Arras, caused the arrest of a number of persons charged with having propagated heretical doctrines in his diocese, and in various parts of the north of France. A synod was convoked at St. Mary's church, in Arras, for their trial. Their rules commanded them to forsake the world; to bring into subjection their fleshly lusts and passions; to support themselves by the work of their hands; to wrong no one, and to evince love to all who felt inclined to adopt their mode of life. This confession, joined with their well-known practice of washing each other's feet, led to the belief that they differed from other Christians only in a devoted attachment to the letter of Scripture. But Gerhard professed to know more of their rules than they acknowledged publicly. He had caused himself, he says, to be initiated into their worship by some proselytes, and so learned all their tenets. They appear to have held the following principles: "The holy Church is the community of the righteous, and is formed of persons chosen by election. Admission into it is signified by the imposition of hands, after a confession of faith and taking certain vows. Besides the regular assemblies in the church, there are prayer-meetings, in which the disciples wash each other's feet. The apostles and martyrs are to be venerated, but saint-worship is forbidden. The fulfilment of the law constitutes righteousness, which alone works salvation. Disobedience in the elect, and disregard of their professional vows, entail everlasting condemnation on them. Neither penitence nor conversion can afterwards avail them." These people rejected the Roman Catholic Church, the supremacy of the bishop of Rome, the respect shown to bishops, the whole hierarchical system, and even all clergy whatever. "Dogmatic, liturgic, and constitutive traditions are worthless and of no account. All the sacraments of the Roman Catholic Church are rejected, especially baptism and the Lord's supper. The consecrated elements of the Lord's supper are nothing more than what they appear to our senses. At the last supper, Christ did not really give his disciples his body for food and his blood for drink. Marriage and all sexual intercourse are to be avoided. Churches are not holy, hence worship does not derive any special virtue from its being held in them. The altar is but a heap of stones. Fumigations and the ringing of bells are useless ceremonies. Crosses, crucifixes, images, etc., tend to idolatry."

Bishop Gerhard charged the Gundulfians with holding these and similar opinions, but they refused to acknowledge them. They attempted only to defend their views regarding baptism, but finally announced that they were ready to recant their errors. Then the bishop and other members of the clergy solemnly condemned the heresy, excommunicated its originators in case they did not repent, and made the prisoners sign a Roman Catholic statement of the doctrines on which they had held heretical opinions, translated from Latin into the vernacular; after which the prisoners were released and the synod closed. Gerhard sent a copy of its acts to the bishop of Liege, who applied himself also with great zeal to the suppression of the heresy. These acts, which are the only source from which the details of this affair can be obtained, are to be found in D'Achéry's *Spicilegium* (2d edit., i, 607-624), and in Mansi's *Concilii* (xix, 423 sq.). Still they give no information as to the rise and development of this party, nor on its relation to those which arose before and after it in the same and neighboring districts. Gundulf appears to have made northern France the exclusive field of his exertions, and it was probably there he had made the converts which were

afterwards arrested at Arras. His connection with them was probably an imitation of Christ's connection with his disciples; they called him the Master, and, as already stated, considered the imitation of the apostles as their highest aim. Gundulf may have been himself a working man who went to that country because the trades, and especially that of weaver, were in a prosperous condition there. Once there, he probably found a body of disciples among his fellow-workmen, whom he instructed in his principles, and whom he afterwards sent as travelling workmen to propagate his views in their own districts. Of the end of Gundulf's career nothing is known. The period of his greatest activity was probably already over in 1025. As we see no mention of search for him having been made by order either of Gerhard or of the bishop of Liege, although his disciples had proclaimed him as their chief, it is probable that he was out of the reach of both, and had perhaps been already removed by death. We have no further information as to what became of the sect afterwards, and, at any rate, it continued, if at all, in secret. Similar sects have existed at all times in the bosom of the Romish Church, and they are generally found to represent vital piety as opposed to the corrupted Christianity of Rome. See Hahn, *Gesch. d. Ketzler im Mittelalter*, pt. i, p. 39 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* v, 414 sq.; Neander, *Ch. History*, iii, 597.

**Guni** (Heb. *Guni'*, גוני, dyed [Gesen.] or protected [Fürst]; Sept. *Puni*, but in 1 Chron. vii, 13, Γωνί, Vulg. *Guni*), the name of two men.

1. One of the sons of Naphtali (B.C. ante 1856, but not necessarily born before the migration to Egypt) (Gen. xlii, 24; Numb. xxvi, 48; 1 Chron. vii, 13). His descendants are called GUNITES (Numb. xxvi, 48).

2. Father of Abdiel, and grandfather of Ahi, which last was chieftain of the Gileadite Gadites (1 Chron. v, 15). B.C. between 1093 and 782.

**Gunite** (Hebrew with the art. *Wg-Guni'*, גוני, Sept. *o Panti*, Vulg. *Gunite*, A. V. "the Gunites"), a general name of the descendants of GUNI, of the tribe of Naphtali (Numb. xxvi, 48).

**Gunn, Walter**, was born in Carlisle, Schoharie Co., N. Y., June 27, 1815. He was graduated at Union College in 1840, and studied theology in the seminary at Gettysburg. He was licensed by the Hartwich Synod in 1842, and the following year was ordained as a missionary to foreign lands. He soon sailed for India, where he labored in faith, and with perseverance and success, among the Tulucoos until his death, which occurred at Guntoon July 8, 1857. Mr. Gunn was the first missionary from the Lutheran Church in the United States who fell in the foreign field. He exerted an influence in India which still lives. He was a man of faith and love, a missionary in the highest sense, of whom the "world was not worthy." (M. L. S.)

**Gunn, William**, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Caswell Co., N. C., March 13, 1797, and died at Lexington, Ky., Sept. 3, 1853. He removed in early life to Tennessee with his father; became, while a mere youth, an active member of the Church; was licensed to preach before 21 years of age, and joined the itinerancy in 1819. He spent his subsequent life in ministerial labors, mainly in the state of Kentucky, filling with great acceptability and usefulness the positions of circuit and station preacher and presiding elder, and died in the full assurance of the faith he preached to others and so beautifully exemplified in his life. He published, in connection with another minister, *The Christian Psalmist* (Louisville, Kentucky), and also another work, chiefly selections of the preceding, and entitled *The Christian Melodist*.—Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, vii, 622; *Minutes of Conf. of M. E. Church South*. (J. W. M.)

**Gunning, Peter, D.D.**, an eminent English High-church bishop, was born at Hoo, in Kent, in the

year 1613, and was educated at Clare Hall, Cambridge. He became fellow and tutor of his college, and distinguished himself as a preacher, but on account of his zeal for the king's service he was ejected, and afterwards was made chaplain to Sir Robert Shirley, at whose death he obtained the chapel at Exeter House, Strand. At the Restoration his services were rewarded; he was created D.D. by the king's mandate. He was one of the coadjutors selected by the bishops to maintain the High-church cause at the Savoy Conference (1661), and was the principal disputant with Baxter. He had a Romanizing tendency, and advocated prayer for the dead. In 1669 he was made bishop of Chichester, and in 1674 was translated to Ely, where he died in 1684. He wrote largely on the controversies of the time, and especially *The Paschal or Lent Fast apostolical and perpetual*, recently reprinted in the *Library of Anglo-Cath. Theology* (Oxford, 1845, 8vo).—Hook, *Ecol. Biog.* vol. v.; Neal, *History of the Puritans*, iii., 90, 168; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, i., 1355.

**Gunpowder Plot**, a conspiracy formed and matured in the years 1604-5 by some English Romanists to blow up with gunpowder the Parliament House, and thus destroy at once the king, lords, and commons of England when assembled at the opening of Parliament, with the hope of being able, during the resultant confusion, to re-establish their faith in the kingdom, or, at least, avenge the oppressions and persecution of its adherents. At the accession of James I to the throne, the Roman Catholics anticipated toleration, or, at all events, a great relaxation in the rigor of the penal laws against them, and were greatly exasperated on finding that not only were their hopes in this regard disappointed, but that increased severity was employed towards them; for James, when once firmly seated on his throne, in Feb. 1604, "assured his council that 'he had never any intention of granting toleration to the Catholics;' that he would fortify the laws against them, and cause them to be put into execution to the utmost." The conceiver of the design of taking so indiscriminate and brutal a vengeance was Robert Catesby, of "ancient family and good estate," who had once abjured and then returned again with increased ardor to his early faith. He made known his scheme first to Thomas Winter, "a gentleman of Worcestershire," and next to John Wright, who belonged to a highly respectable Yorkshire family. According to the statement made in prison (Nov. 19, 1605) by a fellow-conspirator (Fawkes), "these three first devised the plot, and were the chief directors of all the particularities of it." Winter refused his assent to the plan until an effort had been made to obtain, through the mediation of Spain, toleration for the English Catholics by a clause to that effect in the treaty then negotiating between England and Spain. He accordingly went to the Netherlands to further that object, where he learned from the Spanish ambassador that it could not be accomplished. He, however, met at Ostend an old associate, Guy Fawkes (q. v.), and foreseeing in him an efficient coadjutor in Catesby's scheme, induced him to return with him to England without making known to Fawkes the particular nature of the plot. Fawkes, though not the projector or head, became by far the most notorious member of the conspiracy, and popular opinion long represented him as a low, cruel, and mercenary ruffian; but he appears to have been by birth a gentleman, and of a nature chivalrously daring and unselfish, but thoroughly perverted by a blind fanaticism, which led him to regard devotion to his own faith and its adherents as the essence of Christian virtues. Soon after the arrival of T. Winter and Fawkes in London, a meeting was held at Catesby's lodgings, at which there were present the four already named and an additional member of the conspiracy, Thomas Percy, a brother-in-law of John Wright, and "a distant relation of the earl of Northumberland." These five, at Catesby's request, agreed to bind themselves to secre-

cy and fidelity by a solemn oath, which, a few days afterwards, in a lonely house beyond St. Clement's Inn, they took on their knees in the following words: "You swear by the blessed Trinity, and by the sacrament you now propose to receive, never to disclose, directly or indirectly, by word or circumstance, the matter that shall be proposed to you to keep secret, nor desist from the execution thereof until the rest shall give you leave." They then went into an adjoining room and received the holy sacrament from father Gerard, a Jesuit priest, who was, it is said, ignorant of their horrid project. The particulars of the plot were then communicated to Fawkes and Percy, and in furtherance of the plan then agreed on, Percy, whose position as a gentleman pensioner would prevent any suspicion arising therefrom, rented of a Mr. Ferris, on May 24, 1604, a house adjoining the Parliament buildings, the keys of which were given to Fawkes, who was unknown in London, and who assumed the name of John Johnson, and the position of servant to Percy. They took a second oath of secrecy and fidelity to each other on taking possession of the house, but before their preparations were completed for beginning the work of mining through to the Parliament building, the meeting of Parliament was prorogued to Feb. 7, 1605. They separated to meet again in November, and, in the mean while, another house was hired on the Lambeth side of the river, in which wood, gunpowder, and other combustibles were placed, to be removed in small quantities to the house hired of Ferris. This Lambeth house was put in charge of Robert Kay, or Keyes, an indigent Catholic gentleman, who took the oath and became a member of the band. On a night in December, 1604, the conspirators, having provided themselves with tools and other necessaries, went zealously to work on the mine, Fawkes acting as sentinel. The wall separating them from the Parliament House was found to be very thick, and more help was needed; so Christopher Wright, a younger brother of John Wright, was taken in on oath, and Kay brought over from Lambeth. The work was carried on zealously, the conspirators beguiling the labor with discussions of future plans. They agreed in the policy of proclaiming one of the royal family in the place of James, and as they supposed his eldest son, prince Henry, would be present and perish with his father in the Parliament House, Percy undertook to seize and carry off prince Charles as soon as the mine was exploded; and, in default of Percy's success, arrangements were made to carry off the princess Elizabeth, then near Coventry under the care of lord Harrington. "Horses and armor were to be collected in Warwickshire." They failed, however, in devising any safe plan for saving the lives of Roman Catholic members of Parliament. While the matter was thus progressing, Fawkes reported the prorogation of Parliament to Oct. 3, and they separated until after the Christmas holidays. In January, 1605, John Grant, a Warwickshire gentleman, and Robert Winter, eldest brother of Thomas Winter, were admitted to the conspiracy, and shortly after them Thomas Bates, a servant of Catesby, and the only participant in the plot not of the rank of a gentleman. While going on with the work in Feb., 1605, they were alarmed by some noises, and Fawkes, who went out to ascertain the cause, reported that they were caused by the removal of a stock of coal from a cellar under the Parliament House, with the gratifying additional intelligence that the cellar was to be let. Percy straightway hired it, the work on the mine was abandoned, and the gunpowder (36 bbls.) was conveyed from its place of concealment at Lambeth into this cellar, and covered up with stones, bits of iron, and fagots of wood. All was ready in May, and the conspirators separated to await the meeting of Parliament. Fawkes went to the Netherlands on a mission connected with the plot, but returned without much success in August. In September, Sir Edward Baynham, "a gentleman of an ancient



family in Gloucestershire," was admitted into the plot and sent to Rome, not to reveal the project, but, on its consummation, to gain the favor of the Vatican by explaining that its object was the re-establishment of Roman Catholicism in England. A further prorogation of Parliament to Nov. 5 having been made, the conspirators were led, in consequence of the repeated prorogations, to fear that their plot was suspected; but Thomas Winter's examinations, made on the day of prorogation, served to reassure them. "Catesby purchased horses, arms, and powder, and, under the pretence of making levies for the archduke of Flanders, assembled friends who might be armed in the country when the first blow was struck." To obtain the required means for these ends, three wealthy men were admitted (on oath as the others) into the conspiracy, viz. Sir Everard Digby, of Rutlandshire, who promised to furnish £1500, and to collect his Roman Catholic friends on Dunsmore Heath, in Warwickshire, by Nov. 5, as if for a hunting party; Ambrose Rookwood, of Suffolk, who owned a magnificent stud of horses; and Francis Tresham, who "engaged to furnish £2000;" but Catesby mistrusted the latter, and sorely repented having intrusted his secret to him. As the 5th of November drew near, "it was resolved that Fawkes should fire the powder by means of a slow-burning match, which would allow him time to escape before the explosion" to a ship ready to proceed with him to Flanders; and that, in the event of their losing the prince of Wales and prince Charles, the princess Elizabeth should be proclaimed queen, and "a regent appointed during her minority." On another point they failed to harmonize so fully. Each conspirator had a friend or friends in Parliament whose safety he wished to secure, but to communicate the project to so many persons involved too great risk, "and it was concluded that no express notice should be given them, but only such persuasion, upon general grounds, as might deter them from attending. Many of the conspirators were averse to this resolve, "and angry at its adoption; and Tresham in particular, for his sisters had married lords Stourton and Mounteagle." On a refusal of Catesby and other leaders to allow him to notify directly Mounteagle, it is said he hinted that the money promised by him would not be forthcoming, and ceased to attend the meetings. It is probable he warned Mounteagle, for this nobleman unexpectedly gave a supper, Oct. 26, ten days before the meeting of Parliament, at a house at Hoxton which he had not lately occupied, and while seated at table a page brought him a letter, stating that he had received it in the street from a stranger, who urged its immediate delivery into Mounteagle's hands. The letter warned Mounteagle not to attend the Parliament, and hinted at the plot, and was on the same evening shown by Mounteagle to several lords of the council, and on Oct. 31 shown to the king also. The conspirators suspected Tresham of having betrayed them, and accused him of it, but he stoutly denied it. They were now thoroughly alarmed; some left London, and others concealed themselves; but Fawkes remained courageously at his post in the cellar, notwithstanding the hourly increasing intimation that the plot was known to government. On the evening of Nov. 4 the lord chamberlain visited the cellar, saw Fawkes there, and, noticing the piles of fagots, said to him, "Your master has laid in a good supply of fuel." After informing Percy of this ominous circumstance, Fawkes returned to his post, where he was arrested about 2 o'clock on the morning of Nov. 5 by a company of soldiers under Sir Thomas Knevet, a Westminster magistrate, who had orders to search the houses and cellars in the neighborhood. On Fawkes's person was found a watch (then an uncommon thing), some slow matches, some tinder and touchwood, and behind the cellar door a dark lantern with a light burning. They removed the wood, etc., and discovered the gunpowder also. Fawkes was taken before the king

and council, where he boldly avowed his purpose, only expressing regret for its failure, and, in reply to the king's inquiry "how he could have the heart to destroy his children and so many innocent souls," said, "Dangerous diseases require desperate remedies." He utterly refused to name his accomplices, and neither temptations nor tortures, whose horrible severity is shown by the contrast in his signatures on the 8th and 10th of November, could induce him to implicate others further than their own actions had already done, while at no time would he admit the complicity of suspected Jesuit priests, refusing to plead guilty on his trial because the indictment contained averments implicating them. For the connection of the Jesuits with this conspiracy, see GARNET; JESUITS; and the authorities given at the end of this article.

Catesby and John Wright had departed for Dunchurch before Fawkes's arrest, and the other conspirators, except Tresham, fled from London after that event. They met at Ashby Ledgers, and resolved to take up arms, and endeavor to excite to rebellion the Roman Catholics in Warwickshire, Worcestershire, Staffordshire, and Wales; but their failure was complete, and their efforts only served to point them out as members of the conspiracy. They were pursued by the king's troops, and at Holbeach the two Wrights, Percy, and Catesby were killed, and Rookwood and Thomas Winter wounded in a conflict with the troops. The others were soon captured. Tresham died in the Tower of disease; the remaining seven, viz., Digby, Robert and Thomas Winter, Rookwood, Grant, Fawkes, Kay, and Bates, were tried on the 27th January, 1606, and executed on the 30th and 31st of that month. This diabolical plot reacted fearfully against the Romanists, and its memory is still a bulwark of Protestant feeling in England. The revolting atrocity of the deed purposed by these misguided men must ever excite horror and reprobation; but we may hope that candid minds in this more tolerant age, while judging them, will condemn also both the teachings which bred such fanaticism, and the spirit of persecution which aroused it to action.

The 5th of November, in commemoration of this plot, is called Guy Fawkes's Day, and until recently a special service for it was found in the ritual of the English Church. It was made a holiday by act of Parliament in 1606, and is still kept as such in England, especially by the juveniles. The following account of the customs pertaining thereto is abridged from Chambers, *Book of Days*, ii, 549-50. The mode of observance throughout England is the dressing up of a scarecrow figure in cast-off clothing (with a paper cap, painted and knotted with paper strips, imitating ribbons), parading it in a chair through the streets, and at night burning it in a bonfire. The image represents Guy Fawkes, and, consequently, carries a dark lantern in one hand and matches in the other. The procession visits the houses in the neighborhood, repeating the time-honored rhyme—

"Remember, remember,  
The fifth of November,  
The gunpowder treason and plot;  
There is no reason  
Why the gunpowder treason  
Should ever be forgot!"

Numerous variations of the above rhyme are used: for example, at Islip, the following:

"The fifth of November,  
Since I can remember,  
Gunpowder treason and plot;  
This is the day that God did prevent,  
To blow up his king and Parliament.

A stick and a stake,  
For Victoria's sake;  
If you won't give me one,  
I'll take two;  
The better for me,  
And the worse for you!"

It is an invariable custom on these occasions to solici-

it money from the passers-by in the formula "Pray remember Guy!" "Please to remember Guy!" or, "Please to remember the bonfire!"

In former times the burning of Guy Fawkes's effigy was in London a most important ceremony. Two hundred cart-loads of fuel were sometimes consumed in the bonfire in Lincoln's Inn Fields, and thirty Guys would be gibbeted and then cast into the fire. Another immense pile was heaped up in the Clare Market by the butchers, who the same evening paraded the streets with the accompaniment of the famed "marrow-bone-and-cleaver" music. The uproar occasioned by the shouts of the mob, the ringing of the church bells, and the general confusion can be only faintly imagined at the present day.—Jardine, *British Criminal Trials* (Library of Entertaining Knowledge), vol. ii; *Pictorial Hist. of England*, iii, 20-32 (Chambers's ed.); Knight, *Popular Hist. of England*, iii, 321-37; *ibid.*, *Old England*, ii, 151-62; Chambers, *Book of Days*, ii, 546-50; Hume, *Hist. of England*, vol. iv; Chambers, *Cyclopaedia*, s. v. See FAWKES. (J. W. M.)

**Günther**, ANTON, a prominent Roman Catholic philosopher of modern times, was born Nov. 17, 1785, at Lindenau, in Bohemia. He studied philosophy and law at the University of Prague, was for several years tutor in the family of prince Bretzenheim, and took priestly orders in 1820. He was then for several years vice-director of philosophical studies at the University of Vienna. The professorship of philosophy, for which he was a candidate at the earnest solicitation of his friends, he did not obtain, in consequence of the efforts made by the opponents of his philosophical views. The life-work of Günther was to attempt, in opposition to the prevailing philosophical systems, which he regarded as more or less unchristian, the establishment of a thoroughly Christian philosophy. He desired to show that the teachings of divine revelation, being the absolute truth, need not only not to shun the light of reason, but that, on the contrary, reason itself will lead the sound thinker to an acceptance of the Christian philosophy, which he thought had found its most complete expression in the Roman Catholic doctrine. The first work of Günther was the *Vorschule zur speculative Theologie* (Vienna, 1828; 2d enlarged edition 1846), which contained the theory of creation; and it was followed in 1829 by the theory of the incarnation. These works at once established for him the reputation of being one of the foremost philosophers of the Roman Catholic Church. The University of Munich conferred upon him the title of *Doctor Philosophiæ*, which, however, the illiberal government of Austria did not allow him to use. Günther, who lived in great retirement, continued to publish a series of philosophical works, namely, *Peregrin's Gastmahl* (Vienna, 1830);—*Süd- und Nordlichter* (1832);—*Jawasköpfe für Philosophie und Theologie* (published by him conjointly with his friend Dr. Papst, Vienna, 1833);—*Der letzte Symboliker* (with special reference to the works of Möhler and Baur, 1834);—*Thomas à Kempis's: zur Transfiguration der Persönlichkeitspantheismus neuester Zeit* (1835);—*Die Juste-Milieu's in der deutschen Philosophie der gegenwärtigen Zeit* (1837);—*Euristheus und Hercules* (1842). He also published from 1848 to 1854, conjointly with his friend Dr. Veith, a philosophical annual entitled *Lydia*. In none of his works did he undertake to develop a philosophical system as a whole, but he contributed ample material for a new system. He was, in particular, acknowledged as one of the keenest and most powerful opponents of the pantheistic schools, and he found many adherents among the Roman Catholic theologians and scholars of Germany. The "Güntherian philosophy" (*Günthersche Philosophie*) came to establish itself at many of the Roman Catholic universities, and for a time shared with the school of Hermes (q. v.) the control of philosophical studies and learning in Catholic Germany. To the Jesuits and the ultramontane school, the school of

Günther was as obnoxious as that of Hermes. His philosophical treatment of the Christian doctrines was regarded by many as derogatory to the belief in them. He also gave great offence by daring to criticize high authorities, as Thomas of Aquinas. Still greater dissatisfaction was created by his dualistic theory concerning mind and body. His works were denounced in Rome. On Jan. 8, 1857, all his works were put on the Index of prohibited works, and on June 15 a brief of the pope appeared charging him with errors in the doctrine of the Trinity, of Christology and Anthropology, and an over-estimation of the powers of reason. Günther, and with him most of his adherents, submitted to the papal censure Feb. 20, 1857. Günther himself was deeply affected by this humiliation, and expressed the hope that his philosophy might be supplanted by something better. He died Feb. 24, 1863. See CLEMENS [an ultramontane opponent of Günther], *Die speculative Theologie Günthers* (Cöln, 1853). (A. J. S.)

**Guphta**. See JOTAPATA.

**Gur** (Heb. id. גִּירָא, a *whelp*, fully גִּירָא-הַגִּירָא, MALEH'-Gur, i. e. *ascent of the whelp*; Sept. ἡ ἀνάβασις τοῦ γούρου. Vulg. *ascensus Gauer*; Eng. Vers. "the going up to Gur"), a place or elevated ground in the immediate vicinity of (גִּירָא) Ibleam, on the road from Jezreel to Beth-hag-Gan, where Jehu's servants overtook and mortally wounded the flying king Ahaziah (2 Kings ix, 27). B. C. 883. It is, perhaps, the little knoll marked on Van de Velde's *Map* about midway between Zenin and Jelameh. See IBLEAM; GUR-BAL.

**Gur**. See WHELP.

**Gur-ba'al** (Heb. id. גִּירָא-בַּאֵל, *sojourn of Baal*; Sept. πέρρα, Vulg. *Gurbaal*), a place in Arabia, successfully attacked by Uzziah (B. C. 803) (2 Chron. xxvi, 7); hence on the confines of Judæa; probably so called from having a temple of Baal. From the rendering of the Sept., Calmet infers that it was in Arabia Petrea. Arabian geographers mention a place called *Baal* on the Syrian road, north of El-Medineh (*Marasid*, s. v.). The Targum reads "Arabs living in *Gerar*"—suggesting גִּירָא instead of גִּירָא. See GERAR. The ingenious conjectures of Bochart (*Phalq*, ii, 22) respecting the Melunim, who are mentioned together with the "Arabians that dwelt in Gur-Baal," may be considered as corroborating this identification (compare 1 Chron. iv, 39 sq.; see Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* i, 322). See MEHUNIM.

**Gurgoyle**. See GARGOYLE.

**Gurley**, PHINEAS DENSMORE, D. D., an eminent Presbyterian minister, was born Nov. 12, 1816, at Hamilton, Madison County, N. Y., and died Sept. 30, 1868, in Washington, D. C. During his infancy his parents removed to Parishville, St. Lawrence County, N. Y., where, at the age of fifteen, he joined the Presbyterian Church, and soon after entered Union College, where he graduated in 1837 with the highest honors of his class. The same year he entered the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J., and graduated there in Sept. 1840, having been licensed to preach the April preceding at Cold Spring, N. Y. He accepted straightway a call to the First Presbyterian Church of Indianapolis, Ind., from which a strong minority had separated and organized a second church (New School), with the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher as pastor. In this place he labored for nine years with great success, the church being blessed with revivals and largely increased numbers; but in 1850, for the benefit of the health of his family, he removed to Dayton, Ohio, where for four years a like success attended his ministry as pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in that city. In 1854, yielding to the wishes of his brethren, he accepted the pastorate of the F-street Presbyterian

Church in Washington, D. C., with which, in 1859, the Second Presbyterian Church of that city united, and Dr. Gurley remained until his death pastor of the united body, worshipping in a new edifice, and called the New York Avenue Church. He was elected chaplain to the United States Senate in 1859, and was the pastor of several presidents of the United States, among them of Mr. Lincoln, during the sad but exciting scenes of whose dying moments he was present. The following incident which then occurred illustrates forcibly the spirit and power of his Gospel ministrations. When the patriot president had ceased to breathe, Mr. Stanton, secretary of war, turning to Dr. Gurley, said, "Doctor, will you say something?" After a brief pause, Dr. Gurley, addressing the weeping relatives and sympathizing friends, replied, "Let us talk with God;" and, kneeling, offered "a most touching and impressive prayer, which even in that dark hour of gloom lighted up with sunshine every sorrowing heart." Dr. Gurley was a member of the General Assembly (Old School) in 1866, and chairman of its judicial committee; was made moderator of the General Assembly held in 1867, was chosen a member of the committee of fifteen appointed to confer with a like committee of the New-School Assembly on the subject of a reunion of the two Presbyterian bodies in the United States, and "was the author of the amendments to the basis of union adopted by the joint committee in Philadelphia, and subsequently adopted by both assemblies." His health failed in 1867, and, after vainly seeking its restoration in rest and change of scene, he returned to die among his people. Great earnestness and singleness of purpose, with an ever-active zeal for the glory of God and the salvation of souls, characterized his life. See *Memorial Sermon* on Dr. Gurley by W. E. Schenck, D.D. (Washington, D. C., 1869), and *New York Observer*, Oct. 8, 1868. (J. W. M.)

**Gurnall, WILLIAM**, an English divine, and a "man of great excellence of character," was born in 1617, was educated at Emanuel College, Cambridge, and was minister at Lavenham for 35 years. He became a rector in 1644, but did not receive episcopal ordination until the Restoration. He published a volume of *Sermons* (1660, 4to), but is best known as the author of *The Christian in complete Armor* (1st ed. 1656-1662, 3 vols. 4to; new ed. 1844, 1 vol. 8vo), of which an edition, with a biographical introduction by the Rev. J. C. Ryle, was published in 1865 (London, 2 vols. imp. 8vo). This work is described by Dr. E. Williams (*Christian Preacher*) as "full of allusions to scriptural facts and figures of speech, generally well supported; sanctified wit, holy fire, deep experience, and most animated practical applications." Gurnall died in 1679. See *Biographical Introduction* by Ryle in the edition last named above, and Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 749. (J. W. M.)

**Gurney, JOSEPH JOHN**, an eminent minister of the Gospel, Christian philanthropist, and theological writer, was born at Earham Hall, near Norwich, England, Aug. 2, 1788. The family of Gurney, or Gournay, sprang from a house of Norman barons who followed William the Conqueror into England. Such was his reputation for wisdom, discrimination, and sound scholarship, that Lord Morpeth, when in Philadelphia, used to say, "Mr. Gurney is authority upon any subject in London." Although his family for two centuries deservedly wielded great influence in Norfolk, his large reputation is based upon his individual character and merits. In early manhood he dedicated himself to the service of his divine Redeemer, and made an open Christian confession as a member of the religious Society of Friends, in which Church he became an illustrious minister, being instrumental in winning many souls to Christ in Great Britain and Ireland. In the love of the Gospel, he made three missionary visits to the continent of Europe, and spent three years (1837-40) in North America and the West

India Islands, preaching Christ with powerful demonstration of the Spirit. He often joined his sister, the celebrated and excellent Elizabeth Fry, in labors in the British prisons. The apostolic character of his preaching is shown in the volume of sermons and prayers delivered in Philadelphia in the winter of 1838, and taken in short-hand by Edward Hopper, Esq. Possessed of great wealth, he was a faithful steward, and his large-hearted and well-directed benevolence was "like the dew, with silent, genial power, felt in the bloom it leaves along the meads." He was the associate of Clarkson, Wilberforce, his brother-in-law, Sir T. Fowell Buxton, and others, in the successful efforts for the abolition of slavery; and he was never known to be silent or unsympathizing when others needed his voice or his purse. Eminent as were his gifts and acquirements, his simplicity of character and humility, and, more than all, his conformity to the will of Christ, made him the sweet and willing minister and servant of all. In this capacity he served his generation according to the will of God. In his Christian authorship, his influence for good will extend to successive generations. His principal writings are as follows: *Observations on the distinguishing Views of the Society of Friends* (this is a standard book—the seventh edition, containing the author's latest revisions, and an introductory treatise of great value, should supersede former editions);—*Essays on Christianity*;—*Biblical Notes on the Deity of Christ* (an illustration of the texts relating to this subject);—*Essays on the habitual Exercise of Love to God as a Preparation for Heaven*;—*A Letter to a Friend on the Doctrine of Redemption*;—*Hints on the portable Evidences of Christianity*;—*Brief Remarks on the History, Authority, and Use of the Sabbath*;—*Guide to the Instruction of young Persons in the holy Scriptures*;—*On the moral Character of our Lord Jesus Christ*;—*Christianity a Religion of Motives*;—*An Account of John Stratford*;—*An Address to the Mechanics of Manchester*;—*The Accordance of geological Discovery with natural and revealed Religion*;—*Familiar Sketches of the late William Wilberforce*;—*Chalmeriana*;—*Sabbatical Verses, and other Poems*;—*A Winter in the West Indies*;—*A Journey in North America, described in familiar Letters to Amelia Opie*;—*Thoughts on Habit and Discipline*;—*Terms of Union in the Bible Society*;—*Puseyism traced to its Root*;—*Notes on Prisons and Prison Discipline*, etc. His last publication was an admirable and Christian declaration of his faith. In him was illustrated the Scripture, "The path of the just is as a shining light, which shineth more and more unto the perfect day." He fell asleep in Jesus Jan. 4, 1847. See *Memorial* issued by London Yearly Meeting; J. B. Braithwaite, *Memoirs of J. J. Gurney, with Selections from his Journal and Correspondence* (Norwich, 2 vols. 8vo); Hofer, *Non. Biog. Générale*, xxii, 854; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 750. (W. J. A.)

**Gurtlerus.** See GUERTLER.

**Gury, JOSEPH PIERRE**, a Roman Catholic theologian, whose works on moral theology have obtained a great notoriety by the many offensive doctrines which he defends. He was born Jan. 23, 1801, entered in 1824 the Society of Jesus, became professor of moral theology at Vals, in France, and died April 18, 1866, at Mercœur, in the Auvergne. He wrote a *Compendium Theologiæ moralis* (4th ed. Ratisbon, 1868; German translation, Ratisbon, 1869), and *Casus Conscientiæ in præcipuis questionibus Theologiæ moralis* (Ratisbon, 1865). Both works have passed through a large number of editions in France and other countries, and have been introduced as text-books into a number of ecclesiastical seminaries. In the Dict of the grand-duchy of Hesse-Darmstadt, the government was in 1869 attacked by the Liberal party for allowing the Roman Catholic bishop of Mentz to introduce this work into the diocesan seminary, on the ground that it teaches,

in many cases, disobedience to the government, and principles incompatible with a civilized form of government. See Linné, *Das Handbuch Gury's und die christliche Ethik* (Fricberg, 1869). (A. J. S.)

**Gush-Chalab.** See GISHALA.

**Gustavus I, VASA**, the first Protestant king of Sweden, was born at Lindholm, Sweden, May 12, 1496. He descended, both on the paternal and maternal side, from noble Swedish families, and his original name was *Gustavus Ericsson*, since he was the son of the councillor Eric Johansson. From 1512 he was educated for a statesman at the court of the Swedish administrator, Sten Sture. In 1516 and 1517 he took an active part in the war against the Danes, but was treacherously made a prisoner by the Danish king, Christian II, and carried to Denmark. He escaped in September, 1519, landed in Sweden in May, 1520, aroused the peasants of Dalecarlia to a revolt against the Danish rule, and was proclaimed by them head of their own and other communes of Sweden. The forcible abdication of Christian II put an end to the Scandinavian union, and the Swedish Diet of Strengnäss proclaimed Gustavus as king. Being a decided adherent of the Reformation of Luther with whom he carried on a correspondence, Gustavus declined to be crowned by the hands of the Roman Catholic bishops, and postponed his coronation, which did not take place until 1528. In 1530 he formally joined the Lutheran Church, the cause of which he promoted with great eagerness, and even severity, crippling the power of the Roman Catholic clergy by enormous imposts and finally (1544) forcing the Lutheran doctrines upon all his subjects. Like many other Protestant princes of that time, he arrogated to himself an undue influence upon the Church, assuming in 1540 the highest authority in ecclesiastical matters, and thus burdening Sweden with the pernicious system of an oppressive and even intolerant state-churchism. By an act of the Diet of Westerås the crown was declared hereditary in his male descendants. On the whole, Gustavus was one of the best and wisest princes of his time. "He had found Sweden a wilderness, devoid of all cultivation, and a prey to the turbulence of the people and the rapacity of the nobles; and, after forty years' rule, he left it a peaceful and civilized realm, with a full exchequer, and a well-organized army of 15,000 men, and a good fleet, which were both his creations. He promoted trade at home and abroad. Every profession and trade received his attention and fostering care, and schools and colleges owed their revival, after the decay of the older Roman Catholic institutions, to him. He made commercial treaties with foreign nations, and established fairs for foreign traders. In his reign roads and bridges were made in every part of the country, and canals begun, one of which has only recently been brought to completion. In his relations with his subjects Gustavus was firm, and sometimes severe, but seldom unjust, except in his dealings towards the Romish clergy, whom he despoiled with something like rapacity of all their lands and funds. To him the various tribes of Lapps were indebted for the diffusion of Christianity among them by Lutheran missionaries, while the Finns owed to him the first works of instruction, Bibles and hymn-books printed in their own language. Gustavus was methodical, just, moral, and abstemious in his mode of life; an able administrator; and, with the exception of a tendency to avarice, possessed few qualities that are unworthy of esteem" (Chambers, *Cyclopaedia*). He died Sept. 29, 1560. (A. J. S.)

**Gustavus II, ADOLPHUS**, king of Sweden, was the grandson of Gustavus I (q. v.) by his youngest son, Charles IX, at whose death he succeeded to the throne of Sweden. Gustavus, who had been strictly brought up in the Lutheran faith, had at first to quell some disorders at home, arising from the disputed suc-

cession of his father (third son of Gustavus Vasa), who had been elected king on the exclusion of his nephew Sigismund, king of Poland (son of John III, the second son of Gustavus Vasa), whose profession of the Roman Catholic religion made him obnoxious to the Swedish people, and virtually annulled his claims to the crown. He reconciled the Estates by making them many concessions, ended the war with Denmark, in 1612, unsuccessfully, but obtained from the Czar in 1617, by virtue of the treaty of Stolbowa, several places, and renounced all claims to Livonia. The numerous exiles who, during the reign of his father, had fled to Poland, were permitted to return, and thus he thwarted the intrigues of the Polish king Sigismund. In 1620 he built Gothenburg anew, and founded or renewed sixteen other towns. He was eagerly intent upon enlarging the powers of the sovereign by reducing those of the Estates. In 1621 he was involved in a war with Poland, and gained Livonia and Courland, and carried the war into Prussia. Several revolts in Sweden, which broke out in consequence of the heavy taxes, were promptly quelled. In the summer of the year 1630 he went to Germany with an army of about 15,000 men to support the Protestants in the war against the emperor, having remitted the charge of the government and the care of his infant daughter Christina to his chancellor Oxenstiern. After carrying on the war triumphantly for two years [see THIRTY YEARS' WAR], he fell at Lützen, Nov. 6, 1632. Although Gustavus was eminently a warlike king, he made many salutary changes in the internal administration of his country, and devoted his short intervals of peace to the promotion of commerce and manufactures. He was pre-eminently religious, and his success in battle is perhaps to be ascribed not only to a better mode of warfare, and the stricter discipline which he enforced, but also still more to the moral influence which his deep-seated piety and his personal character inspired among his soldiers. The spot where he fell on the field of Lützen was long marked by the *Schvedenstein*, or Swede's Stone, erected by his servant, Jacob Ericsson, on the night after the battle. Its place has now been taken by a noble monument erected to his memory by the German people on the occasion of the second centenary of the battle held in 1832. Other monuments were erected between Coswig and Goertz (1840), and at Bremen (1853). A statue made by Fogelberg was set up at Gothenburg in 1854. In 1832 Protestant Germany established in his honor an association for the support of poor Protestant congregations. See GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS SOCIETY. Biographies have been written, among others, by Rango (Lpz. 1824), Sparfeld (Lpz. 1844), Gfrörer (3d ed. Stuttg. 1852), Freydel (Germ. transl. Lpz. 1852), Helbig (Lpz. 1854), Flathe (*Gustav Adolf u. der dreissigjähr. Krieg*, Dresd. 1840 sq., 4 vols.), H. W. Thiersch (Nördlingen, 1868), and Droysen (vol. i, Leips. 1869). (A. J. S.)

**Gustavus-Adolphus Society** (*Gustav-Adolf-Verein*), a union of members of the Evangelical Protestant Church of Germany for the support of their persecuted or suffering brethren in the faith. It originated as follows. On the occasion of the second secular anniversary of the battle of Lützen (won by Gustavus Adolphus [q. v.] at the cost of his life, Nov. 6, 1632), held in that city Nov. 6, 1832, Schild, a merchant of Leipzig, proposed that a memorial should be erected to the champion of Protestantism. By the influence of Dr. Grossmann it was afterwards resolved that, instead of a monument of stone or brass, an *institution* should be formed in honor of the Protestant hero, having for its object the succor of the Protestant communities suffering from persecution in Roman Catholic countries. An association was soon formed at Dresden and another in Leipzig, and the two were united in 1834. The society thus formed was very popular in Saxony and Sweden. Its funds were chiefly the

fruit of house and church collections. On the anniversary of the Reformation in 1841, Dr. Zimmermann, of Darmstadt, issued an appeal to Protestants throughout the world to unite in forming an association for the support of such Protestant communities as required and were worthy of help. In order to effect this, and to incorporate in it the Leipzig and Dresden associations, a preparatory meeting was held at Leipzig Sept. 16, 1842, and "The Evangelical Society of the Gustavus-Adolphus Institution" was formed. A general assembly was held at Frankfort Sept. 21 and 22, 1843, in which twenty-nine societies were represented.

According to the rules adopted at this meeting, the object of the association is to succor all Protestants, either in or out of Germany, who stand in need of help, be they members of the Lutheran, Reformed, or Union churches, or any other who have given proofs of their adherence to the principles of the evangelical Church. The means are furnished partly by the income of the permanent funds of the association, partly by donations, endowments, yearly collections, etc. The local societies send to the superior association their annual collections. In every state (and for large countries in every province) there is a chief association, with which the others are connected as auxiliaries. The receipts are divided into three parts: one third is under the absolute control of the society which collects it; one third is sent to the central society, with directions as to the application of it, or is even sent direct to its destination; and the remaining third is placed at the disposal of the central society. The central association consists of twenty-four members, elected by the members of the chief associations; nine of them (including the president, treasurer, and cashier) must be residents at Leipzig, the other fifteen must be non-residents; every three years one third of the members go out of office. This central association represents the whole union, manages the general fund, and, when occasion presents, appoints a committee to inquire into the case of parties applying for assistance, and reports on it to the chief associations. In the general assemblies, which are held in different parts of Germany, the state of the association is discussed, the accounts adjusted, questions of general interest settled, etc. In 1846 there were thirty-nine chief associations, viz. eight in Prussia, two in Saxony, three in Hanover, and in the other states each one, except in Bavaria. The government of Bavaria, on Feb. 10, 1844, forbade the formation of branch associations, as well as the reception of gifts from the society; but this prohibition was annulled Sept. 16, 1849, and representatives of Bavaria appeared at the general assembly of 1851. Austria permitted the establishment of societies by the "Protestantpatent" of April 8, 1851. At the general assembly held at Nuremberg in 1862, two central societies (*Hauptvereine*) of Austria, Vienna and Mediasch, were received, the first embracing the German provinces and Galicia, and the latter the German part of Transylvania. The organs of the association are the *Bote der Evangelischen Vereins d. G. A. V.*, published by Zimmermann and Grossmann, Darmstadt, since 1843, and similar ones for Thuringia and Brandenburg. Numerous occasional sheets, reports, etc., are issued by the association.

The society has not been entirely free from internal troubles. While some of its members have sought to confine its operations within the strict limits of the evangelical confession, others have desired to see it based upon humanitarian principles, and thus to receive even Jews and Roman Catholics into membership. The most important difficulty occurred at the general meeting of 1846, at Berlin, where the delegates refused, by a vote of thirty-nine against thirty-two, to recognise Dr. Rupp as the delegate of Königsberg, on account of his having seceded from the national Church. Great excitement spread throughout Germany, and for a moment endangered even the exist-

ence of the association. The question was settled in the Assembly of Darmstadt in 1847, when it was resolved that the assembly should have the right of deciding upon the credentials of all delegates. The strict Lutherans have generally kept aloof from the association on account of its support of Reformed and Union churches. The means of the association have been steadily increasing. Up to 1841 the receipts amounted to 14,727 thalers. In 1858 the society appropriated 107,666 thalers to 379 communities (224 in Germany and 155 in other countries). From 1843 to 1858 the central and branch associations received legacies and donations amounting to 50,000 thalers. Sweden and the Netherlands (where the first Gustavus-Adolphus Society was instituted in 1853) have joined the German association, and helped to swell its funds. According to the report for the financial year 1863-64, the expenditures amounted to \$195,000, by which 723 poor congregations were supported (400 in Germany, 6 in North America, 10 in Belgium, 27 in France, 7 in Holland, 3 in Italy, 206 in Austria, 43 in Prussian Poland, 4 in Portugal, 4 in Switzerland, and 17 in Turkey). At the general assembly held at Dresden in 1865 it was announced that the society, since its foundation in 1842, had expended in the support of Protestant churches two million thalers, the first million from 1843 to 1858, the second from 1859 to 1864; that since its beginning the society had defrayed, either wholly or partly, the expense for the building of 229 new churches. The receipts for the year 1865-66 were reported at the Assembly of Worms (1867) to amount to 177,226 thalers, a slight decrease, caused by the war of 1866. During the year 1866-67, according to the report made at the general assembly at Halberstadt in 1868, 175,197 thalers were distributed among 783 congregations. The twenty-fourth general assembly of the association was held at Bayreuth in August, 1869. The receipts of the last year were stated to be 194,000 thalers. The number of congregations supported by the society amounted to 904; of these, 12 were in America, 348 in Prussia, 301 in Austria, 29 in France, 8 in Belgium, 60 in Rumania, 16 in Holland, 4 in Italy, 5 in Russia, 6 in Switzerland, and 1 in Spain. The total amount expended by the society from its beginning to the close of the financial year 1867-68 in supporting new and poor Protestant congregations amounts to 2,325,879 thalers. Aside from its external efficiency, the society has also been beneficial to its own members by furnishing a common centre of Christian activity for the national Protestant Church of Germany. Its appropriations are made as much as possible in a form to give permanent rather than temporary relief to weak churches. See Zimmermann, *D. Gustavus-Adolphus Verein* (Darmstadt, 1857); *Allgem. Real-Encykl.* vii, 67.

**Guthlac, Sr.**, a Mercian saint, who died in 714. His early life was a wicked one, he even being the leader of a band of robbers; but, abandoning his evil ways at the age of 24, he retired to the monastery of Repton, where he learned to read, and studied the lives of the hermit fathers. He then took up his abode on the desolate isle of Croyland, where, we are told, his temptations and trials paralleled those of St. Anthony, but acquired for him extraordinary favors and consolations from God. He died at the age of 47, and his sanctity, according to the legend, wrought posthumous miracles, which brought about the erection of the abbey of Croyland, famed for its libraries and seminaries and the story of Turketel (q. v.), abbot thereof in 948. See *Life of Guthlac*, by Felix of Croyland, in Mabilon's *Acta Sanctor. Ord. St. Benedict*, iii, 263-284.—Butler, *Lives*, etc., April 11; Janieson, *Legends of the Monastic Ord.*, p. 63-4; Wright, *Biog. Brit. Lit.* (Anglo-Saxon Period), p. 246-9. (J. W. M.)

**Guthrie, WILLIAM**, an eminent clergyman of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, was born at Pitfor-

thy in 1620. He studied at the University of St. Andrew's, and in 1644 became minister of the parish church of Finwick. He died in 1655. His principal work is *The Christian's Great Interest*, with Introductory Essay by T. Chalmers, D.D., and Life (Glasgow, 1850, 7th ed. 12mo). This work has been translated into several languages. See W. Dunlap, *Memoirs of W. Guthrie*; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, i, 1357; Howie, *Scots Worthies*, p. 434.

**Gutter** (גִּטְרָה, *tsinnor'*) occurs in the proposal of David while attacking Jebus, that some one should "get up to the gutter and smite the Jebusites" (2 Sam. v, 8). The Sept. here renders "with the sword" (ἐν παραξήφῳ), and the Vulg. "roof-pipes" (*domatum fistule*). The word only occurs elsewhere in Psa. xlii, 7 (Sept. and Vulg. *cataracts*, English Vers. "water-spouts"). Gesenius supposes it to mean a *water-course*. Dr. Boothroyd gives "secret passage," and in Psa. xlii "water-fall." It seems to refer to some kind of subterraneous passage through which water passed; but whence the water came, whither it went, or the use to which it was applied, cannot be determined, though we know that besiegers often obtained access to besieged places through aqueducts, drains, and subterraneous passages, and we also know that Jerusalem is abundantly furnished with such underground avenues. See JEBUS.

In the account of Jacob's artifice for producing party-colored young among his flock, by placing peeled rods in the drinking-troughs (Gen. xxx, 38, 41), the word for "gutters" in the original is גִּטְרָה, *rach'at*, vessels overflowing with water (as in Exod. ii, 16) for cattle.

**Gützlaff**, KARL FRIEDRICH AUGUST, missionary to China, was born at Stettin, in Pomerania, in 1802, and attracted attention at an early age by his zeal in study, and by the promise of activity which his youth afforded. The way was open for him to posts of usefulness at home, but having resolved to devote himself to missionary labor in foreign parts, he volunteered to go to the Dutch settlements in the East, under the auspices of the Netherlands Missionary Society. Before proceeding thither he came to England, where he met Dr. Morrison, the eminent Chinese scholar and missionary, and received a strong bias towards China as his ultimate field of labor. In 1823 he proceeded to Singapore, and it is said that before he had been there two years he was able to converse fluently in five Eastern languages, and to read and write as many more. In August, 1828, in company with Mr. Toulmin, Gützlaff went to Siam, where he remained more than a year. In 1831 he went to China. Between 1831 and 1834 he made three voyages along the coast, and published an account of his observations. From 1834 to the time of his death he held office under the British government as interpreter and secretary to the minister. An attempt to land in Japan (1837) was unsuccessful. In 1844 he established, conjointly with the American missionary Roberts, two Chinese, and others, a society for the propagation of the Gospel in China, which in 1860 had forty preachers. In 1849 he revisited Europe, and, by his personal exertions, gave a new impulse to missionary effort for China. He returned to China in 1850, and died at Victoria on the 9th of August, 1851. His way of life has been described as follows: "The whole of the early morning was devoted to the religious instruction of successive classes of Chinese who came to his house. From ten till four he was occupied with government duties. After a very brief interval he went out for the rest of the evening, preaching in public places, or teaching from house to house. He also, from time to time, made excursions to different places, accompanied by native teachers. All this toil was voluntary and unremunerated, for, except when he first went out to the East, he was not connected with any missionary society. A few friends in New York and London sent occasional-

ly, we believe, some contributions for purchasing books and medicines, but the work was mainly carried on at his own cost. He was a man of generous, self-denying spirit, in zeal for every good work untiring, and in labor indefatigable. He early inured himself to hardships, and in his devotedness to his work of spreading Christian truth he was regardless of privations and dangers. His medical skill and great learning often opened a way for him where few Europeans could have gained access, and wherever he was known he was beloved by the natives. They used to say sometimes that he must be a descendant of some Chinese family who had emigrated to the isles of the Western Ocean. Whatever may be the permanent results of Gützlaff's labors in the East, it is certain that his efforts for the cause of religion, and of Christian civilization in China, deserve to be held in the grateful remembrance of the Church. He translated the New Testament into the language of the Middle Kingdom. He made himself thoroughly acquainted with the social life of the Chinese, and even introduced himself among their numerous secret societies, concerning the most important of which, the *Triad*, he wrote a memoir, published in the *Journal of the Lond. Asiatic Society* (1849). He never lost an opportunity of disseminating Christianity among the Chinese. Of his visit to China he gave a description in the *Journal of the London Geographical Society*, vol. ix, 1849. The English gave his name to an island situated some seventeen miles from the mouth of the Yang-tsé-Kiang. He wrote, besides the above-mentioned papers, *Observations on the Kingdom of Siam* (in the *Journal of the London Geographical Society*, vol. viii, 1848):—*Journal of three Voyages along the Coast of China, with Notices of Siam, Corea, and the Loo-Choo Islands* (Lond. 1833):—*Sketch of Chinese History, ancient and modern* (Lond. 1834, 2 vols. 8vo):—*China opened, or display of the Topography, Literature, Religion, and Jurisprudence of the Chinese Empire* (Lond. 1838, 2 vols. 8vo):—*The Life of Tao Kwang, the late Emperor of China* (London, 1852, 8vo):—*Hist. of the Chinese Empire* (2 vols. 8vo), which was also published in German. etc.—See Hofer, *Nov. Biog. Générale*, xxii, 922; *Methodist Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1852; *American Quart. Review*, vol. xvii; *Quart. Rev.* (Lond. li, 458); Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 751.

**Guy.** See GUIDO.

**Guyon**, JEANNE-MARIE BOUVIER DE LA MOTHE, an eminent French mystic, was born at Montargis April 13, 1648. She was educated in a convent, and in early youth showed signs of great quickness of mind. At seventeen she wished to take the veil, but her parents would not consent. In 1664 she was married to M. Jacques Guyon, a rich *parvenu*, for whom she had no affection. Her marriage was not a happy one, in consequence of the tyranny of her husband and mother-in-law, who, acting under the advice of her confessors, endeavored to withdraw her from the inward prayer and retirement to which, at the age of twenty, she began to addict herself. Vanity and coquetry were her besetting sins, and, to conquer them, she thought it necessary to purify herself by "good works" and bodily mortifications. She read largely in mystical writers, especially Kempis, Francis of Sales, and the life of Madame Chantal, whose self-inflictions she imitated. A Franciscan monk taught her to "look within instead of without" for peace, and to "seek God in her heart." Her doubts and fears fled: "I was on a sudden so altered that I was hardly to be known either by myself or by others." Madame Guyon dated this conversion from July 22, 1668. Her domestic troubles continued, but she could now bear them patiently. In 1676 her husband died, leaving her with three young children. Her religious feelings now increased in intensity. She believed that she had certain interior communications of the divine will,

but was often deeply distressed about the state of her soul. In 1672, on the anniversary of her conversion, she made "a marriage contract" with Christ, and signed it in her own blood! She formed an intimate acquaintance with Lacombe, a Barnabite mystic, who, from being her teacher, became her follower. In 1681, on St. Magdalene's Day, on occasion of a mass, she says, "My soul was perfectly delivered from all its pains." She soon after went to Paris, was exhorted in what she considered a miraculous manner to devote herself to the service of the Church, and went to Geneva to "convert" Protestants there, but, finding no success or sympathy, she went to Gex in 1681, to an establishment founded for the reception of converted Protestants. Her family then urged her to resign the guardianship of her children, which she did, giving up all her fortune to them, retaining only sufficient for her subsistence. Soon after, D'Arantion, bishop of Geneva, wished her to bestow this pittance upon an establishment, of which she was to be made prioress. She declined, and left Gex for the Ursuline convent at Thonon, where Lacombe became her "father confessor." Here she had a short period of unmingled enjoyment in dreams and reveries of bliss. Both Lacombe and Madame Guyon soon, however, began to gain purer ideas of the Christian life, and of the true nature of faith; but the errors of Romanism and mysticism were too closely incorporated with her mental habits to be got rid of. She preached to the Ursulines at Thonon not only "salvation by faith," but "indifference to life, to heaven, to hell, in the entire union of the soul with God." She returned to Gex, and there, in prayer at night, it was revealed to her that she was "the spiritual mother of Lacombe;" her relations to him became more intimate than ever, and gave occasion afterwards to great but groundless scandal. Lacombe seems to have been a weak man: he finally died in a madhouse. The bishop of Geneva became alarmed, and sought to be rid of his dangerous protégés. Madame Guyon now wandered for some years (1683-1686), visiting Turin, Grenoble, and other places. At about this time also she began to write. Her first work (begun at Gex) was *Les Torrents Spirituels* (published in her *Opuscules*, Cologne, 1704, 12mo). The "torrents" are souls tending to lose themselves in the ocean of God. The work exhibits the writer as a "devout enthusiast, but principally demonstrates her unfitness as a pattern or teacher of experimental godliness." At Grenoble she found herself "suddenly invested," as she expresses herself, "with the apostolic state," and able to discern the condition of those that spake with her, so that, one sending another, she was occupied from six in the morning till eight at night speaking of divine things. "There came," she says, "great numbers from all parts, far and near, friars, priests, men of all sorts, young women, married women, and widows; they all came one after the other, and God gave me that which satisfied them in a wonderful manner, without my thinking or caring at all about it. Nothing was hidden from me of their inward state and condition. . . . I perceived and felt that what I spake came from the fountain-head, and that I was only the instrument of him who made me speak." Her exposition of *Solomon's Song* and of the *Apocalypse* appeared in 1684 at Grenoble. Her notes were written under a quasi inspiration: she had dreams, visions, and marvellous manifestations. "Before I wrote I knew nothing of what I was going to write, and after I had written I remembered nothing of what I had penned," she says, in the singular autobiography which she has left of herself. Another of her works of this period was *Moyen court et très facile pour l'oraison*, which was published, and rapidly ran through five or six editions. The "Quietism" taught in these writings made her many enemies among the priests. In July, 1686, accompanied by Lacombe, she returned to Paris, where persecution and tribulation awaited the wanderers.

The "Quietism" of Molinos was condemned by the pope in 1687, and there was no peace or rest for the mystics or their abettors in Paris. In 1688 Madame Guyon was shut up (chiefly through the instigation of her brother, the Barnabite Lamothe, who bitterly hated her doctrines) in the convent of the Visitation at Paris. In 1689 Madame de Maintenon procured her release, and she soon gathered round her a circle of admiring and devoted friends, among whom was Fénelon, who formed an affection for her which was "stronger than persecution or death." A storm soon arose: Harlay, archbishop of Paris, condemned her writings, and other bishops followed his example. The outcry became general. Madame Guyon demanded of the king, through Madame de Maintenon, a dogmatical examination of her writings. A commission was appointed, consisting of Bossuet, Fénelon, the abbé Tronson, and the bishop of Chalons. At the end of six months thirty articles were drawn up by Bossuet, sufficient, as he deemed, to prevent the mischief likely to arise from Quietism, which were signed by Madame Guyon, who submitted at the same time to the censure which Bossuet had passed on her writings in the preceding April. Notwithstanding this submission, she was subsequently involved in the persecutions of Fénelon, the archbishop of Cambrai, and in 1695 was imprisoned in the castle of Vincennes, and thence removed to the Bastille, enduring the harshest treatment, and subjected to repeated examinations. In 1700 she was released, when she retired to Blois, to the house of her daughter, where she passed the remainder of her days in quiet and repose, in acts of love and charity, and in writing books. No reproach of her enemies and persecutors ever escaped her lips. All the neighborhood loved her; and her bitterest foes admitted that all the charges ever brought against her moral character had been false and scandalous. Her last will begins as follows: "I protest that I die in the faith of the Catholic, apostolical, Roman Church; having no other doctrines than hers; believing all that she believes, and condemning, without restriction, all that she condemns." She died June 9, 1717.

John Wesley sums up, in his usual clear way, the character of Madame Guyon's religious experience as follows: "The grand source of all her mistakes was this—the not being guided by the written word. She did not take the Scriptures for the rule of her actions; at most, they were but a secondary rule. Inward impressions, which she called inspirations, were her primary rule. The written word was not a lantern to her feet, a light in all her paths. No; she followed another light—the outward light of her confessors, and the inward light of her own spirit. It is true, she wrote many volumes upon the Scriptures. But she read them not to learn, but to teach; and therein was hurried on by the rapid stream of her overflowing imagination. Hence arose that capital mistake which runs through all her writings, that God never does, never can purify a soul but by inward and outward suffering. Utterly false! Never was there a more purified soul than the apostle John. And which of the apostles suffered less—yea, of all the primitive Christians? Therefore, all that she says on this head, of 'darkness, desertion, and privation,' and the like, is fundamentally wrong. This unscriptural notion led her into the unscriptural practice of bringing suffering upon herself—by bodily austerities; by giving away her estate to ungodly, unthankful relations; by not justifying herself, than which nothing could be more unjust or uncharitable; and by that unaccountable whim (the source of numberless sufferings which did not end but with her life), the going to Geneva to convert the heretics to the Catholic faith. And yet with all this dross, how much pure gold is mixed! So did God wink at involuntary ignorance. What a depth of religion did she enjoy! of the mind that was in Christ Jesus! What heights of righteousness, and peace,

and joy in the Holy Ghost! How few such instances do we find of exalted love to God and our neighbor; of genuine humility; of invincible meekness and unbounded resignation! So that, upon the whole, I know not whether we may not search many centuries to find another woman who was such a pattern of true holiness" (Wesley, *Works*, vii, 562, 563). See also Curry in *Methodist Quarterly Review*, July, 1848, which contains a discriminating estimate of Uplham's *Life and Religious Opinions of Madame Guyon* (N. Y. 1848-1850, 2 vols. 12mo). Comp. *Christian Review*, iii, 449; xvi, 51; *American Biblical Repository*, iv, 608 (third series); *New Englander*, vi, 165.

Madame Guyon's principal works are, *Moyen court et très facile pour l'oraison* (Lyons, 1688 and 1690; often reprinted; translated into English, London, 1703, 12mo);—*Le Cantique des Cantiques interprété selon le sens mystique* (Grenoble, 1685; Lyon, 1688, 8vo);—*Les torrents spirituels* (first published in the *Opusculs spirituels de Mme. Guyon* (Cologne, 1704, 12mo);—*Les livres de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament, traduits en français avec des explications et des réflexions qui regardent la vie intérieure* (Cologne, 1713-1715, 20 vols. 8vo);—*Recueil de Poesies spirituelles* (Amst. 1689, 5 vols. 8vo);—*Cantiques spirituels, ou cult. mes sur l'amour divin* (5 vols.);—*Discours chrétiens et spirituels sur divers sujets qui regardent la vie intérieure* (Cologne, 1716; Paris, 1790, 2 vols. 8vo);—*Lettres chrétiennes et spirituelles sur divers sujets qui regardent la vie intérieure, ou l'esprit du vrai christianisme* (Cologne, 1717, 4 vols. 8vo). She left MSS. containing her *Justifications*, and a number of mystic verses. The *Vie de Mme. Guyon, écrite par elle-même* (autobiography), which was published after her death, is perhaps not wholly her own work. It is generally thought to have been compiled by Poiret from documents furnished by her, first to the official of the archbishop of Paris, Chéron, and afterwards to the bishop of Meaux, at the time of the conferences of Issy. The book appeared first at Cologne in 1720 (3 vols. 12mo). Poiret also published her whole works (Amsterdam, 1713-22, 39 vols. 8vo). See, besides the works above cited, Herzog, *Real-Encyclopædie*, v, 426 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxii, 934 sq.; *English Cyclopædia*.

**Guyot**, HENRI DANIEL, a Belgian philanthropist, was born at Trois-Fontaines in 1753. He studied at Maestricht and in the University of Franeker, then became pastor of the Walloon Church, and afterwards professor of theology at Gröningen. After filling the office for 28 years, he was deposed by the king of Holland, Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, on some unfounded accusation. He subsequently devoted all his time to a deaf and dumb institution which he had founded in 1790. The first idea of this institution had entered his mind on witnessing a lesson of the abbé de l'Épée, at Paris, in 1785. By his process Guyot succeeded in making a number of his pupils talk. After the restoration of the Belgian kingdom, king William protected the institution. Guyot died Jan. 10, 1828. See Lulofs, *Gedenkrede op H. D. Guyot* (Gröningen, 1828, 8vo); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxii, 950.

**Guysse**, JOHN, D. D., an English Independent minister, was born at Hertford in 1680. He entered the ministry at the age of twenty as assistant to Mr. Hallowell, who soon after dying, Mr. Guysse was chosen to succeed him as pastor of the church at Hertford. In 1732 he accepted an invitation to remove to London as successor to the Rev. Matthew Clarke. Here his sphere of usefulness was enlarged, and his worth became widely known as a scholar, Christian, and divine. He published many sermons, but his great work is his *Practical Expositor, or Paraphrase on the New Testament* (Lond. 1739-52, 3 vols. 4to), which has been several times reprinted. He died November 22, 1761. Among his other writings are *Jesus Christ God-Man* (Lond. 1719, 8vo);—*Treatise on the Holy Spirit* (new

ed. Lond. 1840, 8vo);—*Practical Sermons* (Lond., 1756, 8vo);—*The Scripture Notion of Preaching Christ* (Lond. 1730, 8vo);—*Youth's Monitor* (Lond. 1759, 4th ed.). See Bogue and Bennet, *Hist. of Dissenters*, ii, 618; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 751; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibl.* i, 1357.

**Gymnasium** (γυμνάσιον, A. V. "place of exercise"), a large unroofed building for the purpose of athletic exercises, consisting usually of different compartments, or a set of separate buildings conjoined, each of which was set apart to some special sport, as the *Sphaeristerion* for playing at ball, the *Palastra* for wrestling and the exercises of the pancratium, etc. (Smith, *Dict. of Class. Antiquities*, s. v.). This was almost exclusively a Greek institution, and there was hardly a Greek town of any size that had not its gymnasium. To the Jews it was unknown until the Hellenizing party introduced it in the age of the Maccabees (1 Macc. i, 14). Jason, the Hellenizing high-priest, caused one to be erected at Jerusalem (2 Macc. iv, 12 sq.). This innovation was viewed with much displeasure by the strict party among the Jews. Whether Herod the Great, when he introduced the theatre and amphitheatre, restored the gymnasium, does not appear, but the probability is that he did (Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 8, 1; compare *War*, i, 21, 11).—Kitto, s. v. See GAMES.

**Gymnosophists** (Γυμνοσοφισταί), an ancient sect of Hindoo philosophers, who distinguished themselves outwardly from others by discarding all clothing. They were believers in metempsychosis, and often sought to facilitate their transmigration by committing suicide—generally burning themselves alive. They placed the height of wisdom in contemplation and ascetic practices to mortify carnal instincts. They inculcated utter disregard of temporal advantages. This sect furnished for a long time counsellors to the kings, and stood in high consideration. They were divided into two classes, the Brachmans and Garmans, or Samaneans. Calanos, in the time of Alexander the Great, belonged to this sect. See FAKIRS, as also Cicero, *Tusc. Quest.* v, 27; Plutarch, *l'it. Alexand.* c. 65; Arrian, *Indica*, xii; Quintus Curtius, viii, cap. iv; Strabo, § 712-719.

**Gypsies, Gypseys, or Gipsies** (a corrupt form of *Egyptians*), the English name of a singular vagabond race of people, with a language and laws or customs peculiar to themselves, found throughout the whole of Europe, and in parts of Asia, Africa, and America, and everywhere noted for their aversion to the habits of settled life, and for the practice of deceptive tricks and thieving. They bear different names in different countries. In France they are called *Bohémiens* (because they first came thither from Bohemia, or from böem, an old French word meaning sorcerer, because of their practising on the credulity of the vulgar); in Spain, *Gitanos* or *Zincali*; in Germany, *Zigeuner*; in Italy, *Zingari*; in Holland, *Heddenen* (heathens); in Sweden and Denmark, *Tartars*; in Selavie countries, *Tsigani*; in Hungary, *Czigánok*; in Turkey, *Tshengender*; in Persia, *Sisech*; in Arabia, *Harami*, etc. Various nicknames are also applied to them, as *Cagoux* and *Gueux* in France; *Zieh-Gauner* (wandering rogues) in Germany, and *Tinklers* in Scotland. They call themselves *Rom* (men or husbands; comp. Coptic *Rem*), *Calo* (black), or *Sinte* (from Ind; hence *Zincali*, or black men from Ind).

*Origin and History.*—In the absence of any historical records of their migrations, their original country and the causes which drove them thence to scatter so widely over the earth have been the subject of speculation among the learned, and various theories have been proposed as solutions of the mystery of their origin and history. Some writers have connected them with the *Σιγύρραι*, mentioned by Herodotus (v, 9) as a people of Median extraction dwelling beyond the Lower Danube, and the *Σιγύρροι*, described by Strabo (§ 520) as living near Mount Caucasus, and



practising Persian customs. Others have referred them variously to Tartary, Nubia, Mesopotamia, Assyria, Ethiopia, Morocco, etc.; but the account which the Gypsies, at their appearance in Western Europe, gave of themselves, claimed "Little Egypt" as the original home of the race, whence they were driven in consequence of the Moslem conquests. According to one version of the story, pope Martin V imposed on them, as a penance for their renunciation of the true faith, a life of wandering and an inhibition of the use of a bed for seven years; according to another version, God himself had doomed them to this vagabond life because their forefathers had refused hospitality to Joseph and Mary when they took refuge in Egypt with the infant Saviour—"a notion which has, curiously enough, been partly revived in our own day by Roberts, with this difference only, that he proves them, from the prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, to be the descendants of the ancient Egyptians, and their wanderings to be the predicted punishment of the various iniquities of their forefathers" (Chambers). We owe to the once-prevalent belief that they were from Egypt the origin of the English term Gypsies and the Spanish Gitanos. The results of the investigations made within the last hundred years in the fields of comparative philology and ethnology prove beyond reasonable grounds of doubt that the theories above named are erroneous, and that we must look to India, "the nursing home of nations" (*tellus gentium nutrix*), as also the fatherland of the Gypsies. It is now the almost, if not entirely universally received opinion that they came to Europe from Hindûstan, either impelled by the ravages of Tamerlane, or, more probably, at an earlier date, in quest of fresh fields for the enjoyment of their vagabond life, and the exercise of their propensity for theft and deception. This view of their origin rests upon their physiological affinities with Asiatic types of men, as well as on the striking resemblances between the Gypsy language and Hindûstane, and the similarity of their habits and modes of life to those of many roving tribes of India, especially of the Nuts or Bazegurs, who are styled the Gypsies of India, and are counterparts of those in Europe, both in other respects and also in having no peculiar religion, since they have never adopted the worship of Brahma. The Nuts are thought by some to be an aboriginal race, prior even to the Hindûs. Another theory, which seeks to reconcile the Gypsy statement of an Egyptian origin with the clear evidences of a Hindû one, would find their ancestors in the mixed multitude that went out from Egypt with Moses (see Exod. xii, 38; Numb. xi, 4; Neh. xiii, 3), and who, according to this view, passed onward to India and settled there, and from their descendants, subsequently, bands of Gypsies migrated to Europe, probably at different times and by different routes (see Simson).

The earliest supposed reference to Gypsies in European literature is contained in a German paraphrase of Genesis, written about A.D. 1122 by an Austrian monk, in which mention is made of "Ismaelites and braziers, who go peddling through the wide world, having neither house nor home, cheating people with their tricks, and deceiving mankind, but not openly." In the early part of the 15th century they had established themselves in Hungary and Wallachia, and began to spread over Western Europe in considerable numbers; one of their bands, which appeared at Basle in 1422, numbered, according to the old Swiss historian Stumpf, 14,000. They were under a kind of feudal leadership of so-called dukes, knights, etc., and, telling the story of their expulsion from Egypt and penal pilgrimage, sought to excite sympathy. At first they were well received as Christian pilgrims performing their allotted penance; but the deception was soon found out, and their thefts and impositions on the credulity of the people soon caused them to be regard-

ed as nuisances and pests to society. Very stringent, even barbarously cruel laws were enacted, and in most places enforced against them, without, however, extirpating them, or seriously diminishing their numbers. After the middle of the 18th century more humane views in regard to them obtained, and measures were employed to improve their social and moral condition with some degree of success. A society for their improvement was formed at Southampton, England, in 1832, by the Rev. George Crabbe, and a school has been established at Farnham, in Dorsetshire, "in which Gypsy children are instructed in the knowledge of Scripture, where they are at the same time trained for service and taught various trades." The number of them who adopt more settled modes of life is increasing, according to Simson, who further states that Gypsies have been found occupying honorable and responsible positions in public as well as private life, and reckons the celebrated John Bunyan among Gypsies. Grellman estimated the number of Gypsies in Europe at 700,000 to 800,000. Simson (p. 493) considers that estimate far too low, and thinks there are at least 4,000,000 in Europe and America. The Gypsies, as a race, have no religion, and, indeed, are usually described as destitute of religious sentiments or ideas, their language containing no word signifying God, soul, or immortality. But the sacrifice of horses, which, Simson asserts, formerly constituted a part of the Gypsy marriage ceremonies, and is still a necessary part of a valid divorce ceremony, not only involves a religious idea, but presents a coincidence with Hindû mythological conceptions. See GANGES. They have, for policy's sake, often conformed, so far as necessary, to the religion of the country in which they roved, but Velasquez says sarcastically, "The Gypsies' church was built of lard, and the dogs ate it." In regard to their morals, little that is commendatory can be said. They are described as squalid, thievish, treacherous, and revengeful, and their most strongly-marked virtue, viz. a strict regard for the corporeal chastity (*acha*) of their women, is sadly disfigured by the permission allowed them to employ the grossest licentiousness in manner merely in order to allure others to vice for the sake of gain as procuresses. Some of them show great aptitude for music, and the choirs of Moscow owe their chief excellence to them, and among the Hungarian Gypsies are found the most celebrated violinists of that country. They furnish a field for the display of the religious activities of this age, full of difficulties, yet provocative of effort, and Christians should zealously labor and pray for the conversion of this race, assured that its evangelization and consequent moral and material elevation will be one of the grandest of the victories of the Gospel over degradation and sin promised to the Church of Christ in its conflicts here.

*Language and Version.*—The Gypsies call their language Rommany, and modern philological researches prove that it belongs to the Sanscrit family. It has doubtless received additions and modifications from the languages of the countries in which the race has sojourned, yet it is still so nearly the same with modern Hindûstane that a Gypsy can readily understand a person speaking in that dialect—a fact which tends to verify the statements made as to the zealous care with which the Gypsies have cherished their ancestral tongue. Mr. George Borrow, who devoted himself to the study of their language and life, translated the whole of the New Testament into the Spanish dialect of Rommany, and in 1838 printed at Madrid 500 copies of the Gospel of Luke, in the translation of which, as far as the eighth chapter, he had been assisted by Gypsies. This version was found to be perfectly intelligible to the Gitanos, and copies were eagerly sought after by them, not, Mr. Borrow thinks, because of the truths it contained, but from a desire to see and read their broken jargon in print. He remarks: "The

only words of assent I ever obtained, and that rather of a negative kind, were the following from the mouth of a woman: 'Brother, you tell us strange things, though perhaps you do not lie; a month since I would sooner have believed these tales than that this day I should see one who could write Rommany.'” The following specimen of the version is from Bagster's *Bible of every Land*, p. 111—Luke vi, 27—29: “27 Tamí penelo á sangue sos lo Jneulais: Camelad á jires daschmanuces, querelad mistos á junos sos camelan sangue choro. 28 Majarad á junos sos zermánelan á sangue, y mangelad á Debél por junos sos araqerelan sangue choro! 29 Y á ó sos curarè tuece andrè yeque mejilla, dinle tambien a vare. Y á ó sos nicobelàre tuece o uehardo, na ó impidas lliguerar tambien a furi.” For further information on the Gypsies and their language, see the following works: Peyssonel, *Observations historiques et géographiques sur les peuples barbares qui ont habité les bords du Danube et du Pont-Euxin* (Paris, 1765, 4to); Pray, *Annales regum Hungarie ad annum Chr. MDLXIV deducti* (Vienna, 1764—70, 5 pts. fol.); Grellman, *Historische Versuch über die Zigeuner* (2d ed. Göttingen, 1787; English translation by Roper, Lond. 1787, 4to); Bischoff, *Deutsch-Zigeunerisches Wörterbuch* (Hmenau, 1827); Kogalmichan, *Esquisse sur l'histoire, les Mœurs et la langue des Cigains* (Berlin, 1837); Predari, *Origine e vicende dei Zingari* (Milan, 1841); Pott, *Die Zigeuner in Europa und Asien* (Halle, 1844—45, 2 vols. 8vo)—“the most wonderfully thorough and exhaustive book ever written on the subject of the Gypsies and their language”; Von Heister, *Ethnographie und geschichtliche Notizen über die Zigeuner* (Königsberg, 1842); Bataillard, *De l'émigration et de la dispersion des Bohémiens en Europe* (in 5th vol. of the *Bibliothèque de l'école de Chartres*, 1844); Böhtlingk, *Die Sprache der Zigeuner in Russland* (St. Petersburg, 1852); Borrow, *The Zinca'i* (London and N. York); Bagster's *Bible of every Land* (Lond. u. d.), p. 111—13; Simson, *A History of the Gipsies* (N. York and Lond. 1866, 12mo); Roberts, *Gypsies, their Origin, Continuance, etc.* (Lond. 8vo); Brand, *Popular Antiquities* (Lond. 1842, 3 vols. post 8vo), iii, 45—53; Thos. Browne, *Works* (Lond. 1852, Behn's ed.), ii, 204—6; Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, s. v.; *New American Cyclopædia*, viii, 612 sq. (J. W. M.)

**Gyrovagi, wandering monks.** The monasticism of Occidental Europe at an early period took the form of common life in monasteries. Ascetics and hermits were gradually obliged to connect themselves with their brethren settled in convents. Many of them, however, unwilling to submit to conventional discipline, travelled from place to place, from convent to convent, from abbey to abbey, being entertained a few days at each place, in consequence of the general rule of hospitality in vigor in all convents, but evading all propositions tending to render their stay a permanent one. When they had gone over their whole circuit they began it anew, and from this habit received the name of *Gyrovagi*. Isidore of Seville gave this name also to the *Circumcelliones* (q. v.). These wandering monks were the pests of the convents, introducing gossip and vice wherever they went. Vainly did Augustine, in *De Opere Monachorum*, c. 28, and Cassian, *Collatio* 18, declare themselves strongly against these vagrant monks. Benedict wrote his rules expressly (cap. i) in view of the Sarabaites and Gyrovagi, whom he seems to have been the first to mention by that name in writing. Columbanus and Isidore of Seville (*De eccl. s. officii*, lib. ii, c. 15), in the 7th century, also censured the degeneracy of monachism; but it required the rule of Benedict, in the 8th century, and the efforts of Charlemagne, Louis the Pious, and Benedict of Aniane, to bind the Western monks firmly to regular conventional life, thus putting an end to the race of homeless, wandering monks. The later mendicant orders are, to a certain extent; a reproduction of them. The name *Gyrovagi* has also been applied to unsettled, travelling members of the Roman

clergy. See Martone, *Comment. in Reg. S. P. Benedicti*, p. 53 sq. (Paris, 1690); Herzog, *Real-Encycl.* v, 433.

**Elliott, CHARLES, D. D.**,\* an eminent scholar and minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born May 16, 1792, at Glenconway, County Donegal, Ireland. His early education was obtained in the ordinary schools of the neighborhood, but he soon went beyond their range in private study. He was brought to a religious life under the ministry of the Rev. E. Hazleton in 1811, and soon after turned his studies towards preparation for the ministry. He was licensed about 1813 as a local preacher, and taught school until 1816, when, with his widowed mother and her eight other children, he sailed for America. Settling in Western Pennsylvania, he devoted himself to farm labor and teaching school, preaching meanwhile almost every Sunday. In 1818 he was received on trial into the Ohio Conference, and was appointed first to Zanesville Circuit; then, in 1819, to Duck Creek Circuit; in 1820 he was ordained deacon, and appointed to Erie Circuit, and in 1821 to Mahoning Circuit; during part of the next year he was missionary to the Wyandotte Indians. From 1823 to 1827 he was presiding elder of the Ohio district; 1827—31, professor of languages in Madison College, Pa.; 1831—2, pastor at Pittsburg; 1833—6, editor of the *Pittsburg Conference Journal*; 1836—48, editor of the *Western Christian Advocate*. The next four years were spent in the regular work of the ministry; and from 1852 to 1856 he was again editor of the *Western Christian Advocate*. In 1857 he became professor, and in 1858 president of the Iowa Wesleyan University; and also edited the *Central Christian Advocate*, published at St. Louis from 1860 to 1864. He was nine times a delegate to the General Conference. After a long career of arduous and successful labor, he died at Mount Pleasant, Iowa, Jan. 3, 1869. “In every department of labor Dr. Elliott was an untiring worker; work was his element. Naturally blessed with a vigorous constitution and a cheerful flow of spirits, he never felt labor a burden. In his busiest hours he was light of heart, and often playful as a child. Mere elegance was never his study, either as to mind or manners; but, while the learned found in him a master and the child a companion, the most fastidious felt at home with him as a gentleman. To know him was to love him.” His scholarship was not only varied, but accurate, and in knowledge of the history and theology of the Roman Catholic Church he was not exceeded by any theologian of his time. The marvel is that, amid his incessant labors as preacher, editor, etc., he found time for so much study and authorship. His writings include *An Essay on the Subjects and Modes of Esqutism* (1834, 12mo);—*An Essay on the Value of the Soul* (1835, 12mo);—*Indian Reminiscences, principally of the Wyandotte Nation* (1835, 16mo);—*Debucation of Roman Catholicism* (N. Y. 1841, 2 vols. 8vo; London, 1851, royal 8vo);—*Life of Bishop Roberts* (1844, 12mo);—*The Sinfulness of American Slavery* (1850, 2 vols. 12mo);—*The Great Secession* (a history of the division of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1844 on account of slavery; N. Y. 1852, royal 8vo);—*The Bible and Slavery* (1857, 12mo);—*South-western Methodism, a History of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Missouri from 1844 to 1864* (1868, 12mo). He also left ready for the press an elaborate work on *Political Romanism*, which, it is to be hoped, will be published. The *Delineation of Roman Catholicism* is unrivalled in English literature as a storehouse of facts and arguments; it is drawn from original sources, and is worked out with great care and accuracy. The English edition is provided with a copious index.—*Sketch* by the Rev. L. M. Vernon; *Irish Evangelist*, April, 1869.

\* The pages in which this article would be in place, alphabetically, were stereotyped before the death of Dr. Elliott.

# LIST OF ARTICLES IN VOL. III.

Eachard . . . . .	Page	1 Edar . . . . .	Page	51 Eisenmenger . . . . .	Page	110 Eliab, 5 . . . . .	Page	138 Elipandus . . . . .	Page	152
Eadfrith . . . . .	1	Eddy . . . . .	1	51 Eker . . . . .	110	Eliab, 6 . . . . .	138	135 Eliphah . . . . .	152	
Eadmer . . . . .	1	Eedmann . . . . .	51	51 Ekkehard (A. J. S.) . . . . .	110	Eliab, 7 . . . . .	138	138 Eliphalel . . . . .	152	
Eagle . . . . .	1	Eden, 1 . . . . .	52	52 Ekrebel . . . . .	110	Eliada, 1 . . . . .	133	139 Eliphalel . . . . .	152	
Eagle, in the Church of England . . . . .	4	Eden, 2 . . . . .	56	56 Ekron . . . . .	110	Eliada, 2 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 1 . . . . .	152	
Eanes . . . . .	4	Eden, 3 . . . . .	57	57 Ekronite . . . . .	111	Eliada, 3 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 2 . . . . .	152	
Ear . . . . .	4	Eden, 4 . . . . .	57	57 Ela . . . . .	111	Eliadah . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 3 . . . . .	152	
Ears, Touching the . . . . .	4	Edenius . . . . .	57	57 Eladah . . . . .	111	Eliadun . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 4 . . . . .	152	
Ears of Corn . . . . .	4	Eder, 1 . . . . .	57	57 Elah, 1 . . . . .	111	Eliah . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 5 . . . . .	152	
Ear, Earing . . . . .	4	Eder, 2 . . . . .	57	57 Elah, 2 . . . . .	111	Eliabah . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 6 . . . . .	152	
Eardley . . . . .	4	Edes . . . . .	57	57 Elah, 3 . . . . .	111	Eliabba . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 7 . . . . .	152	
Early . . . . .	4	Edessa . . . . .	57	57 Elah, 4 . . . . .	111	Eliakim, 1 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 8 . . . . .	152	
Early English . . . . .	5	Edgar, John . . . . .	58	58 Elah, 5 . . . . .	111	Eliakim, 2 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 9 . . . . .	152	
Earnest . . . . .	5	Edgar, John Todd . . . . .	58	58 Elah, 6 . . . . .	111	Eliakim, 3 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 10 . . . . .	152	
Ear-ring . . . . .	5	Edge . . . . .	58	58 Elah, 7 . . . . .	111	Eliakim, 4 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 11 . . . . .	152	
Earth . . . . .	7	Edias . . . . .	58	58 Elah, 8 . . . . .	111	Eliakim, 5 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 12 . . . . .	152	
Earthquake . . . . .	8	Edict . . . . .	58	58 Elais . . . . .	112	Eliakim, 6 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 13 . . . . .	152	
East . . . . .	10	Edification . . . . .	58	58 Elam, 1 . . . . .	112	Eliakim, 7 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 14 . . . . .	152	
East, Turning towards the . . . . .	11	Edithryda, St. . . . .	59	59 Elam, 2 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 8 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 15 . . . . .	152	
Eastburn . . . . .	12	Edinburgh (A. J. S.) . . . . .	59	59 Elam, 3 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 9 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 16 . . . . .	152	
East Sea . . . . .	12	Edmund, 1 . . . . .	59	59 Elam, 4 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 10 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 17 . . . . .	152	
East Wind . . . . .	12	Edmund, St. . . . .	59	59 Elam, 5 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 11 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 18 . . . . .	152	
Easter . . . . .	12	Edna . . . . .	59	59 Elam, 6 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 12 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 19 . . . . .	152	
Easter, Celebration of . . . . .	12	Edom . . . . .	59	59 Elam, 7 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 13 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 20 . . . . .	152	
Easter Controversies (A. J. S.) . . . . .	13	Edomite . . . . .	59	59 Elam, 8 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 14 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 21 . . . . .	152	
Easter, John, 1 . . . . .	14	Edrei, 1 . . . . .	60	60 Elam, 9 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 15 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 22 . . . . .	152	
Easter, John, 2 . . . . .	14	Edrei, 2 . . . . .	61	61 Elam, 10 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 16 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 23 . . . . .	152	
Eastern Church . . . . .	14	Edrei, 3 . . . . .	61	61 Elam, 11 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 17 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 24 . . . . .	152	
Eating . . . . .	14	Edumia, Hebrew . . . . .	61	61 Elam, 12 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 18 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 25 . . . . .	152	
Eaton, John . . . . .	16	Eduth . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 13 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 19 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 26 . . . . .	152	
Eaton, Samuel . . . . .	16	Edward I. . . . .	63	63 Elam, 14 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 20 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 27 . . . . .	152	
Ehak, 1 . . . . .	16	Edward II. . . . .	63	63 Elam, 15 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 21 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 28 . . . . .	152	
Ehak, 2 . . . . .	16	Edward III. . . . .	63	63 Elam, 16 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 22 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 29 . . . . .	152	
Ehak, 3 . . . . .	16	Edward VI . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 17 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 23 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 30 . . . . .	152	
Ehba (A. J. S.) . . . . .	16	Edward VII . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 18 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 24 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 31 . . . . .	152	
Ehed, 1 . . . . .	19	Edward VIII . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 19 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 25 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 32 . . . . .	152	
Ehed, 2 . . . . .	19	Edward IX . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 20 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 26 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 33 . . . . .	152	
Ehed-jesu, 1 (J. H. W.) . . . . .	19	Edwards, Beta Bates (E. A. P.) . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 21 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 27 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 34 . . . . .	152	
Ehed-jesu, 2 (J. H. W.) . . . . .	19	Edwards, John . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 22 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 28 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 35 . . . . .	152	
Ehed-melech . . . . .	19	Edwards, Jonathan, 1 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 23 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 29 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 36 . . . . .	152	
Ehel (A. J. S.) . . . . .	19	Edwards, Jonathan, 2 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 24 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 30 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 37 . . . . .	152	
Ehen . . . . .	20	Edwards, John . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 25 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 31 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 38 . . . . .	152	
Ehenezzer . . . . .	20	Edwards, John, 1 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 26 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 32 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 39 . . . . .	152	
Eher, 1 . . . . .	20	Edwards, John, 2 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 27 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 33 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 40 . . . . .	152	
Eher, 2 . . . . .	20	Edwards, John, 3 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 28 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 34 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 41 . . . . .	152	
Eher, 3 . . . . .	20	Edwards, John, 4 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 29 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 35 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 42 . . . . .	152	
Eher, 4 . . . . .	20	Edwards, John, 5 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 30 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 36 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 43 . . . . .	152	
Eher, 5 . . . . .	20	Edwards, John, 6 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 31 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 37 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 44 . . . . .	152	
Eher, Paul . . . . .	20	Edwards, John, 7 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 32 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 38 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 45 . . . . .	152	
Eherhard (A. J. S.) . . . . .	20	Edwards, John, 8 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 33 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 39 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 46 . . . . .	152	
Eherlin . . . . .	20	Edwards, John, 9 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 34 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 40 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 47 . . . . .	152	
Eherlin, Sebastian . . . . .	20	Edwards, John, 10 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 35 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 41 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 48 . . . . .	152	
Ebert, Jacob (J. H. W.) . . . . .	21	Edwards, John, 11 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 36 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 42 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 49 . . . . .	152	
Ebert, Theodor . . . . .	21	Edwards, John, 12 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 37 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 43 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 50 . . . . .	152	
Ebiasaph . . . . .	21	Edwards, John, 13 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 38 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 44 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 51 . . . . .	152	
Ebionites . . . . .	21	Edwards, John, 14 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 39 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 45 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 52 . . . . .	152	
Ebnerian Manuscript . . . . .	22	Edwards, John, 15 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 40 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 46 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 53 . . . . .	152	
Eboda . . . . .	22	Edwards, John, 16 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 41 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 47 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 54 . . . . .	152	
Ebony . . . . .	22	Edwards, John, 17 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 42 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 48 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 55 . . . . .	152	
Ebrardus . . . . .	24	Edwards, John, 18 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 43 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 49 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 56 . . . . .	152	
Ebreman . . . . .	24	Edwards, John, 19 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 44 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 50 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 57 . . . . .	152	
Ebronah . . . . .	24	Edwards, John, 20 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 45 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 51 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 58 . . . . .	152	
Ebutus . . . . .	24	Edwards, John, 21 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 46 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 52 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 59 . . . . .	152	
Ecanus . . . . .	24	Edwards, John, 22 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 47 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 53 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 60 . . . . .	152	
Ecbatana . . . . .	24	Edwards, John, 23 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 48 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 54 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 61 . . . . .	152	
Ecece Homo . . . . .	26	Edwards, John, 24 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 49 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 55 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 62 . . . . .	152	
Ecehellensis . . . . .	26	Edwards, John, 25 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 50 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 56 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 63 . . . . .	152	
Ecclesiastes . . . . .	26	Edwards, John, 26 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 51 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 57 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 64 . . . . .	152	
Ecclesiastic . . . . .	35	Edwards, John, 27 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 52 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 58 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 65 . . . . .	152	
Ecclesiastic History . . . . .	35	Edwards, John, 28 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 53 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 59 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 66 . . . . .	152	
Ecclesiastic Polity . . . . .	39	Edwards, John, 29 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 54 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 60 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 67 . . . . .	152	
Ecclesiasticus . . . . .	42	Edwards, John, 30 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 55 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 61 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 68 . . . . .	152	
Ecelesiology . . . . .	46	Edwards, John, 31 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 56 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 62 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 69 . . . . .	152	
Echard, Jacques . . . . .	46	Edwards, John, 32 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 57 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 63 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 70 . . . . .	152	
Echard, Lawrence . . . . .	46	Edwards, John, 33 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 58 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 64 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 71 . . . . .	152	
Eck . . . . .	46	Edwards, John, 34 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 59 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 65 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 72 . . . . .	152	
Eckart . . . . .	49	Edwards, John, 35 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 60 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 66 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 73 . . . . .	152	
Eckermann . . . . .	49	Edwards, John, 36 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 61 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 67 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 74 . . . . .	152	
Efectics . . . . .	49	Edwards, John, 37 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 62 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 68 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 75 . . . . .	152	
Eclipse . . . . .	50	Edwards, John, 38 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 63 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 69 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 76 . . . . .	152	
Economy . . . . .	51	Edwards, John, 39 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 64 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 70 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 77 . . . . .	152	
Etheis . . . . .	51	Edwards, John, 40 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 65 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 71 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 78 . . . . .	152	
Euador (A. J. S.) . . . . .	51	Edwards, John, 41 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 66 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 72 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 79 . . . . .	152	
Ed . . . . .	51	Edwards, John, 42 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 67 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 73 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 80 . . . . .	152	
		Edwards, John, 43 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 68 . . . . .	113	Eliakim, 74 . . . . .	139	139 Eliphaz, 81 . . . . .	152	
		Edwards, John, 44 . . . . .	63	63 Elam, 69 . . . . .	113					

Flusa.....	Page 170	Ena.....	Page 231	Epithaphia.....	Page 275	Ethics (B.I.L.N.)	Page 319	Evangelical Alliance	Page 367
Fluzai.....	171	En-shemesh.....	231	Epi-poch.....	275	Ethiopia.....	325	Evangelical Association	367
Flvira (A.J.S.).....	171	En-sign.....	231	Equitius (A.J.S.).....	276	Ethiopian.....	322	Evangelical Church	369
Ely, Ezra Stiles.....	171	Entablature.....	232	Equity.....	276	Ethiopian Eunuch.....	322	Evangelical Union	370
Ely Cathedral.....	171	En-taunim.....	232	Equivocation.....	277	Ethiopian Woman.....	322	Evangelist.....	370
Elyman.....	171	En-tappuah.....	232	Er, 1.....	277	Ethiopians.....	322	Evangelistarium.....	371
Elymais.....	171	Entelechy.....	232	Er, 2.....	277	Ethiopic Language.....	332	Evangelium Aeter-	371
Elymas.....	172	Entertainment.....	232	Er, 3.....	277	Ethiopic Version.....	332	num.....	371
Elzabad, 1.....	172	Enthusiasm.....	233	Eran.....	277	Ethma.....	335	Evans, Caleb.....	371
Elzabad, 2.....	172	Entity.....	234	Eranite.....	277	Ethuan.....	343	Evans, Christmas.....	371
Elzaphan.....	172	Entrance into the	234	Erasmus.....	277	Ethunarch.....	344	Evans, John.....	372
Emanation (A.J.S.).....	173	Church.....	234	Erebrantianism.....	279	Ethui.....	344	Evans, John.....	372
Emancipation.....	172	Entwistle.....	234	Erastus.....	279	Ethynology.....	344	Evans, John.....	372
Embalm.....	172	Enzinas, Francisco.....	234	Erastus, Thomas.....	280	Ethmadiadin.....	344	Evans, John.....	372
Embalming the Dead.....	175	Enzinas de, Jayme.....	234	Erdt.....	280	Eitwelin (E. de S.).....	344	Evans, John.....	372
Ember Weeks.....	175	Eon (A.J.S.).....	234	Erebtindli.....	280	Eubulus.....	344	Evans, John.....	372
Emblem.....	176	Equinians.....	234	Erech.....	280	Eucharist.....	344	Evans, John.....	372
Embroider.....	176	Epaet.....	234	Eremitite.....	281	Euchel.....	344	Evans, John.....	372
Embury.....	177	Epaenetus.....	235	Erfurt (A.J.S.).....	281	Euchelion.....	344	Evans, John.....	372
Emerald.....	177	Epaon.....	235	Eri.....	281	Eucherius (A.J.S.).....	344	Evans, John.....	372
Emerson, John S.....	177	Epaophras.....	235	Erle IX.....	281	Euchoclogion.....	344	Evans, John.....	372
Emerson, Ralph.....	177	Epaoproditus.....	236	Erite.....	281	Eudæmon (A.J.S.).....	344	Evans, John.....	372
Emery.....	177	Epaorch.....	236	Erizatsy.....	281	Eudæmonism (A.J.).....	344	Evans, John.....	372
Emim.....	178	Eparely (A.J.S.).....	236	Erdlangen (A.J.S.).....	281	Eudes.....	344	Evans, John.....	372
Eminence.....	178	Epe.....	236	Ernesti.....	282	Eudocia.....	345	Evans, John.....	372
Emlyn.....	178	Epefanofschinus.....	236	Eroge.....	282	Eudoxia.....	345	Evans, John.....	372
Emmanuel.....	178	Epehah, 1.....	236	Erpen.....	282	Eudoxius.....	345	Evans, John.....	372
Emmaus, 1.....	178	Epehah, 2.....	237	Error.....	282	Euergetes.....	345	Evans, John.....	372
Emmaus, 2.....	178	Epehah, 3.....	237	Erskine, J. benzer.....	283	Euergetius.....	346	Evans, John.....	372
Emmaus, 3.....	179	Epehah (a measure).....	237	Erskine, John.....	283	Eugenius I.....	346	Evans, John.....	372
Emmer.....	179	Epehai.....	237	Erskine, Ralph.....	283	Eugenius II.....	346	Evans, John.....	372
Emmeran.....	179	Epher, 1.....	237	Esaias.....	283	Eugenius III.....	346	Evans, John.....	372
Emmons (E.A.P.).....	179	Epher, 2.....	237	Esar-haddon.....	283	Eugenius IV.....	346	Evans, John.....	372
Emmor.....	180	Epher, 3.....	237	Esau (son of Isaac).....	284	Eugippius (A.J.S.).....	347	Evans, John.....	372
Emperor.....	183	Ephes-dammim.....	237	Esau.....	284	Euhemerus.....	347	Evans, John.....	372
Emory, John.....	181	Ephesian.....	237	Esay.....	284	Eulalia (A.J.S.).....	347	Evans, John.....	372
Emory, Robert.....	181	Ephesians, Epistle to.....	237	Eschatology, Bibli-	284	Eulalins (J.H.W.).....	348	Evans, John.....	372
Emotion.....	182	Ephesians, General	241	cal.....	284	Eulogia.....	348	Evans, John.....	372
Empiricism.....	182	Council of.....	247	Eschatology, Theo-	289	Eulogius.....	348	Evans, John.....	372
Empiric (G.F.H.).....	183	Ephesus, Robber	217	logical (A.J.S.).....	289	Eulogius of Cordova.....	348	Evans, John.....	372
Enis Congress (A.J.S.).....	185	Council of.....	217	Escorial.....	289	Eumatin.....	348	Evans, John.....	372
Eniser (A.J.S.).....	185	Ephlal.....	248	Escraulon.....	290	Eumice.....	348	Evans, John.....	372
En.....	185	Ephod.....	248	Esdras.....	290	Eumenes.....	348	Evans, John.....	372
Enam.....	185	Ephod (a sacred vest-	248	Esdras, First Book of.....	291	Eumomians.....	349	Evans, John.....	372
Enan.....	185	ment).....	248	Esdras, Second Book	291	Eumomius (A.J.S.).....	349	Evans, John.....	372
Enasibus.....	185	Ephratha.....	249	of.....	292	Eunuch.....	350	Evans, John.....	372
Encebia.....	185	Ephraem Manuscript	249	Esebon.....	292	Eunuchus.....	351	Evans, John.....	372
Encamp.....	186	Ephraim, 1.....	250	Esebrias.....	292	Eunodias.....	351	Evans, John.....	372
Enchantment.....	188	Ephraim, Tribe of.....	250	Esek.....	292	Euphrates.....	351	Evans, John.....	372
Enacratis (A.J.S.).....	188	Ephraim, Gate of.....	253	Eshbaal.....	297	Euphrates (bishop of	351	Evans, John.....	372
Encyclica (A.J.S.).....	188	Ephraim, Wood of.....	253	Eshban.....	297	Cologne) (A.J.S.).....	351	Evans, John.....	372
Encyclopedia of Theol-	189	Ephraim, 2.....	254	Eshcol, 1.....	297	Euroclydon.....	354	Evans, John.....	372
ogy.....	189	Ephraim, 3.....	254	Eshcol, 2.....	297	Euroclydon.....	354	Evans, John.....	372
Encyclopedia, Fr.....	190	Ephraimite.....	254	Eshben.....	297	Europe (A.J.S.).....	355	Evans, John.....	372
Endor.....	192	Ephraim, 1.....	254	Eshlek.....	298	Eusebians.....	355	Evans, John.....	372
En-eglam.....	192	Ephraim, 2.....	254	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eusebius.....	355	Evans, John.....	372
Enemessar.....	193	Ephraim, 1.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eusebius of Alexan-	355	Evans, John.....	372
Enenius.....	193	Ephraim, 3.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	dria (A.J.S.).....	356	Evans, John.....	372
Energiel.....	193	Ephraimite, 1.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eusebius Bruno (A.	356	Evans, John.....	372
Emergontem.....	193	Ephraimite, 2.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	J.S.).....	356	Evans, John.....	372
Enfantin (A.J.S.).....	193	Ephraimite, 3.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eusebius of Ce area	356	Evans, John.....	372
Enfield.....	193	Ephraim, 2.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eusebius of Doryle-	356	Evans, John.....	372
Engaddi.....	194	Ephraim, 3.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	um.....	356	Evans, John.....	372
En-gannim, 1.....	194	Ephraim, 4.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eusebius (bishop of	356	Evans, John.....	372
En-gannim, 2.....	194	Ephraim, 1.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Emesa).....	356	Evans, John.....	372
En-gannim, 3.....	194	Ephraim, 2.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eusebius (a Nitrian	356	Evans, John.....	372
En-gannim, 4.....	194	Ephraim, 3.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	monk).....	356	Evans, John.....	372
En-gedi.....	194	Ephraim, 4.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eusebius of Laodii-	356	Evans, John.....	372
Engedi, Wilderness	195	Ephraim, 1.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	on (A.J.S.).....	356	Evans, John.....	372
of.....	195	Ephraim, 2.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eusebius of Nicome-	356	Evans, John.....	372
Engelbert (A.J.S.).....	195	Ephraim, 3.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	dia.....	356	Evans, John.....	372
Engelbert, Saint (A.	195	Ephraim, 4.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eusebius of Vercelli	356	Evans, John.....	372
J.S.).....	195	Ephraim, 1.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eusebius, St., of Sa-	356	Evans, John.....	372
Engelbrecht.....	195	Ephraim, 2.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	mosata (A.J.S.).....	356	Evans, John.....	372
Engelhardt (A.J.S.).....	195	Ephraim, 3.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eusebius (bishop of	356	Evans, John.....	372
Engine.....	196	Ephraim, 4.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Thessalonica).....	356	Evans, John.....	372
England, Church of.....	197	Ephraim, 1.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eusebius.....	356	Evans, John.....	372
Engles, Joseph Pat-	208	Ephraim, 2.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eustathius of Anti-	356	Evans, John.....	372
erson.....	208	Ephraim, 3.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	och.....	356	Evans, John.....	372
Engles, William M.....	208	Ephraim, 4.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eustathius of Thes-	356	Evans, John.....	372
English Versions of	208	Ephraim, 1.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	salonica (A.J.S.).....	356	Evans, John.....	372
the Bible.....	208	Ephraim, 2.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eustathius (bishop	356	Evans, John.....	372
Engrave.....	223	Ephraim, 3.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	of Sebaste).....	356	Evans, John.....	372
En-haddah.....	223	Ephraim, 4.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eustathius.....	356	Evans, John.....	372
En-hakkore.....	223	Ephraim, 1.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eustathius of Con-	356	Evans, John.....	372
En-harod.....	223	Ephraim, 2.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	stantinople.....	356	Evans, John.....	372
En-hazor.....	223	Ephraim, 3.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eutychianus.....	356	Evans, John.....	372
En-mishpat.....	223	Ephraim, 4.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eutychianus.....	356	Evans, John.....	372
Enmity.....	223	Ephraim, 1.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eutychianus.....	356	Evans, John.....	372
Ennodius.....	224	Ephraim, 2.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eutychianus.....	356	Evans, John.....	372
Enoch, 1.....	224	Ephraim, 3.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eutychianus.....	356	Evans, John.....	372
Enoch, 2.....	224	Ephraim, 4.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eutychianus.....	356	Evans, John.....	372
Enoch, 3.....	224	Ephraim, 1.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eutychianus.....	356	Evans, John.....	372
Enoch, 4.....	225	Ephraim, 2.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eutychianus.....	356	Evans, John.....	372
Enoch, 5.....	225	Ephraim, 3.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eutychianus.....	356	Evans, John.....	372
Enoch, 6.....	225	Ephraim, 4.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eutychianus.....	356	Evans, John.....	372
Enoch, Book of.....	225	Ephraim, 1.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eutychianus.....	356	Evans, John.....	372
Enos.....	230	Ephraim, 2.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eutychianus.....	356	Evans, John.....	372
En-irimon.....	230	Ephraim, 3.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eutychianus.....	356	Evans, John.....	372
En-rogel.....	230	Ephraim, 4.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eutychianus.....	356	Evans, John.....	372
Enrolment.....	231	Ephraim, 1.....	255	Eshkalkonite.....	298	Eutychianus.....	356	Evans, John.....	372



Foster, Benjamin (L. E.S.).....	Page 628	Frédet (J.W.M.).....	Page 663	Fulness.....	Page 692	Gall, St., monastery	Page 757
Foster, James (L.E.S.).....	629	Fresco Painting (G. F.C.).....	664	Fulvia.....	693	Gall, St., Manuscript	722
Foster, John (L.E.S.).....	629	Fresenius (A.J.S.).....	664	Functionaries.....	693	Galland.....	722
Fothergill (J.W.M.).....	629	Frey, Jean L. (J.W.M.).....	664	Fundamentals.....	693	Gallas (A.J.S.).....	722
Foucher (J.W.M.).....	629	Frey, Joseph S. C. F. (L.E.S.).....	664	Funeral.....	694	Gallaudet.....	723
Fouhls (J.W.M.).....	629	Freylinghausen (J. N.P.).....	665	Funeral Discourses.....	696	Gallery.....	723
Foundling Hospitals (J.W.M.).....	631	Friedl (J.W.M.).....	665	Furlog.....	697	Gallery (of a church)	723
Fountain.....	631	Friedl (J.W.M.).....	665	Furnace (L.E.S.).....	697	Galluz.....	724
Fountain-gate.....	632	Frick, Albert (J.W.M.).....	665	Furnaces, Tower of.....	698	Galla, 1.....	758
Fouqueré (J.W.M.).....	632	Frick, Elias.....	665	Furneaux (J.W.M.).....	698	Galla, 2.....	758
Fouquet (J.S.M.).....	632	Frick, Johann (J.W.M.).....	665	Furniture.....	698	Galla, 3.....	759
Fourier, François C. M.....	633	Fridin.....	665	Furrow.....	698	Galla, 4.....	759
Fourier, Pierre (J.W.M.).....	633	Friedlander (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Furrows.....	699	Galla, 5.....	759
Fournmont (J.W.M.).....	633	Friedrich.....	666	Fury (J.P.W.).....	699	Galla, 6.....	760
Fowler.....	634	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Gal.....	699	Galla, 7.....	760
Fowler, Christopher (J.W.M.).....	635	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Gaal.....	699	Galla, 8.....	760
Fowler, Edward.....	636	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 9.....	760
Fowler, Orin.....	636	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 10.....	760
Fowles (J.W.M.).....	636	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 11.....	760
Fox, Edward.....	638	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 12.....	760
Fox, George.....	638	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 13.....	760
Fox, John.....	639	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 14.....	760
Fox, Richard (J.W.M.).....	639	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 15.....	760
Fox, William J.....	639	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 16.....	760
Frache (J.W.M.).....	639	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 17.....	760
France.....	639	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 18.....	760
Francis of Assisi.....	648	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 19.....	760
Francis of Borja.....	649	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 20.....	760
Francis of Paula.....	649	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 21.....	760
Francis of Sale.....	650	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 22.....	760
Francis, Converse.....	650	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 23.....	760
Francis I (J.W.M.).....	650	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 24.....	760
Franciscans (A.J.S.).....	650	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 25.....	760
Franisco de Vittorio (J.W.M.).....	662	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 26.....	760
Franeke, August H.....	652	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 27.....	760
Franeke, Theophil A. (J.W.M.).....	653	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 28.....	760
Franeke, Egidius (J.P.W.).....	654	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 29.....	760
Franeke, Christian (J.W.M.).....	654	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 30.....	760
Franois, Laurent (J.W.M.).....	654	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 31.....	760
François de Toulouse (J.W.M.).....	654	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 32.....	760
Francus.....	654	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 33.....	760
Frank.....	654	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 34.....	760
Frankenberg.....	655	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 35.....	760
Frankfurt, Council of.....	655	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 36.....	760
Frankfurter (J.H. W.).....	655	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 37.....	760
Frankincense.....	655	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 38.....	760
Frantz.....	657	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 39.....	760
Fraser, Alexander (J.W.M.).....	657	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 40.....	760
Fraser, James (J.W.M.).....	657	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 41.....	760
Frassen.....	657	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 42.....	760
Fraternity (A.J.S.).....	657	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 43.....	760
Fraticelli.....	658	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 44.....	760
Frands.....	658	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 45.....	760
Fransimons.....	658	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 46.....	760
Fransigie (J.W.M.).....	658	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 47.....	760
Frederiks (J.P.W.).....	659	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 48.....	760
Free Congregations (A.J.S.).....	659	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 49.....	760
Freedom.....	659	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 50.....	760
Free Offering.....	659	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 51.....	760
Freeké (J.W.M.).....	659	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 52.....	760
Freeman.....	660	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 53.....	760
Freeman, James.....	660	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 54.....	760
Free Religious Association (A.J.S.).....	660	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 55.....	760
Free-thinkers.....	660	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 56.....	760
Frehlinghusen, Theodor J. (W.J.R. T.).....	660	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 57.....	760
Frehlinghusen, Rev. Theodore (W.J.R. T.).....	660	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 58.....	760
Frehlinghusen, John (W.J.R.T.).....	660	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 59.....	760
Frehlinghusen, Theodor (W.J.R.T.).....	661	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 60.....	760
French, William.....	661	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 61.....	760
French Prophets.....	661	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 62.....	760
French Versions.....	662	Friedrich (J.H. J.W.M.).....	666	Caal.....	699	Galla, 63.....	760

Geoffrey of Monmouth.....Page	790	Geshnri.....Page	840	Giraldu Cambrensis.....Page	875	Gollus, Petrus (d.P. W.).....Page	920	Grant, Johnson, Page	166
Geography.....Page	790	Gessellus (J.P.W.)	841	Girdle.....	876	Gomar.....	920	Grantianum.....	166
Geology.....Page	794	Gessler.....	841	Girdle.....	876	Gomer, 1.....	920	Granville (J.N.P.)	966
Geon.....Page	809	Gether.....	841	Girgashite.....	877	Gomer, 2.....	921	Grapp.....	966
George (duke of Saxony).....Page	809	Geth-emane.....	842	Gishborne.....	878	Gomorra.....	922	Grapphus (A.J.S.)	967
George (elector).....Page	809	Geuel.....	842	Gischala.....	878	Gomorra.....	922	Grass.....	967
George, Bishop Enoch (G.L.T.).....Page	809	Geulinx (A.J.S.)	843	Gisp.....	878	Gondulf.....	922	Grass-hopper.....	968
George of Laodicea.....Page	810	Gezert.....	843	Gita.....	878	Gonestus.....	922	Gratian.....	968
George of Polenz.....Page	810	Ghazzali.....	843	Githal-hepher.....	878	Gonfalou.....	922	Gratianus.....	969
George of Trebizond.....Page	810	Ghislain.....	843	Gittaim.....	878	Gonzalez de Berceo (A.J.S.).....	922	Gratus.....	969
George (Prince of Anhalt).....Page	810	Ghislain.....	844	Gittite.....	879	Gonzalez, Tirso.....	922	Graul (A.J.S.).....	169
George, St.....Page	811	Ghost.....	844	Githith.....	879	Good.....	922	Grave.....	970
George the Arrian.....Page	811	ghostly.....	844	Giton.....	879	Good, John Mason.....	923	Gravel.....	971
George the Pisidian.....Page	811	Giah.....	844	Gitolagita (A.J.S.)	879	Good, John Friday.....	923	Graven Image.....	171
Georgia (A.J.S.).....Page	812	Giant.....	846	Glanvil.....	880	Goode.....	924	Graverol.....	171
Georgian Language.....Page	812	Gib.....	846	Glaophya.....	880	Goode.....	924	Graves, Hiram Atwill (L.E.S.).....	971
Georgian Version.....Page	812	Gibbar.....	846	Glaucus (J.N.P.)	880	Goodel.....	924	Graves, Richard.....	972
Georgius Synecellus.....Page	812	Gibbethon.....	846	Glas.....	880	Goody Trees.....	924	Graving.....	172
Gepirus.....Page	813	Gibbites.....	846	Glass-painting (G.P. C.).....	882	Goodman, Christopher.....	924	Gray.....	973
Gera, 1.....Page	814	Gibbon.....	847	Glab, Salomo.....	882	Goodman, Godfrey.....	925	Gray, James.....	973
Gera, 2.....Page	814	Gibbons.....	847	Glastonbury.....	883	Goodness of God.....	925	Gray, Robert.....	973
Gera, 3.....Page	814	Gibborim.....	848	Glatz (A.J.S.).....	883	Goodrich, Chauncey Allen.....	925	Great Britain and Ireland (A.J.S.)	974
Gerah.....Page	814	Gibbs.....	848	Glebe.....	883	Goodrich, Elizabeth.....	925	Greaves.....	975
Gerardo.....Page	814	Gibeah of Benjamin.....	849	Glede.....	883	Goodrich, Thomas.....	925	Greca.....	975
Gerar.....Page	814	Gibeah of Judah.....	849	Glendy.....	884	Goodwin, John.....	926	Grecaian.....	975
Gerard, Alexander.....Page	815	Gibeah of Philistines.....	849	Glendorely.....	884	Goodwin, Thomas.....	926	Greecian Architecture (G.F.C.).....	975
Gerard, Gilbert.....Page	815	Gibeon.....	849	Gloria.....	885	Gopher.....	926	Greece.....	979
Gerard, Thom.....Page	815	Gibeonite.....	849	Gloria Patri.....	885	Gophus.....	927	Greece, Kingdom of (A.J.S.).....	982
Gerasa.....Page	815	Gibon, Edmund.....	850	Gloria, James H.....	886	Gordun, James L.....	927	Greek Church (A.J.S.).....	982
Gerassene.....Page	816	Gibon, Robert.....	853	Gloria (ray of light) (G.F.C.).....	887	Gordon, Robert.....	927	Greek Church, United (A.J.S.).....	986
Gerauld.....Page	816	Gibon, Tobias.....	853	Gloss.....	887	Gordun, Thomas.....	928	Greckish.....	986
Gerbals.....Page	817	Gibson, William.....	853	Glosses (J.N.P.).....	889	Gordon Case.....	928	Greck Language.....	986
Gerberon.....Page	817	Gicht.....	854	Gloves.....	889	Gortun (A.J.S.).....	928	Greck Versions.....	988
Gerbert.....Page	817	Giddald.....	854	Gloncester.....	889	Gorkum, the Martyrs of (A.J.S.).....	928	Green, Ashbel.....	990
Gerbillon.....Page	817	Gidde, 1.....	854	Gloves.....	889	Gorkun, J.W.M.....	928	Green, William.....	991
Gerdes.....Page	817	Gidde, 2.....	854	Gnutton.....	889	Goshen, 1.....	928	Greenfield.....	991
Gerdil.....Page	817	Giddings.....	854	Gnaphens (J.P.W.).....	889	Goshen, 2.....	932	Greenham.....	991
Gerdes.....Page	817	Gideon.....	855	Gnash.....	889	Goshen, 3.....	932	Greenhill.....	991
Gerdes.....Page	817	Gideonite.....	855	Gnash.....	889	Gospel.....	932	Greenland (A.J.S.)	991
Gerhard, Joh. P., 1.....Page	818	Gidon.....	855	Gnat.....	890	Gospel, side of the Altar.....	932	Greenwood.....	991
Gerhard, Joh. E., 2.....Page	818	Gier-eagle.....	855	Gnat.....	890	Gospeller.....	932	Greenwood.....	991
Gerhard, St.....Page	818	Gieseler.....	855	Gnosticism (C.P.W.).....	890	Gospels.....	932	Greenwood.....	991
Gerhardt.....Page	819	Giffen (J.P.W.).....	855	Gnosticism (C.P.W.).....	890	Gospels, Spurious.....	932	Gregoire.....	991
Gerhoch (A.J.S.).....Page	819	Giffen, Spiritual.....	859	Goad (A.J.S.).....	896	Gospels, Spurious.....	932	Gregorius (E. de S.)	992
Gerizim.....Page	823	Giffith (J.N.P.).....	861	Goad.....	896	Gospell, Simon, 1.....	951	Gregorian Chant.....	992
Gerlach.....Page	823	Giger.....	861	Goad, Thomas.....	897	Gospell, Simon, 2.....	951	Gregorius Agrigenus.....	993
Gerle (J.W.M.).....Page	823	Gihon, 1.....	862	Goady.....	897	Gothic Architecture (G.F.C.).....	942	Gregorius Alexandrinus.....	993
German, St., en Laye.....Page	823	Gihon, 2.....	862	Goady.....	897	Gothic Version.....	949	Gregorius Antiochenensis.....	993
German, St., Manuscripts.....Page	823	Gilalal.....	863	Goady.....	897	Gothus.....	950	Gregorius Casariensis.....	993
German Catholics (A.J.S.).....Page	823	Gilbert de la Porrée.....	864	Goady.....	897	Gotschke.....	950	Gregorius Constantinensis.....	993
German Ref. Ch. in America (E.V.G.).....Page	824	Gilbert, Alphalet W.....	864	Goady.....	897	Gotte, Thomas.....	951	Gregorius Nazianzenus.....	993
Germanus I.....Page	831	Gilbert, Gad Smith.....	864	Gobal (A.J.S.).....	900	Gottschalk.....	951	Gregorius Nyssenus.....	196
Germanus II.....Page	831	Gilbert, Joseph.....	864	Goblet.....	900	Gotte, William.....	951	Gregorius Syracusanus.....	997
Germanus III.....Page	831	Gilbert, Sempringham, St.....	864	Goch.....	900	Goulart, Simon, 1.....	951	Gregorius Turonensis.....	997
Germanus of Auxerre, St.....Page	832	Gilboa.....	864	Goch.....	900	Goulart, Simon, 2.....	951	Gregorius Neo-Cesariensis.....	997
Germanus, St. (of Paris).....Page	832	Gilda.....	865	Goch.....	900	Goulding.....	952	Gregorius of Armenia.....	997
German Versions.....Page	832	Gilder.....	865	Goch.....	900	Gour, Jonathan.....	952	Gregorius of Bactria.....	997
Germany, Ancient Religion of (J.N.P.).....Page	834	Gilead, 1.....	866	Goch.....	900	Gourds, Wild.....	953	Gregorius of Heimburg.....	997
Germany, History of Christianity in (A.J.S.).....Page	834	Gilead, Balm of.....	866	Goch.....	900	Gousset.....	953	Gregorius of Constantinople.....	198
Gerobolus (J.P.W.).....Page	825	Gilead, 2.....	866	Goch.....	900	Gouttes (J.N.P.).....	954	Gregory I.....	1001
Geroda.....Page	825	Gilead, 3.....	866	Goch.....	900	Governor.....	954	Gregory II.....	1001
Gerodian.....Page	825	Gilead, 4.....	866	Goch.....	900	Govina (A.J.S.).....	954	Gregory III.....	1001
Gershon, 1.....Page	826	Gilead, 5.....	866	Goch.....	900	Gozan.....	954	Gregory IV.....	1001
Gershon, 2.....Page	826	Gilead, 6.....	866	Goch.....	900	Grabal.....	954	Gregory V.....	1001
Gershon, 3.....Page	826	Gileadite.....	866	Goch.....	900	Grabe.....	954	Gregory VI (anti-pope).....	1001
Gershon, 4.....Page	826	Giles.....	866	Goch.....	900	Grace, Letters of.....	954	Gregory VII.....	1001
Gershon.....Page	826	Giles, John, 1.....	866	Goch.....	900	Grace at Meads.....	954	Gregory VIII.....	1001
Gershonite.....Page	826	Giles, John, 2.....	866	Goch.....	900	Gradual.....	954	Gregory IX.....	1004
Gerson, Jean C.....Page	826	Gilly, David.....	866	Goch.....	900	Graduate.....	954	Gregory X.....	1004
Gertrude, St., 1.....Page	828	Gilly, William S.....	866	Goch.....	900	Graefte.....	954	Gregory XI.....	1005
Gertrude, St., 2.....Page	828	Gilman.....	866	Goch.....	900	Graft.....	954	Gregory XII.....	1005
Gertruda.....Page	828	Gilman.....	866	Goch.....	900	Grafton (L.E.S.).....	964	Gregory VI (anti-pope).....	1001
Gervaise, François-Armand.....Page	828	Gilman.....	866	Goch.....	900	Grafton, Isabella.....	964	Gregory VII.....	1001
Gervaise and Protase.....Page	828	Gilman.....	866	Goch.....	900	Graham, Mary Jane.....	964	Gregory VIII.....	1001
Gervaise of Canterbury (J.W.M.).....Page	829	Gilman.....	866	Goch.....	900	Graham, Robert.....	964	Gregory IX.....	1004
Gesem.....Page	829	Gilman.....	866	Goch.....	900	Grain.....	964	Gregory X.....	1004
Gesenius, Friedrich H. W.....Page	829	Gilman.....	866	Goch.....	900	Gramma.....	964	Gregory XI.....	1005
Gesenius, Justus (N.P.).....Page	829	Gilman.....	866	Goch.....	900	Gramm.....	964	Gregory XII.....	1005
Gesham.....Page	829	Gilman.....	866	Goch.....	900	Grand.....	964	Gregory XIII.....	1005
Geshem.....Page	829	Gilman.....	866	Goch.....	900	Grandmont (A.J.S.)	965	Gregory XIV.....	1005
Geshim.....Page	829	Gilman.....	866	Goch.....	900	Grange (G.F.C.).....	965	Gregory XV.....	1005
Geshur.....Page	829	Gilman.....	866	Goch.....	900	Grant, Asahel.....	965	Gregory XVI.....	1005
Geshur.....Page	829	Gilman.....	866	Goch.....	900	Grant, Asahel.....	965	Gregory XVII.....	1005

LIST OF ARTICLES IN VOL. III.

Gregory XIII. Page	1005	Griswold (J.W.M.)	1013	Guardian of the	Guillon..... Page	1029	Gunther (A.J.S.)	1031
Gregory XIV.....	1005	Page	1013	Spiritualities, Page	Gully.....	1029	Page	1031
Gregory XV.....	1005	Grits.....	1013	Guarin.....	Guiscard (J.W.M.)	1029	Gur.....	1031
Gregory XVI.....	1005	Grizzled.....	1013	Guastallines.....	Guise, House of (J. W.M.).....	1029	Gurbaal.....	1031
Gregory, George.....	1006	Groin (G.F.C.).....	1013	Gude.....	Guise, W.M.).....	1029	Gurley (J.W.M.).....	1031
Gregory, John.....	1006	Groningenis.....	1013	Gudgodah.....	Guise, Charles (J. W.M.).....	1029	Gurnall (J.W.M.).....	1031
Gregory, Olinthus		(Groot.....	1013	Gudule.....	Guise, W.M.).....	1029	Gurney (W.J.A.).....	1031
Gilbert.....	1006	Gropper.....	1013	Guédier de Saint-	Guise, François of		Gury (A.J.S.).....	1031
Gillet (W.J.A.).....	1006	Grosseteste (G.F. H.).....	1013	Aubin.....	Guise, Henry of Lor-		Gustavus I (A.J.S.)	1031
Greslon.....	1006	Grosseteste (G.F. H.).....	1013	Guelphs and Ghi-	Guise, Henry of Lor-		Gustavus II (A.J.S.)	1031
Gretser.....	1007	Grosstete.....	1017	bellines (J.W.M.)	Guise, raine.....	1030	Gustavus-Adolphus	1031
Greve, Egbert Jan.	1007	Grosvenor.....	1017	Guénée.....	Gulf.....	1030	Society.....	1031
Greve, Jan.....	1007	Grotius.....	1017	Guertler (J.H.P.)..	Gullich (J.P.W.)..	1030	Guthrie (J.W.M.)..	1031
Grey, Richard.....	1007	Grove.....	1021	Guest-chamber....	Gulloth.....	1030	Guthrie.....	1031
Grey, Zachary.....	1007	Grove, Henry.....	1023	Guibert de Nogent	Gundulf.....	1031	Gutter.....	1031
Greyhound.....	1007	Gruber.....	1023	(J.W.M.).....	Gunn, 1.....	1031	Gutzlaff.....	1031
Grief.....	1007	Gruner.....	1023	Guibert (anti-pope)	Gunn, 2.....	1031	Guyot.....	1031
Grie-bach.....	1008	Grynæus, Johann.	1023	Guide.....	Gunite.....	1031	Guyot.....	1031
Griffen (G.B.D.)..	1010	Grynæus, Johann J.	1023	Guido de Arezzo... 1027	Gunn, Walter (M. L.S.).....	1031	Guyse.....	1031
Griffin, Edmund		Grynæus, Simon, 1	1024	Guido de Bres... 1027	Gunn, William (J. W.M.).....	1031	Gymnasium.....	1031
Dorr.....	1011	Grynæus, Simon, 2	1024	Guignard (J.N.P.)	Gunn, William (J. W.M.).....	1031	Gymnosophists.....	1031
Griffin, Edward D.	1011	Grynæus, Thomas.	1024	Guignes (J.W.M.)..	Gunning.....	1031	Gypsies (J.W.M.)..	1031
Griffith (L.E.S.)..	1011	Gualbert.....	1024	Guild.....	Gunning.....	1031	Gyrovagi.....	1031
Grimshaw.....	1011	Gualter.....	1024	Guilds (J.W.M.)..	Gunpowder Plot (J. W.M.).....	1032	Elliott.....	1032
Grind.....	1011	Guard.....	1024	Guillemine (J.N.P.)				
Grindal.....	1012	Guardian Angel... 1025						

END OF VOL. III.









